

# Letters to the Editor

Send your letters to the Editor, British Dental Journal, 64 Wimpole Street, London, W1G 8YS  
Email [bdj@bda.org](mailto:bdj@bda.org)

Priority will be given to letters less than 500 words long. Authors must sign the letter, which may be edited for reasons of space.

Readers may now comment on letters via the *BDJ* website ([www.bdj.co.uk](http://www.bdj.co.uk)). A 'Readers' Comments' section appears at the end of the full text of each letter online.

## RISKING OUR LEGITIMACY

Sir, I write in response to Dr McKeever.<sup>1</sup> 1) We are in agreement that during the last epoch of human development (from farming to civilisation) malocclusion, or deviation in dental arrangement, has changed from rare to endemic and this is largely due to the environment. 2) Dr McKeever also suggests that any debate would have to consider a more complex aetiology pointing out that open bite and Class III malocclusions predated this period and that we should align our terminology. To which I would respond that the helicoidal wear pattern associated with the heavy levels of attrition would largely explain these malocclusions and terminology is a detail that could easily be resolved.

He raises some good points but it is only through engagement in debate and scientific exchange that it can be possible to find the truth.

However esoteric, or dull, we must remember that currently 30% of the population are treated with inter-ventive orthodontic therapy including major surgery, while it is openly acknowledged the cause is unknown for most patients. There is solid (if not overwhelming) evidence supporting an environmental influence and little suggesting a genetic aetiology (despite gargantuan efforts) from which it may be concluded that current orthodontic treatment, which is based on the genetic assumption, is not evidence-based. It would be unethical to call for more publications when adequate evidence has already been published; it is time for a debate!

Three and a half years ago I made a challenge to the BOS for a debate to test

the proposal 'Malocclusion is caused by the environment and modified by the genes'. I have alerted the GDC, the CHRE, the All Party Dental Committee and the Minister of Health to my concerns; all have disclaimed responsibility and suggested that the only route is through the BOS.

I understand the reluctance of any established organisation to engage in a debate that it could lose but this is our duty: to engage and to search for the truth, whatever and wherever that leads. If we chose not to engage in this debate we risk our legitimacy and the very foundations of our self-governing profession.

The importance of this issue cannot be overstated and as such may I ask the BOS to please give a clear and open response in this journal, as is normal scientific protocol, as to whether they will engage, and if not, why they feel that a debate should not be held or what the alternative should be.

M. Mew, by email

1. McKeever A. Genetics versus environment in the aetiology of malocclusion. *Br Dent J* 2012; 212: 527-528.

DOI: 10.1038/sj.bdj.2013.166

## HANGING ON THE TOOTH

Sir, tooth wear due to abrasion has been attributed to detrimental habits including pipe smoking, pencil chewing, nail biting and the habit of holding various objects between teeth. In a 50-year-old male patient that recently visited our dental clinic, severe abrasion was seen particularly on both the lower central incisors (Fig. 1). Upon enquiring, the patient was embarrassed to confess that he possessed a life-long habit of using his lower teeth to hook clothes hangers



Fig. 1 By hook or by hanger

while adjusting his wardrobe ... with the clothes still on them! This was a very unusual cause of such severe tooth wear. The patient claimed to have no functional or aesthetic concerns but was interested to learn about the treatment options for restoration of these teeth. Of course, before proceeding with any restorations, one must be cautious of the fact that the patient might not let go of such a deep-rooted habit very easily, which might leave the dentist hanging!

S. Adnan, Karachi

DOI: 10.1038/sj.bdj.2013.167

## EVIDENCE TRANSPARENCY

Sir, I read Martin Kelleher's opinion article (*The difficulties of making 'CPD verifiability' a legitimate measure of learning outcomes*; *BDJ* 2012; 213: 383-384) with interest. It rightly identifies the difficulty of translating new knowledge into sustained behaviour change. The field of knowledge use/implementation/translation (call it what you will) has much work to do on reliable and valid measures of process or outcomes resulting from educational interventions among many others.<sup>1</sup>

But the piece also made me think about the knowledge being imparted. After sitting through many CPD courses myself I have started to wonder what