Study exploring accuracy of impression techniques finds partial vs. complete edentulism may be a factor

This study was published in the July/August issue of The International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants (IOMI), the official journal of the Academy of Osseointegration (AO).

Background
An accurate implant impression is necessary to generate an accurate cast, which is the milestone for the fabrication of a precisely fitting prosthesis. Several clinical and laboratory variables can affect the accuracy of an implant cast, with one of the most significant being the impression procedure. Although various implant impression techniques have been used to generate a definitive cast, the body of evidence shows controversy over which technique is most accurate. Furthermore, a previous review on accuracy did not account for partially vs. completely edentulous patients but reported on them collectively.

Key point
The splinted technique was more accurate than nonsplinted for both partially and completely edentulous patients, while the open-tray technique was more accurate than closed-tray for completely edentulous patients but not significantly more accurate for partially edentulous patients. Impression materials did not affect the accuracy of implant impressions. Implant angulation greater than 20 degrees affected accuracy of impressions for both partially and completely edentulous patients. The dental literature provides insufficient data for the effect of implant connection type on accuracy and on digital impression techniques.
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Purpose
Seeking to evaluate the accuracy outcomes of digital and conventional impression techniques for partially and completely edentulous patients separately, researchers conducted a systemic review. They also sought to assess the effect of different variables — materials, angulation and connection type — on the accuracy of implant impressions.

Materials and methods
A systemic review of the evidence was performed by searching publications indexed in the MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE and CENTRAL databases from Jan. 1, 1980 to Sept. 1, 2013, and supplemented with a hand search of the literature. Information extracted and assessed from the articles included: study design, edentulous jaw, implant number, impression technique, connection type, abutment angulations, accuracy method implant brand, splint method, splint material, impression material and the results of impression accuracy.

Results
Of the 88 articles selected for full-text reading, 76 studies were ultimately selected for inclusion in the research — four clinical and 72 in vitro. Studies were grouped according to edentulism status. A total of 41 studies were investigations of impressions for completely edentulous patients. For partially edentulous patients, 35 studies were found. Of the research on completely edentulous patients, most in vitro studies and three clinical studies demonstrated better accuracy with the splinted (15) vs. the non-splinted technique (1), and nine showed no difference. One clinical study and half of the in vitro studies reported better accuracy with the open-tray (10) vs. the...
closed-tray technique (i), and 10 showed no difference. For partially edentulous patients, one clinical study and most in vitro studies showed better accuracy with the splinted (8) vs. the nonsplinted technique (2), and three studies showed no difference. The majority of in vitro studies showed better accuracy with the open-tray (10) vs. the closed-tray technique (i) and seven studies showed no difference. The only clinical study reported no difference.

More information
For a complete copy of the study and the JOMI July/August “Table of Contents,” visit www.osseo.org/NEWJOMI.html. To join AO and begin receiving JOMI (bi-monthly) or obtain online access to JOMI, visit www.osseo.org/NEWJOMI.html.

About the International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants
This journal integrates clinical and scientific data to improve methods and results of oral and maxillofacial implant therapy. It presents pioneering research, seminal studies, emerging technology, position papers and consensus reports, as well as the many clinical and therapeutic innovations that ensue as a result of these efforts. The editorial board is composed of recognized opinion leaders in their respective areas of expertise and reflects the international reach of the journal. It is published by Quintessence Publishing and is the official journal of the Academy of Osseointegration.

Do you know enough about the implant company you work with?

By DENTSPLY Implants Staff

Dental implant technology continues to evolve and grow through continued advancements in implant-to-abutment interface design, surface treatment, digital technology and patient-specific solutions. These developments have helped to simplify procedures, reduce treatment time, ensure more long-term and optimal outcomes and, ultimately, contribute to a higher level of patient satisfaction.

With these developments, new solutions and new companies are also continuing to emerge at a rapid pace, often making it more difficult to know what is the right choice for your practice and your implant patients. Some aspects to consider when choosing an implant partner may include:

- How long has the company been on the market?
- How focused are they on the research and documentation behind its products?
-What personnel and support are available to you in your product use and practice development?
- Is the company actively introducing new technologies and leading innovation and change?
- Will the company and products be around — not only today but tomorrow — when you need them?

These critical aspects to consider because, in most cases, your patients will rely on you for their long-term care. In turn, you should have the confidence that your implant provider will be there for you throughout the entire journey.

DENTSPLY Implants is based on a solid foundation of 40 years of expertise, knowledge and experience in all relevant fields and technologies of implant dentistry. Its comprehensive portfolio of solutions for all phases of implant therapy is designed to support its commitment to providing simplicity to its customers and is backed by extensive documentation, according to DENTSPLY.

The launch and introduction of ASTRA TECH Implant System EV is another example of the company’s innovation. The system provides many enhancements and innovations that help simplify the implant process, including a user-friendly surgical tray with three interchangeable overlay options, self-guiding impression components where only one hand is needed and a one-position-only placement design for ATLANTIS patient-specific abutments.

So what are you looking for in an implant company? If a strong history of experience and expertise, documented success, comprehensive solutions for all your implant needs and products and services of the highest quality matter to you, take a closer look at DENTSPLY Implants.