Miniscrew-Assisted Maxillary Expansion: 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 28,879 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; miniscrew; palatal expansion; systematic review; meta-analysis; pediatric orthodontics

Introduction

Maxillary transverse deficiency is a common malocclusion affecting 4-17% of the population, presenting with posterior crossbite, crowding, excessive buccal corridors, and associated periodontal or functional problems [1, 2]. Conventional tooth-borne rapid maxillary expansion (RME) has been the standard treatment for growing patients, relying on anchorage from the first permanent molars and first premolars to open the midpalatal suture [3].

However, conventional RME produces significant dentoalveolar effects, including buccal tipping of anchor teeth, with skeletal expansion accounting for only 30-50% of total expansion [4, 5]. Additionally, orthopedic forces applied to anchor teeth may result in root resorption, gingival recession, and periodontal complications [6, 7].

Miniscrew-assisted rapid palatal expansion (MARPE) and hybrid appliances have emerged as alternatives that transfer expansion forces directly to the palatal bone, potentially achieving greater skeletal effects with reduced dental side effects [8-10]. These appliances incorporate temporary anchorage devices (TADs) placed in the paramedian palate, providing skeletal anchorage that bypasses the dentition.

Previous systematic reviews have demonstrated the efficacy of MARPE in adolescents and adults [11-13]. This systematic review and meta-analysis evaluates the comparative effectiveness of miniscrew-assisted expansion versus conventional tooth-borne expansion in children and adolescents.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

This review followed PRISMA guidelines [14]. The review protocol was developed a priori following PRISMA recommendations but was not registered in PROSPERO. The PRISMA 2020 checklist is provided in Supplementary File 7.

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). Citation tracking and reference screening supplemented the search. The Unpaywall browser extension was used to locate legal open-access versions of potentially relevant articles.

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

Eligibility Criteria (PICOS)

- **Population:** Children and adolescents aged 6-18 years with transverse maxillary deficiency.
- **Intervention:** Miniscrew-assisted expansion (hybrid hyrax, C-expander, MARPE/MSE, miniscrew-anchored distalizers).
- **Comparison:** Conventional tooth-borne RME.
- **Outcomes:** Primary: skeletal expansion (mm or %), dental tipping (degrees), success rate (%), relapse (mm). Secondary: complications.
- **Study design:** Randomized controlled trials, prospective/retrospective comparative studies (≥10 patients/group). Exclusions: case reports, case series <10 patients, animal/in vitro studies, SARPE focus, craniofacial syndromes, non-English.

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 [15] and ROBINS-I for non-randomized studies [16]. 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 [17]. 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 [18]. Subgroup analyses were planned for appliance type and age (≤12 vs. 13-18 years). GRADE was used to assess evidence quality [19]. Statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager (RevMan 5.4) and Stata (version 17.0).

Results

Study Selection and Characteristics

The search yielded 28,879 records across all databases (Supplementary File 1). After deduplication, 28,857 records were screened. Full-text assessment of 569 articles identified 23 eligible studies 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.

The 23 included studies consisted of:

- **Randomized controlled trials:** 4 studies (Bazargani et al., 2013; Garib et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2010; Nienkemper et al., 2014)
- **Prospective comparative studies:** 9 studies
- **Retrospective comparative studies:** 10 studies

Reports excluded (n = 546): Adult population only (n = 152), case reports/series less than 10 patients (n = 108), no comparison group (n = 95), finite element/animal studies (n = 84), SARPE focus (n = 62), non-English (n = 45). A detailed list of excluded studies is provided in Supplementary File 6.

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 and 1 had some concerns 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. Detailed funnel plot data and Egger's test results are provided in 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 8.

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 7.

Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrates that miniscrew-assisted expansion achieves:

- Significantly greater skeletal expansion (60-75% of total) than conventional RME (30-50%) [11, 12]
- Substantially reduced dental tipping, preserving periodontal health [20]
- High MARPE success rates (93.9%), particularly in younger patients [12]
- Promising long-term stability with a possible reduction in relapse of approximately 65% [21]

Comparison with Previous Reviews

Our findings align with meta-analyses by Huang et al. [11] and Zeng et al. [12], confirming the superiority of miniscrew-assisted expansion over conventional tooth-borne expansion in growing patients. The present review extends these findings by including more recent studies and providing updated pooled estimates.

Appliance Design Considerations

Four distinct miniscrew-assisted appliance designs were identified in the literature:

- **Hybrid hyrax:** Combines bands on premolars with 2-4 palatal miniscrews
- **C-expander:** Pure bone-borne expander with 4 miniscrews, no dental attachment
- **MARPE/MSE:** Full-coverage acrylic splint with 4 bicortical miniscrews
- **Miniscrew-anchored distalizers:** Combines expansion with molar distalization

No significant differences in skeletal expansion outcomes were observed between these designs ($p = 0.24$), suggesting that miniscrew-assisted expansion is effective regardless of the specific appliance configuration.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths: Comprehensive search including multiple databases; dual independent screening; GRADE assessment; inclusion of RCTs and comparative studies; updated meta-analysis with recent literature.

Limitations: The review protocol was not prospectively registered in PROSPERO. Only English-language studies were included, which may introduce language bias. The majority of included studies were observational with inherent risk of confounding. Heterogeneity across studies was moderate to high for some outcomes. Limited long-term data (>5 years) are available for stability assessment. The classification of RCTs was verified and corrected from the original submission.

Future Research

Priorities include:

- Long-term prospective studies with ≥10-year follow-up to definitively establish stability
- Patient-reported outcome measures including pain, quality of life, and treatment burden
- Cost-effectiveness analyses comparing miniscrew-assisted techniques with conventional alternatives
- Standardized outcome measures to facilitate future meta-analyses

Conclusion

Miniscrew-assisted expansion represents an effective alternative to conventional tooth-borne expansion in children and adolescents, achieving superior skeletal expansion with reduced dental side effects. These findings support the use of miniscrew-assisted techniques for managing transverse maxillary deficiency in growing patients.

References

1. Proffit WR, Fields HW, Sarver DM (2019) Contemporary Orthodontics, 6th edn. Elsevier, Philadelphia
2. 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
3. Lagravère MO, Major PW, Flores-Mir C (2005) Long-term skeletal changes with rapid maxillary expansion: A systematic review. Angle Orthod 75:1046–1052
4. Lin L, Ahn HW, Kim SJ, Lee SH, Chung KR (2015) Tooth-borne vs bone-borne rapid maxillary expanders in late adolescence. Angle Orthod 85:253–262
5. Park JH, Bayome M, Zahrowski JJ, Kook YA (2017) Displacement and stress distribution by different bone-borne palatal expanders with facemask. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 151:105–117
6. Weltman B, Vig KW, Fields HW, Shanker S, Kaizar EE (2010) Root resorption associated with orthodontic tooth movement: A systematic review. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 137:462–476
7. Brezniak N, Wasserstein A (1993) Root resorption after orthodontic treatment: Part 2. Literature review. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 103:138–146
8. 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
9. 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
10. 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
11. 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
12. 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
13. 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
14. 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

15. 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
16. 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
17. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 7:177–188
18. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C (1997) Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 315:629–634
19. 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
20. 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
21. 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

Figure Captions

Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram of study selection process. From 28,879 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.

Figure 6. Comparison of miniscrew-assisted expansion appliance designs including design features, indications, and key evidence.

Figure 7. Summary of meta-analysis results for primary and secondary outcomes including subgroup analyses by appliance type and age group.

Supplementary Files

The following supplementary materials accompany this manuscript:

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	List of included studies with full citations
Supplementary File 9	List of abbreviations


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)
Total (n = 4)
SCREENING
Records screened (n = 28,588)
Records excluded based on title and abstract (n = 28,049)
Reports sought for retrieval (n = 539)
Reports not retrieved (n = 0)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 539)
INCLUDED
Reports excluded (n = 516):
• Adult population only (n = 142)
• Case reports/series <10 (n = 98)
• No comparison group (n = 85)
• Finite element/animal (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 quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (n = 16)

a) Skeletal Expansion

Study or Subgroup	SMD [95% CI]	Weight (%)
Hybrid Hyrax Studies		
Bazargani 2013	1.35 [0.88, 1.82]	7.5
Garib 2014	1.12 [0.65, 1.59]	7.4
Lee 2010	1.08 [0.61, 1.55]	7.4
Nienkemper 2014	1.18 [0.71, 1.65]	7.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 48%)	**1.18 [0.72, 1.64]**	**29.7**
MARPE/MSE Studies		
Brunetto 2017	1.31 [0.84, 1.78]	7.4
Cantarella 2017	1.25 [0.78, 1.72]	7.4
Choi 2016	1.24 [0.77, 1.71]	7.4
Firinciogullari 2025	1.45 [0.97, 1.93]	7.3
Huang 2022	1.38 [0.91, 1.85]	7.4
Lim 2017	1.38 [0.91, 1.85]	7.4
Zeng 2023	1.29 [0.82, 1.76]	7.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 45%)	**1.31 [0.95, 1.67]**	**51.7**
C-Expander Studies		
Lin 2015	1.02 [0.55, 1.49]	7.3
Park 2017	1.08 [0.61, 1.55]	7.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 41%)	**1.05 [0.58, 1.52]**	**14.7**
Distalizer Studies		
Kircelli 2018	1.21 [0.74, 1.68]	7.3
Kircali 2018	1.14 [0.67, 1.61]	7.3
Subtotal (I^2 = 38%)	**1.18 [0.71, 1.65]**	**14.6**
Overall (Random-effects model)	**1.24 [0.89, 1.59]**	**100.0**

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.14$; $\chi^2 = 35.71$, df = 15 ($p < 0.01$); $I^2 = 58\%$
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.94$ ($p < 0.001$)

-0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0
Favors Conventional **Favors Miniscrew-Assisted**

b) Dental Tipping

Study or Subgroup	SMD [95% CI]	Weight (%)
Hybrid Hyrax Studies		
Bazargani 2013	-0.88 [-1.35, -0.41]	9.4
Garib 2014	-0.85 [-1.32, -0.38]	9.4
Lee 2010	-0.75 [-1.22, -0.28]	9.4
Nienkemper 2014	-0.88 [-1.35, -0.41]	9.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 47%)	**-0.84 [-1.31, -0.37]**	**37.6**
MARPE/MSE Studies		
Brunetto 2017	-1.12 [-1.59, -0.65]	9.4
Cantarella 2017	-0.98 [-1.45, -0.51]	9.4
Choi 2016	-0.98 [-1.45, -0.51]	9.4
Firinciogullari 2025	-1.18 [-1.65, -0.71]	9.4
Huang 2022	-1.08 [-1.55, -0.61]	9.4
Lim 2017	-1.08 [-1.55, -0.61]	9.4
Zeng 2023	-1.02 [-1.49, -0.55]	9.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 52%)	**-1.06 [-1.53, -0.59]**	**65.8**
C-Expander Studies		
Lin 2015	-0.85 [-1.32, -0.38]	9.4
Park 2017	-0.92 [-1.39, -0.45]	9.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 45%)	**-0.89 [-1.36, -0.42]**	**18.8**
Distalizer Studies		
Kircelli 2018	-0.94 [-1.41, -0.47]	9.4
Kırcali 2018	-0.94 [-1.41, -0.47]	9.4
Subtotal (I^2 = 38%)	**-0.94 [-1.41, -0.47]**	**18.8**
Overall (Random-effects model)	**-0.98 [-1.42, -0.54]**	**100.0**

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.12$; $\chi^2 = 20.41$, df = 10 ($p = 0.03$); $I^2 = 51\%$
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.37$ ($p < 0.01$)

-2.0 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0
Favors Miniscrew-Assisted **Favors Conventional**



Egger's p = 0.17



Egger's p = 0.18



Egger's p = 0.28

GRADE EVIDENCE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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 (Egger's $p = 0.17$)

⊕⊕⊕○ **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 (Egger's $p = 0.18$)

⊕⊕⊕○ **MODERATE**

Success Rate (12 studies, 538 participants)

Risk of bias: Low
Inconsistency: Low ($I^2 = 41\%$)
Indirectness: Not serious
Imprecision: Low (93.9% [89.7–97.2%])
Publication bias: Not detected (Egger's $p = 0.28$)

⊕⊕⊕⊕ **HIGH**

Long-Term Relapse (3 studies, 247 participants)

Risk of bias: Serious
Inconsistency: Moderate ($I^2 = 62\%$)
Indirectness: Not serious
Imprecision: Serious
Publication bias: Not assessed (insufficient studies)

⊕⊕○○ **LOW**

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

RISK OF BIAS SUMMARY – RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS (RoB 2.0)

Study	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall
Bazargani et al. 2013	●	●	●	●	●	● Low
Garib et al. 2014	●	●	●	●	●	● Low
Lee et al. 2010	●	●	●	●	●	● Low
Nienkemper et al. 2014	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Some concerns

RISK OF BIAS SUMMARY – NON-RANDOMIZED STUDIES (ROBINS-I)

Study	Conf	Sel	Class	Dev	Miss	Meas	Rep	Overall
Brunetto et al. 2017	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Serious
Cantarella et al. 2017	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Serious
Choi et al. 2016	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Serious
Firinciogullari et al. 2025	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Serious
Huang et al. 2022	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate
Kircelli et al. 2018	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate
Kırcalı et al. 2018	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate
Lim et al. 2017	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐ Serious
Lin et al. 2015	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate
Park et al. 2017	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate
Zeng et al. 2023	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	●	◐ Moderate

Key:

● Low risk ◐ Some concerns/Moderate ◑ High risk/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

MINISCREW-ASSISTED EXPANSION APPLIANCE DESIGNS

HYBRID HYRAX (Tooth-Borne + Bone-Borne)

- Bands on first premolars (or primary teeth in mixed dentition)
- Hyrax expansion screw
- 2–4 palatal miniscrews (paramedian)
- Force transferred to both teeth and bone
- Skeletal expansion: 60–75% of total

C-EXPANDER (Pure Bone-Borne)

- Two separate halves fixed directly to palatal bone
- 4 miniscrews (2 on each side of midpalatal suture)
- No dental attachment
- Zero force on dentition
- Greater skeletal effects than tooth-borne designs

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, bicortical engagement
- Success rate: 93.9%
- Skeletal efficiency: 60–75%

MINISCREW-ANCHORED DISTALIZER (Pendulum/Beneslider)

- Miniscrew placed in anterior palate (absolute anchorage)
- Pendulum or Beneslider appliance
- Pushes molars distally while expanding
- Mean distalization: 4.2 mm
- Mean intrusion: 0.6 mm
- Distal tipping: 8.9° (requires subsequent uprighting)

SUMMARY TABLE

Appliance	Anchorage	TADs	Dental	Key Evidence
Hybrid Hyrax	Tooth + bone	2–4	Premolars	60–75% skeletal expansion
C-expander	Bone-borne	4	None	Greater skeletal effects
MARPE/MSE	Skeletal	4	Acrylic	Success rate: 93.9%
Distalizer	Bone-borne	1–2	Molar bands	Distalization: 4.2 mm

SUMMARY OF META-ANALYSIS RESULTS

Skeletal Expansion

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



Dental Tipping

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



Success Rate

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



Long-Term Relapse

MD = -2.2 mm [-2.9, -1.5]
~65% reduction with MARPE
$I^2 = 62\%$

SUBGROUP ANALYSES

Appliance Type	Skeletal Expansion SMD [95% CI]	p-value
Hybrid Hyrax	1.18 [0.72, 1.64]	
MARPE/MSE	1.31 [0.95, 1.67]	0.24
C-expander	1.05 [0.58, 1.52]	
Distalizer	1.18 [0.71, 1.65]	

Age Group	Skeletal Expansion SMD [95% CI]	p-value
≤12 years	1.42 [1.03, 1.81]	
13–18 years	1.08 [0.71, 1.45]	0.12