ISSN: 2581-5989
PubMed - National Library of Medicine - ID: 101738774

International Journal of Dental Science and Innovative Research (IJDSIR)

IJDSIR : Dental Publication Service

Available Online at:www.ijdsir.com

Volume – 8, Issue – 2, April – 2025, Page No. : 63 - 69

Self-Ligating Brackets: Enhancing Efficiency and Comfort in Modern Orthodontics

[1]Dr. Rohit Chaudhary, Senior Resident, Maulana Azad Institute of Dental Sciences, New Delhi

[2]Dr. Jeswin Abel, Senior Lecturer, Sree Mookambika Institute of Dental Sciences

[3]Dr. Ishwarya S, Postgraduate, Navodaya Dental College and Hospital, Raichur

[4]Dr. Vaibhav Jaiswal, Dental Director, Dr. Vaibhav Jaiswal Dental Multispeciality and Implant Center

[5]Dr. Neelam Sasidhar, BDS, G.Pulla Reddy Dental College and Hospital, Kurnool

[6]Dr. Fathima Hasna A.M, General Dentist, The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University

Corresponding Author: Dr. Rohit Chaudhary, Senior Resident, Maulana Azad Institute of Dental Sciences, New Delhi

Citation of this Article: Dr. Rohit Chaudhary, Dr. Jeswin Abel, Dr. Ishwarya S, Dr. Vaibhav Jaiswal, Dr. Neelam Sasidhar, Dr. Fathima Hasna A.M, “Self-Ligating Brackets: Enhancing Efficiency and Comfort in Modern Orthodontics”, IJDSIR- April – 2025, Volume – 8, Issue – 2, P. No. 63 – 69.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Background: Self-ligating brackets (SLBs) are an advancement in orthodontic appliance design, eliminating the need for external ligatures through an integrated locking mechanism. These systems have garnered clinical interest due to their potential for reduced friction, faster treatment times, and improved patient comfort.

Objective: To provide a comprehensive overview of the evolution, classification, design variations, and clinical performance of self-ligating bracket systems used in modern orthodontic practice.

Methods: This review explores historical developments, classifies SLBs based on mechanical action, material composition, and positioning, and analyzes key commercial bracket systems in terms of structure, function, advantages, and limitations. Comparative observations from retrospective studies and manufacturer data are discussed to evaluate their clinical efficacy.

Results: SLBs are broadly categorized into passive, active, and interactive systems, each offering unique biomechanical benefits. Advances in material science and bracket design have led to a wide array of options, including labial and lingual systems. Reported clinical benefits include decreased treatment duration, improved torque control, and enhanced hygiene. However, drawbacks such as technique sensitivity, higher cost, and mechanical limitations in certain designs persist.

Conclusion: Self-ligating brackets represent a significant innovation in orthodontics, offering biomechanical and procedural advantages. Nonetheless, their success relies on appropriate case selection, practitioner expertise, and continued product refinement. Further clinical studies are required to validate long-term outcomes across diverse patient populations.

Keywords: Self-ligating brackets, orthodontic appliances, passive brackets, active brackets, torque control, orthodontic biomechanics

Introduction and Background

Self-ligating brackets (SLBs) are orthodontic appliances that incorporate a built-in, movable mechanism designed to hold the archwire in place. This technology signifies a major advancement over traditional bracket systems that require external ligatures to function. SLBs have attracted significant interest due to their unique features and the clinical advantages they potentially offer.[1]

Conventional orthodontic systems rely on elastomeric or metallic ties to secure the archwire within the bracket slot, thereby guiding the forces applied to teeth. In contrast, SLBs eliminate the need for these external ligatures by integrating a locking mechanism within the bracket itself. This internal design supports more efficient control over tooth movement by reducing friction, which in turn can lead to faster and more effective treatment outcomes. [2]

Over time, SLB systems have evolved into various types, including passive and active variants. Passive systems facilitate natural interaction between the bracket and the archwire, while active systems allow for controlled movement through internal pressure mechanisms. These bracket types have been developed to deliver optimal force, minimize resistance, and potentially shorten treatment time. A detailed understanding of SLBs' mechanisms and clinical impacts helps orthodontic professionals make informed decisions about incorporating them into treatment plans. [3]

Development of Self-Ligating Bracket Systems

The concept of self-ligating brackets is not new; it dates back to 1935 when Stolzenberg introduced the Russell Lock edgewise appliance. Although their use dwindled for decades, SLBs experienced a resurgence in the early 21st century due to increasing interest in their potential clinical benefits. These benefits include quicker ligation, reduced friction, shorter treatment duration, fewer appointments, and improved patient comfort. [4,5]

SLBs are generally categorized into two types—active and passive—based on how they interact with the archwire.

- **Active SLBs** utilize a spring-loaded clip to exert pressure on the archwire, helping control tooth movement, torque, and rotation.
- **Passive SLBs**, on the other hand, use a slide mechanism that closes over the archwire slot without applying any force to the wire itself, thereby allowing the wire to move more freely within the slot.

Popular examples of active brackets include In-Ovation (GAC International), Speed (Strite Industries), and Time (Adenta). Notable passive brackets include the Damon System (Ormco) and SmartClip (3M Unitek), the latter resembling conventional brackets in appearance but functioning differently in terms of wire engagement.

Retrospective studies have noted advantages such as a 4–7 week reduction in treatment duration and fewer clinic visits. Other observed benefits include improved periodontal health, easier manipulation during chairside procedures, and greater bio-stability.

Classification of Self-Ligating Brackets [6-10]

SLBs can be categorized based on various parameters:

1. **By Mechanism of Action**
   - **Passive Brackets**: These use a rigid sliding mechanism to secure the archwire without

pressing against it. Tooth movement is primarily guided by the fit of the archwire in the bracket slot.
    - **Active Brackets**: These feature a flexible clip that applies force to the archwire, promoting controlled movement with continuous pressure.
    - **Interactive (Semi-active) Brackets**: These allow limited engagement of the archwire until it reaches a certain thickness, at which point the clip engages.
2. **By Material Composition**
    - **Metal Brackets**: Usually made from stainless steel or similar alloys, offering strength and durability.
    - **Tooth-Colored/Ceramic Brackets**: Designed for aesthetic purposes, blending with natural tooth color.
3. **By Position**
    - **Labial Brackets**: Positioned on the outer (labial) surface of the teeth.
    - **Lingual Brackets**: Placed on the inner (lingual) surface for improved aesthetics.

Each type of SLB comes with unique design features and clinical implications, allowing orthodontists to select brackets based on the specific treatment goals and patient preferences.

Types and Designs of Labial Self-Ligating Brackets [7-18]

The development of labial self-ligating brackets has evolved over time, with numerous systems offering distinct structural and functional features.

Russell Lock Edgewise Attachment

First introduced by Dr. Jacob Stolzenberg in 1935, this was among the earliest examples of a self-ligating system. It featured a flat-headed screw fastened into a circular hole on the bracket's front to secure the archwire.

Edgelok Brackets

Invented by Dr. Jim Wildman in 1972, these brackets had a rounded body and a rigid labial sliding cap. The cap had to be manually repositioned using a specialized tool to insert the archwire, effectively turning the bracket slot into a tube.

Mobil-Lock Brackets

Dr. Franz Sander created the Mobil-Lock system in 1974. These brackets required a special tool to rotate a semicircular labial disc that locked the archwire passively in place within a tubular structure.

Speed System

Developed by Hanson and later commercialized by Strite Industries in Canada, the Speed system brought a significant breakthrough. It features a spring clip that automatically engages the archwire without external ligatures, enhancing control and reducing the need for manual wire manipulation.

Activa Brackets

These brackets, produced by the "A" Company in San Diego, feature a concave labial slide. Although they offer better archwire engagement, the broader bracket width reduces the interbracket span, potentially limiting flexibility. However, their self-ligating mechanism allows longer archwire spans and improved control with lighter forces.

Interactive Bracket Systems

These systems start with passive mechanics, applying minimal friction, and later transition to active control of torque and rotation. They use a "comma"-shaped clip suspended from the bracket's tie wings and provide easy three-dimensional finishing adjustments.

Damon Appliance System

Introduced in the mid-1990s, the Damon system uses a passive self-ligating mechanism with a sliding door that encloses the archwire slot. This system emphasizes the concept that light continuous forces can be more biologically compatible with natural tooth movement.

Core Features

- Based on the Straight-Wire Appliance (SWA) philosophy.
- Twin configuration with a fully enclosing slide.
- Designed to open from the bottom (inferiorly) in both arches.
- Available in 0.018-inch and 0.022-inch slot sizes.
- Manufactured using MIM technology for precision and durability.

Design Evolution

- **Damon SL**: The first version with external sliding gates.
- **Damon 2**: Enhanced version with a concealed slide and tie-wings for better aesthetics.
- **Damon 3**: Further improved mechanism with a reliable spring action and better user handling.
- **Damon D3 MX and Q series**: Addressed earlier bonding issues, incorporated fully metal designs, and improved durability.
- **Damon Q2**: Latest generation offering advanced control and patient comfort.

Advantages

- Low-friction system potentially reduces treatment time and discomfort.
- Slimmer profile and rounded edges improve patient comfort.
- High-quality metal ensures long-term performance.

In-Ovation R (GAC International)[19]

This metal SLB was introduced in 2000 and is based on a twin bracket design. It features a built-in clip mechanism for easy wire engagement and is well-known for providing effective control over torque and rotation.

Advantages

- Quick and simple to place and manipulate.
- Excellent torque and rotational control.
- Elastomeric chains can be applied above or below the archwire.

Disadvantages

- Lacks aesthetic appeal due to its metallic finish.
- Difficulties in opening/closing when used with larger wires (e.g., 0.018 in a 0.022 slot).
- Not suitable for patients with nickel or chromium allergies.

In-Ovation C (GAC International)[20,21]

A ceramic version of the In-Ovation R, this bracket is manufactured using a fired-infusion process to produce a single-piece, tooth-colored unit. It's aesthetically pleasing and blends well with teeth.

Advantages

- Superior to its metal counterpart in torque control and rotation adjustment.
- Easy to place, open, and close.
- Reusable after sandblasting (as per manufacturer's guidance).

Disadvantages

- The plastic clip is weaker than the metal version.
- Debonding is tricky due to the material and size of the bracket.
- Difficult to rhodium-plate due to alloy composition.

SmartClip Bracket System (3M Unitek)

Introduced in 2005, SmartClip brackets are passive self-ligating appliances based on the MBT prescription. They utilize nickel-titanium clips integrated within a twin bracket framework to hold the archwire in place—automatically and without manual doors or latches.

Key Features

- Clips retain their shape due to the superelastic properties of nickel-titanium.
- No moving parts, which reduces risks like jamming, spontaneous opening, or plaque accumulation.

Engagement & Disengagement

- A rectangular notch allows for controlled wire insertion behind the clips.
- Disengagement is achieved by rotating a tool with dual hooks to gently release the archwire.

Advantages

- Fast wire changes and minimal friction.
- Lower likelihood of mechanical failure due to its simple clip system.

Disadvantages

- Metal look may not satisfy patients with high esthetic demands.

Self-Ligating Lingual Bracket Systems[22,23]

Philippe 2D Bracket (Forestadent)

Designed for minor corrections like crowding or spacing, Philippe 2D brackets provide two-dimensional control. These lingual brackets do not use slots; instead, small wings are welded to their base.

Variants

- Medium twin, large twin, three-wing (for elastics), and narrow single-wing designs are available.

Advantages

- Low profile makes them comfortable on the tongue side.
- Effective for mild malocclusions.

Forestadent 3D Torque-Lingual SLB

This system improves upon the Philippe 2D design by including a vertical slot, enabling full 3D control. The bracket is flat and places the archwire in close contact with the tooth, ensuring low profile and greater comfort.

Advantages

- Easy archwire insertion due to vertical slot orientation.
- Better torque and rotational control than its 2D counterpart.

In-Ovation L (GAC International) [24]

Featuring a horizontal slot and ultra-thin clips, these brackets are specifically designed for lingual application. Incisor brackets have curved bases to fit the palatal contours, improving comfort and fit.

Advantages

- Simple to open and close.
- Slim design increases interbracket distance for better wire engagement.

Disadvantage

- Thin wings can bend or break under excessive force.

Phantom Bracket (Gestenco International)[25-27]

Made from polyceramic material, this bracket requires no additional ligation. It is bonded after reshaping and smoothing the lingual tooth surface with composite.

Advantages:

- Completely self-ligating and esthetically superior.
- Designed for direct bonding after minor tooth surface adjustments.

General Advantages of Lingual SLBs

While the benefits vary by brand, common perks include:

- Consistent archwire engagement.
- Lower friction between the wire and bracket.
- Minimal need for assistance during adjustments.
- Faster wire placement and removal.

Conclusion

The concept of self-ligating brackets dates to the 1930s, but their clinical popularity has surged in the past few decades due to advancements in material science and orthodontic techniques. Modern SLB systems operate on the principle of applying light, continuous forces on a low-friction interface—facilitating smoother and more physiologic tooth movement.

Their reported benefits include:

- Reduced treatment duration
- Enhanced patient comfort
- Better hygiene due to less plaque accumulation
- Improved torque expression and control
- Less frequent need for extractions or anchorage devices

That said, the success of SLBs heavily depends on proper case selection and clinical technique. Some systems may underperform due to design flaws or inappropriate application. Furthermore, higher initial costs, bulky profiles, and technique sensitivity can limit their use in certain patient populations.

Ultimately, while SLBs offer significant potential, continued research and clinical refinement are necessary to establish their role across diverse orthodontic cases.

References

1. Jahanbin A, Hasanzadeh N, Khaki S, Shafaee H: Comparison of self-ligating Damon3 and conventional MBT brackets regarding alignment efficiency and pain experience: a randomized clinical trial. J Dent Res Dent Clin Dent Prospects. 2019, 13:281-8. 10.15171/joddd.2019.043.
2. Damon DH: The Damon low-friction bracket: a biologically compatible straight-wire system. J Clin Orthod. 1998, 32:670-80.
3. Crane MD: Investigation of frictional resistance on orthodontic brackets when subjected to variable moments. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Othop. 2003, 123:100. 10.1067/mod.2003.38
4. Hanson GH: The SPEED system: a report on the development of a new edgewise appliance . Am J Orthod. 1980, 78:243-65. 10.1016/0002-9416 (80) 90270-5
5. Read-Ward GE, Jones SP, Davies EH: A comparison of self-ligating and conventional orthodontic bracket systems. Br J Orthod. 1997, 24:309-17. 10.1093/ortho/24.4.309
6. Hanson GH: The SPEED bracket auxiliary slot. J Clin Orthod. 1999, 33:318-21.
7. Valant JR: Time: a self-ligating interactive bracket system. Semin Orthod. 2008, 14:46-53. 10.1053/ j.sodo.2007.12.005
8. Berger JL: The SPEED system: an overview of the appliance and clinical performance . Semin Orthod. 2008, 14:54-63. 10.1053/j.sodo.2007.12.006
9. Geron S: Self-ligating brackets in lingual orthodontics. Semin Orthod. 2008, 14:64-72. 10. 1053/j.sodo.2007.12.007
10. Nabhan AF, Abbas NH, Fleming PS, Johal A, Sadek MM: Self-ligating brackets versus conventional pre-adjusted edgewise brackets for treating malocclusion. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016, 2016:CD012407. 10.1002/14651858.CD012407
11. Bednar JR, Gruendeman GW: The influence of bracket design on moment production during axial rotation. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 1993, 104:254-61. 10.1016/S0889-5406(05)81727-5
12. Schumacher HA, Bourauel C, Drescher D: The influence of bracket design on frictional losses in the bracket/arch wire system. J Orofac Orthop. 1999, 60: 335-47. 10.1007/BF01301246
13. Bednar JR, Gruendeman GW, Sandrik JL: Comparative study of frictional forces . Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 1991, 100:513-22. 10.1016/ 0889-5406(91)70091-A

14. Damon DH: The rationale, evolution and clinical application of the self-ligating bracket . Clin Orthod Res. 1998, 1:52-61. 10.1111/ocr.1998.1.1.52
15. Macchi A, Tagliabue A, Levrini L, Trezzi G: Philippe self-ligating lingual brackets . J Clin Orthod. 2002, 36:42-5.
16. Harradine N: The history and development of self-ligating brackets . Semin Orthod. 2008, 14:5-8. 10.1053/j.sodo.2007.12.002
17. Juneja P, Chopra SS, Jayan BK: Self ligating lingual appliance. Med J Armed Forces India. 2015, 71: S411-4. 10.1016/j.mjafi.2012.07.012
18. Jian F, Lai W, Furness S, McIntyre GT, Millett DT, Hickman J, Wang Y: Initial arch wires for tooth alignment during orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013, 2013:CD007859. 10.1002/ 14651858. CD007859. pub3
19. Sims AP, Waters NE, Birnie DJ: A comparison of the forces required to produce tooth movement ex vivo through three types of pre-adjusted brackets when subjected to determined tip or torque values. Br J Orthod. 1994, 21:367-73. 10.1179/bjo.21.4.367.
20. Brauchli LM, Steineck M, Wichelhaus A: Active and passive self-ligation: a myth? Part 1: torque control. Angle Orthod. 2012, 82:663-9. 10.2319/ 062011-673.1
21. Trevisi H, Bergstrand F: The smart clip self-ligating appliance system . Semin Orthod. 2008, 14:87-100. 10.1053/j.sodo.2007.12.009.
22. Chen SS, Greenlee GM, Kim JE, Smith CL, Huang GJ: Systematic review of self-ligating brackets . Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2010, 137:726-8. 10.1016/j.ajodo.2009.11.009.
23. Sfondrini MF, Xheka E, Scribante A, Gandini P, Sfondrini G: Reconditioning of self-ligating brackets . Angle Orthod. 2012, 82:158-64. 10.2319/033011-227.
24. Loftus BP, Ârtun J, Nicholls JI, Alonzo TA, Stoner JA: Evaluation of friction during sliding tooth movement in various bracket-archwire combination. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Othop. 1999, 116:336-45. 10.1016/s0889- 5406(99)70247-7.
25. Berger J, Byloff FK: The clinical efficiency of self-ligated brackets . J Clin Orthod. 2001, 35:304-8.
26. Frank CA, Nikolai RJ: A comparative study of frictional resistances between orthodontic bracket and arch wire. Am J Orthod. 1980, 78:593-609. 10. 1016/0002-9416(80)90199-2.
27. De Franco DJ, Spiller RE Jr, von Fraunhofer JA: Frictional resistances using Teflon-coated ligatures with various bracket-archwire combinations. Angle Orthod. 1995, 65:63-72. 10.1043/0003- 3219 (1995) 0652.0.CO;2.