

Trabecular Metal[™] Implants — from Orthopedics to Dental Implantology

Suheil M. Boutros, DDS, MS¹

¹Practice limited to Periodontics and Implants Surgery, Grand Blanc, Michigan. Dean's Faculty, The University of Michigan.

Presented at the Academy of Osseointegration Annual Meeting, 2013

Background

Trabecular Metal Material* (TM) is an 80% porous, tantalum-based biomaterial with a trabecular structure designed for bone ongrowth and bone ingrowth (osseoincorporation). Its extensive clinical use in orthopedics¹⁻² led to the development of a new, tapered, threaded, titanium dental implant with a TM midsection. Evaluations in both animal³ and human⁴ models have suggested that the combination of conventional implant threads and TM's interface with the bone⁵ may provide adequate primary anchorage to support immediate loading in selected patients. The present study was conducted to evaluate that concept.



Figure 1: TM implant immediately placed into a grafted sinus using a crestal approach through a fresh extraction socket (left). After placement, the implant was immediately provisionalized out of occlusion (right).



Figure 2: Preoperative (left) and 10-months after loading (middle and right).

2 Materials and Methods

Eighteen (18) implants were placed with or without simultaneous bone augmentation in 14 patients with healed or fresh extraction sockets (Figures 1-4). Impressions for the final prosthesis were taken at implant placement. Within 48 hours of placement, implants were immediately provisionalized out of occlusion. Implants were definitively loaded in occlusion within 2 weeks postoperative. Clinical and radiographic evaluations of bone levels were conducted at the time of abutment connection, and at 6 and 12 months.

3 Results

One patient received 3 implants, 2 patients received 2 implants each, and 11 patients received 1 implant. At 12 months, all 18 implants in the 14 participating patients were clinically osseointegrated and functioning according to their prosthodontic intent. Bone and soft tissue levels remained stable and asymptomatic, and there were no prosthetic complications.



Figure 3. One-year follow-up

Diameter	Length	Number Placed
4.1 mm	10 mm	2
	11.5 mm	3
	13 mm	3
4.7 mm	10 mm	1
	11.5 mm	2
	13 mm	3
6.0 mm	10 mm	1
	11.5 mm	1
	13 mm	2

Table 1. Distribution of Implants Placed

Discussion

Immediate implant loading of inadequately stabilized dental implants can result in deleterious micromovements capable of damaging or preventing osseointegration.⁶ In the present study, TM implants achieved stability for immediate loading in all 14 patients.





5 Conclusion

Within the limitations of this study, TM implants exhibited adequate primary stability to enable immediate loading in selected patients.

References

6

- Wigfield C, et al. Clinical experience with porous tantalum cervical interbody implants in a prospective randomized controlled trial. Br J Neurosurg 2003;17:418-425.
- Unger AS, et al. Evaluation of a porous tantalum uncemented acetabular cup in revision total hip arthroplasty. Clinical and radiological results of 60 hips. J Arthroplasty 2005;20:1002-1009.
- Kim DG, et al. Evaluation of Trabecular Metal® dental implants in a canine model. Presented at the 19th Annual Scientific Meeting of the European Academy of Osseointegration, Oct 6-9, 2010, Glasgow, Scotland.
- Wen HB, et al. CI-8 Dental implants made of Trabecular Metal: interim developmental findings. Abstract presented at the 27th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Osseointegration, Phoenix, Arizona, March 1-3, 2012.
- Zhang Y, et al. Interfacial frictional behavior: cancellous bone, cortical bone, and a novel porous tantalum biomaterial. J Musculoskelet Res 1999;3:245-251.
- Szmukler-Moncler S, et al. Timing of loading and effect of micromotion on bone-dental implant interface: review of experimental literature. J Biomed Mater Res (Appl Biomater) 1998;43:192-203.

* Trabecular MetalTM Implant is a trademark of Zimmer, Inc

