Introduction

In the field of orthodontics, class II malocclusion poses a common challenge to the orthodontists for a successful treatment outcome. Worldwide, data show it to be more prevalent in whites than in blacks, more in developed countries than developing countries and more in urban as compared to the rural population. The prevalence of class II malocclusion in India also shows variation, where it is much higher in North India (10%–15%), whereas in South India, it is around 5%.[1] In spite of the fact that successful treatment of this condition has been proved on many occasions, clinicians and patients continue to look for simpler and better methods for correcting the occlusion while maintaining or improving the facial appearance.[2] Treatment of Class II malocclusion in adolescents has always relied on growth modification. The majority of treatment modalities such as functional appliances are directed toward stopping or redirecting maxillary growth and simultaneously stimulating mandibular growth.[3‑5] Transverse deficiency is a result of perioral muscles having a restraining effect on dental arches.[6] This paper demonstrates Twinkle R 3D appliance – A combination of Frankel appliance and twin-block appliance and R represents the name of the first author (Dr. Rohan Rai) for the treatment of Class II division I malocclusion with constricted maxillary arch and hyperactive perioral muscles.

Patient Selection

Patients who can be considered for Twinkle R 3D appliance are those having Class II division I dental malocclusion on a moderate skeletal Class II base with abnormal perioral musculature and potential for mandibular growth.

Appliance Design

The design of the appliance is derived from Frankel appliance based on functional matrix theory and twin-block appliance originated from the servo system theory which has been coalesced in a single appliance. Thus, the name Twinkle-R 3D appliance, combination of the parent appliances which brings about three-dimensional changes desired in skeletal class II cases and R stands for the name of the first author of the present article [Figure 1]. Twinkle R 3D appliance consists of two components: the maxillary component and mandibular component. The design of the maxillary component involved an acrylic baseplate which covered the palate and occlusal surfaces of the first molars and second premolars. The inclined
planes were constructed at 70° to the occlusal plane and advancement if required was carried out by the addition of acrylic to the upper block. A midline jack screw was an active expansion component in the upper component. The mandibular component consisted of acrylic baseplate which covered from canine to the second premolars. The buccal shields and the lip pads prevented the abnormal perioral function and enhanced the passive expansion of the maxillary dental arch. Both blocks had delta clasps on the first molars and first premolars to provide posterior retention. Ball end clasps in the anterior segment served the purpose of added retention [Figure 2].

Case Report

A 12-year-old female patient reported to the department with a chief complaint of forwardly placed upper front
teeth. The patient cited esthetics as the main reason for desiring orthodontic treatment.

On extraoral examination, she had a mesocephalic, mesoproscopic face, convex profile, posterior divergence, and incompetent lips. The patient displayed 100% upper incisor crown exposure, increased buccal corridor space, and a nonconsonant smile arc. Intraoral examination revealed a constricted maxilla, reduced intercanine width of 30 mm, and intermolar width of 42 mm and mild crowding in the lower anterior segment. The patient exhibited Class II molar relation bilaterally, over jet of 9 mm and overbite of 6 mm [Figure 3]. Ashley Howe’s analysis showed an increased premolar basal arch width compared to premolar diameter concluding that arch expansion is possible. The cephalometric tracing confirmed that the patient had a moderate Class II skeletal pattern with ANB value of 6 degrees. The patient had average growth pattern and proclined maxillary and mandibular incisors [Figure 4 and Table 1].

The objectives of treatment in the sagittal plane were to achieve ideal overjet and overbite by mandibular advancement, in the vertical plane to correct lower anterior facial height, in the transverse plane to achieve expansion of maxilla and overall to attain a pleasing soft tissue profile.

The initial treatment plan decided for the patient was to opt either for twin block or the Frankel appliance. However, according to our treatment objectives, it was essential to achieve maxillary expansion complemented with an ideal overjet, overbite, and improvement in soft-tissue profile. Thus, this lead to the discovery of Twinkle R 3D appliance which was fabricated with a construction bite made by sagittal advancement of 6 mm and vertical opening of 4 mm. The patient was asked to wear the appliance for 14 h in a day. Activation of jackscrew was done by slow maxillary expansion protocol, that is quarter turn every 2 days for 3 weeks. After the desired expansion was attained, activation was discontinued. The patient was asked to follow-up every 3 weeks and was instructed to wear the appliance for a period of 8 months [Figure 5].

Following 8 months of treatment, the patient’s profile and smile greatly improved due to expansion of the maxillary arch complemented by mandibular advancement. Overjet and overbite were improved due to the postural forward positioning of the mandible. The midlines were coincident with each other and with the face. In addition, a good buccal occlusion and Class I canine relation were achieved [Figure 6]. End of treatment panoramic tomogram showed good root parallelism and healthy appearance of supporting tissues [Figure 7]. Superimposition and cephalometric analysis showed 4 mm of increase in mandibular length [Figure 8 and Table 1].

**Discussion**

Class II malocclusions can result from many contributing components, both dental and skeletal. Although maxillary protrusion and mandibular retrusion are both found to be possible causative factors, it has been reported that the most common underlying cause of Class II malocclusion in a population is mandibular retrusion. In this case report, Twinkle R 3D appliance has been used to bring about the correction of jaw discrepancies.

| Parameters                  | Pre-Rx | Post-Rx |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------|
| SNA (°)                     | 80     | 80      |
| Effect maximum length (mm)  | 87     | 89      |
| SNB (°)                     | 74     | 77      |
| Effect mand length (mm)     | 104    | 108     |
| ANB (°)                     | 6      | 3       |
| Angle of convexity (mm)     | 14     | 7       |
| FMA (°)                     | 31     | 32      |
| SN-GO-GN (°)                | 33     | 35      |
| LAFH (mm)                   | 58     | 62      |
| Articular angle (°)         | 130    | 137     |
| Base plane angle (°)        | 19     | 22      |
| Upper incisor to NA (°)     | 38     | 34      |
| Upper incisor to SN (°)     | 115    | 110     |
| Lower incisor to NB (°)     | 30     | 30      |
| IMPA (°)                    | 96     | 96      |
| “S” line to upper lip (mm)  | 3      | 2       |
| “S” line to lower lip (mm)  | −1     | 1       |

**Table 1: Cephalometric analysis**
Frankel appliance stimulates normal function while eliminating lip trap, hyperactive mentalis and aberrant buccinators and orbicularis oris action.[6] The components of Frankel appliance, the buccal shields, and lip pads help in obliterating the adverse effects of abnormal perioral musculature such as constricted maxillary arch and abnormal mentalis muscle activity which is predominantly seen in this case. Forward mandibular positioning with Frankel appliance unloads the normal environmental pressure on the condyle and hence is the mechanism to stimulate mandibular growth.[8] According to McNamara and Petrovic, a forward positioning of 3–4 mm is sufficient to elicit the desired response from the lateral pterygoid muscle and subsequent condylar feedback.[9] One of the limitations of twin block appliance is to elicit soft-tissue changes in and around the dentition. Hence,
in this case, the twin block appliance was modified by incorporating buccal shields and lip pads to the mandibular component, just as seen in a FR II appliance to bring about the desired changes in the perioral musculature. The above modification was done by taking into consideration Frankel’s philosophy of vestibular arena of operation. To address the transverse problem, a jack screw was incorporated in the maxillary component of the appliance to actively expand the maxillary arch. According to the protocol, the patient was instructed to turn the jack screw once a week and was reviewed every 4 weeks. By amalgamating the concept of active expansion by jackscrew and passive expansion by buccal shields and lip pads, we were able to increase intercanine width from 30 mm to 33 mm and intermolar width from 42 mm to 47 mm.

In the treatment involving functional appliances, symmetrical overjet and possibility of advancing mandible without any interference are a critical issue. In our case report, SNB angle decreased by 3° whereas in our case report, SNB angle decreased by 3° while SNA angle remained the same. Their study also proved that twin block appliance not only resulted in forward positioning of the mandible but also depicted mandibular lengthening as shown by the linear measurements Co-Po, +7.17 mm, +3°, ANB angle reduced by 3° while SNA angle increased by 3°, ANB angle reduced by 3° while SNA angle remained the same. Their study also proved that twin block appliance not only resulted in forward positioning of the mandible but also depicted mandibular lengthening as shown by the linear measurements Co-Po, +7.17 mm, whereas in our case, mandibular length also increased by 4 mm. It was further seen that there was an increase of about 2.7 ± 1.7 mm in lower anterior facial height by clockwise rotation of the maxillary plane has been reported and in treatment of deep bite, bite blocks are trimmed selectively to encourage eruption of lower molars, which was advantageous in our case. Thus, vertical component, that is, lower anterior facial height increased by 4 mm. Patient was satisfied with the treatment results with her self-esteem being significantly improved.

**Conclusion**

Functional jaw orthopedics has been practiced since before the turn of the century. There have been significant improvements in the design of functional appliances, with the goal aimed at achieving greater patient acceptance and increased wear time. These appliances seem to offer a valuable treatment modality to the orthodontist. Hence, this is one such appliance which could act as an aid to orthodontist in the treatment of skeletal class II malocclusion.
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