issn 1868-3207 • Vol. 23 • Issue 2/2022

2/22

implants

international magazine of oral implantology



research
How clean do sterile implants have to be?

case report
Complex rehabilitation of periodontally compromised dentition

interview
New directions in implantology—where is the journey heading?

oemus

SOME STARS SHINE BRIGHTER THAN OTHERS.*

CLEANIMPLANT QUALITY EVALUATION UPDATE

INDEPENDENT. THOROUGH. RELIABLE.

In-Kone
GLOBAL D

SDS1.2
SWISS DENTAL SOLUTIONS

AnyRidge
MEGAGEN

T6
NUCLEOSS

ICX-Premium
MEDENTIS MEDICAL

Conelog
CAMLOG

Patent/BioWin!
ZIRCON MEDICAL

Prama
SWEDEN & MARTINA

NobelActive
NOBEL BIOCARE

UnicCa
BTI

TRUSTED QUALITY
CLEAN IMPLANT
CERTIFIED • PEER-REVIEWED

SDS2.2
SWISS DENTAL SOLUTIONS

BlueSky
BREDENT MEDICAL

Kontact S
BIOTECH DENTAL

BlueDiamond
MEGAGEN

*These implant systems were awarded the CleanImplant „Trusted Quality“ seal after an unbiased and peer-reviewed quality assessment.

- Receive quality information about your implant in use.
- Provide more safety for your patients and avoid negligence claims.
- Win new patients as a CleanImplant Certified Dentist.
- Find out more. Join in and support the charitable initiative.

More information:
www.cleanimplant.com/dentists

CLEAN IMPLANT FOUNDATION

Dr Rolf Vollmer

First Vice President and Treasurer of DGZI

"The bone sets the tone and the tissue is the issue"

The quotation by Dennis Tarnow should be the benchmark for implant treatment. Advancing knowledge and the possibilities of digital techniques are making it increasingly possible to develop the ideal implant treatment plan effectively. This makes it all the more important to work together with your dental technician as a team in order to analyse the examination findings exactly and to implement them in the best possible way according to the patient's desires.

On 1 and 2 April, we had the opportunity to go through and discuss the possibilities of a digital workflow with a group of colleagues as part of a course in the curriculum of the German Association of Dental Implantology (DGZI). Digital planning according to CBCT data and intra-oral scans can be ideally coordinated. In addition, it can be found out very quickly whether bone augmentation measures should be carried out. If this is the case, the choice of bone grafting material should be based on the experience and results of the guideline conferences, in which the DGZI is involved by provision of its expertise. As far as bone augmentation is concerned, such guidelines are very helpful and give clinicians greater confidence in the treatment process. According to the recommendations, defects of 3–5 mm in size can be built up with a wide variety of bone grafting materials. The limits become apparent when, for example, a vertical alveolar ridge elevation is necessary. In these cases, autologous or allogenic bone block grafting should be considered. Here too, a digital workflow can be implemented, for example in model printing before grafting and in planning of individually milled block grafts. The current issue of implants—**international magazine of** oral implantology takes a closer look at this topic, and I wish you an enjoyable read.

Yours,



Dr Rolf Vollmer

First Vice President and Treasurer of DGZI


page 12


page 28


page 46

editorial

research

case report

industry

interview

manufacturer news

events

about the publisher

Cover image courtesy of
Camlog Biotechnologies GmbH /
www.camlog.com

k3pro
KONUS DENTAL IMPLANTS

ARGON
MEDICAL DEVICES & DENTAL IMPLANTS

Compress®

Implant



Softbone stability!

Available in 8, 9, 11 and 13 mm length with
4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.5 and 6.0 mm diameter

Beveled shoulder for preservation of bone and Soft tissue

Plateau designed thread for maximum primary stability in soft bone

Microbacterial Seal + micromoment free Implant-Prosthetics-Connection

Slightly conical, slender implant body for maximum clearance between the thread and body for formation of blood coagulum

Spiral progressive + compressive thread for easy insertion in soft bone



Implant design allows the use of reduced diameter Final drills, according to the bone quality

ARGON Medical
Fon.: +49 6721/ 3096-0
info@argon-medical.com
www.argon-medical.com

Quality & Design
Made in Germany

PURE IMPLANT TESTED PURITY
STABLE TISSUE SUBCRESTAL POSITIONING
ACTIVE THREAD-DESIGN BONE-CONDENSING & PROGRESSIVE
1,5° KONUS® CONNECTION
OSSEO INTEGRATION® GUARANTEE
PERI PROTECT® DESIGN
OSTEO ACTIVE® SURFACE

How clean do sterile implants have to be?

Analysis and clinical relevance of factory-related contaminations

Dr Dirk U. Duddeck, Germany

The initial phase of the biological response to a placed implant is primarily determined by the implant's surface characteristics. The properties of any implant surface are an essential factor of its non-irritant integration into surrounding tissue structures.[1] Undisturbed osteoblast proliferation and osteoblast differentiation at the implant surface depend decisively on the microstructure of the surface.[2] Since the 1980s, however, there have also been growing demands for flawless cleanliness of the implant systems used.[3] In this context, it is a logical step not only to look at current analytical techniques but also to take a critical look at the clinical significance of avoidable contamination on brand-new sterile-packaged implants.

SEM imaging

Imaging in the material contrast mode of a scanning electron microscope (SEM) has proved to be very useful for the analysis of particulate and film-like contaminants on sterile-packaged dental implants. Back-scattered electrons from the implant surface have typical energy of up to 10 keV. The intensity of these signals depends on the average atomic number of the sample material in focus. Compared with titanium or zirconium, heavier elements, such as iron or nickel, show more intense back scattering so that corresponding image areas appear bright (Fig. 1). In contrast, locations with lighter elements, such as carbonaceous plastic particles, are displayed darker than areas with titanium or zirconium (Fig. 2).

The image generated by the back-scattered electron detector thus allows conclusions regarding the distribution of foreign materials or elements in the imaged section of the implant surface. For a valid assessment of the particle load of an implant, a SEM image of the entire implant should always be acquired. In order



Fig. 1: Metal particle of iron, chromium and nickel on the surface of a titanium implant (Adin). SEM 2,500× magnification. **Fig. 2:** Numerous organic particles on the entire implant shoulder (OCO Biomedical). SEM 500× magnification.



Fig. 3: Factory-related contamination of entire implant threads (Ritter Implants). Full-size SEM image of the implant electronically compiled from hundreds of single images at 500× magnification using the material contrast technique (back-scattered electron mode).

to depict details at high magnification without pixelation, up to 600 individual SEM images must be electronically stitched together in high resolution for these comprehensive overview images. The resulting SEM image in material contrast provides a detailed overview and allows the quantitative detection of individual particles (Fig. 3).

Identification of impurities

Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) provides information about the exact elemental composition of an impurity and thus provides hints about its origin. When fast electrons hit the sample surface, X-rays are emitted inter alia. The energy of these X-rays is characteristic of each chemical element present in the sample or contaminant. The energy and the number of X-ray quanta emitted in this way are measured over a defined time and output as an EDS spectrum.

Time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometry (ToF-SIMS) provides even more precise information about the chemical composition of an impurity. The method provides information on the atomic and molecular structure of the uppermost monolayers of a substrate on an analysis area of $500 \times 500\,\mu m^2$ with sensitivity in the parts per million range and a lateral resolution of up to 100 nm. Comparison of the spectra with known substances allows precise material determination of the respective contamination (Fig. 4).

Too many implants of inferior quality

In a study from 2017 to 2020, the CleanImplant Foundation, a non-profit organisation based in Berlin in Germany, analysed sterile-packaged implants from various manufacturers. In cooperation with Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin in Germany, a total of 14 ceramic implant systems and 86 implant systems made of titanium and its alloys were examined under the SEM. The protocol of analysis used in this quality assessment study was published in a 2019 pilot study by Duddeck et al.[4] The samples were examined for contaminants under the SEM in a testing laboratory accredited according to the DIN EN ISO/IEC 17025:2018 standard. For the study, the implants were unpacked in a particle-free environment (Class 5 clean room according to the DIN EN ISO 14644-1 standard) and subsequently scanned in the same clean room to exclude any laboratory interference with the test samples. To an unexpected extent, that is, in more than one-third of the samples examined, the analysis revealed factory-related residues and contamination. SEM imaging identified not only carbonaceous contaminants in significant quantities (Fig. 5) but also foreign metals such as chromium, iron, tungsten, nickel, copper and tin. Implants made of titanium and zirconium dioxide were affected, regardless of price, market position, size of the manufacturer or production location. Subsequent to the SEM/EDS analysis, selected contaminated implant samples were additionally examined by a detailed ToF-SIMS analysis. Polysiloxanes, that is, synthetic polymers (Fig. 6), thermoplastics and residues of dodecylbenzene sulphonic acid were found on the implant surfaces. This cytotoxic surface-active chemical is one of the most aggressive components in many cleaning agents and is classified as a hazardous substance.

Clinical relevance

In particular, organic carbonaceous foreign materials have been associated with initial bone loss or even peri-implantitis in the literature.[5] Increased osteoclast activity associated with a possible foreign-body reaction, resulting in peri-implant bone resorption, could be the cause.[6] Exposure to foreign particles induces macrophages to secrete tumour necrosis factor-α, interleukin-1β, interleukin-6 and prostaglandin E2, which in turn stimulates the differentiation of osteoclast precursors into mature osteoclasts. This response would explain clinically striking bone loss during the initial healing phase or the early onset of peri-implantitis. All particles found in the study



Fig. 4: Time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometry instrument (tascon).

appear to have survived the wet chemical cleaning procedures in the manufacturing process or contaminated the implant in the handling and packaging process. Especially foreign particles with a size of 0.2–7.2 µm are classified as pro-inflammatory.[7–9] If they detach from the surface during the insertion of the implant, macrophages take up the particles by phagocytosis and subsequently release pro-inflammatory cytokines. The result is an expanding zone of soft-tissue damage and inflammation.[6]



Fig. 5: Carbonaceous particles (polysiloxanes) on a titanium implant at the implant apex of a titanium implant (T3, ZimVie). SEM 500× magnification.

Independent test procedure provides safety for dentists

All implants examined in the recent quality assessment study, including those significantly contaminated, showed the CE mark on the packaging or carried the U.S. Food and Drug Administration logo for marketing clearance on the US market. With the introduction of a worldwide quality seal for clean implants, the "Trusted Quality" mark, the CleanImplant Foundation addressed this issue years ago. Criteria for implants that are largely free of foreign particles were defined in a guideline in 2017 and published as a consensus paper involving renowned scientists such as Prof. Tomas Albrektsson, Prof. Ann Wennerberg, Prof. Hugo de Bruyn, Prof. Florian Beuer, Prof. Jaafar Mouhyi, Dr Michael Norton, and Dr Luigi Canullo.[10] These scientists also form the foundation's scientific advisory board, which ultimately decides on the awarding of the above-mentioned quality seal. For the testing procedure of an implant system, a total of five samples are included. A maximum of three implants are obtained from the respective manufacturer and at least two implants from implantology practices. This procedure ensures random selection during sampling and reliably prevents the acquisition of potentially specially treated test samples. The independent and thorough analysis of the samples must be renewed every two years in specially accredited testing laboratories. The same protocol of analysis described in the *Journal of Clinical Medicine* in 2019 is to be applied.[4]

Before the seal can be awarded, proof of a multi-annual survival rate of at least 95% must be provided for the respective implant system, as well as proof of the absence of a significant number of particles. The results of the analysis and the sufficiently reliable clinical documentation of a system are always checked independently by two members of the scientific advisory board in a peer-review process and compared with the requirements of the guideline. Not until all criteria are met can an implant system be awarded the seal for a period of two years. To date, the following systems have been awarded the foundation's "Trusted Quality" seal after rigorous peer review (in alphabetical order): AnyRidge and BLUEDIAMOND (MegaGen), blueSKY (bredent medical), CONELOG (CAMLOG), ICX-PREMIUM (medentis medical), In-Kone (Global D), Kontact S (Biotech Dental), NobelActive (Nobel Biocare), Patent/BioWin! (Zircon Medical/Champions), Prama (Sweden & Martina), SDS1.2 and SDS2.2 (SDS Swiss Dental Solutions), T6 (NucleOSS) and UnicCa (BTI). Other implant systems are currently undergoing the testing process of the foundation.

Discussion

The evaluation of the CleanImplant quality assessment study revealed both light and shadow with regard to the current quality level and sustainable quality control of dental implants. This creates a problem for the careful

PERFECT MATCH

MIS CONICAL CONNECTION. **MAKE IT SIMPLE**

MIS conical connection feature a 12-degree friction fit which ensures a secure seal and minimal micro-movements. Visit MIS Blog to get tips from experienced, world-renowned implant specialists on optimizing working with conical connection implants and restorative components: www.mis-implants.com/blog