

Foreword

F. Kalifa¹, T. Siebert²

¹ *DFO specialist in private practice*

² *Dentofacial Orthopedics Dept, Faculty of Dental Surgery, Strasbourg, France*



The opinions set out in the Editorial focus on retention, from the earliest days of orthodontics up to the end of the 20th century; have there been any developments in these early years of the 21st century?

Is there a “consensus”? Have we found “the” solution, as Julien Philippe puts it in his Editorial?

Unlike the vast majority of orthodontists last century, we now work not only with children and adolescents, but also with adults. That is to say, our treatments concern a much wider age range and many more patients. Needless to say, that hardly simplifies the problem of “retention”, which now takes on a multitude of forms.

And yet a consensus did appear in France at the turn of the century, at least on one point: the need for retention following orthodontic treatment, which had not always been universally agreed. The French National Health Accreditation and Assessment Agency (ANAES), defining criteria for completion of dentofacial orthopedic treatments in a report finalized in December 2003, placed the need for retention under the “precautionary principle”. By 2012, an Appeals Court verdict judged retention to be mandatory (“Obligation de contention... !” Alain Béry, *Rev Orthop Dento Faciale* 2012;46:347-360).

This issue of the Journal of Dentofacial Anomalies and Orthodontics is entitled “End of Treatment and Retention”, as retention makes no sense unless the preceding treatment has achieved maximal stability over time.

This is why we made the firm decision to present the topic via reports of cases that had been duly “finished” before implementation of retention.

The Editorial is followed by a few definitions of terms and expressions on the present topic from the Terminology Commission. Our professional vocabulary is in constant flux: the orthognathodontic dictionary first brought out at the end of the last century has been ceaselessly updated since.

In his article “Keeping orthodontic treatment results steady”, Julien Philippe presents retention in the light of his own rich professional experience.

Michel Martin, in a dense and richly illustrated article, presents a series of case reports of “Orthodontic treatment in adolescents at 5 to 22 years follow-up after active treatment”. He describes in detail all the elements of active treatment that achieved the intended result, stressing the importance of occlusal finishing. The types and durations of retention are specified.

Address for correspondence:

Thibaut Siebert

1 Cours Fernand Jaenger – 67200

Strasbourg, France

E-mail: t.siebert@wanadoo.fr

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The patient needs to understand that nothing in life is permanent, teeth undergo the assaults of time, and he or she has to play an active role in maintaining oral health.

We acknowledge here a lifetime's professional experience and how exceptional Michel Martin's contribution is: it is very rare to have critical case studies with such long follow-up.

Isabelle Bonafé, in the following article, addresses the clinical examination determining choice of retention, and describes removable mono-maxillary apparatuses: Hawley plates and thermoformed splints. She stresses the need for precision manufacture and indispensable follow-up after fitting.

Jacques Faure, in an article illustrated by case reports, focuses on "Finishing: practice and protocol". Finishing is a late treatment phase that should not be underestimated. He explains the requisite duration, fundamental occlusion setting, the

procedure to be followed and its stages, and the indispensable "forceps work". He wants us to push back the "specter of recurrence", be it due to dysfunction or aging - and that, at all events, it not be due to errors in our treatment.

Florence Roussarie and Gaspard Douady deal with a "Side effect of bonded retention wires", warning against the "wire syndrome" in retention fixed by metal wire, found in some bonded teeth: however rare, it may induce severe gum retraction due to strong movements in version. During control examinations with this type of retention, the practitioner needs to be able to screen for this syndrome. Recommendations are set out to prevent iatrogenesis and achieve a cure.

And, as ever, you will find the usual section: the Press Review, by Hélène Guiral-Desnoës and Alain Benauwt.

Thanks to all our colleagues who contributed to this edition. Enjoy reading!