OIT-77-E
July 2026

K Line Europe

Laura Wagner
Victor Martínez de Albéniz
Antón González-Robatto

Abstract for promotional use only. Full version available at www.iesepublishing.com

Do Not Copy or Post

In early 2026, Dr. Sherif Kandil, founder and CEO of K Line Europe, reflected on the company's 10-year journey. The firm had evolved from a start-up in digital orthodontics into one of the largest private-label manufacturers of dental aligners. Its centralized manufacturing network, anchored by plants in Cairo (Egypt), Chaves (Portugal), and Tijuana (Mexico), produced thousands of aligners per day for customers worldwide. Volumes were growing, quality metrics were stable, and operations appeared to be well under control.

Yet, Kandil was increasingly uneasy. To chase growth and navigate rapid and turbulent market developments, K Line's business model had pivoted several times already, from a direct-to-orthodontist approach to the current manufacturing-for-others focus. Recent discussions with his management team once again raised questions about whether the company's operating model was the right one.

The debate was triggered by a new initiative: the Aligner Concierge Manufacturing Service (ACMS), introduced by Thomas Pichler, K Line's chief business officer. Pichler challenged the logic of centralized manufacturing in an industry built on 3D printing and mass customization. ACMS proposed operating small, modular production units embedded in or near customers' facilities, with the promise of sharply shorter lead times. An early pilot had shown encouraging results, and interest from clients was growing. At the same time, the leaders of K Line's centralized plants voiced concerns about the implications for scale, utilization, and control.

Kandil now faced a structural choice: Should K Line continue to build on its hub-based manufacturing network, or commit to a distributed, client-embedded model? The decision would shape the company's footprint, economics, and organization for years to come.

This case was prepared by Professors Laura Wagner and Victor Martínez de Albéniz, and Antón González-Robatto, MBA 2019. July 2026.
All the material contained in this document has been provided by the company unless otherwise stated.
IESE cases are designed to promote class discussion rather than to illustrate effective or ineffective management of a given situation.

Copyright © 2026 IESE. To order copies contact IESE Publishing via www.iesepublishing.com. Alternatively, write to publishing@iese.edu or call +34 932 536 558.
No part of this content may be reproduced, incorporated into public AI platforms or services, transmitted, distributed, disseminated, or made available to third parties without IESE's authorization.

Last edited: 15/7/26

Dental alignment

People align their teeth to improve oral health, enhance chewing and speech function, and achieve a more balanced and confident smile. Efforts to align teeth date back to ancient civilizations, when early devices used by the Egyptians and Romans were made from materials such as gold wires and animal gut. Modern orthodontics emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries with the development of metal braces.

Clear aligners, a modern orthodontic solution, were designed to straighten teeth using a series of clear, removable trays, as shown in Exhibit 1. They were custom-made to gradually move teeth into their desired positions with controlled, incremental adjustments. Unlike traditional braces, the nearly invisible look of clear aligners made them an aesthetically appealing option for many patients. They could be removed for eating, brushing, and flossing, allowing for better oral hygiene and comfort. As a result, they became an increasingly popular choice for both adolescents and adults seeking less visible orthodontic treatment.

Clear aligners were originally developed under the brand Invisalign by Align Technology, Inc., an American company that patented clear aligner treatment, digital treatment planning, and mass-customized manufacturing. These patents gave Align Technology a dominant position in the clear-aligner market for nearly two decades and limited direct competition. In October 2017, over 40 key Invisalign patents began to expire. The expiration removed significant barriers to entry and opened the market to competitors. The result was a rapid expansion of the market, increased competition, and lower-cost alternatives to Invisalign. Nevertheless, in 2026, Align Technology still held 66% of the global market, while K Line held only 1%.

The treatment process began with a digital scan of the patient's mouth at an orthodontic clinic. A software-generated plan then simulated the intended tooth movements, with changes typically introduced weekly over a span of several months. Once the treatment plan was ready, a series of custom aligners was manufactured and delivered to the clinic, which met with the patient to initiate treatment. Follow-up visits were scheduled to ensure adequate progression, and occasionally, if tooth movements deviated from the plan, new scans and replanning took place.

The clear aligner market

The clear aligner industry connected four main groups of players. *Patients* sought orthodontic treatment for aesthetic or functional reasons. *Clinics*, ranging from independent dentists to large dental service organizations, diagnosed cases, prescribed treatment, and monitored progress. *Dental aligner companies* acted as integrators who manage branding, treatment planning, digital platforms, and logistics and interface directly with clinics and patients. *Manufacturers* such as K Line specialized in the production and fulfillment of aligners on behalf of dental aligner companies. Historically, dental aligner companies and manufacturers were vertically integrated, but the recent trend was to keep product management and manufacturing activities separate.

Treatment complexity varied widely. During treatment, patients followed a predefined sequence of aligners and were required to switch to a new tray every 7–14 days, with each aligner representing a discrete step in the planned tooth adjustments. A standard initial treatment included 40–60 aligners, and most patients required at least one refinement, adding 10–20 additional aligners. As a result, the representative patient received around 50–80 aligners over the course of treatment, often across two production cases. Simpler aesthetic corrections could be completed with 30–40 aligners, while advanced bite realignment cases could exceed 100.

Abstract for promotional use only. Full version available at www.iesepublishing.com

Do Not Copy or Post

Pricing mirrored this complexity. In 2025, in European markets, clinics charged patients €3,000–€5,000 upfront per treatment, with complex cases exceeding €6,000. Aligner companies typically sold to clinics at €800–€2,000 per treatment, depending on brand and volume. Their costs included:

- Manufacturing and logistics costs paid to manufacturers: €325–€520 per treatment, including refinements; equivalent to about €6.5 per aligner for a representative treatment of 50–80 aligners.
- Planning and management costs: €60–€150
- Marketing and commercial costs: €300–€800

The typical production cost per aligner varied substantially by location and operating model, from around €2/unit in low-cost regions to up to €6–€10/unit in higher-cost regions. Despite digital workflows, industry lead times from scan to first aligner remained at two to four weeks, with similar delays for refinements. These lags created friction, as patients expected faster results, especially in self-pay markets. Dentists were also placed under pressure, as delays often necessitated rescheduling, required additional visits, or caused a loss of patient trust.

History of K Line

Against this backdrop of rising expectations for speed, consistency, and clinical trust, K Line had grown from a small start-up into one of the world's leading private label manufacturers. Its evolution mirrored the industry's shifts from the early direct-to-orthodontist model to private label manufacturing and, most recently, from centralized to distributed production models aimed at minimizing lead times. However, that journey had not followed a straight path.

Early beginnings (2014–2016)

Kandil, founder and CEO of K Line, was a trained orthodontist with degrees from Donau Krems and Universität für Weiterbildung Krems, Austria. As a self-made entrepreneur, Kandil founded K Line in Dortmund, Germany, in 2014, combining clinical insight with relentless commercial energy. In its early years, the company operated as an integrated dental aligner brand and manufacturer. It used a direct-to-orthodontist model and supplied aligners to orthodontists and dental clinics. K Line's first production site was established in Düsseldorf, Germany, in 2015, where the company operated from a modest facility equipped with a small number of 3D printers. The team focused on refining the product and building credibility, one clinic at a time.

In 2016, Kandil expanded the company's footprint by establishing Cairo, Egypt, as K Line's technical and operational hub—the "digital heart" of the organization—where treatment planning and initial manufacturing capacity were centralized. These early efforts established the foundational capabilities and customer relationships upon which K Line would later scale.

Abstract for promotional use only. Full version available at www.iesepublishing.com

Do Not Copy or Post