

Dental Anthropology

A PUBLICATION OF
THE DENTAL ANTHROPOLOGY ASSOCIATION

Laboratory of Dental Anthropology Department of Anthropology
Arizona State University Box 872402 Tempe, AZ 85287-2402, U.S.A.

Volume 13, Number 2, 1999

ISSN 1096-9411

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

F.N. HATTAB,¹ A.S. AL-MOMANI,² O.M. YASSIN,² M.A.O. AL-OMARI,¹ A.H. HAMASHA,¹ M.A. RAWASHDEH,¹ AND A. TAVAS³

¹Departments of Restorative and Pediatric Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Jordan University of Science and Technology, P.O. Box 3030, Irbid, 22110, Jordan; ²Departments of Pediatric Dentistry and Orthodontics, Prince Rashid Military Hospital, Royal Medical Services, Irbid, Jordan; ³Visiting Professor of Orthodontics.

ABSTRACT Odontometric data on the deciduous dentition of Jordanians are lacking and such data on Arabs are generally scarce. The aim of this study was to provide a detailed description of crown-size dimensions in the deciduous dentition of Jordanians and to compare the findings with those of other populations.

Measurements of mesiodistal (MD) and buccolingual (BL) crown diameters were obtained from dental casts of 84 males and females aged 2.9 to 5.8 years. The differences in crown size (MD and BL diameters) between the right and left sides of the dental arch were not significant. All antimeric teeth showed high correlation coefficients in their crown dimensions ($p < 0.001$). These findings suggest that either right or left side measurements can be taken to represent the tooth size of the study population.

The relative variability in crown size showed that the lateral incisors were the most variable teeth (coefficient of variation: CV=7.5%), while the second molars were the most stable teeth (CV=4.7%). The MD diameters were more variable in the males for all teeth except the mandibular first molars, whereas variabilities in BL dimensions showed a similar pattern in both sexes. No significant differences in crown size measurements were found between males and females. Male means exceeded females means only by 0.05 mm. The central incisors displayed the greatest percentage of sexual dimorphism, while the second molars were the least dimorphic teeth. No specific pattern of percentages of sexual dimorphism were noted between the MD and BL diameters. The percentage of sexual dimorphism in the present sample was considerably lower than those of other ethnic groups. Jordanian children had tooth size that was larger than their Egyptian and North American counterparts, close to those of Japanese, and smaller than those of British children.

INTRODUCTION

The mesiodistal (MD) crown diameter, also called tooth size, tooth crown size, crown length, or crown width; and the buccolingual (BL) crown diameter, also referred to as breadth or width, provide significant information on human evolution and biological problems as well as on forensic and clinical dentistry. From an evolutionary viewpoint the deciduous dentition is thought to have changed less over time than the permanent dentition (Margette and Brown, 1978; Axelsson and Kirveskari, 1984). For a century anthropologists used crown diameters to trace the reduction of tooth size, reaching conclusions that appear to be a concomitant of selective forces and technological and dietary changes during human evolution (LeBlanc and Black, 1974; Kieser, 1990; Bermudez de Castro and Nicolas, 1995). Tooth crown diameters furnish human biologists with an insight into the genetic relation between populations and environmental adaptation (Garn *et al.*, 1967; Margette and Brown, 1978; Haeussler *et al.*, 1989; Sciulli, 1990). In forensic odontology tooth size proved to be a reliable sex discriminator (Black, 1978; DeVito and Saunders, 1990). Of clinical interest is the interrelation between tooth size and arch alignment, in which large teeth are associated with dental crowding (Lundström, 1969; Doris *et al.*, 1981). That an increase in tooth size may be a step toward hyperdontia, while reduced crown diameters and right-left asymmetries of tooth size were associated with oligodontia of permanent dentition has also been stated (Brook, 1984; Schalkvan der Weide *et al.*, 1994).

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

Crown dimensions of deciduous teeth and the impact of biological factors on their sizes have been much less documented than those of the permanent dentition, a situation that is probably due to difficulties in data collection. Twin studies have demonstrated that crown size is genetically determined by factors acting during odontogenesis, yet estimates of heritability in different populations have ranged from 34% up to 90% (Dempsey *et al.*, 1995). Townsend and Brown (1978) confirmed the strong genetic component on tooth size, but thought that heritabilities tended to be elevated because of shared environmental effects. Interestingly, these authors found that the common environmental influence on BL dimensions exceeded that on the MD dimensions. Garn *et al.* (1979) provided evidence that maternal and fetal determinants may account for as much as half of crown-size variability. Apparently, intra-individual crown-size similarities between isomerics and antimeres and interpopulation differences in bilateral asymmetries of tooth size might well reflect environmental influences, rather than changes in gene frequency (Perzigian, 1977; Garn *et al.*, 1979). Harris and Bailit (1988) emphasized that tooth crown dimensions are not as highly heritable as was often claimed in the early literature. Evidence is accumulating that tooth size reflects a complex interaction between a variety of genetic and environmental factors, with the effect of environment being greater in the prenatal than the postnatal period.

Sexual dimorphism in tooth size characterizes modern humans and varies between different populations. While some authors found that sexual dimorphism in tooth size is less pronounced in the deciduous than in the permanent dentition (Black, 1978; Lysell and Myrberg, 1982), others showed that sexual dimorphism in deciduous teeth is as great as or even greater than that seen in the permanent teeth (Potter *et al.*, 1981; DeVito and Saunders, 1990). The explanations proposed for crown-size dimorphism between males and females include variation in odontogenetic timing and enamel thickness, comparatively larger bodies in males than in females, the effect of sex chromosomes in promoting tooth growth, and hormonal influence (Garn *et al.*, 1979; Stini, 1985; Kieser, 1990). Dental sexual dimorphism may well reflect some sort of interaction between genetic and environmental factors, the nature of which is not well understood.

Tooth size exhibits a continuous range of variation among individuals and between populations. Because of the lack of odontometric data on the deciduous dentition in Jordanians and the paucity of such data on Arabs in general, the present study was carried out to measure the MD and BL crown diameters of deciduous teeth in Jordanians and to compare the results with data for other population groups.

MATERIALS

Jordan is an Arab state of Southwest Asia (the Middle East) with a population of four million people and a history of some of the oldest settled sites in the world. Jordan has been the home of hunters from the lower Paleolithic and Paleolithic-Mesolithic times. It is bounded on the north by Syria, on the east by Iraq, on the southeast and south by Saudi Arabia, and on the west by West Bank and Israel. Jordan is made up of three major physiographic regions: the Jordan deserts occupying more than four-fifths of its territory, the East Bank uplands, and the Jordan rift valley, a branch of the great African rift valley.

The sample in the present study is comprised of 84 male and female children, who were born of Jordanian parents and grew up in Jordan. All were apparently healthy children who presented for dental treatment needs. The mean age (\pm standard deviation) for males was 4.9 (± 0.7) years and for females, 5.0 (± 0.8) years. The range was between 2.9 and 5.8 years. Teeth were selected for measurements only if they were fully erupted, were not noticeably affected by attrition or caries, had not been restored, did not display abnormal crown morphology, and were present in the complete dentition.

METHODS

Alginate impressions were taken in suitable perforated trays for the upper and lower dental arches of every subject. Impressions were cast in dental stone immediately to obviate problems with distortion of the model. The MD and BL crown diameters were registered for each maxillary and mandibular deciduous tooth from the second molar on one side to the corresponding tooth on the contralateral side.

The MD crown diameter of a tooth was obtained by measuring the greatest distance between the approximate surfaces of the crown using an electronic sliding caliper inserted from the buccal or labial aspect and held parallel to the occlusal and vestibular surfaces of the crown (Moorrees *et al.*, 1957; Hunter and Priest, 1960). The BL crown diameter was taken as the greatest distance between the labial or buccal surface and the lingual surface of the tooth

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

crown in a plane perpendicular to the MD crown diameter of the tooth (Margette and Brown, 1978). If a tooth was rotated or malpositioned in relation to the curvature of the dental arch, the MD measurement was taken between the points of the approximate surfaces of the crown where the observer considered that contact with adjacent teeth would normally occur. Measurements were made by two observers (F.N.H and A.S.A-M).

Intra-observer reliability was evaluated by a replicability trial in which nine casts, selected at random, were measured on two occasions. Precision of the measurements was calculated by means of the method error statistic (S), also known as the technical error measurement:

$$S = \sqrt{\sum d^2 / 2n}$$

In the equation for (S) d is the difference between the repeated measurements and n is the number of double determinations (Dahlberg, 1940). The value of S was small: 0.08 mm or 1.2% of the mean.

Inter-observer error was calculated by differences between the means of two sets of measurements using the paired t-test. The differences were not statistically significant. The average difference was 0.16 mm or 2.1% of the mean measurements.

Descriptive statistics including the mean of the MD and the BL crown size, standard deviation (SD), standard error of the mean (SEM), minimum and maximum values, and coefficient of variation ($CV = 100 \text{ SD} / \bar{x}$) were computed for each individual tooth. The data for males and females were analyzed separately and in combination when appropriate. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used to express the degree of association between right and left measurements of homologous teeth in each dental arch by sex and by sexes pooled. The significant levels of the correlation coefficients were determined and the differences between sets of data were evaluated by the analysis of variance. The Student's t-test was employed to determine the differences in the tooth measurements between boys and girls. Sexual dimorphism in tooth size was quantified by expressing the percent to which the crown diameters of males exceeded those of females for each individual tooth: $100 (\text{male mean} / \text{female mean} - 1.00)$. For comparative evaluation of the differences in tooth crown size between populations, crown area (also called summary tooth size, cross-sectional crown area, or robustness value) was obtained by multiplying the MD diameter by the BL diameter and expressing the value in mm^2 . Hereafter, we refer to the MD and BL measurements of a tooth as crown diameters or size. Because most of the teeth except the maxillary first and second molars exhibit a greater anterior-posterior component than a medio-lateral component, the MD diameter denotes crown length and the BL dimension, crown width.

RESULTS

The mean MD diameters, standard deviations (SD), and coefficient of variation (CV) values for males are shown in Table 1 and for females, in Table 2. The corresponding data for the BL dimensions are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Statistical analysis using analysis of variance revealed no significant differences in both sexes between the crown size of teeth on the right and left sides of the dental arch. In absolute terms the differences between the mean crown diameters of homologous teeth were very small and ranged from 0.00 mm to 0.11 mm mesiodistally and 0.00 to 0.13 mm buccolingually, with the greatest differences representing 2.71% of the mean measurements. Some individual right-left differences can be shown by the coefficient of correlation (Table 5). For the MD diameters the r values ranged from 0.72 to 0.90 and for the BL diameters, from 0.76 to 0.94 (sexes pooled). In 14 of the 20 correlations antimeric teeth in males were more correlated than those in females.

Teeth that displayed the highest correlation in the MD dimensions are the maxillary central incisors followed by mandibular second molars, while the maxillary canines showed the greatest correlation buccolingually followed next by the mandibular central incisors. The pattern and magnitude of the coefficient correlations varied at random between MD and BL measurements (Table 5). In all instances the correlations between right and left homologous pairs were highly significant ($P < 0.001$). These findings indicate that right or left measurements could be taken to represent crown size diameters in this population.

The relative variability of crown size indicated by the coefficients of variation are shown in Tables 1 to 4. Only slight differences in the mean variability were found between males and females (6.5% vs 6.2%), as well as between the MD and BL diameters (6.2% vs 6.4%). Notable is the independence of the MD and BL dimensional variations of incisors as opposed to those of molars: variability ranged between 4.7% and 9.7% for incisors versus 3.9% and 6.4% for molars. For both sexes the second molars were the least variable teeth in MD and BL dimensions, except for female maxillary molars in which the MD diameter of central incisors varied comparatively less. In general, the

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

TABLE 1. Mesiodistal crown diameters (in mm) of the deciduous teeth of Jordanian male subjects.

Tooth	Side	N	\bar{x}	SD	SEM	Range	CV	\bar{x}_A
Maxillary Teeth								
central incisor	right	34	6.54	0.39	0.068	5.81-7.57	5.9	6.55
central incisor	left	32	6.56	0.38	0.068	5.85-7.44		
lateral incisor	right	37	5.48	0.40	0.066	4.86-6.46	7.2	5.45
lateral incisor	left	38	5.42	0.38	0.062	4.55-6.29		
canine	right	39	6.72	0.50	0.079	5.53-7.72	7.1	6.73
canine	left	38	6.74	0.45	0.073	4.47-7.77		
first molar	right	37	7.38	0.47	0.078	6.61-8.78	6.3	7.35
first molar	left	37	7.31	0.46	0.075	6.30-8.35		
second molar	right	36	9.04	0.54	0.090	8.11-10.50	5.8	9.01
second molar	left	36	8.97	0.51	0.086	8.02-10.10		
Mandibular Teeth								
central incisor	right	35	4.15	0.33	0.055	3.43-4.86	8.2	4.13
central incisor	left	34	4.11	0.35	0.060	3.50-5.05		
lateral incisor	right	37	4.83	0.41	0.068	4.07-5.75	8.6	4.82
lateral incisor	left	37	4.80	0.42	0.069	4.00-5.60		
canine	right	39	5.82	0.39	0.062	4.92-6.63	6.5	5.84
canine	left	40	5.86	0.37	0.058	4.89-6.63		
first molar	right	35	8.07	0.45	0.075	7.10-9.10	5.6	8.03
first molar	left	33	7.98	0.45	0.079	7.30-9.08		
second molar	right	40	9.98	0.47	0.075	9.00-10.75	4.7	9.96
second molar	left	38	9.93	0.47	0.076	9.00-10.80		

N is the number of subjects. \bar{x} is the mean for N. CV is the coefficient of variation (%). \bar{x}_A is the average of the right and left measurements.

TABLE 2. Mesiodistal crown diameters (in mm) of the deciduous teeth of Jordanian female subjects.

Tooth	Side	N	\bar{x}	SD	SEM	Range	CV	\bar{x}_A
Maxillary Teeth								
central incisor	right	40	6.46	0.32	0.051	5.91-7.00	4.7	6.46
central incisor	left	40	6.45	0.29	0.046	5.99-6.96		
lateral incisor	right	41	5.41	0.32	0.049	4.65-5.98	6.3	5.41
lateral incisor	left	41	5.40	0.36	0.057	4.52-6.02		
canine	right	40	6.69	0.38	0.060	5.81-7.50	6.1	6.68
canine	left	41	6.67	0.46	0.071	5.63-7.65		
first molar	right	38	7.20	0.40	0.065	6.33-7.97	5.6	7.19
first molar	left	38	7.18	0.40	0.065	6.44-7.99		
second molar	right	40	9.00	0.49	0.077	6.91-9.77	4.9	9.00
second molar	left	40	9.00	0.39	0.062	8.32-9.71		
Mandibular Teeth								
central incisor	right	39	4.12	0.35	0.056	3.52-5.58	7.9	4.06
central incisor	left	41	4.01	0.29	0.045	3.50-4.77		
lateral incisor	right	41	4.79	0.30	0.047	4.19-5.50	6.7	4.81
lateral incisor	left	42	4.82	0.34	0.052	4.01-5.50		
canine	right	39	5.92	0.38	0.061	4.83-6.93	5.9	5.93
canine	left	42	5.94	0.32	0.041	5.33-6.49		
first molar	right	35	7.98	0.46	0.078	6.79-9.00	5.9	7.96
first molar	left	36	7.94	0.48	0.080	6.52-9.01		
second molar	right	39	9.97	0.36	0.058	8.96-11.15	3.9	9.94
second molar	left	38	9.90	0.42	0.068	9.81-11.02		

lateral incisors were the most variable in both MD and BL dimensions.

The tooth crown diameters of males were not consistently larger than those of females (Tables 1 to 4). In 13 of the 20 MD and BL diameters (right and left sides pooled) males showed a larger crown size than females with differences ranging between 0.01 mm and 0.16 mm with an average of 0.05 mm. Statistical analysis showed no significant differences between males and females in the crown size of any individual tooth. The patterning and magnitude of gender dimorphism is possibly best investigated by means of the percentage of sexual dimorphism suggested by Garn *et al.* (1967). The percentages of sexual dimorphism of MD and BL diameters are presented in Tables 6 and 7. Overall, the second molars displayed the least dimorphism in crown size (0.49%), while the central incisors (1.37%) and the first molars (1.17%) showed the greatest dimorphism in the dentition. The total average of sexual dimorphism percentage was 0.98% for the MD and 0.71% for the BL diameters with no specific pattern in the expression of sexual dimorphism between MD and BL dimensions.

The cumulative MD diameter was calculated as the sum of crown lengths of individual teeth in each arch up to and including the second molars. In males the cumulative lengths of the maxillary and mandibular teeth were 70.16 and 65.53 mm, respectively. The corresponding lengths in females were 69.46 mm and 65.39 mm.

A valuable measure for comparing the crown size between groups is the sum of crown areas of individual teeth (Lukacs *et al.*, 1983). The total crown area of Jordanians was calculated and compared with those of other populations (Table 7).

A comparison of the MD diameters in the Jordanian sample with those reported for the deciduous dentition of Egyptians (EL-Nofely *et al.*, 1989), North American whites (Black, 1978), and Australian Aborigines (Margette and Brown, 1978) are presented in Table 6. The BL diameters of Jordanians compared with those of North American whites (Black, 1978), Hindu from western India (Lukacs *et al.*, 1983), and Australian Aborigines (Margette and Brown, 1978) are shown in Table 7.

DISCUSSION

The paucity of odontometric data on populations in this region is responsible for the difficulty in comparing the present findings with those of others, except for the

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

MD data of Egyptian children reported by El Nofely *et al.* (1989). The present study of crown size (MD and BL diameters) is based on measurements from dental casts obtained from children born of Jordanian parents.

The present study showed no significant differences between right and left crown measurements in both genders. These findings are consistent with those reported for the deciduous dentition in other populations (Moorrees *et al.*, 1957; Margette and Brown, 1978; Lysell and Myrberg, 1982). According to Garn *et al.* (1979), intra-individual crown-size correlation and similarities between isomerics and antimerics might well derive from specific intrauterine events during odontogenesis and relatively less from genetic effect. Harzer (1987) provides evidence that the right-left differences between homologous teeth are smaller than the differences in tooth size between monozygotic twins, suggesting that the side differences can be attributed to environmental influences. Accumulated evidence indicates that the small amount of dimensional variation between antimerics is due to fluctuating asymmetry with little or no evidence for a genetic basis of bilateral asymmetry (Potter and Nance, 1976; Perzigian, 1977; Fields *et al.*, 1995). The random differences in tooth size between antimerics suggest a relative developmental stability within the dentition.

To express the magnitude of inequalities between antimeric teeth, correlation coefficients were used. The results showed that the *r* values between homologous teeth of Jordanians (Table 5) are consistently lower than those reported for North American whites (Moorrees and Reed, 1964) but comparable to those Lysell and Myrberg (1982) published for a Swedish sample. Although no significant right-left differences could be demonstrated, the magnitude of bilateral asymmetry appears to be a characteristic for ethnic groups. Perzigian (1977) indicated that within the morphological classes of the permanent dentition the comparatively more distal teeth are more asymmetrical than their mesial neighbors. Such a trend was not prominent in our sample (Table 5) or those reported by others on deciduous teeth (Moorrees and Reed, 1964; Lysell and Myrberg, 1982).

The relative variability in the crown size of the present sample showed that the lateral incisors, genders pooled, were the most variable teeth (CV=7.5%), while the second molars were the most stable teeth in the dentition (CV=4.7%). Similar observations were reported for other populations (Foster *et al.*, 1969; Black, 1978; Margette and Brown, 1978; Lysell and Myrberg, 1982; DeVito *et al.*, 1990), but varied from those of Moorrees *et al.* (1957) who found that the first molars were the least variable (CV=5.1%). DeVito *et al.* (1990) reported that the

TABLE 3. Buccolingual crown diameters (in mm) of the deciduous teeth of Jordanian male subjects.

Tooth	Side	N	\bar{x}	SD	SEM	Range	CV	\bar{x}_A
Maxillary Teeth								
central incisor	right	43	4.95	0.33	0.050	4.00-5.90	6.9	4.95
central incisor	left	41	4.95	0.35	0.057	4.07-5.90		
lateral incisor	right	43	4.60	0.40	0.061	3.85-5.44	8.3	4.62
lateral incisor	left	41	4.64	0.37	0.057	3.92-5.32		
canine	right	43	5.94	0.42	0.064	5.12-6.92	6.9	5.92
canine	left	43	5.90	0.40	0.062	5.01-7.05		
first molar	right	44	8.28	0.42	0.063	7.21-9.53	4.9	8.32
first molar	left	44	8.35	0.40	0.060	6.60-9.52		
second molar	right	44	9.51	0.45	0.069	8.50-10.92	4.6	9.52
second molar	left	44	9.53	0.43	0.065	8.65-10.90		
Mandibular Teeth								
central incisor	right	41	3.79	0.29	0.045	3.19-4.60	8.1	3.79
central incisor	left	39	3.78	0.32	0.050	3.23-4.64		
lateral incisor	right	42	4.26	0.29	0.044	3.55-5.20	6.1	4.24
lateral incisor	left	42	4.22	0.23	0.036	3.69-4.95		
canine	right	44	5.58	0.39	0.058	4.43-6.62	7.7	5.55
canine	left	44	5.52	0.46	0.070	3.96-6.71		
first molar	right	44	7.27	0.43	0.064	6.44-8.11	5.9	7.23
first molar	left	44	7.18	0.42	0.063	6.28-8.23		
second molar	right	44	9.02	0.38	0.058	8.06-9.87	4.4	8.99
second molar	left	44	8.95	0.41	0.062	8.12-9.92		

Abbreviations are the same as those in Table 1.

TABLE 4. Buccolingual crown diameters (in mm) of the deciduous teeth of Jordanian female subjects.

Tooth	Side	N	\bar{x}	SD	SEM	Range	CV	\bar{x}_A
Maxillary Teeth								
central incisor	right	31	4.87	0.27	0.048	4.36-5.31	5.8	4.86
central incisor	left	31	4.85	0.29	0.053	4.16-5.38		
lateral incisor	right	30	4.64	0.48	0.088	3.57-5.91	9.7	4.61
lateral incisor	left	30	4.57	0.41	0.073	3.54-5.37		
canine	right	31	5.93	0.47	0.085	5.11-6.65	8.3	5.94
canine	left	31	5.94	0.51	0.091	5.09-6.78		
first molar	right	31	8.33	0.34	0.060	7.48-9.08	4.2	8.38
first molar	left	31	8.42	0.36	0.065	7.63-9.28		
second molar	right	30	9.54	0.44	0.081	8.57-10.70	5.3	9.55
second molar	left	30	9.55	0.58	0.106	8.26-10.90		
Mandibular Teeth								
central incisor	right	32	3.83	0.28	0.050	3.43-4.68	7.2	3.81
central incisor	left	32	3.78	0.27	0.048	3.38-4.54		
lateral incisor	right	32	4.30	0.29	0.051	3.81-4.92	7.2	4.28
lateral incisor	left	32	4.25	0.33	0.058	3.73-5.40		
canine	right	32	5.54	0.35	0.062	4.79-6.42	6.4	5.55
canine	left	32	5.55	0.36	0.065	4.94-6.61		
first molar	right	32	7.35	0.46	0.082	6.21-8.42	6.4	7.29
first molar	left	32	7.22	0.47	0.083	6.35-8.32		
second molar	right	32	8.87	0.41	0.074	7.84-9.71	4.1	8.87
second molar	left	32	8.87	0.31	0.055	8.08-9.47		

Abbreviations are the same as those in Table 1.

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

TABLE 5. Correlation coefficients (r) for crown size diameters between the antimeres of the total sample (sexes pooled).

Tooth	Mesiodistal			Buccolingual		
	N	r	Rank	N	r	Rank
Maxillary Teeth						
Ri1-Li1	71	0.9	1	74	0.85	6
Ri2-Li2	79	0.8	5	73	0.86	5
Rc-Lc	80	0.7	7	74	0.94	1
Rm1-LM1	73	0.8	3	76	0.82	9
Rm2-Lm2	75	0.7	9	76	0.88	4
Mandibular Teeth						
R1-L1	75	0.8	6	71	0.89	3
R2-L2	78	0.7	10	74	0.84	7
Rc-Lc	79	0.7	8	76	0.84	8
Rm1-Lm1	69	0.8	4	75	0.91	2
Rm2-Lm2	77	0.8	2	76	0.76	10

dimensions of deciduous teeth in Canadian Caucasians were comparatively more variable in the females for all of the teeth except the canines. Margette and Brown (1978) discovered neither differences in tooth size variability nor differences between MD and BL variability in Australian Aboriginals. We found that MD dimensions were comparatively more variable in the males for all teeth except the mandibular first molars, whereas variabilities in BL diameters showed a similar pattern in both genders (Tables 1 to 4).

Our results on sexual dimorphism in crown size revealed that the MD and BL diameters of males did not significantly differ from those of females in all tooth types. These findings are in contrast with those of other populations in which male means were significantly larger than those of females for all teeth (Lysell and Myrberg, 1982; DeVito *et al.*, 1990; Ooshima *et al.*, 1996), for all of the teeth except the BL diameter of the mandibular central incisors (Lukacs *et al.*, 1983), in six of ten MD dimensions (Moorrees *et al.*, 1957), in eleven of 20 MD and BL diameters (Foster *et al.*, 1969; Farmer and Townsend, 1993), and in five out of 20 MD and BL diameters (Margette and Brown, 1978).

A useful method for quantifying gender differences in tooth size is the percentage by which the mean diameter of males exceeds that of females (Tables 4 and 5). No distinct differences in the total average of gender dimorphism percentages between MD and BL dimensions were observed (0.98% vs 0.71%). No specific pattern of sexual dimorphism existed between the MD and BL diameters within the same sample and between populations (Tables 6 and 7). The magnitude of the total average of the percentage of sexual dimorphism (MD and BL combined) of Jordanians (0.85%) was remarkably lower than that of North Americans (1.54%), South Australian Caucasians (1.99%), Australian Aboriginals (3.08%), and Hindu (3.68%). The highest percentages of sexual dimorphism in crown size were found in British children aged 2½ to 3 years: an overall average of 5.24% (computed from figures published by Foster *et al.*, 1969). In their study the anterior teeth displayed greater gender dimorphism than posterior teeth, a finding which was not confirmed by the present study (Tables 6 and 7) and in other population groups (Black, 1978; Margette and Brown, 1978; El Nofely *et al.*, 1989; Farmer and Townsend, 1993).

These findings clearly indicate inter-population differences in gender dimorphism of the deciduous dentition. Such an observation was also reported for the permanent dentition (Haeussler *et al.*, 1989; Hattab *et al.*, 1996). The sexual dimorphism of the deciduous dentition in the present sample (0.98%) was considerably less pronounced than that of the permanent dentition of the same population (3.60%) (Hattab *et al.*, 1996). This low level of gender dimorphism may reflect the relatively smaller sex differences in the timing of the developmental processes in the deciduous dentition which develops over a shorter period of time than the permanent dentition. While canines were the most dimorphic teeth in the permanent dentition, they displayed a lower percentage of dimorphism than the central incisors and first molars in the deciduous dentition (Table 6).

Comparison of MD and BL diameters of the deciduous dentition in Jordanians and other populations are presented in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. Statistical analysis using the t-test showed that the MD dimensions of all teeth in Jordanians were significantly larger than those of Egyptians to a level of $p < 0.001$ with absolute differences ranging from 0.27 mm for the central incisors to 0.47 mm for the first molars. Jordanians had larger MD diameters than those of North Americans, except for the maxillary canines in males and central incisors in females. The differences were significant for the maxillary first molars and mandibular second molars. The MD dimensions of Jordanians were close to those of Japanese children (Ooshima *et al.*, 1996) both in pattern and in magnitude. In BL dimensions Jordanians possess significantly smaller maxillary central incisors and first molars than Americans. British children exhibit larger MD and BL dimensions than Jordanians in 15 out of 20 comparisons with differences that were highly significant for canines and central incisors, except for the MD diameter of the maxillary central incisors. In all instances the crown sizes of Jordanians were significantly smaller than those of Australian Aboriginals ($P < 0.001$).

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

TABLE 6. Mesiodistal crown diameters (in mm), sexual dimorphism (%), and the rank order of sexual dimorphism of the deciduous teeth in Jordanians compared with other population groups.

Tooth	Jordanians			Egyptians			North American Whites			Australian Aboriginals						
	M	F	%	Rank	M	F	%	Rank	M	F	%	Rank				
central incisor	6.55	6.46	1.39	4	6.13	6.16	-0.48	10	6.40	6.52	-1.84	3	7.35	7.20	1.97	8
lateral incisor	5.45	5.41	0.74	7	4.96	4.93	0.61	9	5.24	5.33	-1.69	6	6.00	5.93	1.11	10
canine	6.73	6.68	0.75	6	6.46	6.33	2.05	2	6.78	6.66	1.80	4	7.41	7.21	2.75	3
first molar	7.35	7.19	2.23	1	6.86	6.72	2.08	1	6.69	6.59	1.52	7	7.55	7.28	3.71	2
second molar	9.01	9.00	0.11	10	8.67	8.55	1.40	6	8.84	8.79	0.57	9	9.65	9.42	2.44	5
					Mandibular Teeth											
central incisor	4.13	4.06	1.72	2	3.94	3.89	1.29	7	4.03	4.10	-1.71	5	4.51	4.34	3.94	1
lateral incisor	4.82	4.81	0.21	8	4.51	4.44	1.58	4	4.58	4.72	-2.97	1	5.01	4.91	2.01	7
canine	5.84	5.93	-1.52	3	5.36	5.32	0.75	8	5.83	5.81	0.34	10	6.31	6.16	2.53	4
first molar	8.03	7.96	0.88	5	7.59	7.48	1.47	5	7.85	7.74	1.42	8	8.25	8.12	1.55	9
second molar	9.96	9.94	0.20	9	9.58	9.41	1.81	3	9.88	9.69	1.96	2	10.89	10.64	2.37	6
\bar{x} D			0.98				1.35				1.58				2.44	

\bar{x} D is the total average of the percent of sexual dimorphism.

TABLE 7. Buccolingual crown diameters (in mm), sexual dimorphism (%), and the rank order of sexual dimorphism of the deciduous teeth in Jordanians compared with other population groups.

Tooth	Jordanians			North American whites			Hindu (western India)			Australian Aboriginals						
	M	F	%	Rank	M	F	%	Rank	M	F	%	Rank				
central incisor	4.95	4.86	1.85	1	5.13	5.19	-1.16	6	5.25	5.04	4.17	4	5.47	5.30	3.34	7
lateral incisor	4.62	4.61	0.22	9	4.71	4.64	1.51	5	4.94	4.71	4.88	2	5.24	5.01	4.59	2
canine	5.92	5.94	-0.34	7	6.11	5.97	2.34	2	6.19	5.96	3.86	6	6.61	6.34	4.23	3
first molar	8.32	8.38	-0.72	5	8.83	8.56	3.15	1	9.07	8.76	3.54	7	9.07	8.77	3.37	6
second molar	9.52	9.55	-0.31	8	9.54	9.36	1.92	4	10.15	9.75	4.10	5	10.65	10.27	3.74	4
A^2 (mm ²)		243.28				239.58				257.67				282.96		
					Mandibular Teeth											
central incisor	3.79	3.81	-0.52	6	3.86	3.84	0.52	9	3.88	3.87	0.26	10	4.33	4.19	3.20	8
lateral incisor	4.24	4.28	-0.93	3	4.37	4.35	0.46	10	4.35	4.21	3.33	8	4.75	4.65	2.04	10
canine	5.55	5.55	0.00	10	5.60	5.55	0.90	7	5.64	5.38	4.83	3	6.05	5.84	3.74	5
first molar	7.23	7.29	-0.82	4	7.37	7.31	0.82	8	7.51	7.27	3.30	9	7.92	7.49	5.81	1
second molar	8.99	8.87	1.35	2	8.90	8.70	2.30	3	9.32	8.87	5.07	1	9.87	9.57	3.05	9
\bar{x} D			0.71				1.51				3.74				3.71	
A^2 (mm ²)		215.61				212.28				218.71				246.94		
ΣA^2 (mm ²)		458.89				451.86				476.38				529.90		

\bar{x} D is the total average of the percent of sexual dimorphism. A^2 (mm²) is the crown area. ΣA^2 (mm²) is the total crown area.

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

Comparisons of the crown areas of Jordanians with those of other populations are presented in Table 7. Summed crown areas of individual teeth showed that Jordanians, sexes pooled, exhibited a larger total crown area than Americans (458.89 mm² vs 451.86 mm²), but smaller than Hindu (476.48 mm²), and much less than Australian Aborigines (529.0 mm²). This last ethnic group is thought to have the largest teeth in the contemporary populations.

SUMMARY

In summary, the present study of MD and BL diameters of deciduous teeth in Jordanian males and females showed the following: 1) In both genders a bilateral symmetry in crown size of homologous teeth was evident by highly significant correlation coefficients. 2) The lateral incisors were the most variable teeth in both MD and BL dimensions, while the second molars were the most stable teeth. 3) No significant differences in crown diameters, either mesiodistally or buccolingually, were found between males and females. 4) Noticeable inter-population differences in crown diameters with respect to the pattern and degree of sexual dimorphism, dimensional variability, and right-left side correlations suggest a complex interaction of genetic and environmental factors in determining tooth crown dimensions. Hopefully, the present data on Jordanians will provide a useful reference for future studies on populations in this poorly examined region.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to thank Ms. Dua'a Sarieh for typing the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- Axelsson G, and Kirveskari P (1984) Crown size of deciduous teeth in Icelanders. *Acta Odontol. Scand.* 42:339-343.
- Bermudez de Castro JM, and Nicolas ME (1995) Posterior dental size reduction in Hominids: the Atapuerca evidence. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 96:335-356.
- Black TK (1978) Sexual dimorphism in the tooth crown diameter in the deciduous teeth. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 48:77-82.
- Brook AH (1984) A unifying etiological explanation for anomalies of human tooth number and size. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 29:373-378.
- Dahlberg G (1940) Statistical methods for medical and biological students. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.
- Dempsey PJ, Townsend GC, and Neale MC. (1995) Genetic covariance structure of incisor crown size in twins. *J. Dent. Res* 74:1389-1398.
- DeVito CMA, and Saunders SR (1990) A discriminant function analysis of deciduous teeth to determine sex. *J. Forensic Sci.* 35:845-858.
- Doris JM, Bernard BW, Kuffinec MM, and Stom C (1981) A biometric study of tooth size and dental crowding. *Am. J. Orthod.* 79:326-336.
- El-Nofely A, Sadek L, and Soliman N (1989) Spacing in the human deciduous dentition in relation to tooth size and dental arch size. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 34:437-441.
- Farmer V, and Townsend G (1993) Crown size variability in the deciduous dentition of South Australian children. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* 5:681-690.
- Fields SJ, Spiers M, Hershkovitz I, and Livshits G (1995) Reliability of reliability coefficients in the estimation of asymmetry. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 96:83-87.
- Foster TD, Hamilton MC, and Lavelle GLB (1969) Dentition and dental arch dimensions in British children at the age of 2½ to 3 years. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 14:1031-1040.
- Gam SM, Lewis AB, Swindler DR, and Kerewsky RS (1967) Genetic control of sexual dimorphism in tooth size. *J. Dent. Res.* 46:963-972.
- Gam SM, Osborne RH, and McCabe KD (1979) The effect of prenatal factors on crown dimensions. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 51:665-678.
- Haeussler AM, Irish JD, Morris DH, and Turner II CG. (1989) Morphological and metrical comparison of San and Central Sotho dentitions from southern Africa. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 78:115-122.
- Harris E, and Bailit H (1988) A principal component analysis of human odontometrics. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 75: 87-99.
- Harzer W (1987) A hypothetical model of genetic control of tooth-crown growth in men. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 32:159-162.
- Hattab EN, Al-Khateeb S, and Sultan I (1996). Mesiodistal crown diameters of permanent teeth in Jordanians. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 41:641-645.
- Hunter WS, and Priest WR (1960) Errors and discrepancies in measurement of tooth size. *J. Dent. Res.* 39:405-414.
- Kieser JA (1990) Human Adult Odontometrics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LeBlanc SA, and Black B (1974) A long term trend in tooth size in the eastern Mediterranean. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 41:417-422.
- Lukacs JR, Joshi MR, and Makhija PG (1983) Crown dimensions of deciduous teeth of prehistoric and living populations of Western India. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 61:383-387.
- Lundström A (1969) Changes in crowding and spacing of teeth with age. *Dent. Pract.* 19:218-224.
- Lysell L, and Myrberg (1982) Mesiodistal tooth size in the deciduous and permanent dentition. *Eur. J. Orthod.* 4:113-122.
- Margette B, and Brown T (1978) Crown diameters of the deciduous teeth in Australian Aborigines. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 48:493-502.
- Moorrees CPA, and Reed RD (1964) Correlations among crown diameters of human teeth. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 9:685-697.

CROWN DIAMETERS OF DECIDUOUS TEETH IN JORDANIANS

- Moorrees CFA, Thomsen SO, Jensen E, and Yen PKJ (1957) Mesiodistal crown diameters of deciduous and permanent teeth. *J. Dent. Res.* 36:39-47.
- Ooshima T, Ishida R, Mishima K, and Sobue S (1996) The prevalence of developmental anomalies of teeth and their association with tooth size in the primary and permanent dentitions of 1650 Japanese children. *Int. J. Paediatr. Dent* 6:87-94.
- Perzigian AJ (1977) Fluctuating dental asymmetry variation among skeletal populations. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 47:81-88.
- Potter RHY, Alcazaren AB, Herbosa FM, and Tomaneng J (1981) Dimensional characteristics of the Filipino dentition. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 55:33-42.
- Potter RHY, and Nance WE (1976) A twin study of dental dimensions. I. Discordance, asymmetry, and mirror imagery. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 44:391-396.
- Schalk-van der Weide, Steen WHA, Beemer PA, and Bosam F (1994) Reductions in size and left-right asymmetry of teeth in human oligodontia. *Archs. Oral Biol.* 39:935-939.
- Sciulli PW (1990) Deciduous dentition of the late Archaic population of Ohio. *Hum. Biol.* 62:222-245.
- Stini WA (1985) Growth rates and sexual dimorphism in evolutionary perspective. In RI Gilbert Jr, and JH Mielke (eds.): *In: The Analysis of Prehistoric Diets*. London, Academic Press., pp. 191-226.
- Townsend GC, and Brown T (1978) Heritability of permanent tooth size. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 49:479-504.

A BRIEF COMMENT ON AN INTENTIONALLY MODIFIED TOOTH FROM THE RIO TALGUA REGION, NORTHEASTERN HONDURAS

NICHOLAS P. HERRMANN¹, DEREK C. BENEDIX¹, ANN M. SCOTT², AND VALERIE A. HASKINS³

¹Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0720, U.S.A.; ²Prewitt and Associates, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.; ³Department of Social Sciences, Adirondack Community College, Queensbury, New York, U.S.A..

ABSTRACT A single tooth from an ossuary cave in eastern Honduras was examined for the evidence of intentional modification. Using various microscopic methods, the authors did not observe linear striations associated with filing. However, characteristics consistent with normal masticatory processes were documented.

INTRODUCTION

Dental mutilation, also known as intentional dental modification, is an interesting cultural practice that has enjoyed a long and diverse history in many populations around the globe. Many explanations have been suggested for groups to artificially alter the morphology of their teeth. For instance, some researchers believe dental modifications are indicative of beautification (Rubin de la Borbolla, 1940; Romero, 1958; Fastlicht, 1976), ethnic markers, or tribal identification (van Reenen, 1978a,b, 1986; Handler, 1994), and social status (Fastlicht, 1948, 1976). For those interested, Milner and Larsen (1991) offer a detailed discussion of this practice.

Aside from these reasons for engaging in this interesting behavior, a fundamental question exists when considering intentional dental modification: What is the longevity of filing signature marks on modified teeth under masticatory function? Several authors have examined various methods for filing teeth (van Rippen, 1917; Havill, *et al.*, 1997). In a gross macroscopic example, van Rippen (1917) states that blades manufactured from obsidian were used to file or cut the incisal and mesial and/or distal margins of teeth in some prehistoric Mesoamerican populations. Havill and co-workers (1997) utilize scanning electron microscopy (SEM) to examine the signature marks left on intentionally modified teeth. Their study suggests that striations on the incisal borders of teeth are indicative of intentional filing.




Fig. 1. Modified tooth from Cueva de las Arañas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, we examined a modified mandibular incisor found in the vestibule of Cueva de las Arañas (Cave of the Spiders), an ossuary cave located in the Olancho Valley of northeastern Honduras near Catacamas. The cave is situated a few hundred meters from Cueva del Rio Talgua (Cave of the Glowing Skulls), an important ossuary cave discovered and investigated in 1994 and 1996 by Dr. James E. Brady of California State University-Los Angeles.