

APPLICABILITY OF TANAKA AND JOHNSTON PREDICTION EQUATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY POPULATION OF PASHTUNS

by Akbar Ali

Submission date: 11-Jul-2018 11:48AM (UTC+0500)

Submission ID: 981781479

File name: Turnitin_18387-73285-3-RV.docx (72.17K)

Word count: 2661

Character count: 14625

**APPLICABILITY OF TANAKA AND JOHNSTON PREDICTION EQUATIONS
IN CONTEMPORARY POPULATION OF PASHTUNS**

Authors

Akbar Ali Khan^a, Saman Baseer^b, Noor Durrani^c, Imran Tajik^d

^aSenior Registrar, Department of Orthodontics, KMU Institute of Dental Sciences,
Kohat, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

^bDemonstrator, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital, Gandhara Institute of Medical
Sciences, Peshawar, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

^cDemonstrator, Department of Orthodontics, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital,
Gandhara Institute of Medical Sciences, Peshawar, Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan.

^dProfessor, Department of Orthodontics, Sardar Begum Dental Hospital,
Gandhara Institute 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](tel:+923339111372)

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To determine the accuracy of ⁵ Tanaka and Johnston prediction equations ⁵ 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 ⁴ statistical and linear regression analysis.

Results: ³ Statistically significant differences were noted between male and female tooth sizes. ³ 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 ¹ developed in this study can be used for diagnostic planning in local Pashtun children.

Key words: ⁷ Tanaka and Johnston, regression equations, mixed dentition analyses.

INTRODUCTION

11

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 Johnston¹ and Moyers², radiographic techniques as suggested by Staley et al³ and Huckaba et al⁴ and a combination of these techniques as used by Hixon Oldfather⁵ and Bishara et al.⁶

Since the general tendency is to use the simplest approach possible, Tanaka and Johnston¹ 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 Nigeria¹⁷ and Morocco¹⁸ have reported significant differences between actual and predicted mesiodistal widths of canine premolars segments when Tanaka and Johnston¹ regressions are applied to other populations and ethnic groups (Table I). Studies on Pakistani population carried out by Mengal and Afzal¹⁹ and Bherwani et al²⁰ have reported significant differences between actual and predicted mesiodistal widths of canine premolar segments whereas a study by Sarwat et al²¹ reported non-significant differences when Tanaka and Johnston¹ prediction equations were applied to local population groups.

However these studies¹⁹⁻²¹ 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 Johnston¹ 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 Lundstrom²⁴ where the same investigator (AAK) measures all the cast and then re-measures a few (30 in this study) randomly selected casts after a period 2 weeks.

Benchmark of clinical significance

Lee Chen et al⁸ and Bishara et al²⁵ have suggested that the difference between actual and predicted widths of canine premolar segments should be ≥ 1 mm per quadrant to be clinically significant.

1 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 Johnston¹ and Bherwani's²⁰ 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 than 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 for lower 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 Johnston¹ for North American population and by Bherwani et al²⁰ for Pakistani population (Table V). Statistically significant overestimations of tooth sizes was observed when applying Tanaka and Johnston¹ 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's²⁰ 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.

DISCUSSION

Various investigators^{13, 16, 25, 27, 28} have confirmed differences in tooth sizes based on racial and ethnic backgrounds.²² Frankel and Benz²⁹ 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 Johnston¹ and Bherwani et al²⁰ did not completely satisfy the condition of clinical accuracy for both genders or for both arches. Bherwani et al²⁰ 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 Moyers² 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 Johnston¹ 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. 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, $y=5.35+0.73(x)$



Table I

COMPARISON OF REGRESSION CONSTANTS IN DIFFERENT STUDIES

Study	Arch		r	Constants		SEE	r ²
	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's Regression (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±0.94	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

APPLICABILITY OF TANAKA AND JOHNSTON PREDICTION EQUATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY POPULATION OF PASHTUNS

ORIGINALITY REPORT

19%

SIMILARITY INDEX

7%

INTERNET SOURCES

18%

PUBLICATIONS

3%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Bherwani, A.K.. "Development of a prediction equation for the mixed dentition in a Pakistani sample", American Journal of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics, 201111 **6%**

Publication
 - 2** www.odoan.org.np **4%**

Internet Source
 - 3** Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan **2%**

Student Paper
 - 4** Nebu Ivan Philip, Manisha Prabhakar, Deepak Arora, Saroj Chopra. "Applicability of the Moyers mixed dentition probability tables and new prediction aids for a contemporary population in India", American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2010 **2%**

Publication
-

5

Sharon Lee-Chan, Bailey N. Jacobson, Kyint H. Chwa, Ronald S. Jacobson. "Mixed dentition analysis for Asian-Americans", American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 1998

Publication

1%

6

E. S. J. ABU ALHAIJA. "Mixed dentition space analysis in a Jordanian population: comparison of two methods", International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry, 3/2006

Publication

1%

7

Emmanuel Ajayi. "Regression Equations and Probability Tables for Mixed Dentition Analysis in a Nigerian Population", Journal of Dental Health, Oral Disorders & Therapy, 2014

Publication

1%

8

Janson, G.R.P.. "A radiographic comparison of apical root resorption after orthodontic treatment with 3 different fixed appliance techniques", American Journal of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics, 200009

Publication

1%

9

Shaza M. Hammad, Abeer M. Abdellatif. "Mixed dentition space analysis in Egyptian children", Pediatric Dental Journal, 2010

Publication

<1%

Uysal, T.. "New regression equations for mixed-

10

dentition arch analysis in a Turkish sample with no Bolton tooth-size discrepancy", American Journal of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics, 200903

Publication

<1%

11

Robert N. Staley, Thomas W. O'Gorman, James F. Hoag, Tom H. Shelly. "Prediction of the widths of unerupted canines and premolars", The Journal of the American Dental Association, 1984

Publication

<1%

12

www.jpmpm.org

Internet Source

<1%

13

Aneel K. Bherwani, Mubassar Fida. "Development of a prediction equation for the mixed dentition in a Pakistani sample", American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2011

Publication

<1%

14

www.wjes.org

Internet Source

<1%

15

Alex F. Roche, Robert M. Malina. "Manual of Physical Status and Performance in Childhood", Springer Nature, 1983

Publication

<1%

16

Al-Dlaigan,, Yousef H., Nasser D. Alqahtani, Khalid Almoammar, Thikriat Al-Jewair,, Fahad

<1%

Salamah,, Mohammed Alswilem, and Sahar F AIBARAKATI. "Validity of Moyers Mixed Dentition Analysis for Saudi population", Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 1969.

Publication

17

www.utwente.nl

Internet Source

<1%

18

Falou Diagne, Khady Diop-Ba, Pape Ibrahima Ngom, Khadim Mbow. "Mixed dentition analysis in a Senegalese population: elaboration of prediction tables", American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2003

Publication

<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off

APPLICABILITY OF TANAKA AND JOHNSTON PREDICTION EQUATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY POPULATION OF PASHTUNS

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13
