



## IMPLANTS IN THE ESTHETIC ZONE: A REVIEW

### Prosthodontics

**Sandip Rajan**

Senior Resident Vardhman Mahavir Medical College and Safdarjung Hospital

### KEYWORDS

#### INTRODUCTION

The replacement of lost teeth by implants has now a days revolutionized oral rehabilitation while significantly advancing restorative dentistry. In the early years of modern implantology, the chief concern was tissue health and implant survival. Over the last decade, the importance of esthetics has gained equal importance in the success of the final restoration as health. In sites with multiple missing teeth and with deficiencies in soft tissue or bone, specially in esthetic areas, implant placement and restoration is challenging. Preservation or creation of a soft tissue scaffold needed to create the illusion of a natural tooth is often difficult to achieve [1,2]. Placement of a dental implant in the esthetic zone is a technique sensitive procedure with little room for error. A subtle mistake in the positioning of the implant or the mishandling of soft or hard tissue can lead to esthetic failure and patient dissatisfaction [3,4,5]. This article presents guidelines for ideal implant diagnosis and treatment planning, positioning and restoration that can be implemented for addressing different clinical situations involving replacement of missing teeth in the esthetic zone.

#### Diagnosis and treatment planning

Thorough preoperative diagnosis and treatment planning combined with excellent clinical skills are an important prerequisite to achieve a successful esthetic results for implant placement in the esthetic zone. Preoperative assessment of the patient's expectations is also of paramount importance. A careful explanation might be necessary to clarify what the patient should expect, if the patient is found to have unrealistic expectations. The skills of the entire implant team, consisting of the restorative dentist, implant surgeon, and dental technician, are all required to develop and execute a comprehensive, well sequenced treatment plan.

#### Data collection

An accurate and comprehensive data collection is required for the development of a proper treatment. The database must include the patient's chief complaint, comprehensive medical history, dental history, extraoral and intra-oral clinical examinations, radiographic examination results, documentation of patient expectations, and an assessment of risk factors for implant failure (esthetic or functional) [6]. Uncontrolled medical conditions; parafunctional habits, such as bruxism; poor compliance with oral hygiene or maintenance regimens; active periodontal disease; and smoking status should be evaluated and taken into consideration.

For ideal implant placement and optimal esthetic restorations, a comprehensive evaluation of the edentulous site must be performed [4]. Facial, dental, and periodontal status must be evaluated.

#### Gingival recession and biotypes

The gingival biotype should be assessed because such an assessment will partly determine the risk for postsurgical recession [7,8]. A thin, highly scalloped gingival biotype is much less resistant to trauma from surgical or restorative procedures and, consequently, is more prone to recession in comparison with a thick, flat gingival biotype. A thin gingival biotype dictates

placement of the implant in a slightly more palatal position to reduce the chance of recession and prevent a titanium "shadow" from showing through the thin gingival tissue. Similarly, the implant should be placed somewhat more apically to achieve a proper emergence profile and avoid a ridge lap restoration [4].

#### Interdental papilla

Bone quality and quantity must be carefully assessed as the supporting

bone influences the establishment of overlying soft tissue. The bone crest should be within a physiological distance of 2 to 3 mm of the cemento-enamel junction or, when recession is present, 2 to 3mm of the buccal gingival margin. The distance between the underlying interproximal bone height on the adjacent natural teeth and the final prosthetic contact point dictates the formation and spontaneous regeneration of the interdental papillae associated with the implant. If this distance is more than 5 mm, the complete papilla formation will be compromised. This often leads to the so-called "blank triangle". In order to verify the results of interdental papilla regeneration, various methods of measuring the length of the papilla have been introduced. Invasive methods, such as bone probing under local anesthesia, might cause discomfort to the patients and possibly damage the delicate gingival unit.

Informed consent should be obtained and the patient's expectations are again determined. Only after this discussion can surgery be undertaken.

#### Implant placement

The surgical approach must be carefully planned and executed. Tischler has proposed guidelines for implant placement and restoration in the esthetic zone [9]. According to these guidelines, the surgeon should:

- Employ a conservative flap design;
- Evaluate the existing bone and soft tissue;
- Time the placement correctly;
- Visualize the three-dimensional position of the implant;
- Consider healing time before implant loading;
- Consider the determinants of emergence profile; and
- Select a proper abutment and final restoration design.

The implant should be considered the apical extension of the restoration and the preferred design of the restoration should guide the surgical placement of the implant [10,11]. This concept is known as restoration driven implant placement, in contrast to the previously accepted concept of bone-driven implant placement. Restoration-driven implant placement

mandates that the implant is placed where it can be properly restored. If the desired site is lacking in bone or soft tissue, then augmentation procedures must be employed to create an acceptable site.

Four positional parameters contribute to the success of the restoration and all must be carefully considered during implant placement. These are the buccolingual, mesiodistal, and apicocoronal positions relative to the implant platform, as well as the angulation of the implant. Prosthetic design factors (eg, cement- versus screw-retained prosthesis) are also critical.

#### Buccolingual position

Implant placed too far buccally: Results in a dehiscence of the buccal cortical plate and has a high potential for gingival recession. In addition, this placement vastly complicates the restoration of the implant.

Implant placed too far to the palatally: Requires a ridge-lap restoration that is both unhygienic and unesthetic [4,11,12].

So, a proper buccolingual positioning of the implant simplifies the restorative procedure, results in a proper emergence profile, and facilitates oral hygiene. The buccal wall must maintain a thickness of at

least 1 mm to prevent recession and improve esthetics.

The ideal buccal-lingual position is a function of the desired crown location and the design of the implant and abutment. Placement should be such that the crown emerges naturally from the soft tissue scaffold to create the illusion of a natural tooth [13]. To achieve this, the centerline of the implant must often be located at or near the center of the tooth it replaces [14]. The implant must be positioned in such a way that the buccal aspect of the implant platform just touches an imaginary line that touches the incisal edges of the adjacent teeth. There are, however, situations requiring that the implant be placed in a more palatal position (eg, in patients presenting with a thin gingival biotype). Conversely, it is sometimes wiser to place the implant in slight labioversion.

#### Mesiodistal position

To avoid an unfavorable esthetic outcome, the available mesiodistal space must be carefully measured so that an implant of the proper size may be selected and proper implant spacing planned. Placement of an implant too close to adjacent implants or teeth may result in interproximal bone loss with subsequent loss of papillary height. Studies have shown that, in addition to the vertical component, there is a lateral component to the crestal bone loss around the implant [15,16]. Based on these findings, a minimum distance of 1.5 to 2 mm should be maintained between implants and neighboring teeth and, in the case of multiple implants, a space of 3 to 4 mm at the implant abutment level should be maintained between implants [15,16]. A strong inverse correlation exists between crestal bone loss at adjacent teeth or between implants and the horizontal distance of the implant fixture to the tooth or implant [15,16]. In the case of a maxillary central incisor site, it may be desirable to place the implant slightly to the distal to mimic the natural asymmetry of the gingival contour often seen in these teeth.

#### Apicocoronal position or countersink

Apical positioning of the implant is required to mask the metal of the implant and abutment. This positioning may involve countersinking the osteotomy site. The degree to which this is done and the manner in which it is accomplished will depend, in part, on the design of the implant head. The amount of countersinking required is somewhat dependent upon the implant diameter [17]. The wider the implant, the less distance is needed to form a gradual emergence profile. In such cases, less countersinking will be required. The distance from the platform to the mucosal margin is sometimes referred to as "running room." The countersink should provide sufficient running room to form a gradual transition between the implant platform and the contour of the restoration (ie, emergence profile). A variable amount of running room is needed to compensate for an implant platform that often has a smaller diameter than that of the cervix of the tooth it replaces. Without apical placement to compensate for the difference in diameter, the transition from implant to tooth can be abrupt.

In general, the more apical the placement of the implant, the better the emergence profile. However, locating the implant-abutment interface more apically means losing more crestal bone for establishing the periimplant biological width [18-20]. It is generally accepted that the crestal bone is reestablished 1.5 mm apical to the implant-abutment interface. This spacing is also known as the microgap. The apicocoronal position of the implant should provide a balance between health and esthetics. The emergence profile and the location of the microgap are the two most important parameters affecting health and esthetics. Generally speaking, there is an inverse relationship between these two parameters. The more apical the implant placement, the more esthetic the restoration (and the less healthy the tissue). Excessive countersinking of the implant can cause saucerization, which is the undesirable circumferential vertical and horizontal crestal bone loss, and subsequent gingival recession after loading. Conversely, superficial placement of the implant can lead to visible metal margin or optical reflection and a compromised restoration without a gradual, pleasing emergence profile. In a patient without gingival recession, it is generally acceptable to use the cemento-enamel junction (CEJ) location of adjacent teeth as a point of reference to determine the apicocoronal position of the implant platform. The sink depth of the implant shoulder should be 1 to 2 mm for a one-stage implant or 2 to 3 mm for a two-stage implant apically to the imaginary line connecting mid-buccal of CEJs of the adjacent teeth without gingival recession. It is essential to take into consideration the varying CEJs of the adjacent teeth. For example, the CEJ of the maxillary

lateral incisor is usually located 1 mm more coronally than the CEJs of the adjacent central incisor and canine. In patients with gingival recession, the mid-buccal gingival margin can be used as a reference in lieu of the CEJ. A final consideration involves the potential for additional growth of the maxilla. It has been suggested that implants should be placed only after the age of 15 in females and 18 in males [21] to avoid potential problems caused by further skeletal growth. However, some evidence shows continuous vertical growth of the maxilla after age 18 [22,23], so the issue is not entirely resolved.

#### Implant angulation

Ideally, implants should be placed so that the abutment resembles the preparation of a natural tooth. In screw-retained prostheses, poor angulation can alter screw placement, which may have a significant effect on esthetics. Implants positioned with too much angulation either toward the palatal or the buccal often compromise esthetics and may also impact home care [22]. It is generally accepted that the implant angulation should mimic the angulation of adjacent teeth if the teeth are in reasonably good alignment. Most implant systems include a provision for some type of angled or custom abutments to compensate for situations where ideal alignment may not be possible. Surgical guides can help provide the right angulation, as this may be difficult to visualize at the time of surgery. In the maxillary anterior regions, a subtle palatal angulation is sometimes recommended to increase labial soft tissue bulk and to avoid the problems with thin buccal walls described earlier.

#### Timing of implant placement following tooth removal

Garber has described three scenarios for the timing of implant placement following extraction [9]. Immediate placement occurs at the time of tooth extraction, staged placement occurs at least 8 weeks following extraction, and delayed placement is performed 3 months or more following extraction. A simplified scheme, presented below, considers only two groups. Implants placed immediately following extraction and those placed a variable time following tooth removal. Immediate placement of implant at the time of extraction following tooth removal, a variable amount of ridge collapse takes place because of bone resorption. This bone loss can occur in either buccal-lingual or apicocoronal dimensions or in both. As much as 3 to 4 mm of buccolingual and apicocoronal bone resorption can occur during the 6 months following extraction. This bone resorption reduces bone available for implant placement and may preclude such treatment altogether. To correct these defects, complex regenerative procedures are sometimes required. Unfortunately, these procedures involve additional treatment time, morbidity, and cost.

To avoid these problems, a technique has been introduced involving simultaneous tooth extraction and immediate implant placement [13]. This technique allows for bone and soft tissue preservation and shortens treatment time. Placing implants immediately or soon after extraction preserves bone and overlying soft tissue, according to clinical observations [24,25]. The necessary initial implant stability is obtained through the use of longer and wider implants, which are capable of engaging bone in the apical and palatal portions of the socket. Since the hard and soft tissue scaffolds can be maintained by immediate implant placement, it is appropriate to consider this option in the esthetic zone. However, because of poor planning and surgical misadventure, compromised esthetic results are sometimes observed following immediate placement.

#### Atraumatic extraction

After clinical and radiographic evaluation, the hopeless tooth is atraumatically extracted so as to preserve both the bony socket wall and soft tissue architecture. A number of instruments have been developed for this purpose, including the periosteal. The periosteal, a slim elevator like instrument, is introduced into the periodontal ligament space and used to sever the periodontal ligament. The instrument is gradually advanced toward the apex of the tooth. Care should be taken to preserve the thin buccal wall of maxillary incisors. When necessary to preserve the integrity of the socket, the tooth is carefully sectioned and the fragments carefully removed. Whenever possible, the surgeon should avoid reflecting a flap to preserve the vascular supply and periosteum covering the bone. This will minimize bone resorption. Once the extraction is completed, the socket is debrided and then evaluated.

#### Implant placement

The decision regarding immediate implant placement is determined by three factors:

- Absence of acute noncontained infection;
- Achievement of initial stability of the implant; and
- Sufficient quantity and quality of bone present.

In the presence of disseminated infection in an extraction socket, delaying placement for about 3 weeks postextraction may be considered to allow for resolution of local pathology and achievement of primary soft tissue closure [8]. The integrity of the socket is evaluated. If the socket wall is intact and a favorable horizontal and vertical level of both soft tissue and bone architecture is present, immediate implant placement may be attempted. The necessary initial implant stability is obtained through the apical and palatal engagement of existing bone of the maxillary socket by using a long implant. Tapered implants or implants with wider diameters can also be of use in engaging the bony walls. The three-dimensional placement of the implant is visualized and planned using the surgical guide. It is often helpful to gauge the dimensions of the socket relative to implant configuration by placing various depth gauges in the socket. Some minimum amount of apical stability is required. Unfortunately, evidence is insufficient to give clear guidelines, but in our clinic we must be able to engage at least 6 mm of bone of reasonable quality before considering immediate placement. The depth gauge helps us make that assessment. A minimum of 1 mm of buccal plate should be maintained to enhance long-term prognosis and reduce the risk of soft tissue recession. A concomitant soft tissue augmentation at the same time of implant placement may be recommended in patients with a thin gingival biotype to further reduce the risk of soft tissue recession and buccal bone resorption. After an immediate implant placement into extraction socket, it is critical to assess the horizontal space, if any, from the implant surface to the socket wall. Studies have shown that no bone augmentation is needed if the periimplant space is 2 mm or less because spontaneous bone fill and osseointegration will take place when using a rough surface implant. In sites where the peri-implant horizontal defect measures more than 2 mm, a bone regenerating technique is required to predictably achieve bone fill and increase the percentage of bone-to-implant contact. When a slight horizontal defect in the socket buccal wall is present, the size of this defect should be determined. If this defect is less than 5 mm in the apicocoronal direction or less than one third of the mesiodistal dimension between the adjacent teeth, immediate implant placement at the time of extraction can be accomplished. Depending on the size of the dehiscence, lateral bone augmentation or guided bone regeneration may be performed as needed.

In the case of larger bony defects, more extensive augmentation is required. Generally, if sufficient initial stability of the implant can be obtained, a bone grafting procedure with membrane can usually be performed at the time of placement. In the case of bony defects so extensive that implant placement is precluded, then delayed implant placement following lateral ridge augmentation is indicated. Grafting materials used for this purpose include both autogenous bone or allograft bone replacement graft. Vertical (apicocoronal) bone loss is usually the result of periodontal disease and represents a particularly difficult challenge. No surgical approach is available to predictably augment the ridge height.

Regardless of the type of procedure planned for the mature site, proper flap management is critical for success. Careful attention should be paid to incision design and flap extension in an effort to preserve the blood supply of the flap. A papillae sparing incision (parapapillary incision) may be used to preserve blood supply to the delicate interdental papillae and to minimize the potential of postsurgical recession [26,27]. Implant placement without incision is mentioned in the literature [28]. In this procedure, the implant is placed into predetermined abundant bone through an opening made by a soft tissue punch. There is insufficient data to properly evaluate this procedure, but the author does not recommend it because this approach does not permit adequate visualization of the bone. Such visualization is necessary for proper three-dimensional positioning of the implant. To achieve a successful esthetic result and good patient satisfaction, implant placement in the esthetic zone demands a thorough understanding of anatomic, biologic, surgical, and prosthetic principles. The ability to achieve harmonious, indistinguishable prosthesis from adjacent natural teeth in the esthetic zone is sometimes challenging. Placement of dental implants in the esthetic zone is a technique-sensitive procedure with little room for error. Guidelines are presented for ideal implant positioning and for a variety of therapeutic modalities that can be implemented for addressing different clinical

situations involving replacement of missing teeth in the esthetic zone.

## References

1. Magne P, Magne M, Belsler U. Natural and restorative oral esthetics. Part I: rationale and basic strategies for successful esthetic rehabilitations. *J Esthet Dent* 1993;5(4):161-73.
2. Magne P, Magne M, Belsler U. Natural and restorative oral esthetics. Part II: esthetic treatment modalities. *J Esthet Dent* 1993;5(6):239-46.
3. Belsler UC, Schmid B, Higginbottom F, et al. Outcome analysis of implant restorations located in the anterior maxilla: a review of the recent literature. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2004;19(Suppl):30-42.
4. Buser D, Martin W, Belsler UC. Optimizing esthetics for implant restorations in the anterior maxilla: anatomic and surgical considerations. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2004;19(Suppl):43-61.  
Belsler U, Buser D, Higginbottom F. Consensus statements and recommended clinical procedures regarding esthetics in implant dentistry. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2004;19(Suppl):73-4.
5. Barbosa F. Patient selection for dental implants. Part I: data gathering and diagnosis. *J Indiana Dent Assoc* 2000;79(1):8-11.
6. Jansen CE, Weisgold A. Presurgical treatment planning for the anterior single-tooth implant restoration. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 1995;16(8):746, 748-52, 754.
7. Kois JC. Predictable single tooth peri-implant esthetics: five diagnostic keys. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 2001;22(3):199-206.
8. Tischler M. Dental implants in the esthetic zone. Considerations for form and function. *NY State Dent J* 2004;70(3):22-6.
9. Garber DA, Belsler UC. Restoration-driven implant placement with restoration-generated site development. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 1995;16(8):796, 798-802, 804.
10. Garber DA. The esthetic dental implant: letting restoration be the guide. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1995;126(3):319-25.
11. Belsler UC, Bernard JP, Buser D. Implant-supported restorations in the anterior region: prosthetic considerations. *Pract Periodontics Aesthet Dent* 1996;8(9):875-83.
12. Tarnow DP, Eskow RN. Considerations for single-unit esthetic implant restorations. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 1995;16(8):778, 780, 782-774 passim.
13. Lazzara RJ. Immediate implant placement into extraction sites: surgical and restorative advantages. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 1989;9(5):332-43.
14. Sadan A, Blatz MB, Bellerino M, et al. Prosthetic design considerations for anterior single-implant restorations. *J Esthet Restor Dent* 2004;16(3):165-75.
15. Tarnow DP, Cho SC, Wallace SS. The effect of inter-implant distance on the height of interimplant bone crest. *J Periodontol* 2000;71(4):546-9.
16. Esposito M, Ekstubbbe A, Grondahl K. Radiological evaluation of marginal bone loss at tooth surfaces facing single Branemark implants. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 1993;4(3):151-7.
17. Jansen CE, Weisgold A. Presurgical treatment planning for the anterior single-tooth implant restoration. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 1995;16(8):746, 748-52, 754.
18. Cochran DL, Hermann JS, Schenk RK, et al. 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* 1997;68(2):186-98.
19. Hermann JS, Cochran DL, Nummikoski PV, et al. Crestal bone changes around titanium implants. A radiographic evaluation of unloaded nonsubmerged and submerged implants in the canine mandible. *J Periodontol* 1997;68(11):1117-30.
20. Hermann JS, Buser D, Schenk RK, et al. Biologic width around titanium implants. A physiologically formed and stable dimension over time. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2000;11(1):1-11.
21. Oesterle LJ, Cronin RJ Jr, Ranly DM. Maxillary implants and the growing patient. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1993;8(4):377-87.
22. Iseri H, Solow B. Continued eruption of maxillary incisors and first molars in girls from 9 to 25 years, studied by the implant method. *Eur J Orthod* 1996;18(3):245-56.
23. Bernard JP, Schatz JP, Christou P, et al. Long-term vertical changes of the anterior maxillary teeth adjacent to single implants in young and mature adults. A retrospective study. *J Clin Periodontol* 2004;31(11):1024-8.
24. Denissen HW, Kalk W, Veldhuis HA, et al. Anatomic consideration for preventive implantation. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1993;8(2):191-6.
25. Sclar AG. Preserving alveolar ridge anatomy following tooth removal in conjunction with immediate implant placement. The Bio-Col technique. *Atlas Oral Maxillofac Surg Clin North Am* 1999;7(2):39-59.
26. Nemcovsky CE, Artzi Z. Split palatal flap. II. A surgical approach for maxillary implant uncovering in cases with reduced keratinized tissue: technique and clinical results. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 1999;19(4):385-93.
27. Nemcovsky CE, Artzi Z. Split palatal flap. I. A surgical approach for primary soft tissue healing in ridge augmentation procedures: technique and clinical results. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 1999;19(2):175-81.
28. Schwartz-Arad D, Chausu G. Immediate implant placement: a procedure without incisions. *J Periodontol* 1998;69(7):743-50.