Journal of Applied Dental and Medical Sciences
NLM ID: 101671413 ISSN:2454-2288
Volume 10 Issue 3 July-Sept 2024

Review Article

Review of Implant Design and Osseointegration

Madhavi Singh[1] , Manish Goutam[2]

[1] Department of Periodontics, Awadh Dental College and Hospital, Jamshedpur, Jharkhand
[2] Department of Prosthodontics, Awadh Dental College and Hospital, Jamshedpur, Jharkhand

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Dental implant; Implant design; Osseointegration; Thread geometry; Surface modification; Implant stability

ABSTRACT

Dental implants have become a highly predictable treatment modality in modern dentistry. The success of implants is determined by a combination of biological processes and design-related factors, with osseointegration serving as the cornerstone for long-term stability. Implant macrodesign, including body geometry, thread configuration, crest module, and apical modifications, governs primary stability and biomechanical load distribution. Microdesign, encompassing surface roughness, coatings, and biomaterial composition, plays a critical role in enhancing bone-to-implant contact and accelerating secondary stability. This review provides a comprehensive overview of implant design parameters and their impact on osseointegration, discusses recent technological advances, and outlines clinical implications. The article also highlights the biological principles underlying implant integration and examines how design innovations are improving survival rates and long-term outcomes.

Introduction

Dental implants are widely recognized as one of the most successful and predictable methods of tooth replacement. Since the introduction of osseointegration by Brånemark in the 1960s [1], implants have evolved considerably in design and surface technology. Today, the survival rates of implants often exceed 90% over ten years [2]. However, implant success is not merely dependent on surgical technique and host bone quality—it is profoundly influenced by implant design. The macro- and microdesign features dictate how an implant achieves primary stability, how it distributes biomechanical forces, and how the surrounding bone responds during healing [3]. Thus, implant design has emerged as one of the most crucial determinants of successful osseointegration.

Implant Macrodesign

Macrodesign refers to the gross geometric configuration of the implant body. It includes shape, length, diameter, thread configuration, crest module, and apical modifications. Each of these elements influences the implant's primary stability, stress distribution, and long-term bone preservation. Implant body design is generally cylindrical, tapered, or a hybrid form. Cylindrical implants provide greater surface area contact but may achieve lower insertion torque compared with tapered implants. Tapered implants, by contrast, offer improved insertion in narrow ridges and higher stability in soft bone [4]. Studies using finite

* Corresponding author*:* Dr. Manish Goutam, Department of Prosthodontics, Awadh Dental College and Hospital,Jamshedpur,Jharkhand. Email: drmanishgoutam@gmail.com

element analysis (FEA) confirm that tapered implants distribute occlusal forces more favorably in low-density bone, whereas cylindrical implants are effective in denser bone types [5].

Thread geometry plays a pivotal role in implant biomechanics. Thread shape (V-shaped, square, buttress, reverse buttress), depth, pitch, and helix angle all influence stress transfer to the surrounding bone. Square and buttress threads are associated with improved compressive load transfer, reducing shear forces, which are detrimental to bone healing [6]. A reduced thread pitch increases the number of threads per unit length, thereby enhancing surface area and initial fixation [7]. Deeper threads improve stability in softer bone but may complicate insertion in dense bone. The helix angle affects the rate of insertion, but excessive angles may compromise load-bearing capacity [8].

The crest module represents the coronal part of the implant and is critical for preserving marginal bone. Platform switching—where the abutment is narrower than the implant platform—has been shown to minimize crestal bone resorption and maintain soft tissue architecture [9,10]. Apical design modifications, such as tapered ends, perforations, or vents, enhance ease of placement and may promote additional bone ingrowth, particularly in compromised bone [11].

Implant Microdesign and Surface Features

Microdesign relates to implant surface properties, including material composition, surface roughness, and biological coatings. Titanium remains the most widely used implant material due to its excellent biocompatibility, corrosion resistance, and favorable mechanical properties [12].

Surface topography plays a vital role in osseointegration. Moderately roughened surfaces demonstrate superior bone-to-implant contact compared to smooth or excessively rough surfaces [13]. Techniques such as sandblasting, acid etching, anodization, and plasma spraying enhance surface roughness, thereby promoting osteoblastic activity and faster healing [14]. Hydroxyapatite coatings have been employed to further improve osseointegration, particularly in low-density bone, although concerns regarding long-term stability of the coating persist [15].

Recent advances have focused on nanostructured and bioactive surfaces. Nanotopographies enhance protein adsorption and cell adhesion, facilitating earlier bone formation [16]. Biofunctional coatings with antibacterial properties or drug-release capabilities are under development to reduce peri-implantitis risk and accelerate bone healing [17].

Biomechanics of Osseointegration

Biomechanics govern how implant design interacts with functional loads and bone response. Primary stability is mechanical and is achieved by implant geometry and surgical technique. Secondary stability arises from biological healing and bone remodeling [18].

The direction and magnitude of applied forces strongly influence implant longevity. Compressive forces are more favorable for bone than shear or tensile forces [19]. Thread geometry and implant body design must therefore minimize shear stress

and maximize compressive load transfer. FEA studies have consistently demonstrated that platform switching reduces stress concentration at the crestal bone and distributes loads more evenly [20].

Biological Aspects of Osseointegration

Osseointegration occurs through a sequence of biological events: initial clot formation, inflammatory response, provisional matrix deposition, bone remodeling, and maturation [21]. Surface characteristics of the implant modulate cellular events, including osteoblast attachment, proliferation, and differentiation. Moderately rough surfaces enhance osteoconduction and shorten healing periods [22].

Bone preservation around the implant neck remains a challenge. Microgaps and stress concentrations can lead to crestal bone loss. Design modifications such as internal connections, platform switching, and optimized crest modules have been shown to mitigate this problem [23].

Recent Advances in Implant Design

Technological innovations are driving significant improvements in implantology. Three-dimensional (3D) printing has introduced patient-specific implants with optimized macro- and microdesign [24]. Nanotechnology allows the fabrication of surfaces that mimic natural bone topography, enhancing cellular response. Additionally, bioactive and antibacterial coatings hold promise in reducing complications such as peri-implantitis.

Research is also directed toward smart implants with integrated sensors that can monitor stability and healing. Drug-eluting implants capable of delivering growth factors or antibiotics locally are another area of ongoing exploration [25].

Clinical Implications

Clinicians must tailor implant selection to patient-specific factors, including bone density, anatomical considerations, and loading requirements. Tapered implants with aggressive thread designs are recommended for soft bone, while cylindrical implants are suited for dense bone. Platform switching and surface-modified implants are particularly useful in compromised cases and immediate loading protocols.

Understanding implant design principles ensures predictable outcomes, reduces complications, and improves long-term success rates.

Conclusion

Implant design is central to achieving successful osseointegration. Macrodesign features such as body geometry, thread configuration, crest module, and apical design contribute to mechanical stability and stress distribution. Microdesign and surface modifications enhance biological integration and bone-to-implant contact. Recent innovations, including nanotechnology and bioactive coatings, are paving the way for implants with improved survival and reduced complications. An evidence-based understanding of these principles enables clinicians to select implants optimally suited to clinical situations, thereby improving patient outcomes.

References

1. Brånemark PI, Hansson BO, Adell R, et al. Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Suppl. 1977;16:1–132.
2. Albrektsson T, Zarb G, Worthington P, Eriksson AR. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: a review and proposed criteria. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1986;1(1):11–25.
3. Steigenga JT, al-Shammari KF, Nociti FH, Misch CE, Wang HL. Dental implant design and its relationship to long-term implant success. Implant Dent. 2003;12(4):306–17.
4. Buser D, Janner SF, Wittneben JG, Brägger U, Ramseier CA, Salvi GE. 10-year survival and success rates of 511 titanium implants with a sandblasted and acid-etched surface. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2012;14(6):839–51.
5. Geng JP, Xu DW, Tan KB, Liu GR. Finite element analysis of an osseointegrated stepped screw dental implant. J Oral Implantol. 2004;30(4):223–33.
6. Abuhussein H, Pagni G, Rebaudi A, Wang HL. The effect of thread pattern upon implant osseointegration. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2010;21(2):129–36.
7. Strong JT, Misch CE, Bidez MW. Functional surface area: thread form parameter optimization for implant body design. Compend Contin Educ Dent. 1998;19(4):4–9.
8. Misch CE. Contemporary Implant Dentistry. 3rd ed. St. Louis: Mosby; 2012.
9. Lazzara RJ, Porter SS. Platform switching: a new concept in implant dentistry for controlling postrestorative crestal bone levels. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2006;26(1):9–17.
10. Calvo-Guirado JL, Ortiz-Ruiz AJ, Negri B, et al. Immediate maxillary restoration of single-tooth implants using platform switching for crestal bone preservation: a 12-month study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(2):275–81.
11. Bumgardner JD, Boring JG, Cooper RC Jr, et al. Preliminary evaluation of a new dental implant design in canine models. Implant Dent. 2000;9(3):252–60.
12. Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Oral implant surfaces: Part 1—review focusing on topographic and chemical properties. Int J Prosthodont. 2004;17(5):536–43.
13. Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T. Effects of titanium surface topography on bone integration: a systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):172–84.
14. Le Guéhennec L, Soueidan A, Layrolle P, Amouriq Y. Surface treatments of titanium dental implants for rapid osseointegration. Dent Mater. 2007;23(7):844–54.
15. Golec TS, Krauser JT. Long-term retrospective studies on hydroxyapatite-coated endosteal and subperiosteal implants. Dent Clin North Am. 1992;36(1):39–65.
16. Variola F, Brunski JB, Orsini G, et al. Nanoscale surface modifications of medically relevant metals: state-of-the art and perspectives. Nanoscale. 2011;3(2):335–53.
17. Subramani K, Jung RE, Molenberg A, Hammerle CH. Biofilm on dental implants: a review of the literature. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(4):616–26.
18. Duyck J, Vandamme K. The effect of loading on peri-implant bone: a critical review of the literature. J Oral Rehabil. 2014;41(10):783–94.
19. Frost HM. Wolff's Law and bone's structural adaptations to mechanical usage: an overview for clinicians. Angle Orthod. 1994;64(3):175–88.
20. Maeda Y, Miura J, Taki I, Sogo M. Biomechanical analysis on platform switching: is there any biomechanical rationale? Clin Oral Implants Res. 2007;18(5):581–4.
21. Davies JE. Mechanisms of endosseous integration. Int J Prosthodont. 1998;11(5):391–401.
22. Cochran DL, Schenk RK, Lussi A, Higginbottom FL, Buser D. Bone response to unloaded and loaded titanium implants with a sandblasted and acid-etched surface: a histometric study in the canine mandible. J Biomed Mater Res. 1998;40(1):1–11.
23. Hermann JS, Buser D, Schenk RK, Higginbottom FL, Cochran DL. Biologic width around titanium implants: a histometric analysis of the implant–gingival junction around unloaded and loaded nonsubmerged implants in the canine mandible. J Periodontol. 2001;72(3):315–23.
24. Revilla-León M, Özcan M. Additive manufacturing technologies used for processing polymers: current status and potential application in prosthetic dentistry. J Prosthodont. 2019;28(2):146–58.
25. Pankhurst CL, Coulter WA. Implant infections: treatment strategies and risk factor management. Br Dent J. 2007;202(2):79–83.