Autogenous Bone Graft And Freeze Dried Demineralized Bone Graft In Direct Sinus Lift Technique-Sreview

Dr.Vijay Ebenezer¹, Dr. Balakrishnan²

(Head Of The Department,Department Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery,Sree Balaji Dental College And Hospital ,Chennai,Tamilnadu)¹ (Professor,Department Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery,Sree Balaji Dental College And Hospital ,Chennai,Tamilnadu)²

Abstract:

Over the past few years there has been a large change in the outlook and treatment modalities used in dentistry. Implants are considered to be the major breakthrough in the replacement of a lost tooth as, it has lots of pros and less of cons as explained earlier. After the loss of the maxillary molar tooth, the alveolar bone shows rapid resorption, and the size of the maxillary sinus also increases.

Keywords: sinus lift ,bone graft,dental implant

INTRODUCTION

Implant Is seen an ascending phase in its development. Branemark et al in the 1960's demonstrated the ability of natural bone to accept implanted titanium during its remodelling stages leading to osseointegration. Branemark's original protocol recommends complete implant after tooth extraction; this process requires 6 to 12 months. The requirement for successful osseointegration of dental implants is a sufficient osseous tissue to ensure the stabilization of implant and to allow for bone-to-implant contact of the entire surface intended for osseointegration, which is 6 months from placement of implants. The first maxillary sinus floor augmentation procedure was performed by Oscar Hilt Tatum, Jr. in 1974. Dr. Hilt Tatum Jr was first performed SINUS LIFT Theinadequate phone volume is a result of ongoing maxillary sinus pneumatization and remodelling of the alveolar crest. Augmentation of the maxillary sinus floor with autogenous bone bone is a frequently used method where the bone graft have been harvested from the both extraoral and intraoral donor site.Common intraoral donor site include the maxi llary tuberosity, zygomati c comaxillary buttress, the zygoma, the mandibular symphysis, the body of the mandible and and the ramus ramus of the mandible. intraoral donor site is suitable and local anaesthesia is sufficient for such procedure. Becktor et al used particulate autogenous bone from the mandibular body for sinus floor augmentation where the residual vertical bone height varied between 2.6 and 6.5 mm. He reported an implant survival rate of 98.9% after a follow-up of 12 months with minimal postoperative complications. Demineralized freeze dried bone allograft (DFDBA), demineralized bone matrix (DBM), formation proceeds.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Etruscan population in (500 BC) 1 as quoted by Ring M utilized soldered gold bands incorporating pontics from animals to restore masticatory function as bridge. Evidence exist that Egyptians in (2500 BC) 1 as quoted by Ring M attempted to stabilize periodontally compromised teeth with use of gold ligature wire. The first evidence of the use of implants was by Mayan population in (600 AD) 1 as quoted by Ring M they utilized pieces of steel to replicate three lower incisor teeth.

Alvin Strock (1938)56 as quoted by Rasmussen R.A. designed the first successful vitallium screw implant which provided anchorage for replacement of a missing tooth.

Goldberg and Gershkoff (1948)56 as quoted by Rasmussen R.A. described subperiosteal implant with extension of framework to the external oblique ridge.

Lee (1950)56 as quoted by Rasmussen R.A. introduced the use of endosseous implant with the central post and circumferential extensions.

R. Earl Robinson et al (1969) 61 first introduced the term osseous coagulum in his paper Osseous Coagulum for bone induction. He described that at 25,000 to 30,000 rpm, using a no. 6 or no. 8 round carbide bur, a bone dust is obtained which when coated with blood becomes a coagulum . The donor bone is obtained from any intraoral source. Usually it is obtained from areas where there is a requirement for osseous correction such as the removal of lingual ridges, exostoses, palatal excrescences. This technique is based on two assumptions: (1) that the smaller resorption and replacement; and (2) that mineralized fragments can induce osteogenesis as other investigators have reported. The results of osseous coagulum bone induction are fairly consistent and the technique offers considerable promise in the osseous regeneration procedures.

Rowland a. Hutchinson et al (1973) 53 first described the use of an osseous coagulum filter for collection of osseous coagulum during osteotomies.

Schulte et al (1978)57 clinically tested 95 Tuebinger immediate implants of different types. The longest time of observation was 2 and 1/2 years.

M. Hodosh et al (1980)33 conducted a study where composite polymer material composed of poly (methyl) methacrylate (PMMA) and silica microspheres was developed for use in dental implants as a possible alternative to the highly successful vitreous carbonpolymethacrylate (VC-PMMA) dental implant

Boyne and James (1980) 2 reported on the elevation of the maxillary sinus floor in patients with large, pneumatized sinus cavities in preparation for the placement of blade implants.

Sture Lundqvist et al (1983)59 reported that most striking result of this short -term longitudinal study is the overwhelmingly positive rehabilitation effect resulting from the substitution of a complete upper denture with a fixed prosthesis. This verifies earlier results obtained in crosssectional investigations after significantly longer periods of observation. Clinical and technical procedures used in the production of fixed prosthesis on osseointegrated implants in the edentulous maxillae were described. The subjective evaluation and some cl inical recordings in 21 treated patients were reported. Initia l results were very favorable.

P. Kavanagh et al (1985)48 reported that a large number of dental implants and percutaneous devices have been placed in humans, little are known of many aspects of One advantage is that wide variety of techniques has been developed for observing cell behaviour that would be inappropriate or unethical to apply to humans. Moreover, relative to large animals such as dogs or primates, rodents are inexpensive to purchase and maintain, and as a consequence a greater number of animals can be used forstudy.

Tatum(1986)3 first proposed dental implant placement through the lateral window approach technique and its clinical application. This technology expanded the implant indication of the posterior maxillary region, having the advantages of direct vision when performing surgery, control of the elevated height, effective protection

Sarupinder Singh et al (1989) 54 did a study on the , but it lacks validation of its sterilization capabilit ies. 48 titanium implants were contaminated with spores of biological indicator bacillus stearothermophilus and subjected to —dynamic sterilized by UV light. 47 of as indic ated by not producing turbidity in a suitable growth medium. This sterilization technique only requires a 20 -second exposure.

Thomas GJ. Et al (1990)51 stated that the AMBE technique with augmentation has been a highly successful and predictable procedure. It facilitates lifting the sinus membrane gently and displacing it upward.

Pallesan et al (2002)20 concluded the early stages of bone regeneration were positively influenced by autogenous bone graft with smaller particle sizes **21.** Graft harvesting methods can be successfully used for sinus floor augmentation in patient with inadequate alveolar bone height which provide a adequate graft volume for implants. Morbidity is minimal and the survival of the grafts, implants and prosthetic constructions is satisfactory.

Wallace and Froum(2003) 4, they showed a high success rate using this technology for implant restoration. autogenous bone graft through the lateral window approach

Urist et al first described the osteoinductivity of DFDBA, after observing endochondral bone formation on DFDBA when placed in soft tissue. It has since been discovered that BMPs are the factors responsible for the novo bone formation.12

Malcolm P. J. Young et al (2002) 36 carried out a study for clinical and histological evaluation of bone collected in filters. The aims of this study were 1) to compare the clinical performance of two bone collectors Thirty -eight patients (paired for implant site) were categorised into three clinical groups. Patients underwent bone collection with the . With regard to the mean mass of bone that was collected for each clinical group, the Osseous Coagulum Trap collected greater mass and this reached statistical significance (P 0.025) for samples that were collected during the insertion of four maxillary implants. With regard to the histological nature of the tissue that was collected, bone and coagulum predominated in most samples, while muscle and fibrous tissue were found only occasionally.

Wilson TG Jr et al (2003) conducted a study to improve the bone-to-implant contact and the initial bonetoimplant contact in a vertical dimension. The implant surface, the type of membrane, and the method of membrane placement used in a previous study by his group were modified. Osseointegration occurred across all Horizontal defect, with the percentage of bone -to-implant contact in the range of 0.05 to 1.5 mm. The first bone -to

Stephen T. Chen et al (2004)60 published an article along with the clinical procedures and outcomes associated with immediate and delayed implant placement. Results showed Peri - implant defects had a high potential for healing by regeneration of bone, irrespective of healing protocol and bone augmentation method. spontaneous bone fill when implants with rough surfaces were used. In the presence of HD's larger than 2 mm, orwhen socket walls were damaged, concomitant augmentation procedures with barrier membranes and bone grafts were required.

Springer et al (2004)58 analyzed the bone vitality of the bone particles obtained through bone filters, osteoblast like cells were able to express alkaline phosphatase, osteocalcin and collagen type 1 which are markers of cell differentiation. Data from various studies confirmed the presence of osteoblast like cells, which could proliferate and differentiate along the osteogenic lineage suggesting they are capable of regeneration after transplantation.

Clark M. Stanford et al (2010) 14 reviewed the recent developments in titanium implant surface technology and to discuss the role in mediating macrophage biology in the wound healing site around the implant. Implant macro retentive features, implant micro-retentive features, implant wound healing and the potential role of surface modification were reviewed in the article.

Mario Santagata (2010)39 concluded that simplified treatment modality can make implant rehabilitation of the atrophic maxillary premolar region more accessible in a single stage with immediate loading to facilitate bone density improvement.

R. Vijayalakshmi et al (2012) 52 reported a case in by GBR with PRF (Platelet Rich Fibrin)enhanced bone graft and the Platelet Rich Fibrin smeared barrier membrane for guided bone regeneration dehiscence or fenestration defect.

Johannes Kuttenberger et al (2012) 28 showed the graft collected through coagulum to contain high number of cells and they bridge the spaces between the bone chips, as well as covering the bone chips. The fibrin matrix was partially replaced with newly formed; non-calcified, collagen type I -containing extracellular matrix, and collagen type IV -positive structures were identified. The study positively identified the presence of endothelial cells. Since collagen type IV is found in basal lamina, we hypothesise that these two findings are suggestive of vessel -like structures. Furthermore, the growth factor pattern observed (IL - 8+, HGF+, VEGF+ and active TGF β 1–) is indicative of a pro - angiogenic environment.

Wang peng (2013) stated that maxillary sinus floor elevation with autogenous bone graft through the lateral window approach technique is feasible and safe, and that the elevation of maxillary sinus floor is predictable in implant rehabilitation for patients with reduced vertical bone height in the posterior maxillary region.

Mark rowan et al (2014)37 conducted a study and the purpose was to objectively measure the stability of immediately placed implants compared to implants placed at healed sites using ISQ values obtained via RFA. Data was collected from 137 Nobel Replace Tapered Groovy Implants placed in 85 patients, ages 19-93.

CONCLUSION: Demineralized freeze dried bone allograft & autogenous graft both were convenient grafting method and aided in faster osteointegration around the implant.

Reference:

1. Abraham.M et al (2014) A Brief HistoricalPerspective on Dental Implants, Their SurfaceCoatings and Treatments. Open Dent J. 2014; 8: 50–55.(1)

2. Boyne PJ, James RA. Grafting of the maxillary sinusfloor with autogenous marrow and bone. J Oral Surg1980;38:613-6.

3. Tatum H Jr. Maxillary and sinus implantreconstructions. Dent Clin North Am 1986;30:207-29.

4. Wallace SS, Froum SJ. Effect of maxillary sinusaugmentation on the survival of endosseous dentalimplants. A systematic review. Ann Periodontol2003;8:328-43.

5. Sahana Purushotham, Arjun MachingalRaveendran,Bekal Kavitha Kripalani , and MelbaLisa D'Souza: Direct sinus lift and immediate implantplacement using peizosurgical approach- A casereport, J Clin Diagn Res. 2016 Jan; 10(1): ZD20–ZD22. Published online 2016 Jandoi: [10.7860/JCDR/2016/16620.7150]

6. Shruti Pillai et al : Bone Substitutes for Sinus Lift/J. Pharm. Sci. & Res. Vol. 8(5), 2016, 367-372

7. Stevenson, Sharon, Biology of bone grafts, Orthopedic clinics of North America, 1999, 30,4, 543 -552

8. Thomas Starch-Jensen **and** Janek Dalsgaard Jensen:Maxillary Sinus Floor Augmentation: a Review ofSelected Treatment Modalities : J Oral MaxillofacRes. 2017 Jul-Sep; 8(3): e3, Published 2017Sep,30. doi: [10.5037/jomr.2017.8303]

9. Jakse N, Payer M, Tangl S, Berghold A, KirmeierR, Lorenzoni M : Influence of low-level lasertreatment on bone regeneration and osseointegration of dental implants following sinus augmentation. An experimental study on sheep

10. Park, Young-Bum, Hwan-Su Jeon, June-Sung Shim,Keun-Woo Lee, and Hong-Seok Moon. "Analysis of the maxillary sinus septum using 3-dimensional computed tomography." *Journal of Oraland Maxillofacial Surgery* 69, no. 4 (2011): 1070-1078.

11. Hatano N, Shimizu Y, Ooya K. A clinical long-termradiographic evaluation of graft height changes aftermaxillary sinus floor augmentation with a 2:1autogenous bone/xenograft mixture and simultaneousplacement of dental implants. Clin Oral Implants Res2004;15:339-45.

12. Pjetursson BE, Tan WC, Zwahlen M, Lang NP. : Asystematic review of the success of sinus floorelevation and survival of implants inserted in

\ombination with sinus floor elevation. J ClinPeriodontol 2008;35(8 Suppl):216-40.

13. Jensen OT, Shulman LB, Block MS, Iacono VJ.Report of the Sinus Consensus Conference of 1996.Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 1998;13(Suppl):11-45

14. Reddi, A. Hari ., Role of morphogenetic proteins inskeletal tissue engineering and regeneration, Naturebiotechnology, 1998, 16, 3, 247-252.

15. Rosario Rizzo, Vittorio Checchi, Federico Marsili, Antonio Zani, Serena Incerti -Parenti, Luigi Checchi: A New Transalveolar Sinus Lift Procedure for SingleImplant Placement: The Ebanist Technique. ATechnical Description and Case Series, 017 Mar31. doi: [10.2174/1874210601711010187

16. Wood RM, Moore DL. : Grafting of the maxillarysinus with intra orally harvested autogenous bone

prior to implant placement. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 1988 Sep 1;3(3).

17. Joseph Y. K. kan et al (2003) Immediate placementand provisionalization of maxillary anterior singleimplants: 1 - year prospective study. Int j oral maxfac implants 2003; 18: 31 - 39.

18. Dragoo MR, Sullivan HC. : A clinical andhistological evaluation of autogenous iliac bone graftsin humans: Part I. Wound healing 2 to 8 months .Journal of periodontology. 1973 Oct ;44(10):599-613.

19. Andreasen JO, Paulsen HU, Yu Z, Schwartz O. Along-term study of 370 autotransplanted premolars.Part III. Periodontal healing subsequent totransplantation. Eur J Orthod 1990;12:25-37

20. Wang X, Luo Y. : Influencing factors on boneresorption after alveolar bone grafting. Zhonghua KouQiang Yi Xue Za Zhi 2005;40: 373-5

21. Pallesan L, Schou S, Aaboe M, et al: Influence of particle size of autogenous bone graft on the earlystages of bone regeneration: A histologic and stereologic study in rabbit calvarium. Int J Oralaxillofac Implant 17:498,2002

22. Smith JD, Abramson M : Membranous vsendochondrial bone autografts. Arch otolaryngal99:203,1974

23. Ikeda A, Ikeda M, Komatsuzaki A. A CT study of the course of growth of the maxillary sinus: normalsubjects and subjects with chronic sinusitis. ORL JOtorhi nolaryngol Relat Spec. 1998;60(3):147-152

24. **24.Kan JY, Rungcharassaeng K, Kim J, Lozada JL,Goodacre CJ.** Factors affecting the survival ofimplants placed in grafted maxillary sinuses: a clinicalreport. J Prosthet Dent. 2002;87(5):485-489.

25. Sakka S, Krenkel C. Simultaneous maxillary sinuslifting and implant placement with autogenous parietalbone graft: outcome of 17 cases. J CraniomaxillofacSurg. 2011;39(3):187-191.

26. Rosano G, Taschieri S, Gaudy JF, Weinstein T, DelFabbro M. Maxillary sinus vascular anatomy and itsrelation to sinus lift surgery. Clin Oral Implants Res. 011; 22(7):711-715.

27. Fugazzotto PA, Vlassis J. Long-term success of sinus ugmentation using various surgical approaches and rafting materials. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants1998;13:52-8.

28. Johannes Kuttenberger et al (2012) A novel theedimensional bone chip organ culture. Clin Oral nvest. 2012.

29. Herzberg R, Dolev E, Schwartz-Arad D. Implant arginal bone loss in maxillary sinus grafts. Int J Oral axillofac Implants 2006; 21:103-10.

30. **Drosos, Georgios I., et al.,** Safety and efficacy of ommercially available demineral ised bone matrix reparations: a critical review of clinical studies, Injury, 2007, 38, 4, S13-S21

31. **Rodriguez**, **Arlene**, **et al.**, Maxillary sinus augmentation with deproteinated bovine bone and platelet rich plasma with simultaneous insertion of endosseous implants, Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery, 2003, 61,2, 157-163

32. **AB Tarun Kumar, Ullas Anand,** Maxillary sinus augmentation, Journal of Internationalclinical dental research organisation, 2015, 7, 3, 81-93

33. M. Hodosh et al (1980) Strength and biocompatibility of polymath acrylate – silica composite dental implant materials. The journal of prosthetic dentistry. Feb 1980 vol 43 no 2

34. **Summers RB.** The osteotome technique: part 3—less invasive methods of elevating the sinus floor.Compendium. 1994;15:698, 700,702–704 passim;quiz 710.

35. Halpern KL, Halpern EB, Ruggiero S. Minimally invasive implant and sinus lift surgery with immediate loading. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2006;64:1635–1638.

36. Malcolm P. J. Young et al (2002) Bone collected during dental implant surgery: a clinical and histological study. Clin. Oral Impl. Res, 13, 2002; 298–30.

37. Mark rowan et al (2014) Mechanical versus Biological Stability of Immediate and Delayed Implant Placement Using Resonance Frequency Analysis10.1016/j.joms.2014.09.024

38. Zijderveld, S.A., Zerbo, I.R., van den Bergh, J.P.,Schulten, E.A. & ten Bruggenkate, C.M. (2005) Maxillary sinus floor augmentation using a beta - tricalcium phosphate (Cerasorb) alone compared to autogenous bone grafts. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants 20: 432–440.

39. Mario Santagata, MD* Luigi Guariniello, MD, PhD Raffaele Rauso, MD Gianpaolo Tartaro, MD(2010) Immediate Loading of Dental Implant After Sinus Floor Elevation With Osteotome Technique: A Clinical Report and Preliminary Radiographic Results . Journal of Oral Implantology 36(6):485-9

40. Peleg M, Garg AK, Mazor Z. Healing in smokers versus nonsmokers: survival rates for sinus floor augmentation with simultaneous implant placement . Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2006;21(4):551-559.

41. Wallace SS, Froum SJ. Effect of maxillary sinus augmentation on the survival of endosseous dental implants. A systematic review. Ann Periodontol. 2003; 8(1):328-343

42. Ahmed Kamal Abo zekry Ragia Mounir Waleed Ragab El-Beialy: Open sinus lift surgery and augmentation with (SCPC versus H.A):Asystematic review, doi.org/10.1016/j.fdj.2018.08.002

43. Jung RE, Zembic A, Pjetursson BE, Zwahlen M, Thoma DS. : Systematic review of the survival rate and the incidence of biological, technical, and aesthetic complications of single crowns on implants reported in longitudinal studies with a mean follow-up of 5 years. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2012 Oct;23(suppl6):2-21.

44. Lundgren S, Cricchio G, Hallman M, Jungne r M, Rasmusson L, Sennerby L. Sinus floor elevation procedures to enable implant placement and integration: techniques, biological aspects and clinical outcomes. Periodontol 2000. 2017 Feb;73(1):103-20.

45. Danesh-Sani SA, Loomer PM, Wallace SS. A comprehensive clinical review of maxillary sinus floor elevation: anatomy, techniques, biomaterials and complications. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016 Sep;54(7):724-30.

46. Carreño Carreño J, Aguilar-Salvatierra A, Gómez- Moreno G, García Carreño EM, Menéndez López - Mateos ML, Perrotti V, Piattelli A, Calvo-Guirado JL, Menéndez-Núñez M:. Update of Surgical Techniques for Maxillary Sinus Augmentation: A Systematic Literature Review. Implant Dent. 2016 Dec;25(6):839-844.

47. **Skoglund, Annika, Peter Hising, Cecilia Young,** A clinical and histologic examination in humans of the osseous response to implanted natural bone mineral, International journal of oral and maxillofacial implants, 1997, 12,2, 1-12

48. P Kavanagh et al (1985) A rodent model for the investigation of dental implants. The journal of prosthetic dentistry. August 1985 volume 54 num 2

49. **Stanley, Harold R., et al.,** Using 45S5 bioglass cones as endosseous ridge maintenance implants to prevent alveolar ridge resorption: a 5year evaluation, International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants, 1997, 12,1, 1-19

50. Virolainen, Petri, et al., Expression of matrix genes during incorporation of cancellous bone allografts and autografts, Clinical orthopaedics and related research, 1995, 317, 263-272

51. *Thomas GJ.* Et al (1990)*Sinus lifts: a possible solution to the atrophic maxilla. J Macomb. Dent Soc. 1990;29:9–11.*

52. R.Vijayalakshmi, C.S.Rajmohan, D.Deepalakshmi , and G. Sivakami et al (2012) Use of platelet rich fibrin in a fenestration defect around an implant. J Indian Soc Periodontol. 2012 Jan-Mar; 16(1): 108–112.

53. Rowland A. Hutchinson et al (1973) Osseous Coagulum Collection Filter. J Periodontol. 1973 Nov;44(11):688 -90.

54. Sarupinder Singh et al (1989) Dynamic sterilization of titanium implants with ultraviolet light . int j oral maxillafac implants 1989 ;4:139 -146.

55. Schropp et al (2003) Bone healing and soft tissue contour changes following single-tooth extraction: a clinical and radiographic 12-month prospective study.Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2003 Aug;23(4):313-23.

56. Reinhard Gruber et al (2009) Neutrophil elastase activity and concentrations of inter leukin1 – in crevicular fluid after immediate replacement and immediate loading of implant. Brit ish journal of Oral and Maxillofacial surgery 48 (2010)228

57. Schulte et al (1978). The Tübingen immediate implant in clinical studies. Dtsch Zahnarztl Z. 1978 May;33(5):348-59.

58. Springer et al (2004) Particulated bone grafts. Effectiveness of bone cell supply. Clin Oral Implants Res 2014:15;205-212

59. **Sture Lundqvistet al (1983)** Maxillary fixed prostheses on osseointegrated dental implants. The journal of prosthetic dentistry Aug 1983 vol 50 no 2

60. Stephen T. Chen et (2004) Immediate or Early Placement of Implants Following Tooth Extraction: Review of Biologic Basis, Clinical Procedures, andOutcomes. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19 Suppl:12-25.

61. R. Earl. Robinson et al (1969) Osseous Coagulum for Bone Induction. Journal of Periodontology.September 1969, Vol. 40, No. 9, Pages 503-510.