SOCKET PRESERVATION USING NOVABONE FOR FUTURE IMPLANT PERSPECTIVE

A Case Report

Devavrat Patel[*], **Priyal Modi**[**], **Tejal Sheth**[***], **Mihir Shah**[****]

ABSTRACT

Alveolar bone loss may occur due to a diversity of factors such as periodontitis, aggressive manipulation during extractions, endodontic pathology and facial trauma. Socket preservation provides greater control and predictability in preventing site collapse and esthetic compromise. It is a simplified, minimally invasive regenerative approach for optimizing the preservation of the hard and soft tissue components of the alveolar ridge immediately following tooth extraction. The preservation of bone volume is of major importance in order to ensure the proper implant and esthetic rehabilitations.

Keywords : Socket, Bioactive Glass, Novabone, ab gel

INTRODUCTION: Soft tissue contour depends on the basic bone anatomy. Following tooth extraction, sockets undergo a remodeling process that influences the implant rehabilitation treatment of the edentulous areas[1]. Alveolar bone loss may occur due to a diversity of factors such as periodontitis, aggressive manipulation during extractions, endodontic pathology and facial trauma. Most extractions are done with no regard for maintaining the alveolar ridge. Extraction of tooth and succeeding healing of the socket frequently results in osseous abnormalities of the alveolar ridge, including decreased height and width of the residual ridge[2,3]. The severity of the healing form may pose a problem for the clinician in 2 ways: one it creates an esthetic problem in the fabrication of a restoration supported by implant or in the construction of a conventional prosthesis; and it may make the placement of an implant perplexing.[4] However, it is possible to minimize such glitches by simply carrying out ridge preservation procedures in extraction sockets using grafting materials with or without barrier membranes[5,6].

Prevention of alveolar bone loss post-extraction was first described by Greenstein (1985) and Ashman and Bruins (1985). Cohen (1988) was the first to coin the term socket preservation, a technique planned for prosthetic socket maintenance, ridge preservation, and ridge augmentation. Basic socket preservation, although similar in all cases, varies with the method of socket closure. As a result, there are a number of different socket preservation procedures namely:

1. Connective tissue graft (Langer and Calangar, 1980)
2. Socket seal or free gingival graft (Landsberg and Bichacho, 1994)
3. Bio-Col or resorbable hemostatic plug technique (Sklar, 1999)
4. Guided bone regeneration
    1. Nonresorbable membrane
    2. Resorbable membrane
    3. Normal restorability (4–6 weeks)
    4. Extended restorability (4–6 months)
5. Alloderm or acellular dermal graft (Misch, 1998)
6. Prosthetic "pontic" socket plug
    1. Removable (Misch, 1998; Kois and Kan, 2001)
    2. Fixed (Kois, 1998; Spear, 1999; Sklar, 1999)
7. Combination epithelialized subepithelial connective tissue graft (Stimmelmayr 2010)
8. Modified socket seal surgery with composite graft approach (Misch and Misch, 1999)

* PG Student, ** PG Student, ***Professor, **** Professor & Head

DEPARTMENT OF PERIODONTICS AND ORAL IMPLANTOLOGY
AHMEDABAD DENTAL COLLEGE & HOSPITAL, TA. KALOL, DIST: GANDHINAGAR, GUJARAT, INDIA

ADDRESS FOR AUTHOR CORROSPONDENCE : DR. DEVAVRAT PATEL, TEL: +91 8347478500

To preserve bone at the future implant site socket preservation techniques have been employed, also known as socket seal surgery, which involve the placement of different bone graft materials in the socket[7,8]. The literature also confirms that socket grafting can considerably reduce early bone loss[9,10].

In this Study we are using Novabone® which is a synthetic absorbable osteoconductive bone graft substitute composed of a calcium phosphosilicate bioactive glass.

CASE REPORT

A 33year-old female with a noncontributory medical history, presented to Department of Periodontics at Ahmedabad dental hospital with chief complaints of bleeding & swollen gums. Clinical examination showed garde III mobility in 24 tooth. The prognosis of this tooth was hopeless so extraction was advised, followed by socket preservation procedure keeping in mind future implant rehabilitation.

Phase I treatment was given to patient which include scaling and root planning of oral cavity. Patient's vital signs were determined and assessed before surgical treatment. To minimize vasoconstriction, a local anesthetic (lidocaine 2%), with minimal epinephrine concentration, i.e. a maximum of 1:100,000, was administered in the area of 24.

To minimize the mechanical pressure and trauma to the alveolar bone, a slow a nd gentle rotating force was used while extracting the tooth.

Thumb support against the labial aspect of the alveolus and a check on the state of the soft tissue walls of the fresh extraction socket was done to ensure intactness. The fresh socket was debrided of granulation tissue and residual periodontal ligament fibers followed by a thorough evaluation of the remaining bony socket.

PRE- OPERATIVE SOCKET VIEW IRT 24

SOCKET GRAFTING WITH AB GEL + SYBOGRAFT

Following the extraction, ab gel was placed in the socket followed by osteoconductive bone graft (Novabone) was placed. then cross matress sutures are taken. Antibiotics and oral analgesics were prescribed. A 0.2% chlorhexidine mouthwash was prescribed every 12 hours for 2-week duration post-surgically. Patient was instructed not to use a toothbrush or mechanical cleansing at the surgical area and only a soft diet was advised for the first 2 weeks of the healing process. Sutures were removed after 10 days of surgery and healing was found to be satisfactory with no bone graft exposed in the oral cavity. The patient did not report any untoward consequences. The patient was assessed after 3 months and 6 months.

CROSS MATTRESS SUTURES IN PLACE IRT 24

POST- OPERATIVE VIEW

PRE-OPERATIVE IOPA IRT 24

POST – OPERATIVE IOPA AFTER 6 MONTHS IRT 24

After six months a good bony healing was noticed both clinically and radiographically

DISCUSSION

The failure to preserve the anatomy of hard and soft tissues usually results in esthetic failures and compromises the final results. Socket preservation provides greater control and predictability in preventing site collapse and esthetic compromise. It is a simplified, minimally invasive regenerative approach for optimizing the preservation of the hard and soft tissue components of the alveolar ridge immediately following tooth extraction[11].

Various grafting materials have been used to preserve the socket before implant placement like autograft, allograft, xenografts, alloplasts. In this Study we are using Novabone® which is a synthetic absorbable osteoconductive bone graft substitute composed of a calcium phosphosilicate bioactive glass.

The particles of the graft are irregular in form, measuring from 90-170μm.

Bioactive glass composes of 46.1 mol% SiO_2, 26.9 mol% CaO, 24.4 mol% Na_2O, and 2.5 mol% P_2O_5[12]. Bioactive glass forms a carbonated hydroxyapatite layer on their surfaces once exposed to simulated body fluids or implanted in vivo. It has been theorized that these bioactive properties guide and promote osteogenesis, allowing rapid formation of bone.

Schepers et al in 1998 conducted a study to analyze the efficacy of narrow size range bioactive glass particles for the treatment of bone defects prior to implant placement. Partial edentulous areas were created on both sides of the mandible of six beagle dogs. Bioactive glass particles were immediately packed on one side and other side was left vacant as a control. Analysis revealed that more bone tissue and increased remodeling activity at the interface was seen in the implants placed in bioactive glass treated areas which was statistically more significant as compared to implants placed in untreated regions[14].

Antonietta M. Gatti et al investigated the ability of PerioGlas® in the socket preservation.. Granules of the PerioGlas® exhibited a biodegradation involving precipitation of calcium phosphate which works as a scaffold for osteoblasts colonization. All cases studied revealed the bioactivity of these granules resulting in formation of new bone and biodegradation of the glass. After 2 years of clinical follow-up, all the implants were efficaciously loaded and seemed stable[15].

Arthur et al evaluated the effectiveness of an acellular dermal matrix material as a membrane to cover the implant and a bioactive glass as a grafting material in case of immediate implant placement in the extraction socket. After 6 months, they found that the mineralized tissue had completely occupied the defect around the implant[16].

CONCLUSION

Loss of teeth often result in hard and soft tissue collapse, therefore the preservation of bone volume is of major importance in order to ensure the proper implant and esthetic rehabilitations. Today the commonly used method for ridge preservation procedure is a bone graft material placed in the extraction socket and covered by a cross or non-cross linked membrane followed by complete or partial flap closure. The decision to use socket preservation technique should be made on a case-by-case basis. Surgeons should be familiarized with the wide array of techniques and materials used in order to optimize and preserve the anatomy of bone and soft tissues.

REFERENCES

1. Nader RA, Tabarani C. Socket preservation in the daily practice: A clinical case report. Dental Tribune Middle East & Africa Edition, 2013;2:12-3.
2. Marcus SE, Drury TF, Brown LJ, Zion GR. Tooth retention and tooth loss in the permanent dentition of adults: United States, 1988–1991. J Dent Res 1996;75:Spec No.684–95.
3. Mecall RA, Rosenfeld AL. Influence of residual ridge resorption patterns on fixture placement and tooth position. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 1991; 11(1):8–23.
4. Lekovic V, Camargo PM, Klokkevold PR, Weinlaender M, Kenney EB, Dimitrijevic B, Nedic M. Preservation of alveolar bone in extraction sockets using bioabsorbable membranes. J Periodontol. 1998;69(9):1044–9.
5. Zubillaga G, Von Hagen S, Simon BI, Deasy MJ. Changes in alveolar bone height and width following post-extraction ridge augmentation using a fixed bioabsorbable membrane and demineralized freeze-dried bone osteoinductive graft. J Periodontol. 2003; 74(7):965–75.
6. Winkler S. Implant site development and alveolar bone resorption patterns. J Oral Implantol 2002; 28(5):226–9.
7. Wang HL, Kiyonobu K, Neiva RF. Socket augmentation: rationale and technique. Implant Dent. 2004;13(4):286-96.
8. John V, De Poi R, Blanchard S. Socket preservation as a precursor of future implant placement: Review of the literature and case reports. Compend Contin Educ Dent. 2007;28(12):646-53.
9. Allegrini S Jr, Koening B Jr, Allegrini MR, Yoshimoto M, Gedrange T, Fanghaenel J, et al. Alveolar ridge sockets preservation with bone grafting—review. Ann Acad Med Stetin. 2008;54(1):70-81.

10. Ashman A. Postextraction ridge preservation using a synthetic alloplast. Implant Dent. 2000; 9(2):168-76.
11. Landsberg CJ, Bichacho N. A modified surgical/prosthetic approach for optimal single implant supported crown. Part I- The socket seal surgery. Pract Periodontics Aesthet Dent. 1994;6(2):11-7.
12. Reynolds MA, Aichelmann-Reidy ME, Branch- Mays GL. Regeneration of periodontal tissue: bone replacement grafts. Dent Clin North Am. 2010;54(1):55-71.
13. Froum S, Cho SC, Rosenberg E, Rohrer M, Tarnow D. Histological comparison of healing extraction sockets implanted with bioactive glass or demineralized freeze dried bone allograft: A pilot study. J Periodontol. 2002;73:94-102.
14. Schepers, Ducheyne, Barbier. Bioactive glass particles of narrow size range: a new material for the repair of bone defects. Implant Dent. 1993;2(3):151-6.
15. Antonietta M. Gatti, Leopoldo A. Simonetti, Emanuela Monari, Stefano Guidi, David Greenspan. Bone Augmentation with Bioactive Glass in Three Cases of Dental Implant Placement. J Biomater Appl. 2006;20(4):325-39.
16. Novaes AB Jr, Papalexiou V, Luczyszyn SM, Muglia VA, Souza SL, Taba Júnior M. Immediate Implant in Extraction Socket with Acellular Dermal Matrix Graft and Bioactive Glass: A Case Report. Implant Dent. 2002;11(4):343-8.