

Emerging Trends in Orthodontic Retention: A Comprehensive Review

Mathan Boje M^{1*}, Dr. Praveen Kumar V²

¹Intern, Department of Orthodontics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences (Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth), India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Orthodontics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences (Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth), India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36348/sjodr.2024.v09i11.004>

Received: 05.10.2024 | Accepted: 14.11.2024 | Published: 20.11.2024

*Corresponding author: Mathan Boje M

Intern, Department of Orthodontics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences (Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth), India

Abstract

Orthodontic retention, the crucial post-treatment phase, helps maintain dental stability and prevents teeth from shifting back to their pre-treatment positions. Traditional retainers like fixed lingual wires and Hawley retainers have been the mainstay of retention protocols for decades. However, innovations in digital technology, material science, and personalized patient monitoring have opened up modern retention protocols that promise enhanced comfort, compliance, and longevity. This review examines both traditional and contemporary retention methods, detailing their benefits and limitations, and discusses potential future trends that could further improve orthodontic retention practices.

Keywords: Orthodontic retention, Dental stability, Relapse prevention, Fixed retainers, Removable retainers.

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Retention after orthodontic treatment is essential to maintaining the correct alignment of teeth and preventing relapse, where teeth begin to revert to their pre-treatment positions due to various forces and growth factors [1]. Traditionally, retention has relied on fixed retainers (bonded lingual retainers) and removable retainers (Hawley or vacuum-formed retainers), each with their own set of pros and cons. However, new advancements in digital technology, such as CAD/CAM design, intraoral scanning, and customized retainer materials, are driving a shift in orthodontic retention practices to prioritize patient comfort, adherence, and long-term stability [2, 3]. This review explores these evolving strategies, emphasizing their role in optimizing retention outcomes for diverse patient needs.

Traditional Retention Methods

Traditional retention protocols have predominantly focused on two main types of retainers—fixed and removable retainers—each tailored for specific patient needs and clinical outcomes.

1. Fixed Retainers:

Fixed retainers are typically bonded to the lingual (tongue-facing) surfaces of the anterior teeth, particularly in the lower arch where relapse is most common. These retainers provide continuous retention

that does not depend on patient compliance, making them particularly effective for maintaining stability over time [1-4]. Studies indicate that fixed retainers significantly reduce the likelihood of tooth movement in the anterior region, although they can pose challenges in terms of hygiene maintenance, leading to increased plaque accumulation and risk of gingival issues if not adequately managed [5]. Bonding techniques have also evolved, with new adhesives improving the long-term stability of these retainers.

2. Removable Retainers:

Removable retainers, such as Hawley retainers, are traditionally made of an acrylic base with a labial bow. While they are adjustable and highly durable, Hawley retainers can be visually noticeable, which some patients find unappealing [6]. Vacuum-formed retainers, or Essix retainers, are a more aesthetic option, as they are clear and less conspicuous. However, they may lack the durability of Hawley retainers, as they are prone to wear, discoloration, and potential deformation over time [7]. Both types require consistent patient compliance, as even occasional lapses in wearing the retainer can lead to dental relapse [8].

Modern Retention Protocols

Recent technological advancements have introduced new materials and customization options that improve retainer fit, durability, and patient satisfaction.

These innovations address some of the shortcomings associated with traditional retention methods.

1. Digital Scanning and CAD/CAM Fabrication:

Digital intraoral scanning technology allows orthodontists to take precise impressions of the patient's teeth without the discomfort of traditional molds. This leads to retainers with a more exact fit, improving comfort and reducing the need for post-delivery adjustments [9]. CAD/CAM (computer-aided design and manufacturing) technology also facilitates the creation of retainers that are more resilient and can be reproduced easily if lost or damaged, as the digital scan serves as a permanent record [10].

2. Thermoplastic and Shape-Memory Materials:

The development of advanced thermoplastic materials, such as SmartTrack, offers improved elasticity and resilience, which helps retainers maintain their form over time despite repeated wear. These materials also provide better retention by adapting to minor changes in the dental arch, reducing the likelihood of relapse [11]. Shape-memory polymers (SMPs) represent another innovative approach, as they respond to temperature changes and allow the retainer to slightly adjust, potentially reducing the need for multiple retainers in cases of minor tooth movement [12].

3. 3D Printing and Customization:

3D printing technology has revolutionized the production of orthodontic retainers, enabling orthodontists to create retainers that closely match the patient's dental anatomy. This leads to improved comfort, as well as better adherence and effectiveness, as the custom-fit retainers are often perceived as more comfortable by patients. Retainers made with 3D printing technology are also easier to reproduce, offering orthodontists a quick and cost-effective way to replace lost or damaged retainers [13, 14].

Comparative Analysis of Traditional and Modern Retention Protocols

Comparing the effectiveness, patient compliance, and costs of traditional and modern retention methods provides insight into the relative advantages and limitations of each approach:

1. Effectiveness and Longevity:

Traditional fixed retainers are highly effective, particularly for lower anterior teeth where they prevent rotational and spacing relapse. However, they can experience bonding issues, especially if subjected to significant force. By contrast, modern customized retainers—particularly those made with digital scanning and 3D printing—offer a snug fit that enhances durability and stability, potentially leading to longer-lasting results [15].

2. Patient Compliance:

Compliance is critical for removable retainers, and non-adherence is a common cause of relapse. Modern digital solutions, such as smartphone apps that monitor retainer wear and send reminders, have been shown to improve compliance, especially among younger patients who benefit from digital reminders and adherence tracking [16].

3. Cost and Maintenance:

Fixed retainers generally involve lower replacement costs over time but require diligent hygiene maintenance. Conversely, digitally fabricated retainers may involve a higher initial cost due to their customized design, but their comfort and precise fit may reduce the frequency of adjustment visits, potentially balancing out the initial expense [17].

Technological Advances in Retention

The incorporation of new technologies has expanded retention options and introduced methods that directly address some of the challenges associated with traditional retention:

1. Artificial Intelligence and Digital Monitoring:

Artificial intelligence (AI) and digital monitoring systems are emerging as valuable tools for enhancing patient adherence. AI-powered applications can monitor retainer wear, providing real-time data on adherence. Such systems are particularly useful for removable retainers, where patient compliance is essential to prevent relapse. Digital monitoring has proven beneficial in reminding patients to wear their retainers consistently and facilitating early intervention when signs of non-adherence arise [18].

2. Shape-Memory Polymers and Bioactive Materials:

Shape-memory polymers are an innovative material choice for retainers, as they can adjust in response to thermal stimuli, allowing the retainer to adapt to slight tooth movements. Bioactive materials are another emerging trend, as they can interact with biological tissues, promoting bone stability and periodontal health, which supports long-term retention [19]. Such materials actively contribute to maintaining alignment and may decrease the need for mechanical retention over time [20].

CONCLUSION

Orthodontic retention practices are evolving rapidly, with advances in digital technology and material science providing a more patient-centered approach. While traditional retainers remain effective and widely used, modern innovations like CAD/CAM fabrication, 3D printing, shape-memory polymers, and AI monitoring are transforming the retention landscape. These developments offer improvements in fit, comfort, and compliance, helping orthodontists to better meet individual patient needs and enhance long-term stability.

As orthodontic retention continues to progress, a balanced approach that considers patient-specific factors, clinical efficacy, and adherence will be essential in minimizing relapse and optimizing post-treatment outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Maltagliati, L. Á., Uchôa, S. M. M. A., Calastro, R. C., Patel, M. P., Nahás, A. C. R., da Silva, H. D. P., & Matias, M. (2024). Have orthodontists changed their retention and follow-up protocols due to contemporary orthodontics? An online survey. *Journal of Dental Research, Dental Clinics, Dental Prospects*, 18(3), 225.
- Alam, M. K., Hajeer, M. Y., & Shqaidef, A. (2024). "Impact of various aligner auxiliaries on orthodontic activity: A systematic review and network meta-analysis." *Saudi Dent J*, 36, 199-207.
- Kau, C. H., Soh, J., Christou, T., & Mangal, A. (2023). Orthodontic Aligners: Current Perspectives for the Modern Orthodontic Office. *Medicina*, 59(10), 1773.
- Cornelis, M. A., Gera, A., Gera, S., Isenshtat, A., & Cattaneo, P. M. (2023). Striving for Perfection: How Stable Is Orthodontic Treatment When Excellent Outcomes Are Achieved? A 9-Year Post-Treatment Retrospective Study. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 12(24), 7692.
- Martin, C. (2023). "Retention procedures for stabilising tooth position after treatment with orthodontic braces." *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 5.
- Al Shammary, N. H. (2024). Enhancing Orthodontic Renewal and Retention Techniques: A Systematic Review. *Cureus*, 16(4).
- Wilson, S., Idicula, D., Littlewood, S. J., & Barber, S. (2023). Orthodontic retention experience of university students: A qualitative study. *Journal of Orthodontics*, 50(2), 177-187.
- Knaup, I., Schulte, U., Bartz, J. R., Niederau, C., Craveiro, R. B., Jäger, A., & Wolf, M. (2022). Post-treatment Stability in Orthodontic Retention with Twistflex Retainers—Do Patients Benefit from Additional Removable Retainers?. *Clinical oral investigations*, 26(8), 5215-5222.
- Rosyida, N. F., Ana, I. D., & Alhasyimi, A. A. (2023). "The use of polymers to enhance post-orthodontic tooth stability." *Polymers*, 15(1), 103.
- Lyros, I., Tsolakis, I. A., Maroulakos, M. P., Fora, E., Lykogeorgos, T., Dalampira, M., & Tsolakis, A. I. (2023). Orthodontic retainers—a critical review. *Children*, 10(2), 230.
- Ashari, A., Nik Mustapha, N. M., Yuen, J. J. X., Saw, Z. K., Lau, M. N., Xian, L., ... & Sinnasamy, S. (2022). A two-year comparative assessment of retention of arch width increases between modified vacuum-formed and Hawley retainers: a multi-center randomized clinical trial. *Progress in Orthodontics*, 23(1), 40.
- Littlewood, S. J., Dalci, O., Dolce, C., Holliday, L. S., & Naraghi, S. (2021). Orthodontic retention: what's on the horizon?. *British Dental Journal*, 230(11), 760-764.
- Maulana, H., Yueniwati, Y., Permatasari, N., & Suyono, H. (2024). Role of Pulsed Electromagnetic Field on Alveolar Bone Remodeling during Orthodontic Retention Phase in Rat Models. *Dentistry Journal*, 12(9), 287.
- Jedliński, M., Mazur, M., Schmeidl, K., Grocholewicz, K., Ardan, R., & Janiszewska-Olszowska, J. (2022). Orthodontic Retention—Protocols and Materials—A Questionnaire Pilot Study among Polish Practitioners. *Materials*, 15(2), 666.
- Sonesson, M., Naraghi, S., & Bondemark, L. (2022). Cost analysis of two types of fixed maxillary retainers and a removable vacuum-formed maxillary retainer: a randomized controlled trial. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 44(2), 197-202.
- Qi, J., Kitaura, H., Shen, W. R., Kishikawa, A., Ogawa, S., Otori, F., ... & Mizoguchi, I. (2019). Establishment of an orthodontic retention mouse model and the effect of anti-c-Fms antibody on orthodontic relapse. *PLoS One*, 14(6), e0214260.
- Azami, N., Chen, P. J., Mehta, S., Kalajzic, Z., Dutra, E. H., Nanda, R., & Yadav, S. (2020). Raloxifene administration enhances retention in an orthodontic relapse model. *European journal of orthodontics*, 42(4), 371-377.
- Jowett, A. C., Littlewood, S. J., Hodge, T. M., Dhaliwal, H. K., & Wu, J. (2023). CAD/CAM nitinol bonded retainer versus a chairside rectangular-chain bonded retainer: a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Orthodontics*, 50(1), 55-68.
- Krämer, A., Sjöström, M., Apelthun, C., Hallman, M., & Feldmann, I. (2023). Post-treatment stability after 5 years of retention with vacuum-formed and bonded retainers—a randomized controlled trial. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 45(1), 68-78.
- Ashari, A., Nik Mustapha, N. M., Yuen, J. J. X., Saw, Z. K., Lau, M. N., Xian, L., ... & Sinnasamy, S. (2022). A two-year comparative assessment of retention of arch width increases between modified vacuum-formed and Hawley retainers: a multi-center randomized clinical trial. *Progress in Orthodontics*, 23(1), 40.