Kieferorthopädische Diagnostik und Therapieplanung

Was ist digital möglich?

Ein Beitrag von Tamara Pollak, Dr. Lukas Brämswig,
Dr. Marie-Theres Richter, Dr. Jenny Bartz und Prof. Dr. Michael Wolf

Literaturangabe

1. Chen, Y.J., et al., The effects of differences in landmark identification on the cephalometric measurements in traditional versus digitized cephalometry. Angle Orthod, 2004. 74(2): p. 155-61.

2. Commer, P., et al., Construction and testing of a computer-based intraoral laser scanner for determining tooth positions. Medical Engineering & Physics, 2000. 22(9): p. 625-635.

3. Dutton, E., et al., The effect different substrates have on the trueness and precision of eight different intraoral scanners. J Esthet Restor Dent, 2019.

4. Gesch, D., et al., Examiner differences in the assessment of different malocclusions. J Orofac Orthop, 2006. 67(6): p. 404-13.

5. Koretsi, V., et al., Intra-observer reliability and agreement of manual and digital orthodontic model analysis. European Journal of Orthodontics, 2017. 40(1): p. 52-57.

6. Kumar, A.A., et al., Digital model as an alternative to plaster model in assessment of space analysis. Journal of pharmacy & bioallied sciences, 2015. 7(Suppl 2): p. S465-S469.

7. Kurz, M., T. Attin, and A. Mehl, Influence of material surface on the scanning error of a powder-free 3D measuring system. Clin Oral Investig, 2015. 19(8): p. 2035-43.

8. Mizumoto, R.M., et al., The effect of scanning the palate and scan body position on the accuracy of complete-arch implant scans. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res, 2019. 21(5): p. 987-994.

9. Oshagh, M., S.H. Shahidi, and S.H. Danaei, Effects of image enhancement on reliability of landmark identification in digital cephalometry. Indian J Dent Res, 2013. 24(1): p. 98-103.

10. Peterman, R.J., et al., Accuracy of Dolphin visual treatment objective (VTO) prediction software on class III patients treated with maxillary advancement and mandibular setback. Prog Orthod, 2016. 17(1): p. 19.

11. Revilla-Leon, M., et al., Clinical Study of the Influence of Ambient Light Scanning Conditions on the Accuracy (Trueness and Precision) of an Intraoral Scanner. J Prosthodont, 2019.

12. Toepel-Sievers, C. and H. Fischer-Brandies, Validity of the computer-assisted cephalometric growth prognosis VTO (Visual Treatment Objective) according to Ricketts. J Orofac Orthop, 1999. 60(3): p. 185-94.

13. Yoon, J.H., et al., Model Analysis of Digital Models in Moderate to Severe Crowding: In Vivo Validation and Clinical Application. Biomed Res Int, 2018. 2018: p. 8414605.

14. Zhang, X., et al., Accuracy of computer-aided prediction in soft tissue changes after orthodontic treatment. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop, 2019. 156(6): p. 823-831.