



**Comparison between marginal bone loss
around mini implants supporting cantilevered
and non-cantilevered bar retained overdenture
using digital radiography.**

A Thesis submitted to Faculty of Dentistry Ain Shams University
Oral and Maxcillofacial Prosthodontics department

Submitted By

Ahmed Hamdy Abd el Haffiz Marei

M.D.S(2007) Cairo University

Supervisors

Prof. Hany Eid

Professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry Ain shams University

Prof. Magdi Azzam

Professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry Ain shams University

Prof. Amany El Hadary.

Assistant professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry Future University

2016



**Comparison between marginal bone loss
around mini implants supporting cantilevered
and non-cantilevered bar retained overdenture
using digital radiography.**

A Thesis submitted to
Faculty of Dentistry
Ain Shams University

**In partial fulfilment of the requirement for the Doctor
Degree in Oral and Maxillofacial Prosthodontics.**

Submitted By
Ahmed Hamdy Abd el Haffiz Marei
M.D.S(2007)
Cairo University

**Faculty of Dentistry
Ain Shams University
2016**

Supervisors

Prof.Hany Eid

Professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

Prof.Magdi Azzam

Professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

Prof.Amany El Hadary.

Assistant professor of Removable Prosthodontics

Faculty of Dentistry

Future University

Dedication

To my beloved family

I dedicate this work to my father, my mother, my wife and my daughters for whom I live, and for whom any effort is devoted.



مقارنة في كمية العظام المتآكلة حول الغرسات الصغيرة المتصلة التي تحمل طقم فوقى في حالة وجود كابولي من عدمه باستخدام الاشعة الرقمية

رسالة مقدمة لقسم الاستعاضة الصناعية بكلية طب الأسنان جامعة عين شمس
للحصول على درجة الدكتوراة في الاستعاضة الصناعية للفم و الوجه و الفكين.

مقدمة من

الطبيب/ أحمد حمدي عبد الحفيظ مرعي

ماجستير (٢٠٠٧)

جامعة القاهرة

المشرفون

أ.د/ هاني إبراهيم عيد

أستاذ الاستعاضة الصناعية

كلية طب الاسنان- جامعة عين شمس

أ.د/ مجدي عزام

الأستاذ بقسم الاستعاضة الصناعية

كلية طب الاسنان- جامعة عين شمس

أ.د/ أماني الحضري

الأستاذ بقسم الاستعاضة الصناعية

كلية طب الاسنان- جامعة المستقبل.

جامعة عين شمس

٢٠١٦

Acknowledgment

I should really thank Dr/ Hany Eid for his invaluable help , support and patience to the performance of this study and more important for the invaluable benefit I got in scientific thinking and evaluation from direct communication and discussion with him .

(I don't have time to be concise)

Thanks to Dr/Amany El Hadary first for her insistence that I should affiliate in Aim Shams university and second for her real willingness to help but for her departure to Canada.

And last To my dear friend Dr/ Khaled Mohammed for his help in the statistical section of the research.

List of contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Review of literature	3
	Edentulism	3
	Dental implants	7
	Classification of dental implant	7
	Osseointegration	13
	Mini implants	16
	Overdentures	18
	Attachment	19
	Cantilever	22
	Methods of evaluation	28
	Cone beam	29
	Resonance frequency analysis	33
	Pocket depth	34
3	Aim of the study	36
4	Materials and methods	38
5	Results	70
6	Discussion	81
	Discussion of methodology	81
	Discussion of results	90
7	Summary	92
8	Conclusion	93
9	References	94
10	Arabic summary	

List of figure

Figure	Description	page
Figure 1a	Patient at Prosthodontics clinic	42
Figure 1b	Stent with tentative setting	42
Figure 2a	Position between the 2 premolars (gutta percha)	43
Figure 2b	Anterior loop still present.	43
Figure 2c	Disappearance of anterior loop.	43
Figure 2d	layer number assigned to each position, and its distance between "the gutta percha" position and the "end of anterior loop" position is calculated	43
Figure 3a	Gutta percha position (posterior mark) and calculated "surgical" position (anterior mark) is determined	44
Figure 3b	All surgical sites were determined.	44
Figure 4a	Nerve block anaesthesia	45
Figure 4b	Infiltration at the site of the surgery	45
Figure 5a	Flapless drilling with a pilot drill (1.3 mm)	46
Figure 5b	Surgical drill (1.8 mm)	46
Figure 6	Position after initial hand screwing.	48
Figure 7a	Thumb wrench	48
Figure 7b	Screwing with the thumb wrench.	49
Figure 7c	Height of the mini-implant after screwing the thumb wrench	49
Figure 8a	Screwing technique 1 with ratchet wrench (support of the hand with the thumb and index, stabilization of the wrench with the middle finger , irrigation through an assistant)	50
Figure 8b	Screwing technique 2: support with the index and middle finger and stabilization with the thumb.	50
Figure 8c	Final position of the first mini-implant after being fully seated	51
Figure 9a	Parallel pin added to guide parallel drilling for second implant site.	51
Figure 9b	Parallel pins, planning for drilling the third mini-implant	52
Figure 9c	the steps are repeated for each implant.	52
Figure 10a	The four mini-implants side view	53
Figure 10b	The four mini-implants frontal view	53
Figure 10c	The four implants top view	54
Figure 10d	The four mini-implants different distribution.	54
Figure 11a	the implants without comfort caps before taking the primary impression with the putty	58

Figure 11b	Primary impression	58
Figure 11c	Plastic comfort caps placed on the mini-implants	59
Figure 11d	Plastic comfort caps front view	59
Figure 11e	Final impression including plastic comfort caps	60
Figure 11f	Comfort caps margins bulge in the impression	60
Figure 12	The transfer analogue on the cast	61
Figure 13	The cast bar	61
Figure 14a	cast bar in the patient's mouth.	62
Figure 14b	Cast bar with cantilever	62
Figure 15a	Retentive clips secured in place	63
Figure 15b	Blocking the undercuts under the bar.	63
Figure 16a	Faulty pickup, the undercuts were not blocked properly and the clips were picked along with the bar	64
Figure 16b	Good pickup; the clips transferred to the fitting surface of the denture	64
Figure 17a	Follow up immediately after the surgery	67
Figure 17b	follow up of a patient with cantilevered bar after 6 months	67
Figure 17c	follow up after 12 months	68
Figure 17d	close up for the 3 periods showing the advance of marginal bone resorption around the distal implant	68
Figure 18	Smart pegs screwed on the mini-implants.	69
Figure 19	Bar chart representing comparison between mean amounts of bone loss around mesial and distal implants in Group I	72
Figure 20	Bar chart representing comparison between mean amounts of bone loss around mesial and distal implants in Group II	73
Figure 21	Bar chart representing comparison between mean amounts of bone loss in the two groups	75
Figure 22	Bar chart representing comparison between mean PPD in the two groups	76
Figure 23	Line chart representing changes in mean PPD measurements of the two groups	77
Figure 24	Bar chart representing comparison between mean ISQ scores in the two groups	79
Figure 25	Line chart representing changes in mean ISQscores of the two groups	80

List of tables

1	comparison between amounts of bone loss around mesial and distal implants in Group I	71
2	comparison between amounts of bone loss around mesial and distal implants in Group II	72
3	comparison between amounts of bone loss in the two groups	74
4	comparison between amounts pocket depth in the two groups	75
5	The mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of repeated measures ANOVA and Tukey's tests for comparison between PPD measurements at different time periods	77
6	The mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between ISQ scores in the two groups	78
7	The mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Wilcoxon signed-rank test for comparison between ISQ scores at different time periods	80

Introduction

Over the past forty years several different interventions have been proposed to alleviate the difficulties associated with mandibular dentures use and continued resorption of the alveolar ridges. Achieving stability and retention of the mandibular denture can be difficult when using conventional denture techniques.

For many years clinicians realized that placement of endosseous implants under a removable prosthesis bring considerable benefits including preservation of bone increase the denture stability, functional efficiency, causing a degree of occlusal support. For this reason not in few cases these treatment options has become elective and improves quality of life.

In the last decade mini dental implants grew more and more popular and using it under an overdenture gain everyday new territories, mainly because of their small size which allow it to be inserted in thin ridges with reasonable qualities of bone, their relative cheapness, and because it is less invasive, taking into consideration the increase of longevity .

Cantilevering the bar connecting implants was used routinely to decrease loads on the posterior area in the mandible when it's especially thin and cannot withstand the normal stresses but that was always on the expense of increasing stresses with subsequent bone loss on the distal implants.

Assessment of the success and failure became more and more intrigue and needs more scrutiny, so using cone beam computerized tomography and resonance frequency analysis was mandatory in assessing these implants.

Cone beam computerized tomography is a 3D image that allows the clinician to assess more accurately the position of the implant to the bone boundaries in the mandible and to the vital structure.

In this study we have used the cone beam, resonance frequency analysis and periodontal probing to assess the effect of cantilevering a bar connecting mini-implants supporting a mandibular overdenture.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Edentulism

Oral health is a definite factor in general health, quality of life and economy⁽¹⁾, Teeth are necessary for development and maintenance of alveolar bone through stimulation of bone which is mandatory to keep its density and volume⁽²⁾ Teeth transmit compressive and tensile forces to the surrounding bone enhancing bone remodeling.

Loss of teeth result in mechanical and esthetic adverse consequences, such an effect is aggravated when this loss encompasses all the teeth resulting in the debilitating and unaesthetic condition called edentulism⁽³⁾.

The most common causes of complete edentulism is tooth extractions due to caries and periodontal diseases⁽⁴⁾

History of high tobacco consumption is also a risk factor for tooth loss.^[5]

In USA 10% of the population is edentulous constituting about half the population above 75 years⁽⁶⁾.

The aging process causes physiological changes that affect the whole organism specifically in relation to the oral system. In addition to tooth loss, there is reduced masticatory force, alveolar bone

decomposition, and reduction in the number of functional motor units, leading to decreased muscular activity ⁽⁶⁾

Edentulism results in deterioration of oral health and for a long time the conventional complete denture which was the treatment choice of the dental practitioner was clearly sub optimal, especially concerning the efficiency of mastication ^(8, 9)

The sub physiological amount of stimulation to the bulk of the residual ridge affect the trabeculae and bone density combined with the high stresses on the superficial surface of the bone cause finally loss in the width and height of the ridge ^{.(10)}

The loss of bone width and height result in a narrow ridge with thin mucosa causing discomfort for the patient ⁽¹⁰⁾ The total surface area of the mandible is half that of the maxilla but it's subjected to the same amount of stress ⁽¹¹⁾ Resorption of the mandible especially in the posterior area may extend and result in sharp internal and external oblique ridge with its thin painful unattached mucosa and also in the superior immigration of the genial tubercles. ^{.(12)}

Resorption may extend to the basal bone reaching the mental foramen which can become a supporting structure for the lower denture which may cause parasthesia and fracture of the mandible ⁽¹³⁾

Resorption of the maxilla has a peculiar pattern, in the anterior region bone loss occurs mainly labially, while in the premolar area it

occurs evenly buccally and palatally, and in the posterior area, it occurs mainly buccally⁽³⁾

Following the extraction of teeth, the bony socket and adjacent soft tissue undergo a series of tissue repair processes. Histologic evidence of active bone formation at the bottom of the socket and bone resorption at the edge of the socket are seen as early as two weeks after tooth extraction, and the socket is progressively filled with newly formed bone until about six months⁽¹⁴⁾ Rapid bone remodeling subsides by this time but continuous bone resorption may persist at the external surface of the crestal area of the residual alveolar bone, resulting in considerable morphologic changes of the bone and overlying soft tissues over the years⁽¹⁵⁾

The bone remodeling activity after tooth extraction is localized primarily at the crestal area of the residual ridges, resulting not only in reduced height of the ridge but also in the creation of various three-dimensional shapes of the residual ridge. If the bone resorption is greater at the crestal area than at the lingual or buccal aspects, the residual ridges tend to be flat. In contrast, greater bone resorption at the lingual and buccal areas compared with resorption at the crestal area may result in the so-called knife-edge type of residual ridges⁽¹⁶⁾

A real problem for these patients is that they miss food with high nutritional value because it's harder to chew e.g. fruits and vegetables; so their health is generally compromised.⁽¹⁷⁾

Mastication is a process that has a reflexive character with the involvement of higher centers in the nervous system; the afferent