

## Short implants

Implant placement in the posterior regions can be limited due to physical conditions, e.g. limited vertical bone height due to the expansion of the maxillary sinus or the proximity to the inferior alveolar nerve. Another complicating factor in posterior regions is the general exposure to greater loads than in anterior regions.

Historically, clinical studies have reported on low survival rates for short implants. These studies describe implants with machined surfaces, mostly placed in posterior regions with higher loads and softer bone compared with more anterior regions<sup>1-11</sup>. More recent clinical studies on short implants with rougher surfaces report survival rates similar to implants in general<sup>12-20</sup>. Results from several clinical studies on Astra Tech implants show that the survival rates for shorter implants are similar to longer implants<sup>14, 21-24</sup> and that there is no correlation between implant length and marginal bone level change<sup>14</sup>.

The Astra Tech short implant, OsseoSpeed™ 4.0 S has been developed to allow for implant placement in clinical situations where there is limited vertical bone height. It has the same features and surface as the OsseoSpeed™ implants. In vitro and animal experiments indicate that the OsseoSpeed surface leads to increased bone formation and stronger bone-to-implant bonding at shorter healing times<sup>25, 26</sup>. This is especially valuable in clinically challenging situations e.g. in situations with a reduced bone quantity.

There are several review articles discussing the impact of implant length on the clinical outcome<sup>10, 11, 27-29</sup>. In an extensive review, Renouard and Nisand concluded that the survival rates for short implants were found to be comparable with those obtained for longer implants placed under similar conditions, when using appropriate surgical technique and implants with a rough surface<sup>11</sup>.

## References

Reprints can be ordered from references marked with ID No.

To read more Scientific Reviews please see: [www.astratechdental.com](http://www.astratechdental.com)

1. Friberg B, Jemt T, Lekholm U. Early failures in 4,641 consecutively placed Branemark dental implants: a study from stage 1 surgery to the connection of completed prostheses. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1991;6(2):142-6 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
2. Bahat O. Treatment planning and placement of implants in the posterior maxillae: report of 732 consecutive Nobelpharma implants. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1993;8(2):151-61 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
3. Bahat O. Branemark system implants in the posterior maxilla: clinical study of 660 implants followed for 5 to 12 years. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2000;15(5):646-53 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
4. Jemt T, Lekholm U. Implant treatment in edentulous maxillae: a 5-year follow-up report on patients with different degrees of jaw resorption. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1995;10(3):303-11 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
5. Naert I, Koutisakakis G, Duyck J, Quirynen M, Jacobs R, van Steenberghe D. Biologic outcome of implant-supported restorations in the treatment of partial edentulism. part I: a longitudinal clinical evaluation. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2002;13(4):381-9 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
6. Weng D, Jacobson Z, Tarnow D, Hurzeler MB, Faehn O, Sanavi F, et al. A prospective multicenter clinical trial of 3i machined-surface implants: results after 6 years of follow-up. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2003;18(3):417-23 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
7. Jaffin RA, Berman CL. The excessive loss of Branemark fixtures in type IV bone: a 5-year analysis. *J Periodontol* 1991;62(1):2-4 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
8. Tawil G, Younan R. Clinical evaluation of short, machined-surface implants followed for 12 to 92 months. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2003;18(6):894-901 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
9. Friberg B, Grondahl K, Lekholm U, Branemark PI. Long-term follow-up of severely atrophic edentulous mandibles reconstructed with short Branemark implants. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2000;2(4):184-9 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
10. das Neves FD, Fones D, Bernardes SR, do Prado CJ, Neto AJ. Short implants--an analysis of longitudinal studies. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2006;21(1):86-93 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
11. Renouard F, Nisand D. Impact of implant length and diameter on survival rates. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2006;17 Suppl 2:35-51 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
12. Fugazzotto PA, Beagle JR, Ganeles J, Jaffin R, Vlassis J, Kumar A. Success and failure rates of 9 mm or shorter implants in the replacement of missing maxillary molars when restored with individual crowns: preliminary results 0 to 84 months in function. A retrospective study. *J Periodontol* 2004;75(2):327-32 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
13. Renouard F, Nisand D. Short implants in the severely resorbed maxilla: a 2-year retrospective clinical study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2005;7 Suppl 1:S104-10 [Abstract in PubMed](#)

14. Cecchinato D, Olsson C, Lindhe J. Submerged or non-submerged healing of endosseous implants to be used in the rehabilitation of partially dentate patients. *J Clin Periodontol* 2004;31(4):299-308 (ID No. 78302). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
15. Buser D, Mericske-Stern R, Bernard JP, Behneke A, Behneke N, Hirt HP, et al. Long-term evaluation of non-submerged ITI implants. Part 1: 8-year life table analysis of a prospective multicenter study with 2359 implants. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 1997;8(3):161-72 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
16. Brocard D, Barthelet P, Baysse E, Duffort JF, Eller P, Justumus P, et al. A multicenter report on 1,022 consecutively placed ITI implants: a 7-year longitudinal study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2000;15(5):691-700 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
17. Nedir R, Bischof M, Briaux JM, Beyer S, Szmukler-Moncler S, Bernard JP. A 7-year life table analysis from a prospective study on ITI implants with special emphasis on the use of short implants. Results from a private practice. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2004;15(2):150-7 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
18. Mericske-Stern R, Grutter L, Rosch R, Mericske E. Clinical evaluation and prosthetic complications of single tooth replacements by non-submerged implants. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2001;12(4):309-18 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
19. Levine RA, Clem D, Beagle J, Ganeles J, Johnson P, Solnit G, et al. Multicenter retrospective analysis of the solid-screw ITI implant for posterior single-tooth replacements. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2002;17(4):550-6 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
20. Romeo E, Ghisolfi M, Rozza R, Chiapasco M, Lops D. Short (8-mm) dental implants in the rehabilitation of partial and complete edentulism: a 3- to 14-year longitudinal study. *Int J Prosthodont* 2006;19(6):586-92 [Abstract in PubMed](#)
21. Steveling H, Roos J, Rasmusson L. Maxillary implants loaded at 3 months after insertion: results with Astra Tech implants after up to 5 years. *Clin Impl Dent Rel Res* 2001;3(3):120-4 (ID No. 75414). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
22. van Steenberghe D, De Mars G, Quirynen M, Jacobs R, Naert I. A prospective split-mouth comparative study of two screw-shaped self-tapping pure titanium implant systems. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2000;11(3):202-9 (ID No. 75197). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
23. Warren P, Chaffee N, Felton DA, Cooper LF. A retrospective radiographic analysis of bone loss following placement of TiO<sub>2</sub> grit-blasted implants in the posterior maxilla and mandible. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2002;17(3):399-404 (ID No. 78111). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
24. Ellegaard B, Kolsen-Petersen J, Baelum V. Implant therapy involving maxillary sinus lift in periodontally compromised patients. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 1997;8(4):305-15 (ID No. 75065). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
25. Berglundh T, Abrahamsson I, Albooy JP, Lindhe J. Bone healing at implants with a fluoride-modified surface: an experimental study in dogs. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2007;18(2):147-52 (ID No. 78775). [Abstract in PubMed](#)
26. Ellingsen JE, Johansson CB, Wennerberg A, Holmén A. Improved retention and bone-to-implant contact with fluoride-modified titanium implants. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2004;19(5):659-66 (ID No. 78245). [Abstract in PubMed](#)

# Scientific Review

*Documentation on short implants*

79181-USX-0903

*Date of issue: March 2009*

*Page: 4/4*

27. Misch CE. Short dental implants: a literature review and rationale for use. Dent Today 2005;24(8):64-6, 68 [Abstract in PubMed](#)

28. Hagi D, Deporter DA, Pilliar RM, Arenovich T. A targeted review of study outcomes with short (< or = 7 mm) endosseous dental implants placed in partially edentulous patients. J Periodontol 2004;75(6):798-804 [Abstract in PubMed](#)

29. Morand M, Irinakis T. The challenge of implant therapy in the posterior maxilla: providing a rationale for the use of short implants. J Oral Implantol 2007;33(5):257-66 [Abstract in PubMed](#)

