CAD/CAM nitinol bonded retainer versus a chairside bonded retainer: a multicentre randomised controlled trial

Recruitment status No longer recruiting	Prospectively registered		
	Protocol		
Overall study status Completed	Statistical analysis plan		
	[X] Results		
Condition category	[] Individual participant data		
	No longer recruiting Overall study status Completed		

Plain English summary of protocol

Background and study aims

Following orthodontic brace treatment the teeth are held in their new position by orthodontic appliances called retainers. One type of retainer is called a bonded retainer which is a small metal wire glued behind the front teeth. This study is looking at the use of two different types of bonded retainer to find out which is better: one that is shaped by the orthodontist, or one that has been made from a mould of the teeth by a computer. The study looks at which holds the teeth in their new position the best, which patients prefer and which is the most cost effective.

Who can participate?

Participants who have undergone a course of orthodontic treatment and who now require a retainer

What does the study involve?

Participants are randomly allocated to one of two groups to be treated with either a Memotain bonded retainer or an Ortho FlexTech bonded retainer. Participants are followed up over a 5-year period to determine the effectiveness of the retainers at maintaining the stability of the teeth after orthodontic treatment.

What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

The benefit to patients is that they are followed up for longer than normal (5 years). The study will help to show the best type of retainer for certain patients. The current research suggests there are no associated risks with wearing retainers.

Where is the study run from?

- 1. Leeds Dental Institute (UK)
- 2. St Luke's Hospital (UK)
- 3. Beverley Orthodontic Centre (UK)

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for? September 2017 to January 2019

Who is funding the study?

- 1. Investigator initiated and funded
- 2. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) (additional funding) (UK)

Who is the main contact?

- 1. Adam Jowett
- 2. Simon Littlewood

Contact information

Type(s)

Scientific

Contact name

Mr Adam Jowett

Contact details

St Luke's Hospital Little Horton Lane Bradford United Kingdom BD5 0NA

Type(s)

Scientific

Contact name

Mr Simon Littlewood

Contact details

St Luke's Hospital Little Horton Lane Bradford United Kingdom BD5 0NA

Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

185443

ClinicalTrials.gov number

Secondary identifying numbers

Protocol Number: DT16/86705, IRAS Number: 185443, REC Number 16/YH/0463.

Study information

Scientific Title

CAD/CAM nitinol bonded retainer versus a chairside bonded retainer: a multicentre randomised controlled trial

Study objectives

Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference in stability, survival rate, patient satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness between using a CAD/CAM nitinol bonded retainer (Memotain) and a chairside bonded retainer (Ortho FlexTech).

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

Yorkshire & The Humber - Bradford Leeds Research Ethics Committee, 07/07/2017, REC ref: 16/94/0463, protocol number: DT16/86705

Study design

Multicentre prospective two-arm parallel-group randomised controlled trial with a 1:1 allocation

Primary study design

Interventional

Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

Study setting(s)

Other

Study type(s)

Treatment

Participant information sheet

Not available in web format, please use the contact details to request a patient information sheet

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Orthodontic relapse

Interventions

Simple randomisation will be used to allocate patients to one of the two groups. The randomisation website: www.sealedenvelope.com will be used to allocate patients to treatment group 1 or group 2. Block sizes of 2, 4 and 6 will be used.

Group 1: Memotain bonded retainer

Group 2: Ortho FlexTech bonded retainer

Patients are followed up to determine the efficacy of a CAD/CAM nitinol bonded retainer (Memotain) compared with a chairside bonded retainer (Ortho FlexTech) at maintaining the stability of the upper and lower arches after orthodontic treatment.

Intervention Type

Device

Phase

Not Applicable

Drug/device/biological/vaccine name(s)

Not provided at time of registration

Primary outcome measure

Stability measured by changes in Little's Irregularity Index, and the width of the upper and lower dental arches measured by inter-canine and inter-molar width. In extraction cases, the trialists will also assess whether or not the extraction space re-opens. These measurements will be carried out on orthodontic study models taken at the debond appointment, and the 6 month, 1 year, 2 year and 5 year review appointments.

Secondary outcome measures

Assessed at the 6 week, 6 month, 1 year, 2 year and 5 year review appointments:

- 1. The survival rate of each retainer type
- 2. The patient satisfaction with each retainer type

Assessed at the 1 year and 5 year review appointments:

1. The cost-effectiveness of each retainer type

Overall study start date

12/09/2017

Completion date

11/01/2019

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

Each subject will:

- 1. Have undergone a course of upper and lower fixed appliance orthodontic treatment with satisfactory correction of the presenting malocclusion, where the treating clinician feels that retention is required
- 2. Have a full and normal complement of teeth in the upper and lower labial segments (incisors and canines) with these teeth being of normal size and shape
- 3. Brush their teeth at least twice per day
- 4. Be in good health
- 5. Be willing and able to comply with the trial regime
- 6. Have given written informed consent

Subjects may:

- 1. Have received treatment at any of the research sites
- 2. Have had dental extractions (premolar or molar) or a non-extraction approach
- 3. Have had other orthodontic treatment (e.g. removable or functional appliances) as part of their orthodontic treatment
- 4. Have undergone adjunctive surgical treatment, whether minor oral surgery to expose a tooth or orthognathic surgery to correct the position of the jaws

Participant type(s)

Patient

Age group

All

Sex

Both

Target number of participants

100 patients (50 patients per arm)

Total final enrolment

63

Key exclusion criteria

Subjects with:

- 1. Nickel allergy
- 2. Cleft palate and/or other severe facial deformity
- 3. Poor periodontal health including the presence of supragingival or subgingival calculus or periodontal pocketing greater than 3.5mm as determined by a basic periodontal examination (BPE) probe
- 4. Gross or uncontrolled caries
- 5. Prosthodontic requirement in the upper or lower arch at end of treatment
- 6. Restorations on the palatal/lingual surfaces of upper or lower incisors or canines
- 7. A starting malocclusion requiring extreme transverse correction

Date of first enrolment

20/10/2017

Date of final enrolment

05/07/2019

Locations

Countries of recruitment

England

United Kingdom

Study participating centre Leeds Dental Institute (University Dental Hospital)

The Worsley Building Clarendon Way Leeds United Kingdom LS2 9LU

Study participating centre St Luke's Hospital (District General Hospital)

Little Horton Lane Bradford United Kingdom BD5 0NA

Study participating centre Beverley Orthodontic Centre (Specialist Orthodontic Practice)

114 Norwood Beverley United Kingdom HU17 9HL

Sponsor information

Organisation

Leeds Dental Institute

Sponsor details

Worsley Building Clarendon Way Leeds England United Kingdom LS2 9LU +44 (0)113 3434897 governance-ethics@leeds.ac.uk

Sponsor type

Hospital/treatment centre

ROR

https://ror.org/024mrxd33

Funder(s)

Funder type

Other

Funder Name

Funder Name

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) (additional funding)

Alternative Name(s)

National Institute for Health Research, NIHR Research, NIHRresearch, NIHR - National Institute for Health Research, NIHR (The National Institute for Health and Care Research), NIHR

Funding Body Type

Government organisation

Funding Body Subtype

National government

Location

United Kingdom

Results and Publications

Publication and dissemination plan

Planned publication in a high-impact peer reviewed journal in late 2020.

Intention to publish date

11/10/2020

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study will be included in the subsequent results publication.

IPD sharing plan summary

Other

Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Results article		01/03/2023	23/03/2023	Yes	No
HRA research summary			26/07/2023	No	No