Supra-erupted maxillary molar teeth pose a major restorative challenge when attempting to prosthetically rehabilitate a partially edentulous mandibular dental arch. Traditional approaches with conventional tooth-borne appliances usually entail undesirable side-effects, including extrusion of adjacent teeth. Temporary anchorage devices (TADs), often inserted in the alveolar process, should help to minimize this phenomenon. The interradicular placement of mini-implants positioned between the roots of the maxillary molars has a number of inherent disadvantages and limitations. The preferred site for insertion of mini-implants is the anterior palate, which ensures a low risk of failure and mini-implant fracture. The ‘Mousetrap’ appliance is comprised of two mini-implants in the anterior palate, with attached lever arms for molar intrusion and a transpalatal arch (TPA) to avoid unwanted palatal tipping of the molar to be intruded. The ‘Mini-Mousetrap’ appliance was designed as a pared-down version without a TPA. If a TPA is not used, molar movement must be closely monitored, and the line of force action may need modification in order to minimize unwanted molar tipping. (Semin Orthod 2020; 26:11–23) © 2020 Published by Elsevier Inc.
the zygomatic buttress is also a viable option, but the implant will need to be placed in unattached mucosa. Potential drawbacks of mini-implant placement in unattached mucosa are a higher failure rate for retention, and possible soft tissue irritation causing discomfort and pain.10,11

A third alternative site of placement of mini-implants is within the alveolar process.1,2,5,12 However, there are several inherent disadvantages of insertion in the interradicular area of the maxillary molar teeth:

• insufficient space on the buccal aspect to insert a mini-implant safely between the molar roots.13-15

Trying to solve this problem by placing a narrow diameter implant potentiates a higher risk of fracture16 and subsequent failure.17,18

• a thicker soft tissue on the palatal side of the alveolar process,19 necessitating a longer lever arm which increases the likelihood of mini-implant tipping and failure.17

• contact between a mini-implant and a dental root may cause damage to periodontal structures and possibly lead to failure.20,21

• a molar colliding with a mini-implant during intrusion may cause root surface damage.22,23

• the risk of penetrating the maxillary sinus, when a mini-implant is inserted in the posterior area of the upper alveolar process.24

In order to minimize these risks, a prudent overarching strategy is placement of mini-implants safely away from both the roots and the intended path of tooth movement. The anterior palate is an adequate alternative insertion site, where mini-implants with larger dimensions can be safely placed with a higher degree of retention and stability.25 Mini-implants have been used in the anterior palate in combination with a lever arm. Aptly described as a ‘Mousetrap’ (Fig. 1A,B), this appliance generates an intrusive movement on the upper molars with only minimal palatal tipping, if combined with a TPA. The ‘Mousetrap’ has been used for intrusion of overerupted molars in preprosthodontic patients26 and for maxillary molar intrusion in anterior open bite cases.27

However, the placement of a TPA may compromise overall patient comfort, and in some cases, may not be tolerated at all. The routine usage of a TPA for every patient who requires

![Figure 1. Design of the mousetrap appliance: A: One or two lever arms are connected to two mini implants inserted in the anterior palate. In the deactivated state, the distal ends of the lever arms are located apically. By pulling the lever arms downward and connecting them to the molars, a constant intrusive force is produced. The center of resistance (CR) of the molars must be considered for force application especially in the sagittal dimension, while a TPA is used to avoid unwanted tooth movement in the transversal orientation. B: Options for the posterior connection of the intrusion lever arms to the molars: Using steel ligatures (left) or soldering hooks on the TPA as a stop for the lever arm (right).](image)

![Figure 2. Design of the mini-mousetrap appliance. Given that a TPA is not used, the CR of the molar must be considered in sagittal and transversal orientations.](image)
maxillary molar intrusion may be questioned. An alternative for consideration, is a pared-down variation of the palatal appliance without a TPA named the ‘Mini-Mousetrap’ (Fig. 2).

Clinical procedure

The “Mousetrap” and the ‘Mini-Mousetrap’ appliances are anchored in the anterior palate distally from the rugae (T-Zone) on two mini-implants (2 x 9 mm, Benefit, PSM, La Quinta, CA, USA), which may be inserted in the midline or in a paramedian configuration (Fig. 3A). A lever arm extends from the TAD-anchored miniplate to the molar region (Fig. 3B). A Beneplate (Fig. 3B) which has an incorporated 0.032” stainless steel (or β-Titanium) wire is fixed to the mini-implants with small fixing screws (Fig. 3c). If the mini-implants are not inserted perfectly in parallel, the Beneplate body can be easily adapted using a three-pronged plier. Activation of the Mousetrap appliance occurs by pulling the lever arms downward and connecting them to the molars, which produces a constant intrusive force. A force gauge can be used to measure the level of the applied intrusive force. Our clinical protocol includes the application of an approximate intrusive force of less than 100 grams per side. If bodily intrusion is indicated, the line of force action should be coincident with the CR of the molars. Simultaneous intrusion and uprighting of molars

Figure 3. Mini-Implant anchorage unit: A: Head of a Benefit mini-implant with an inner screw thread. B: Normal and wide Beneplates with wires (0.032”) in place for paramedian (upper) and median (lower) mini-implant insertion. C: Fixing screw. D: Impression cap and E: Laboratory analogue.
can be achieved by changing the line of force action more mesially or distally from the CR. (Fig. 1). In the posterior region, the intrusive force can be applied by two different options: 1. Using a steel ligation, or by soldering a hook on the TPA as a stop for the lever arm (Fig. 1B). The Beneplate can either be adapted chairside immediately after mini-implant insertion or indirectly on a plaster model. Impression caps (Fig. 3D) and laboratory analogues were used (Fig. 3E) for the clinical cases presented.

**Clinical examples with the ‘Mousetrap’**

**Case 1**

The treatment protocol of a 25-year-old adult female patient with a supra-erupted maxillary right first molar is illustrated. The patient was referred from her general dentist only for intrusion of the overerupted maxillary molar; the patient elected not to receive comprehensive prosthodontic rehabilitation of the edentulous area of the right mandible.

**Figure 4.** Case 1: 25-year-old female patient with a supra-erupted maxillary right first molar, resulting in insufficient occlusal vertical space for prosthodontic rehabilitation of the edentulous area of the right mandible.

**Figure 5.** Case 1: Mousetrap mechanics in-situ.
treatment to resolve the lower incisor irregularity. The subsequent restorative plan entailed the placement of an osseointegrated implant in the mandibular right molar region (Fig. 4A-H). After insertion of two mini-implants and adaption of two molar bands, the Beneplate was attached to the mini-implants and an intrusive force was applied to the overerupted right first molar (Figs. 5, 6 A, B). After six months of treatment, the molar was sufficiently intruded to facilitate the planned restorative treatment (Figs. 7A-D, 8). In the meantime, osseointegration of the dental implant had occurred and the prosthodontic restoration was inserted (Fig. 8).

Case 2

The treatment protocol of a 26-year-old female patient with a supra-erupted maxillary left second molar is illustrated. The patient was referred from her general dentist for intrusion of the molar (Fig. 9A-F). An osseointegrated dental implant had previously been surgically positioned in the lower left molar region (Fig. 10), but was not able to be prosthetically restored due to the supraerupted maxillary molar and insufficient occluso-vertical dimension (Fig. 11). After insertion of two mini-implants and adaption of two molar bands on the upper right first and the left second molar, the Beneplate was adjusted and secured to the mini-implants. A TPA, with a small hook serving as a stop for the lever arm, was inserted (Fig. 12). After five months of active treatment, the maxillary molar had been intruded.
approximately 2 mm (Figs. 13, 14), but the prosthodontist requested further intrusion. Two months later, the maxillary left second molar was even over-intruded (Figs. 15, 16). The dental implant (Fig. 17A,B) was restored with a ceramic crown. At the four-month follow-up examination, spontaneous vertical eruption of the maxillary molar had occurred, and occlusal contact with the antagonistic tooth in the mandibular dental arch was present (Fig. 18A,B).
Figure 10. Case 2: Panoramic radiograph: An osseointegrated dental implant had previously been surgically positioned in the lower left molar region but was not able to be prosthetically restored due to the overerupted maxillary molar and insufficient occlusal vertical dimension.

Figure 11. Plaster models denoting the reduced occlusal vertical dimension for prosthetic rehabilitation of the dental implant.

Figure 12. Case 2: Mousetrap mechanics. A Beneplate with a 0.032” ss wire is adjusted and secured on top of the mini-implants. A TPA with a small hook serves as a stop for the lever arm.

Figure 13. Case 2: After five months of treatment, the molar is intruded approximately by 2 mm.

Figure 14. Case 2: Panoramic radiograph after five months.

Figure 15. Case 2: After seven months of treatment, the maxillary left second molar is intruded with distinctive overcorrection.
Clinical examples with the ‘Mini-Mousetrap’

Case 3

A 19-year-old patient presented with bilateral supra-eruption of the upper second molars due to absence of the mandibular second molars (Fig. 19).

After insertion of two mini-implants, a Beneplate with 0.8 mm wire was adapted chairside. The intrusion lever arms were inserted during the same appointment (Fig. 20). After five months, the maxillary molars were intruded approximately 2 mm and the intended treatment goal was achieved (Fig. 21).
Figure 20. Case 3: The Beneplate was adapted and adjusted chairside immediately after median insertion of two mini-implants (A,B) and secured with two fixing screws (C).

Figure 21. Case 3: Intraoral situation (A) and OPG (B) after five months. Lateral views before and after intrusion of the upper second molars (C).
Case 4

The second example illustrates treatment of a 32-year-old female patient with an over-erupted maxillary left first molar (Fig. 22), resulting from the premature loss of the mandibular left molar. After insertion of two paramedian mini-implants, a 0.8mm TMA wire (instead of a Beneplate) was bent, adapted, and secured to the mini-implants (Fig. 23). After four months, the maxillary left first molar had been intruded by approximately 2mm (Fig. 24), and after a further three months, total intrusion approximated 3.5 mm (Figs. 25, 26). Minor distal tipping of the maxillary left first molar is noted, which may occur when the TPA is not utilized and the line of action of the intrusive force is not adequately considered.

Discussion

Supra-erupted maxillary molars often require intrusion to facilitate prosthodontic rehabilitation of missing teeth in the mandibular arch. The Mouse-trap appliance offers the following advantages over other contemporary TAD-based appliances:

Figure 22. Case 4: 32-year-old female patient with a supra-erupted left maxillary first molar.

Figure 23. Case 4: After insertion of two paramedian mini-implants (A) an impression was taken and an intrusion lever arm (0.032" TMA wire) was bent on a plaster model (B,C) and fixed on the two mini-implants (D). Grinding a small groove in the molar to be intruded, can help to improve retention, especially in presence of a failing restoration which needs to be renewed (E).
Figure 24. Case 4: Intraoral situation after four months: The maxillary left first molar has been intruded by approximately 2 mm.

Figure 25. Case 4: After a total treatment time of seven months the maxillary left first molar has been intruded by approximately 3.5 mm. Note slight distal tipping.
- a biomechanical approach with reliable determination of the point of force application, the direction of the line of the force applied, and the magnitude of the force applied. A constant force can be delivered that is measurable and easily modifiable during the progress of treatment,
- low surgical invasiveness,
- no risk of penetration of the maxillary sinus,
- no risk of root damage at the time of insertion of the mini-implant or during molar intrusion, and
- lower failure rate and negligible risk of mini-implant fracture as the anterior hard palate can be considered an optimum insertion site.

The duration treatment time for 2.3-4 mm intrusion of elongated upper molars with the Mousetrap appliance ranges from 4-10 months (unpublished data from our clinic, n=20). The average rate of molar intrusion of 0.33 mm/month compares favourably to conventional tooth borne molar intrusion as intrusion is initiated immediately, hence avoiding delays associated with customary levelling phase of 3-4 months of the anchorage teeth.

The Mousetrap molar intrusion mechanics can be used with or without a TPA. The placement of a TPA may reduce patient comfort but reduces the risk of tipping of the molars to be intruded. Conversely, the down-pared ‘Mini-Mousetrap’ appliance (without a TPA), must be closely monitored as molar movement progresses and the direction of the force may need to be adjusted in order to avoid unwanted tipping. The Mousetrap and Mini-Mousetrap are not only indicated for mere pre-prosthodontic intrusion of maxillary molars, but can be coupled with palatal TAD-borne sliders for intrusion and simultaneous distalization, or for intrusion and mesialization of teeth as part of an overall biomechanical plan.

**Conclusion**

The choice of the anterior palate as a site of mini-implant placement minimizes the risk of failure or mini-implant fracture. Both Mousetrap and ‘Mini-Mousetrap’ have proven to be reliable devices for intrusion of supra-erupted molars.
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