



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2017; 3(9): 90-93
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 15-07-2017
Accepted: 16-08-2017

Dr. Dhananjay Rathod
Senior Lecturer, Nims Dental
College, Jaipur, Rajasthan,
India

Dr. Gazal Bisht
Post Graduate Student,
Department of Endodontics,
Seema Dental College,
Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India

Dr. Pankaj Rathod
Senior Lecturer, Department
of Oral Surgery, P.D.M Dental
College, Haryana, India

Dr. Abhilasha Singh
M.D.S (Periodontology),
Delhi Hospital, Bahadurgarh,
Haryana India

Correspondence

Dr. Dhananjay Rathod
Senior Lecturer, Nims Dental
College, Jaipur, Rajasthan,
India

Frictional evaluation of self ligating system and conventionally available traditional system: A review

Dr. Dhananjay Rathod, Dr. Gazal Bisht, Dr. Pankaj Rathod and Dr. Abhilasha Singh

Abstract

The present period of self-ligating system includes the framework related with improving and giving more proficient treatment modalities building up an inclination to contrast them with the routinely accessible framework. Alike conventionally accessible customary apparatuses, self-ligating framework give the simplicity of ligation when contrasted with the conventional accessible framework which require the utilization of elastomeric modules or metallic ligatures. A short portrayal of the self-ligating sections interms of the frictional resistance and the advancements, clinical focal points and the confirmation in regards to treatment productivity is investigated. The present article distinguishes the frictional resistance and the adequacy of the self ligating framework with the conventionally available appliance system.

Keywords: Self Ligating System, Traditional System, Ligation

Introduction

Self-ligating bracket system (SLBs) spearheaded in the 1930's experienced a recovery with an assortment of new appliances being created. Various favorable circumstances over traditional machine frameworks which incorporates the lessening of frictional resistance has been claimed [1]. Preparatory review look into has indicated a distinct preferred standpoint, with a diminishment in general treatment time of 4 to 7 months and a comparable reduction in required appointments [5, 6]. Recently, many reviews have been led utilizing self ligating sections and the revealed points of interest of this system which incorporate expanded patient solace, enhanced oral cleanliness, expanded patient co-operation, less chairside time, shorter treatment time, more prominent patient acknowledgment, decreased erosion, full and secure wire ligation, port protection and longer arrangement interims [7-10].

Properties of a perfect ligation framework

Ligation ought to.

- Provide the capacity to be secure and vigorous;
- Guarantee a full section engagement of the archwire;
- Have negligible to low grinding amongst section and archwire;
- Be simple to utilize;
- Ensure a legitimate decent oral cleanliness.

Deficiencies of traditional ligation

- Failure to give and to keep up full archwire engagement
- High contact (at first put, an elastomeric in a 'figure of 8' design expands the grinding by a component of 70-220%. contrasted with the "O" design 2 (Sims *et al.* 1993) which in part meets this prerequisite.)
- Potential obstruction to oral cleanliness
- Wire ligation is moderate

"Wire ties" offer secure, empower full, incomplete or far off ligation with lower contact than elastomeric, however miss the mark in the time criteria as they need more opportunity for ligation. Shivapuja and Berger (1994) [12] have demonstrated that wire ligation is slow

contrasted with elastomerics. In the review, the utilization of wire ligatures added just about 12 minutes to the time expected to evacuate and supplant two archwires

Advantages of self-ligating brackets

These points of interest apply on a fundamental level to all self-ligating sections, in spite of the fact that the distinctive makes differ in their capacity to convey these preferences reliably by and by:

1. More certain full archwire engagement;
2. Low erosion amongst section and archwire;
3. Less chairside help;
4. Faster archwire expulsion and ligation.

3. Frictional properties of self ligating brackets and conventionally available traditional system

- Studies in regards to the frictional resistance in the sections were being finished by many creators reasoned that ligation with inexactly set ligatures or extended modules that decrease frictional powers in standard straight wire sections, the diminishment being most noteworthy for round archwires. Frictional powers recorded from archwires secured with elastomeric modules demonstrated a relentless diminishment over a 3-week time span, contingent upon to what extent the module had been in position on the bracket [13]
- A new polymeric-covered ligature (SuperSlick™; TP Orthodontics, Inc., Indiana, USA) guaranteed to decrease erosion essentially and possibly abbreviate treatment time. The polymeric-covered module creates a four-overlap diminishment in erosion contrasted and a control module, as far as anyone knows by rendering its surface elusive on contact with water or saliva [14]
- Blake *et al.* [15] compared the properties of the SPEED and edgewise appliances. SPEED (Strite Industries Ltd, Ontario, Canada) are dynamic self-ligating brackets, which give a ceaseless rotatory and torque activity through a spring clip mechanism. No factually huge contrast between the two appliances considering the root resorption was found for the maxillary central and lateral incisors and the mandibular central incisors. The distinction was huge for the mandibular lateral incisors ($p < 0.05$).
- An *in-vitro* examine by Simona Tecco *et al.* [16] demonstrated that the self-ligating brackets (Time and Damon SL II) fundamentally showed lower friction than Victory Series sections and Slide ligatures. Very low friction has been plainly shown and evaluated in work by Sims *et al* (1993, 1994) [17], Shivapuja and Berger (1994) [12] for both Aactiva and Speed sections. The friction is significantly lower than for elastomeric rings with traditional sections and is by all accounts an intrinsic normal for self-ligating sections.
- Thomas *et al* (1998) [18] affirmed to a great degree low friction with Damon sections contrasted with both traditional preadjusted and furthermore Tip-Edge brackets.
- Kapur *et al* (1998) [19] found that with NiTi wires the friction per section was 41 g with Mini Twin and regular ligation and 15 gm with Damon sections while with stainless steel wires, these qualities were 61 gm and just 3.6 gm separately.
- Pizzoni *et al* (1998) [20] in a study detailed that Damon bracket system indicated lower friction than Speed

brackets which thus had less friction than traditional bracket system expressing that: "On account of rectangular wires, the Damon section was altogether superior to any of alternate bracket system and ought to be favored if sliding mechanics is the strategy of decision".

- Meling *et al* (1997) [21], analyzed the impact of friction on wire solidness and concluded that each elastomeric put in an "O" setup delivers a normal of 50 gm of frictional force.
- Khambay B, Millett B and McHugh S (2004) [22] directed a review to research the impact of elastomeric and stainless steel (SS) ligation to analyse mean frictional forces on Stainless steel and TMA wires, each with measurements of 0.017×0.025 and 0.019×0.025 in combination with a self-ligating Damon II module, and a pre-shaped 0.09 inch SS ligature. The samples were tested on a Nene M3000 machine, with a crosshead speed of 5 mm/minute and each trial went on for 4 minutes. There was no predictable example in the mean frictional resistance over the different wire sort, size and ligation strategy. Under the states of this analysis, the utilization of passive self-ligating bracket is the main technique for practically eliminating friction. With the utilization of 0.019x0.025 inch stainless steel archwire, elastomeric ties indicated 400 (125.42 g/cm²) to more than 600 times (152.30gm/cm²) greater friction. Active self ligating sections demonstrated 216 (54.12gm/cm²) times the friction of the passive self ligating damon tube (0.25gm/cm²). Patients treated with the In-Ovation "R" self-ligating section completed a normal of 5.7 months sooner (19 months by and large) than those experiencing conventional treatment [23].
- Reicheneder *et al.* [24] in a study concluded that Opal SL brackets had fundamentally bring lower friction than customary brackets when combined with either 0.017 X 0.025 or 0.019X 0.025-inches archwires.
- The Oyster clay SL brackets possessed lower friction than conventional brackets when tried with either 0.017-0.025-in or 0.019-0.025-in archwires. Clinical trial examining pain perception showed lesser discomfort utilizing self-ligating than traditional bracket system (Miles *et al.*, 2006) [25] in a split-mouth composed review inferred that Damon2™ brackets provide less pain perception at first than the traditional bracket system but more excruciating progressively when tying in the second arch wire.
- Fleming *et al* [26]. evaluated contrast in the pain perception experienced between expulsion and addition of orthodontic archwires between Smart Clip self-ligating sections and a traditional Victory brackets. They found that bracket system had no impact on pain experienced on involvement of the 0.016" nickel-titanium archwire but prominent inconvenience was experienced amid archwire inclusion and removal of the 0.019" \times 0.025" wire with the Smart Clip appliance.
- Monteiro M *et.al* (2014) [27] investigated the impact of archwire material (NiTi, beta-Ti and stainless steel) and bracket system (self-ligating and regular) on the frictional resistance of two sorts of two systems namely the self-ligating (Smartclip, 3M/Unitek) and traditional system (Gemini, 3M/Unitek) with a variety of slot angulations joined with elastomeric ligatures (TP

Orthodontics). All sections were tried with archwire 0.019"x0.025" nickel-titanium, beta-titanium, and stainless steel (Unitek/3M). The mechanical testing performed with a general testing machine eMIC DL 10000 (eMIC Co, Brazil) concluded the ability of the Self-ligating bracket to deliver essentially lower friction compared to that of the traditional bracket system.

- Gomes S *et.al* (2016) ^[29] compared frictional resistance among various self ligating brackets utilizing Finite Elements Analysis (FEA). Seventy nine (79) slide tests were performed by joining an upper first bicuspid traditional brackets with 0.018" stainless steel wires and 0.010" ligature by methods for an INSTRON 3345 load framework to acquire normal greatest static frictional resistance (MSFR). In ordinary sections, a 0.018" archwire shoed stresses at a linear rate with greatest fixation at the middle. Alternately 0.020 x 0.020" and 0.019 x 0.025" archwires demonstrated stress over the bracket width. The most noteworthy ordinary strengths were 1.53 N for the 0.018" archwire, 4.85 N for the 0.020 x 0.020" archwire and 8.18 N for the 0.019 x 0.025" archwire. Thus, passive self ligating brackets possessed less frictional resistance than active and traditional brackets
- Giudice AA *et al.* (2016) ^[30] explored the imperviousness to sliding (RS) identified with self-ligating and regular ligation bracket frameworks at a few rotational angulations utilizing run of the mill adjusting arch wires in a 3 bracket exploratory model. Imperviousness to sliding (RS) was measured in self-ligating (SL: Interactive selfligating sections with shut slide) and customary ligation (CL: Interactive self-ligating sections with open slide and elastomeric ligatures) gathers in conjunction with 0.014-in heat activated NiTi. The Resistance to sliding RS estimations were essentially higher at every angulation ($P < 0.0001$) with the customary bracket framework than with self-ligation

4. Conclusion

The points of interest offered by the Self Ligating framework are profitable and persistent benevolent when contrasted with the industrially accessible traditional framework. Low friction, an enhanced full section engagement and decrease in span of archwire ligation are a portion of the many advantages that make the rundown of the self ligating framework. Numerous advancements found in the present situation offer the likelihood of a huge diminishment in normal treatment time and furthermore in mooring necessities, especially in cases requiring substantial tooth developments

5. References

1. Harradine N. Self Ligating Brackets: Where Are We Now? J ORTHOD. 2003; 30:262-273.
2. Fleming P, Dibiase T. Self Ligating Appliances: Evolution or Revolution? J Clin Orthod. 2008; 42:641-651.
3. Rinchuse D, Miles P. Self Ligating Brackets: Present And Future; Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2001; 132:216-222.
4. Miles P. Self Ligating Brackets In Orthodontics: Do They Deliver What They Claim? Aust Dent J. 2009; 54:9-11.
5. Harradine N. Self Ligating brackets And Treatment Efficiency. Clin Orthod Res. 2001; 4:220-227.
6. Eberting J, Tuncay O. Treatemnt Time, Outcome And Patient Satisfaction, Comparison Of Damon And Conventional Brackets. Clin Orthod Res, 2001, 228-234.
7. Paduano S, Cioffi I, Iodice G, Rapuano A, Silva R. Time efficiency of self-ligating vs conventional brackets in orthodontics: effect of appliances and ligating systems. Prog Orthod. 2008; 9:74-80. [PubMed]
8. Chen SS, Greenlee GM, Kim JE, Smith CL, Huang GJ. Systematic review of self-ligating brackets. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2010; 137:726.e1-726.e8. [PubMed]
9. Monteiro MR, Silva LE, Elias CN, Vilella Ode V. Frictional resistance of self-ligating versus conventional brackets in different bracket-archwire-angle combinations. J Appl Oral Sci. 2014; 22:228-34. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
10. Turnbull NR, Birnie DJ. Treatment efficiency of conventional vs self-ligating brackets: effects of archwire size and material. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2007; 131:395-9. [PubMed]
11. Sims APT, Waters NE, Birnie DJ, Pethybridge RJ. A comparison of forces required to produce tooth movement *in-vitro* using two self ligating brackets & Pre-adjusted bracket employing two types of ligation, European journal of orthodontics. 1993; 15:377-385.
12. Shivapuja, Berger. Conventional ligation versus self-ligation - AJO-DO, 1994, 472-480.
13. Nigel Taylor G, Keith Ison. Frictional resistance between orthodontic brackets and archwires in the buccal segments. The Angle Orthodontist. 1996; 66(3):215-222.
14. Devanathan D. Performance study of a low friction ligature. Research Laboratory, TP Orthodontics, LaPorte, Indian, 2000.
15. Blake M, Woodside DG, Pharoah MJ. A radiographic comparison of apical root resorption after orthodontic treatment with the edgewise and Speed appliances. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop. 1995; 108:76-84.
16. Simona Tecco, Donato Di Iorio, Giancarlo Cordasco. Italia Verrocchi and Felice Festa An *in vitro* investigation of the infl uence of self-ligating brackets, low friction ligatures, and archwire on frictional resistance. European Journal of Orthodontics. 2007; 29:390-397.
17. Sims APT, Waters NE, Birnie DJ. A comparison of the forces required to produce tooth movement *ex vivo* through three types of preadjusted brackets when subjected to determined tip or torque values. British Journal of Orthodontics. 1994; 21:367-373.
18. Thomas S, Birnie DJ, Sherriff M. A comparative *in vitro* study of the frictional characteristics of two types of self ligating brackets and two types of preadjusted edgewise brackets tied with elastomeric ligatures. European Journal of Orthodontics. 1998; 20:589-596.
19. Kapur R, Sinha PK, Nanda RS. Frictional resistance of the Damon SL bracket Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 1998; 32:485-489.
20. Pizzoni L, Raunholt G, Melsen B. Frictional forces related to self-ligating brackets. European Journal of Orthodontics. 1998; 20:283-291.

21. Meling TR, Ødegaard J, Holthe K, Segner D. The effect of friction on the bending stiffness of orthodontic beams: A theoretical and *in vitro* study. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics*. 1997; 112: 41-49.
22. Khambay B, Millett D, Mc Hugh S. Evaluation of methods of archwire ligation on frictional resistance *European Journal of Orthodontics*. 2004; 26:327-332.
23. Voudouris JC. Interactive edgewise mechanisms: Form and function comparison with conventional edgewise brackets, *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics*. 1997; 111:119-40.
24. Reicheneder *et al.* Frictional properties of aesthetic brackets *European Journal of Orthodontics*. 2007; 29:359-365.
25. Miles PG, Weyant RJ, Rustveld L. A clinical trial of Damon 2 versus conventional twin brackets during initial alignment. *Angle Orthod*. 2006; 6:480-485.
26. Fleming PS, DiBiase AT, Sarri G, Lee RT. Pain experience during initial alignment with a self-ligating and a conventional fixed orthodontic appliance system: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Angle Orthod* 2009; 79:46-50.
27. Monteiro M, Silva C, Elias C, Vilella N. Frictional resistance of self-ligating versus conventional brackets in different bracket-archwire-angle combinations; *J. Appl. Oral Sci*. 2014; 22:3.
28. Seo Y *et al.* Effect of self-ligating bracket type and vibration on frictional force and stick-slip phenomenon in diverse tooth displacement conditions: an *in vitro* mechanical analysis, *Eur J Orthod*. 2015; 37(5):474-480.
29. Gómez SL *et al.* Comparison of frictional resistance among conventional, active and passive selfligating brackets with different combinations of arch wires: a finite elements study, *Acta Odontol Latinoam*. 2016; 29(2):130-136.
30. Giudice AA *et al.* Analysis of resistance to sliding expressed during first order correction with conventional and self-ligating brackets: an *in-vitro* study. *Int J Clin Exp Med*. 2016; 9(8):15575-15581.