# 18387-Akbar-MIXED DENTITION PREDICTION EQUATIONS RSDAuthor

*by* Muhammad Akbar

# APPLICABILITY OF MIXED DENTITION PREDICTION EQUATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY POPULATION OF PASHTUNS

**Authors**

Akbar Ali Khan[a], SamanBaseer[b], Noor Durrani[c], Imran Tajik[d]

[a]Senior Registrar, Department of Orthodontics, KMU Institute of Dental Sciences, Kohat, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

[b]Demonstrator, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital, GandharaInstitiute of Medical Sciences, Peshawar, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

[c]Demonstrator, Department of Orthodontics, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital, Gandhara Institiute of Medical Sciences, Peshawar, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

[d]Professor, Department of Orthodontics, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital, Gandhara Institiute of Medical Sciences, Peshawar, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

**Corresponding Author**

Akbar Ali Khan; Senior Registrar, Department of Orthodontics, KMU Institute of Dental Sciences, Phase 2 FEFA building Kohat, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

Email address: akbar_ak@hotmail.com

Contact Number:+92 333 9111372

# ABSTRACT

**OBJECTIVE:** To determine the accuracy of Tanaka and Johnston prediction equations when applied to a sample of Pashtun population of Pakistan.

**METHODS:** Odontometric data from casts of 180 subjects (90 males and 90 females, ages 13-19 years) of Pashtun origin was collected using digital callipers and subjected to statistical and linear regression analysis.

**RESULTS:** Statistically significant differences were noted between male and female tooth sizes. Tanaka and Johnston equations significantly overestimated the sizes of canines and premolars when applied to ethnic Pashtun population. Regression equations were developed for use in local population.

**CONCLUSION:** Tanaka and Johnston equations developed for North American population (at 75th percentile) should be used with caution for mixed dentition analyses in local Pashtun population as it overestimates tooth sizes in males and females. Regression equations developed in this study can be used for diagnostic planning in local Pashtun children.

**KEY WORDS:** Linear regressions (MeSH), Mixed dentition (MeSH), Tanaka and Johnston (non MeSH).

## INTRODUCTION

Prediction of mesiodistal widths of unerupted canines and premolars during mixed dentition is an interesting aspect orthodontic diagnosis and treatment. Researchers have developed various methods for estimating the crown widths of these unerupted teeth which include the use of prediction equations and probability tables, developed by Tanaka and Johnston[1] and Moyers[2], radiographic techniques as suggested by Staley, et al.[3] and Huckaba, et al.[4] and a combination of these techniques as used by Hixon Oldfather[5] and Bishara, et al.[6]

Since the general tendency is to use the simplest approach possible, Tanaka and Johnston[1] prediction equations became widely used for its ease of use, effectiveness and lack of need for any expensive equipment or exposure to radiation. However these prediction equations were developed from odontometric data derived from population of North European descent, therefore the accuracy of these equations is questionable when applied to local ethnic population.[7]

Review of literature shows that researchers in Egypt,[6] Turkey,[7] America,[8] Peru,[9] Saudi Arabia,[10] Jordan,[11] Italy,[12] Syria,[13] India,[14] Hong Kong,[15] Thailand,[16] Nigeria[17] and Morocco[18] have reported significant differences between actual and predicted mesiodistal widths of canine premolars segments when Tanaka and Johnston[1]regressions are applied to other populations and ethnic groups (Table I). Studies on Pakistani population carried out by Mengal and Afzal[19] and Bherwani, et al.[20] have reported significant differences between actual and predicted mesiodistal widths of canine premolar segments whereas a study by Sarwat, et al.[21] reported non-significant differences when Tanaka and Johnston[1] prediction equations were applied to local population groups.

However these studies[19-21] did not ethnically profile the subjects in their samples which can lead to errors when applying their values to different ethnic groups in Pakistan.[22] Therefore this study was carried out in a population sample of Pashtuns (who constitute an indigenous ethnic group settled in Northwest Pakistan and Eastern Afghanistan) to find out; 1) the applicability of Tanaka and Johnston[1] equations in Pashtuns, 2) to determine the accuracy of regression equations developed by Bherwani et al for Pakistani population in ethnic Pashtun group and 3) to develop regression equations for Pashtun population if necessary.

## METHODS

### Data Collection

Dental casts of 180 subjects (90 females and 90 males, average age 15.54 years) that met the inclusion criteria were collected at Sardar Begum Dental Hospital, Gandhara University Peshawar. The subjects included were those with an age range 13-19 years, who had full set

of permanent teeth from first molar to first molar in both arches and were Pushtun residents of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa province with at least past two generations of Pushtun ancestry whereas patients with interproximal caries, restorations, hypoplastic or worn down teeth, syndromic patients and those with severe crowding which would complicate tooth size measurements were excluded. Patients with damaged cast records and previous history of Orthodontics were also excluded.

**Measurement Method**

Digital vernier calliper (Mitotoyo, Kawasaki, Japan) calibrated to the nearest of 0.01 mm was used to measure the mesiodistal widths lower incisors, maxillary and mandibular canine and premolars on dental casts according to the method suggested by Moores and Reed.[23] The measurements for right and left sides were averaged to obtain a single value for canine premolar segments

**Reliability of measurements**

Good intraexaminer reliability (r>0.95) was found by a method suggested by Lundstrom[24] where the same investigator (AAK) measures all the cast and then re-measures a few (30 in this study) randomly selectedcasts after a period 2 weeks.

**Benchmark of clinical significance**

Lee Chen, et al.[8] and Bishara, et al.[25] have suggested that the difference between actual and predicted widths of canine premolar segments should be $\geq$ 1mm per quadrant to be clinically significant.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

Descriptive statistics including means, standards deviations and ranges were calculated for age, individual teeth (lower incisors, canines and premolars) and tooth segments (lower incisors and canine premolar segments). Student t test was used to analyze the difference between right and left canine premolar segments of upper and lower arches in both males and females. Independent sample t test was used to determine difference in tooth sizes between males and females. Repeated measures ANOVA was used to compare the actual tooth sizes and tooth sizes predicted by Tanaka and Johnston[1] and Bherwani's[20] regression equations. Regression equations were derived alongwith correlation coefficients (r) and coefficients of determination ($r^2$) to analyze the relationships between lower incisors and canine premolar segments in both arches.Data was analysed using SPSS software version 20 for Windows.

**RESULTS**

Data was analysed for 90 male and 90 female subjects with a mean age of 15.7 years (SD, 1.7) and 15.4 years (SD, 1.5), respectively.  Descriptive statistics for individual teeth and

groups of teeth are summarized in Table II. Generally larger tooth sizes were noted in males than in females. Also the mesiodistal tooth width of canine premolar segment was slightly larger in maxilla that in mandible for both male and female groups.

Statistically insignificant differences, except for upper arch in males, were found between right and left canine premolar segments of males and females within the corresponding arches as shown in Table III. Statistically significant difference was noted for combined tooth widths only for upper arch in males (mean =0.08mm, p=0.027). However, this difference was below the level of clinical significance of 0.25mm as suggested by Ballard,[26] hence it could be ignored and the values of right and left sides were averaged in this study to obtain a single value for canine premolar segments.

The values of tooth sizes obtained from male and female samples were computed to evaluate for sexual dimorphism. Statistically significant differences were noted for individual teeth and for groups of teeth with males showing larger tooth sizes than females (Table IV). Individually the greatest difference was noted for lower canines and least for lower central incisors. In groups of teeth, differences recorded were least forlower incisors segment and greatest for lower canine-premolar segment.

Actual mesiodistal widths of canine premolar segments derived in this study were compared to those predicted by regression equations derived by Tanaka and Johnston[1] for North American population and by Bherwani, et al.[20] for Pakistani population (Table V). Statistically significant overestimations of tooth sizes was observed when applying Tanaka and Johnston[1]equations to both arches of male and female Pashtuns but the differences were clinically relevant in females. However, except for upper arch in males, Bherwani's[20] prediction equations significantly underestimated from the actual tooth sizes in both males and females, with clinically significant differences for lower arches of both genders.

Regression equations represented by $y=a+b(x)$ were derived from the data (Table VI). Here $y$ denotes the mesiodistal widths of unerupted canine and premolars for one segment, $a$ is slope of the curve, $b$ is the y-intercept and $x$ is mesiodistal width of lower incisors in millimetres. The values for coefficient of correlation (r) ranged from 0.59 to 0.73 and the coefficient of determination ($r^2$) ranged from 0.36 to 0.52.

The regression equations derived for prediction of unerupted canine-premolar segments in Pashtuns are given as;

    a. For combined males and females,
         i. Upper Arch, y=8.62+0.65(x)
        ii. Lower Arch, y=6.24+0.7(x)
    b. For males only,
         i. Upper Arch, y=9.82+0.61(x)
        ii. Lower Arch, y=9.57+0.62(x)
    c. For Females Only,
         i. Upper Arch, y=10.1+0.59(x)
        ii. Lower Arch, y=5.35+0.73(x)

**DISCUSSION**

Various investigators[13, 16, 25, 27, 28] have confirmed differences in tooth sizes based on racial and ethnic backgrounds.[22] Frankel and Benz[29] have suggested that the similarity in tooth sizes in a particular race or ethnicity may be due to similar gene pool as compared to other groups. The hereditary differences serve a basis of inaccuracies when prediction equations derived from odontometric data of a certain race/ethnicity are applied to another group.[30]

In our study it was observed that both prediction equations developed by Tanaka and Johnston[1] and Bherwani, et al.[20] did not completely satisfy the condition of clinical accuracy for both genders or for both arches. Bherwani, et al.[20] derived prediction equations from a population sample based on nationality rather than on ethnicity, which could explain the differences reported in this study. Any approximation of actual and predicted values of canine-premolar segments observed, such as in upper arch of males, could be attributed to chance (Table V).

Regression equations were derived from the data in our study at the 75th percentile. Experienced clinicians may prefer the 50th percentile to equalize the margin of error between underestimation and overestimation but Moyers[2] suggested a slight overestimation of values as relative spacing can be easily managed by orthodontic therapy as compared to crowding.

The coefficient of correlation (r) shows the strength of relation between the lower incisor segment and the canine-premolar segments. The values of r in our study were generally above 0.5 for both arches in males and females which means that the lower incisors segment can be used to construct prediction equations for canine-premolar segments with relative reliability (Table VI). The coefficient of determination ($r^2$) shows the accuracy of fit of the regression equation. The $r^2$ values derived in this study were in the moderate range and comparable to other studies, given in Table VI. The moderate to low values of $r^2$ usually observed for simple regressions is the reason for some clinicians to prefer the use of complex multiple regressions which gives slightly higher values for $r^2$.[31-34] However, the clinical advantage of comparatively higher $r^2$ values still needs to be scientifically confirmed.

Since sexual dimorphism for tooth sizes was reported in this study, separate regression equations were derived for males and females for accurate prediction. However for ease of use and memorization, combined prediction equations were also developed by approximation of male and female tooth sizes.

## CONCLUSION

1. Tanaka and Johnston[1] regressions did not accurately predict the mesio-distal widths of canine premolar segments in ethnic Pashtuns.
2. Regression equations based on nationality may not be reliable for use in a specific ethnic group.
3. Significant sexual dimorphism in tooth sizes exists for Pashtun population.
4. Customized regression equations were derived for prediction of unerupted canine-premolar segments in Pashtun population.

## REFERENCES

1.      Tanaka MM, Johnston LE. The prediction of the sizes of unerupted canines and premolars in a contemporary orthodontic population J Am Dent Assoc 1974(88):798-801.
2.      Moyers RE. Analysis of Dentition and Occlusion. In: Moyers RE, editor. Handbook of orthodontics. 4 ed. Chicago: Year Book Medical Publishers; 1988. p. 235-40.
3.      Staley RN, Hu P, Hoag JF, Shelly TH. Prediction of the combined right and left canine and premolar widths in both arches of the mixed dentition. Pediatr Dent 1983;5(1):57-60.
4.      Huckaba GW. Arch Size Analysis and Tooth Size Prediction. Dent Clin North Am 1964(43):431-40.
5.      Hixon EH, Oldfather RE. Estimation of the sizes of unerupted cuspids and bicuspids. Angle Orthod 1958;28;236-40.
6.      Bishara SE, Jakobsen JR, Abdallah EM, Fernandez Garcia A. Comparisons of mesiodistal and buccolingual crown dimensions of the permanent teeth in three populations from Egypt, Mexico, and the United States. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 1989;96(5):416-22.
7.      Uysal T, Basciftci FA, Goyenc Y. New regression equations for mixed-dentition arch analysis in a Turkish sample with no Bolton tooth-size discrepancy. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2009;135(3):343-8. DOI 10.1016/j.ajodo.2007.01.036
8.      Lee-Chan S, Jacobson BN, Chwa KH, Jacobson RS. Mixed dentition analysis for Asian-Americans. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 1998;113(3):293-9. DOI S0889540698000523 [pii]
9.      Flores-Mir C, Bernabe E, Camus C, Carhuayo MA, Major PW. Prediction of mesiodistal canine and premolar tooth width in a sample of Peruvian adolescents. Orthod Craniofac Res 2003;6(3):173-6.
10.     Al-Khadra BH. Prediction of the size of unerupted canines and premolars in a Saudi Arab population. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 1993;104(4):369-72. DOI S0889540693000265 [pii]

11. Al-Bitar ZB, Al-Omari IK, Sonbol HN, Al-Ahmad HT, Hamdan AM. Mixed dentition analysis in a Jordanian population. Angle Orthod 2008;78(4):670-5. DOI 0003-3219-78-4-670 [pii]

12. Alessandri Bonetti G, Verganti S, Zanarini M, Bonetti S, Gatto MR. Mixed dentition space analysis for a northern Italian population: new regression equations for unerupted teeth. Prog Orthod 2011;12(2):94-9. DOI 10.1016/j.pio.2011.02.001

13. Nourallah AW, Gesch D, Khordaji MN, Splieth C. New regression equations for predicting the size of unerupted canines and premolars in a contemporary population. Angle Orthod 2002;72(3):216-21. DOI 10.1043/0003-3219(2002)072<0216:NREFPT>2.0.CO;2

14. Philip NI, Prabhakar M, Arora D, Chopra S. Applicability of the Moyers mixed dentition probability tables and new prediction aids for a contemporary population in India Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2010;138(3):339-45. DOI 10.1016/j.ajodo.2008.09.035

15. Yuen KK, Tang EL, So LL. Mixed dentition analysis for Hong Kong Chinese. Angle Orthod 1998;68(1):21-8. DOI 10.1043/0003-3219(1998)068<0021:MDAFHK>2.3.CO;2

16. Jaroontham J, Godfrey K. Mixed dentition space analysis in a Thai population. Eur J Orthod 2000;22(2):127-34.

17. Otuyemi OD, Noar JH. A comparison of crown size dimensions of the permanent teeth in a Nigerian and a British population. Eur J Orthod 1996;18(6):623-8.

18. Diagne F, Diop-Ba K, Ngom PI, El Boury O. Mixed dentition analysis in a Moroccan population. Odontostomatol Trop 2004;27(108):5-10.

19. Mengal N, Afzal A. Mixed dentition analysis for Pakistani population. J Surg Pak 2004(9):10-4.

20. Bherwani AK, Fida M. Development of a prediction equation for the mixed dentition in a Pakistani sample. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2011;140(5):626-32.

21. Memon S, Fida M. Comparison of three mixed dentition analysis methods in orthodontic patients at AKUH. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 2010;20(8):533-7. DOI 04.2010/JCPSP.533537

22. Altherr ER, Koroluk LD, Phillips C. Influence of sex and ethnic tooth-size differences on mixed-dentition space analysis. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2007;132(3):332-9. DOI 10.1016/j.ajodo.2005.08.043

23. Moorrees C, Reed R. Correlations among crown diameters of human teeth. Arch Oral Biol 1964;9:685-97.

24. Lundstrom A. Tooth morphology as a basis for distinguishing monozygotic and dizygotic twins. American journal of human genetics 1963;15:34-43.

25. Bishara SE, Fernandez Garcia A, Jakobsen JR, Fahl JA. Mesiodistal crown dimensions in Mexico and the United States. Angle Orthod 1986;56(4):315-23. DOI 10.1043/0003-3219(1986)056<0315:MCDIMA>2.0.CO;2

26. Ballard ML. Asymmetry in Tooth Size: A Factor in the Etiology, Diagnosis and Treatment of Malocclusion. The Angle Orthodontist 1944;14(3):67-70.

27. Abu Alhaija ES, Qudeimat MA. Mixed dentition space analysis in a Jordanian population: comparison of two methods. Int J Paediatr Dent 2006;16(2):104-10. DOI 10.1111/j.1365-263X.2006.00700.x

28. Arslan SG, Dildes N, Kama JD, Genc C. Mixed-dentition analysis in a Turkish population. World J Orthod 2009;10(2):135-40.

29. Frankel HH, Benz EM. Mixed dentition analysis for black Americans. Pediatr Dent 1986;8(3):226-30.

30. Garn SM, Lewis AB, Kerewsky RS. X-linkage inheritance of tooth size. J Dent Res 1965;44:439-41.

31.     Bernabe E, Flores-Mir C. Are the lower incisors the best predictors for the unerupted canine and premolars sums? an analysis of a Peruvian sample. Angle Orthod 2005;75(2):202-7. DOI 10.1043/0003-3219(2005)075<0198:ATLITB>2.0.CO;2

32.     Legovic M, Novosel A, Legovic A. Regression equations for determining mesiodistal crown diameters of canines and premolars. Angle Orthod 2003;73(3):314-8.DOI 10.1043/0003-3219(2003)073<0314:REFDMC>2.0.CO;2

33.     Memon S, Fida M. Development of a prediction equation for the estimation of mandibular canine and premolar widths from mandibular first permanent molar and incisor widths. Eur J Orthod 2012;34(3):340-4. DOI 10.1093/ejo/cjr015

34.     Melgaco CA, de Sousa Araujo MT, de Oliveira Ruellas AC. Mandibular permanent first molar and incisor width as predictor of mandibular canine and premolar width. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2007;132(3):340-5. DOI 10.1016/j.ajodo.2005.07.033

**TABLE I: COMPARISON OF REGRESSION CONSTANTS IN DIFFERENT STUDIES**

| Study | Arch | | r | Constants | | SEE | $r^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | a | b | | |
| Frankel & Benz[29] | Mx | | 0.62 | 11.93 | 0.44 | | 0.38 |
| | Md | | 0.70 | 9.93 | 0.52 | | 0.49 |
| Al Khadra[10] | Mx | | 0.65 | 7.20 | 0.63 | | 0.42 |
| | Md | | | 8.60 | 0.55 | | 0.49 |
| Jaroontham& Godfrey[16] | Mx | | 0.60 | 11.87 | 0.47 | 0.84 | 0.36 |
| | Md | | 0.64 | 10.3 | 0.50 | 0.82 | 0.41 |
| Phillips et al[14] | Mx | M | 0.66 | 7.15 | 0.67 | 0.81 | 0.43 |
| | | F | 0.65 | 7.44 | 0.65 | 0.72 | 0.43 |
| | Md | M | 0.68 | 5.55 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.46 |
| | | F | 0.67 | 6.15 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.44 |
| Al Bitar et al[11] | Mx | | 0.60 | 10.94 | 0.46 | 0.84 | 0.36 |
| | Md | | 0.66 | 8.43 | 0.55 | 0.86 | 0.44 |
| Tanaka & Johnston[1] | Mx | | 0.63 | 10.41 | 0.51 | 0.86 | 0.40 |
| | Md | | 0.65 | 9.18 | 0.54 | 0.85 | 0.42 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Bherwani et al[20] | Mx | | 0.59 | 10.52 | 0.48 | 0.82 | 0.35 |
| | Md | | 0.65 | 8.56 | 0.54 | 0.79 | 0.42 |
| Mx, maxilla; Md, mandible; M, male; F, female; SEE, standard error of estimate. | | | | | | | |

**TABLE II: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR LI AND CPM**

| Tooth | Sex | Maxillary Arch | | | Mandibular Arch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean (mm) | SD (mm) | SEM (mm) | Mean (mm) | SD (mm) | SEM (mm) |
| LCI | Both | | | | 5.63 | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| | F | | | | 5.54 | 0.34 | 0.03 |
| | M | | | | 5.72 | 0.37 | 0.03 |
| LLI | Both | | | | 6.2 | 0.39 | 0.03 |
| | F | | | | 6.09 | 0.38 | 0.04 |
| | M | | | | 6.31 | 0.39 | 0.04 |
| LI | Both | | | | 23.67 | 1.41 | 0.11 |
| | F | | | | 23.26 | 1.31 | 0.13 |
| | M | | | | 24.08 | 1.39 | 0.14 |
| C | Both | 7.92 | 0.51 | 0.04 | 6.97 | 0.47 | 0.03 |
| | F | 7.69 | 0.43 | 0.04 | 6.72 | 0.41 | 0.04 |
| | M | 8.15 | 0.48 | 0.05 | 7.22 | 0.41 | 0.05 |
| PM1 | Both | 7.24 | 0.46 | 0.03 | 7.3 | 0.52 | 0.04 |
| | F | 8.05 | 0.43 | 0.04 | 7.15 | 0.52 | 0.05 |
| | M | 7.39 | 0.45 | 0.05 | 7.44 | 0.48 | 0.05 |
| PM2 | Both | 6.95 | 0.47 | 0.03 | 7.31 | 0.48 | 0.04 |
| | F | 6.84 | 0.43 | 0.04 | 7.19 | 0.47 | 0.05 |
| | M | 7.07 | 0.49 | 0.05 | 7.43 | 0.46 | 0.05 |
| CPM | Both | 22.12 | 1.24 | 0.09 | 21.58 | 1.30 | 0.09 |
| | F | 21.64 | 1.09 | 0.11 | 21.08 | 1.22 | 0.12 |
| | M | 22.6 | 1.21 | 0.12 | 22.09 | 1.17 | 0.12 |

LCI, lower central incisor; LLI, lower lateral incisor; LI, lower incisors; C, canine; PM1, first premolar; PM2, second premolar; CPM, canine and premolars; M, male; F, female; SEM, standard error of mean.

**TABLE III: RIGHT AND LEFT TOOTH SIZE DIFFERENCES FOR CPM SEGMENTS**

| Sex | Tooth segment | Mean difference (mm) | SD | t | df | P value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M+F (n=180) | Upper CPM | 0.159 | 0.66 | 3.241 | 179 | 0.001* |
| | Lower CPM | -0.061 | 0.67 | -1.22 | 179 | 0.223 |
| M (n=90) | Upper CPM | 0.08 | 0.34 | 2.256 | 89 | 0.027* |
| | Lower CPM | 0.001 | 0.54 | 0.019 | 89 | 0.985 |
| F (n=90) | Upper CPM | 0.164 | 0.80 | 1.943 | 89 | 0.06 |
| | Lower CPM | -0.122 | 0.76 | -1.514 | 89 | 0.134 |

CPM, canine and premolars; M, male; F, female; SD, standard deviation.
*p<0.05

**TABLE IV: GENDER DIMORPHISM FOR TOOTH SIZES**

| Tooth Segment | Sex | Mean (mm) | SD | Mean difference | P value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UC | M (n=90) | 8.14 | 0.47 | -0.451 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 7.69 | 0.44 | | |
| UPM1 | M (n=90) | 7.38 | 0.45 | -0.290 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 7.09 | 0.44 | | |
| UPM2 | M (n=90) | 7.06 | 0.49 | -0.223 | 0.002* |
| | F (n=90) | 6.84 | 0.43 | | |
| LC | M (n=90) | 7.22 | 0.41 | -0.493 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 6.73 | 0.41 | | |
| LPM1 | M (n=90) | 7.44 | 0.49 | -0.286 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 7.16 | 0.52 | | |
| LPM2 | M (n=90) | 7.43 | 0.47 | -0.233 | 0.001* |
| | F (n=90) | 7.19 | 0.47 | | |
| LCI | M (n=90) | 5.72 | 0.37 | -0.179 | 0.001* |
| | F (n=90) | 5.54 | 0.34 | | |
| LLI | M (n=90) | 6.31 | 0.39 | -0.231 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 6.09 | 0.38 | | |
| Upper CPM | M (n=90) | 22.60 | 1.21 | -0.965 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 21.64 | 1.09 | | |
| Lower CPM | M (n=90) | 22.09 | 1.17 | -1.013 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 21.08 | 1.23 | | |
| LI | M (n=90) | 24.08 | 1.39 | -0.821 | 0.000* |
| | F (n=90) | 23.26 | 1.32 | | |

LCI, lower central incisor;  LLI, lower lateral incisor;  LI, lower incisors; UC, upper canine; UPM1, upper first premolar; UPM2, upper second premolar; LC, lower canine; LPM1, lower first premolar; LPM2,  lower second premolar; CPM, canine and premolars; M, male; F, female; SD, standard deviation
*p<0.05

**TABLE V: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND PREDICTED TOOTH SIZES**

| Tooth Segment | Sex | Actual MD widths (mm) | MD widths as predicted by Johnston & Tanka Regression (mm) | Mean Difference from actual (mm) | P Value | MD widths as predicted by Bherwani'sR egression (mm) | Mean Difference from actual (mm) | P Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UpperCP M | M+F | 22.12±1.24 | 22.83±0.71 | -0.72±0.96 | 0.000* | 21.88±0.67 | 0.24±0.96 | 0.001* |
| | M | 22.60±1.21 | 23.04+0.69 | -0.44±0.96 | 0.000* | 22.08±0.67 | 0.52±0.96 | 0.000* |
| | F | 21.64±1.09 | 22.63+0.66 | -0.99±0.87 | 0.000* | 21.69±0.63 | -0.05±0.87 | 0.598 |
| Lower CPM | M+F | 21.58±1.30 | 22.33±0.70 | -0.75±094 | 0.000* | 20.21±0.70 | 1.37±0.59 | 0.000* |
| | M | 22.09+1.17 | 22.54±0.70 | -0.44+0.93 | 0.000* | 20.49±0.63 | 1.60+0.54 | 0.000* |
| | F | 21.08+1.22 | 22.13±0.66 | -1.05+0.87 | 0.000* | 19.94+0.66 | 1.13±0.56 | 0.000* |
| | | | | | | | | |

CPM, canine and premolars; MD, mesiodistal; M, male; F, female
*p<0.05

## TABLE VI: REGRESSION PARAMETERS FOR PREDICTION OF CANINE-PREMOLARS SEGMENTS IN ETHNIC PASHTUNS

| Sex | Arch | r | Constants | | SEE | $r^2$ |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | a | b | | |
| Combined | Mx | 0.65 | 8.62 | 0.65 | 0.95 | 0.42 |
| | Md | 0.70 | 6.24 | 0.70 | 0.93 | 0.49 |
| Males | Mx | 0.61 | 9.82 | 0.61 | 0.97 | 0.37 |
| | Md | 0.62 | 9.57 | 0.62 | 0.93 | 0.38 |
| Females | Mx | 0.59 | 10.1 | 0.59 | 0.88 | 0.35 |
| | Md | 0.73 | 5.35 | 0.73 | 0.85 | 0.53 |
| Mx, maxilla; Md, mandible; SEE, standard error of estimate | | | | | | |

# 18387-Akbar-MIXED DENTITION PREDICTION EQUATIONS RSDAuthor

new prediction aids for a contemporary population in India", American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2010

Publication

Exclude quotes          On              Exclude matches          < 1%

Exclude bibliography    On