Advantages and Disadvantages of Linking Implants to the Natural Dentition
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Restoration of the partially edentulous patient has been managed by traditional prosthodontic methods including fixed prosthodontic treatment, when sufficient abutment teeth are available; conventional and precision-attachment removable partial dentures; and distal-extension removable partial dentures, when posterior abutments are inadequate. In limited circumstances, tooth-supported long and short cantilevered restorations have functioned successfully. However, some patients have either too few teeth in a poor distribution or insufficient periodontal support to provide abutment teeth for traditional fixed protheses. A removable prosthesis may not be desired by the patient or biomechanically indicated. In these situations, osseointegration should be considered. Furthermore, with the increased predictability of osseointegrated implants, the restoration of the partially edentulous patient with segmental tissue-integrated prostheses may be biologically more conservative than the traditional preparation of multiple abutment teeth.

The concept of osseointegration, as developed by P-I Bränemark, has permitted restoration of the fully edentulous patient since 1965. With more than 25 years of successful function, the bone-anchored prosthesis has taken a prominent position in prosthodontic treatment planning and oral rehabilitation.

The criteria for implants have changed over the past two decades. In 1986, Albrektsson et al set forth minimal success guidelines more rigid than previous criteria. The highly predictable success experienced with osseointegrated implants is critically dependent on meticulous execution of specific surgical and prosthodontic treatment protocols.

IMPLANT ATTACHMENT TO BONE

One essential element in the long-term success of an implant-supported prosthesis for the partially edentulous patient is the development and maintenance of implant attachment to the host bone. Four general categories of mechanisms are identified, as discussed in detail earlier in this issue: (1) a highly differentiated fibrous attachment; (2) a less-differentiated fibrous attachment; (3) the use of artificial fixatives such as bone cement, typically methylmethacrylate, as in orthopedic procedures; and (4) direct implant-to-bone contact, known as osseointegration, which is generally defined as the direct contact between ordered living bone and the surface of a load-carrying implant. It is the author's opinion that only osseointegration can be considered acceptable for long-term biomechanical implant success.

The success of osseointegration depends heavily on the skill of the surgeon and the prosthodontist in providing gentle surgical manipulation of bone and soft tissue, on precise
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fabrication of the prosthesis, and on the manufacturer's preparation of the implant surface and geometry. Following these standards and with successful osseointegration of titanium fixtures, restoration of the partially edentulous patient has been reported. The results of a retrospective study, summarized by van Steenberghe, of the prosthodontic treatment of 38 partially edentulous patients by six centers on three continents show success rates for the individual fixtures in the upper and lower jaws of 87% and 92%, respectively. Approximately 58% of these implants were connected to the natural dentition.

Ericsson et al. reported on 10 patients, ages 31 to 60, with a combination of osseointegrated fixtures and natural teeth serving as abutments. Six bridges were originally connected to tooth abutments (type A), and four were connected to an interlocking precision attachment installed in the contact area between the tooth and the fixture-supported area. Stress broken attachments were used for patients with increased mobility of their dentition. Analysis of the treatment outcome was made through clinical and radiographic measurements.

Balshi, in a paper delivered to the fourth Annual Scientific Session of the Academy of Osseointegration, described a study of 214 fixtures used to support 60 bridges in partially edentulous patients. In most cases, either two or three fixtures were used to support the prosthesis. The duration of prosthesis use ranged from 6 months to 4 years. All bridges were fabricated of porcelain fused to gold, and 16% were connected to natural teeth. All prostheses in this study were completely retrievable. Those connected to natural teeth were joined by either telescopic copings (11 cases) or interlocking precision attachments (2 cases). A multitude of parameters were studied, including marginal bone loss measured radiographically. Only 8 of the 209 surviving fixtures demonstrated bone loss, predominantly between 0.5 and 1.0 mm, with the exception of one fixture with a 5-mm bone loss that was accounted for by extraction surgery immediately adjacent to the implants.

The discussion of implants to restore partially edentulous patients must include consideration of bone quality and quantity because of the significant differences between the maxilla and the mandible. Hobo et al. state "a maxillary prosthesis may require attachment using a non-rigid connector to a natural tooth... to include cantilever extension." The concept of time, functional loading, and bone remodeling around osseointegrated implants was presented at the second International Congress on Tissue Integration in Oral, Orthopedic and Maxillofacial Implants. This paper described the gradual loading time versus prosthetic design criteria for optimal bone remodeling around implants that may be subjected to excessive loads in patients suffering from parafunctional habits.

**CONNECTING OSSEOINTEGRATED IMPLANT FIXTURES TO NATURAL TEETH**

There are two possible methods of connecting an osseointegrated implant to a natural tooth: rigid and nonrigid. The rigid connection of a single osseointegrated implant to a natural tooth, when loaded, produces a differential be-
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*Figure 1. A. Loss of bone around implant site. Preoperative radiograph of site. B. Rigid connection between osseointegrated implant and second molar. Note angular bone loss mesial and distal to the implant.*
between the viscoelastic deflection of the tooth via the periodontal ligament and an almost negligible elastic deformation of the osseointegrated fixture. In some of these cases, angular bone loss around the implants has been noted (Fig. 1).

Because the long-term effects of rigid connection are not yet known, the use of a nonefficient connection has been advocated (Fig. 2) and used clinically with success, as illustrated by Langer and Sullivan (Figs. 3 and 4). Using finite element analysis, van Rossum et al.
cluded that more uniform stress was obtained around the implant with a low E-modulus of the stress-absorbing element. This study also showed that the bone surrounding the natural tooth revealed a decrease in the height of the peak stresses.

Rigid connection, if close enough to the natural tooth, may immobilize teeth. This concept has been effective in the treatment of periodontally mobile teeth$^3,4$ (Fig. 5).

THE PERIODONTAL LIGAMENT

When reviewing osseointegrated implants connected to natural teeth, one must consider the effect of the periodontal ligament. This structure is organized fibrous connective tissue with a specific functional orientation and acts as a protective mechanism, providing resiliency and shock absorption. It stimulates surrounding bone to effect bone remodeling, as seen in

Figure 4. Precision attachments create a nonrigid connection to the natural teeth. (From Langer B, Sullivan D: Osseointegration: Its impact on the relationship of periodontics and restorative dentistry. Int J Periodont Restor Dent 9:165–184, 1989; with permission.)
orthodontic tooth movement. Through its neuroreceptors, the ligament provides a proprioceptive response mechanism. It is, however, the resiliency factor that makes the ligament-supported tooth so very different from the osseointegrated implant, especially when connection of the two with a prosthesis is contemplated.

The stabilization of periodontally mobile teeth using osseointegration in adjacent edentulous areas has been described (see Fig. 5) for partially edentulous arch segments as well as for full-arch rehabilitation incorporating periodontally mobile teeth joined to the tissue-integrated prosthesis with telescopic copings (Fig. 6).

When connecting natural teeth to osseointegrated implants, the surgeon should consider the fact that the implants and prosthesis will have virtually no movement, whereas teeth will move to various degrees in the sockets. The closer the implant and the teeth, the less movement or functional support is provided by the tooth, whereas with increased distance, more...
Figure 6. Full arch rehabilitation. A, Maxillary anterior teeth are restored with cast gold telescopic copings. B, The porcelain-gold prosthesis is supported by Brånemark fixtures in the posterior edentulous areas and periodontally compromised teeth in the anterior areas. C, Fixture position relative to the natural dentition supporting the full reconstruction.
functional support will be provided. Such an example is diagrammatically illustrated by Langer and Sullivan\textsuperscript{20, 21} (Fig. 7). A fixed bridge is supported by a single canine and a single canine implant on the opposite side.

**IMPLANT LOCATION FOR PARTIAL PROSTHESIS**

The location of fixtures for the partially edentulous patient must take account of four biologic considerations: (1) bone quality; (2) bone quantity; (3) bone configuration; and (4) remaining teeth. The quality and quantity of bone will influence the number, location, and size of the fixtures used to restore a partially edentulous area. The generally accepted rule calls for the greatest number of fixtures of the longest length for areas of inferior bone quality and quantity, such as the mandibular posterior and maxillary posterior regions.

Although the maxillary tuberosity has poor-quality bone, the region of the pterygoid plates beyond the tuberosity has proved to provide ample stability for osseointegration and for posterior prosthesis support (Fig. 8). Bone configuration in both jaws affects the use of osseointegrated implants and must be considered in the treatment planning stages. The most important factors are the general osseous form, the contents of the body of bone, its border limitations, and adjacent structures.

The neurovascular bundle in the body of the mandible frequently inhibits direct fixture placement in longstanding partially edentulous areas where resorption is advanced (Fig. 9). The accurate location of the neurovascular bundle via CT scan reformatted imaging or conventional tomograms is helpful, as discussed earlier in this issue. When insufficient bone is available above the neurovascular bundle, buccal displacement of the bundle should be considered. When the bundle is moved laterally, the surgeon can take advantage of the full length of the remaining mandibular bone, providing longer fixtures (Fig. 10).

In the maxilla, an inadequate amount of bone in the area of the antrum or the floor of the nose may be treated through the use of autogenous bone grafting from a variety of donor sites, depending on the volume required. With the exception of a rigid block section of donor bone, most grafts should be allowed to heal for a minimum of 4 months, and preferably 6 months, prior to fixture placement. Grafting is discussed extensively in earlier articles in this issue.

**MAXILLARY ANATOMIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PARTIALLY EDENTULOUS**

The nasal cavity generally does not present a problem for the partially edentulous patient (Text continued on page 956).
Figure 8. Pterygoid maxillary fixture provides the distal abutment support, with the natural permolar serving as the anterior abutment.

Figure 9. Avoidance of neurovascular bundle in mandible with advanced resorption. A, Preoperative radiograph shows bone over the inferior alveolar canal; CT scans were used to determine the position of the canal. B, Fixtures inserted to avoid the canal with a fixed prosthesis at time of placement. C, Five-year postoperative radiograph demonstrates excellent maintenance of bone.
Figure 10. Placement of longer fixtures after movement of neurovascular bundle. A, Pretreatment anterior view shows space between mandibular right canine and lateral incisor. B, Occlusal view of right canine and bicuspids, which have drifted distally owing to longstanding posterior edentulism. C, Bilateral posterior osseointegrated implants support temporary acrylic bridges used as posterior orthodontic anchorage. Note the coiled springs and the almost-completed tooth repositioning. D, Pretreatment intraoral radiographs.

(Illustration continued on following page)
Figure 10 (Continued). E, Pretreatment panradiograph. Note that tooth No. 29 is not restorable. F, Posterior Bränemark fixtures are used for orthodontic anchorage.

(Illustration continued on opposite page)
Figure 10 (Continued). G, Posttreatment panradiograph shows bilateral mandibular implant prosthesis after orthodontic treatment. H, Posttreatment intraoral radiographs demonstrate postorthodontic use of implants for independent prosthesis.
unless teeth and bone were lost in trauma (Fig. 11). If minimal bone is available, either autogenous onlay grafting from the iliac crest or autogenous inlay grafting, as described by Higuchi, may be necessary. If the patient has a high lip line during speech, laughing, or smiling, a gingival replacement unit should be included in the treatment plan.9

Below the sinuses, a minimum of 9 mm of bone is recommended for the placement of a 10-mm screw-type fixture that engages the cortical plate of the sinus floor (see Fig. 8). If less bone is available, autogenous grafts should be considered.

Although several authors have discussed the poor quality and prognosis for osseointegration in the posterior maxilla, other authors (T Balshi, manuscript submitted), including some clinicians previously reluctant to use the maxillary posterior region, have found that the pterygomaxillary area often provides excellent stability on initial fixture placement and good long-term results (see Fig. 8).17 This location becomes especially important for partially edentulous patients with enlarged maxillary sinuses (P-I Bränemark, personal communication, 1989).

MANDIBULAR ANATOMIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PARTIALLY EDENTULOUS

When severe resorption or traumatic loss of bone has occurred, shorter implants are required. A minimum of 8 to 9 mm of bone can be acceptable for the placement of a 10-mm fixture, with its apex penetrating the inferior cortical plate by 1 or 2 mm.

The center of the fixture placed medially to the mental foramen is generally 5 mm away for planning purposes. The surgeon must identify any possible anterior component to the neurovascular bundle. The lingual undercut should be observed during dissection to establish proper implant inclination and to prevent large perforations.

Knife-edge ridges, usually in long-span edentulous areas, may require alveoloplasty if sufficient bone is available for fixture placement above the inferior alveolar canal. If the quantity of bone is insufficient, the treatment plan may call for a dehiscence of the implant on the facial and lingual to be covered by barrier materials such as Vicryl mesh or Gore-Tex, which help promote bone growth surfaces.8,18

GUIDESTENT FABRICATION

The use of surgical guidestents with partially edentulous patients has been reported to provide distinct advantages.2,10,22 If a single 3.75-mm-diameter fixture is placed between adjacent teeth, a minimum of 7 mm of intertooth space is required to permit approximately 1.5+ mm of alveolar bone between the root cemen
tum and the fixture threads. If two fixtures are considered, the optimal distances of the fixture

![Figure 11. Maxillary anterior implants in bone remaining below the nasal cavity after traumatic loss of the alveolar ridge.](image-url)
closest to the natural tooth is 3 mm. If less bone is available, the minimal distance should be 1.5 mm. The ideal interfixtural distance is also 3 mm. However, in some circumstances, such as the replacement of a single molar, two fixtures may be placed in a 12-mm space, permitting 2 mm of space between the fixtures and the teeth.\textsuperscript{6,16}

**TOOTH LOCATION AND IMPLANT-ASSISTED ORTHODONTICS**

Examination of the location of the remaining teeth relative to the edentulous area should include consideration of long-axis angulation. Often, in longstanding partially edentulous conditions, drifted teeth require orthodontic repositioning. Gupton has used osseointegrated fixtures successfully in adjacent edentulous areas as anchorage elements for tooth movement (S Gupton, personal communication, 1991) (see Fig. 10). Fixtures are helpful for anterior consolidation to close spaces, as well as for molar uprighting to recapture spaces where molars have been lost (Fig. 12). The posterior maxillary fixtures (Fig. 13) provided 2 years of anchorage to correct a deep overbite. These same osseointegrated fixtures may subsequently be used for prosthesis support.

**Figure 12.** Use of implants in consolidation and uprighting. A, Pretreatment radiographs. Note missing mandibular molars and tilted adjacent teeth. B, Pretreatment panradiograph.

*(Illustration continued on following page)*
Figure 12 (Continued). C. Midtreatment panoramic. Orthodontic molar uprighting prepares space for implant placement. D. Posttreatment panoramic. Posterior tooth replacement supported by Bränemark fixtures independent of the orthodontically repositioned natural dentition.
RESTORATIVE CONDITION: VIRGIN VERSUS PRERESTORED

Fixture location is also affected by the condition of adjacent teeth. If these teeth are healthy and without restorative need, one should consider multiple fixture placement if possible, based on available bone and interdental space. The final prosthesis should not be connected to the natural dentition (see Figs. 10G, 12D, and 13F). In similar biologic circumstances where only a single fixture can be placed, anterotational prosthetic components should be used to connect the single-tooth prosthesis to the osseointegrated fixture, rather than to the natural tooth (Fig. 14).

Under no circumstances should a lingual or occlusal finger-rest or "stabilizing arm" be extended onto the virgin unrestored enamel of an adjacent tooth. Movement of the natural tooth inevitably permits bacteria to initiate caries beneath the strut of the finger-rest casting regardless of the accuracy of the contact at the time of delivery. The temptation to use resin bonding material to fasten such rest extensions to the enamel should also be avoided, with the realization that the implant-supported prosthesis rigidly connected to the osseointegrated fixture will not have the mobility inherently provided by the periodontal ligament of the tooth intended to function as an anterotational element. Under occlusal load, the tooth may be depressed into its socket, breaking the bond between the enamel and the strut of a finger-rest.

PERIODONTAL CONDITION OF THE NATURAL TEETH

Connecting for Prosthesis Support

If only a single fixture can be placed as an abutment for a fixed prosthesis requiring the use of a natural tooth as the other abutment, the tooth should have good periodontal health with no clinical mobility. Whenever possible, the fixture should be placed over two teeth distal or mesial to the abutment tooth or several teeth away (see Fig. 7; Fig. 15).

---

Figure 13. Correction of deep overbite with aid of posterior maxillary fixtures. A, Palatal view of active orthodontic treatment with acrylic temporary prosthesis on two osseointegrated implants used as posterior anchorage. B, Porcelain-gold implant-supported prosthesis is constructed after completed orthodontics. C, Preoperative deep overbite. D, After implant-assisted orthodontics corrected the deep overbite.
Figure 13 (Continued). E. Midorthodontic panradiograph. F. Posttreatment panradiograph.
Figure 14. Connection of single-tooth prosthesis to implant. A, Single, porcelain-gold molar crown (left) fits precisely on the antirotational titanium Bränemark abutment. B, The assembled crown and single-tooth abutment. C, Facial view of single implant-supported replacement for the maxillary first molar. D, Occlusal view of first molar shows access hole for abutment screw. This prosthesis is easily retrievable. E, Posttreatment radiograph of implant-supported single tooth.
Connecting for Periodontal Support

Osseointegrated fixtures may be used to stabilize teeth when the natural dentition has suffered from diminished periodontal support secondary to periodontitis and loss of surrounding alveolar bone, shortened roots of congenital or iatrogenic origin, or longstanding parafunctional overload. Using a 0 to +3 mobility scale, only those teeth with +1 or +2 mobility should be considered for fixture-connected stabilization.

Loose anterior teeth that present with functional mobility as a result of occlusal function will generally require multiple fixtures for stabilization, because the same occlusal forces will be totally directed to the osseointegrated implants when the patient moves through the excursive movements. The forces will be transmitted to the fixtures via the essentially cantilevered crown used to stabilize the mobile tooth.

Special care must be taken in the treatment-planning stage to design a retrievable prosthesis suitable for easy modification in the future should the periodontally compromised tooth be lost (Fig. 16).

CONSTRUCTION OF THE FINAL IMPLANT-SUPPORTED PROSTHESIS

Historically, the full-arch implant-supported prosthesis reported by Swedish researchers was constructed of resilient veneer material, such as acrylic resin (Laboratory of Experimental
Biology, University of Göteborg, Sweden, unpublished data). Porcelain has proved to be an effective veneer material for osseointegrated implant bridges.\(^5\) If porcelain is selected for a tissue-integrated prosthesis, the opposing dentition should be supported by natural teeth so that the periodontal ligament will function as a shock absorber. If the porcelain prosthesis is to be opposed by another implant-supported dentition, that prosthesis should be veneered with a more resilient material. The use of a porcelain tissue-integrated prosthesis opposed by another porcelain tissue-integrated prosthesis may in time produce fractures in the porcelain or at the implant-bone interface.

**DESIGN DISTRIBUTION AND MATERIALS**

The four Kennedy classifications of partially edentulous patients may be applied to individuals to be restored with a tissue-integrated prosthesis. The classifications are valid in both maxilla and mandible for independent prostheses and for those connected to the natural teeth.\(^6\)

For the maxillary anterior implant-supported prosthesis, porcelain fused to gold is the material of choice. Porcelain provides excellent color stability and wear characteristics. Should an opposing implant prosthesis be required, porcelain may be used, with great care taken to minimize centric impact while maintaining appropriate contact for occlusal guidance in excursive movements.

**SUMMARY**

The Brånemark method of osseointegration has offered a multitude of possibilities for restoration of the partially edentulous patient. When Brånemark fixtures are used as abutments in conjunction with the natural dentition, the difference in the attachment mechanisms to bone should be kept in mind. The resiliency of the periodontal ligament must be taken into account in the bridge construction. When teeth and implants are used for prosthesis support, the design should be completely retrievable. Telescopic copings and precision attachments are essential design elements for the implant-tooth prosthesis. However, whenever the opportunity presents, optimal prosthetic design calls for a totally implant-supported prosthesis with no connection to the natural dentition.
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