

Retraction

Retracted: Comparison of Movement of the Upper Dentition According to Anchorage Method: Orthodontic Mini-Implant versus Conventional Anchorage Reinforcement in Class I Malocclusion

International Scholarly Research Notices

Received 20 March 2019; Accepted 20 March 2019; Published 4 April 2019

Copyright © 2019 International Scholarly Research Notices. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

At the request of the authors, International Scholarly Research Notices has retracted the article titled “Comparison of Movement of the Upper Dentition According to Anchorage Method: Orthodontic Mini-Implant versus Conventional Anchorage Reinforcement in Class I Malocclusion” [1]. There were several mistakes on the sample selection and group categorization. The authors divided the patients into Group 1 (N=20) and Group 2 (N=20), but this group categorization did not consider “Angle Classification”, which is a critical factor in orthodontics. The authors also measured only the upper arch. However, for the interpretation of the real change, we should have considered the lower arch. Without the lower arch data, the results may be useless. The correct categorization and sample criteria are as follows:

(i) *Categorization.* The subjects were 52 adult female patients treated with sliding mechanics (MBT brackets, .022 slot, .019X.025 stainless steel wire, 3M-Unitek, Monrovia, CA, USA). They were allocated into Group 1 (N=24, Class I malocclusion (CI), upper and lower first premolar (UPILP1) extraction, and CAR), Group 2 (N=15, CI, UPILP1 extraction, and OMI), and Group 3 (N=13, Class II division 1 malocclusion, upper first and lower second premolar extraction, and OMI).

(ii) *Sample Criteria.* Skeletal and dental condition: Class I or Class II molar relationship, normal overbite (>0 , <4), labioversed upper incisor (U1 to palatal plane $>105^\circ$), and less than 4 mm crowding in each arch.

mini-implant versus conventional anchorage reinforcement in class I malocclusion,” *ISRN Dentistry*, vol. 2011, Article ID 321206, 7 pages, 2011.

References

- [1] A.-Y. Lee and Y. H. Kim, “Comparison of movement of the upper dentition according to anchorage method: orthodontic