



DISCUSSION

The incidence of impacted canines were found to be ranging from 1.29% to 8.8% from literature review. The present study consisted of 406 OPGs among which only 17(4.19%) patients were found to have canine impaction. Variations in the incidences were found with different studies Anastasia et al (8) found the incidence to be 8.8%, Ali Murat et al (6) found it to be 1.74 %, Jason Cooke found it to be 2.5% (5), U.Aydin et al found it to be 3.58% (4) and A. Alqerban et al found it to be 1% to 3% (2).

The present study found that there was a female predilection for canine impaction which was in accordance with studies done by Anastasia et al, Muhammet Selim et al, Ali Murat Aktan et al. Majority of the impacted canines were unilateral (64.7%) in nature.

The present study also reveals that maxillary canine is more commonly impacted than the mandibular canines and among the 17 patients no patient had impaction of both maxillary and mandibular canines. Ali Murat Aktan et al also reported with a predilection of 1.74% for maxillary canine. Study done by Sandeepa NC et al (3) also shows predilection for maxillary canine which was found to be 77.5%.

Incidence of canine impaction varies with population studied as reported by Anastasia et al (8) who studied in North Greek population and found the incidence to be 8.8%. Muhammet Selim et al (7) reported an incidence of 1.29% and Ali Murat et al (6) reported the incidence to be 1.74% which is very close to Muhammet et al (7) and both the studies were performed in Turkish population. Study done by Sandeepa NC et al (3) found it to be 2.66% among the South Indian population. The present study was also performed in South Indian population and the incidence was found to be 4.19%. There is a considerable variation between both studies the reason might be the sample size and inclusion of other impacted teeth as well.

CONCLUSION

The incidence of the present study was found to be 4.19%. The maxillary canines were more commonly impacted than the mandibular counterparts. Knowledge about incidence of canine impaction along with parameters such as gender predilection, jaw predilection is crucial before treating the patients for impacted canines as canines play a vital role in aesthetics and function.

Panoramic radiography could be a useful imaging modality in detecting impacted canines. But the drawback of panoramic radiography is the uni planar visualisation of the image. Advancement in imaging has led to the introduction of CBCT which allows us to visualise the image in all three dimensions. Hence impacted canines are visualised better in CBCT but the fact that the 3D imaging uses more radiation than panoramic radiography should also be considered. Calculation of risks versus benefits is mandatory before subjecting the patient to radiation. From a diagnostic perspective panoramic radiography would suffice in detecting the impacted canines.

REFERENCES

1. Aqeel Ibrahim Lazim The Prevalence of Impacted Maxillary Canine among Iraqi Patients of Al-Basrah City J Bagh Coll Dentistry 2016; 28(1):73-77).
2. A. Alqerban R, Jacobs P, Lambrechts G, Loozen G, Willems Root resorption of the maxillary lateral incisor caused by impacted canine: a literature review Clin Oral Invest September 2009, Volume 13, Issue 3, 247-255.
3. Sandeepa NC, Ajmal M, Deepika N (2016) A Retrospective Panoramic Radiographic Study on Prevalence of Impacted Teeth in South Karnataka Population. J Oral Hyg Health 4:197
4. U Aydin, HH Yilmaz and D Yildirim Incidence of canine impaction and transmigration in a patient population Dentomaxillofacial Radiology 2004 33, 164-169.
5. Cooke J, Wang HL Canine impactions: incidence and management Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2006 Oct;26(5):483-91
6. Aktan AM, Kara S, Akgünlü F, Malkoç S The incidence of canine transmigration and tooth impaction in a Turkish subpopulation Eur J Orthod. 2010 Oct;32(5):575-81.
7. Yavuz MS, Aras MH, Büyükkurt MC, Tozoglu S. Impacted Mandibular Canines. J Contemp Dent Pract 2007 November; (8)7:078-085.
8. Fardi A, Kondylidou-Sidira A, Bachour Z, Parisis N, Tsirlis A. Incidence of impacted and supernumerary teeth-a radiographic study in a North Greek population. Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal. 2011 Jan 1;16 (1):e56-61.
9. Raja A, Mustafa, Amal H. Abuaffan Prevalence of impacted canines among Sudanese university students Braz Dent Sci 2014 Oct - Dec;17(4).
10. Bishara SE. Impacted maxillary canines:a review. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.1992;101:159-71.
11. Mulick JF. Impacted Canines. JC Orthod. 1997; 40:824 - 34.
12. Richardson G, Russell KA. A Review of Impacted Permanent Maxillary Cuspids- Diagnosis and Prevention. J Can Dent Assoc.2000; 66:497- 501.

	Male N	%	Female N	%	Total
Total sample size	262	64.53	144	34.47	406
Total canine impaction	7	41.18	10	58.82	17

	Maxilla N	%	Mandible N	%	Total
Canine impaction in the jaw	14	82.35	3	17.65	17