





population the participants responded that there is equal discomfort in using both the appliances.

Out of the total population, 73% of the participants responded that the treatment time is more with removable appliances and 27% of them responded that the treatment time is more with fixed appliances. 71% of the participants responded that removable appliances show more desired changes as compared to fixed appliances. 53% of the participants responded that fixed appliances can be used for older patients as compared to 47% participants responded that removable appliances can be used for older patients. Luther. F [22-24] has explained that the appliance has to be designed and fitted in a certain manner which can also be used in old aged people which gives comfort and is used widely on many patients. 68% of the participants responded that fixed appliances are more hygienic as compared to removable appliances. Greco PM has explained that removable appliances are less hygienic because the patients are reluctant to follow proper hygiene techniques and also said concerning hygiene fixed appliances are better [15]. 80% of participants responded that fixed appliances are aesthetic as compared to removable appliances. Figure 1 depicts the association between the year of study of the student and the type of orthodontic appliance that is more aesthetic. Out of the total study population, majority, 36% of the second year students, 15% of the first year students, 10% of the third year students, 7% of the fourth year students and 6% of the interns preferred removable appliances over fixed appliances. The results were statistically significant according to the Chi square test, where  $p < 0.05$ .

### CONCLUSION

According to the data collected the majority of the participants were from second year and most of them preferred removable appliances over fixed appliances, but both the appliances have their own pros and cons so both the appliances can be used in different procedures and cases.

### REFERENCES

- Littlewood S, Tait A, Mandall N, et al. The role of removable appliances in contemporary orthodontics. *Br Dent J* 2001; 191:304-310.
- Artun J. A post treatment evaluation of multibonded lingual appliances in orthodontics. *Eur J Orthod* 1987; 9:204-210.
- A critical evaluation of orthodontic treatment in the general dental services of England and Wales. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1992; 101: 292-293.
- Derks A, Katsaros C, Frencken JE, et al. Caries-inhibiting effect of preventive measures during orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances. A systematic review. *Caries Res* 2004; 38:413-420.
- Erdinc AME, Ertan Erdinc AM. Perception of pain during orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances. *Eur J Orthod* 2004; 26:79-85.
- Patient Compliance to Wear Orthodontic Retainers during Postretention may Vary by Age, Gender, and Time since Braces were Removed. *J Evid Based Dent* 2012; 12:202-203.
- Wiedel AP, Bondemark L. Fixed versus removable orthodontic appliances to correct anterior crossbite in the mixed dentition-a randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Orthod* 2015; 37:123-127.
- Tang EL, Wei SH. Assessing treatment effectiveness of removable and fixed orthodontic appliances with the occlusal index. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1990; 98:550-556.
- Ackerman MB, McRae MS, Longley WH. Microsensor technology to help monitor removable appliance wear. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2009; 135:549-551.
- Alzoubi EEM. An Evaluation of Oral Health-Related Quality Of Life in Orthodontic Patients Treated with Fixed and Twin Blocks Removable Appliances. *JDHODT* 2016; 5.
- Kerr WJS, Buchanan IB, McColl JH. Use of the PAR Index in Assessing the Effectiveness of Removable Orthodontic Appliances. *Br J Orthod* 1993; 20:351-357.
- Stewart FN, Kerr WJS, Taylor PJS. Appliance wear: the patient's point of view. *Eur J Orthod* 1997; 19:377-382.
- Sergl HG, Klages U, Pempera J. On the prediction of dentist-evaluated patient compliance in orthodontics. *Eur J Orthod* 1992; 14:463-468.
- Santini A, Turner S. UK-GDPs' knowledge of light curing of resin based composites materials. *Dental Materials*. 2010; 26:e38.
- Greco PM. You make the decision. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2013; 143:S12
- Khan A, Verpoort F, Asiri AM, et al. Metal Organic Frameworks for Chemical Reactions: From Organic Transformations to Energy Applications. Elsevier. 2021; 500002E
- Alam MK, Alfawzan AA, Haque S, et al. Sagittal Jaw Relationship of Different Types of Cleft and Non-cleft Individuals. *Front Pediatr* 2021; 9:651951.
- Marya A, Venugopal A. The Use of Technology in the Management of Orthodontic Treatment-Related Pain. *Pain Res Manag* 2021; 2021:5512031.
- Adel S, Zaher A, El Harouni N, et al. Robotic Applications in Orthodontics: Changing the Face of Contemporary Clinical Care. *Biomed Res Int* 2021; 2021:9954615.
- Venugopal A, Vaid N, Bowman SJ. The quagmire of collegiality vs competitiveness. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2021; 159:553-555.
- Atherton JD, Lovius BBJ. The advantages and disadvantages of removable appliance therapy. *Am J Orthod* 1972; 62:591-600.

22. Luther F, Nelson-Moon Z. Orthodontic Retainers and Removable Appliances: Principles of Design and Use. John Wiley & Sons. 2012; 200.
23. Maliael MT, Saveetha Dental College and Hospital Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences (SIMATS), Chennai-, Nadu T, India. Correlation of frankfort horizontal with the sellanasion line angular data in different sagittal skeletal bases. Bioinformation. 2020; 16:1088-1093.
24. Varghese RM, Subramanian AK, Sreenivasagan S, et al. Comparison of dentoskeletal changes in skeletal class II cases using two different fixed functional appliances: Forsus fatigue resistant device and powerscope class II corrector-A clinical study. Int J Oral Health Dent 2021; 13:234.