

401 N. Lindbergh Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63141 Tel.: 314.993.1700, #546 Toll Free: 800.424.2841, #546 Fax: 800.708.1364 Cell: 314.283.1983 Send via email to: jbode@aaortho.org and cyoung@aaortho.org

AAO Foundation Final Report Form (a/o 6/30/2019)

Type of Award: Orthodontic Faculty Development Fellowship Award

Name of Principal Investigator: Bingshuang Zou

Institution: Faculty of Dentistry, University of British Columbia

<u>Title of Project</u>: "Three-dimensional upper airway changes after maxillary protraction with alternative rapid maxillary expansion and constriction"

Period of AAOF Support (e.g. 07-01-19 to 06-30-21):

Amount of Funding: \$20,000

Summary/Abstract

Abstract

Objective: This retrospective study aimed to compare the three-dimensional upper airway changes after maxillary protraction (MP) with alternative rapid maxillary expansion and constriction (Alt-RMEC) versus conventional rapid maxillary expansion (RME) in growing Class III malocclusions.

Materials and Methods: Approval for the study protocol was obtained from the University of British Columbia Institutional Review Board (H19-01744). Case inclusion criteria were growing Class III patients consecutively treated by one orthodontist with RME or Alt-RMEC combined with facemask maxillary protraction to achieved a Class II molar relationship and a minimum overjet of 3mm. Pre-treatment (T1) and post-treatment (T2) cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans were used to measure the nasopharyngeal, glossopharyngeal, and hypopharyngeal airway changes in terms of volume, sagittal and cross-sectional area. Skeletal and dental changes were measured on the cephalograms generated from CBCT. The changes after treatment and the comparison of the two groups were assessed. SPSS software (version 25; IBM, Armonk, NY) was used to analyze data. Shapiro-Wilk test was used to evaluate data distribution. Independent sample t tests or Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare the differences between two groups at T1. Paired t tests or Wilcoxon rank tests were used to compare the changes before and after treatment in each group. Independent sample t tests or Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare the difference between groups.

Results:

A total of forty-one Class III patients (mean age: 9.9 years; range: 7-12 years) were selected and divided into two groups: Group 1 (MP/RME) (15 F, 7 M, mean age 9.7 ± 1.2 years) and Group 2

(RME/MP) (13 F, 6 M, mean age 10.3 ± 1.4 years). All measurements showed excellent correlations (ICC>0.90) intra- and inter-observer reliabilities. All data were normally distributed. There was no significant difference between two groups in age, any cephalometric (Table 1) or 3D upper airway measurements (Table 2) at T1. Treatment duration in two groups also showed no significant difference.

The maxilla moved forward significantly after treatment in both groups (A-True vertical plane, $1.90 \pm 2.22 \text{ mm}$, P<0.01 vs $2.36 \pm 1.56 \text{ mm}$, P<0.001), but there was no significant difference between groups (P>0.005). All the other significant skeletal and dental changes associated with two treatment protocol also showed non-significant inter-group difference (Table 3). Significant increase in the measurements of midsagittal area (MSA) and volume in the nasopharyngeal and total upper airway after treatment were observed in both groups. MSA and volume in other upper airway areas in Group 1 also showed significant changes, but the intergroup difference was not significant except that Group 1 had more significant volumetric change in the velopharynx than Group 2 (2411.0 ± 3227.7 vs 649.1 ± 1636.3, P<0.05).

Measurements	Group 1		Group 2		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Age (y)	9.66	1.23	10.28	1.45	0.143
Tx duration	10.59	4.36	10.84	2.65	0.828
(m)					
SNA (°)	80.66	2.88	80.33	4.58	0.782
SNB (°)	81.97	3.18	81.52	4.70	0.714
ANB (°)	-1.31	2.08	-1.18	1.23	0.807
FMA (°)	29.99	4.41	28.94	5.15	0.488
PP-FH (°)	3.21	4.24	1.49	4.96	0.238
Mx body	35.89	3.61	36.19	3.85	0.796
length (mm)					
Mn body	69.93	5.07	71.77	4.04	0.211
length (mm)					
Co-A (mm)	71.13	3.61	72.73	4.47	0.211
A-TV plane	55.69	2.37	56.95	2.50	0.105
(mm)					
A-FH (mm)	28.16	2.56	28.70	3.32	0.560
U1-FH (°)	109.97	7.30	110.81	6.08	0.695
U1-PP (mm)	23.50	2.43	24.11	2.06	0.399
U6-PP (mm)	13.01	5.69	14.37	4.96	0.422
IMPA (°)	82.6	6.74	82.07	6.24	0.788

Table 1. Age, treatment duration, skeletal and dental measurements at T1 and comparison between two groups

Table 2. Upper airway measurements at T1 and comparison between two groups

Measurements	Group 1		Group 2		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Nasopharynx					
CSA (mm ²) @	398.5	158.2	409.4	166.9	0.831
PNS					
$MSA (mm^2)$	111.8	72.5	102.2	64.9	0.660
Volume (mm ³)	3154.3	1562.3	2956.8	1503.8	0.684
Velopharynx0.6					

CSA (mm ²) @	170.5	87.2	193.7	79.7	0.383
Uvula					
$MSA (mm^2)$	246.4	50.4	265.6	66.6	0.300
Volume (mm ³)	5077.9	2118.5	5624.6	2398.9	0.443
Glossopharynx					
$CSA (mm^2)$ @	207.0	80.9	222.9	93.5	0.564
Et					
$MSA (mm^2)$	170.3	77.4	202.5	83.7	0.208
Volume (mm ³)	2916.1	1768.7	3690.5	2059.2	0.203
Hypopharynx					
$CSA (mm^2) @$	198.3	70.3	234.8	81.0	0.130
Eb					
$MSA (mm^2)$	79.2	39.7	93.6	47.0	0.296
Volume (mm ³)	1839.8	1099.6	2216.9	1301.3	0.321
Total					
MSA(mm ²)	612.6	160.9	663.2	195.5	0.369
Minimum	75.8	54.6	84.4	50.9	0.606
$CSA (mm^2)$					
Volume (mm ³)	13092.0	5258.7	14497.4	6124.4	0.434

Table 3. Skeletal and dental changes after treatment (T2-T1) and comparison between two	
groups	

Measurements	Group 1		Group 2		P value
	Mean \pm SD	P value	Mean \pm SD	P value	
SNA (°)	2.82 ± 1.73	0.000*	2.15 ± 1.64	0.000*	0.212
SNB (°)	-0.15 ± 1.29	0.593	-0.94 ± 2.18	0.078	0.162
ANB (°)	2.97 ± 1.72	0.000*	3.08 ± 1.43	0.000*	0.825
FMA (°)	1.00 ± 2.86	0.114	2.02 ± 3.08	0.010*	0.280
PP-FH (°)	-1.81 ± 2.74	0.005*	0.00 ± 2.55	1.000	0.035
Mx body	1.12 ± 2.96	0.090	2.00 ± 4.22	0.054	0.441
length (mm)					
Mn body	1.45 ± 2.29	0.007*	2.25 ± 2.88	0.003*	0.330
length (mm)					
Co-A (mm)	3.03 ± 2.13	0.000*	2.95 ± 2.16	0.000*	0.912
A-TV plane	1.90 ± 2.22	0.001*	2.36 ± 1.56	0.000*	0.448
(mm)					
A-FH (mm)	1.50 ± 2.47	0.009*	1.07 ± 2.64	0.094	0.588
U1-FH (°)	3.95 ± 5.45	0.003*	4.01 ± 5.74	0.007*	0.979
U1-PP (mm)	1.35 ± 2.58	0.022*	0.84 ± 1.28	0.010*	0.433
U6-PP (mm)	2.01 ± 2.43	0.001*	1.97 ± 2.97	0.010*	0.958
IMPA (°)	0.29 ± 5.25	0.798	-1.12 ± 3.57	0.187	0.328

*Indicates significant differences between two groups (P<0.05).

Table 4. Upper airway	changes after treatment	(T2-T1) and cor	nparison between two groups

Measurements	Group 1		Group 2		P value
	Mean \pm SD	P value	Mean \pm SD	P value	
Nasopharynx					
CSA (mm ²) @ PNS	91.2 ± 148.5	0.009*	24.6 ± 114.7	0.362	0.121

5.9 ± 41.0				0 000
	0.000*	45.7 ± 42.8	0.000*	0.988
$507.5 \pm$	0.000*	$1466.6 \pm$	0.000*	0.919
305.8		1246.1		
8.8 ± 160.0	0.031*	-3.3 ± 114.5	0.901	0.070
0.1 ± 68.2	0.002*	12.2 ± 45.4	0.189	0.059
411.0 ±	0.002*	649.1 ±	0.101	0.038*
227.7		1636.3		
5.2 ± 139.4	0.072	-2.4 ± 85.8	0.906	0.120
7.4 ± 80.8	0.042*	10.0 ± 52.0	0.413	0.212
394.4 ±	0.033*	18.4 ±	0.967	0.083
866.2		1914.7		
4.9 ± 82.8	0.061	-6.3 ± 69.2	0.694	0.094
0.9 ± 64.7	0.036*	7.6 ± 47.2	0.490	0.202
56.9 ±		329.1 ±		0.308
867.2		1305.2		
59.7 ±	0.002*	83.4 ± 115.8	0.006*	0.173
13.8				
1.8 ± 100.9	0.009*	25.8 ± 75.6	0.155	0.209
083.6 ±	0.002*	2577.5 ±	0.015*	0.102
266.3		4159.5		
	305.8 3.8 ± 160.0 0.1 ± 68.2 411.0 ± 227.7 5.2 ± 139.4 7.4 ± 80.8 394.4 ± 366.2 4.9 ± 82.8 0.9 ± 64.7 56.9 ± 367.2 59.7 ± 38 1.8 ± 100.9 $083.6 \pm$	305.8 3.8 ± 160.0 0.031^* 0.1 ± 68.2 0.002^* $411.0 \pm$ 0.002^* $411.0 \pm$ 0.002^* 5.2 ± 139.4 0.072 5.2 ± 139.4 0.072 7.4 ± 80.8 0.042^* $394.4 \pm$ 0.033^* 366.2 0.042^* 4.9 ± 82.8 0.061 0.9 ± 64.7 0.036^* $56.9 \pm$ 0.043^* 367.2 0.002^* 13.8 1.8 ± 100.9 0.009^* $0.83.6 \pm$ 0.002^*	305.8 1246.1 3.8 ± 160.0 0.031^* -3.3 ± 114.5 0.1 ± 68.2 0.002^* 12.2 ± 45.4 $411.0 \pm$ 0.002^* $649.1 \pm$ 227.7 1636.3 5.2 ± 139.4 0.072 -2.4 ± 85.8 7.4 ± 80.8 0.042^* 10.0 ± 52.0 $394.4 \pm$ 0.033^* $18.4 \pm$ 366.2 1914.7 4.9 ± 82.8 0.061 -6.3 ± 69.2 0.9 ± 64.7 0.036^* 7.6 ± 47.2 $56.9 \pm$ 0.043^* $329.1 \pm$ 367.2 1305.2 $59.7 \pm$ 0.002^* 83.4 ± 115.8 1.8 ± 100.9 0.009^* 25.8 ± 75.6 $083.6 \pm$ 0.002^* $2577.5 \pm$	305.8 1246.1 3.8 ± 160.0 0.031^* -3.3 ± 114.5 0.901 0.1 ± 68.2 0.002^* 12.2 ± 45.4 0.189 $411.0 \pm$ 0.002^* $649.1 \pm$ 0.101 227.7 1636.3 0.101 5.2 ± 139.4 0.072 -2.4 ± 85.8 0.906 7.4 ± 80.8 0.042^* 10.0 ± 52.0 0.413 $394.4 \pm$ 0.033^* $18.4 \pm$ 0.967 366.2 1914.7 0.967 4.9 ± 82.8 0.061 -6.3 ± 69.2 0.694 0.9 ± 64.7 0.036^* 7.6 ± 47.2 0.490 $56.9 \pm$ 0.043^* $329.1 \pm$ 0.286 367.2 1305.2 1305.2 1305.2 $59.7 \pm$ 0.002^* 83.4 ± 115.8 0.006^* 13.8 100.9 0.009^* 25.8 ± 75.6 0.155 $083.6 \pm$ 0.002^* $2577.5 \pm$ 0.015^*

*Indicates significant differences between two groups (P<0.05).

Conclusions: Maxillary protraction following different expansion protocols seem to have similar effects on the forward movement of the maxilla and the volume of nasopharyngeal and total upper airway.

Response to the following questions:

- Were the original, specific aims of the proposal realized? Yes, the original specific aims were to evaluate the changes in the upper airway after maxillary protraction with Alt-RMEC and compare with that with traditional RME in skeletal Class III malocclusions as a result of maxillary deficiency. The conclusion of the project was maxillary protraction following different expansion protocols showed similar effects on the forward movement of the maxilla and the volume of nasopharyngeal and total upper airway.
- 2. Were the results published?
 - a. If so, cite reference/s for publication/s including titles, dates, author or co-authors, journal, issue and page numbers
 - b. Was AAOF support acknowledged?
 - c. If not, are there plans to publish? If not, why not?

The results have not been published, but I have been working on a manuscript to have

the results published in the orthodontic journal. AAOF support will be acknowledged.

- 3. Have the results of this proposal been presented?
 - a. If so, list titles, author or co-authors of these presentation/s, year and locations
 - b. Was AAOF support acknowledged?
 - c. If not, are there plans to do so? If not, why not?

The results have not been presented, but I'm aiming to have the results presented at the annual Angle Society Meeting Northwest Component Scientific Poster-board Session 2022 Feb 9-11. AAOF support will be acknowledged.

4. To what extent have you used, or how do you intend to use, AAOF funding to further your career?

Funding from the AAOF OFDFA has enabled me to pursue my academic career. As a junior faculty member looking to make a career in academics, this award has relieved my educational debt is in line with the mission of the AAOF. This financial assistance in the form of an Orthodontic Faculty Development Fellowship Award has been helping me to further develop my role as a teacher and researcher at this early stage of my career.