



Experts Reach Consensus Concerning the Optimum Number of Implants

## Placing “reserve” implants no longer deemed advisable

Organized under the auspices of the Foundation for Oral Rehabilitation (FOR), an international consensus conference was recently held on patient-centered management and the optimal number of implants for the treatment of edentulism. The moderators report on the group’s findings in the following article.

*By Professors Wilfried Wagner and Daniel van Steenberghe*



The group of experts from left to right: Drs Gerry Raghoebar, Bernhard Pommer, Claudia Dellavia, John Brunski, Wilfried Wagner, Daniel van Steenberghe, Emeka Nkenke, Massimo Del Fabbro, Bilal Al-Nawas, Regina Mericske-Stern, and Georg Watzek.

Loss of teeth and their surrounding tissues should be considered a form of amputation. Edentulism often results in a loss of quality-of-life, and it remains a

major problem in oral health, since the decline of its prevalence is offset by the sheer volume of the aging population. The serendipitous discovery

### THE FOUNDATION FOR ORAL REHABILITATION (FOR)


is an independent, international initiative that unites professionals from various disciplines to improve oral health care and support humanitarian leadership.

### BACKGROUND

This article is a summary of the consensus conference held at the University of Mainz, Germany, March 27–28, 2014.

The topic was “Patient centered management and optimal number of implants in the treatment of edentulism”.

More in depth findings and analysis can be found in the *European Journal of Oral Implantology*, Volume 7 / Supplement 2, Summer 2014.



Two previously edentulous jaws restored with prosthetic teeth attached to six implants in each jaw. The radiograph is published courtesy of Dr. Enrico Agliardi.

by Per-Ingvar Brånemark of osseointegration, allows permucosal titanium implants to provide a permanent anchorage to dental prostheses. Oral implants are subject to significant loads—commonly  $\geq 30$  kg—during chewing or parafunction, which must be counteracted by reactions at the bone-to-implant interface, leading to stress and strain. Since the nature of the interface changes during the healing phase and over time, it is important to avoid improper levels of stress and strain in the bone around implants. It should be noted that although Ante's law on crown-to-root ratios, dating back to 1926, hardly applies to the natural dentition, it very definitely does not

apply to implant-supported fixed prostheses.

Although scientific evidence resolving the issue is widely available, the number of implants needed to support or retain a dental prosthesis remains a matter of debate in some parts of the world.

**FOR**, as a global organization, therefore invited an international team of eight experts to scrutinize and elucidate different aspects of edentulous jaw rehabilitation. Their investigations of the literature ranged from quality-of-life assessments to biomechanics, and from jaw function to prosthodontics. Each expert produced a critical review of the literature, not limited to random-

ized controlled trials, but also including retrospective and prospective cohort studies (in order to avoid ignoring significant, clinically relevant information). Their findings were distributed within the expert group, which subsequently met for two days at the University of Mainz to compose a consensus text.

#### PATIENT-CENTERED FINDINGS

When the use of oral implants to anchor dental prostheses became routine in the eighties, it was common practice to install a large number of implants, the idea being that, even if one implant failed, there would be no need to replace it, since the remaining implants would hopefully suffice to support the fixed prosthesis.

Today, with improved implant surfaces and well-proven protocols, the incidence of failure has become so rare that the placement of supplementary implants to avoid such revision surgery no longer seems reasonable. The optimal number of implants should solely be determined by a patient-centered approach to the challenge at hand. Concerning the minimal number of implants needed, one study (Brånemark P-I et al, Clin. Oral. Implants Res. 1995) compared fixed prostheses in edentulous jaws supported by either 4 or 6 implants, depending on the available bone volume. All patients had been treated by Brånemark himself during the pioneering years. All had 10-years of follow-up. No statistical difference for implant survival rates was found in cases where either


4 or 6 implants were placed. These findings counteracted the widespread tendency at the time to systematically insert 6 implants or more for each edentulous jaw.

### CONSIDER THE SIDE-EFFECTS

When available bone volume is limited due to advanced bone resorption, inserting 6 implants or more can necessitate bone augmentation procedures. Side effects of bone graft harvesting from different intra- and extra-oral donor sites should not be underestimated. Morbidity is the rule after horizontal and vertical crestal bone augmentation procedures. Sinus inlay grafts impact less on the quality-of-life in postoperative periods.

In a patient-centered approach, the aim should be to avoid more invasive procedures, such as grafting, when a more limited number of implants offer the same reliable long-term outcome. The pros and cons of invasive and less invasive treatments should at least be discussed with the patient. The arguments should be put into perspective of age, general health condition, and functional and esthetic demands.

When providing a fixed prosthesis to rehabilitate an edentulous jaw, limiting the support to 4 implants leads to high survival rates. In this context, it should be noted that tilted implants help to achieve a sufficient anterior-posterior spread and are not associated with more marginal bone loss than axial ones. The forces in the tilted configurations comprised of 2 tilted and 2 axial



Based on just four implants in each jaw, precision manufactured NobelProcera frameworks have been used here in a case carried out according to the All-on-4® treatment concept. The radiograph is published courtesy of Dr. Paulo Maló.

implants can actually be lower than configurations comprised solely of 4 axial ones, due to a greater anterior-posterior spread and more limited cantilever spans. Calculations demonstrate that adding supplementary implants does not improve the load distribution.

Literature also reveals that for overdentures in the lower jaw, 2 or 4 implants lead to high survival rates and great patient satisfaction. Although a fixed prosthesis comes closer to the jaw function of dentate subjects, patients who have been edentulous for some time often prefer an overdenture to a fixed prosthesis.

Several studies indicate that even one central implant can stabilize an overdenture in the lower jaw. A randomized control trial of denture wearers, comparing one midline mandibular implant with the classical two-implant approach revealed no difference in patient satisfaction.

In the upper jaw, however, overdentures preferably should be retained by 4 implants with individual locator-abutments or interconnected by a bar.

To avoid grafting procedures one can also use short ( $\leq 8$  mm) and/or narrow ( $\leq 3.5$  mm) implants. Another approach is to use extra-maxillary anchorage locations, such as the zygoma.

The use of 2 to 4 zygomatic implants, with or without anterior maxillary implants, also offers a predictable outcome for the support of a complete fixed prosthesis. This advanced treatment option is most appropriately carried out at specialized centers.

### WEIGH RISKS AGAINST BENEFITS

When considering treatment alternatives for the rehabilitation of edentulism, one should consider the risks and benefits. The “cost” of pain, of treatment time and of the patient’s unavailability to normal social/professional life, are as relevant as financial costs. As far as the financial costs are concerned, using only four implants to support a fixed prosthesis is—on average—several thousand dollars cheaper, and less time-consuming, than treatment based on 5 to 8 implants (Babbush et al, Impl. Dent. 2014).

However, esthetic demands can lead to the insertion of 6 implants or more, especially in the maxilla. To achieve a passive fit of the cross-arch prosthesis, when no CAD/CAM technique is used, segmentation of the prosthesis may become mandatory. In such a situation  $\geq 6$  implants should be inserted.

The consensus group concluded that for a fixed prosthesis in the edentulous maxilla or mandible, 4 or 6 implants are appropriate numbers if their placement does not necessitate major bone grafting procedures.

As a predictable alternative to more invasive surgery, one can opt for 4 implants only, with the two distal ones tilted dorsally to augment the anterior-posterior spread. Patient satisfaction and quality of life should be leading principles in opting for a treatment scheme. In future, clinicians ought to mention the number of patients treated, rather than the number of implants placed.

Sign in at [www.FOR.org](http://www.FOR.org)

or contact the FOR Center team at [info@forcenter.org](mailto:info@forcenter.org) to learn more.

### References

Brånemark PI, Svensson B, van Steenberghe D. Ten-year survival rates of fixed prostheses on four or six implants ad modum Branemark in full edentulism. Clin Oral Implants Res.1995;6:227–231

Babbush et al. Patient-related and financial outcomes analysis of conventional full-arch rehabilitation versus the All-on-4 concept: a cohort study. Impl Dent 2014; 23:218-224

### THE EXPERTS AND THE EXPERTISE EACH COVERED

Bernhard Pommer	Patient preferences
John Brunski	Biomechanical considerations
Regina Mericske-Stern	Optimal implant numbers for fixed reconstructions
Claudia Dellavia	Functional jaw muscle assessment
Massimo Del Fabbro	Marginal bone around straight vs. tilted implants
Gerry Raghoobar	Optimal implant numbers for overdentures
Emeka Nkenke	Bone grafting to offset resorption, pros and cons
Bilal Al-Nawas	Bone substitute materials used with oral implants

Group moderators: Wilfried Wagner and Daniel van Steenberghe

# FOR

### Foundation for Oral Rehabilitation (FOR)

Werftstrasse 4  
PO 2558  
6002 Lucerne 2  
Switzerland  
Phone: +41 41 248 0857  
[info@forcenter.org](mailto:info@forcenter.org)  
[www.FOR.org](http://www.FOR.org)