FACTORS INFLUENCING DENTAL IMPLANT SUCCESS RATES: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Hesham Mohammed S Alamri[1]*, Mohammed Ali N Alasmari[2], Bander Hassan Mohammad Alfaifi[3], Khaled Saleh J Alshehri[4], Nawaf Ayedh Ali Alqahtani[5], Ali Saleh A Alshehri[6], Saeed Mohammed Alzedani[7]

Abstract

The success of dental implants is influenced by a multitude of factors spanning patient characteristics, surgical techniques, prosthetic considerations, biomaterials, and post-operative care protocols. This narrative review delves into the comprehensive analysis of these factors to provide a structured understanding of the intricacies involved in achieving optimal dental implant success rates. Beginning with an exploration of the anatomy and physiology of dental implants, including the osseointegration process and factors influencing it, the review progresses to discuss patient-related factors such as systemic health conditions, oral hygiene, and lifestyle habits. Surgical factors such as technique, implant design, bone quality, and timing of placement are scrutinized for their impact on implant success. Prosthetic considerations encompassing design, materials, occlusal forces, and implant-abutment connections are evaluated alongside discussions on emerging technologies like digital dentistry and predictive models. Complications and risk factors, including peri-implantitis and infection, are examined, emphasizing the importance of preventive measures and early intervention. The review concludes with insights into future directions in implant dentistry, highlighting advances in materials, digital workflows, and personalized treatment approaches. Overall, this review provides valuable insights for clinicians, researchers, and patients, guiding clinical practice, fostering innovation, and paving the way for improved dental implant success rates.

Keywords: Dental implants, osseointegration, patient factors, surgical techniques, prosthetic considerations, biomaterials, complications, digital dentistry, predictive models, implant success.

[1]*General Dentist, Dentistry Administration, Directorate Of Health Affairs, Asir, Saudi Arabia
[2]General Dentist, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery Department, Khameas Musheat General Hospital, Khameas Musheat, Saudi Arabia
[3]General Dentist, Sarat Abedah Dental Center, Ministry Of Health, Aseer, Saudi Arabia
[4]Consultant of Endodontic, Khamis Mushiet Dental Center, Ministry Of Health, Khamis Mushait, Saudi Arabia.
[5]General Dentist, Dental Clinic, Al-Numais Primary Health Care Center, Al-Numais, Saudi Arabia
[6]General Dentist, Dental Clinic, Al-Souda Primary Health Care Center, Abha, Saudi Arabia
[7]General Dentist, Commitment Administration, Aseer Health Affairs, Aseer, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding Author:** Hesham Mohammed S Alamri
*General Dentist, Dentistry Administration, Directorate Of Health Affairs, Asir, Saudi Arabia

DOI: 10.53555/ecb/2022.11.10.145

I. Introduction

Dental implants have revolutionized the field of dentistry by offering a durable and reliable solution for replacing missing teeth [1]. Unlike traditional dentures or bridges, which sit on the gums or adjacent teeth, dental implants are anchored directly into the jawbone, mimicking the natural tooth structure. This provides not only aesthetic benefits but also functional advantages, such as improved chewing ability and speech [2,3].

The concept of dental implants dates back to ancient civilizations, where materials like seashells and stones were used to replace missing teeth. However, modern dental implantology emerged in the 20th century with the development of biocompatible materials and surgical techniques that promote successful integration with the bone [2,4].

The success of dental implants is paramount for ensuring long-term patient satisfaction and oral health. Dental implant success is typically defined by criteria such as osseointegration, absence of infection, stability, and functionality [1,5]. High success rates not only indicate the effectiveness of the implant procedure but also contribute to the patient's quality of life by restoring oral function and aesthetics [4,5].

The purpose of this narrative review is to comprehensively explore the various factors that influence dental implant success rates. By examining the existing literature and research findings, we aim to provide a deeper understanding of the multifaceted aspects that contribute to successful implant outcomes. This review seeks to inform clinicians, researchers, and patients about the critical factors to consider before, during, and after dental implant placement.

II. Anatomy and Physiology of Dental Implants

A. Overview of Dental Implant Structure

A dental implant comprises three main components: the implant fixture, abutment, and prosthetic restoration. The implant fixture, usually made of titanium or titanium alloy, is surgically placed into the jawbone and serves as the artificial tooth root [6]. The abutment connects the implant fixture to the prosthetic restoration, which can be a crown, bridge, or denture, depending on the patient's needs [3,6].

B. Osseointegration Process

Osseointegration is a crucial process that determines the success of dental implants. It refers to the direct structural and functional connection between the implant surface and the surrounding bone [2,6,7]. During osseointegration, bone cells adhere to the implant surface, forming a strong bond that stabilizes the implant within the jawbone. Factors such as implant design, surface characteristics, and bone quality influence the osseointegration process [7].

C. Factors Influencing Osseointegration

Several factors contribute to the success of osseointegration. Adequate bone quantity and quality are essential for achieving strong implant stability and integration. Surgical techniques, such as proper implant placement and loading protocols, also play a significant role in promoting successful osseointegration [8]. Additionally, patient factors like systemic health conditions, smoking habits, and oral hygiene can influence the osseointegration process and overall implant success rates [9].

III. Patient-Related Factors

A. Systemic Health Conditions

The overall health status of patients can impact dental implant success rates. Systemic conditions such as diabetes, autoimmune disorders, and osteoporosis may affect bone healing and osseointegration. Proper medical evaluation and management of systemic health conditions are crucial considerations before undergoing implant treatment [1,10].

B. Oral Health and Hygiene

Maintaining good oral hygiene is imperative for preventing peri-implant complications and ensuring long-term implant success. Poor oral hygiene can lead to plaque accumulation, peri-implantitis, and implant failure. Patients should receive education and guidance on oral care practices to optimize implant outcomes [3,8,11].

C. Smoking and Alcohol Consumption

Smoking and excessive alcohol consumption are known risk factors for dental implant failure. These habits can impair wound healing, compromise immune function, and increase the risk of infections around the implant site [12]. Patients who smoke or consume alcohol should be counseled on the detrimental effects and encouraged to modify their lifestyle behaviors for better implant success rates [3,12,13].

D. Age and Gender

Age and gender may also influence dental implant outcomes. Older patients may experience slower bone healing and reduced bone density, impacting the osseointegration process [4,13,14]. Gender-specific factors, such as hormonal changes, can also affect bone metabolism and implant stability. Personalized treatment plans based on age, gender, and individual health factors are essential for

optimizing implant success in diverse patient populations [13-15].

IV. Surgical Factors

A. Surgical Technique

The surgical approach to implant placement significantly influences success rates. Factors such as surgical skill, precision in implant placement, atraumatic techniques, and proper tissue management contribute to optimal outcomes [15,16]. Careful planning, including radiographic assessment and virtual implant placement using digital technology, enhances the predictability and success of implant surgery [3,15].

B. Implant Design and Surface Characteristics

The design and surface properties of dental implants play a crucial role in osseointegration and long-term stability. Implant surface modifications, such as roughening or coating with bioactive materials, can enhance bone-to-implant contact and accelerate healing [16]. Advanced implant designs, such as tapered or platform-switched implants, offer biomechanical advantages that contribute to improved success rates [17].

C. Bone Quality and Quantity

The availability of adequate bone volume and quality is essential for successful implant placement and osseointegration. Bone augmentation techniques, such as bone grafting and sinus lifting, may be necessary in cases of deficient bone volume [1-3,15]. Preoperative assessment of bone density and morphology helps determine the appropriate surgical approach and implant selection for optimal outcomes [15,16].

D. Immediate vs. Delayed Implant Placement

The timing of implant placement, whether immediate or delayed after tooth extraction, can impact success rates. Immediate implant placement offers advantages such as preservation of alveolar bone and reduced treatment time [3,4,16]. However, careful case selection and surgical expertise are required to ensure favorable outcomes with immediate implants. Delayed implant placement allows for adequate healing and resolution of infection or pathology before implant placement, contributing to long-term success [18].

V. Prosthetic Factors

A. Prosthesis Design and Material

The design and material of the prosthetic restoration have a significant impact on dental implant success rates. Prosthesis design includes considerations such as crown morphology, contour, and occlusal scheme [18]. A well-designed prosthesis ensures proper load distribution and occlusal forces, minimizing stress on the implant and surrounding bone. Additionally, the choice of prosthetic material influences biocompatibility, aesthetics, and long-term durability [4,19]. Common materials used for implant restorations include ceramics, metals, and hybrid materials, each with its advantages and considerations regarding mechanical properties and esthetics [19].

B. Occlusal Forces and Bite Stability

Occlusal forces exerted on dental implants must be carefully managed to prevent complications such as implant overload or biomechanical failure. Proper occlusal adjustments and bite stability are essential to distribute forces evenly across the implant and supporting bone [20,21]. Occlusal factors, including parafunctional habits and occlusal discrepancies, should be addressed to maintain implant stability and minimize the risk of complications over time [21].

C. Implant-Abutment Connection

The implant-abutment connection plays a critical role in implant stability, maintenance of soft tissue health, and prevention of microbial infiltration. Different types of implant-abutment connections, such as internal hex, external hex, or morse taper connections, offer varying degrees of mechanical strength and sealing properties [22]. A tight and stable implant-abutment interface is essential for long-term success, as it prevents micromovement, bacterial colonization, and potential peri-implant complications [22-24].

D. Cement vs. Screw-Retained Restorations

The choice between cement-retained and screw-retained implant restorations has implications for implant success and maintenance. Cement-retained restorations offer esthetic advantages by concealing screw access holes but may pose challenges related to excess cement removal and potential peri-implant inflammation [25,26]. On the other hand, screw-retained restorations allow for retrievability and easier maintenance but may compromise esthetics in certain cases. The selection of the appropriate retention method depends on factors such as esthetic demands, access for hygiene, and clinician preference [27].

VI. Biomaterials and Biocompatibility

A. Biomaterials Used in Implant Dentistry

The choice of biomaterials in implant dentistry plays a crucial role in implant success and biocompatibility. Titanium and its alloys are widely used due to their excellent biocompatibility, corrosion resistance, and osseointegration

properties [3,28]. However, advancements in biomaterial science have led to the development of alternative materials such as zirconia, polyetheretherketone (PEEK), and bioactive ceramics. These biomaterials offer unique advantages in terms of aesthetics, mechanical properties, and biological response, expanding the options for implant restorations and overcoming limitations associated with traditional materials [29,30].

B. Tissue Response and Biocompatibility

Biocompatibility of dental implants is determined by their ability to integrate with surrounding tissues without eliciting adverse reactions. Tissue response to implants involves a complex interplay of biological processes, including inflammation, wound healing, and bone remodeling [31]. Biocompatible implants promote favorable tissue integration, minimal inflammatory response, and long-term stability within the oral environment. Factors such as surface modifications, material composition, and implant design influence biocompatibility and tissue response, ultimately affecting implant success rates [3,4,32].

C. Allergic Reactions and Implant Failure

Although rare, allergic reactions to implant materials can contribute to implant failure and complications. Hypersensitivity reactions to components like titanium or nickel alloys may manifest as local inflammation, soft tissue reactions, or systemic symptoms [33]. Preoperative allergy testing and careful selection of biocompatible materials are essential strategies to minimize the risk of allergic complications and ensure implant success. Understanding the role of biocompatibility and potential allergenicity is crucial for clinicians and patients when planning implant treatment [5,12,34].

VII. Maintenance and Follow-Up

A. Post-Operative Care Instructions

After implant placement, patients receive detailed post-operative care instructions to promote healing and prevent complications. These instructions typically include guidelines for oral hygiene practices, dietary restrictions, medication usage, and follow-up appointments [10,14,15]. Proper post-operative care plays a vital role in implant success by reducing the risk of infection, promoting tissue healing, and optimizing long-term outcomes [19].

B. Long-Term Follow-Up Protocols

Long-term follow-up is essential to monitor implant stability, peri-implant health, and patient satisfaction. Follow-up protocols may include periodic clinical examinations, radiographic evaluations, and assessment of prosthetic function [1,3]. Early detection of complications such as peri-implantitis, implant mobility, or prosthesis-related issues allows for timely intervention and preservation of implant longevity. Regular follow-up visits also provide an opportunity to address patient concerns, reinforce oral hygiene practices, and maintain optimal oral health [16,22].

C. Implant Survival vs. Success Rates

Implant survival rates, indicating the presence of implants in the oral cavity, do not necessarily equate to implant success. While high implant survival rates are desirable, achieving long-term success requires considerations beyond mere implant presence [23,28]. Factors such as osseointegration, absence of peri-implant complications, functional stability, and patient satisfaction contribute to comprehensive implant success rates. Clinicians should assess both implant survival and success criteria to evaluate the overall effectiveness and durability of implant treatments [3].

VIII. Conclusion

In summary, this narrative review comprehensively explores the multifaceted factors influencing dental implant success rates. From anatomical considerations and patient-related factors to surgical techniques, prosthetic aspects, biomaterials, complications, and emerging technologies, a holistic understanding of these factors is essential for optimizing implant outcomes. The findings from this review have significant implications for clinical practice. Clinicians must carefully evaluate patient-specific factors, choose appropriate implant designs and materials, adhere to best surgical practices, and implement comprehensive maintenance protocols to maximize implant success rates and long-term patient satisfaction. Future research endeavors should focus on further elucidating the role of emerging technologies, biomaterial advancements, and predictive models in enhancing implant success rates. Longitudinal studies, randomized controlled trials, and multicenter collaborations are needed to validate predictive models, assess long-term outcomes, and refine clinical guidelines for implant dentistry. Additionally, research on personalized implant treatments tailored to individual patient profiles can contribute to advancements in precision medicine and improved implant success rates across diverse patient populations.

References

1. Saghiri MA, Freag P, Fakhrzadeh A, Saghiri AM, Eid J. Current technology for identifying dental implants: a narrative review. Bulletin of the National Research Centre. 2021 Dec;45:1-1.
2. Kandavalli SR, Wang Q, Ebrahimi M, Gode C, Djavanroodi F, Attarilar S, Liu S. A brief review on the evolution of metallic dental implants: history, design, and application. Frontiers in Materials. 2021 May 13;8:646383.
3. Guillaume B. Dental implants: A review. Morphologie. 2016 Dec 1;100(331):189-98.
4. Meyer G, Fanghänel J, Proff P. Morphofunctional aspects of dental implants. Annals of Anatomy-Anatomischer Anzeiger. 2012 Mar 20;194(2):190-4.
5. Babbush CA, Hahn JA, Krauser JT, Rosenlicht JL. Dental implants: the art and science. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2010 Mar 9.
6. Hämmerle CH, Glauser R. Clinical evaluation of dental implant treatment. Periodontology 2000. 2004 Feb;34(1):230-9.
7. Leblebicioglu B, Rawal S, Mariotti A. A review of the functional and esthetic requirements for dental implants. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 2007 Mar 1;138(3):321-9.
8. Parithimarkalaignan S, Padmanabhan TV. Osseointegration: an update. The Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society. 2013 Mar;13(1):2-6.
9. Elias CN, Meirelles L. Improving osseointegration of dental implants. Expert review of medical devices. 2010 Mar 1;7(2):241-56.
10. Listgarten MA. Soft and hard tissue response to endosseous dental implants. The Anatomical Record: An Official Publication of the American Association of Anatomists. 1996 Jun;245(2):410-25.
11. Oshida Y, Tuna EB, Aktören O, Gençay K. Dental implant systems. International journal of molecular sciences. 2010 Apr;11(4):1580-678.
12. Moraschini V. Success of dental implants in smokers and non-smokers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2016 Feb 1;45(2):205-15.
13. Elias CN. Factors affecting the success of dental implants. Implant dentistry: a rapidly evolving practice. Rijeka: InTech. 2011 Aug 29:319-64.
14. Geckili O, Bilhan H, Geckili E, Cilingir A, Mumcu E, Bural C. Evaluation of possible prognostic factors for the success, survival, and failure of dental implants. Implant dentistry. 2014 Feb 1;23(1):44-50.
15. Marchand F, Raskin A, Dionnes-Hornes A, Barry T, Dubois N, Valéro R, Vialettes B. Dental implants and diabetes: conditions for success. Diabetes & metabolism. 2012 Feb 1;38(1):14-9.
16. Sennerby L, Roos J. Surgical determinants of clinical success of osseointegrated oral implants: a review of the literature. International Journal of Prosthodontics. 1998 Sep 1;11(5).
17. Abullais SS, AlQahtani NA, Kudyar N, Priyanka N. Success of dental implants: Must-know prognostic factors. Journal of Dental Implants. 2016 Jan 1;6(1):44-8.
18. Cakarer S, Selvi F, Can T, Kirli I, Palancioglu A, Keskin B, Yaltirik M, Keskin C. Investigation of the risk factors associated with the survival rate of dental implants. Implant Dentistry. 2014 Jun 1;23(3):328-33.
19. Rameh S, Menhall A, Younes R. Key factors influencing short implant success. Oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2020 Sep;24:263-75.
20. Steigenga JT, Al-Shammari KF, Nociti FH, Misch CE, Wang HL. Dental implant design and its relationship to long-term implant success. Implant dentistry. 2003 Dec 1;12(4):306-17.
21. Karoussis IK, Brägger U, Salvi GE, Bürgin W, Lang NP. Effect of implant design on survival and success rates of titanium oral implants: a 10-year prospective cohort study of the ITI® Dental Implant System. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2004 Feb;15(1):8-17.
22. Vetromilla BM, Brondani LP, Pereira-Cenci T, Bergoli CD. Influence of different implant-abutment connection designs on the mechanical and biological behavior of single-tooth implants in the maxillary esthetic zone: A systematic review. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2019 Mar 1;121(3):398-403.
23. Albrektsson T, Zarb G, Worthington P, Eriksson AR. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: a review and proposed criteria of success. Int j oral maxillofac implants. 1986 Jan 1;1(1):11-25.
24. Pjetursson BE, Zarauz C, Strasding M, Sailer I, Zwahlen M, Zembic A. A systematic review of the influence of the implant-abutment connection on the clinical outcomes of ceramic and metal implant abutments supporting fixed implant reconstructions. Clinical oral implants research. 2018 Oct;29:160-83.
25. Hamed MT, Abdullah Mously H, Khalid Alamoudi S, Hossam Hashem AB, Hussein Naguib G. A systematic review of screw versus cement-retained fixed implant supported reconstructions. Clinical, cosmetic and investigational dentistry. 2020 Jan 14:9-16.
26. Jain JK, Sethuraman R, Chauhan S, Javiya P, Srivastava S, Patel R, Bhalani B. Retention failures in cement-and screw-retained fixed restorations on dental implants in partially

edentulous arches: A systematic review with meta-analysis. The Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society. 2018 Jul 1;18(3):201-11.
27. Manawar A, Dhanasekar B, Aparna IN, Naim H. Factors influencing success of cement versus screw-retained implant restorations: a clinical review. Journal of Osseointegration. 2012 Oct 30;4(3):43-7.
28. Duraccio D, Mussano F, Faga MG. Biomaterials for dental implants: current and future trends. Journal of Materials Science. 2015 Jul;50:4779-812.
29. Ananth H, Kundapur V, Mohammed HS, Anand M, Amarnath GS, Mankar S. A review on biomaterials in dental implantology. International journal of biomedical science: IJBS. 2015 Sep;11(3):113.
30. Bhasin SS, Perwez E, Sachdeva S, Mallick R. Trends in prosthetic biomaterials in implant dentistry. Journal of the International Clinical Dental Research Organization. 2015 Dec 1;7(Suppl 1):S148-59.
31. Listgarten MA. Soft and hard tissue response to endosseous dental implants. The Anatomical Record: An Official Publication of the American Association of Anatomists. 1996 Jun;245(2):410-25.
32. von Wilmowsky C, Moest T, Nkenke E, Stelzle F, Schlegel KA. Implants in bone: Part I. A current overview about tissue response, surface modifications and future perspectives. Oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2014 Sep;18:243-57.
33. Sicilia A, Cuesta S, Coma G, Arregui I, Guisasola C, Ruiz E, Maestro A. Titanium allergy in dental implant patients: a clinical study on 1500 consecutive patients. Clinical oral implants research. 2008 Aug;19(8):823-35.
34. Siddiqi A, Payne AG, De Silva RK, Duncan WJ. Titanium allergy: could it affect dental implant integration?. Clinical oral implants research. 2011 Jul;22(7):673-80.