

Is the use of clear aligners a real critical change in oral health prevention and treatment?

G. Galluccio

DS, DDS - Associate Professor of Orthodontics and Clinical Gnatology, Department of Oral and Maxillo Facial Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, Sapienza University of Rome

Abstract

The introduction, in the late years of the last century, of clear aligners therapy (CAT) has drastically changed the approach' perspective to orthodontic treatment. Both patients and clinicians' expectations appear to be addressed with clear aligner therapy achieving an aesthetic appearance and fewer side effects, mainly due to the difficult maintenance of proper oral hygiene in the conventional fixed approach.

Research has partially confirmed these key points of CAT but similarly revealed several limitations to the overall benefit of this treatment. Both the aforementioned key points of the CAT are currently under discussion: the aesthetic appearance is not uniform, due to the presence in some cases of extensive need for attachments, and the better periodontal conditions are certainly present in the CAT but mainly limited to the short term.

This critical review of the state of the art clarifies the gray areas, such as to inform the researcher with the aim of elaborating an adequate study design in order to evaluate the advantages and limitations of this orthodontic approach. *Clin Ter 2021; 172 (2):113-115. doi: 10.7417/CT.2021.2295*

Key words: Clear Aligners, orthodontic aligner, treatment outcome, oral hygiene, aesthetics

The development of clear aligners approach has deeply changed the number of possible treatment alternatives in clinical orthodontics. Corresponding changes has been established in the patient awareness of this therapy, perceived as more esthetic, efficient and safe for the oral health (1).

Since the introduction in 1998 of Invisalign, the first owner orthodontic technique using a series of aligners generated with CAD-CAM system able to slowly drive the teeth gradually into the right position, promises of a global change, both for the orthodontist and the patient, have been claimed (2).

The main change and advantages claimed for the use of clear aligners are related to the aesthetic aspect of the aligners, able to avoid the social complains of the patients

wearing a conventional orthodontic fixed appliance, the possibility to perform correct procedures of oral hygiene since the aligners are removable, and therefore to avoid the onset of decays or periodontal affections, and finally the shortening of the treatment time with a comparable final result.

The related advantages of this newel technique and procedures have been claimed primarily from the companies and needed a quite long time to be confirmed or negated from the literature. This process is obviously still totally in action.

Nevertheless, pointing out of the literature evidence results seems essential for the clinician and the researcher so much that they can correctly choose both clinical uses of these devices and possible further studies aimed to clarify and improve this treatment strategy.

The predominant manufacturing companies' choices of the commercial denomination always recall the idea of "invisible", "clear" or "ethereal" with the aim to underline to patients and clinicians the low visibility of the intraoral devices. The constituent materials are in fact characterized from the transparency, more or less depending on the product, but are consistently confirmed from the laboratory analysis (3,4).

The transparency is the key to fulfill other two goals of this treatment choice: visibility and correlated compliance. The cooperation of the patient is in Clear aligners treatment (CAT) is requested for a total of at least 400 hours of use for each aligner, that means about 20 hours a day before the planned change of the aligner. Due to the possible decay of the elastic properties (5), the cooperation is crucial to the progression from one aligner to the following one.

But though the visibility of the appliance is one of the principal concerns, this seems to be not the only one factor decisive to gain the correct use because, especially in the adolescents, the basic personality traits seem to play a more important role in this aspect (6). Bringing the action to the insertion of compliance control devices into the aligners seems not to change significantly in this aspect (7).

These variables, therefore, suggest the need for a careful choice of candidates to this treatment on a base of previous deeper personality analysis, not considering them automatically compliant because of the aesthetic characteristics of

the devices, moreover in consideration that also children and adolescents seem not to be immune to anxiety and stress - able to deeply influence the offered compliance to the treatment - mainly linked to behavior related response, and sometimes also related to the onset of craniomandibular disorders (8). The possibility of correct compliance is mostly challenging in cases of developmental disability (9).

Some studies in adults, evaluating the oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) and pain level in the initial stage of treatments of patients with clear aligners versus fixed appliances, indicate a lower level for both the aspects for the patients in CA treatment (10). In a recent literature revision, on the other hand, the conclusions relative to OHRQoL in clear aligners therapy compared with fixed appliances therapy are still inconclusive, and a strong need of high-quality RCT studies is evident (11).

A shared strong advantage, claimed for the CA therapy, is the easier maintenance of a good level of oral health, due to the possibility of appliance removing, eliciting a better attitude and behavior towards oral health (12).

The level of tooth brushing and the consequent plaque deposition and the frequency of food intake result to be reduced in the CAT, provided that a oriented oral health procedures instruction is administered during the treatment (13) but in a prospective randomized clinical trial comparing the level of oral hygiene of patient in treatment with CA or fixed appliance (FA), both with conventional brackets (CB) or self-ligating brackets (SLB) - the last type also claimed as better for this aspect (14) - no statistically significant difference was found among the three groups after 18 months of therapy (15).

Among the possible negative collective effects of the orthodontic treatment, particularly of the FA treatment, is there also the develop of surface damage, notably the develop of white lesions (16), and the deterioration of the periodontal status of the patient.

The develop of white spot lesions (WSLs) seems though to be more complex to be analyzed. If a significant lower number of WSLs is developed in patient in CA treatment compared to traditionally treated patients, an important variable is the treatment durations, in addition to the type of treatment (17), that is usually shorter in CAT patients, mainly for the kind of initial malocclusions candidate to this approach. Surprising, the dimension of the WSLs seems to be wider in CAT patients although reduced in number and severity (18).

Periodontal status of the orthodontic patients is one of the major concern for the clinician, due to the need of not induce damages but possibly to maintain or improve the initial conditions, avoiding inflammatory processes in presence of orthodontic forces (19). Also in this case, however, the better performance of CA is not completely confirmed from the literature; better periodontal indices are reported for CA and SLB groups versus CB (20), slightly lower microbial colonization and risk of caries development (21), slightly decreasing microbial diversity but with a positive relatively stable levels of periodontal conditions during the first stage of treatment (22). Currently, the maintenance of a good level of periodontal health seem to be surely easy in CAT, provided that a constant support is conducted from a dental hygienist (23) and as long as correct cleaning procedures of

the aligners are realized to minimize the effects of microbial colonization (19, 24).

If visibility therefore strong affect the patient and clinician's choice of the preferred therapy, the research is still evaluating the potential of correction in different malocclusion conditions. Some particularly difficult corrections, often requiring multidisciplinary approach, such as syndromes affecting the craniofacial structures (25), or deep dental impactions (26), are still of a questionable approach with CAT, or at least requires the increase of treatment times or extensive appeal to auxiliaries or multiple attachments, heavily depriving the CA therapy of the main aspect of esthetic perceptions (27).

In conclusion, the introduction of clear aligners therapy has surely pushed clinicians and researchers to a consistent change in the orthodontic approach and in extensive studies aimed to discriminate between the claiming of the companies and the reality of treatment potential (28-30). Still extensive studies are though required to establish the rules and the limits of this extraordinary treatment option, considering all the cited field of doubt.

References

1. Rosvall MD, Fields HW, Ziuchkovski J, et al. Attractiveness, acceptability, and value of orthodontic appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2009; 135:276-288
2. Weir T. Clear aligners in orthodontic treatment. *Aust Dent J* 2017; 62 Suppl 1:58-62. doi:10.1111/adj.12480
3. Alexandropoulos A, Al Jabbari YS, Zinelis S, et al. Chemical and mechanical characteristics of contemporary thermoplastic orthodontic materials. *Aust Orthod J*. 2015 Nov; 31(2):165-70. PMID: 26999889
4. Ma YS, Fang DY, Zhang N, et al. Mechanical Properties of Orthodontic Thermoplastics PETG/ PC2858 after Blending. *Chin J Dent Res*. 2016 Mar;19(1):43-8. doi: 10.3290/j.cjdr.a35696. PMID: 26981606
5. Condo' R, Pazzini L, Cerroni L, et al. Mechanical properties of "two generations" of teeth aligners: Change analysis during oral permanence. *Dent Mater J*. 2018 Sep 30;37(5):835-842. doi: 10.4012/dmj.2017-323. Epub 2018 Jul 12. PMID: 29998941
6. Xu F, Tang GH. The impact of personality traits on adolescents' adaptation and compliance to clear retainers. *Shanghai Kou Qiang Yi Xue*. 2017 Feb;26(1):98-101. Chinese. PMID: 28474077
7. Schott TC, Göz G. Color fading of the blue compliance indicator encapsulated in removable clear Invisalign Teen® aligners. *Angle Orthod*. 2011; 81(2):185-191. doi:10.2319/052610-288.1
8. Romani V, Di Giorgio R, Castellano M, et al. Prevalence of craniomandibular disorders in orthodontic pediatric population and possible interactions with anxiety and stress. *Eur J Paediatr Dent*. 2018;19(4):317-323. doi:10.23804/ejpd.2018.19.04.13
9. Corridore D, Zumbo G, Corvino I, et al. Prevalence of oral disease and treatment types proposed to children affected by Autistic Spectrum Disorder in Pediatric Dentistry: a Systematic Review. *Clin Ter*. 2020 May-Jun; 171(3):e275-e282. doi: 10.7417/CT.2020.2226. PMID: 32323718

10. Gao M, Yan X, Zhao R, et al. Comparison of pain perception, anxiety, and impacts on oral health-related quality of life between patients receiving clear aligners and fixed appliances during the initial stage of orthodontic treatment [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 2]. *Eur J Orthod*. 2020;cjaa037. doi:10.1093/ejo/cjaa037
11. Zhang B, Huang X, Huo S, et al. Effect of clear aligners on oral health-related quality of life: A systematic review [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 27]. *Orthod Craniofac Res*. 2020;10.1111/ocr.12382. doi:10.1111/ocr.12382
12. Guerra F, Rinaldo F, Mannocci A, et al. Knowledge, attitude and behavior towards oral health: gender differences between parents. *Clin Ter*. 2017 Nov-Dec;168(6):e361-e370. Italian. doi: 10.7417/T.2017.2035. PMID: 29209685.
13. Zhao R, Huang R, Long H, et al. The dynamics of the oral microbiome and oral health among patients receiving clear aligner orthodontic treatment. *Oral Dis*. 2020;26(2):473-483. doi:10.1111/odi.13175
14. Impellizzeri A, Putrino A, Zangrillo C, et al. Efficiency of self-ligating vs conventional braces: Systematic review and meta-analysis *Dental Cadmos*, 2019; 87(6):347-356 DOI: 10.19256/d.cadmos.06.2019.0
15. Chhibber A, Agarwal S, Yadav S, et al. Which orthodontic appliance is best for oral hygiene? A randomized clinical trial. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2018; 153(2):175-183. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2017.10.009
16. Guerra F, Mazur M, Corridore D, et al. Evaluation of the esthetic properties of developmental defects of enamel: a spectrophotometric clinical study. *Scientific World Journal*. 2015; 2015:878235. doi:10.1155/2015/878235
17. Buschang PH, Chastain D, Keylor CL, et al. Incidence of white spot lesions among patients treated with clear aligners and traditional braces. *Angle Orthod*. 2019; 89(3):359-364. doi:10.2319/073118-553.1
18. Albhaisi Z, Al-Khateeb SN, Abu Alhaija ES. Enamel demineralization during clear aligner orthodontic treatment compared with fixed appliance therapy, evaluated with quantitative light-induced fluorescence: A randomized clinical trial. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2020;157(5):594-601. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2020.01.004
19. Guerra F, Mazur M, Ndokaj A, et al. Periodontitis and the microbiome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Minerva Stomatol*. 2018;67(6):250-258. doi:10.23736/S0026-4970.18.04198-5
20. Mulla Issa FHK, Mulla Issa ZHK, Rabah AF, et al. Periodontal parameters in adult patients with clear aligners orthodontics treatment versus three other types of brackets: A cross-sectional study. *J Orthod Sci*. 2020;9:4. Published 2020 Feb 12. doi:10.4103/jos.JOS_54_17
21. Mummolo S, Tieri M, Nota A, et al. Salivary concentrations of *Streptococcus mutans* and *Lactobacilli* during an orthodontic treatment. An observational study comparing fixed and removable orthodontic appliances. *Clin Exp Dent Res*. 2020; 6(2):181-187. doi:10.1002/cre2.261
22. Guo R, Zheng Y, Liu H, et al. Profiling of subgingival plaque biofilm microbiota in female adult patients with clear aligners: a three-month prospective study. *PeerJ*. 2018;6:e4207. Published 2018 Jan 2. doi:10.7717/peerj.4207
23. Madariaga ACP, Bucci R, Rongo R, et al. Impact of Fixed Orthodontic Appliance and Clear Aligners on the Periodontal Health: A Prospective Clinical Study. *Dent J (Basel)*. 2020; 8(1):4. Published 2020 Jan 2. doi:10.3390/dj8010004
24. Levrimi L, Novara F, Margherini S, et al. Scanning electron microscopy analysis of the growth of dental plaque on the surfaces of removable orthodontic aligners after the use of different cleaning methods. *Clin Cosmet Investig Dent*. 2015;7:125-131. Published 2015 Dec 15; doi:10.2147/CCIDE.S95814
25. Impellizzeri A, Midulla G, Romeo U, et al. Delayed Eruption of Permanent Dentition and Maxillary Contraction in Patients with Cleidocranial Dysplasia: Review and Report of a Family. *Int J Dent*. 2018 Jul 4; 2018:6591414. doi: 10.1155/2018/6591414. eCollection 2018
26. Alligri A, Putrino A, Cassetta M, et al. The mandibular permanent second molars and their risk of impaction: a retrospective study. *Eur J Paediatr Dent*. 2015;16(3):246-250
27. Thai JK, Araujo E, McCray J, et al. Esthetic perception of clear aligner therapy attachments using eye-tracking technology. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2020;158(3):400-409. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.09.014
28. Giordano A, Guarnieri R, Galluccio G, et al. Epidemiology of Malocclusion in 3,491 Subjects Attending Public Dental Service in Rome (Italy): Evaluation of the Orthodontic Treatment Need Index. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2019 May 1; 20(5):631-638
29. Vozza I, Capasso F, Calcagnile F, et al. School-age dental screening: oral health and eating habits. *Clin Ter*. 2019 Jan-Feb;170(1):e36-e40. doi: 10.7417/CT.2019.2105. PMID: 30789195
30. Haouili N, Kravitz ND, Vaid NR, et al. Has Invisalign improved? A prospective follow-up study on the efficacy of tooth movement with Invisalign. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2020 Sep;158(3):420-425. doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.12.015. Epub 2020 Jun 30