

Challenges and Limitations of Digital Implantology

Sarra Nasri^{1*}, Yosra Gassara¹, Rim Kallala², Rihab Dakhli¹, Zohra Noura¹, Jilani Saafi¹, Mounir Cherif¹, Belhassen Harzallah¹

¹Department of Fixed Prosthodontics, Faculty of dental Medicine, University of Monastir, Research Laboratory of Occlusodontics and Ceramic Prostheses LR16ES15, Monastir, Tunisia

²Department of Dental Anatomy, Faculty of Dental Medicine, University of Monastir, Research Laboratory of Occlusodontics and Ceramic Prostheses LR16ES15, Monastir, Tunisia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36347/sjmcr.2024.v12i11.015> | Received: 05.10.2024 | Accepted: 08.11.2024 | Published: 12.11.2024

*Corresponding author: Sarra Nasri

Department of Fixed Prosthodontics, Faculty of dental Medicine, University of Monastir, Research Laboratory of Occlusodontics and Ceramic Prostheses LR16ES15, Monastir, Tunisia

Abstract

Review Article

Digital implantology has revolutionized dental implant treatment by enhancing precision, efficiency, and patient outcomes. Utilizing digital technologies such as 3D imaging, guided surgery, and computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM), digital implantology offers a highly accurate approach to implant placement and restoration. However, this technology comes with its own set of challenges and limitations that can impact its effectiveness and accessibility. Technical challenges, including software compatibility issues and the need for high-resolution imaging, can hinder the seamless integration of digital tools. Additionally, the high cost of digital equipment and the need for specialized training limit widespread adoption, particularly in smaller practices or resource-limited settings. Moreover, the steep learning curve associated with mastering digital tools and adapting to new workflows can increase the risk of operator error during the transition from traditional methods. This paper explores the main challenges and limitations of digital implantology, including technological, financial, and practical obstacles, and highlights strategies to address these issues, ensuring that the benefits of digital advancements are optimized for both practitioners and patients.

Keywords: Digital implantology, 3D imaging, Guided surgery, CAD/CAM technology, Implant placement precision, Training and learning curve.

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Actual literature provide evidence in favor of using digital implantology to achieve accurate implant placement, better aesthetics, and increased patient satisfaction. It also highlights the possibility of dynamic navigation to enhance clinical performance and the significance of prosthetically guided implant planning.

Challenges and limitations:

1. Accuracy and Precision:

- Challenge:** Despite advancements in technology, achieving absolute accuracy in digital implantology remains a challenge. Implant placement accuracy can be impacted by a number of factors, including software algorithm limits, data matching mistakes, and distortion in imaging modalities [1].
- Limitation:** Errors in the digital planning and production of surgical guides could result in a

departure from the planned implant locations, endangering the overall surgical outcome.

2. Complex Cases:

- Challenge:** Complex instances, such as those involving patients with poor bone quality, anatomical abnormalities, or large patches of edentulous tissue, may provide difficulties for digital implantology. These situations call for careful preparation and specially designed solutions, which can be outside the scope of typical digital operations [2, 3].
- Limitation:** Digital implantology may not be as applicable in some clinical circumstances due to their complexity, which would call for a more customized and nuanced approach to treatment planning and implementation.

3. Cost and Accessibility:

- **Challenge:** Digital implantology technology, such as CBCT scanners, CAD/CAM systems, and 3D printers, might have hefty upfront costs. For some dental offices, especially smaller ones or those with fewer resources, this expense can be a deterrent to adoption [4, 5].
- **Limitation:** The limited availability of sophisticated digital instruments and knowledge could impede the extensive adoption of digital implantology, hence affecting the standard and efficaciousness of patient care [6].

4. Learning Curve and Training:

- **Challenge:** It takes expertise with specialized software and technology as well as training to incorporate digital workflows into clinical practice. In order to become proficient with these technologies and modify their processes to include digital implantology, dentists and clinicians could encounter a learning curve.
- **Limitation:** The lack of standardized training courses and other educational materials for digital implantology may prevent these methods from being widely used, which could result in practitioners using different degrees of expertise and getting different results.

5. Interdisciplinary Collaboration:

- **Challenge:** Effective interdisciplinary collaboration between radiologists, dental technologists, prosthodontists, and dentists is often essential to successful digital implantology. Logistical issues can arise when coordinating communication and process integration among various disciplines.
- **Limitation:** The significance of cohesive teamwork and shared decision-making procedures is underscored by the possibility of errors, delays, or suboptimal treatment outcomes resulting from inadequate communication and coordination among team members involved in digital implantology.

6. Regulatory and Ethical Considerations:

- **Challenge:** The rapid evolution of digital technologies in implant dentistry raises regulatory and ethical considerations related to data privacy, patient consent, and compliance with industry standards. Ensuring adherence to legal requirements and ethical guidelines is essential for maintaining patient trust and professional integrity [7].
- **Limitation:** Regulatory complexities and ethical dilemmas in digital implantology may pose challenges for practitioners in navigating legal frameworks, safeguarding patient

information, and upholding ethical standards in clinical practice [8, 9].

CONCLUSION

To solve the issues with digital workflows and validate these beneficial results, more research is necessary.

Addressing these challenges and limitations through ongoing research, education, and technological innovation is essential for advancing the field of digital implantology and maximizing its potential to improve patient outcomes and enhance the quality of dental implant treatments.

REFERENCES

1. Greenberg, A. M. (2015). Digital technologies for dental implant treatment planning and guided surgery. *Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Clinics*, 27(2), 319-340.
2. Schimmel, M., Memedi, K., Parga, T., Katsoulis, J., & Mueller, F. (2017). Masticatory Performance and Maximum Bite and Lip Force Depend on the Type of Prosthesis. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*, 30(6), 565-572.
3. Turkyilmaz, I., Tozum, T. F., Fuhrmann, D. M., & Tumer, C. (2012). Seven-year follow-up results of TiUnite implants supporting mandibular overdentures: early versus delayed loading. *Clinical implant dentistry and related research*, 14, e83-e90.
4. Soto-Peñaloza, D., Zaragoza-Alonso, R., Peñarrocha-Diago, M., & Peñarrocha-Diago, M. (2017). The all-on-four treatment concept: Systematic review. *Journal of clinical and experimental dentistry*, 9(3), e474-e488.
5. Spielau, T., Hauschild, U., & Katsoulis, J. (2019). Computer-assisted, template-guided immediate implant placement and loading in the mandible: a case report. *BMC Oral Health*, 19, 1-9.
6. Garcia-Hammaker, S., & George, F. M. (2019). Use of a surgical template for minimally invasive second-stage surgery: A dental technique. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, 121(1), 37-40.
7. Morton, D., Phasuk, K., Polido, W. D., & Lin, W. S. (2019). Consideration for contemporary implant surgery. *Dental Clinics*, 63(2), 309-329.
8. Ozan, O., Turkyilmaz, I., Ersoy, A. E., McGlumphy, E. A., & Rosenstiel, S. F. (2009). Clinical accuracy of 3 different types of computed tomography-derived stereolithographic surgical guides in implant placement. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*, 67(2), 394-401.
9. Verbruggen, M., Fortin, T., Widmann, G., Jacobs, R., & Quirynen, M. (2014). Different techniques of static/dynamic guided implant surgery: modalities and indications. *Periodontology*, 2000, 66(1), 214-227.