Prosthodontics at the crossroads: is this a ‘golden age’?

Oral health still needs to be integrated into general healthcare, and dentists need to advocate for that.
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North Cork HSE orthodontic treatment waiting list 2009-2010: retrospective audit of patient records

Précis:
In 2009/2010, 57% of patients on the North Cork HSE orthodontic treatment waiting list were female and the most predominant malocclusion was Class II division 1 (40%).

Abstract:
Purpose of the study: To evaluate the case profile and verify the treatment eligibility (based on the modified IOTN) from written case records, of patients accepted for orthodontic treatment from the North Cork area of HSE South.

Materials and methods: A data collection form was designed and applied to the written case records of 200 consecutive patients accepted for orthodontic treatment in 2009/2010. Data relating to the IOTN (DHC and AC, where relevant) were provided by a calibrated examiner.

Results: Based on the written case records, most (57%) of the treatment cohort were female and had an average age of 14 years and two months. The predominant malocclusion was Class II division 1 (40%). The prevalence of Class III malocclusion was high at 18%. A total of 61% of patients were in grade 5 and 36% in grade 4. The majority of patients in each of these grades fell into DHC 5a (32%), followed by 5i (24%) and 4d AC>8 (16%).

Conclusions: Written case records conclude that patients accepted for orthodontic treatment from the North Cork area of HSE South were predominantly female. Class II division 1 malocclusion was the most common accepted for treatment. These records verify that those patients accepted for orthodontic treatment satisfy the eligibility criteria for HSE treatment.
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Changes in orthodontic treatment modalities in the past 20 years: exploring the link between technology and scientific evidence

Précis
Technology drives the market in orthodontics, with claims of better results in less time. In many instances the evidence for such changes is lacking.

Abstract
Statement of the issue: Is there a link between the many perceived advances in orthodontic techniques/therapy and science in the past 20 years? The purpose of this paper is to take five topics and match the perceptions with the scientific evidence. The variety of appliances and the swings in treatment philosophy have been dramatic, including the swing from extraction to non-extraction therapy, the introduction of space-age wires, appliances that grow mandibles, the introduction and extraordinary growth of Invisalign, and reduced friction brackets to reduce treatment time, all with claims by manufacturers of better results than ever before. The focus is on faster treatment, reduced visits/appointments and superior results. Most of these ‘advancements’ represent what has been the ‘juggernaut of technology’.

Materials and methods: Five questions are posed, and an evidence-based approach is used to critically examine the literature in these selected topics.

Results: The evidence is lacking for some of the most commonly used systems and materials in orthodontic practice today.

Conclusion: More randomised clinical trials are needed in orthodontic practice to evaluate treatment outcomes.