ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

OPTIMIZING ORTHODONTIC TREATMENT PROTOCOLS FOR DISTAL OCCLUSION (ANGLE CLASS II MALOCCLUSION): EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS, DECISION PATHWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OPTIMIZATION ACROSS THE LIFESPAN

Khamidjonova Shakhzoda Bakhrilloevna[1]
Khayitova Raykhona Tolibovna, Co-author[2]
Scientific Supervisor: Juraev Firdavs Abdurakhmonovich[3]
Samarkand State Medical University

Abstract. Distal occlusion (Angle Class II malocclusion) is a highly prevalent sagittal discrepancy that encompasses heterogeneous etiologies and phenotypes, including maxillary protrusion, mandibular retrognathia, dentoalveolar compensation, and functional disturbances. Optimizing treatment therefore requires structured diagnosis and deliberate selection among growth modification, orthodontic camouflage, skeletal anchorage strategies, and orthognathic surgery. This scholarly review synthesizes contemporary primary studies, systematic reviews, and clinical guidance to propose an evidence-informed framework for optimizing Class II protocols across children, adolescents, and adults. Evidence from randomized and controlled trials indicates that early two-phase Class II treatment in childhood can reduce incisor prominence and may reduce new incisal trauma, but does not yield superior final outcomes after completion of comprehensive therapy compared with single-phase adolescent treatment, supporting selective early intervention rather than routine early treatment. Growth modification modalities (Twin Block, Herbst, headgear) demonstrate clinically meaningful overjet reduction and molar relationship improvement, with variable skeletal effects and predictable dentoalveolar side effects (notably mandibular incisor proclination with fixed functional appliances and vertical changes with cervical headgear). Contemporary meta-analysis comparing Twin Block and Herbst in children highlights trade-offs in mandibular body length improvement versus dentoalveolar consequences and molar relationship change, underscoring the value of phenotype-matched appliance selection. For non-growing patients, camouflage approaches using fixed appliances, Class II elastics, distalization mechanics, extraction strategies, and aligner-based protocols can be effective when discrepancy severity and facial objectives permit; systematic evidence suggests nonextraction treatment may be slightly shorter, while extractions produce predictable arch and soft-tissue changes with limited high-certainty comparative outcome data.

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025
Temporary anchorage devices (TADs) expand biomechanical options to reduce anchorage loss and improve vertical control, yet evidence remains heterogeneous and complication management requires imaging-guided planning and monitoring. Orthognathic surgery for severe skeletal Class II provides direct correction; available systematic evidence indicates high stability for mandibular advancement and bimaxillary procedures, though certainty is low due to nonrandomized data. A practical decision flowchart, treatment timeline, and comparative modality tables are presented, along with a critical appraisal of evidence strength and key research gaps.

Keywords. Class II malocclusion; distal occlusion; functional appliances; cervical headgear; fixed functional appliances; temporary anchorage devices; molar distalization; extraction therapy; orthognathic surgery; retention; stability; evidence synthesis.

Distal occlusion is defined in contemporary regional clinical protocols as a sagittal occlusal anomaly characterized by distal positioning of the mandibular dental arch relative to the maxillary arch, with the first permanent molars in an Angle Class II relationship (mesiobuccal cusp of the maxillary first molar positioned anterior to the intercuspation groove of the corresponding mandibular molar). This definition is clinically operational because it links the sagittal discrepancy to a measurable molar relationship and aligns with an internationally recognizable classification tradition originating from Edward Angle, while also allowing stratification by incisor inclination (Class II Division 1 with proclined/protrusive maxillary incisors and Class II Division 2 with retroclined incisors) and by overjet magnitude.

A key practical barrier to “optimized” treatment is that Class II malocclusion is not a single disease entity but rather a phenotype family. Regional protocols explicitly acknowledge multiple diagnostic categories that map onto different etiologies, including maxillary prognathism or macrognathia, mandibular retrognathia or micrognathia, and functional etiologies such as mouth breathing, atypical swallowing, or oral habits; these distinctions are not semantic, because they fundamentally determine whether growth modification, dental camouflage, anchored distalization, or surgical correction is biomechanically rational.

The aim of this scholarly synthesis is to develop an evidence-informed, clinically operational framework for optimizing orthodontic treatment of distal occlusion (Angle Class II malocclusion) across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood by (1) systematizing diagnostic stratification and severity grading; (2) critically appraising comparative effectiveness, stability, and complications across major treatment modalities; and (3) translating the evidence into practical recommendations, decision

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

pathways, and timelines suitable for adoption in academic and clinical orthodontic settings.

Materials and Methods. This article is an evidence synthesis intended for scholarly and clinical translation rather than a primary clinical trial. Sources were selected to prioritize (1) primary randomized and controlled clinical trials where available, (2) systematic reviews and meta-analyses with transparent methods, (3) clinical practice guidelines and protocol documents, and (4) high-quality observational studies for long-term stability and complication profiles when trials are not feasible.

To strengthen clinical applicability across both English and Russian contexts, the synthesis integrates an example of a formal regional clinical protocol for distal occlusion (Republic of Belarus) that provides operational definitions, severity gradations (including cephalometric mm-based criteria in lateral cephalometry), and a structured diagnostic set that includes medical history, extraoral examination, habit assessment, and standardized photographic series. Additional Russian-language academic sources were included to reflect regional clinical perspectives and local research questions such as breathing dysfunction associations and TMJ imaging findings.

Evidence appraisal was performed qualitatively by triangulating findings across (a) the Cochrane review addressing early versus late Class II treatment and comparisons among appliance types, which explicitly reports certainty constraints and heterogeneity, (b) contemporary modality-specific meta-analyses (e.g., Twin Block vs Herbst), and (c) guideline documents for retention and complication management that emphasize low evidence areas and reliance on expert-based considerations when trials are sparse. The objective of this appraisal is not to assign a single numerical grade to each recommendation, but to explicitly distinguish high-certainty statements (supported by multiple controlled trials or consistent meta-analytic results) from low-certainty statements (heterogeneous observational evidence, small samples, or indirect evidence), and to make those certainty differences visible in clinical decision-making.

Results and Discussion

Optimization begins with standardization of what “Class II” means in a given patient. A Belarusian protocol defines distal bite/occlusion explicitly and stratifies severity by (1) the sagittal discrepancy between apical bases relative to the occlusal plane on lateral cephalometry (3–6 mm, 7–11 mm, >11 mm) and (2) overjet categories in Division 1 (2.1–5 mm mild; 5.1–7 mm moderate; 7.1–10 mm severe), while also recognizing Division 2 based on maxillary incisor retroclination. This approach is

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

clinically valuable because it ties severity to quantifiable metrics and supports protocolization of treatment thresholds.

A second critical diagnostic axis is etiologic level: dentoalveolar versus skeletal versus functional. The same protocol emphasizes identifying factors influencing distal occlusion at the dentoalveolar and/or gnathic level and links distal occlusion to functional issues such as swallowing dysfunction and possible mouth breathing. From a protocol optimization perspective, this means that Class II correction should not be reduced to "move teeth to Class I," but should integrate habit management (e.g., oral breathing drivers, atypical swallowing) and interdisciplinary referral where necessary, because untreated functional drivers can undermine stability and compliance across modalities.

A third axis is growth potential. Evidence and professional guidance converge that functional appliance therapy is generally more efficient when aligned with pubertal growth phase rather than purely prepubertal timing, and that early mixed-dentition intervention is best reserved for specific indications (trauma risk, psychosocial factors, selected functional needs) rather than routine early treatment. Growth assessment tools (cervical vertebral maturation, hand-wrist radiography, growth history) are therefore not optional for optimized protocols; they are central decision variables.

Finally, diagnostic documentation and medical context are part of optimization rather than administrative overhead. The Belarus protocol defines mandatory diagnostic elements including medical and dental history, extraoral examination including posture and facial profile assessment, habit evaluation, intraoral examination with occlusal registration, and standardized facial and intraoral photography. It also emphasizes identifying systemic or psychosocial conditions that may contraindicate or alter orthodontic management and evaluating periodontal and inflammatory status before proceeding.

A central optimization question is whether to treat early or to treat at the pubertal growth phase. The Cochrane review concludes that early two-phase treatment (typically ages 7–11 in the included trials) produces significant reduction in incisor prominence at the end of phase I with either functional appliance or headgear, but after completion of phase II in adolescence there are no differences in final outcomes between early and late treatment for variables other than the incidence of new incisal trauma; early treatment shows a significant reduction in new incisal trauma with low to moderate evidence certainty.

From a protocol design standpoint, this supports a selective early-treatment strategy based on explicit risk or need. A practical, evidence-consistent approach is to reserve early intervention for (a) high-overjet trauma risk profiles, (b) pronounced

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

psychosocial distress or teasing associated with dental appearance, (c) specific functional needs that are plausible to influence growth and stability, and (d) severe sagittal discrepancies where early dentoalveolar decompensation could simplify later comprehensive treatment—while acknowledging limited evidence that early treatment reduces later extraction or surgery need.

When functional therapy is chosen, optimization requires anticipating modality trade-offs. Contemporary meta-analysis comparing Twin Block and Herbst in children found no significant difference in ANB angle change between appliances, but identified that Herbst is associated with greater increases in mandibular incisor inclination and position relative to the mandibular plane (L1-MP angle WMD 2.64; L1-MP linear WMD 0.76), while also suggesting superior performance in mandibular body length. Twin Block showed more favorable changes for U1-SN and certain profile or vertical parameters and improved molar relationship more strongly in the included synthesis.

Optimization therefore positions Twin Block and Herbst not as interchangeable "Class II correctors" but as phenotype-specific tools. In a patient with thin mandibular symphysis, periodontal susceptibility, or already proclined lower incisors, an optimized protocol should either (1) select a modality with lower proclination tendency, (2) incorporate anchorage control adjuncts such as skeletal anchorage, or (3) plan for compensatory mechanics and retention strategies that limit the long-term consequences of incisors being moved outside a stable envelope.

Duration is a practical optimization variable because unnecessarily long treatment increases risk for decalcification, compliance decay, and dropouts. Professional educational guidance from the Australian Society of Orthodontists suggests that Herbst and Twin Block appliances are commonly used for about 6–9 months prior to fixed appliance placement in pubertal growth, and that fixed functional springs used during fixed appliances tend to remain in place roughly 4–6 months, acknowledging that cooperation, breakages, growth remaining, and growth direction modulate duration. [34] A clinical study of Twin Block also reports an active phase ranging from 9 to 14 months (average 12 months) in a sample with Class II Division 1 criteria, illustrating variability by case and protocol design.

Functional appliances may also intersect with airway concerns. An umbrella review published in the European Journal of Orthodontics[36] (early 2026 issue, published December 2025) evaluated evidence credibility and reported meta-analytic signals of significant enlargement in oropharyngeal spaces and increases in airway volumes after functional appliance therapy in growing Class II patients, while also highlighting uncertainty linked to methodological overlap and variable significance across outcomes. In optimization terms, airway findings can be considered supportive

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

but not decisive: airway changes are secondary outcomes and should not substitute for a medical evaluation when obstructive sleep apnea or ENT pathology is suspected.

Cervical headgear is sometimes framed as "legacy orthodontics," yet the evidence base remains robust for selected phenotypes. A systematic review of cervical headgear effects concluded that cervical headgear is efficient for correcting Class II Division 1 malocclusion and primarily acts via restriction of maxillary anterior displacement, distalization and extrusion of maxillary molars, and slight maxillary expansion. A prospective controlled study similarly reported distal movement of maxillary first molars and restriction of anterior maxillary displacement without significant changes in the GoGn.SN angle over approximately 15 ± 4 months.

Optimization requires two explicit controls: first, compliance architecture; second, vertical side-effect management. The systematic review underlines that treatment effect is linked to daily hours of wear and patient motivation, which suggests that a protocol optimized for headgear should include objective wear monitoring or structured motivational frameworks and should avoid selecting headgear when adherence is predictably low. Vertical effects are not universally adverse, but molar extrusion can open the bite and increase vertical parameters in some growth patterns, implying that an optimized protocol either avoids cervical pull in extreme high-angle cases or incorporates compensatory mechanics.

Because headgear can restrict maxillary growth and reduce overjet, it can also function as a selective early intervention when incisal trauma risk is central, consistent with Cochrane evidence that early treatment's primary lasting benefit is trauma reduction rather than superior final occlusal outcomes.

In non-growing patients or in cases where skeletal discrepancy is mild to moderate, camouflage is often the most practical option. Modern camouflage includes conventional fixed appliances with elastics, distalization mechanics, aligner-based distalization, extraction/nonextraction strategies, and TAD-supported anchorage reinforcement. Optimization hinges on predictable force systems and minimization of unwanted movements.

A major contemporary meta-analysis comparing conventional, skeletal, and "invisible" (clear aligner) approaches for maxillary molar distalization in Class II reports that clear aligner distalization yields less distalization and less tipping (approximately 2.33 mm and 3.01°) than conventional appliances (about 3.29 mm and 6.39°) and skeletal appliance groups (about 3.48 mm and 5.84°). The conventional group showed significantly greater anchorage loss (about 1.69 mm and 3.99° incisor change) and greater mandibular plane angle increase (about 0.66°). The meta-analysis additionally reports that distalization after eruption of maxillary second molars may

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

increase anchorage loss and that miniscrew position influences efficacy, with infrazygomatic placement associated with larger distalization than certain palatal/buccal placements in subgroup analyses.

These data enable specific protocol optimization levers. When clear aligners are selected for adult Class II camouflage, the protocol should assume partial translation of planned movement into achieved movement and anticipate that distalization may be less than predicted, requiring either longer staging, auxiliary anchorage, or acceptance of limited correction envelope. When conventional distalizers are used with dental anchorage, anchorage loss and vertical increases are predictable risks; optimized protocols therefore favor skeletal anchorage when anterior anchorage is limited or when vertical control is critical.

Direct evidence comparing miniscrew anchorage to Class II elastics in adult clear-aligner maxillary arch distalization indicates comparable distalization efficiency between approaches, but improved vertical control of anterior teeth and improved tipping control of posterior teeth with miniscrew anchorage. This supports a nuanced optimization strategy: miniscrews may not automatically increase net distalization efficiency, but they may improve the quality of movement (reduced unwanted extrusion and tipping), which can translate into better facial control and reduced finishing complexity.

Temporary anchorage devices can be understood as optimization tools for anchorage control and side-effect reduction rather than as “Class II treatments” themselves. Protocols may use TADs to reinforce anchorage during Class II elastics, to support distalization, to augment fixed functional appliances, or to enable vertical control in high-angle Class II patterns.

The evidence base, while expanding, remains heterogeneous. A systematic review of bi-maxillary skeletal anchorage devices found only four eligible studies with moderate overall risk of bias and inconsistent skeletal and dentoalveolar effects beyond consistent overjet reduction and sagittal improvement signals. The review explicitly calls for better designed randomized trials and standardization of participant characteristics and skeletal age assessment. A separate systematic review with meta-analysis assessing skeletal anchorage combined with Class II devices (Herbst, Forsus, Carriere Motion, elastics) reported an overall small difference in skeletal divergence (SMD around 0.19), with a statistically significant decrease in skeletal divergence in the Herbst + TAD subgroup (mean ~1.44° decrease), while also emphasizing limitations including small study numbers, heterogeneity, and questionable clinical relevance for some observed effects.

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

Optimization therefore requires restrained interpretation: TADs can improve biomechanical control, but they do not magically convert dentoalveolar camouflage into skeletal correction, and the magnitude of skeletal change may be small relative to clinical expectations. Where TADs matter most is in controlling side effects that undermine stability: mandibular incisor proclination, vertical opening, anchorage loss, and uncontrolled tipping.

Complication management is inseparable from optimization. A scoping review of orthodontic miniscrew complications emphasizes that TADs optimize anchorage without relying on patient compliance, but carries risks requiring meticulous planning with radiological guidance and monitoring. It provides specific management guidance: root or periodontal ligament contact requires removal and healing (with endodontic therapy if pulp is involved), safe distance margins (e.g., a 2 mm gap to surrounding structures), and hygiene protocols such as chlorhexidine to manage soft tissue inflammation, highlighting that optimization is procedural, not merely conceptual.

Extraction versus nonextraction decisions in Class II orthodontics often carry strong opinions, yet optimization demands evidence-based realism about what extractions do and do not predictably change. A systematic review and meta-analysis comparing four-first-premolar extraction versus nonextraction (across malocclusions including Class II) reports that extractions are associated with decreases in maxillary and mandibular inter-first molar width and retraction of upper and lower lips, while nonextraction is associated with an increase in mandibular intercanine width and a shorter treatment duration by about 0.36 years on average. The meta-analysis notes no significant difference for some occlusal/esthetic outcomes and calls for higher-quality research.

In optimized Class II protocols, extraction is best framed as an anchorage and soft-tissue strategy, most justifiable when crowding/protrusion or incisor position goals cannot be safely or efficiently achieved with distalization or growth modification. Conversely, in borderline cases where extractions would be performed mainly to facilitate Class II correction, distalization supported by skeletal anchorage may offer an alternative with different trade-offs, acknowledging that distalization itself has anchorage and vertical consequences as shown in distalization meta-analysis.

For severe skeletal Class II malocclusion, orthognathic surgery remains the definitive corrective modality, usually in combination with orthodontic phases. A systematic review of relapse in Class II orthognathic surgery concludes that mandibular advancement and bimaxillary procedures appear highly stable, while single-jaw maxillary procedures are mostly stable sagittally but may be problematic vertically; the evidence is limited and low quality due to small nonrandomized cohorts. This implies

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

that "optimization" in surgical cases is less about choosing among many trials and more about integrating stability principles, careful planning, and realistic patient counseling about uncertainty.

Time is a major optimization dimension in orthognathic care. A commissioning guide from The Royal College of Surgeons of England specifies that presurgery orthodontics generally takes 18–24 months, with appointments every four to six weeks, and that post-surgical orthodontics may be required on a six-weekly basis for up to twelve months. A contemporary observational study of mandibular advancement surgery in Finland reports mean combined treatment duration of about 28.1 months, with about 18.9 months preoperative and 9.2 months postoperative orthodontics. Patient-facing NHS information leaflets similarly describe ~18–24 months of orthodontics with a further ~six months after surgery in many cases.

Sequencing innovations such as surgery-first approaches may reduce total duration in selected cases, with a systematic narrative indicating mean treatment times around 14.2 months in surgery-first groups versus about 20.16 months in conventional groups, while also highlighting heterogeneity, case selection constraints, and the influence of extractions on duration. For optimization, the implication is that surgery-first is a potentially useful efficiency strategy, but only in carefully selected interdisciplinary contexts where occlusal interferences, decompensation needs, and stability considerations are appropriately managed.

Evidence supporting selective early treatment benefits is relatively strong in direction but constrained in certainty. The Cochrane review provides the most methodologically rigorous synthesis available for early versus late treatment in prominent upper incisors/Class II Division 1, concluding that early treatment does not improve final outcomes relative to late treatment after completion of comprehensive care, except for reduced incisal trauma incidence, with low to moderate certainty across outcomes. This supports guideline-like decision thresholds centered on trauma and psychosocial burden rather than routine early intervention.

Evidence supporting headgear effects is reasonably consistent for selected phenotypes, including maxillary restraint and molar distalization/extrusion, but the generalizability to contemporary mixed-mechanic protocols is limited by changing practice patterns and the central importance of compliance.

Evidence comparing functional appliance types is increasingly quantitative, yet heterogeneity remains substantial. The Twin Block versus Herbst meta-analysis provides convergent signals on predictable side effects (especially mandibular incisor proclination with Herbst) and on certain differential outcomes (molar relationship,

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

posterior facial height, mandibular body length), but variation in appliance design, wear protocols, and growth staging limits direct "best-appliance" claims.

Evidence on skeletal anchorage as a Class II optimization tool is promising but currently insufficient for universal protocol mandates. Systematic reviews show consistent overjet reduction but inconsistent skeletal and dentoalveolar effects, and meta-analysis suggests small average skeletal divergence differences with some appliance-specific signals; the limitation is not a lack of plausibility but a shortage of comparable, well-controlled trials with meaningful long-term patient outcomes.

Evidence on distalization mechanics is becoming stronger and more actionable, including quantitative comparisons among aligners, conventional appliances, and skeletal anchorage. Still, distalization studies often focus on dental movement metrics rather than full-course outcomes such as PAR/ABO-OGS scores, stability, periodontal outcomes, and patient-reported experiences.

Evidence on extraction decisions remains dominated by retrospective studies and mixed malocclusion samples. The available meta-analysis provides useful signals about duration and arch/soft-tissue changes but cannot fully resolve patient selection bias; optimized protocols must therefore integrate evidence with phenotype-based clinical judgment and facial objectives.

Orthognathic stability evidence for Class II is limited in quality, relying on small nonrandomized cohorts. The systematic review suggests favorable stability for mandibular advancement and bimaxillary procedures but explicitly rates evidence quality as low. Optimization in surgical cases should therefore prioritize risk stratification, stability-oriented planning, and realistic counseling rather than assuming that published hierarchies fully predict individual relapse.

Finally, patient experience and complication profiles are under-represented relative to skeletal/dental metric outcomes. A systematic review on complications, impacts, and success rates of Class II correctors in adolescents emphasizes that complications are more prevalent with fixed designs but that success rates may be higher, and that patient experiences during Class II corrector wear are not fully understood—an explicit gap relevant to shared decision-making and adherence design.

Optimizing Class II treatment can be operationalized as a small set of decision-anchored practices that are consistent with current evidence.

A first recommendation is to formalize a severity and phenotype rubric at diagnosis. Using quantifiable severity thresholds (overjet and cephalometric base relationships), incisor inclination subtype, and etiologic ICD-linked categories (maxillary vs mandibular vs functional) supports consistent method selection and facilitates audit and research reproducibility.

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

A second recommendation is to make early treatment selective, documented, and justified. If early phase is chosen, the treatment plan should specify the intended lasting benefit (usually trauma risk reduction and psychosocial relief) and explicitly plan the retention/monitoring bridge to adolescent comprehensive correction to avoid inefficiency highlighted in evidence and professional guidance.

A third recommendation is to design biomechanics around side-effect containment, not only sagittal correction. If using fixed functional appliances (or Herbst), plan proactively for mandibular incisor inclination management through archwire sequencing, anchorage planning, and consideration of skeletal anchorage adjuncts in risk phenotypes, consistent with meta-analytic signals of greater lower incisor changes. If using headgear, screen for vertical pattern susceptibility and monitor vertical changes, consistent with known molar extrusion and vertical parameter effects.

A fourth recommendation is to treat anchorage as a planned resource, not an afterthought. Where distalization or elastics risk anterior anchorage loss or vertical opening, consider skeletal anchorage; distalization meta-analysis shows that conventional anchorage produces greater anchorage loss and vertical changes, while skeletal anchorage and miniscrew-supported strategies can improve control.

A fifth recommendation is to integrate complication prevention protocols for TAD use. Evidence-based complication management emphasizes imaging guidance, safe distances to roots and anatomical structures, hygiene protocols to prevent inflammation, and defined responses to root contact, instability, sinus proximity, and fracture. These should be embedded into standard operating procedures if TADs are part of the optimized protocol.

A sixth recommendation is to pre-design retention and long-term follow-up. The evidence base recognizes lifelong tendencies for post-treatment dental change and the role of retention regimen and communication. Clinical guidelines report that full-time wear of vacuum-formed retention may not confer advantages over part-time regimens in some contexts, that relapse can occur with both fixed and removable retention, and that excessive lower incisor proclination should be avoided unless prolonged retention is planned. Guideline development work emphasizes individualized retention choice and communication among orthodontist, dentist, and patient.

A seventh recommendation is to adopt outcome measurement beyond cephalometrics. Class II protocol optimization is best evaluated using a combined endpoint set incorporating occlusal indices (PAR, ABO-OGS where feasible), incisal trauma incidence (especially if early treatment is used), patient-reported experiences, and longer follow-up stability measures. Current evidence explicitly notes gaps in

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

patient-centered outcomes for Class II correctors and limited evidence base for retention; integrating these outcomes into routine audit is itself an optimization step.

Conclusions

Distal occlusion (Angle Class II malocclusion) cannot be optimized through appliance preference alone; it requires a phenotype-driven, growth-stage-matched, side-effect-minimizing protocol with retention designed from the outset. Regional clinical protocols provide an operational definition and quantifiable severity stratification that can serve as a reproducible diagnostic foundation, including division subtypes and functional etiologic categories.

The strongest evidence-based optimization message on timing is that routine early two-phase treatment is not warranted for all Class II patients, because final outcomes after comprehensive treatment are generally similar between early and late approaches; early treatment is best justified selectively by its consistent advantage in reducing new incisal trauma risk and by patient-centered indications such as psychosocial distress.

For growth modification, headgear remains an evidence-supported strategy for Class II with maxillary protrusion dominance, while functional appliances are effective in many mandibular retrognathia settings but carry predictable dentoalveolar side effects. Comparative evidence between Twin Block and Herbst indicates that appliance choice can be optimized by anticipating different profiles of mandibular incisor proclination, molar relationship changes, and mandibular body length response.

For orthodontic camouflage, current evidence supports that distalization is achievable with aligners and conventional appliances, but that skeletal anchorage improves control and that aligner distalization may show lower distalization magnitude compared with conventional and skeletal approaches in meta-analysis. Miniscrew anchorage may not increase distalization efficiency versus elastics but can improve vertical and tipping control, which is clinically meaningful for face and finishing. Extraction decisions should be optimized by separating biomechanical need (space/anchorage/incisor position) from generalized beliefs; the best available synthesis suggests nonextraction tends to be slightly shorter and extractions produce predictable arch width and lip changes, with limited high-certainty comparative outcome data.

TADs are best conceptualized as optimization tools for anchorage and side-effect reduction rather than as universal Class II solutions. Evidence indicates potential benefits but also heterogeneity and the need for meticulous complication prevention and management via imaging-guided planning and monitoring.

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025

For severe skeletal Class II in skeletally mature patients, orthognathic surgery provides the broadest correction. Current systematic evidence suggests high stability for mandibular advancement and bimaxillary procedures, but the certainty is low due to limited nonrandomized data. Time-optimization strategies such as surgery-first can reduce total duration in selected cases, but require careful case selection and interdisciplinary coordination.

Across all modalities, long-term stability is reinforced by retention protocol quality and by addressing relapse drivers such as habits and unstable interdigitation. Evidence-based retention guidance and guideline development underscore individualized retention choice and sustained communication to maintain outcomes, particularly when treatment mechanics involve significant incisor position change.

Literature

1. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Belarus. (2022). Diagnosis and treatment of patients with distal occlusion (adult and child population): Clinical protocol (Republic of Belarus). (Published in MedElement clinical protocols repository).

2. Cochrane Collaboration. Batista, K. B. S. L., Thiruvenkatachari, B., Harrison, J. E., O'Brien, K. D., & others. (2018). Orthodontic treatment for prominent upper front teeth (Class II malocclusion) in children and adolescents (Cochrane Database systematic review).

3. Henriques, J. F. C., Maltagliati, L. Á., Janson, G., et al. (2015). Effects of cervical headgear appliance: A systematic review. Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics.

4. Rosa, A. J., do Nascimento, R. R., Mucha, J. N., & Vilella, O. V. (2020). Effects of the cervical headgear in growing Angle Class II malocclusion patients: A prospective study. Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics.

5. Xu, F., et al. (2024). Comparison of Twin Block appliance and Herbst appliance in the treatment of Class II malocclusion among children: A meta-analysis. BMC Oral Health.

6. Australian Society of Orthodontists. (2024). Class II correction with functional appliances (professional educational document).

7. British Orthodontic Society. (2026). Functional appliances (patient and clinician information page).

8. Liu, F., Liu, J., Guo, M., Li, Z., Shu, G., & Dai, F. (2024). Miniscrew anchorage versus Class II elastics for maxillary arch distalization using clear aligners. The Angle Orthodontist.

ISSN: 3060-4737 Volume 3, Issue 2 IF(Impact Factor) 10.98 / 2025
9. Huang, Y. T. L., et al. (2025). Analysis of the efficacy of conventional, skeletal and invisible orthodontic appliance for upper molar distalization in Class II malocclusion patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Oral Health.

10. Alhammadi, M. S., et al. (2022). Skeletal and dentoalveolar effects of Class II malocclusion treatment using bi-maxillary skeletal anchorage: A systematic review. BMC Oral Health.

11. Gotti, E., et al. (2024). Mandibular advancement and skeletal anchorage in Class II malocclusion patients: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Bioengineering.

12. del Rosso, C., et al. (2025). Clinical management of orthodontic miniscrew complications: A scoping review. MDPI (open access via PMC).