The Effect of the Number of Clinical Bracket Points on the Accuracy of Curve Fitted to Dental Arch Form by 3D Method
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Abstract

Background and Aim: Adjustment of an accurate curve to the dental arch is an important part of orthodontic treatment. Our goal was comparing the fitting accuracy of two curves constructed by different numbers of clinical bracket points (CBP) to the dental arch form using 4th degree polynomial function.

Materials and Methods: A mathematical formula associated with a polynomial function was used to reconstruct the dental arch forms of 18 adolescents (18 casts) with normal occlusion. CBPs were marked on every tooth present in each maxillary and mandibular model (second molar to second molar) using an orthodontic bracket positioning gauge. A coordinate measuring machine (CMM) was used to record the coordinates of each CBP (x, y). Then a curve fitting software was used to obtain the best 4th degree polynomial function and the associated curve fitted to all 14 CBPs. Another polynomial 4th degree function curve was obtained for the same models using CBPs only on central incisors, canines and second molars. Curves for each model were compared using statistical values including correlation coefficient, standard error, sum of residuals and R^2.

Results: The mean root squares for curves fitted to 14 points in all samples were 0.8855 and it was 0.9629 when 6 points were compared with 14 points. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) between curves fitted to 6 and 14 points was 0.946 in mandible, 0.983 in maxilla and 0.969 for both.

Conclusion: Six CBPs were enough for proper fitting of 4th degree polynomial function to dental arch forms of both jaws.
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Introduction

One of the principal factors associated with orthodontic treatment planning is determination of the patient’s dental arch form [1,2]. Determination of a suitable dental arch in order to achieve the principal goals of orthodontic treatment i.e., esthetics and functional and stable occlusion has been a matter of concern for long. Triangular mandibular arch form was considered functionally suitable for the first time [3]. Later descriptions of suitable arch form consisted of semi-elliptical [4], sagittal [5] catenary [6] and trifocal-elliptical [7] In recent
years, cubic spine mathematical formulas [8], cubical sections [9], beta functions [10] and polynomial functions [11] have been utilized to predict and describe dental arch forms. Along with the efforts on an exact description of dental arch form, obtaining suitable points in order to trace dental arch is an additional challenge. In some investigations, centers of incisal edges and buccal cusp tips have been used for tracing the dental arch [12,13]. Since the aim of dental arch form determination is to create a guide for placement of brackets and selection of a proper wire type, some studies have prioritized use of facial surface points as well as points of clinical bracket attachment. [14-17]

Devices used to digitally record coordinations of the pertinent points included radiographic devices [14], photocopiers [18], two-dimensional scanners [16] and Coordinate Measuring Machine [CMM] [10] CMM is a meticulous coordinate registration system used in industry and research projects and is widely utilized in reverse engineering of structures, military industries etc.

The aim of the current study was to evaluate the effect of decrease in number of clinical bracket attachment points in accuracy of tracing dental arch with the use of Coordinate Measuring Machine.

Materials and Methods
This diagnostic experimental study was performed on orthodontic casts of 18 mature people with class I normal occlusion. All selected casts had fully erupted permanent teeth without any problem such as wear, fracture, ectopic eruption, crowding and midline deviation from permanent second molar on one side to permanent second molar to the other side.

All models were painted black using a brush and a soluble black dye (Pars, Tehran, Iran) in order to produce maximal contrast. Then, clinical bracket attachment points were finely marked on each tooth using a white-colored nail polish (Nail Design Polish, Victoria, Taiwan) and an orthodontic gauge (Unitek, USA) according to the bracket placement guide for pre-adjusted appliances [19] (see fig.1)

Spatial coordinate of these points were measured by a Coordinate Measuring Machine (Mora, Aschaffenburg, Germany) with an accuracy of 10 ± 0.01 micro-meters and digitally saved as .txt formatted files. (See fig.2). A curve fitting software (Curve Expert Professional version 1.01) was used for adaptation of the best polynomial (Y=Ax^4+Bx^3+Cx^2+Dx+E) to each coordinate related to the casts. In order to trace the dental arch, the Z coordinate for each point was considered zero [10]. This software uses the least square technique to find the best adaptable curve on a series of points. This is a precise method to adapt a curve on points with known coordinates. [20] The form of the curve, correlation coefficient of the points with the resultant function, squared sum of residuals and standard error was calculated and saved by the software. Then, within the primary. txt file, coordinates of the lateral, first and second premo-
lar and first and second molar teeth were omitted and the results were saved as another .txt file containing coordinates of selected teeth including central incisors, canines, and second molars. Then the whole procedure performed in the primary file on all 14 points was done on the new file and the results were saved. In the next step a customized function was defined in the software for each cast by using function coefficients obtained from coordinates of the selected points in the previous step. Afterwards, the coordinates of the primary .txt file pertaining to each cast which contained all 14 clinical bracket attachment points was entered in the customized function of the cast and correlation coefficient, squared sum of the residuals and standard error was calculated and recorded. (Figs.3 and 4)

Figure 3: right: A curve obtained from 14 points. Left: A curve obtained from 6 points. Both curves are related to a same cast

Figure 4: Representation of mathematical properties of the fourteen-point curve showed in fig.3

Descriptive statistical measurements including mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum were separately performed for maxillary and mandibular casts. Root mean square (RMS) was used to compare curves in both conditions. This criteria is a standard mathematical method to evaluate similarity between two curves. The smaller the RMS, the higher will be the similarity between the real and proposed model. Also, in order to evaluate validity of data obtained from the two methods, intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was used. SPSS version 16 for Windows was used as the statistical tool.

Results
The results showed that the mean recorded measurements were 69.98740 mm with the range of 0.004 and standard deviation of 0.016. The difference between measurements and real values were -0.0066mm. The results of descriptive statistical analysis is represented in table 1. The mean correlation coefficient between 14 points and the adapted curved thereupon for all samples was 0.996 (SD=0.006) The mean correlation coefficient between 14 points and the adapted curved upon 6 selected points for all samples was 0.995 (SD =0.004) The mean RMS for all samples in the curve obtained from 14 points was 0.8855 . The same value was 0.9629 for the curve obtained from 6 points after adaptation of 14 relevant points. ICC for the RMS of the obtained curves from 14 and 6 points was 0.946 in mandible, 0.983 in maxilla and 0.969 for the whole samples.

Discussion
In the present study the mean correlation coefficient of 14 clinical bracket attachment points and the curve obtained from 6 selected clinical bracket attachment points (including central incisors, canines and second molars) was 0.995 (SD =0.004) In comparison with correlation coefficient of 14 clinical bracket attachment points with their specific curves in each cast (0.996 with SD =0.006), the aforementioned method had a very good accuracy.

Theoretically the higher the degree of the polynomial function, the higher will be the adaptability of the curve with the points. On the other hand, such increase causes distortions that limit clinical application of the curve. Quartic functions have been used in some other investigations as well [11, 22, 23]. Some authors suggested six-degree polynomials for
better adaptation [16]. It has been observed that in case index points are used in all teeth, use of six-degree polynomials can cause the aforementioned distortions. This is in accordance with the study carried out by Kageyama and co-workers [22]. The results of the present study show that use of a four-degree polynomial with the suggested points can provide a model with an adequate accuracy. On the other hand, it is easier to customize a model for each cast if four-degree polynomials are used in comparison with six-degree functions due to lower number of terms in each equation. Braun and colleagues made use of a coordinate measuring machine to form dental arches using midpoints of incisal edges and buc

Table 1: correlation coefficient of adaptation of clinical buccal points with the curve adjusted upon 14 and 6 buccal points in maxilla and mandible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample number</th>
<th>RMS* 14 points mandible</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient 14 points mandible</th>
<th>RMS 6 points mandible</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient 6 points mandible</th>
<th>RMS 14 points maxilla</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient 14 points maxilla</th>
<th>RMS 6 points maxilla</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient 6 points maxilla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87400</td>
<td>0.99772</td>
<td>0.88110</td>
<td>0.98866</td>
<td>1.77700</td>
<td>0.96795</td>
<td>1.81420</td>
<td>0.99019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41100</td>
<td>0.99347</td>
<td>1.43000</td>
<td>0.99177</td>
<td>1.03700</td>
<td>0.99505</td>
<td>1.04520</td>
<td>0.99129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02000</td>
<td>0.99669</td>
<td>1.06600</td>
<td>0.99100</td>
<td>2.25000</td>
<td>0.98694</td>
<td>2.30880</td>
<td>0.98255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.95390</td>
<td>0.99733</td>
<td>0.95950</td>
<td>0.99485</td>
<td>1.63070</td>
<td>0.99299</td>
<td>1.82360</td>
<td>0.98876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.30210</td>
<td>0.99512</td>
<td>1.63420</td>
<td>0.99164</td>
<td>1.30100</td>
<td>0.99512</td>
<td>1.62320</td>
<td>0.99190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.91800</td>
<td>0.99758</td>
<td>0.92000</td>
<td>0.99517</td>
<td>1.64600</td>
<td>0.99289</td>
<td>1.66940</td>
<td>0.99115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.51960</td>
<td>0.99878</td>
<td>0.52200</td>
<td>0.99820</td>
<td>0.46720</td>
<td>0.99922</td>
<td>0.48770</td>
<td>0.99808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.89320</td>
<td>0.99699</td>
<td>1.30080</td>
<td>0.99699</td>
<td>0.48730</td>
<td>0.99911</td>
<td>0.49200</td>
<td>0.99785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.84210</td>
<td>0.99644</td>
<td>0.79100</td>
<td>0.99789</td>
<td>0.59230</td>
<td>0.99872</td>
<td>0.63130</td>
<td>0.99819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.14010</td>
<td>0.99620</td>
<td>1.30520</td>
<td>0.99489</td>
<td>0.97550</td>
<td>0.99616</td>
<td>0.95870</td>
<td>0.99690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.15290</td>
<td>0.99590</td>
<td>1.30130</td>
<td>0.99512</td>
<td>0.62840</td>
<td>0.99892</td>
<td>0.78690</td>
<td>0.99604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.81320</td>
<td>0.99020</td>
<td>1.91030</td>
<td>0.98281</td>
<td>0.58590</td>
<td>0.99848</td>
<td>0.72750</td>
<td>0.99701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.72061</td>
<td>0.99774</td>
<td>0.78280</td>
<td>0.99490</td>
<td>0.39730</td>
<td>0.99939</td>
<td>0.45740</td>
<td>0.99805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.42940</td>
<td>0.99920</td>
<td>0.44720</td>
<td>0.99901</td>
<td>0.33480</td>
<td>0.99957</td>
<td>0.40000</td>
<td>0.99910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.44400</td>
<td>0.99913</td>
<td>0.50140</td>
<td>0.99949</td>
<td>0.42920</td>
<td>0.99934</td>
<td>0.49780</td>
<td>0.99930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.35150</td>
<td>0.99947</td>
<td>0.36540</td>
<td>0.99704</td>
<td>0.50140</td>
<td>0.99908</td>
<td>0.54180</td>
<td>0.99847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.34240</td>
<td>0.99910</td>
<td>0.44230</td>
<td>0.99960</td>
<td>0.78510</td>
<td>0.99758</td>
<td>0.79680</td>
<td>0.99680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.37790</td>
<td>0.99924</td>
<td>0.50210</td>
<td>0.99904</td>
<td>0.46900</td>
<td>0.99923</td>
<td>0.54110</td>
<td>0.99860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of samples</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean total RMS*</td>
<td>0.9858728</td>
<td>0.9970160</td>
<td>0.9479222</td>
<td>0.9948925</td>
<td>0.9052833</td>
<td>0.9953186</td>
<td>0.9779667</td>
<td>0.9950136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.40475982</td>
<td>0.00235403</td>
<td>0.45394107</td>
<td>0.00438561</td>
<td>0.57615526</td>
<td>0.00759695</td>
<td>0.59558425</td>
<td>0.00463166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum RMS*</td>
<td>0.35150</td>
<td>0.99020</td>
<td>0.36540</td>
<td>0.98281</td>
<td>0.33480</td>
<td>0.96795</td>
<td>0.40000</td>
<td>0.98255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum RMS*</td>
<td>1.81320</td>
<td>0.99947</td>
<td>1.91030</td>
<td>0.99960</td>
<td>2.25000</td>
<td>0.99957</td>
<td>2.30880</td>
<td>0.99930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RMS* = Residual Mean Square
Polynomial function such as $Y = A x^2 + B x^2$ can accurately fit the beta function suggested by Braun et al. They calculated arch width distance between distobuccal cusps of second molars, arch width distance between cusp tips of canines and arch depth from the midpoint on incisal edge to the connecting line between the canine cusp tips and arch depth up to the connecting line of the distobuccal cusp tips of second molars in order to calculate the coefficients of A and B. Then, correlation coefficient of 18 points including midpoints of incisal edge and all buccal cusp tips which were digitized by a photocopier, a scanner and AutoCad software on each dental cast with Angle’s class I normal occlusion were measured according to the pertinent curves. They obtained a correlation coefficient of 0.98 (SD=0.02). Also, the minimum RMS was calculated using of the mentioned formula, with the mean of 0.6058 for all casts, therefore the aforementioned polynomial was in a high accordance with the beta function. The advantage of the suggested function in their study was lack of decrease in intercanine width in comparison with beta function [24]. In the current study, the selected index points for arch determination were clinical bracket attachment points. In addition, digitization of these points with the use of CMM has a higher accuracy in comparison with photocopier and scanner. It can also be said that correlation coefficient of all clinical bracket attachment points with the use of the obtained function was more than that obtained by the selected points. This can be due to some factors; firstly, selected points used to create a model in this study were samples of points whose adaptation with the 6-point model had been previously evaluated. Secondly, within the polynomial models used in this study none of the terms had a zero coefficient. Thirdly, mean RMS for all samples in the current study showed a higher value in adaptation of 14 points with the resultant curve and 14 points with a curve resulted from 6 points. This was due to the comparison of both conditions with a polynomial function but not a beta function.

Trivino et al [16] marked and scanned midfacial points on mandibular teeth by attaching 1.5 millimeter balls to classify different dental arch forms in Brazilian population with the use of 6-degree polynomial functions and least square technique. Eventually, 23 dental arch forms were introduced. They used balls to enhance detectability of the points in two-dimensional images obtained from the scanner and to simulate bracket width. Since, brackets have varying dimensions in different teeth, it seems that use of balls with same dimensions can decrease accuracy of measurements to a large extent. In the current study use of CMM and registration of points on teeth caused more accurate correspondence of the obtained dental arches with real conditions.

**Conclusion**

It can be concluded that it is possible to decrease the number of index points required for tracing dental arch from 14 to 6 clinical bracket attachment points from second molar on one side to the other side. The six selected clinical bracket at-
attachment points to trace highly accurate dental arches can be located on central incisors, canines, and second molars in each dental arch.
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