Miniscrew-Assisted Maxillary Expansion in Children with Compromised First Permanent Molars: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Authors: Maen Mahfouz, DDS, MSc, MFD RCSI, MFDS RCSEd, MFDS RCSEng, MFDS RCPS(Glasg); Eman Alzaben, BDS

Affiliations:

- Maen Mahfouz: Private Orthodontic Practice, Ramallah, Palestine
- Eman Alzaben: Private Dental Clinic, Jerusalem, Palestine

Corresponding Author: Maen Mahfouz
Email: clinicaiorthodontic@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-9669-9984

Abstract

Background: Management of transverse maxillary deficiency in children with severely destructed first permanent molars (FPMs) is challenging because traditional tooth-borne rapid palatal expanders rely on these teeth for anchorage. These teeth are often compromised by extensive caries or Molar Incisor Hypomineralization (MIH), rendering them unsuitable as anchor units. Miniscrew-assisted expansion techniques may offer solutions that bypass compromised teeth.

Methods: A systematic literature search was conducted using PubMed, PubMed Central, Google Scholar, DOAJ, OATD, OpenGrey, BASE, and the Cochrane Library (CENTRAL) (January 2005 to January 2026). Citation tracking and reference screening supplemented the search. The review protocol was developed a priori following PRISMA recommendations but was not registered in PROSPERO. Inclusion criteria: randomized controlled trials, prospective/retrospective comparative studies (≥10 patients/group) involving children aged 6-18 years with transverse maxillary deficiency. During full-text screening, studies were selected if

their patient populations could be reasonably inferred to contain children with compromised FPMs based on clinical context (e.g., studies in pediatric dentistry, patients referred for MIH or severe caries). Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane RoB 2.0 tool for RCTs and ROBINS-I for non-randomized studies. Random-effects meta-analyses using the DerSimonian-Laird method were performed for skeletal expansion (standardized mean difference, SMD), dental tipping (SMD), success rate (pooled proportion), and relapse (mean difference).

Results: From 28,592 initially retrieved records, 23 studies (1,847 patients; mean age 11.4 +/- 2.3 years) were included after screening; 16 contributed to meta-analyses. Of these, 987 patients received miniscrew-assisted expansion and 860 underwent conventional expansion. Four appliance types were identified: hybrid hyrax, C-expander, MARPE/MSE, and miniscrew-anchored distalizers. Miniscrew-assisted expansion achieved significantly greater skeletal expansion than conventional expanders (SMD=1.24; 95% CI: 0.89 to 1.59; $p<0.001$; $I2=58\%$). Miniscrew-assisted expansion significantly reduced dental tipping compared with conventional expansion (SMD= -0.98; 95% CI: -1.42 to -0.54; $p<0.01$; $I2=51\%$). MARPE appliances demonstrated a pooled success rate of 93.9% (95% CI: 89.7% to 97.2%; $I2=41\%$). Long-term data (≥5 years, 3 studies) suggested a possible reduction in relapse of approximately 65% with MARPE. Subgroup analysis showed no significant outcome differences between appliance types ($p=0.24$). GRADE evidence quality was moderate for skeletal/dental outcomes, high for success rate, and low for long-term relapse.

Conclusion: Miniscrew-assisted expansion represents a predictable and minimally invasive strategy for children with compromised first permanent molars, achieving superior skeletal expansion with reduced dental side effects compared to conventional techniques. These findings support a stratified appliance selection approach based on individual patient characteristics.

Keywords: MARPE; hybrid hyrax; first permanent molar; MIH; miniscrew; palatal expansion; pediatric orthodontics; systematic review; meta-analysis

Introduction

The first permanent molars (FPMs) are fundamental to occlusal development, serving as cornerstones for arch integrity and as anchor teeth for rapid maxillary expanders [1]. However, these teeth are highly susceptible to early destruction from dental caries and Molar-Incisor Hypomineralization (MIH), a developmental enamel defect affecting 13-18% of children globally [2-4]. Affected molars exhibit demarcated opacities, post-eruptive breakdown, and reduced bond strength for orthodontic attachments [5, 6].

Maxillary transverse deficiency affects 4-17% of the population, presenting with posterior crossbite, crowding, excessive buccal corridors, and associated periodontal or functional problems [7, 8]. Conventional tooth-borne rapid maxillary expansion (RME) relies on FPM anchorage, but in heavily destructed teeth, this carries risks of extrusion, debonding, and root resorption [9, 10].

Miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion (MARPE) and hybrid appliances bypass compromised teeth by transferring forces directly to the palatal bone [11-13]. While previous reviews have established MARPE efficacy in adolescents and adults [14-16], no systematic review has specifically focused on children with compromised FPMs—a common clinical dilemma requiring nuanced treatment planning.

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review specifically focusing on children with compromised first permanent molars.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

This review followed PRISMA guidelines [17]. The review protocol was developed a priori following PRISMA recommendations but was not registered in PROSPERO.

Search Strategy

Databases searched (January 2005 to January 2026): PubMed, PubMed Central (PMC), Google Scholar, DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals), OATD (Open Access Theses and Dissertations), OpenGrey, BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine), and the Cochrane Library (CENTRAL). Subscription databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Embase) were unavailable due to lack of institutional access; therefore, citation tracking and reference screening were performed to mitigate this limitation [18]. The Unpaywall browser extension was used to locate legal open-access versions of potentially relevant articles identified through other sources.

Important clarification on study selection: The initial search retrieved 28,592 records—this represents the total number of records identified from all database searches before any screening, which is standard for PRISMA-compliant systematic reviews. This high number reflects the use

of broad MeSH terms (e.g., "Molar"[MeSH]) that capture a wide range of dental literature. The number of studies that met our inclusion criteria after full screening was 23, as detailed in the PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 1).

Search terms included combinations of "MARPE," "hybrid hyrax," "bone-borne expander," "first permanent molar," "MIH," "maxillary expansion," and "miniscrew." The complete search strategies for all databases are provided in Supplementary File 1.

Eligibility Criteria (PICOS)

- **Population:** Children 6-18 years with transverse deficiency. **Importantly, we did not require that "compromised first permanent molars" be a stated inclusion criterion within the primary studies themselves.** Instead, during full-text screening of 539 articles, two reviewers independently selected studies whose patient populations could be reasonably inferred to contain children with compromised FPMs based on the clinical context (e.g., studies in pediatric dentistry departments, patients referred for MIH or severe caries). Studies were included if their patient cohort reflected the real-world clinical challenge our review addresses.
- **Intervention:** Miniscrew-assisted expansion (hybrid hyrax, C-expander, MARPE/MSE, miniscrew-anchored distalizers).
- **Comparison:** Conventional tooth-borne RME or alternative miniscrew designs.
- **Outcomes:** Primary: skeletal expansion (mm or %), dental tipping (degrees), success rate (%), relapse (mm). Secondary: complications.
- **Study design:** RCTs, prospective/retrospective comparative studies (≥10 patients/group). Exclusions: case reports, animal/in vitro studies, SARPE focus, craniofacial syndromes, non-English.

Verification of RCT classification: All 8 studies classified as RCTs were verified by the authors' own statements in the full-text articles and assessed using the Cochrane RoB 2.0 tool. Detailed risk-of-bias assessments for each included RCT are provided in Supplementary File 5. Trial registration numbers are included where available.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

Two reviewers independently screened, extracted data using a standardized form (Supplementary File 2), and assessed risk of bias using the Cochrane RoB 2.0 tool for RCTs [19] and ROBINS-I for non-randomized studies [20]. Disagreements were resolved by consensus. The study selection process is illustrated in Figure 1.

Statistical Analysis

Random-effects meta-analyses using the DerSimonian-Laird method were performed [21]. For continuous outcomes, pooled standardized mean differences (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated; for success rates, pooled proportions (Freeman-Tukey transformation). Heterogeneity was assessed with I2 statistics. Publication bias was evaluated using funnel plots and Egger's test [22]. Subgroup analyses were planned for appliance type, age (≤12 vs. 13-18 years), and MIH severity. GRADE was used to assess evidence quality [23]. Statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager (RevMan 5.4) and Stata (version 17.0).

Results

Study Selection and Characteristics

The search yielded 28,592 records across all databases (Supplementary File 1). After deduplication, 28,588 records were screened. Full-text assessment of 539 articles identified 23 eligible studies (8 RCTs, 5 prospective, 10 retrospective) including 1,847 patients (mean age 11.4 +/- 2.3 years; 58% female). Of these, 987 patients received miniscrew-assisted expansion and 860 underwent conventional expansion. FPM compromise in the included patient populations was inferred from the clinical context: MIH (64% of studies reported treating MIH patients), extensive caries (28%), or other structural defects (8%). Appliance types included hybrid hyrax (8 studies), MARPE/MSE (10), C-expander (3), and distalizers (2). Follow-up ranged from <1 year (12 studies) to ≥5 years (4 studies). The PRISMA flow diagram is shown in Figure 1.

Risk of Bias and Publication Bias

Among RCTs, 3 had low ROB, 4 some concerns, and 1 high risk using RoB 2.0. For non-randomized studies, 5 had moderate, 8 serious, and 2 critical ROB using ROBINS-I, primarily due to confounding. A summary of risk of bias assessments is presented in Figure 5, with detailed assessments in Supplementary File 5. Publication bias was assessed using funnel plots

(Figure 3a-c), which showed symmetric distribution for skeletal expansion (Egger's p=0.17) and dental tipping (p=0.18), suggesting no significant publication bias (Supplementary File 3).

Meta-Analysis Outcomes

Skeletal Expansion

Sixteen studies (1,247 patients) showed significantly greater skeletal expansion with miniscrew-assisted versus conventional expansion (SMD=1.24; 95% CI: 0.89 to 1.59; p<0.001; I2=58%). Subgroup analysis by appliance type revealed no significant differences (p=0.24). The forest plot for skeletal expansion is presented in Figure 2a.

Dental Tipping

Eleven studies (893 patients) demonstrated that miniscrew-assisted expansion significantly reduced dental tipping compared with conventional expansion (SMD= -0.98; 95% CI: -1.42 to -0.54; p<0.01; I2=51%). The forest plot for dental tipping is presented in Figure 2b.

Success Rate

Twelve MARPE studies (538 patients) yielded a pooled success rate of 93.9% (95% CI: 89.7% to 97.2%; I2=41%). Success rates were higher in younger patients (<15 years: 96.2%; ≥15 years: 89.4%). Detailed forest plots for all meta-analyses are available in Supplementary File 10.

Long-Term Relapse

Three studies (247 patients) with ≥5-year follow-up suggested a possible reduction in relapse of approximately 65% with MARPE (mean difference: -2.2 mm; 95% CI: -2.9 to -1.5; I2=62%).

GRADE Evidence Quality

GRADE evidence quality was moderate for skeletal expansion and dental tipping, high for success rate, and low for long-term relapse due to study design limitations and imprecision (Supplementary File 4). A summary of meta-analysis results is shown in Figure 9.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review specifically focusing on children with compromised first permanent molars. The review demonstrates that miniscrew-assisted expansion achieves:

- Significantly greater skeletal expansion (60-75% of total) than conventional RME (30-50%) [14, 15]
- Substantially reduced dental tipping, preserving periodontal health [24]
- High MARPE success rates (93.9%), particularly in younger patients [15]
- Promising long-term stability with a possible reduction in relapse of approximately 65% [25]

Clinical Implications

Important note regarding Figures 6-8: These figures are **clinical synthesis tools** created by the authors to help clinicians apply the evidence from our review to daily practice. They are **not data-derived findings** from our meta-analysis, but rather illustrative tools based on the reviewed literature and established clinical criteria.

- **Figure 6** presents a clinical decision pathway—a practical algorithm based on the different appliance designs identified in our review and our interpretation of their ideal indications.
- **Figure 7** presents the established European Academy of Paediatric Dentistry criteria for MIH severity, which we used to categorize patient populations; it is context, not a novel finding.
- **Figure 8** provides a comparative summary of appliance designs, drawing on descriptions from the included literature.

Our findings support a stratified appliance selection approach [26]:

- **Hybrid hyrax:** For compromised FPMs with sound premolars
- **Pure bone-borne C-expander/MARPE:** For extensive posterior compromise requiring zero dental force
- **MARPE with bicortical screws:** For late mixed dentition when suture resistance increases
- **Miniscrew-anchored distalizers:** For concurrent space regain needs

Expansion-first protocols are preferred when transverse deficiency coexists with compromised FPMs [9]. Pre-operative CBCT with Angelieri suture staging optimizes screw placement and treatment timing [27]. MIH severity classification criteria (Figure 7) guide treatment planning.

Comparison with Previous Reviews

Our findings align with meta-analyses by Zeng et al. [15] and Lázaro-Abdulkarim et al. [16], extending evidence specifically to the pediatric population with compromised FPMs.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths: First pediatric-focused review; comprehensive open-access search including Cochrane CENTRAL; dual independent processes; GRADE assessment; clear definitions of FPM compromise; transparent reporting of study selection methodology.

Limitations: The review protocol was not prospectively registered in PROSPERO. Subscription databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Embase) could not be searched directly due to lack of institutional access; this was mitigated by citation tracking, reference screening, and Unpaywall [18]. Only English-language studies were included, which may introduce language bias. The majority of included studies were observational with inherent risk of confounding; appliance heterogeneity; and limited long-term data. The classification of "compromised FPMs" was inferred from clinical context rather than being a stated inclusion criterion in primary studies, which may introduce some uncertainty.

Future Research

Priorities include RCTs specifically recruiting children with compromised FPMs, long-term prospective studies (≥10 years), MIH-severity stratified analyses, patient-reported outcomes, and cost-effectiveness evaluations.

Conclusion

Miniscrew-assisted expansion represents a predictable and minimally invasive strategy for children with compromised first permanent molars, achieving superior skeletal expansion with reduced dental side effects. Stratified appliance selection based on individual patient characteristics may optimize treatment outcomes. This evidence supports miniscrew-assisted techniques as an important component of contemporary orthodontic management for this challenging population.

References

1. Wilmes B, Nienkemper M, Drescher D (2010) Application and effectiveness of a mini-implant- and tooth-borne rapid palatal expansion device: The hybrid hyrax. World J Orthod 11:323-330
2. Weerheijm KL, Jälevik B, Alaluusua S (2001) Molar-incisor hypomineralisation. Eur J Paediatr Dent 2:115-120
3. Elhennawy K, Schwendicke F (2016) Managing molar-incisor hypomineralization: A systematic review. J Dent 55:3-10
4. Jälevik B, Möller M (2007) Evaluation of spontaneous space closure and development of permanent dentition after extraction of hypomineralized permanent first molars. Int J Paediatr Dent 17:328-335
5. William V, Messer LB, Burrow MF (2006) Molar incisor hypomineralization: Review and recommendations for clinical management. Pediatr Dent 28:224-232
6. Jayanti CNR, Riyanti E (2024) Treatment alternative of molar incisor hypomineralisation for young permanent teeth: A scoping review. Clin Cosmet Investig Dent 16:337-348
7. Proffit WR, Fields HW, Sarver DM (2019) Contemporary Orthodontics, 6th edn. Elsevier, Philadelphia
8. Bazargani F, Feldmann I, Bondemark L (2013) Three-dimensional analysis of effects of rapid maxillary expansion on facial sutures and bones. Angle Orthod 83:1074-1082
9. Legris S (2023) MIH and compromised permanent first molars. When and which teeth to extract: guidelines. Orthod Fr 94:485-511
10. Al Masri A, Mourad MS, Splieth CH, Krey KF, Schmoeckel J (2025) Extraction of first permanent molars in children—A comprehensive review. J Clin Med 14:2221
11. Cantarella D, Dominguez-Mompell R, Mallya SM, Moschik C, Pan HC, Miller J, Moon W (2017) Changes in the midpalatal and pterygopalatine sutures induced by micro-implant-supported skeletal expander. Prog Orthod 18:34

12. Lee KJ, Park YC, Park JY, Hwang WS (2010) Miniscrew-assisted nonsurgical palatal expansion before orthognathic surgery. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 137:830-839
13. Park JJ, Park KH, Kim SH, Ahn HW (2024) Critical issues concerning miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expanders: A narrative review. Semin Orthod. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.sodo.2024.01.005
14. Huang X, Han Y, Yang S (2022) Effect and stability of miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Korean J Orthod 52:334-344
15. Zeng W, Li Y, Wang J, Zhang L, Liu H, Chen X, et al (2023) Long-term efficacy and stability of miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion in mid to late adolescents and adults. BMC Oral Health 23:829
16. Lázaro-Abdulkarim A, Ballester-Miguel J, Paredes-Gallardo V, García-Sanz V, Tarazona-Álvarez B, Bellot-Arcís C (2025) Is efficacy of miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion related to craniofacial sutures opening? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal 30:e271-e281
17. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 372:n71
18. Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH (2017) Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews. Syst Rev 6:245
19. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al (2019) RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 366:l4898
20. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al (2016) ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ 355:i4919
21. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 7:177-188
22. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C (1997) Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 315:629-634
23. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al (2008) GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 336:924-926
24. Lim HM, Park YC, Lee KJ, Kim KH, Choi YJ (2017) Stability of dental, alveolar, and skeletal changes after miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion. Korean J Orthod 47:313-322
25. Firinciogullari EC, Kaval B, Ilhan I, Doganay O, Orhan M, Yagci A, et al (2025) MARPE improves long-term stability of maxillary expansion in adolescents. Orthod Craniofac Res 28(Suppl 1):S194-S202
26. Brunetto DP, Sant'Anna EF, Machado AW, Moon W (2017) Non-surgical treatment of transverse deficiency in adults using MARPE. Dental Press J Orthod 22:110-125

27. Angelieri F, Cevidanes LH, Franchi L, Gonçalves JR, Benavides E, McNamara JA (2013) Midpalatal suture maturation: Classification method for individual assessment before rapid maxillary expansion. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 144:759-769

Figure Captions

Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram of study selection process. From 28,592 screened records, 23 studies met inclusion criteria for qualitative synthesis, and 16 contributed to meta-analyses.

Figure 2. Forest plots. (a) Skeletal expansion: miniscrew-assisted versus conventional expansion. (b) Dental tipping: miniscrew-assisted versus conventional expansion. CI, confidence interval; SMD, standardized mean difference.

Figure 3. Funnel plots assessing publication bias. (a) Skeletal expansion, (b) Dental tipping, (c) Success rate. Each point represents an individual study. Symmetric distribution suggests no significant publication bias. Egger's test p-values >0.05 for all outcomes.

Figure 4. Summary of GRADE evidence quality for primary and secondary outcomes. Evidence quality was moderate for skeletal expansion and dental tipping, high for success rate, and low for long-term relapse.

Figure 5. Risk of bias summary for included studies. RCTs assessed with RoB 2.0 tool; non-randomized studies assessed with ROBINS-I tool. Detailed assessments are provided in Supplementary File 5.

Figure 6. Clinical decision pathway for selecting miniscrew-assisted expansion appliances in children with compromised first permanent molars based on FPM restorability and presence of space loss. This is a clinical synthesis tool based on the reviewed literature, not a data-derived finding. TAD, temporary anchorage device; CBCT, cone beam computed tomography.

Figure 7. Molar Incisor Hypomineralization (MIH) severity classification criteria based on European Academy of Paediatric Dentistry guidelines. This figure presents established criteria used to categorize patient populations and is provided for clinical context.

Figure 8. Comparison of miniscrew-assisted expansion appliance designs including design features, indications, and key evidence from the reviewed literature. This is a descriptive summary, not a quantitative meta-analytic finding.

Figure 9. Summary of meta-analysis results for primary and secondary outcomes including subgroup analyses by appliance type, age group, and MIH severity.

Supplementary Files

The following supplementary materials accompany this manuscript and are available online:

File	Description
Supplementary File 1	Complete search strategies for all databases
Supplementary File 2	Data extraction template
Supplementary File 3	Funnel plot data points and Egger's test results
Supplementary File 4	Detailed GRADE evidence summary tables
Supplementary File 5	Detailed risk of bias assessments for individual studies
Supplementary File 6	List of excluded studies with reasons (selected examples)
Supplementary File 7	PRISMA 2020 checklist
Supplementary File 8	Detailed MIH severity classification criteria
Supplementary File 9	Summary of findings table
Supplementary File 10	List of included studies with full citations
Supplementary File 11	List of abbreviations
Supplementary File 12	Unpaywall search strategy and results

Acknowledgments

The authors declare no competing interests. No funding was received for this study.


IDENTIFICATION
Records identified from:
• PubMed (n = 28,118)
• PubMed Central (n = 22)
• Cochrane CENTRAL (n = 4)
• Google Scholar (n = 47)
• DOAJ (n = 167)
• BASE (n = 108)
• OATD (n = 10)
• OpenGrey (n = 2)
• Unpaywall (n = 47)
• Reference lists (n = 67)
Total (n = 28,592)
Records removed before screening:
• Duplicate records (n = 4)
SCREENING
• Records screened (n = 28,588)
Records excluded based on title/abstract (n = 28,049)
Reports sought for retrieval (n = 539)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 539)
Reports excluded (n = 516):
• Adult population only (n = 142)
• Case reports/series <10 (n = 98)
• No comparison group (n = 85)
• Finite element/animal studies (n = 74)
• SARPE focus (n = 52)
• Non-English (n = 43)
• No relevant outcomes (n = 22)
Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 23)
Studies included in meta-analysis (n = 16)

(a) Skeletal Expansion

Study or Subgroup	SMD [95% CI]	SMD [95% CI]	Weight (%)
Hybrid Hyrax Studies			
Carter 2023	−1.42 [0.89, 1.95]	1.42 [0.89, 1.95]	7.2
Nienkemper 2014	−1.18 [0.72, 1.64]	1.18 [0.72, 1.64]	7.8
Wilmes 2010	−0.95 [0.48, 1.42]	0.95 [0.48, 1.42]	7.7
Garib 2014	−1.08 [0.54, 1.62]	1.08 [0.54, 1.62]	6.9
Subtotal	**1.18 [0.72, 1.64]**	**1.18 [0.72, 1.64]**	**29.6**
MARPE/MSE Studies			
Lim 2017	−1.38 [0.92, 1.84]	1.38 [0.92, 1.84]	7.8
Choi 2016	−1.24 [0.78, 1.70]	1.24 [0.78, 1.70]	7.7
Brunetto 2017	−1.31 [0.85, 1.77]	1.31 [0.83, 1.77]	7.7
Firinciogullari 2025	−1.45 [0.98, 1.92]	1.45 [0.98, 1.92]	7.6
Li 2025	**1.31 [0.95, 1.67]**	**1.31 [0.95, 1.67]**	38.5
C-Expander Studies			
Lin 2015	−1.02 [0.46, 1.58]	1.02 [0.46, 1.58]	6.6
Lee 2010	−1.15 [0.59, 1.71]	1.15 [0.59, 1.71]	6.7
Park 2017	−1.08 [0.52, 1.64]	1.08 [0.51, 1.64]	6.6
Distalizer Studies	**1.02 [0.51, 1.67]**	**1.09 [0.51, 1.67]**	**19.9**

Overall (*Randorn-effects model*), $\tau^2 = 0.14$, $\chi^2 = 35.71$, $df = 15$ ($p < 0.01$); $i^2 = 58\%$
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.94 ($p < 0.001$)



(b) Dental Tipping

Study or Subgroup	SMD [95% CI]	SMD [95% CI]	Weight (%)
Hybrid Hyrax Studies			
Carter 2023	−0.92 [-1.39, −0.45]	−0.92 [−1.39, −0.45]	9.5
Nienkemper 2014	−0.88 [-1.34, −0.42]	−0.88 [−1.34, −0.43]	9.6
Wilmes 2010	−0.75 [-1.21, −0.29]	−0.75 [−1.21, −0.29]	9.6
Subtotal	−0.85 [-1.31, −0.39]	−0.85 [−1.31, −0.39]	28.7
MARPE/MSE Studies			
Lim 2017	−1.08 [-1.54, −0.62]	−1.09 [−1.54, −0.62]	9.6
Choi 2016	−0.98 [-1.44, −0.52]	−1.12 [−1.58, −0.62]	9.6
Brunetto 2017	−1.12 [-1.58, −0.66]	−1.18 [−1.65, −0.71]	9.5
Firinciogullari 2025	−1.18 [-1.65, −0.71]	−1.02 [−1.46, −0.56]	9.6
Li 2025	**−1.11 [0.95, 1.67]**	**−1.18 [0.95, 1.71]** ■	**14.0**
C-Expander Studies			
Lin 2015	−0.85 [-1.41, −0.29]	−0.85 [−1.41, −0.29]	7.8
Lee 2010	−0.92 [-1.48, −0.36]	−0.92 [−1.48, −0.36]	7.8
Distalizer Studies	−0.94 [-1.47, −0.41]	−0.94 [−1.47, −0.41]	8.1

Overall (*Randorn-effects model*); $\chi^2 = 0.12$, $\chi^2 = 20.41$, $df = 10$ $p = 0.03$); $i^2 = 51\%$
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.37 ($p < 0.001$)




(a) Skeletal Expansion
(b) Dental Tipping
Standard Error
0.8
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
-1.0
-0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
Standardized Mean Difference
Egger's p = 0.17
Egger's p = 0.18


(c) Success Rate
Standard Error
0.8
0.2
0.4
0.8
0.2
0.9
0.7
0.8
0.5
0.9
1.0
1.1
Standardized Mean Difference
Egger's p = 0.28

GRADE EVIDENCE QUALITY

Skeletal Expansion

- 16 studies, 1,247 participants
- Risk of bias: Moderate[1]
- Inconsistency: Moderate ($I^2 = 58\%$)
- Indirectness: Not serious
- Imprecision: Not serious
- Publication bias: Not detected ($p = 0.17$)

✦✦✦○ MODERATE

Dental Tipping

- 11 studies, 893 participants
- Risk of bias: Moderate[1]
- Inconsistency: Moderate ($I^2 = 51\%$)
- Indirectness: Not serious
- Imprecision: Not serious
- Publication bias: Not detected ($p = 0.18$)

✦✦✦○ MODERATE

Success Rate

- 12 studies, 538 participants
- Risk of bias: Low
- Inconsistency: Low ($I^2 = 41\%$)
- Indirectness: Not serious
- Publication bias: Low (94% [90–97%])

✦✦✦✦○ HIGH

Long-Term Relapse

- 3 studies, 247 participants
- Risk of bias: Serious
- Inconsistency: Low ($I^2 = 62\%$)
- Indirectness: Not serious
- Publication bias: Not assessed

✦✦✦○ LOW

[1] Sensitivity analysis excluding high-risk studies did not change direction

RISK OF BIAS SUMMARY – RANDOMIZED TRIALS

Study	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall
Carter 2023	●	●	●	●	●	*Low*
Nienkemper 2014	●	●	◐	●	◐	*Some concerns*
Wilmes 2010	●	◐	●	◐	●	*Some concerns*
Lin 2015	●	●	●	●	◐	*Low*
Garib 2014	●	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Some concerns*
Lee 2010	●	◐	●	◐	◐	*Low*
Lagravére 2005	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*High*
Bazargani 2013	●	●	●	●	◐	*Some concerns*
Legris 2023	◐	◐	◐	◐	●	*Moderate*

RISK OF BIAS SUMMARY – NON-RANDOMIZED STUDIES

Study	Conf	Sel	Class	Dev	Miss	Meas	Rep	Overall
Park 2024	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*
Lázaro-A 2025	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Legris 2023	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*
Huang 2022	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*
Abu Arqub 2021	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Moulis 2020	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Zeng 2023	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*
Siddhisaributr	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*
Cantarella 2017	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Choi 2016	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Lim 2017	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Brunetto 2017	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Carlson 2016	●	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Critical*
Firinciogullari	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Serious*
Li 2025	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	*Moderate*

Key: ● Low ◐ *Moderate* ◐ *Serious* ○ *Critical*

D1: *Randomization*, D2: Deviations, D3: *Missing data*, D4: *Measurement*, D5: *Reporting*

Conf: *Confounding*, Sel: *Selection*,

Class: *Classification*, Dev: *Deviation*,

Miss: *Missing data*, Meas: *Measurement*, Rep: *Reporting*


TRANSVERSE DEFICIENCY DETECTED
(child aged 6–18 years)
ASSESS FIRST PERMANENT MOLARS
(MIH, caries, structural defects)
RESTORABLE
• Mild-Moderate
• Limited caries
• Sound enamel
• Suitable for banding
NON-RESTORABLE
• Severe MIH
• Extensive caries
• Extraction imminent
QUESTIONABLE
• Uncertain prognosis
• Borderline cases
HYBRID HYRAX
• Bands on premolars
• 2–4 palatal TADs
• Preserves anchorage
C-EXPANDER or MARPE/MSE
• Pure bone-borne
• Zero dental force
• Max skeletal effect
CBCT + SUTURE ASSESSMENT
• Angelieri staging
• Bone depth mapping
• Tooth bud location
SPACE LOSS PRESENT?
(mesial drift of molars)
MINISCREW-ANCHORED DISTALIZER
• Pendulum/Beneslider
• 1–2 anterior TADs
• Simultaneous expansion + distalization
PROCEED WITH SELECTED EXPANDER
YES
PROCEED WITH SELECTED EXPANDER
EXPANSION PROTOCOL
• Activation: 0.25 mm twice daily
• Duration: 2–4 weeks
• Overexpansion: 2–3 mm
EXPANSION PROTOCOL
• Activation: 0.25 mm twice daily
• Duration: 2–4 weeks
• Retention: 3–6 months passive

MOLAR INCISOR HYPOMINERALIZATION (MIH)

Severity Classification

(European Academy of Paediatric Dentistry)

MILD

- Demarcated opacities without enamel breakdown
- Minimal sensitivity to air/thermal stimuli
- Normal tooth morphology
- Conventional banding usually possible

Management: Regular monitoring, fluoride varnish, sealants

MODERATE

- Demarcated opacities with post-eruptive breakdown
- Increased sensitivity
- Atypical caries progression
- Margins of restorations may be compromised

Management: Glass ionomer, composites, stainless steel crowns, banding with glass ionomer cement

---

SEVERE

- Extensive enamel breakdown
- Atypical caries extending to pulp
- Hypersensitivity
- Difficulty achieving local anesthesia

Management: Prefabricated crowns, extraction often necessary, multidisciplinary approach, anchorage compromised

---

Distribution in Included Studies

Severity	Studies	Patients	Percentage
Mild	8	287	24.3%
Moderate	12	458	38.8%
Severe	15	436	36.9%
Total	23	1,181	100.0%

MINISCREW-ASSISTED EXPANSION APPLIANCES

HYBRID HYRAX (Tooth-Borne + Bone-Borne)

- **Design::** Bands on first premolars or primary teeth
- Hyrax expansion screw
- 2–4 palatal miniscrews (paramedian)
- Force transferred to teeth and bone

Indication: Compromised FPMs with sound premolars

Evidence: Skeletal expansion: 60-75% of total

C-EXPANDER (Pure Bone-Borne)

- Two separate halves fixed to palatal bone
- 4 miniscrews (2 each side of midpalatal suture)
- No dental attachment

Indication: Extensive posterior compromise, pre-extraction

Evidence: Greater skeletal effects than tooth-borne

MARPE/MSE (Miniscrew-Assisted Rapid Palatal Expansion)

- Full-coverage acrylic splint or metal framework
- Central expansion screw
- 4 micro-implants (paramedian, bicortical)
- MSE: 1.8 mm × 11 mm screws

Indication: Late mixed dentition, increased suture resistance

Evidence: Success rate: 93.9%, Skeletal efficiency: 60–75% [illegible]%

MINISCREW-ANCHORED DISTALIZER (Pendulum/Beneslider)

- **Design:** Miniscrew in anterior palate (absolute anchorage)
- Pendulum or Beneslider appliance
- Pushes molars distally while expanding

Indication: Combined expansion + space regain

Evidence: Mean distalization: 4.2 mm, Mean intrusion: 0.6 mm
Distal tipping: 8.9° (requires uprighting)

SUMMARY TADLE

Appliance	Anchorage	TADs	Dental	Dental	Ideal
Hybrid Hyrax	Tooth+bone	2–4	Premolars	Premolars	Compromised
C-expander	Bone-borne	4	None	Pre-extraction	FPMs
MARPE/MSE	Skeletal	4	Acrylic	Late mixed	dentint
Distalizer	Bone-borne	1–2	Molar bands	Molar bands	Expansion+space

SUMMARY OF META-ANALYSIS RESULTS

Skeletal Expansion

SMD = 1.24 [0.89, 1.59], $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 58\%$ ~58%

Favors Conventional ——◆—— Favors Miniscrew

Dental Tipping

SMD = −0.98 [−1.42,−0.54], $p < 0.01$, $I^2 = 51\%$ ~51%

Favors Miniscrew ——◆—— Favors Conventional

Success Rate

93.9% [89.7%, 97.2%], $I^2 = 41\%$

80% ——◆—— 100%

Long-Term Relapse MD = −2.2 mm [−2.9, −1.5], $I^2 = 62\%$

65% reduction with MARPE ——◆——

Favors MARPE Favors Conventional

SUBGROUP ANALYSES

Appliance Type	Skeletal Expansion SMD [95% CI]	
Hybrid Hyrax	1.18 [0.72, 1.64]	1.18 [0.72, 1.64]
MARPE/MSE	1.31 [0.95, 1.67]	1.31 [0.95, 1.67]
C-expander	1.09 [0.51, 1.67]	1.09 [0.51, 1.67]
Distalizer	1.18 [0.65, 1.71]	1.18 [0.65, 1.71]

Test for subgroup differences: p = 0.24

SUBGROUP ANALYSES

Appliance Type	Skeletal Expansion SMD [95% CI]	
Hybrid Hyrax	1.18 [0.72, 1.64]	1.42 [1.03, 1.81]
MARPE/MSE	1.31 [0.95, 1.67]	1.08 [0.71, 1.45]
C-expander	1.09 [0.51, 1.67]	1.18 [0.65, 1.71]
Distalizer	1.18 [0.65, 1.71]	1.18 [87.3., 95.6%]

Test for subgroup differences: p = 0.34

MIH Severity	Success Rate	Success Rate [95% CI]
Mild Moderate	94.2% [90.1%, 97.8%]	Severe [97.3%, 95.6%]

Test for subgroup differences: p = 0.34