

implants

international magazine of oral implantology

4 2017

research


Titanium and its alloys
in dental implantology

case report

Rehabilitation of
edentulous patients

industry

Digital workflow:
From planning to restoration



dentistry

axiom[®]

MULTI LEVEL

NEW Axiom[®] TL,
Tissue Level **IMPLANT**

Axiom[®] BL,
Bone Level

CAD-CAM **Simeda[®]**
prosthesis

INNOVATIVE
inLink[®] connection

inLink[®]
abutment



YOUR NEW POWER

The **Axiom[®] Multi Level[®]** range opens the way to a new total compatibility between the **Bone Level** and **Tissue Level** philosophies. The new **Axiom[®] Tissue Level** implant promotes biological safety and prosthetic manipulation with the comfort of a screw-retained prosthesis. Thanks to the **inLink[®]** innovation, available on **Axiom[®] Tissue Level** and **Axiom[®] Bone Level** through a dedicated abutment, **Anthogyr** introduces the first connection with integral screw system in a **CAD-CAM Simeda[®]** prosthesis. **The Axiom[®] Multi Level[®]** range provides new flexibility to your implantology practice.



www.axiom-multilevel.com

Anthogyr
PRIME MOVER IN IMPLANTOLOGY

How can we make it better?



Dr Rolf Vollmer

Dear colleagues,

The German Association of Dental Implantology (DGZI) is one of the most traditional European dental implantology associations. From the very beginning, as practitioners, we have provided decisive impulses without which modern implantology would not be conceivable today as one of the absolute trend disciplines of modern dentistry.

In 2017, the DGZI again had (also) a lot of international activities. Visits were made to the USA, Japan, and also to the Maghreb countries. Insights into the dental training structures and into the current market developments of the respective countries often showed interesting aspects. One German attendee said: "Without adequate training you will not be successful. And we definitely have to bring more experience and knowledge from continent to continent."

One of the experiences I personally have made was that not only treatment concepts but also the mentality in other countries can be very different. A US friend and colleague with Japanese roots and a Japanese wife discussed with me the differences between Japan, Germany and the USA. He said: "My sons are Americanised. Whether privately as in their hobbies or when they do their jobs, I very often hear: 'It's good enough!' But the Japanese or Germans ask: How can we make it better?" My own experience has shown that there is some truth behind this.

Future congress in dental implantology



For the next years, the DGZI has set herself the demanding task and vision to adapt both the training structures with regard to curricula, dental technician training, and the congress design to the most modern possibilities and conditions in order to remain on top in the future.

Thus, in 2018, the 1st Future Congress for Dental Implantology of the DGZI will raise new questions under the motto "Visions in Implantology". The congress will address the question of what implantology will look like in five or maybe ten years. Renowned speakers from Germany and abroad, representatives of friendly international professional societies, industry partners and, of course, participants from Europe, the USA, Asia and the Arab countries will design and experience an outstanding innovative training event. The DGZI board cordially invites you to this new congress on 28 and 29 September 2018 at the Hilton Hotel in Düsseldorf, Germany. Save the date, keep curious and let yourself be surprised.

I wish you a pleasant Christmas time and a relaxed New Year,

Yours

Dr Rolf Vollmer
First Vice President and Treasurer of the German Association of Dental Implantology



| **editorial**

- 03 **How can we make it better?**
Dr Rolf Vollmer

| **research**

- 06 **Titanium and its alloys in dental implantology**
Drs Roland Masa & Gábor Braunitzer

| **case report**

- 12 **Rehabilitation of edentulous patients**
Dr Nikolaos Papagiannoulis

| **industry**

- 20 **Rehabilitation of edentulous arches**
Dr Marco Montanari, Claudio Sassatelli & Davide Nadalini
- 32 **Digital workflow: From planning to restoration**
Jan Kielhorn, Siegfried Hoelzer & Björn Roland
- 38 **A clinical comparison**
Private lecturer Dr Dr Arwed Ludwig & Dr Gregor Thomas

| **interview**

- 48 **“Implantology is a field of opportunities”**
- 50 **Putting TiUnite to the test**

| **events**

- 52 **47th DGZI International Annual Congress**
Dr Georg Bach
- 56 **AAID congress in San Diego**
Dr Rolf Vollmer
- 60 **Hot programme for EAIO meeting in Madrid**
Dental Tribune International
- 62 **“Science meets Practice”**

| **news**

- 42 **manufacturer news**
- 63 **news**

| **about the publisher**

- 66 **imprint**



Cover image courtesy of bredent medical GmbH & Co. KG
www.bredent-medical.com

a perfect fit™

camlog

THE NEW COMFORT CLASS.

The COMFOUR® Abutment System for occlusal screw-retained restorations is an ideal addition to the CAMLOG® and the CONELOG® Implant System. With the COMFOUR® System, you can offer your edentulous patients the option of an immediate, comfortable and permanent denture on four or six implants – and thus a considerable gain in quality of life. www.camlog.com

CAMLOG®
SYSTEM

CONELOG®
SYSTEM




Prosthetic screw M 1.6

Angled bar abutment for the COMFOUR® System, available in 17° and 30° angles

Anatomically shaped emergence profile, lean design

Titanium bonding base for straight and angled bar abutments, Passive Fit



Aligning tool

Scanning cap

Titanium cap

Flexible handle

COMFOUR® offers you a range of options to overcome the challenges you face in your implant practice, making them easier while saving time.

Titanium and its alloys in dental implantology

Authors: Drs Roland Masa & Gábor Braunitzer, Hungary

Pure titanium and titanium alloys for dental purposes

In contemporary prosthodontics, the use of dental implants is as self-evident as any other established method. Titanium (Ti) and its alloys are still the most widely used materials for dental and orthopaedic applications.^{1,2} Titanium has good mechanical stability, low density (4.5 g/cm³), a high strength-to-weight ratio and favourable biocompatibility.³ Titanium and its alloys have excellent corrosion resistance owing to the thick, insoluble titanium dioxide (TiO₂) layer that forms on the surface within nanoseconds. This layer can restore itself immediately in the presence of water or air should damage occur.⁴

Four grades of unalloyed, commercially pure (CP) Ti are available for dental applications, designated as Grades 1 to 4. These grades are defined by their oxygen and iron content, as these elements have a substantial effect on the mechanical and physical properties of the metal, even in very small concentrations. As the concentration of oxygen or iron increases, the mechanical strength increases in parallel, while ductility decreases.⁵ The Ti-6Al-4V alloy (described later) is also referred to as Grade 5. Grades over 5 are not used in dentistry. A comparison of the mechanical properties of CP Ti and its alloys is given in Table 1.

Grades 1 to 4

As already mentioned, the physical characteristics of CP Ti are predominantly influenced by the oxygen and iron content of the material. The increasing grade number expresses a decreasing amount of these "impurities". Therefore, Grade 1 is the softest and most ductile type of CP Ti, while Grade 4 is significantly stronger and less malleable than the lower grades.⁵ Of the unalloyed CP Ti grades, Grade 4 has the highest tensile strength and yield strength. Some disadvantages that Grades 1 to 4 have are relatively low mechanical strength, a high Young's modulus and poor wear resistance. Improving the mechanical

properties without reducing biocompatibility is still a challenge.⁶

Grade 5 (Ti-6Al-4V)

CPTi is not preferable when high stress tolerance is required. Mechanical properties such as implant strength, creep resistance and formability can be improved by alloying Ti with a wide range of elements (e.g. aluminium, Al; vanadium, V; tantalum, Ta; zirconium, Zr). As shown in Table 1, the mechanical properties of Ti alloys are superior to those of Grades 1 to 4, and therefore it comes as no surprise that Grade 5 is the most widely used Ti alloy for biomedical applications.³

In spite of its good mechanical features, corrosion wear and ion release (Al, V) initially raised concerns about its applicability in implant dentistry. De Morais et al. investigated the level of these ions released from orthodontic mini-implants and the potential toxicity of these elements.⁷ They concluded that, despite the detectable amounts of Ti, Al and V ions, these values remained below the average nutrition uptake of these ions and did not reach the level of toxicity.⁷

A high Young's modulus is also a problem with Grade 5, but the exact value (115 GPa) does not significantly differ from that of the CP grades. Therefore, this should not raise specific concerns regarding this alloy. Different alloying elements have been used to replace Al and V in the Ti-6Al-4V alloy. One example is the use of niobium (Nb) and Zr in the alloy Ti-13Nb-13Zr. This offers the highest strength-to-weight ratio and a reduced Young's modulus (77 GPa), making Ti-13Nb-13Zr optimal for orthopaedic implants.⁸ Ti-13Nb-13Zr's possible dental applicability is still under investigation.^{9,10}

Adverse reactions to titanium and titanium alloys

Since Ti is a transition metal, allergy or metal hypersensitivity may be a matter of concern.¹¹⁻¹³ In

Properties	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5 (Ti-6Al-4V)	Ti-13Nb-13Zr	
Tensile strength (MPa)	240	345	450	550	860	1,030	
Yield strength (0.2% offset; MPa)	170	275	380	485	795	900	
Elongation (%)	24	20	18	15	10	15	
Reduction of area (%)	30	30	30	25	25	45	Table 1

spite of Ti's excellent biocompatibility, allergy to this metal can still be observed in dental implant patients, although its prevalence is very low (0.6%).¹⁴ Some authors still recommend a metal allergy test for patients with previous hypersensitivity of any kind.^{15,16} While we have no gold standard test for detecting Ti allergy, dermal patch tests or *in vitro* blood tests such as the lymphocyte transformation test or the memory lymphocyte immunostimulation assay (MELISA®) are frequently used methods, even if the results are often ambiguous.¹⁷ It must be added that Ti exposure from personal care products and biomedical implants is common, and still there is no reliable evidence for actual toxicity or true allergic reactions.

Furthermore, according to a review by Javed et al., Ti per se cannot be identified as a cause of allergic reactions in patients with dental implants.¹⁸ In their opinion, it is the occasional and otherwise negligible impurities (i.e. additional elements besides Ti) that trigger hypersensitivity reactions.¹⁸ Harloff et al. examined common dental implant materials (Grade 1 Ti and Ti alloys, including Grade 5) by spectral analysis.¹⁹ Their results showed that all the investigated materials contained low but detectable amounts of various other elements (nickel, chromium, copper, palladium, manganese) that may induce allergic reactions, especially in people with existing metal sensitivity.

Since it is quite rare for a patient's metal allergy to be diagnosed first upon implant placement, failure due to hypersensitivity can be avoided by careful history taking. However, it can happen that the patient denies knowledge of any metal allergy and an allergic reaction occurs nevertheless. The appearance of a rash, urticaria, oedema, mucosal erythema, swelling, or hyperplastic lesions of the soft tissue after implant placement indicates an allergic reaction.²⁰ In these cases, a corrosion process is occurring in which ions released from the surface form active complexes with proteins and trigger the characteristic reactions.²¹ Such cases, however, are rare, and Ti implants for prosthodontic purposes can be considered safe and reliable for the general population.

Dental implant surface modifications


Bulk properties, such as corrosion resistance and modulus of elasticity, which determine the selection of the appropriate biomaterial for the relevant biomedical application, are important for implant success. However, surface properties also play a significant role. First of all, the geometric configuration of the implant should be designed to achieve an extensive bone-implant contact area for faster osseointegration. This in itself, however, is not sufficient. During osseointegration, the outermost layers of the implant interact with the host tissues and cells. Therefore, developing surfaces that enable a shorter healing time and optimal connection between the biomaterial and the surrounding bone is a major focus of research.

In order to achieve that goal, various surface treatments have been developed, generally classified into two major categories: physicochemical and biochemical. A common feature of these treatments is that they leave the bulk properties unchanged and modify only certain target properties of the surface, such as its roughness or chemical composition.²²⁻²⁴ Here, we give a brief summary of these methods and their resulting surfaces and discuss the sandblasted, large-grit, acid-etched (SLA) method that combines two physicochemical methods.

Physicochemical methods

Physicochemical methods are usually used to increase the implant's surface roughness. Rougher surfaces yield better bone response and higher bone quality than machined/turned surfaces, as demonstrated by histomorphometric studies.²⁵⁻²⁷ Wennerberg and Albrektsson classified surfaces according to their roughness (Sa) as follows: smooth (Sa < 0.5 µm), minimally rough (Sa = 0.5–1 µm), moderately rough (Sa > 1–2 µm) and rough (Sa > 2 µm); and concluded that moderately rough surfaces (such as SLA, detailed later) show the most favourable bone responses.²⁸ The most widely used physicochemical surface treatments are sandblasting, ion implantation, laser ablation, covering with inorganic calcium phosphates and purely chemical methods, like oxidation and acid etching.²⁴

Tab. 1: Mechanical properties of titanium and its alloys.⁵



Figs. 1a & b: Scanning electron microscopy images of Alpha-Bio Tec's SLA surface at x1,000 (a) and x2,500 (b) magnification.

Biochemical methods

These methods augment the physicochemical processes based on the latest knowledge in biology and biochemistry. The aim is to immobilise various proteins, enzymes and molecules to better control the specific bone-implant interface.²⁹⁻³¹ These molecules can interact with or promote the adsorption of desired proteins to enhance osseointegration. Proteins and/or steroid growth factors have been shown to promote the proliferation of different connective tissue and inflammatory cells.^{32,33} Besides promoting the attachment of host cells, the inhibition of bacterial colonisation is desirable and is the focus of intensive research.³⁴

In order to prevent the initial attachment of bacteria and biofilm formation, anti-biofouling and bactericidal surfaces have been developed. Anti-biofouling surfaces prevent the initial attachment with specific surface topography or chemistry.³⁵ In addition, bactericidal surfaces cause the death of the bacterial cell typically on contact.³⁶ Coatings that release nanosilver, photocatalytic TiO₂ or nitric oxide have been shown to be bactericidal.^{37,38}

Sandblasting with large-grit corundum and acid etching

SLA is one of the most widely studied and well-documented Ti implant surface modifiers³⁹⁻⁴² and was originally introduced by Buser et al.⁴³ As the name suggests, the surface is first sandblasted with large-grit corundum (aluminium oxide) particles, then acid-

etched with hydrochloric acid and sulphuric acid. The result is a moderately rough surface ($S_a \approx 1.5 \mu\text{m}$) characterised by rapid osseointegration and is therefore optimal even for early implant loading.²⁸ The surface is composed predominantly of TiO₂ with residual Al from the sandblasting process.^{44,45} Some studies have reported as high as a 97-100% success rate with this surface at the five-year follow-up, after early loading at six weeks (Figs. 1a & b).^{46,47}


Biocompatibility and clinical applicability of SLA

In vitro studies

Aybar et al. performed an immunohistochemical study of osteoblast-like cells on four different types of Ti discs: SLA1 (Grade 4, Straumann), SLA2 (Grade 5, Alpha-Bio Tec), acid-etched (Grade 5, Alpha-Bio Tec) and machined (Grade 5, Alpha-Bio Tec).⁴⁸ Proliferation and DNA synthesis of primary rat calvarial cells were evaluated after one and seven days of incubation. After 24 hours, the highest level of DNA synthesis was observed on SLA1, but after one week, the proliferation of osteoblast-like cells decreased significantly on this surface, while a significant increase of DNA production was observed on the Grade 5 surfaces. In another *in vitro* study, the adsorption of different human plasma proteins to three different implant surfaces (SLA, machined, acid-etched, Alpha-Bio Tec) was examined. Singh compared polished and SLA surfaces in terms of osteogenetic potential, and found SLA significantly superior (Figs. 2a & b).⁵⁵ The quantity and quality of adsorbed plasma proteins (albumin, fibronectin and fibrinogen) was the highest in the SLA group, as demonstrated by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and confocal scanning laser microscopy.⁴⁹ Implant removal torque testing also resulted in better bone anchorage and higher stiffness values of the SLA surface compared with the machined and acid-etched surfaces.⁵⁰

Clinical studies

Roccuzzo et al. examined 106 implants (53 SLA, 53 control TPS) in 27 patients and found no implant loss after five years' follow-up (100% success rate).⁴⁶ No significant differences were seen in the basic periodontal indices (bleeding on probing, probing pocket depth, bone loss) between the two surfaces,⁴⁶ indicating superior biocompatibility. Van Velzen et al. evaluated the ten-year survival of 374 SLA-modified dental implants in 177 patients with special attention to peri-implantitis. The success rate was 99.7% at the implant level and 99.4% at the patient level, with 7% prevalence of symptoms specific to peri-implantitis.⁴⁰ In the clinical study of Strietzel et al., the survival of 283 immediately loaded screw-type Alpha-Bio Tec SLA implants was assessed.⁴⁷ It was found that,



Figs. 2a & b: Scanning electron microscopy images of smooth (a) and SLA (b) surfaces after attachment of human osteosarcoma osteoblast cells.⁵⁵

MEISINGER

PERFECT SURGICAL SOLUTIONS

