### Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study

# Deepthi sonia Arani<sup>1</sup>, Kalamalla A Saran Babu<sup>2</sup>\*, Mahammad Rasool<sup>3</sup>, Sateesh Babu S<sup>4</sup>, Tejavath Kommalu<sup>5</sup> and Shanawaz Shaik<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Prosthodontics, Care Dental Hospital, Nellore, India

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Narayana Dental College and Hospital, Nellore, India <sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, CKS Theja Dental College and Hospital, Tirupati, India <sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Asan Memorial Dental college and Hospital, Chennai, India <sup>5</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Mamatha Dental College and Hospital, Khammam, Telangana, India <sup>6</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Narayana Dental College and Hospital, Nellore, India

\*Corresponding Author: Kalamalla A Saran Babu, Department of Prosthodontics, Narayana Dental College and Hospital, Nellore, India.

Received: November 25, 2019; Published: December 23, 2019

**DOI:** 10.31080/ecde.2020.19.regression-formula-to-correlate-the-relationship-between-facial-measurements-in-the-selection-of-ante-rior-teeth-to-cephalometric-analysis-of-soft-and-hard-tissues-of-nose-a-pilot-study

#### Abstract

**Aims and Objectives:** To evaluate the soft and hard tissue dimensions of nose and to determine the relation with size of anterior teeth; to derive a formula from the analysis of clinical and cephalometric parameters.

**Materials and Methodology:** Twenty full dentate subjects (10 males, 10 females) with age in between 18 - 25 yrs were selected. Bizygomatic width of all the subjects were measured clinically and based on sear's formula/pounds concept, predicted width of upper central incisor (PWCI) and predicted width of all the upper anteriors (PTWU) were calculated. Similarly, actual widths of central incisor (AWCI) and total width of all upper anteriors (ATWU)were evaluated through study models by using digital vernier calipers. In the meanwhile, cephalometric parameters of nose such as Nasal depth (ND), N' to SN, N to ANS, Nasal length (NL) Columella convexity (CC) were identified in the lateral cephalograms and the distance between them were measured and the values were tabulated to *FIT* in regression model and regression formula was obtained to calculate the actual width of upper central incisor and total width of all upper anteriors.

**Results:** The results of all measurements were subjected to statistical analysis (paired 't' test) and the correlation is very high and significant. AWCI - All Nasal Parameters = 'P'-value < 0.05 (0.00), ATWU-All Nasal Parameters = 'P'-value < 0.05 (0.00) (except for NL). Similarly, values obtained through regression equation by using cephalometric parameters were found in similarity to other modalities of measurements.

**Conclusion:** In this study an attempt has been made, to evaluate the cephalometric nasal dimensions and their relation to the size of upper anterior teeth, statistically significant results were obtained and a regression formula was derived. Cephalometric Nasal parameters can also be used as a guide in the selection of upper anterior teeth.

Keywords: Regression Formula; Nasal Parameters; Bizygomatic Width

#### Introduction

Esthetic tooth placement and physiological tooth arrangement are biologically compatible and desirable for patients seeking prosthetic treatment. It is apparent that beauty, harmony, naturalness and individuality are major qualities" of esthetics. The face excels in beauty when compared with other anatomic divisions of the human being and maxillary anterior teeth contribute a lot to the beauty of the face [1,2]. The size, form, position and the arrangement of individual maxillary anterior teeth make the most crucial contribution to the facial

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

## Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study

appearance. It is very difficult to lay down exact rules for guidance in this phase of prosthetic dentistry. There are no rules of thumb but there are anatomical landmarks and manufactured aids that can be used as guides [3,4]. Almost nine anatomical entities (size of face, size of maxillary arch, nose, etc.) can be used as guides to select the size of anterior teeth [5,6]. As per literature available, many formulae were available in selecting the size of anterior teeth but there is always a questionable validity and no universally accepted parameter in this aspect. Moreover, limited studies were conducted on the relation between nasal Parameters and size of anterior teeth [7,8].

This pilot study was done to compare the clinical and cephalometric evaluation of soft and hard tissues of nose and its correlation with other facial measurements in the selection of anterior teeth.

#### **Materials and Methodology**

Twenty full dentate subjects (10 males, 10 females) of age between 18 - 25 yr were selected for this study with inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1). Maxillary impressions of all the study participants are made with irreversible hydrocolloid alginate (Zelgan; Dentsply, India) and casts were poured with type 4 gypsum product (die stone). Model evaluation was done with digital vernier calipers to calculate the Actual width (Figure 1) of C.I (AWCI) and Actual width of total 6 anteriors (ATWU). Similarly clinical measurements were done to know the bizygomatic width (Figure 2) in each subject by using sear's formula, H.pound's concept, berry's biometric index and predicted width of CI (PWCI)and predicted width of total 6 anteriors (PTWU) was calculated.

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Angle class I	Interdental spacing
Natural well aligned dentition	Crowding
No restorations	Apparent loss of tooth structure
No tooth loss in maxilla	Congenital nasal defects
No history of orthodontic treatment	

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion criteria.



Figure 1: Measurement of actual width of anterior teeth using digital vernier calipers (DIGIMATIC).

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

03



Figure 2: Measurement of Bizygomatic width using clinical Facial measurements.

Furthermore, radiographic evaluation was done by using lateral cephalograms (Figure 3) in order to determine the following parameters Nasal depth (ND), N' to SN, N to ANS, Nasal length (NL), Columella convexity (CC)were calculated. The methodology of the study was briefly explained in table 2.



Figure 3: Cephalometric analysis.

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

### Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study

Clinical Measurements	Study Model Evaluation	Radiographic Evaluation			
Clinical Measurements <ul> <li>Bizygomatic width was measured in each subject</li> <li>Sear's formula, H.pound's concept berry's biometric index</li> <li>Predicted width of CI</li> </ul>	Study Model Evaluation         •       Maxillary impressions         □       Digital         Vernier       Calipers         •       Actual width of C.I (AWCI)	Radiographic Evaluation Lateral cephalograms			
<ul> <li>Predicted width of total 6 anteri- ors</li> </ul>	• Actual width of total 6 ante- riors (ATWU)	N' to SN N to ANS			
		Nasal length (NL) Columella convexity (CC)			

Table 2: Methodology of the study.

#### **Results**

All the PWCI, PTWU values using clinical facial measurements and AWCI, ATWU by study model measurements and distance between cephalometric landmarks were calculated and tabulated (Table 3). Similarly pictorial representation of values of gender wise comparison were listed in table 4. The values obtained in cephalometric analysis was *FIT* in regression model and regression formula was obtained.

Sex	BZW in mm	PWCI In mm	P TW U In mm	A W CI in mm	A TW U mm	NASAL DEPTH mm	N' to SN In mm	N to AN S In mm	N.L In mm	C.C In mm
		BZW/16	BZW/3.36							
Females										
1.	128	8	38	8.3	44.8	20	62	58.00	55.00	4.50
2.	132	8.25	39.2	8.5	44.8	13	50	50.00	45.00	3.00
3.	120	7.5	35.71	8.4	45.4	13.5	49	54.00	39.00	4.00
4.	122	7.6	36.3	8.2	43	17	53	58.00	47.00	4.00
5.	130	8.12	38.6	8.2	43	19	56	55.00	51.00	4.00
6.	117	7.3	34.8	8	43.2	15	50	53.00	45.00	3.00
7.	126	7.8	37.5	8.4	45	19	56	54.00	44.00	4.00
8.	124	7.7	36.9	8.8	45	16	50	52.00	42.00	3.50
9.	125	7.8	37.2	9.2	47.6	16	52	52.00	50.00	3.00
10.	127	7.9	37.7	9.7	50	16	46	52.00	39.00	3.00
Males										
1.	138	8.625	41.07	7.7	44.2	16	55	60.00	47.50	4.00
2.	130	8.12	38.6	8.8	46.8	19	56.5	55.00	46.00	3.00
3.	130	8.12	38.6	8.1	44.6	17	56	57.00	44.00	3.00
4.	121	7.5	36	8.3	43.8	18	55	55.00	50.00	4.00
5.	130	8.12	38.6	8	45.8	16	54	58.00	46.00	3.00
6.	126	7.8	37.5	8.5	47.2	18	61	56.00	53.00	2.50
7.	131	8.18	39	9.3	50.2	21	55	57.00	49.00	3.00
8.	132	8.2	39.2	9.5	49.6	17.5	54	55.00	46.00	3.50
9.	133	8.3	39.5	8.4	46.2	20	55	52.00	48.00	5.00
10.	124	7.7	36.9	9	46.8	17.5	57	56.00	51.00	3.00

Table 3: Clinical facial measurements; Study model measurements; cephalometric nasal parameters measurements.

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.



Table 4: Pictorial representation of Gender wise comparison.

#### "Regression equation"

AWCI = 14.07 + (ND x 0.192) - (N'- SN x 0.087) -

(N - ANS x 0.060) + (NL x 0.012) - (CC x 0.387)



ATWU = a x 5 + (- 4.22 TO 3.33) mm

The results calculated through formula were compared with the clinical facial measurements and study model evaluation (Table 5).

Subject	AWCI	PWCI	Through Formula
Male-1	7.7 mm	8.6 mm	8.4 mm
Female-1	8.3 mm	8 mm	8.5 mm

**Table 5:** Comparison of Predicted width, actual width of central incisor and total upper anteriors

 with the measurements derived through regression formula.

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

Then Statistical analysis Paired 't' test was done to compare the parameters used in the study (Table 6):

				Daire	ed Sample	- Statistic					
				Pane	a Sampie	S Statistic. Mean	5 N	Std. D	eviation	Sto	Error
						Nicus .		510.2.	SVIALIO.	N	Aean
	Dele 7		A_TW	U		45.8500	0	20 2	2.20800		.49372
	Pair		ND			17.2250	0	20	2.11184		.47222
			A_TW	U		45.8500	)	20 2	2.20800		.49372
	Pair 8		N_SN			54.1250	0	20	3.87935		.86745
			A_TW	U		45.8500	0	20 3	2.20800		.49372
	Pair 9		N_ANS			54.9500	0	20 2	2.60516		.58253
			A TW	u		45.8500		20	2 20800		49372
	Pair 10		NASAL	LENG	тн	46.8750	0	20	4 21112		.94164
			A TW.	u		45.8500		20	2 20800		49372
	Pair 11		COLUN	MELLA		3.5000	0	20	.64889		.14510
			00	Pa	ired Samp	les Test				_	
					Pa	red Differe	ences		t	df	Sig.
			M	ean	Std.	Std. Error	95% Co	Infidence			(2-taneo)
					Deviation	Mean	of the D	ifference			
							Lower	Upper			
	Doir 7		28	22500	2 70494	60484	27 35905	29,8909	47.32	19	000
	Pair	A_TW_0-ND	20	02500	2.70454	.00404	21.30000	29.0000	5 6	15	
	Pair 8	A_TW_U-N_SN	-8.	27500	4.64881	1.03951	-10.450/1	-6.0992	9 -7.961	19	.000
	Pair 9	A_TW_U-N_ANS	-9.1	10000	3.65254	.81673	-10.80944	-7.3905	6 11.14 2	19	.000
	Pair 10	A_TW_U-NASALLEN	IGTH -1.	02500	4.93813	1.10420	-3.33612	1.2861	2928	19	.365
	Pair 11	A_TW_U-COLUMELI	LA 42.	35000	2.53637	.56715	41.16294	43.5370	6 74.67	19	.000
		CONVEXITY							-		
			Pa	ired §	amplee	Statistic				-	
			_		ampies	Statistic	5			-	
4					Me	an	N	Std. De	viation	S	td. Error Mean
Cair	-	A_W_CI			Me 8.5	an i650	N 2	Std. De	viation .53830	S	Std. Error Mean .1203
Pair	1	A_W_CI A_TW_U	J		8.5 45.8	an 3650 3500	N 2	Std. De 0 0 2	viation .53830 .20800	S	3td. Error Mean .1203 .4937
Pair	1	A_W_CI A_TW_U A_W_CI	J		8.8 45.8 8.5	an 5650 3500 5650	N 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830	ç	td. Error Mean .1203 .4937 .1203
Pair Pair 1	1 2	A_W_Ci A_TW_U A_W_Ci ND	] 		8.5 45.8 8.5 17.2	an 5650 3500 5650 2250	N 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .11184	ç	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .1203 .1203 .4722
Pair Pair: Pair:	1 2	A_W_Ci A_TW_Li A_W_Ci ND A_W_Ci	1 J 1		Me 8.5 45.8 17.2 8.5	an 5650 3500 5650 2250 5650	N 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2	.53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830	ę	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .120: .472 .120:
Pair Pair: Pair:	1 2 3	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN	   		Me 8.1 45.8 17.2 8.5 54.1	an 5650 3500 5650 2250 5650 2250	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3	.53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935	S	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .4722 .1203 .8674
Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3	A_W_CI A_TW_U A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI	   		Me 8. 45.8 8. 17.2 8.5 54.1 8.5	an 5650 3500 5650 2250 5650 1250 5650	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3	.53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935 .53830	S.	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472 .1203 .8674 .1203
Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4	A_W_CI A_TW_U A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS			Me 8. 45. 8. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 54. 9. 54.9	5650 3500 5650 2250 5650 1250 5650 1500	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2	.53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516	5	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472 .120: .8674 .1203 .8674 .1203 .5825
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4	A_W_CI A_TW_U A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI			Me 8: 45: 8: 17: 8: 54: 8: 54: 8: 54: 8: 54: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8:	5650 3500 5650 2250 5650 1250 5650 3500 5650	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 2	.53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830	5	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .493 .120: .472 .120: .8674 .1203 .5825 .1203
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI NASALI	I J I LENGTH		Me 8.1 45.1 8.2 17.2 8.2 54.5 8.5 54.9 8.5 8.5 8.5 46.8	3650 3500 3650 2250 3650 1250 3650 3500 3650 3500 3650	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 4	.53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112	~	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472: .120: .867 .120: .582: .120: .941
Pair Pair: Pair: Pair: Pair:	1 2 3 4 5	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI NASALI A_W_CI	I J I LENGTH	1	Me 8.1 45.1 8.1 17.1 8.1 54.5 8.5 54.9 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5	3650 3500 5650 2250 5650 1250 5650 3500 5650 3750 5650	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112 .53830	2	td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472: .120: .867 .120: .5824 .120: .9410 .120:
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI NASALI A_W_CI COLUM CONVE	LENGTH	1	Me 8.1 45.1 8.1 17.1 8.1 54.5 8.5 46.8 8.5 46.8 8.5 3.5	an 5650 3500 5650 2250 5650 2250 5650 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3550 3500 3000 30	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .2112 .53830 .64889		td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472 .120: .867 .120: .582 .120: .582 .120: .582 .120: .120: .120: .120: .145
Pair Pair: Pair: Pair: Pair! Pair!	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_CI A_TW_U A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI N_ASALI A_W_CI COLUM CONVE	I J I LENGTH ELLA XITY	Paire	Me 8.1 45.1 8.1 17.1 8.1 54.2 8.5 4.5 8.5 4.5 8.5 4.5 8.5 8.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3	5650 3500 3500 2250 3650 1250 3650 3500 3650 3750 3650 3750 3650 3750 3650 3750 3650 3750 3650 3750 3650 3750 3750 3750 3750 3750 3500	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .60516 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112 .53830 .64889		td. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472: .120: .867 .120: .582: .120: .582: .120: .941( .120: .145
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI NASALI A_W_CI COLUM CONVE	LENGTH	Paire	Me 8. 45.1 8. 17.1 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 3. 54. 3. 54. 8. 54. 3. 54. 8. 8. 54. 3. 54. 8. 8. 54. 8. 8. 54. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8. 8	5650 5650 5650 5650 5650 5650 5650 5650 5650 5000 5650 5000	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112 .53830 .64889	Ę	Std. Error Mean .1200 .493 .1200 .4722 .1200 .867 .1200 .5829 .5939 .1200 .5829 .5939 .1200 .5829 .593
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_CI A_TW_L A_W_CI ND A_W_CI N_SN A_W_CI N_ANS A_W_CI NASALI A_W_CI COLUM CONVE	I I LENGTH ELLA XITY	Paire	Me 8.1 45.1 8.2 17.1 8.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 8.2 46.8 8.5 46.8 8.5 46.8 8.5 46.8 8.5 46.8 8.5 45.1 8.5 54.2	31           5650           3500           5650           3500           5650           3500           5650           3500           5650           3500           5650           3650           3500           3650           3650           3750           3650           3000           s Test           Difference           Error         95	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .653830 .21112 .53830 .64889 t	đf	Std. Error Mean .1200 .493 .1200 .472 .1200 .867 .1200 .582 .1200 .582 .1200 .9411 .1200 .145
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_Ci A_TW_L A_W_Ci ND A_W_Ci N_SN A_W_Ci NASALI A_W_Ci COLUM CONVE	I I LENGTH ELLA XITY	Paire	Me 8. 45. 8. 17. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 8. 46. 8. 8. 3. 54. 3. 54. 3. 54. 3. 54. 3. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54	31000000000000000000000000000000000000	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 2 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .62112 .53830 .64889 t	đf	Std. Error Mean .1200 .493 .1200 .472 .1200 .867 .1200 .582 .1200 .9410 .1200 .145 Sig. (2-tailed
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_Ci A_TW_U A_W_Ci ND A_W_Ci N_SN A_W_Ci N_ANS A_W_Ci NASALI A_W_Ci COLUM CONVE	I I LENGTH ELLA XITY Mean	Paire St Devi	Me 8.1 45.3 8.1 17.1 8.1 17.1 8.1 54.5 8.5 8.5 54.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8	31           3650           3500           3650           2250           3650           2250           3650           3500           3650           3500           3650           3500           3650           3750           3650           3000 <b>s Test</b> Difference           Error           95	N     2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112 .53830 .64889 t	đf	Std. Error Mean .1200 .493 .1200 .472 .1200 .867 .1200 .582 .1200 .582 .1200 .582 .1200 .941 .1200 .145
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair	1 2 3 4 5 6	A_W_C A_TW_U A_W_C ND A_W_C N_SN A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C NASAL NASAL COLUM CONVE	LENGTH ELLA XITY	Paire St Devia	Me 8. 45.1 8. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 55. 8. 55. 8. 8. 55. 8. 8. 55. 8. 8. 55. 8. 8. 55. 8. 8. 55. 55	statistic           an           5650           3500           5650           2250           5650           2250           5650           3500           5650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3000           s Test           Difference           Error           95           an           39425	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 3 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .60516 .53830 .60516 .53830 .64889 t -94.571	df	Std. Error Mean .1200 .493 .1200 .4722 .1200 .867 .1200 .5822 .1200 .5822 .1200 .5823 .1200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair1	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 <u>A_W</u> <u>A_W</u>	A_W_C A_TW_U A_W_C ND A_W_C N_SN A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C NASAL NASAL COLUM CONVE	LENGTH ELLA XITY	Paire St Devia 10 1.7 0 2.1	Me 8. 45.1 8. 17.2 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 17.2	31           3650           35650           35650           35650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           39000           s Test           Difference           - Error           39425           47192	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .11184 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .60516 .60516 .653830 .21112 .53830 .64889 t t	df 19	Std. Error Mean .120 .493 .120 .472 .120 .867 .120 .582 .120 .582 .120 .582 .120 .541 .120 .145
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair2 Pair3	1 2 3 4 5 6 4 5 6	A_W_C A_TW_L A_W_C ND A_W_C N_SN A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C NASAL A_W_C COLUM COLUM CONVE	I I I LENGTH ELLA XITY Mean -37.2850 -8.6600 -45.5600	Paire St Devia 10 1.7 10 2.1 10 4.0	Me 8. 45. 8. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 46.8 8. 3. 46.8 8. 3. 46.8 8. 3. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54	Statistic           an           5650           3500           5650           2250           5650           35650           35650           35650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3000           Statistic           Statistic           39425           47192           90767	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 2 0 5 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 5 0 5 0 2 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .60516 .53830 .21112 .53830 .64889 t t -94.571 -18.351 -50.195	df 19 19	Std. Error Mean .120 .493 .120 .472 .120 .867 .120 .582 .120 
Pair Pair: Pair: Pair Pair1 Pair2 Pair3 Pair4	1 2 3 4 5 6 6	A_W_C A_TW_U A_W_C ND A_W_C N_SN A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C NASAL A_W_C COLUM CONVE	I J I LENGTH ELLA XITY Mean -37.2850 -8.6600 -45.5600 -46.3850	Paire St Devia 0 1.7 0 2.1 0 4.0 0 2.8	Me Me 8. 45. 8. 17. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 46. 8. 3. 46. 8. 3. 46. 8. 3. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54. 54	Statistic           an           5650           3500           5650           2250           5650           2250           5650           35650           35650           3650           3650           3650           3650           3750           5650           3750           5650           3750           5650           3750           5650           3750           5650           39000           Stats           Stats           39425           47192           90767           54057	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 .53830 .87935 .53830 .60516 .53830 .621112 .53830 .64889 t -94.571 t -18.351 .50.195 -72.412	df 19 19	Std. Error Mean .120: .493 .120: .472: .120: .867. .120: .582: .120: .582: .120: .582: .120: .941! .120: .582: .120: .120: .582: .120: .120: .582: .120: .041! .120: .041! .120: .045: .00 .00 .00 .00
Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair Pair1 Pair2 Pair2 Pair4 Pair5	1 2 3 4 5 6 4 5 6	A_W_C A_TW_U A_W_C ND A_W_C N_SN A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C N_ANS A_W_C CONVE	I J I LENGTH ELLA XITY -37.2850 -8.6600 -46.3850 -38.3100	Paire St Devii 0 1.7 10 2.1 10 4.0 10 2.8 10 4.3	Me Me 8. 45.1 8. 17. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 54. 8. 46. 8. 46. 8. 46. 8. 54. 17. 25. 17. 26. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17	statistic           an           5650           3500           5650           2250           5650           2250           5650           2250           5650           3500           5650           3550           5650           3750           5650           5000           5650           3750           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5650           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000           5000	N 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. De 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 2 0 3 0 4 0 2 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4	viation .53830 .20800 .53830 2.11184 .53830 .60516 .53830 .61112 .53830 .64889 t -94.571 -18.351 -50.195 -72.412 -39.596	df 19 19 19 19	Std. Error Mean .120 .493 .120 .472 .120 .867 .120 .582 .120 .941 .120 .145 Sig. (2-tailec .0 .0 .0

Table 6: Statistical Analysis.

.97618

.21828

5.06500

4.60814

5.52186 23.204 19

.000

AWCI - All Nasal Parameters = 'P'-value < 0.05 (0.00)

CONVEXITY

air 6

ATWU-All Nasal Parameters = 'P'-value < 0.05 (0.00) (except for NL) .

Citation: Deepthi sonia Arani., et al. "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". EC Dental Science 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

The test is Significant and the correlation is very high

#### Discussion

Determination of the ideal size and shape of the teeth in harmony with the facial measurements is of paramount importance in establishing good and pleasing esthetics in the prosthetic rehabilitation of complete or partial edentulous patients. Keeping this aspect in point of view, one should relate the possible interrelationship of possible variables in the orofacial complex to the size of the teeth that increases the final outcome of the dental treatment. Several numerous attempts have been put forward to make use of facial measurements for evaluation of the size of artificial teeth for edentulous patients [9-12]. Considering the relationship of width of the alae of nose to the inter canine width of maxillary anteriors, this pilot study was main focused in endowing a particular or specific relationships between facial measurements in the selection of anterior teeth to cephalometric analysis of soft and hard tissues of nose [7,8].

In this study for purpose of selection of anterior teeth, conventional methods such as predicted clinical facial measurements using Sears formula/pounds concept; actual measurements by study model evaluation through digital vernier calipers were explored, interrupted, correlated with the values of regression formula derived by cephalometric analysis of nasal parameters [13]. All the values obtained in the cephalometric measurements were fit into a regression model, applied to the data and the correlations were calculated after deriving the regression model. By using regression equation derived, the total width of upper central incisor and total width of all anteriors was calculated and compared with the predicted width obtained by clinical facial measurements and the measurements obtained by the study model evaluation.

From the results of paired t-test there is statistically significance difference when the P-value is less than (< .05) and therefore it indicates that the width of the central incisor can be determined depending on the cephalometric analysis of soft and hard tissues of nose. It also confirms that the width of central incisor has some relation to the width of the face. But this was contradictory to the results conducted by A Alsaadi., *et al.* [14] whereas studies conducted by Gomes VL [2], Kini AY, *et al.* [12] has positive results in these aspects. In gender comparison of both the males and females; values of predicted widths, actual widths, widths obtained by regression formula; all of them are almost similar and satisfactory. These results are similar to the results of the study groups conducted by Attokaran G., *et al.* [15,16] in two successive years.

The present study confirms that values obtained by regression equation derived using cephalometric analysis of soft and hard tissues of nose can be used for predicting the width of central incisor and total width of maxillary anteriors there by selecting the size of anterior teeth in replacing edentulous situations. Future studies with more number of samples of both genders should be considered for using this regression equation.

#### Limitations of the Study

- Limited number of samples
- Magnification
- Edentulous state
- Nasal defects
- Cost

#### Conclusion

From the results of the present pilot study, the following statements can be concluded:

- 1. Cephalometric nasal parameters can also be used as a guide in the selection of upper anterior teeth.
- 2. The values obtained for measuring the width of upper central incisor or total width of upper anterior teeth through regression formula derived by using cephalometric analysis of nasal parameters is in similarity with the results derived by conventional methods.
- 3. There was almost no disparity in the values of the results when gender comparison is done.
- 4. The Statistical analysis Paired 't' test was done to compare the results used in the study. The test is Significant and the correlation is very high.

#### **Bibliography**

- 1. Faure JC., et al. "The influence of different facial components on facial esthetics". European Journal of Orthodontics 24.1 (2002): 1-7.
- 2. Gomes VL., et al. "Correlation between facial measurements and mesiodistal width of the anterior teeth". Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry 18.4 (2006): 196-205.
- 3. MP Bingham. "The selection of artificial anterior teeth appropriate for the age and gender of the complete denture wearer. A study into the variation of choices made by general dental practitioners, final year dental students and fine art students". MSc(R) thesis (2011).
- 4. Rosentiel SF., *et al.* "Dentists' preferences of anterior tooth proportion--a web based study". *Journal of Prosthodontics* 9.3 (2000): 123-136.
- 5. MV Kumar, *et al.* "The science of anterior teeth selection for a completely edentulous patient: a literature review". *Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society* 11.1 (2011): 7-13.
- 6. BJ Smith. "The value of the nose width as an esthetic guide in prosthodontics". Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry 34.5 (1975): 562-573.
- 7. Aljabaa AH. "Lateral cephalometric analysis of the nasal morphology among Saudi adults". *Clinical, Cosmetic and Investigational Dentistry* 11 (2019): 9-17.
- 8. MA Shamlan and AM Aldrees. "Hard and soft tissue correlations in facial profiles: a canonical correlation study". *Clinical, Cosmetic and Investigational Dentistry* 7 (2015): 9-15.
- 9. Latta GH., *et al.* "The relationship between width of the mouth, inter alar distance, bizygomatic width and inter pupillary distance in edentulous patients". *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 65.2 (1991): 250-254.
- 10. Liao P., *et al.* "Evaluation of maxillary anterior teeth width: A systematic review". *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 122.3 (2019): 275-281.e7.
- 11. A L-Kaisy N and Garib BT. "Selecting maxillary anterior tooth width by measuring certain facial dimensions in the Kurdish population". *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 115.3 (2016): 329-334.

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.

## Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study

- 12. Kini AY and Angadi GS. "Biometric ratio in estimating widths of maxillary anterior teeth derived after correlating anthropometric measurements with dental measurements". *Gerodontology* 30.2 (2013): 105-111.
- 13. Isa ZM., *et al.* "Regression methods to investigate the relationship between facial measurements and widths of the maxillary anterior teeth". *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 103.3 (2010): 182-188.
- 14. A Alsaadi., et al. "Use of Facial Indicator for Choosing Anterior Teeth". Advances in Dentistry and Oral Health 1.3 (2015): 19-24.
- 15. Attokaran G and Shenoy K. "Correlation between Interalar Distance and Mesiodistal Width of Maxillary Anterior Teeth in Thrissur, Kerala, Indian Population". *Journal of International Society of Preventive and Community Dentistry* 8.2 (2018): 118-123.
- 16. Attokaran G and Shenoy K. "Correlation between Innercanthal Distance and Mesiodistal Width of Maxillary Anterior Teeth in a Thrissur, Kerala, India, Population". *Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice* 17.5 (2016): 382-387.

Volume 19 Issue 1 January 2020 ©All rights reserved by Kalamalla A Saran Babu., *et al.* 

*Citation:* Deepthi sonia Arani., *et al.* "Regression Formula to Correlate the Relationship between Facial Measurements in the Selection of Anterior Teeth to Cephalometric Analysis of Soft and Hard Tissues of Nose-A Pilot Study". *EC Dental Science* 19.1 (2020): 01-09.