



**University of Dundee**

**Anchorage effectiveness of orthodontic miniscrews compared to headgear and transpalatal arches**

Alharbi, Fahad; Almuzian, Mohammed; Bearn, David

*Published in:*  
Acta Odontologica Scandinavica

*DOI:*  
[10.1080/00016357.2018.1508742](https://doi.org/10.1080/00016357.2018.1508742)

*Publication date:*  
2019

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Alharbi, F., Almuzian, M., & Bearn, D. (2019). Anchorage effectiveness of orthodontic miniscrews compared to headgear and transpalatal arches: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Odontologica Scandinavica*, 77(2), 88-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016357.2018.1508742>

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Anchorage Effectiveness of Orthodontic Miniscrews compared to Headgear and Transpalatal Arches: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

### **Authors**

1. Fahad Alharbi / Assistant Professor/ Department of Orthodontics/ Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia, fahad409@hotmail.com
2. Mohammed Almuzian \*/ Honorary Lecturer/ Discipline of Orthodontics/ Faculty of Dentistry/ University of Sydney, dr\_muzian@hotmail.com
3. David Bearn/ Professor/ Department of Orthodontics/ University of Dundee/ Scotland/ UK, D.Bearn@dundee.ac.uk

\*Address for correspondence:

Mohammed Almuzian

Discipline of Orthodontics/ The university of Sydney

Rm2.22, Building C12/ The University of Sydney/ NSW/ 2006

T +61 2 9351 8329/8314/ F +61 2 9351 8336 |

Email: dr\_muzian@hotmail.com

**Key words:** systematic review, orthodontics, miniscrews, headgear, transpalatal arch, anchorage

# Anchorage Effectiveness of Orthodontic Miniscrews compared to Headgear and Transpalatal Arches: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

## Introduction

Anchorage by definition is the resistance to unwanted tooth movement { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Proffit</Author><Year>2006</Year><RecNum>1</RecNum><DisplayText>(1)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>1</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">1</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Book">6</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Proffit, William R</author><author>Fields Jr, Henry W</author><author>Sarver, David M</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Contemporary orthodontics</title></titles><dates><year>2006</year></dates><publisher>Elsevier Health Sciences</publisher><isbn>0323078184</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></End Note>}. Orthodontic anchorage, conventionally, has been provided by different methods including incorporating multiple teeth, or use of headgear, face masks, chin caps, transpalatal arches (including Nance buttons), lingual arches or intermaxillary elastics { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Wahl</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>2</RecNum><DisplayText>(2)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>2</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">2</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Wahl, Norman</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Orthodontics in 3 millennia. Chapter 15: Skeletal anchorage</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>707-

710</pages><volume>134</volume><number>5</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.

More recently orthodontic skeletal anchorage devices have been suggested as a reliable method for providing maximum to absolute anchorage { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Kuroda</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>3</RecNum><DisplayText>(3,

4)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>3</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">3</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kuroda,

Shingo</author><author>Yamada, Kazuyo</author><author>Deguchi,

Toru</author><author>Kyung, Hee-Moon</author><author>Takano-Yamamoto,

Teruko</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Class II malocclusion treated with miniscrew anchorage: comparison with traditional orthodontic mechanics outcomes</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>302-

309</pages><volume>135</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>0889-

5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Park</Author><Year>2004</Year><RecNum>4</RecNum><record><rec-number>4</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">4</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Park,

Hyo-Sang</author><author>Kwon, Tae-Geon</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Sliding mechanics with microscrew implant anchorage</title><secondary-title>The Angle orthodontist</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Angle orthodontist</full-title></periodical><pages>703-

710</pages><volume>74</volume><number>5</number><dates><year>2004</year></dates><isbn>0889-

5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Park</Author><Year>2004</Year><RecNum>4</RecNum><record><rec-number>4</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">4</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Park,

Hyo-Sang</author><author>Kwon, Tae-Geon</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Sliding mechanics with microscrew implant anchorage</title><secondary-title>The Angle orthodontist</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Angle orthodontist</full-title></periodical><pages>703-

710</pages><volume>74</volume><number>5</number><dates><year>2004</year></dates><isbn>0889-

5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Park</Author><Year>2004</Year><RecNum>4</RecNum><record><rec-number>4</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">4</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Park,

Hyo-Sang</author><author>Kwon, Tae-Geon</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Sliding mechanics with microscrew implant anchorage</title><secondary-title>The Angle orthodontist</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Angle orthodontist</full-title></periodical><pages>703-

710</pages><volume>74</volume><number>5</number><dates><year>2004</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>

r></dates><isbn>0003-3219</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.

Skeletal anchorage devices can be defined as the use of implants, plates, screws or screw-retained devices inserted into bone to provide resistance to unwanted tooth movement (indirect anchorage) or a point from which orthodontic traction can be applied (direct anchorage) { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Ödman</Author><Year>1994</Year><RecNum>5</RecNum><DisplayText>(5)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>5</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">5</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ödman, Jan</author><author>Lekholm, Ulf</author><author>Jemt, Torsten</author><author>Thilander, Birgit</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Osseointegrated implants as orthodontic anchorage in the treatment of partially edentulous adult patients</title><secondary-title>The European Journal of Orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The European Journal of Orthodontics</full-title></periodical><pages>187-201</pages><volume>16</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>1994</year>r></dates><isbn>0141-5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. It

can broadly be divided into two categories: osseointegrated implants such as mid-palatal implants { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Wehrbein</Author><Year>1999</Year><RecNum>6</RecNum><DisplayText>(6)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>6</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">6</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Wehrbein, Heinrich</author><author>Merz, Beat R</author><author>Diedrich, Peter</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Palatal bone support for orthodontic implant anchorage-a clinical and radiological study</title><secondary-title>The European Journal of Orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The European Journal of Orthodontics</full-

title></periodical><pages>65-70</pages><volume>21</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>1999</year></dates><isbn>0141-5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} and onplants { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Block</Author><Year>1995</Year><RecNum>7</RecNum><DisplayText>(7)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>7</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">7</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Block, Michael S</author><author>Hoffman, David R</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>A new device for absolute anchorage for orthodontics</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>251-258</pages><volume>107</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>1995</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, and mechanically retained devices such as titanium mini-plates { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>De Clerck</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>8</RecNum><DisplayText>(8)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>8</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">8</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>De Clerck, Hugo J</author><author>Cornelis, Marie A</author><author>Cevitanes, Lucia H</author><author>Heymann, Gavin C</author><author>Tulloch, Camilla JF</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Orthopedic traction of the maxilla with miniplates: a new perspective for treatment of midface deficiency</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery: official journal of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery: official journal of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons</full-

title></periodical><pages>2123</pages><volume>67</volume><number>10</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>},  
zygomatic wires and miniscrews { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Kuroda</Author><Year>2007</Year><RecNum>9</RecNum><DisplayText>(9,  
10)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>9</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">9</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kuroda, Shingo</author><author>Sugawara, Yasuyo</author><author>Deguchi, Toru</author><author>Kyung, Hee-Moon</author><author>Takano-Yamamoto, Teruko</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Clinical use of miniscrew implants as orthodontic anchorage: success rates and postoperative discomfort</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>9-15</pages><volume>131</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2007</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Cope</Author><Year>2005</Year><RecNum>10</RecNum><record><rec-number>10</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">10</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Conference Proceedings">10</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Cope, Jason B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Temporary anchorage devices in orthodontics: a paradigm shift</title><secondary-title>Seminars in Orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><pages>3-9</pages><volume>11</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2005</year></dates><publisher>Elsevier</publisher><isbn>1073-8746</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The use of miniscrews has increased in orthodontics due to their ease of insertion and removal, reasonable cost, biocompatibility and capability to withstand orthodontic forces { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Cousley</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>11</Rec

Num><DisplayText>(11, 12)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>11</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">11</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Cousley, RRJ</author><author>Sandler, PJ</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Advances in orthodontic anchorage with the use of mini-implant techniques</title><secondary-title>British dental journal</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>British dental journal</full-title></periodical><pages>E4-E4</pages><volume>218</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2015</year></dates><isbn>0007-0610</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Prabhu</Author><Year>2006</Year><RecNum>12</RecNum><record><rec-number>12</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">12</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Prabhu, Jagadish</author><author>Cousley, Richard RJ</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Current Products and Practice Bone anchorage devices in orthodontics</title><secondary-title>Journal of Orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of Orthodontics</full-title></periodical><pages>288-307</pages><volume>33</volume><number>4</number><dates><year>2006</year></dates><isbn>1465-3125</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="145 752 854 901" data-label="Text">
<p>Recent reviews investigated the effectiveness of all types of skeletal anchorage devices in anchorage provision in relation to conventional methods { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13, 14)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, R</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Recent reviews investigated the effectiveness of all types of skeletal anchorage devices in anchorage provision in relation to conventional methods</title><secondary-title></secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title></full-title></periodical><pages></pages><volume></volume><number></number><dates><year></year></dates><isbn></isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="761 937 854 956" data-label="Page-Footer">
<p>{PAGE }</p>
</div>



timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O&apos;Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-1858</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Antoszezwska-Smith</Author><Year>2017</Year><RecNum>14</RecNum><record><rec-number>14</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">14</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Antoszezwska-Smith, Joanna</author><author>Sarul, Michał</author><author>Łyczek, Jan</author><author>Konopka, Tomasz</author><author>Kawala, Beata</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of orthodontic miniscrew implants in anchorage reinforcement during en-masse retraction: A systematic review and meta-analysis</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>440-455</pages><volume>151</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2017</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.  
However, the findings of these reviews were not specific to the most commonly used skeletal anchorage device, the mechanically retained miniscrews. The aim of this review therefore was to systematically review the effectiveness of miniscrews in reinforcing anchorage during En-masse retraction of anterior teeth.

## Methods

### **Protocol registration, conflict of interest, and funding**

This review received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The study protocol was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) under protocol number (CRD 42017071439). The study was planned and reported accordingly with the preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis { ADDIN EN.CITE

```
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Moher</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>15</RecNum><DisplayText>(15)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>15</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">15</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Moher, David</author><author>Liberati, Alessandro</author><author>Tetzlaff, Jennifer</author><author>Altman, Douglas G</author><author>Prisma Group</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement</title><secondary-title>PLoS medicine</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>PLoS medicine</full-title></periodical><pages>e1000097</pages><volume>6</volume><number>7</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1549-
```

1676</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} and Cochrane Guidelines for Systematic Reviews { ADDIN EN.CITE

```
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Higgins</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>16</RecNum><DisplayText>(16)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>16</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">16</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Book">6</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Higgins, Julian PT</author><author>Green, Sally</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of
```

interventions</title></titles><volume>4</volume><dates><year>2011</year></dates><publisher>John Wiley & Sons</publisher><isbn>1119964792</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 189 294 207" data-label="Section-Header>
<h3><b>Eligibility criteria</b></h3></div>
<div data-bbox="145 216 851 312" data-label="Text>
<p><i>Participants</i>: Participants of any age or gender required En-masse retraction of anterior teeth, using fixed orthodontic appliances combined with extraction of maxillary premolars, treated in general practitioner/specialist offices or hospital settings were included.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 319 850 364" data-label="Text>
<p><i>Interventions</i>: Participants who required orthodontic anchorage reinforcement by mechanically-retained miniscrews of any length but a diameter of 2 mm or less.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 372 850 442" data-label="Text>
<p><i>Comparators</i>: Participants required anchorage reinforcement using headgear, Nance appliance, transpalatal arch appliances or any other conventional anchorage appliances.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 450 851 886" data-label="Text">
<p><i>Outcome measures</i>: The primary outcome was the anchorage loss defined as amount of mesial movement of the upper first permanent molar, measured in millimetres {<br>ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite ExcludeYear="1"><Author>Al-Sibaie</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>17</RecNum><DisplayText>(17)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>17</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">17</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Al-Sibaie, Salma</author><author>Hajeer, Mohammad Y</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Assessment of changes following en-masse retraction with mini-implants anchorage compared to two-step retraction with conventional anchorage in patients with class II division 1 malocclusion: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><pages>275-283</pages><volume>36</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2013</year></dates><isbn>1460-2210</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 893 851 912" data-label="Text">
<p>Secondary outcomes including the treatment and space closure duration, number of</p></div>
<div data-bbox="760 937 850 956" data-label="Page-Footer">
<p>{PAGE }

visits, quality of treatment, adverse effects and patient-reported outcomes were collected from the studies when available.

*Study design:* The included studies in this systematic review were human RCTs published in English. There was no limitation in terms of publication's year, publication status, or publication type. All in vitro studies, animal studies, case reports and case series and review articles were excluded. Language exclusion criteria was applied following the primary search to avoid bias in the search protocol.

### ***Information sources and search strategy***

A comprehensive search using a combination of controlled vocabulary and free text terms was designed to identify published, ongoing and unpublished studies (Appendix 1). The following electronic databases were searched up to March 16, 2018: MEDLINE via PubMed; Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials searched via the Cochrane Library and Scopus. Up to March 7, 2018, a manual search in the leading orthodontic journals and other bibliographic databases were also searched for ongoing and unpublished data (Appendix 1). Reference lists of the included articles and other relevant systematic reviews to this topic were screened for any additional relevant literature and to include an additional controlled vocabulary and free text terms, if present. We assumed that adverse effects are described in included studies only.

### ***Study selection***

Electronic database searching was performed independently and in duplicate by two reviewers (FA and MA). A manual search and additional bibliographic databases search were undertaken by one reviewer (DB). Duplicate removal was undertaken using EndNote reference manager software by one reviewer. First, relevant articles were identified through their titles and abstracts. In cases of unclear study design, corresponding authors were contacted for further information. Then, the full text of the potential articles was assessed for eligibility by two reviewers (FA and DB). In the case of disagreement between the reviewers, a consensus was made through open discussion with the third reviewer (MA). All excluded studies were listed with their exclusion justification (Appendix2).

### **Data extraction**

Two reviewers (FA and MA) extracted the data using a pre-piloted standardised data extraction form and the following information was collected: (1) authors, (2) year of publication, (3) study setting, (4) number and age of the participants, (5) miniscrew number and dimensions, (6) types of conventional anchorage appliance, (6) amount of anchorage loss in miniscrew and control group; and (7) any secondary outcomes. In the case of disagreement between the reviewers, a consensus was made through open discussion with the third reviewer (DB). Authors were contacted to clarify data if required for further information.

### **Assessment of risk bias in the included studies**

The included RCTs were assessed for risk of bias by two reviewers (FA and DB), using the Cochrane collaboration's tool, a domain-based tool { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Higgins</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>18</RecNum><DisplayText>(18)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>18</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">18</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal

Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Higgins, Julian P

T</author><author>Altman, Douglas G</author><author>Gøtzsche, Peter

C</author><author>Jüni, Peter</author><author>Moher,

David</author><author>Oxman, Andrew D</author><author>Savović,

Jelena</author><author>Schulz, Kenneth F</author><author>Weeks,

Laura</author><author>Sterne, Jonathan A

C</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>The Cochrane Collaboration's

tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials</title><secondary-

title>BMJ</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>BMJ</full-

title></periodical><volume>343</volume><dates><year>2011</year></dates><urls

><related-

urls><url><http://www.bmj.com/content/bmj/343/bmj.d5928.full.pdf></url></related

-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1136/bmj.d5928</electronic-resource-

num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Each included study was assessed regarding the risk of bias in (1) random sequence generation; (2) allocation concealment; (3) blinding

of participants and personnel; (4) blinding of outcome assessors; (5) incomplete outcome data; (6) selective reporting; (7) other sources of bias. In the case of disagreement between the reviewers, a consensus was made through open discussion with the third reviewer (MA).

The overall risk of bias of individual studies was categorised as being at low (if all domains were at low risk of bias), high (if one or more domains were at high risk of bias), or unclear risk of bias (if one or more domains were at unclear risk of bias).

### **Data synthesis**

For continuous data, the standard mean difference (SMD) with its 95% confidence intervals was chosen as a summary effect. Statistical aggregation of the results was carried out using a random-effects of the SMD. A random-effects model was applied to the pooled estimates as it takes into its consideration the possible existence of heterogeneity. The heterogeneity across the studies was assessed using the  $I^2$  and  $Chi^2$  statistics. A 25%, 50% and 75% statistic accounts for low, moderate and high levels of heterogeneity respectively.

In the eligible studies with more than two arms, comparisons were made between the miniscrews arm and each of the controlled arms individually according to Cochrane Guidelines for Systematic Reviews { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Higgins</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>16</RecNum><DisplayText>(16)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>16</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">16</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Book">6</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Higgins, Julian PT</author><author>Green, Sally</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions</title></titles><volume>4</volume><dates><year>2011</year></dates><publisher>John Wiley & Sons</publisher><isbn>1119964792</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div><div data-bbox="144 867 853 912" data-label="Text"><p>The statistical tests were performed using the Review Manager (RevMan) Version 5.3 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). The</p></div><div data-bbox="760 936 853 956" data-label="Page-Footer"><p>{PAGE }</p></div>

net confidence in the effect estimates and any subsequent clinical recommendations was enhanced by rating the overall quality of the resultant evidence using the GRADE approach.

### **Additional analysis**

The protocol of this review included a visual inspection of a generated contour-enhanced funnel plot if 10 or more studies met the inclusion criteria. Besides, Egger's

linear regression tests { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Egger</Author><Year>1997</Year><RecNum>19</RecNum><DisplayText>(19)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>19</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">19</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Egger, Matthias</author><author>Smith, George Davey</author><author>Schneider, Martin</author><author>Minder, Christoph</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test</title><secondary-title>Bmj</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>BMJ</full-title></periodical><pages>629-634</pages><volume>315</volume><number>7109</number><dates><year>1997</year></dates><isbn>0959-8138</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

were pre-planned to examine publication bias. To investigate the robustness of this review, further sensitivity tests were performed examining the impact of removing

each study on the overall outcome { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Higgins</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>16</RecNum><DisplayText>(16)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>16</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">16</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Book">6</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Higgins, Julian PT</author><author>Green, Sally</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of

interventions</title></titles><volume>4</volume><dates><year>2011</year></dates><publisher>John Wiley & Sons</publisher><isbn>1119964792</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="144 192 213 208" data-label="Section-Header>
<h2>Results</h2>
</div>
<div data-bbox="144 220 324 238" data-label="Section-Header>
<h3>Results of the search</h3>
</div>
<div data-bbox="144 246 853 419" data-label="Text>
<p>The initial search strategy identified 751 records (Figure 1). As a result of the initial screening and duplicate removal, 717 records were excluded (5 duplicate studies and the rest were not eligible studies). The full texts of the remaining 34 articles were assessed which led to the exclusion of 27 studies (Appendix 2). The final sample included seven RCTs; { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, all of them were single centre parallel two-arm trials except the RCT by Sandler and colleagues { ADDIN EN.CITE</p></div>
<div data-bbox="144 428 853 862" data-label="Text>
<p><EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}</p></div>
<div data-bbox="144 870 853 888" data-label="Text>
<p>which was a multicentre three-arms parallel trial. Three trials were performed in India</p></div>
<div data-bbox="761 937 853 956" data-label="Page-Footer>
<p>{PAGE }</p>
</div>



{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, two in China { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum  
><DisplayText>(21, 22)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,  
YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li,  
Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in  
cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw  
implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental  
protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-  
title></periodical><pages>687-  
695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</yea  
r></dates><isbn>1365-  
2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2008  
</Year><RecNum>22</RecNum><record><rec-number>22</rec-number><foreign-  
keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">22</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma,  
Junqing</author><author>Wang, Lin</author><author>Zhang,  
Weibing</author><author>Chen, Wenjing</author><author>Zhao,  
Chunyang</author><author>Smales, Roger  
J</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative evaluation of micro-  
implant and headgear anchorage used with a pre-adjusted appliance  
system</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-  
title></periodical><volume>30</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2008  
</year></dates><isbn>0141-  
5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, one in Syria { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Al-

Sibaie</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>17</RecNum><DisplayText>(17)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>17</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">17</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Al-Sibaie, Salma</author><author>Hajeer, Mohammad Y</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Assessment of changes following en-masse retraction with mini-implants anchorage compared to two-step retraction with conventional anchorage in patients with class II division 1 malocclusion: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><pages>275-283</pages><volume>36</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2013</year></dates><isbn>1460-2210</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, and one in the UK { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year>

r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. All of the included RCTs were performed in university settings.

### **Characteristics of the interventions**

Four studies compared miniscrews to transpalatal arch { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}

and two compared miniscrews to headgear (HG) { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>22</RecNum

><DisplayText>(22, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>22</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">22</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma,

Junqing</author><author>Wang, Lin</author><author>Zhang, Weibing</author><author>Chen,

Wenjing</author><author>Zhao, Chunyang</author><author>Smales, Roger J</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative evaluation of micro-

implant and headgear anchorage used with a pre-adjusted appliance system</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><volume>30</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2008

</year></dates><isbn>0141-5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2

014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-

id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,

Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez,

Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm

multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of

Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-  
20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The  
last study compared miniscrews with other methods of conventional anchorage  
provision including HG, transpalatal arch , differential moments and the banding of a  
second molar { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</R  
ecNum><DisplayText>(25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>25</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay,  
Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj,  
K</author><author>Patil,  
Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-  
implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion  
patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29.  
e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The  
three-arm trial { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</Rec  
Num><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,

Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} also

included an additional comparison between miniscrews and Nance appliance (Table 1). The overall number of the participants analysed in the 7 included RCTs were 271 who had been treated using 310 miniscrews and 149 conventional anchorage appliances, however, the outcomes 241 participants treated using 250 miniscrews and 134 conventional anchorage appliances were meta-analysed.

#### **Characteristics of the participants**

Two RCTs recruited adolescent participants { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} while the rest recruited adults and young adults. Female participants were dominant in four studies { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} and one study recruited more males than females { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,

Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of

Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-  
20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Two  
studies included only female participants { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNu  
m><DisplayText>(20, 25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim  
Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga  
B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between  
conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using  
orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-  
title></periodical><pages>128-  
136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</yea  
r></dates><isbn>1056-  
6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year  
>2008</Year><RecNum>25</RecNum><record><rec-number>25</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay,  
Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj,  
K</author><author>Patil,  
Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-  
implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion  
patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-



timestamp="1521310851">17</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Al-Sibaie, Salma</author><author>Hajeer, Mohammad Y</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Assessment of changes following en-masse retraction with mini-implants anchorage compared to two-step retraction with conventional anchorage in patients with class II division 1 malocclusion: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><pages>275-283</pages><volume>36</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2013</year></dates><isbn>1460-2210</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

measured maxillary molar movement from the start of the treatment until a Class I canine relationship was achieved. Two trials { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20, 25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</RecNum><record><rec-number>25</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal



Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay,  
Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj,  
K</author><author>Patil,  
Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-  
implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion  
patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29.  
e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

measured the degree of mesial movement of the molar during space closure phase,  
before the commencement of space closure up to the end of space closure phase. The  
primary outcome was measured from the beginning of the treatment to the end of  
space closure in one study { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sharma</Author><Year>2012</Year><RecNum>24</Rec  
Num><DisplayText>(24)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>24</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">24</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sharma,  
Mohit</author><author>Sharma, Vineet</author><author>Khanna,  
Bharat</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Mini-screw implant or  
transpalatal arch-mediated anchorage reinforcement during canine retraction: a  
randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>Journal of orthodontics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of Orthodontics</full-  
title></periodical><pages>102-  
110</pages><volume>39</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2012</yea  
r></dates><isbn>1465-3125</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. In  
the last trial { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>22</RecNum  
><DisplayText>(22)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>22</rec-number><foreign-

keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">22</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma, Junqing</author><author>Wang, Lin</author><author>Zhang, Weibing</author><author>Chen, Wenjing</author><author>Zhao, Chunyang</author><author>Smales, Roger J</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative evaluation of micro-implant and headgear anchorage used with a pre-adjusted appliance system</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><volume>30</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0141-

5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, the amount of mesial molar movement of the upper first permanent molar was not reported. In five trials { ADDIN

EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, anchorage loss as primary outcome was measured on cephalometric tracings and the average of the two sides was considered. However, in one trial in { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,

Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-

20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, left and right mesial molar movements were measured individually, therefore, we calculated the average of both sides for ease of meta-analysis.

*Secondary outcomes*

Two studies { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm

multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

reported the overall duration of treatment. Duration of the space closure was reported in two trials, in days { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim

Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between

conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-

136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

months { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</R

ecNum><DisplayText>(25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>25</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay,

Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj, K</author><author>Patil,

Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-

implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29. e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Only one RCT { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} reported on the number of visits, PARS score reduction and patient perception. Two studies { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal

Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,  
YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li,  
Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in  
cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw  
implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental  
protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-  
title></periodical><pages>687-  
695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</yea  
r></dates><isbn>1365-  
2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2  
014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><record><rec-number>23</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,  
Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight,  
Paul</author><author>O'Brien,  
Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods  
of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm  
multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-  
20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

provided brief reports about the adverse effect of interventions.

### **Risk of bias**

In summary, out of the seven studies included in this review, four studies were assessed as having an overall high risk of bias { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, while three studies were assessed as having an overall low risk of bias { ADDIN

EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. The assessment of the risk of bias in the RCTs is presented and summarised in figure 2.

The random sequence generation was adequate in all studies except for one study { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div><div data-bbox="145 554 853 572" data-label="Text"><p>Allocation concealment was graded as unclear in two studies { ADDIN EN.CITE</p></div><div data-bbox="145 580 853 910" data-label="Text"><p><EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21, 22)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-</p></div><div data-bbox="761 937 853 956" data-label="Page-Footer"><p>{PAGE }</p></div>

695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>22</RecNum><record><rec-number>22</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">22</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma, Junqing</author><author>Wang, Lin</author><author>Zhang, Weibing</author><author>Chen, Wenjing</author><author>Zhao, Chunyang</author><author>Smales, Roger J</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative evaluation of micro-implant and headgear anchorage used with a pre-adjusted appliance system</title><secondary-title>European journal of orthodontics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></periodical><volume>30</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0141-5387</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

and a high risk of bias in one study { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. In four studies { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, the outcome assessors were



blinded. The remaining three studies were graded as having either a high risk of bias {

ADDIN

EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum>

<DisplayText>(20, 21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number>

<foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-

id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal

Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim

Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga

B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between

conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using

orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-

title></periodical><pages>128-

136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year>

</dates><isbn>1056-

6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009

</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><record><rec-number>21</rec-number>

<foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal

Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,

YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li,

Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in

cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw

implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental

protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-

title></periodical><pages>687-

695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year>

</dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} or an

unclear risk of bias { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</R

ecNum><DisplayText>(25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>25</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay, Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj, K</author><author>Patil, Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29.e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The

risk of bias in the completion of the outcome data reporting domain (Attrition bias) was low in all included studies except one trial { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</R ecNum><DisplayText>(25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>25</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay, Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj, K</author><author>Patil, Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29.e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</yea

r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 108 851 205" data-label="Text"><p>Selective reporting bias was assessed as being of low risk in three studies { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} while the remaining studies were graded as having a high risk of selective reporting bias { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. In all the included studies no other potential sources of bias were identified.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 216 272 233" data-label="Section-Header"><h3><b>Meta-analysis</b></h3></div>
<div data-bbox="145 241 641 259" data-label="Section-Header"><h4><i>Mesial Movement of the upper first molars (anchorage loss)</i></h4></div>
<div data-bbox="145 268 851 625" data-label="Text"><p>Six RCTs { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} appropriately reported the primary outcome, but at variable time point, and they were included in the meta-analysis analysis (Figure 3). Data from 241 participants were included in a random effects meta-analysis to assess the anchorage effectiveness of 250 miniscrews when compared with 134 conventional anchorage devices. The conventional methods included headgear, transpalatal arch, Nance appliances, banding of second molar and differential anchorage methods. The overall standard mean difference (SMD) of the anchorage loss between the main two groups was -2.05 mm in favour of miniscrews ((95% CI (-3.01) to (-1.09), P<0.001, I<sup>2</sup>= 89%, 6 RCTs)) which was higher when subgroup analysis comparing the miniscrews and TPA groups was undertaken ((SDM=(-3.13), 95% CI (-4.72) to (-1.55), P<0.001, I<sup>2</sup> 88%, 4 RCTs)). Sensitivity analysis indicated that, after exclusion of the studies with a high risk of bias { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, the SMD was preserved at -1.82 mm in favour of miniscrews ((95% CI (-2.55) to (-1.09) P<0.001, I<sup>2</sup>= 81%, 3 RCTs)) (Figure 4).</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 633 403 651" data-label="Section-Header"><h4><i>Overall duration of Treatment</i></h4></div>
<div data-bbox="145 659 851 702" data-label="Text"><p>The overall duration of the treatment was reported in two RCTs; one trial { ADDIN EN.CITE</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 711 851 912" data-label="Text"><p><EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw</p></div>
<div data-bbox="761 937 851 956" data-label="Page-Footer"><p>{PAGE }</p></div>

implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-

695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} had

high risk of bias and it showed that there is statistically non-significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference in terms of total treatment duration between miniscrews ( $25.65 \pm 5.06$  months) and TPA device ( $26.88 \pm 6.54$  months). Similarly, the second trial { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,

Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm

multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-

20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

which has low risk of bias concluded that difference in the overall treatment duration was almost equal ( $P > 0.05$ ) in those treated using miniscrews (26.83 months, 95% CI 8.5-45.16), Nance appliance (27.43 months, 95% CI 15.03-39.83) or Headgear appliance (28.01 months, 95% CI 17.46-38.51). Results from 105 participants (total of

78 miniscrews and 66 conventional anchorage appliances) were pooled in a fixed-

effect meta-analysis. The difference in the means of the treatment duration was -0.14 year (95% CI (-0.49) to 0.21, P= 0.95, I<sup>2</sup>= 0%) in favour of miniscrews (Figure 5). It was not possible to undertake a subgroup analysis as there was only two RCTs which measured this outcome.

#### *Duration of space closure phase*

The duration of space closure phase was reported in two RCTs { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20, 25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</RecNum><record><rec-number>25</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay, Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj, K</author><author>Patil, Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of

Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29.  
e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, both  
with high risk of bias, hence, the data was assessed narratively. The first trial { ADDIN  
EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNu  
m><DisplayText>(20)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim  
Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga  
B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between  
conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using  
orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-  
title></periodical><pages>128-  
136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</yea  
r></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

calculated the number of days required to close extraction spaces using miniscrews  
(182.43, SD 9.64 days) and TPA (181, SD 32.07 days) while the second trail { ADDIN  
EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</R  
ecNum><DisplayText>(25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>25</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay,  
Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj,  
K</author><author>Patil,

Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29. e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} used month as a unit of time, 8.61 (SD 2.2) month and 9.94 (SD 2.44) month in miniscrews and TPA groups respectively. Both trials found that there is no statistically significant (P >0.05) difference in terms of time required to close extraction spaces.

*Number of visits*

Only one study { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} reported on the number of visits required to complete the treatment using different anchorage systems. Participants from the miniscrews arm completed their treatment

within 18.38 (SD 5.95) visits, this was shorter than those from the headgear and Nance appliance arms, 19.24 (SD 6.42) and 21.77 (SD 4.41) visits respectively.

### *Quality of the treatment*

The quality of the treatment was assessed in one trial { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} using Peer Assessment Rating index (PAR index). Participants treated using miniscrews as an anchorage appliance had the highest PAR score (26.59, SD 13.82), followed by those treated by Nance appliance (25.69, SD 11.47) and headgear (21.26, SD 10.61). In comparison with headgear group, there was -3.97 and -1.24 PAR points in favour of miniscrews and Nance appliance groups respectively. The difference in PAR scoring between headgear and miniscrews groups was significant (P<0.05).

### *Patient perception and adverse effects*

Only one study { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-



id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,  
Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight,  
Paul</author><author>O'Brien,  
Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods  
of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm  
multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-  
20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>  
reported on pain perception using miniscrews, Nance and headgear appliances. Using  
6-point Likert scale, Sandler and colleagues { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</Rec  
Num><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,  
Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight,  
Paul</author><author>O'Brien,  
Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods  
of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm  
multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-  
20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</yea

r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

found that participants had very mild level of discomfortability during placement and on removal of both miniscrews and Nance appliances. The authors also found that the participants' free text comments were almost always positive toward miniscrews, unlike Nance and headgear. Nine out of ten participants (90%) recommended miniscrews to their peers. For those who had been treated using headgear and Nance appliance, the figures were approximately 77% and 57% respectively. Comfort, compliance and convenience with the headgear appliance was poor among adolescent patients.

Two trials reported briefly on the adverse effect { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum>><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-

2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum>><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,

Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Both

reported no serious harms secondary to interventions. However, in one trial { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,

YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-

695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, 8

miniscrews failed throughout the treatment which were replaced two months later without complications. In the second trial { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, only one miniscrews fractured during its insertion but it was left it in situ without complications, the authors did not report whether replacement was undertaken immediately or at later stage. Table 2 represent the summary of findings table for the main outcomes of this systematic review.

## Discussion

Overall, the findings from this review suggest that there is moderate quality evidence that reinforcement of anchorage using mechanically retained miniscrews are more clinically efficient than any conventional anchorage devices.

A meta-analysis of the pooled data found a significant difference between miniscrews on one hand and conventional anchorage devices/ mechanics on the other hand, 2.05 mm in favour of miniscrews. Excluding studies with low risk of bias from the data synthesis still showed a similar finding (1.82mm). Jambi and colleagues { ADDIN EN.CITE

```
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O&apos;Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-1858</isbn></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>
```

} in their review found surgical anchorage devices result in less anchorage loss (1.68 mm, 95% CI 2.27-1.09) than conventional approaches. Although they included in their review osseointegrated implants, their estimate did not differ significantly from our review estimate. Moreover, in Jambi et al. study { ADDIN EN.CITE

```
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"
```

timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-

1858</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, the pooled data from the high-quality RCTs showed a mean difference of 2.17 mm (95% CI, 2.58-1.77) in favour of skeletal anchorage which is slightly higher than our findings. A similar systematic review was undertaken by Papadopoulos and co-workers { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Papadopoulos</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>26 </RecNum><DisplayText>(26)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>26</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">26</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Papadopoulos, MA</author><author>Papageorgiou, SN</author><author>Zogakis, IP</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Clinical effectiveness of orthodontic miniscrew implants: a meta-analysis</title><secondary-title>Journal of dental research</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of dental research</full-title></periodical><pages>969-

976</pages><volume>90</volume><number>8</number><dates><year>2011</year></dates><isbn>0022-0345</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, included five cohort studies and three RCTs, they concluded that miniscrews were more effective than conventional anchorage methods (2.4 mm, 95% CI 1.8-2.9 in favour of miniscrews). However, Papadopoulos and colleagues included studies with high risk of bias which could affect robustness of their findings. Another systematic review that investigated anchorage effectiveness of orthodontic implants (not

mechanically miniscrews) and headgear was undertaken by Li and colleagues { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Li</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>27</RecNum>  
<DisplayText>(27)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>27</rec-number><foreign-  
keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">27</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Li, F</author><author>Hu,  
HK</author><author>Chen, JW</author><author>Liu, ZP</author><author>Li,  
GF</author><author>He, SS</author><author>Zou, SJ</author><author>Ye,  
QS</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of anchorage  
capacity between implant and headgear during anterior segment retraction: a  
systematic review</title><secondary-title>The Angle Orthodontist</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Angle orthodontist</full-  
title></periodical><pages>915-  
922</pages><volume>81</volume><number>5</number><dates><year>2011</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0003-3219</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The

result of their search included four RCTs, one prospective cohort study and three retrospective studies; however, they pooled the data from two studies only. The estimated mean difference was 1.34 mm (95% CI 2.02-0.67) in favour of implants which is slightly lower than that in our findings.

In our review, some of the secondary outcomes were reported in two studies with variable quality { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum  
><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"  
timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,  
YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li,  
Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in  
cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw  
implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental

protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The adverse effect of the different anchorage appliances was briefly reported in these two trials, both found that there was no serious adverse effect with any of the reviewed anchorage appliances apart from few failed/ fractured miniscrews which were replaced or left in situ without complications { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu,



YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Failure rate of the miniscrews was variable among the included studies but overall it was low and comparable to the published data { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Alharbi</Author><Year>2018</Year><RecNum>31</RecNum><DisplayText>(31)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>31</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521323554">31</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Alharbi, F.</author><author>Almuzian, M.</author><author>Bearn, D.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Orthodontics, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al Kharj, Saudi Arabia.&#xD;Discipline of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.&#xD;Department of Orthodontics, University of Dundee, Scotland, UK.</auth-address><titles><title>Miniscrews failure rate in orthodontics: systematic review and meta-analysis</title><secondary-title>Eur J Orthod</secondary-title><alt-title>European journal of orthodontics</alt-title></titles><alt-periodical><full-title>European journal of orthodontics</full-title></alt-periodical><edition>2018/01/10</edition><dates><year>2018</year><pub-dates><date>Jan 5</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0141-5387</isbn><accession-num>29315365</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1093/ejo/cjx093</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>}. However, in Liu and colleagues trial { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>},

eight miniscrews were failed and the operator waited for 2 months before replacing them to allow bone healing at the insertion site; this could increase both overall treatment duration, space closure phase durations and overall cost of treatment. Nevertheless, the data extracted from these two studies { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum>><DisplayText>(21, 23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum>><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

revealed that treatment duration was shorter when miniscrews as anchorage device were used, however, this was not statistically significant. Likewise, duration of space closure phase was almost identical among those treated with miniscrews or other means of anchorage provision as reported by two low quality trials { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Basha</Author><Year>2010</Year><RecNum>20</RecNum><DisplayText>(20, 25)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>20</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">20</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Basha, Asim Ghouse</author><author>Shantaraj, Ravi</author><author>Mogegowda, Shivalinga B</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparative study between conventional en-masse retraction (sliding mechanics) and en-masse retraction using orthodontic micro implant</title><secondary-title>Implant dentistry</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Implant dentistry</full-title></periodical><pages>128-

136</pages><volume>19</volume><number>2</number><dates><year>2010</year></dates><isbn>1056-6163</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Upadhyay</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>25</RecNum><record><rec-number>25</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">25</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Upadhyay, Madhur</author><author>Yadav, Sumit</author><author>Nagaraj, K</author><author>Patil, Sameer</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Treatment effects of mini-

implants for en-masse retraction of anterior teeth in bialveolar dental protrusion

patients: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>18-29. e1</pages><volume>134</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. It is

worth mentioning that the loss of anchorage in the conventional anchorage samples resulted in a smaller amount of extraction space left for incisor retraction, hence, the time required for space closure could be shortened. If the above mentioned point and the extra waiting time required to replace failed miniscrews were taken in consideration, theoretically, miniscrews implication on treatment duration would be accentuated. Jambi and co-workers { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O&apos;Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-1858</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} found similar outcome and they indicated that orthodontic treatment reinforced with surgical anchorage was on average shorter by 0.15 year (0.37 years shorter to 0.07 years longer) compared to the group treated with conventional anchorage, however, it is worth noticing that the pooled the data in that review were collected from three studies, two of them used palatal implants { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Borsos</Author><Year>2012</Year><RecNum>28</RecNum><DisplayText>(28, 29)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>28</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310852">28</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Borsos, Gabriella</author><author>Vokó, Zoltan</author><author>Gredes, Tomasz</author><author>Kunert-Keil, Christiane</author><author>Vegh, Andras</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Tooth movement using palatal implant supported anchorage compared to conventional dental anchorage</title><secondary-title>Annals of Anatomy-Anatomischer Anzeiger</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Annals of Anatomy-Anatomischer Anzeiger</full-title></periodical><pages>556-560</pages><volume>194</volume><number>6</number><dates><year>2012</year></dates><isbn>0940-9602</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>29</RecNum><record><rec-number>29</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310852">29</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Doyle, Peter</author><author>Majumder, Arun</author><author>O'Dwyer, Jonathan</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Tinsley, David</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Palatal implants are a good alternative to headgear: a randomized trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>51-57</pages><volume>133</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} and

only one study used miniscrews { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Liu</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>21</RecNum><DisplayText>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>21</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">21</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Liu, YH</author><author>Ding, WH</author><author>Liu, J</author><author>Li, Q</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Comparison of the differences in cephalometric parameters after active orthodontic treatment applying mini-screw implants or transpalatal arches in adult patients with bialveolar dental protrusion</title><secondary-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Journal of oral rehabilitation</full-title></periodical><pages>687-695</pages><volume>36</volume><number>9</number><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>1365-2842</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. In our review, participants treated using miniscrews attended 2-3 visits fewer than those treated using other anchorage approaches { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien, Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-

20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. This is contradicting with the findings of the Cochrane review { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O&apos;Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-1858</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} in which the outcomes of one study { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>29</RecNum><DisplayText>(29)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>29</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202" timestamp="1521310852">29</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Doyle, Peter</author><author>Majumder, Arun</author><author>O'Dwyer, Jonathan</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Tinsley, David</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Palatal implants are a good alternative to headgear: a randomized trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-



title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>51-57</pages><volume>133</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

indicated that treatment takes 7 visits more to be completed by surgical anchorage, although visits required for surgical healing of mid-palatal implants (osseointegration) were not counted.

In our review, one study { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</RecNum><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,

Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari, Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>O'Brien,

Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-

title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

reported on patients' perception and found that patients had positive perception about miniscrews unlike headgear and Nance appliance. This is unlike the outcomes of Jambi et al. review { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Jambi</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>13</RecNum><DisplayText>(13)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>13</rec-

number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">13</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jambi, Safa</author><author>Walsh, Tanya</author><author>Sandler, Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Skeggs, Richard M</author><author>O&apos;Brien, Kevin D</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Reinforcement of anchorage during orthodontic brace treatment with implants or other surgical methods</title><secondary-title>The Cochrane Library</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>The Cochrane Library</full-title></periodical><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>1465-

1858</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}, in which two trials { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Feldmann</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>30</RecNum><DisplayText>(29, 30)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>30</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310852">30</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Feldmann, Ingalill</author><author>Bondemark, Lars</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Anchorage capacity of osseointegrated and conventional anchorage systems: a randomized controlled trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>339. e19-339.

e28</pages><volume>133</volume><number>3</number><dates><year>2008</year></dates><isbn>0889-

5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>29</RecNum><record><rec-number>29</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310852">29</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal

Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Benson, Philip E</author><author>Doyle,  
Peter</author><author>Majumder, Arun</author><author>O'Dwyer,  
Jonathan</author><author>Speight, Paul</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,  
Badri</author><author>Tinsley,  
David</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Palatal implants are a good  
alternative to headgear: a randomized trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal  
of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>51-  
57</pages><volume>133</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2008</yea  
r></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

reported that participants experienced more discomfort with bone anchorage  
devices, however, both studies used surgical implants which makes the comparison  
with our review not possible. Furthermore, there is limited evidence that the quality  
of the occlusal outcomes is better when miniscrews were used as an anchorage device  
in comparison to other anchorage appliances { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Sandler</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>23</Rec  
Num><DisplayText>(23)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>23</rec-  
number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-  
id="eereerpwwppee0eva0pxxd2z00x05vzsf202"

timestamp="1521310851">23</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal  
Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Sandler,  
Jonathan</author><author>Murray, Alison</author><author>Thiruvengkatachari,  
Badri</author><author>Gutierrez, Rodrigo</author><author>Speight,  
Paul</author><author>O'Brien,  
Kevin</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Effectiveness of 3 methods  
of anchorage reinforcement for maximum anchorage in adolescents: A 3-arm  
multicenter randomized clinical trial</title><secondary-title>American Journal of  
Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</secondary-  
title></titles><periodical><full-title>American Journal of Orthodontics and  
Dentofacial Orthopedics</full-title></periodical><pages>10-

20</pages><volume>146</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn>0889-5406</isbn><urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="145 163 482 181" data-label="Section-Header>
<h3>Strengths and limitations of this review</h3>
</div>
<div data-bbox="145 189 851 364" data-label="Text>
<p>The authors attempted to minimise bias being introduced into this systematic review by undertaking a comprehensive search of multiple databases and literature sources aiming to identify every single research that matched the inclusion criterion. Two reviewers independently evaluated and retrieved database results and articles in duplicate, while a third reviewer mediated any unresolved disagreement. Furthermore, studies eligible for quantitative synthesis were conducted in three different regions of the world; hence, generalizability of the obtained results is good.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="145 371 851 624" data-label="Text>
<p>On the other hand, the body of evidence was generally of low to moderate quality, mainly due to the unclear domains presented in many included trials. Furthermore, findings of this review should be interpreted with some caution due to the substantial heterogeneity across the studies. This high level of heterogeneity could be a result of discrepancies in clinical and statistical methodology, variation in the assessment tools, age/ gender variations and small sample size among the included studies. The mean age of participants in the included studies ranged from 14.22 years to 22.4 years and they have variable failure rate of miniscrews ranging from 1 to 8 miniscrews. This might have had an impact of the anchorage effectiveness provided by miniscrews as well as on the total cost of the treatment.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="145 632 851 703" data-label="Text>
<p>Within the included trials, measurement of the anchorage losses was performed at four different time points, this could affect the pooled effects, hence the data should be interpreted with caution.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="145 711 851 886" data-label="Text>
<p>The limited data on the secondary outcomes do not allow conclusive findings on the miniscrews or conventional anchorage regarding the total treatment duration, serious adverse effect, cost-effectiveness or patients-reported outcomes. None of the included trials reported on the cost-effectiveness of the different anchorage devices, although our research indicated an ongoing trial in Sweden (registration number NCT02644811). Statistical analysis of the publication bias was not performed in this review as only a few studies were included.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox="760 937 850 956" data-label="Page-Footer>
<p>{PAGE }</p>
</div>

### **Recommendations for clinical practice**

Overall, data analysis of this review shows that there is moderate anchorage favouring miniscrews in providing anchorage over conventional methods. There is also a limited evidence suggesting that treatment with miniscrews provides better occlusal outcomes and is better tolerated by patients than headgear or Nance appliances. Limited evidence suggesting that there is no significant difference in terms of overall treatment duration, space closure duration, adverse side effect, space closure duration and number of orthodontic visit. **None of the included trials reported on the cost-effectiveness of the different anchorage devices.**

### **Implications for research**

**There is a need for further long-term and high quality RCT to report on number of the required orthodontic appointments, failure arte of different anchorage devices, cost efficiency, discomfort and related quality of life issues.**

### **Conclusion**

There is a moderate quality evidence suggesting that miniscrews are statistically more effective than conventional anchorage devices, preserving 2.206mm of space, **this effect might be considered clinically significant.** Limited evidence suggesting that there is no significant difference in terms of overall treatment duration, space closure duration, adverse side effect, space closure duration and number of orthodontic visit. Additionally, there is limited evidence suggesting that the occlusal outcomes and patient perception secondary to anchorage reinforcement using miniscrews as anchorage appliance are better than any other anchorage appliances. **However, due to the high level of statistical and clinical heterogeneity, this finding should be interpreted with caution.** High quality RCTs with large sample size would give more conclusive evidence.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Dr Hisham Mohammed from Glasgow Dental Academy for his help in undertaking this review.

**Supplementary material:** Supplementary material is available online.

**Funding:** None

**Conflict of interest:** The authors did not receive any funding or have financial interest for undertaking this review.

## References

{ ADDIN EN.REFLIST }

**List of figures**

Figure 1 Flow chart of the selection of studies

Figure 2 Risk of bias summary

Figure 3 Forest plot of anchorage loss (all studies)

Figure 4 Forest plot

Figure 5 Forest plot of treatment duration

**List of table**

Table 1 Characteristics of studies included in the systematic review

Table 2 Summary of findings table for the main outcomes of this systematic review

**Appendix**

Appendix 1 Search methods

Appendix 2 Excluded studies