



Management of Class II Division 2 Malocclusion: A Contemporary Review of Diagnosis and Treatment Strategies

[RUDRAKSHALA NANDINI]¹, [Sanju Somaiah]², [Gowtham B Reddy]³,
[Sunil Muddaiah]⁴, [Sujith Mathew]⁵, [Ravi kiran]⁶

Abstract

Class II Division 2 malocclusion is a distinct clinical entity characterised by retroclined maxillary central incisors, a deep traumatic overbite, and a posteriorly positioned mandibular dental arch, occurring against a backdrop of strong perioral musculature and a well-balanced facial profile. Its heritable pattern, distinctive dentofacial morphology, and tendency for relapse set it apart from Class II Division 1 malocclusion and have led some authors to describe it as "a syndrome in itself." Management is fundamentally staged: the deep bite must be unlocked and incisor inclination corrected before any sagittal correction is attempted. Growing patients benefit from growth modification with fixed functional appliances, whereas non-growing individuals are managed by dental camouflage, molar distalization, skeletal anchorage, or orthognathic surgery, depending on the severity of the underlying skeletal discrepancy. This review synthesises the classification systems, characteristic features, etiological factors, and evidence-based treatment modalities for Class II Division 2 malocclusion, with an emphasis on clinically relevant decision-making and long-term retention.

Keywords: Class II Division 2; deep bite; retroclined incisors; fixed functional appliances; molar distalization; orthognathic surgery; retention

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

Edward Angle observed that a case of malocclusion must first be classified in its entirety before any treatment plan can be devised.¹ This principle remains central to the management of Class II Division 2 malocclusion, a condition whose correction requires as much diagnostic discipline as mechanical skill. Since Class II malocclusion is easily recognised by patients and clinicians alike, its correction constitutes a substantial share of any orthodontic practice, and the growing number of adults now seeking treatment has made the non-growing Class II Division 2 patient an increasingly common presentation.

Unlike Class II Division 1 malocclusion, which is dominated by proclined and protrusive maxillary incisors, Division 2 malocclusion presents an almost paradoxical picture: retroclined upper incisors, a deep overbite, and a squarish, well-proportioned face that often belies the severity of the underlying occlusal disharmony. Comprehensive treatment in adults is further complicated by the absence of growth, which removes growth modification as a treatment option and leaves camouflage or orthognathic surgery as the only pathways to correction. The orthodontic literature on this malocclusion spans more than a century, from Angle's original descriptions to contemporary cephalometric, biomechanical, and skeletal-anchorage-based studies, yet its management continues to challenge clinicians because the same features that make it distinctive, strong musculature, a deep bite, and a favourable facial profile, also make relapse a persistent risk. This review traces the classification, clinical features, etiology, and treatment strategies for Class II Division 2 malocclusion, drawing together classical and contemporary evidence to guide clinical decision-making.

CLASSIFICATION

Angle's original classification (1899) defined Class II malocclusion as a distal occlusion of the mandibular dentition relative to the maxillary dentition, and further divided it into two divisions based on incisor position: Division 1, with proclined and spaced upper incisors, and Division 2, with lingually inclined, bunched

upper incisors and normal lip and nasal function.¹ Subsequent classification systems refined this concept. Lischer introduced descriptive terms such as disto-occlusion and axiversion to characterise individual tooth positions,² while Simon's gnathostatic system related the dental arches to the Frankfort horizontal, orbital, and midsagittal planes, introducing terms such as protraction and retraction.³ Robert Strang shifted emphasis from the teeth to the mandibular body itself, defining Division 2 as a distal relationship of the mandible to the cranial base accompanied by vertical or lingual inclination of the maxillary incisors.⁴ Baldrige, and later Elsasser and Wylie, proposed that Class II malocclusion may arise from maxillary excess, mandibular deficiency, or dental arch position independent of skeletal base,^{5,6} an idea later formalised in the Ackerman-Proffit diagrammatic classification, which evaluates alignment, profile, transverse relationship, sagittal class, and bite depth as independent variables rather than a single label.⁷ The British Standard Incisor Classification offered a simpler, tool-free method for epidemiological use, defining Class II Division 2 purely by the relationship of the lower incisor edge to the cingulum plateau of the retroclined upper incisors.⁸

CLINICAL AND CEPHALOMETRIC FEATURES

Class II Division 2 malocclusion presents a recognisable triad: retroclined maxillary central incisors, a deep overbite, and a posteriorly positioned mandibular dental arch, a combination the Germans termed "Deckbiss" or coverbite.⁹ The maxillary lateral incisors are typically proclined and mesiolabially rotated relative to the retroclined centrals, a feature that has led to descriptive subtyping by Van der Linden into Types A, B, and C, distinguished by the degree of arch-length deficiency and the resulting labial displacement of the laterals and canines.¹⁰ Dentally, the incisors tend to be smaller with shorter, bulbous crowns and reduced labiopalatal thickness, sitting roughly 12 degrees more upright than in normal occlusion. The upper arch is typically square, wider posteriorly than anteriorly, with a shallow palate. Facially, patients often display a pleasing, squarish or rounded profile with a prominent chin, deep mentolabial sulcus, high lower lip line, thin upper lip, and a short lower facial height, reflecting normal to reduced vertical growth and a horizontal growth pattern. Peri-oral musculature, particularly the masseter, temporalis, and mentalis, is notably more active than in Class II Division 1 patients, generating the higher resting lip and biting forces that are central to the etiology of the malocclusion. Given the distinctiveness and heritability of this presentation, Peck and Peck described Class II Division 2 malocclusion as "a syndrome in itself."¹¹

Skeletally, Class II Division 2 malocclusion is typically associated with a straight to mildly convex profile, prominent malar bones, and a backward path of mandibular closure. Anterior facial height is characteristically less than posterior facial height, producing the short, horizontally growing face described earlier, and the maxillary molars tend to drift mesially, tipping, rotating, and translating in a manner that itself deepens the bite over time. These features have prompted numerous cephalometric investigations comparing Division 2 malocclusion with normal occlusion and with Division 1 malocclusion, several of which have sought pathognomonic cephalometric markers to distinguish the two divisions, though no single measurement has proved universally discriminating. Clinically, the combination of a short lower face, backward mandibular rotation, and mesially drifting molars means that bite depth tends to worsen rather than self-correct with age, reinforcing the need for early diagnosis and intervention.

ETIOLOGY

The retroclination of the maxillary central incisors that defines Division 2 malocclusion is now understood to arise from a combination of hereditary predisposition and soft-tissue pressure. Familial clustering has been repeatedly demonstrated, and several authors attribute the condition primarily to genetic factors.¹¹ Superimposed on this hereditary substrate is an increased resting pressure from hyperactive labial and mentalis musculature, combined with a high, occlusally positioned lower lip line;¹² it is the resting rather than functional component of this pressure that appears dominant in tipping the maxillary centrals lingually. This same pressure gradient explains why the lateral incisors, erupting later along a naturally more labial path, escape retroclination and instead migrate labially,¹³ a sequence reinforced by anterior arch-length deficiency that prevents the laterals or canines from being brought lingually by the lower lip.¹³ Overbite itself compounds the problem, since a deepening bite further restricts the space available for the erupting laterals and canines.¹⁴ The lower lip position relative to the maxillary incisors has similarly been shown to correlate closely with the degree of retroclination.¹⁵ A counter-clockwise mandibular growth rotation has also been implicated, producing an excess of soft tissue in the lower face, a deepened mentolabial sulcus, and a cranially redirected lip line that further compounds incisor retroclination.¹⁰

TREATMENT PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Treatment planning for Class II Division 2 malocclusion is best approached methodically rather than mechanically. Salzmann's classical treatment objectives, correcting the molar relationship, aligning both arches, levelling the occlusal plane, and re-establishing normal incisor and jaw relationships, remain a useful

checklist.¹⁶ Moyers described the available strategies as tooth movement, guidance of eruption, restraint or promotion of skeletal growth, and surgical correction,¹⁷ while Karad and Janson have each proposed frameworks that separate dentoalveolar, functional, and progressively more severe skeletal presentations.^{18,19} Bishara's simplified scheme is perhaps the most clinically useful: dental Class II malocclusion is managed by an extraction or non-extraction approach, while skeletal Class II malocclusion is managed by growth modification, camouflage, or orthognathic surgery.²⁰ Critically, all three pathways are available to the growing child, but only camouflage and surgery remain available once growth has ceased, a distinction that fundamentally shapes treatment planning in the adult patient.

MANAGEMENT OF THE GROWING PATIENT

In the growing patient, the retroclined maxillary incisors must first be proclined, using removable springs or a fixed 2×4 setup, to unlock the occlusion, improve lip support, and permit subsequent functional correction. Fixed functional appliances, most notably the Herbst appliance reintroduced by Pancherz in 1979, are then used for mandibular advancement.²¹ Herbst therapy achieves Class I correction through a combination of maxillary growth restraint, mandibular growth enhancement, maxillary molar distalization with incisor retraction, and mandibular molar mesialization with incisor proclination.²¹ While growth modification is traditionally considered ineffective once the great majority of facial growth is complete, condylar and glenoid fossa growth can be reactivated by the Herbst appliance even at the end of the growth period, and the magnitude of stimulated mandibular growth in young adults approaches that seen in adolescents, even though total growth increments are smaller.²² This has led to a "new concept" of Class II management that extends growth modification well into early adulthood, reserving camouflage and orthognathic surgery for older patients.²² Because late-treated patients have fully erupted dentitions, good post-treatment interdigitation is achievable, which itself protects against relapse by allowing the intercuspal arches to transmit and coordinate maxillary and mandibular growth forces.²²

MANAGEMENT OF THE NON-GROWING PATIENT

Extraction versus Non-extraction

Most clinicians favour a non-extraction approach in Class II Division 2 malocclusion wherever possible, since incisor retraction and molar protraction both tend to deepen an already excessive overbite.²⁰ Conversely, the labial movement of lower incisors and the distal movement and extrusion of maxillary molars that accompany non-extraction levelling actively assist overbite correction. Many Division 2 patients also present with retrusive lips and a prominent chin and nose; premolar extraction followed by incisor retraction in such patients risks an unacceptable "edentulous" profile.²³ As a rule, borderline crowded cases are best started non-extraction, with extraction of second premolars reserved for severe retroclination, deep bite, and crowding in both arches. Long-term comparisons of extraction and non-extraction edgewise therapy in borderline Class II patients have found comparable occlusal outcomes between the two approaches, reinforcing that the decision should be individualised rather than protocol-driven.²³

The choice between extraction and non-extraction is never absolute, and the decision must weigh the degree of crowding, the pretreatment lip and chin projection, and the depth of the bite in each individual patient rather than following a fixed rule. In practice, most contemporary clinicians reserve extraction for the minority of Division 2 patients with genuinely severe crowding or retroclination, treating the majority successfully through arch development, incisor proclination, and controlled overbite reduction alone.²⁴

MOLAR DISTALIZATION

Distalization of the maxillary molars is indicated when arch-length deficiency is minimal and the Class II molar relationship is mild, particularly in patients with residual vertical growth and favourable incisor inclination.²⁵ It becomes considerably more difficult once the second and third molars have fully erupted and vertical facial growth is complete, both common features of the non-growing patient. Headgear-mediated distalization depends heavily on vertical growth for its effect and is correspondingly limited in adults, though success has been reported using extended wear protocols combined with second molar extraction.²⁶ A favourable time to move molars distally is in the mixed dentition before the second molars erupt, since erupted second molars present a resistance to distal movement and are associated with greater anchorage loss and longer treatment time.^{25,26} Correction of mesially rotated molars using a transpalatal arch or similar auxiliary can itself recover 1 to 2 mm of arch length per side, an often underused adjunct.

ROLE OF TEMPORARY ANCHORAGE DEVICES

Temporary anchorage devices have substantially broadened the scope of camouflage therapy in adults who might previously have been considered surgical candidates.^{27,28} Miniscrews and miniplates provide

absolute anchorage that is independent of patient compliance, allowing simultaneous intrusion, retraction, and distalization without the reciprocal tooth movements that limit conventional mechanics.²⁷ Skeletal anchorage systems using titanium miniplates at the zygomatic buttress allow effective en-masse distalization of molars, premolars, and incisors without the anchorage loss inherent to conventional intraoral distalizing appliances, with reported net molar distalization of approximately 3.8 mm.²⁷ In Class II Division 2 camouflage specifically, TAD-supported intrusion of the maxillary and mandibular incisors is particularly useful for correcting the deep bite without the extrusive side effects associated with utility arches and reverse curve archwires, and TAD-supported distalization has similarly been shown to produce favourable dentoskeletal and soft-tissue effects with minimal anchorage loss.²⁸ Their principal limitation remains the need for adequate bone volume and root separation at the intended insertion site, along with a modest but real risk of loosening or soft-tissue irritation over the course of treatment.

FIXED MECHANOTHERAPY: A STAGED APPROACH

Fixed appliance therapy for Class II Division 2 malocclusion follows a deliberate sequence rather than a single mechanical formula, and treatment planning should proceed methodically rather than by devising a mechanical strategy before the goals of therapy are fully understood.²⁹ Treatment begins with disocclusion using an anterior bite plane or posterior bite turbos to eliminate traumatic incisal contact and free the trapped lower incisors. The upper arch is then aligned first, using light round nickel-titanium wires to begin gentle proclination of the retroclined incisors without generating forces that risk root resorption. A utility arch, proclination spring, or rectangular wire with labial root torque is then used to deliberately increase overjet and correct incisor inclination, "unlocking" the bite before any sagittal mechanics are introduced. Deep bite correction proceeds through intrusion of the lower incisors with a reverse curve of Spee and extrusion of the posterior segments via the bite plane. Only once the bite is opened is the lower arch bonded and aligned, and sagittal correction undertaken, functional appliances in growing patients, Class II elastics in non-growing patients. Finishing is completed with rectangular stainless steel wires to achieve ideal torque, overjet, overbite, and intercuspation, and settling elastics are used as needed. Clinicians should never initiate Class II elastics before the bite has been unlocked, since doing so risks reinforcing rather than correcting the underlying incisor retroclination.

Class II elastics remain the most widely used interarch mechanism for sagittal correction, acting from the maxillary canine or premolar region to the mandibular molar region. Their effect is predominantly dentoalveolar rather than skeletal: retroclination of the maxillary incisors, proclination of the mandibular incisors, and mesial movement of the lower molars, accompanied by an extrusive vertical component that can increase lower facial height.³⁰ Systematic evidence confirms their effectiveness in mild to moderate cases, with early application potentially shortening treatment duration, although patient compliance remains the principal determinant of success. Self-ligating brackets offer reduced friction that may facilitate arch development and sliding space closure, but they confer no inherent anchorage advantage over conventional brackets, and full torque expression, critical for controlling incisor inclination in Division 2 cases, still depends on adequately filling the bracket slot with a sufficiently rigid rectangular archwire rather than on the ligation mechanism itself.

ORTHOGNATHIC SURGERY

For adults with a significant skeletal component, camouflage alone is insufficient, and orthognathic surgery becomes necessary.³¹ Bilateral sagittal split osteotomy remains the most common procedure for mandibular deficiency, permitting controlled anterior repositioning of the distal segment with rigid internal fixation. Distraction osteogenesis is reserved for severe deficiencies requiring large advancements, allowing gradual bone formation with simultaneous soft-tissue adaptation. When the maxilla contributes to the discrepancy, a Le Fort I osteotomy allows three-dimensional repositioning,³² and bimaxillary surgery combines both procedures for optimal control of the occlusal plane and facial proportions in complex cases.³³ Advancement genioplasty is frequently added to improve chin projection without altering occlusion. A surgery-first approach, bypassing presurgical decompensation, is increasingly used in selected cases with careful virtual surgical planning. Notably, mandibular advancement can also increase posterior airway space, an incidental benefit in patients with coexisting airway concerns. Based on outcome data, superior repositioning of the maxilla and modest mandibular advancement are the most stable procedures, while downward movement of the maxilla remains the least predictable.³⁴

RETENTION AND STABILITY

Class II Division 2 malocclusion carries a particularly high tendency for relapse, driven by strong perioral and mentalis musculature and the deep bite that defines the condition. Retention must therefore be regarded as an integral, not incidental, part of treatment. An upper Hawley retainer incorporating an anterior bite plane helps maintain corrected incisor inclination and overbite, while fixed lingual retainers, particularly in the

lower arch, guard against relapse of incisor position. Following orthognathic surgery, stability varies by procedure: superior maxillary repositioning and modest mandibular advancement in patients with normal or short facial height are the most stable, whereas downward maxillary movement carries a substantially greater risk of vertical relapse.³⁴ Long-term stability is also favoured by achieving good post-treatment interdigitation, since a well-intercusped occlusion helps transmit and coordinate ongoing maxillary and mandibular growth forces, counteracting unfavourable relapse patterns.²²

II. CONCLUSION

Class II Division 2 malocclusion is a distinct orthodontic entity defined by retroclined maxillary incisors, deep bite, and a posteriorly positioned mandibular arch set against a strong musculature and a well-balanced facial profile. Successful management depends on recognising its unique etiology and dentofacial features and on following a staged biomechanical sequence that unlocks the bite and corrects incisor inclination before sagittal correction is attempted. Growing patients are best served by growth modification with fixed functional appliances, while non-growing patients require individualised camouflage, molar distalization, skeletal anchorage, or orthognathic surgery depending on the severity of the skeletal discrepancy. Because relapse risk is high, long-term retention is not an afterthought but a core determinant of lasting success. A systematic, staged approach to diagnosis, biomechanics, and retention remains the most reliable path to predictable outcomes in this challenging malocclusion.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Angle EH. Classification of malocclusion. Dental Cosmos. 1899;41:248-264.
- [2]. Lischer BE. Principles and methods of orthodontia. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger; 1912.
- [3]. Simon PW. On gnathostatic diagnosis in orthodontics. Int J Orthod. 1924;10:755-758.
- [4]. Strang RHW. A discussion of the Angle classification and its important bearing on treatment. Angle Orthod. 1938;8:182-208.
- [5]. Baldrige JP. A study of the relation of the maxillary first permanent molars to the face in Class I and Class II malocclusions. Angle Orthod. 1941;11:100-109.
- [6]. Elsasser W, Wylie WL. The craniofacial morphology of mandibular retrusion. Am J Phys Anthropol. 1948;6:461-473.
- [7]. Ackerman JL, Proffit WR. The characteristics of malocclusion: a modern approach to classification and diagnosis. Am J Orthod. 1969;56:443-454.
- [8]. Ballard CF, Wayman JB. A report on a survey of the orthodontic requirements of 310 army apprentices. Trans Br Soc Study Orthod. 1964;86.
- [9]. Mayerhofer B. Lehrbuch der Zahnkrankheiten. Jena: G Fischer; 1912.
- [10]. Van der Linden FPGM. Development of the dentition. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing Co.; 1983:99-109.
- [11]. Peck S, Peck L, Kataja M. Class II division 2 malocclusion: a heritable pattern of small teeth in well-developed jaws. Angle Orthod. 1998;68(1):9-20.
- [12]. Posen AL. The influence of maximum perioral and tongue force on the incisor teeth. Angle Orthod. 1972;42:285-309.
- [13]. Fletcher GGT. The retroclined upper incisor. Br J Orthod. 1975;2:207-216.
- [14]. Mills JRE. The problem of overbite in Class II, division 2 malocclusion. Br J Orthod. 1973;1:34-48.
- [15]. Luffingham JK. The lower lip and the maxillary central incisors. Eur J Orthod. 1982;4:263-268.
- [16]. Salzmann JA. Analysis of eight types of Class II Division 1 malocclusion. In: Practice of Orthodontics. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott; 1966;2:633-660.
- [17]. Moyers RE. Handbook of Orthodontics. 4th ed. Chicago: Year Book Medical Publishers; 1988:191-192, 270-272.
- [18]. Karad A. Clinical Orthodontics. India: Elsevier; 2010:67-148, 183-206.
- [19]. Janson G. Relevant variables of Class II malocclusion treatment. R Dental Press Ortodon Ortop Facial. 2009;14(4):149-157.
- [20]. Bishara SE. Treatment of Class II malocclusions. In: Textbook of Orthodontics. Philadelphia: Saunders; 2001:335-362.
- [21]. Pancherz H. The Herbst appliance: its biologic effects and clinical use. Am J Orthod. 1985;87:1-20.
- [22]. Ruf S, Pancherz H. When is the ideal period for Herbst therapy--early or late? Semin Orthod. 2003;9:47-56.
- [23]. Paquette DE, Beattie JR, Johnston LE. A long-term comparison of nonextraction and premolar extraction edgewise therapy in "borderline" Class II patients. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 1992;102:1-14.
- [24]. Janson G, Valarelli FP, Hermont R, de Freitas MR, Pinzan A. Relationship between malocclusion severity and treatment success rate in Class II nonextraction therapy. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2009;135:274.e1-274.e8.
- [25]. Gianelly AA. Distal movement of the maxillary molars. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 1998;114:66-72.
- [26]. Kinzinger G, Eren M, Diedrich P. Treatment effects of intraoral appliances with conventional anchorage designs for non-compliance maxillary molar distalization: a literature review. Eur J Orthod. 2008;30:558-571.
- [27]. Cornelis MA, De Clerck HJ. Biomechanics of skeletal anchorage, part 1: Class II extraction treatment. J Clin Orthod. 2006;40(4):261-269.
- [28]. Upadhyay M, Yadav S, Nagaraj K, Nanda R. Dentoskeletal and soft tissue effects of mini-implants in Class II division 1 patients. Angle Orthod. 2009;79:240-247.
- [29]. Lindauer SJ. Orthodontic treatment planning. In: Biomechanics in Clinical Orthodontics. Philadelphia: WB Saunders; 1997:23-49.
- [30]. Bryk C, White LW. The geometry of Class II correction with extractions. J Clin Orthod. 2001;35:570-579.
- [31]. Proffit WR, White RP, Sarver DM. Combining surgery and orthodontics. In: Contemporary Treatment of Dentofacial Deformity. St Louis: Mosby; 2003:245-267, 386-393.
- [32]. Bell WH, Proffit WR, White RP. Maxillary excess. In: Surgical Correction of Dentofacial Deformities. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1980;1:236, 310-314.
- [33]. Epker BN, Stella JP, Fish LC. Class II deformities. In: Dentofacial Deformities. 2nd ed. St Louis: Mosby; 1995;1:189-568.
- [34]. Bailey L. Stability and predictability of orthognathic surgery. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2004;126:273-277.