AN OVERVIEW TREATING PERI-IMPLANTITIS WITH THE TECHNIQUE OF IMPLANTOPLASTY

Ahmad Abdullah Alharbi[1*], Mohammed Abdullah Alzahrani[2], Hanan Abdullah Turkstani[3], Essam Abdun Bassaif[3], Zohair Ali Alghamdi[4], Ahmed Abdullatif Alhababi[4], Khalid Nassir Balbaid[5], Ghayah Abdo Alasiri[6], Abdullah Abdulaziz Turkistani[7], Fathi Saleh Shahabuddin[8], Mohammad Abubakr Elaidarous[9], Wesam Faiz Bakhadlaq[10], Faisal Saeed Alzahrani[11], Anhar Abdullah Binomran[12], Raiya Mohammed Shareef[13]

Abstract:
For the purpose of this study, the definition and features of peri-implant disease will be investigated, with a particular emphasis placed on per-implantitis. The purpose of this endeavor is to improve one's understanding of the subject matter and to investigate a number of management tactics that have been emphasized. Through the utilization of electronic databases such as MEDLINE and EMBASE, we carried out an exhaustive evaluation of the existing literature. With a particular emphasis on papers written in English, we conducted a search for studies that primarily focused on the application of implantoplasty as a treatment for peri-implantitis. Peri-implant diseases are characterized by symptoms that are comparable to those of gum disease. These symptoms include bleeding during dental hygiene practices, as well as gums that are inflamed or sensitive when they are surrounding the implants. As is the case with natural teeth, implants need to be maintained with normal dental hygiene practices such as brushing and flossing, in addition to receiving routine checkups from a dental trained expert. In addition to a history of gum disease, smoking, insufficient plaque management, and diabetes mellitus, other risk factors for developing peri-implant disease include a history of both of these conditions. As a component of a thorough periodontal assessment, it is essential to do routine examinations on dental implants. The inability of osseointegration to occur completely and the eventual loss of the implant are both possible outcomes that might be brought about by an undetected preimplantation defect.

[1*]General Dentistry Saudi Ministry of Health
[2]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[3]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[4]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[5]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[6]Dental Assistant, Saudi Ministry of Health
[7]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[8]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[9]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[10]General Dentistry, Saudi Ministry of Health
[11]Asfan Health Center, dental hyginest
[12]General dentist, Altukssui primary health care
[13]Dental Assistant, Alkaakiah primary health care center

***Corresponding Author:** Ahmad Abdullah Alharbi
*****General Dentistry Saudi Ministry of Health

DOI: 10.53555/ecb/2022.11.7.53

Introduction:

When there is an imbalance between the quantity of bacteria that are present and the body's ability to defend against them, peri-implant illness can emerge. This occurs after a dental implant has been successfully integrated into the bone. Peri-implant illnesses can impact either the preimplant mucosa alone, which is referred to as peri-implant mucositis, or they can include both the preimplant mucosa and the supporting bone, which is referred to as peri-implantitis [1]. It is a common occurrence for patients with peri-implant dysfunction to have bleeding on probing, often known as BOP [1]. Moreover, the presence of pus, higher probing depths in comparison to the original measures, recession of the mucosal tissue, the existence of a draining sinus (fistula), and swelling or abnormal development of the mucosal tissue around the implant are all additional clinical symptoms that may indicate the presence of the illness. If the preimplant disease is not properly diagnosed, it might lead to the failure of the osseointegration process and the consequent loss of the implant.

In the field of dental care, food impaction, which is defined as the accumulation of food particles around natural or artificial teeth, is a problem that is widely recognized throughout the industry. Food impaction is described as the act of firmly wedging food into the interproximal region with vertical pressure from chewing (vertical impaction) or with the application of tongue or cheek pressure (horizontal impaction) [2]. This definition comes from the Glossary of Periodontal Terms, which describes the process. It is also possible for meal particles to become trapped inside the preimplant sulcus as a consequence of implant restorations. On the basis of empirical research, foods such as popcorn, seeds, legumes, and almonds are frequently implicated in cases of food impaction. The majority of the husk that is found in many seeds, including sunflower seeds, is composed of cellulose, which is a polymer that cannot be digested by enzymes designed for human consumption. The difference in the alignment of supracrustal connective tissue that exists between natural teeth and dental implants is something that is commonly understood [3]. Instead of being attached to one another, the fibers that surround the implants arrange themselves in a manner that is parallel to the surface of the abutment, and they simply adhere to the surface of the joint [3]. As a consequence of this, the preimplant sulcus may be susceptible to obstructions caused by food and foreign bodies.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the characteristics of peri-implant illness, with a specific emphasis on per-implantitis, as well as the definition of peri-implant disease. Having this knowledge will improve our understanding of the topic at hand as well as the many different ways that are stressed for its care.

Review:

A significant amount of research has been conducted on human biopsy specimens in order to investigate the histological characteristics of spontaneously occurring peri-implantitis lesions [4-6]. When compared to peri-implant mucositis, the lesions that were found at peri-implantitis locations (which were identified by bleeding on probing, suppuration, and radiographic bone loss) had a bigger proportion of B cells (CD19+) and a higher number of neutrophil granulocytes. Similar to periodontitis, the lesions that were seen in peri-implantitis locations were characterized by a high presence of lymphocytes and plasma cells. One thing that set them apart, however, was the fact that they had a higher concentration of polymorphonuclear leukocytes and macrophages [5]. In addition, recent studies have shown that the size of peri-implantitis lesions, which are defined as implant sites between teeth that have bleeding on probing and a probing depth of 7 mm or more, is more than twice as great as the size of the lesions that are detected at periodontitis sites (3.5 mm2 versus 1.5 mm2) [6]. Furthermore, the existence of peri-implantitis lesions was identified by bigger proportions of area, quantity, and thickness of plasma cells, macrophages, and neutrophils, as well as a higher concentration of vascular frameworks located outside and next to the infiltrated cells [5]. This was done in order to determine the presence of peri-implantitis lesions. According to the findings of another study inquiry, which utilized immunohistochemical analysis of soft tissue samples that were obtained, IL-1 was revealed to be a key cytokine that activates osteoclasts in locations that are associated with peri-implantitis [4]. The bone component of the sites was not included in the research that were stated above that used human peri-implant tissue samples. This is a crucial point to highlight because ethical constraints prevented them from doing so.

Researchers have effectively isolated typical periodontopathogenic bacteria from both healthy and sick implant sites by applying standard DNA probe and culture tests. This was accomplished. The distribution of these identified species did not significantly change depending on the condition of the medical implant, regardless of whether it was healthy, had peri-implant mucositis, or had peri-implantitis [7]. Peri-implantitis, on the other hand, was shown to be related with elevated levels of 19

distinct bacterial species, including Porphyromonas gingivalis and Tannerella forsythia [8]. This was in contrast to healthy implant locations, where normal levels of these bacteria were found. Peri-implantitis is frequently associated with opportunistic pathogens such as Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus aureus (S. aureus), fungal organisms such as Candida albicans, Candida boidinii, Penicillum spp., Rhadotorula laryngis, and Paelicomyces spp., and viruses such as human cytomegalovirus and Epstein-Barr virus. Additionally, observational studies have shown that peri-implantitis is frequently associated with these pathogens. In light of this, it appears that the infection is multifaceted and diverse. It is essential to take into consideration the fact that the submucosal microbiota of peri-implantitis lesions has not been adequately examined using methods that do not rely on culture. Because of this, the microbiological profile that is linked with peri-implantitis need to be regarded as being insufficient.

It is usual practice to characterize peri-implantitis based on medical symptoms of inflammation. These indicators include redness, swelling, enlargement of the mucosa, bleeding on probing (BOP+) with or without pus, as well as changes in pocket depth (PD) and loss of bone that may be seen on radiographs [3-6]. The probing depth (PD) of implant sites that have been diagnosed as having peri-implantitis is frequently increased. A total of 2,277 implants were implanted in 588 people over the course of nine years, and research was conducted on those individuals. In the study, it was discovered that a probing depth of 6 millimeters or more was present in 59% of the implants that exhibited symptoms of moderate to severe peri-implantitis. These indicators were indicated by bleeding on probing and bone loss that was larger than 2 millimeters. A probing depth of 6 millimeters or more was observed in 3% of the implants that were categorized as healthy (defined as the lack of blood on probing) and 16% of the implants that were diagnosed with mucositis (defined as bleeding on probing but no bone loss more than 0.5 millimeters). As the severity of peri-implantitis grew, it was noted that the prevalence of implants with a pocket depth (PD) of 6 mm or greater rose. This was the case according to the findings.

A cross-sectional study was carried out by Schwarz et al. on a total of 238 patients, each of whom had 512 implants. The patients had a median function duration of 23 months, with the range going all the way up to 80 months [12]. The frequency of BOP scores ranged from 33% to 50% at sites with peri-implant mucositis (as determined by bleeding on probing (BOP+) on at least one side of the implant), with a maximum of 67% at sites with periimplantitis (defined as BOP+ and/or suppuration and changes in radiographic bone level compared to baseline). This was determined by considering the presence of BOP+ on at least one side of the implant. Implant sites that were damaged by illness showed a greater incidence of probing depth (PD) measurements ranging from 4 to 6 millimeters when compared to sites that had a healthy and well-maintained preimplant mucosa. There was a comparable distribution of PD values between sites that had mucositis and those that had peri-implantitis. Only one implant was found to have peri-implantitis, and that implant had probing depth (PD) values that were more than or equal to seven millimeters [12]. Within the context of this particular scenario, it is essential to acknowledge that determining the presence of a physiological peri-implant illness at implant sites is a difficult task. There was a wide range of variance in the vertical mucosal density that was evaluated at healthy implant sites, with measures ranging from 1.6 to 7.0 mm (i.e. the degree of mucosal margin to the crestal bone) [13]. This was discovered by an examination that was carried out not too long ago. For the purpose of evaluating and contrasting the horizontal mucosal thickness (hMT) at both healthy and ill implant sites, a cross-sectional investigation was carried out. When compared to healthy implant sites, the median horizontal marginal thickness (hMT) was substantially higher at ill implant sites (1.1 mm) than it was at healthy implant sites. On the other hand, the hMT was comparable for mucositis and peri-implantitis locations (1.7 mm and 1.6 mm, respectively). Based on the placement of the implant (either in the upper or lower jaws) or its position (either in the front or rear of the mouth), the values in all of the groups that were studied did not substantially differ from one another [14].

The existence of periapical peri-implantitis lesions has been recorded in a number of case series, in addition to the occurrence of peri-implant infections in regions that have increased probing depths. Typically, the implants that were affected were identified by a periapical radiological radiolucency, with or without accompanying clinical symptoms of inflammation. These signs may include redness, swelling, the creation of a fistula, and/or the formation of an abscess [15]. Within the time frame of two to eight weeks and about four years after the implant was inserted, clinical and radiographic signs were utilized to detect the existence of inflammation [15], [16], [17]. Such observations were made. A direct association between retrograde periimplantitis and the occurrence of periapical endodontic lesions in

neighboring teeth has been discovered by the majority of research investigations [15], [16], [17]. Such a correlation has been confirmed to exist.
Case studies have revealed a variety of oral-mucosal lesions that can arise at dental implants and can be similar to illnesses that involve the peri-implant region. There are primary malignant tumors, such as oral squamous cell carcinoma, as well as metastases, giant cell, and pyogenic granuloma that are included in these lesions [18-20]. There are obvious distinctions between these pathological illnesses and peri-implant sickness in terms of nonspecific inflammation at the histopathologic level [18-20]. This is despite the fact that these diseases have many medical characteristics at the medical level.

For the purpose of cleaning the implant, it is required to make use of instruments that are not as hard as titanium. Some examples of such instruments are flossing, polishing with a rubber cup and paste, utilizing interdental brushes, and selecting plastic scaling instruments. Research has demonstrated that metal and ultrasonic scalers are capable of roughening the surface area of the implant, whereas these scalers do not [21]. Utilizing ultrasonic scalers that have nonmetallic tips or curettes made of resin and carbon fiber can significantly reduce the amount of damage that is done to the implant surface area. On the other hand, the presence of implant threads and roughness on the surface may make it more difficult to clean the region.
When it comes to effectively removing contaminants from the surface areas of implants with peri-implant pockets measuring 5 mm or more and exposed implant threads, the research that was carried out by Karring et al. demonstrated that performing sub-mucosal debridement using either an ultrasonic instrument or carbon fiber curettes alone is insufficient [22]. In order to properly treat peri-implantitis, it is possible that depending just on mechanical or ultrasonic debridement could not be sufficient. This is a sensible suggestion.
Using a monkey model, researchers evaluated four different approaches to the purification of implant surfaces: (1) using an air-powder abrasive technique followed by an application of citric acid; (2) using only an air-powder abrasive technique; (3) using gauze soaked in saline followed by an application of citric acid; and (4) using gauze soaked simultaneously in 0.1% chlorhexidine and saline [23]. There were no discernible differences between any of the treatments that were utilized, according to the medical criteria, radiography (more precisely quantitative electronic subtraction radiography), histology, and stereology. The findings of a laboratory study that combined the application of toluidine blue solution and moderate laser irradiation shown that it is feasible to eradicate germs from a variety of titanium surfaces without causing any changes to the surface of the implant [23].
Peri-implantitis can be treated using photodynamic treatment, which is a non-invasive approach that can be used to lower the amount of germs present [26]. For example, 2% chlorhexidine or 3% hydrogen peroxide are both examples of topical antiseptics that can be utilized. The use of gauze that has been soaked in a mixture of chlorhexidine and saline solution is a successful method for achieving the purification of implants that have been impacted by contamination. When it comes to dealing with implants that have titanium plasma-sprayed or sandblasted/acid-etched surfaces, this procedure is especially simple and effective [21].
Reduced levels of F were seen as a consequence of the employment of an erbium-doped: yttrium, aluminum, and garnet (Er: YAG) laser in the non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis lesions. After one month had passed after the therapy, nucleatum was detected [26]. According to the findings of Schwarz et al., the Er: YAG laser and the combination of mechanical debridement and chlorhexidine are equally efficient in dramatically increasing peri-implant probing pocket depth and clinical attachment level after six months of therapy. This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of these two methods. The utilization of the Er: YAG laser, on the other hand, leads to a significantly more significant reduction in bleeding during probing when compared to the utilization of chlorhexidine in addition [24]. On the other hand, a further research investigation that was carried out by Schwarz et al. discovered that the efficiency of the Er: YAG laser was only noticed for a period of six months, especially for advanced peri-implantitis lesions [25]. However, it has been indicated that the utilization of the Er: YAG laser on its own might not be sufficient to adequately cure peri-implantitis. The utilization of further restorative methods, such as the utilization of the Er: YAG laser once more or the utilization of osseous regeneration therapies subsequently, can be required.
For the purpose of making an educated decision on whether to provide antibiotics on a local or systemic level, it is essential to have accurate microbiological data regarding the presence of possible bacteria. In order to select the most suitable treatment, it is essential to get information on the makeup of the subgingival microbial component. Furthermore, the oral distribution patterns of possible bacteria have a crucial

influence in determining whether an antibiotic drug should be provided locally or systemically. This is because oral microorganisms are more likely to be found in the mouth. In order to carry out this procedure, it is necessary for medical specialists to take into consideration the periodontal condition of the teeth that are still present.
The findings of the research carried out by Schwarz et al. demonstrated that the treatment of peri-implant infection through mechanical debridement with plastic curettes and antiseptic treatment with 0.2% chlorhexidine led to significant improvements in bleeding on probing, peri-implant probing pocket depth, and clinical attachment level after a period of six months, in comparison to the initial measurements [24]. An investigation that was carried out by Renvert and colleagues shown that the utilization of disinfectant therapy in conjunction with mechanical debridement does not provide any further advantages in the treatment of shallow peri-implant sores that have a mean probing pocket depth of less than 4 millimeters [27]. In shallow peri-implant sores with an average pocket probing depth of less than 4 millimeters, it would appear that the incorporation of antibacterial therapy in conjunction with mechanical debridement does not give any extra advantages. On the other hand, it seems to give further clinical benefits in deep peri-implant lesions that have an average pocket probing depth of more than 4 millimeters, and in particular in those that have an average pocket probing depth of more than 5 millimeters. It is possible that patients who have certain peri-implant issues and do not have any other infections are candidates for treatment using local drug-delivery devices. Topical administration of antibiotics, which involves the implantation of tetracycline fibers for a period of ten days, has the potential to provide a continuously high concentration of the antimicrobial agent directly to the afflicted region for a longer length of time [28]. When it comes to the treatment of peri-implant lesions, the utilization of minocycline microspheres in combination with mechanical therapy appears to be potentially beneficial; nonetheless, it may require replication [28]. The research that was carried out by Renvert and colleagues demonstrated that the additional benefits that are derived from the incorporation of the antibiotic minocycline into mechanical debridement are, in general, superior, albeit to a limited degree, in comparison to the advantages that are obtained through the combination of a disinfectant (chlorhexidine) and mechanical debridement [27]. For a period of one year, the improvements in peri-implant probing depths that were accomplished with the extra use of minocycline can be sustained. The amount of bone loss that was detected did not surpass three implant threads, as stated in the research conducted by Renvert et al. [27]. The collection of thorough microbiological data and the administration of antibiotics in a systemic manner are both performed in the event that the illness is prevalent. For a period of ten days, Lang et al. recommend the following antibiotic regimens: either taking systemic ornidazole 500 mg twice a day for ten days, or metronidazole 250 mg three times a day for ten days, or a combination of metronidazole 500 mg and amoxicillin 375 mg once daily for ten days [28]. It is necessary to manage both peri-implantitis and chronic periodontal disease if the two conditions are shown to be related with one another. Given the circumstances, it is possible that the administration of systemic antibiotics will be continued. In the present moment, there are no clinical trials that are currently being conducted to investigate the utilization of systemic antibiotics for the treatment of peri-implantitis.
It would appear that antibiotics are capable of providing sufficient management of superficial peri-implant infection [1], provided that mechanical and antibacterial therapies are carried out prior to the beginning of antibiotic therapy. However, it is yet unknown whether or not more severe peri-implant lesions may be efficiently treated without the need for surgery by utilizing a combination of a targeted antibiotic and mechanical debridement.
The technique of surgery In many cases, surgical excision is only performed on implants that are situated in locations that are not considered to be cosmetically significant. In order to ease the complete removal of dead tissue and the cleaning of the afflicted implant, a surgical flap is made available. Autogenous bone grafts that were covered by membrane layers, autogenous bone grafts that were not covered by membranes, membranes that were not covered by membranes, and a control access flap therapy were all utilized throughout the surgical process. When compared to the other three treatments, the results demonstrated that defects that were treated with membrane-covered autogenous bone had much higher levels of bone regrowth and reosseointegration [21]. On the other hand, membrane exposure is one of the most typical outcomes of these therapies. In the event that porous e-PTFE membrane layers are exposed, there is a possibility that bacteria will infiltrate the membrane, which will then lead to infection [21].
For the time being, there are no randomized controlled medical studies that are available for the use of access flap surgical technique (open-flap

debridement) as a solo treatment for periimplantitis. The combination of resective surgical procedures and implantoplasty can have a positive impact on the survival rates of rough-surfaced implants that are affected by peri-implantitis, as well as improve peri-implant clinical parameters such as pocket-probing depth, suppuration, and sulcus bleeding, according to the findings of a randomized comparative clinical trial that was carried out by Romeo et al. [29]. Both nanocrystalline hydroxyapatite and directed bone regeneration were shown to result in considerable clinical improvements after six months of non-submerged healing, as evidenced by clinical criteria [30]. This was demonstrated by the research that was carried out by Schwarz et al. Both treatment strategies were effective in dramatically lowering pocket-probing depth and boosting clinical attachment level, as demonstrated by the findings of the clinical trial conducted by Schwarz et al., which was conducted over a period of two years. Nevertheless, the utilization of a mixture of natural bone mineral and collagen membrane was linked to more significant enhancements in these clinical parameters, which, as a result, resulted in a more predictable and enhanced healing outcome [31]. A reliable comparison analysis of the efficacy of both therapy methods was not possible due to the small sample size of the research study, which consisted of just 22 patients. It is vital to begin collecting greater data on the many different regeneration procedures that may be used to treat peri-implantitis.

Conclusion:

There are a number of treatments that have been described for peri-implantitis. These treatments include non-surgical therapies, as well as surgical therapies that are resective and regenerative. A combination of several approaches is frequently used. Due to the fact that the results of research on various treatment options for peri-implantitis are inconclusive and the topic of major controversy, it is now impossible to develop a treatment program that is widely approved. Implantoplasty is a clinical treatment that is used to smooth down the exposed threads of an implant. This results in a more desired site where the implant meets the tissue that is around it. In the course of the healing period, the mechanical modification of the implant surface helps to assist the adjustment of the surrounding soft tissue and encourages a reduction in the adhesion of germs to the implant. According to the findings of prior research, the purpose of this investigation was to determine whether or not implantoplasty is beneficial in improving the health of the area surrounding the implant.

References:

1. Zitzmann, N. U. & Berglundh, T. (2008) Definition and prevalence of peri-implant disease. Journal of Clinical Periodontology 35 (Suppl. 8), 286–291.
2. Glossary of periodontal terms 2001. 4th ed. Chicago: American Academy of Periodontology; 2001. p. 20, 38. Available at: http:// www.joponline.org/page/glossary. Accessed October 28, 2013.
3. Listgarten MA, Lang NP, Schroeder HE, Schroeder A. Periodontal tissues and their counterparts around endosseous implants. Clin Oral Implants Res 1991;2:1-19.
4. Konttinen YT, Lappalainen R, Laine P, Kitti U, Santavirta S, Teronen O. Immunohistochemical evaluation of inflammatory mediators in failing implants. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2006;26:135–141.
5. Berglundh T, Gislason O, Lekholm U, Sennerby L, Lindhe J. Histopathological observations of human periimplantitis lesions. J Clin Periodontol. 2004;31:341–347.
6. Carcuac O, Berglundh T. Composition of human peri-implantitis and periodontitis lesions. J Dent Res. 2014;93:1083–1088.
7. Renvert S, Roos-Jansaker AM, Lindahl C, Renvert H, Rutger Persson G. Infection at titanium implants with or without a clinical diagnosis of inflammation. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2007;18:509– 516.
8. Persson GR, Renvert S. Cluster of bacteria associated with periimplantitis. J Periodontal Res. 2016;51(6):689–698.
9. Leonhardt A, Renvert S, Dahlen G. Microbial findings at failing implants. Clin Oral Implants Res. 1999;10:339–345.
10. Rakic M, Grusovin MG, Canullo L. The microbiologic profile associated with peri-implantitis in humans: a systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2016;31:359–368.
11. Derks J, Schaller D, Håkansson J, Wennström JL, Tomasi C, Berglundh T. Effectiveness of implant therapy analyzed in a Swedish population: prevalence of peri-implantitis. J Dent Res. 2016;95:43–49.
12. Schwarz F, Becker K, Sahm N, Horstkemper T, Rousi K, Becker J. The prevalence of peri-implant diseases for two-piece implants with an internal tube-in-tube connection: a cross-sectional analysis of 512 implants. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2017;28:24–28.
13. Fuchigami K, Munakata M, Kitazume T, Tachikawa N, Kasugai S, Kuroda S. A diversity of peri-implant mucosal thickness by site. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2017;28:171–176.

14. Schwarz F, Claus C, Becker K. Correlation between horizontal mucosal thickness and probing depths at healthy and diseased implant sites. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2017;28:1158–1163.
15. Penarrocha-Diago M, Maestre-Ferrin L, Penarrocha-Oltra D, Canullo L, Piattelli A, Penarrocha-Diago M. Inflammatory implant periapical lesion prior to osseointegration: a case series study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2013;28:158–162.
16. Kutlu HB, Genc T, Tozum TF. Treatment of refractory apical periimplantitis: a case report. J Oral Implantol. 2016;42:104–109.
17. Tozum TF, Sencimen M, Ortakoglu K, Ozdemir A, Aydin OC, Keles M. Diagnosis and treatment of a large periapical implant lesion associated with adjacent natural tooth: a case report. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 2006;101:132– 138.
18. Kaplan I, Hirshberg A, Shlomi B, et al. The importance of histopathological diagnosis in the management of lesions presenting as peri-implantitis. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2015;17 Suppl 1:e126–133.
19. Bischof M, Nedir R, Lombardi T. Peripheral giant cell granuloma associated with a dental implant. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19:295–299.
20. Ozden FO, Ozden B, Kurt M, Gunduz K, Gunhan O. Peripheral giant cell granuloma associated with dental implants: a rare case report. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24:1153– 1156.
21. Schou S, Berglundh T, Lang NP. Surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):140–9.
22. Karring ES, Stavropoulos A, Ellegaard B, Karring T. Treatment of periimplantitis by the Vectors system.A pilot study. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16:288–93.
23. Schou S, Holmstrup P, Jorgensen T, Skovgaard LT, Stoltze K, Hjorting-Hansen E, et al. Implant surface preparation in the surgical treatment of experimental peri-implantitis with autogenous bone graft and ePTFE membrane in cynomolgus monkeys. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2003;14:412–22.
24. Schwarz F, Sculean A, Bieling K, Ferrari D, Rothamel D, Becker J. Two year clinical results following treatment of peri-implantitis lesions using a nanocristalline hydroxyapatite or a natural bone mineral in combination with a collagen membrane. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35:80–7.
25. Schwarz F, Bieling K, Bonsmann M, Latz T, Becker J. Nonsurgical treatment of moderate and advanced peri-implantitis lesions: A controlled clinical study. Clin Oral Invest. 2006;10:279–88.
26. Rutger GP, Ann-Marie RJ, Christel L, Stefan R. Microbiologic Results After Non-Surgical Erbium-Doped:Yttrium, Aluminum, and Garnet Laser or Air-AbrasiveTreatment of Peri-Implantitis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Periodontol. 2011;82:1267–78.
27. Renvert S, Lessem J, Dahlen G, Renvert H, Lindahl C. Mechanical and repeated antimicrobial therapy using a local drug delivery system in the treatment of peri implantitis: A randomized clinical trial. J Periodontol. 2008;79:836–44.
28. Lang NP, Wilson TG, Corbet EF. Biological complications with dental implants: Their prevention, diagnosis and treatment. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2000;11(Suppl 1):146–55.
29. Romeo E, Lops D, Chiapasco M, Ghisolfi M, Vogel G. Therapy of peri-implantitis with resective surgery. A 3-year clinical trial on rough screw-shaped oral implants. Part II: Radiographic outcome. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2007;18:179–87.
30. Schwarz F, Bieling K, Latz T, Nuesry E, Becker J. Healing of intrabony peri-implantitis defects following application of a nanocrystalline hydroxyapatite (Ostimt) or a bovine-derived xenograft (Bio-Osst) in combination with a collagen membrane (Bio-Gidet). A case series. J Clin Periodontol. 2006;33:491–9.
31. Schwarz F, Sculean A, Bieling K, Ferrari D, Rothamel D, Becker J. Two year clinical results following treatment of peri-implantitis lesions using a nanocristalline hydroxyapatite or a natural bone mineral in combination with a collagen membrane. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35:80–7.