



Short Communication

Tooth Implant Supported Prosthesis

Harshmeer Nagra¹

¹*Department of Prosthodontics, Krishnadevaraya College of Dental Sciences, Bangalore*

How to cite: Harshmeer N. Tooth implant supported prosthesis. *Int J Prostho Rehabil* 2022; 3: 1:39-42

Received : 02.05.2022

Accepted: 20.05.2022

Web Published: 13.06.2022

ABSTRACT

Implant- tooth supported prostheses have significant biological and biomechanical benefits. Due to the widespread use of implants to support prostheses in partly edentulous patients, encountering this condition of mandatory connection between tooth and implant is becoming increasingly unusual. Long-term prognosis of this treatment approach is, however, a topic of specific dispute in dentistry literature due to biomechanical differences between a tooth and an implant. The purpose of this review is to critically analyse the technical issues, the biological effects of tooth-implant supported prostheses, and the recommendations that could be useful in preventing long-term issues related to the tooth supported permanent partial denture.

Keywords: Tooth implant supported prosthesis; Complications; Splinting

Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Harshmeer Nagra,

Department of Prosthodontics,

Krishnadevaraya College of Dental Sciences,

Bangalore-562157

E-Mail id: harshmeer896@gmail.com

Introduction

Depending on the quantity and health of the remaining teeth, the amount of accessible space, the strength of the bone support, the cost, and the preferences of the patient, there are several treatment options available to replace lost teeth. Fixed dental prostheses supported by implants have been demonstrated to be an effective therapeutic option.^[1] When there is an anatomical space restriction for implants or a failure of an implant to osseointegrate, an implant may occasionally be linked to the remaining natural teeth.^[2]

Discussion

Benefits and Drawbacks:

The splinting of a natural tooth to an implant, improved mechanoreception, and extra support for the overall load on the dentition are benefits of tooth implant supported prosthesis. Additionally, using implants to join teeth expands the range of treatments a restorative dentist may perform, lowers the cost of replacing teeth, and does away with the need for cantilevers.^[3,4] The drawbacks of such connections include a greater requirement for maintenance and repair.^[4-6] The issue with the implant-to-natural-tooth link is that the osseointegrated implants and the tooth have different movement patterns, which might put an excessive amount of stress on the implant. Numerous studies have documented severe marginal bone loss or implant failure, particularly in the areas nearest to the implants. This triggered debate about whether it is possible to attach implants to natural teeth.

Rationale:

There are several arguments in favour of fusing dental implants with natural teeth. The common ones include anatomical restrictions in the posterior regions where there is insufficient bone, local and systemic conditions that prevent the placement of additional implants, failed implants with some implant remaining, financial limitations for additional implant placement and bone augmentation procedures, and failed implants with some implant remaining. The necessity for extra support, where implants must give occlusal guidance, and the requirement to distribute the weight among the natural teeth in order to prevent overloading the implant are other factors. Implants can also give the remaining natural teeth more support in cases when the gums are damaged. It's always a challenging task to restore esthetics in anterior region with implants than natural teeth.^[6]

Types of Connections:

Three different types of connections are employed in tooth implant supported prostheses:

1. Rigid connection: Using a fixed dental prosthesis, the tooth is rigidly connected to the implant.
2. Non-rigid connection: Telescopic restorations, non-precision attachments, and precision attachments are used to telescopically link the tooth to the implant. It serves as a stress-breaking component.
3. Resistant connection: It features a flexible part that mimics the periodontal ligament. It serves as a stress-absorbing component.^[7]

Complications

Complications associated with tooth implant supported prosthesis is broadly classified into biological and technical complications. The slow loss of bone surrounding the implant neck, bone fracture, loss of osseointegration, peri-implantitis, endodontic issues, caries following cement breakdown, and root fracture

are examples of biological difficulties. Comparing stiff connection to non-rigid tooth to implant prosthesis and free standing implant restorations, marginal bone loss with rigid connection is expected to be three times greater. It met acceptable requirements, nevertheless. The aforementioned information leads to the conclusion that when implants were attached to teeth, high loads may not have been passed. On the other hand, there are reports in the literature showing equal rates of bone loss with both rigid and non-rigid connections. Abutment fracture, teeth or root fracture, tooth intrusion, fatigue-induced prosthesis fracture, fracture of the implant, fracture of the abutment screw, loss of the prosthesis cement bond to the tooth or abutment, and fatigue-induced implant fracture are examples of technical complications brought on by mechanical damage to the teeth or implant.^[8]

Conclusion

It is clear from the research above that there are a number of negative side effects associated with fusing implants to natural teeth. However, the implantologist can and should examine the idea of fusing natural teeth to the implant when the circumstances call for it. To ensure a predictable course of therapy, a treatment plan must be created. Before the treatment plan is established, the patient should be given a risk-benefit analysis and informed of any potential problems. Reducing the danger of tooth intrusion and implant overload should be the major priority.^[9, 10]

Authors' contribution

Harshmeer Nagra: Manuscript editing, Literature search, data collection, data analysis

Acknowledgement

The authors would thank the dental institutions for the support

Conflict of interest

The authors have nothing to disclose or any conflicts of interest.

Source of funding- None

References

- [1]. Buser D, Chappuis V, Bornstein MM, Wittneben JG, Frei M, Belser UC. Long-term stability of contour augmentation with early implant placement following single tooth extraction in the esthetic zone: a prospective, cross-sectional study in 41 patients with a 5-to 9-year follow-up. *Journal of Periodontology*. 2013 Nov;84(11):1517-27.
- [2]. Papaspyridakos P, Chen CJ, Singh M, Weber HP, Gallucci GO. Success criteria in implant dentistry: a systematic review. *Journal of Dental Research*. 2012 Mar;91(3):242-8.
- [3]. Gehrke P, Johannson D, Fischer C, Stawarczyk B, Beuer F. In vitro fatigue and fracture resistance of one- and two-piece CAD/CAM zirconia implant abutments. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2015 May-Jun;30(3):546-54. doi: 10.11607/jomi.3942. PMID: 26009905.
- [4]. Block MS. Maxillary fixed prosthesis design based on the preoperative physical examination. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2015 May 1;73(5):851-60.
- [5]. Trakas T, Michalakis K, Kang K, Hirayama H. Attachment systems for implant retained overdentures: a literature review. *Implant dentistry*. 2006 Mar 1;15(1):24-34.

- [6]. Al-Omiri MK, Al-MasriM ,Alhihawi MM, Mailath G and Lynch E. Combined implant and tooth support: An up-to-date comprehensive review. *Int J Dent.* 2017;2017:6024565.
- [7]. Shenoy VK, Rodrigue SJ, Prashanti E, Saldanha SJ. Tooth implant supported Prosthesis: A Literature review. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Dentistry.* 2013 Sep 1;3(3):143.
- [8]. Ting M, Faulkner RJ, Donatelli DP, Suzuki JB. Tooth-to-Implant–Supported Fixed Partial Denture: A Comprehensive Overview of Systematic Reviews. *Implant dentistry.* 2019 Oct 1;28(5):490-9.
- [9]. Huang YC, Ding SJ, Yan M, Huang TW. Clinical outcomes and complications of posterior three-unit porcelain-fused-to-metal restoration combined with tooth-implant-supported prosthesis: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Dental Sciences.* 2022 Jan 1;17(1):184-93.
- [10]. Mamalis A, Markopoulou K, Kaloumenos K and Analitis A. Splinting osseointegrated implants and natural teeth in partially edentulous pateints: A systematic review of the literature. *The Journal of oral implantology.*2010;38:424-34.



Published by MM Publishers
<https://www.mmpubl.com/ijprosthor>

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

Copyright ©2022 Harshmeer Nagra