

CHAPTER 6

ORTHODONTIC RETENTION: PROTOCOLS, MATERIALS, AND LONG-TERM STABILITY

Ferit DADAŞLI¹

INTRODUCTION

Relapse is not a complication of orthodontics; it is a biological expectation. After active treatment, periodontal and supracrestal fibers reorganize slowly, occlusion continues to settle, soft tissue pressures reassert themselves, and growth or aging can tilt the equilibrium again. Retention therefore extends orthodontic care from the day brackets or aligners are removed into the patient's long-term oral health habits. In this chapter, stability is approached as the product of biology and appliance design. This chapter addresses tissue remodeling; the roles of occlusion, arch form, and soft tissues in long-term tooth position; and the impact of removable and fixed retainers on stability. Adjunctive measures-circumferential supracrestal fiberotomy and interproximal reduction-are positioned as selective tools for high-risk movements such as rotation and spacing.

WHY RETENTION MATTERS

Orthodontic correction places teeth in esthetic and functional positions that are biologically unfamiliar. After appliances are removed, the periodontium and soft tissues need time to adapt (1). Gingival supracrestal fibers, in particular, reorganize much more slowly than the periodontal ligament and can continue to exert relapse-directed tension for many months. That is why rotational corrections and closed diastemas so often test a clinician's retention plan (2,3).

Occlusion also continues to change. Posterior contacts may improve if vertical settling is allowed, whereas appliances that lock the bite can keep teeth from

¹ DDS, Specialist, Private Practice, fdadasli@gmail.com, ORCID iD: 0009-0009-0803-1905

For fixed retainers, fivestranded stainless steel offers a favorable balance of flexibility and tensile strength; deadsoft coaxial or braided wires deform more under load, which can be a liability if deformation occurs before the patient returns. Bonding technique - clean enamel, isolation, thin, smooth composite - often determines success (10). CAD/CAM NiTi expands the palette by trading chairside bending for digital precision; accuracy studies show high fidelity between plan and inmouth position, which is useful where lingual geometry is unforgiving (11).

Fiberreinforced composite “ribbon” splints have been explored as metalfree retainers; while esthetic, their longterm behavior and the potential to restrict physiologic tooth mobility have limited widespread adoption relative to steel or NiTi options (27).

MEASURING STABILITY

Clinically, stability means comfortable function, unchanged alignment, and a familiar occlusion. Research quantifies this with Little’s Irregularity Index for anterior alignment, the PAR index for overall occlusion, and outcomes such as retainer survival, periodontal effects, and patient satisfaction (28,29).

CONCLUSION

Retention begins where active treatment ends. It aligns with biology, permits occlusal settling, and uses appliances as unobtrusive supports. Hawley and wrap-around retainers allow vertical settling; clear overlays offer esthetics and simplicity; fixed retainers provide continuous control when relapse risk is high or cooperation limited. CSF and IPR are targeted adjuncts, not routine. Protect results in the first months after debond; thereafter, light, indefinite night wear and practical maintenance sustain long-term stability tailored to movement type, tissue health, and patient lifestyle.

REFERENCES

1. Little RM, Wallen TR, Riedel RA. Stability and relapse of mandibular anterior alignment—first premolar extraction cases treated by traditional edgewise orthodontics. *American Journal of Orthodontics*. 1981 Oct 1;80(4):349–65.
2. Boese LR. Fiberotomy and Reproximation Without Lower Retention, Nine Years In Retrospect: Part I. *The Angle Orthodontist*. 1980 Apr 1;50(2):88–97.
3. Thilander B. Biological basis for orthodontic relapse. *Seminars in Orthodontics*. 2000 Sept 1;6(3):195–205.
4. Littlewood SJ, Kandasamy S, Huang G. Retention and relapse in clinical practice. [cited 2025 Sept 30]; Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/adj.12475>
5. Richardson ME. The etiology of late lower arch crowding alternative to mesially directed forces: A review. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 1994 June

- 1;105(6):592–7.
6. Henry Fields, Brent Larson, David M. Sarver, William R. Proffit. *Contemporary Orthodontics*. Mosby; 2025.
 7. Sauget E, Covell DA, Boero RP, Lieber WS. Comparison of occlusal contacts with use of Hawley and clear overlay retainers. *Angle Orthod*. 1997;67(3):223–30.
 8. Ades AG, Joondeph DR, Little RM, Chapko MK. A long-term study of the relationship of third molars to changes in the mandibular dental arch. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 1990 Apr 1;97(4):323–35.
 9. *Orthodontic Retainers: A Contemporary Overview*. *The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*. 2019 July;20(7):857–62.
 10. Kartal Y, Kaya B. Fixed Orthodontic Retainers: A Review. *Turk J Orthod*. 2019 June;32(2):110–4.
 11. Kravitz ND, Grauer D, Schumacher P, Jo Y min. Memotain: A CAD/CAM nickel-titanium lingual retainer. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 2017 Apr 1;151(4):812–5.
 12. Lyros I, Tsolakis IA, Maroulakos MP, Fora E, Lykogeorgos T, Dalampira M, et al. Orthodontic Retainers—A Critical Review. *Children*. 2023 Feb;10(2):230.
 13. Lorenzoni DC, Henriques JFC, Silva LK da, Rosa RR, Berretin-Felix G, Freitas KMS, et al. Comparison of speech changes caused by four different orthodontic retainers: a crossover randomized clinical trial. *Dental Press J Orthod*. 2024;29:e2423277.
 14. Ramazanzadeh B, Ahrari F, Hosseini ZS. The retention characteristics of Hawley and vacuum-formed retainers with different retention protocols. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2018 Mar 1;10(3):e224–31.
 15. Lustig JR, Rossouw PE, Buschang PH, Behrents RG, Woody RD. Assessment of post-orthodontic occlusal contacts with wrap-around and clear overlay retainers. *Seminars in Orthodontics*. 2017 June 1;23(2):166–77.
 16. Pravindevaprasad A, Therese BA. Tooth positioners and their effects on treatment outcome. *J Nat Sci Biol Med*. 2013;4(2):298–301.
 17. AL-MAAITAH EF, ALOMARI S, AL-NIMRI K. Comparison between round multi-strand wire and rectangular wire bonded retainers: a randomized clinical trial. *Dental Press J Orthod*. 28(2):e2321101.
 18. Arn ML, Dritsas K, Pandis N, Kloukos D. The effects of fixed orthodontic retainers on periodontal health: A systematic review. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 2020 Feb 1;157(2):156–164.e17.
 19. Edwards JG. A long-term prospective evaluation of the circumferential supracrestal fiberotomy in alleviating orthodontic relapse. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 1988 May 1;93(5):380–7.
 20. Jahanbin A, Ramazanzadeh B, Ahrari F, Forouzanfar A, Beidokhti M. Effectiveness of Er:YAG laser-aided fiberotomy and low-level laser therapy in alleviating relapse of rotated incisors. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 2014 Nov 1;146(5):565–72.
 21. Miresmaeili AF, Mollabashi V, Gholami L, Farhadian M, Rezaei-Soufi L, Javanshir B, et al. Comparison of conventional and laser-aided fiberotomy in relapse tendency of rotated tooth: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *International Orthodontics*. 2019 Mar 1;17(1):103–13.
 22. Zachrisson BU, Nyøygard L, Mobarak K. Dental health assessed more than 10 years after interproximal enamel reduction of mandibular anterior teeth. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 2007 Feb 1;131(2):162–9.
 23. Beltrami F, Kiliaridis S, Antonarakis GS. Long-term stability of posterior crossbite correction, treated in the mixed or permanent dentition of growing children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Orthodontics & Craniofacial Research*. 2024;27(1):1–14.
 24. Forde K, Storey M, Littlewood SJ, Scott P, Luther F, Kang J. Bonded versus vacuum-formed retainers: a randomized controlled trial. Part 1: stability, retainer survival, and patient satisfaction outcomes after 12 months. *Eur J Orthod*. 2018 July 27;40(4):387–98.

25. Heier EE, Smit AD, Wijgaerts IA, Adriaens PA. Periodontal implications of bonded versus removable retainers. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*. 1997 Dec 1;112(6):607–16.
26. Raja TA, Littlewood SJ, Munyombwe T, Bubb NL. Wear resistance of four types of vacuum-formed retainer materials: A laboratory study. *Angle Orthod*. 2014 July;84(4):656–64.
27. Sfondrini MF, Vallittu PK, Lassila LVJ, Viola A, Gandini P, Scribante A. Glass Fiber Reinforced Composite Orthodontic Retainer: In Vitro Effect of Tooth Brushing on the Surface Wear and Mechanical Properties. *Materials (Basel)*. 2020 Feb 25;13(5):1028.
28. Little RM. The Irregularity Index: A quantitative score of mandibular anterior alignment. *American Journal of Orthodontics*. 1975 Nov 1;68(5):554–63.
29. Richmond S, Shaw WC, O'Brien KD, Buchanan IB, Jones R, Stephens CD, et al. The development of the PAR Index (Peer Assessment Rating): reliability and validity. *Eur J Orthod*. 1992 Apr 1;14(2):125–39.