Journal of Applied Dental and Medical Sciences
NLM ID: 101671413 ISSN:2454-2288
Volume 11 Issue 1 Jan-March 2025

Review Article

Loading Protocol in Dental Implant

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 implants; Loading protocols; Immediate loading; Early loading; Delayed loading; Osseointegration

ABSTRACT

Dental implants have become a predictable treatment option for replacing missing teeth, with high survival rates and long-term functionality. A critical aspect influencing implant success is the timing of prosthetic loading, which determines when an implant-supported restoration is placed into function. Traditionally, a delayed loading protocol was considered essential to ensure osseointegration. However, with advancements in implant surface technology, surgical protocols, and digital planning, immediate and early loading have emerged as viable alternatives. This review examines the biological and biomechanical principles, clinical outcomes, and current evidence on immediate, early, and conventional loading protocols. Factors influencing protocol choice, recent advances, and future perspectives are also discussed. Evidence suggests that immediate and early loading can achieve comparable success rates to conventional loading when appropriate case selection and clinical protocols are followed.

Introduction

The success of dental implants depends on achieving and maintaining osseointegration, a direct structural and functional connection between living bone and the implant surface [1]. Since the original protocol described by Brånemark in the 1960s, delayed loading after 3–6 months of healing was considered necessary to avoid implant micromotion and failure [2]. This conservative approach was highly predictable but prolonged rehabilitation and patient discomfort. Advances in implant design, surface modifications, and understanding of biomechanics have challenged this concept, introducing immediate and early loading protocols [3,4]. These shortened protocols aim to improve patient satisfaction and reduce treatment time without compromising success.

Historical Background

Brånemark's two-stage delayed loading protocol emphasized an undisturbed healing period for predictable osseointegration [2]. While effective, this approach limited patient acceptance, particularly in esthetic zones. In the 1990s, reports of immediate and early loading demonstrated comparable success in selected cases [5,6]. The introduction of roughened implant surfaces and improved thread designs further enhanced stability, making earlier loading more feasible [7]. Today, clinicians can individualize treatment by selecting among immediate, early, and conventional protocols depending on bone quality, stability, and patient factors [8].

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

Types of Loading Protocols

Loading protocols are classified based on the interval between implant placement and functional loading [9]:

1. Immediate Loading: Prosthesis connected within 48 hours of implant placement. Requires insertion torque ≥35 Ncm or ISQ ≥65. Benefits include shorter treatment time, esthetic preservation, and higher patient satisfaction. Risks involve failure if primary stability is inadequate [10,11].

2. Early Loading: Prosthesis placed after 1 week to 2 months. Provides a compromise between biology and efficiency, allowing some bone healing before functional load. Indicated when immediate loading poses risk but stability is adequate [12].

3. Conventional/Delayed Loading: Prosthesis loaded after 2–6 months, depending on bone density and location. Remains the gold standard for compromised bone or systemic risk cases [2,13].

Biomechanical Considerations

Biomechanics play a critical role in determining loading success. Excessive micromotion (>100–150 μm) may cause fibrous encapsulation, while controlled functional load can stimulate bone remodeling [14]. Primary stability depends on bone density, implant design, and surgical technique [15]. Secondary stability, resulting from bone remodeling, ensures long-term success [16]. Stress distribution is influenced by implant geometry, surface area, and occlusal forces. Splinting implants in full-arch cases helps distribute forces, reducing micromotion risk [17].

Biological Basis

Bone healing around implants involves hemostasis, inflammation, woven bone deposition, and lamellar bone remodeling [18]. Delayed loading was based on respecting these biological stages. However, Wolff's law suggests that bone adapts to functional loading, and controlled stimulation may accelerate maturation [19]. Animal and clinical studies confirm that immediate and early loading can promote osseointegration when stability is adequate [20].

Clinical Outcomes

Systematic reviews show comparable survival rates between immediate, early, and delayed loading when strict protocols are followed [21,22]. Immediate loading achieves survival rates >95% in carefully selected cases [23]. Early loading also demonstrates predictable outcomes, especially with roughened surface implants [24]. Conventional loading maintains the highest predictability in poor bone or systemic risk patients [25]. Complications such as screw loosening and prosthetic fractures are slightly more common in immediate loading but manageable with proper occlusal design [26].

Factors Affecting Protocol Choice

Several factors influence selection [27,28]:

- Bone quality: Dense cortical bone supports immediate loading; trabecular bone favors delayed loading.

- Implant design: Tapered, wide-diameter implants with aggressive threads enhance stability.
- Surface modification: Roughened and bioactive surfaces accelerate osseointegration [29].
- Occlusion: Functional loads must be controlled to prevent overload.
- Patient factors: Smoking, diabetes, and bruxism increase risk [30].

Recent Advances

Digital dentistry has improved precision in planning and execution of implants, increasing success in immediate protocols [31]. Resonance frequency analysis (RFA) and insertion torque measurements allow objective assessment of implant stability [32]. Nanostructured surfaces, bioactive coatings, and CAD/CAM provisionalization further expand indications for immediate loading [33,34]. Short implants and innovative designs have shown success even in atrophic ridges [35].

Future Perspectives

Future trends include biomimetic implant surfaces, growth factor coatings, and regenerative strategies with stem cells to enhance healing [36]. Artificial intelligence and 3D printing may allow fully customized implants and prostheses, improving predictability under immediate and early loading [37].

Conclusion

Loading protocols are integral to implant success. While delayed loading remains safest in compromised conditions, evidence strongly supports immediate and early loading in well-selected cases with adequate stability and controlled occlusion. Advances in surface technology, digital planning, and regenerative approaches continue to expand their clinical applicability. Individualized, evidence-based decision-making remains key to optimizing 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. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1986;1(1):11–25.
3. Cochran DL. The scientific basis for immediate and delayed loading of dental implants. J Periodontol. 1999;70(12):1524–31.
4. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Coulthard P, Worthington HV. Different loading times for dental implants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2009;(1):CD003878.
5. Testori T, Del Fabbro M, Galli F, et al. Immediate occlusal loading of implants in edentulous mandible. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2003;18(4):544–51.
6. Glauser R, Ruhstaller P, Windisch S, et al. Immediate occlusal loading of implants. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2001;3(4):204–13.
7. Morton D, Gallucci G, Lin W, et al. Consensus statements on immediate loading. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29 Suppl:270–82.
8. Gallucci GO, Morton D, Weber HP. Loading protocols for dental implants in edentulous

patients. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24 Suppl:132–46.

9. Lindhe J, Meyle J. Peri-implant diseases: consensus report. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(8 Suppl):282–5.

10. Sennerby L, Meredith N. Implant stability measurements using resonance frequency analysis. Periodontol 2000. 2008;47:51–66.

11. Javed F, Romanos GE. Role of primary stability in immediate loading. J Dent. 2010;38(8):612–20.

12. Szmukler-Moncler S, Piattelli A, Favero GA, Dubruille JH. Early and immediate loading in dental implantology. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2000;11(1):12–25.

13. Buser D, Chen ST, Weber HP, Belser UC. Early implant placement following extraction. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2008;28(5):441–51.

14. Brunski JB. Avoid pitfalls of overloading and micromotion. Dent Implantol Update. 1993;4(10):77–81.

15. Davies JE. Mechanisms of endosseous integration. Int J Prosthodont. 1998;11(5):391–401.

16. Lang NP, Pun L, Lau KY, Li KY, Wong MC. Systematic review on survival and success rates of implants. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2012;23 Suppl 5:39–66.

17. Degidi M, Piattelli A. Immediate functional and non-functional loading: 2- to 60-month study. J Periodontol. 2003;74(2):225–41.

18. Bornstein MM, Halbritter S, Harnisch H, Weber HP, Buser D. Early loading of non-submerged titanium implants. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(5):482–90.

19. Duyck J, Naert I. Failure of oral implants: aetiology, symptoms and factors. Clin Oral Investig. 1998;2(3):102–14.

20. Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T. Effects of titanium surface topography. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20 Suppl 4:172–84.

21. Gjelvold B, Mahmood DJ, Wennerberg A, Chrcanovic BR. Immediate vs conventional loading in edentulous maxilla. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2017;46(10):1258–70.

22. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Maghaireh H, Worthington HV. Interventions for replacing missing teeth: immediate vs conventional loading. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;(3):CD003878.

23. Calvo-Guirado JL, Gómez-Moreno G, López-Marí L, et al. Immediate loading of implants with platform switching. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2010;21(1):55–61.

24. Payer M, Heschl A, Kirmeier R, et al. Immediate provisional restoration of implants: 3-year results. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2008;19(4):327–33.

25. Vercruyssen M, Laleman I, Jacobs R, Quirynen M. Computer-supported implant planning. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2015;26 Suppl 11:69–76.

26. Berglundh T, Armitage G, Araujo M, et al. Peri-implant diseases and conditions. J Clin Periodontol. 2018;45 Suppl 20:S286–S291.

27. Al-Nawas B, Domagala P, Fragola G, et al. Immediate and early loading of dental implants in partially edentulous patients. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2016;27(6):e61–e66.

28. Ogiso B, Tabata T, Borgese D. Histologic comparison of early loaded vs unloaded implants. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1994;9(4):447–52.

29. Calvo-Guirado JL, Gómez-Moreno G, López-Marí L, et al. Immediate loading of implants with platform switching. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2010;21(1):55–61.

30. Payer M, Heschl A, Kirmeier R, et al. Immediate provisional restoration of implants: 3-year results. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2008;19(4):327–33.