

ANALOG INDIRECT BONDING – HAS IT BECOME OBSOLETE?



D. Paddenberg, M. Bock, B. Paddenberg

Private office, Paderborn, Germany

98th European Orthodontic Society Congress, Oslo, Norway, June 2023

Aim

Indirect bonding in form of an analog workflow has been used in clinical routine since many years. Enabled by technical progress, the procedure can nowadays also be carried out with full digital support. The aim of this paper is to compare both workflows based on clinical experience.

Material and methods

The following sub steps are compared: Impression/scan, placement of brackets on the digital/physical model, thermoforming/3d print of the tray, bonding itself. The comparison focuses on precision, time required, susceptibility to errors, needed equipment and material expenditure.

Results

	Analog	Digital
Precision	bracket base is individualized, better fit less adhesive used, less excess material	more extensive magnification and display options
Time required	faster placing and tray manufacturing easily delegable due to intuitve handling more manual work	less manual work more automation possible
Susceptibility to errors		brackets may detach from the tray mounttray parameters can be difficult to find(dependent on bracket model)
Equipment and material expenditure	equipment: thermoforming unit consumables: alginate, plaster, thermoforming sheets, kneadable silicone, chemically curing composite, insulating material	equipment: intraoral scanner, computer with software, DLP/SLA printer incl. washing and curing unit consumables: resin

Conclusion

Even by today's standards, the analog workflow is a valuable method for indirect bonding. Advantages arise in particular from lower upfront investment costs, shorter production time and good delegability to a dental technician. Which way is more suitable seems to depend mainly on the orientation and equipment of the practice.