

Indirectly Printed Thermoformed Aligners- Oral Health Related Quality of Life: A Mini Review

Dr Santosh Kumar Goje¹, Dr Vishwa Shah²

¹BDS, MDS, Professor and Head, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, KMSDCH, Vadodara, Gujarat, India

Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Vadodara, Gujarat, India K.M. Shah Dental College and Hospital, pin-391760

²BDS, Post graduate student (MDS resident), Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, KMSDCH, Vadodara, Gujarat, India

Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Vadodara, Gujarat, India K.M. Shah Dental College and Hospital, pin-391760

¹santoshgoje@gmail.com, ²vishwafshah@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Santosh Kumar Goje, Vishwa Shah (2024) Indirectly Printed Thermoformed Aligners- Oral Health Related Quality of Life: A Mini Review. *Library Progress International*, 44(2s), 1636-1641.

ABSTRACT

Clear aligner is an advanced orthodontic method with benefits of comfort, aesthetics, and convenience. This review describes the pain perception, and impacts on oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) of adult patients receiving clear aligners for orthodontic treatments. As more and more patients are opting for clear aligners over the conventional fixed appliance therapy patient's perception of pain and comfort regarding the aligners becomes extremely important. Therefore, proper evaluation regarding the pain perception and comfort and Oral health related quality of life during the orthodontic treatment with clear aligners must be evaluated. The present mini review aims to summarize the studies in the literature regarding the pain, tissue irritation, fit of the clear aligners. It was concluded that pain perception with clear aligners was lesser than fixed appliances, discrepancy in the fit of the aligners will not lead to desired tooth movement. In general, greater comfort was offered by clear aligners than fixed appliance therapy.

KEYWORDS

Clear Aligners, CAT, Clear Aligner Therapy, Ohrqol, Indirectly Printed Aligners, Pain Perception, Comfort, Durability

INTRODUCTION

Today's patients may experience increased worry and anxiety because to their increased awareness of any postoperative symptoms associated with dental procedures. Patients frequently suffer varying degrees of pain, discomfort, and worry during the early phases of any orthodontic treatment, which can interfere with everyday activities like eating and sleeping^{1,2}. Greater anxiety levels have been associated with more painful and long-lasting postoperative periods.³ In the dental field, "Oral Health-Related Quality of Life" (OHRQoL) focuses on

quality of life linked to oral health.^{4,5,6} The OHRQoL reflects people's comfort when eating, sleeping and engaging in social interaction; their self-esteem; and their satisfaction with respect to their oral health. The literature presents various tools aimed at quantifying OHRQoL by estimating patient difficulties associated with discomfort, pain, mastication difficulties, speech disturbances and social impairments^{5,7,8,9,10}. OHRQoL scores during orthodontic treatment seem to be negatively affected by physical discomfort, pain, functional problems, and psychological issues.^{11,12} Nevertheless, these scores improve substantially with time. CAT is becoming increasingly popular among patients seeking orthodontic therapy. However, this system has serious limitations regarding the accuracy of expected tooth movements compared to conventional fixed appliance orthodontic treatment.¹³ Studies on CAT have shown better patient-reported experiences in oral hygiene, comfort, esthetics, pain, periodontal status, patient chair-time and overall treatment time.^{13,14,15,16} Another recent study evaluated OHRQoL and oral hygiene in adolescents during the first year of aligner therapy. They found that OHRQoL was only slightly affected and that oral hygiene at home was intensified.¹⁷ However, the type of appliance used influences the pain and quality of life of patients at the start of orthodontic treatment.¹⁸

When comparing quality of life (QoL) between patients treated with fixed appliances and Invisalign (Align Technology, San Jose, CA), it was observed that both presented similar QoL results, except under the category of eating and chewing where the aligner group showed better results.¹⁹

PAIN, TISSUE IRRITATION

Pain is a subjective response and presents a large number of individual variations under the same trigger conditions. It depends on several factors such as age, sex, individual pain threshold, emotional state, stress, amount of applied force, cultural differences, and previous experiences of pain.^{20,21} Pain complaints are a common feature during orthodontic treatment²² directly influencing patient's satisfaction.²³ It is one of the main reasons for orthodontic treatment discontinuation.²⁴ It is well known that during orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances, it is common to feel pain and discomfort²⁵, reaching its peak 24 h after arch insertion, and being almost imperceptible 7 days after.^{26,27} However, the type of the appliances may have an influence on the pain and discomfort reported by the patients due to the type of force applied. Removable appliances produce intermittent forces, which allow the tissues to reorganize before compressive forces are reapplied.²⁸ Regarding studies that have evaluated pain levels with clear aligners compared to fixed appliances, some studies have found positive^{21,29,30} or negative³¹ results related to clear aligners. Almasoud et al¹⁴ compared the pain perception between self- ligating Damon's bracket system and clear aligners and found that Patients treated with Invisalign observed lower pain than did with braces. Increase of pain was experienced at 24 h and decrease at day 7 in both groups.

Mais-Damois et al³² found similar results regarding pain comparison between clear aligners and fixed appliance, they also found that the tissue irritation was lesser for aligners. These results of pain perception were also in agreement with Miller et al³⁰, White et al²¹. Shalish et al³¹ compared OHRQL of lingual appliances with clear aligners, it was found that lingual appliance was associated with more severe pain and analgesic consumption, increase in oral and general dysfunction, and the most difficult and longest recovery. Long term comparison of 6 months was performed by Chan et al³³ for orthodontic pain comparison between fixed appliances and clear aligners, similar amount of pain was found in the 1st 2 days of both the groups. The clear aligner pain remained minimal, fixed appliance pain peaked 2 days post appointments and remained elevated till 7 days when new arch wire was used.

ACCURACY AND FIT

In dentistry, dimensional accuracy is a common research topic since many dental prostheses need to fit precisely to increase longevity and lower the chance of oral pathology.³⁴ There are many ways to evaluate dimensional correctness. Three techniques have been used to evaluate the dimensional accuracy of thermoplastic dental materials intended for use in retainers: micro-CT³⁷, optical scanners³⁶, and computer coordinate machines.³⁵ Once a model's volume and the volume that each retainer encloses have been measured, they are sent into a computer software that uses a best-fit function to align the volumetric renderings and digitally measures the distances between the retainers at pre-selected reference points. Literature shows that the accuracy of aligner fit have reported average discrepancies far beyond the ranges of clinical acceptability. Mantovani et al.³⁸ measured the aligner gaps of two commercially available aligner systems by using scanning electron microscopy and found average discrepancies ranging from 0.102 mm to 0.351 mm. Lombardo et al.⁷ investigated the measurements of aligner gaps of five commercially available aligner systems using micro-computed tomography (micro-CT) scans and found discrepancies ranging from 0.047 mm to 0.651 mm. If the discrepancy between the aligner and the tooth is greater than 0.25 mm at a site where 0.25 mm movement is prescribed, no clinically appreciable tooth movement will occur. This discrepancy of fit could be a potential cause for the lack of movement accuracy of up to 57% in some planned orthodontic movement. Less information is available regarding the dimensional accuracy of aligners or retainers. Cole et al.³⁹ compared the dimensional accuracy of thermoformed retainers versus direct-printed retainers and found that direct-printed retainers had greater discrepancies. They used optical scanning and metrology software to assess accuracy at specific landmarks and found average discrepancies ranging from 0.1 mm to 0.3 mm for thermoformed retainers and 0.1 mm to 0.4 mm for direct-printed retainers. Jindal et al.⁴⁰ evaluated the geometrical accuracy of direct-printed aligners and found that crown heights were more accurate than those of their thermoformed counterparts. While the average discrepancy in thermoformed aligners was 0.37 mm, the corresponding value for direct-printed aligners was 0.21 mm which was in contrast with the study by Cole et al.³⁹ Prior to this study, the dimensional accuracy of direct-printed aligners had not been thoroughly evaluated.

COMFORT

Flores-mir et al⁴¹ conducted a cross-sectional study comparing conventional fixed appliances and clear aligners and assessed dental impacts on daily living via a patient satisfaction questionnaire. It was found that patients were better satisfied being treated with clear aligners when chewing and eating were concerned. Both groups treated patients had statistically similar satisfaction outcomes, except for eating and chewing

In a study by Fujiyama et al⁴² comparing the clear aligners with the Edgewise straight wire found that the intensity of pain was lesser with aligners but this study questioned the durability of the aligner as problems such as tray deformation were found and hence must be checked.

CONCLUSION

Pain perception of the patients using Clear aligners as a mode of treatment was lesser than patients with fixed labial (edgewise, MBT, self ligating) and lingual appliances. Tissue irritation with fixed appliances was greater than clear aligners.

Poor aligner fit with greater discrepancy between the tooth surface and the aligner will result in no tooth movement.

Patients were overall better satisfied with the treatment with clear aligners when compared with fixed appliances.

REFERENCES

1. Jones M, Chan C. The pain and discomfort experienced during orthodontic treatment: a randomized controlled clinical trial of two initial aligning arch wires. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1992;102(4):373–81.
2. De Jongh A, Meijerink-Anderson M. Clinical management of dental anxiety: what works for whom? *Int Dent J.* 2005;55:73–80
3. Klages U, Ulusoy O, Kianifard S, Wehrbein H. Dental trait anxiety and pain sensitivity as predictors of expected and experienced pain in stressful dental procedures. *Eur J Oral Sci.* 2004;112(6):477–83.
4. Sischo L, Broder HL. Oral health-related quality of life: what, why, how, and future implications. *J Dent Res.* 2011;90(11):1264–70.
5. Cunningham SJ, Hunt NP. Quality of life and its importance in orthodontics. *J Orthod.* 2001;28(2):152–8.
6. Inglehart MR, Bagramian R. Oral health-related quality of life. Chicago: Quintessence; 2002.
7. Locker D, Jokovic A. Using subjective oral health status indicators to screen for dental care needs in older adults. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 1996;24(6):398–402.
8. O'Brien K, Kay L, Fox D, Mandall N. Assessing oral health outcomes for orthodontics—measuring health status and quality of life. *Community Dent Health.* 1998;15(1):22–6.
9. Chaushu S, Becker A, Zeltser R, Branski S, Vasker N, Chaushu G. Patients perception of recovery after exposure of impacted teeth: a comparison of closed- versus open-eruption techniques. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2005;63:323–9.
10. Chaushu G, Becker A, Zeltser R, Vasker N, Branski S, Chaushu S. Patients' perceptions of recovery after routine extraction of healthy premolars. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2007;131(2):170–5.
11. Feu D, Miguel JA, Celeste RK, Oliveira BH. Effect of orthodontic treatment on oral health-related quality of life. *Angle Orthod.* 2013;83(5):892–8.
12. Chen M, Wang DW, Wu LP. Fixed orthodontic appliance therapy and its impact on oral health-related quality of life in Chinese patients. *Angle Orthod.* 2010;80(1):49–53.
13. Galan-Lopez L, Barcia-Gonzalez J, Plasencia E. A systematic review of the accuracy and efficiency of dental movements with Invisalign. *Korean J Orthod.* 2019;49(3):140–9.
14. Almasoud NN. Pain perception among patients treated with passive self-ligating fixed appliances and Invisalign® aligners during the first week of orthodontic treatment. *Korean J Orthod.* 2018;48(5):326–32.
15. Cardoso PC, Espinosa DG, Mecnas P, Flores-Mir C, Normando D. Pain level between clear aligners and fixed appliances: a systematic review. *Prog Orthod.* 2020;21(1):3.
16. Diddige R, Negi G, Kiran KVS, Chitra P. Comparison of pain levels in patients treated with 3 different orthodontic appliances—a randomized trial. *Med Pharm Rep.* 2020;93(1):81–8.
17. Sauer MK, Drechsler T, Peron PF, Schmidtman I, Ohlendorf D, Wehrbein H, Erbe C. Aligner therapy in adolescents: first-year results on the impact of therapy on oral health-related quality of life and oral hygiene. *Clin Oral Investig.* 2023;27(1):369–75.
18. Antonio-Zancajo L, Montero J, Albaladejo A, Oteo-Calatayud MD, Alvarado-Lorenzo A. Pain and oral-health-related quality of life in orthodontic patients during initial therapy with conventional, low-friction, and lingual brackets and aligners (Invisalign): a prospective clinical study. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(7):2088.
19. Flores-Mir C, Brandelli J, Pacheco-Pereira C. Patient satisfaction and quality of life status after 2 treatment modalities: Invisalign and conventional fixed appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2018;154(5):639–44.

20. . Bergius M, Kiliaridis S, Berggren U. Pain in orthodontics a review and discussion of the literature. *J Orofac Orthop.* 2000;62(2):125–37.
21. White DW, Julien KC, Jacob H, Campbell PM, Buschang PH. Discomfort associated with Invisalign and traditional brackets: a randomized , prospective trial. *Angle Orthod.* 2017;87(6):801–8.
22. Kazancı F, Aydoğan C, Alkan Ö. Patients' and parents' concerns and decisions about orthodontic treatment. *Korean J Orthod.* 2016;46(1):20–6.
23. Al-Omiri MK, Abu Alhaija ES. Factors affecting patient satisfaction after orthodontic treatment. *Angle Orthod.* 2006;76(3):422–31.
24. Haynes S. Discontinuation of orthodontic relative to patient age Orthodontic. *J Dent.* 1967;2(4):138–42.
25. Jones M, Chan C. The pain and discomfort experienced during orthodontic treatment: a randomized controlled clinical trial of two initial aligning arch wires. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1992;102(4):373–81.
26. Ngan P, Kess B, Wilson S. Perception of discomfort by patients undergoing orthodontic treatment. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1989;96(1):47–53.
27. Scheurer PA, Firestone AR, Burgin WB. Perception of pain as a result of orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances. *Eur J Orthod.* 1996;18(4):349–57.
28. Thilander B, Rygh P, Reitan K. Tissue reactions in orthodontics.: Elsevier, Philadelphia, PA; 2005. 247-286 p.
29. Almasoud NN. Pain perception among patients treated with passive selfligating fixed appliances and Invisalign ® aligners during the first week of orthodontic treatment. *Korean J Orthod.* 2018;48(5):326–32.
30. Miller KB, McGorray SP, Womack R, Quintero C, Perelmuter M, Gibson J, et al. A comparison of treatment impacts between Invisalign aligner and fixed appliance therapy during the first week of treatment. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2007;131(3):302.e1–9.
31. Shalish M, Cooper-kazaz R, Ivgi I, Canetti L, Tsur B, Bachar E, et al. Adult patients' adjustability to orthodontic appliances. Part I : a comparison between Labial, Lingual, and Invisalign™. *Eur J Orthod.* 2012;34(6):724–30
32. . Masi-damois C. Comparaison de la perception de la douleur entre le traitement orthodontique avec Invisalign® et le traitement avec fils et boîtiers fixes; 2015.
33. Chan V, Shroff B, Kravitz ND, Carrico C, Hawkins D, Tran P, et al. Orthodontic pain with fixed appliances and clear aligners: A 6-month comparison. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* [Internet]. 2024
34. Holm C, Tidehag P, Tillberg A, Molin M. Longevity and quality of FPDs: a retrospective study of restorations 30, 20, and 10 years after insertion. *Int J Prosthodont.* 2003;16:283 9.
35. Johal A, Sharma NR, McLaughlin K, Zou LF. The reliability of thermoform retainers: a laboratory-based comparative study. *Eur J Orthod.* 2015;37:503–7. doi: 10.1093/ejo/cju075.
36. Cole D, Bencharit S, Carrico CK, Arias A, Tüfekçi E. Evaluation of fit for 3D-printed retainers compared with thermoform retainers. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.*
37. Lombardo L, Palone M, Longo M, Arveda N, Nacucchi M, De Pascalis F, et al. MicroCT X-ray comparison of aligner gap and thickness of six brands of aligners: an in-vitro study. *Prog Orthod.* 2020;21:12. doi: 10.1186/s40510-020-00312-w.bcb319f3655c432fbba7d300c6451bad
38. Mantovani E, Castroflorio E, Rossini G, Garino F, Cugliari G, Deregibus A, et al. Scanning electron microscopy evaluation of aligner fit on teeth. *Angle Orthod.* 2018;88:596–601. doi: 10.2319/120417-827.1

39. Cole D, Bencharit S, Carrico CK, Arias A, Tüfekçi E. Evaluation of fit for 3D-printed retainers compared with thermoform retainers. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2019;155:592–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2018.09.011
40. Jindal P, Juneja M, Siena FL, Bajaj D, Breedon P. Mechanical and geometric properties of thermoformed and 3D printed clear dental aligners. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2019;156:694–701. doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.05.012.
41. Flores-Mir C, Brandelli J, Pacheco-Pereira C. Patient satisfaction and quality of life status after 2 treatment modalities: Invisalign and conventional fixed appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2018;154(5):639–44.
42. Fujiyama K, Honjo T, Suzuki M, Matsuoka S, Deguchi T. Analysis of pain level in cases treated with Invisalign aligner : comparison with fixed edgewise appliance therapy. *Prog Orthod.* 2014;15(1):64