The posterior maxilla: An update of anatomical notions based on advances in endosseous implant surface technology. A case report
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Abstract

Objective: Fixed implant-supported rehabilitation of the posterior maxilla is a challenge to dental professionals. Limitations of technique and material have established wrong concepts, especially with regard to bone classification. For instance, the concept of poor-quality bone has been associated with high rates of therapeutic failure because of implants with poorly evolved surfaces. A literature review on the embryological origin of tissues and the anatomy of the maxilla highlight the high regenerative ability of trabecular bone, which is rich in mesenchymal cells. Methods: The present report describes a case of failure of a machined-surface implant placed by osteotomy at the maxillary first molar region. The implant was replaced by a sandblasted, large grit, acid-etched SLA surface with a six-year survival rate follow-up. Clinical and radiographic assessments were performed every six months. Results: Data revealed implant osseointegration stability as well as tissue biocompatibility and prosthetic functionality. Conclusion: The literature on technically advanced implant surfaces suggests that the posterior maxilla is a safe and predictable site for fixed implant-supported rehabilitation.
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**Introduction**

The development of Implantology as a dental specialty has resulted in new possibilities for the oral rehabilitation of edentulous patients, and, as a consequence, has made the outcomes of such treatments increasingly predictable.1 However, the technology used in its early stages resulted in a high osseointegration failure rate, mostly due to the lack of interaction at the interface of contact between the bone and smooth or machined-surface implants. Some hypotheses have mistakenly associated structural deficiencies in certain craniofacial regions with implant failure. Such regions, particularly the posterior maxilla, have thus been classified as poor-quality bone.2

The posterior maxilla predominantly consists of trabecular or spongy bone. It is characterized not only by fast absorption of the alveolar bone after tooth loss, but also by maxillary sinus pneumatization, which usually worsens the prognosis of implant-supported rehabilitation. Moreover, the literature emphasizes the importance of the anatomical formation of the posterior maxilla and the advances in implant surfaces treatment.3,4

Bone classifications are being currently reviewed by studies that address technologically advanced implants, particularly those with rough, high-energy, hydroxyalted, and bioactive surfaces. Such surfaces stimulate the migration and transformation of mesenchymal cells into osteoblasts, thus shortening the healing process and improving the predictability of implant-supported rehabilitation therapy in the posterior maxilla. In addition, implants are placed using non-invasive techniques, such as osteotomy.5,6,7

**Case report**

The present case report describes the treatment performed on a Caucasian, 59-year-old, female, non-smoker patient in good overall health who required periodontal treatment and oral rehabilitation. After conservative periodontal treatment was performed, unfavorable elements of the anterior and posterior maxilla were removed, and fixed implant-supported rehabilitation was planned. After extraction of #24 and 26, machined-surface implants (Steri-Oss system, Yorba Linda, CA) were placed using 3.8 x 10 mm implant burs in the region of #25, and by means of osteotomy with a 4.5 x 8 mm implant installed in the region of #26. In accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions, the healing cap was placed six months after the first procedure.

However, after a follow-up period of 20 months, osseointegration failed (Fig 1) at the second surgical stage, and the implant was covered by fibrous tissue (Figs 2, 3, 4, and 5). The affected area was subjected to scaling, and six months were allowed for healing (Figs 6 and 7). After this six-month healing period, a non-submerged wide-neck 4.8 x 8 mm implant with a sandblasted, large-grit, acid-etched surface (SLA® Straumann Dental Implant System, Basel, Switzerland) was installed in the same region by means of the same osteotome technique (Figs 8 and 9).

After a healing period of sixteen weeks (Figs 10 and 11), the patient was subjected to solid abutment fixation (Fig 12) with torque of 35 N and provisionalization. Masticatory load was established after eight months when implants were finalized with metal-ceramic crowns (Figs 13 and 14). Since then, the patient has been monitored every six months. Results were considered satisfactory after five years (Figs 15 and 16).

**Discussion**

A wide body of scientific evidence supports the success of treatment using SLA surfaces8 at the posterior maxilla.9,10,11 Nevertheless, the literature still refers to bone classifications that describe the posterior maxilla as poor-quality bone. Such classifications are based on the results of the interaction between the bone and smooth or machined surfaces, which demand longer implants and a greater initial stabilization in the cortical bone. The classification of stabilization in...
Figure 1 - Failure in implant #26 osseointegration was observed after 20 months.

Figure 2 - Implant removal without osseointegration.

Figure 3 - Removed implant and fibrosis associated with the machined surface.

Figure 4 - Fibrosis associated with the implant site.

Figure 5 - Removal of fibrosis.

Figure 6 - Radiograph showing healing six months after failure in implant #26 and the presence of machined implant surface of #24.

Figure 7 - Complete bone repair after six months.

Figure 8 - Straumann wide-neck 4.8 x 8 mm SLA Plus implant.

Figure 9 - Implant placement by osteotomy.

Figure 10 - Sixteen weeks after healing.

Figure 11 - Radiographic image after healing.

Figure 12 - Solid abutment fixation with torque of 35 N.
Rough-surface implants, such as SLA, exhibit higher surface energy and activate stationary mesenchymal cells at the treated region, promoting the fast formation of secondary bone and consequently increasing the predictability of treatment outcomes. They are placed with simple surgical techniques and are associated with lower degrees of morbidity. It is also important to emphasize the increase in bone height that is achieved at the region of the osteotomy and the SLA implant, as measured by Brägger’s index.\textsuperscript{2,5}

In an \textit{in vitro} experiment, Kunzler et al\textsuperscript{18} showed that the number of osteoblasts at the rough end of implants was almost two-fold greater than the number found at their smooth end, whereas the number of fibroblasts was almost three times higher at the polished titanium surfaces of rough surfaces.

In another \textit{in vitro} experiment, Grösnerr-Schreiber et al\textsuperscript{19} found a strong correlation between the number of fibroblast focal adhesion contacts (FACs) and surface roughness, with the highest number of FACs found on the surfaces with the lowest degree of surface roughness. Subcrestal placement of ITI implants showed that reabsorption occurs in the bone adjacent to the polished surface of implants, thus clinically confirming the results of the \textit{in vitro} experiments.\textsuperscript{18,20} The present case report shows the difference between the results obtained with the two approaches, and the follow-up analyses demonstrate the

As a function of the advances in the design and surfaces of implants, osseointegration is accomplished via the activation of mesenchymal cells which are found in large numbers at the posterior maxilla. Treated rough implant surfaces induce the transformation of the mesenchymal cells into osteoblasts, whereas smooth surfaces preferentially induce differentiation into fibroblasts.\textsuperscript{13-16}

The cortical bone is based on radiographic assessments and on the feeling of resistance that dental surgeons experience upon implant placement.\textsuperscript{1,12}

Rough-surface implants, such as SLA, exhibit higher surface energy and activate stationary mesenchymal cells at the treated region, promoting the fast formation of secondary bone and consequently increasing the predictability of treatment outcomes. They are placed with simple surgical techniques and are associated with lower degrees of morbidity. It is also important to emphasize the increase in bone height that is achieved at the region of the osteotomy and the SLA implant, as measured by Brägger’s index.\textsuperscript{2,5}
degree of stability that was achieved in rehabilitation using an implant with an SLA surface. Consequently, scientific evidence and technological advances indicate a need to review the outdated bone classification system that rates the posterior maxilla as poor-quality bone. The results obtained from this study are similar to those presented by the current literature and suggest that the SLA surfaces are suitable for posterior maxilla.
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