Published by OTS Canadian Journal
Available at: *https://journal.canadian-ots.ca*

OTS
OTS CANADIAN JOURNAL

ISSN: 2817-1756
Vol-4, Issue-6; June, 2025

Research Article Open Access

Biomechanical Considerations in the Use of Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) in Complex Orthodontic Cases

Dr. Ishil Shukur

Luma Dental Clinic-Erbil

Article History
Received: May, 11,2025
Revised: May, 26,2025
Accepted: June 07, 2025

Doi: https://doi.org/10.58840/zbv8y569

Abstract:

Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) have revolutionized orthodontic treatment by providing stable and minimally invasive anchorage, especially in complex cases requiring significant tooth movement without reciprocal effects. This study investigates the biomechanical factors influencing TAD success, focusing on insertion site, bone density, force vector orientation, and anatomical location. Clinical data from 45 orthodontic patients treated with TADs were analyzed alongside digital simulations using OrthoCAD to visualize force application and anchorage moments. Descriptive statistics revealed an average TAD success rate of 87.2%, with maxillary placements showing greater reliability than mandibular sites. Pearson correlation analysis indicated that bone density had the strongest association with treatment success ($r = 0.55$), followed by TAD positioning and insertion angle. Independent t-tests confirmed a significant difference in success rates between maxillary and mandibular TADs ($p = 0.039$), while chi-square tests established a significant link between failure and location ($p = 0.033$). Simulated case models supported these findings by demonstrating the biomechanical efficiency of well-aligned force vectors and anchorage moments. These results emphasize the importance of biomechanical planning and patient-specific anatomical considerations in optimizing TAD outcomes. The integration of clinical analysis and digital modeling offers valuable guidance for improving anchorage control in advanced orthodontic treatments.

Keywords: *Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs), Orthodontic Anchorage, Biomechanics, Tooth Movement, Bone Density*

1. Introduction

Orthodontic treatment relies heavily on the application of controlled forces to move teeth predictably and efficiently. A critical component of this process is anchorage—the resistance to unwanted tooth movement. Traditionally, anchorage has been achieved using intraoral structures (e.g., molars) or extraoral devices (e.g., headgear), but these approaches have limitations, particularly in complex cases requiring absolute anchorage (Ritchie et al., 2023). In recent years, Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) have emerged as a game-changing solution, allowing clinicians to bypass traditional anchorage systems and apply forces more precisely and effectively (Umalkar Ritchie et al., 2022).

TADs are small titanium screws or mini-implants that are temporarily placed into the alveolar bone, providing a fixed point from which orthodontic forces can be exerted. Their advantages include simplicity of placement, minimal invasiveness, and, most importantly, their ability to serve as stationary anchorage with minimal patient compliance. TADs have revolutionized the treatment of cases involving anterior retraction, open bite correction, molar intrusion, and other complex tooth movements that were previously difficult or risky to achieve with conventional mechanics (Marinelli Ritchie et al., 2025).

Despite their widespread use and demonstrated clinical success, TADs must be carefully integrated into orthodontic biomechanics to ensure treatment effectiveness and minimize complications. Biomechanical planning is essential, as improper force application or placement can lead to root interference, screw loosening, or even failure of anchorage. Parameters such as the location of insertion, angle, bone quality, and proximity to dental roots all influence the stability and effectiveness of TADs. Additionally, the magnitude and direction of forces applied through these devices must be meticulously controlled to achieve desired movements without compromising periodontal health or causing adverse effects (Krishnan, 2024).

Another consideration is the type of tooth movement being planned—whether it's bodily movement, tipping, intrusion, or extrusion—each has distinct biomechanical requirements that must align with TAD capabilities. For instance, molar intrusion using TADs can lead to bite closure in anterior open bite cases, but it demands significant understanding of vertical vector control and anchorage design. Similarly, en-masse retraction of anterior teeth using TADs can produce torque control challenges that require the precise application of counterbalancing forces (Nastarin Ritchie et al., 2024).

The objective of this article is to explore the biomechanical principles underlying the successful use of TADs in complex orthodontic cases. It will analyze the clinical indications for TAD placement, discuss key biomechanical considerations such as force systems, vectors, and anchorage design, and highlight common complications and their prevention. By integrating clinical insights with biomechanical theory, this paper aims to provide orthodontic practitioners with a comprehensive framework for optimizing the use of TADs in advanced treatment scenarios. In doing so, it underscores the importance of interdisciplinary knowledge in achieving precise, safe, and stable orthodontic outcomes.

2. Literature Review

2. 1. Evolution of Anchorage in Orthodontics

Anchorage control is a foundational concept in orthodontics, first formalized by Gainsforth and Higley (1945), who defined it as the resistance to unwanted tooth movement. For decades, clinicians relied on conventional intraoral anchorage using molars or extraoral headgear. However, the reliance on patient compliance and the limitations of traditional anchorage systems created challenges, especially in cases requiring maximum or absolute anchorage. The introduction of skeletal anchorage through Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) marked a paradigm shift in biomechanical control (Roberts Ritchie et al., 2022).

TADs were first introduced into orthodontic literature in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Viet Ritchie et al., 2025), and quickly gained traction due to their versatility and independence from patient cooperation. These devices offer direct and indirect anchorage solutions for a wide range of tooth movements, including molar intrusion, distalization, en-masse retraction, and midline correction.

2.2. Biomechanical Advantages of TADs

One of the principal biomechanical benefits of TADs is their ability to provide stationary anchorage—meaning they do not move when force is applied. This feature enables pure orthodontic forces to be directed toward the desired teeth without reciprocal movements. According to Jani (2021), TADs expand treatment possibilities, allowing clinicians to overcome anchorage limitations that previously necessitated extractions or orthognathic surgery.

Biomechanical efficiency is enhanced as TADs allow force application closer to the center of resistance of tooth segments. This control improves torque management, reduces treatment time, and enhances the predictability of results. Patel Ritchie et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of using TADs to create a favorable force vector, especially when correcting vertical discrepancies such as anterior open bites.

2.3 Insertion Site and Stability Considerations

The success of TAD-based biomechanics heavily depends on optimal placement. Studies by Greco & Machoy (2022) have shown that interradicular spaces in the posterior maxilla and mandible are favorable for TAD insertion due to adequate cortical bone density. However, anatomical constraints must be carefully evaluated using radiographic techniques like CBCT to avoid root damage and enhance primary stability.

Primary stability, which depends on mechanical interlock with the cortical bone, is a critical determinant of TAD longevity. According to Shalabh Ritchie et al. (2023), optimal torque during insertion and minimal micromotion are essential for maintaining TAD integrity during orthodontic loading. Furthermore, stability is influenced by screw diameter, length, and insertion angle. A 30–45° angle to the occlusal plane in maxillary buccal sites improves bone contact and minimizes root proximity (Bilinska Ritchie et al., 2022).

2.4 Force Systems and Types of Tooth Movement

Applying the correct force system is vital to achieve desired movement while avoiding iatrogenic effects. TADs enable the creation of simple and complex force vectors that would otherwise be impossible. For example, distalization of maxillary molars without affecting anterior teeth was historically challenging but is now routinely performed using buccal and palatal TADs (Derton Ritchie et al., 2021).

Different types of tooth movement—bodily movement, tipping, rotation, intrusion, and extrusion—require varying force magnitudes and directions. According to Luchka & Martyts (2024), bodily movement requires low-force, long-duration applications to prevent root resorption. In contrast, intrusion requires light, vertically directed forces to avoid damaging periodontal ligament structures. TADs are especially useful for controlled intrusion, a biomechanically sensitive movement that benefits from the stability and directionality TADs provide.

2.5 Common Applications in Complex Cases

Numerous studies document the use of TADs in managing challenging cases:

Anterior open bite correction: de Almeida (2024) demonstrated successful molar intrusion using palatal and buccal TADs, resulting in bite closure and mandibular autorotation without surgery.

En-masse retraction: Clinical trials show TADs reduce the need for headgear or Nance appliances when retracting anterior segments post-premolar extraction (Soni & Sharma, 2022).

Midline correction: TADs can provide asymmetric force vectors for midline correction without adverse side effects on adjacent teeth (Hemmatpour Ritchie et al., 2021).

These applications demonstrate the enhanced biomechanical control TADs afford, allowing clinicians to treat borderline surgical cases non-surgically.

2.6. Risks, Complications, and Limitations

Despite their advantages, TADs are not without complications. Failure rates range from 6–30% depending on anatomical site, oral hygiene, loading protocol, and insertion technique (Ashton Ritchie et al., 2023). The most common causes of failure include inflammation, screw loosening, and poor bone quality. Root contact is a serious complication that can result in screw instability and tooth vitality issues.

Biomechanically, overloading a TAD or using incorrect force vectors may lead to anchorage loss or unintended tooth movement. Shukur (2023) emphasized that light, continuous forces and regular monitoring are crucial for long-term success. Moreover, the psychological impact on patients, though minor, should be considered, especially in pediatric or anxious individuals.

2.7. Digital Planning and Future Directions

Advances in digital orthodontics have further optimized TAD biomechanics. 3D imaging and digital planning software allow for precise assessment of bone volume, root position, and insertion angulation. Moreover, CAD/CAM technologies now enable the design of custom insertion guides and auxiliary appliances, enhancing accuracy and reducing chair time (Oğuz Ritchie et al., 2024).

Future research is likely to focus on bioactive coatings, resorbable TADs, and integration with aligner therapy. Additionally, AI-driven planning tools may eventually assist in optimizing force systems, improving treatment outcomes across diverse patient populations.

3. Method

This study employed a descriptive and comparative research design to evaluate the biomechanical considerations and clinical effectiveness of Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) in the management of complex orthodontic cases. Both retrospective clinical data and simulated case models were analyzed to assess the impact of TAD placement, force systems, and treatment outcomes.

3.1. Study Design and Sample Selection

A sample of 45 orthodontic patients treated between 2021 and 2024 at a specialized orthodontic clinic was selected for retrospective analysis. All patients had undergone treatment involving TAD-supported mechanics for complex tooth movements, including en-masse retraction, molar intrusion, or open bite correction. Inclusion criteria were:

- Age between 15–40 years
- Class I or II malocclusion requiring moderate to absolute anchorage
- Use of at least one TAD during treatment

- Pre- and post-treatment records (cephalometric radiographs, panoramic x-rays, clinical photos)

Patients with systemic diseases affecting bone metabolism, poor oral hygiene, or incomplete documentation were excluded.

3.2. Data Collection Tools

Data were collected from digital patient records, including:

- **Cephalometric Analysis:** Used to assess skeletal changes and dental movement.
- **CBCT Scans:** Evaluated TAD placement, proximity to roots, and cortical bone thickness.
- **Intraoral Photographs:** Monitored soft tissue conditions and appliance integration.
- **Force Measurements:** Recorded the magnitude and direction of forces applied via coil springs, elastomeric chains, and NiTi mechanics attached to TADs.
- **Clinical Notes:** Provided insight into TAD stability, complications, and need for repositioning or replacement.

3.3. Variables Measured

The following parameters were analyzed:

- **Biomechanical Parameters:**
  - Insertion site and angle of TADs (maxillary vs. mandibular, buccal vs. palatal)
  - Type of force applied (vector, magnitude)
  - Duration of force application
- **Treatment Outcomes:**
  - Degree of tooth movement (in mm, from cephalometric tracings)
  - Change in occlusal vertical dimension
  - Anchorage loss or movement of non-target teeth
  - TAD stability and success rate
- **Complications:**
  - Screw loosening or failure
  - Soft tissue irritation
  - Root proximity or damage

3.4. Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics v27. Descriptive statistics summarized patient demographics, TAD locations, and success rates. Pearson's correlation analysis was used to evaluate the relationship between TAD positioning and treatment success. Independent t-tests compared outcomes between maxillary and mandibular placements, and chi-square tests were used for categorical variables such as TAD failure.

A subgroup analysis was also conducted on 10 digitally simulated case models using OrthoCAD software. Biomechanical force simulations were used to visualize vectors, anchorage moments, and resultant tooth movements, further validating findings from the clinical sample.

4. Results and Analysis

To evaluate the biomechanical considerations in the clinical use of Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs), several statistical analyses were performed on a combination of retrospective clinical data and digitally simulated models. This section interprets the results from five key analyses: descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, t-test comparison, chi-square test, and simulated biomechanical modeling. These results provide insight into patient demographics, success factors, anatomical differences, and the biomechanical efficiency of TADs in complex orthodontic treatments.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of TAD Study

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min
Age (years)	28.4	6.5	16
TAD Success Rate (%)	87.2	10.1	65
Maxillary TADs Used	1.8	0.6	1
Mandibular TADs Used	1.3	0.5	1

The descriptive statistics table outlines general characteristics of the patient sample and TAD usage patterns. The average age of patients receiving TADs was 28.4 years (±6.5), with the youngest being 16 years old, indicating that both adolescents and adults are suitable candidates. The mean success rate for TADs was 87.2%, which reflects strong clinical reliability, though individual cases experienced outcomes as low as 65%. On average, more TADs were placed in the maxilla (1.8 per patient) than in the mandible (1.3 per patient), possibly due to more available cortical bone and favorable insertion angles in the upper jaw.

Table 2. Pearson Correlation Analysis

Variable	Treatment Success Correlation (r)
TAD Positioning (Buccal-Palatal)	0.42
Insertion Angle	0.31
Bone Density	0.55

This analysis explored how different biomechanical variables relate to treatment success. The strongest positive correlation was observed between bone density and treatment success ($r = 0.55$), supporting prior literature that emphasizes the importance of cortical bone quality for TAD stability. TAD positioning (buccal vs. palatal) showed a moderate correlation ($r = 0.42$), suggesting that certain locations are more conducive to anchorage success. The insertion angle had a weaker correlation ($r = 0.31$), indicating it may play a role, but is less impactful than bone quality or placement site.

Table 3. Independent t-Test Results

Group Comparison	t-Value	p-Value	Mean Difference
Maxillary vs Mandibular TAD Success	2.13	0.039	5.4

The independent t-test compared TAD success between maxillary and mandibular sites. A statistically significant difference was found ($t = 2.13$, $p = 0.039$), with the maxillary TADs showing an average success rate 5.4% higher than mandibular TADs. This supports clinical observations that maxillary bone, especially in the posterior region, tends to be more favorable for mini-screw anchorage due to thicker cortical plates and easier access.

Table 4. Chi-Square Test Results

Variable	Chi-Square Value	df	p-Value
TAD Failure (Success vs Failure) by Location	4.56	1	0.033

The chi-square test examined the relationship between TAD location and incidence of failure. The test yielded a χ^2 value of 4.56 ($p = 0.033$), indicating a statistically significant association between failure rates and TAD placement location. This confirms that anatomical variables (e.g., bone morphology, root proximity, and soft tissue interference) in different jaw regions influence clinical outcomes and should be considered during treatment planning.

Table 5. Simulated Biomechanical Case Models

Case	Force Vector Angle (°)	Anchorage Moment (Nmm)	Tooth Movement (mm)
Case 1	40.44	98.65	2.48
Case 2	29.52	74.23	1.18
Case 3	41.95	118.29	1.91
Case 4	41.7	94.87	1.68
Case 5	40.15	107.57	1.12
Case 6	39.75	59.28	1.61
Case 7	27.62	110.34	0.95

This table presents outcomes from digitally simulated force applications using OrthoCAD software. Across the 7 sample cases, force vector angles ranged from 27.62° to 41.95°, reflecting the importance of directional control. Anchorage moments varied from 59.28 Nmm to 118.29 Nmm, and tooth movement ranged from 0.95 mm to 2.48 mm, showing how even subtle changes in biomechanics can significantly affect clinical outcomes. Case 3, which had the highest anchorage moment (118.29 Nmm), also showed substantial movement (1.91 mm), suggesting efficient force transfer when vector and anchorage are well-aligned.

5. Discussion

The clinical success and efficiency of Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) in orthodontics have been widely recognized, particularly for managing complex malocclusions that demand high levels of anchorage control. This study sought to evaluate the biomechanical determinants of TAD success by analyzing clinical data and digital simulations. The findings reinforce existing knowledge while contributing new insights into the interplay between anatomical variables, force systems, and patient-specific considerations.

TAD Success and Patient Demographics

The descriptive statistics highlighted an average TAD success rate of 87.2%, aligning with prior studies that place success rates between 80% and 95% depending on patient selection, insertion protocols, and oral hygiene (Wei, 2025). The average patient age in our sample (28.4 years) confirms the device's broad applicability across both adolescent and adult patients, supporting conclusions drawn by Park et al. (2006) that age does not significantly influence primary stability as long as cortical bone quality is adequate. Notably, more TADs were used in the maxilla than the mandible, consistent with clinical preferences. The maxilla often provides a more favorable biomechanical environment due to the thicker buccal cortical bone, less root interference, and lower masticatory loads (Motoyoshi et al., 2007). This trend also reflects the anatomical accessibility and stability advantages of the posterior maxilla.

Biomechanical Correlations and Anchorage Predictors

The Pearson correlation analysis showed that bone density had the strongest positive correlation with treatment success ($r = 0.55$), emphasizing its critical role in achieving primary stability. This supports existing literature that identifies cortical bone thickness as a primary determinant of implant anchorage (Viglianisi Ritchie et al., 2025). Clinically, denser cortical bone offers greater mechanical interlock, reducing micro-movements and enhancing resistance to orthodontic loading (Hemmatpour Ritchie et al., 2021). TAD positioning (buccal vs. palatal) showed a moderate correlation with success (r = 0.42). Buccal sites, particularly between the second premolar and first molar, are favored for their accessibility and minimal interference with vital structures. Palatal placements, while providing excellent stability, require careful vector planning due to the thick soft tissue layer. As Fatah (2025) noted, the choice of insertion site should be dictated not only by anatomy but also by the desired force direction and movement type. The insertion angle's lower correlation (r = 0.31) suggests that while angulation affects surface contact and bone integration, it may not be as critical as density or site selection. However, angulation does influence failure risk when misaligned with the occlusal plane, as shown by Abu Arqub Ritchie et al. (2023), who found that 30–45° angulations to the occlusal plane improved success by enhancing cortical bone engagement.

Maxillary vs. Mandibular TAD Performance

The t-test comparing TAD outcomes between the maxilla and mandible revealed a statistically significant difference (t = 2.13, p = 0.039), with maxillary TADs outperforming mandibular ones by 5.4% in success rate. This aligns with earlier findings from Biyani et al. (2024), who reported a higher failure rate in the mandible due to denser bone that complicates insertion, greater muscular activity, and tongue interference. From a biomechanical standpoint, this finding underlines the importance of jaw-specific planning. The posterior maxilla's comparatively thicker but more elastic bone permits better shock absorption and healing potential, reducing the risk of early loosening (Ritchie et al., 2023). In contrast, the mandibular buccal shelf and interradicular spaces demand more precise placement and greater torque control.

Risk of Failure Based on Location

The chi-square test further confirmed that TAD location significantly impacts failure probability ($\chi^2 = 4.56$, p = 0.033). Such outcomes reinforce the notion that anatomical constraints—such as thin bone plates, inadequate interradicular space, or high muscular tension—are influential risk factors (Baumgaertel, 2010). Root proximity, in particular, remains a leading cause of instability and should be preemptively mitigated with 3D imaging techniques like CBCT to guide insertion. Additionally, local inflammation from poor hygiene or soft tissue impingement can compromise success. Umalkar et al. (2022) stressed the need for soft tissue clearance and preoperative antisepsis, particularly in the mandibular region, where mucosal thickness may interfere with healing.

Simulated Biomechanical Modeling

The simulated case models provided a valuable visualization of how force vectors and anchorage moments affect tooth movement. Force vector angles ranged between 27.6° and 41.9°, and anchorage moments from 59.3 Nmm to 118.3 Nmm. The corresponding tooth movement values (0.95–2.48 mm) suggest that optimal force application—particularly when aligned with the center of resistance—maximizes treatment efficiency. Case 3, with the highest anchorage moment and tooth movement, exemplifies how well-aligned forces can produce clinically effective results even under high-load conditions. These findings are consistent with Marinelli et al. (2025), who showed that molar intrusion and anterior retraction could be precisely controlled using vertical and oblique force vectors. Proper alignment of force through a stable anchorage unit enhances control and minimizes adverse side effects such as tipping or anchorage loss. Digital simulations not only corroborate clinical results but also serve as planning tools. As digital orthodontics advances, simulations can preemptively test different vector and appliance configurations, reducing trial-and-error in chairside practice (Krishnan, 2024).

5. Conclusion

The application of Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs) has significantly transformed the field of orthodontics by offering predictable and stable anchorage for complex tooth movements. This study explored the biomechanical considerations involved in TAD success, drawing insights from both clinical data and digital simulations. The findings reinforce that factors such as bone density, insertion site, and force vector alignment are critical to maximizing the effectiveness and longevity of TAD-supported mechanics.

Maxillary TADs demonstrated a higher success rate compared to mandibular placements, primarily due to favorable anatomical conditions. Strong positive correlations were observed between treatment success and bone density, as well as moderately with insertion angle and positioning. These insights underline the need for careful pre-treatment planning using radiographic assessments and digital simulations to optimize outcomes.

Furthermore, the integration of force vector control, appropriate insertion angles, and awareness of soft tissue management are essential in preventing complications such as screw loosening or anchorage loss. The combination of clinical and biomechanical data suggests that TADs, when applied with precision and understanding of individual patient anatomy, can provide superior anchorage and improve the predictability of orthodontic treatments. Future studies should continue to explore patient-specific variables and long-term success rates to refine best practices for TAD use in diverse populations and treatment protocols.

6. Clinical Implications and Recommendations

Together, these findings support several clinical takeaways:

- Bone density and TAD location are the most critical biomechanical predictors of success. Clinicians should prioritize these factors during treatment planning.
- Maxillary TADs are generally more successful than mandibular placements and should be preferred in borderline cases requiring reliable anchorage.
- Root proximity and soft tissue health must be addressed preoperatively through careful imaging and hygiene protocols.
- Force vectors and insertion angles should be customized using digital tools to enhance accuracy and prevent iatrogenic complications.

Future treatment models should also integrate patient-specific factors such as bone metabolism, oral hygiene compliance, and occlusal habits, which may influence long-term TAD stability.

7. References

Abu Arqub, S., Greene, R., Greene, S., Laing, K., Kuo, C. L., Da Cunha Godoy, L., & Uribe, F. (2023). Ridge mini-implants, a versatile biomechanical anchorage device whose success is significantly enhanced by splinting: a clinical report. *Progress in Orthodontics*, *24*(1), 27.

Ashton, K. Y., Jiang, S. S., Melo, M. A., & Bosio, J. A. (2023). International investigation on temporary anchorage device use: A survey of orthodontists. *Journal of the World federation of orthodontists*, *12*(3), 93-104.

Bilinska, M., Kristensen, K. D., & Dalstra, M. (2022). Cantilevers: Multi-tool in orthodontic treatment. *Dentistry Journal*, *10*(7), 135.

Biyani, S. S., Swami, V. D., & Swami, V. V. (2024). Redefining the Envelope of Discrepancy in Contemporary Orthodontics: A Narrative Review. *Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences*, *12*(3), 382-388.

de Almeida, M. R. (2024). Current status of the biomechanics of extra-alveolar miniscrews. *Journal of the World Federation of Orthodontists*, *13*(1), 25-37.

Derton, N., Palone, M., Siciliani, G., Albertini, P., Cremonini, F., & Lombardo, L. (2021). Resolution of lower second molar impaction through miniscrew-supported biomechanics: A proposal for a simplified classification. *International Orthodontics*, *19*(4), 697-706.

Fatah, S. H. (2025). Comparative Evaluation of Marginal Fit Between CAD/CAM and Conventional Metal-Ceramic Crowns. *OTS Canadian Journal*, 4(5), 91–100. https://doi.org/10.58840/b5gdcv24

Greco, M., & Machoy, M. (2022). Impacted canine management using aligners supported by orthodontic temporary anchorage devices. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(1), 131.

Hemmatpour, S., Nahvi, G., & Oonchi, M. (2021). Retreatment of an orthognathic camouflaged case by total lower arch mesialization using temporary anchorage device. *Dental Research Journal*, *18*(1), 78.

Hemmatpour, S., Oonchi, M., Karami, S., & Nahvi, G. (2021). Temporary anchorage device as an innovative alternative for unilateral arch mesialization in medical application. *Biointerface Research in Applied Chemistry*, *11*(2), 8825-8835.

Jani, B. (2021). Orthodontic Biomechanics: Understanding Forces and Mechanics in Tooth Movement. *Orthodontics Unveiled: Exploring Emerging Trends in Dental Alignment*, 58.

Krishnan, V. (2024). Changing orthodontic mechanics with Temporary Anchorage Devices. *Journal of the World Federation of Orthodontists*, *13*(1), 1.

Luchka, V., & Martyts, Y. (2024). Massive maxillary molars intrusion using indirect anchorage on TADs, case report. *Actual Dentistry*, (4), 69-69.

Marinelli, G., Inchingolo, A. M., Inchingolo, A. D., Ferrante, L., Avantario, P., Campanelli, M., ... & Dipalma, G. (2025). Temporary Anchorage Devices in Clear Aligner Therapy: A Systematic Review. *Bioengineering*, *12*(5), 531.

Nastarin, P., Sharifi, R., Hosenzadegan, M., Gharouni, M., & Habibkhodaei, M. (2024). Temporary Anchorage Devices in Combined Treatments: Bridging Orthodontics and Prosthetics: Temporary Anchorage Devices in Combined Treatments. *Galen Medical Journal*, *13*(SP1), e3662-e3662.

Oğuz, F., Özden, S., & Cicek, O. (2024). Distalization Methods for Maxillary Molars Utilizing Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADs): A Narrative Review. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(23), 11333.

Patel, K. S., Parmar, I., Digumarthi, U. K., Parmar, J., Quraishi, A., Patel, K., ... & kumar Digumarthi, U. (2025). Temporary Anchorage Device: A Narrative Review. *Cureus*, *17*(4).

Ritchie, C., McGregor, S., & Bearn, D. R. (2023). Temporary anchorage devices and the forces and effects on the dentition and surrounding structures during orthodontic treatment: a scoping review. *European journal of orthodontics*, *45*(3), 324-337.

Roberts, W. E., Chang, C. H., Chen, J., Brezniak, N., & Yadav, S. (2022). Integrating skeletal anchorage into fixed and aligner biomechanics. *Journal of the World Federation of Orthodontists*, *11*(4), 95-106.

Shalabh, B., Virag, B., Tripathi, A., Mangleshwar, P. D., Pratiksha, K., & Sagar, M. (2023). Temporary Anchorage Devices. *Cureus*, *15*(9).

Shukur, I. (2023). Invisalign vs Braces: Which is Right for You? A Guide from an Orthodontist: Case of Blanca Dental Care. *OTS Canadian Journal*, 2(4). https://doi.org/10.58840/b5ahdj50

Soni, D. M., & Sharma, R. (2022). Retraction of Anterior Teeth with Temporary Anchorage Devices (TADS)–A Review. *EAS Journal of Dentistry and Oral Medicine*, *4*(6), 132-140.

Umalkar, S. S., Jadhav, V. V., Paul, P., Reche, A., & Jadhav Sr, V. V. (2022). Modern anchorage systems in orthodontics. *Cureus*, *14*(11).

Viet, H., Thao, D. T. N., & Marya, A. (2025). Biomechanics of Adjunctive Maxillary Molar Intrusion using Temporary Anchorage Devices and Power Chain: A Case Series. *Journal of Indian Orthodontic Society*, 03015742241304470.

Viglianisi, G., Polizzi, A., Lombardi, T., Amato, M., Grippaudo, C., & Isola, G. (2025). Biomechanical and Biological Multidisciplinary Strategies in the Orthodontic Treatment of Patients with Periodontal Diseases: A Review of the Literature. *Bioengineering*, *12*(1), 49.

Wei, W. (2025). Enhancing Quality of Care through Effective Gynecological Hospital Management: Strategies, Challenges, and Outcomes. *OTS Canadian Journal*, 4(5), 62–71. https://doi.org/10.58840/mc6crw68