

Accuracy of a Method to Monitor Root Position Using 3D Digital Crown/root Model During Orthodontic Treatments

Kaho Ogawa

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Yoshiki Ishida

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Yukinori Kuwajima

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Cliff Lee

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Jacob R Emge

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Mitsuru Izumisawa

Iwate Medical University: Iwate Ika Daigaku

Kazuro Satoh

Iwate Medical University: Iwate Ika Daigaku

Shigemi Nagai

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

John D Da Silva

Harvard School of Dental Medicine

Chia-Yu Chen (✉ Chia-Yu_Chen@hsdm.harvard.edu)

Harvard School of Dental Medicine <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3829-1256>

Research article

Keywords: Digital dentistry, CBCT, digital scans, orthodontic tooth movement

Posted Date: May 18th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-525470/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Objectives.

The objective of this retrospective clinical study was to assess the accuracy of a method of predicting post-movement root position during orthodontic treatment, using a 3D digital crown/root model (3DCRM), which was created with pre-movement records of both CBCT and dental-arch digital scans.

Material & Methods.

Pre-movement CBCT scans, post-movement CBCT scans, and dental-arch digital scans of five patients who had completed orthodontic treatments were used in this study with the approval of internal review board of Iwate Medical University. The 3DCRM was superimposed onto post-movement scanned dental-arch to identify the post-movement root position (test method). Post-movement CBCT (referenced as current method) served as the control used to identify the actual post-movement root position. The predicted root positions by the two methods were compared using color displacement mapping and 3D coordinate XYZ analysis.

Results.

Color displacement mapping showed that the average root displacement of five cases was $-0.16 \text{ mm} \pm 0.05 \text{ mm}$. 3D coordinate analysis revealed no significant differences between test and current methods in X and Y axis. However, the discrepancy in Z axis (especially in cases of intrusion) was greater than all other directions (mesial, distal, labial, palatal and extrusion direction) for all three tooth types examined (central incisor, lateral incisor and canine, $p < 0.05$). A strong positive correlation between the degree of discrepancy and the distance of tooth movement was observed on the Z axis ($r = 0.71$).

Conclusions.

The 3DCRM method showed promising potential to accurately predict root position during orthodontic treatments without the need for a second CBCT. However, root resorption, which affected the Z axis prediction, needs to be closely monitored using periapical radiographs to complement this method.

Clinical Relevance.

The 3DCRM method can be a useful tool to better evaluate root positioning during and after orthodontic treatment without the need to expose patients to an additional CBCT scan.

Introduction

The goal of orthodontic treatment is to establish ideal three-dimensional crown and root position in a functional, stable, and esthetic occlusion. Andrews reported six keys to normal occlusion, 1) molar relationship, 2) crown angulation (mesiodistal tip), 3) crown inclination (labiolingual or buccolingual

inclination), 4) rotations, and 5) occlusal plane and 6) occlusion based on crown information from study models.[1] Proper root position and parallelism are imperative for adequate occlusal function, periodontal health, implant placement, and restorative treatment.[2–5] Root position and parallelism are important factors for achieving even distribution of occlusal forces to create ideal function and for establishing proper contours and emergence profiles of restorations.[2–5] Root proximity may lead to rapid periodontal breakdown and horizontal bone loss instead of intrabony defects that are amenable to regeneration.[6–11] The consequences of roots moving out of the alveolar housing include clinical attachment loss, recession, bone dehiscence, mobility, and even tooth loss.[12, 13] Therefore, predicting root position during orthodontic treatment is a critical factor for successful outcomes.

Two-dimensional (2D) images such as cephalometric and panoramic radiographs cannot evaluate the three-dimensional (3D) position of the teeth and roots relative to the maxillofacial region and alveolar bone during orthodontic treatments. With its increasing availability, cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) has been used to aid in diagnosis and assessment during orthodontic treatment. The advantage of CBCT is that it provides the exact 3D location of the crown and roots of teeth and their relationship with both neighboring teeth and alveolar bone.[14, 15] Therefore, visual and timely evaluation of root positioning using 3D imaging by CBCT is crucial in orthodontic treatments. However, CBCT is not without its disadvantages.

Since the effective radiation dose from CBCT is significantly higher compared to conventional radiographs, routine usage of CBCT is not recommended during orthodontic treatments as a substitute for conventional radiographs, especially when the population for orthodontic treatment is relatively young.[16, 17] Furthermore, CBCT rendering of teeth lacks precise occlusal surface and accurate interdigitation.[18] Artifacts from metal restorations and orthodontic brackets can also result in discrepancies.[19] On the other hand, digital scanning can provide precise tooth morphology and register accurate interocclusal relationship. Studies have also shown that brackets did not affect the accuracy of digital scans.[20, 21] Therefore, registration and subsequent superimposition of CBCT and digital scans obtained with either an intraoral scanner or an extraoral lab scanner have become a standard workflow in many orthodontic appliance systems to assess tooth alignment. While this method is generally clinically acceptable, the registration of CBCT to digital scans is less accurate compared to registration of digital scans to digital scans.[22]

To overcome these shortcomings, Lee et al. in 2014 introduced a monitoring method by creating “teeth composites” whereby the 3D digital model was composed of crown extracted from digital scans and root portion extracted from CBCT.[22] The author demonstrated in an ex-vivo typodont study that this method was reliable to track the 3D position of whole teeth including roots. This method was not further verified in clinical studies due to impracticality related to technique-sensitive, complex and time-consuming process of threshold segmentation of teeth in real patients.

With the rapid development of imaging and digital technology in recent years, much improvement has been made in both hardware and software. Many commercial companies now provide service to

clinicians to process CBCT, digital scan data and produce 3D models with 3D printing. The cost of these services has also become significantly lower. Creating 3D digital crown/root models (3DCRM) by integrating digital scan crowns and CBCT root with patient data become a feasible approach. Therefore, this method first introduced by Lee et al. in 2014 will be an ideal modality.

This is a retrospective study using clinical cases and the aims of this study were 1) to assess the accuracy of this new method of predicting post-movement root position compared to the current method of using post-movement CBCT and 2) to analyze the association of accurately predicting root position in each of the three tooth types, and 3) to analyze the association between accuracy of test method and the amount of actual root apex movement. We hypothesize that the 3DCRM method will be as accurate as the use of post-movement CBCT in evaluating root positioning and thus eliminate the use of a second or multiple CBCTs during or at the completion of orthodontic treatment.

Materials And Methods

Data collection

In five orthodontic cases, the pre- and post-movement CBCT images and scanned dental arches were obtained from the patient database of the Division of Orthodontics, Department of Developmental Oral Health Science, School of Dentistry, Iwate Medical University in Japan. Cases with cleft-palate and other craniofacial syndromes were excluded. This study was approved by the institutional review board (IRB) of Iwate Medical University, School of Dental Medicine (No. 01329).

The CBCTs were captured at 90 ~ 120 kV, 6.0 ~ 7.5 mA using a dental CBCT scanner (3D Accuitomo 170, J. MORITA CORP, Kyoto, Japan). The images were reconstructed with 0.28 mm slice thickness and exported as digital imaging and communications in medicine (DICOM) files. The pre- and post-movement scanned dental arches were obtained using a 3D digital scanner (MDS500 Dental Scanner, AGE Solutions S.r.l., Pisa, Italy) and exported as STL files.

Fabrication of 3D digital crown/root models (3DCRM)

The CBCT DICOM files as well as digital scanning STL files were sent to a commercial 3D service company (3DDX, Boston, MA, USA) for further processing. Briefly, the pre- and post-movement DICOM files were imported into dental implant planning software (Simplant, Materialise Dental NV, Leuven, Belgium) and converted to stereolithography (STL) files. The 3D digital crown/root models (3DCRM) were created using pre-movement CBCT images and scanned dental arches (Fig. 1). The STL data of the pre-movement CBCT images and the scanned dental arches were superimposed with the crown shape as index (Fig. 1A). Second, using the superimposed images, individual 3DCRMs of the six maxillary anterior teeth were created and exported as STL files (Fig. 1B). The accuracy of the resulting 3DCRMs were checked by three clinicians before approval for use in the study.

Test method to predict the post-treatment root position

These 3DCRMs were superimposed onto the post-movement scanned dental arches using 3D data inspection software (GOM inspect, GOM, Braunschweig, Germany, Fig. 2A). The 3D coordinates in X, Y, and Z axis of the root apex were measured by the same person three times at three different time points, and the average value was used for the analysis.

Current method to identify the post-treatment root position

The post-movement of CBCT and scanned dental arches were imported into 3D data inspection software, and this data was superimposed with the crown shape as index. The 3D coordinates in X, Y, and Z axis of the root apex were measured with the same manner as the test method (Fig. 2B).

Analysis of accuracy for prediction of post-movement root position and statistical analysis

- Color displacement map

A color displacement map of the root was used by 3D data inspection software to quantify the differences between the root position created by the test method and the current method. The average displacement of each tooth was calculated and the statistical difference among the tooth type was analyzed using one-way ANOVA ($p < 0.01$, SPSS ver. 24, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

- 3D coordinates assessment of the discrepancy in six directions.

The discrepancy between post-movement root position determined by the test method and that of the current method was calculated in 3D axis X (DX), Y (DY) and Z (DZ) by the following equations (1):

$$DX = X_{test} - X_{current} \text{ (Positive: to labial, Negative: to palatal)}$$

$$DY = Y_{test} - Y_{current} \text{ (Positive: to mesial, Negative: to distal)}$$

$$DZ = Z_{test} - Z_{current} \text{ (Positive: to apical-intrusion, Negative: to incisal-extrusion)} \quad (1)$$

The discrepancy in each of the three axes amongst the three tooth types were compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc test ($p < 0.01$). One sample t-test was also performed to compare between the discrepancy in each of the three axes and CBCT voxel size.

- Association between accuracy of test method and the amount of actual root apex movement.

The amount of actual root apex movement (DARAM) was calculated using the 3D coordinates of pre-movement of CBCT (Pre) and post-movement of CBCT (Post) by the following equations (2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{DARAM (X)} &= |X_{post} - X_{pre}| \\
\text{DARAM (Y)} &= |Y_{post} - Y_{pre}| \\
\text{DARAM (Z)} &= |Z_{post} - Z_{pre}| \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

The Pearson's correlation coefficient between the distance of root movement (DARAM in X, Y and Z axis) and absolute value of the discrepancy on the X, Y and Z axis was calculated.

Results

Displacement in color map

The color displacement map of the root position by the test method and the current method displayed three colors: green, blue, and red (Fig. 3). Case 2 was predominantly in the green range indicating a minimum discrepancy between test method compared to the current method. In contrast, case 4 had significant yellow ~ red color at the root apex indicating outward displacement greater than 0.5 mm (Fig. 3). The average root displacement of five cases was $-0.16 \text{ mm} \pm 0.05 \text{ mm}$, and there was no significant difference among the three tooth types ($p > 0.01$, Table I).

Discrepancy in 3D coordinates

Figure 4 shows the distribution of discrepancy in X (the labial and palatal direction), Y (the mesial and distal direction) and Z axis (the intrusion and extrusion direction) with the zero point, which is the location determined by the current method. On the XY coordinate plane, mesial-palatal discrepancy is shown in quadrant I; mesial-labial discrepancy in quadrant II, distal-labial discrepancy in quadrant III, and distal-palatal discrepancy in quadrant IV. The most discrepancy was seen in quadrant III, which means that the root position was predicted to be more distal and labial. The Z axis analysis indicated that root position was overly predicted in the apical direction. The average discrepancy of each of X, Y, Z axis and directions is shown in Fig. 5. The discrepancy in Z axis on apical direction (intrusion direction) was significantly greater than all other directions for all tooth types ($p < 0.05$, Fig. 5). The discrepancy in Z axis on apical direction was also significantly higher than CBCT voxel size ($p < 0.01$), but no significant difference was observed between the discrepancy on other five axes and CBCT voxel size. Average discrepancy of each of three tooth types is shown in Table II. No significant difference was observed among the tooth types in the X, Y, and Z axis.

Association

There was a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.71$) observed between the amount of root movement in the Z axis (DARAM) and the absolute value of discrepancy in the Z axis. This means that prediction accuracy of root position by the test method decreases as the distance of root movement increases in Z axis. No correlation was observed within the X and Y axis (Fig. 6).

Discussion

Orthodontic treatment aims to move teeth to ideal positions within the extent of the alveolar bone without damaging the roots or adjacent structures.[15] Therefore, it is important to monitor the position of both the roots and crowns of teeth. The CBCT and panoramic radiographs are used to confirm the root position during orthodontic treatments. The majority of orthodontists use panoramic radiographs to visualize the correct root positions. A survey in 2008 found that 67.4% and 80.1% of American orthodontists took panoramic radiographs during orthodontic treatments and post-treatment, respectively.[23] There is a report that the magnification-distortion ratio of the CBCT images (1.04) is smaller than that of panoramic radiographs (1.20).[24] However, several papers reported that CBCT should not be used routinely on every patient due to resulting higher dose of radiation in comparison to conventional radiographs.[16, 17, 25, 26] Therefore, our new method to accurately predict the root position during orthodontic treatments without taking additional CBCT will be beneficial and necessary.

3DCRM used in this study is a digital model of the crown and root created by the pre-movement scanned dental arches and CBCT images. We hypothesized that the root position during orthodontic treatments could be predicted by superimposing 3DCRM onto the post-movement scanned dental arches without extra CBCT images. The 3DCRM can be individually superimposed to each tooth of post-movement scanned dental arches by utilizing the crown portion as the index.

In this study, we evaluated the accuracy of new method (test method) in predicting root position using the color mapping analysis and 3D coordinate analysis. The advantage of the color mapping analysis is to visualize the displacement of the entire root surface.

The color mapping analysis visually indicated the distinguishable displacement between the test method and current method mainly at the root apex, and the rest root surface had minimal discrepancy within the green level. Furthermore, our results (average $0.16 \text{ mm} \pm 0.05 \text{ mm}$ displacement) based on clinical cases was comparable to results from the ex vivo typodont study by Lee et al in which displacements of $0.17 \pm 0.32 \text{ mm}$ and $0.11 \pm 0.16 \text{ mm}$ were found for the maxillary and mandibular teeth respectively.[22]

3D coordinate analysis can provide an accurate prediction of the root apex in the direction of discrepancy with numerical data. The 3D coordinate analysis indicated a significant discrepancy only on the Z axis (the apex/intrusion and incisal/extrusion direction) but neither the X axis (the labial and palatal direction) nor the Y axis (the mesial and distal direction). The numerical data of the average discrepancy on the Z axis-apical was 0.83 mm, which is 2.9 times larger than a single CBCT voxel unit (0.28mm). In contrast, the data on X and Y axis was about 1.1 ~ 1.8 times larger without statistical difference. This means that a discrepancy existed with regards to the root apex position in the Z axis, especially in the intrusion direction. In addition, a strong positive correlation was observed between the distance of actual root apex movement and the discrepancy along the Z axis.

The discrepancy in the apical direction is likely due to root resorption that occurs during orthodontic treatment. Based on the changes in the crown orientation, superimposition of the pre and post-movement scans allowed the root orientation, and thus the bucco-lingual and mesio-distal orientation could be predicted. However, resorption of the apex of the root and the amount of resorption cannot be predicted,

leading to the discrepancy along the Z axis. Excessive orthodontic and occlusal-loading forces are associated factors of root resorption.[27–33] Since the root resorption associated with orthodontic treatment can occur and progress without any symptoms, monitoring root positions with radiographs during orthodontic treatment is essential.[34] Routine radiographic evaluation using periapical films is recommended to accurately monitor the root position during orthodontic treatment.

One of the limitations of this study is the lack of variation of clinical cases. The cases used were non-extraction cases, and the amount of root movement was relatively small. Further study is required involving moderate to severe crowding cases to validate this method.

Conclusions

The 3DCRM method showed promising potential to accurately predict root position during orthodontic treatments. However, in cases of root resorption, it was difficult to identify the position of the root in the apico-coronal direction. Therefore, frequent assessment of root resorption using periapical radiographs is recommended to compensate for the lack of accuracy of predicting movement along the Z axis.

Declarations

Compliance with Ethical Standards

1. Ethics approval and consent to participate: This work contained use of patient orthodontic treatment records, digital scans and CBCT data retrospectively. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Iwate Medical University approved the study.
2. Consent for publication: This manuscript does not contain identifiable data; therefore, it does not require additional consent for publication except for the IRB approval.
3. Competing interests: All authors declare no conflict of interest.
4. Funding: The work was not supported by any external funding
5. Authors' contributions: KO performed the measurement and wrote the manuscript. YI performed the measurements and was responsible for research design. YK was responsible for the clinical management and gathering of clinical data. CL contributed to statistical analysis. JE contributed to the discussion and integration of data. MI and KS overseen the IRB application as well as the clinical treatments. SN was responsible for communication between the two research sites/team and contributed to inception of the study. JD contributed greatly to interpretation of the data. CYC was responsible for substantively revised the work and interpretation of data.
6. Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank 3DDX for working on the CBCT segmentation and 3D model creation.

References

1. Andrews LF: **The six keys to normal occlusion.** *Am J Orthod* 1972, **62**(3):296-309.

2. Balut N, Klapper L, Sandrik J, Bowman D: **Variations in bracket placement in the preadjusted orthodontic appliance.** *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 1992, **102**(1):62-67.
3. Dewel BF: **Clinical observations on the axial inclination of teeth.** *Am J Orthod* 1949, **35**(2):98-115.
4. Vermynen K, De Quincey GN, van 't Hof MA, Wolffe GN, Renggli HH: **Classification, reproducibility and prevalence of root proximity in periodontal patients.** *J Clin Periodontol* 2005, **32**(3):254-259.
5. Vermynen K, De Quincey GN, Wolffe GN, van 't Hof MA, Renggli HH: **Root proximity as a risk marker for periodontal disease: a case-control study.** *J Clin Periodontol* 2005, **32**(3):260-265.
6. Olsen CT, Ammons WF, van Belle G: **A longitudinal study comparing apically repositioned flaps, with and without osseous surgery.** *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 1985, **5**(4):10-33.
7. Waerhaug J: **Eruption of teeth into crowded position, loss of attachment, and downgrowth of subgingival plaque.** *Am J Orthod* 1980, **78**(4):453-459.
8. Nevins M: **Interproximal periodontal disease - the embrasure as an etiologic factor.** *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 1982, **2**(6):8-27.
9. Klassman B, Zucker HW: **Treatment of a periodontal defect resulting from improper tooth alignment and local factors.** *J Periodontol* 1969, **40**(7):401-403.
10. Ritchey B, Orban B: **The crests of the interdental alveolar septa.** *The Journal of Periodontology* 1953, **24**(2):75-87.
11. Akiyoshi M, Mori K: **Marginal periodontitis: a histological study of the incipient stage.** *J Periodontol* 1967, **38**(1):45-52.
12. Wennstrom JL: **Mucogingival considerations in orthodontic treatment.** *Semin Orthod* 1996, **2**(1):46-54.
13. Steiner GG, Pearson JK, Ainamo J: **Changes of the marginal periodontium as a result of labial tooth movement in monkeys.** *J Periodontol* 1981, **52**(6):314-320.
14. Garib DG, Calil LR, Leal CR, Janson G: **Is there a consensus for CBCT use in Orthodontics?** *Dental press journal of orthodontics* 2014, **19**(5):136-149.
15. Kapila SD, Nervina JM: **CBCT in orthodontics: assessment of treatment outcomes and indications for its use.** *Dento maxillo facial radiology* 2015, **44**(1):20140282.
16. Signorelli L, Patcas R, Peltomaki T, Schatzle M: **Radiation dose of cone-beam computed tomography compared to conventional radiographs in orthodontics.** *Journal of orofacial orthopedics = Fortschritte der Kieferorthopadie : Organ/official journal Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Kieferorthopadie* 2016, **77**(1):9-15.
17. Silva MA, Wolf U, Heinicke F, Bumann A, Visser H, Hirsch E: **Cone-beam computed tomography for routine orthodontic treatment planning: a radiation dose evaluation.** *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of*

- Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 2008, **133**(5):640.e641-645.
18. Othman AA, El-Beialy AR, Fawzy SA, Kandil AH, El-Bialy AM, Mostafa YA: **Methods for managing 3-dimensional volumes**. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 2010, **137**(2):266-273.
 19. Schulze R, Heil U, Gross D, Bruellmann DD, Dranischnikow E, Schwanecke U, Schoemer E: **Artefacts in CBCT: a review**. *Dento maxillo facial radiology* 2011, **40**(5):265-273.
 20. Kang SJ, Kee YJ, Clara Lee K: **Effect of the presence of orthodontic brackets on intraoral scans**. *The Angle orthodontist* 2020.
 21. Jung YR, Park JM, Chun YS, Lee KN, Kim M: **Accuracy of four different digital intraoral scanners: effects of the presence of orthodontic brackets and wire**. *Int J Comput Dent* 2016, **19**(3):203-215.
 22. Lee RJ, Pham J, Choy M, Weissheimer A, Dougherty HL, Jr., Sameshima GT, Tong H: **Monitoring of tyodont root movement via crown superimposition of single cone-beam computed tomography and consecutive intraoral scans**. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 2014, **145**(3):399-409.
 23. Keim RG, Gottlieb EL, Nelson AH, Vogels DS, 3rd: **2008 JCO study of orthodontic diagnosis and treatment procedures, part 1: results and trends**. *Journal of clinical orthodontics : JCO* 2008, **42**(11):625-640.
 24. Yim JH, Ryu DM, Lee BS, Kwon YD: **Analysis of digitalized panorama and cone beam computed tomographic image distortion for the diagnosis of dental implant surgery**. *The Journal of craniofacial surgery* 2011, **22**(2):669-673.
 25. Isaacson KG, Thom AR, Atack NE, Horner K, Whaites E: **Guidelines for the use of radiographs in clinical orthodontics**, 4 edn: British Orthodontic Society; 2015.
 26. Abdelkarim AA: **Appropriate use of ionizing radiation in orthodontic practice and research**. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 2015, **147**(2):166-168.
 27. Baumrind S, Korn EL, Boyd RL: **Apical root resorption in orthodontically treated adults**. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 1996, **110**(3):311-320.
 28. Weiland F: **Constant versus dissipating forces in orthodontics: the effect on initial tooth movement and root resorption**. *European journal of orthodontics* 2003, **25**(4):335-342.
 29. Taithongchai R, Sookkorn K, Killiany DM: **Facial and dentoalveolar structure and the prediction of apical root shortening**. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 1996, **110**(3):296-302.

30. Paetyangkul A, Turk T, Elekdag-Turk S, Jones AS, Petocz P, Cheng LL, Darendeliler MA: **Physical properties of root cementum: Part 16. Comparisons of root resorption and resorption craters after the application of light and heavy continuous and controlled orthodontic forces for 4, 8, and 12 weeks.** *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 2011, **139**(3):e279-284.
31. Maltha JC, van Leeuwen EJ, Dijkman GE, Kuijpers-Jagtman AM: **Incidence and severity of root resorption in orthodontically moved premolars in dogs.** *Orthodontics & craniofacial research* 2004, **7**(2):115-121.
32. Stenvik A, Mjor IA: **Pulp and dentine reactions to experimental tooth intrusion. A histologic study of the initial changes.** *Am J Orthod* 1970, **57**(4):370-385.
33. Currell SD, Liaw A, Blackmore Grant PD, Esterman A, Nimmo A: **Orthodontic mechanotherapies and their influence on external root resorption: A systematic review.** *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics* 2019, **155**(3):313-329.
34. Ahangari Z, Nasser M, Mahdian M, Fedorowicz Z, Marchesan MA: **Interventions for the management of external root resorption.** *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2015(11):Cd008003.

Tables

Table I.

The average of root displacement of each tooth type.

	Average	S.D.	Max.	Min.
Total	-0.165	±0.053	1.889	-1.222
Central incisor	-0.140	±0.102	1.889	-1.222
Lateral incisor	-0.136	±0.122	1.878	-1.000
Canine	-0.177	±0.124	1.516	-1.055
Unit: mm				

Table II.

The average of root displacement of each tooth type in X, Y, Z axis and six directions. There was no significant difference among three tooth types.

Discrepancy		Central incisor		Lateral incisor		Canine	
Axis	Direction	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	n
X axis	Palatal	0.63 (0.38)	6	0.46 (0.28)	10	0.51 (0.18)	3
	Labial	0.48 (0.44)	4	NA	0	0.33 (0.16)	7
Y axis	Distal	0.18 (0.06)	5	0.24 (0.27)	7	0.61 (0.50)	6
	Mesial	0.41 (0.51)	5	0.17 (0.13)	3	0.35 (0.21)	4
Z axis	Incisal	0.27 (0.19)	2	0.21 (0.02)	2	0.36 (0.30)	5
	Apical	0.92 (0.61)	8	0.83 (0.47)	8	0.72 (0.32)	5
							Unit: mm

Figures




Figure 1

Protocol to generate the 3D digital crown/root models (3DCRM): A, pre-movement CBCT image. B, pre-movement scanned dental arches. C, the pre-movement CBCT image was superimposed on the pre-

movement scanned dental arches with the crown shape as index. D, the individual 3DCRM of the six maxillary teeth were extracted from surrounding structures.




Figure 2

Determination of the post-movement root position by the test method and the current method. A: The test method, the individual 3DCRM were superimposed on the post-movement scanned dental arches with the crown shape as index. B: The current method, post-movement of CBCT data were superimposed on the post-movement scanned dental arches.

ew Fig.3




Figure 3

The color displacement map of the root position of case 2 and case 4. The green (zero point) indicates that the test method and the current method had no displacement. The red indicates the outward displacement of the test method compared to the current method. The blue indicates the inward displacement of the test method compared to the current method.




Figure 4

The distribution of the discrepancy between the test method and the current method in X, Y and Z axis with zero point as the current method. X axis represents discrepancy to labial-palatal, Y axis to mesial-distal and Z axis to apex/intrusion- incisal/extrusion.




Figure 5

Comparison of the average discrepancy of each X, Y, Z axis and six directions by one-way ANOVA and Turkey's post-hoc test. The discrepancy in Z axis on apical direction (intrusion direction) was significantly greater than all other directions ($p < 0.05$).




Figure 6

Correlation between the actual amount of root apex movement (DARAM) and discrepancy absolute value.
A, X axis B, Y axis C, Z axis.