

Class II Division 2 malocclusion: Genetics or environment? A case report of monozygotic twins

Sabine Ruf, DDS, Dr med dent; Hans Pancherz, DDS, Odont Dr

Abstract: A pair of monozygotic twins with different malocclusion phenotypes (Class II Division 2 and Class II Division 1) is presented. The case report supports the hypothesis that heredity is not the sole controlling factor in the etiology of Class II Division 2 malocclusion.

Key Words: Class II Division 2, Etiology, Twin studies, Genetics

The Class II Division 2 malocclusion (II/2), first defined by Angle¹ in 1899, has an incidence rate of 1.5% to 7%.²⁻⁵ Its etiology is generally believed to be genetic, and familial occurrence has been documented in several studies of twins and triplets.⁶⁻⁸ Some authors consider factors such as a high lip line,^{4,9-11} hyperactive lip or mentalis muscles,¹²⁻¹⁷ and increased masticatory bite forces¹⁸⁻¹⁹ to be of main importance. Others stress morphologic and growth factors, such as an upright incisor position,^{12,15,20} small tooth size,⁵ increased collum angle of the upper incisors,^{3,21} thin incisors with small tubercula,²² decreased vertical jaw development,^{9,20,23} overdevelopment of the interincisor bone or upper anterior alveolar process,^{4,13,19,20,24} and anterior rotation of the mandible.²⁵

Case report

A pair of monozygotic male twins is presented. The boys exhibited a marked similarity in facial appearance (Figure 1). Their occlusions, however, were remarkably different. One boy (Figure 2) had a Class II Division 2 malocclusion (II/2) with half a cusp distal occlusion in the molar region, an overjet of 1 mm, and a deepbite (overbite = 7 mm), while his brother (Figure 3)

had a Class II Division 1 malocclusion (II/1) with half a cusp distal occlusion in the molar region, an overjet of 12 mm, and a deepbite (overbite = 5 mm). According to the mother, there was a history of finger sucking in twin II/2 (!) but not in twin II/1, who presented a lower lip dysfunction during swallowing, placing the lower lip behind the upper front teeth.

The radiographic cephalometric analysis revealed no differences in skeletal morphology (Figures 4, 5), although they did differ in the inclination of the upper incisors, with the teeth retroclined in twin II/2 and proclined in twin II/1. Superimposition of the tracings from the lateral cephalograms of twin II/2 and twin II/1 (Figure 5) showed that there was no absolute difference in upper lip position. How-

ever, relative to the position of the upper incisors, twin II/2 exhibited a high lip line.

Both boys were treated successfully with removable and fixed orthodontic appliances (upper plate, activator, multibracket appliance) over a period of 4 years (Figures 6, 7, and 8). The only difference in orthodontic treatment between the boys consisted in a proclination of the upper incisors previous to functional appliance treatment in twin II/2. The post-treatment superimposition of the cephalometric tracings showed no real difference in dentoskeletal morphology between the two boys (Figure 9).

Discussion

Discordancy for malocclusion in dizygotic twins is a frequent find-

Author Address

Dr. Sabine Ruf
Abteilung für Kieferorthopädie
Zentrum für ZMK
Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen
Schlangenzahl 14
D-35392 Giessen, Germany

E-mail: Sabine.Ruf@dentist.med.uni-giessen.de

Sabine Ruf, assistant professor, Department of Orthodontics, University of Giessen, Germany.

Hans Pancherz, professor and head, Department of Orthodontics, University of Giessen, Germany.

Submitted and accepted: January 1999

Angle Orthod 1999; 69(4):321-324.



Figure 1
Pretreatment facial photographs of twin II/2 (left) and twin II/1 (right) at 10 years

ing.⁷ However, malocclusion discordancy in monozygotic twins has, to our knowledge, been reported only by Leech²⁶ in 1955. As in the present case report, one of Leech's twins exhibited a Class II/2 malocclusion and the other a Class II/1 malocclusion.

In agreement with several cephalometric studies, we found that Class II/2 malocclusions exhibit no distinct skeletofacial pattern.^{12,27-29} Pancherz et al.²⁹ showed that, except for the position of the maxillary incisors, no difference exists in dentoskeletal morphology when comparing Class II/1 and Class II/2 malocclusions. This was also true for the present pair of twins.

Angle⁹ claimed that a high lip line was the main etiologic factor in the development of Class II/2 malocclusions. Interestingly, the absolute vertical positions of the upper and lower lips in the twins were iden-



Figure 2A
Figure 2
Pretreatment facial profile, frontal and lateral intraoral photographs of twin II/2 at 10 years




Figure 2B




Figure 2C



Figure 3A
Figure 3A-C
Pretreatment facial profile, frontal and lateral intraoral photographs of twin II/1 at 10 years




Figure 3B




Figure 3B




Figure 4A
Lateral cephalograms of twin II/2 and twin II/1 at 10 years



Figure 4B




Figure 5
Pretreatment superimposed tracings of the lateral cephalograms of twin II/2 and twin II/1 at 10 years



Figure 6

Posttreatment facial appearance of twin II/2 (left) and twin II/1 (right) at 15 years

tical. However, relative to the position of the upper incisors, twin II/2 exhibited a high lip line, which was also the case in Leech's²⁶ twins. This finding suggests that it is not primarily lip position that is responsible for the difference in incisor inclination, but rather incisor position itself.^{12,20} Another explanation might be a difference in the functional pattern of the lip musculature.¹²⁻¹⁷ However, if incisor position is genetically determined,^{12,20} the question is: What caused the difference in upper incisor position in the identical twins? Is it the functional pattern of the lip musculature as both II/1 twins—Leech's²⁶ and the present—exhibited an atypical swallowing pattern (placing the lower lip behind the upper incisors)? And is this lip dysfunction a primary pattern or is it the result of the proclined upper incisors? Or is the mother mixing up her boys? Is it twin II/1 who had a history of finger sucking and not twin II/2? The mother disagrees, but if it is the case, then function could overcome the genetically predetermined pattern.

Conclusions

The etiology of the Class II/2 malocclusion remains unclear. Neither form nor function seems to be the sole controlling factor. There are many open questions, and further research is necessary to elucidate the true etiology of the Class II/2 malocclusion.



Figure 7A

Figure 7A-C Posttreatment facial profile, frontal and lateral intraoral photographs of twin II/2 at 15 years



Figure 7B



Figure 7C



Figure 8A

Figure 8A-C Posttreatment facial profile, frontal and lateral intraoral photographs of twin II/1 at 15 years



Figure 8B




Figure 8C




Figure 9 Posttreatment superimposed tracings of twins' lateral cephalograms at 15 years

References

1. Angle EH. Classification of malocclusion. *Dent Cosmos* 1899; 41: 248-264, 350-357.
2. Ingervall B, Seemann L, Thilander B. Frequency of malocclusion and need of orthodontic treatment in 10-year-old children in Gothenburg. *Svensk Tandläkare-Tidskrift* 1972; 65:7-21.
3. Delevianis HP, Kuftinec MM. Variation in morphology of the maxillary central incisors found in Class II, division 2 malocclusions. *Am J Orthod* 1980; 78:438-443.
4. Karlson AT. Craniofacial characteristics in children with Angle Class II div. 2 malocclusion combined with extreme deep bite. *Angle Orthod* 1994; 64:123-130.
5. Peck S, Peck L, Kataja M. Class II, Division 2 malocclusion: A heritable pattern of small teeth in well developed jaws. *Angle Orthod* 1998; 68:9-20.
6. Kloeppel W. Deckbiss bei Zwillingen. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1953; 14:130-135.
7. Markovic MD. At the crossroad of facial genetics. *Eur J Orthod* 1992; 14:469-481.
8. Litt RA, Nielsen IL. Class II, Division 2 malocclusion - to extract or not extract. *Angle Orthod* 1984; 54:123-138.
9. Angle EH. *Okklusionsanomalien der Zähne*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: SS White, 1908: 35-39.
10. Ballard CF. Variations of posture and behaviour of the lips and tongue which determine the position of the labial segments; the implications in orthodontics, prosthetics and speech. *Trans Eur Orthod Soc* 1963: 67-93.
11. Fränkel R, Falck F. Zahndurchbruch und Vererbung beim Deckbiss. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1967; 28:175-182.
12. Schwarze AM. Der Deckbiss (Steilbiss) im Fernröntgenbild. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1956; 17:89-103, 186-196, 258-282.
13. Arvystas MG. Nonextraction treatment of severe Class II, Division 2 malocclusions. Part 1. *Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop* 1990; 97:510-521.
14. Schuricht H. Beitrag zur Morphogenese des Deckbisses. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1953; 14:92-97.
15. Logan WR. Deckbiss - A clinical evaluation. *Trans Eur Orthod Soc* 1959: 313-317.
16. Farmand M. Deckbissbehandlung von Erwachsenen ohne Prämolarenextraktion. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1988; 49:56-61.
17. Beresford JS. Limitations in treating Class II, division 2 malocclusion. *Br Dent J* 1968; 8:351-352.
18. Witt E. Kraftmessung und Kraftanalyse beim Tragen der Vorhofplatte. *Schw Monatsschr Zahnheilk* 1966; 76: 178-187.
19. Sassouni V. A classification of skeletal facial types. *Am J Orthod* 1969; 55:109-123.
20. Hausser E. Zur Ätiologie und Genese des Deckbisses. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1953; 14:154-161.
21. Bryant RM, Sadowsky PL, Hazelrig JB. Variability in three morphologic features of permanent maxillary central incisors. *Am J Orthod* 1984; 86:25-32.
22. Backlund E. Overbite and the incisor angle. *Trans Eur Orthod Soc* 1958: 277-286.
23. Wallis SF. Integration of certain variants of facial skeleton in Class II, Division 2 malocclusion. *Angle Orthod* 1963; 33:60-67.
24. Korkhaus G. Über den Aufbau des Gesichtschädels beim Deckbiss. *Fortschr Kieferorthop* 1953; 14:162-171.
25. Björk A. Prediction of mandibular growth rotation. *Am J Orthod* 1969; 55:585-599.
26. Leech HL. Angles Class II div. 1 and Class II div. 2 in identical twins. *Trans Br Soc Study Orthod* 1955; 42:38-42.
27. Hitchcock HP. The cephalometric distinction of Class II, Division 2 malocclusion. *Am J Orthod* 1976; 69:447-454.
28. Fischer-Brandies H, Fischer-Brandies E, König A. A cephalometric comparison between Angle Class II, Division 2 malocclusion and normal occlusion in adults. *Br J Orthod* 1985; 12:158-162.
29. Pancherz H, Zieber K, Hoyer B. Cephalometric characteristics of Class II division 1 and Class II division 2 malocclusions: A comparative study in children. *Angle Orthod* 1997; 67:111-120.