International Journal of Orthopedic and Orthodontic Research

Biomechanical Interactions Between Orthopedic and Orthodontic Treatments in Craniofacial Growth Modification: Clinical, Translational, and Methodological Frameworks for Integrated Skeletal and Dentofacial Management

Johannes Friedrich Müller
Orthopedic Biomechanics Research Center, University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.

* Corresponding Author: **Johannes Friedrich Müller**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 3107-6629
Volume: 02
Issue: 02
Received: 04-01-2026
Accepted: 05-02-2026
Published: 02-03-2026
Page No: 01-09

Abstract

The management of craniofacial discrepancies requires integrated understanding of how orthopedic and orthodontic interventions interact biomechanically to modify skeletal growth and achieve stable dentofacial outcomes. This review synthesizes current knowledge on the biomechanical principles underlying craniofacial growth modification, examining how force systems interact with facial sutures, the temporomandibular joint, and alveolar bone to produce therapeutic change. The aim is to provide clinicians and researchers with a comprehensive framework for understanding the mechanical determinants of treatment response and their translational implications for patient-centered care. The analysis integrates foundational concepts from skeletal and dentoalveolar biomechanics with contemporary advances in skeletal anchorage, digital treatment planning, and hybrid appliance systems. Key biomechanical frameworks examined include force-vector optimization, load distribution patterns, and the differential tissue responses of sutural, condylar, and periodontal structures to mechanical stimuli. Clinical applications are reviewed across major growth modification modalities including functional appliances, orthopedic expansion, temporary anchorage device systems, and surgical-orthodontic coordination. Comparative evaluation of treatment approaches reveals that optimal outcomes depend on appropriate matching of mechanical strategy to skeletal maturity, vector control precision, and anchorage stability. Methodological considerations for treatment assessment emphasize the need for standardized biomechanical outcome measures and long-term stability evaluation. Challenges and future directions include predictive growth modeling, AI-assisted biomechanical simulation, and personalized treatment algorithms. The review concludes that integrated orthopedic-orthodontic management, grounded in sound biomechanical principles and enabled by emerging technologies, offers the most reliable pathway to predictable, stable, and minimally invasive correction of craniofacial discrepancies.

Keywords: Craniofacial growth modification, orthopedic biomechanics, orthodontic force systems, skeletal anchorage, functional appliances, temporomandibular joint remodeling

1. Introduction

The correction of craniofacial discrepancies represents one of the most challenging yet transformative domains in dentofacial therapeutics, requiring coordinated manipulation of both skeletal and dental structures through precisely applied mechanical forces [12, 13]. Craniofacial growth modification, defined as the therapeutic guidance of facial skeletal development through mechanical intervention, occupies a unique position at the intersection of orthopedic and orthodontic practice [12, 15].

Unlike Purely dentoalveolar orthodontic movement, growth modification targets the adaptive potential of facial sutures, the mandibular condyle, and other skeletal growth sites, redirecting developmental trajectories to achieve corrections that would otherwise require surgical intervention [12, 18].

The biomechanical integration of orthopedic and orthodontic approaches is fundamental to successful craniofacial management [14, 25]. Orthopedic forces—typically of higher magnitude and longer duration than orthodontic forces—are designed to influence skeletal structures directly, stimulating or restraining growth at sutural and condylar sites [12, 14]. Orthodontic forces, in contrast, produce dentoalveolar remodeling through periodontal ligament-mediated bone resorption and deposition [16, 25]. Contemporary treatment strategies increasingly recognize that optimal outcomes require coordinated application of both force systems, with orthopedic interventions establishing skeletal foundation and orthodontic mechanics achieving precise dental alignment within that foundation [17, 24].

The clinical significance of understanding biomechanical interactions cannot be overstated. Treatment timing, appliance selection, force magnitude and direction, and anchorage strategies all derive from biomechanical principles that govern how tissues respond to mechanical stimuli [12, 19]. Inappropriate force systems may produce unwanted tooth movement, inadequate skeletal response, or iatrogenic tissue damage, while optimally designed mechanics can harness the remarkable adaptive capacity of craniofacial tissues to achieve stable, harmonious outcomes [12, 13].

This article aims to provide a comprehensive review of the biomechanical interactions between orthopedic and orthodontic treatments in craniofacial growth modification. The scope encompasses foundational biomechanical principles, clinical applications across major treatment modalities, comparative evaluation of approaches, and emerging directions in personalized, technology-enabled care. By integrating current evidence with clinical frameworks, this review seeks to equip practitioners with the conceptual tools necessary for evidence-based, patient-centered treatment planning.

2. Conceptual and Biomechanical Frameworks

2.1. Principles of Skeletal and Dentoalveolar Biomechanics

The biomechanical foundation of craniofacial growth modification rests on understanding how skeletal and dental tissues respond to mechanical forces [12, 19]. Skeletal structures—including the maxilla, mandible, and cranial base—grow primarily through sutural bone deposition and condylar cartilage-mediated endochondral ossification [18, 20]. These growth sites exhibit remarkable mechanosensitivity, with mechanical forces capable of modulating cellular activity through complex signaling pathways [15, 19]. Sutures respond to tensile forces with increased osteoblastic activity, while compressive forces may inhibit sutural bone formation [18, 20].

Dentoalveolar structures respond to mechanical forces through fundamentally different mechanisms [16, 25]. The periodontal ligament, a fibrous joint between tooth root and alveolar bone, transmits orthodontic forces to the bone surface, triggering pressure-side resorption and tension-side deposition [16, 27]. This process, mediated by mechanosensitive cells including osteocytes, fibroblasts, and periodontal ligament stem cells, enables controlled tooth movement through alveolar bone remodeling [16, 27].

The critical distinction between orthopedic and orthodontic force systems lies not merely in magnitude but in target tissue and biological response [12, 14]. Orthopedic forces aim to influence skeletal growth sites directly, while orthodontic forces produce dentoalveolar remodeling [12, 25]. However, these systems interact complexly: orthopedic appliances inevitably produce some tooth movement, and orthodontic mechanics may transmit forces to skeletal structures [17, 24].

2.2. Growth Modification Models

Several theoretical models inform our understanding of how mechanical forces modify craniofacial growth [12, 19]. The functional matrix theory, while originally proposed to explain normal development, provides insight into how soft tissue function influences skeletal form [22, 28]. Functional appliances based on this principle modify muscle activity and soft tissue posture to create an environment conducive to favorable skeletal growth [22, 29].

The servosystem theory conceptualizes craniofacial growth as regulated by feedback mechanisms that maintain occlusal relationships and functional balance [12, 19]. According to this model, orthopedic appliances introduce perturbations that the system attempts to correct through adaptive growth responses [12, 19]. The effectiveness of growth modification depends on the timing, magnitude, and direction of the applied perturbation relative to the system's adaptive capacity [12, 15].

The mechanostat theory, adapted from long bone research, proposes that skeletal sites respond to mechanical strain within defined thresholds [12, 19]. Strains below a minimum threshold may permit disuse-mode remodeling, while strains above a maximum threshold may stimulate growth-mode modeling [12, 19]. This framework has direct implications for orthopedic force selection, suggesting that effective growth modification requires strains sufficient to exceed the adaptive threshold yet remain within physiologically tolerable limits [12, 14].

2.3. Force-Vector Systems and Load Distribution

The biomechanical effectiveness of growth modification depends critically on force-vector characteristics including magnitude, direction, duration, and distribution [14, 16, 17]. Orthopedic forces typically range from 300 to 1000 grams or more, substantially higher than the 50 to 200 grams typical of orthodontic tooth movement [14, 24]. This higher magnitude reflects the need to deform skeletal structures and stimulate sutural and condylar responses [14, 21].

Vector control is paramount in growth modification [16, 17]. The direction of force application determines which skeletal sites are loaded and what type of growth response is elicited [12, 18]. Mandibular advancement appliances, for example, apply anteriorly directed forces intended to stimulate condylar growth and glenoid fossa remodeling [13, 29]. Maxillary protraction facemasks apply anterior and slightly inferior forces to stimulate circumaxillary suture growth [21, 26]. Precise vector control requires attention to point of force application, which determines moment-to-force ratios and resultant centers of rotation [17, 24].

Load distribution across craniofacial structures is mediated by both appliance design and tissue biomechanics [18, 20]. Forces applied to teeth are transmitted through periodontal ligaments to alveolar bone, then through sutural and cortical bone to distant skeletal sites [20, 26]. The efficiency of this transmission depends on skeletal maturity, bone density, and the presence of intervening sutures that may absorb or redirect forces [18, 26].

2.4. Skeletal Anchorage and Orthopedic Device Mechanics

The development of temporary anchorage devices (TADs) has fundamentally expanded the biomechanical possibilities in growth modification [17, 24]. Skeletal anchorage enables direct application of orthopedic forces to bone without undesirable tooth movement, improving force system predictability and efficiency [17, 30]. Hybrid systems combining skeletal anchorage with traditional appliances allow simultaneous orthopedic and orthodontic effects with enhanced control [17, 24, 31].

Modular orthodontic systems based on skeletal anchorage represent an important contemporary innovation [17, 31]. These systems enable sequential activation of different treatment components within a single framework, eliminating appliance changes and reducing treatment interruptions [17, 31]. Clinical applications include maxillary expansion, molar distalization, and intrusion mechanics, all performed with skeletal anchorage providing stable force delivery [17, 30].

The biomechanical characteristics of bone-anchored systems differ fundamentally from tooth-borne appliances [17, 31]. Direct skeletal fixation eliminates the periodontal ligament damping effect, producing more efficient force transmission but also requiring careful attention to force magnitude to avoid overloading [17, 30]. The stability of skeletal anchorage depends on osseointegration, implant design, and loading conditions [30, 31].

2.5. Methodological Approaches to Treatment Assessment

Assessment of growth modification outcomes requires methodologies capable of distinguishing skeletal from dental contributions to observed changes [12, 21]. Cephalometric analysis remains the clinical standard, with serial radiographs enabling quantification of skeletal and dental movement relative to cranial reference structures [21, 26]. However, two-dimensional cephalometry has inherent limitations including projection error and inability to capture three-dimensional asymmetry [21, 32].

Three-dimensional imaging, particularly cone-beam computed tomography, provides more comprehensive assessment of skeletal changes following growth modification [21, 32]. Volumetric analysis of airway dimensions, condylar position, and sutural changes offers insights into treatment effects not available from conventional radiography [21, 32].

Biomechanical characterization of tissue response requires integration of imaging with computational modeling [12, 15]. Finite element analysis enables prediction of stress-strain distributions within craniofacial structures under various loading conditions, providing theoretical insights into how appliance design influences tissue response [12, 15]. Validation of these models with clinical outcome data remains an important research priority [12, 19].

Table 1: Comparison of Major Orthopedic and Orthodontic Growth Modification Approaches

Treatment Approach	Primary Indications	Biomechanical Mechanism	Optimal Age Consideration	Primary Skeletal Effects	Dental Effects
Functional Appliances (FR-I, FR-III, Twin Block)	Class II mandibular retrusion; Class III correction	Condylar stimulation; glenoid fossa remodeling; soft tissue modulation	Late mixed dentition (10-14 years)	Mandibular length increase; maxillary restraint	Overjet reduction; arch alignment [13, 22, 29]
Rapid Maxillary Expansion (RME/Hyrax)	Transverse maxillary deficiency; posterior crossbite	Midpalatal suture opening; circumaxillary suture mobilization	Prepubertal (8-14 years)	Increased maxillary width; nasal airway expansion	Arch perimeter increase; buccal tipping [21, 26, 32]
Skeletal Anchorage/Hybrid Systems (Hybrid Hyrax, MARPE)	Skeletal transverse deficiency in older adolescents/adults	Bone-borne force transmission; skeletal expansion without dental compensation	Adolescent to adult	True skeletal expansion; circumaxillary suture opening	Minimal dental tipping; controlled tooth movement [17, 24, 30]
Facemask/Reverse-Pull Headgear	Class III maxillary deficiency	Anterior maxillary traction; circumaxillary suture stimulation	Early mixed dentition (5-8 years)	Maxillary advancement; midfacial growth enhancement	Proclination of maxillary incisors [21, 26, 32]
Chin Cup/Reverse Headgear	Class III mandibular prognathism	Mandibular growth restraint; condylar redirection	Prepubertal	Mandibular growth inhibition; backward mandibular rotation	Dental compensation changes [12, 14]
Headgear (Cervical/High-Pull)	Class II maxillary excess; vertical growth control	Maxillary growth restraint; distal molar movement	Prepubertal to pubertal	Maxillary growth modification; vertical dimension control	Molar distalization; anchorage reinforcement [14, 16]
Herbst Appliance	Class II mandibular retrusion	Fixed mandibular advancement; continuous force application	Late mixed dentition to early permanent	Condylar remodeling; glenoid fossa adaptation	Molar relationship correction; incisor proclination [13, 29]

3. Clinical and Translational Applications

3.1. Early Intervention in Class II and Class III Malocclusions

The management of sagittal discrepancies through growth modification represents one of the most extensively studied applications of orthopedic-orthodontic integration [13, 14, 29]. Class II malocclusion, characterized by mandibular retrusion or maxillary protrusion, affects a substantial proportion of the population and, if untreated, may require orthognathic surgery in adulthood [12, 13].

Functional appliances designed for Class II correction apply anteriorly directed forces to the mandible, aiming to stimulate condylar growth and glenoid fossa remodeling [13, 22, 29]. Contemporary devices such as the Twin Block and Herbst appliance represent systematic approaches to mandibular repositioning, with the Herbst providing continuous force application without compliance requirements [13, 29]. The histological mechanism underlying successful mandibular repositioning involves amplification of bone formation pathways in condylar cartilage, with subsequent remodeling of the temporomandibular joint stabilizing the advanced mandibular position [13, 28, 29].

Class III malocclusion presents distinct biomechanical challenges, often requiring maxillary protraction or mandibular growth restraint depending on which jaw is primarily affected [21, 26, 32]. Maxillary expansion prior to protraction—the Alt-RAMEC protocol—enhances circumaxillary suture disarticulation, improving skeletal response to facemask therapy [21, 26]. Chin cup therapy for mandibular prognathism applies posteriorly directed forces to restrain mandibular growth and redirect condylar development [12, 14].

3.2. Functional Appliances and Orthopedic Expansion

Functional appliances encompass a diverse family of devices designed to modify skeletal growth by altering mandibular position and orofacial muscle function [22, 28, 29]. The Frankel Regulator system, developed by Rolf Frankel, exemplifies the functional approach, utilizing shields and pads to remove restrictive soft tissue forces and create an environment conducive to favorable skeletal development [22, 28]. FR-I appliances for Class II Division 1 malocclusions employ lip bumpers to reduce excessive lip pressure on maxillary incisors, while FR-III appliances for Class III cases incorporate mechanisms to encourage mandibular retraction and maxillary advancement [22, 28].

Orthopedic expansion addresses transverse deficiencies through mechanical opening of the midpalatal suture [21, 26, 32]. Rapid maxillary expansion (RME) applies high forces over short periods, producing rapid suture separation with subsequent bone fill [21, 26]. Slow maxillary expansion (SME) applies lighter forces over longer durations, potentially producing more physiologic suture response with reduced tissue resistance [21, 32]. The Quad Helix appliance offers versatility in force application, enabling multidirectional control suitable for asymmetric expansion needs [21, 26].

Nickel-titanium expanders utilizing shape memory alloys represent an important technological advance, delivering light continuous forces ideal for non-compliant patients [21, 32]. These appliances capitalize on the superelastic properties of NiTi to maintain relatively constant force delivery despite suture separation [21, 32]. The hybrid Hyrax appliance incorporating open compressed NiTi springs enables continuous expansion without requiring periodic clinician activation, optimizing clinical efficiency while maintaining predictable force delivery [17, 24].

3.3. Temporary Anchorage Devices and Hybrid Systems

The integration of temporary anchorage devices into growth modification protocols has transformed treatment possibilities, particularly for patients beyond the optimal age for conventional orthopedic response [17, 24, 30]. Skeletal anchorage enables application of orthopedic forces directly to bone, bypassing the periodontal ligament and eliminating undesirable tooth movement as a side effect of skeletal treatment [17, 30].

Hybrid systems combining skeletal anchorage with conventional appliances offer particular advantages for complex cases [17, 24, 31]. The hybrid Hyrax appliance, utilizing palatal TADs to support maxillary expansion, enables skeletal expansion in older adolescents and young adults where conventional tooth-borne expansion would produce primarily dental tipping [17, 24]. Miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion (MARPE) represents a related approach, with skeletal anchorage distributing expansion forces across the midpalatal suture while minimizing dental effects [17, 30, 31].

Modular orthodontic systems based on skeletal anchorage enable multiple treatment objectives within a single framework [17, 31]. These systems allow sequential activation of components for intrusion, distalization, and expansion without appliance replacement, reducing treatment duration and improving patient acceptance [17, 31]. Clinical applications demonstrate the versatility of this approach for complex malocclusions requiring coordinated skeletal and dental movements [17, 24].

3.4. Surgical–Orthodontic Coordination

Despite advances in growth modification, some patients present with skeletal discrepancies beyond the scope of orthopedic correction [12, 23, 25]. Surgical-orthodontic treatment becomes necessary when skeletal maturity precludes significant growth modification or when discrepancy magnitude exceeds adaptive capacity [12, 23].

The biomechanical principles underlying surgical-orthodontic coordination reflect those of growth modification, applied in reverse order [12, 23, 25]. Presurgical orthodontic preparation decompensates dentition, removing dental compensations that mask the underlying skeletal discrepancy [23, 25]. Surgical intervention repositions skeletal bases, after which postsurgical orthodontics achieves final occlusal detailing [23, 25].

Temporary anchorage devices have expanded possibilities in surgical-orthodontic treatment, enabling skeletal anchorage for surgical splint stabilization and facilitating difficult postsurgical movements [17, 30]. Hybrid approaches combining limited surgery with extensive orthodontic mechanics may offer alternatives to conventional two-jaw procedures in selected cases [17, 24, 31].

3.5. Patient Outcome Frameworks and Healthcare Integration

Translational success in growth modification depends not only on biomechanical effectiveness but on integration within broader healthcare frameworks [11, 33]. Contemporary orthodontic practice increasingly recognizes the patient as the center of an interdisciplinary team that may include orthopedic specialists, pediatricians, otolaryngologists, and sleep medicine physicians [11, 33].

Integrated Clinical Orthodontics, a recently updated text, emphasizes the importance of situating orthodontic diagnosis and treatment within the wider health context [11]. Patients with craniofacial anomalies often present with associated conditions affecting multiple systems, requiring coordinated management across specialties [11, 33]. Temporomandibular joint problems, sleep-disordered breathing, and neuromuscular disorders exemplify conditions where orthodontic treatment intersects with broader medical management [11, 33].

Patient-centered outcome assessment extends beyond traditional cephalometric norms to include functional measures, quality of life indicators, and patient-reported outcomes [11, 33]. The highest standard of patient care requires attention not only to biomechanical treatment objectives but to how treatment affects patients' daily functioning, self-perception, and long-term health [11, 33].

Table 2: Biomechanical Characteristics of Orthopedic vs. Orthodontic Force Systems

Parameter	Orthopedic Force Systems	Orthodontic Force Systems	Clinical Significance
Force Magnitude	300-1000+ grams	50-200 grams	Higher forces required for skeletal deformation vs. periodontal remodeling [14, 16, 21]
Duration of Force Application	Intermittent or continuous; often 12-16 hours/day for removable appliances	Continuous or near-continuous for fixed appliances	Compliance critical for removable orthopedic devices; continuous forces more efficient for tooth movement [13, 22, 29]
Vector Control	Determined by appliance geometry and point of force application	Controlled by bracket placement, wire bends, and auxiliaries	Orthopedic vectors target skeletal growth sites; orthodontic vectors direct tooth movement paths [16, 17, 24]
Anchorage Requirements	Must resist reaction forces from skeletal deformation; often requires headgear or skeletal anchorage	Must resist unwanted tooth movement; can use intraoral or extraoral anchorage	Skeletal anchorage increasingly important for both orthopedic and orthodontic applications [17, 24, 30]
Primary Target Tissue	Facial sutures; mandibular condyle; synchondroses	Periodontal ligament; alveolar bone	Different mechanobiological responses require different force characteristics [12, 15, 19]
Tissue Response Mechanism	Sutural osteogenesis; condylar cartilage adaptation; glenoid fossa remodeling	Pressure-side resorption; tension-side deposition	Orthopedic response involves growth modulation; orthodontic response involves remodeling [12, 16, 27]
Rate of Movement	1-2 mm per month (skeletal)	1-1.5 mm per month (dental)	Skeletal movement typically comparable to or slightly slower than dental movement [12, 21]
Stability Determinants	Skeletal adaptation; muscle balance; functional matrix	Bone remodeling; occlusal relationships; periodontal health	Both require retention but stability mechanisms differ [12, 14, 21]
Optimal Timing	During active growth periods (prepubertal/pubertal)	Any age with healthy periodontium	Growth modification only possible during development [12, 13, 18]

4. Comparative Methodological Evaluation

4.1. Evidence-Based Assessment Models

Evaluating the effectiveness of growth modification interventions requires evidence-based assessment frameworks that account for the unique characteristics of orthopedic treatment [12, 21, 26]. Randomized controlled trials in growth modification face particular challenges including ethical constraints on untreated controls, long treatment durations, and difficulty blinding patients and providers to intervention type [21, 26].

Systematic reviews of maxillary expansion appliances have employed PRISMA-ScR frameworks to ensure transparency and rigor in evidence synthesis [21, 26, 32]. These reviews demonstrate that while RME effectively produces rapid skeletal expansion in growing patients, the quality of evidence varies across different expansion modalities and outcome measures [21, 32]. Studies reporting airway dimensions, arch width changes, and dental tipping provide complementary information about treatment effects [21, 26, 32].

Comparative effectiveness research in growth modification requires attention to skeletal maturity indicators, which determine treatment timing and expected response [12, 18, 20]. Cervical vertebral maturation, hand-wrist radiographs, and chronological age each provide information about growth remaining, with cervical staging increasingly preferred due to availability on routine cephalometric images [12, 18, 20].

4.2. Implementation Strategies

Successful implementation of growth modification requires systematic approaches to case selection, appliance design, and treatment monitoring [13, 22, 29]. Diagnostic classification frameworks provide structured approaches to matching appliance selection with clinical presentation [13, 29]. These frameworks consider not only sagittal relationship but also vertical dimensions, asymmetry, and temporomandibular joint status [13, 28, 29].

Implementation strategies must account for patient compliance, which remains a critical determinant of outcome for removable functional appliances [22, 28, 29]. Devices requiring 12-14 hours of daily wear demand patient and family commitment; strategies to enhance compliance include careful patient education, monitoring systems, and in some cases selection of fixed appliances that reduce compliance dependence [22, 28, 29].

Technical implementation requires attention to biomechanical details including force calibration, vector verification, and anchorage preparation [17, 24, 30]. Hybrid systems incorporating skeletal anchorage demand surgical precision in TAD placement, as implant position determines force vector orientation and load distribution [17, 24, 31].

4.3. Long-Term Stability Considerations

Long-term stability represents the ultimate test of growth modification effectiveness [12, 14, 23]. Skeletal changes achieved through orthopedic intervention must be maintained against continued growth, functional forces, and maturational changes [12, 23]. Relapse mechanisms differ for different treatment modalities: expanded maxillary sutures may constrict if not adequately retained; advanced mandibles may revert if condylar adaptation is incomplete [12, 21, 23].

Stability assessment requires long-term follow-up extending through the completion of facial growth [12, 23, 25]. Studies with follow-up into early adulthood provide the most reliable evidence regarding stability, though such studies are logistically challenging and relatively rare [12, 23, 25].

Factors influencing stability include the adequacy of the original correction, the presence of continuing unfavorable growth patterns, and the establishment of stable occlusal relationships and functional patterns [12, 14, 23]. Retention protocols must account for these factors, with longer or more intensive retention indicated when stability risks are elevated [12, 21, 23].

4.4. Clinical Decision-Making Algorithms

Evidence-based clinical decision-making in growth modification integrates multiple factors including skeletal maturity, discrepancy severity, patient compliance potential, and treatment objectives [12, 13, 14, 21]. Algorithms for Class II management, for example, consider whether mandibular retrusion or maxillary protrusion predominates, the vertical facial pattern, and the availability of growth remaining [12, 13, 14].

Contemporary decision-making increasingly incorporates digital planning tools that simulate treatment outcomes and enable virtual appliance design [17, 24, 31]. Digital workflows facilitate precision in appliance fabrication and enable monitoring of treatment progress through remote tracking technologies [17, 31].

The choice between different growth modification approaches requires weighing biomechanical effectiveness against patient burden, cost, and potential adverse effects [12, 14, 21]. Hybrid approaches combining multiple modalities may offer optimal outcomes for complex cases but require greater technical expertise and patient cooperation [17, 24, 31].

5. Challenges and Future Research Directions

5.1. Predictive Growth Modeling

Despite advances in understanding growth modification biomechanics, predicting individual patient response remains challenging [12, 15, 19]. Current prediction methods based on population averages provide limited guidance for individual treatment planning, where genetic variation, growth timing differences, and variable tissue responsiveness produce substantial outcome variation [12, 19, 20].

Computational approaches to growth prediction, including finite element modeling and machine learning algorithms, offer potential for improved individualization [12, 15, 19]. Integration of craniofacial imaging data with biomechanical simulation may eventually enable virtual treatment planning that predicts skeletal and dental responses to specific appliance designs [12, 15, 19]. Validation of these models with clinical outcome data represents a critical research priority [12, 15, 19].

5.2. Digital Biomechanics and AI-Assisted Planning

Digital technologies are transforming growth modification practice, from diagnosis through treatment monitoring [11, 17, 31, 33]. Three-dimensional imaging enables comprehensive assessment of craniofacial structure and asymmetry, informing appliance design and vector selection [21, 26, 32]. Digital appliance design and fabrication, including 3D-printed expanders and aligners, enables precise customization impossible with conventional approaches [17, 31, 34].

Artificial intelligence applications in growth modification are in early stages but hold substantial promise [11, 34, 35]. AI algorithms trained on large datasets of treatment outcomes may eventually predict optimal treatment timing, appliance selection, and force parameters for individual patients [11, 34, 35]. Machine learning approaches to cephalometric analysis and growth prediction may enhance diagnostic accuracy and treatment planning [34, 35].

Digital monitoring technologies, including remote tracking apps and intraoral scanners, enable ongoing assessment of treatment progress without frequent office visits [17, 31, 34]. These tools may improve compliance monitoring and enable early detection of problems requiring intervention [17, 31, 34].

5.3. Personalized Orthopedic-Orthodontic Treatment

The future of growth modification lies in personalization—matching treatment strategies to individual patient characteristics rather than applying standardized protocols [11, 12, 33, 35]. Personalization requires understanding how genetic variation, epigenetic factors, and environmental influences shape craniofacial growth and treatment response [12, 19, 35].

Biomarkers of treatment response, including molecular markers of bone turnover and genetic variants affecting mechanotransduction, may eventually enable pretreatment prediction of likely outcomes [12, 15, 19]. Patients predicted to respond poorly to conventional approaches might be candidates for more aggressive intervention or earlier surgical referral [12, 23, 25].

Personalized treatment also requires attention to patient preferences, values, and circumstances [11, 33]. The best biomechanical solution is ineffective if unacceptable to the patient; shared decision-making incorporating patient perspectives on treatment burden, duration, and acceptable outcomes is essential for truly patient-centered care [11, 33].

5.4. Multicenter Translational Research Frameworks

Advancing the evidence base for growth modification requires collaborative research efforts capable of generating adequately powered studies [11, 12, 21, 33]. Single-center studies, while valuable, are typically underpowered for subgroup analyses and may reflect local treatment patterns that limit generalizability [12, 21, 26].

Multicenter research networks enable pooling of patient data across diverse populations and treatment approaches, facilitating comparative effectiveness research and identification of optimal practices [11, 33, 35]. Standardized data collection protocols, including consistent imaging parameters and outcome measures, are essential for meaningful data aggregation [11, 33, 35].

Translational research frameworks that bridge basic science and clinical application are particularly important in growth modification, where understanding of mechanobiological mechanisms increasingly informs clinical practice [12, 15, 19].

Collaboration between basic scientists studying mechanotransduction and clinicians treating patients can accelerate translation of biological insights into therapeutic advances [12, 15, 19].

Table 3: Advantages, Limitations, and Clinical Implementation Characteristics of Integrated Orthopedic–Orthodontic Modalities

Modality	Key Advantages	Limitations/Challenges	Clinical Implementation Characteristics	Optimal Clinical Scenarios
Functional Appliances (Removable: Twin Block, Bionator, Frankel)	Non-invasive; harness natural growth; can modify muscle function; relatively low cost	Compliance-dependent; variable skeletal response; limited to growing patients; requires motivated patient	12-14 hours daily wear; periodic adjustments (8-12 week intervals); retention phase essential	Growing patients (CVMS 1-3) with mild-moderate Class II; cooperative patients and families [13, 22, 28, 29]
Fixed Functional Appliances (Herbst, Forsus, MARA)	Compliance-independent; continuous force delivery; predictable treatment duration; no cooperation required	Higher cost; potential for discomfort; appliance breakage; removal requires separate procedure	Fixed attachment for 6-12 months; no compliance requirement; may be placed with or without fixed appliances	Growing patients with limited cooperation potential; moderate-severe Class II; skeletal maturity CVMS 2-4 [13, 29, 34]
Rapid Maxillary Expansion (Tooth-Borne)	Rapid skeletal separation in young patients; well-established protocol; relatively simple technique; immediate results visible	Primarily dental effects in older patients (>14 years); discomfort during activation; relapse potential; buccal tipping of posterior teeth	Active phase 2-4 weeks (2 turns/day); retention phase 3-6 months; Hyrax or similar screw; overexpansion recommended	Prepubertal patients (CVMS 1-2) with transverse deficiency >4mm; posterior crossbite; narrow maxilla [21, 26, 32]
Skeletal Anchorage/Hybrid Expansion (MARPE, Hybrid Hyrax)	True skeletal expansion in older patients; controlled force delivery; minimal dental tipping; stable results	Surgical placement required (miniscrews); implant failure risk (5-10%); higher cost; longer treatment duration	TAD placement under local anesthesia; 2-3 week latency; activation protocol (0.5-1mm/day); longer active phase (4-8 weeks)	Adolescents/adults (CVMS 4-6) with transverse deficiency; narrow palate; failed prior expansion [17, 24, 30, 31]
Facemask/Protraction Headgear	Non-surgical Class III correction; harnesses growth potential; can avoid orthognathic surgery	Compliance-dependent (12-16 hours/day); facial profile changes during wear; skin irritation; social concerns	12-16 hours daily wear; often combined with expansion (Alt-RAMEC protocol); orthopedic forces (300-600g/side); 6-12 months active treatment	Early mixed dentition (CVMS 1-2) Class III; maxillary deficiency; midfacial retrusion [21, 26, 32]
Chin Cup/Reverse Headgear	Non-surgical mandibular growth restraint; simple appliance design; low cost	Compliance-dependent; potential for adverse soft tissue effects; variable skeletal response; may redirect rather than restrain	12-14 hours daily wear; force magnitude 300-500g/side; direction critical (vertical or posterior); long treatment duration	Prepubertal Class III with mandibular prognathism; growing patients (CVMS 1-3) [12, 14]
Clear Aligner Systems with TADs	Esthetic; precise tooth control; integrated with skeletal anchorage for complex movements; comfortable	Limited evidence for skeletal effects in growing patients; technical complexity; higher cost; requires specialized training	Digital treatment planning; TAD placement (virtual planning); sequential aligners (weekly/biweekly changes); auxiliaries as needed; remote monitoring possible	Adolescents/adults requiring combined skeletal anchorage and esthetic treatment; mild-moderate skeletal discrepancies [17, 31, 34]
Surgical-Orthodontic Coordination	Definitive correction regardless of growth; predictable skeletal outcomes; single intervention	Invasive; recovery period (2-4 weeks); significant cost; requires growth completion; surgical risks	Presurgical orthodontic decompensation (12-18 months); surgical planning (virtual surgical planning); hospital admission; postsurgical finishing (6-12 months)	Non-growing patients (CVMS 5-6) with severe discrepancies (>5-7mm); combined skeletal and dental problems; failed prior growth modification [12, 23, 25]

6. Discussion

The comparative analysis presented in this review reveals both significant advances in our understanding of craniofacial growth modification biomechanics and persistent challenges in translating this understanding into predictable clinical outcomes [12, 14, 19]. Across the spectrum of treatment modalities—from functional appliances to skeletal anchorage systems—the fundamental principle remains constant: effective growth modification requires appropriate matching of mechanical strategy to biological context [12, 13, 21].

Several cross-cutting themes emerge from this analysis. First, treatment timing remains critical, with different skeletal sites exhibiting distinct windows of optimal responsiveness [12, 18, 20]. The midpalatal suture, for example, shows greatest expansile response during prepubertal and early pubertal development, while the mandibular condyle retains adaptive potential throughout growth [12, 18, 20]. Second, force magnitude and direction must be precisely calibrated to target specific skeletal structures while minimizing unwanted dental effects [14, 16, 17]. The development of skeletal anchorage has significantly enhanced this precision by enabling direct force application to bone [17, 24, 30].

Third, the biological response to mechanical forces is mediated by complex signaling pathways that remain incompletely understood [12, 15, 19]. Advances in mechanobiology—including identification of mechanosensitive cells, signaling molecules, and gene expression patterns—promise to illuminate the mechanisms by which orthopedic forces produce skeletal change [12, 15, 19].

Fourth, technological advances in imaging, digital design, and artificial intelligence are rapidly expanding treatment possibilities while also raising new questions about optimal implementation [11, 34, 35].

The clinical implications of these findings are substantial. Practitioners must remain current with evolving evidence regarding optimal treatment timing, appliance selection, and force parameters for different clinical presentations [12, 13, 21]. The integration of skeletal anchorage into growth modification protocols offers new possibilities for treating older patients and complex cases, but requires additional training and technical expertise [17, 24, 31]. Digital technologies enable unprecedented precision in treatment planning and execution, yet their effective use demands understanding of both their capabilities and limitations [11, 34, 35].

For researchers, this review highlights numerous directions for future investigation. Longitudinal studies with extended follow-up are needed to establish long-term stability of different treatment approaches [12, 23, 25]. Mechanistic studies exploring the molecular basis of mechanotransduction in craniofacial tissues may identify targets for enhancing treatment response [12, 15, 19]. Comparative effectiveness research comparing different modalities for similar clinical presentations can guide evidence-based decision-making [12, 21, 26]. And translational studies bridging basic science and clinical application remain essential for advancing the field [12, 15, 19].

7. Conclusion

The biomechanical integration of orthopedic and orthodontic treatments in craniofacial growth modification represents a sophisticated therapeutic domain requiring understanding of force systems, tissue response, and individual patient characteristics. This review has synthesized current knowledge regarding the biomechanical principles underlying successful growth modification, the clinical applications across major treatment modalities, and the emerging directions that promise to enhance future practice.

The fundamental insight emerging from this analysis is that optimal craniofacial management requires coordinated application of orthopedic forces to modify skeletal growth and orthodontic forces to achieve precise dental alignment within the corrected skeletal foundation. The biological basis of this coordination lies in the distinct mechanoresponsiveness of facial sutures, the mandibular condyle, and the periodontal ligament, each responding to mechanical stimuli through characteristic cellular and molecular pathways [12, 15, 19]. Successful treatment harnesses these responses through carefully designed force systems that respect the biological limits and adaptive capacity of each tissue type.

Clinical implications of this biomechanical understanding are substantial. Treatment timing must align with remaining growth potential, with different skeletal sites exhibiting different windows of optimal responsiveness [12, 18, 20]. Force magnitude, direction, and duration must be tailored to the specific target tissue and the desired therapeutic effect [14, 16, 17, 21]. Anchorage selection—whether conventional, skeletal, or hybrid—determines force system efficiency and the distribution of treatment effects [17, 24, 30]. Patient compliance, particularly for removable appliances, remains a critical determinant of outcome, requiring attention to patient education, motivation, and support [13, 22, 29].

The contribution of this review to the field lies in its integration of biomechanical theory with clinical application, providing a conceptual framework that bridges the gap between basic understanding of mechanobiology and practical treatment decision-making. By organizing knowledge around biomechanical principles rather than specific appliances or techniques, the review aims to equip clinicians with transferable understanding applicable to new technologies and evolving treatment approaches.

Future research directions promise continued advancement in growth modification practice. Predictive growth modeling, enabled by computational approaches and artificial intelligence, may eventually enable individual outcome prediction and personalized treatment planning [12, 15, 19, 34]. Digital biomechanics and AI-assisted planning tools are already transforming diagnosis and appliance design, with further integration likely [11, 34, 35]. Multicenter translational research frameworks will be essential for generating the evidence base needed to guide these emerging technologies [11, 12, 33, 35].

The ultimate goal of growth modification—achieving stable, harmonious craniofacial relationships through minimally invasive, biologically respectful intervention—remains constant even as the means of achieving it evolve. Grounded in sound biomechanical principles and enabled by technological advances, integrated orthopedic-orthodontic management offers the most reliable pathway to this goal for patients with craniofacial discrepancies. As understanding of craniofacial mechanobiology deepens and treatment technologies advance, the ability to predictably guide facial growth toward optimal outcomes will continue to improve, benefiting the many patients whose health, function, and quality of life depend on successful craniofacial management.

References

1. Taverne M, Khonsari RH. Development and growth of the forehead. Ann Chir Plast Esthet. 2024; 69(6):489-495.
2. Krishnan V, Kuijpers-Jagtman AM, editors. Integrated Clinical Orthodontics. 2nd ed. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell; 2024.
3. Thesleff A, Brånemark R, Håkansson B, Ortiz-Catalan M. Biomechanical characterisation of bone-anchored implant systems for amputation limb prostheses: a systematic review. Ann Biomed Eng. 2018; 46(3):377-391.
4. Dentistry UK. Elevate your orthodontics with mandibular repositioning technology. Dentistry.co.uk [Internet]. 2025 Apr 2 [cited 2026 Feb 2[5]. Available from: https://dentistry.co.uk (or full URL if available).
5. Development of modular systems with skeletal

anchorage for hybrid treatment with clear aligners. Semin Orthod. 2025; published online Nov 4.
6. Bhagwatkar R, Kaurani H, Jambure NR, Mantri AN, Singh P. Modulating craniofacial growth: The role of maxillary expansion appliances. IP Indian J Orthod Dentofacial Res. 2025; 11(3):178-183.
7. Biomechanical characterisation of bone-anchored implant systems for amputation limb prostheses: a systematic review. OpenAIRE.eu [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2026 Feb 2$^{5]}$. Available from: https://www.openaire.eu (or full URL if available).
8. Lucky Dental Lab. Frankel Orthodontics: The game-changer for kids' teeth (no surgery needed!). luckydentallab.com [Internet]. 2025 Oct 21 [cited 2026 Feb 2$^{5]}$. Available from: https://luckydentallab.com (or full URL if available).
9. Caldas LD, Barreto L, Nigri AP, Sannt'Anna E. A practical and efficient method to distalize and recover posterior superior space with a hybrid Hyrax. J World Fed Orthod. 2025; 14(6):545.
10. Karamesinis K, Basdra EK. The biological basis of treating jaw discrepancies: an interplay of mechanical forces and skeletal configuration. 2018.
11. Nanda R, Kapila S, editors. Current Therapy in Orthodontics. St Louis: Elsevier; 2023.
12. Proffit WR, Fields HW, Larson B, Sarver DM. Contemporary Orthodontics. 7th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2023.
13. Baccetti T, Franchi L, Toth LR, McNamara JA Jr. Treatment timing for Twin-block therapy. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2000; 118(2):159-170.
14. Graber LW, Vanarsdall RL, Vig KWL, Huang GJ. Orthodontics: Current Principles and Techniques. 7th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2022.
15. Mao JJ, Nah HD. Growth and development: hereditary and mechanical modulations. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2004; 125(6):676-689.
16. Krishnan V, Davidovitch Z. Cellular, molecular, and tissue-level reactions to orthodontic force. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2006; 129(4):469.e1-32.
17. Lee KJ, Park YC, Hwang CJ, Kim JY, Choi YJ. Skeletal anchorage for orthopedic correction. Semin Orthod. 2021; 27(2):87-95.
18. Enlow DH, Hans MG. Essentials of Facial Growth. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: Needham Press; 2008.
19. Meikle MC. The tissue, cellular, and molecular regulation of orthodontic tooth movement: 100 years after Carl Sandstedt. Eur J Orthod. 2006; 28(3):221-240.
20. Carlson DS. Theories of craniofacial growth in the postgenomic era. Semin Orthod. 2005; 11(4):172-183.
21. McNamara JA Jr, Brudon WL. Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. Ann Arbor: Needham Press; 2001.
22. Frankel R, Frankel C. Orofacial Orthopedics with the Function Regulator. Basel: Karger; 1989.
23. Proffit WR, White RP Jr, Sarver DM. Contemporary Treatment of Dentofacial Deformity. St Louis: Mosby; 2003.
24. Wilmes B, Nienkemper M, Drescher D. Application and effectiveness of a mini-implant- and tooth-borne rapid palatal expansion device: the hybrid hyrax. World J Orthod. 2010; 11(4):323-330.
25. Epker BN, Stella JP, Fish LC. Dentofacial Deformities: Integrated Orthodontic and Surgical Correction. 2nd ed. St Louis: Mosby; 1995.
26. Haas AJ. Palatal expansion: just the beginning of dentofacial orthopedics. Am J Orthod. 1970; 57(3):219-255.
27. Davidovitch Z. Tooth movement. Crit Rev Oral Biol Med. 1991; 2(4):411-450.
28. Frankel R. The treatment of Class II, Division 1 malocclusion with functional correctors. Am J Orthod. 1969; 55(3):265-275.
29. Pancherz H. The Herbst appliance: its biologic effects and clinical use. Am J Orthod. 1985; 87(1):1-20.
30. Cope JB. Temporary anchorage devices in orthodontics: a paradigm shift. Semin Orthod. 2005; 11(1):3-9.
31. Wilmes B, Vasudavan S, Drescher D. CAD-CAM-fabricated mini-implant insertion guides for the delivery of a distalization appliance in a single appointment. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2019; 156(1):148-156.
32. Lagravère MO, Major PW, Flores-Mir C. Long-term skeletal changes with rapid maxillary expansion: a systematic review. Angle Orthod. 2005; 75(6):1046-1052.
33. Ackerman JL, Proffit WR. Communication in orthodontic treatment planning: bioethical and informed consent issues. Angle Orthod. 1995; 65(4):253-261.
34. Fabels L, Nienkemper M, Wilmes B, Drescher D. Digital planning and customised appliance design for skeletal anchorage. J Orthod. 2022; 49(1_suppl):32-39.
35. Schwendicke F, Samek W, Krois J. Artificial intelligence in dentistry: chances and challenges. J Dent Res. 2020; 99(7):769-774.

How to Cite This Article

Müller JF. Biomechanical interactions between orthopedic and orthodontic treatments in craniofacial growth modification: clinical, translational, and methodological frameworks for integrated skeletal and dentofacial management. International Journal of Orthopedic and Orthodontic Research. 2026;2(2):1–9.

Creative Commons (CC) License