

Orthodontic Root Torque Control: Biological Limits, Bracket Prescription and Archwire Mechanics

Dr. Sharath Kumar Shetty¹; Dr. Anagha Rao²

¹Professor and HOD, ²Post Graduate

^{1,2} Dept. of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics K V G Dental College and Hospital
Sullia, Dakshina Kannada

Publication Date: 2026/09/28

Abstract: Root torque is essential for three-dimensional orthodontic tooth control and influences incisor inclination, occlusion, facial esthetics and periodontal health. Although preadjusted appliances incorporate predetermined third-order information into bracket prescriptions, prescribed torque does not necessarily correspond to clinically expressed torque. Torque expression is influenced by bracket positioning, slot and archwire dimensions, torsional play, wire material, edge geometry, ligation, bracket deformation and manufacturing variability. In addition, root movement is constrained by the alveolar housing and periodontal tissues. This narrative review examines orthodontic torque through three interconnected concepts: prescription, mechanical expression and biological limitation. Evidence concerning bracket prescription, bracket–archwire interaction, archwire mechanics, anterior torque control, skeletal anchorage and customized digital appliances is reviewed. Recent developments, including low-play bracket–archwire designs and 3D-printed customized brackets, may improve mechanical precision, although their clinical superiority remains incompletely established. Predictable torque control requires individualized treatment objectives, accurate appliance positioning, appropriate archwire selection and consideration of the patient's biological envelope. Torque should therefore be regarded not as a fixed bracket value but as a patient-specific biomechanical variable.

Keywords: Orthodontic Torque; Root Torque; Third-Order Tooth Movement; Bracket Prescription; Torsional Play; Torque Expression; Archwire Mechanics; Alveolar Housing; Customized Brackets.

How to Cite: Dr. Sharath Kumar Shetty¹; Dr. Anagha Rao (2026), Orthodontic Root Torque Control: Biological Limits, Bracket Prescription and Archwire Mechanics. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology* 11(9), 1646-1651. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep151>

I. INTRODUCTION

Orthodontic torque represents third-order tooth movement involving buccolingual or labiolingual inclination. Mechanically, it is generated when a rectangular archwire engages the walls of a bracket slot and produces a couple around the long axis of the tooth. Rauch provided the foundational description of orthodontic torque and its clinical application.¹

The development of the preadjusted edgewise appliance transferred much of the first-, second- and third-order information from the archwire to the bracket. Andrews subsequently incorporated average tooth-position characteristics into the straight-wire appliance through his six keys to normal occlusion.² The principal objective was to reduce the need for individualized archwire bends and simplify three-dimensional tooth positioning.

The underlying assumption is that an accurately positioned bracket combined with an appropriately dimensioned archwire will reproduce the torque incorporated into the prescription. Clinical orthodontics, however, demonstrates that this relationship is not exact. The torque value incorporated into a bracket represents **prescribed torque**, whereas the moment actually transmitted to the tooth represents expressed torque. The difference arises from several mechanical and clinical variables, including bracket-slot geometry, archwire dimensions, torsional play, wire material, edge geometry, bracket positioning and manufacturing variability.³

An additional limitation is biological. Root movement takes place within the periodontal ligament and alveolar housing. The thickness and morphology of the cortical plates vary considerably between individuals and may restrict the extent of safe root displacement.⁴ Consequently, mechanical

ability to generate torque does not imply that the corresponding root position can be achieved safely.

The modern interpretation of orthodontic torque can therefore be organized around three sequential concepts: bone thickness, periodontal phenotype, tooth position, root morphology and direction of movement. External apical root resorption is similarly influenced by multiple biological and treatment-related variables rather than torque alone.⁸

Therefore, the objective of torque control should not be Prescription → expression → biological limit. Maximum expression of the available mechanical.

This framework provides a clinically relevant basis for understanding why the torque incorporated into an orthodontic appliance may differ from the final position of the root.

II. BIOLOGICAL BASIS AND LIMITS OF ORTHODONTIC ROOT TORQUE

Orthodontic torque is fundamentally a moment system. The resulting tooth movement depends on the magnitude and direction of the applied moment, the location of force application and its relationship to the center of resistance. A torque moment alone does not determine the final position of the root; the accompanying force system and the biological response of the periodontal tissues are equally important.

This is particularly relevant during anterior retraction. A retraction force applied at the bracket level generally produces a tendency toward lingual crown tipping.

Maintaining incisor inclination or producing controlled root movement therefore requires an appropriate counter-moment. Smith and Burstone emphasized the importance of considering the complete force system when predicting orthodontic tooth movement.⁵

The biological response to torque is also influenced by the available alveolar housing. Handelman demonstrated that the anterior alveolus can represent an important anatomical limitation to orthodontic treatment, particularly when substantial incisor movement is required.⁴ Subsequent CBCT-based research has demonstrated substantial individual variation in alveolar bone thickness and its relationship with incisor inclination.⁷

A systematic review and meta-analysis by Guo et al. reported measurable changes in alveolar bone dimensions around anterior teeth during orthodontic treatment, although the magnitude of change varied considerably between studies.⁶ These findings reinforce the concept that root position should be planned in relation to the patient's existing alveolar anatomy rather than solely according to a population-derived bracket prescription.

Excessive movement of roots toward thin cortical plates may be associated with dehiscence, fenestration and gingival recession, particularly in susceptible patients. The relationship is multifactorial and depends on initial moment.

It should be controlled root positioning within an anatomically and periodontally acceptable envelope.

III. BRACKET PRESCRIPTION AND THE PRESCRIPTION–EXPRESSION GAP

The development of preadjusted appliances transferred much of the desired tooth positioning information from the archwire into the bracket. Andrews established the basis for this approach, while subsequent prescriptions such as Roth and MBT introduced different torque values according to variations in treatment philosophy and clinical objectives.²

The presence of multiple prescriptions indicates that no single torque value is universally optimal. Initial incisor inclination, skeletal pattern, facial profile, periodontal phenotype, alveolar morphology, extraction requirements and desired final incisor position vary among patients.

Germane et al. demonstrated that biological variables can modify the faciolingual position achieved using straight-wire appliances.⁹ Tooth morphology and bracket positioning can further modify the effective expression of the prescription.¹⁰

Consequently, the prescription should be regarded as a starting mechanical specification rather than a fixed biological target.

➤ Mechanical Determinants Of Torque Expression:

The most important mechanical limitation is torsional play. When a rectangular archwire is smaller than the bracket slot, the wire can rotate before contacting the slot walls. This angular clearance delays torque engagement and reduces the amount of the prescribed torque that is initially expressed. Archambault et al. demonstrated substantial variation in engagement angles and torque expression according to bracket-slot and archwire dimensions.³

The clinical implication is particularly relevant to commonly used combinations such as a 0.019 × 0.025-inch wire in a 0.022-inch slot. Although described as a rectangular finishing wire, this combination does not completely fill the slot and therefore retains a measurable degree of torsional play.

Actual dimensions are also important. Joch et al. demonstrated clinically relevant variability in bracket-slot and archwire dimensions between manufacturers.¹¹ Arreghini et al. showed that torque expression varies according to the interaction between slot dimensions, wire cross-section and material.¹² Tepedino et al. subsequently confirmed dimensional variability in commercially available orthodontic slots and archwires and emphasized its clinical implications.¹³

Slot geometry itself may influence torque expression beyond nominal slot height. A 2024 investigation comparing passive self-ligating brackets with different slot depths demonstrated significant differences in archwire–slot play and torque expression despite identical nominal slot heights.¹⁴

Wire edge geometry is another contributor. The corners of orthodontic archwires are not perfectly sharp, and rounding or beveling alters the point at which the wire contacts the slot. Meling et al. demonstrated theoretically that both slot height and wire rounding influence torsional play.¹⁵

Bracket deformation can also affect torque delivery. Lacoursiere et al. demonstrated elastic and plastic deformation of bracket tie wings during torque application, indicating that bracket mechanics should be considered alongside wire mechanics.¹⁶ Ligation represents an additional variable because it influences how effectively the archwire is seated within the slot. However, evidence does not support the assumption that self-ligating brackets inherently provide superior torque expression. A systematic review found considerable variation between studies and emphasized the influence of the overall bracket–wire configuration rather than ligation alone.¹⁷

Thus, the clinically relevant variable is not simply the nominal torque value of a bracket but the entire bracket–archwire interface.

IV. ARCHWIRE MECHANICS AND CLINICAL TORQUE CONTROL

Archwire selection determines how effectively the prescribed torque can be transmitted to the tooth. Rectangular wires provide third-order control because their vertical dimensions permit engagement with the slot walls. As the wire dimensions approach the actual slot dimensions, torsional play decreases and torque can be expressed more efficiently.

Wire material also has a major influence. Stainless steel provides high torsional stiffness and remains particularly useful during finishing. β -titanium or TMA provides lower stiffness and greater flexibility, allowing individualized torque bends to be incorporated more readily.

Nickel-titanium wires are highly effective for alignment because of their springback and superelasticity but are generally less suitable for precise finishing torque because of their lower torsional stiffness.

Arreghini et al. demonstrated that torque expression differs according to wire material even when wire dimensions are similar.¹² This reinforces the principle that wire size alone cannot predict the moment delivered to the tooth.

Clinical torque control becomes particularly important during anterior retraction.

Retraction mechanics tend to produce lingual crown tipping, and maintaining incisor inclination requires an appropriate counter-moment. Rectangular archwire torque, individualized third-order bends, power arms, segmented mechanics and skeletal anchorage may all be used to modify the force system.

A systematic review by Kuc et al. identified several approaches for anterior torque control but found substantial heterogeneity among the available evidence.²⁰ The appropriate method therefore depends on the desired type of incisor movement, anchorage requirements and biological limitations.

Skeletal anchorage provides an additional means of controlling the force system by allowing the line of action of the retraction force to be modified and reducing unwanted reciprocal tooth movement. However, TADs do not increase the dimensions of the alveolar housing. They improve mechanical control, but do not remove biological limitations.

Individualized third-order bends remain important during finishing. Residual torque discrepancies may result from bracket positioning, tooth morphology, torsional play, manufacturing variation and differences between the prescribed and desired final tooth position. Finishing bends should therefore be regarded as a means of individualized correction rather than evidence of failure of the preadjusted appliance concept.

➤ Emerging Bracket–Archwire Designs

Recent research has attempted to address the prescription–expression gap at its mechanical source. Rather than simply increasing the nominal torque incorporated into the bracket, newer designs aim to reduce torsional play and improve engagement between the archwire and slot. A 2024 finite-element study of a superelastic NiTi V-slot system reported substantially lower torsional play than conventional bracket–archwire combinations.¹⁸ A recent study of a novel self-ligating bracket design also demonstrated differences in torque transmission and biomechanical effects compared with conventional systems.¹⁹ These developments are promising, but laboratory improvements in torque transmission cannot yet be assumed to translate directly into superior clinical root positioning. Long-term controlled clinical evidence remains necessary.

V. CUSTOMIZED AND DIGITAL APPROACHES TO TORQUE CONTROL

Digital orthodontics has shifted torque planning from population-based bracket prescriptions toward potentially individualized three-dimensional appliance design.

CAD/CAM systems permit individualization of bracket prescription, base morphology and position according to a digital treatment setup. This approach can theoretically incorporate the desired crown and root position directly into appliance design. However, customization does not automatically result in superior clinical outcomes. A 2025 systematic review and meta-analysis comparing customized CAD/CAM and conventional brackets found comparable overall treatment outcomes and appointment requirements, although customized systems demonstrated an advantage in treatment duration in the included studies.²¹

Three-dimensional printing represents a further development. A 2026 systematic review and meta-analysis of in-vitro studies found that 3D-printed customized brackets demonstrated clinically acceptable dimensional accuracy, with several studies showing greater slot accuracy than conventional bracket systems. However, accuracy remained dependent on printing technology, material and post-processing, while surface characteristics remained a concern.²²

Recent research has also explored customized 3D-printed bracket bases and their influence on bonding and mechanical performance, reflecting the rapid development of digitally manufactured orthodontic appliances.²³

These technologies have the potential to reduce variability in bracket positioning and slot geometry and to integrate individualized torque values with a patient's three-dimensional treatment objectives.

Nevertheless, digital customization does not eliminate the biological limits imposed by alveolar anatomy.

The future direction of torque control is therefore likely to involve:

Individualized diagnosis → individualized root-position target → customized appliance → controlled force delivery → biological monitoring.

The critical distinction is that digital technology can improve mechanical precision, but it cannot make an anatomically unsuitable root position biologically acceptable.

VI. CLINICAL INTEGRATION, EVIDENCE GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Table 1 Determinants of Orthodontic Torque

Components	Principal Determinants
Prescription	Bracket torque, treatment philosophy, desired final tooth position
Expression	Slot dimensions, wire dimensions, torsional play, edge geometry, wire material, ligation, bracket deformation
Clinical delivery	Bracket positioning, tooth morphology, initial inclination
Biological limit	Alveolar housing, cortical bone, periodontal phenotype, root morphology
Final outcome	Achieved three-dimensional root position

Table 2 Contemporary Approaches to Improving Torque Control

Approach	Main Advantage	Main Limitation
Rectangular stainless-steel archwire	High torsional stiffness	Residual slot play
Individual torque bends	Precise local correction	Operator dependent
TAD-assisted mechanics	Improved force-system control	Does not overcome biological limits
Customized CAD/CAM brackets	Individualized prescription and positioning	Clinical superiority remains uncertain
3D-printed brackets	Potentially high dimensional accuracy	Manufacturing and material limitations
V-slot systems	Reduced torsional play	Limited clinical evidence
Digital planning	Patient-specific three-dimensional target	Virtual and clinical outcomes may differ

Table 3 Principal Consideration of Clinical Stages

Clinical Stage	Principal Consideration
Diagnosis	Initial incisor inclination and skeletal pattern
Treatment planning	Desired final crown and root position
Biological assessment	Available alveolar envelope where indicated
Appliance selection	Appropriate torque prescription
Bracket placement	Accurate three-dimensional positioning
Working/Finishing wire	Appropriate dimension and torsional stiffness
Torque correction	Individualized bends or modified mechanics
Anchorage	TADs when required for force-system control
Finishing	Verification of achieved root inclination
Stability	Maintenance of an appropriate periodontal and occlusal position

The contemporary understanding of root torque can be summarized by integrating the three components of the proposed framework.

The available evidence supports several important

conclusions. First, prescribed torque is not equivalent to expressed torque. Slot–wire dimensions, torsional play, manufacturing variability and bracket characteristics can substantially modify the actual moment delivered to the tooth.³

Second, expressed torque is not equivalent to achieved root movement. Tooth movement is influenced by the periodontal ligament, force system, center of resistance and biological response, while the alveolar housing establishes an anatomical boundary.⁴

Third, advances in customized appliances have improved the potential for individualized treatment planning but have not eliminated the difference between planned and achieved tooth position. Current systematic reviews do not demonstrate consistent clinical superiority of customized appliances.²¹ Future research should therefore move beyond laboratory measurement of torque moments and focus on clinically relevant outcomes, including three-dimensional root displacement, alveolar bone response, periodontal health, treatment stability and agreement between virtual and achieved root positions. Standardized protocols for measuring torque expression would also improve comparison among bracket and archwire systems.

The most promising direction is not simply to develop brackets capable of expressing greater torque, but to develop systems capable of delivering the appropriate torque for a specific tooth within a specific biological environment.

VII. CONCLUSION

Orthodontic root torque is best understood as an interaction between prescription, mechanical expression and biological limitation.

Bracket prescription establishes the intended third-order correction, but the actual torque delivered to the tooth depends on slot and wire dimensions, torsional play, edge geometry, material properties, bracket deformation, ligation and bracket positioning. The resulting root movement is further constrained by the patient's alveolar anatomy and periodontal environment.

Recent developments in customized CAD/CAM appliances, 3D-printed brackets and low-play bracket–archwire designs provide opportunities for greater mechanical precision. However, current evidence does not demonstrate that customization or increased torque expression automatically produces superior clinical outcomes.

Predictable torque control therefore requires individualized prescription, accurate mechanical delivery and respect for biological boundaries. The objective should not be maximum torque expression but controlled and stable root positioning within a healthy anatomical envelope.

The prescription–expression–biological limit concept provides a useful framework for interpreting contemporary torque mechanics and for moving orthodontic treatment from standardized appliance prescriptions toward genuinely patient-specific three-dimensional tooth control.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Rauch ED. Torque and its application to orthodontics. *Am J Orthod.* 1959;45(11):817-830. doi:10.1016/0002-9416(59)90222-2.
- [2]. Andrews LF. The six keys to normal occlusion. *Am J Orthod.* 1972;62(3):296-309. doi:10.1016/S0002-9416(72)90268-0.
- [3]. Archambault A, Lacoursiere R, Badawi H, Major PW, Carey J, Flores-Mir C. Torque expression in stainless steel orthodontic brackets: a systematic review. *Angle Orthod.* 2010;80(1):201-210. doi:10.2319/080508-352.1.
- [4]. Handelman CS. The anterior alveolus: its importance in limiting orthodontic treatment and its influence on the occurrence of iatrogenic sequelae. *Angle Orthod.* 1996;66(2):95-109. doi:10.1043/0003-3219(1996)066<0095:TAIII>2.3.CO;2.
- [5]. Smith RJ, Burstone CJ. Mechanics of tooth movement. *Am J Orthod.* 1984;85(4):294-307. doi:10.1016/0002-9416(84)90187-8.
- [6]. Guo R, Zhang L, Hu M, Huang Y, Li W. Alveolar bone changes in maxillary and mandibular anterior teeth during orthodontic treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Orthod Craniofac Res.* 2021;24(2):165-179. doi:10.1111/ocr.12421.
- [7]. Dalaie K, Hajimiresmail YS, Safi Y, Akbarzadeh Baghban A, Behnaz M, Talebi Rafsanjan K. Correlation of alveolar bone thickness and central incisor inclination in skeletal Class I and II malocclusions with different vertical skeletal patterns: a CBCT study. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2023;164(4):537-544. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2023.02.021.
- [8]. Weltman B, Vig KWL, Fields HW, Shanker S, Kaizar EE. Root resorption associated with orthodontic tooth movement: a systematic review. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2010;137(4):462-476. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2009.06.021.
- [9]. Germane N, Bentley BE Jr, Isaacson RJ. Three biologic variables modifying faciolingual tooth angulation by straight-wire appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1989;96(4):312-319. doi:10.1016/0889-5406(89)90350-8.
- [10]. Miethke RR, Melsen B. Effect of variation in tooth morphology and bracket position on first and third order correction with preadjusted appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1999;116(3):329-335. doi:10.1016/S0889-5406(99)70246-5.
- [11]. Joch A, Pichelmayer M, Weiland F. Bracket slot and archwire dimensions: manufacturing precision and third order clearance. *J Orthod.* 2010;37(4):241-249. doi:10.1179/14653121043182.
- [12]. Arregghini A, Lombardo L, Mollica F, Siciliani G. Torque expression capacity of 0.018 and 0.022 bracket slots by changing archwire material and cross section. *Prog Orthod.* 2014;15:53. doi:10.1186/s40510-014-0053-x.

- [13]. Tepedino M, Paiella G, Iancu Potrubacz M, Monaco A, Gatto R, Chimenti C. Dimensional variability of orthodontic slots and archwires: an analysis of torque expression and clinical implications. *Prog Orthod.* 2020;21:32. doi:10.1186/s40510-020-00333-5.
- [14]. Saraiva PC, Cruz MH, Medeiros IS, Bozelli JV, Neto JR, Paiva JB. Comparison of torque expression among passive self-ligating brackets with different slot depths: an in vitro study. *Int Orthod.* 2024;22(2):100866. doi:10.1016/j.ortho.2024.100866.
- [15]. Meling TR, Ødegaard J, Meling EØ. A theoretical evaluation of the influence of variation in bracket slot height and wire rounding on the amount of torsional play between bracket and wire. *Kieferorthop Mitt.* 1993;7:41-48.
- [16]. Lacoursiere RA, Nobes DS, Homeniuk DLN, Carey JP, Badawi HM, Major PW. Measurement of orthodontic bracket tie wing elastic and plastic deformation by arch wire torque expression utilizing an optical image correlation technique. *J Dent Biomech.* 2010;2010:397037. doi:10.4061/2010/397037.
- [17]. Al-Thomali Y, Mohamed RN, Basha S. Torque expression in self-ligating orthodontic brackets and conventionally ligated brackets: a systematic review. *J Clin Exp Dent.* 2017;9(1):e123-e128. doi:10.4317/jced.53187.
- [18]. Stocker T, Wichelhaus A, Baumert U, Janjic Rankovic M, Seidel CL, Sabbagh H. Torque expression of superelastic NiTi V-slot and conventional stainless steel orthodontic bracket-archwire combinations: a finite element analysis. *Comput Biol Med.* 2024;180:108938. doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2024.108938.
- [19]. Liu Y, Guo L, Feng Y, Hua J, Dai Q, Chen Z, et al. Comparative study of torque expression and its biomechanical effects: spherical self-ligating bracket with lock-hook system versus passive self-ligating bracket and conventional bracket. *BMC Oral Health.* 2025;25:30. doi:10.1186/s12903-025-05423-6.
- [20]. Kuc AE, Kotuła J, Nahajowski M, Warnecki M, Lis J, Amm E, et al. Methods of anterior torque control during retraction: a systematic review. *Diagnostics (Basel).* 2022;12(7):1611. doi:10.3390/diagnostics12071611.
- [21]. Bardideh E, Kerayechian N, Ghorbani M, Younessian F, Shafae H. The efficacy and effectiveness of customized CAD/CAM brackets in fixed orthodontic treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Orthod.* 2025;47(1):cjae075. doi:10.1093/ejo/cjae075.
- [22]. Shaadoun RI, Hajeer MY, Alam MK, Jaber ST, Abou Hamed H. Accuracy of 3D-printed customized orthodontic bracket: a systematic review and meta-analysis of in vitro studies. *Int Orthod.* 2026;24(3):101151. doi:10.1016/j.ortho.2026.101151.
- [23]. Zheng Y, Zhang R, Li F, Liu S, Jin Y, Liu L, et al. Effect of 3D-printed customized base designs on the mechanical retention and bonding strength of metal brackets. *Sci Rep.* 2026. doi:10.1038/s41598-026-59472-0.