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ABSTRACT

Aim: This study was performed to compare two different modalities of alveolar ridge splitting performed simultaneously with dental implant placement regarding the alveolar crestal bone changes and implant stability

Subjects and methods: 12 patients were included in this study. Group 1 (6 patients, 12 implant) while Group 2 (6 patients, 10 implants). Single surgery was performed to each patient involving alveolar ridge splitting, expansion and simultaneous implant (or implants) placement. Ridge splitting in group 1 was performed using the piezoelectric surgery and in group 2 using the traditional surgical disc, while the alveolar ridge expansion and implant placement were performed using the same procedures for both groups. Marginal bone loss on the buccal and lingual aspects of the implant was evaluated 4 months after implant insertion using the CBCT. The implant stability ISQ values were measured immediately after implant insertion and 4 months after the surgery during the prosthetic steps by the Ostell.

Results: Post treatment, a higher mean percent resorption in marginal bone was recorded in traditional surgical disc group with an extremely significant difference between groups. Also, a higher mean percent increase in ISQ2 was recorded in piezo- electric surgery group with an extremely significant difference between groups.

Conclusion: Piezoelectric ridge splitting is accompanied with decreased postoperative marginal bone loss and enhanced secondary ISQ compared to traditional surgical disc splitting.
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INTRODUCTION

Alveolar bone develops in association with teeth eruption and resorbs following teeth extraction leading to dimensional changes in alveolar ridges (Devlin & Ferguson 1991, LeKovic et al. 1998, Araujo & Lindhe 2005). In 2003, Schropp et al. reported that the bucco-lingual alveolar ridge width decreased by 50% after 1 year of dental extraction.

Implant diameter is highly critical for implant success. Each 1 mm increase in implant diameter allows the implant surface area to increase by 20-30% and consequently decreasing crestal stresses (Misch 1999).

Guided bone regeneration GBR, alveolar ridge splitting and onlay autogenous bone grafting are among the most common surgical procedures used to augment deficient alveolar ridges (Aghaloo and Moy 2007). However, many disadvantages have been associated with GBR and onlay autografts. GBR is commonly associated with barrier membrane collapse and dehiscence (Buser et al. 1990, Von Arx & Buser 2006, Rocuzzo et al. 2007), while onlay grafting may be associated with donor site morbidity and prolonged treatment time (Nkenke et al. 2002, Tessier et al. 2005).

The alveolar ridge splitting and expansion was first introduced by Simion et al. 1992 and Scipioni et al. 1994. It depends on the viscoelastic properties of alveolar bone & involves manipulation of the resorbed alveolar ridge allowing the lateral repositioning of the buccal cortical plate away from the lingual plate which permits implant placement in deficient alveolar ridges without any bone removal (Simion et al. 1992, Scipioni et al. 1994).

The area of the ridge where bony plate has been lateralized shows natural tendency to heal by bone fill like bone fracture rather than by fibrous tissue due to double cellularity and double vascularity. Literature has shown that no need for bone graft or membrane when ridge splitting is used as the healing is similar to bone fracture healing (Scipioni et al. 1994, Scipioni et al. 1997, Coatoam & Mariotti 2003, Fischer et al. 2008).

Shorter treatment period, no need for donor sites and the possibility of simultaneous implant placement are among the merits of ridge splitting over autogenous block grafting (Scipioni et al 1994, Sethi & Kaus 2000).

To allow successful splitting with simultaneous implant placement the alveolar ridge width should be 3 mm or more with at least 1 mm trabecular bone between the cortical plates (Misch 2004, Suh et al 2005, Khairnar et al 2014).

The splitting can be performed on the residual alveolar ridge traditionally using the chisel and mallet, the surgical disc, ultra-fine fissure burs and recently using the piezoelectric surgical devices while the expansion is performed by the osteotomes, chisels, bone spreaders and the engine driven expanders (Suh et al. 2005, Blus & Szmukler-Moncler 2006, Mazzocco et al. 2011).

The piezo electric surgery has many advantages including selective cutting of the bone without affecting the soft tissues, greater visibility during operation and cutting by cavitation effect thus avoiding excessive heat which may affect the healing (Holtzclaw et al. 2010 and Sohn et al. 2010).

The literature showed that dental implants placed simultaneously with alveolar ridge splitting were associated with marginal bone loss by time (Strietzel et al. 2002, Jensen et al. 2009, Kolerman 2014, Gehrke et al. 2016).

Taking into consideration the decreased bone trauma applied to the alveolar ridge when using the piezoelectric surgery, this study was performed to evaluate primarily the crestal bone loss around dental implants placed simultaneously with alveolar ridge splitting performed using the piezoelectric surgical device versus the alveolar ridge splitting performed using the traditional surgical disc. Also, evaluation of the effect of the two different splitting modalities on the implant stability had been investigated.
AIM OF THE STUDY

This study was performed to compare two different modalities of alveolar ridge splitting performed simultaneously with dental implant placement regarding the alveolar crestal bone changes (primary objective) and implant stability (secondary objective).

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

A total of 12 patients with age range 30-45 Y was included in this study. They received a total of 22 dental implants. Group 1 (6 patients, 12 implant) while Group 2 (6 patients, 10 implants).

All the patients included in the study were free from any systemic diseases as evidenced by Burket’s oral medicine health history questionnaire (Glick et al., 2008) and suffering from missing one or two mandibular premolars or molars with sufficient alveolar ridge height (at least 15 mm from the inferior alveolar canal or mental foramen) and insufficient alveolar ridge buccolingual (BL) width that interfere with conventional straight forward implant placement. The minimum BL width included in the study was 4 mm to facilitate ridge splitting and expansion.

All the patients were informed about the full details of the surgical procedure performed in the study and all the treatment alternatives available were discussed then an informed consent was taken from each participant. Patients with residual infections in the edentulous areas, vulnerable groups, smokers and patients with poor oral hygiene were excluded from this study.

Cone beam computed tomographic examination (CBCT) was performed twice for every patient in this study. The 3D images were generated by the I-CAT Vision TM software (Imaging Sciences International, Hatfield, Pa). The first CBCT was performed for initial diagnosis and preoperative measurement of alveolar ridge dimensions, while the second one was performed 4 months after the surgery for evaluation of alveolar ridge dimensional changes around the dental implant.

Treatment protocol: Preoperative analysis included detailed patient history, clinical examination, clinical photographs and the CBCT to evaluate the initial alveolar ridge morphology. Professional periodontal treatment and oral hygiene instructions were provided to all patients two weeks before the surgical procedure. Single surgery was performed to each patient involving alveolar ridge splitting, expansion and simultaneous implant (or implants) placement.

All surgeries were performed under local anaesthesia (Aticaine hydrochloride 4% with 1/100000 epinephrine, septanest SP, Septodont) in an outpatient setting by the same operator. All patients were premedicated one hour before the surgical procedure with amoxicillin 875mg /clavulanic acid 125 mg orally (Hibiotic 1gm tablets/ Amoun Pharmaceuticals) and dexamethasone phosphate 8 mg I.M. injection (Epidron ampoule 2ml; Eipico).

Alveolar Ridge splitting in group 1 was performed using the piezoelectric surgery and in group 2 using the traditional surgical disc, while the alveolar ridge expansion and implant placement were performed using the same surgical kits & procedures for both groups (fig 1, fig 2).

Surgical steps: Full thickness mucoperiosteal flap was reflected buccaly and lingually at the edentulous area using one paracrestal incision and two vertical buccal incisions. One crestal horizontal osteotomy and two vertical buccal osteotomies were then applied for ridge splitting.

For group 1, the crestal and vertical osteotomies were performed using the ultrasonic piezoelectric device (Variosurg, NSK). The crestal osteotomy was performed using the variosurg SG4 tip (variosurg osteoflat scalpel) to depth of 8 mm then the vertical buccal osteotomies were performed 8mm coronal-apical meeting the crestal one. In group 2, the surgical disc (Surgident; Korea) was used to create
the crestal and vertical osteotomies. A small chisel (Surgident; Korea) about 1.5mm thickness was used to complete the depth of the crestal osteotomy after the disc.

Following splitting, the same ridge expanders (Surgident; Korea) were used to expand the ridge in both groups to the depth of 8 mm. Initially none cutting guiding drill was used to locate the future implant position in the edentulous area followed by sequential use of non-cutting expanders series to reach the final expander size. This was followed by using the implant kit (Interactive system; Implant Direct; Sybron Dental Specialties) cutting drills to prepare the apical portion of the implant recipient site (5mm apical to the expanded part).

All the implants used in this study were the same size (3.5mm x 11.5mm) and were placed 1.5mm subcrestally with sufficient primary stability exceeding 30 NCM using the torque wrench. Periosteal releasing incisions were made at the base of the flap to allow tension free adaptation of the wound edges. Polypropylene 4/0 interrupted sutures (blue monofilament, Assut sutures) were performed followed by prescribing the postoperative medications. The sutures were removed two weeks later.

The patients were instructed not to wear any removable prosthesis for the healing period and to return for follow up every 2 weeks for the first month then once per month till the prosthetic steps (4 months following implant insertion).

**Evaluation of the marginal bone changes** (Figure 3): The initial distance from the apex of the implant to the buccal alveolar crest (ABC1) or the lingual alveolar crest (ALC1) just after implant insertion was 13mm in all cases since all the implants were 11.5mm in length and placed subcrestally by 1.5mm. Four months after implant insertion, ABC2 and ALC2 were measured for all implants using the second CBCT. Crestal bone loss was evaluated on the buccal and lingual aspects of the implant by calculating the difference between ABC1&ABC2 and the difference between ALC1 & ALC2 respectively.
Evaluation of implant stability ISQ: The implant stability was measured by the Ostell Mentor (integration diagnostics AB, Goteborg, Sweden) for the magnetic resonance frequency measurements. The smart peg was placed into each implant and tightened to approximately 5 Ncm. The Transducer probe was aimed at the small magnet at the top of the smart peg at a distance of 2-3mm and held stable during the pulsing until the ostell displayed the ISQ (implant stability quotient) value. The ISQ values were measured immediately after implant insertion (ISQ 1- Baseline) and 4 months after the surgery during the prosthetic steps (ISQ 2- Follow up). The ISQ was measured for each implant buccally, lingually, mesially and distally and the mean value was calculated for each implant.

RESULTS

Statistical analysis was then performed using a commercially available software program (SPSS 18; SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). Values were presented as mean and standard deviation (SD). Data were explored for normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality. The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated that most of data were normally distributed (parametric data), so paired (dependent) t test was used to compare pre and post treatment values. Independent t test was used to compare both groups. The Pearson correlation coefficient is used to measure the strength of a linear association between two variables. The level of significance was set at P < 0.05.

Both groups recorded the same (ABC1) and (ALC1). Four months after splitting, a higher mean value was recorded in Piezo electric surgery groups (10.84±0.4; 10.76±0.4 for ABC2 and ALC2 respectively) with an extremely significant difference (p=0.00) (Table 1, Fig.4). Both groups recorded the same primary implant stability. Four months after splitting, a higher mean value was recorded in Piezo electric surgery groups (64.3±1.4) with an extremely significant difference (p=0.00), (Table 1, Fig.5).

| **TABLE (1)** Comparison of Apex to buccal crest (ABC), apex to lingual crest (ALC) and implant stability (ISQ) in both groups (independent t test) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Groups** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev.** | **Std. Error Mean** | **Difference** | **t** | **P** |
| **Mean** | **Std Error** | **C.I. lower** | **C.I. lower** |
| ABC 1 | Piezo electric | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0 | 1 ns |
| Disc | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ABC 2 | Piezo electric | 10.84 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.38 | 0.27 | 1.80 | 2.95 | 8.89 | 0* |
| Disc | 8.47 | 0.8 | 0.2 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALC 1 | Piezo electric | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0 | 1 ns |
| Disc | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALC 2 | Piezo electric | 10.76 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.21 | 0.25 | 1.68 | 2.75 | 8.88 | 0* |
| Disc | 8.55 | 0.7 | 0.2 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ISQ 1 | Piezo electric | 58.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | -0.02 | 0.40 | -0.85 | 0.82 | -0.04 | 0.967 ns |
| Disc | 58.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ISQ 2 | Piezo electric | 64.3 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 4.00 | 0.50 | 2.96 | 5.04 | 8.01 | 0* |
| Disc | 60.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Significance level p<0.05, * significant, ns=non-significant  C.I.=95% confidence interval
In both groups, Apex to buccal crest (ABC) and apex to lingual crest (ALC) significantly decreased four months after splitting, a greater decrease was noted in traditional surgical disc group (table 2, Fig. 4). In both groups, secondary implant stability was significantly higher than primary implant stability (p=0.00). A greater increase was noted in piezo electric surgery group (table 2, Fig.5).

Four months after splitting, a higher mean percent decrease in Apex to buccal crest (ABC) and apex to lingual crest (ALC) was recorded in traditional surgical disc group (-34.87±5.84; -34.26±5.41 for ABC and ALC respectively) with an extremely significant difference (p=0.00) between groups. Also, a higher mean percent increase in implant stability (ISQ) was recorded in Piezo electric surgery group (10.62±1.44) with an extremely significant difference (p=0.00) between groups. Strong positive correlation was reported between ABC2 and ISQ2, ALC2 and ISQ2 in both groups.

### TABLE (2) Comparison of pre and post treatment Apex to buccal crest (ABC), apex to lingual crest (ALC) and implant stability (ISQ) within the same group (paired t test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Paired Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>-25.59</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level p<0.05, * significant, ns=non-significant  C.I.=95% confidence interval
PIEZOELECTRIC-ALVEOLAR RIDGE SPLITTING: A SUCCESSFUL MODALITY REDUCING

DISCUSSION


Implant insertion simultaneously with ridge splitting allows decreased number of surgeries and surgical trauma for the patient but may be associated with some difficulties met by the operator in ideal positioning of the implant and obtaining sufficient primary stability, and may be associated with future crestal bone loss (Geherke et al. 2016).

In our study, the ridge splitting osteotomies was performed using the piezoelectric device in group 1 (test group) owing to its precise atraumatic cutting, reduced heat generation, reduced fracture risks and decreased postoperative necrosis (Horton et al. 1975, Aro et al. 1981, Vercellotti et al. 2001a, b) suggested that this may have positive effect on the crestal bone after implant insertion.

For ridge expansion, the engine driven ridge expanders were selected to be used instead of using the conventional osteotomes or chisel and mallet since proved to be a successful alternative in the literature (Beolchini et al. 2014, 2015, Ella et al. 2014 and Tang et al. 2015).

Percussion and tests for mobility with the help of radiographs are classically used to evaluate the stability of dental implants and the osseointegration but usually these methods lack sensitivity and standardization and are affected by the clinician variables (Meredith et al. 1997a, b, Scipioni et al. 1997, Fischer et al. 2008).

The resonance frequency analysis (RFA) using the ostell allows the clinical evaluation of the implant stability quotient (ISQ) values and has been successfully used during the last decade (Meredith et al. 1997a, b and Da Silva Netro et al. 2014).

In our study, the primary and secondary implant stability (ISQ1, ISQ2) had been evaluated using the Ostell™ being rapid, standardized method and easily accepted by the patients.

During patient selection, strict inclusion and exclusion criteria were used to minimize the variables that may have an effect on the result. All patients have mandibular deficient ridge with one or two missing teeth with 1 mm at least trabecular bone present between the buccal and lingual plates to allow bone to spread adequately on either side of the ridge and maintain adequate blood supply.

Regarding the statistical results of our study, both groups recorded the same (ABC1) and (ALC1) since implants with the same length 13 mm were used in all cases and all were placed subcrestally by 1.5 mm. Also, no significant differences were found between the two groups in the mean primary ISQ values.

Both groups showed significant decrease in ABC and ALC after 4 months of implant insertion which was in accordance to previous studies that reported marginal bone loss around implants placed simultaneously with ridge splitting related to the trauma from splitting and remodeling process.

Significant greater decrease in both ABC and ALC was noted in the surgical disc group (group 2) after 4 months of splitting compared to the piezoelectric group which indicates less crestal resorption in the piezoelectric surgery group after splitting. These may be explained by the atraumatic cutting with reduced heat generation obtained by the piezoelectric surgery (Holtzclaw et al. 2010, Sohn et al. 2010).

Regarding the implant secondary stability ISQ2, higher mean values were recorded in the piezo group with an extremely significant difference between groups. This can be explained by previous studies that showed that the RFA is affected by the part of the implant exposed above bone level (Gupta et al. 2011).

Strong positive correlation was reported between ABC2 and ISQ2, ALC2 and ISQ2 in both groups. This is in accordance to previous studies that shown that stability increased when bone-implant contact surface area increased (Balleri et al. 2002, Calandriello et al. 2003 and Turkyilmaz et al. 2007).

CONCLUSION

Implants placed simultaneously with piezoelectric-alveolar ridge splitting exhibits decreased marginal bone loss and greater secondary ISQ when compared to Implants placed simultaneously with surgical disc-alveolar ridge splitting.
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