

Comprehensive Assessment of Various Pre-Surgical Factors Governing Overall Prognosis of Implant Treatment: An Original Research Study

Meenal Airan^{1*} Pinki Bankoti² Juhi Jaiswal³ Soumya Singh⁴ Bhart Vashishat⁵ Vishakha Lal⁶

¹Reader, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

²Senior Lecturer, Department of Prosthodontics and Implantology, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

³Reader, Department of Prosthodontics and Implantology, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

⁴Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

⁵Senior Lecturer, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

⁶Senior Lecturer, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

ABSTRACT

Background: With the boom of implant dentistry, practitioners are more concerned about implant related failures which is very common these days. Nevertheless, detailed and accurate treatment planning is advisable to reduce this clinical dilemma. This study was conducted to evaluate different pre surgical factors governing overall prognosis of implant treatment.

Materials & Methods: This study was conducted on 30 patients those looking for replacement of single teeth by implant therapy. Basic demographic details related to age, gender was also recorded for all selected patients. Before finalizing treatment planning, a comprehensive analysis was done by studying cone beam computed tomography of all patients. Authors particularly have chosen few imperative pre surgical factors to study like precise site of implant placement, quality and quantity of bone at the osteotomy site, orientation of bone, proximity with any vital anatomical structure. Authors compared actual or clinical length and width of osteotomy site (and implant dimension) with dimensions suggested by cone beam computed tomography. Results were subjected to statistical analysis. P value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Results: All noticeable findings and data were sent for statistical analysis using statistical software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 21. Out of 30 patients, males were 18 and females were 12. In group I, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were identical. This confirms the clinical usefulness of cbct in pre-surgical planning. P value was highly significant here (0.001). In group II, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were non-identical. P value was not significant here (0.080). In group III, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were non-relatable. This could be attributed as faulty and hence not included in the inference.

Conclusion: Within the limitations of the study authors concluded that all pre surgical factors significantly affect the overall success of implant treatment. Our study results must be considered as suggestive for presuming prognosis for similar clinical conditions.

Keywords: Dental implant, Implant planning, Oral Surgery, Prosthodontics.

INTRODUCTION

Completely or partially edentulous patients are a diverse group that consists of those who are

anatomically incompetent, medically compromised, economically weaker, geriatric, congenitally

Received: Dec. 1, 2020; Accepted: Dec. 29, 2020

*Correspondence Dr. Meenal Airan.

Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Institute of Dental Sciences, Bareilly, UP, India.

Email: meenal.vardan@gmail.com

doi: <https://doi.org/10.53064/jrad.2021.12.1.11>

Copyright ©2021

malformed, genetically affected. General complications of tooth loss include progressive alveolar bone loss and diminished masticatory efficiency.¹⁻⁴ Since decades, complete denture has been the standard therapeutic protocol in partially edentulous patients. However, it is a great challenge to attain acceptable results, particularly in the case of mandibular arch presenting severe resorption of the alveolar ridge.⁵⁻⁷ Since the introduction of the concept of osseointegration by Branemark, implant therapy have become a standard treatment option for restoring missing teeth. Edentulism limits a patient's ability to perform two essential tasks in life: speaking and eating, and handicap. In the past, the most common treatment for partial edentulism has been to restore function with removable dentures.⁸⁻¹² Due to the fact that, partial edentulism causes progressive bone loss, treatment with conventional denture is limited and detrimental changes continue overtime. Implant therapy have different advantages over conventional partial dentures such as alveolar bone maintenance, preservation of periodontal proprioception, enhanced psychological comfort, and increased masticatory efficiency.¹³⁻¹⁴ Bone loss around dental implants is generally measured by monitoring changes in marginal bone level using radiographs. After the first year of implantation, an implant should have <0.2 mm annual loss of marginal bone level to satisfy the criteria of success. However, the process of measuring marginal bone level on radiographs has a precision of 0.2 mm owing to variations in exposure geometry, exposure time and observer perception.^{2,6,9,15} Therefore keeping all these factors in mind, this study was conducted to evaluate different pre surgical factors governing overall prognosis of implant treatment.

MATERIALS & METHODS

This study was conducted in the department of oral surgery and prosthodontics of the institute in which total 30 patients studied those looking for replacement of single teeth by implant therapy. Initial and preliminary examinations including implant placement were attempted in the department of oral and maxillofacial surgery. For prosthetic rehabilitations, patients were referred to the department of Prosthodontics. Basic demographic details related to age, gender was also recorded for all selected patients. All participating patients were informed in detail about the study.

Informed consents were obtained from all participating patients. Before finalizing treatment planning, a comprehensive analysis was done by studying cone beam computed tomography of all patients. All relevant findings of cone beam computed tomography reports were noted and tabulated logically. Authors particularly have chosen few imperative pre surgical factors to study like precise site of implant placement, quality and quantity of bone at the osteotomy site, orientation of bone, proximity with any vital anatomical structure. Authors compared actual or clinical length and width of osteotomy site (and implant dimension) with dimensions suggested by cone beam computed tomography. In cone beam computed tomography, three dimensional cross sectional images were developed at cross sectional interval of 1.0 mm with motion set at standard levels. Qualitative and quantitative measurements were noted for available bone height, bone width in the areas of interest. Three dimensional reconstructions of cone beam computed tomography allows clinician to predict the bony morphology, nerve patterns, joint structures, position and extent of maxillary sinuses. To avoid any inter-observer variation, the comprehensive expressions of cone beam computed tomography images were completed by two different and independent experienced observers. Results were subjected to statistical analysis. P value < 0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

In a joint estimate of different dental implant companies, more than three million implants are placed each year and this number will increase yearly. Implant treatment is now considered a common method of rehabilitation of partially edentulous jaws. In this study, all noticeable findings and data were sent for statistical analysis using statistical software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 21 (IBM Inc., Armonk, New York, USA). The finalized data was subjected to appropriate statistical tests to obtain p values, mean, standard deviation, chi-square test, standard error and 95% CI. Table 1 and Graph I showed that out of 30 patients, males were 18 and females were 12. All selected and studied patients were segregated into 4 age groups. 12 patients were noticed in the age range of 26-30 years. Hence we can presume that majority of the studied patients

were of younger age groups. P value was found to be significant in group I & III of age range 26-30 and 36-40 years. The measured value was 0.01 and 0.02 respectively. Table 2 demonstrates comparison of implant dimension at osteotomy stages. Participants were studied in three subgroups based on the dimensional similarities at clinical stage and CBCT recommendations. In group I, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were identical. This confirms the clinical usefulness of cbct in pre-surgical planning. P value was highly significant here (0.001). In group II, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were non-identical. This could be due to patient related limitations and instrumental factors. P value was not significant here (0.080). In group III, cbct suggested dimension and clinical dimensions were Non-relatable. This could be attributed as faulty and hence not included in the inference. P value was not significant here (0.500).

Table 1: Age & Gender Wise Distribution of Patients.

Age Group (Yrs)	Male	Female	Total	P value
26-30	7	5	12	0.01*
31-35	5	3	8	0.50
36-40	3	2	5	0.02*
41-45	3	2	5	0.80
Total	18	12	30	*p<0.05 significant

Table 2: Comparison of implant dimension at osteotomy stages (cbct vs clinical: n=30).

Gro up	CBCT Vs Clinical	n	Std. Deviat ion	Std. Err or	95 % CI	Pears on Chi-Squar e Value	Level of Significa nce (p value)
Gro up I	Identical	28 (94 %)	0.387	0.229	1.96	1.245	0.001*
Gro up II	Dissimilar	1 (3%)	0.536	0.346	1.60	2.732	0.080
Gro up III	Non-relatable	1 (3%)	0.741	0.099	1.12	2.626	0.500


*p<0.05 significant

DISCUSSION

In the recent past, three-dimensional (3D) imaging technique Cone beam computed tomography

(CBCT) has established many landmarks in the field of dental radiology. Presently, CBCT is mostly advised by oral radiologist (for head & neck diagnosis) and by prosthodontists (for implantology).^{4,7,8,16} Edentulism is a chronic condition for which the palliative therapy is a set of removable complete dentures.

Graph 1: Age & gender wise distribution of patients.



Given the global increase in the life expectancy, and the increase in the elderly population, the seekers for this treatment among the elderly edentulous population will be increased.¹⁷⁻²¹ With the advance of the dental implants, the retention and stability of mandibular complete denture have been improved to a large extent. According to recent UN data, the increasing number of elderly patients in the population, especially in Western countries, is a certain reality for the future. In Portugal, it has been predicted that the percentage of the population over 60 years old could rise from 24% in 2011 to 40% by 2050.²²⁻²⁴ Few of the pioneer workers had assessed the placement location, length, diameter of implant, over a period of 2 years under load. They also evaluated the local and systemic risk factors for implant failure. Overall survival rate of 96.8% (2.84% and 0.38% early and late implant failures, respectively) was observed. The patient-based survival rate was 91.8%. Bone grafting seems to be a risk factor for implant failure.²⁵ Mohajerani et al conducted a retrospective cohort study on two groups of patients, the patients with a failed implant before loading and those without a failed implant. Age, gender, implant type, implant surface, implant length, bone type, type of surgery (one- or two-stage) and immediate (fresh socket) or delayed placement of implant were the variables were assessed in this study. Out of the 1,093 evaluated implants, 73 cases (6.68%) failed in early stages. The two groups were significantly different in terms of implant surface, fresh socket placement, prophylactic use of antibiotics, and bone density ($p < 0.05$). Age, gender, implant height, implant type

(cylindrical or tapered) and one-stage or two-stage placement were not significantly different between the two groups ($p > 0.05$).³¹ Edentulous patients are a diverse group comprised of those who are anatomically deficient, medically compromised, economically depressed, geriatric, congenitally deformed, genetically affected as well as general population for a number of other reasons have been rendered edentulous. The use of implants has dramatically improved treatment choices for most edentulous patients, but it may not be suitable for all patients particularly in less prosperous countries or for patients who are unable to afford costs associated with this treatment option.²⁶⁻²⁸ Evidence of biomechanical success and psychosocial satisfaction has led to an emerging consensus that a two implant overdenture should be recommended treatment in the management of an edentulous mandible. In the last two decades, the use of prosthetic retention systems in dental implants has achieved good results in edentulous patients, significantly increasing their satisfaction and prosthetic rehabilitation results. The criteria proposed by many pioneer researchers included immobility, absence of peri-implant radiolucencies, absence of pain, absence of infections and <0.2 mm vertical bone loss per year (except the first year).^{29,30}

CONCLUSION

Within the limitations of the study authors concluded very significant inferences. Moreover, CBCT demonstrated real condition of various pre surgical factors including bone quality and quantity with accurate dimensional presumptions. Hence, these inferences could be used for precise pre-surgical planning of implant therapy. It was also concluded that all these pre surgical factors significantly affect the overall success of implant treatment. Our study results must be considered as suggestive for presuming prognosis for similar clinical conditions. However, we expect some other large scale studies to be performed that might further establish certain standard and concrete guidelines in these perspectives.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare they have no potential conflict of interests regarding this article.

REFERENCES

1. Bali A, Jindal M, Goel A, Gupta V, Dadwal A, Chauhan S. Comparative evaluation of clinical and radio-graphical outcomes of immediate versus delayed dental implant placement: A prospective study. *Indian J Dent Sci* 2019;11:133-7.
2. Nayak R, Devanna R, Dharamsi AM, Shetty J, Mokashi R, Malhotra S. Crestal Bone Loss around Dental Implants: Platform Switching vs Platform Matching—A Retrospective Study. *J Contemp Dent Pract* 2018;19(5):574-578
3. Yadav R, Agrawal KK, Rao J, Anwar M, Alvi HA, Singh K, Himanshu D. Crestal Bone Loss under Delayed Loading of Full Thickness Versus Flapless Surgically Placed Dental Implants in Controlled Type 2 Diabetic Patients: A Parallel Group Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Prosthodont*. 2018;27(7):611-617.
4. Dereci Ö, Mumcu E. The Evaluation of the Relationship between Loading Time and Crestal Bone Loss around Dental Implants at 12 Months Control Evaluation after Loading. *J Long Term Eff Med Implants*. 2020;30(4):295-300.
5. Bajaj S, Rani S, Issar G, Sethi U, Kumar S, Mishra S. Comparative evaluation of crestal bone levels around endosseous implants as influenced by conventional and diode laser during second-stage surgery in mandibular implant-supported overdenture: An in vivo study. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc*. 2020 Jan-Mar;20(1):52-60.
6. Uppala S, Parihar AS, Modipalle V, Manual L, Oommen VM, Karadiguddi P, Gupta P. Crestal bone loss around dental implants after implantation of Tricalcium phosphate and Platelet- Rich Plasma: A comparative study. *J Family Med Prim Care*. 2020 Jan 28;9(1):229-234.
7. Krhen J, Canjuga I, Jerolimov V, Krhen T. Implant stability measurement six weeks after implantation. *Acta Stomatol Croat*. 2009;43(1):45-51.
8. Marx RE, Ehler WJ, Peleg M. "Mandibular and facial reconstruction" rehabilitation of the head

- and neck cancer patient. *Bone*. 1996 Jul;19(1 Suppl):59S-82S.
9. Živko-Babić J, Jakovac M, Carek A, Lovrić Ž. Implanto-prosthetic therapy of a missing front tooth. *Acta Stomatol Croat*. 2009;43(3):234-241.
 10. Misch CE. Dental implant prosthetics; Library of Congress Cataloging in-Publication Data. St Louis: Mosby; 2005.
 11. Nickenig HJ, Wichmann M, Schlegel KA, Nkenke E, Eitner S. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone levels adjacent to parallel-screw cylinder machined-neck implants and rough-surfaced micro-threaded implants using digitized panoramic radiographs. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2009 Jun;20(6):550-4.
 12. Piao CM, Lee JE, Koak JY, Kim SK, Rhyu IC, Han CH, et al. Marginal bone loss around three different implant systems: radiographic evaluation after 1 year. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2010 Jul;37(7):538-44.
 13. Lee SY, Piao CM, Koak JY, Kim SK, Kim YS, Ku Y, et al. A 3-year prospective radiographic evaluation of marginal bone level around different implant systems. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2010 Jul;37(7):538-44.
 14. Shin YK, Han CH, Heo SJ, Kim S, Chun HJ. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone level around implants with different neck designs after 1 year. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2006 Sep-Oct;21(5):789-94.
 15. Canullo L, Fedele GR, Iannello G, Jepsen S. Platform switching and marginal bone-level alterations: the results of a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2010 Jan;21(1):115-21.
 16. Albrektsson T, Chrcanovic B, Östman PO, Sennerby L. Initial and long-term crestal bone responses to modern dental implants. *Periodontol* 2000. 2017 Feb;73(1):41-50.
 17. Fickl S, Zuhr O, Stein JM, Hürzeler MB. Peri-implant bone level around implants with platform-switched abutments. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2010 May-Jun;25(3):577-81.
 18. Prosper L, Redaelli S, Pasi M, Zarone F, Radaelli G, Gherlone EF. A randomized prospective multicenter trial evaluating the platform-switching technique for the prevention of post-restorative crestal bone loss. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2009 Mar-Apr;24(2):299-308.
 19. Patil YB, Asopa SJ, Deepa, Goel A, Jyoti D, Somayaji NS, Sabharwal R. Influence of Implant Neck Design on Crestal Bone Loss: A Comparative Study. *Niger J Surg*. 2020 Jan-Jun;26(1):22-27.
 20. Veis A, Parissis N, Tsirlis A, Papadeli C, Marinis G, Zogakis A. Evaluation of peri-implant marginal bone loss using modified abutment connections at various crestal level placements. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 2010 Dec;30(6):609-17.
 21. Annibali S, Bignozzi I, Cristalli MP, Graziani F, La Monaca G, Polimeni A. Peri-implant marginal bone level: a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies comparing platform switching versus conventionally restored implants. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2012 Nov;39(11):1097-113.
 22. Goswami MM. Comparison of Crestal Bone Loss along Two Implant Crest Module Designs. *Med J Armed Forces India*. 2009 Oct;65(4):319-22.
 23. Kahnberg KE. Implant Surgery in the Posterior Region of the Jaws. *Acta Stomatol Croat*. 2005;39(3):245.
 24. Sbordone L, Toti P, Menchini-Fabris GB, Sbordone C, Guidetti F. Implant Success in Sinus-Lifted Maxillae and Native Bone: A 3-year Clinical and Computerized Tomographic Follow-up. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2009 Jul-Aug;24(4):695-703.
 25. Sbordone L, Levin L, Guidetti F, Sbordone C, Glikman A, Schwartz-Arad D. Apical and Marginal Bone Alterations around Implants in Maxillary Sinus Augmentation Grafted with Autogenous Bone or Bovine Bone Material and Simultaneous or Delayed Dental Implant

- Positioning. Clin Oral Impl Res. 2011;22:485-91.
26. Sbordone C, Toti P, Guidetti F, Califano L, Pannone G, Sbordone L. Volumetric changes after sinus augmentation using blocks of autogenous iliac bone or freeze-dried allogeneic bone. A nonrandomized study. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2014 Mar;42(2):113-8.
27. Sbordone C, Toti P, Ramaglia L, Guidetti F, Sbordone L, Martuscelli R. A 5-year clinical and computerized tomographic implant follow-up in sinus-lifted maxillae and native bone. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2014 Sep;25(9):1056-64.
28. Rasouli Ghahroudi AAR, Talaee pour AR, Mesgarzadeh A, Rokn AR, Khorsand A, Mesgarzadeh NN, Kharazi Fard MJ. Radiographic Vertical Bone Loss Evaluation around Dental Implants Following One Year of Functional Loading. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2014 Sep;25(9):1056-64.
29. Boronat A, Penarrocha M, Carrillo C, Marti E. Marginal bone loss in dental implants subjected to early loading (6 to 8 weeks post placement) with a retrospective short-term follow-up. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2008 Feb;66(2):246-50.
30. Albrektsson T, Zarb G, Worthington P, Eriksson AR. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: a review and proposed criteria of success. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1986 Summer;1(1):11-25.
31. Mohajerani H, Roozbayani R, Taherian S, Tabrizi R. The risk factors in early failure of dental implants: a retrospective study. J Dent. 2017;18(4):298-303.