Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/mjafi

Case Report

Prosthodontic rehabilitation protocols for immediate implants

Col M. Viswambaran^{a,*}, Maj N. Thiruvalluvan^b^a Commanding Officer & Classified Specialist (Prosthodontics), Military Dental Centre, Jabalpur 482001, India^b Graded Specialist (Prosthodontics), Military Dental Centre, Ambala Cantt 133004, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 February 2013

Accepted 11 June 2013

Available online 24 September 2013

Keywords:

Implants

Extraction

Graft

Introduction

Implant dentistry is one of the preferred treatment options for rehabilitation of partially and completely edentulous patients.^{1,2} The placement of implants can be immediate or conventional. In conventional implant placement the internal and external dimensions of extraction sockets and thus the dimensions of the residual alveolar ridge change with healing, which can lead to bone deficiencies that sometimes may contraindicate the placement of dental implant. The placement of implants in fresh extraction sockets reduces morbidity, decreases treatment time, and preserves bone in the residual alveolar ridge.^{3,4} The technique involves atraumatic extraction of the tooth followed by implant placement. Voids between the implant and the socket walls are filled with a particulate bone graft material. This clinical case presentation describes the prosthodontic protocols involved in immediate implant placement.

Case report

A 37-year-old male patient reported with a chief complaint of broken upper right posterior tooth. Past dental history revealed that the patient had undergone endodontic treatment for the same tooth 5 years back and fractured while eating. Medical and personal history was non-contributory. Intra oral examination and radiographic evaluation using orthopantomography revealed partially edentulous maxillary arch with missing 24 and fractured 14 [Fig. 1]. Mandibular arch had full complement of teeth and the occlusion was mutually protective. No other hard and soft tissue abnormalities detected.

Intra oral peri apical (IOPA) radiographic evaluation showed fractured root at middle third in relation to 14. Treatment plan considered was extraction of 14 followed by immediate implant placement, and conventional implant placement in relation to 24.

Maxillary right first pre molar was extracted atraumatically under local anesthesia. The socket was carefully curetted to remove any infected soft tissue remnants. Implant was selected based on the preoperative investigation findings, on site clinical examination of the extracted tooth and socket dimensions. The osteotomy was performed using sequential drills following manufacturer's recommendations. Upon completion of osteotomy a 4.5 mm × 13 mm implant with abutment [Xive® implant system, Dentsply] was placed into the prepared socket [Fig. 2]. Demineralized freeze dried bone graft material [Dembone™, Pacific coast tissue bank, USA] was used to fill the horizontal defect dimensions of 1.5 mm (HDD). The implant stability was evaluated using resonance

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91 (0) 9165269306 (mobile).

E-mail address: mviswambaran@rediffmail.com (M. Viswambaran).

0377-1237/\$ – see front matter © 2013, Armed Forces Medical Services (AFMS). All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2013.06.001>

Fig. 1 – Pre-rehabilitaion intra oral view & OPG.

frequency analyzer (Osstell, Germany). Immediate abutment removed, sealing screw placed and the site was sutured using 3.0 silk.

In relation to 24, crestal incision was placed and flap reflected. Osteotomy was performed using sequential drills under copious irrigation following manufacturer's recommendations. Upon completion of osteotomy a 3.75 mm × 13 mm implant [Xive® implant system, Dentsply] was placed, sealing screw placed and the surgical site was sutured using 3.0 silk.

The patient was prescribed necessary antibiotics and analgesics and postoperative instructions were given. After 06 months, radiographic and clinical evaluation revealed successfully osseointegrated implants. Second stage surgery was performed and during which implants were exposed and gingival formers were placed. After two weeks, Impression was made with elastomeric impression material (3M® ESPE AG, Germany) using closed tray technique [Fig. 3]. The master casts were retrieved followed by die preparation and fabrication of PFM crowns. A mutually protected occlusal scheme was selected considering patient's pre rehabilitation occlusion. The PFM crowns were cemented using type1 glass ionomer (GC Gold Label 1, GC Fuji, India) and the occlusion verified [Fig. 4]. The patient was evaluated clinically and radiographically for the last two years at regular intervals using OPG & IOPA radiographs for successful osseointegration and crestal bone loss and shown favorable results [Fig. 5].

Discussion

Indications for extraction prior to immediate implant placement include periodontally compromised tooth, root fractures, endodontic failures and root resorption. The first step in determining whether immediate implant placement is a reasonable clinical choice is the evaluation of the potential implant site. Residual extraction socket morphology changes with reduction in external dimension such as 5–6 mm (50%) in bucco-lingual direction and 2–4 mm (26%) in apico-coronal direction in 12 months. The internal dimension changes accounted for vertical socket height reduction by 3–4 mm and

Fig. 2 – Implant with abutment.

Fig. 3 – Maxillary elastomeric impression.

Fig. 4 – Post rehabilitation intra oral maxillary view & teeth in occlusion.

horizontal socket width reduction by 4–5 mm.^{5,6} Dimensional changes in mucosa also takes place which may complicate ideal implant positioning in fresh extraction sockets. The slope of the axial walls, the root curvature of the extracted tooth, and the final position of the apex of the extracted tooth in the alveolar housing pose challenges to the precise, atraumatic placement of an implant in the most desirable restorative position. Therefore, immediate implant placement should be limited to those defects that have three or four walled sockets, sufficient bone to stabilize the implant, and minimal circumferential defects.

Fig. 5 – Post operative OPG & IOPA radiograph.

Ensuring primary stability of the immediately placed implant is the critical factor in achieving osseointegration. One of the main problems encountered in immediate implant placement is the difficulty in achieving primary stability. It is very difficult to find an implant matching the exact dimensions of the socket and there is usually a defect between the socket wall and implant. In the case presented here DFDBA was successfully used to fill these gaps. DFDBA is an osteoconductive material and there is enough scientific evidence to show its efficacy in management of such defects.^{7–9}

Advantages and disadvantages

The primary advantages of placing immediate implants are the reduction in time of therapy, reduction in surgical episodes, and preservation of the bone and gingival tissues.¹⁰ Greater rate of bone resorption occurs during the first six months following tooth extraction, unless an implant is placed or a socket augmentation procedure performed. The early maintenance of the gingival form greatly facilitates the peri-implant gingival tissue esthetics by maintaining support for the interdental papillae. Aside from the biological advantages of immediate implant placement, there are also psychological advantages. Factors such as tooth ankylosis, fracture of the buccal plate, socket expansion during extraction, or extensive infection might make immediate implant placement impossible or less predictable.

Potential disadvantages of immediate implant placement include, but are not limited to the following: (i) lack of control of the final implant position; (ii) difficulty obtaining primary stability; (iii) inadequate soft tissue coverage; (iv) inability to inspect all aspects of the extraction site for defects or infection; (v) difficulty in preparing the osteotomy due to bur movement (chatter) on the walls of the extraction site; and (vi) the added cost of bone grafting. While all the disadvantages listed are not present in every situation, any can result in a compromised case.¹¹

Conclusion

Immediate implant placement in postextraction sites, without waiting for the site to heal, is a treatment modality that has received much attention. This approach is being increasingly reported in the literature and has shown favorable results. Case selection is an essential requirement for good prognosis.

Conflicts of interest

All authors have none to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Lazzara RJ. Immediate implant placement into extraction sites: surgical and restorative advantages. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent.* 1989;9:332–343.

2. Parel SM, Triplett RG. Immediate fixture placement: a treatment planning alternative. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1990;5:337–345.
3. Kan JY, Rungcharassaeng K, Umezu K, Kois JC. Dimensions of peri-implant mucosa: an evaluation of maxillary anterior single implants in humans. *J Periodontol*. 2003;74:557–562.
4. Fugazzotto PA. Implant placement in maxillary first premolar fresh extraction sockets: description of technique and report of preliminary results. *J Periodontol*. 2002;73:669–674.
5. Wilson Jr TG, Schenk R, Buser D, et al. Implants placed in immediate extraction sites: a report of histologic and histometric analyses of human biopsies. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1998;13:333–341.
6. Wagenberg BD, Ginsburg TR. Immediate implant placement on removal of the natural tooth: retrospective analysis of 1,081 implants. *Compend Contin Educ Dent*. 2001;22(5):399–402.
7. Trombelli L, Heitz-Mayfield LJ, Needleman I, Moles D, Scabbia A. A systematic review of graft materials and biological agents for periodontal intraosseous defects. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2002;29(suppl 3):117–135.
8. Garrett S. Periodontal regeneration around natural teeth. *Ann Periodontol*. 1996;1:621–666.
9. Boeck Neto Rodolfo Jorge, Gabrielli Mario Francisco Real, Lia Raphael Carlos Carnelli, Marcantonio Elcio, Shibli Jamil Awad, Marcantonio Jr Elcio. Histomorphometrical analysis of bone formed after maxillary sinus floor augmentation grafting by grafting with a combination of autogenous bone and demineralised freeze dried bone allograft or hydroxyl apatite. *J Periodontol*. 2002;73:266–270.
10. Misch CE. Implant success or failure: clinical assessment in implant dentistry. In: Misch CE, ed. *Contemporary Implant Dentistry*. St Louis: Mosby; 1993:29–42.
11. Schwartz-Arad D, Chaushu G. The ways and wherefores of immediate placement of implants into fresh extraction sites: a literature review. *J Periodontol*. 1997;68:915–923.