Effects of Herbst Appliance Treatment on the Mandibular Incisor Segment: A 3-D Analysis

João Paulo Schwartz (✉ joaoschwartz@hotmail.com)

Universidade Estadual Paulista Julio de Mesquita Filho <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4703-7105>

Taísa Boamorte Ravelli

Universidade Estadual Paulista Julio de Mesquita Filho

Dirceu Barnabé Ravelli

Universidade Estadual Paulista Julio de Mesquita Filho

Sabine Ruf

Justus Liebig Universitat Giessen

Research article

Keywords: Cone-Beam Computed Tomography, Herbst appliance, Incisor proclination, Orthodontic treatment

Posted Date: October 1st, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-80093/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Three-dimensionally evaluation of the treatment changes of a Herbst appliance using a lower anchorage unit not touching the lingual surface of the lower incisors.

Methods: 23 Class II:1 patients (12 males, 11 females) with a mean age of 15.7 ± 1.7 years treated with a Flip-Lock Herbst® (TP Orthodontics, Inc., La Porte, IN, USA) appliance. The lower anchorage unit for the Herbst appliance consisted of two anchor bands connected by a lingual arch with 3mm distance from the incisor's lingual surface. Treatment changes in mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite were evaluated by means of cone beam computed tomography images (i-CAT® Classic unit, Imaging Sciences International, Hatfield, PA, USA) obtained before and after treatment with the Herbst appliance.

Results: On average, there was a statistically significant increase in mandibular incisor inclination ($2.6 \pm 1.8^\circ$) and a reduction in overjet ($3.2 \pm 2.2\text{mm}$) and overbite ($1.3 \pm 0.9\text{mm}$). Genders did not differ significantly. Incisor proclination was however only seen in 74% of the patients. The changes in mandibular incisor inclination were associated with the changes in overjet ($r = 0.1$ to 0.5) and overbite ($r = 0.3$ to 0.7).

Conclusion: A Herbst appliance with a mandibular anchorage unit distant from the incisor's lingual surface results in smaller amounts of mandibular incisor proclination compared to literature. However, as it induces canine anchorage loss, the decreased amount of proclination may not prevail after multibracket treatment.

Trial registration: This study was registered 08 February 2011, reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Araraquara Dental School, Paulista State University (FOAr-UNESP), project number 62/2010. <https://www.foar.unesp.br/#!/comissoes-e-comites/cep/>

Background

Lower incisor proclination is an undesired side effect of Herbst treatment. Although, so far, no investigation could prove a clinically significant negative impact of incisor proclination on periodontal health, neither short- nor long-term [1–5], a proclination may hinder the achievement of a Class I occlusal relationship by increasing lower dental arch length and is said to be more prone to relapse. Up to now, regardless of the type of anchorage unit used, not even with additional skeletal anchorage, could the position of the mandibular incisor be satisfactorily controlled during Herbst treatment [6–9]. To what extent, a lower arch anchorage unit not touching the lingual surface of the lower incisor could prevent or reduce the amount of proclination has not been studied yet.

All aforementioned mentioned studies have used two-dimensional radiographs for the analysis of Herbst appliance treatment effects, which hinder a tooth specific evaluation of changes. In contrast, cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) images allow to assess a single tooth three-dimensionally (3D) and to

study tooth inclination changes induced by different orthodontic appliances [10, 11] as well as their impact on alveolar bone support [5].

The aim of the present study was to evaluate individually for each incisor by means of CBCT the mandibular incisor inclination changes as well as overjet and overbite changes induced by a Herbst appliance with a lower anchorage unit not touching the lingual surface of the lower incisors.

Methods

This retrospective study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Araraquara Dental School, Paulista State University (FOAr-UNESP), project number 62/2010. A total of 30 patients meeting the inclusion criteria were invited to participate in the study. Five patients refused to participate. Two patients were excluded because of appliance breakage. The final sample consisted of 23 consecutively treated (12 male, 11 female; mean age 15.7 ± 1.7 years) patients with Class II division 1 malocclusion. Hand wrist radiographs were used to assess the skeletal maturity according to Hägg and Taranger [12]. The percentage of cases within the different skeletal maturity groups before treatment were: MP3-G (4%), MP3-H (4%), R-I (17%), R-IJ (27%), R-J (48%).

The inclusion criteria were bilateral Class II canine and molar relationship $\geq \frac{1}{2}$ cusp, overjet > 5 mm, complete permanent dentition (except third molars), convex profile, straight nasolabial angle and short mentocervical line. Exclusion criteria were syndromic patients, increased vertical facial height, previous orthodontic treatment and need for maxillary expansion.

All patients were treated with a Herbst appliance (Fig. 1). The anchorage unit for the Herbst appliance consisted of upper first molar bands connected by a transpalatal arch (1.2 mm steel wire) with 2 mm distance from the palate as well as two occlusal extensions to reduce first molar intrusion and prevent second molar overeruption. In the lower arch two anchor bands were connected by a lingual arch (1.2 mm stainless steel wire) with 3 mm distance from the incisor's lingual surface to prevent incisor proclination. The labial cantilever was connected to the lingual arch at the level of the interproximal area between the canine and first premolar on both sides. The telescopic mechanism used was a Flip-Lock Herbst® (TP Orthodontics, Inc., La Porte, IN, USA). No additional appliances were used. The average treatment duration with the Herbst appliance was 8.5 ± 0.7 months.

CBCT images were obtained before (T0) and after (T1) treatment. Patients were scanned in an upright position with maximum intercuspation using a tomographic i-CAT® Classic unit (Imaging Sciences International, Hatfield, PA, USA) with a 17×13.3 cm of FOV, 120 kV tube voltage, 18.4 mA tube current and 0.4 mm isometric voxel size. CBCT images were examined by means of multiplanar reconstruction (axial, sagittal and coronal). The Dolphin® Imaging software (Dolphin Imaging & Management Solutions, Chatsworth, CA, USA) was used to evaluate the mandibular incisor inclination and the RadiAnt™ DICOM Viewer software (Medixant, Poznan, POL) was used for the measurement of overjet and overbite.

The CBCT images were analyzed metrically. In the first step, the reference plans were defined. The plane that includes the superior tip of the odontoid process of the axis, the tip of the anterior nasal spine and the nasion point is defined as the midsagittal plane (MSP) and the sagittal plane was oriented to coincided with the MSP [10, 11], (Fig. 2). In the coronal and axial view, the cursors are set to intersect in the center of the mandibular incisor of interest [10, 11], (Fig. 3).

The following measurements were performed in sagittal multiplanar reconstruction: mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite. The mandibular incisor inclination measurement was angular between three points, the first at the incisal edge, the second at the root apex and the third at the intersections of the axial and coronal cursors, positioned at the incisal edge and root apex, respectively (Fig. 4). Overjet measurement was linear, parallel to the axial cursor, between two points, one at the incisal edge of maxillary incisor and the other one at the buccal surface of mandibular incisor (Fig. 4). Overbite measurement was linear, parallel to the coronal cursor, between two points, one at the incisal edge of mandibular incisor and other at the intersections of the axial and coronal cursors, positioned at the incisal edge of maxillary incisor and incisal edge of mandibular incisor, respectively (Fig. 4).

Statistical Analysis

All measurements were performed twice by a single examiner with a minimum interval of at least two weeks between the measurements. The error of the method was evaluated by Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and indicated excellent reliability for mandibular incisor inclination (ICC = 0.965), overjet (ICC = 0.970) and overbite (ICC = 0.958).

After the data had been tested for normality with the Shapiro-Wilk Test, Student's t-Test and Wilcoxon t-Test were used to compare dependent samples in parametric and non-parametric cases, respectively. Student's independent t-Tests was used for gender comparison and Pearson's and Spearman's rank correlation analyses were performed to determine the relationship of changes in mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite.

A distinction was made between the following correlations: strong ($r \geq 0.8$), moderate (r 0.4–0.8) and weak ($r < 0.4$). If there was a weak insignificant correlation, it was denoted as no correlation. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS® (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA) and GraphPad Prism® (GraphPad Prism Inc, San Diego, CA, USA) and the results were considered at a significance level of 5%.

Results

Comparisons of mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite between genders did not show any statistical differences (Table 1), therefore the data were pooled for further evaluation. The individual mean changes for each patient are shown in Fig. 5.

Table 1

Difference by gender of mandibular incisor inclination, overjet, overbite before and after treatment.

Variable	Period	Male	Female	<i>P</i> Value
		$\bar{x} \pm SD$	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	
Incisor Inclination (°)	T0	32.7 ± 4.8	32.4 ± 9.2	0.860
Overjet (mm)	T1	34.3 ± 5.7	36.1 ± 8.5	0.249
Overbite (mm)	T1-T0	1.6 ± 1.1	3.6 ± 2.6	0.142
	T0	6.9 ± 2.0	6.8 ± 1.5	0.813
	T1	3.4 ± 1.3	3.9 ± 1.5	0.109
	T1-T0	-3.5 ± 2.4	-2.9 ± 2.0	0.377
	T0	4.0 ± 2.0	4.2 ± 1.6	0.701
	T1	2.7 ± 1.6	2.8 ± 1.0	0.708
	T1-T0	-1.3 ± 0.9	-1.3 ± 0.9	0.940
T0- before treatment; T1- after treatment; $\bar{x}$ - mean; SD- standard deviation; <i>P</i> - level of significance.				

Mandibular incisor inclination increased in 17 (74%) and decreased in 6 (26%) patients, with a range of changes from + 0.4° to + 10.8° and - 0.4° to -3.2°, respectively. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the changes in mandibular incisor inclination. Treatment resulted in statistically significant changes, showing an increase of all means from T0 to T1.

Table 2

Mean, standard deviation and level of significance of mandibular incisor inclination before and after treatment.

Inclination (°)	n	T0	T1	T1-T0	<i>P</i> Value
		$\bar{x} \pm SD$	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	
32	23	32.2 ± 7.0	35.2 ± 8.8	3.0 ± 2.1	0.005**
31	23	33.4 ± 7.7	35.5 ± 6.3	2.1 ± 1.5	0.004**
41	23	32.8 ± 8.2	35.5 ± 7.4	2.7 ± 1.9	0.020*
42	23	31.7 ± 6.2	34.4 ± 6.4	2.6 ± 1.9	0.006**
Total	92	32.5 ± 7.2	35.2 ± 7.2	2.6 ± 1.8	0.000***
Male	48	32.7 ± 4.8	34.3 ± 5.7	1.6 ± 1.1	0.000***
Female	44	32.4 ± 9.2	36.1 ± 8.5	3.6 ± 2.6	0.000***
T0- before treatment; T1- after treatment; $\bar{x}$ - mean; SD- standard deviation; <i>P</i> - level of significance; * <i>P</i> < 0.05; ** <i>P</i> < 0.01; *** <i>P</i> < 0.001.					

Overjet decreased in all 23 (100%) patients with a range of changes from -1.0 mm to -6.6 mm. Overbite increased in 3 (13%) and decreased in 20 (87%) patients, with a range of changes from + 0.08 mm to + 0.7 mm and - 0.4 mm to -3.8 mm, respectively. Tables 3 and 4 show the means and standard deviations of the changes in overjet and overbite. Treatment resulted in statistically significant average reductions for overjet and overbite.

Table 3
Mean, standard deviation and level of significance of overjet before and after treatment.

Overjet (mm)	n	T0 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	T1 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	T1-T0 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	PValue
32	23	6.8 ± 1.9	3.6 ± 1.5	-3.2 ± 2.2	0.000***
31	23	6.5 ± 1.6	3.6 ± 1.3	-2.8 ± 2.0	0.000***
41	23	6.9 ± 1.5	3.6 ± 1.7	-3.2 ± 2.3	0.000***
42	23	7.4 ± 1.9	3.8 ± 1.4	-3.6 ± 2.5	0.000***
Total	92	6.9 ± 1.7	3.6 ± 1.4	-3.2 ± 2.2	0.000***
Male	48	6.9 ± 2.0	3.4 ± 1.3	-3.5 ± 2.4	0.000***
Female	44	6.8 ± 1.5	3.9 ± 1.5	-2.9 ± 2.0	0.000***
T0- before treatment; T1- after treatment; $\bar{x}$ - mean; SD- standard deviation; <i>P</i> level of significance; *** <i>P</i> < 0.001.					

Table 4
Mean, standard deviation and level of significance of overbite before and after treatment.

Overbite (mm)	n	T0 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	T1 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	T1-T0 $\bar{x} \pm SD$	PValue
32	23	4.0 ± 1.9	2.6 ± 1.4	-1.3 ± 0.9	0.000***
31	23	4.2 ± 1.8	2.9 ± 1.3	-1.2 ± 0.9	0.000***
41	23	4.2 ± 1.8	2.9 ± 1.5	-1.2 ± 0.9	0.001**
42	23	4.0 ± 1.7	2.5 ± 1.3	-1.4 ± 1.0	0.000***
Total	92	4.1 ± 1.8	2.7 ± 1.3	-1.3 ± 0.9	0.000***
Male	48	4.0 ± 2.0	2.7 ± 1.6	-1.3 ± 0.9	0.000***
Female	44	4.2 ± 1.6	2.8 ± 1.0	-1.3 ± 0.9	0.000***
T0- before treatment; T1- after treatment; $\bar{x}$ - mean; SD- standard deviation; <i>P</i> level of significance; ** <i>P</i> < 0.01; *** <i>P</i> < 0.001.					

There was a statistical significant moderate correlation between mandibular incisor inclination changes and overjet changes for the mandibular left lateral incisor and mandibular right central incisor (Table 5). There were statistical significant moderate correlation between mandibular incisor inclination changes and overbite changes for the mandibular left lateral incisor, mandibular right central incisor, mandibular right lateral incisor and total (Table 6).

Table 5
Pearson's and Spearman's rank correlation analysis between mandibular incisor inclination changes and overjet changes.

Variable	n	Pearson's Correlation		Spearman's Correlation	
		Coefficient	P Value	Coefficient	P Value
32	23	-0.54	0.007**	-0.28	0.195
31	23	-0.32	0.129	-0.39	0.064
41	23	-0.47	0.022*	-0.55	0.006**
42	23	-0.23	0.280	-0.17	0.411
Total	92	-0.30	0.151	-0.22	0.294
* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$.					

Table 6
Pearson's and Spearman's rank correlation analysis between mandibular incisor inclination changes and overbite changes.

Variable	n	Pearson's Correlation		Spearman's Correlation	
		Coefficient	P Value	Coefficient	P Value
32	23	-0.71	0.000***	-0.51	0.012*
31	23	-0.35	0.094	-0.30	0.154
41	23	-0.55	0.005**	-0.51	0.011*
42	23	-0.46	0.024*	-0.38	0.067
Total	92	-0.49	0.016*	-0.38	0.071
* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.					

Discussion

This CBCT study evaluated three-dimensionally the mandibular incisor inclination changes as well as overjet and overbite changes induced by a Herbst appliance with a lower anchorage unit not touching the lingual surface of the lower incisors.

3D CBCT images allow an assessment of the buccolingual inclination of individual teeth with good accuracy in any given plane [13, 14]. Regarding the acquisition of tomographic images, the accuracy of CBCT with different voxel resolutions (0.2 and 0.4 mm) to linear measurement was evaluated and there was no significant statistical difference between these voxel protocols [15, 16].

Up to now, regardless of the type of anchorage unit used, not even with additional skeletal anchorage, could the position of the mandibular incisor during Herbst treatment be satisfactorily controlled nor be predicted on an individual level [4, 6–8, 17–21]. It is however known, that the length of the anchorage unit [19, 20, 22], the severity of the malocclusion [8], the incremental mandibular advancement [23, 24], the skeletal anchorage [6, 7] and the skeletal maturity [25–27] of the patients influence the amount of incisor proclination to a certain extent. Thus, comparisons with literature are difficult and very anchorage sensitive and the corresponding conclusions have to be drawn with care.

In interpreting the results, it must be kept in mind that the changes induced by the Herbst appliance are a summation effect of treatment and dentofacial growth.

The skeletal maturity evaluation of the present sample showed that 92% of the patients were in the post-pubertal period, a developmental stage during which more dentoalveolar than skeletal changes are seen during a Class II treatment with a Herbst appliance [27]. The mandibular incisors of patients treated after the pubertal growth peak have been shown to procline more than those of patients treated pre-peak [25, 26].

There were no statistical differences in mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite between genders neither before nor after treatment, which is in concordance with previous cephalometric studies [8, 28].

The mean increase of mandibular incisor inclination from T0 to T1 (2.6°) was smaller when compared to previous studies using different types of Herbst appliance anchorage such as a cast splint appliances (6.7° to 12°) [8], and even skeletal anchorage (4.8°), [6, 7]. One reason for this smaller amount of proclination could be the design of the lingual arch with 3 mm distance from the incisor's lingual surface upon insertion, thus reducing the anchorage load on the incisors. According Pancherz and Hansen [19], a reduced anchorage load on the incisors by means of a lingual acrylic pelotte reduces the amount of incisor proclination.

The mean reduction of overjet (-3.2 mm) was rather small in comparison to the above mentioned Herbst studies, thus resulting in a reduced risk for anchorage loss [8, 19, 29]. However, Martin and Pancherz [8] evaluated mandibular incisor proclination during Herbst treatment with cast splint anchorage including a lingual arch touching the lower incisors and found an average lower incisor proclination of 6.7° , which is twice as much as in the present study.

Another important point regarding the mandibular anchorage unit used in the present study is the connection of the labial cantilever with the lingual arch at the level of the interproximal area between the

canine and first premolar on both sides. This contact with the distal surface of the canines favors a canine anchorage loss which induces a crowding in the lower incisor/canine area (Fig. 6). As in the modern Herbst therapy, the orthopedic phase is followed by a multibracket appliance (MB) phase, the crowding will result in secondary incisor proclination. Thus, whether the amount of proclination using an anchorage unit not touching the lingual surface of the lower incisors is really smaller after the end of active orthodontic treatment (Herbst plus subsequent MB) cannot be answered yet.

There was a marked interindividual variation in treatment effects in the present study with respect to the amounts of mandibular incisor proclination, overjet and overbite reduction. This large variation has also been described in previous studies and the reasons for it remain largely unknown [4, 6, 19, 30]. A retroclination of the lower incisors in certain patients has also been reported in previous Herbst publications [6, 8, 21].

Overall, there were some limitations due the study design which should be considered when interpreting the results. These limitations include the small sample size, absence of a control group, length of observation period (only Herbst phase) and tomography images acquisitions protocols (voxel size and field of vision). These weaknesses will be considered in a future research project.

Conclusion

The 3D evaluation of the mandibular incisor segment by means of CBCT scans revealed that Herbst appliance treatment with a mandibular anchorage unit distant from the incisor's lingual surface results in smaller amounts of mandibular incisor proclination compared to literature. However, as it induces canine anchorage loss, the decreased amount of proclination may not prevail after MB treatment. Future studies analyzing the total orthodontic treatment period (Herbst + MB) are needed.

Abbreviations

CBCT
cone beam computed tomography; 3D:three-dimensionally; MP3-G:stage G, middle phalanx of the third finger; MP3-H:stage H, middle phalanx of the third finger; R-I:stage I, distal epiphysis of the radius; R-IJ:stage IJ, distal epiphysis of the radius; R-J:stage J, distal epiphysis of the radius; T0:before treatment; T1:after treatment; FOV:field of vision; kV:Kilovoltage; mA:milliamperage; MSP:midsagittal plane; ICC:Intraclass Correlation Coefficient;MB:multibracket appliance;

Declarations

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

Approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Araraquara Dental School (number 62/2010), Paulista State University (FOAr-UNESP). The study was ethically approved by the Institution, the procedures were in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki and all the subjects signed a consent

form. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant's guardian/s for inclusion in the study.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Written informed consent to publish individual person's data (images) were obtained.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

The datasets used during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

FUNDING

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES); Finance Code 001, Programa Doutorado Sanduíche no Exterior (PDSE) process number 88881.133389/2016-01.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

JPS contributed to the conception and project design, data analysis, statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript. TBR contributed to the conception and project design. DBR contributed to the conception and project design, data analysis and wrote the manuscript. SR contributed to the conception and project design, data analysis and wrote the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

References

1. Bock NC, Ruf S, Wiechmann D, Jilek T. Herbst plus Lingual versus Herbst plus Labial: a comparison of occlusal outcome and gingival health. *Eur J Orthod*. 2016;38:478–84.
2. Bock NC, Saffar M, Hudel H, Evalahti M, Heikinheimo K, Rice DPC, et al. Long-term effects of Class II orthodontic treatment on oral health. *J Orofac Orthop*. 2018;79:96–108.
3. Joss-Vassalli I, Grebenstein C, Topouzelis N, Sculean A, Katsaros C. Orthodontic therapy and gingival recession: a systematic review. *Orthod Craniofac Res*. 2010;13:127–41.
4. Ruf S, Hansen K, Pancherz H. Does orthodontic proclination of lower incisors in children and adolescents cause gingival recession? *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 1998;114:100–6.

5. Schwartz JP, Raveli TB, Schwartz-Filho HO, Raveli DB. Changes in alveolar bone support induced by the Herbst appliance: a tomographic evaluation. *Dental Press J Orthod*. 2016;21:95–101.
6. Bremen J, Ludwig B, Ruf S. Anchorage loss due to Herbst mechanics-preventable through miniscrews? *Eur J Orthod*. 2015;37:462–6.
7. Elkordy SA, Aboelnaga AA, Fayed MM, AboulFotouh MH, Abouelezz AM. Can the use of skeletal anchors in conjunction with fixed functional appliances promote skeletal changes? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Orthod*. 2016;38:532–45.
8. Martin J, Pancherz H. Mandibular incisor position changes in relation to amount of bite jumping during Herbst/multibracket appliance treatment: a radiographic-cephalometric study. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2009;136:44–51.
9. Pancherz H, Ruf S. The Herbst appliance. Research-based clinical management. London: Quintessence Publishing Co Ltd; 2008.
10. Grunheid T, Gaalaas S, Hamdan H, Larson BE. Effect of clear aligner therapy on the buccolingual inclination of mandibular canines and the intercanine distance. *Angle Orthod*. 2016;86:10–6.
11. Hamdan HA, Grunheid T, Larson BE. Effect of orthodontic treatment with preadjusted edgewise appliances on the buccolingual inclination of mandibular canines: a CBCT study. *Orthod Craniofac Res*. 2015;18:156–64.
12. Hagg U, Taranger J. Skeletal stages of the hand and wrist as indicators of the pubertal growth spurt. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 1980;38:187–200.
13. Gribel BF, Gribel MN, Frazao DC, McNamara JA Jr, Manzi FR. Accuracy and reliability of craniometric measurements on lateral cephalometry and 3D measurements on CBCT scans. *Angle Orthod*. 2011;81:26–35.
14. Shewinvanakitkul W, Hans MG, Narendran S, Martin Palomo J. Measuring buccolingual inclination of mandibular canines and first molars using CBCT. *Orthod Craniofac Res*. 2011;14:168–74.
15. Patcas R, Muller L, Ullrich O, Peltomaki T. Accuracy of cone-beam computed tomography at different resolutions assessed on the bony covering of the mandibular anterior teeth. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2012;141:41–50.
16. Ponder SN, Benavides E, Kapila S, Hatch NE. Quantification of external root resorption by low- vs high-resolution cone-beam computed tomography and periapical radiography: A volumetric and linear analysis. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2013;143:77–91.
17. Bock NC, Ruf S, Wiechmann D, Jilek T. Dentoskeletal effects during Herbst-Multibracket appliance treatment: a comparison of lingual and labial approaches. *Eur J Orthod*. 2016;38:470–7.
18. Pancherz H, Hansen K. Occlusal changes during and after Herbst treatment: a cephalometric investigation. *Eur J Orthod*. 1986;8:215–28.
19. Pancherz H, Hansen K. Mandibular anchorage in Herbst treatment. *Eur J Orthod*. 1988;10:149–64.
20. Weschler D, Pancherz H. Efficiency of three mandibular anchorage forms in Herbst treatment: a cephalometric investigation. *Angle Orthod*. 2005;75:23–7.

21. Wiechmann D, Schwestka-Polly R, Pancherz H, Hohoff A. Control of mandibular incisors with the combined Herbst and completely customized lingual appliance—a pilot study. *Head Face Med.* 2010;6:3.
22. El-Fateh T, Ruf S. Herbst treatment with mandibular cast splints—revisited. *Angle Orthod.* 2011;81:820–7.
23. Banks P, Wright J, O'Brien K. Incremental versus maximum bite advancement during twin-block therapy: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2004;126:583–8.
24. Du X, Hagg U, Rabie AB. Effects of headgear Herbst and mandibular step-by-step advancement versus conventional Herbst appliance and maximal jumping of the mandible. *Eur J Orthod.* 2002;24:167–74.
25. Konik M, Pancherz H, Hansen K. The mechanism of Class II correction in late Herbst treatment. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1997;112:87–91.
26. Pancherz H, Hagg U. Dentofacial orthopedics in relation to somatic maturation. An analysis of 70 consecutive cases treated with the Herbst appliance. *Am J Orthod.* 1985;88:273–87.
27. Ruf S, Pancherz H. When is the ideal period for Herbst therapy - early or late? *Semin Orthod.* 2003;9:47–56.
28. Hansen K, Iemamnuaisuk P, Pancherz H. Long-term effects of the Herbst appliance on the dental arches and arch relationships: a biometric study. *Br J Orthod.* 1995;22:123–34.
29. Pancherz H. The mechanism of Class II correction in Herbst appliance treatment. A cephalometric investigation. *Am J Orthod.* 1982;82:104–13.
30. Bock NC, Ruf S. Dentoskeletal changes in adult Class II division 1 Herbst treatment—how much is left after the retention period? *Eur J Orthod.* 2012;34:747–53.

Figures

Figure 1

Herbst appliance. Legend fig. 1 Mandibular (a) and maxillary (b) anchorage units. Frontal (c) and lateral (d) intraoral views.

Figure 2

Definition of midsagittal plane as a reference plane for measurements. Legend fig. 2 In the sagittal view, the coronal and axial cursors intersect the superior tip of the odontoid process of the axis and axial cursor, as well, intersect the tip of the anterior nasal spine (a). In the coronal view, the sagittal and axial cursors intersect the superior tip of the odontoid process of the axis (b). In the axial view, the coronal and sagittal cursors intersect the superior tip of the odontoid process of the axis and sagittal cursor, as well, intersect the tip of the anterior nasal spine (c). In the sagittal view, the coronal cursor is moved until intersect with nasion point (d). In the coronal view, the sagittal cursor intersect the nasion point and the axial cursor intersect the anterior nasal spine (e).

Figure 3

Techniques used to assess mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite. Legend fig. 3 Coronal (a), axial (b) and sagittal (c) views.

Figure 4

Measurements used to evaluate mandibular incisor inclination, overjet and overbite. Legend fig. 4 Sagittal view (a). Reference points for mandibular incisor inclination measurement (b). Mandibular incisor inclination (c), overjet (d) and overbite (e) measurements.

Figure 5

Individual changes (n=23) of average (teeth 32-42) mandibular incisor induced by treatment (T1-T0). Legend fig. 5 inclination (a), overjet (b) and overbite (c).

Figure 6

Mandibular dental arch before and after Herbst appliance treatment. Legend fig. 6 before (a) and after (b) treatment. Note the canine anchorage loss.