ECRONICON OPEN ACCESS

EC DENTAL SCIENCE
Editorial

Peri-Implant Bone Level Evaluation

Tanay Vijaykumar Chaubal*

Associate Professor, Periodontist and Oral Implantologist, DY Patil University School of Dentistry, Mumbai, India

***Corresponding Author**: Tanay Vijaykumar Chaubal, Associate Professor, Periodontist and Oral Implantologist, DY Patil University School of Dentistry, Mumbai, India.

Received: December 16, 2016; **Published:** March 10, 2017

As long as there have been dental implants, clinicians and researchers have been using diagnostic means to follow up their osseointegration and the peri-implant marginal bone levels [1,2]. In thousands of clinical follow-up and comparative studies on implant placement, two-dimensional intraoral radiographs have been used to describe the success rate of the implants [3]. Peri-implant bone measures during the follow-up phase are still considered as a clinical standard of reference to express the dental implant status and osseointegration success [4,5]. Practically, to all of us and in the vast majority of studies, this clinical standard is an expression of linear vertical distances, denoted as marginal bone levels at the mesial and distal implant sites taken with a strict paralleling technique, given that the horizontal and vertical angulation is perpendicular to the axis of the implant [6]. During nearly every consensus report, we have continued to repeat the statement that we consider the intraoral radiograph as being the ultimate diagnostic follow-up tool. Due to the vertical angulation differences, speculation arises regarding how many bone level gains have been reported throughout this half century because of a slightly horizontally angulated radiography. This cannot be visually perceived, unless we are able to depict either the full three-dimensional crater morphology or the bone in the vicinity of the craters, potentially superimposed on the implant, considering the slight horizontal angular deviations [7]. The only way to fully exclude this problem is to have a three-dimensional view of the peri-implant tissues. With changing times we are more focused on vestibular bone in the aesthetic zone; bone grafting for defect fill-up and sinus augmentation; severe peri-implant bone loss and crater development, often coined as peri-implantitis [8]. All of this should question the traditional two-dimensional diagnostics as they are imposing the bone with three-dimensional healing and changes thus to evaluate their effect; and also what we can express when merely looking to the superimposed approximal bone adjacent to the implants. In research, we can even question the histology, as long as it remains two-dimensional and as long as the evaluation is limited to a selective number of slices. On top of that, when evaluating the histological slices, we usually compare these with several radiographic observations, but seldom do we fully register the exact same cutting angle and position. As we observe three dimensional structural changes, one should move towards attempting to observe and report this via three-dimensional histology. This brings us back to the potential clinical means for three-dimensional evaluation [9,10]. Yet again, much research applied the simple two-dimensional measures while dealing with a three-dimensional change. Linear measures should thus be considered as an angled and thus biased view, often not really revealing what we are looking for and definitely not counting as a clear prognostic marker. One may then jump towards all the research using cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) for postoperative evaluations. Indeed, there is actually only one appropriate approach: when following up bone healing, grafting and peri-implant bone tissue changes using 3D imaging, it is important to properly register the preoperative and postoperative images to assess volumetric changes and not report on millimeters of gain [11]. Although the latter is easily understood by all we continue to report on linear bone level. Although a plethora of different CBCTs are available, it seems that few have paid attention to the problem of metal artifacts [12]. Artifacts are worse with denser materials and thus more with zirconium than with titanium, but in general they cause blooming of the implant, with enlargements easily reaching a quarter of the implant diameter, not forgetting the black bands and streak artifacts. It is evident that this hampers three dimensional peri-implant diagnostics, especially in places where it is critical to observe bone, such as in the vestibular region. Only a few machines and protocols seem to allow a reliable depiction, but still include only some jaw bone and patient-specificity.

In conclusion, after half a century of research, we are still lacking reliable diagnostic and prognostic measures and if we wish to improve, one should strive for a three-dimensional evaluation.

Bibliography

1. Adell R., *et al*. "A 15-year study of osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw". *International Journal of Oral Surgery* 10.6 (1981): 387-416.

2. Adell R. "Tissue integrated prostheses in clinical dentistry". *International Dental Journal* 35.4 (1985): 259-265.

3. Lang NP., *et al*. "Peri-implant diseases: where are we now?--Consensus of the Seventh European Workshop on Periodontology". *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* 38.11 (2011): 178-181.

4. Quirynen M., *et al*. "The reliability of pocket probing around screw-type implants". *Clinical Oral Implants Research* 2.4 (1991): 186-192.

5. van Steenberghe D and Quirynen M. "Reproducibility and detection threshold of peri-implant diagnostics". *Advances in Dental Research* 7.2 (1993): 191-195.

6. Sewerin IP. "Errors in radiographic assessment of marginal bone height around osseointegrated implants". *Scandinavian Journal of Dental Research* 98.5 (1990): 428-433.

7. Jacobs R and van Steenberghe D. "Radiographic Planning and Assessment of Endosseous Oral Implants". *Springer-Verlag: Heidelberg* (1998).

8. Berglundh T., *et al*. "Are peri-implantitis lesions different from periodontitis lesions?" *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* 38.11 (2011): 188-202.

9. Loubele M., *et al*. "Comparative localized linear accuracy of small-field cone-beam CT and multislice CT for alveolar bone measurements". *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology* 105.4 (2008): 512-518.

10. Kühl S., *et al*. "Detection of peri-implant bone defects with different radiographic techniques - a human cadaver study". *Clinical Oral Implants Research* 27.5 (2016): 529-534.

11. Van Dessel J., *et al*. "Objective 3D quantification of socket preservation treatment strategies using L-PRF: A split mouth randomized control trial". EAO Congress Stockholm, poster 613 (2015).

12. Pauwels R., *et al*. "Quantification of metal artifacts on cone beam computed tomography images". *Clinical Oral Implants Research* 24 (2013): 94-99.

Volume 8 Issue 4 March 2017