Evaluation of Bone Height Changes Around Implants with Two Different Attachments in Mandibular Implant Overdentures

A proposal submitted to faculty of dentistry Ain- Shams University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Doctor Degree in Oral and Maxillofacial Prosthodontics

Submitted by

Mai Hassan Diab

B.D.S. 2008 (October 6 University)

M.D.S. 2013 (Cairo University)

Assistant lecturer in Prosthodontics Department

October 6th University

Faculty of Dentistry
Ain-Shams University
2020



Supervised by:

Prof. Dr. Hany Ibrahim Eid

Professor of Prosthodontics
Faculty Of Dentistry - Ain shams University

Dr. Noha Helmy Nawar

Assistant Professor of Prosthodontics Faculty Of Dentistry - Ain shams University

Acknowledgment

First of all I would like to thank God, who guided my way throughout this study. It is only by his will that everything can be achieved.

Then, I am profoundly grateful to **Dr. Hany Ibrahim Eid**, Professor of Prosthodontic, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain-Shams University, for his supportive guidance, valuable suggestions and enthusiastic push as well as his valuable advice. It was an honor to work under his scientific supervision which give me the push to finish this study.

I am deeply indebted to **Dr. Noha Helmy Nawar**, Assistant professor of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, An-Shams University, for her meticulous supervision, constructive comments, continuous encouragement and her endless understanding and patience.

Iwould like to demonstrate my appreciation to **Dr. Ahmed Mostafa**, for his effort, helpful and supportive to me during this study.

Last but not least words are not enough to express my deepest love and grateful to my dear friend **Dr. Heba Elsarrif** for her immeasurable effort, support and encouragement to complete this work.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my father who had never failed me, gave me un believable love and support through all my life.

Words failed to express my appreciation and gratitude to my family members.

- My beloved Mother
- My wonderful Husband
- My lovely Brother
- My beautiful Daughter

Contents

Title	Page No.
Introduction	1
Review of literature	3
• Implant overdenture	3
Overdenture attachment	8
Radiographic evaluation	22
Aim of study	36
Material & methods	37
Results	56
Discussion	71
Discussion of methodology	71
Discussion of result	77
Summary & conclusion	116
References	119
Arabic Summary	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
No.		No.
1	Pre_operative cone beam.	39
2	Primary impression	41
3	Secondary impression	41
4	Centric occluding relation record	42
5	Complete denture insertion	43
6	Implant package	44
7	Two crestal incision	45
8	Drilling for the implant insertion.	45
9	Parallism between two implant	46
10	Implant installation by ratchet.	46
11	Cover screw was tightened over the implant	47
12	Mucoperiosteal flap was repositioned and sutured	47
13	The housing-cap assembly	48
14	locator insidethe patient' mouth	49
15	The housing-cap assembly	49
16	The Ols attachment in the patient'mouth	49
17	Two relieved areas corresponding to the housing- cap	50
	assembly	
18	Isolated ring of Ols attachment	51
19	Isolated ring of locator attachment	51
20	Duralay (inlay resin cement).	52
21	Housing cap assembly picked up in the fitting surface of	52
	denture for OLS attachment	

22	Housing cap assembly picked up in the fitting surface of	52
	denture for Locator attachment	
23	Overdenture inserted in patient's mouth	53
24	Bone height measurement.	54
25	Mean difference and standard deviation of all	57
	surfaces of group I during 1st 6 months	
26	Mean difference and standard deviation of bone loss	58
	around implant surfaces of group I during 2 nd 6	
	months	
27	Mean difference and standard deviation of bone loss	60
	around implant surfaces of group I during 1st year	
28	Mean difference and standard deviation of bone loss	61
	around implant surfaces of group II during 1st 6	
	months	
29	Mean difference and standard deviation of bone loss	63
	around implant surfaces of group II during 2 nd 6	
	months	
30	Mean difference and standard deviation of bone loss	64
	around all implant surfaces of group II during 1st	
31	Bone loss difference in different time intervals in	66
	group I (Locator)	
32	Bone loss difference in different time intervals in group II (OLS).	68
33	Comparison between both groups regarding mean difference of	70
	bone loss at all time intervals.	
32	Drilling for the implant insertion	78
33	Paralleling tools in the osteotomy sites	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
1	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of all surfaces of group I during 1st 6 months.	56
2	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of bone loss around implant surfaces of group I during 2nd 6 months.	58
3	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of bone loss around imlant surfaces of group I during 1st year	59
4	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of bone loss around implant surfaces of group during 1st 6 months	61
5	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of bone loss around implant surfaces of group II during 2nd 6 months	62
6	Mean difference (mm) and standard deviation of bone loss around all implant surfaces of group II during 1st year.	64
7	Bone loss difference in different time intervals in group I (Locator)	66
8	Bone loss difference in different time intervals in group II (OLS).	68
9	Comparison between both groups regarding mean differences of bone loss at all time intervals	69

Introduction

Dental implant with complete edentulism is considered an integrated and effective treatment modality in prosthetic dentistry. Implant prostheses have shown dramatic improvements in masticatory performance, aesthetics, and patient satisfaction. The dental implants and the insertion of implant-supported prostheses have been found to extraordinarily reduce bone loss in the edentulous mandible, as well as promote bone deposition distal to implants.

It was reported that two-implant overdenture became the model of care for edentulous mandible.

Bone preservation is deemed to be one of the most important factor that can be accomplished by teeth or implant supported overdentures. Furthermore, implant overdentures get better the prostheses support, retention and stability.

Attachment is defind as a mechanical device for the fixation, retention, and stabilization of a prosthesis Also, It could be described as a retainer made from a metal receptacle And a similarly fitting part; the former (the [female] component matrix) is typically included in the regular or extended crown contours of the abutment tooth, and the latter. (The [male] part of the patrix), is attached to a pontic or denture framework.

Implant with attachment used together to improve the retention ,the stability and support of overdenture , so extending their longevity.

The attaching mechanism for an implant-retained overdenture should be choosed with taking into cosideration the following items: cost effectiveness, amount of retention needed, amount of available bone, expected level of oral hygiene, patient's social status, patient's expectation, maxillo-mandibular relationship, status of antagonistic jaw and inter-implant distance.

Locator attachments were found to be more advantageous than ball and bar systems regarding rate of complications in clinical practice. They are resilient, retentive, durable, and have some built-in angulation compensation. Moreover, repair and replacement are fast and easy. Locator attachments seem to function moderately well, but long-term evaluation is guaranteed.

Polyetheretherketone (PEEK) material was considered as an ideal partner in prosthetic dentistry and implantology due to its good mechanical and physical properties. PEEK has shown a worthly flexibility with high mechanical resistance to wear and high tensile, fatigue and flexural strength. PEEK is applied to make thermo-stable, electrically and thermally insulating, high-quality plastic component. It also achieves low specific mass, bone-like elasticity, and almost no material fatigue..

The question of this research here was if OLS attachment have an effect on mandibular implant supporting bone resorption or not.

Review of literature

Implant Overdenture

Implantation of implant dentistry in prosthodontics treatment options have solved many problems in esthetics, phontics, retention and stability^[1].

Enhancing retention and stability of the prosthesis is deemed the most important factors for creating more favorable mandibular implant overdenture treatment consequence and improving patient satisfaction ^[2].

Implant overdentures have shown to provide long-term clinical success. A lot of studies have reported an excellent implant survival rates between 94% and 100% and a well accepted patient satisfaction rates for implant overdentures. ^[3].

Although, the cost of implants is quite high, so the use of fewer implant number (2 instead of 4) in mandibular implant overdentures offers a less expensive option for an edentulous patient ^[4].

Mandibular implant overdentures reduce further bone resorption and improve success rate at least 95%. However, there are few serious complications ^[5].

One of the obstacles facing implant overdentures is resorbed alveolar ridges in edentulous patients with limited bone height\width . in addition cases with limited inter-arch space as it may complicate the choice of prosthetic components ^[6].

Furthermore, in implant prosthetic restoration prosthesis, the loosening of overdenture attachment was considered the most common,