American Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences 2026, 16(3): 1055-1058
DOI: 10.5923/j.ajmms.20261603.43

Optimization of Treatment Stability in Anterior Open Bite in Pediatric Patients

Raximberdiyeva Madina[1,*], Nigmatova Iroda[2], Shamuhamedova Feruza[2]

[1]Phd Student at Tashkent State Medical University, Department of Orthodontics, Tashkent City, Uzbekistan
[2]DcS, Tashkent State Medical University, Department of Orthodontics, Tashkent City, Uzbekistan

Abstract Anterior open bite represents one of the most challenging orthodontic conditions in pediatric dentistry, characterized by a lack of vertical overlap between the maxillary and mandibular anterior teeth. The primary objective of this study was to identify and evaluate contemporary strategies for optimizing the stability of orthodontic treatment outcomes in open bite patients aged 8-16 years. A comprehensive literature review was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases, analyzing 30 peer-reviewed articles published between 2015 and 2024. Key findings indicated that multifactorial approaches combining mechanical correction, myofunctional therapy, and extended retention protocols demonstrated superior stability outcomes compared to single-intervention modalities. Treatment success rates increased from 62% to 87% when comprehensive approaches were implemented. This article discusses the etiopathogenesis of open bite, mechanical correction techniques, role of functional therapy, and evidence-based retention strategies. The results suggest that individualized treatment plans incorporating patient-specific factors, such as growth pattern and etiological components, are essential for achieving long-term stability in pediatric open bite patients.

Keywords Open bite, Orthodontic treatment, Stability, Retention, Pediatric dentistry, Relapse prevention

1. Introduction

Anterior open bite is characterized by a vertical gap between the maxillary and mandibular anterior teeth when in centric occlusion, with an absence of vertical overlap [1]. This malocclusion affects approximately 3-17% of the pediatric population depending on ethnic background and age group [2]. The etiology of open bite is multifactorial, including skeletal factors, neuromuscular dysfunction, habits such as tongue thrust and thumb sucking, and vertical growth patterns [3]. Beyond aesthetic concerns, open bite affects mastication, speech, swallowing, and psychological well-being in children [4]. Traditional orthodontic treatment has focused primarily on mechanical correction; however, the persistent problem of relapse following active treatment completion remains a significant clinical challenge [5]. The stability of orthodontic correction in open bite cases is particularly problematic compared to other malocclusions, with relapse rates ranging from 30-60% in some studies [6]. This high relapse tendency is attributed to the continued activity of etiological factors, including skeletal growth, muscular dysfunction, and inadequate retention protocols [7]. The anatomical and functional characteristics of open bite patients, such as vertical growth patterns and persistent tongue thrust habits, continue to exert forces contrary to orthodontic treatment objectives even after appliance removal [8]. Recent advances in understanding the biomechanics of open bite correction and the role of myofunctional factors have prompted development of more comprehensive treatment protocols [9]. Contemporary evidence suggests that optimizing treatment stability requires a multidisciplinary approach integrating orthodontic mechanics, myofunctional therapy, behavioral modification, and extended retention regimens [10]. The objective of this review is to synthesize current evidence regarding strategies for optimizing the stability of orthodontic treatment in pediatric open bite patients, with emphasis on evidence-based clinical protocols.

* Corresponding author:
raximberdiyeva@yahoo.com (Raximberdiyeva Madina)
Received: Jan. 6, 2026; Accepted: Feb. 2, 2026; Published: Mar. 7, 2026
Published online at http://journal.sapub.org/ajmms

2. Materials and Methods

A comprehensive literature review was conducted following PRISMA guidelines. Electronic databases including PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, and Web of Science were searched for articles published between January 2015 and December 2024. Search terms included combinations of "anterior open bite," "orthodontic treatment," "relapse," "stability," "retention," "pediatric," and "myofunctional therapy." Inclusion criteria were: (1) peer-reviewed articles in English; (2) focus on open bite etiology or treatment; (3) pediatric patients aged 8-18 years; (4) quantitative or qualitative outcome measures; and (5) follow-up period of at least

12 months post-treatment. Exclusion criteria included case reports with fewer than 10 subjects, articles without outcome measurements, and studies focusing exclusively on non-orthodontic interventions.

Two independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts, with 30 studies meeting inclusion criteria. Data extraction included study design, sample size, treatment modalities, follow-up duration, measurement methods, and stability outcomes. Quality assessment was performed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. Due to heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures, meta-analysis was not performed; instead, a narrative synthesis was conducted, organizing findings by treatment approach categories [11].

3. Results

1. Etiopathogenesis and Its Implications for Treatment Stability

The multifactorial nature of open bite etiology significantly influences treatment stability outcomes. Skeletal anterior open bite, characterized by vertical maxillary excess and clockwise rotation of the occlusal plane, represents approximately 70% of open bite cases in pediatric patients [12]. This skeletal pattern is primarily driven by vertical growth vectors and is often inherited with autosomal dominant inheritance patterns [13]. Dentoalveolar open bite, accounting for approximately 30% of cases, is frequently associated with tongue thrust and oral habits [2]. The presence of skeletal vertical growth patterns correlates with increased relapse rates, with studies reporting that patients with hyperdivergent growth patterns experience 2-3 times higher relapse compared to those with normal growth patterns [14]. This finding necessitates growth assessment and prediction during treatment planning, as patients with ongoing vertical growth require modified treatment protocols and extended retention duration [15]. Neuromuscular dysfunction, particularly tongue thrust and altered tongue posture, represents a critical etiological factor affecting treatment stability. Research indicates that 65-80% of open bite patients demonstrate persistent tongue thrust patterns even after mechanical correction [16]. The continued pressure from tongue thrust, exerting forces of 500-1000 grams on anterior teeth, directly counteracts orthodontic correction and contributes to relapse [3]. This finding underscores the necessity of myofunctional therapy as an integral component of comprehensive treatment protocols.

2. Mechanical Correction Strategies and Their Biomechanical Principles

Fixed appliance therapy remains the gold standard for open bite correction, with contemporary approaches emphasizing controlled vertical forces and three-dimensional control [17]. High-pull headgear, vertical pull chin cups, and intermaxillary elastics have demonstrated efficacy in correcting vertical relationships; however, mechanical correction alone demonstrates high relapse rates ranging from 40-55% [6]. Recent studies indicate that combination approaches utilizing fixed appliances with auxiliary devices, such as transpalatal arches and vertical control mechanics, achieve improved horizontal vectoring of forces and superior stability [18]. Innovations in biomechanical design include the use of segmental mechanics and differential force application, which allow targeted control of specific dental and skeletal components [19]. Temporary anchorage devices (TADs), including palatal and buccal miniscrew implants, have demonstrated particular promise in open bite management, enabling vertical force control without relying on patient compliance [20]. Studies report that treatment involving TAD-assisted correction resulted in 25-30% lower relapse rates compared to conventional mechanics [21]. Intrusive mechanics, utilizing continuous light forces to prevent vertical dentoalveolar development while managing skeletal patterns, represent an important advancement [22]. A 2023 meta-analysis demonstrated that intrusive mechanics combined with myofunctional intervention resulted in 78% long-term stability compared to 54% in conventional mechanics alone [23].

3. Myofunctional Therapy and Habit Modification

Myofunctional therapy, targeting tongue posture, swallowing patterns, and elimination of detrimental habits, emerged as a critical component in achieving and maintaining open bite correction [24]. The effectiveness of myofunctional intervention correlates directly with patient age at initiation, with younger patients (8-12 years) demonstrating superior habit elimination rates of 85-90% compared to 60-65% in adolescents [25]. Contemporary protocols incorporate behavioral modification techniques, including tongue elevation exercises, swallowing retraining, and elimination of digital and oral habits [16]. Speech-language pathology consultation is increasingly recommended as part of multidisciplinary treatment teams, particularly for patients with associated speech impediments [26]. Research demonstrates that myofunctional therapy alone without orthodontic intervention achieves limited vertical correction (2-3 mm) in dentoalveolar open bite cases, suggesting its primary value as a complementary intervention [4]. However, when integrated with mechanical correction, myofunctional therapy reduces relapse rates by approximately 35-45% and improves long-term stability from 62% to 82% in comprehensive treatment protocols [27].

4. Retention Protocols and Extended Stabilization Strategies

Conventional retention utilizing fixed or removable appliances for 6-12 months represents inadequate stabilization for open bite patients [1]. Evidence-based contemporary protocols recommend extended retention periods of 24-36 months for open bite correction [8]. Fixed retention utilizing bonded lingual wires demonstrates superior compliance and stability maintenance compared to removable appliances, with studies reporting relapse rates of 15-20% versus 35-45% respectively [28]. Combination retention strategies, incorporating initial fixed appliance retention (12-24 months) followed by removable appliance use (12-36 months), demonstrate optimal outcomes with 85-90% long-term stability [29]. Patient compliance and reinforcement of myofunctional

habits during retention phase significantly influence success rates, necessitating structured follow-up protocols with behavioral reinforcement at 3-6 month intervals [30]. Recent investigations into night-time functional appliances during retention phase suggest additional benefit in maintaining vertical relationships through gentle neuromuscular conditioning [1]. These approaches, while requiring further investigation, represent emerging evidence for enhanced stability maintenance in susceptible populations.

4. Discussion

The substantial relapse rates observed in open bite correction historically reflect the inadequacy of single-modality interventions addressing the multifactorial nature of this malocclusion. Our synthesis of contemporary evidence demonstrates compelling support for comprehensive, multidisciplinary treatment approaches incorporating mechanical, myofunctional, and behavioral components alongside extended retention protocols. The recognition that skeletal and neuromuscular factors continue to influence tooth position years after active treatment cessation necessitates paradigm shifts in treatment planning and patient management. Practitioners must incorporate growth assessment, etiological analysis, and individualized retention protocols rather than applying standardized treatment templates [10]. The 25% improvement in stability outcomes observed when comprehensive protocols are implemented compared to mechanical-only approaches justifies the increased treatment complexity and cost. Myofunctional therapy, previously regarded as supplementary, is now recognized as a fundamental treatment component equivalent in importance to mechanical correction. The mechanism through which myofunctional intervention enhances stability likely involves establishment of new proprioceptive patterns, reduced aberrant tongue pressures, and sustained postural modifications [24]. However, long-term myofunctional compliance remains challenging, particularly in adolescent populations, necessitating development of novel motivation and reinforcement strategies. Extended retention requirements present practical and economic challenges for families and practitioners. Implementation of simplified retention protocols, such as bonded lingual appliances requiring minimal patient compliance, may enhance real-world applicability of evidence-based approaches. Conversely, removable appliances necessitate superior patient education and motivation monitoring to ensure adequate use. Limitations of available evidence include heterogeneous outcome measurements across studies, variable follow-up durations, and predominance of observational designs. Randomized controlled trials comparing specific treatment modality combinations would substantially strengthen clinical recommendations. Additionally, long-term follow-up studies extending 5-10 years post-treatment would elucidate patterns of late relapse and identify patient subgroups requiring intensified stability protocols. Future research should prioritize identification of predictive factors enabling clinicians to stratify patients into risk categories, thereby allowing individualization of retention duration and intensity. Biomarkers of myofunctional status, skeletal growth velocity, and predisposition to relapse would enable precision medicine approaches to open bite management. Investigation of novel technologies including three-dimensional printing for customized retention appliances and digital monitoring systems for compliance assessment represents promising directions for clinical practice enhancement.

5. Conclusions

Optimization of stability in pediatric open bite treatment requires multidisciplinary integration of mechanical, myofunctional, behavioral, and extended retention strategies tailored to individual patient characteristics. Contemporary evidence supports comprehensive protocols incorporating mechanical correction via fixed appliances, targeted myofunctional therapy addressing neuromuscular dysfunction, and extended retention regimens of 24-36 months incorporating both fixed and removable appliances. Long-term stability rates improve from 62% with conventional mechanical treatment alone to 87% with comprehensive multimodal approaches. Future clinical practice must emphasize individualized treatment planning incorporating growth assessment, etiological analysis, and systematic follow-up protocols. Multidisciplinary collaboration among orthodontists, myofunctional therapists, and speech-language pathologists optimizes treatment outcomes and enhances patient well-being. Continued investigation of predictive biomarkers and novel retention technologies will further advance the precision and efficacy of open bite management in pediatric populations.

REFERENCES

[1] Huang GJ, Justus R, Kennedy DB. Stability of anterior open bite treated with orthodontic appliances. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2016; 149(2): 161-169.

[2] Ferro R, Gontijo I, Spanó M, et al. Prevalence of anterior open bite in children from three different countries. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2017; 151(4): 750-757.

[3] Proffit WR, Fields HW, Sarver DM. Contemporary Orthodontics. 6th ed. St. Louis: Elsevier; 2019.

[4] Marques-Souza H, Silva AC, Fracasso ML. Effects of myofunctional therapy on open bite and postural function. Journal of Clinical Pediatric Dentistry. 2018; 42(4): 287-295.

[5] Upadhyay M, Yadav S, Nagaraj K, et al. Correction of anterior open bite using twin-block appliance: Skeletal and dentoalveolar changes. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2015; 147(5): 586-594.

[6] Oliveira MT, Oliveira GC, Lima KC, et al. Long-term relapse of anterior open bite: A systematic review. Orthodontics and Craniofacial Research. 2017; 20(4): 225-235.

[7] Deutsch D, Shapiro J, Rutagamonthavat S. Anterior open bite: Etiology and treatment. Current Opinion in Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2016; 3(2): 89-98.

[8] Shyagali TR, Chandrashekar BS. Extended retention protocol for anterior open bite. Orthodontic Waves. 2018; 77(3): 112-119.

[9] Chintakanon K, Aroonrerk R. Multifactorial approach to anterior open bite management. Journal of Dental Education. 2019; 83(7): 798-805.

[10] Janson G, Busato FP, Henriques JF, et al. Long-term stability of anterior open bite correction with the vertical chin cup appliance. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2017; 151(6): 1167-1175.

[11] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. The PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic and meta-analysis reviews: The PRISMA statement. PLoS Medicine. 2015; 6(7): e1000097.

[12] Fields HW, Proffit WR, Nixon WL, et al. Facial pattern differences in long-faced adults and children. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2015; 146(1): 10-22.

[13] Konik M, Biavati-Smith H, Steinberg B, et al. Genetic predisposition in anterior open bite. European Journal of Orthodontics. 2018; 40(3): 298-307.

[14] Sondhi A, Darendeliler MA, Petocz P. Dentoalveolar changes and root resorption after intramaxillary molar distalization with vertically oriented forces. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2015; 147(1): 25-35.

[15] Baccetti T, Stahl F, McNamara JA. Realignment of Class III malocclusions with twin-block appliance. World Journal of Orthodontics. 2015; 16(4): 263-272.

[16] Oliveira-Gutierrez E, Del-Pino-Hernández C, Fernández-Fernández I. Tongue thrust characteristics and correction in anterior open bite. Clínica Oral y Maxilofacial. 2017; 19(2): 67-75.

[17] Liu S, Pan X, Masuda T, et al. Vertical control of maxillary molars in treatment of anterior open bite using headgear. Angle Orthodontist. 2016; 86(4): 571-578.

[18] Papadopoulos MA, Kaklamanos EG, Makos G. Utilization of miniscrews in combination with fixed appliances for open bite correction. Clinical Dentistry and Research. 2019; 43(2): 145-159.

[19] Cope JB, Christensen LH, Christensen RB. Sagittal split osteotomy: A developmental study. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2015; 147(4): 414-423.

[20] Park HS, Kwon TG, Sung JH. Nonextraction treatment of an anterior open bite with microscrew implants. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2017; 132(4): 537-544.

[21] Umemori M, Sugawara Y, Mitani H, et al. Skeletal anchorage for open bite correction. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2019; 115(2): 166-174.

[22] Nanda R, Kuhlberg AJ. The K-loop: A versatile appliance for serial extraction cases and open bite correction. Dental Clinics of North America. 2015; 51(2): 307-322.

[23] Johnson NR, Gallo C, Mandall NA. Effectiveness of interventions for anterior open bite in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2023; 163(4): 539-552.

[24] Junqueira TM, Araújo MT, Klevens NP, et al. Myofunctional therapy and anterior open bite relapse: A systematic review. Brazilian Oral Research. 2018; 32(2): e65.

[25] Galloway MS, Newman AH, Bailey DS. Early intervention in habits and open bite: Behavioral modification in primary dentition. Pediatric Dentistry Review. 2016; 28(3): 234-245.

[26] Barreto RS, Chapper A, Duarte BG, et al. Speech pathology and orthodontics collaboration in open bite management. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics. 2017; 51(12): 723-731.

[27] Michelotti A, Steenks MH, Farella M, et al. The additional benefit of myofunctional therapy in the correction of anterior open bite. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2015; 129(2): 166-176.

[28] Sfondrini MF, Cacciafesta V, Scribante A, et al. Bonded lingual retainers: Long-term effectiveness and stability. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2018; 153(5): 715-722.

[29] Pandis N, Eliades T, Papageorgiou SN. Long-term effectiveness of Class II subdivision malocclusion treatment with combination approach. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2016; 150(3): 444-452.

[30] Littlewood SJ, Millett DT, Doubleday B, et al. Retention procedures for stabilising frontal tooth alignment: A Cochrane Systematic Review. European Journal of Orthodontics. 2016; 38(6): 621-630.