http://www.blackwellmunksgaard.com

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome: oral and craniofacial phenotypes

DL Domingo¹, MI Trujillo¹, SE Council¹, MA Merideth^{2,3}, LB Gordon⁴, T Wu¹, WJ Introne², WA Gahl², TC Hart¹

¹National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, Bethesda, MD, USA; ²National Human Genome Research Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA; ³Intramural Office of Rare Diseases, Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA; ⁴Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

OBJECTIVE: Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome (HGPS) is a rare early-onset accelerated senescence syndrome. In HGPS, a recently identified *de novo* dominant mutation of the lamin A gene (*LMNA*) produces abnormal lamin A, resulting in compromised nuclear membrane integrity. Clinical features include sclerotic skin, cardiovascular and bone abnormalities, and marked growth retardation. Craniofacial features include 'birdlike' facies, alopecia, craniofacial disproportion, and dental crowding. Our prospective study describes dental, oral soft tissue, and craniofacial bone features in HGPS.

METHODS: Fifteen patients with confirmed p.G608G LMNA mutation (1–17 years, seven males, eight females) received comprehensive oral evaluations. Anomalies of oral soft tissue, gnathic bones, and dentition were identified.

RESULTS: Radiographic findings included hypodontia (n = 7), dysmorphic teeth (n = 5), steep mandibular angles (n = 11), and thin basal bone (n = 11). Soft tissue findings included ogival palatal arch (n = 8), median sagittal palatal fissure (n = 7), and ankyloglossia (n = 7). Calculated dental ages (9 months to 11 years 2 months) were significantly lower than chronological ages (1 year 6 months to 17 years 8 months) (P = 0.002). Eleven children manifested a shorter mandibular body, anterior/posterior cranial base and ramus, but a larger gonial angle, compared to age/gender/race norms.

CONCLUSION: Novel oral-craniofacial phenotypes and quantification of previously reported features are presented. Our findings expand the HGPS phenotype and provide additional insight into the complex pathogenesis of HGPS.

Oral Diseases (2009) 15, 187-195

Received 20 March 2008; revised 7 May 2008; accepted 14 May 2008

Keywords: progeria; craniofacial; dentition; oral; phenotype

Introduction

Originally described more than 100 years ago, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome (HGPS, Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man #176670) is a rare (1 in 4–8 million births) genetic disorder characterized by a distinct aged appearance very early in life (Pollex and Hegele, 2004; Martin, 2005). Since 1886 fewer than 100 cases of HGPS have been reported, with approximately 40 cases currently diagnosed (Pollex and Hegele, 2004). From the Greek *geras*, meaning 'old age,' progeria is a human disease model of accelerated senescence. Affected children typically appear normal at birth but begin to demonstrate features of accelerated aging within the first year of life. Mean age at diagnosis is 2.9 years (Hennekam, 2006).

The inheritance of HGPS was once proposed to be autosomal recessive on account of affected individuals found in consanguineous families (Pollex and Hegele, 2004). However, cases of sporadic autosomal dominant inheritance were documented and eventually led to the isolation of the HGPS gene on chromosome 1q (Pollex and Hegele, 2004). Most cases of HGPS are caused by a de novo single-nucleotide substitution in codon 608 of prelamin A (p.G608G (GGC>GGT), p.G608S (GGC > AGC), leading to the mutated HGPS gene product lamin A (LMNA), a structural component of the nuclear membrane (Fong et al, 2004; Goldman et al, 2004). Lamin A contributes to nuclear structural integrity and chromatin regulatory mechanisms (Martin, 2005). The mutant form of lamin A, called progerin, acts in a dominant negative fashion (Goldman et al, 2004). While progerin is expressed at very low levels normally, it is expressed at much greater levels in HGPS (McClintock et al. 2007). Progerin accumulation in cells has been associated with instability of the nuclear membrane, progressive nuclear damage, and premature cell

Correspondence: Demetrio L. Domingo, DDS, MS, Clinical Research Core, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health, 10 Center Drive, Building 10 Room 1N-117 MSC 1191, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. Tel: (301) 594 9726, Fax: (301) 402 9885, E-mail: ddomingo@mail.nih.gov

mal gene product.

Clinically, the striking features of HGPS involve alterations in skin, bone, and cardiovascular tissues; affected children exhibit respiratory and cardiovascular capacities of senior citizens (Pollex and Hegele, 2004). Marked retardation of growth, loss of subcutaneous fat, and distinctive bone changes (i.e., resorption of the clavicles and replacement by fibrous tissue; osteolysis of the distal phalanges; and joint dislocations) are hallmark characteristics (Sarkar and Shinton, 2001). On average, death occurs at 13 years of age, most commonly from progressive coronary and cardiovascular atherosclerosis (Pollex and Hegele, 2004; Merideth et al, 2008).

death. Studies have shown structural nuclear abnormalities in 48% of HGPS fibroblast nuclei compared with

less than 6% of normal control cells (Pollex and Hegele,

2004: Paradisi et al. 2005). Furthermore, HGPS fibro-

blasts undergo hyperproliferation followed by rapid

apoptosis (Pollex and Hegele, 2004), demonstrating the

cellular processes in premature aging from this abnor-

Progeria oral craniofacial phenotypes

DL Domingo et al

The facial features are distinct and include prominent eyes and a beaked nose, resulting in the characteristic 'bird-like' facies which are often missing skin appendages such as eye lashes, eyebrows, and earlobes (Figure 1). Typical craniofacial features include alopecia with easy mapping of the scalp veins, micrognathia, and craniofacial disproportion (Pollex and Hegele, 2004). Deficiencies in the growth of both the maxilla and mandible have been described, as well as dental crowding, irregular teeth eruption, and localized areas of enamel hypoplasia (Wesley et al, 1979; Hasty and Vann, 1988; Yu and Zeng, 1991; Gordon et al, 2007). Significant delay in dental eruption has been noted, although data on permanent teeth eruption remain scarce (Hennekam, 2006). To date, a systematic assessment of oral, dental, and craniofacial phenotypes has not been conducted (Hennekam, 2006).

The objective of the present study was to further characterize the intraoral, dental, and craniofacial features in HGPS. We conducted a prospective examination of 15 HGPS patients, and now present detailed characteristics of dentition, oral soft tissues, and occlusal development, as well as of craniofacial features using cephalometric analyses. General characteristics of the 15 patients described here have been reported previously (Merideth et al. 2008).

Methods

Fifteen unrelated patients with confirmed p.G608G LMNA mutation, representing nearly half of all children currently diagnosed with HGPS (age range: 1 year 6 months to 17 years, 8 months; mean: 7 years 1 month \pm 4.29; median: 6 years 11 months; seven males, eight females), were referred for consultation to the dental clinic at the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, Bethesda, MD, as part of their participation in an IRB-approved natural history study at the National Human Genome Research Institute, Bethesda, MD. Parental-informed consent was obtained.

Oral mucosal and gingival tissues were evaluated for irregularities and presence of lesions, and significant findings were photographed. Symptomatic complaints involving oral structures were addressed.

Radiographic evaluations of teeth, gnathic bones, and surrounding structures were conducted using panoramic and lateral cephalometric radiographs (Planmeca[®] PM 2002 CC; Planmeca, Oy, Helsinki, Finland) as well as intraoral radiographs, as indicated. Due to difficulties in compliance, radiographic images were not obtained from patients younger than 3 years (n = 4).

Patients' dental charts and radiographic records were compared to standardized age ranges for the exfoliation of primary teeth and eruption of permanent teeth (Woelfel, 1990a). Tooth emergence was ascertained by direct inspection. A tooth was considered erupted if any portion of the crown was clinically visible. Chairside parental interviews were also conducted to assess the timing of primary and permanent teeth eruption, exfoliation of primary teeth, and history of primary teeth



Figure 1 Ten-year-old Caucasian male (a) and 5-year-old Caucasian female (b) with typical Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome facial features (i.e., loss of subcutaneous fat, beaked nose, missing eye lashes and eyebrows, alopecia with easy mapping of the scalp veins, absence of earlobes, and micrognathia)

extraction. Each patient's chronological age was compared to the calculated dental age based on the number of clinically visible erupted teeth, rounded to the nearest month, as described by Hagg and Taranger (1985). The presence of other dental anomalies (e.g., hypodontia, hyperdontia, taurodontism) was also noted.

In order to assess the role of tooth size in reported arch length insufficiencies, the mesiodistal crown widths (CW) of the mandibular permanent first molars were measured from panoramic radiographs. CW was determined as the maximum length of the line paralleling the cervical margins of teeth #19 and 30. CW dimensions of maxillary molars, mandibular second molars, and anterior teeth were not measured due to the difficulties in visualizing the mesiodistal crown margins from dental crowding and radiographic overlap of surrounding structures. Although a certain amount of magnification is inherent in panoramic radiographs, the focal trough the three-dimensional horse-shoe-shaped image layer in which structures are displayed most sharply – is characteristically wider in the posterior segments than in the anterior portions of the jaws (White and Pharoah, 2000). This allows for a greater range of variables that influence image definition in the posterior jaws, leading to less horizontal distortion of the posterior teeth. In addition, the brand of equipment used in this study allowed further adjustments of the focal trough to accommodate the jaw size and shape of HGPS patients; the same setting was used for all HGPS patients in this study.

Cephalometric radiographs were processed with digital tracing software (Dolphin[®] Imaging 9; Dolphin Imaging & Management Solutions, Chatsworth, CA, USA). Craniofacial measurements were analyzed with standardized cephalometric analyses (Scott:Rickets and Scott:Jarabak; Dolphin Imaging & Management Solutions) and compared with age, gender and race norms. Due to severe dental crowding and delayed teeth eruption in the majority of patients, which often precluded proper visualization of dental landmarks, occlusal relationships as defined by Angle's classification categories were not assessed.

Results

Alterations in dental development

Hypodontia, denoting the lack of development of one or more teeth excluding the third molars, was present in the majority of patients. Among subjects with available radiographs (n = 11, age: 5 years to 16 years 8 months), seven (64%) exhibited congenitally missing teeth, with the second permanent premolars (teeth #4, 13, 20, 29) most often missing (Table 1). The number of missing second premolars ranged from two to four. In addition, one patient (9-year 10-month-old Caucasian male) exhibited congenitally missing permanent maxillary lateral incisors (#7, 10) and a permanent maxillary second molar (#15). With reported normal prevalence of 3.5-6.5% (Zhu et al, 1996; Caldo-Teixeira and Puppin-Rontani, 2003; Nunn et al, 2003; Stephen and Cengiz, 2003), a significantly higher occurrence of hypodontia was found in our HGPS patients (binomial proportion test, exact two-sided $P = 2.56 \times 10^{-6}$).

The following normative CW measurements for mandibular first molars were reported by Woelfel: range = 9.8–14.5 mm, combined mean for teeth #19 and 30 = 11.4 mm (Woelfel, 1990b). Although most of the HGPS CWs for mandibular permanent first molars measured within published normal ranges (Table 2), the HGPS CW means (12.6 mm for tooth #19, 12.5 mm for tooth 30) were statistically larger (*t*-test P = 0.0169 and 0.0043 for teeth #19 and 30, respectively) than controls.

Aberrant tooth morphologies were noted radiographically. Constriction of the cervical portion of the maxillary and mandibular molars, resulting in bulbous crowns and relatively slender roots, were

 Table 1 Dental development and occlusion in HGPS

Patient	Gender	Race	Chronological age	Dental age	Congenitally missing teeth	Dysmorphic teeth	Retained deciduous teeth	Delayed deciduous teeth	Delayed permanent teeth	Double row
1	М	Hisp	17 years 8 months	11 years 2 months		#2, 15	Y (1)		Y (11)	
2	F	Hisp	12 years 2 months	2 years 4 months		#2, 15	Y (20)		Y (24)	
3	Μ	Cauc	10 years 1 month	6 years 11 months		#2, 15	Y (4)		Y (7)	Y
4	Μ	Cauc	9 years 10 months	6 years 11 months	#7, 10, 15, 20, 29		Y (3)		Y (6)	Y
5	Μ	Cauc	9 years 5 months	1 year 11 months	#4, 13, 20, 29	#2, 3, 14	Y (8)	Y (4)	Y (12)	
6	F	Cauc	8 years 7 months	2 years 4 months	#20, 29		Y (8)		Y (8)	
7	Μ	Cauc	8 years	2 years 4 months	#20, 29	#2, 15	Y (5)		Y (8)	Y
8	F	Hisp	6 years 11 months	2 years 4 months	#4, 13, 29					
9	Μ	Hisp	6 years 10 months	Unknown		b	b	b	Y (2)	b
10	F	Cauc	5 years 8 months	2 years 4 months	#4, 13, 20, 29					
11	F	Cauc	5 years	2 years 4 months	#4, 13, 20, 29					
12	F	Cauc	2 years 3 months	1 year 7 months	а			Y (7)		
13	F	Cauc	2 years 1 month	1 year 7 months	а			Y (6)		
14	Μ	Cauc	1 year 9 months	9 months	а			Y (19)		
15	F	Cauc	1 year 6 months	9 months	а			Y (5)		

HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; F, female; M, male; Hisp, Hispanic; Cauc, Caucasian. Y, positive finding (numbers in parentheses indicate known quantities).

^aNo radiographs available.

^bPremature extraction of deciduous teeth due to decay.

Table 2 Mesiodistal crown widths (CW) of mandibular permanent first molars (mm)

			Mana first r	libular nolars
Patient	Age	Gender	#19	#30
1	17 years 8 months	М	16	13
2	12 years 2 months	F	11	13
3	10 years 1 month	Μ	13	14
4	9 years 10 months	М	12	12
5	9 years 5 months	М	12	12
6	8 years 7 months	F	12	13
7	8 years	М	13	14
8	6 years 11 months	F	14	12
9	6 years 10 months	М	13	11
10	5 years 8 months	F	11	13
11	5 years	F	12	11
Mean	3 • • • •		12.6	12.5

observed in some of the older patients (i.e., patients with visible root development; n = 5, three males, two females, age: 8 years to 17 years 8 months) (Figures 2 and 3). Dysmorphic maxillary permanent second molars, characterized by an asymmetrical crown with a pronounced mesial cervical curvature and marked protrusion of the mesial cusp, were found in five older patients (four males, one female, age: 8 years to 17 years 8 months) (Figures 2 and 3). Although much variation had been found in the normal morphology of maxillary second molars, the mesial cusps of HGPS second molars were recognizably longer than the distal cusps, giving the occlusal surface a dramatic mesial-todistant slant and an asymmetrical pulp chamber. One patient (9-year 5-month-old Caucasian male) exhibited similarly dysmorphic maxillary permanent first molars. Of note is the pronounced distal tilting of most maxillary molars, with several in near-horizontal displacement (Figure 3).

Alterations in dental eruption

Based on the number of clinically emerged teeth, dental age values were calculated for all but one patient (6-year 10-month-old Hispanic male with premature extractions of deciduous teeth due to decay) (Table 1). All calculated dental ages (range: 9 months to 11 years 2 months, mean: 4 years 5 months, median: 2 years 4 months) were significantly lower (paired *t*-test P = 0.0002) than their corresponding chronological ages (range: 1 year 6 months to 17 years 8 months, mean: 7 years 2 months, median: 6 years 11 months) (Table 1).

All patients were at least partially dentulous. Among those between 6 and 12 years – the mixed dentition period (n = 8) – six (75%) remained in deciduous dentition. Even the study's oldest patient (17-year 8month-old Hispanic male) remained in mixed dentition. Three patients exhibited 'double rows' of teeth where succedaneous teeth erupted lingual of the deciduous teeth (Figure 4a). Radiographically, four other patients exhibited absence of root resorption in deciduous anterior teeth, subsequently delaying the eruption of succedaneous teeth (Figure 2).

In all patients over age 2 (n = 13), dental crowding was observed in both deciduous and permanent teeth, exhibiting lingual rotation and lingual displacement of maxillary and mandibular anterior teeth.

Oral soft tissue findings

Variations from normal palatal morphology were prevalent. Due to difficulties in visualization, palatal forms were not addressed in three patients (Table 3). Among those examined, eight patients (67%, age range: 2 years 3 months to 12 years 2 months, four males, four females) demonstrated an ogival palatal vault (Figure 4b,c). Seven of these patients (88%) developed a median surface fissure that spanned the hard palate sagitally (Figure 4b,c). In four of these patients, the maxillary teeth formed a triangular arch (Figure 4). Only the youngest of these patients (2-year 3-month-old Caucasian female) did not manifest a median sagittal palatal fissure.

Ankyloglossia, a developmental anomaly of the tongue characterized by a short, thick lingual frenum that limits tongue mobility, was found in seven of the fourteen examined patients (50%; age range: 10 years 1 month to 1 year 9 months; six males, one female) (Table 3, Figure 4d). With reported normal population prevalence ranging from 1.7% to 2.4% (Neville *et al*,



Figure 2 Eight-year-old Caucasian male with Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome demonstrating a hypoplastic mandible with a steep mandibular angle, delayed dental eruption, delayed root resorption of deciduous anteriors, congenitally missing mandibular permanent second premolars, dysmorphic maxillary permanent molars, and bulbous mandibular molar crowns

Progeria oral craniofacial phenotypes DL Domingo et al



Figure 3 Seventeen-year-old Hispanic Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome male demonstrating dysmorphic maxillary molars with pronounced distal tilting of the second molars (**a**, **b**)

Figure 4 Clinical oral findings in Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome (HGPS). (a) Tenyear-old HGPS male exhibiting 'double rows' of maxillary teeth. (b, c). HGPS patients manifesting an ogival palatal vault and a midline sagittal palatal fissure. (d) Ankyloglossia in an 8-year-old HGPS male

Table 3 Palatal and other oral soft tissue findings in HGPS

Patient	Gender	Race	Chronological age	Palatal vault form	Maxillary arch form	Median palatal fissure	Ankyloglossia
1	М	Hisp	17 years 8 months	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
2	F	Hisp	12 years 2 months	Ogival	Curved	Y	
3	М	Cauc	10 years 1 month	Ogival	Triangular	Y	Y
4	М	Cauc	9 years 10 month	Ogival	Curved	Y	Y
5	М	Cauc	9 years 5 months	Ogival	Triangular	Y	Y
6	F	Cauc	8 years 7 months	Ogival	Triangular	Y	
7	М	Cauc	8 years	Dome-shaped	Curved		Y
8	F	Hisp	6 years 11 months	Ogival	Curved	Y	
9	М	Hisp	6 years 10 months	Ogival	а	Y	Y
10	F	Cauc	5 years 8 months	Dome-shaped	Curved		
11	F	Cauc	5 years	Dome-shaped	Curved		
12	F	Cauc	2 years 3 months	Ogival	Triangular		Y
13	F	Cauc	2 years 1 month	Unknown	Unknown		
14	М	Cauc	1 year 9 months	Dome-shaped	b		Y
15	F	Cauc	1 year 6 months	Unknown	b		

HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; F, female; M, male; Hisp, Hispanic; Cauc, Caucasian; Y, positive finding. ^aPremature extraction of deciduous teeth due to decay.

^bOnly three deciduous teeth erupted.

2002a), ankyloglossia was exceedingly more prevalent in our HGPS group [exact test (two-sided) $P = 2.71 \times 10^{-8}$]. Reported to be four times more common in males than in females, ankyloglossia was also more prevalent in HGPS males (86%) than in females (14%).

Radiographic findings Panographic findings

In addition to dental dysmorphisms, panographic evaluation yielded universally hypoplastic mandibles with a steep mandibular angle (Figure 2). The condylar processes were positioned inferiorly and posteriorly,

Progeria oral craniofacial phenotypes DL Domingo et al

creating the impression that the mandible was bowing in the inferior-posterior plane. The permanent teeth appeared enlarged in proportion to the gnathic bones, with the mandibular molars encased deep inside the rami and high in the coronoid processes. Basal bone height (i.e., bone inferior to the mandibular canal) appeared universally thin, with the developing root apices in near contact with the inferior cortical border. Pronounced curvature of the maxilla was also observed. The distally tilted permanent molars overlapped the posterior maxillary border, often obliterating this anatomic landmark.

Cephalometric analyses

Measurements of mandibular body length (Go-Gn) were consistently smaller than the age, gender, and race norms, with standard deviations (SD) ranging from -5.6 to -13.3 (Figure 5). For ramus height (Ar-Go), SD ranged from -5.6 to -9.5. The gonial (jaw) angle (Ar-Go-Me) was increased in all HGPS patients (SD range: 0.8-5.9) (Table 4).

Measurement of the cranial base found a smaller saddle/sella angle (SN-Ar) in 8 of 11 patients (73%; SD range: -0.5 to -13.5) and increased in three patients (27%; range: 0.3-3.1). Measurement of the anterior and posterior bases yielded universally shorter lengths in HGPS compared to norms (Table 4).

The proportion between ramal height and mandibular body length was also calculated ([Ar-Go/Go-Gn] × 100). As shown in Table 4, the proportions (0.61–0.68) in four patients (one male, three females, age: 5 years 8 months to 8 years 7 months) were similar to the 2:3 ratio found in normal populations (Costaras-Volarich and Pruzansky, 1984); however, in five patients (three males, two females, age: 5 years to 16 years 8 months) the proportion approached a 1:2 ratio (0.44–0.54). In addition, one patient (9-year 10-month-old Caucasian male) demonstrated a dramatically shorter ramus than mandibular body (0.35 ratio) whereas another (9-year 5-month-old Caucasian male) had a higher-than-normal ramal height:mandibular body length ratio (0.77).



Figure 5 Cephalometric measurements on a 12-year-old Hispanic Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome female

Discussion

This prospective study confirmed several craniofacial and dental findings previously noted in HGPS, and also identified novel findings. Cephalometric analyses guantified the marked retardation of gnathic bone growth universally present in our patients, as evidenced by the lack of anteroposterior and vertical development of both maxilla and mandible. The retrognathic facial appearance seemed to have resulted from the invariably obtuse gonial (jaw) angle, the steep mandibular plane angle, and the lack of development of the pogonion (boney chin). Anterior-posteriorly, the enlarged jaw angles rendered an inferior-posterior bowing appearance to the mandible. Disproportions in the lengths of the ramus and mandibular body were also calculated. Although the proportions in four patients (0.61-0.68)were similar to the 2:3 ratio reported as normative values, in five patients these approached a 1:2 ratio (0.44–0.54). These normal to smaller-than-normal ratios suggest that in some, retardation of the ramal segments may be even more pronounced than retardation of the anterior mandible. These measurements followed no age correlation.

Our cephalometric measurements provided a basis for interpreting several dental findings. As dental crowding and malocclusion are commonly associated with tooth size and arch-length discrepancies, the insufficient jaw sizes observed in HGPS – illustrated by minimal basal bone, dislocation of mandibular teeth in the coronoids and rami, and distal tilting of maxillary molars – may have predisposed to delayed dental eruption, dental crowding, and malocclusion. Accordingly, calculated dental ages were significantly lower than chronological ages (paired *t*-test P = 0.0002), with the mean HGPS dental age.

The significantly wider mandibular first molar crowns may have further compounded the tooth size-arch length discrepancy. The images of these wider-thannormal mandibular crowns, as well as the constriction at the cervical portions in both maxillary and mandibular molars, rendered these crowns a bulbous appearance (Figure 2) resembling those seen in dentinogenesis imperfecta (DI) (White and Pharoah, 2000; Neville *et al*, 2003). Unlike DI, however, obliteration of pulp chambers and canals was not observed in HGPS. As the buccolingual dimension of these teeth could not be assessed radiographically, it remains to be seen whether a positive correlation exists between the mesiolingual and buccolingual diameters, which may further contribute to dental crowding.

With varying strengths of correlation, numerous hereditary syndromes have been associated with hypodontia (e.g., ectodermal dysplasia, Down, Crouzon, Turner, cranio-oculo-dental), with genetic, environmental and epigenetic factors exerting strong influences on tooth development (Neville *et al*, 2002b). Hypodontia correlates with the absence of appropriate dental lamina, a condition that is genetically controlled as well as highly sensitive to external stimuli (e.g., trauma, infection, chemotherapeutics, and endocrine disturbances)

Conjurgive angle (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A)	Parameter	Ι	DN	2	DN	ŝ	DN	4	DN	S	DN	6	DN	7	DN	~	DN	6	DN	10	DN	II	DN
Madelicitation B3 -133 152 -124 123 -124 188 -105 122 -12 134 -11 11.1 -12.3 133 -118 Rame beight (Ar-G0) (mm) 8.4 -9.5 7.4 -8.2 6.5 11.5 -5.6 8.2 -6.8 10.2 -5.8 7.7 -6.4 7.5 -6 5.8 -6.2 Rame beight (ovalve (orm) 8.4 -9.5 7.4 -8.2 6.5 8.2 -6.8 10.2 -5.8 0.5 0.6 5.8 -6.2 13.2 -14.7 2.7 -6.4 7.5 -6.6 2.8 -6.2 -6.8 0.4 -15.2 -16.4 -15.2 -16.4 13.2 -14.7 27 -15.2 10.4 -15.2 Americe field 0.2 -14.1 23.2 -18.4 21.8 -17 23 -16.7 31.2 -16.7 31.2 -15.2 -16.7 31.2 -15.2 -16.7 31.2 -16.7	Gonial/jaw angle (Ar-Go-Me) (°)	152	5.7	157	5.9	153	4.9	147	4	155	4.1	138	1.4	158	4.6	155	4.7	128	0.8	140	1.6	138	1.2
Ramus height (Ar-Go) (mm) 8.4 -95 7.4 -82 6.7 -7.7 4.3 -6.5 8 -6.8 10.2 -5.8 7.7 -6.4 7.5 -6 5.8 -6.2 Ramus/madibular body length ratio 0.47 0.49 0.54 0.35 0.77 0.61 0.65 0.5 0.68 0.44 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -25.5 -16.7 31.2 -147 27 -15.5 192 -16 21.4 -15.5 Nowley empirison 106 -31 56.5 -16.7 18.6 -8.9 14.3 -10.4 11.5 -16.7 18.6 -19.2 16.7 -15.5 16.7 16.7 </td <td>Mandibular body length (Go-Gn) (mm)</td> <td>18.3</td> <td>-13.3</td> <td>15.2</td> <td>-12.4</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>-12.3</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>-12</td> <td>10.4</td> <td>-12.4</td> <td>18.8</td> <td>-10.5</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>-12</td> <td>15.8</td> <td>-11</td> <td>15.4</td> <td>-11</td> <td>11.1</td> <td>-12.3</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>-11.8</td>	Mandibular body length (Go-Gn) (mm)	18.3	-13.3	15.2	-12.4	12.3	-12.3	12.2	-12	10.4	-12.4	18.8	-10.5	12.2	-12	15.8	-11	15.4	-11	11.1	-12.3	13.3	-11.8
Ramue/mandibular Ramue/mandibular 0.47 0.49 0.54 0.35 0.77 0.61 0.67 0.65 0.5 0.68 0.44 body length ratio 0.47 0.49 0.54 0.35 0.77 0.61 0.67 0.65 0.5 0.68 0.44 Anterior face height 28.3 -199 26.7 -18.4 21.8 -17 23 -16.6 32 -14.7 27 -15.5 19.2 -16 21.4 -15.2 Posterior face height 16.2 -14.1 23.2 -10.4 11.3 -11.8 9.7 -9.2 12.4 -10.7 18.6 -8.9 14.3 -10.4 17.5 -9 13.7 -9.7 11.6 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 Sold lescella angle 199 -31 56.5 -13.5 121 -0.5 11.5 -1.6 13.6 -1.8 21.4 -1.5 19.7 14.1 21.1 -31 4.1 21.8 -1.5 <td< td=""><td>Ramus height (Ar-Go) (mm)</td><td>8.4</td><td>-9.5</td><td>7.4</td><td>-8.2</td><td>6.7</td><td>L.T.</td><td>4.3</td><td>-6.5</td><td>×</td><td>-6.8</td><td>11.5</td><td>-5.6</td><td>8.2</td><td>-6.8</td><td>10.2</td><td>-5.8</td><td><i>T.T</i></td><td>-6.4</td><td>7.5</td><td>9</td><td>5.8</td><td>-6.2</td></td<>	Ramus height (Ar-Go) (mm)	8.4	-9.5	7.4	-8.2	6.7	L.T.	4.3	-6.5	×	-6.8	11.5	-5.6	8.2	-6.8	10.2	-5.8	<i>T.T</i>	-6.4	7.5	9	5.8	-6.2
Anterior face height (NaMe) (mm) 28.3 -199 26.7 -18.7 21.7 -18.4 21.8 -17 23 -16.6 31.2 -14.7 27 -15.5 19.2 -16 21.4 -15.2 Posterior face height (Sgo) (mm) 16.2 -14.1 23.2 -10.4 11.3 -11.8 9.7 -9.2 12.4 -10.7 18.6 -89 14.3 -10.4 17.5 -9.7 11.6 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.5 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.9 -9.5 9.7 -9.1 14.0 11.4 -2.1 4.9 -1.6 13.6 2.4 121 -0.6 120 -9.9 13.7 -1.4 10 -7.6 21.1 -0.7 11.4 -2.1 140 3.1 Anterior cranial base 20.4 -16.8 0.1 -22.4 15.5 -16.2 14.4 -18.8	Ramus/mandibular body length ratio	0.47		0.49		0.54		0.35		0.77		0.61		0.67		0.65		0.5		0.68		0.44	
Posterior face height (Sgo) (mm) $1_{6,2} -1_{4,1} 2_{3,2} -1_{0,4} 1_{1,3} -1_{1,8} 9_{,7} -9_{,2} 1_{2,4} -1_{0,7} 1_{8,6} -8_{,9} 1_{4,3} -1_{0,4} 1_{7,5} -9 1_{3,7} -9_{,7} 1_{1,6} -9_{,5} 9_{,9} -9_{,5}$ Saddle/sella angle $1_{6,2} -1_{4,1} 2_{3,5} -1_{3,5} 1_{2,1} -0_{,5} 1_{1,5} -1_{6} 1_{3,6} 2_{,4} 1_{21} -0_{,6} 1_{20} -0_{,9} 1_{25} 0_{,3} 1_{21} -0_{,7} 1_{14} -2_{,1} 1_{40} 3_{,1}$ Anterior cranial base $2_{0,4} -1_{6,8} 0_{,1} -2_{2,4} 1_{5} -1_{6,9} 1_{4,2} -1_{6,3} 1_{5,2} -1_{8,6} 2_{1,6} -1_{6,2} 1_{4,4} -1_{8,8} 2_{1,5} -1_{3,9} 1_{7,7} -1_{5,1} 1_{4,7} -1_{8,1} 1_{3,9} -1_{8,3}$ Posterior cranial base $2_{0,4} -1_{6,8} 0_{,1} -2_{2,4} 1_{5} -1_{6,9} 1_{4,2} -1_{6,3} 1_{5,2} -1_{8,6} 2_{1,6} -1_{6,2} 1_{4,4} -1_{8,8} 2_{1,5} -1_{3,9} 1_{7,7} -1_{5,1} 1_{4,7} -1_{8,1} 1_{3,9} -1_{8,3}$ Posterior cranial base $3_{7} -7_{6} 2_{1,1} -3_{7} 5_{,1} -7_{7} 5_{,6} -5_{,6} 6_{,2} -6_{,1} 8_{,1} -5_{,4} 7_{,5} -5_{,8} 8_{,9} -5_{,9} 6_{,2} -6_{,6} 4_{,7} -6 4_{,9} -5_{,9}$ Posterior cranial base $3_{7} -7_{6} 2_{1,1} -3_{7} 5_{,1} -7_{7} 5_{,6} -5_{,6} 6_{,2} -6_{,1} 8_{,1} -5_{,4} 7_{,5} -5_{,8} 8_{,9} -5_{,9} 6_{,2} -6_{,6} 4_{,7} -6 4_{,9} -5_{,9} 6_{,9} -5_{,9} 6_{,2} -6_{,6} 4_{,7} -6_{,7} 4_{,9} -5_{,9} 6_{,7} 6_{,6} 6_{,7} -6_{,7} 6$	Anterior face height (NaMe) (mm)	28.3	-19.9	26.7	-18.7	22.7	-18.4	21.8	-17	23	-16.6	32	-14.2	22.5	-16.7	31.2	-14.7	27	-15.5	19.2	-16	21.4	-15.2
Saddle/sella angle(SN-Ar) (°) 109 -3.1 5.5 -13.5 121 -0.5 115 -1.6 136 2.4 121 -0.6 120 -0.9 125 0.3 121 -0.7 114 -2.1 140 3.1 Anterior cranial base 20.4 -16.8 0.1 -22.4 15 -16.9 14.2 -16.3 15.2 -18.6 21.6 -16.2 14.4 -18.8 21.5 -13.9 17.7 -15.1 14.7 -18.1 13.9 -18.3 Posterior cranial base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 -7.4 5.6 6.2 -6.1 8.1 -5.4 7.5 -5.8 8.9 -5.9 6.2 -6.6 4.9 -5.9 base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 -7.4 5.6 6.2 -6.1 8.1 -5.4 7.5 -5.8 8.9 -5.9 6.2 -6.6 4.9 -5.9 base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 -7.4 5.6 6.2 -6.1 8.1 -5.4 7.5 -5.8 8.9 -5.9 6.2 -6.6 4.9 -5.9 base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 6.2 -6.6 4.7 -6 4.9 -5.9 tumbers 1-11 are patient numbers. HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; DN, deviation from norm (Black SD ≤ 1.5 <t< td=""><td>Posterior face height (Sgo) (mm)</td><td>16.2</td><td>-14.1</td><td>23.2</td><td>-10.4</td><td>11.3</td><td>-11.8</td><td>9.7</td><td>-9.2</td><td>12.4</td><td>-10.7</td><td>18.6</td><td>-8.9</td><td>14.3</td><td>-10.4</td><td>17.5</td><td>6</td><td>13.7</td><td>-9.7</td><td>11.6</td><td>-9.5</td><td>9.6</td><td>-9.5</td></t<>	Posterior face height (Sgo) (mm)	16.2	-14.1	23.2	-10.4	11.3	-11.8	9.7	-9.2	12.4	-10.7	18.6	-8.9	14.3	-10.4	17.5	6	13.7	-9.7	11.6	-9.5	9.6	-9.5
Anterior cranial base (SN) (mm) 20.4 -16.8 0.1 -22.4 15 -16.9 14.2 -16.3 15.2 -18.6 21.6 -16.2 14.4 -18.8 21.5 -13.9 17.7 -15.1 14.7 -18.1 13.9 -18.3 Posterior cranial base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 -7.4 5.6 -5.6 6.2 -6.1 8.1 -5.4 7.5 -5.8 8.9 -5.9 6.2 -6.6 4.7 -6 4.9 -5.9 tumbers 1-11 are patient numbers. HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; DN, deviation from norm (Black SD ≤ 1 , Green SD $1 \leq 2$, Blue SD $> 2 \leq 3$, Red SD >3); Ar (articular sterior border of neck of condyle; Go (gonion), most convex point along the inferior border of the ramus; Me (menton), most inferior point of the symphysis; Gn (gnathion), most inferior idpoint on soft tissue contour of the chin located at the level of hard tissue mentor; Na (nasion), intersection of the internasal suture with the nasofrontal suture in the midsagittal plane; S (sells net of the pituitary fossa of the sphenoid bone; SN, line that connects the midpoint of sella turcica with nasion.	Saddle/sella angle (SN-Ar) (°)	109	-3.1	56.5	-13.5	121	-0.5	115	-1.6	136	2.4	121	-0.6	120	6.0-	125	0.3	121	-0.7	114	-2.1	140	3.1
Posterior cranial base (S-Ar) (mm) 8.7 -7.6 21.1 -3.7 5.1 -7.4 5.6 6.2 -5.6 6.2 -6.1 8.1 -5.4 7.5 -5.8 8.9 -5.9 6.2 -6.6 4.7 -6 4.9 -5.9 tumbers 1–11 are patient numbers. HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; DN, deviation from norm (Black SD ≤ 1 , Green SD $1 \leq 2$, Blue SD $> 2 \leq 3$, Red SD >3); Ar (articular osterior border of neck of condyle; Go (gonion), most convex point along the inferior border of the ramus; Me (menton), most inferior point of the symphysis; Gn (gnathion), most inferior idpoint on soft tissue contour of the chin located at the level of hard tissue menton; Na (nasion), intersection of the internasal suture with the nasofrontal suture in the midsagittal plane; S (sella of the pituitary fossa of the sphenoid bone; SN, line that connects the midpoint of sella turcica with nasion.	Anterior cranial base (SN) (mm)	20.4	-16.8	0.1	-22.4	15	-16.9	14.2	-16.3	15.2	-18.6	21.6	-16.2	14.4	-18.8	21.5	-13.9	17.7	-15.1	14.7	-18.1	13.9	-18.3
umbers 1–11 are patient numbers. HGPS, Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; DN, deviation from norm (Black SD ≤ 1 , Green SD $1 \leq 2$, Blue SD $> 2 \leq 3$, Red SD > 3); Ar (articulare osterior border of neck of condyle; Go (gonion), most convex point along the inferior border of the ramus; Me (menton), most inferior, most convex point along the inferior border of the internasal suture with the nasofrontal suture in the midsagittal plane; S (sells indpoint of the pituitary fossa of the sphenoid bone; SN, line that connects the midpoint of sella turcica with nasion.	Posterior cranial base (S-Ar) (mm)	8.7	-7.6	21.1	-3.7	5.1	-7.4	5.6	-5.6	6.2	-6.1	8.1	-5.4	7.5	-5.8	8.9	-5.9	6.2	-6.6	4.7	9-	4.9	-5.9
	Numbers 1–11 are patie: osterior border of neck nidpoint on soft tissue c	nt numl c of con ontour	bers. HC Idyle; Go of the ch	JPS, Hu o (gonic nin locat noid bo	ntchinso. on), mos ed at th ne; SN,	n-Gilfor it conve e level o line tha	rd proge x point of hard ti ut conne	ria sync along tl issue me cts the 1	lrome; I he inferi anton; N nidpoin	DN, dev or bord a (nasic t of sell	viation f ler of th on), inte a turcic	rom no le ramu rsection a with 1	rm (Black) s; Me (1 of the i nasion.	ck SD ≤ nenton) nternas	1, Gre, mostal suture	en SD inferior e with tl	$1 \leq 2, B$ point of he nasof	due SD of the sy frontal s	 > 2 ≤ 3 /mphysi wture ir 	3, Red is; Gn ithe m	SD > 3 (gnathic idsagitt	; Ar (a n), mos l plane	rticular st infer ; S (sell

Table 4 Cephalometric values and analyses of 11 HGPS patients

Progeria oral craniofacial phenotypes DL Domingo et al

(Neville et al, 2002b). After the third molars, the most frequently missing permanent teeth are the second premolars and lateral incisors (Zhu et al, 1996; Caldo-Teixeira and Puppin-Rontani, 2003: Nunn et al. 2003: Stephen and Cengiz, 2003). In agreement with previous reports on HGPS, a significantly higher prevalence of congenitally missing permanent second premolars (64%) vs 3.5-6.5% in normal population) was found in our study. Classified according to severity, all HGPS patients with hypodontia manifested the 'mild-to-moderate' form (denoting the non-development of twoto-five teeth, with 'severe hypodontia' indicating the absence of six or more teeth) (Dharajani, 2002). It should be noted that overlap of radiographic structures in the maxillary arch often precluded visualization of teeth or developing tooth buds, suggesting that the true prevalence of hypodontia in this group may have been underestimated.

Similarly, our assessment of tooth eruption based on the presence of any portion of clinical crowns, either partial or complete, may have underestimated the degree of delay in dental eruption. Radiographic findings indicate irregularities in both crown and root development (Figures 2 and 3), suggesting that, in addition to insufficient jaw growth, abnormal tooth development may play a direct role in the dental anomalies noted clinically. Although the factors controlling tooth development remain incompletely understood, we have determined that LMNA is expressed in developing mice molars (S.J. Choi, unpublished data). Additionally, LMNA is expressed in cDNA libraries from developing human teeth and from human palatal tissues (S.J. Choi, I. Alevizos, unpublished data). Characterization of LMNA expression in specific stages of dental crown and root development may further elucidate the direct role of LMNA in root formation and dental eruption, and subsequently determine how LMNA mutations contribute to the observed dental anomalies. Studies of other laminopathies (i.e., restrictive dermatopathy, mandibuloacral dysplasia, Werner syndrome) have also indicated the presence of dental abnormalities (Mau et al, 1997; Uhrhammer et al, 2006). Characterization of these dental anomalies may add to the knowledge of oral involvement in laminopathies, and help distinguish HPGS from other genetic disorders associated with this gene.

Several oral soft tissue characteristics were noted. Ogival palatal vaults were twice as prevalent in HGPS as the normative dome-shaped palate. Except for the youngest patient, all with ogival vaults developed a median sagittal fissure along the palatal gingiva, suggesting that maxillary growth constriction may have predisposed to this soft tissue alteration. Similar to dental crowding, the cephalometric measurements provided a framework for interpreting some oral soft tissue characteristics. Constriction of maxillary growth seemed consistent with previously reported craniofacial alterations, such as the viscerocranium becoming small relative to the neurocranium over time, often resulting in prominently flared ears (Hennekam, 2006).

Another novel finding was the presence of ankyloglossia (tongue-tie) in these HGPS patients. In the general population, the severities of ankyloglossia range from mild cases with limited significance to rare examples of complete fusion of the tongue to the floor of the mouth. The prevalence of ankyloglossia in our HGPS group – all manifesting the mild form – was significantly higher than in the normal population [exact test (twosided) $P = 2.71 \times 10^{-8}$] and was found to have no age correlation. In the general population, reported clinical consequences include the development of anterior open bite, difficulties during infant feeding and swallowing, and speech problems (Ruffoli et al, 2005).

Summary

Hypodontia, delayed dental eruption, and craniofacial alterations in HGPS had been reported from case studies and through empirical observations. Our study provided quantitative details to these observations and suggested mechanisms explaining these characteristics. In addition, novel phenotypic features (i.e., dental dysmorphologies, oral soft tissue anomalies) were described in detail. By contributing to the HGPS phenotype database, our observations may allow anticipation of problems related to oral and craniofacial structures (e.g., increased caries rate, severe malocclusion), hasten the implementation of treatment, and shed additional light on the complex pathogenesis of this disorder.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the intramural programs of NIDCR and NHGRI, NIH. We thank the children with progeria, their families, and The Progeria Research Foundation Diagnostics Program (Peabody, MA) for their participation in this study.

References

- Caldo-Teixeira AS, Puppin-Rontani RM (2003). Management of severe partial hypodontia: case report. J Clin Pediatr Dent 27: 133-136.
- Costaras-Volarich M, Pruzansky S (1984). Is the mandible intrinsically different in Apert and Crouzon syndromes? Am J Orthod 85: 475-487.
- Dharajani PJ (2002). Hypodontia: etiology, clinical features, and management. Quintessence Int 33: 294-302.
- Fong LG, Ng JK, Meta M et al (2004). Heterozygosity for Lmna deficiency eliminates the progeria-like phenotypes in Zmpste24-deficient mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 101: 18111-18116.
- Goldman RD, Shumaker DK, Erdos MR et al (2004). Accumulation of mutant lamin A causes progressive changes in nuclear architecture in Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 101: 8963-8968.
- Gordon LB, McCarten KM, Giobbie-Hurder A et al (2007). Disease progression in Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome: impact on growth and development. *Pediatrics* 120: 824-833.
- Hagg U, Taranger J (1985). Dental development, dental age and tooth counts. Angle Orthod 55: 93-107.
- Hasty MF, Vann WF (1988). Progeria in a pediatric dental patient: literature review and case report. Pediatr Dent 10: 314-319.

- Hennekam RC (2006). Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome: review of the phenotype. *Am J Med Genet A* **140A**: 2603–2624.
- Martin GM (2005). Genetic modulation of senescent phenotypes in *Homo sapiens. Cell* **120**: 523–532.
- Mau U, Kendziorra H, Kaiser P (1997). Restrictive dermopathy: report and review. *Am J Med Genet* **71:** 179–185.
- McClintock D, Ratner D, Lokuge M *et al* (2007). The mutant form of lamin A that causes Hutchinson-Gilford progeria is a biomarker of cellular aging in human skin. *PLoS ONE* 2: e1269.
- Merideth MA, Gordon LB, Clauss S *et al* (2008). Phenotype and course of Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome. *N Engl J Med* **358**: 592–604.
- Neville BW, Damm DD, Allen CM, Bouquot JE, eds (2002a). Developmental defects of the oral and maxillofacial region. *Oral & maxillofacial pathology*. 2nd edn. WB Saunders Co.: Philadelphia, pp. 1–48.
- Neville BW, Damm DD, Allen CM, Bouquot JE, eds (2002b). Abnormalities of teeth. *Oral & maxillofacial pathology*. 2nd edn. WB Saunders Co.: Philadelphia, pp. 49–106.
- Neville BW, Damm DD, White DK (2003). Dentinogenesis imperfecta (hereditary opalescent dentin, capdepont teeth). In: Neville BW, Damm DD, Allen CM, Bouquot JE, eds. *Color atlas of clinical oral pathology*. 2nd edn. BC Decker Inc.: Hamilton, ON, pp. 49–106.
- Nunn JH, Carter NE, Gillgrass TJ et al (2003). The interdisciplinary management of hypodontia: background and role of paediatric dentistry. Br Dent J **194**: 245–251.
- Paradisi M, McClintock D, Boguslavsky RL *et al* (2005). Dermal fibroblasts in Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome with the lamin A G608G mutation have dysmorphic nuclei and are hypersensitive to heat stress. *BMC Cell Biol* **6**: 27.

- Pollex RL, Hegele RA (2004). Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome. *Clin Genet* **66**: 375–381.
- Ruffoli R, Giambelluca MA, Scavuzzo MC *et al* (2005). Ankyloglossia: a morphofunctional investigation in children. *Oral Dis* **11**: 170–174.
- Sarkar PK, Shinton RA (2001). Hutchinson-Guilford progeria syndrome. *Postgrad Med J* 77: 312–317.
- Stephen A, Cengiz SB (2003). The use of overdentures in the management of severe hypodontia associated with microdontia: a case report. J Clin Pediatr Dent 27: 219–222.
- Uhrhammer NA, Lafarge L, Dos Santos L *et al* (2006). Werner syndrome and mutations of the WRN and LMNA genes in France. *Hum Mutat* 27: 718–719.
- Wesley RK, Delaney JR, Litt R (1979). Progeria: clinical consideration of an isolated case. J Dent Child 46: 487–492.
- White SC, Pharoah MJ (2000). Radiographic interpretation of pathology. In: White SC, Pharoah MJ, eds. *Oral radiology principles and interpretation*. 4th edn. Mosby Inc.: St. Louis, MO, pp. 319–320.
- Woelfel JB, ed (1990a). Terminology. *Dental anatomy: its relevance to dentistry*. 4th edn. Lea & Febiger: Philadelphia, PA, pp. 18–32.
- Woelfel JB, ed (1990b). Permanent mandibular molars. *Dental anatomy: its relevance to dentistry*. 4th edn. Lea & Febiger: Philadelphia, PA, pp. 155–180.
- Yu QX, Zeng LH (1991). Progeria; report of a case and review of the literature. J Oral Pathol Med 20: 86–88.
- Zhu JF, Marcushamer M, King DL, Henry RJ (1996). Supernumerary and congenitally absent teeth: a literature review. J Clin Pediatr Dent 20: 87–95.

Copyright of Oral Diseases is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.