

الحمد لله رب العالمين

CLINICAL EVALUATION OF EARLY LOADING IMPLUS IMPLANT SYSTEM IN MAXILLA

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MASTER DEGREE IN
ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL SURGERY

BY

WAEI MOHAMED ALHANASH

B.D.S.

FACULTY OF ORAL AND DENTAL MEDICINE

Cairo University

2010

Supervisors

Prof. Ragia Mohammed Mounir

Professor of oral and maxillofacial surgery

Faculty of oral and dental medicine

Cairo University

Dr. Hassan Abdel-Ghany Osman

Lecturer of oral and maxillofacial surgery

Faculty of oral and dental medicine

Cairo University

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

{ وقل ربي زدني علما }

(صدق الله العظيم)

Dedication

To my mother who have been inspiring and encouraging with unreserved understanding throughout the course of my study years.

To my father who always believed and trust in me and gave me support throughout my whole life.

To my brothers and sisters for their unlimited support

To all my friends who was always beside me when I was in need to them.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Allah, the almighty, who enable me to complete this research thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to **Prof.Ragia Mohammed Mounir** for her guidance, encouragement and support, which crucial in helping me to complete this study, she gave me generously of her knowledge, time and effort.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Hassan Abdel-Ghany Osman** that give me support that kept me going during all stages of preparation.

Contents

Content	Page (No)
List of figures	VII
List of tables	XII
Introduction	1
Review of literature	4
Aim of the study	25
Patients and methods	26
Results	46
Discussion	60
Summary	65
Conclusion	67
Recommendations	68
References	69
Arabic summary	-

List of figures

Figure (No)	Page(No)
Fig1: Schematic summary of the biology of osseointegration.	10
Fig2: effect of the surface treatment carried out With a mixture of organic acids at low magnification	21
Fig3: distribution of shape of micro-cavities at greater magnification(3000 x)	21
Fig4: implus implant in its kit and vial.	28
Fig5: implus fixture.	28
Fig6: Implus implant system kit.	28
Fig7: Film holder with bite block and ring placed at patient cast.	30
Fig8: periapical intraoral radiograph immediately preoperative.	30
Fig9: digital panoramic radiograph (magnification1:1)	30

Fig10a: preoperative frontal view of patient with missing ^L case no1 group A.	32
Fig 10b: intra-oral occlusal view immediately preoperative case no 1 group A.	32
Fig11:Mucoperiosteal flap incision for implant no 4 group A and implant no 7 group B.	35
Fig 12: flap reflection for implant no 4 group A and implant no 7 group B.	35
Fig 13: Using parallel pin for implant no 4 group A and implant no 7 group B.	36
Fig 14: implant insertion implant no 1 group A.	36
Fig 15:implant fixture with cover screw after placement implant no 1 group A .	37
Fig 16: suturing with silk after placement of implant no 1 group A.	37
Fig17: healing of the wound.	39
Fig 18 a:Using tissue punch to expose implant fixture no 4 group A.	40

Fig18 b: implant no 4 group A exposure after using tissue punch.	40
Fig 19: implant no 1 group A abutment .	41
Fig20: prosthetic part fabrication.	41
Fig 21 a and b: prosthetic part placement and implant no 1 group A loading.	42
Fig22: Histogram showing comparison between (PD) in early loading and delayed loading groups after 12weeks.	49
Fig23: Histogram showing comparison between (PD) in early loading and delayed loading groups 24 weeks.	49
Fig24: Histogram showing comparison between (BI) in early loading and delayed loading groups after 12 weeks.	51
Fig25: Histogram showing comparison between (BI) in early loading and delayed loading groups 24 weeks	51
Fig26 : intraoral radiograph immediately after implant placement.	53

Fig27: Digital panorama after implant placement.	53
Fig28: digital intra-oral radiograph before implant placement.	54
Fig29: digital intra-oral radiograph after early implant loading(fixture with abutment).	54
Fig30: Digital panorama after early implant loading 6 weeks post-operative.	54
Fig31: Histogram showing comparison between bone density in early loading and delayed loading groups immediately postoperative.	57
Fig 32: Histogram showing comparison between bone density in early loading and delayed loading groups after 12 weeks.	57
Fig 33: Histogram showing comparison between bone density in early loading and delayed loading groups after 24 weeks.	58

Fig34: bone density measurement after implant placement.	59
Fig 35: Bone density measurement after implant loading.	59

List of tables

Table (No)	Page(NO)
Table(1): gender and age of each patient,implant length,diameter and site of the placement in group A.	46
Table(2): gender and age of each patient,implant length,diameter and site of the placement in group B.	47
Table(3): the mean values, standard deviation(S.D) and student's t-test (p-value)of the probing depth (PD) in all surfaces around the implant in both groups.	48

Table(4): the mean of bleeding index (BI) in all surfaces around the implants at 12 weeks and 24 weeks.	50
Table(5): the means, standard deviation(SD) values and results of student's t-test and p-value for the comparison between bone density in the two groups.	56

Abstract

Titanium implant surface characteristics have been modified by many methods as plasma spray , sandblasting and acid etching; which have been used to increase surface area and alter the micro-topography and texture of implant surface.

In this study the early loading protocol of single implant using Implus implant system which is treated by mixture of bio-organic acids(B.O.A.T) is compared with conventional(delayed loading) protocol in maxilla.

In this study the early loading protocol using Implus implant system is compared with conventional (delayed loading) protocol, ten implants were placed in to two equal groups, in the first group the implants were undergo early loading(after six weeks) while in the second group the implants undergo delayed loading(after twelve weeks).

The results had shown that there is no any difference between the implants which loaded in both groups, thus early loading of Implus implant system had shown to be reliable method in maxilla.

Keywords: dental implant, early loading, Implus implant system, maxilla.

Introduction

Endosseous dental implants gain greater acceptance among clinicians and patients. This has come about for several reasons, including excellent success rates published in long-term studies, improvements in fixture and abutment designs and more predictable surgical placement techniques⁽¹⁾.

In recent years, the utilization of endosseous implants for the rehabilitation of completely or partially edentulous patients has become a standard of care in dentistry. This progress is based on the concept of osseointegration first described by **Branemark et al (1969,1977)**. although unaccepted at the time, it was proven later through the work of **Schroder et al.(1976,1981)**. In the past 15 years, numerous prospective long-term studies have documented the high efficacy and predictability of osseointegrated implants^(2,44).

Osseointegration simply denotes the intimate contact of bone to the implant surface. the clinical manifestation of histological osseointegration, has been defined by the immobility when special mechanical testing devices are activated⁽³⁾.