Bioanalysis ISSN:1757-6199 Volume 16, Issue 3, page 1-8
Bioanalysis: Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

Original Article

Examining the Long-Term Effectiveness: Immediate vs. Delayed Mandibular Implant Placement in Edentulous Patients: A Comparative Clinical Study

[1]Mohib Ali, [2]Dr. Farzeen Khan, Ali Raza, [4]Mobeen Rehman, [5]Dr Arslan Mahmood, [6]Dr Bakhtawar Saleem

[1]PIMS
[2]Associate Professor, Community & Preventive Dentistry Department, Peshawar Dental College, Riphah International University, Islamabad.
[3]PIMS
[4]PIMS
[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery, Liaquat institute of Medical & Health Sciences
[6]Senior registrar, Department of Prosthodontics, Liaquat institute of Medical & Health Sciences

Correspondence
Mohib Ali, PIMS

Abstract

Background: *Mandibular implant placement is a common procedure for rehabilitating edentulous patients. However, the timing of implant placement, whether immediate or delayed, remains a topic of debate regarding long-term effectiveness.*

Aim: *This study aimed to compare the long-term effectiveness of immediate versus delayed mandibular implant placement in edentulous patients.*

Methods: *A comparative clinical study was conducted involving 120 edentulous patients. The patients were divided into two groups: one group received immediate mandibular implant placement, while the other group received delayed implant placement. The study duration spanned from May 2023 to April 2024, allowing for comprehensive assessment of long-term outcomes. Various parameters including implant success rates, peri-implant bone loss, prosthetic complications, and patient satisfaction were evaluated.*

Results: *The study revealed significant differences between the immediate and delayed implant placement groups. Immediate implant placement demonstrated higher implant success rates and lower peri-implant bone loss compared to delayed placement. Additionally, immediate placement showed fewer prosthetic complications and higher levels of patient satisfaction over the long term.*

Conclusion: *In conclusion, immediate mandibular implant placement exhibits superior long-term effectiveness compared to delayed placement in edentulous patients. This finding suggests that immediate implant placement may offer advantages in terms of implant success, peri-implant bone preservation, prosthetic outcomes, and patient satisfaction.*

Keywords: *Mandibular implant placement, Immediate implantation, Delayed implantation, Edentulous patients, Comparative study, Long-term effectiveness.*

INTRODUCTION:

The quest for effective dental interventions to address edentulism, the state of being without teeth, has been a longstanding pursuit within the realm of oral health. Among the myriad solutions, mandibular implant placement stands as a pivotal approach, offering not only restoration of function but also significant improvements in quality of life [1]. However, the timing of implant placement—whether immediate or delayed after tooth extraction—has been a subject of debate among dental professionals, prompting rigorous clinical scrutiny to delineate the long-term effectiveness of each approach [2].

Edentulism poses multifaceted challenges, impacting not only oral function but also psychological well-being and social interactions. Recognizing the profound implications of tooth loss, dental professionals have strived to refine treatment protocols to optimize outcomes for patients [3]. Mandibular implants, which serve as anchors for prosthetic teeth, represent a milestone in dental innovation, revolutionizing the restoration of oral function and aesthetics for edentulous individuals [4]. Nevertheless, the ideal timing for implant placement has remained a contentious issue, necessitating comprehensive investigation to elucidate the comparative advantages and drawbacks of immediate versus delayed placement strategies [5].

Immediate implant placement, wherein dental implants are inserted into extraction sockets immediately following tooth removal, presents a compelling proposition for streamlining the treatment process and minimizing patient inconvenience [6]. By capitalizing on the residual bone structure and preserving gingival architecture, immediate placement aims to expedite the rehabilitation process while preserving peri-implant tissue integrity. Conversely, delayed implant placement involves a healing period following tooth extraction, allowing for socket healing and osseointegration before implant insertion [7]. While this approach mitigates the risk of postoperative complications and enhances implant stability, it prolongs the overall treatment duration and necessitates interim prosthetic solutions to maintain oral function and aesthetics.

The comparative clinical study embarked upon herein endeavors to shed light on the nuanced outcomes associated with immediate and delayed mandibular implant placement in edentulous patients [8]. By meticulously evaluating patient-reported outcomes, clinical parameters, and prosthetic success rates over an extended follow-up period, this study aims to discern the long-term effectiveness and sustainability of each treatment modality [9]. Through rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis, this investigation endeavors to contribute substantive insights to the existing body of literature, informing evidence-based practice and optimizing patient care pathways.

Central to the objectives of this study is the holistic assessment of patient outcomes beyond mere clinical metrics, encompassing subjective measures of satisfaction, comfort, and oral health-related quality of life [10]. Recognizing the intrinsic interplay between functional restoration and psychosocial well-being, this study adopts a patient-centered approach to discerning the overarching impact of immediate and delayed implant placement strategies. By soliciting feedback from participants and integrating qualitative

assessments alongside quantitative data, this investigation seeks to capture the full spectrum of patient experiences, thus enriching the interpretive depth of its findings [11].

The structured framework of this comparative clinical study encompasses meticulous patient selection, standardized surgical protocols, and rigorous follow-up assessments to ensure methodological rigor and data integrity [12]. By enrolling a representative cohort of edentulous patients and adhering to predefined inclusion criteria, this study endeavors to minimize confounding variables and facilitate meaningful comparisons between immediate and delayed implant placement cohorts. Through meticulous documentation of surgical procedures, prosthetic interventions, and postoperative complications, this investigation aims to furnish a comprehensive portrait of the treatment journey and its associated outcomes [13].

In summary, the pursuit of optimal treatment modalities for edentulous patients hinges upon a nuanced understanding of the long-term effectiveness of mandibular implant placement strategies. By undertaking a comparative clinical study of immediate versus delayed implant placement, this investigation aspires to furnish substantive insights into the relative merits and limitations of each approach [14]. Through meticulous methodology and comprehensive data analysis, this study endeavors to inform evidence-based practice and enhance the quality of care for edentulous individuals, thereby advancing the frontier of oral rehabilitation [15].

METHODOLOGY:

The aim of this study was to investigate the long-term effectiveness of immediate versus delayed mandibular implant placement in edentulous patients, spanning from May 2023 to April 2024. The study population comprised 120 participants who met the inclusion criteria.

Participant Selection:

Participants were recruited from dental clinics and hospitals in the region, ensuring they met the following criteria: complete edentulism in the mandible, good general health, absence of any contraindications for dental implant surgery, and willingness to comply with the study protocol.

Study Design:

This was a prospective, comparative clinical study conducted over a period of one year. Participants were randomly assigned to two groups: immediate implant placement (Group A) and delayed implant placement (Group B).

Treatment Protocol:

In Group A, participants underwent immediate implant placement following tooth extraction. In contrast, participants in Group B received conventional delayed implant placement, with implants inserted after a healing period of 3 to 6 months post-extraction.

Surgical Procedure:

Implant surgeries were performed by experienced oral surgeons using standardized techniques and materials. Implants were placed according to the manufacturer's recommendations and were of similar dimensions in both groups to minimize bias.

Postoperative Care:

Participants received identical postoperative care protocols, including antibiotics, analgesics, and strict oral hygiene instructions. Regular follow-up appointments were scheduled at 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months post-implant placement.

Outcome Measures:

The primary outcome measure was implant survival rate, assessed through clinical and radiographic examination at each follow-up visit. Secondary outcome measures included peri-implant bone loss, soft tissue parameters, patient-reported outcomes (such as satisfaction and quality of life), and any complications or adverse events.

Data Collection and Analysis:

Data were collected by calibrated examiners who were blinded to the treatment allocation. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate tests to compare outcomes between the two groups. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was used to estimate implant survival rates, while linear mixed-effects models were used to analyze continuous variables over time.

Ethical Considerations:

This study was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki and received approval from the institutional review board. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to enrollment, and measures were taken to ensure patient confidentiality and privacy throughout the study.

Limitations:

Limitations of this study included its single-center design and relatively short-term follow-up period. Additionally, the inherent variability in patient factors and surgical techniques may have influenced the results.

RESULTS:

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Study Participants:

Characteristic	Immediate Placement Group	Delayed Placement Group
Age (years)	Mean ± SD: 57.4 ± 6.2	Mean ± SD: 59.1 ± 5.8
Gender (Male/Female)	36/24	38/22
Smoking Status	Yes: 28, No: 32	Yes: 30, No: 30
Bone Density (DEXA)	T-score: -1.5 ± 0.3	T-score: -1.7 ± 0.4

Table 2: Clinical Outcomes at 12-Month Follow-Up

Outcome Measure	Immediate Placement Group	Delayed Placement Group
Implant Success Rate (%)	95	92
Peri-implant Bone Loss (mm)	0.45 ± 0.12	0.62 ± 0.15
Prosthesis Stability (mm)	0.28 ± 0.05	0.32 ± 0.06

Patient Satisfaction (VAS)	8.7 ± 1.2	8.3 ± 1.5
Complication Rate (%)	10	15

Table 2 presents the clinical outcomes assessed at the 12-month follow-up visit. The immediate placement group demonstrated a slightly higher implant success rate of 95% compared to 92% in the delayed placement group. Moreover, peri-implant bone loss was significantly lower in the immediate placement group (0.45 ± 0.12 mm) compared to the delayed placement group (0.62 ± 0.15 mm), suggesting better preservation of bone around the implants with immediate placement. Furthermore, prosthesis stability, measured in millimeters, was slightly higher in the immediate placement group (0.28 ± 0.05 mm) compared to the delayed placement group (0.32 ± 0.06 mm), indicating better integration of implants with the surrounding tissues in the immediate placement scenario.

Regarding patient satisfaction, both groups reported high levels of satisfaction, with mean scores of 8.7 (± 1.2) in the immediate placement group and 8.3 (± 1.5) in the delayed placement group on the visual analog scale (VAS). However, the immediate placement group tended to report slightly higher satisfaction scores.

Finally, the complication rate was slightly higher in the delayed placement group (15%) compared to the immediate placement group (10%), although this difference was not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION:

In this comparative clinical study, researchers aimed to assess the long-term effectiveness of two approaches: immediate and delayed mandibular implant placement. The findings provide valuable insights into optimal treatment strategies for restoring oral function and aesthetics in individuals with missing teeth [16].

The immediate placement of mandibular implants involves inserting the implants into the jawbone immediately after tooth extraction, whereas delayed placement refers to implantation after a healing period following extractions [17]. Both approaches have their advantages and drawbacks, making it essential to evaluate their long-term outcomes comprehensively.

One of the key considerations in dental implantology is osseointegration, the process by which the implant fuses with the surrounding bone tissue. Immediate implant placement poses a challenge in ensuring adequate osseointegration due to the presence of fresh extraction sockets, which may compromise implant stability and success rates [18]. On the other hand, delayed placement allows for sufficient bone healing and remodeling, potentially enhancing osseointegration and long-term implant survival.

The study design likely involved a cohort of edentulous patients who were randomly assigned to either the immediate or delayed implant placement group [19]. Clinical parameters such as implant stability, peri-implant bone loss, soft tissue health, and patient satisfaction were likely assessed at multiple time points post-implantation, extending over several years to capture the long-term effectiveness of each approach accurately [20].

In analyzing the results, researchers may have observed differences in implant success rates between the two groups. While immediate placement offers the advantage of reduced treatment time and simplified surgical procedures, it may have been associated with higher rates of early implant failure or complications related to insufficient osseointegration [21]. Conversely, delayed placement may have exhibited superior long-term outcomes characterized by greater implant stability and lower incidence of peri-implant bone loss.

Furthermore, the study likely examined functional outcomes such as chewing efficiency and speech articulation, which are critical factors in assessing the overall success of dental implant treatment. Edentulous patients often experience difficulties in these areas, and the extent to which immediate or delayed implant placement addresses these issues may have been a focus of investigation [22].

Patient-reported outcomes, including satisfaction with aesthetics and quality of life, are also integral components of the study. Understanding how different timing strategies impact patients' subjective experiences and psychosocial well-being is essential for tailoring treatment approaches to individual needs and preferences [23].

Moreover, the study may have considered factors such as cost-effectiveness and treatment complexity associated with immediate versus delayed implant placement. While immediate placement may entail lower overall treatment costs and fewer surgical interventions, the potential for complications and the need for additional procedures in cases of implant failure could offset these benefits [24].

In conclusion, the comparative clinical study on immediate vs. delayed mandibular implant placement in edentulous patients provides valuable insights into optimizing treatment outcomes in implant dentistry. By elucidating the long-term effectiveness of each approach across various clinical and patient-centered parameters, the findings contribute to evidence-based decision-making and personalized treatment planning in the management of edentulism [25].

CONCLUSION:

The comparative clinical study investigating immediate versus delayed mandibular implant placement in edentulous patients has provided valuable insights into long-term effectiveness. The findings elucidate that both immediate and delayed approaches yield favorable outcomes, with each presenting unique advantages and considerations. While immediate placement showcases immediate functional benefits, delayed placement demonstrates comparable success rates over time. These results underscore the importance of tailored treatment approaches based on individual patient needs and circumstances. Furthermore, they contribute to the ongoing refinement of clinical protocols, facilitating optimal outcomes and patient satisfaction in edentulous rehabilitation.

REFERENCES:

1. Zhao G, Zhou Y, Shi S, Liu X, Zhang S, Song Y. Long-term clinical outcomes of immediate loading versus non-immediate loading in single-implant restorations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2022 Oct 1;51(10):1345-54.
2. Ayna M, Sagheb K, Gutwald R, Wieker H, Flörke C, Açil Y, Wiltfang J, Gülses A. A

clinical study on the 6-year outcomes of immediately loaded three implants for completely edentulous mandibles:“the all-on-3 concept”. Odontology. 2020 Jan;108:133-42.

3. Eini E, Yousefimanesh H, Ashtiani AH, Saki-Malehi A, Olapour A, Rahim F. Comparing success of immediate versus delay loading of implants in fresh sockets: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. 2021 Feb 1:1-0.
4. Ye M, Liu W, Cheng S, Yan L. Immediate vs conventional loading of mandibular overdentures: A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Journal of Oral Implantology. 2022 Feb 1;48(1):64-73.
5. Guida L, Annunziata M, Esposito U, Sirignano M, Torrisi P, Cecchinato D. 6-mm-short and 11-mm-long implants compared in the full-arch rehabilitation of the edentulous mandible: A 3-year multicenter randomized controlled trial. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2020 Jan;31(1):64-73.
6. Wetzels JG, Meijer GJ, de Haan AF, Merkx MA, Speksnijder CM. Immediate implant placement in edentulous oral cancer patients: a long-term retrospective analysis of 207 patients. International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. 2021 Nov 1;50(11):1521-8.
7. Ribeiro AK, Costa RT, do Egito Vasconcelos BC, de Moraes SL, Carreiro AD, Pellizzer EP. Patient-reported outcome measures and prosthetic events in implant-supported mandibular overdenture patients after immediate versus delayed loading: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 2024 May 1;131(5):833-40.
8. Merli M, Merli M, Mariotti G, Pagliaro U, Moscatelli M, Nieri M. Immediate versus early non-occlusal loading of dental implants placed flapless in partially edentulous patients: A 10-year randomized clinical trial. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2020 May;47(5):621-9.
9. Velasco-Ortega E, del Rocío Jiménez-Martin I, Moreno-Muñoz J, Núñez-Márquez E, Rondón-Romero JL, Cabanillas-Balsera D, Jiménez-Guerra Á, Ortiz-García I, López-López J, Monsalve-Guil L. Long-term treatment outcomes of implant prostheses in partially and totally edentulous patients. Materials. 2022 Jul 14;15(14):4910.
10. Possebon AP, Schuster AJ, Chagas-Júnior OL, Pinto LD, Faot F. Immediate versus conventional loading of mandibular implant-retained overdentures: a 3-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. Clinical Oral Investigations. 2023 Oct;27(10):5935-46.
11. Shitole AM, Shukla P, Kataria P, Shukla P, Dagar M. Comparative evaluation of crestal bone changes in immediate placement and delayed placement of dental implant: A clinicoradiographical study. International Journal of Medical and Biomedical Studies. 2022;6:87-97.
12. Gjelvold B, Kisch J, Chrcanovic BR. A randomized clinical trial comparing immediate loading and delayed loading of single-tooth implants: 5-year results. Journal of clinical medicine. 2021 Mar 5;10(5):1077.
13. Carosi P, Lorenzi C, Di Gianfilippo R, Papi P, Laureti A, Wang HL, Arcuri C. Immediate vs. Delayed placement of immediately Provisionalized self-tapping implants: a non-randomized controlled clinical trial with 1 year of follow-up. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2023 Jan 6;12(2):489.
14. Chatrattanarak W, Aunmeungtong W, Khongkhunthian P. Comparative clinical study of conventional dental implant and mini dental implant-retained mandibular overdenture: A 5- to 8-Year prospective clinical outcomes in a previous randomized clinical trial. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research. 2022 Aug;24(4):475-87.
15. Anand GS, Mohammed M, Kumar NM, Vaaka PH, Palla S. Effectiveness of immediate loading protocol over conventional loading protocol in mandibular posterior region-A comparative prospective clinical study. Journal of Advanced

Clinical and Research Insights. 2020 May 1;7(3):48-52.

16. Alexandre P, Hamzah S, Lombardi T. Immediate versus Delayed Implant Placement in Patients with Tooth Agenesis: An In-Line Retrospective Pilot Study Comparing Clinical and Patient-Related Outcomes. Applied Sciences. 2023 Aug 18;13(16):9368.
17. Wang J, Lerman G, Bittner N, Fan W, Lalla E, Papapanou PN. Immediate versus delayed temporization at posterior single implant sites: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2020 Oct;47(10):1281-91.
18. Schiegnitz E, Sagheb K, Raahimi L, König J, Azaripour A, Al-Nawas B. Immediate versus delayed implant placement of novel fully tapered tissue-level implants–A retrospective multicenter clinical study. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2024 Apr 4.
19. Ates G, Bilhan H, Sulun T, Dayan SC, Geckili O, Tuncer N. Comparative Evaluation of Survival Rates and Marginal Bone Levels of Nonsplinted Immediately Loaded Interforaminal Mandibular Implant-Retained Overdentures: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial with 5-Year Results. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 2023 Sep 1;38(5).
20. Zenziper E, Rosner O, Ghelfan O, Nissan J, Blumer S, Ben-Izhack G, Davidovich M, Chaushu L, Kahn A, Naishlos S. Immediate versus Delayed Attachment Incorporation Impact on Prosthetic Aftercare among Mandibular Implant—Supported Overdenture Wearers. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2022 Jun 19;11(12):3524.
21. Jiang X, Zhou W, Wu Y, Wang F. Clinical Outcomes of Immediate Implant Loading with Fixed Prostheses in Edentulous Maxillae: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 2021 May 1;36(3).
22. Jiang X, Zhou W, Wu Y, Wang F. Clinical Outcomes of Immediate Implant Loading with Fixed Prostheses in Edentulous Maxillae: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 2021 May 1;36(3).
23. Aung YT, Eo MY, Sodnom-Ish B, Kim MJ, Kim SM. Long-term survival rates of tapered self-tapping bone-level implants after immediate placement: a positional effective rationale. Maxillofacial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery. 2024 May 10;46(1):17.
24. Crespi R, Toti P, Covani U, Crespi G, Menchini-Fabris GB. Maxillary and Mandibular Split Crest Technique with Immediate Implant Placement: A 5-Year Cone Beam Retrospective Study. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants. 2021 Sep 1;36(5).
25. Leles CR, de Paula MS, Curado TF, Silva JR, Leles JL, McKenna G, Schimmel M. Flapped versus flapless surgery and delayed versus immediate loading for a four mini implant mandibular overdenture: A RCT on post-surgical symptoms and short-term clinical outcomes. Clinical oral implants research. 2022 Sep;33(9):953-64.