Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

A Clinico-Radiological Assessment of the Stability and Crestal Bone Loss of Implants Placed Using Osseodensification and Traditional Drilling Protocol: A Comparative Study

Dr Saransh Malot[1], Dr Mitrata Vyas[2*], Dr Shashank Sharma[3], Dr Nidhi Sharma[4], Dr Heena Mehta[5], Dr Dave Chinmay Sharadchandra[6]

[1]Reader, Department of Prosthodontics, Darshan Dental College and Hospital, Udaipur
[2]Senior Lecturer Department of Pediatrics and Prevention Dentistry, Darshan Dental college and Hospital, Udaipur
[3]Senior lecturer Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Darshan Dental College and Hospital, Udaipur
[4]Senior Lecturer, Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Daswani Dental College and Hospital, Kota
[5]Reader, Department of Oral medicine and Radiology, Darshan dental college and hospital, Udaipur
[6]Assistant professor, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Government Dental College and Hospital, Ahmedabad

***Corresponding author: Dr Mitrata Vyas, Senior Lecturer Department of Pediatrics and Prevention Dentistry, Darshan Dental college and Hospital, Udaipur**

(Received: 16 May 2023 Revised: 22 June 2023 Accepted: 23 Aug 2023)

KEYWORDS
Crestal bone levels; implant stability; osseodensification; resonance frequency analysis

ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim of the present study was to evaluate and compare the stability of the implant and the loss of crestal bone in the implants placed using OD drilling and traditional drilling technique.

Methods: The study was conducted in the Department of Prosthodontics, Darshan Dental College and Hospital, Udaipur to evaluate and compare the stability and crestal bone loss (CBL) of implants placed using traditional and OD drilling technique. For the purpose of the study, a total number of 30 patients who required implant-supported prosthesis in maxillary anterior region were selected from the outpatient department.

Results: The primary stability of implant placed using OD drills was found to be slightly higher than implant placed with traditional drill. On comparison, there was no statistical significance of primary stability obtained at baseline and 6 months when subjected to unpaired t-test ($P > 0.05$). In the intragroup comparison the data was found to be statistically significant at 4 months for Group II and at 8 months for Group I ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: There was no statistically significant difference in implant stability between the traditional drilling and OD drilling

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

technique ($P < 0.05$). On comparison of crestal bone levels between OD and traditional drilling, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups ($P < 0.05$).

1. INTRODUCTION

Dental implants have become a popular alternative in the oral and maxillofacial rehabilitation after the introduction of the concept of osseointegration. The volume and quality of the bone present at the site are important factors determining the type of surgical procedure and the type of the implant, and they are related to the success of dental implant surgery.[1] Maxilla and mandible present a wide variation in respect to the bone density and the type of bone present in different regions. A poor density bone, such as in the maxillary posterior region, can negatively influence the bone to implant contact and delay osseointegration.[2,3] A regular sequential osteotomy removes a considerable amount of bone to make the preparation enough to receive an implant with decided diameter. This may be deleterious in a condition where the bone is soft or the density of the bone is poor such as in maxillary posterior region. Therefore, a new osteotomy preparation technique, osseodensification, has recently been developed.[4,5]

Nevertheless, adequate primary stability is necessary to predict the survival of dental implants. This has led to the practice of under-preparing the implant bed to be significantly narrower in diameter than the thread diameter of the implant, especially in soft bone. This is associated with the self-tapping screw implant design, which guarantees a close fit of the dental implant and bone.[6,7] Although this widely used surgical technique can achieve high insertion torque(IT) or implant stability quotient (ISQ) values, it can produce excessive strain on the bone, which causes transient necrosis in the surrounding bone and may delay or impair bone remodeling.[8,9] Further, friction between the dental implant and bone could damage the implant surface owing to the release of titanium particles.[10] Thus, the under-preparation of the implant bed produces high primary stability; however, it increases peri-implant remodeling and subsequent stability loss during the short- term healing.[11]

The aim of the present study was to evaluate and compare the stability of the implant and the loss of crestal bone in the implants placed using OD drilling and traditional drilling technique.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in the Department of Prosthodontics, Darshan Dental College and Hospital, Udaipur to evaluate and compare the stability and crestal bone loss (CBL) of implants placed using traditional and OD drilling technique. For the purpose of the study, a total number of 30 patients who required implant-supported prosthesis in maxillary anterior region were selected from the outpatient department.

Patients with signs of parafunctional habits, untreated periodontal disease, heavy smoker (more than10 cigarettes/day), and pregnant or lactating women were excluded from the study. Furthermore, all patients met the following inclusion criteria: good oral hygiene, single tooth missing in the maxillary region with D3 (350–850 HU) and D4 (150–350 HU) bone with adjacent and opposite tooth present. Patients were given oral and written information regarding the risk of surgery and written

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

informed consent and ethical clearance was obtained.

Procedure

For the purpose of the study, patients were divided into two groups, i.e., Group I and Group II. In Group I, 10 implants were placed in maxilla using traditional drilling technique, while in Group II, 10 implants were placed using OD drilling technique following the standard two-stage procedure of implant placement. The patients selected for Group II were mainly with narrow ridges. Preoperative analysis of surgical site was done clinically and by using cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT). To reduce the postoperative swelling, patients were given antibiotic therapy, i.e., 500 mg amoxicillin + 125 mg clavulanate potassium (AUGMENTIN 625 mg Duo, Galaxo SmithKline) 24 h prior to surgery which was continued for 5 days postsurgery. Paracetamol 325 mg and dexamethasone 0.75 mg were given half an hour before commencing the surgery. The surgical site was prepared following standard surgical protocol. A crestal incision was made and a full-thickness mucoperiosteal flap was raised at the site of implant placement. Following elevation of flap, surgical stent was placed at the site and optimal implant location was then marked using a surgical round bur with the guidance of surgical stent. ADIN Touareg S spiral dental implants of various diameter and length were used for the study. Decision tree for osseodensification protocol [Table 1] was followed. For Group I (traditional drilling technique), the osteotomy was prepared up to the desired depth using the Pilot Drill (speed of 800–1000 rpm at 1:20 reduction torque), thereafter, traditional drills were used in sequence as per the implant diameter protocol. For example, if a 3.75-mm diameter of implant was to be placed, the traditional drills (Alpha Bio – DFI, Israel) of gradually wider diameter ranging from D2.8, D3.2, and D3.65 were used. After final implant placement, veneer grafting was done (Bio-Oss granules, Geistlich) using membrane (periocol–GTR) and primary closure was achieved.

For Group II, Osteotomy was prepared to the desired depth using the pilot drill (clockwise drill speed 800–1500 rpm with copious irrigation) thereafter Osseodensification drills were used in sequence as per the implant diameter protocol).

Using VT1525, then depending on the density of the bone (soft or medium), the drill motor is reversed (counterclockwise drill speed 800–1500 rpm with copious irrigation). Gradually wider diameter burs were used, i.e., VT1828, VT2535, and VT2838. The final placement of implant was done, and simultaneous buccal veneer grafting was performed.

The second stage was done after 6 months[12] and standard prosthetic protocol is followed for fabrication of implant prosthesis. During the course of study, implant healing was uneventful. All 20 implants remained stable and showed no sign of pain, suppuration, or peri-implant infection throughout the study.

Stability of Implants

The stability of each implant was measured clinically using resonance frequency analysis (RFA) (Osstell™, Integration Diagnostics, Savedalen, Sweden). RFA was carried out at the time of implant placement and 6 months after surgery. It was recorded three times for each implant at every interval. The system frequency response was measured by attaching transducer to the implant in buccolingual direction. The excitation sign was given over a range of frequencies (typically 5–15

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

KHz with peak amplitude of 1 V), and the first flexural resonance was measured.

Crestal bone level

The crestal bone levels were evaluated around the implant at baseline, after 6 and 8 months (postloading) using CBCT. The palatal and labial measurements were done on the sagittal section, while mesial and distal measurements were done on the tangential or coronal sections in the CBCT using measuring tools. The CBL was indicated by a negative value (−) and bone growth was indicated by a positive (+) value. The second-stage surgery was performed after 6 months of implant placement. All the observations relevant to each parameter, i.e., RFA values and crestal bone levels which were recorded at baseline, 6 and 8 months were expressed in the form of mean, standard deviations, and maximum and minimum scores. Unpaired t-test was used to make intergroup comparisons, while one-way ANOVA F-test was used to make intragroup comparisons. Standard prosthetic procedure was used for the fabrication of prosthesis and implant protected occlusion was given.

Table 1: Decision tree for osseodensification protocol

Implant diameter	**Drill**	**Bur 1**	**Bur 2**	**Bur 3**	**Bur 4**
3.5, 3.7, 3.8	Pilot drill	VT1525	VT2535		
4.0, 4.2, 4.3	Pilot drill	VT1828	VT2838		
4.5, 4.7, 4.8	Pilot drill	VT1525	VT2535	VT3545	
5.0, 5.2, 5.3	Pilot drill	VT1828	VT2838	VT3848	

3. RESULTS

Table 2: Table with values measured

	Osseodensification method		**Traditional method**	
S no.	**Immediate postoperative (RFA1)**	**Before loading (RFA2)**	**Immediate postoperative (RFA1)**	**Before loading (RFA2)**
1	56	58	57	56
2	71	63	36	62
3	36	62	76	67
4	76	67	38	61
5	68	71	75	76
6	71	63	36	56
7	68	69	63	64
8	72	67	59	66
9	76	66	77	74
10	58	74	77	75
Mean	64.6	66.4	58	66.2
SD	11.37	5.25	18.22	7.43
Maximum	76	74	77	75
Minimum	36	58	36	56

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

Table 3: Crestal bone levels from first implant thread after immediate post op

At baseline (Osseodensification method)				At baseline (Traditional method)			
Labial buccal	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**	**Labial buccal**	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**
2.01	1.81	0.38	0.72	2.01	1.81	0.38	0.72
0	0.35	0.23	1.28	−4.54	0.64	0	−0.97
−4.55	0.69	0	−0.96	0.37	1.02	0	−0.72
0.37	1.2	0	−0.72	−1.63	1.02	−0.38	−3.09
2.62	2.43	−2.32	−0.88	1.08	2.01	0.35	0.61
0	0.35	0.28	1.28	−1.28	−0.97	−1.28	−4.27
−0.57	0	0.37	0.31	−3.25	1	−1.81	0.81
−0.81	0	0.58	0	1.09	0.37	2.81	−1.37
2.62	2.43	−2.34	−0.88	1.21	1.28	2.1	2.11
−2.72	1.77	−1.04	1.39	1.08	2.01	0.35	0.61
−0.101	1.103	−0.388	0.153	−0.385	1.018	0.251	−0.557
2.278	0.955	1.119	0.977	2.187	0.896	1.381	1.957
2.62	2.43	0.58	1.39	2.01	2.01	2.81	2.11
−4.55	0	−2.32	−0.96	−4.54	−0.97	−1.81	−4.27

Table 4: Crestal bone levels from first implant thread after 6 months

After 6 months (Osseodensification method)				After 6 months (Traditional method)			
Labial buccal	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**	**Labial buccal**	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**
1.02	0.21	−0.41	1.21	1.02	0.21	−0.41	1.21
−0.57	0	0.37	0.31	3.34	0	0	−0.97
−3.34	0	0	−0.97	−2.16	0	−2.47	−1.71
−2.16	0	−2.47	−1.71	0.58	1.65	−1.1	1.13
1.01	1.28	−1.02	1.11	0.52	1.01	0.37	0.52
1.01	1.28	−1.02	1.11	3.53	2.28	−4.8	−1.14
2.31	1.02	−1.02	0.88	0.33	2.01	0	−0.73
1.11	0	−3.54	1.74	−1.83	3.58	0	−1.69
1.96	−0.98	−0.52	1.61	1.5	1.89	0.91	2.43
2.9	2.06	−2.21	2.05	0.52	1.01	0.37	0.52
0.525	0.487	−1.184	0.734	0.735	1.364	−0.713	−0.043
1.980	0.894	1.211	1.206	1.841	1.146	1.717	1.403
2.9	2.06	0.37	2.05	3.53	3.58	0.91	2.43
−3.34	−0.98	−3.54	−1.71	−2.16	0	−4.8	−1.71

Table 5: Crestal bone levels from first implant thread after 8 months

Post loading (Osseodensification method)				Post loading (Traditional drilling method)			
Labial buccal	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**	**Labial buccal**	**Palatal**	**Mesial**	**Distal**
0.34	0	−0.21	0	0.34	0	−0.21	0
−0.81	0	0.58	0	0	0	−1.14	−1.24
0	0	−1.14	−1.24	0.38	0	−0.32	0
0.38	0	−0.32	0	0	0	−1.18	−1.23
2.31	1.02	−1.02	0.88	4.57	1.51	2.08	0

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

1.76	−0.98	−0.57	−2.58	2.53	2.21	−0.52	−0.23
−1.27	−1.98	−1.34	1.09	0	0	0	2.01
1.34	1.21	0.21	−1.01	0	0	1.02	1.62
0.53	1.01	−0.21	1.21	1.35	2.01	−1.01	1.02
1.34	2.01	0.3	1.01	4.57	1.51	2.08	0
0.592	0.229	−0.372	−0.064	1.374	0.724	0.080	0.195
1.122	1.151	0.644	1.230	1.867	0.957	1.236	1.076
2.31	2.01	0.58	1.21	4.57	2.21	2.08	2.01
−1.27	−1.98	−1.34	−2.58	0	0	−1.18	−1.24

The primary stability of implant placed using OD drills was found to be slightly higher than implant placed with traditional drill. On comparison, there was no statistical significance of primary stability obtained at baseline and 6 months when subjected to unpaired t-test ($P > 0.05$). Table 2-5

Table 6: Comparison among the different sites for different time points (at baseline, 6 months and 8 months) for osseodensification and traditional drilling technique

Time points	**Source of variation**	***P***	***F* (Cal.)**	**df**
At base line	Between groups (traditional drill method)	0.079	2.448	3
	Between groups (osseodensifying drill technique)	0.172	1.764	3
After 6 months	Between groups (traditional drilling technique)	0.407	0.992	3
	Between groups (osseodensifying drilling technique)	0.017	3.872	3
After 8 months	Between groups (traditional drilling technique)	0.017	3.869	3
	Between groups (osseodensifying drilling technique)	0.183	1.707	3

Test applied: (by one-way ANOVA-F-test). In the intragroup comparison the data was found to be statistically significant at 4 months for Group II and at 8 months for Group I ($P < 0.05$).

4. DISCUSSION

Immediate loading has revolutionized implant dentistry by fulfilling the patients need for restoration of the edentulous site without much delay. However, the decisive factor for immediate loading is an optimum primary stability[13] which in turn is effected mostly by the surgical procedures and the quality of the bone. Maintaining bone bulk and density during implant site preparation is essential for initial bone-implant contact and biomechanical stability. Hence, in order to achieve an optimum stability to allow for immediate loading, an adequate volume of bone in the implant bed is essential. The challenges for achieving primary stability are often found in maxilla where bone is deficient both in terms of quality and quantity. However, there are several surgical techniques introduced in the past for enhancing primary stability in such low-density areas. Undersizing the osteotomy is a common practice, especially

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

in narrow ridges to preserve bone bulk and to achieve increase in the primary stability; however, undersizing the osteotomy does creates a high degree of bone mechanical strain.[14] Drilling protocol as a whole, be it undersizing osteotomy or conventional method for dental implant placement, has several drawbacks such as heat generation and bone removal, which worsens the stability in low-density bone.

The primary stability of implant placed using OD drills was found to be slightly higher than implant placed with traditional drill. On comparison, there was no statistical significance of primary stability obtained at baseline and 6 months when subjected to unpaired t-test ($P > 0.05$). In the intragroup comparison the data was found to be statistically significant at 4 months for Group II and at 8 months for Group I ($P < 0.05$). The recently introduced concept of Osseodensification has limited implant survival rates in humans, as reported in the literature.[15,16] One study reported a survival rate of 97% in crestal maxillary sinus lift procedures[16], which was similar to the success rate observed in this study (98.1%). Another study reported survival of 92.8% when Osseodensification was used for alveolar ridge expansion[15], which was inferior to the 98.1% success rate in this observation. A recent study showed a 100% success rate on implants placed by Osseodensification, but with a small sample size (10 implants).[17]

This report provides further evidence to support Osseodensification as a valid method to increase success rates in immediate implant placement protocols, with and without immediate loading, using a larger sample size. Despite the limited long-term evidence of success, Osseodensification has shown to improve primary stability of dental implants.[18] This appears to be more significant during immediate loading protocols, where high insertion torques are required for successful treatment. Recent in vitro studies compared standard drilling sequences with Osseodensification protocols in low-density polyurethane blocks, and also concluded that OD resulted in higher primary stability values.[19,20] Fresh extraction sites are known to provide reduced insertion torque and consequently inferior primary stability for implant placement. A recent study, however, presented a 93.1% implant survival rate in immediate implant placement in molar areas with septum expansion instrumented by Osseodensification.[21]

At 8 months of implant placement in the present study, the crestal bone levels for Group II was 36.90%, while for Group I, it was 29.84% as compared to the 6 months. This shows that the crestal bone levels in Group II were higher as compared to crestal bone levels in Group I. The reason for such differences in crestal bone levels can be attributed to the difference in the healing pattern. In Group II, there was always a thin labial bone left after creating osteotomy, while in Group I, there was dehiscence in most of the cases on labial aspects. Thus, in Group II, the osteogenic potential of the leftover labial bone, combined with the osteoconductive potential of the bone graft provided better vascularization and faster angiogenesis. This is in accordance with the study done by Maiorana et al[22] who concluded that bio-Oss can be placed on grafted area taking advantage of its osteoconductive property and compensating for the natural bone resorption that always occurs. The autografted bone chips in the osteotomy wall of Group II were also nuclei for more and dense bone formation as compared to Group I. Since the bone graft requires a

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

very long time for its resorption, bone healing was slower in Group I.

5. CONCLUSION

There was no statistically significant difference in implant stability between the traditional drilling and OD drilling technique ($P < 0.05$). On comparison of crestal bone levels between OD and traditional drilling, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups ($P < 0.05$).

6. REFERENCES

1. Huwais S, Meyer EG. A novel osseous densification approach in implant osteotomy preparation to increase biomechanical primary stability, bone mineral density, and bone-to-implant contact. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2017;32(1):27–36.
2. Isoda K, Ayukawa Y, Tsukiyama Y, et al. Relationship between the bone density estimated by cone-beam computed tomography and the primary stability of dental implants. Clin Oral Implants Res 2012;23(7):83
3. Cassetta M, Stefanelli LV, Pacifici A, et al. How accurate is CBCT in measuring bone density? A comparative CBCT-CT in vitro study. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2014;16 (4):471–478.
4. Trisi P, Berardini M, Falco A, et al. New osseodensification implant site preparation method to increase bone density in low-density bone: In vivo evaluation in sheep. Implant Dent 2016;25(1):24.
5. Lioubavina-Hack N, Lang NP, Karring T. Significance of primary stability for osseointegration of dental implants. Clin Oral Implant Res 2006;17(3):24 4–250.
6. Jimbo, R.; Giro, G.; Marin, C.; Granato, R.; Suzuki, M.; Tovar, N.; Lilin, T.; Janal, M.; Coelho, P.G. Simplified drilling technique does not decrease dental implant osseointegration: A preliminary report. J. Periodontol. 2013, 84, 1599–1605.
7. Jimbo, R.; Janal, M.N.; Marin, C.; Giro, G.; Tovar, N.; Coelho, P.G. The effect of implant diameter on osseointegration utilizing simplified drilling protocols. Clin. Oral Implants Res. 2014, 25, 1295–1300.
8. Coelho P.G., Marin C., Teixeira H.S., Campos F.E., Gomes J.B., Guastaldi F., Anchieta R.B., Silveira L., Bonfante E.A. Biomechanical evaluation of undersized drilling on implant biomechanical stability at early implantation times. J. Oral Maxillofac. Surg. 2013, 71, e69–e75.
9. Duyck J., Roesems R., Cardoso M.V., Ogawa T., De Villa Camargos G., Vandamme, K. Effect of insertion torque on titanium implant osseointegration: An animal experimental study. Clin. Oral Implants Res. 2015, 26, 191–196.
10. Senna P., Antoninha Del Bel Cury A., Kates S., Meirelles, L. Surface damage on dental implants with release of loose particles after insertion into bone. Clin. Implant Dent. Relat. Res. 2015, 17, 681– 692.
11. Barone A., Alfonsi F., Derchi G., Tonelli P., Toti P., Marchionni S., Covani, U. The effect of insertion torque on the clinical outcome of single implants: A randomized clinical trial. Clin. Implant Dent. Relat. Res. 20 16, 18, 588–600.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2023) 13(4), 32-40 | ISSN: 2251-6719

12. Piattelli M, Favero GA, Scarano A, Orsini G, Piattelli A. Bone reactions to anorganic bovine bone (Bio-Oss) used in sinus augmentation procedures: A histologic long-term report of 20 cases in humans. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1999;14:835–40.
13. Pai UY. 44. Indirect sinus lift of atrophic posterior maxilla using osseodensification: a case report. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2018 Nov;18(Suppl 2):S108.
14. Campos FE, Gomes JB, Marin C, Teixeira HS, Suzuki M, Witek L, Zanetta-Barbosa D, Coelho PG. Effect of drilling dimension on implant placement torque and early osseointegration stages: an experimental study in dogs. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2012 Jan;70(1):e43-50.
15. Koutouzis T., Huwais S., Hasan F., Trahan W., Waldrop T., Neiva R. Alveolar ridge expansion by osseodensificaton-mediated plastic deformation and compaction autografting: A multicenter retrospective study. Implant Dent. 2019, 28, 349–355.
16. Huwais, S.; Mazor, Z.; Ioannou, A.L.; Gluckman, H.; Neiva, R. A multicenter retrospective clinical study with up-to-5- year follow-up utilizing a method that enhances bone density and allows for transcrestal sinus augmentation through compacting grafting. Int. J. Oral Maxillofac. Implant. 2018, 33, 1305–1311.
17. Sultana, A.; Makkar, S.; Saxena, D.; Wadhawan, A.; Kisum, C.K. To compare the stability and crestal bone loss of implants placed using Osseodensification and traditional drilling protocol: A clinicoradiographical study. J. Indian Prosthodont. Soc. 2020, 20, 45–51.
18. Salman, R.D.; Bede, S.Y. The Use of Osseodensification for Ridge Expansion and Dental Implant Placement in Narrow Alveolar Ridges: A Prospective Observational Clinical Study. J. Craniofac. Surg. 2022, Epub ahead of print.
19. Fanali S., Tumedei M., Pignatelli P., Inchigolo F., Pennacchietti P., Pace G.; Piattelli A. Implant primary stability with an osteocondensation drilling protocol in different density polyurethane blocks. Comput. Methods Biomech. Biomed. Engin. 2021, 24,14 – 20.
20. De Carvalho Formiga, M.; Gehrke, A.F.; de Bortoli, J.P.; Gehrke, S.A. Can the design of the instrumets used for undersized osteotomies influence the initial stability of implants installed in low-density boné? An in vitro pilot study. PLoS ONE 2021,e0257985.
21. Bleyan, S.; Gaspar, J.; Huwais, S.; Schwimer, C.; Mazor, Z.; Mendes, J.J.; Neiva, R. Molar Septum Expansion with Osseodensification for Immediate Implant Placement, Retrospective Multicenter Study with Up-to-5-Year Follow-Up, Introducing a New Molar Socket Classification. J. Funct. Biomater. 2021, 4, 66.
22. Maiorana C, Beretta M, Salina S, Santoro F. Reduction of autogenous bone graft resorption by means of bio-oss coverage: A prospective study. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2005;25:19–25.