IMPLANT PROTECTIVE OCCLUSION AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT FOR SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF PROSTHETIC RESTORATIONS

Natasha Stavreva
Faculty of Dentistry-Skopje, Department of Prosthodontics, University "St. Cyril and Methodius"-Skopje, natasha_stavreva@yahoo.com

Abstract: Oral implantology is rapidly utilized in the field of dentistry, especially in prosthetics. Occlusion specific to implants can be termed Implant Protective Occlusion. Implant-Protective Occlusion is that occlusal scheme which reduces the forces at the crestal bone/implant interface. Biomechanical principles form the basis of this concept. The primary goal of Implant-Protective occlusion is to maintain the occlusal load transferred to the implant within the physiologic limits of each patient. Implant dentistry continues to struggle with what is the appropriate occlusal concept for implant-supported restorations. The biological and mechanical consequences of the loading environment leads to establishing and maintaining an implant interface in a wide variety of bone quality, implant and prosthesis designs. The aim of this paper is to highlight implant occlusal principle and clinical applications for long-term success of implants and prosthetic restorations. More specifically, the occlusal considerations for implant supported prostheses make a major contribution to ensure predictable results.
Keywords: implant, occlusion, success, failure, prosthetic restoration

1. INTRODUCTION

The prosthodontist has specific responsibilities to minimize overload to the bone-to-implant interface. These include a proper diagnosis leading to a treatment plan providing adequate support, based on the patient's individual force factors; a passive prosthesis of adequate retention and progressive loading to improve the amount and density of the adjacent bone and further reduce the risk of stress beyond physiologic limits. The final element is the development of an occlusal scheme that minimizes risk factors and allows the restoration to function in harmony with the rest of the stomatognathic system. [1] Rehabilitation of missing teeth with prosthesis has undergone a series of changes over the years. Various treatment options considered are complete dentures, removable partial dentures, fixed partial dentures and overdentures. The quest for replacements as close to natural teeth as possible resulted in the development of implants. [2]

Occlusion specific to implants can be termed Implant Protective Occlusion. Implant-Protective Occlusion is that occlusal scheme which reduces the forces at the crestal bone/implant interface. Biomechanical principles form the basis of this concept. The direction of force, force magnification, and implant position relative to arch or location are blended together for a consistent approach to implant reconstruction. [3] The direction of force demonstrates that angled forces increase the type of forces, alter their point of application, and reduce bone strength. Force magnifiers include cantilevers, offset loads, and monumental forces to the implant body. These magnifiers dramatically increase the amount of force applied to a prosthesis. [4] The implant position is often determined by the density of bone and the amount of force. Adequate surface area of implant includes width, length, and number. The surface area is a primary component in the resistance of force factors. In addition occlusal table width and occlusal contacts contribute to the amount of force, type and direction and may be modified to reduce crestal loads. [5]

Presently, implant restorations are considered to be the most ideal restorative option available. Implants provide with advantages such as maintenance of bone, restoration and maintenance of occlusal vertical dimension, maintenance of facial aesthetics, improved esthetics, improved phonetics, improved occlusion, improvement or allowance for regaining of oral proprioception, improved stability and retention of removable prostheses, improved psychological health and elimination of the need to alter adjacent teeth.

The primary goal of Implant-Protective occlusion is to maintain the occlusal load transferred to the implant within the physiologic limits of each patient. Implant dentistry continues to struggle with what is the appropriate occlusal concept for implant-supported restorations. The biological and mechanical consequences of the loading environment leads to establishing and maintaining an implant interface in a wide variety of bone quality, implant and prosthesis designs. To the prosthodontist, the role occlusion is more focused on extending the service life of the restoration and the connecting abutments than protecting the osseous integration of the implants. [6]

2. GENERAL OCCLUSAL SCHEME

The concept of occlusion suitable for osseointegrated prostheses is basically the same as that of gnathologic occlusion.

In centric, all of the posterior teeth should have contacts, and anterior teeth should have a clearance of about 30μm. If the entire arches are restored with osseointegrated prostheses such as a fully bone anchored bridge, it will be easier to establish such an occlusion. In the mixed dentition, which is composed of natural teeth and osseointegrated bridgework, the natural tooth sinks approximately 30μm during its function. An osseointegrated bridge, which is supported only by bone, does not sink. Therefore, the centric contacts of the osseointegrated fixed bridge should be slightly more open than the natural teeth. In centric, the osseointegrated bridge should not contact with opposing teeth under the soft bite pressure, while strong bite pressure, the bridge should contact after the natural tooth intrudes approximately 30μm. The osseointegrated bridge begins to contact after the contact of all the natural posterior teeth. In order to avoid the overloading of the occlusal surface, the osseointegrated prosthesis should not have plane-to-plane contact. Point contact especially cusp-tofossa tripodal contact is preferred. [7]
During eccentric movement, the concept of disclusion is generally recommended. Anterior segments of the osseointegrated prosthesis should guide the mandible to produce the posterior disclusion. Canine guided occlusion is not recommended for the osseointegrated prosthesis as it generates excessive occlusal forces into the single implant fixture, which is placed in the canine area. In order to distribute the stress over the entire fixture, anterior group function is recommended. [8]

3. NATURAL TOOTH VERSUS IMPLANT BIOMECHANICS

It is critical for the practitioner to appreciate the differences between natural teeth and endosseous implants in regard to the application of stress. The most significant difference is created by the periodontal ligament and its unique properties. (Tab. 1)

Tab. 1 Natural tooth versus implant biomechanics

TOOTH	IMPLANT
1. Periodontal membrane. a) Shock absorber. b) Longer force duration (decrease impulse of force). c) Distribution of force around tooth. d) Tooth mobility can be related to force. e) Mobility dissipates lateral force. f) Fremitus related to force. g) Radiographic changes to force – reversible.	1. Direct bone-implant. a) Higher impact force. b) Short force duration (increased force impulse). c) Force primarily to crest. d) Implant is always rigid (mobility is failure). e) Lateral force increases strain to bone. f) No fremitus. g) Radiographic changes at crest (bone loss)- not reversible
2. Biomechanical design. a) Cross-section related to direction and amount of stress. b) Elastic modulus similar to bone. c) Diameter related to force magnitude.	2. Implant design. a) Round cross-section and designed for surgery. b) Elastic modulus 5 to 10 times that of cortical bone. c) Diameter related to existing bone.
3. Sensory nerve complex in and around tooth. a) Occlusal trauma induces hyperemia and leads to cold sensitivity. b) Proprioception (reduced maximum bite force). c) Less functional bite force.	3. No sensory nerves. a) No precursor sign of slight occlusal trauma. b) Occlusal awareness of 2 to 5 times less (higher maximum bite force functional). c) Functional bite force 4 times higher.
4. Occlusal material: Enamel. a) Enamel wear, stress lines, abfractions, pits.	4. Occlusal material: Porcelain (metal crown) a) No early signs of force.
5. Surrounding bone is cortical. a) Resistant to change.	5. Surrounding bone is trabecular. a) Conducive to change.

As a result, decreasing stress is constant concern to minimize the risk of implant complications. (Tab. 2)

Tab. 2 Natural tooth versus implant characteristics under load

CRITERION	TOOTH	IMPLANT
Connection	Periodontal ligament	Function ankylosis
Impact force	Decreased	Increased
Mobility	Variable Anterior teeth more than posterior	None

	teeth	
Movement	Shock breaker effect of Periodontal ligament	Stress captured at crest
Apical	Intrude quickly 28μm	No initial movement
Lateral	56 to 108μm	10 to 50μm
Diameter	Large	Small
Modulus of elasticity	With or without cortical bone	5 to 10 times greater than trabecular bone
Signs of hyperemia	Yes	No
Orthodontic movement	Yes	No
Fremitus	Yes	No
Radiographic changes	Periodontal thickening and cortical bone resorption	No
Progressive loading	Since childhood	Shorter loading period
Wear	Enamel wear facets, Localized fatigue, stress fracture, cervical abfraction, pitting on occlusal cusps.	Minimal wear, screw loosening, stress, fracture of prosthetic components or implant body
Tactile sensitivity	High	Low
Occlusal awareness (proprioception)	High detection of premature contacts	Low; higher loads to premature occlusal contacts

4. CLASSIFICATION OF OSSEOINTEGRATED PROSTHESES

Osseointregrated prostheses can be classified as follows:

1. Free standing bridge
   - Kennedy Class I
   - Kennedy Class II
   - Kennedy Class III
   - Kennedy Class IV
2. Bridge connected to the natural teeth
3. Fully bone anchored bridge
4. Single tooth replacement
5. Overdenture

1. Occlusion for free standing bridges

Kennedy class I

In this, both sides of the arch are restored by osseointegrated bridges, and they maintain the vertical height. Careful consideration should be taken to determine the amount of clearance given to the natural anterior dentition. [22,37,38] The amount of disclusion required for this case is the same as in the natural dentition because anterior guidance is provided by the natural dentition: Protrusive 1.1 mm, non-working side 1.0 mm; working side 0.5 mm. [9]

Kennedy Class II

This situation is ideal for the osseointegrated free-standing bridge because the contralateral side of the arch will maintain the vertical height, while the other side is restored by the osseointegrated bridge. In the Kennedy Class II situation, because the anterior teeth are natural teeth, they can bear the occlusal load safely. The amount of disclusion suggested for this case is the same as for a natural dentition: Protrusive 1.1 mm; Non-working side 1.0 mm, Working side 0.5 mm. [10]

Kennedy Class III

This situation is also ideal for osseointegrated implants because the vertical height is maintained by natural teeth. The amount of disclusion suggested for this case is the same as for a natural dentition: Protrusive 1.1 mm; Non working side 1.0 mm, Working side 0.5 mm. [11]

Kennedy Class IV

In this case, posterior disclusion is guided by the osseointegrated bridge. In order to minimize the horizontal load introduced to the implant site, group-function occlusion is preferred. During lateral movement, posterior teeth on the working side can help bear the horizontal load, while the non-working side is discluded. The amount of disclusion suggested for this case is as follows: Protrusive 0.8mm; Non-working side 0.4mm; Working side 0.0mm. Because an anterior fixed bridge does not sink like natural teeth, the clearance of natural teeth must be greater than the one given to natural anterior teeth (> 30μm). [10]

2. Connection for natural teeth

The natural tooth is depressed during its function, while the osseointegrated implant is not. If the osseointegrated implant prosthesis and the natural teeth are connected rigidly, under the occlusal loads, the implant receives the majority of the stress and is overloaded. To avoid this, a non-rigid connector is used. The female (keyway) is placed on the distal end of the retainer supported by the natural tooth; the key connected to the osseointegrated bridge is engaged into the keyway. Thus, the natural tooth can be depressed freely without interference of the osseointegrated bridge. Based on long term observation it was found that the natural tooth depressed permanently and produced a gap between key and keyway. The osseointegrated prosthesis with the key is extruded a visible amount and the retainer cemented to the natural tooth is depressed.

In order to avoid this phenomenon, some suggested the use of telescopic crown to connect the osseointegrated bridge. However through a long term observation it was found again that the natural tooth depressed often, the cement connecting the outer crown to the inner coping was broken down and the cement washed out, producing plaque accumulation. [12]

3. Occlusion for fully bone anchored bridge

The occlusion recommended for a fully bone anchored bridge is the mutually protected occlusion. In centric, it is necessary to have a 30μm clearance at the anterior region and to have centric stops on the posterior teeth. In order to eliminate harmful horizontal stress, the disclusion should be employed. To avoid the localization of the stress, anterior group function must be used. The anterior guidance should be made slightly flatter than that of the natural teeth to avoid overstress of the fixture. This produces a smaller amount of disclusion. Recommended amounts of disclusion for fully bone anchored bridges are as follows: Protrusive 1mm; Non-working side 0.8 mm; Working side 0.3 mm. [13]

4. Occlusion for single tooth replacement

Occlusion required for this restoration is equal to the natural dentition. In centric for anterior teeth, it must have a clearance of 30μm; for premolar, it should contact only under heavy load.

During eccentric movement, the anterior restoration should contact with opposing teeth in order to create anterior group function. This eccentric contact is essential to prevent the extrusion of opposing teeth. Because the restoration does not contact in centric, contact during eccentric movement is required. For premolars, the restoration must disclude during eccentric movement and avoid lateral stress. [14]

5. Occlusion for overdentures

The occlusion recommended for the overdenture is the fully balanced occlusion with lingualized occlusion. The concepts that apply to the regular denture are accepted for the osseointegrated overdenture.

However, in the case of an edentulous maxillary overdenture and a mandibular fully bone anchored bridge, in centric a small clearance is recommended in the anterior teeth, while the posterior teeth contact simultaneously. [15]

6. CONSLUSION

Occlusion has been an important variable in the success or failure of most prosthodontic reconstructions. With natural teeth, a certain degree of flexibility permits compensation for any occlusal irregularities. Implant occlusion is not as forgiving as natural occlusion. Implant occlusion should be reevaluated and adjusted, if needed, on a regular basis to prevent from developing potential overloading on dental endosseous implants, thus providing implant longevity. [16]

The objectives of implant occlusion are to minimize overload on the bone-implant interface and implant prosthesis, to maintain implant load within the physiologic limits of individualized occlusion, and finally to provide long-term stability of implants and implant prostheses. To accomplish these objectives, increased support areas, improved force direction, and reduced force magnification are indispensable factors in implant occlusion. [17]

Further studies in this area are needed to clarify the relationship between occlusion and implant success.

REFERENCES

Akay, A.S., Arısan, V. (2017). Dental Implants in the Medically Compromised Patient Population. IntechOpen:59-90.

Alghamdi, H.S. (2018). Methods to improve osseointegration of dental implants in low quality (type-IV) bone: an overview. Journal of functional biomaterials;9:7.

Babbush, C.A. (2001). Dental Implants – The Arts and Science. Ed 1. Philadelphia : W B Saunders Co.

Bassit, R., Lindstrom, H., Rangert, B. (2002) In Vivo Registration of force development with ceramic and acrylic resin occlusal materials on Implant-supported prostheses. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants; 17:17-23.

Binsu, S., Nair, K.C., Nayar, S., Tella, S. (2016). An innovative simplified method for assessing available bone in mandible for implant. J Indian Prosthodont Soc;16:213-5.

Deo, S.S., Singh, D.P., Dogra, N. (n.d). Bruxism: Its multiple causes and its effects on Dental Implants: A review. Journal of oral health and craniofacial science; 2:57-63.

Guobis, Z., Pacauskiene, I., Astramskaite, I. (2016). General diseases influence on peri-implantitis development: A systematic review. J Oral Maxillofac Res;7:e5.

Katona, T.R., Eckert, G.J. (2017).The mechanics of dental occlusion and disclusion. Clin. Biomech., 50, 84–91.

Kline, R., Hoar, J., Beck, G.H. (2002). A prospective multicenter clinical investigation of a bone quality based implant system. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants, 11 : 224-234.

Li, X.Q., Ma, X.N., Xu, X. (2018). Occlusal analysis of implant-supported fixed denture in edentulous patients. Hua Xi Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi, 36, 628–632.

Lin, C.L., Wang, J.C. (2003). Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis of a splinted implant with various connectors and occlusal forces. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants; 18:331-340.

Radi, I.A., Ibrahim, W., Iskandar, S.M., Abdel, Nabi N. (2018). Prognosis of dental implants in patients with low bone density: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry;120:1-10.

Richter, E.J. (1998). In Vivo horizontal Bending Moments on Implants: Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants; 13:232 244.

Taylor, T.D., Belser, U. (2000). Prosthodontic considerations. Clin Oral Impl Res:11 (Suppl):101-107.

Tawil, G., Aboujaoude, N., Younan, R (2006). Influence of prosthetic parameters on the survival and complication rates of short implants. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants:21:275-282.

Torrado, E., Ercoli, C., Mardini, M.A., Graser, G.N., Tallents, R.H., Cordaro. (2004).A comparison of the porcelain fracture resistance of screwretained and cement retained implant- supported metal ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent; 91:532-7.

Wang, T.M., Lee, M.S., Kok, S.H., Lin, L.D. (2004). Intrusion and reversal of a free standing natural tooth bounded by two implant -supported prostheses: A clinical report. J Prosthet Dent; 92:418-22.