Prevalence of Developmental and Acquired Dental Anomalies on Digital panoramic Radiography in Patients Attending the Dental Faculty of Rasht, Iran
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Abstract

Introduction: Many epidemiological studies have been conducted to determine the prevalence of the various types of the dental anomalies. The aim of the present study was determination of developmental and acquired dental anomalies in patients attending the faculty of dentistry in Rasht, Iran.

Materials and Methods: In this retrospective cross-sectional study, 1224 digital panoramic radiographs belong to 758 females and 466 males were assessed for evaluation of 10 developmental and acquired dental anomalies. This study was done in two steps; prospective and retrospective. Both clinical and radiographic evaluation of patients was conducted for diagnosis of missing teeth, talon cusp, amelogenesis imperfecta, dentinogenesis imperfecta and dentine dysplasia. The chi-square test, Fisher-Exact test, Independent t-test and Kappa were used for statistical analysis of data.

Result: 396 patients (32.4%) presented at least one developmental dental anomaly and 285 patients (23.3%) had at least one acquired dental anomaly. Overall, 38.1% of 581 patients with dental anomaly were males and 61.9% of them females. Supernumerary teeth in males was more than five times higher than females (p<0.005). Pulp stone in females was 7% higher than males (p<0.005). The most prevalent anomaly was impaction (16.6%), followed by dense invagination (10.9%), dilaceration (5.6%), microdontia(3.8%), supernumerary tooth (1.1%), taurodontism(0.5%) and transposition(0.1%).

Conclusion: The dental anomalies occur with different frequencies in various populations. Since, these anomalies may be the cause of various dental problems, it seems that the precise diagnosis of these anomalies is essential in the prevention of the next problems.
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Introduction

Dental anomalies are one type of the anomalies of the human structure that result from disturbances during tooth formation.\(^1\)

Dental anomalies can be congenital, developmental or acquired and consisted of various changes in tooth number, size, shape, position in the jaws, eruption pattern and normal morphology.\(^1\) Congenital abnormalities typically are those inherited genetically. The acquired anomalies come from teeth alterations during normal formation.\(^2\) The developmental anomalies are those that occur during tooth development.\(^2\) They could appear isolated or related to various other syndromes.\(^1,2\) These anomalies may begin before or after birth, hence deciduous or permanent teeth may be affected.\(^3\) Dental anomalies in comparison with more common oral disorders such as dental caries and periodontal diseases have low frequency but their management is usually complicated, because they can result in the malocclusion, esthetic problems and predisposition to the other oral diseases.\(^4\)

Many epidemiological studies have been done in different populations of the world to survey the prevalence of dental anomalies but the results are conflicting.\(^4,5\) Differences in their results can be related to racial and regional variations, variable sampling techniques and the different diagnostic criteria.\(^5\) The early detection of dental anomalies is important, because they can result in many disturbances and early diagnosis can prevent from such complications.\(^6\) For example, existence of dense invagination and absence of early diagnosis can be the cause of pulpo-periapical lesions without obvious detection of dental caries. However, conservative treatments would prevent such problems.\(^2,6\) Also, their incidence and degree of expression can provide significant information for genetic studies and contribute to the understanding of differences within (intra) and between (inter) populations.\(^5\)

This study was run due to lack of enough studies regarding the prevalence of both acquired and development dental anomalies in Guilan province in large samples. So, the purpose of the present study was to determine the prevalence and distribution of selected developmental and acquired dental anomalies on digital panoramic radiography of the patients attending to the faculty of dentistry Rasht, Iran during 2010-2012.

Materials and Methods

In this cross-sectional study, our study was run in two steps:

**Step 1:** Retrospective radiographic study which was the major part for evaluation of the prevalence of dental anomalies.

**Step 2:** Prospective study with considering both clinical and radiographic findings to assess the frequency of some other dental anomalies.

**Step 1:**

In the retrospective cross-sectional study, a total of 1224 digital panoramic radiographies of patients who attended the department of radiology of the dental faculty of Guilan university of medical sciences, during 2010-2012 were included in this study. The age of subjects was 7-76 years (mean age 12.67±30.55). Overall, the panoramic views of 758 females and 466 males were evaluated.

The exclusion criteria of the subjects included the presence of cleft lip and palate; inadequate teeth (less than 28 teeth); improper quality of radiographs, having orthodontic brackets and dental fracture that influence the diagnosis of the dental anomalies. In each radiography, teeth which had crown, endodontic treatment, caries or restorations that influence the diagnosis of some anomalies such as pulp stone, dense invagination, and taurodontism were excluded.

In order to reduce the radiographic misinterpretation, teeth with incomplete root formation and the maxillary molars and premolars for evaluation of dilaceration and external root resorption, were not included in the study. But, these teeth were used for the evaluation of the anomalies that were related to the number of teeth (i.e. supernumerary teeth) in overall patient sampling.

The inclusion criteria included following items:

1. The archived standard digital computed panoramic radiographs (CR) that were taken by the same unit; EC proline
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planmeca (Helsinki, Finland) with appropriate diagnostic quality.
2. The radiographies with determined complete demographic information (name, age, sex and date of radiography) were used.
3. The radiographs of patients more than 7 years old were selected.
4. All photostimulable phosphor plates (PSP) were processed by digitizer (Konica-Minolta, Tokyo, Japan).

The panoramic views were carefully analyzed by a maxillofacial radiologist using standard medical monitor with the ability for magnification and brightness adjustment of archived digital panoramic radiographs. The list of different anomalies that were investigated in this study is presented below.

- **Developmental anomalies related to:**
  1. The number of tooth:
     - Impacted supernumerary tooth
     - Erupted supernumerary tooth
  2. The size of tooth: microdontia
  3. The shape of tooth:
     - Dense invagination
     - Taurodontism
     - Dilaceration
  4. The eruption and position:
     - Impaction
     - Transposition
- **Acquired anomalies:**
  - Internal root resorption
  - External root resorption
  - Pulp stone

The radiographic diagnostic criteria in the present study were made on the basis of the descriptions presented in accepted text in the field of maxillofacial radiology \(^{(2)}\). Also, in this study, the prevalence of impacted teeth and related pathologic conditions (dental caries in adjacent teeth, root resorption of adjacent teeth and pericoronal cystic & tumoral lesions) were evaluated.

**Step 2:**

In prospective survey, the frequency of some anomalies that required both clinical and radiographic evaluation was assessed. These anomalies included missing teeth (anodontia, hypodontia and oligodontia); structural anomalies (dentinogenesis imperfecta, dentin dysplasia and amelogenesis imperfecta) and shape anomaly (talon cusp).

We originally obtained the approval of the ethical board of the institutional ethics committee of Guilan University of Medical Sciences Research Foundation in Rasht, Iran, before conducting this investigation (Ethics Approval Number 1367) to ensure our compliance with the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki and Tokyo for humans. Accordingly, our protocol complied with these guidelines. Moreover, we obtained written consent of the participating patients to use their panoramic images for this study.

The data were collected and statistically analyzed using Chi-square test, Fisher-exact test, Independent t-test and Kappa in SPSS version 16 soft ware. Confidence interval in the all analysis was %95.

Figures 1 and 2 reveal two dental anomalies that were detected in the present study.

Figure 1. Erupted mesiodense in the anterior portion of the maxilla

Figure 2. A case of hypoplastic type of amelogenesis imperfecta. Note to the square shape crown of teeth, spacing between teeth (picket fence appearance) and the enlargement of the follicular spaces in some portions.
Results

Step 1:

In this study, 32.4% (396) of 1224 subjects had at least one developmental anomaly and 23.3% (285) had at least one acquired dental anomaly. Overall, 581 cases (47.5) had one anomaly (acquired or developmental). Sex distribution of dental anomaly was 208 males (38.1%) and 373 females (61.9%). Individuals with both acquired and developmental anomalies constituted 8.2% of the population.

The distribution and prevalence of the dental anomalies are provided in table 1. The most frequent dental anomaly was pulp stone (22.1%). Table 2 shows the prevalence of dental anomalies based on gender. Supernumerary teeth in men was 5 times greater than females (P=0.005).

The prevalence of positional anomalies (impaction, transposition) was 16.7%, followed by the shape anomalies (dense invagination, dilaceration and taurodontism) (15.9%); size anomalies (microdontia) (3.8%); number anomalies (supernumerary teeth) (1.1%) and the acquired anomalies (pulp stone, internal root resorption and external root resorption) (23.3%). Among the developmental anomalies, impaction was the most common one (16.6%). Table 3 shows the prevalence of dental anomalies based on the involved jaws.

Comparison of dental anomalies based on unilateral or bilateral occurrence of the jaws, showed that 77.9% of dense invagination occurred bilaterally, that was statistically significant (P=0.0001). Approximately, 69.8% of dense invaginations was found in Lateral maxillary teeth that was more than other teeth (P=0.0001). Root dilacerations had the highest frequency in mandibular third molar (62.7%). Dilaceration of the mesial root had the most prevalent rate (52.6%, 40 teeth), followed by dilaceration of the distal root (19.7%, 15 teeth) and dilaceration of the both mesial and distal roots (15.8%, 12 teeth).

Maxillary third molar was the most frequent site for the presence of supernumerary teeth (8 cases, 50%). Followed by the maxillary central incisor (mesiodense) which was 25% (4 case), upper lateral incisor (2 cases, 12.5%), upper canine (1 case, 6.2%) and the lower third molar (1 case, 6.2%).

Supplemental supernumerary teeth (supernumerary tooth with normal size and shape) constituted 81.2%. Accordingly, 75% were impacted, 18.8% were rudimentary (supernumerary tooth with abnormal shape and small size) and 25% were erupted.

Taurodontism was seen in 6 patients (10 teeth). The maxillary first molars had the most prevalent rate (50%).

Impaction was observed in 320 teeth. The most frequent tooth was the maxillary third molar (45.3%), followed by the mandibular third molar (40.3%). Among the 320 impacted teeth, 96.3% were without lesions. The most common lesions were pericoronal related to the impacted teeth (1.9%, 6 teeth). Pulp stone was seen in 271 patients, which was the most frequent dental anomaly. The maxillary first molar was the most prevalent tooth (45.6%, 262 teeth, P=0.0001). Table 4 shows the distribution and prevalence of pulp stone according to the involved teeth. The mean age of subjects without pulp stone was 28.59±12.88 years and the group with pulp stone, 36.12%±11.43 years. Independent t-test showed that the difference between ages was 8 years which was statistically significant. (P=0.0001)

According to Kappa test, concomitant occurrence of the supernumerary teeth and microdontia (P=0.001), and also between supernumerary teeth and external root resorption (P=0.005) was statistically significant. The external root resorption was observed in 9 patients (10 teeth). The mandibular first molar was the most frequent tooth (30%) with external root resorption (P=0.944) and the mandibular first premolar was in the next order (20%). The internal root resorption was seen in 6 teeth. The most frequent tooth with internal root resorption was the maxillary lateral incisor (33.3%).

Step 2:

In this step, 48, who were examined both clinically and radio graphically, had 106 missing teeth (3rd molars excluded). Oligodontia was found in 6 patients, and the
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It was found that 60.4% of missing teeth was observed in the maxilla. The bilateral occurrence of missing was 74.5%. The missing anomaly was found in the maxillary lateral incisor (27.35%) greater than other teeth (Table 5).

Transposition was seen in 6 teeth of 4 patients. Two of them were between the maxillary lateral and canine and the other 4 cases were transposition of the maxillary canine and the first premolar.

Talon cusp was detected in 4 teeth. 3 of them were related to the maxillary lateral incisor and one tooth was seen in the maxillary canine. Amelogenesis imperfecta was observed in 6 patients including brothers and sisters 2 each, and 2 other non-familial female cases. Dentine dysplasia was only found in an 18 years-old female.

Table 1. The prevalence of development and acquired dental anomalies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dental anomaly</th>
<th>NO (%)</th>
<th>Supernumerary</th>
<th>Dilac1</th>
<th>Dense invag2</th>
<th>Microdo3</th>
<th>Tauro4</th>
<th>Transpos5</th>
<th>Imp6</th>
<th>Int RR7</th>
<th>Ext RR8</th>
<th>Pulp stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>13 (5.1)</td>
<td>133 (5.1)</td>
<td>47 (2.8)</td>
<td>6 (0.5)</td>
<td>203 (0.1)</td>
<td>6 (16.6)</td>
<td>9 (0.5)</td>
<td>7 (0.7)</td>
<td>271 (22.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>1211 (98.8)</td>
<td>1162 (94.9)</td>
<td>1091 (89.1)</td>
<td>1177 (96.2)</td>
<td>1218 (99.5)</td>
<td>1223 (99.9)</td>
<td>1027 (83.4)</td>
<td>1218 (99.5)</td>
<td>1215 (77.9)</td>
<td>953 (77.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td>1224 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Dilaceration; 2: Dens Invagination; 3: Microdentia; 4: Taurodontis; 5: Transposition; 6: Impaction; 7: Internal root resorption; 8: Internal root resorption

Table 2. Distribution and prevalence of dental anomalies based on gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>NO (%)</th>
<th>Supernumerary</th>
<th>Dense invag</th>
<th>Dilac</th>
<th>Taurodo</th>
<th>Microdo</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Transpos</th>
<th>Pulp stone</th>
<th>Ext RR</th>
<th>Int RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>10 (2.1)</td>
<td>50 (10.7)</td>
<td>27 (5.8)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.9)</td>
<td>78 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (17.8)</td>
<td>83 (1.3)</td>
<td>6 (0.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>3 (0.4)</td>
<td>83 (10.9)</td>
<td>35 (4.6)</td>
<td>3 (0.4)</td>
<td>29 (3.8)</td>
<td>125 (16.5)</td>
<td>1 (24.8)</td>
<td>188 (0.4)</td>
<td>3 (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>13 (1.1)</td>
<td>133 (10.9)</td>
<td>62 (5.1)</td>
<td>6 (0.5)</td>
<td>47 (3.8)</td>
<td>203 (16.6)</td>
<td>1 (22.1)</td>
<td>271 (0.7)</td>
<td>9 (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P- value | 0.005* | 0.904 | 0.362 | 0.416 | 0.974 | 0.910 | 0.619 | 0.004* | 0.079 | 0.41 |

* P<0.05 is considered to be significant
### Table 3. Distribution and prevalence of dental anomalies based on involved jaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jaw</th>
<th>NO (%)</th>
<th>Supernumerary</th>
<th>Dense invag</th>
<th>Dilac</th>
<th>Taurodo</th>
<th>Microdo</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Transpos</th>
<th>Pulp stone</th>
<th>Ext RR</th>
<th>Int RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max No (%)</td>
<td>15 (93.8)</td>
<td>285 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (0.5)</td>
<td>51 (92.7)</td>
<td>175 (54.7)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>325 (56.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand No (%)</td>
<td>1 (6.2)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
<td>5 (0.5)</td>
<td>4 (7.3)</td>
<td>145 (45.3)</td>
<td>0 (100)</td>
<td>250 (100)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No (%)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td>285 (100)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
<td>55 (100)</td>
<td>320 (100)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>575 (100)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P value is statistically significant.

### Table 4. Location and prevalence of pulp stone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involved tooth</th>
<th>Pulp Stone Tooth number</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary first molar</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary second molar</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular first molar</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular second molar</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary third molar</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular third molar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular second premolar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary second premolar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Location and frequency of missing teeth (excluding third molars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involved tooth</th>
<th>Missing Tooth Tooth number</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary lateral incisor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular second premolar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary second premolar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary first premolar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular lateral incisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular central incisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular first premolar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandibular canine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary second molar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary canine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

Several studies\(^{(4,6)}\) have determined the prevalence of dental anomalies among Iranian population. There was a significant difference between the prevalence of dental anomalies observed in the present study and those reported in the previous studies\(^{(4,6)}\). These differences can be explained primarily by the influences of the different races, local environment and nutrition.\(^{(5)}\)

In the present study, the positional anomalies occurred predominantly. In Gupta et al.\(^{(5)}\), the most frequent dental anomaly was the positional one. It should be noted that in their study\(^{(5)}\), impaction, rotation and ectopic eruption were considered as the positional anomalies. In the present study, the positional anomalies consisted of impaction and transposition. In Gupta et al. rotation was the most frequent anomaly among the positional anomalies but, in the present study, impaction
was the most common anomaly between the positional types.

The prevalence of the supernumerary teeth was 1.1%. This result is similar to the previous studies. Nayak and co-worker\(^{(9)}\) reported a total prevalence rate of 0.6% for supernumerary teeth in Indian population, which was lower than our study. This dissimilarity can be explained primarily by selection of the children as a study group and in this age range, the development of the some supernumerary teeth probably had not been started. The prevalence of supernumerary teeth was 0.5\(^{(10)}\), 2.4\(^{(4,5)}\) and 14\(^{(11)}\); in other words, varied in different studies. The comparison of the results of the present study with the ones on Iranian populations\(^{(4,6)}\) shows that the prevalence rate in ours is lower. This difference can be attributed to the dissimilarity in study design, sample selection criteria, racial and nutritional differences, sampling techniques and inclusion criteria. In the present study, the prevalence of supernumerary teeth in men was 5.25 times more than women that was similar to the previous findings\(^{(3,6,12,13)}\).

In the present study, a total prevalence rate of microdontia was 3.8% which confirmed the previous findings\(^{(1,5,14)}\). However, Guttal et al\(^{(3)}\) in Indian population reported the prevalence rate of 0.16% for microdontia, which is much lower than ours. The prevalence rate ranges from 0.8% to 8.4\(^{(15)}\).

Dense invagination was observed in 10.9% of the patients. This result is not in agreement with the previous studies\(^{(4,6,14)}\). The most frequent cases of dense invagination were bilateral (77.9%) and all of them were detected in maxilla and mainly in lateral incisor.

The prevalence of taurodontism in the present study was 0.5% confirming previous researches\(^{(4,16)}\) but higher in some other studies\(^{(5,6,14,17,18)}\).

In the present study, root dilaceration was observed in 5.1% of subjects. The previous studies\(^{(4,6,19,20)}\) reported various results. Ezoddini et al\(^{(6)}\) reported even higher rate. The lower rate of root dilacerations in our study in comparison to Ezoddini et al. can be related to the fact that, we evaluated only the mandibular teeth for detecting dilacerations and the maxillary teeth for preventing misinterpretation in radiography, were excluded. The most frequent tooth with dilaceration was mandibular third molar. Dilacerasions of the mandibular third molars had the highest prevalence rate in Malcic et al.\(^{(21)}\) It should be noted that, delay eruption, endodontic problems or difficulties during extraction had been reported about dilacerated teeth. Hence, early diagnosis could prevent the future problems.\(^{(19)}\)

In the present study, the most frequent impacted teeth from the highest to the lowest frequency were the maxillary third molar, mandibular third molar, maxillary canine, mandibular second premolar, maxillary canine, mandibular second premolar, maxillary first premolar and mandibular second molar, confirming the previous studies\(^{(2)}\).

Transposition was found to be 0.1% in our study which is similar to the previous studies\(^{(14,22,23)}\). Accordingly, the total prevalence rate of pulp stone was 22.1%, which was the most frequent dental anomaly. Ahanagari et al.\(^{(24)}\) reported the prevalence rate of 5.7%. In the present study, pulp stone had significant predilection to females, which was in agreement of Ahanagari et al. research.

In our study, the mean difference of the age of the patients with pulp stone was 8 years greater than the patients without it. Therefore it can be concluded that the prevalence of this acquired dental anomaly in older patients is higher. As mentioned previously, in the present study, we prospectively evaluated some patients both clinically and radiographically.

Missing teeth was observed in 106 teeth excluding the third molars and 6 cases were accompanied with oligodontia, and the others with hypodontia. The maxillary lateral incisor was the most frequent missing tooth, followed by the mandibular second premolar, confirming the previous studies\(^{(3,12,19)}\). Also, it was found that 60.4% of missing teeth were in the maxilla and 74.5% were bilateral.

In the present study, talon cusp was observed in only 4 teeth. The previous study reported variable frequency of talon cusps (1% to 8%). The most frequent cases have been reported in maxilla as well as maxillary permanent lateral incisors in most cases\(^{(25)}\). Juan
et al. have emphasized that early diagnosis of talon cusp is highly important to prevent some problems such as occlusal interference, caries and periapical pathosis, and the periodontal problems \(^{(26)}\).

A rare finding depicted in the present study was a case of dentin dysplasia type I (radicular type). It was an 18 year old female complaining of tooth mobility and dental caries. There was not any history of the permanent teeth extraction. She noted that some of the teeth were lost spontaneously, because of the mobility. On panoramic view, missing some teeth and impaction of the others were revealed. Characteristic findings were short roots or rootless teeth in almost all teeth. Other interesting findings were detection of 6 cases of hypoplastic amelogenesis imperfecta.

Some of the limitations of the present study were unfeasibility of recalling the patients for clinical evaluation of the patients in step 1 of this study. Therefore, further prospective investigations regarding the dental anomalies using both the clinical and radiological examinations (preferably full mouth radiographic series) with larger sample size, are necessary in Guilan population.

In addition, more investigations are recommended to evaluate the correlation of familial and genetical background as well as the relationship between cleft lip and palate; and different syndromes with these anomalies.

**Conclusion**

In this present study, pulp stone had the most prevalence rate among the total anomalies. This anomaly occurred in the maxillary first molars as the most common location. Pulp stone in females was 7% more than in males. Among the developmental anomalies, impaction was the most frequent anomaly. Among permanent teeth, the maxillary third molars had the most prevalence rate.
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