

Letters From Our Readers

To: Editor, *The Angle Orthodontist*

Re: Mandibular growth comparisons of Class I and Class II division 1 skeletofacial patterns by Helder B. Jacob, Peter H. Buschang. *The Angle Orthod.* 2014;84:755–761.

I would like to congratulate the authors of the study for their attempt to shed light on the differences in growth of the mandible between Class I and Class II subjects. I have a few questions regarding case selection. I believe that the Class II sample should have been limited to those with mandibular retrusion. Class II malocclusion in general can be attributed to maxillary protrusion, mandibular retrusion, or a combination of both.^{1,2,3} Therefore, the sample in this study could have had a skeletal discrepancy attributed to either the maxilla, mandible or both. It may be possible that the difference is negligible between Class II subjects with excessive maxillary growth along with a normal mandible, and those with Class I relationships.

Do you think the outcome would have been different if only Class II subjects with a deficient mandible were used in this study?

*Soumya Narayani Thirumoorthy, MDS
Orthodontist, All Smiles Dental Clinic,
Karamana, Thiruvananthapuram, India.
e-mail: soumyanarayani@yahoo.co.in*

REFERENCES

1. Rosenblum Robert E. Class II malocclusion: mandibular retrusion or maxillary protrusion? *Angle Orthod.* 1995;65(1): 49–62.
2. Antonini Antonino, Marinelli Andrea, Baroni Giulia, Franchi Lorenzo, Defraia Efisio. Class II Malocclusion with Maxillary Protrusion from the Deciduous Through the Mixed Dentition: A Longitudinal Study. *Angle Orthod.* 2005;75:980–986.
3. Sidlauskas Antanas, Svalauskiene Vilma, Sidlauskas Mantas. Assessment of Skeletal and Dental Pattern of Class II Division 1 Malocclusion with Relevance to Clinical Practice. *Stomatologija, Baltic Dental and Maxillofacial Journal.* 2006;8: 3–8.