



Research Paper

Molar Uprighting: Principles, Diagnosis, Biomechanics and Current Clinical Techniques

[Dr Kavya Vijay]¹, [Dr Sunil Muddaiah]², [Dr.Goutham B Reddy]³, [Dr.Sanju Somaiah]⁴, [Dr.Rachana R]⁵, [Dr.Akshay Sangeet]⁶

¹Postgraduate Student, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science,

²Professor, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science

³Professor and Head, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science

⁴Professor, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science

⁵Reader, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science

⁶Postgraduate Student, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Coorg Institute of Dental Science

Corresponding author: [Dr Kavya Vijay]

ABSTRACT

Molar uprighing is an important adjunctive orthodontic procedure used to correct mesially inclined or impacted molars and to facilitate periodontal, prosthodontic and occlusal rehabilitation. Mesial tipping commonly follows early loss of a permanent first molar, but it may also arise from posterior space deficiency, abnormal eruption, ectopic positioning, third-molar interference and other local or iatrogenic factors. Successful management requires careful assessment of periodontal health, dental pathology, anchorage, available space, occlusion, root morphology, alveolar bone and patient cooperation. The biomechanical objective is to generate an appropriate uprighing moment while controlling undesirable effects such as extrusion, rotation, distal movement of the anchorage unit and anterior tooth displacement. Numerous removable and fixed appliances have been described, including helical springs, box loops, T-loops, cantilevers, nickel-titanium auxiliaries and customized sectional systems. The development of temporary anchorage devices has substantially expanded treatment options by permitting direct application of force to the target molar while minimizing reciprocal movement of the anchorage segment. Surgical uprighing remains an alternative for severely impacted teeth when conventional orthodontic mechanics are unsuitable. This review summarizes the indications, diagnostic considerations, biomechanical principles and major clinical approaches to molar uprighing, with emphasis on conventional fixed appliances, skeletal anchorage and surgical techniques.

KEYWORDS

Molar uprighing; impacted molar; mesial tipping; orthodontic biomechanics; temporary anchorage devices; miniscrew anchorage; surgical uprighing

Received 09 Sep., 2026; Revised 16 Sep., 2026; Accepted 18 Sep., 2026 © The author(s) 2026.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

Adjunctive orthodontic treatment involves limited tooth movement undertaken to facilitate disease control, restoration of function or improvement of the restorative environment. Molar uprighing is a classic example. A molar may become mesially inclined because it is impacted during eruption or because it drifts into the space created by premature loss of an adjacent first molar. The resulting inclination can compromise occlusion, periodontal health, proximal contacts and the design of subsequent prosthetic treatment. The literature summarized in the present dissertation describes a wide range of approaches developed to correct these problems, from simple separating devices to sophisticated skeletal anchorage systems.

Mesial impaction of the mandibular second molar is relatively uncommon, with the source literature reporting a prevalence of approximately 0.3% in the general population and 2–3% among orthodontic patients. It occurs more frequently in the mandible than in the maxilla and may present unilaterally or bilaterally, with or

without third-molar involvement. In contrast, post-emergent mesial drifting most often follows loss of the mandibular first molar during childhood or adolescence. The second molar moves mesially and may rotate, while the premolars can tip distally into the extraction space. Such changes may reduce the available restorative space and create plaque-retentive areas.

The clinical importance of uprighting extends beyond alignment. Restoration of a more favorable axial inclination may improve access for oral hygiene, reduce pseudo-pocket formation, facilitate preparation of an abutment, improve pontic or implant space and direct occlusal forces more favorably along the long axis of the tooth. Consequently, molar uprighting frequently represents an interdisciplinary procedure involving orthodontics, periodontics and restorative dentistry.

ETIOLOGY AND INDICATIONS

The causes of mesial drifting can broadly be divided into pre-emergent and post-emergent factors. Pre-emergent causes include ectopic positioning, obstacles in the eruption pathway such as impacted third molars or other lesions, abnormal eruption mechanisms including ankylosis or dilaceration, posterior arch-length deficiency, delayed emergence of the second premolar and premature loss of primary molars. The dissertation also notes that excessive arch length can occasionally permit a second molar to tip mesially during eruption. Hereditary influences and iatrogenic factors, including certain orthodontic procedures, may contribute.

Post-emergent mesial migration is particularly important after early extraction of the first permanent molar. Without timely replacement or orthodontic management, adjacent molars can tip and rotate toward the edentulous space, while opposing teeth may supraerupt. The resulting configuration can complicate prosthetic rehabilitation and contribute to periodontal problems. Indications for correction of an impacted or tipped molar include establishment of functional occlusion, prevention of supraeruption of the opposing tooth, reduction of caries risk and prevention of periodontal attachment loss or root resorption of adjacent teeth. Uprighting can also regain space and improve the path of insertion for fixed or removable prostheses.

DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT PLANNING

A comprehensive diagnosis should precede appliance selection. The source material emphasizes medical and dental history, clinical examination, periapical radiographs and study casts. The periodontal condition is fundamental because active periodontal disease, particularly advanced furcation involvement, can compromise the prognosis. Any required periodontal or endodontic treatment should be completed before orthodontic movement. Traumatic occlusion should also be relieved because occlusal interference may resist movement.

Anchorage assessment is central to treatment planning. Conventional uprighting mechanics produce reciprocal forces that can tip or displace the premolars and canine. These teeth must therefore have adequate periodontal support and should be consolidated when necessary. The amount of available arch space must be assessed in relation to the mesiodistal width of the molar; additional space may be required when rotation is also planned. Root morphology, root resorption and alveolar bone width should be evaluated radiographically. Dense bone may prolong movement, whereas a severely resorbed, knife-edge ridge may favor distal crown movement rather than mesial root movement.

Occlusal relationships must be evaluated before and throughout treatment. A tipped molar that remains in premature contact may resist correction or develop traumatic contacts as it uprights. Occlusal adjustment may therefore be required. Treatment planning should also address the third molar. Depending on its position, hygiene access and intended function, extraction may be preferable to uprighting both second and third molars. The source notes that greater inclinations require greater apical movement and may increase the complexity and risk of treatment; an inclination greater than approximately 75 degrees was presented as a situation in which surgical techniques may become more appropriate.

BIOMECHANICAL PRINCIPLES

The essential biomechanical problem in molar uprighting is generation of a moment capable of changing the tooth's axial inclination while controlling the position of its center of resistance. A force applied at the crown, away from the center of resistance, produces a moment and can move the crown distally while the root moves mesially. However, the same force may create an extrusive component. If the force system is not properly controlled, reciprocal effects may occur in the anchorage unit.

For mild mesial tipping, a single distalizing force may be sufficient because the line of action can be placed at a favorable distance from the center of resistance. With moderate or severe tipping, the crown may be locked beneath the height of contour of the first molar. An initial distalizing force may first be needed to unlock the molar, followed by an uprighting spring or moment-producing auxiliary. Fixed appliances offer continuous force and improved control, but their effectiveness makes unwanted movement possible if the force system is not balanced.

Extrusion is a frequent side effect of conventional uprighting. In selected cases, slight extrusion may be clinically acceptable and may improve the pseudopocket configuration. When maintenance of the original occlusal level is essential, intrusion must be incorporated into the force system. Techniques such as crossed tipback springs, cantilevers and skeletal anchorage have been described to combine uprighting with intrusion or to reduce extrusive effects. The biomechanical design should therefore be individualized according to whether distal tipping, mesial root movement, intrusion, extrusion, rotation or space closure is desired.

REMOVABLE APPLIANCES

Removable appliances may be useful for mild tipping, particularly when the molar is less than approximately 20 degrees from vertical. The dissertation describes recurved helical coil finger springs, dumbbell-shaped springs incorporated into split-space retainers and the sling-shot appliance. These designs can provide useful anchorage and are relatively simple to activate. A sling-shot design uses elastic material between buccal and lingual hooks to apply a force across the mesial surface of the molar; placement must avoid the cervical area because an unfavorable line of action may increase extrusion.

Other removable approaches include free-ended springs and hybrid removable partial dentures incorporating molar-uprighting springs. These appliances can maintain function and may be economical, but their effectiveness depends on patient compliance. Compared with fixed appliances, removable systems may result in longer treatment time, less precise control and possible loss or incorrect insertion of the appliance. They are therefore best reserved for appropriately selected mild or moderately difficult cases.

FIXED ORTHODONTIC TECHNIQUES

Fixed appliances remain among the most versatile methods for molar uprighting. The literature includes helical uprighting springs, open-coil springs, box loops, sectional archwires, T-loop springs, cantilevers, tipback springs and various nickel-titanium auxiliaries. Their principal advantage is continuous force delivery with improved control over tooth movement.

Helical and open-coil systems can deliver distalizing forces to a tipped molar, while box loops and T-loops are designed to generate a more controlled moment. The T-loop system described in the source uses a rectangular wire with an anterior stabilizing segment and a distal component inserted into the molar tube. A distal gable bend produces a moment that uprights the molar and encourages mesial root movement. The system can also be modified to permit limited mesial space closure.

Crossed tipback springs are designed to provide uprighting while controlling vertical effects. Equal activation can neutralize the vertical forces, whereas differential activation may introduce intrusion. Cantilever springs provide a predictable force system because the point of force application and the moment arm can be selected deliberately. Nickel-titanium auxiliaries, including superelastic and heat-activated systems, offer relatively light and continuous forces. The source describes the Molar Uprighting Simple Technique (MUST), which uses superelastic nickel-titanium wire in specially positioned molar and premolar tubes. The system is intended to provide uprighting with an intrusive component while reducing occlusal interference.

Other fixed approaches include the Australian uprighting spring, modified transpalatal bar, first-molar bypass technique, Sander spring, Neoslider, renewable archwire and sectional modified Loca system. Many of these techniques share the same principle: create a distal force at the molar crown while maintaining adequate anchorage and minimizing reciprocal movement. Appliance selection should be based on the severity and direction of the impaction, available attachment surface, desired vertical movement and the need for rotational or buccolingual control.

SKELETAL ANCHORAGE AND TEMPORARY ANCHORAGE DEVICES

The development of skeletal anchorage has changed the management of difficult molar uprighting cases. Conventional mechanics rely on adjacent teeth as anchorage, creating reciprocal movement and often requiring extensive stabilization. Miniscrews and related temporary anchorage devices permit the force to be applied directly to the target molar or provide a stable anchorage point from which a controlled force system can be generated.

The dissertation cites early use of osseointegrated and retromolar implants for molar uprighting and later describes multiple miniscrew-based systems. A retromolar miniscrew can provide a distal point of force application, allowing an elastic chain or spring to deliver a distalizing force to a bonded button. A mesial miniscrew may be used when access to the retromolar area is limited. The force system must be selected according to the position of the screw relative to the molar's center of resistance.

Direct miniscrew anchorage can be particularly useful when a severely tipped molar must first be unlocked and then uprighted. One described protocol uses a distalizing force to release the molar from the first molar's height of contour, followed by a rectangular uprighting spring to generate the required tipback moment.

Other techniques use a miniscrew-supported cantilever, G-chain elastics, or a TMA spring. Dual-miniscrew systems can provide greater resistance to unwanted moments and permit three-dimensional vector control.

Skeletal anchorage is also useful in preprosthetic treatment. Placement of a miniscrew in an edentulous first-molar space can provide anchorage for uprighting the adjacent second molar while improving the ridge configuration for later prosthetic rehabilitation. The source describes techniques in which the miniscrew supports a TMA spring or a modified Uprighter Jet, as well as systems combining orthodontic movement with ridge augmentation. The major advantage is reduction of unwanted anterior tooth movement and improved control of the force system; however, treatment still requires careful assessment of soft-tissue anatomy, available bone and screw stability.

SURGICAL UPRIGHTING

Surgical uprighting is an alternative for severely impacted mandibular second molars when conventional orthodontic mechanics are impractical or when patient cooperation is limited. Treatment options described in the source include simple separation, extraction of the second molar with possible third-molar substitution, surgical uncovering followed by orthodontic traction, and surgical uprighting or repositioning.

Case selection is critical. Favorable factors include adequate space, appropriate root development and a position that permits stabilization after repositioning. The source emphasizes that the arc of rotation should generally not exceed 90 degrees because larger movements approach the biological demands of transplantation. The periodontal tissues and cortical plates should be preserved as much as possible, and the final position should permit healthy soft-tissue attachment and hygiene access.

The surgical procedure generally involves flap reflection, removal or sectioning of the third molar when indicated, conservative removal of distal bone and gentle elevation of the second molar into an upright position. The tooth should ideally be slightly out of occlusion immediately after surgery to avoid traumatic loading. If necessary, stabilization may be achieved with a resin-bonded splint or other orthodontic support. Some techniques combine surgical uprighting with immediate bracket placement, allowing orthodontic stabilization soon after healing begins.

Reported benefits include rapid correction, preservation of buccal keratinized tissue and improved orthodontic access. Nevertheless, surgical repositioning carries biological risks including pulpal necrosis, external root resorption, ankylosis and periodontal complications. Buccal displacement or crossbite can occur, particularly when extensive buccal bone removal is required. Therefore, surgical uprighting should be considered only after weighing the severity of impaction against the risks and predictability of orthodontic alternatives.

CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND RETENTION

Successful molar uprighting depends not only on the active appliance but also on control of the surrounding environment. Oral hygiene should be emphasized because tipped molars often create plaque-retentive pseudopockets. Occlusal contacts should be reviewed periodically, and the appliance should be adjusted if rotation, extrusion or unwanted anchorage movement develops. When skeletal anchorage is used, screw stability and soft-tissue health must be monitored.

After uprighting, the tooth should be incorporated into the main archwire when appropriate so that three-dimensional alignment and occlusal settling can be completed. Residual spaces may be closed or preserved according to the restorative plan. Retention is particularly important because periodontal and occlusal adaptation continue after active correction. The source emphasizes rigorous retention before definitive restorative treatment is completed.

II. DISCUSSION

The evolution of molar uprighting techniques reflects increasing emphasis on biomechanical control and anchorage preservation. Early removable springs remain useful for limited corrections, but fixed appliances provide greater consistency and control in adult patients and in more complex cases. The introduction of nickel-titanium materials has facilitated light, continuous force delivery, while carefully designed loops and cantilevers allow clinicians to tailor moments and vertical components.

Skeletal anchorage represents the most important development in the management of challenging molar uprighting cases. By moving the anchorage source away from the dental segment, miniscrews can reduce reciprocal movement and permit force application from locations that are difficult to reproduce with conventional appliances. This is especially valuable when the first molar is missing, when anterior anchorage is poor, or when simultaneous intrusion and uprighting are required. However, TADs do not eliminate the need for diagnosis and biomechanical planning; incorrect force direction can still produce rotation, extrusion or other unwanted movements.

Surgical uprighting occupies a distinct position in the treatment spectrum. It can provide rapid correction of severe impactions but introduces surgical and biological risks. The literature summarized in the dissertation supports a staged decision-making approach in which conservative orthodontic options are considered first when the tooth has a favorable position and attachment can be achieved. Surgical intervention becomes more attractive as the degree of impaction increases, access becomes limited, or conventional mechanics are unlikely to provide efficient correction.

Overall, molar uprighting should be regarded as a multidisciplinary procedure rather than a simple tipping correction. The desired final position should be determined in relation to periodontal health, occlusion and the restorative objective. The choice between distal crown movement and mesial root movement, the need for intrusion or extrusion, the management of the third molar and the type of anchorage should all be considered before appliance fabrication.

III. CONCLUSION

Molar uprighting is an important adjunctive procedure for restoring favorable molar position after impaction or mesial drifting. A successful outcome requires accurate diagnosis, evaluation of periodontal and osseous conditions, appropriate space analysis, control of occlusion and deliberate biomechanical planning. Conventional removable and fixed appliances remain valuable, particularly for mild to moderate corrections, while nickel-titanium auxiliaries and cantilever-based mechanics can improve force control. Temporary anchorage devices have expanded the therapeutic possibilities by providing direct and stable anchorage with reduced reciprocal tooth movement. Surgical uprighting remains an effective option for selected severe impactions but requires careful biological and surgical risk assessment. Ultimately, treatment should be individualized to achieve a stable, hygienic, functional and restorative-friendly molar position.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Halicioglu K, Celikoglu M, Buyuk SK, Sekerci AE, Candirli C. Effects of early unilateral mandibular first molar extraction on condylar and ramal vertical asymmetry. *Eur J Dent.* 2014;8:178-183.
- [2]. Burns MH. Orthodontic management of tipped abutment molars. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1973;87:843-847.
- [3]. Norton LA, Proffit WR. Molar uprighting as an adjunct to fixed prosthesis. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1968;76:312-315.
- [4]. Vig KW. Some methods of uprighting lower second molars. *Br J Orthod.* 1975;2:217-223.
- [5]. Reynolds LM. Uprighting lower molar teeth. *Br J Orthod.* 1976;3:45-51.
- [6]. Fernandes AF, Fernandes DJ, Quintao C, Mendes A. Uprighting an impacted second molar with a spring anchored to a composite support. *J Clin Orthod.* 2008;42:301-302.
- [7]. Rao J, Singh GK, Alvi HA, Kumar L, Agrawal KK. Removable partial denture with molar uprighting spring: an innovative hybrid appliance. *J Prosthodont Res.* 2013;57:57-61.
- [8]. Khouw FE, Norton LA. The mechanism of fixed molar uprighting appliances. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1972;27:381-389.
- [9]. Rubin RM. Uprighting impacted molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 1977;11:44.
- [10]. Tuncay OC, Biggerstaff RH, Cutcliffe JC, Berkowitz J. Molar uprighting with T-loop springs. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1980;100:863-866.
- [11]. Simon RL. Rationale and practical technique for uprighting mesially inclined molars. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1984;52:256-259.
- [12]. Lang R. Uprighting partially impacted molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 1985;19:646-650.
- [13]. Kogod M, Kogod HS. Molar uprighting with the piggyback buccal sectional arch wire technique. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1991;99:276-280.
- [14]. Weiland FJ, Bantleon HP, Droschl H. Molar uprighting with crossed tipback springs. *J Clin Orthod.* 1992;26:335.
- [15]. Majourau A, Norton LA. Uprighting impacted second molars with segmented springs. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1995;107:235-238.
- [16]. Melsen B, Fiorelli G, Bergamini A. Uprighting of lower molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 1996;30:640-645.
- [17]. Capelluto E, Lauweryns I. A simple technique for molar uprighting. *J Clin Orthod.* 1997;31:119.
- [18]. Shellhart WC, Oesterle LJ. Uprighting molars without extrusion. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1999;130:381-385.
- [19]. Park HS. A simple method of molar uprighting with micro-implant anchorage. *J Clin Orthod.* 2002;36:592-596.
- [20]. Santoro M, Kim ES, Teredesai M, Karaggiannopoulos N. Modified removable transpalatal bar for rapid uprighting of impacted second molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 2002;36:496-499.
- [21]. McFarlane RB. First molar bypass technique for uprighting ectopic second molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 2004;38:454.
- [22]. Jain S, Raka M, Sandey A. Uprighting a horizontally impacted mandibular second molar. *J Clin Orthod.* 2005;39:143-144.
- [23]. Zachrisson BU, Bantleon HP. Optimal mechanics for mandibular molar uprighting. *World J Orthod.* 2005;6.
- [24]. Miao YQ, Zhong H. An uprighting appliance for impacted mandibular second and third molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 2006;40:110-116.
- [25]. Sawicka M, Racka-Pilszak B, Rosnowska-Mazurkiewicz A. Uprighting partially impacted permanent second molars. *Angle Orthod.* 2007;77:148-154.
- [26]. Sohn BW, Choi JH, Jung SN, Lim KS. Uprighting mesially impacted second molars with miniscrew anchorage. *J Clin Orthod.* 2007;41:94.
- [27]. Gracco A, Lombardo L, Cozzani M, Siciliani G. Uprighting mesially inclined mandibular second molars with a modified Uprighter Jet. *J Clin Orthod.* 2007;41:281.
- [28]. Lee KJ, Park YC, Hwang WS, Seong EH. Uprighting mandibular second molars with direct miniscrew anchorage.
- [29]. Lee KJ, Joo E, Yu HS, Park YC. Restoration of an alveolar bone defect caused by an ankylosed mandibular molar by root movement of the adjacent tooth with miniscrew implants. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2009;136:440-449.
- [30]. Greco M, Meddis V, Giancotti A. The G-chain and miniscrew anchorage: simple mechanics for molar uprighting. *J Clin Orthod.* 2012;46:24.
- [31]. Ziegler S. Uprighting mechanics for mesially inclined lower second and third molars. *J Clin Orthod.* 2012;46:218-224.

- [32]. Celli D, Gasperoni E, Pansoni P, Deli R. Uprighting of mandibular second molars with the sectional modified Loca system. *Orthodontics*. 2013;14.
- [33]. Raghav S, Vinod P, Shashikala KV. The Neoslider appliance for uprighting mesially impacted mandibular second molars. *J Clin Orthod*. 2013;47:553-557.
- [34]. Nienkemper MA, Pauls AL, Ludwig BJ, Wilmes B, Drescher D. Preprosthetic molar uprighting using skeletal anchorage. *J Clin Orthod*. 2013;47:433-437.
- [35]. Kim M, Kim M, Chun YS. Molar uprighting by a nickel-titanium spring based on a setup model. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2014;146:119-123.
- [36]. Mah SJ, Won PJ, Nam JH, Kim EC, Kang YG. Uprighting mesially impacted mandibular molars with 2 miniscrews. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2015;148:849-861.
- [37]. Verma SA, Gupta DK, Singh G, Mittal S. A customized appliance for molar uprighting and space regaining. *J Clin Orthod*. 2015;49:452-454.
- [38]. Tsay TP. A renewable archwire for uprighting impacted lower second molars. *J Clin Orthod*. 2016;50:254-257.
- [39]. Janakiraman N, Hakami Z, Uribe FA. An efficient and effective technique for uprighting mesially erupting lower second molars. *J Clin Orthod*. 2017;51:179-180.
- [40]. Barros SE, Janson G, Chiqueto K, Ferreira E, Rösing C. Expanding torque possibilities: a skeletally anchored torqued cantilever for uprighting kissing molars. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2018;153:588-598.
- [41]. Zhou J, Gan X, Han X, Razzoog ME, Zhu Z. Uprighting a mesially tilted mandibular left second molar with anchorage from a dental implant. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2020;123:50-53.
- [42]. Davis WH, Patakas BM, Kaminishi RM, Parsch NE. Surgically uprighting and grafting mandibular second molars. *Am J Orthod*. 1976;69:555-561.
- [43]. Terry BC, Hegtvedt AK. Self-stabilizing approach to surgical uprighting of the mandibular second molar. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol*. 1993;75:674-676.
- [44]. McAbey CP, Grumet JT, Siegel EB, Iacopino AM. Surgical uprighting and repositioning of severely impacted mandibular second molars. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2003;134:1459-1462.
- [45]. Anderson K, Murtagh K, Sacks HG. Soft tissue and occlusal management in the surgical uprighting of impacted molars. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2012;70:e438-e440.
- [46]. Boynton T, Lieblich SE. Surgical uprighting of second molars. *Atlas Oral Maxillofac Surg Clin North Am*. 2013;21:235.
- [47]. Kravitz ND, Yanosky MA, Cope JB, Silloway K, Favagehi M. Surgical uprighting of lower second molars. *J Clin Orthod*. 2016;50:33-40.
- [48]. Zhou J, She X, Miller PD, Yao H. Selective osteotomy-assisted molar uprighting and simultaneous ridge augmentation for implant site development. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2019;156:846-857.
- [49]. Kim SH, Kook YA, Jeong DM, Lee W, Chung KR, Nelson G. Clinical application of accelerated osteogenic orthodontics and partially osseointegrated mini-implants for minor tooth movement. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2009;136:431-439.