

Mini Implants In Orthodontics- A Review

Type of article : A Review

Authors:

1. Dr. Subhiksha K C,
*Post graduate,
Department of Orthodontics,
Sree Balaji dental college,
Bharath Institute Of Higher Education and Research,*

2. Dr. M.S. Kannan
*Professor and head of department
Department of Orthodontics,
Sree Balaji dental college,
Bharath Institute Of Higher Education and Research*

Corresponding author:

Subhiksha K C,
*Post graduate,
Sree Balaji dental college,
Bharath Institute Of Higher Education and Research,
Velachery main road,
Pallikaranai,
Chennai – 600100
Mail – Subhiksha.kc@gmail.com*

Conflict of interest: We herewith state that the enclosed article is free of conflict of interest.

Source of Funding: Nil

ABSTRACT:

In this article we will discuss about the advancement of implants in orthodontic treatment and feature their utilization in multidisciplinary cases. The utilization of dental implants has significantly expanded in the course of the most recent thirty years, generally as an outcome of their effective long term osseointegration. This has prompted expanded orthodontic use, with suitable adjustments in the plan when required. It is entrenched that implants can offer a choice when supplanting missing teeth, following orthodontic treatment. This article, nonetheless, will focus on the utilization of implants during orthodontics, to upgrade the orthodontic treatment.

KEYWORDS: *implants, anchorage*

INTRODUCTION:

Osseo-integration:

The research by Branemark during the 1960s on osseointegrated implants is well known.^[1,2] His meaning of a direct contact between living bone and an implant, on the light microscope level^[1] depicts the goal of osseointegration, however the embodiment of its clinical achievement is the dependability of long term implant fixation, even in the presence of practical loading. This has been upheld by numerous investigations, including a meta-analysis,^[3] which revealed a 90 percent achievement rate for osseointegrated implants utilized for bridge abutments.

Types Of Implants:

The ascent in the utilization of dental implants has prompted an extraordinary variety in their plan and assembling. The classification of implants can be founded on their position, material of development, or plan.

- The position of the implant can be subperiosteal, transosseous, or endosseous, the remainder of which is the most ordinarily utilized sort of dental implant.
- Titanium is the acknowledged ideal material for implant production, yet different variations incorporate gold alloys, vitallium, cobalt-chromium, vitreous carbon, aluminum oxide ceramics or nickel-chromium-vanadium alloys.^[4] Even with the supported titanium metal, the implant surface perhaps hard or smooth, and may have an extra hydroxyapatite or titanium-shower coating.^[5]
- There seems, by all accounts, to be an absence of agreement among specialists and clinicians with respect to the best design for an implant. The fundamental zone of contest concerns around how an implant gains its help from the surrounding bone. A screw string around the implant surface guides loading of the surrounding bone in pressure, though a smooth barrel shaped plan expands implant uphold when shear forces are applied on the bone. Both these varieties show a more uniform pressure dispersion under loading when contrasted with other designs.^[6]

Guidelines For Placement:

The procedure for effective osseointegration of an implant, as generally depicted by Branemark,^[2] includes a two-stage surgery. To start with, the implant installation is subset into position and a cover screw is found over it during the necessary 4–6-month healing period. The subsequent stage includes the fitting of abutment to the osseointegrated implant after it has been revealed. A 2-week time span is considered goal of the gingivae after this technique and, ensuing to this, restorative work can start. There is a pattern towards prior loading of implants and conceivable immediate loading, to limit the postpone that outcomes from the broad healing period required. Notwithstanding, there are no long term follow up investigations of this methodology as it is as yet in its outset.

Suitability For Implants:

Before starting any implant treatment, factors that should be considered incorporate the quality and quantity of bone present, the age of the patient, and the thinking behind their looking for implant treatment. Bone quality and the degree of edge resorption are significant elements to evaluate, and radiographic arrangement of these has been already described.^[7]

The age of the patient is a significant thought, as implants are risky whenever implanted in developing children for the accompanying reasons.^[8]

- The utilization of implants in the foremost maxilla is contraindicated because of the chance of the mid-palatal suture being open
- Resorption in the posterior maxilla, coming about because of development changes, could prompt the exposure of the implant into the sinus
- The posterior mandible proceeds to go through development changes in each of the three planes of space also, thusly, complete implant arrangement around there would be hard to assess

In any event, when development is finished and the teeth show up completely erupted, infra-occlusion of implant supported crowns may occur.^[9] This is a result of negligible proceeded with eruption of the contiguous teeth, post-immaturity, and is most often observed with upper lateral incisors.

Implants As Source Of Absolute Anchorage:

During active treatment, orthodontic anchorage intends to limit the degree of inconvenient, undesirable tooth movement. There are techniques accessible to lessen anchorage loss during treatment. Notwithstanding, these methods are regularly just partly successful, for instance, transpalatal arches or headgear. The capacity of osseointegrated implants to stay stable under occlusal loading has driven orthodontists to utilize them as harbor units without patient consistence.

History:

The idea of metal segments being screwed into the maxilla and mandible to upgrade orthodontic anchorage was first distributed in 1945,^[10] with the utilization of vitalliumscrews to impact tooth development in dogs. Notwithstanding some achievement, the resultant tooth development was restricted because of the implants loosening inside within a month of beginning tooth development. After twenty years, Linkow^[11] depicted the endosseousbladeimplant for orthodontic anchorage, yet didn't cover the long term stability. Vitreous carbon implants demonstrated a failure rate of 67 percent^[12] while going through orthodontic loading, and endeavors at utilizing Bioglass-covered ceramic implants^[13] for orthodontic anchorage were nearly as not satisfying. Although all the above materials were viable with bone, none of them indicated reliable long term attachment of bone toimplant interface, which implies they didn't accomplish genuine osseo-integration.

Osseo-Incorporated Implants And Orthodontics

In malocclusions requiring an elevated level of anchorage control, osseo-integrated implants can be utilized on a brief premise to limit loss of anchorage. For instance, Roberts^[14] utilized regular, two-stage titanium implants in the retromolar area, to help strengthen anchorage while effectively closing first molar extraction sites in the mandible. After completion of the orthodontic treatment, the implants were eliminated utilizing a trephine and histologically analyzed. They found a high level of osseo-integration had been kept up, in spite of the orthodontic loading. In another investigation, Turley et al. ^[15] utilized tantalum markers and bone labelling colors in dogs to delineate the stability of two-stage implants in cases of orthodontic or orthopaedic traction. This work moreover indicated that one-stage implants were less successful in this treatment.

Implant based anchorage can be of specific advantage in treating certain parts of malocclusions, for instance:

- Retracting and realigning anterior teeth with no posterior support.
- Closing edentulous spaces in first molar extracted sites.
- Center-line rectification while missing posterior teeth.
- Re-building up appropriate transverse and anteroposterior position of isolated molar abutments.
- Intruding/extruding teeth.
- Protraction or retraction.
- Stabilization of teeth with diminished bone support.
- Orthopedic traction.

Design Of Orthodontic Implants:

One of the conspicuous weaknesses of two-stage implants for orthodontic anchorage is the requirement for a long healing time of 4–6 months, which adds essentially to the treatment time. The bone depth needed for customary endosseousimplants may likewise limit the areas accessible for implantplacement. Because of these issues, implants have been planned explicitly for orthodontic purposes. Generally, an implant used to upgrade orthodontic anchorage should be biocompatible, modest, easily implanted and removed under local anaesthesia, and be little enough to situate in different sites in the mouth. It ought to likewise osseo-integrate in few days, and would be stable to orthodontic loading taking all planes of space.

The expanding desire for early loading of implants utilized for orthodontic anchorage drove Melsen to createthe Aarhus implant^[16]. Because of its little measurements (6 mm length), this titanium anchorage screw can be situated in different sites, including between the roots of teeth. It is said to permit osseo-integration to happen even within the presence of quick orthodontic loading, giving the orthodontic forces (25–50 g from Sentalloy springs) go through the screw. The strain that creates in the bone surrounding the loaded screw prompts a field where expanded bone formationresults. Because of the size of the screw it tends to be utilized in various areas and can be without any problem eliminated when not, at this point required.

While trying to deliver an implant that is little and simple to place and remove, Kanomi^[17] has portrayed a miniimplant, which is 6 mm long and 1.2 mm in diameter. This implant, which was

created from a mini bone screw utilized for fixing bone plates, is screwed into the alveolus under local anesthesia, to inside 3 mm of the apices of the teeth. Resulting to healing and osseointegration, a titanium bone plate is fixed to the screw, and goes about as a hook for the attachment of an orthodontic ligature wire to help intrusion of the corresponding teeth. Because of possible oral hygiene issues, the ligature isn't attached straightforwardly to the implant. The author didn't explain how long the healing period is permit osseointegration, however did remark on the utilization of this implant for orthodontic space closure and molar distalization.

Implants Used For Anchorage And Asabutments For Restorations

Orthodontic implants can also be placed in a position that allows them to act initially as a source of anchorage, but then as an abutment for restorative work. Cases requiring implants for both restorative management and orthodontic anchorage require extensive planning involving the orthodontist, restorative specialist, oral surgeon, and periodontist. There are cost and time implications, and the potential surgical difficulties of access and local anatomy that may prejudice against the ideal positioning of a conventional implant should be borne in mind.

Orthodontic Implant Attachments

Once the implant osseointegrates with the bone, it has to be included into the appliance. It is possible to attach an orthodontic archwire directly to the implant cover screws, but movement of the teeth is faster and better controlled if single crowns or denture teeth are used as superstructures.^[18]

The type of attachment used depends on factors such as:

- The magnitude of force required.
- The need for aesthetics.
- The method of force application

It is important that endosseous implants required for restorative management are not compromised, orthodontic loading of a single two-stage endosseous implant should not commence for 6 months in the mandibular arch.

Stability Of Implants

Concern regarding the stability of osseointegrated implants undergoing orthodontic loading has been addressed by Hurzeler et al^[19] This team looked at the bone implant interface of implants used for orthodontic anchorage in healthy mouths. Their histological findings indicated that repetitive mechanical trauma did not result in increased peri-implant bone loss. In addition, the application of any lateral load did not cause marginal bone loss, but in fact led to a compensatory increase in density of the peri-implant bone through structural adaptation.

From a clinical standpoint, up to 400 g of orthodontic force (which is greater than the normal range required for conventional orthodontic tooth movement), has been successfully anchored against an osseointegrated dental implant in several malocclusions.^[20] The only reported problem in these cases was repeated loosening of the abutment screw, with no significant loss of anchorage.

CONCLUSION:

Osseointegrated implants can now be used as absolute anchorage units in orthodontics. They are very useful in cases where the compliance of patient is poor. The continuing development of orthodontic implants has led to the production of smaller designs which are easy to insert and remove, and do not require a long healing period prior to loading.

In the future, as developments occur in implant technology, they may have a significant role as anchorage reinforcement aids and make headgear obsolete. However, there is a need for high quality research in this area.

REFERENCES

1. Branemark P-I, Adell R, Breine U, et al. Intra-osseous anchorage of dental prostheses. I. Experimental studies. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg* 1969; 3: 81.

2. Albrektsson T, Branemark P-I, Hansson HA et al. Osseointegrated titanium implants. Requirements for ensuring long-lasting, direct bone-to-implant anchorage in man. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1981; 52: 155.
3. Lindh T, Gunne J, Tillberg A, et al. A meta-analysis of implants in partial edentulism. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 1999;10: 139–148
4. Worthington P, Lang BB, Lavelle WE. *Osseointegration in Dentistry: an introduction*. Quintessence, Illinois, 1994.
5. Rasmussen RA. *The Branemark System of Oral Reconstruction: a colour atlas*. IshiyakuEuroAmerica Inc., Tokyo, 1992.
6. Siegel D, Soletz U. Numerical investigations of the influence of implant shape on the stress distribution in jaw bone. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Impl* 1989; 4: 333–339.
7. Lekholm U, Zarb GA. Patient selection and preparation. In P-I. Branemark, G. A. Zarb and T. Albrektsson (eds) *Tissue Integrated Prosthesis: osseointegration in clinical dentistry*. Quintessence, Chicago, 1985, pp. 199–209.
8. Oesterle LJ. Implant considerations in the growing child. In: K. W. Higuchi (ed.) *Orthodontic applications of osseointegrated implants*. Quintessence, Illinois, 2000, pp. 156–157.
9. Thilander B, Odman J, Lekholm U. Orthodontic aspects of the use of oral implants in adolescents: a 10 year follow-up study. *Eur J Orthod* 2001; 23: 715–731.
10. Gainsforth BL, Higley LB. A study of orthodontic anchorage possibilities in basal bone. *Am J Orthod Oral Surg* 1945; 31:406–117.
11. Linkow LI. The endosseous blade implant and its use in orthodontics. *Int J Orthod* 1969; 18: 149–154.
12. Sherman JA. Bone reaction to orthodontic forces on vitreous carbon dental implants. *Am J Orthod* 1978; 74: 79–87.
13. Turley PK, Shapiro PA, Moffett BC. The loading of bioglass coated aluminium oxide implants to produce sutural expansion of the maxillary complex in the pigtail monkey *Macaca Nemestrina*. *Arch Oral Biol* 1980; 25: 459–469.
14. Roberts WE, Marshall KJ, Mozsary PG. Rigid endosseous implant utilized as anchorage to protract molars and close an atrophic extraction site. *Angle Orthod* 1989; 60: 135–151.
15. Turley PK, Kean C, Schur J et al. Orthodontic force application to titanium endosseous implants. *Angle Orthod* 1988; 58:151–162.
16. Melsen B, Verna C. A rational approach to orthodontic anchorage. *Progress in Orthodontics* 1999; 1: 10–22.
17. Kanomi R. Mini-implant for orthodontic anchorage. *J Clin Orthod* 1997; 31: 763–767
18. Goodacre et al. Prosthodontic considerations when using implants for orthodontic anchorage. *J Prost Dent* 1997; 77:162–170
19. Hurzeler MB, Quinones CR, Kohal RJ, et al. Changes to periimplant tissues subjected to orthodontic forces and ligature breakdown in monkeys. *J Periodontol* 1998; 69: 396–404.
20. Higuchi KW, Slack JM. The use of titanium fixtures for intraoral anchorage to facilitate orthodontic tooth movement. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1991; 6: 338–344.