On the 44th annual congress of the German Association of Dental Implantology (DGZI), Prof. Dr Herbert Deppe was elected president of the society by the members’ assembly. For three years, Prof. Deppe was assessor of the executive committee. As associate professor for dental surgery and implantology he teaches at the TU Munich and due to his huge engagement he has a lot of contacts to other scientific societies and institutions in the dental world. In the following interview carried out by Markus Brakel, press spokesman of the DGZI, Prof. Deppe talks about goals and challenges concerning his presidency but also the DGZI in total.

Prof. Deppe: In regard of the implantological societies, I see a big challenge in their strengthening. Spin-offs lead to small organisations with possibly only a few hundred members, which are not taken seriously anymore. Such negative consequences can be seen on the part of the trade unions. For me it is important to tackle this in a cooperative way. The difficulty of establishing this cooperative thought becomes clear when thinking of the joint event of the big implantological societies in Munich planned in the year before which unfortunately failed to come about. That’s pretty sad, I think.

For science, development has to focus on materials research on the one hand—especially in the area of high-performance ceramics—but also on the biologisation of implants on the other hand. This means: moving away from “death material” towards the “tooth from the test tube.” Experiments on mice do already point the way for how to grow a “third teeth.” This is one of the challenges science has to face.

Speaking of education, a training of all those who have not dealt with implantology yet is very important to me—this especially includes the dental technicians. From my point of view, the DGZI is a leading force in the integration of dental technicians.

Which goals did you set yourself for your presidency?

In the first place, I want to move forward the intensification of the contacts with other specialised fields as periodontology or colleagues from prosthetics and biomechanics. Thereby, I would like to extend the already existing personal contacts and those of the DGZI; here is still something to do. As leading author or co-author of three guidelines of the DGZMK, I have good contacts to other specialised fields as the German Association for Periodontology, which I would like to win for joint congresses.

Since your establishment, dental implantology has undergone a tumultuous development which is still continuing. As the oldest German implantological society, where do you see the DGZI’s currently biggest challenges?
Furthermore, it is my heartfelt concern to intensify the collaboration between the oral and maxillofacial surgeons and the dental profession. Of course, this should be understood at the disposal of the patients’ health in order to search for the patient’s best solution as a team. Hereby, I would propose the excellent cooperation of the DGMKG and the BDO in Bavaria as a leading example.

_Keyword: international contacts. The DGZI has a close connection especially to Japan. Which importance has the professional exchange across state borders for you?_

International contacts exist—as you already said—traditionally in the DGZI especially to colleagues in Japan and Switzerland. However, we are also strongly connected with the Arabian area. At the moment, I think that the strengthening of the already taken paths is more important than getting worked up over something new. Especially in the Arabian area this is currently not easy. This is also what we notice at the TU where it is difficult to keep in contact with the local universities, since over there was not only an awakening of spring but also some icy breeze, which makes it not easier in all cases. Therefore, I would be happy if we could address this topic intensively within the executive committee.

_With the reinforcement of the factor quality, the Federal Government of Germany plans a paradigm shift in health policy which becomes practically tangible with the foundation of the new institute for quality. What could this mean for the dental implantology in the daily practice?_

In principle, improvements in quality should be supported. In terms of “quality” in the area of implantology, young patients with cleft palate come to my mind that are constitutionally lacking teeth and often cannot get an implant treatment due to the current legal situation. Of course, there are exceptional cases in the SGB V (German Code of Social Law V), which nonetheless, based on my experiences, are too much restricted. I can imagine that the DGZI will contribute to this. Future will show if there can be achieved a solution with the new quality institute.

_Which profile should the DGZI gain during your presidency among the scientific societies in the long run?_

There is no need to reinvent the DGZI. We should tackle things in all modesty. Thereby, the DGZI has a distinctive profile: the society has always seen itself as representative of the practising colleagues as well as the universities, where special credits go to my predecessors. For me it is out of the question that we will further carry out award ceremonies for doctoral theses and offer curricula to university and practice. However, we want to stick to our values which are on the one hand letting established practitioners feel at home in the DGZI and on the other hand stick to the clear scientific demand of our society. One could say: In old spirit to new goals! Thereby, a personal remark should be allowed: We have to remind ourselves day-to-day that we have one of the greatest professions. Here, modesty is called for. This also includes the insight that one or another step is better made by someone else and thus react accordingly. With this in mind, I would go along with the executive committee: Keep your feet on the ground—and keep reaching for the stars!

Many thanks for this interview!