



Research Article

Comparison Between Impacted Maxillary and Mandibular Canines in an Iraqi Population: Prevalence and Classification

Ali Hussien Abbas Alhussaini^{*1}, Zainab Hasan Al-Ghurabi², Layla Sabri Yas²,

Omar Abdul Jabbar Abdul Qader³, Zainul Ahmad Rajion⁴

¹Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, College of Dentistry, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq;

²Department of Oral Diagnostic Sciences, College of Dentistry, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq; ³College of Dentistry, University of Al Mashreq, Baghdad, Iraq; ⁴College of Dentistry, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Indera Mahkota, Kuantan, Malaysia

Received: 10 January 2025; Revised: 6 March 2025; Accepted: 8 March 2025

Abstract

Background: Concerning the importance of impacted canines for aesthetics and function to improve patients' health, it is crucial to provide the oral surgeon and orthodontist with a complete analysis of their location, angulation, and relation with adjacent teeth. **Objective:** To determine and compare the frequencies of different types of impacted maxillary and mandibular canines under the current classification systems in an Iraqi population sample. **Methods:** This study retrospectively examined the cone beam computed tomography scans of 1000 Iraqi patients aged 12–40 years (380 males and 620 females) who had attended the Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology Department at Ghazi Al-Hariri and Al-Sadder City Hospitals. **Results:** Of the 1000 patients, 49 had impacted maxillary canines (4.9%), of which 18(36.7%) were male and 31(63.3%) were female. Bilateral impaction was more common than unilateral impaction (61.2% vs. 19.0%). Type II was the most common impaction type. In addition, 20 patients had impacted mandibular canines (2%), of which 8(40.0%) were male and 12(60.0%) were female. Bilateral impaction was less common than unilateral impaction (25.0% vs. 75.0%). Type III was the most common impaction. **Conclusions:** Impaction was more common for maxillary canines (4.9%) than for mandibular canines (2.0%). Type II impaction was the most common for maxillary canines, followed by Types I, IV, and VII. In contrast, Type III impaction was the most common for mandibular canines, followed by Type V.

Keywords: CBCT, Impacted canine, Prevalence classification.

مقارنة بين الأنياب المظمورة في الفك العلوي والسفلي في عينة سكانية عراقية: الانتشار والتصنيف

الخلاصة

الخلفية: فيما يتعلق بأهمية الأنياب المظمورة من الناحية الجمالية والوظيفية لتحسين صحة المرضى، فمن المهم تزويد جراح الفم وأخصائيي تقويم الأسنان بتحليل كامل لموقعها وزاويتها وعلاقتها بالأسنان المجاورة. **الهدف:** تحديد ومقارنة ترددات أنواع مختلفة من الأنياب المظمورة في الفك العلوي والسفلي في ظل أنظمة التصنيف الحالية في عينة سكانية عراقية. **الطرائق:** فحصت هذه الدراسة بأثر رجعي عمليات مسح التصوير المقطعي المحوسب ذي الحزمة المخروطية لـ 1000 مريض عراقي تتراوح أعمارهم بين 12 و 40 عامًا (380 ذكرًا و 620 أنثى) الذين حضروا إلى قسم الأشعة القموية والوجهية والفكين في مستشفى غازي الحريري ومدينة الصدر. **النتائج:** من بين 1000 مريض، كان لدى 49 مريضًا أنياب علوية مظمورة (4.9٪)، منهم 18 (36.7٪) من الذكور و 31 (63.3٪) من الإناث. كان الانسداد الثنائي أكثر شيوعًا من الانسداد أحادي الجانب (61.2٪ مقابل 19.0٪). كان النوع الثاني هو النوع الأكثر شيوعًا للانسداد. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، كان لدى 20 مريضًا انسداد في الأنياب السفلية (2٪)، منهم 8 (40.0٪) من الذكور و 12 (60.0٪) من الإناث. كان الانسداد الثنائي أقل شيوعًا من الانسداد أحادي الجانب (25.0٪ مقابل 75.0٪). كان النوع الثالث هو النوع الأكثر شيوعًا. **الاستنتاجات:** كان الانسداد أكثر شيوعًا في الأنياب العلوية (4.9٪) مقارنة بالأنياب السفلية (2.0٪). كان الانسداد من النوع الثاني هو الأكثر شيوعًا في الأنياب العلوية، يليه النوع الأول والرابع والسابع. في المقابل، كان الانسداد من النوع الثالث هو الأكثر شيوعًا في الأنياب السفلية، يليه النوع الخامس.

* **Corresponding author:** Ali H. A. Alhussaini, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, College of Dentistry, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq; Email: dr.alialhussaini@codental.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Article citation: Alhussaini AHA, Al-Ghurabi ZH, Yas LS, Abdul Qader OA, Rajion ZA. Obesity and Correlation of Body Mass Index and Body Composition among Sports Sciences versus Non-Sport Sciences Students. *Al-Rafidain J Med Sci.* 2025;8(1):180-184. doi: <https://doi.org/10.54133/ajms.v8i1.1690>

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Al-Rafidain University College. This is an open access journal issued under the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).



INTRODUCTION

Teeth that remain completely or incompletely embedded in the alveolar bone or mucosa of the jawbone for more than two years beyond the physiological eruption time are defined as impacted [1]. The lower third molars are the most impacted

teeth, followed by maxillary canines [2]. Multiple factors can cause the higher prevalence of impacted canines. The maxillary canine has a longer root and eruption path, developing deep in the jaw. Furthermore, genetic factors play an important role in maxillary canine impactions [3]. Many factors can affect tooth eruption, such as lack of space, trauma,

and genetic factors [4-9]. Notably, maxillary canines are impacted 20 times more often than mandibular canines [10]. For maxillary canines, bilateral impaction is common, while unilateral ectopic impaction is uncommon [11]. Preoperative assessment of impacted teeth regarding their position, depth, orientation, and relation to the adjacent teeth is vital. All these variables cannot be determined without radiographic assessment. Therefore, radiographic tools should be used in the assessment of impacted canines. Cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) is a new imaging modality in dentistry for accurately evaluating impacted canines. It has multiple applications in dentistry [12-14] and orthodontics [15-17]. This study used the Yamamoto classification system [18] to assess impacted maxillary canines and the Mupparapu classification system [19] to assess impacted mandibular canines (Figures 1 and 2). It aimed to establish and compare the frequencies of different types of impacted maxillary and mandibular canines under these classification systems in an Iraqi population sample.




Figure 1: The seven subtypes of impacted maxillary canine [18].




Figure 2: The five subtypes of impacted mandibular canine [19].

METHODS

Study design and participants

This study retrospectively collected CBCT scans for 1000 Iraqi patients aged 12–40 years (380 males and 620 females) who had attended the Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology Department at Ghazi Al-Hariri and Al-Sadder City Hospitals between March 2020 and January 2024. Two CBCT machines were utilized to acquire the data used in this study: a KaVo OP 3D (tube voltage = 90 kVp, tube current = 16 mA, exposure time = 11 s, field of view [FOV] size = 8 × 15, voxel size = 0.3 mm, software = OnDemand3D) and a Carestream Dental CS 9500 (tube voltage = 90

kVp, tube current = 15 mA, exposure time = 15 s, FOV size = 12 × 10, voxel size = 0.3 mm, software = Carestream).

Exclusion criteria

Impacted canine associated with cleft palate. Impacted canine associated with pathological lesion or trauma.

Analysis procedure

Firstly, the CBCT scans were reviewed to identify any impacted canines that had failed to erupt into the oral cavity. All impacted canines were first reviewed in the 3D view and then diagnosed using a reconstructed panoramic view and matched to the seven subtypes of impacted maxillary canine [18] under a classification system based on the long axis angles and occlusal plane and five subtypes of impacted mandibular canine [19]. The data were analyzed regarding the classification system, gender, and whether the impaction was unilateral or bilateral. This study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of the College of Dentistry at the University of Baghdad, Iraq (approval number: 913724).

RESULTS

Of the 1000 patients whose CBCT scans were reviewed, 49 had impacted maxillary canines (4.9%; Figure 3), of whom 18 (36.7%) were male and 31 (63.3%) were female (Table 1).




Figure 3: The percentages of impacted maxillary and mandibular canines.

Table 1: The prevalence of impacted canines by gender.

Gender	Impacted maxillary canine n(%)	Impacted mandibular canine n(%)
Male	18(36.7)	8(40)
Female	31(63.3)	12(60)

Bilateral impaction (61.2%) was more common than unilateral impaction (19.0%) (Table 2).

Table 2: The prevalence of impacted canines by affected side

Impacted maxillary canine n(%)		Impacted mandibular canine n(%)	
Bilateral	Unilateral	Bilateral	Unilateral
30(61.2)	19(38.8)	5(25)	15(75)

Type II impaction was the most common (37.9%). In addition, 20 patients had impacted mandibular canines (2.0%), of whom 8 (40.0%) were male and 12 (60.0%) were female (Table 3). Bilateral impaction (25.0%)

was less common than unilateral impaction (75.0%). Type III impaction was the most common (72.0%) (Table 4).

Table 3: The prevalence of impacted maxillary canines by classification type

Gender	Impacted maxillary canine type n(%)							Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	
Male	7(8.9)	16(20.2)	1(1.2)	2(2.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(1.2)	27(34.1)
Female	8(10.1)	30(37.9)	0(0.0)	8(10.1)	1(1.2)	0(0.0)	5(6.3)	52(65.8)

Table 4: The prevalence of impacted mandibular canines by classification type

Gender	Impacted mandibular canine type n(%)					Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	
Male	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(24)	0(0.0)	3(12)	9(36)
Female	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	12(48)	0(0.0)	4(16)	16(64)
Total	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	18(72)	0(0.0)	7(28)	25(100)

DISCUSSION

Our study found that the prevalence of impacted maxillary canines was 4.9% among 1000 Iraqi patients whose CBCT scans were reviewed (Figures 4 and 5), like other studies in Türkiye (5.1%) [9] and Hungary (5.4%) [20].




Figure 4: CBCT panoramic view: (A) Type II, (B) Type IV, (C) Type V, and (D) Type I impacted maxillary canines.




Figure 5: CBCT panoramic view: (A, B) Type III, (C, D) Type V impacted mandibular canines.

The long eruption path is one factor affecting the impaction of maxillary canines [21]. Our study also found that the prevalence of impacted mandibular canines was 2.0% among the 1000 Iraqi patients, higher than in other studies on various populations that reported prevalences of impacted mandibular canines ranging from 0.07% to 1.36% [22-27]. While the prevalence found in our study is higher than in these studies, it is consistent with other studies that reported prevalences for impacted mandibular canines of 1.7% [28] and 1.36% [29]. Among the 49 patients with impacted maxillary canines identified in our study, 18 were male and 31 were female. Similarly, among the 20 patients with impacted mandibular canines identified in our study, 8 were male and 12 were female. Therefore, impacted maxillary canines are more common in females than in males, consistent with previous studies [27,29]. This difference may be related to the smaller skull size in females. Our study found that unilateral impaction (38.8%) was less common than bilateral impactions (61.2%) for impacted maxillary canines, contrasting with other studies [30-32]. However, our study found that Type II impaction was the most common for maxillary canines, followed by Types I, IV, and VII. While a previous study [30] also found Type II to be the most common, the order of the other types differed: Types VI, I, and VII. Different studies have reported different findings. In the study by Mupparapu [19], Type I impaction was the most common for mandibular canines, followed by Types II, IV, III, and V. In our study, Type III impaction was the most common for mandibular canines, followed by Type V; the other types were not observed in our study. To our knowledge, no similar studies to ours exist, and the differences among previous studies might be related to the small number of transmigrated mandibular canines found. Regarding the importance of impacted canines for aesthetics and function, it is crucial to provide the oral surgeon and orthodontist

with a complete analysis of their location and relation with adjacent teeth.

Study limitations

One of the important limitations in this study was the difficulty of data collection, it takes a long time because the data was obtained from different centers utilizing different devices. The second limitation was that the study restricted to mid field of view (FOV) only which led to neglecting a large number of small view scans.

Conclusions

Our study found a prevalence of 4.9% for impacted maxillary canines and 2.0% for impacted mandibular canines. Females were more affected by impacted maxillary and mandibular canines than males. Bilateral impaction was more common than unilateral impaction for maxillary canines, while the opposite was true for mandibular canines. Type II impaction was the most common for maxillary canines, followed by Types I, IV, and VII. Type III impaction was the most common for mandibular canines, followed by Type V, while Types I, II, and IV were not observed in our Iraqi population sample.

Conflict of interests

No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Funding source

The authors did not receive any source of funds.

Data sharing statement

Supplementary data can be shared with the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- Bass TB. Observations on the misplaced upper canine tooth. *Dent Pract Dent Rec*. 1967;18(1):25-33. PMID: 5235604.
- Pedro FL, Bandéca MC, Volpato LE, Marques AT, Borba AM, Musis CR, et al. Prevalence of impacted teeth in a Brazilian subpopulation. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2014;15(2):209-213. doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-10024-1516.
- Chung DD, Weisberg M, Pagala M. Incidence and effects of genetic factors on canine impaction in an isolated Jewish population. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2011;139: 331-335. doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2010.06.023.
- Sajjani AK, King NM. Impacted mandibular canines: prevalence and characteristic features in southern Chinese children and adolescents. *J Dent Child (Chic)*. 2014;81(1):3-6. PMID: 24709426.
- Yavuz MS, Aras MH, Büyükkurt MC, Tozoglu S. Impacted mandibular canines. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2007;8(7):78-85. PMID: 17994158.
- Mason C, Papadakou P, Roberts GJ. The radiographic localization of impacted maxillary canines: a comparison of methods. *Eur J Orthod*. 2001;23(1):25-34. doi: 10.1093/ejo/23.1.25.
- Kuftinec MM, Shapira Y. The impacted maxillary canine: I. Review of concepts. *ASDC J Dent Child*. 1995;62(5):317-324. PMID: 8550920.
- Hudson AP, Harris AM, Mohamed N. Early identification and management of mandibular canine ectopia. *SADJ*. 2011;66(10):462-464. PMID: 23193881.
- Celikoglu M, Kamak H, Oktay H. Investigation of transmigrated and impacted maxillary and mandibular canine teeth in an orthodontic patient population. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2010;68(5):1001-1006. doi: 10.1016/j.joms.2009.09.006.
- Aktan AM, Kara S, Akgünlü F, Malkoç S. The incidence of canine transmigration and tooth impaction in a Turkish subpopulation. *Eur J Orthod*. 2010;32(5):575-581. doi: 10.1093/ejo/cjp151.
- Richardson G, Russell KA. A review of impacted permanent maxillary cuspids--diagnosis and prevention. *J Can Dent Assoc*. 2000;66(9):497-501. PMID: 11070629.
- Jung YH, Liang H, Benson BW, Flint DJ, Cho BH. The assessment of impacted maxillary canine position with panoramic radiography and cone beam CT. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol*. 2012;41(5):356-360. doi: 10.1259/dmfr/14055036.
- Alrahabi M, Sohail Zafar M. Evaluation of root canal morphology of maxillary molars using cone beam computed tomography. *Pak J Med Sci*. 2015;31(2):426-430. doi: 10.12669/pjms.312.6753.
- Noaman AT, Bede SY. The effect of bone density measured by cone beam computed tomography and implant dimensions on the stability of dental implants. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2022;33(6):e553-e557. doi: 10.1097/SCS.00000000000008429.
- Lai CS, Bornstein MM, Mock L, Heuberger BM, Dietrich T, Katsaros C. Impacted maxillary canines and root resorptions of neighbouring teeth: a radiographic analysis using cone-beam computed tomography. *Eur J Orthod*. 2013;35(4):529-538. doi: 10.1093/ejo/cjs037.
- Rahman VF, Fatah AA. Localization of maxillary impacted canine using cone beam computed tomography for assessment of angulation, distance from occlusal Plane, alveolar width and proximity to adjacent teeth. *J Baghdad Coll Dent*. 2017; 29(1):70-75.
- Al-Khawaja NFK, Nahidh M, Abdulsahab RJ. Assessment of maxillary incisors' angulation and position in different types of malocclusions using cone-beam computed tomography. *Contemp Clin Dent*. 2021;12(4):401-407. doi: 10.4103/ccd.ccd_743_20.
- Yamamoto G, Ohta Y, Tsuda Y, Tanaka A, Nishikawa M, Inoda H. A new classification of impacted canines and second premolars using orthopantomography. *Asian J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2003;15(1):31-37. doi: 10.1016/S0915-6992(03)80029-8.
- Mupparapu M. Patterns of intra-osseous transmigration and ectopic eruption of mandibular canines: review of literature and report of nine additional cases. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol*. 2002;31(6):355-360. doi: 10.1038/sj.dmfr.4600732.
- Róza N, Fábán G, Szádeczky B, Kaán M, Gábris K, Tarján I. Prevalence of impacted permanent upper canine and its treatment in 11-18-year-old orthodontic patients. *Fogorv Sz*. 2003;96(2):65-69. PMID: 12762148.
- Andreasen JO, Peterson J, Laskin DM, (Eds.), Textbook and Color Atlas of Tooth Impactions—Diagnosis, Treatment and Prevention. Mosby Year Book, St Louis. 1997.
- Grover PS, Lorton L. The incidence of unerupted permanent teeth and related clinical cases. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol*. 1985;59:420-425. doi: 10.1016/0030-4220(85)90070-2.
- Chu FC, Li TK, Lui VK, Newsome PR, Chow RL, Cheung LK. Prevalence of impacted teeth and associated pathologies--a radiographic study of the Hong Kong Chinese population. *Hong Kong Med J*. 2003;9(3):158-163. PMID: 12777649.
- Lazim AI. The prevalence of impacted maxillary canine among Iraqi patients of Al-Basrah City. *J Baghdad Coll Dent*. 2017; 28(1):73-77.
- Sajjani AK, King NM. Impacted mandibular canines: prevalence and characteristic features in southern Chinese children and adolescents. *J Dent Child (Chic)*. 2014 ;81(1):3-6. PMID: 24709426.
- Aydin U, Yilmaz HH, Yildirim D. Incidence of canine impaction and transmigration in a patient population. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol*. 2004;33(3):164-169. doi: 10.1259/dmfr/15470658.
- Topkara A, Sari Z. Impacted teeth in a Turkish orthodontic patient population: prevalence, distribution and relationship

- with dental arch characteristics. *Eur J Paediatr Dent.* 2012;13(4):311-316. PMID: 23270290.
28. Agastra E, Saettone M, Parrini S, Cugliari G, Deregibus A, Castroflorio T. Impacted permanent mandibular canines: Epidemiological evaluation. *J Clin Med.* 2023;12(16):5375. doi: 10.3390/jcm12165375.
 29. Sanu OO, Adeyemi TA, Isiekwe MC. Incidence of impacted mandibular canine and associated pathologies in an orthodontic patient population in Lagos, Nigeria. *Nig Q J Hosp Med.* 2012;22(4):291-295. PMID: 24596969.
 30. Al-Zoubi H, Alharbi AA, Ferguson DJ, Zafar MS. Frequency of impacted teeth and categorization of impacted canines: A retrospective radiographic study using orthopantomograms. *Eur J Dent.* 2017;11(1):117-121. doi: 10.4103/ejd.ejd_308_16.
 31. Gashi A, Kamberi B, Ademi-Abdyli R, Perjuci F, Sahatçiu-Gashi A. The incidence of impacted maxillary canines in a Kosovar Population. *Int Sch Res Notices.* 2014;2014:370531. doi: 10.1155/2014/370531.
 32. Al Fawzan AA, Alruwathi M, Alsadoon S. Prevalence of maxillary canine impaction in orthodontics at Eastern Riyadh specialized dental center. *IOSR J Dent Med Sci.* 2017;16(1):72-74. doi: 10.9790/0853-1601057274.