

18.

Maintenance Requirements of Implant Supported Fixed Prosthesis Opposed by Either Implant Supported Fixed Prosthesis or Natural Teeth: 5 Years Results

Davis DM, Packer ME, Watson RM.

Department of Prosthetic Dentistry, GKT Dental Institute, London, UK

AIM: To compare the maintenance requirements of implant supported fixed prosthesis opposed by implant supported fixed prosthesis natural teeth or complete dentures.

METHOD: The maintenance requirements were obtained by examining the dental records of 15 people, of whom 6 were edentulous in both arches and 9 edentulous in one arch. The results were compared to those obtained from 22 edentulous people in whom implants had been used in the mandible (control group). All the patients were treated with Nobel Biocare implants using standard implant and prosthetic protocols.

RESULTS: The main maintenance requirement was the need to repair part of the superstructure. The artificial teeth and the acrylic resin had to be repaired on 44 occasions in the group with implants in both jaws and 14 occasions in the group with implants opposed by natural teeth. This compared with 2 occasions in the control group. Similarly the group with implants in both jaws were more likely to fracture the gold alloy framework, an event which occurred on 6 occasions. The Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance on ranks was used to identify significant differences and Dunn's method of All Pairwise Multiple Comparison Procedures was used to distinguish which group differed from the other. The group with implants in both jaws was significantly different to the other two groups in relation to the higher incidence of fracture of the teeth and acrylic resin superstructure ($p < 0.0001$) and fracture of the gold alloy framework ($p = 0.0002$).

CONCLUSION: The maintenance requirements of implant supported fixed prosthesis opposed by implant supported fixed prosthesis are much greater than when opposed by natural teeth or complete dentures.

19.

Follow up Clinical Observations of a Patient with Replantation, Transplantation and Implantation

Spiechowicz E¹, Piekarczyk J², Gawor E¹, Stendera P¹, Ciechowicz B.¹

¹Department of Prosthodontics, Medical Academy in Warsaw;

²II-nd Department of Maxillo-Facial Surgery, Medical Academy, Warsaw, Poland

The paper presents the case of a young female patient treated with T.B.R. implants after unsuccessful replantation. The patient applied for the treatment in the Prosthodontic Department in January 1994, three months after the procedure of retained canine replantation. Before the replantation the patient had been treated with an orthodontic traction device, but the treatment was unsuccessful. The lack of bony restitution and permanent inflammation was the reason for canine extraction and immediate denture application. Bony defect after unsuccessful replantation and canine extraction was the reason for the surgical procedure of augmentation by transplantation from iliac bone 6 months later. Healing after bone augmentation was satisfactory and provided favourable conditions for implant installation. Two cylinder T.B.R. implants were placed in the region of the missing canines in September 1995. After 6 months the healing screws were connected to the implants. After 1 week a small correction of the gingival flap, pulling the mucous membrane on the labial surface, was made on the right side. Healing then proceeded without additional problems. The final prosthetic restorations were made in March 1996. The patient has a regular check-up. The implant mobility is measured with Periotest and depth of gingival pockets with Florida probe.

20.

Preplanned Esthetics in Prosthodontics - A Controlled Approach

Gilboa I.

Private practice, Netanya, Israel

The benefits of preplanned oral rehabilitation procedures are: high quality dentistry, better patient-dentist communication, increased efficiency, and reduced stress