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#### Abstract

Background: Evaluation of dental arches is of great importance for definitive diagnosis and optimal craniofacial treatment. The circumference or perimeter is the most important dimension of the dental arch and it changes according to age and gender. This issue hasn't been conducted yet in sulaimani city; Aims: aim of the present study was to assess the dimensional changes in the dental arches occurring during the transitional period from mixed to permanent dentition in individuals with normal dentition. Methods: A group of fifty children with normal dentition aged 8-9 years were selected according to specific criteria in sulaimani city in kurdistan of iraq, dental arch dimensions were measured. Five years later, a second examination and measurement was performed to record the changes in dental arches. The data was analyzed by using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS, version 15) program for obtaining the descriptive statistics including the mean, and standard deviation, also the inferential statistics (t-test) was applied to test the significance difference between the dimensions. Results: The study showed an increase in the arch perimeter of the maxilla in the transition from mixed to permanent dentition for both males and females whereas in the lower arch it was the reverse. The arch perimeter differences between maxillary and mandibular arches show high significancy in both mixed and permanent dentitions $\mathrm{P}(0.00), \mathrm{P}(0.00)$. There was asymmetry in the ach length between right and left side for both mixed and permanent dentition and most of the measurements of the permanent dentition showed high significant differences between right and left sides. There was a significant difference $\mathrm{P}(0.00)$ in maxillary and mandibular left and right incisor- canine distance (I-C) between males and females.


Conclusion: Controlling the reduction of total arch length in the transition period from mixed dentition to permanent dentition may help in the early treatment of crowding of the teeth.
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## Introduction

Dental arch dimensions change systematically during the period of intensive growth and development and less so in adulthood (Carter GA, McNamara JA-1998). Dental arch dimensions are not static; they change systematically during the period of intensive growth and development (Moorrees CFA-1959, Sillman JH- 1964, Knott VB -1972, Cohen JT-1940). Causes of changes in size and form of the dental arch are multifactorial, such as sutural expansion in the maxilla, remodeling of alveolar bone (RossPowel RE, Harris EF-2000, Dempster WT, Adams WJ, Duddies RA-1963, Harris EF -1997) interarch relationships of the teeth, and contractile properties of supracrestal fibers (Goose DH, Appleton J-1982). In the dental arch, relatively rapid changes occur during transitional dentition, and once a functional permanent dentition is established, smaller changes are observed to continue (Carter GA, McNamara JA-1982). The understanding of the sagittal and transversal changes that occur between mixed and permanent dentitions in the maxillary and mandibular arches is crucial for the clinician interested in early orthodontic treatment. It has been reported that growth and development period have been influenced by environmental factors, nutrition, and ethnic variations; systemic, health, and individual variations could also occur (Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Treder J-1997).

Evaluation of dental arches is of great importance for definitive diagnosis and optimal craniofacial treatment. The values of the dimensions of the arch include: width, depth and circumference, intercanine and intermolar distances, overjet and overbite, which change during growth in different ways (the width of the teeth remains the same, whereas the lengths of the mandibular and maxillary bones increase) (Prabhakaran S, Sriram CH, Muthu MS, Rao CR, Sivakumar N-2006).

The circumference or perimeter is the most important dimension of the dental arch and changes according to age and gender. The increases in the arch are more related to the events underlying tooth development and somewhat less to skeletal growth (Alhaija ESJ, Qudeimat MA-2003).

Many authors (Bishara SE, Treder JE, Damon P, Olsen M -1996, Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Treder J-1998, Eslambolchi S, Woodside DG, Rossouw PE-2008, Slaj M, Jezina MA, Lauc T, Rajić-Mestrović S, Miksić M- 2003, Moorrees CF, Chadha JM.- 1965, Sinclair PM, Little RM.- 1983,

Harris EF-1997) have also reported an increase in arch perimeter until permanent dentition is completed and a diminution of this dimension with age, mainly in the lower arch (Dager MM-2008, Tibana RH, Palagi LM, Miguel JA-2004). Some studies suggest that arch size has a modest genetic component and that arch length and width growth factors are largely independent (Cassidy KM, Harris EF, Tolley EA, Keim RG-1998). As regards the different dimensions of dental arches between sexes, it can be observed that, generally speaking, males present greater arch dimensions than females (Cassidy KM, Harris EF, Tolley EA, Keim RG-1998, Knott VB-1972, Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Treder J-1997, Knott VB-1961, Bishara SE, Treder JE, Damon P, Olsen M-1996, Haralabakis NB, Sifakakis I, Papagrigorakis M, Papadakis G-2006, Mutinelli S, Manfredi M, Cozzani M 2000). The clinical importance of predicting changes in dental arch form is obvious. By changing dental arch form without modifying its dimension, different arch lengths may be achieved for each millimeter of incisor proclination (DeKock WH-1972).

## Materials and methods

This issue hasn't been conducted yet in sulaimani city; therefore the current study aims to assess the dimensional changes in the dental arches occurring during the transitional period from mixed to permanent dentition in individuals with normal dentition. The study involved 50 children aged 8-9 years from the city of Sulaimani in Iraqi Kurdistan. The children were examined twice: the first examination was done at recruitment at the mixed dentition stage (8-9) years and the second examination was done after 5 years at permanent dentition stage (13-14) years. A consent form was filled by the participant's parents. During both examinations, alginate impressions of both upper and lower dental arches were taken for all the 50 children and dental stone was poured into the impressions immediately. The dental casts obtained were used for measuring various dental arch dimensions using digital sliding calipers. Approval of ethical committee of Faculty of Medical Sciences/ University of Sulaimani was obtained before conducting the present study.

The dental arch perimeter is the distance from the mesio-buccal cusp of the first permanent molar around the dental arch to the same point in the opposite side. It was measured from adding four segmental measurements with each other's, which included two incisal segments and two buccal segments, while the dental arch segmental measurements are

1. Incisal - canine distance (right and left): The linear distance from the incisal point to the canine cusp tip.
2. Canine - molar distance (right and left): The linear distance from the canine cusp tip to the mesiobuccal cusp tip of the first permanent molar.
3. Incisal - molar distance (right and left): The linear distance from the incisal point to the mesiobuccal cusp tip of the first permanent molar.

The data was analyzed by using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS, version 15) program for obtaining the descriptive statistics including the mean, and standard deviation, also the inferential statistics (t-test) was applied to test the significance difference between the dimensions. Paired ttest was used to determine the changes that occur during growth. Student ttest was used to know if there were any differences between measurements in regard to gender. The critical level of statistical significance was determined at a probability level of less than 0.05 ( $\mathrm{P} \leq 0.05$ ).

Inclusion criteria:

1. The eruption of the first molar or permanent incisors (or both) was the criteria of sample selection at the beginning of study.
2. All subjects were healthy free from any chronic condition affecting growth.
3. Absence of crowding.
4. No history of orthodontic treatment.

## Results:

The total sample in this longitudinal study was 50 children with normal dentition. the equal number of males and females were taken to be included in the present study. In this study there was a significant difference $\mathrm{P}(0.00)$ in maxillary and mandibular left and right incisor- canine distance (IC) between males and females (Table I,II).

Asymmetry was also revealed in the arch length between right and left side for both mixed and permanent dentition. Most of the measurements of the permanent dentition show high significant differences between right and lefts (Table III).

The arch perimeter differences between maxillary and mandibular arches show high significancy in both mixed and permanent dentitions $\mathrm{P}(0.00), \mathrm{P}(0.00)$. All the measurements of the maxillary arch greater than the mandibular arch except for (C-M) of the left side for mixed dentition and right side for permanent (Table IV).

There was an increase in the arch perimeter of the maxilla in the transition from mixed to permanent dentition for both males and females whereas in the lower arch it was the reverse. Also the results showed a decrease in canine - molar distance (C-M) of the four segments of the arches between mixed to the permanent dentition (Table V). The (I-C) measurements of all segments of the sample's dental arches greater in permanent than mixed dentition whereas the (I-M, C-M) was in reverse to that. All the measurements of the sample showed high significant difference between mixed to permanent dentition except mandibular (I-M) and maxillary (I-C, C-M) (Table V).

## Discussion

In this study the asymmetry was observed in the arch length between right and left side for both mixed and permanent dentition, and most of the measurements of the permanent dentition show high significant differences between right and lefts. The arch perimeter differences between maxillary and mandibular arches show high significancy in both mixed and permanent dentitions.

There were a number of studies investigating changes in dental arches during the period of growth. Some of these studies showed that dental arch form and size were affected variability in eruptive paths of the teeth, growth of the supporting bones (Dager MM, McNamara JA, Baccetti T, Franchi L-2008, Harris EF-1997, Knott VB-1961), and movement of the teeth after emergence due to habits and unbalanced muscular pressure (Bishara SE, Treder JE, Damon P, Olsen M-1996, Haralabakis NB, Sifakakis I, Papagrigorakis M, Papadakis G-2006). Subjects evaluated in this study had no parafunction, but had normal occlusion and acceptable aesthetic; Therefore, the changes observed in the study were physiological.

In this study, incisor-canine length increased in both jaws in the transition from mixed to permanent dentition with greater increase in the maxilla than the mandible because of greater mesio-distal dimension of maxillary incisors and canines. On the other hand canine-molar, incisormolar, total dental arch lengths decreased both in maxilla and mandible and there was a greater decrease in the mandible than the maxilla due to the greatness of leeway space in the mandible. These results are in agreement with the results of DeKock WH -1972,Moores CFA -1959, Sinclair PM, Little RM-1983, Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Treder JE, Stasi MJ-1989, and Harris EF -1997, who reported a decrease in the dimension of arch length with the attainment of adulthood, afterwards the dental arch attains the stable dimension.

The present study agreed with the Shrestha RM, Bhattarai P- 2008, 2009 which reported that arch dimensions of the males were significantly greater compared to females, also in agreement with the findings of Barrett MJ, Brown T, Macdonald MR -1965, Bishara SE, Treder JE, Damon P, Olsen M- 1996and Huang ST, Miura F, Soma K-1991 confirming that arch lengths of the males were greater than those of the females. The present study is also consistent with the contemporary studies on arch circumference (Huang ST, Miura F, Soma K -1991) of the Nepalese adults; which reported that arch dimensions of the Nepalese males were significantly greater as compared to females. Most theories consider dental arch forms to be symmetrical. However, White LW-1977 observed a great deal of asymmetry in the dental arches. Lavelle CLB, Plant CG-1969 observed the dimensions of the teeth and arch lengths on the right side were greater than those on the
left, but the differences were insignificant agree with the present study, but Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Treder JE, Stasi MJ-1989 found no significant differences between right and left sides in arch length measurement in a disagreement with our results.

The apparent bilateral differences on arch dimensions in this study showed that dental arch with normal occlusion is dimensionally asymmetrical which are in agreement with Shrestha RM,BhattaraiP-2009.

## Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that controlling the reduction of total arch length in the transition period from mixed dentition to permanent dentition may be helpful for the early treatment of crowding.
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Table I: Distribution of studied sample according to sex (Maxillary arch)

|  |  | Parameters | Genders | N | Mean, $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{cm}$ ? | SD | tvalue | pvalue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxilla | Mixed dentition | I-C Right | Male | 25 | 18.532 | 0.243567 | 6.38 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 18.1116 | 0.221222 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C Left | Male | 25 | 18.5484 | 0.375185 | 6.55 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 17.8988 | 0.323707 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Right | Male | 25 | 23.3776 | 0.847419 | 2.65 | 0.011 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 22.7524 | 0.834263 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Left | Male | 25 | 22.7016 | 0.589058 | 4.26 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 22.0016 | 0.570648 |  |  |
|  |  | Perimeter | Male | 25 | 83.1596 | 1.556592 | 5.54 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 80.7644 | 1.496541 |  |  |
|  | Permanent dentition | I-C Right | Male | 25 | 19.8864 | 0.530847 | 2.99 | 0.004 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 19.4576 | 0.479473 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C Left | Male | 25 | 20.4936 | 0.466421 | 3.11 | 0.003 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 20.0944 | 0.440635 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Right | Male | 25 | 21.8344 | 1.151253 | 1.78 | 0.081 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 21.2472 | 1.175594 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Left | Male | 25 | 21.5384 | 1.434264 | 1.59 | 0.118 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 20.9004 | 1.403355 |  |  |
|  |  | Perimeter | Male | 25 | 83.7528 | 3.367387 | 2.17 | 0.035 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 81.6996 | 3.307076 |  |  |

Table II: Distribution of the studied sample according to sex (Mandibular arch)

|  |  | Parameters | Genders | N | Mean | SD | $\begin{aligned} & \text { t- } \\ & \text { value } \end{aligned}$ | pvalue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mandible | Mixed dentition | I-C Right | Male | 25 | 14.0408 | 0.607014 | 2.83 | 0.007 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 13.5528 | 0.61055 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C Left | Male | 25 | 13.8508 | 0.367411 | 4.42 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 13.3972 | 0.357695 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Right | Male | 25 | 23.3468 | 0.629767 | 4.307 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 22.5688 | 0.647465 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Left | Male | 25 | 23.2252 | 0.684069 | 3.89 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 22.4772 | 0.673495 |  |  |
|  |  | Perimeter | Male | 25 | 74.4636 | 1.456597 | 4.95 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 71.996 | 1.477346 |  |  |
|  | Permanent dentition | I-C Right | Male | 25 | 14.76 | 0.56899 | 2.68 | 0.010 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 14.3132 | 0.605273 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C Left | Male | 25 | 14.8308 | 0.390341 | 4.24 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 14.3524 | 0.405794 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Right | Male | 25 | 22.1868 | 0.400414 | 6.77 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 21.3956 | 0.425069 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M Left | Male | 25 | 21.298 | 0.340771 | 7.75 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 20.5612 | 0.331151 |  |  |
|  |  | Perimeter | Male | 25 | 73.0756 | 0.741845 | 11.78 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Female | 25 | 70.6224 | 0.729893 |  |  |

Table III: Comparison between the right and the left sides of the studied sample

|  |  | Parameters |  | Mean | n | SD | t-value | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxilla |  | $\mathrm{C}^{\text {I- }}$ | Right | 18.3218 | 50 | 0.31323 | 1.58 | 0.119 |
|  |  |  | Left | 18.2236 | 50 | 0.477407 |  |  |
|  | Mixed dentition | I-M | Right | 38.518 | 50 | 0.58327 | 1.07 | 0.289 |
|  |  |  | Left | 38.6436 | 50 | 0.586114 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M | Right | 23.065 | 50 | 0.890135 | 7.13 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 22.3516 | 50 | 0.674129 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C | Right | 19.672 | 50 | 0.545464 | 11.48 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 20.294 | 50 | 0.492246 |  |  |
|  | Permanent dentition | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{I}- \\ \mathrm{M} \end{gathered}$ | Right | 38.1832 | 50 | 1.110425 | 8.34 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 38.7406 | 50 | 1.469279 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M | Right | 21.5408 | 50 | 1.189132 | 5.38 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 21.2194 | 50 | 1.440837 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C | Right | 13.7968 | 50 | 0.651004 | 1.37 | 0.17 |
|  |  |  | Left | 13.624 | 50 | 0.425762 |  |  |
|  | Mixed dentition | I-M | Right | 30.7912 | 50 | 7.524693 | 2.55 | 0.014 |
|  |  |  | Left | 33.3932 | 50 | 0.815236 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M | Right | 22.9578 | 50 | 0.744307 | 1.904 | 0.063 |
|  |  |  | Left | 22.8512 | 50 | 0.770779 |  |  |
|  |  | I-C | Right | 14.5366 | 50 | 0.623648 | 1.123 | 0.267 |


| Mandible |  |  | Left | 14.5916 | 50 | 0.462241 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Permanent dentition | I-M | Right | 33.1722 | 50 | 0.600976 | 4.402 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 33.0042 | 50 | 0.588547 |  |  |
|  |  | C-M | Right | 21.7912 | 50 | 0.571595 | 8.61 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Left | 20.9296 | 50 | 0.499077 |  |  |

Table IV: Arch differences of the study sample in mixed and permanent dentition


Table V: Differences of study sample in mixed and permanent dentition

|  | Parameters |  |  | Mean | N | SD | t-value | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxilla | I-C | right | MD | 18.3218 | 50 | 0.31323 | 15.57 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 19.672 | 50 | 0.545464 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 18.2236 | 50 | 0.477407 | 33.05 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 20.294 | 50 | 0.492246 |  |  |
|  | I-M | Right | MD | 38.518 | 50 | 0.58327 | 1.805 | 0.077 |
|  |  |  | PD | 38.1832 | 50 | 1.110425 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 38.6436 | 50 | 0.586114 | 0.53 | 0.59 |
|  |  |  | PD | 38.7406 | 50 | 1.469279 |  |  |
|  | C-M | Right | MD | 23.065 | 50 | 0.890135 | 10.33 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 21.5408 | 50 | 1.189132 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 22.3516 | 50 | 0.674129 | 8.11 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 21.2194 | 50 | 1.440837 |  |  |
|  | Perimeter | MD |  | 81.962 | 50 | 1.93578 | 1.96 | 0.055 |
|  |  | PD |  | 82.7262 | 50 | 3.4621 |  |  |
| Mandible | I-C | Right | MD | 13.7968 | 50 | 0.651004 | 10.79 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 14.5366 | 50 | 0.623648 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 13.624 | 50 | 0.425762 | 12.25 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 14.5916 | 50 | 0.462241 |  |  |
|  | I-M | Right | MD | 30.7912 | 50 | 7.524693 | 2.28 | 0.026 |
|  |  |  | PD | 33.1722 | 50 | 0.600976 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 33.3932 | 50 | 0.815236 | 7.61 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 33.0042 | 50 | 0.588547 |  |  |
|  | C-M | Right | MD | 22.9578 | 50 | 0.744307 | 10.307 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 21.7912 | 50 | 0.571595 |  |  |
|  |  | Left | MD | 22.8512 | 50 | 0.770779 | 21.79 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | PD | 20.9296 | 50 | 0.499077 |  |  |
|  | Perimeter | MD |  | 73.2298 | 50 | 1.91351 | 8.98 | 0.000 |
|  | Perimeter | PD |  | 71.849 | 50 | 1.437268 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{MD} \\ & \mathrm{D}=1 \end{aligned}$ | Mixed D manent | tit |  |  |  |

