

University of Dundee

Third molar classification using Gleiser and Hunt system modified by Khöler in Russian adolescents – Age threshold of 14 and 16

Franco, Raquel Porto Alegre Valente; Franco, Ademir; Turkina, Anna; Arakelyan, Marianna; Arzukanyan, Alina; Velenko, Pavel

Published in:
Forensic Imaging

DOI:
[10.1016/j.fri.2021.200443](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fri.2021.200443)

Publication date:
2021

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

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

Citation for published version (APA):

Franco, R. P. A. V., Franco, A., Turkina, A., Arakelyan, M., Arzukanyan, A., Velenko, P., Bortolami, P. B., Makeeva, I., & Silva, R. H. A. D. (2021). Third molar classification using Gleiser and Hunt system modified by Khöler in Russian adolescents – Age threshold of 14 and 16. *Forensic Imaging*, 25, Article 200443. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fri.2021.200443>

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.

1 **Third molar classification using the Gleiser and Hunt system modified by Köhler**
2 **in Russian adolescents – age threshold of 14 and 16**

3 **Abstract**

4 **Objective:** this study tested the applicability of Gleiser and Hunt dental staging system
5 modified by Kohler (GHK) on third molar classification considering the age thresholds
6 of legal interest of 14 and 16 years.

7 **Design:** 918 panoramic radiographs of Russian females and males aged between 8 and
8 23 years were collected. 3M development was classified based on the GHK technique.
9 Ordinal logistic regression was used to test the performance of the technique to separate
10 the Russian individuals as being under or over the age of 14 and 16. Receiver Operating
11 Characteristic (ROC) curves with their respective area under the curve (AUC) were used
12 to quantify the accuracy of the proposed research set up.

13 **Results:** AUC was 0.834 (\pm 0.021) and 0.858 (\pm 0.016) for separating individuals under
14 of over 14 and 16 respectively (females and males combined).

15 **Conclusion:** The staging technique (GHK) had potential applicability to separate Russian
16 adolescents as younger or older than 14 or 16 years. However, future study set ups with
17 narrower age intervals must be designed to challenge the regression approach with a more
18 difficult separation. Whenever applicable, techniques based on other developing
19 permanent teeth (possibly for the age of 14) must be used.

20 **Keywords:** *Forensic Dentistry; Forensic Odontology; Growth and development; Dental*
21 *age estimation; Russia.*

1 **1. Introduction**

2 In Russia, the age of 16 represents the legal threshold for consent with sexual
3 intercourse. The penalties for illegal sexual activity may increase if the victim is younger
4 than 14 [1]. Forensic expertises related to these age limits are challenging because the
5 techniques designed for children – based on crown-root development of the permanent
6 teeth (except third molars) – increase their error over the time, especially due to the scarce
7 teeth with incomplete apex formation [2-4]. By the age of 16, third molars are the only
8 developing teeth [5]. In practice, these teeth may contribute not only to the process of age
9 estimation regarding the ages of legal consent [6], but also throughout the early adulthood
10 as a contribution to the assessment of legal majority [7, 8].

11 In 1994, Köhler et al. [9] modified a staging system proposed by Gleiser & Hunt
12 [10]. The modified technique (GHK) predicted third molar development within stages of
13 crown, root and apex formation, namely: $\frac{1}{2}$ crown formation (stage 1), $\frac{3}{4}$ crown formation
14 (stage 2), complete crown formation (stage 3), initial root formation (stage 4), $\frac{1}{4}$ root
15 formation (stage 5), $\frac{1}{2}$ root formation (stage 6), $\frac{3}{4}$ root formation (stage 7), complete root
16 formation (stage 8), $\frac{1}{2}$ apex formation (stage 9) and complete apex formation (stage 10).
17 The technique was previously used in several populations worldwide, such as the Belgian
18 one [11], but was never applied in Russian adolescents – scientific gap addressed in the
19 present study.

20 By knowing the applicability of the technique among Russians, this study might
21 support forensic dental practices not only in the original country (with casuistics related
22 to age of consent) but also abroad when it comes to age estimation of undocumented
23 Russians in clandestine migration. Based on the hypothesis that age is correlated with
24 third molar development (and that it can be measured with GHK), this study aims to test

1 the applicability of the GHK to separate Russian individuals under or over the ages of 14
2 and 16 years.

3 **2. Materials and Methods**

4 Ethical approval was obtained for an observational cross-sectional study
5 (protocol: 5-11, SU). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
6 Epidemiology) guidelines were followed [12].

7

8 ***2.1 Sample and variables***

9 The sample consisted of panoramic radiographs of 551 females (60%) and 367
10 males (40%). The radiographs were acquired for therapeutic purposes and were
11 retrospectively collected. The inclusion criteria were Russian individuals aged between 8
12 and 23 years, with available information about date of birth, date of radiographic
13 acquisition and sex. Systemic diseases, visible bone lesions associated with any of the
14 third molars, history of third molar extraction, therapeutic intervention in the third molars
15 and low-quality images were the exclusion criteria. The eligibility criteria led to 918
16 images (Table 1). The images were imported to a computer (Vaio PCG- 71911X, Sony
17 Corp.TM, Minato, Tokyo, Japan). Adobe Photoshop CS6 (Adobe Inc.TM, San Jose, CA,
18 USA) was used for image visualization. A single examiner classified each third molar
19 following GHK technique. GHK stages were tested for correlation with the chronological
20 age and sex. The ages related to sexual consent (14 and 16 years) were used as reference
21 to separate individuals under or over 14 and 16. In this context, age groups <14/16 years
22 and $\geq 14/16$ years were established.

23

24 ***2.2 Examiner agreement***

1 The main examiner revisited 100 images after a month to enable intra-examiner
2 agreement testing. A second examiner was added to enable the inter-examiner agreement
3 – in this process, the same 100 panoramic radiographs were analyzed by the second
4 examiner and compared with the main examiner. The analyses were supervised by a third
5 examiner. Agreement tests were calculated with Weighted Kappa for the upper right
6 (#18), upper left (#28), lower left (#38) and lower right (#48) third molar (Dental coding
7 following the International Dental Federation).

8

9 ***2.3 Statistical Analysis***

10 Descriptive statistics were quantified. Bivariate and multivariate inferential
11 analyses were quantified next. Shapiro-Wilk tested the variables for normality. Pearson's
12 Chi-square assessed the association of age and sex within the age groups, and between
13 the quantity third molars between females and males. Spearman's coefficient tested the
14 correlation of stages between third molars (statistical significance at $p < 0.01$). Ordinal
15 logistic regression verified the predictive power of the staging system (GHK) to separate
16 individuals under or over 14 and 16 years. An universal polytomous model (PLUM) was
17 structured [13]. The model was established with proportional-odds and Logit function
18 [14]. Model adjustment and homogeneity of the slopes were also assessed [15]. Receiver
19 operating characteristic (ROC) curves calculated to compare individuals' age with the
20 separation (under or over 14 and 16) predicted by the model. Statistics were performed
21 with SPSS 20.0 software (IBM Corp.TM, Armonk, NY, USA) and MedCalc 19.1.3
22 (MedCalc Software Ltd.TM, Ostend, Belgium).

23

24 **3. Results**

1 Intra-examiner agreement was 0.96, 0.95, 0.96 and 0.96 for #18, 28, 38 and 48,
2 respectively. The same teeth showed inter-examiner agreement of 0.95, 0.96, 0.96 and
3 0.95, respectively. Shapiro-Wilk revealed lack of normality for stage distribution.

4 Sample's mean age was 15.69 ± 4.24 years (median: 16 years; IIQ: 12 – 19 years;
5 mean female: 16.3 ± 4.15 years, male: 14.77 ± 4.52 years). A total of 317 (34.5%)
6 individuals were classified in the group <14 years, while 601 (65.5%) were ≥ 14 . 455
7 (49.6%) individuals were aged <16 years and 463 (50.4%) were ≥ 16 (Table 2).

8 The individuals within the age groups of 14 and 16 (under and over) had
9 statistically significant association of sex and age ($p < 0.001$) (Table 3). The number of
10 available third molars was similar between females and males ($p = 0.865$).

11 The regression model revealed that tooth #48 was more significant to classify
12 individuals under or over 14 ($p = 0.002$), while for the age threshold of 16, GHK stages
13 for tooth #18 showed statistical significance ($p = 0.027$). The area under the curve
14 reached 0.820 and 0.854, for the separation of Russian females under or over 14 and 16,
15 respectively. For males, the AUC values were 0.855 and 0.866, respectively (Table 4).
16 Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive, and negative predictive values were reported
17 in Table 5.

18 19 **4. Discussion**

20 At first sight, the GHK stages applied to the population of Russian individuals
21 enabled proper classification based on the legal thresholds of 14 and 16 years. These
22 outcomes are possibly explained by the AUC values that ranged above 0.8 for both sexes.
23 Additionally, sensitivity and specificity, and positive/negative predictive values were
24 above 70%. Classifications of AUC rates could interpret these values as, at least,
25 acceptable [16]. From an overview, good performance was expected because most of the

1 third molars were staged 10 among patients aged 19-23 years. This aspect of the sample
2 makes the separation process less challenging. In other words, defining a third molar in
3 stage 10 as being from an individual >14 is easier than defining the same for a third molar
4 staged 5, for instance. In practice, dental age estimation may face straightforward
5 questions from Magistrates, as “Is the victim under 14 or not?” In this context, narrowing
6 the sample to an interval close the age threshold of interest could be interesting to propose
7 a more challenging separation of individuals to the model. On the other hand, this set up
8 could not reflect reality because individuals under dental age estimation have
9 unknown/disputable age. For this reason, this study must be interpreted a preliminary
10 contribution to the field of dental age estimation by showing that, in general, third molars
11 may allocated individuals based on their stage of formation. However, additional
12 parameters may be used to enhance age estimation from third molars.

13 A previous study [4], for instance, combined age information from permanent
14 teeth and third molars in age intervals of overlapping dental development – namely 14-
15 15.99 years. The authors observed a decrease in the mean error (difference between
16 chronological and estimated dental age) of the method [4]. The staging systems combined
17 in the study were GHK (for third molars) and Demirjian’s et al. [2] – age calculated
18 according to Willems’ et al. [17], and the outcomes were only statistically significant for
19 females [4]. This information may be relevant especially regarding the females victims
20 of sexual violence during childhood. Age estimation, in this context, could benefit from
21 combined age estimation techniques, especially because the interval between 14-15.99
22 includes the legal thresholds of sexual consent addressed in the present study (14 and 16
23 years). In a recent study, Platt et al. [18] revisited 498 reports of child sexual abuse and
24 detected higher frequency of female victims (75.5%) specifically aged between 10 and

1 15 years (41.2%). These victims may need dental age estimation to indicate to the Court
2 that a sexual crime affected someone under the age of consent.

3 By increasing the age threshold of legal interest to 16, the combination of third
4 molars and permanent teeth may not be possible because in most individuals the
5 permanent teeth have complete root formation. Consequently, the methods available for
6 children fails to perform in adolescents [19]. Accordingly, a recent systematic literature
7 review and meta-analysis [20] showed that a method based on developmental stages of
8 permanent teeth had the worst performance exactly among individuals in the age group
9 of 16. In this scenario, third molars remain the sole source of age information and the
10 methods for subadults remain the useful ones [21]. In this case, the present study
11 corroborates the scientific literature that estimates that third molars usually have $\frac{1}{2}$ root
12 formation around the age of 16 [22]. Specifically, tooth #18, for instance, was staged only
13 eight times as $\frac{1}{2}$ root formation in the age group of <14 years, while among individuals
14 aged equal or above 16 it was staged 50 times. In practice, using specific stages as cut-
15 off indicators is not a reliable procedures, especially because third molar have a broad
16 spectrum of variability among persons. Instead, metric cut-offs (continuous data) appear
17 to be proper indicators of age groups as previously pointed out in the scientific literature
18 [23-25].

19 In this context, the teeth (#48 and #18) pointed out as proper predictors of age for
20 the specific thresholds (14 and 16, respectively) emerged as interesting data to be
21 considered in future studies. Some of the methods based on metric assessments of teeth
22 proposed the visualization and quantification of developmental information from single
23 third molars, such as teeth #38 [26]. Investigating these methods in comparison with the
24 teeth highlighted by the model of the present study.

1 These are original findings of the applicability of staging techniques for dental age
2 estimation. Sampling was suboptimal due to heterogeneity of distribution within age
3 intervals, which is justified based on the availability of images – as all the available
4 panoramic radiographs were collected by convenience. The logistic regression does not
5 require normality, but the outcomes must be carefully interpreted because the apparently
6 optimistic predictive values could be more realistic with balanced samples. Future studies
7 in the field should improve the sample distribution in order to allow comparisons between
8 estimated and chronological ages within age intervals of one year.

9 10 **5. Conclusions**

11 To the best of our knowledge, GHK staging system was applied for the first time
12 in the Russian population. For the first, the technique was tested based on its performance
13 on distinguishing individuals below or above the age thresholds of legal interest of 14 and
14 16 years. The thresholds are strongly associated with the Russian legislation behind
15 sexual consent and penalties for those who act illegally. Application of the technique in
16 practice, however, depend on later testing of the regression model in a more challenging
17 sample (also through internal and external validation). At first sight, the performance of
18 the research set up was optimistic, but the inherent sample characteristics rises a flag of
19 caution and suggests the interpretation of these findings as preliminary in a broad
20 scenario.

21 22 **Declaration of interest statement**

23 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest related to this study.
24
25

1 **Acknowledgment**

2 This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de
3 Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **References**

- 2 [1] Russia. On amendments and additions to the criminal code of the Russian Federation.
3 N 162-FZ. Available at: http://consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_45408/#p243
- 4 [2] Demirjian, A., Goldstein, H., & Tanner J. M. (1973). A new system of dental age
5 assessment. *Human Biology*, 45, 211-27.
- 6 [3] Franco, A., Oliveira, M. N., Vidigal, M. T. C., Blumenberg, C., Pinheiro, A. A., &
7 Paranhos, L. R. (2020). Assessment of dental age estimation methods applied to Brazilian
8 children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dentomaxillofacial radiology*, 50,
9 20200128. <https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20200128>
- 10 [4] Franco, A., Thevissen, P., Fieuws, S., Souza, P. H., & Willems, G. (2013).
11 Applicability of Willems model for dental age estimations in Brazilian children. *Forensic*
12 *Science International*, 231, 401.1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2013.05.030>.
- 13 [5] Neves, J. A., Antunes-Ferreira, N., Machado, V., Botelho, J., Proença, L., Quintas,
14 A., Delgado, A. S., Mendes, J. J., & Cameriere, R. (2020). Validation of the Third Molar
15 Maturation Index (I3M) to assess the legal adult age in the Portuguese population.
16 *Scientific Reports*, 10, 18466. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75324-x>
- 17 [6] Franklin, D, Flavel, A., Noble, J., Swift, L., & Karkhanis, S. (2015). Forensic age
18 estimation in living individuals: methodological considerations in the context of medico-
19 legal practice. *Research and Reports in Forensic Medical Science*, 5, 53-66.
20 <https://doi.org/10.2147/RRFMS.S75140>.
- 21 [7] Gunst, K., Mesotten, K., Carbonez, A., & Willems, G. (2003). Third molar root
22 development in relation to chronological age: a large sample sized retrospective study.
23 *Forensic Science International*, 136, 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379->
24 [0738\(03\)00263-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(03)00263-9).

- 1 [8] Preeti, S., Wadhwan, V., & Sharma, N. (2018). Reliability of determining the age of
2 majority: a comparison between measurement of open apices of third molars and
3 Demirjian stages. *Journal of Forensic Odonto-stomatology*, 36, 2–9. PMID: 30712026.
4 PMCID: PMC6626538.
- 5 [9] Köhler, S., Schmelzle, R., Loitz, C., & Püschel, K. (1994). Development of wisdom
6 teeth as a criterion of age determination. *Annals of Anatomy*, 176, 339–345.
7 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0940-9602\(11\)80513-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0940-9602(11)80513-3).
- 8 [10] Gleiser, I., & Hunt, E. E. Jr., (1955). The permanent mandibular first molar: its
9 calcification, eruption and decay. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 13, 253–
10 283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330130206>.
- 11 [11] Thevissen, P. W., Pittayapat, P., Fieuws, S., & Willems, G. (2009). Estimating age
12 of majority on third molars developmental stages in young adults from Thailand using a
13 modified scoring technique. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54, 428-32.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00961.x>
- 15 [12] Von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gotsche, P. C., &
16 Vandembroucke, J. P. (2008). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies
17 in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.
18 *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 61, 344–349.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008>.
- 20 [13] Lopes, L. J., Gamba, T. O., Visconti, M. A., Ambrosano, G. M., Haiter-Neto, F., &
21 Freitas, D. Q. (2016). Utility of panoramic radiography for identification of the pubertal
22 growth period. *American Journal of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 149, 509–
23 515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2015.06.030>.

- 1 [14] Decarlo, L.T. (2003). Using the PLUM procedure of SPSS to fit unequal variance
2 and generalized signal detection models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments &*
3 *Computers*, 35, 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195496>.
- 4 [15] Domínguez-Almendros, S., Benítez-Parejo, N., & Gonzalez-Ramirez, A. R. (2011).
5 Logistic regression models. *Allergologia et Immunopathologia*, 39, 295–305.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aller.2011.05.002>.
- 7 [16] Hosmer, D. W., Lemeshow, S. (2000). *Applied Logistic Regression*, 2nd ed. New
8 York, NY: John Wiley and Sons. p. 160-164.
- 9 [17] Willems, G., Van Olmen, A., Spiessens, B., & Carels, C. (2001). Dental age
10 estimation in Belgian children: Demirjian's technique revisited. *Journal of Forensic*
11 *Sciences*, 46, 893–895. PMID: 1145101073
- 12 [18] Platt, V. B., Back, I. C., Hauschild, D. B., & Guedert, G. M. (2018). Sexual violence
13 against children: authors, victims and consequences. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 23,
14 1019–1031. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018234.11362016>.
- 15 [19] Foti, B., Lalys, L., Adalian, P., Giustiniani, J., Maczel, M., Signoli, M., Dutour, O.,
16 & Leonetti, G. (2003). New forensic approach to age determination in children based on
17 tooth eruption. *Forensic Science International*, 132, 49–56.
18 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(02\)00455-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(02)00455-3).
- 19 [20] Yan, J., Lou, X., Xie, L., Yu, D., Shen, G., & Wang, Y. (2013). Assessment of dental
20 age of children aged 3.5 to 16.9 years using Demirjian's method: a meta-analysis based
21 on 26 studies. *PLoS One*, 8, e84672. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084672>.
- 22 [21] Franco, A., Vetter, F., Coimbra, E. F., Fernandes, Â., & Thevissen, P. (2020).
23 Comparing third molar root development staging in panoramic radiography, extracted
24 teeth, and cone beam computed tomography. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*,
25 134, 347–353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00414-019-02206-x>.

1 [22] Miloro, M., Ghali, G. E., Larsen, P. E., & Waite, P. D. (2011). Peterson's principles
2 of oral and maxillofacial surgery. (3rd ed.). Shelton, USA: PMHP.

3 [23] Cameriere, R., Pacifici, A., Viva, S., Carbone, D., Pacifici S, & Polimeni, A. (2014).
4 Adult or not? Accuracy of Cameriere's cut-off value for third molar in assessing 18 years
5 of age for legal purposes. *Minerva Stomatologica*, 63, 283-94.

6 [24] Deitos, A.R., Costa, C., Michel-Crosato, E., Galić, I., Cameriere, R., & Biazevic, M.
7 G. (2015). Age estimation among Brazilians: Younger or older than 18? *Journal of*
8 *Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 33, 111–115. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13582J>.

9 [25] De Luca, S., Biagi, R., Begnoni, G., Farronato, G., Cingolani, M., Merelli, V.,
10 Ferrante, L., & Cameriere, R. (2014). Accuracy of Cameriere's cut-off value for third
11 molar in assessing 18 years of age. *Forensic Science International*, 235, 102.1–6.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2013.10.036>.

13 [26] Cameriere, R., Ferrante, L., De Angelis, D., Scarpino, F., & Galli, F. (2008). The
14 comparison between measurement of open apices of third molars and Demirjian stages to
15 test chronological age of over 18 year olds in living subjects. *International Journal of*
16 *Legal Medicine*, 122, 493-7. <https://doi.or/10.1007/s00414-008-0279-6>.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Tables

Table 1 – Sample distribution based on sex and age

Age	F	M	F+M
8.00-8.99	14	22	36
9.00-9.99	8	18	26
10.00-10.99	29	26	55
11.00-11.99	36	26	62
12.00-12.99	32	32	64
13.00-13.99	36	38	74
14.00-14.99	46	30	76
15.00-15.99	42	20	62
16.00-16.99	44	32	76
17.00-17.99	38	22	60
18.00-18.99	36	18	54
19.00-19.99	32	13	45
20.00-20.99	31	24	55
21.00-21.99	54	19	73
22.00-22.99	51	17	68
23.00-23.99	22	10	32
Total	551	367	918

F: females; M: males

10
11
12
13
14

Table 2 – Distribution of individuals based on sex and age group, and distribution of quantity and arch position of the available third molars

Variables	n	%
Sex (n = 918)		
Female	551	60
Male	367	40
Age threshold of 14 (n = 918)		
<	317	34.5
Age threshold of 16 (n= 918) ≥	601	65.5

	< 455	49.6
	≥ 463	50.4
Available third molars per individual (n = 918)		
1	35	3.8
2	109	11.9
3	113	12.3
4	661	72.0
Quantity of third molar per position (n = 3053)		
#18	783	25.6
#28	800	26.2
#38	729	23.9
#48	741	24.3

1 *N* = absolute number of occurrences; % relative number of occurrences; #18: maxillary
2 right third molar; #28: maxillary left third molar; #38: mandibular left third molar; #48
3 mandibular right third molar.

4

5 Table 3 – Outcomes for testing the association between individuals' sex and age within
6 the studied age groups of 14 and 16

Age groups	Sex				<i>p</i>
	Female		Male		
	N	%	n	%	
14 years					< 0.001*
<	155	28.1	162	44.1	
≥	396	71.9	205	55.9	
16 years					<0.001*
>	243	44.1	212	57.8	
≥	308	55.9	155	42.2	
Total	551	100.0	367	100.0	

7 *Pearson's Chi-square test set with statistical significance of 5%.*

8

9 Table 4 – Outcomes of the ordinal logistic regression model based on its performance to
10 predict the chronological age within each age group, for females and males combined,
11 using GHK stages.

12

Age group	Predictors	Estimate	SE	Wald	OR	CI 95%	<i>p</i>
GHK stages							
< 14 / ≥ 14 years	#18	0.38	0.25	2.25	1.46	0.89-2.38	0.134
	#28	0.06	0.27	0.06	1.07	0.63-1.80	0.809
	#38	0.24	0.24	1.02	1.28	0.80-2.05	0.312
	#48	0.77	0.25	9.44	2.15	1.32-3.50	0.002*
	#18						

< 16 / ≥ 16 years	0.57	0.26	4.87	1.76	1.07-2.91	0.027*
#28	0.12	0.26	0.21	1.13	0.67-1.89	0.645
#38	0.21	0.24	0.82	1.24	0.78-1.97	0.365
#48	0.38	0.23	2.71	1.46	0.93-2.30	0.100

1 *OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; SE: standard error; *p < 0.05. Age group (< 18*
2 */ ≥ 18 years): Model Fitting Information (-2 log-likelihood intercept only = 681.970; -2*
3 *log-likelihood intercept and covariates = 158.408); Pseudo R-Square (Cox and Snell =*
4 *0.570; Nagelkerke = 0.779; McFadden = 0.642).*

5

6 Table 5 – Outcomes of predictive accuracy for the use of third molar staging according
7 to GHK technique.

Sex	Age	AUC ± SE	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
Females	< 14 / ≥ 14	0.820 ± 0.029	71.84%	91.37%	75.51%	89.75%
	< 16 / ≥ 16	0.854 ± 0.021	80.11%	89.74%	88.17%	82.55%
Males	< 14 / ≥ 14	0.855 ± 0.029	84.29%	87.57%	73.75%	93.08%
	< 16 / ≥ 16	0.866 ± 0.025	86.89%	87.18%	87.60%	86.44%

8 AUC = area under the curve; SE = standard error; PPV = positive predictive value; NPV
9 = negative predictive value.

10