

Group	Mean CBL ± SD (mm)
Group A, LANCE n(16)	2.463±0.281mm*
Group B, SEVEN® n(16)	1.163±0.187mm
Group C, C1 n(16)	1.215±0.122mm

Table 1. Implant groups and CBL. The * marks the value with highest bone loss. (p<0.05)

Group	Mean BIC ± SD (%)
Group A, LANCE n(16)	38.6±22.3%
Group B, SEVEN® n(16)	40.10±5.32%
Group C, C1 n(16)	44.02±4.6% *

Table 2. Implant groups and BIC. The * marks the value with highest bone loss. (p<0.05)

the factors that may affect bone alterations during scarring after placement of the immediate implant, noted that the position of the implant relative to the vestibular alveolar ridge and the position in the vestibulo-lingual direction, affected how much resorption there was of the vestibular ridge.

Conclusion

Within the limitations of this study in dogs, we may conclude that:

The neck configuration, specifically the connection type, impact the height of the crestal bone. Implants with an external connection have larger CBL. Implants with an internal connection, hexagonal or conical, have smaller CBL.

The BIC is larger in conical implants of type C1.

References

- Johnson, K. A study of the dimensional changes occurring in the maxilla following tooth extraction. Australian Dental Journal. 1969; 14:241-244.
- Cardaropoli, G., Araújo, M. & Lindhe, J. Dynamics of bone tissue formation in tooth extraction sites. An experimental study in dogs. Journal of Clinical Periodontology 2003;30: 809-818.
- Schropp L, Wenzel A, Kostopoulos L, & Karring T. Bone healing and soft tissue contour changes following single-tooth extraction: a clinical and radiographic 12-month prospective study. The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry 2003;23:313-323.
- Botticelli, D., Berglundh, T. & Lindhe, J. Resolution of bone defects of varying dimension and configuration in the marginal portion of the periimplant bone. An experimental study in the dog. Journal of Clinical Periodontology 2004; 31: 309-317.
- Araújo MG & Lindhe J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction. An experimental study in the dog. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2005;32:212-218.
- Araújo MG, Sukekava F, Wennstrom JL & Lindhe J. Ridge alterations following implant placement in fresh extraction sockets: an experimental study in the dog. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2005;32:645-652.
- Lazzara, R.J. Immediate implant placement into extraction sites: surgical and restorative advantages. International Journal of Periodontics and Restorative Dentistry 1989 9: 332-343.
- Schwartz-Arad, D. & Chaushu, G. Placement of implants into fresh extraction sites: 4 to 7 years retrospective evaluation of 95 immediate implants. Journal of Periodontology. 1997;68: 1110-1116.

- Schwartz-Arad, D. & Chaushu, G. The ways and wherefores of immediate placement of implants into fresh extraction sites: a literature review. Journal of Periodontology. 1997;68: 915-923.
- Becker, B.E., Becker, W., Ricci, A. & Geurs, N. A prospective clinical trial of endosseous screw-shaped implants placed at the time of tooth extraction without augmentation. Journal of Periodontology. 1996;69: 920-926.
- Brägger, U., Hämmerle, C.H. & Lang, N.P. Immediate transmucosal implants using the principle of guided tissue regeneration (IT). A cross-sectional study comparing the clinical outcome one year after immediate to standard implant placement. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 1999;7: 266-276.
- Grunder U, Polizzi G, Goene' R, Hatano N, Henry P, Jackson WJ, Kawamura K, Köhler S, Renouard F, Rosenberg, R., Triplett, G., Werbit, M. & Lühner, B. A 3-year prospective multi-center follow-up report on the immediate and delayed-immediate placement of implants. The International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 1999;14: 210-216.
- Covani U., Calvo G. & Barone A. Bone-Remodeling Around Implants Placed in Fresh Extraction Sockets. The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry. 2010;30: 601-7.
- Botticelli, D., Berglundh, T. & Lindhe, J. The influence of a biomaterial on the closure of a marginal hard tissue defect adjacent to implants. An experimental study in the dog. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2004;15:285-292.
- Botticelli, D., Berglundh, T. & Lindhe, J. Hard-tissue alterations following immediate implant placement in extraction sites. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2004;31: 820-826.
- Calvo-Guirado JL, Ortiz-Ruiz AJ, Negri B, López-Mari L, Rodríguez-Barba C & Schöttig F. Histological and histomorphometric valuation of immediate implant placement on a dog model with a new implant surface treatment. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2010;21: 308-315.
- Paolantonio M, Dolci M, Scarano A, d'Archivio D, di Placido G & Tumini V. Immediate implantation in fresh extraction sockets. A controlled clinical and histological study in man. Journal of Periodontology. 2001;72: 1560-1571.
- Araújo MG, Wennstrom JL & Lindhe J. Modeling of the buccal and lingual bone walls of fresh extraction sites following implant installation. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2006;17:606-614.
- Araújo MG, Sukekava F, Wennstrom JL & Lindhe J. Tissue modeling following implant placement in fresh extraction sockets. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2006;17:615-624.
- Pontes AEF, Ribeiro FS, Izzi G, Piatelli A, Cirelli JA & Marcantonio-Jr E. Biologic width changes around loaded implants inserted in different levels in relation to crestal bone: histometric evaluation in canine mandible. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2008;19:483-490.
- Todescan FF, Pustiglioni FE, Imbroni AV, Albrektsson T & Gioco M. Influence of the microgap in the periimplant hard and soft tissues: a histomorphometric study in dogs. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2002;17:467-472.
- Hämmerle CH, Brägger U, Bürgin W & Lang NP. The effect of subcrestal placement of the polished surface of ITI implants on marginal soft and hard tissues. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 1996;7: 111-9.
- Buser D, Martin WC, Belsler UC. Surgical considerations for single tooth replacements in the esthetic zone: standard

procedures in sites without bone deficiencies. In: Belsler UC, Martin W, Jung R, Hammerle CH, Schmid B, Morton D, Buser D, eds. ITI Treatment Guide. Implant Placement in the Esthetic Zone. Single Tooth Replacements. 2007;1: 26-37. Berlin: Quintessence Publishing Company Ltd.

- Welander M, Abrahamsson I & Berglundh T. Placement of two part implants in sites with different buccal and lingual bone heights. J Periodontol. 2009;80: 324-9.
- Abrahamson I, Welander M, Linder E & Berglundh T. Healing at implants placed in an alveolar ridge with a sloped configuration: An experimental study in dogs. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2012; Doi:10.1111/1708-8208.2012.00460.x.
- Al-Nsour MM, Chan HL & Wang HL. Effect of the platform switching technique on preservation of periimplant marginal bone: A systematic review. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 2012; 27: 138-45.
- Abuhussein H, Pagni G, Reboudi A. & Wang H. L. The effect of thread pattern upon implant osseointegration. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2010;21:129-36 26. Caneva M, Botticelli D, Rossi F, Cardoso LC, Panfili F & Lang NP. Influence of implants with different sizes and configurations installed immediately into extraction sockets on peri-implant hard and soft tissues: An experimental study in dogs. Clin. Oral Implants Res. 2012;23: 396-401.
- Batelli M, Att W & Strub J. Implant neck configurations for preservation of marginal bone level: A systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2011;26:290-303
- Donath K, Breuner G. A method for the study of undecalcified bones and teeth with attached soft tissues. The Säge-Schliff (sawing and grinding technique). J Oral Pathol. 1982;11:318-26.
- Vignoletti F, Johansson C, Albrektsson T, De Sanctis M, San Roman F & Sanz M. Early healing of implants placed into fresh extraction sockets: an experimental study in the beagle dog. De novo bone formation. J Clin Periodontol. 2009; 36: 265-77.
- Vignoletti F, de Sanctis M, Berglundh T, Abrahamsson I & Sanz M. Early healing of implants placed into fresh extraction sockets: an experimental study in the beagle dog. It: ridge alterations. J Clin Periodontol. 2009; 36: 688-97.
- Caneva M, Salata LA, de Souza SS, Baffone G, Lang NP & Botticelli D. Influence of implant positioning in extraction sockets on osseointegration: histomorphometric analyses in dogs. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2010;21:43-9
- Palacci P. Optimal implant positioning. In: Palacci, P, ed. Esthetic Implant Dentistry, Soft and Hard Tissue Management 2001; 101-137. Berlin: Quintessence Publishing Company Inc.
- Palacci P, Ericson LE. Implant placement philosophy. In: Palacci, P, ed. Esthetic Implant Dentistry, 2001; 69-89. Berlin: Quintessence Publishing Company Inc.
- Tomasini C, Sanz M, Cecchinato D, Petrusson B, Ferris J, Lang NP & Lindhe J. Bone dimensional variations at implants placed in fresh extraction sockets: a multilevel multivariate analysis. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2010;21: 30-6.


34

News No.34 October 2013

MIS's Quality System complies with international quality control standards: ISO 13485:2003 - Quality Management System for Medical Devices, ISO 9001: 2008 - Quality Management System and CE Directive for Medical Devices 93/42/EEC. MIS's products are cleared for marketing in the USA and CE approved.

© MIS Corporation. All rights Reserved

Preservation of marginal bone and bone contact as a function of implant geometry. A comparative study in dogs.



www.mis-implants.com

MC-N3413 Rev.1



Preservation of marginal bone and bone contact as a function of implant geometry. A comparative study in dogs.

Delgado-Peña JE¹, Aragonés-Lamas JM¹, Calvo-Guirado JL², Delgado-Ruiz RA³, Ramírez-Fernández MP², Maté-Sánchez del Val JE², Negri B²

Summary

Goal: To evaluate the effect of 3 different implant designs on crestal bone loss (CBL) and bone-implant contact (BIC) in immediate implant procedures.

Materials and methods: A total of 6 Foxhound dogs underwent mandibular premolar extractions – p2, p3, p4, and the first molar M1 bilaterally, and received 48 immediate implants (MIS® Implants Technologies, Bar Lev Industrial Park, Israel). Three groups of 16 implants each were established, group A (LANCE Implants, external connection), group B (SEVEN® Implants), internal hexagon and multiple micro-rings on the neck; and group C (C1 Implants, internal conical connection and three micro-rings). Eight implants per dog were randomly inserted at crestal level, 4 in each half-arch, and a healing abutment was inserted. The animals were euthanized after 3 months and samples were taken for histological and histomorphometric analysis of crestal bone loss (CBL) and bone-implant contact (BIC).

Results: In group A there was a 2.463±0.231 mm decrease of CBL; in group B there was a decrease of 1.163±0.187mm, while group C exhibited a decrease of 1.215±0.122mm. For group A, BIC was equal to 38.62%±2.3%; for group B it was 40.10%±5.3% and for group C it was 44.02%±4.2%. Implants with external connection showed larger CBL (p<0.05); there was no difference regarding BIC between the groups (p>0.05).

Conclusions: All immediate crestal level implants exhibited bone loss; a higher proportion of external hexagon immediate implants lost more crestal bone, and internal connection implants lost less crestal bone.

Introduction

Loss of teeth brings about a progressive remodeling of the alveolar bone in the apico-coronal direction, as well as in the vestibulo-lingual direction^{1,2,3,4,5}; the fastest reduction takes place during the first few months^{3,5,6}.

Several authors have described the post-extraction insertion of an implant, aimed at preserving the dimensions of the alveolar ridge, lessen the number of surgical procedures and at the same time simplify surgical procedures^{7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17}.

Even though it has been suggested that this procedure may diminish the tissue remodeling process¹⁸, it has not been possible to confirm this in animal studies^{19,20}; and it has been found that bone resorption continues, being higher rate in the vestibular wall and less at the lingual walls^{19,20}.

One way to diminish the resorption process may be a change in the insertion depth of implants in the corono-apical direction. In these experimental studies, it has been established that when the implants are placed in more apical positions, the first bone-implant contact is apically displaced²¹, and no signs of inflammation are seen in the periimplant mucosa²².

From a clinical viewpoint, implants are often placed in a subcrestal position in esthetic areas and in those cases where the implant primary stability may not be achieved in the patients' bone, or in those cases where there is limited interocclusal height for the restoration profile^{23,24}. There may also be a benefit in implant subcrestal placing to compensate for crestal bone remodeling and improve bone-implant contact in the implant neck zone^{23,25}.

It has been shown that certain configurations of the implant's neck may help preserving the crestal bone dimensions. Thus, when dealing with different heights of the vestibular ridge and the lingual ridge, using implants with a beveled neck may help keep the previous height of the ridge without necessarily flattening the higher ridge²⁶. Implants with platform switching²⁷; the presence of microspirals²⁸ and the implant diameter²⁹ may help preserve the crestal ridge.

There is not enough evidence in the literature regarding the effectiveness of the various neck configurations in titanium implants as regards to preserving marginal bone vs. insertion level³⁰.

The bibliography does not yet contain reports on the effects of crestal insertion of the LANCE, SEVEN® and C1 implants in sockets after extraction.

It was thus the goal of this study to evaluate crestal bone loss (CBL) and bone-implant contact (BIC) around three titanium implants in sockets after extraction, with different implant-level neck configurations and different geometries.

Material and methods

The study comprised of 6 Foxhound dogs, about one year old and weighing between 14 and 15 kg. The Animal Research Ethics Committee at Murcia University, Spain, approved the study protocol (January 2011) which is in compliance with the guidelines established by the European Union Directive of November 24, 1986 (86/609 / EEC). The animals were fed a daily pellet diet.

Upon clinical examination, the dogs were found to be in good overall health.



Fig. 1 View of the three implant types used in this study, L to R.: C1, SEVEN® and LANCE. All implants are tapered.




Fig. 2 Surgical procedure.




Fig. 3 Placing of healing abutments.




Fig. 4 Histological image showing the references for the CBL evaluation. a) LANCE Implant b) SEVEN® Implant c) C1 Implant.




Fig. 5 Histological image of BIC. A) SEVEN® Implant B) LANCE Implant C) C1 Implant.

Surgical Procedure

The animals were pre-anesthetized with acepromazine, 0.2% - 1.5 mg / kg ten minutes before being given butorphanol (0.2 mg / kg) and medetomidine (7µg/kg). The mixture was injected intramuscularly into the quadriceps femoris. The animals were taken to the operating room, an intravenous catheter (22 or 20 G) was inserted into the cephalic vein, and Propofol was injected at the rate of 0.4 mg / kg / min. Local infiltrative anesthesia was applied at the surgical sites. These procedures were supervised by a veterinary doctor.

Mandibular premolars were extracted (p2, p3, and p 4) as well as a molar (M1) from both half-arches. The teeth were sectioned at the furcation in the lingual-vestibular direction using a tungsten carbide drill to extract the roots individually using a syndesmotome, elevator and forceps, while attempting to keep the bony walls intact.

After appropriate alveolar debridement, implant sites were prepared in the distal alveoli following the manufacturer's recommended protocol to a depth of 10 mm, to achieve insertion of the implant leveled with the bone crest.

Eight implants were inserted randomly into each dog. Implants were made of Grade 23 titanium (Ti-6Al-4V ELI alloy), and all had a similar surface treatment (sandblasting + acid etching). Group A: 16 LANCE Implants (MIS® Implant Technologies, Bar Lev Industrial Park, Israel), with external hexagonal connection; group B, 16 SEVEN® Implants (MIS® Implant Technologies, Bar Lev Industrial Park, Israel), with internal hexagon; group C 16 C1 Implants (MIS® Implants Technologies, Bar Lev Industrial Park, Israel), with internal conical connection. (Fig.1)

The implants were positioned as centered as possible relative to the vestibular and lingual bone walls. All implants were inserted with a minimum torque of 35 Ncm, were fitted with healing abutments torqued to 20 Ncm, and neither regeneration procedure nor bio-material were applied. (Fig.2 and Fig.3)

During the first week following surgery the animals received antibiotics and pain killers: amoxicillin (500 mg, twice a day) and 600 mg ibuprofen (three times a day), via systemic route. The sutures were removed after two weeks and the dogs were fed a soft diet for 14 days. Plaque control was achieved by cleaning the oral cavity with chlorhexidine gluconate.

Histological preparation and histomorphometric analysis

The six dogs were euthanized 12 weeks after implants insertion with an overdose of Sodium Pentothal (Abbot Laboratories), and perfused via the carotid arteries with a fixer containing a mixture of 5% glutaraldehyde and 4% formaldehyde. The jaws were dissected and

each implant site extracted using a diamond saw (EXAKT Apparatebau, Norderstedt, Hamburg, Germany).

The biopsies were processed for sectioning following the methods described by Donath and Brenner (1982)³¹; the biological and histomorphometric analysis were performed in order to evaluate CBL and BIC.

The samples were dehydrated using different ethanol concentrations up to 100%, infiltrated with methacrylate and polymerized. They were then sectioned with a diamond saw in the vestibulo-lingual direction, using an Exakt® saw (Exakt Apparatebau, Norderstedt, Hamburg, Germany). Two sections were obtained, about 100µm thick, and reduced to 40µm final thickness using an Exakt 400s CS device (Exakt Apparatebau).

The samples were stained using toluidine blue and a semi-quantitative evaluation was made of CBL and BIC. The CBL was stated in mm, referring to the upper edge of the implant platform and to the first bone-implant contact (f-BIC), vestibular (V=fBIC) or lingual (L=fBIC) (Fig. 4). The BIC was stated as a percentage, and measured along the whole vestibular and lingual surface of the implant by computing the mineralized bone contacting the implant surface vs. the total length.

The morphometric analysis was performed using calibrated digital images at 10X and 40X magnification, using a Leica® Q500Mc microscope by Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany.

Statistical Analysis

The analysis unit was each dog. The intra-reviewer reliability was determined performing three measurements and then calibration, for a maximum 5% error.

The ANOVA test for independent samples was run, as well as a Bonferroni post-test for multiple comparisons between means.

The data was stated in millimeters for CBL and as percentages for BIC. A descriptive statistic was performed using the mean and standard deviation values. The value of p was set at 0.05.

Results

Three healing abutments were lost, no implants were lost and there were no signs of mobility. All the groups showed a decrease in crestal bone, which was highest for group A.

In group A there was a 2.463±0.231 mm decrease of CBL; in group B there was a decrease of 1.163±0.187 mm, while group C exhibited a decrease of 1.215±0.122 mm. A comparison between all groups showed that the external connection implants in group A

exhibited a larger CBL (p<0.05) compared to groups B and C, differences between groups B and C were not statistically significant (p>0.05).

For group A, BIC was 38.62%±2.3%; for group B it was 40.10%±5.3% and for group C it was 44.02%±4.2%. A comparison between all groups showed that there was no difference regarding the BIC between groups A and B (p>0.05) while BIC was highest for group C (p>0.05) compared to groups A and B.

Discussion

Dental extraction followed by immediate implant placement results in notable changes in the dimensions of the vestibular crest (30-43%), horizontal loss (63-80%), as well as vertical (65-69%)³².

This research showed that there was bone resorption both in the vestibular and lingual crest after implant placement, which corroborates the findings reported in previous studies^{22,5,6,17}.

The evidence of healing of periimplant tissues around implants inserted immediately after tooth extraction, without regenerative techniques, agrees with findings from other animal studies^{5,6,16}.

Bone formation begins simultaneously with important bone resorption, and the size of the socket seems to affect the bone healing process^{32,33}.

In a study aimed to find whether the reduction of the alveolar ridge which takes place with post-extraction implants is affected by the size of the hard tissue walls of the cavity, it was found that the marginal space that existed between the implant and the bone walls disappeared and was filled with bone that at the same time resorbed at the crest. The remodeling of the alveolus in the marginal region happened together with a marked decrease in the dimensions both of the delicate vestibular wall and the lingual wall. On the vestibular side this resulted in a certain marginal loss of osseointegration⁶.

In order to reduce bone remodeling the implants should be inserted about 1 mm deeper than the level of the vestibular and lingual alveolar ridge, in a position relative to the center of the socket, in order to reduce or eliminate exposure above the alveolar ridge of the pitted and treated surface of the implant³⁴.

Even though in clinical practice implants are normally placed at bone crest level, subcrestal placement of the implant may be used in esthetically important areas to minimize the risk of metal showing and allow for enough room along the vertical to develop an adequate emergence profile^{24,35,26}.

Tomasi et al. (2010)³⁷, in a clinical test with a multivariate multilevel model used to analyze

¹ School of Medicine, Health Sciences Department at Alcalá University, Madrid, Spain. ² School of Medicine and Odontology at Murcia University, Murcia, Spain. ³ School of Dental Medicine, Department of Prosthetic Dentistry and Digital Technologies, Stonybrook University, New York, USA.