

## Letters From Our Readers

**To: Editor, *The Angle Orthodontist***

**Re: Response to: Giutini V, Vangelisti A, Masucci C, Efisio Defraia C, McNamara J, Franchi L. Treatment effects produced by the Twin-block appliance vs the Forsus Fatigue Resistant Device in growing Class II patients. *The Angle Orthodontist*. 2015;85:784–789.**

We would like to thank Drs Xiaolong Li and Wenli Lai for their interesting questions. It is true that the treatment sequencing was different in the Forsus and Twin Block groups. However, skeletal maturity with the CVM method was evaluated at the beginning of the phase of mandibular advancement. Contrary to what we wrote, skeletal maturity in the Forsus group actually was evaluated on lateral cephalograms that were available when the Forsus appliance was mounted on fixed appliances<sup>1</sup> and not at the start of fixed appliance therapy (T1). Therefore, there was a good matching

between the two groups in terms of skeletal maturity at the beginning of the phase of mandibular advancement. Beside the issues of treatment timing or treatment sequencing, we think that the lack of significant mandibular skeletal modification in the Forsus group might have been due to the short duration of active Forsus treatment (on average, less than 6 months). We thank Drs Xiaolong Li and Wenli Lai for providing the opportunity to clarify these important issues.

*Veronica Giuntini, Andrea Vangelisti, Caterina Masucci, Efisio Defraia, James McNamara, Lorenzo Franchi*

### REFERENCE

1. Cacciatore G, Alvetro L, Defraia E, Ghislanzoni LT, Franchi L. Active-treatment effects of the Forsus fatigue resistant device during comprehensive Class II correction in growing patients. *Korean J Orthod*. 2014 May;44(3):136-142.