



UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS
SISTEMA DE BIBLIOTECAS DA UNICAMP
REPOSITÓRIO DA PRODUÇÃO CIENTÍFICA E INTELLECTUAL DA UNICAMP

Versão do arquivo anexado / Version of attached file:

Versão do Editor / Published Version

Mais informações no site da editora / Further information on publisher's website:

<https://meridian.allenpress.com/angle-orthodontist/article/89/1/163/58337/Letters-From-Our-Readers>

DOI: 10.2319/0003-3219-89.1.163

Direitos autorais / Publisher's copyright statement:

©2019 by Edward H. Angle Society of Orthodontists. All rights reserved.

DIRETORIA DE TRATAMENTO DA INFORMAÇÃO

Cidade Universitária Zeferino Vaz Barão Geraldo

CEP 13083-970 – Campinas SP

Fone: (19) 3521-6493

<http://www.repositorio.unicamp.br>

Letters From Our Readers

To: Editor, *The Angle Orthodontist*.

Re: A comparative study of the effect of the intrusion arch and straight wire mechanics on incisor root resorption: A randomized, controlled trial. Marcio R de Almeida, Aline SB Marçal, Thais MF Fernandes, Juliana B Vasconcelos; Renato R de Almeida; Ravindra Nanda. *The Angle Orthodontist*. 2018; 88: 20-26.

Recently, we read the manuscript authored by de Almeida et al.¹, who evaluated the magnitude of root resorption by means of Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) in patients treated with intrusion arch or continuous archwire mechanic. Although this is a relevant clinical subject, we have very concerns about the acquisition of CBCT exams before and after the patient's treatment, with no apparent justification for ionizing radiation exposure to such a dose other than for the purpose of the study's publication.

According to the ALADA (*as low as diagnostically acceptable*)² and the guidelines that support the use of CBCT in Orthodontics, this examination is not indicated for routine diagnosis, it should not be used as the first imaging method to evaluate root resorption, as in the specific case of the research and, mainly, it should not be used exclusively for follow-up without clinical suspicion or justification based on individual patients' evaluation.³⁻⁵ Other reasons for concern are the low age range of the patients included in the sample that are more susceptible to the stochastic effects of ionizing radiation, as well as the size of the FOV used since it is not necessary to irradiate the patient's entire head when only a specific region was analyzed.⁵

Finally, we cannot understand how an ethical committee has approved this project. Considering the

respect and appreciation we have for The Angle Orthodontist journal, we hope this letter can make researchers consider this aspect before carrying out similar study in the future.

*Eduarda Helena Leandro Nascimento,
Deborah Queiroz Freitas,
Department of Oral Diagnosis, Division of Oral Radiology, Piracicaba Dental School, University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Sao Paulo, Brazil
Email: eduarda.hln@gmail.com*

REFERENCES

1. de Almeida MR, Marçal ASB, Fernandes TMF, Vasconcelos JB, de Almeida RR, Nanda R. A comparative study of the effect of the intrusion arch and straight wire mechanics on incisor root resorption: A randomized, controlled trial. *Angle Orthod*. 2018;88:20–26.
2. Bushberg JT. Eleventh annual Warren K. Sinclair keynote address-science, radiation protection and NCRP: building on the past, looking to the future. *Health Phys*. 2015;108:115–123.
3. SEDENTEXCT Project. European Commission. Radiation Protection NO. 172 SedentexCT. Guidelines on CBCT for Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology. Luxembourg: EU publications office. 2012.
4. American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology. Clinical recommendations regarding use of cone beam computed tomography in orthodontics. [corrected]. Position statement by the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*. 2013; 116:238–257.
5. Aps JK. To beam or not to beam: that is the question. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol*. 2013;42:20120375.