

## POST-EXTRACTIVE IMPLANTS: OUTCOME OF 40 CASES

M. A. LOPEZ<sup>1</sup>, M. ANDREASI BASSI<sup>1</sup>, L. CONFALONE<sup>1</sup>,

S. FANALI<sup>2</sup>, V. CANDOTTO<sup>3</sup>, D. PEDREIRA DE OLIVEIRA<sup>3</sup> and F. CARINCI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Private practice, Roma, Italy, <sup>2</sup>Department of Oral Science, Nano and Biotechnology, University "G. D'Annunzio", Chieti, Italy, <sup>3</sup>Department of D.M.C.C.C., Section of Maxillofacial and Plastic Surgery, University of Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy

In the last two decades, several investigators have reported immediate placement of dental implants into extraction sockets achieving excellent results with a two-stage surgical procedure. Recently immediate loading has become an emerging technique as it has been documented to be a successful and time saving procedure. As regard the possibility of immediate/early loading of implants placed in fresh extraction sockets few reports are available. In addition they are based on limited series with short follow-up. Thus we decided to perform a retrospective study on a series of post-extractive implants. A total of 40 two-piece implants (FMD srl, Rome, Italy) were inserted in post extractive sockets, 22 in females and 18 in males. The median age was  $52 \pm 11$  (min-max 24-69 years). Twenty- one implants were inserted in upper jaw and 19 in mandible. Fixtures replaced 7 incisors, 3 cuspids, 12 premolars and 18 molars. Implant'length was  $x \leq 10$  mm,  $10,30 \leq x \leq 12,30$ , equal to 13 mm and  $x \geq 14$  mm in 6, 14, 9, and 11 cases, respectively. Implant' diameter was narrower than 3.5 mm, equal to 3.8 mm and wider than 4.0 mm in 1, 7, and 32 cases, respectively. There were 28, 2 and 10 Elisir, I-fix, and Shiner implant types, respectively. No implant on single tooth rehabilitations, was lost, survival rate = 100%. Then peri-implant bone resorption (i.e. delta IAJ) was used to investigate SCR. Seven fixtures have a crestal bone resorption greater than 1.5 mm (SCR = 82.5%). Statistical analysis demonstrated that there was a difference between surgeons ( $p= 0.005$ ). In conclusion FMD implants are reliable devices for oral rehabilitation with a very high SCR and SVR.

*Corresponding author:*

Prof. Francesco Carinci, M.D

Department of D.M.C.C.C Section of Maxillofacial and Plastic Surgery University of Ferrara

Corso Giovecca 203, 44100 Ferrara ITALY

E-mail: [crc@unife.it](mailto:crc@unife.it) Web: [www.carinci.org](http://www.carinci.org)

Phone: +39.0532.455874 Fax: +39.0532.455876

1721-727X (2012)

This publication and/or article is for individual use only and may not be further reproduced without written permission from the copyright holder.

Unauthorized reproduction may result in financial and other penalties

DISCLOSURE: ALL AUTHORS REPORT NO CONFLICTS OF

INTEREST RELEVANT TO THIS ARTICLE.

European Journal of Inflammation – Vol. 10, no. 2 (S), 21-25 (2012)