ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 07, 2020

SYSTAMATIC REVIEW ON DIFFERENT ORTHODONTIC IMPLANTS CURRENTLY USED IN DENTISTRY

Dr. Anand V Professor & HOD[1],

Dr.Monisha S,Junior Resident[2]

Meenakshi Academy of Higher Education and Research

anandv@mmchri.ac.in

Abstract

It is important, considering the wide range of orthodontic devices currently available on the market, to select the most biocompatible orthodontic implant available on the market. Current science data have shown that in vitro measurements of the toxicity of residual particles produced by various orthodontic apparatuses with oral cell lines provide accurate data. In this relation, three commercially available implants, i.e., stainless steel and titanium implants have been tested for in vitro biocompatibility. Methods: Human gingival fibroblasts (HGFs) have been used as the in vitro model to determine cellular morphology, viability of the cells, and cytotoxicity via a 24-hour and 72-hour test for celular implant exposure with 3-(4,5-dimethythiazol-2-yl)-, 2-5,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MT) and LDH test. Results: The results compare implant surface structure and topography with biological, laboratory assessments related to the direct cells (genetic fibroblasts) and blood vessel toxicology (HET-CAM) trial. A relative cytototoxicity of HGF cells occurs for the stainless steel implant, while the other two tests did not produce substantial alteration in HGF cells. Conclusion: The stainless steel implant caused mild cytotoxic effects among the three orthodontic implants samples. This calls for improved alertness in their clinic usage, especially in patients with a strong sensitivity to nicke [1,2].

Keywords: DENTAL, IMPLANT, SURGERY

BACKGROUND

The complex microbiota in the oral cavity plays a significant part in sustaining health by developing the immune response and inhibiting the colonisation of diseases. However, certain oral diseases can be caused in some conditions by ordinary microbiota. Oral dysbiosis causes major changes, decreases the number of positive bacteria and allows possible pathogens to spread. The issue with this is a biofilm-like condition that is characterised by alveolar bone resorption, which can lead to mobility of tooth and tooth loss in susceptible persons with periodontitis. Indeed, periodonstic patients who have obtained dental implants rehabilitate are more vulnerable to peri-implant infections, which are often primarily etiological in terms of impaired plaque treatment[3,4].

ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 07, 2020

In a systemic analysis carried out in 2017, patient-level statistics and implant-level data suggest that 9.25% and 19.83% of the cases analysed were present with peri-implantitis, while 29.48% of patients and 46.83% of implants analysed were affected by mucositis. Biofilm avoidance not only becomes desirable, but necessary, as there has been no consensus on the best treatment procedure. The supportive status and the adequate prothetic design at the therapeutic stage, followed by oral hygiene and frequent appointments are the prerequisites for this[3–9]. At the level of study, the need to analyse materials produced with, or by modification through topographical surface characteristics (e.g. touch angle and roughness) either antibiofilms or antigymicrobial surfaces, or through integration of antibiofilms may also be calculated through physicochemical examination at a constant stage.

This material has been commonly used in implant dentistry since it was shown by Branemark et al. (1981) to revolutionise oral recovery practises[10–12]. However, metallic waste is released under some cases, such as clinical therapy for peri-implantitis or wear-corrosion, leading to harmful effects on peri-implant tissues. Metal particles have been shown to activate molecular mechanistic pathways, such as the rise in proinflammatory cytokine and osteoclasts and the penetration of cytotoxic and genotoxic inflammatory cells. There has therefore been a rising interest in finding an alternative material for dental implants and implant abutments.

IMPLANTS

The long-term successes of dental implants have been verified for several years. Several research have since identified experimental surgical and prosthodontic procedures aimed at enhancing the clinical effects of implant-based therapies (3,4). For restaurations that endorse implant, the effectiveness of the procedure depends on the pasive fitness of the superstructure, as biological and mechanical problems will arise if the passive fit is not reached. The fit depends on the precision of implant printing that can be achieved by traditional techniques or digital techniques implemented more recently[13,14]. In a typical workflow, the development of an implant-supported prothesis must begin with the assistance of an implant transfer post. Conventional printing may be graded either specifically (pick up) or implicitly (transfer). Intraoral scanners are also available for digital printing with the advent of digital technology in dentistry. The manufacturers agree that intraoral scanning are an integral element of automated workflow, giving patients greater convenience, a decreased time of turn and, compared with traditional procedures, even a better cost-benefit ratio[15,16].

NEW METHODS IN DENTAL IMPLANTS

Dentistry has improved substantially as a result of the implementation in everyday cline practise of modern emerging technology and tools such as CAD, CAM, laser-sintering, and 3D printing. Currently, prothese recovery trials of dental implants are focused on therapeutic criteria evaluation. The survival rate may be calculated through longevity, while the technological and biological effects of therapy are tested via success, sampling depth (PD), test bleeding (BOP) and other radiographic data. Results based on patients and operators for protocols for implant therapy are uncommon and primarily rely on the happiness of the patients with the results reached at the conclusion of the procedure. In order to properly select which procedure to use, clinical knowledge about the results of implant care following a

ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 07, 2020

precise workflow, patient and operator expectations should be considered[17–21]. "Printing" is defined as the "negative resemblance or copy in the reverse surface of an object, an impression on the face of an object and adjacent structures for use in dentistry," according to the 9th edition of The Glossary of Prosthodontics. Depending on the technology and the material used by the operator[8] there is considerable difference in printing and subsequent master casts[22–25]. In the so-called "conventional" method, a cast is created after printing with a rack filled with a printing medium. The automated machine digitally captures the intraoral state using intraoral 3D acquisition equipment and helps the computer to create a virtual image by means of the acquired knowledge. Now patients are expecting more convenience-based care protocols to produce a good clinical result[9,12,26–28]. With intraoral screening (IOS), the classical impression of patients prevents damage due to the risks of suffocation, gagging and discomfort of the taste.

Technology CAD/CAM has changed dentistry, having a profound impact on both dental and dental laboratories, particularly prosthodontics and restorative dentistry. However, the majority of research in digital dentistry concentrated much of the time on the development of modern and more advanced protocols, on the accurate and precise measurement of intraorally molecular scanners and dental milling machines[29,30]. In addition, the CAD/CAM technology was introduced as a rehabilitation to the edentulous and partly edentulous arch while designing CAD/CAM titanium bars. They can be tailored to suit the tooth and soft tissue around them better. Scarano et al. say that, due to the high precision of this technology[17], this leads to simplification in terms of prothesis workflow. Moeller et al. say that in the case of bad implants CAD/CAM titanium bars should also be used. Changing a well-established procedure requires clinical evidence that recognises the effect of this approach on patients and the everyday life of the surgeon and can be represented by implant work on a crown or bridges. Few research have analysed a fully digital implant restore workflow to clinically validate this approach, taking into account patient and operator expectations, time, quality and cost[31–34].

DISCUSSION

Since 1973, when Duret initially performed dental restoration with digital skills, a close connection between CAD / CAM (Computer Assisted Design) technology and implant dentistry has been developed. The CAD process consists of the collection of data, design for the temporary or definitive reconstruction and preparing of the implant installation in virtual or software-based design. A subtractive frying machine uses the cutting tool and the measuring paths of such instruments to cut a repair material block to create the CAD product during the CAM process. Additive processing technologies in various therapeutic dental fields recently has been developed and used to manufacture implant-supported restauration in digital works[35–39]. Some dental CAD/CAM systems are used for prosthodontic restaurants (in-office type) in the offices of patients that are given to the mouth of patients on treatment day. Many CAD/CAM dental systems produce dental laboratory products (in-lab type). A small variety of applications in the in-office form of CAD and CAM system is limited to inlays, porcelain laminate veneers and single crowns owing to the clinic conditions. As the in-office form is a full data collection, analysis, and output device, a range of restorations were made and scientifically appealed to this in-office CAD/CAM. The laboratory sort not only creates single restorative techniques, but also fixed protheses that restore four, five, or even absent teeth over the long term. Such a CAD/CAM system calls for the relocation of the dental laboratory oral details of a patient. A stone model is scanned using an extraoral scanner and the automated printing technique is used in the clinic for traditional printing.. Dental doctor will cut down on the time needed to begin the restauration design process and send the acquired data electronically to every dental laboratory in the world with the intra-oral scanner.

Subtractive or additive processing for implant-supported restauration is used to treat components, including metals, ceramics and polymers[12,40,41]. Depending on the form of processing device, the necessary materials for different CAD/CAM systems have been developed and implemented in various ways. For direct processing, ceramic or metal lingots for definitive protheses, subtractive manufacturing, particularly milling, is used. The ceramic products were actively used for SM in the field of fixed prosthodontics assisted by implants, since excess material waste and aesthetics restrict the application of metals (including gold). SM is also used for provisional repair on polymers such as polymethylmethacrylate. In general, SM produces dental protheses reliably and this technology is well known in dental practise. One downside is SM leaves a considerable volume of waste as a result of the material loss caused by the broiling of the material block[42–44].

REFERENCES

1. Szuhanek CA, Watz CG, Avram Ș, et al. Comparative toxicological in vitro and in ovo screening of different orthodontic implants currently used in dentistry. *Materials (Basel)*. 2020;13(24):1-14. doi:10.3390/ma13245690
2. Lai HC. Prevention and management of hardware and biological complications in implant dentistry. *Zhonghua Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi*. 2020;55(11):814-818. doi:10.3760/cma.j.cn112144-20200615-00347
3. Correia A, Rebolo A, Azevedo L, Polido W, Rodrigues PP. SAC Assessment Tool in Implant Dentistry: Evaluation Agreement Level Between Users. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implant*. 2020;35(5):990-994. doi:10.11607/jomi.8023
4. Karlsson K, Derks J, Wennström JL, Petzold M, Berglundh T. Occurrence and clustering of complications in implant dentistry. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2020;31(10):1002-1009. doi:10.1111/clr.13647
5. Brum RS, Labes LG, Volpato CÂM, Benfatti CAM, Pimenta AL. Strategies to reduce biofilm formation in peek materials applied to implant dentistry—a comprehensive review. *Antibiotics*. 2020;9(9):1-21. doi:10.3390/antibiotics9090609
6. Predictable implant dentistry. *Br Dent J*. 2020;229(5):319. doi:10.1038/s41415-020-2166-6
7. García-Gil I, Cortés-Bretón-Brinkmann J, Jiménez-García J, Peláez-Rico J, Suárez-García M-J. Precision and practical usefulness of intraoral scanners in implant dentistry: A systematic literature review. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2020;12(8):e784-e793. doi:10.4317/jced.57025
8. Revilla-León M, Sadeghpour M, Özcan M. A Review of the Applications of Additive

Manufacturing Technologies Used to Fabricate Metals in Implant Dentistry. *J Prosthodont*. 2020;29(7):579-593. doi:10.1111/jopr.13212

9. Barbin T, Velôso D V, Del Rio Silva L, et al. 3D metal printing in dentistry: An in vitro biomechanical comparative study of two additive manufacturing technologies for full-arch implant-supported prostheses. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater*. 2020;108. doi:10.1016/j.jmbbm.2020.103821

10. Betancur D, Ulloa C, Chaparro A, Venegas B, Valdivia-Gandur I, Beltrán V. Implants infections, a current challenge for medicine and dentistry [Infecciones de implantes, un desafío actual para la medicina y la odontología]. *J Oral Res*. 2020;2020(Special Issue 1):17-19. doi:10.17126/JORALRES.2020.028

11. Esquivel J, Piñeyro A. Dual-space technique for creating cement space in a cementation device for implant dentistry: A predictable chairside approach. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2020;124(1):19-22. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2019.05.031

12. Revilla-León M, Sadeghpour M, Özcan M. An update on applications of 3D printing technologies used for processing polymers used in implant dentistry. *Odontology*. 2020;108(3):331-338. doi:10.1007/s10266-019-00441-7

13. De Angelis P, Manicone PF, De Angelis S, et al. Patient and operator centered outcomes in implant dentistry: Comparison between fully digital and conventional workflow for single crown and three-unit fixed-bridge. *Materials (Basel)*. 2020;13(12):1-13. doi:10.3390/ma13122781

14. Kim Y-K. Minimally invasive surgery in implant dentistry. *J Korean Assoc Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2020;46(3):161. doi:10.5125/JKAOMS.2020.46.3.161

15. Rutkowski JL. Global perspectives for implant dentistry. *J Oral Implantol*. 2020;46(3):173. doi:10.1563/aaid-joi-D-20-Editorial.4603

16. AlSarhan MA. Knowledge and Prescription Habits toward Preoperative Antibiotics in Implant Dentistry: A Survey Analysis in a Subset of Dentists in Saudi Arabia. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2020;21(5):568-574. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10024-2798

17. Wadhwani CPK, O'Brien R, Rosen PS, Chung K-H. Testing and calibrating the mechanical-type toggle torque wrenches used in implant dentistry: A dental technique. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2020;123(3):403-407. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2019.04.021

18. Lozada J, Piermatti J, DaSilva J, Garcia A, Rutkowski JL. Reasons for an AAID sponsored implant dentistry education summit. *J Oral Implantol*. 2020;46(1):1-2. doi:10.1563/aaid-joi-D-Editorial.4601

19. Lieber R, Pandis N, Faggion C.M. J. Reporting and handling of incomplete outcome data in implant dentistry: A survey of randomized clinical trials. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2020;47(2):257-266. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13222

20. Klinge A, Khalil D, Klinge B, et al. Prophylactic antibiotics for staged bone augmentation in implant dentistry. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 2020;78(1):64-73. doi:10.1080/00016357.2019.1656819

21. Ben-Zvi Y, Rosenfeld E, Masri D, Avishai G, Chaushu G, Chaushu L. Clinical and radiological characteristics of oro-antral communications/fistulae due to implant dentistry procedures: A cross-sectional retrospective study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2020. doi:10.1111/cid.12962

22. Chiang HSC, Tsai YWC, Huang RYH, et al. Citation Characteristics of H-Classics Articles in Implant Dentistry: A Citation Analysis Using H-Classics Mehod. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implant*. 2020;35(5):900-909v. doi:10.11607/jomi.8129

23. Misch CM. Editorial: Implant dentistry: The 13th recognised ADA dental specialty? *Int J oral Implantol (Berlin, Ger*. 2020;13(2):103-104. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85084870314&partnerID=40&md5=f0c9ad1be1f3a2589730cb04c23f2bfe.

24. Sawase T, Kuroshima S. The current clinical relevancy of intraoral scanners in implant dentistry. *Dent Mater J*. 2020;39(1):57-61. doi:10.4012/dmj.2019-285

25. Liu Y, Xu Y, Li Y, Wu Q. Application of problem-based learning and case-based learning integrated method in the teaching of maxillary sinus floor augmentation in implant dentistry. *PeerJ*. 2020;2020(1). doi:10.7717/peerj.8353

26. Řehounek L, Jíra A, Denk F. Numerical model of a 3D-printed titanium structure for use in implant dentistry. In: Kula T. Frankovsky P. HRBJTFKJ, ed. *EAN 2017 - 55th Conference on Experimental Stress Analysis 2017*. Technical University of Kosice; 2017:21-26. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85026293607&partnerID=40&md5=75e455030c6b030a212f21b4cdb1f1a4.

27. Strong SM. 3D printing, polymethyl methacrylate acrylic, and fully milled zirconia for anterior implant restorations: The brave new world of prosthetic dentistry. *Gen Dent*. 2015;63(2):11-13. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84942325800&partnerID=40&md5=0f1e3ac8eba096666a673de098b0bdcf.

28. Šimunić N, Vidović D, Bursać D, Matković I. Application of 3D printed drill guides in implant dentistry. In: Lackovic I. VD, ed. *IFMBE Proceedings*. Vol 45. Springer Verlag; 2015:383-386. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11128-5_96

29. Ritter L, Hanßen N, Neugebauer J, et al. On the way to the virtualized patient - integrated 3D diagnosis and treatment planning in implant dentistry [Auf dem Weg zum virtuellen patienten integrierte dreidimensionale diagnostik und behandlungsplanung in der implantologie]. *Implantologie*. 2011;19(3):253-259. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85018712348&partnerID=40&md5=cd3721608df239d6d6b879dad4e5d751.

30. Ritter L, Neugebauer J, Dreiseidler T, et al. 3D X-ray meets CAD/CAM dentistry: A novel procedure for virtual dental implant planning [3D X-ray meets CAD/CAM dentistry: Ein neuartiges verfahren zur virtuellen implantatplanung]. *Int J Comput Dent*. 2009;12(1):29-40. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-59049086869&partnerID=40&md5=18cf6e3d381df9914a52ff80d391782f.

31. Hertz P. Making implant dentistry easier and less costly. *Dent Today*. 2012;31(5). https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84870584231&partnerID=40&md5=54250b98a8fc63caa2a5456e3ccb6920.

32. Warpeha W. Pitfalls in full mouth implant dentistry. Part two: Effectively communicating costs and outcomes as a patient advocate in prosthodontic treatment planning. *Northwest Dent*. 2011;90(2):37-40. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-79960684730&partnerID=40&md5=f9457ef0bf8994eb3709614ddc712a56.

33. Adams M. Dental implant dentistry development, cost, and implications for clinical

and practice management. *Dent Implantol Update*. 2006;17(2):9-14. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-33645642873&partnerID=40&md5=4df888006668fcc6fff496f9fb48dcd7.

34. Wohrle PS, Levin RP. Implant marketing: cost effective implant dentistry. *Implant Soc*. 1996;6(2):6-8. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0030310336&partnerID=40&md5=3a7bc72588daaa45cb779d350a913dee.

35. Durham M, Engel B, Ferrill T, Halford J, Singh TP, Gladwell M. Digitally Augmented Learning in Implant Dentistry. *Oral Maxillofac Surg Clin North Am*. 2019;31(3):387-398. doi:10.1016/j.coms.2019.03.003

36. Scherer MD. Digital technology for implant dentistry: Considerations for implementation. *Dent Today*. 2018;37(11). https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85057846253&partnerID=40&md5=e108d728cc0ea56beac449b9746182ed.

37. Beuer F. Editorial: What's new in digital implant dentistry? *Int J Comput Dent*. 2018;21(2):83-84. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85054381796&partnerID=40&md5=78c0bd898d110d0c6f61b465855b660f.

38. Beuer F. Was gibt es Neues in der digitalen Implantologie? [What's new in digital implant dentistry?]. *Int J Comput Dent*. 2018;21(2):83-87. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85054078349&partnerID=40&md5=2a66c4512ea5e6b9fd360820ce037f88.

39. Gellrich N-C, Zimmerer RM, Spalthoff S, et al. A customised digitally engineered solution for fixed dental rehabilitation in severe bone deficiency: A new innovative line extension in implant dentistry. *J Cranio-Maxillofacial Surg*. 2017;45(10):1632-1638. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2017.07.022

40. Pen VR, Chijov Y V, Levchenko SI, Pen O V, Mascadynov LE. Developing the method of analyzing the toxicity of the polymer teeth implant structures for the orthopedic dentistry. In: Kovalev I.V. Voroshilova A.A. BEA, ed. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*. Vol 537. Institute of Physics Publishing; 2019. doi:10.1088/1757-899X/537/4/042081

41. Brum RS, Monich PR, Fredel MC, et al. Polymer coatings based on sulfonated-poly-ether-ether-ketone films for implant dentistry applications. *J Mater Sci Mater Med*. 2018;29(8). doi:10.1007/s10856-018-6139-0

42. Brum RS, Monich PR, Berti F, et al. On the sulphonated PEEK for implant dentistry: Biological and physicochemical assessment. *Mater Chem Phys*. 2019;223:542-547. doi:10.1016/j.matchemphys.2018.11.027

43. Subramanian K, Tran D, Nguyen KT. *Cellular Responses to Nanoscale Surface Modifications of Titanium Implants for Dentistry and Bone Tissue Engineering Applications*. Elsevier Inc.; 2012. doi:10.1016/B978-1-4557-7862-1.00008-0

44. Pires JN, Caramelo FJ, Brito P, Santos J, Botelho MF. Robotics in implant dentistry: Stress/strain analysis. System overview and experiments. *Ind Rob*. 2006;33(5):373-380. doi:10.1108/01439910610685043