

Interceptive Management of Early First Permanent Molar Loss in Children with Unerupted Second Permanent Molars: A Comprehensive Narrative Review

Dr. Shifa Shahabuddin Parkar¹, Dr. Milind Rajan², Dr. Sejal Sachin Shah³,

Dr. Ashlesha Ravindra Sarwade⁴, Dr. Shine Philip Mathews⁵, Dr. Pallavi Arun Sangle⁶,

¹Senior Lecturer, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Yogita Dental College and Hospital, Khed, Maharashtra.

²PHD Scholar, Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Sharad Pawar Dental College and Hospital, Datta Meghe Institute of Higher Education and Research, Wardha-442107, Maharashtra.

³Assistant professor, Department of Pediatric & Preventive Dentistry, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Dental College & Hospital, Kegaon, Solapur- 413002.

⁴Intern, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Dental College & Hospital, Kegaon, Solapur, Maharashtra.

⁵Consultant Orthodontist, FMS Dental Center, Kochi, Kerala.

⁶Intern, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Dental College and Hospital, Kegaon, Solapur, Maharashtra.

Corresponding author: Dr. Shifa Shahabuddin Parkar,

Gmail: parkarshifa84@gmail.com

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i02.S.I\(2\).pp539-547](https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i02.S.I(2).pp539-547)

KEYWORDS

Early First Permanent Molar Loss, spontaneous space closure, interceptive orthodontics, lingual holding arch

Received on:

10-03-2026

Accepted on:

09-04-2026

Published on:

06-05-2026

Abstract

The first permanent molar (FPM) plays a pivotal role in establishing functional occlusion, maintaining arch length, and guiding eruption of posterior teeth. Premature loss of FPM is common due to caries, molar–incisor hypo mineralization, and trauma. When extraction occurs before eruption of the second permanent molar (SPM), conventional space-maintaining appliances are often contraindicated due to absence of a distal abutment, making management complex. Uncontrolled mesial migration of adjacent teeth, tipping of the SPM, arch length reduction, midline shift, and increased malocclusion severity are common sequelae of poorly timed intervention. This review focuses on the biological rationale, timing considerations, and interceptive orthodontic strategies for managing early FPM loss in children with unerupted SPMs. The concept of “timed extraction” is emphasized, which leverages the eruptive potential of the SPM for favorable spontaneous space closure. The role of arch-stabilizing appliances, including lingual holding arches in the mandible and trans palatal arches in the maxilla, is discussed, along with their biomechanical principles. Advanced treatment planning considerations—including arch differences, skeletal pattern, unilateral versus bilateral extraction, presence of third molars, and crowding—are highlighted. Evidence supports early, well-timed intervention with close monitoring to minimize future orthodontic needs.

Introduction:

The first permanent molar erupts around six years of age and serves as the cornerstone of permanent dentition. It establishes posterior occlusion, guides the eruption of premolars and second molars, maintains vertical dimension, and anchors the dental arch [1,2].

Despite its importance, the FPM is highly vulnerable to caries, molar–incisor hypo mineralization, and trauma, often necessitating early extraction [3,4]. Premature extraction, particularly before eruption of the SPM, can have serious developmental consequences. The distal abutment is absent, making conventional space-maintaining strategies ineffective. Consequences may include uncontrolled mesial migration of posterior teeth, rotation and tipping of SPM, midline shift, reduction of arch length, and subsequent malocclusion requiring comprehensive orthodontics. Recent literature has shifted focus from simple space maintenance to interceptive orthodontics, emphasizing timing-sensitive interventions that utilize

growth, eruption dynamics, and natural tooth movement. This approach, often termed “timed extraction,” allows spontaneous mesial migration of SPM into the extraction space, potentially reducing the need for future fixed appliance therapy. [5,6].

This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of: Biological consequences of early FPM loss, Clinical considerations and timing of extraction, Evidence-based interceptive strategies, Appliance selection rationale, Advanced treatment planning including skeletal pattern, crowding, arch differences, and third molar presence.

Biological and Occlusal Significance of the First Permanent Molar

The FPM is critical for: Establishing the occlusal plane. Providing posterior anchorage to control mesial drift of teeth. Guiding eruption of second molars and premolars.

Supporting vertical facial growth.

Early loss disrupts posterior anchorage, and mesial drift forces can alter tooth angulation, reduce arch length, and lead to crowding or midline shifts.

The eruption potential of the SPM can, however, be harnessed to achieve physiological space closure, provided the extraction is appropriately timed.

Consequences of Early FPM Extraction with Unerupted SPM **Clinical sequelae include:**

Mesial tipping of SPM: Especially in the mandible, can lead to impaction if not monitored.

Reduction of arch length: Causes crowding and malocclusion.

Rotation and drifting of premolars: Alters occlusal plane and arch symmetry.

Midline deviation: More pronounced in unilateral extractions.

Increased orthodontic complexity: Early malocclusion may require fixed appliance therapy later.

Timing of Extraction

Timing is the most critical factor for successful spontaneous space closure.

Optimal age: 8–10 years

Dental stage: Early bifurcation of SPM roots (Demirjian Stage E)

Rationale: At this stage, eruptive forces favor upright mesial movement rather than tipping

Early extraction (<8 years): May result in excessive space loss and SPM tipping

Late extraction (>12 years): Reduced spontaneous space closure and need for orthodontic intervention [7,8].

Interceptive Management Strategies

1. Observation and Natural Space Closure:

Suitable for cases with minimal crowding, favorable occlusion, and presence of third molars Requires close clinical and radiographic monitoring every 6 months [9].

2. Arch-Stabilizing Appliances

A. Lingual Holding Arch (Mandible):

Lingual holding arches preserve mandibular arch length by controlling anterior anchorage and preventing mesial movement of the posterior teeth during the mixed dentition stage.

Advantages: Prevents mesial migration of incisors, Maintains arch length without replacing missing molar, Allows controlled mesial drift of SPM.

Disadvantage: It is indicated only when stable posterior abutments (usually first permanent molars) are present. A conventional mandibular lingual holding arch (LLHA) requires stable posterior anchorage, typically the first permanent molars. When both FPMs are missing and SPMs are unerupted, this anchorage is absent, rendering the appliance unsuitable. But Modifications can be used [1].

B. Trans palatal Arch (Maxilla): The transpalatal arch (TPA) is an effective interceptive appliance in the maxilla following early loss of the first permanent molar (FPM) when the second permanent molar (SPM) is unerupted. Its primary functions are to maintain molar rotation, preserve transverse arch width, **and** provide anchorage while permitting natural eruption of the SPM [1,2]. TPAs do not replace missing molars but guide tooth movement to favor spontaneous space closure.

Clinical considerations include:

- **Arch differences:** Maxillary space closure is generally more predictable than mandibular.
- **Unilateral vs bilateral extraction:** Unilateral loss may require contralateral extraction for symmetry.
- **Follow-up:** Clinical and radiographic evaluation every 6 months is recommended to monitor eruption and prevent tipping or impaction

4. First Permanent Molar Missing, Second Permanent Molar Unerupted, Stable Second Primary Molar Present.

When the FPM is missing and the SPM has not yet erupted, but a stable second primary molar (E) is present, a band-and-loop or crown-and-loop space maintainer with a customized design is often indicated. These appliances help preserve the mesiodistal space and prevent migration of adjacent teeth while awaiting eruption of the SPM.

Customized designs may be required to adapt to altered eruption paths and

prolonged eruption timelines. The fixed loop appliances remain a practical solution when at least one stable abutment tooth is available, provided they are closely monitored for fit and hygiene maintenance. [10].

5. Absence of Reliable Posterior Abutment with Delayed Second Molar Eruption

In situations where there is no reliable posterior abutment and the anticipated eruption of the SPM is delayed, conventional space maintainers are inadequate. In such cases, custom fixed maintainers or interim appliances anchored to available teeth are recommended. These appliances aim to stabilize the arch and prevent anterior drift or collapse. [11].

6. Second Permanent Molar Approaching Eruption

If radiographic evaluation indicates that the SPM is close to eruption and adequate space is already present, active intervention may not be necessary.

Instead, careful observation with periodic clinical and radiographic follow-up is recommended.

Unnecessary space maintenance in such cases may interfere with natural eruption and is therefore contraindicated. Monitoring allows clinicians to intervene promptly if unfavorable tipping or space loss begins. [12]

7. Delayed Eruption with Critical Space Requirements

When eruption of the SPM is delayed and space is critical for future occlusal development, placement of a space maintainer is essential. Failure to preserve space may lead to mesial migration of adjacent teeth, loss of arch length, and increased orthodontic complexity.

In such cases, maintaining space until eruption of the SPM supports favorable alignment and minimizes the need for extensive orthodontic mechanics later [13].

Clinical scenario's and Treatment

Scenario	Appliance	Function
Mandibular FPM missing, SPM unerupted, posterior abutment present	Lingual Holding Arch (LLHA)	Maintains arch length, controls anterior anchorage
Maxillary FPM missing, SPM unerupted	Trans palatal Arch (TPA)	Maintains molar rotation & transverse width, guides eruption
Stable primary molar present	Band-and-loop / Crown-and-loop	Maintains mesiodistal space until SPM eruption
No posterior abutment, delayed SPM eruption	Custom fixed maintainer	Stabilizes arch, prevents anterior drift
SPM about to erupt	Observation	Monitors natural eruption; avoids interference

Evidence Table:

Sr. No.	Author and Year	Treatment Outcomes
1	Nunn JH et al. 1996	Retrospective Early FPM extraction favors upright SPM eruption and reduces malocclusion severity [14]
2	Moyers RE 1988	Textbook Differential tooth movement and eruption guidance essential in early molar loss [15]
3	Williams & Hosila 1976	Longitudinal Maxillary spontaneous space closure more predictable than mandibular [16]
4	Thilander & Skagius 1963	Observational Timing of extraction strongly affects SPM tipping and rotation [17]
5	Teo TKY et al. 2013	Systematic review Properly timed extraction reduces need for fixed orthodontics [18]
6	Cobourne MT et al. 2014	Guidelines Recommend extraction at early bifurcation of SPM[2]
7	Proffit WR et al. 2019	Textbook Lingual holding arch preserves arch length by controlling anterior anchorage[1]

Discussion:

Early loss of the first permanent molar (FPM) in children presents a complex interceptive orthodontic challenge, particularly when the second permanent molar (SPM) has not yet erupted. The primary objective in such cases is to promote favorable spontaneous space closure while minimizing the need for future comprehensive orthodontic treatment. Evidence consistently highlights timing of intervention as the most critical determinant of outcome.

Extraction or loss of the FPM during the early stages of SPM development, preferably before advanced root formation, significantly increases the likelihood of upright mesial eruption of the SPM into the extraction space. When intervention is delayed, the eruptive path of the SPM is often compromised, resulting in mesial tipping, rotation, or impaction, thereby increasing the complexity of subsequent orthodontic management.

Appliance selection must be guided by the availability of posterior anchorage. In the absence of a distal abutment,

conventional appliances such as the band-and-loop and distal shoe are generally unsuitable, as their effectiveness relies on stable posterior support. Under these circumstances, arch-stabilizing appliances, including lingual holding arches or modified fixed appliances, may be considered to control anterior anchorage and preserve arch length, provided adequate anchorage teeth are present.

Distinct differences exist between the maxillary and mandibular arches in terms of spontaneous space closure. Maxillary FPM spaces demonstrate more predictable closure due to favorable eruption paths and bone characteristics. Conversely, mandibular space closure is less reliable and frequently requires appliance-guided eruption or stabilization to prevent loss of arch length, incisor retroclination, or lingual collapse.

Comprehensive treatment planning is essential and must account for the

patient's skeletal growth pattern, whether the FPM loss is unilateral or bilateral, the degree of pre-existing crowding, and the presence and developmental stage of third molars, which may influence long-term occlusal outcomes. Failure to integrate these factors can result in asymmetry, residual spacing, or unfavorable occlusal relationships.

Regular clinical and radiographic follow-up is indispensable in interceptive management. Early identification of adverse tooth movement, such as mesial tipping or delayed eruption of the SPM, allows for timely intervention and modification of the treatment strategy.

Conclusion: The interceptive management of early FPM loss in children with unerupted SPMs requires precise timing, individualized appliance selection, and diligent monitoring. When these principles are appropriately applied, spontaneous space closure can be optimized, thereby reducing orthodontic treatment burden and improving long-term occlusal stability.

References

1. Proffit WR, Fields HW, Larson B, Sarver DM. *Contemporary Orthodontics*. 6th ed. St. Louis: Elsevier; 2019.
2. Cobourne MT, Williams A, Harrison M. Interceptive extraction of first permanent molars: a clinical review. *Br Dent J*. 2014;216(3):109–114.
3. Jalevik B, Möller M. Evaluation of spontaneous space closure after extraction of permanent first molars in children. *Eur J Orthod*. 2007;29(6):575–582.
4. Thilander B, Jakobsson SO. Local factors in impaction of maxillary canines. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 1968;26(2):145–168.
5. Plint DA. The effect on occlusion of early loss of deciduous molars. *Dent Pract Dent Rec*. 1970;20:211–218.
6. Royal College of Surgeons of England. Guidance for the extraction of first permanent molars in children. London; 2014.

7. Demirjian A, Goldstein H, Tanner JM. A new system of dental age assessment. *Hum Biol.* 1973;45(2):211–227.
8. Hamza H, Sabbagh H, et al. Spontaneous space closure after extraction of permanent first molars in children and adolescents: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Orthod.* 2024; [Epub ahead of print].
9. Koch G, Poulsen S, Espelid I, Haubek D. Pediatric Dentistry: A Clinical Approach. 3rd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell; 2017.
10. Tunison JH, Kula KS, et al. *Space maintenance and management in mixed dentition.* In: Space maintenance. *Pocket Dentistry.* 2016.
11. Methods of space maintenance for premature loss of a primary molar: a review. *PMCID:* PMC6208772.
12. *Space Maintainers Made Easy.* Oral Health Group.
13. *Space Maintainers – Indian Dental Association.*
14. Nunn JH, Davidson G, Gordon PH, Stirrups DR. Effect of early loss of first permanent molars. *Br Dent J.* 1996;181(2):61–65.
15. Moyers RE. Handbook of Orthodontics. 4th ed. Chicago: Year Book Medical Publishers; 1988.
16. Williams R, Hosila FJ. Effect of extraction sites on incisor retraction. *Am J Orthod.* 1976;69(4):388–410.
17. Thilander B, Skagius S. Orthodontic consequences of early extraction of permanent first molars. *Rep Congr Eur Orthod Soc.* 1963;39:429–442.
18. Teo TKY, Ashley PF, Parekh S, Noar J. Timing of extraction of first permanent molars: Systematic review. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent.* 2013;14(4):193–199.