



Systematic Review

Periodontal health during clear aligners treatment: a systematic review

Gabriele Rossini, Simone Parrini, Tommaso Castroflorio,
Andrea Deregibus and Cesare L. Debernardi

Department of Orthodontics, Dental School, University of Turin, Italy

Correspondence to: Gabriele Rossini, Department of Orthodontics, Dental School, University of Turin, Via Nizza 230, Turin 10125, Italy. E-mail: dr.gabriele.rossini@gmail.com

Summary

Background: Clear aligner treatment (CAT) has been cited as a safe and comfortable orthodontic procedure for adult patients. However, the available evidence is scarce.

Objective: To perform a systematic review of the existing literature in order to assess periodontal health during CAT.

Search methods and selection criteria: Pubmed, Pubmed Central, National Library of Medicine's Medline, Embase, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Clinical trials, Web of Knowledge, Scopus, Google Scholar, and LILACS were searched from January 1945 to September 2014 to identify all peer-reviewed papers potentially relevant to the review.

Data collection and analysis: After duplicate selection and extraction procedures, the risk of bias was assessed according to the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination criteria, and a 3-point grading system, as described by the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care (SBU), was used to rate the methodological quality of the selected papers. A PICOS table was used for data extraction.

Results: Five relevant articles were selected from the 1247 identified articles. The level of evidence was moderate for all the studies. A significant improvement of the periodontal health indexes was revealed, in particular when CAT was compared to fixed appliances. No periodontal CAT adverse effects were observed in the selected studies.

Conclusions: Periodontal health indexes were significantly improved during CAT. The results of this review should be interpreted with some caution because of the number, quality, and heterogeneity of the included studies.

Introduction

Direct or indirect effects of orthodontic treatments on periodontal status and oral health are well known and quite extensively described in the existing literature (1). The periodontal reaction to an orthodontic appliance depends on several factors, such as host resistance, the presence of systemic conditions, and the amount and composition of dental plaque. Lifestyle factors, including smoking, can also compromise periodontal support. Oral hygiene procedures have a great impact on the periodontal health during orthodontic treatment (2). The existing literature supports the link between the increase

of plaque indexes (PIs) and the decrease in overall oral health conditions in orthodontic patients, especially when treated with fixed appliances (3–6). The use of removable appliances can minimize the orthodontics-related negative effects on periodontal health allowing patients easier oral hygiene procedures.

In recent years, increasing numbers of adult patients have sought orthodontic treatment and expressed a desire for aesthetic and comfortable alternatives to conventional fixed appliances (7, 8).

Clear aligners treatment (CAT) was introduced to answer this requests. Although CAT has been cited as a safe, aesthetic and comfortable orthodontic procedure for adult patients, only few trials

were focused on its side effects (9, 10). Considering that teeth and keratinized gingiva are covered almost all day long by aligners, it is important from a clinical perspective to have a sound judgment regarding the periodontal effects of CAT. Two systematic reviews were conducted about CAT and were mainly focused on its potentials (11, 12). None of them reported information about the periodontal effects of this kind of orthodontic treatment.

The present systematic review was undertaken to answer the following clinical research question in permanent dentition subjects:

- Does CAT produce detrimental effects on periodontal structures?

Materials and methods

The protocol for this systematic review (CRD42014009982) was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Review (<http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>).

On 25 September 2014, a systematic search in the medical literature produced between January 1945 and September 2014 was performed to identify all peer-reviewed papers reporting possible periodontal effects of CAT. In order to retrieve lists of potential papers to be included in the review, the search strategy illustrated in Table 1 was used in the following databases: Pubmed, Pubmed Central, National Library of Medicine's Medline, Embase, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Clinical trials, Web of Knowledge, Scopus, Google Scholar, and LILACS.

Title and abstract (TIAB) screening was performed to select articles for full text retrieval.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria for admittance in the systematic review were based on the type of study, were dependent on the clinical research questions, and are reported in Table 2. The reference lists of these articles were perused, and references related to the articles were followed up.

Duplicate papers were removed and the studies were selected for inclusion independently by two of the authors (G.R. and S.P.). Disagreements were solved by discussion between all the authors.

The 'PICO' approach was used to extract data from the selected papers independently and in duplicate by two review authors (S.P. and G.R.). The acronym PICO stands for Population (Participants), Intervention (or Exposure for observational studies), Comparator, and Outcomes. For the purposes of this systematic review, the PICO format was modified in the PICOS one, where 'S' stands for study design (Table 3) (13). The authors of the selected papers were contacted in case of missing information about sample selection and characteristics of their studies.

The primary outcome included the periodontal effects of CAT evaluated on the basis of periodontal indexes variations detected during CAT. The secondary outcome included the eventual CAT orthodontic movements with detrimental effects on dental and periodontal structures.

According to the CRD (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York) and to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statements, evaluation of methodological quality gives an indication of the strength of evidence provided by the study because flaws in the design or in the conduction of a study can result in biases (19, 20). However, no single approach for assessing methodological soundness is appropriate to all systematic reviews (20). A 3-point grading system, described by the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care (SBU) and the CRD, was used to rate the methodological quality of the selected papers (Table 3) (19, 21). Articles were graded according to the SBU criteria as follow:

Table 1. Search strategy.

Database	Search strategy
Pubmed, PMC, Scopus, Web of Knowledge, Embase, NLM	((Orthodont* OR Clear) aligner* OR Invisalign) AND (periodont* OR parodont*) AND (health* OR (disadvant* OR adverse OR collateral OR negative OR unfavourable) AND (effect* OR outcom*))
LILACS	((Orthodont\$ OR Clear) aligner\$ OR Invisalign) AND (periodont\$ OR parodont\$) AND (health\$ OR (disadvant\$ OR adverse OR collateral OR negative OR unfavourable) AND (effect\$ OR outcom\$))
Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Clinical trials	(Orthodontic aligner* or clear aligner* or Invisalign) AND (periodont* OR parodont*) AND (health* OR (adverse effect* or collateral effect* or negative effect* or unfavo\$nable effect* or collateral outcom* or negative outcom* or unfavo\$nable outcom* or disadvant*))

Table 2. Study selection criteria.

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Prospective original studies on human subjects with permanent dentition	Studies on patients with genetic syndrome and severe facial malformations
Studies on orthodontic treatment with clear aligners	Studies with surgical-orthodontic techniques
Studies that included clear descriptions of the materials and applied technique	Case reports
	Reviews
	Abstracts
	Author debates
	Summary articles
	Studies with less than 10 patients
	Studies on animals

1. Grade A (High level of evidence): randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or prospective study with a well-defined control group; presence of defined diagnosis and endpoints; well-described diagnostic reliability tests and reproducibility tests; blinding outcome assessment.
2. Grade B (Moderate level of evidence): same criteria as grade A except for the blinding outcome assessment.
3. Grade C (Low level of evidence): articles that do not meet the criteria of grade A and B.

SBU tool permitted to assess the level of the available evidence of the systematic review accordingly to the following classification:

1. Strong: at least two studies of level 'A'.
2. Moderate: one study of level 'A' and at least two studies of level 'B'.
3. Limited: at least two studies of level 'B'.
4. Scarce: fewer than two studies of level 'B'.

Results

The search strategy yielded five relevant publications. Four studies were prospective non-randomized and one study was prospective

Table 3. PICOS table.

Author (ref.)	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparison	Outcomes	Quality of the evidence (SBU grading system)
Miethke and Vogt (14)	Prospective study	60 patients (43 M and 17 F, age range: 18–51 years, mean age: 30.1 years): 30 patients fixed appliance and 30 patients clear aligners	Orthodontic treatment with fixed appliance	Orthodontic treatment with clear aligners	Modified PI* Modified GI PBI SPD	B
Miethke and Brauner (15)	Prospective study	30 patients with lingual appliance (age range: 16–48 years, mean age: 39.6 years)	Orthodontic treatment with lingual fixed appliance	Orthodontic treatment with clear aligners (from the previous 2005 study)	Modified PI* Modified GI* PBI* SPD*	B
Low et al. (16)	Prospective study	11 patients (7 M and 4 F, age range: 19–39 years)	Clear aligner treatment of slow plaque formers patients	Clear aligner treatment of fast plaque formers patients	PPI	B
Karkhanechi et al. (17)	Prospective study	42 patients: 22 fixed appliance (6 M and 16 F, mean age: 34 ± 7.18 years, age range: 18–44 years) and 20 clear aligners (8 M and 12 F, mean age: 28 ± 6.86 years, age range: 18–44 years)	Orthodontic treatment with fixed appliance	Orthodontic treatment with clear aligners	PI* BoP* GI* PPD* BANA score	B
Levrini et al. (18)	Prospective RCT	30 patients (9 M and 21 F, mean age: 25.1 ± 4.6 years): 10 fixed appliance, 10 clear aligners, and 10 control Class I malocclusion with Little's Index from 1 to 3	Orthodontic treatment with clear aligners and with fixed appliance	Untreated control group	Modified PI* PPD* BoP* Compliance Biofilm mass*	B

BANA, N-benzoyl-dl-arginine-beta-naphthylamide; BoP, bleeding on probing; GI, gingival index; PBI, papillary bleeding index; PI, plaque index; PPD, probing pocket depth; PPI, plaque percentage index; SPD, sulcus probing depth; VAS, visual analog scale.

* $P < 0.05$.

randomized (14–18). The article selection process is illustrated in the PRISMA Flow Diagram (Figure 1).

Sample size in individual studies ranged from 11 to 60 subjects with a total of 173 subjects. Mean age at the start of CAT in the evaluated samples ranged from 16 to 51 years.

From a methodological point of view, the selected papers used different procedures to detect treatment effects: four studies observed periodontal indexes variations, while one study collected biofilm samples from aligners surfaces in order to analyze its ultrastructure and morphology.

Four studies performed a comparison between groups, while one study used the analyzed cases as own control group (14–18).

Quality analysis

According to the SBU tool, the quality of the collected evidences was moderate (grade B) in all the five studies (14–18). Thus, conclusions with a limited level of evidence could be drawn from the review process. The most important sources of bias were the absence of clues about randomization procedures and the lack of adequate blinding procedures. The quality grading of the selected papers is shown in PICOS Table (Table 3).

Effects of interventions

Five studies (one RCT and four prospective Clinical Controlled Trials) analyzed the CAT effects on periodontal health (14–18). All the selected studies analyzed Invisalign (Align Technology, San Jose, California, USA) treatments.

Levrini et al. in their RCT recorded periodontal indexes from 3 groups of patients (10 treated with CAT, 10 treated with fixed buccal appliances, and 10 not-treated subjects) and evaluated the total biofilm mass and the bacterial population in the collected plaque samples (18). Significantly better values of PI [odds ratio (OR): 0.09/95% confidence interval (CI): 0.05–0.15, $P < 0.001$], bleeding on probing (BoP; OR: 0.20/95% CI: 0.11–0.36, $P < 0.001$), probing pocket depth (PPD; $P = 0.002$), and amount of biofilm mass ($P = 0.003$) were found in the CAT sample. Miethke et al. in their 2005 and 2007 studies compared periodontal indexes from patients treated with clear aligners or fixed buccal or fixed lingual appliances (30 patients for each group) (14, 15). Significant differences were found for PI (difference: 0.2) between CAT and fixed buccal appliance group ($P < 0.05$). Significant differences for PI (difference: 0.5), gingival index (GI; difference: 0.4), papillary bleeding index (PBI; difference: 0.2), and sulcus probing depth (T3 difference: 0.2) were observed between CAT and fixed lingual appliance group ($P < 0.05$). Karkhanechi et al. evaluated




Figure 1. Flow chart according to the PRISMA Statement, from Moher *et al.* (20).

periodontal indexes variations between patients treated with fixed appliances (22 patients) and patients treated with clear aligners (20 patients) after 6 weeks, 6 months, and 12 months from therapy beginning (17). Significant differences between CAT and fixed appliances for PI after 6 months ($P < 0.001$) and 12 months ($P < 0.001$), BoP after 12 months ($P < 0.05$), GI after 6 months ($P < 0.01$) and 12 months ($P < 0.01$), and PPD after 6 weeks ($P = 0.012$), 6 months ($P < 0.021$), and 12 months ($P < 0.003$) were revealed. Low *et al.*, who collected and analyzed biofilm samples from clear aligners surfaces of 56 volunteers, did not find any significant variation of the plaque percentage index during treatment (16).

Discussion

The present review evaluated the existing literature related to the periodontal effects of CAT.

Five prospective studies, of which only one was randomized, were included in the review process. Despite the widespread use of CAT, there is still a lack of strong evidence about the type and extent of periodontal effects. Accordingly to the SBU tool, the evidence emerging from the selected papers is of moderate level. The analysis of possible sources of bias revealed the lack of some methodological features: a very strong limitation of all studies was the absence of proper blinding procedures, as well as the lack of information about

sample selection, while in one study a proper control group was not available (16). Therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution. Incomplete reporting of outcomes was investigated according to the Cochrane Collaboration guidelines (19). Results showed complete and reliable data reports among the sample. A meta-analysis of the results of the studies was planned. However, due to the high heterogeneity ($I^2 > 75\%$), meta-analysis was omitted as suggested by the Cochrane Collaboration (19).

A systematic review by Bollen *et al.* stated the absence of reliable evidence about the effects of orthodontic treatment on periodontal health (22). Furthermore, other systematic reviews by van Gastel *et al.* and Talic focused on plaque retention as the main risk factor for periodontal diseases after orthodontic treatment, confirmed that orthodontic treatment itself does not increase the incidence of periodontal pathologies (2, 23). However, oral hygiene procedures have a great impact on the periodontal status of orthodontic patients (2). In this systematic review, the five selected studies (one RCT and four prospective CCTs) analyzed the influence of CAT on periodontal health (14–18). Four studies assessed a statistically significant reduction ($P < 0.05$) of PI in CAT patients with respect to fixed (lingual and/or buccal) appliances patients (14, 15, 17, 18). Other periodontal indexes, as GI, PBI, BoP, and PPD, were analyzed in these studies (15, 17, 18). In each study and for each parameter, a significant improvement during CAT was obtained with respect to fixed appliance treatment.

As widely stated in the scientific literature, the most important orthodontic related risk factors for periodontal disease are the increase of plaque retention and the worsening of plaque quality (3–6, 24).

Between 3 and 12 weeks after the beginning of supragingival plaque formation, a distinctive subgingival microflora predominantly made up of gram-negative, anaerobic bacteria and including some motile species, becomes established. In order to establish in a periodontal site, a species must be able to attach to one of several surfaces including the tooth (or retentive surfaces attached to the tooth), the sulcular or pocket epithelium, or other bacterial species that are attached to these surfaces (24).

The studies by Low *et al.* and Levrini *et al.* regarding the quality and morphology of the oral biofilm of patients treated with CAT or fixed appliances stated, respectively, that biofilm starts forming on the raised edges or textural surfaces of the aligners and that the types of bacteria included in the biofilm were associated to a low risk of periodontal diseases (16, 18).

From a clinical point of view, CAT seems to be a safe procedure for periodontal tissues with respect to fixed appliance treatment techniques, with particular reference to the amount of possible plaque retention. This seems to be due to the removable nature of CAT, facilitating oral hygiene procedures, and to the reduced amount of plaque retentive surfaces. Considering all these observations, CAT could be indicated in the orthodontic treatment of patients with compromised periodontal health. However, there is still a lack of strong evidence to support this hypothesis. Future RCTs on this topic should be encouraged.

Considering all the results of this systematic review, strong limitations come from the heterogeneity and the low number of the selected studies, as well as multiple sources of bias that decreased the overall quality of evidence. It is recommended that future researches in this field should include randomized controlled design with rigorous methodology and proper sample size, in order to increase the power of the studies for estimating the periodontal effects.

Conclusions

1. Most of the studies presented with methodological problems: bias and confounding variables, lack of adequate blinding procedures and absence of proper randomization methods. Thus, conclusions with a moderate level of evidence could be drawn from the review process.
2. Periodontal health, as well as quantity and quality of plaque, were better during CAT than during fixed appliance treatments.
3. A significant decrease of periodontal indices (GI, PBI, BoP and PPD) during CAT was observed in the analyzed sample of patients.

References

1. Cantekin, K., Celikoglu, M., Karadas, M., Yildirim, H. and Erdem, A. (2011) Effects of orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances on oral health status: a comprehensive study. *Journal of Dental Sciences*, 6, 235–238.
2. Talic, N.F. (2011) Adverse effects of orthodontic treatment: a clinical perspective. *The Saudi Dental Journal*, 23, 55–59.
3. Kaygisiz, E., Uzuner, F.D., Yuksel, S., Taner, L., Culhaoğlu, R., Sezgin, Y. and Ateş, C. (2014) Effects of self-ligating and conventional brackets on halitosis and periodontal conditions. *The Angle Orthodontist*, First published on August 7, 2014, 10.2319/041714-289.1.
4. Akgun, O.M., Altug, H., Karacay, S., Guven Polat, G., Duyan, S. and Bedir, O. (2014) Effect of 2 elastomeric ligatures on microbial flora and periodontal status in orthodontic patients. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 145, 667–671.
5. Boke, F., Gazioglu, C., Akkaya, S. and Akkaya, M. (2014) Relationship between orthodontic treatment and gingival health: a retrospective study. *European Journal of Dentistry*, 8, 373–380.

6. Al-Anezi, S.A. (2014) Dental plaque associated with self-ligating brackets during the initial phase of orthodontic treatment: a 3-month preliminary study. *Journal of Orthodontic Science*, 3, 7–11.
7. Melsen, B. (2011) Northcroft lecture: how has the spectrum of orthodontics changed over the past decades? *Journal of Orthodontics*, 38, 134–43; quiz 145.
8. Rosvall, M.D., Fields, H.W., Ziuchkovski, J., Rosenstiel, S.F. and Johnston, W.M. (2009) Attractiveness, acceptability, and value of orthodontic appliances. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 135, 276.e1–12; discussion 276.
9. Kravitz, N.D., Kusnoto, B., Agran, B. and Viana, G. (2009) How well does Invisalign work? A prospective clinical study evaluating the efficacy of tooth movement with Invisalign. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 135, 27–35.
10. Krieger, E., Seiferth, J., Marinello, I., Jung, B.A., Wriedt, S., Jacobs, C. and Wehrbein, H. (2012) Invisalign® treatment in the anterior region: were the predicted tooth movements achieved? *Journal of Orofacial Orthopedics*, 73, 365–376.
11. Lagravère, M.O. and Flores-Mir, C. (2005) The treatment effects of Invisalign orthodontic aligners: a systematic review. *Journal of the American Dental Association (1939)*, 136, 1724–1729.
12. Rossini, G., Parrini, S., Castroflorio, T., Deregibus, A. and Debernardi, C. (2014) Efficacy of clear aligners in controlling orthodontic tooth movement: a systematic review. *The Angle Orthodontist*, First published on November 20, 2014, 10.2319/061614-436.1.
13. Lichtenstein, A.H., Yetley, E.A. and Lau, J. (2009) *Application of Systematic Review Methodology to the Field of Nutrition: Nutritional Research Series*, Vol. 1. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), Rockville, MD.
14. Miethke, R.R. and Vogt, S. (2005) A comparison of the periodontal health of patients during treatment with the Invisalign system and with fixed orthodontic appliances. *Journal of Orofacial Orthopedics*, 66, 219–229.
15. Miethke, R.R. and Brauner, K. (2007) A Comparison of the periodontal health of patients during treatment with the Invisalign system and with fixed lingual appliances. *Journal of Orofacial Orthopedics*, 68, 223–231.
16. Low, B., Lee, W., Seneviratne, C.J., Samaranyake, L.P. and Hägg, U. (2011) Ultrastructure and morphology of biofilms on thermoplastic orthodontic appliances in 'fast' and 'slow' plaque formers. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 33, 577–583.
17. Karkhanechi, M., Chow, D., Sipkin, J., Sherman, D., Boylan, R.J., Norman, R.G., Craig, R.G. and Cisneros, G.J. (2013) Periodontal status of adult patients treated with fixed buccal appliances and removable aligners over one year of active orthodontic therapy. *The Angle Orthodontist*, 83, 146–51.
18. Levrini, L., Abbate, G.M., Migliori, F., Orrù, G., Sauro, S. and Caprioglio, A. (2013) Assessment of the periodontal health status in patients undergoing orthodontic treatment with fixed or removable appliances. A microbiological and preliminary clinical study. *Cumburiyet Dental Journal*, 16, 296–307.
19. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. (2008) *Systematic Reviews – CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Health Care*. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, York.
20. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J. and Altman, D.G.; PRISMA Group. (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6, e1000097.
21. Bondemark, L., Holm, A., Hansen, K., Axelsson, S., Mohlin, B. and Brattstrom, V. (2007) Long-term stability of orthodontic treatment and patient satisfaction. A systematic review. *The Angle Orthodontist*, 77, 181–191.
22. Bollen, A.M., Cunha-Cruz, J., Bakko, D.W., Huang, G.J. and Huijoe, P.P. (2008) The effects of orthodontic therapy on periodontal health: a systematic review of controlled evidence. *Journal of the American Dental Association (1939)*, 139, 413–422.
23. van Gastel, J., Quirynen, M., Teughels, W. and Carels, C. (2007) The relationships between malocclusion, fixed orthodontic appliances and periodontal disease. A review of the literature. *Australian Orthodontic Journal*, 23, 121–129.
24. Ireland, A.J., Soro, V., Sprague, S.V., Harradine, N.W., Day, C., Al-Anezi, S., Jenkinson, H.F., Sherriff, M., Dymock, D. and Sandy, J.R. (2014) The effects of different orthodontic appliances upon microbial communities. *Orthodontics and Craniofacial Research*, 17, 115–23.