Sinus floor elevation procedure with immediate implant placement using artificial bone substitutes: a prospective clinical study
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Abstract

Background and objectives: This study was designed to evaluate the clinical status of implants placed immediately in lifted maxillary sinus using Resorbable Tissue Replacement (R.T.R.) cone bone substitutes.

Methods: Twenty implants were placed in twenty patients in the period between Jan. 2006 and Sept. 2010. Lateral approach, open window method for sinus lift with placement of Resorbable Tissue Replacement Cone bone substitutes were carried out. A 4-6 mm of the bone level was required in the alveolar ridge for primary stability, with sufficient inter-arch space for the prosthesis. All implants were placed in upper molar region simultaneously with sinus lift procedure in conjunction with Tissue Replacement Cone bone substitutes. The implant survival was defined when the prosthesis had been delivered and followed for two years without infection, pain, and mobility after loading.

Results: Twenty patients, 13 males and 7 females, with an average age of 41 years old were participated in this study. A total of twenty implants were followed up for two years. Eighteen patients with eighteen implants (90.0%) showed no signs of sinusitis or other complications and the peri-implant health judged to be good with a peri-implant sulcus depth of 2-3 mm. Two implants (10%) showed mobility before loading.

Conclusion: A good survival rate was observed in implants placed immediately in lifted maxillary sinus using Resorbable Tissue Replacement (R.T.R.) cone bone substitutes.
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Introduction

Implant placement in the posterior maxilla can be problematic, because the alveolar process tends to resorb with age and the maxillary sinus becomes larger. Because there is little available bone volume in this region, sinus floor elevation has become an important procedure in peri-implant grafting. The surgical technique of maxillary sinus floor elevation was first published by Boyne in 1980. Various maxillary sinus floor augmentation techniques have been proposed for managing severe bone loss in the posterior maxilla. The sinus lift subantral augmentation procedure is a well accepted technique to treat the loss of vertical bone height in the posterior maxilla. The surgery is predictable, is not technically demanding, and has greater efficacy in the totally edentulous posterior maxilla. The basic surgical technique involves adequate flap reflection, creating a buccal window osteotomy, reflection of the antral membrane exposing the medial wall, and a loose compaction of the graft. R.T.R. cone is made from β tricalcium phosphate granules coated with a matrix of highly purified collagen fibers of bovine origin, which meet the health and safety requirements recommended by the WHO and the EU. A particulate bone graft material, allogeneic, autogenous, or a combination can be used with immediate implant placement. This procedure has a success rate of about
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To the author’s knowledge, no published papers are available regarding the use of sinus lift procedure with immediate implant placement in Iraqi Kurdistan, accordingly this study was designed to evaluate the success rate of sinus lift procedure with immediate implant placement for patients from Erbil city.

Methods

In a prospective clinical study, twenty patients were undergone sinus lift procedure with immediate implant placement in conjunction with bone substitutes in the period between 2006 and 2010. Panoramic radiographs were taken for all the patients for assessments of the alveolar bone height, the status of the natural teeth and exclusion of any pathology.

The inclusion criteria were:
1. Clinically healthy patients with good oral hygiene
2. Alveolar bone ridge height of at least 4mm (required for primary stabilization).
3. Patient consent achieved for the procedure
4. Adequate inter-arch space for the prosthesis

Surgical procedure: (Figures 1-9)
1. All patients were operated on under local anesthesia, infiltration technique, (lidocaine 2% with vasoconstrictor 1/80,000, CRISTALIA, Brazilia).
2. The perioral region scrubbed by gauze immersed in Iodine solution. Chlorhexidine 0.12% mouth wash was used to disinfect the oral cavity through gargling for 1 minute.
3. The posterior maxillary edentulous area and the maxillary sinus wall were exposed via a full thickness 3 sided mucoperiosteal flap.
4. Bone window osteotomy (6mm diameter) was made using surgical bur (Fissure, DENDIA, A-6800 Feldkirch, Germany) in straight hand piece (W&H, Synea HA-43A, Austria) in the lateral wall of the sinus, 6 mm apical to the crest of the ridge to preserve the remaining alveolar bone.
5. The sinus membrane was detached by large surgical curette (double ended, Martin) and the bony window was pushed and rotated horizontally along with sinus membrane elevation to form apical bony wall for the inserted implant. The sinus membrane was elevated for about 6mm.
6. The alveolar ridge then drilled by Q-Implant surgical set and the implant bed was prepared. A 4mm width and 12mm length implant (TRINON GmbH, QK) was inserted in the prepared bed to achieve primary stability. Then the area between the floor of the sinus and the lifted membrane and the area around the exposed implant was filled with SEPTODONT R.T.R. cone (Resorbable Tissue Replacement, 400µm macropores size, France) impregnated with normal saline. No membrane was used to cover the lateral window in all of the patients.
7. The mucoperiosteal flap was replaced and sutured by simple interrupted suture technique, using (Black silk suture 3/0, ETHICON SETA, B-1130 Brussels, Belgium).
8. Antibiotic, Amoxiklave Tab (Ranbaxy, India, 625mg b.d) and Analgesic, NOPAIN Tab (Naproxen 500mg, Jordan, on need) were prescribed for the patients for 5 days. Chlorhexidine 0.12% mouth wash also prescribed for the patients for 3 times per day for 5 days.
9. The suture was removed after 10 days.
10. Patients were examined clinically (for pain, discomfort, exposure of implant) every month for the first 6 months, and had panoramic radiographs in the 3rd and 6th months after the operation. After 6 months the implants were exposed by punch technique. The healing screws replaced by gingival former for two weeks duration before the beginning of prosthetic phase. The implant survival was defined when the prosthesis had been delivered and followed for two years without infection, pain, and mobility after loading.
**Figure 1:** An OPG view of a patient with deficient vertical bone height

**Figure 2:** Preoperative clinical picture of upper posterior alveolar ridge

**Figure 3:** A three sided flap was reflected to expose the lateral wall of the sinus

**Figure 4:** Bony cut was done to outline the window to be opened on the lateral wall of the maxillary sinus

**Figure 5:** The bony window was pushed and rotated horizontally along with sinus membrane elevation
Figure 6: Implant was placed in the prepared bed

Figure 7: R.T.R. cone after mixing with normal saline

Figure 8: R.T.R. cone filled the space created by sinus lift procedure

Figure 9: The flap is replaced and sutured by simple interrupted suture technique.
Results

Twenty clinically healthy patients, 13 males and 7 females, with an average age of 41 years were participated in this study. The patients gender, age, site of implant, infection during healing period and mobility of the implants after 6 months are shown in (Table 1). Eighteen patients with eighteen implants (90%) in the sites of 1st premolar, 2nd premolar and 1st molar showed no signs of sinusitis, mucosal infection and mobility. The peri-implant sulcus depth measured by periodontal probe and ranged from 2-3mm. Two implants (10%) in 2 male patients became mobile after the sixth month of insertion, which was an indication of failure of osseointegration. There were no signs of infection other than the mobility. The failure of osseointegration were, in the 2nd molar site, when we tried to replace the healing cap by the gingival former (Figure 10). The 2 patients were treated by traditional bridge prosthesis. Figures (11 and 12) shows OPG views after 3 and 6 months of operation. After loading no patient returned back with complaint.

Table 1: Patients Gender distribution, age, site of implant, infection and mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Site of implant</th>
<th>Infection</th>
<th>Mobility after 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2nd molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1st premolar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2nd molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2nd molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20 13 (65%) 7 (35%) Average 41 years 2 (10%)
Figure 10: Showing the No. of implants, the sites, the success and failure rate

Figure 11: OPG radiograph of a patient with sinus lift after 3 months, there are signs of bone formation around the implant
Discussion

The goals of the sinus elevation procedure are the creation of vital bone in the posterior maxilla, the osseointegration of the implants placed in that bone and the survival of those implants under occlusal load. The posterior maxilla may present an additional obstruction to implant placement due to pneumatization (increasing size) of the maxillary sinus. Some patients possess limited crestal bone height in the posterior maxilla even when teeth are present and it is not uncommon for the sinuses to pneumatize further after the extraction of the posterior teeth. According to some authors, augmentation procedures are required when residual bone height beneath the sinus cavity is less than 8-10 mm. The American Academy of Periodontology (cited by Wallace) stated that there is evidence to indicate that the lateral window technique for the sinus bone augmentation procedure is successful at regenerating sufficient bone for implant placement. The implant survival rate is greater than 90% which is similar to implants placed in native bone. The evidence-based reviews further identified some of the important variables that affect the outcome of this procedure. These variables are listed as follows:

1. Particulate bone grafts result in a higher survival rate than block grafts.
2. Bone replacement grafts result in a higher implant survival rate than autogenous bone or composite grafts.
3. Rough surface implants result in a higher survival rate than machine-surfaced implants.
4. Membrane placement over the lateral window results in a higher implant survival rate than if a membrane is not used. In this study we reported a success rate of 90% which is similar to that reported by Tarnow et al. and Forum et al. This high success rate could be attributed to the fact that xenograft has the following efficacy: 1. osteoconductivity which enhance the direct apposition of vital bone on the xenograft surface.
2. slow resorbability which both prevents slumping (loss of graft height) and adds approximately 25% to the overall mineral content of the matured graft.

Figure 12: OPG radiograph of a patient with sinus lift after 6 months showing complete bone formation around the implant.
3. The residual graft material does not interfere with osseointegration.\textsuperscript{7,14,18}

On the other hand implants with rough surface texture was used, which is another factor that affects implant survival in sinus grafts. Rough surface implants result in a higher survival rate than machine-surfaced (smooth surface) implants because of the ability of rough surface to stabilize the blood clot and intimate bone formation.\textsuperscript{14}

In this study 2 (10%) cases were failed. It may be attributed to the fact that no membranes were used for all the patients (was not available) to cover the lateral window which isolate the area of regeneration and exclude non-osteogenic connective tissue from the graft site.\textsuperscript{14}
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