# Relationship of body mass index to maximum bite force in a sample group from Nepalese population

## Pramita Suwal<sup>1</sup>, Bishal Babu<sup>2,\*</sup>, Rojina Shakya<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Additional Professor & HOD, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, <sup>3</sup>PG Student, Dept. of Prosthodontics, BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal

## \*Corresponding Author:

Email: bishal\_bpkihs@yahoo.com

### Abstract

**Statement of problem**: The force generated by masticatory apparatus can be called as bite force in normal functions of jaws. Various factors such as age, sex, built, periodontal support etc. can affect the bite force.

**Purpose**: To evaluate the impact of body mass index (BMI) over bite force in Nepalese adult individuals.

**Materials and Method**: Total 384 adult volunteers from Eastern Nepal were enrolled in the study to record bite force and BMI. Statistical analysis was done at 95% confidence interval with the level of significance at 0.05.

**Results**: The mean maximum bite force (MMBF) of Nepalese adult population was approximately 273N. The BMI had no significant impact on MMBF.

Conclusion: The study found the MMBF of Nepalese adult population and within its limitations, the study did not establish BMI as a predictor of MMBF.

Keywords: Mean maximum bite force, BMI, Masticatory efficiency, Age, Gender, Masticatory apparatus.

## Introduction

Bite force is defined as the force generated between maxillary and mandibular teeth by an act of the jaw elevator muscles. (1) It is one of the determinants of the functional state of the masticatory system, which is determined by the central nervous system, feedback from muscle spindles, mechanoreceptors and nociceptors, which in turn is modified by the craniomandibular biomechanics that influence and coordinates the movement of the jaw elevator muscles. (2) It is utilised to know the beneficial effect of prosthetic rehabilitation, and also in identification of the disorders in stomatognathic system. (3,4)

Several parameters such as craniofacial morphology, 20 age, 50 sex, 60 periodontal support of the teeth, and the type of measuring devices an influence the measurements of bite force determination. Also, for recording various devices like bite fork, force sensing resistors, 89 strain gauge transducers, 100 foil transducers 111 can be utilised.

In the current study, the role of body mass index (BMI) over maximum bite force is evaluated. There are many studies<sup>(12-17)</sup> pertaining to BMI. The results of them were contrasting and thus this study aims to test the hypothesis that the BMI has an impact on MBF in a study sample from Nepalese population.

# Materials and Method

The study was carried out in 384 adult dentate participants with a full set of teeth till the second molar, without considering the presence or absence of the third molar teeth from Nepalese population. The exclusion criteria were that the participants had no known

craniofacial abnormality, no known temporomandibular disorders upon general evaluation, no evidence of wasting disease occurring in the teeth, the absence of carious lesions in the molars, no past history of orthodontic treatment or prosthodontic rehabilitation. The study was ethically permitted by Institutional Review Committee of B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences.

A bite force measuring device was customised for the purpose of measurement of the bite force of the participants. This device had miniature load button of LLB (Load Button Load Cell) series as biting element and stainless steel Clamp Probe paired with FUTEK's Handheld Digital Display (IHH500). The measured force was displayed in Newton(N) digitally.

The participants were seated comfortably in a dental chair in an upright position and then the bite force measurement method was demonstrated. The measuring device was kept straight and parallel to the floor. Instructions to the participants were given and asked to bite with the hardest force on the gauge without any movement of the head. The bite force measurement was made on both sides of the first molar teeth. Three readings of the bite force was taken from each participant, the reading was made in an interval of three minutes for the relaxation of muscle fatigue. To measure the bite force and reduce the inter-observer bias single investigator was allotted to perform and record the score.

Body height was measured with a measuring scale on a wall when patient stood in an erect position without shoes with a precision of 0.1 cm, and weight was recorded in kilograms with a weighing scale. The BMI was calculated using the formula; BMI = weight (kg)/height (meters<sup>2</sup>)

## Results

The data collected were entered into Microsoft Excel program and transferred to SPSS software to perform the statistical analysis. With 95% confidence interval the level of significance was kept as  $p \le 0.05$ . The results of the observations made from the study population showed that mean maximum bite force

(MMBF) was 273.01N on right and 273.70N on left side. While comparing between the bite force at left and right side of the jaw there was no statistically significant difference.

Mean maximum bite force was found to be 314.94N in males and 223.69N in females. There was no statistically significant difference in observations made between genders. The results of the study are depicted in Tables 1-3.

Table 1: Mean and significance of bite force between left and right side

|                  | Number of subjects | MMBF±SD      | p-value |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|
| Right bite force | 384                | 273.01±49.57 | 0.488*  |
| Left bite force  | 384                | 273.70±49.17 |         |

p>0.05 indicating not significant

Table 2: Mean and significance of bite force between genders

| Parameters | Number of subjects | MMBF±SD      | Minimum | Maximum | p-value |
|------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Gender     |                    |              |         |         |         |
| Male       | 209                | 314.94±14.29 | 221.00  | 343.50  | 0.773*  |
| Female     | 175                | 223.69±18.86 | 181.50  | 343.50  |         |

p>0.05 indicating not significant

Table 3: The effect of BMI in MMBF

| Parameters | Number of subjects | MMBF±SD      | Minimum | Maximum | p-value |  |  |
|------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| BMI        |                    |              |         |         |         |  |  |
| Normal     | 367                | 272.18±48.54 | 181.50  | 343.50  | 0.112*  |  |  |
| Overweight | 17                 | 277.18±46.60 | 191.50  | 321.50  |         |  |  |

p>0.05 indicating not significant

### Discussion

The present study was conducted amongst Nepalese population. The separation of teeth was 15 mm in all participants during the recording of the bite force. Several authors<sup>(18,19)</sup> found that the magnitude of force increased when jaw opening was up to 15 -20 mm of the interincisal opening which roughly equals to the optimal length of elevator muscles.

Gender and BMI were found to be predictor of MBF in Saudi Arabian study sample as higher BMI was correlated with higher MBF in the participants who were dentate as well as who had fixed prostheses. (20) Gender difference during the measurement of bite force was observed in some studies (9,10) unlike the observations in the present study. The difference was not significant, may be due to larger but unequal sample of male and female participants.

The bite force of the Taiwanese sample population showed that it was higher in obese girls and overweight boys. The mean serum testosterone was correlated to increase in BMI.<sup>(21)</sup> Their findings contrast to the present study as no significant effect of BMI over the maximum mean bite force was observed. There are several studies<sup>(3,14-16)</sup> which agree with this finding indicating no significant impact of BMI on bite force.

However, lower weight was significantly correlated to MBF values in one of the studies. (14) There are several published studies (12,13) in weight and built which have similar findings, but none of these studies were able to establish BMI as a predictor of MMBF.

## Conclusion

Within the limitations of the measured variables of this study, it was found that the mean maximum bite force in studied population sample was 273N. The right or left side has no significant impact on MMBF, and also there was no statistically significant impact of BMI over MMBF in Nepalese population.

#### References

- Bonakdarchian M, Askon N, Askari M. Effect of face form on maximal molar bite force with natural dentition. Arch Oral Biol 2009; 54(3):201-4.
- 2. Bakke M. Bite Force and Occlusion. Semin Orthod 2006;12 (2):120-6.
- Duygu K, Dogan A, Beck B. Effect of gender, facial dimensions, body mass index and facial type of functional occlusion on bite force. J Appl Oral Sci 2011; 15 (3): 274-9.
- Duygu K, Dagon A, Bec B. Bite force and influential factors on bite force measurements: a literature review. Eur J Dent 2010;4(2):223-32.

- Bakke M, Holm B, Jensen BL, Michler L, Möller E. Unilateral, isometric bite force in 8-68-year-old women and men related to occlusal factors. Scand J Dent Res 1990;98(2):149-58.
- Koç D, Doğan A, Bek B. Effect of gender, facial dimensions, body mass index and type of functional occlusion on bite force. J Appl Oral Sci 2011;19(3):274– 9
- Alkan A, Keskiner I, Arici S, Sato S. The effect of periodontitis on biting abilities. J Periodontol 2006;77(8):1442–5.
- Fernandes CP, Glantz P, Svensson S, Bergmark A. A novel sensor for bite force determinations. Dent Mater 2003;19(2):118–26.
- Kiliaridis S, Kjellberg H, Wenneberg B, Engström C. The relationship between maximal bite force, bite force endurance, and facial morphology during growth. A cross-sectional study. Acta Odontol Scand 1993;51(5):323–31.
- Braun S, Hnat WP, Freudenthaler JW, Marcotte MR, Hönigle K, Johnson BE. A study of maximum bite force during growth and development. Angle Orthod 1996;66(4):261–4.
- Proffit WR, Fields HW. Occlusal forces in normal- and long-face children. J Dent Res 1983;62:571–4.
- Linderholm H, Wennstrom A. Isometric bite force and its relation to general muscle force and body build. Acta Odontol Scand 1969; 28:679-89.
- Braun S, Bartelen HP, Hnat WP, Freudenthaler JW, Marcotte MR, Jonson BE. A study of bite force part 1: relationship to various physical characteristics. Angle Orthod 1995;65(5):367-72.
- Ikebe K, Matsuda K, Morii K, Nokubi T, Ettinger RL.
   The relationship between oral function and body mass index among independently living older Japanese people.
   Int J Prosthodont 2006;19(6):539-46.
- Jain V, Mathur VP, Pillai RS, Karla S. A preliminary study to find out maximum occlusal bite force in Indian individuals. Indian J Dent Res 2014;25(3):325-30.
- Al-Omiri MK, Sghaireen MG, Alhijawi MM, Al Zoubi IA, Lynch CD, Lynch E. Maximum bite force following unilateral implant supported prosthetic treatment: withinsubject comparison to opposite dentate subject. J Oral Rehabil 2014;41(8):624-9.
- Isabel CA, Moyses MR, Van der Bilt A, Gameiro GH, Ribeiro JC, Pereira CJ. The relationship between masticatory and swallowing behaviours and body weight. Physiol Behav 2015;151:314-9.
- Manns A, Palazzi MRC. Bite force and elongation of the masseter muscle under isometric voluntary contractions and variations of vertical dimension. J Prosthet Dent 1979;42(6):674-82.
- Paphangkorakit J, Osborn JW. Effect of jaw opening on the direction and magnitude of human incisal bite forces. J Prosthet Dent 1997;76:561-7.
- Al-Zarea KB. Maximum Bite Force following unilateral fixed prosthetic treatment: a within-subject comparison to the dentate side. Med Princ Pract 2014; 24:142–6.
- Sun KT, Chen SC, Li YU, Chiang HH, Tsai HH, Li CH, et al. Bite-force difference among obese adolescents in central Taiwan. J Formos Med Assoc 2016; 115:404-10.