

THIS IS ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA (primarily)



HOW CAN WE SAY THIS IS ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA?

- is there a deficit in enamel thickness? yes, cuspal third
- is there characteristic surface pitting? yes, chronological pattern
- are the lesion borders rounded? yes, little sign of degradation
- does most cuspal enamel appear normal? yes, colour & shine
- was this defect present before emergence? certainly yes

HOW CAN WE SAY THIS ISN'T MOLAR HYPOMIN (PRIMARILY)?

- is cuspal enamel opaque (mineral deficit)? no, mostly translucent
- did the thickness deficit happen after emergence? mainly no

IS THERE SOME HYPOMIN ENAMEL PRESENT TOO?

- accepting primary defect as Hypoplasia, what about cervical half?
- is cervical enamel full thickness? yes (except for forceps marks)
- is cervical enamel translucent? no, obvious white opacities
- could this reflect Hypomin subsequent to Hypoplasia? yes
- does Hypoplasia remain the dominant clinical phenotype? yes



