

**COMPUTERIZED MORPHOMETRIC ASSESSMENT  
OF THE EFFECT OF LOW LEVEL LASER  
THERAPY ON OSSEOINTEGRATION OF  
IMMEDIATE IMPLANTS WITH GUIDED BONE  
REGENERATION**

*Thesis*

*Submitted to the Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University,  
In Partial Fulfillment for Requirements of Master Degree*

*In*

*Oral And MaxilloFacial Surgery*

*By*

**Mahmoud Sayed Hamed**

B.D.S, Ain Shames University

(2003)

*Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,  
Cairo University*

**2012**



## **SUPERVISORS**

**Dr. Khairy Abd El-Hamied Elmorsy**

*Assistant Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery  
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University*

**Dr. Gamal M. Moutamed**

*lecturer of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery  
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University*

**Dr. Ali Mohamed El-Hoseny Saafan**

*Assistant professor of Dental Laser Application  
Laser Institute, Cairo University*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا  
إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم  
سورة البقرة الآية (٢٢)

# CONTENTS

List of contents	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
AIM OF THE STUDY.....	36
MATERIAL AND METHODS .....	37
RESULTS.....	64
DISCUSSION.....	78
SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS.....	84
REFERENCES .....	86
ARABIC SUMMARY	

## **List of Abbreviations**

<b>GBR</b>	Guided Bone Regeneration
<b>GTR</b>	Guided Tissue Regeneration
<b>LASER</b>	Light Amplification by stimulated Emission of radiation
<b>EPTFE</b>	Expanded poly tetraflouroethelene
<b>LLLT</b>	Low Level Laser Therapy
<b>LILT</b>	Low Intensity Laser Therapy
<b>HILT</b>	High Intensity Laser Therapy
<b>SLAT</b>	Selective Laser therapy
<b>ALP</b>	Alkaline Phosphatase
<b>OP</b>	Osteopontien
<b>BSP</b>	Bone Sialoprotein
<b>HGF</b>	Human Gingival Fibroblast
<b>RFA</b>	Resonance Frequency Analysis
<b>CBCT</b>	Cone Beam Computed Tomography
<b>HU</b>	Hounsfielde unit
<b>ASTM</b>	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
<b>CT</b>	Computed Tomography
<b>HA</b>	Hydroxyappatite
<b>DFDBA</b>	Demineralized Freeze Dried Bone Allograft
<b>MFDBA</b>	Mineralized Freeze Dried Bone Allograft

## List of figures

Figure		Pages
Fig. (1A):	Preoperative panoramic radiograph for a patient in group A (control group).	39
Fig. (1B):	Preoperative panoramic radiograph for a patient in group B (laser group)	39
Fig. (2A):	A photograph showing remaining root for a case number 1 in control group.	41
Fig. (2B):	A photograph showing empty socket for another patient had recent trauma in the study group.	41
Fig. (2C):	A photograph showing elevated mucoperiosteal flap for the same patient in the study group.	42
Fig. (3):	A photograph showing forceps extraction of remaining root of maxillary right central incisor in a patient in the control group.	43
Fig. (4A):	A photograph showing the extraction socket after debridement in the same patient in the control group.	43
Fig. (4B):	A photograph showing the extraction socket after debridement in a patient in the study group.	44
Fig. (5):	A photograph showing the extracted root in a patient in the control group.	44
Fig. (6A):	A photograph showing Spectra implant sequential drills.	45
Fig. (6B):	A photograph showing preparation of the implant osteotomy site in a case of the control group.	45
Fig. (6C):	A photograph showing preparation of the implant osteotomy site in a case of the study group.	46

Fig. (7):	A photograph showing Implant Direct for Spectra system implant product.	46
Fig. (8A):	A photograph showing seating of the implant with finger pressure in a case of the control group.	48
Fig. (8B):	A photograph showing seating of the implant with hand driven implant positioner in a case of the study group.	48
Fig. (9A):	A photograph showing seating of the implant with hand driven implant positioner in a case of the control group.	49
Fig. (9B):	A photograph showing seating of the implant with hand driven implant positioner in a case of the study group.	49
Fig. (10):	A photograph showing removal of fixture mount abutment in a case of the control group.	50
Fig. (11A):	A photograph showing final seated implant with cover screw in a case of the control group.	50
Fig. (11B):	A photograph showing final seated implant with cover screw in a case of the study group.	51
Fig. (12):	A photograph showing Bio-collagen membrane product.	52
Fig. (13A):	A photograph showing bio-collagen membrane over the implant site in a case of the control group.	52
Fig. (13B):	A photograph showing bio-collagen membrane over the implant site in a case of the study group.	53
Fig. (14):	A photograph showing the surgical field after flap closure in a case of the control group.	53
Fig.(15):	A photograph showing laser device.	55

Fig. (16):	A photograph showing laser application at the implant site in a case of the study group.	55
Fig. (17):	A photograph showing connected abutment in a case of the control group.	56
Fig. (18A):	A photograph showing cemented crown in a case of the control group.	57
Fig. (18B):	A photograph showing cemented crown in a case of the study group.	57
Fig. (19):	A photograph showing Rinn XCP with film holder and radiographic template.	59
Fig. (20A):	Measurement of bone density using digora soft ware mesially	60
Fig. (20B):	Measurement of bone density using digora soft ware distally	60
Fig. (21A):	Measurement of bone density by CBCT mesially and for laser group.	61
Fig. (21B):	Measurement of bone density by CBCT distally for laser group.	61
Fig. (21C):	Measurement of bone density by CBCT palataly for laser group.	62
Fig. (21D):	Measurement of bone density by CBCT buccally for laser group.	62
Fig. (22):	Mean bone density in the two groups	66
Fig. (23):	Changes by time in mean bone density	68
Fig. (24):	Mean % increase in bone density in the two groups	69



Fig. (25):	Mean buccal side bone density in Laser group	71
Fig. (26):	Mean palatal side bone density in Laser group	72
Fig. (27):	Mean mesial side bone density in Laser group	74
Fig. (28):	Mean distal side bone density in Laser group	76
Fig. (29):	Scatter diagram representing positive correlation between DIGORA and CBCT	77

## **List of tables**

<b>Tables</b>		<b>Pages</b>
<b>1</b>	The mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between bone density in the two groups.	<b>66</b>
<b>2</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean bone density in control group.	<b>67</b>
<b>3</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean bone density in Laser group.	<b>67</b>
<b>4</b>	The mean %, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between % increase in bone density in the two groups	<b>69</b>
<b>5</b>	The mean and standard deviation (SD) values of buccal side bone density measured by CB.	<b>70</b>
<b>6</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean buccal bone density	<b>70</b>
<b>7</b>	The mean and standard deviation (SD) values of palatal side bone density measured by CB	<b>71</b>
<b>8</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean palatal bone density	<b>71</b>
<b>9</b>	The mean and standard deviation (SD) values of mesial side bone density measured by CB	<b>73</b>

<b>10</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean mesial bone density	<b>73</b>
<b>11</b>	The mean and standard deviation (SD) values of distal side bone density measured by CB	<b>75</b>
<b>12</b>	The mean differences, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for the changes by time in mean distal bone density	<b>75</b>
<b>13</b>	Results of Pearson's correlation coefficient for the correlation between CBCT and DIGORA results	<b>76</b>

## **Introduction**

Marked qualitative and quantitative alterations occur in the alveolar ridge following the loss of teeth; cortical bone replaced by trabecular bone and reduction of the both bucco-lingual and apico-cronal dimensions of the extraction sockets occurs, thus tooth loss for different reasons may lead to alveolar resorption that can prevent proper positioning of dental implants according to prosthetic needs and treatment planning.<sup>(1)</sup>

Immediate implantation has provided implant dentistry the opportunity to achieve better functional and esthetic results. The localized bone defects surroundings implants placed immediately into fresh extraction sites present a challenge to the surgeon. The use of barrier membranes and different graft materials has been widely documented.<sup>(2)</sup>

Several authors have reported placement of implants into extraction sockets and augmentation of these sites with barrier membranes.<sup>(3, 4, 5)</sup>

Implants immediately placed in extraction sites and covered with expanded polytetrafluoroethylene (e-PTFE) barrier suggested that both osseointegration and bone reconstruction could occur with in extraction socket, but increased risk of membrane exposure during the healing phase has been reported, also nonresorbable membranes must be retrieved by employing a second surgical procedure that can disturb healing.<sup>(3, 4)</sup>

Recently, absorbable collagen membranes have been used for guided bone regeneration, to overcome the problems of nonresorbable membranes.<sup>(6)</sup>

Low level laser therapy (LLLT) has the potential of beneficial effects on peri-implant hard and soft tissues regeneration. Under stable

and no hurtful surgical conditions, irradiation with low-power laser could reduce healing time and accelerate implant osseointegrations.<sup>(7)</sup>

In the present study we aimed to evaluate the effect of low level laser therapy on bone repair and osseointegration of immediate dental implants with the advantages of using guided tissue regeneration.

## Review of Literature

Immediate implantation is defined as the insertion of an implant into an empty alveolus when the mucosa is already open, immediately or only a few days after extraction or traumatic tooth loss. Placement of an implant will inhibit the alveolar ridge resorption that normally occurs following tooth loss, the time during which the patient is edentulous is short ended, because healing of the alveolus and healing of the implant occur simultaneously. <sup>(8, 9, 10)</sup>

*Schult* <sup>(11)</sup> was the first to place immediate implants into fresh extraction sites in humans and reported that the success rates were over 90%. Today, it is one of the most important alternatives in treatment edentulousm.

It was revealed by *Becker et al.*, <sup>(12)</sup> that immediate implants have several advantages for the patient as well as for the clinician, including shorts treatment time, less bone resorption, fewer surgical sessions, easier definition of the implant position, and a desirable esthetical results.

Placement of an immediate implant has the desirable effect of preserving alveolar bone width and height. When a tooth is extracted, predictable bone resorption ensues for six months. A typical defect of such resorption is a loss of crestal bone with a labial concavity. <sup>(13)</sup>

Delayed implant placement may result in compromised esthetics and function due to lingual placement of the implant. Hence, in certain circumstances, immediate implants will provide for more ideal prosthetic placement and will optimize esthetics, all via the preservation of bone. <sup>(13,14)</sup>

*Block and Kent*,<sup>(15)</sup> reported that the indications for immediate implantation were, traumatic loss of teeth with a small amount of bone loss, teeth lost because of gross decay without the presence of purulent exudates or cellulites, inability to complete endodontic procedures, presence of severe periodontal bone loss without purulent exudates, and adequate soft tissue health and quantity to obtain primary wound closure

*Harris et al.*,<sup>(16)</sup> concluded that the main disadvantage of immediate implantation was that following tooth extraction, a socket often presents dimensions that may be considerably greater than diameter of a conventional implant. Hence, following implant installation a gap may occur in the marginal part of the recipient sites.

Not all extraction sites suitable for immediate implantations, so certain clinical guidelines must be followed to select the suitable sites so immediate implant placement sites are classified into four classes according to Salama and Salama's<sup>(17)</sup>

Class 1 Ideal socket with no bone or soft-tissue compromises.  
Class 2 Similar to Class 1 but with a thinner more scalloped gingival biotype which may require connective tissue graft at time of implant placement or as a secondary procedure  
Class 3 Buccal bone is missing, however the implant can still be placed within the confines of the alveolar housing. In this case the surgical procedure will normally require simultaneous guided bone augmentation and connective tissue grafting. Alternatively these cases can be handled in a staged approach with socket augmentation followed by delayed implant placement.

However in Class 4 the remaining buccal plate is so severely damaged that simultaneous implant placement is almost certain to lead to