



## International Journal of Applied Dental Sciences

ISSN Print: 2394-7489  
ISSN Online: 2394-7497  
IJADS 2020; 6(4): 289-291  
© 2020 IJADS  
[www.oraljournal.com](http://www.oraljournal.com)  
Received: 06-08-2020  
Accepted: 10-09-2020

**Dr. K Premnath**  
Professor, Department of  
Dentistry, Sambharam Institute  
of Medical Sciences and  
Research, KGF, Karnataka,  
India

**Dr. Nagaranjani Prakash**  
Assistant Professor, Department  
of Prosthodontics, Government  
Dental College and Research  
Institute, Bangalore, Karnataka,  
India

**Dr. BPG Tilak**  
Reader, Department of Oral  
Surgery, Dr. Hegeadwar  
Sanghan Smirithi Dental College,  
Hingoli, Maharashtra, India

**Dr. Kamala R**  
Associate Professor, Department  
of Dentistry, ESICS Medical  
College, Bangalore, Karnataka,  
India

**Dr. Sadananda MP**  
Professor, Department of Oral  
Surgery, KGF College of Dental  
Sciences, KGF, Karnataka, India

**Dr. Syed Ahmed Rheel**  
Associate Professor, Department  
of Oral Medicine, KGF College of  
Dental Sciences, KGF,  
Karnataka, India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. K Premnath**  
Professor, Department of  
Dentistry, Sambharam Institute  
of Medical Sciences and  
Research, KGF, Karnataka,  
India

### Evaluation of surrounding anatomical structures in implant supported FPD with and without cantilever: An original research

**Dr. K Premnath, Dr. Nagaranjani Prakash, Dr. BPG Tilak, Dr. Kamala R, Dr. Sadananda MP and Dr. Syed Ahmed Rheel**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22271/oral.2020.v6.i4e.1078>

#### Abstract

**Objective:** The aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the status of supporting tissue around implant-supported fixed partial denture with or without cantilever clinically and radiographically during a three year period of follow up.

**Materials and Methods:** one hundred patients who were treated by 300 implants supported fixed partial prosthesis with and without cantilever after at least three years of treatment, were evaluated. Clinical and radiographic indices of plaque index, probing pocket depth, bleeding index and marginal bone loss were measured. Collected data were analyzed by Mann-Whitney, Fridman and repeated-measures ANOVA tests using SPSS software.

**Results:** The overall survival rate of implant supported prosthesis was 95.9% after at least three years of treatment. The success rates of implant supported fixed prosthesis with and without cantilever were 94.6% and 96.8% respectively. Marginal bone loss in the cantilevered fixed prosthesis was significantly more than the second group after two and four years of treatment ( $P < 0.001$ ), however, all the clinical indices were not significantly different.

**Conclusion:** Considering the guidelines of cantilever prosthesis applications, using the cantilevered fixed partial dentures have a similar and comparable prognosis as the traditional implant-supported fixed prostheses.

**Keywords:** Dental prosthesis, dental implants, dental prosthesis, implant-supported

#### Introduction

Using dental implants to support fixed prostheses is now a sophisticated alternative to conventional natural tooth-supported fixed prostheses. If dental implant is contraindicated in certain sites of the jaw bone due to anatomical reasons such as horizontal or vertical bone defects or expanded maxillary sinus with no possibility to perform ridge augmentation or sinus lifting due to systemic diseases or financial reasons; or even when limiting the number of implants that can be used is obligatory due to finances, in these situations it is useful to use only one implant to support two missing teeth using the cantilever design. This will spare the patient from using the removable partial denture, which is inferior as regards patients' satisfaction in most of the cases<sup>[1,2]</sup>.

The health of supporting anatomical tissues of dental implants can be endangered by biomechanical factors and various bacterial infections. These factors are usually the principle cause of crestal bone loss around dental implants<sup>[3]</sup>. In cases, where the remaining bones are unfavorable for implant placement, there would be two options for treatment either by bone augmentation or restoring the edentulous area with cantilever fixed prosthesis. Methods of restoring tissues are very sensitive, complicated and difficult; meanwhile several studies have described the advantages of rebuilding the function through cantilever fixed prosthesis which resulted in positive response and high application of cantilever in implant supported fixed prosthesis<sup>[4,5,6]</sup>. Since the impact of a cantilever is similar to a force being exerted by a class I lever biomechanical force in implant supported prosthesis, it might jeopardize the health of its peripheral supporting bone<sup>[7,8]</sup>.

The aim of present study was to evaluate and compare the status of supporting anatomical tissue around implant-supported fixed partial denture with or without cantilever clinically and radiographically during a three year period.

### Materials and Methods

This retrospective study assessed 100 patients including 66 men and 34 women in the age range of 23 to 50 years old. All patients were referred to the Department of prosthodontics and crown & bridge and Implantology and their treatment plan included implant supported fixed partial prosthesis with or without cantilevers. Only patients with at least three year history of prosthesis placement were included in this study.

The exclusion criteria were: poor oral hygiene, systemic diseases, any illness or syndrome which has effect on oral mucosa, any surgical treatment of soft and hard tissues around the implants after its placement and prosthesis which were not fabricated according to the guidelines of implant-supported prosthesis.

Total of 100 patients who have been treated with 300 Dentium implant system; Dentium Co., Seoul, Korea implants were met the criteria and divided into two groups of cantilevered and conventional- implant supported prosthesis. The status of supporting tissue was measured using the clinical and radiographic indices as follows:

1. Plaque Index (PI) was measured as described by Silness and Loe <sup>[9]</sup>.
2. Probing Pocket Depth (PPD): The distance between gingival margin and the bottom of gingival sulcus was measured using a millimetergraded Williams's style periodontal plastic probe (Hu-Friedy Co, Chicago, USA).
3. Bleeding Index: The Muhlemann index was used to determine this quantity <sup>[3]</sup>.
4. Marginal Bone Loss (MBL) around implants was quantified through intra-oral radiographs by measuring the distance between alveolar crest and implant shoulder.

The clinical indices were measured in six sites: mesiobuccal, buccal, distobuccal, distolingual, lingual, and mesiolingual. All indices were measured at the time of implant loading (zero), one, two, and four years after prosthesis placement. Collected data were statistically analyzed by repeated-measures ANOVA, Friedmann and Mann-Whitney tests using SPSS software.

### Results

Participants were 66 men and 34women with the mean age of 37.8 (SD=8.6) year old. Amongst 300 implants which were studied, 120 of them supported cantilevered fixed prosthesis (first group) and the second group included 180 implants which were used as conventional implant supported prosthesis. At the end of the three year of implant placement, 10 implants of the first group and 9 implants of the second group were failed. The overall success rate was 95.9% after three years of loading with the success rates of 94.6% and 96.8% for the first and second group respectively.

The mean cantilever length was 8.3 mm (SD=2.4 mm) which 77% of them were located in distal and 23% in the mesial of the implants.

Mean indices of PPD and MBL after the first, second, and three years of loading in two groups are summarized in Table 1. The mean PPD in the two groups was not significantly different and statistical test only confirmed the negative effect of time on this index. MBL around implants was not significantly different after one year of loading, however,

MBL was higher in the second group after two and four years ( $P<0.001$ ). Results obtained from plaques and bleeding indices are summarized in Table 2. Neither PI nor bleeding index was significantly different in two groups during the study period.

**Table 1:** Measurements of mean probing pocket depth (PPD) and marginal bone loss (MBL) in two groups

Index	Fixed Prosthesis with cantilever (First group)			Fixed Prosthesis without cantilever (Second group)			P value
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	
PPD 0	166	2.88	1.14	277	2.54	0.96	Ns
PPD 1	164	2.87	1.06	277	2.64	0.95	Ns
PPD 2	160	2.96	1.26	265	2.70	0.98	Ns
PPD 3	178	3.04	1.90	267	2.92	1.60	Ns
MBL 0	156	0.48	0.53	250	0.49	0.43	Ns
MBL 1	154	0.69	0.45	243	0.57	0.48	Ns
MBL 2	160	0.93	0.59	265	0.69	0.51	0.00
MBL 3	150	1.01	0.66	267	0.80	0.51	0.00

Ns = Not significant

**Table 2:** Indices changes of plaque index (PI) and bleeding index (BI) during four years of study period

Index	Fixed prosthesis with cantilever		Fixed prosthesis without cantilever		P value
	n	%	n	%	
PI0	164	64%	277	62%	Ns
PI1	180	60%	270	63%	Ns
PI2	177	59%	268	61%	Ns
PI3	179	59%	265	58%	Ns
BI0	174	59%	270	70%	Ns
BI1	181	59%	261	66%	Ns
BI2	179	59%	269	58%	Ns
BI3	180	60%	271	61%	Ns

Ns = Not significant

### Discussion

The prognosis of cantilevered fixed partial denture on natural teeth abutments is considered to be poor since its failure rate has been reported 36-40% in a period of 5 to 7 years <sup>[10]</sup>. There are some anatomical limits for replacing the missing teeth with dental implants, for instance closeness to maxillary sinus and mandibular nerve. Moreover, the great cost of implant treatments might lead to the application of cantilevered fixed prosthesis, however, clinical studies regarding the effect of cantilever on supporting tissues have rarely been carried out.

The cantilever design has a significant influence on stress distribution in implant and its supporting tissues and can lead to unfavorable biomechanical effects around them <sup>[11, 12, 13]</sup>. Furthermore, finite element studies revealed that higher stress concentrations developed in models with cantilever prostheses, therefore, in a long term period, could lead to a higher MBL and jeopardize the health of soft and hard tissues supporting implants <sup>[14]</sup>.

Studies on implants restored with cantilevered fixed prosthesis showed a survival rate between 95.3% to 98.2% <sup>[15, 16]</sup>. In the present study the survival rates of implants supported fixed prosthesis with and without cantilevers were 94.6% and 96.8% respectively. Romeo *et al.*, <sup>[17]</sup> demonstrated a success rate of 96.7% and 96.8% in traditional and cantilevered implant supported prosthesis respectively which is similar to the results of current study. Inspecting the health indices of soft tissue around implants indicate that the PI in groups one and two is zero relating to 58% to 60%

points under study regarding four times of investigation. Similar studies have reported different values for this index. For example, in a study conducted by Gotfredsen and Holm<sup>[18]</sup>, this index was zero related to 90% points at the time of loading, and 76% after four years. Behneke *et al.*,<sup>[15, 16, 19]</sup> reported that the PI in 80% to 84% of the measuring points were zero. Comparing the data obtained from the present study and similar studies indicate that patients participated in the present study have poorer oral hygiene.

Bleeding index in the present study was not significantly different in two study groups and it was zero only in 60-70% of measuring points which is comparable to the Behneke *et al.*,<sup>[15, 16, 19]</sup> study. Other similar study did not measure this parameter.

The mean PPD in group one was varied from 2.88 to 3.04 mm during the study period and it was more than 3.5 mm in 29% of measuring points. In group two, the mean PPD was between 2.54 to 2.92 mm while only 10% of measurements were more than 3.5 mm. The mean PPD obtained in present study was similar to levy *et al.*, and Behneke *et al.*, investigations<sup>[20, 15]</sup>.

The mean MBL in group one ranged between 0.48 to 1.1 mm, while 35% of the implants had a bone loss more than 1 mm at the end of study. In the second group, MBL varied from 0.49 to 0.8 mm and 15% of implants had a bone loss more than 1 mm. In an investigation conducted by Wennstrom *et al.*,<sup>[21]</sup> bone losses in groups with and without cantilever were 0.49 mm and 0.38 mm respectively. In their assessment, 33% of implants of the cantilevered group had bone loss equal to or more than 1 mm, whereas only 19% of the group without cantilever had the same status. MBLs in the cantilever group were significantly higher than the second group which was restored with traditional fixed prosthesis. Wennstrom *et al.*,<sup>[21]</sup> and Romeo *et al.*,<sup>[17]</sup> have found similar result in their investigations. Since there are evidences to indicate the use of the short implants (8 mm) in distal extension edentulous area have a success rate comparable to 11 mm implants, in order to prevent stress concentration in implant's surrounding bone, the use of short implants in distal extension can be suggested.

## Conclusion

Considering the limitations of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. By following the guidelines of implantsupported prosthesis, cantilevered prosthesis can have a success rate comparable to conventional implant-supported prosthesis.
2. Using a cantilever design can increase forces delivered to the implants and its surrounding bone, leading to a higher MBL.

## References

1. Budtz-Jorgensen E, Isidor F. A 5-year longitudinal study of cantilevered fixed partial dentures compared with removable partial dentures in a geriatric population. *J Prosthet Dent* 1990;64:42-47.
2. Jepson N, Allen F, Moynihan P, Kelly P, Thomason M. Patient satisfaction following restoration of shortened mandibular dental arches in a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Prosthodont* 2003;16:409-414.
3. Newman MG, Takei HH, Carranza FA. *Clinical periodontology*. Philadelphia: WB Saunders 2002, P933.
4. Rodriguez AM, Aquilino SA, Lund PS. Cantilever and implant biomechanics: A review of the literature. *J Prosthodont* 1994;3(1):41-6.
5. Shackleton JL, Carr L, Slabbert JC, Becker PJ. Survival

of fixed implant-supported prostheses related to cantilever lengths. *J Prosthet Dent* 1994;71(1):23-6.

6. Becker CM, Kaiser DA. Implant-retained cantilever fixed prosthesis: Where and when. *J Prosthet Dent* 2000;84(4):432-5.
7. Brosky ME, Koriotoh TW, Hodges J. The anterior cantilever in the implant-supported screw-retained mandibular prosthesis. *J Prosthet Dent* 2003;89(3):244-9.
8. Bidez MW, Misch CE. Force transfer in implant dentistry: Basic concepts and principles. *J Oral Implantol* 1992;18(3):264-74.
9. Silness J, Loe H. Periodontal disease in pregnancy II. Correlation between oral hygiene and periodontal condition. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1964;22:121-35.
10. Becker CM. Cantilever fixed prostheses utilizing dental implants: A 10-year retrospective analysis. *Quintessence Int* 2004;35(6):437-41.
11. Çağlar A, Aydın C, Ozen J, Yilmaz C, Korkmaz T. Effects of mesiodistal inclination of implants on stress distribution in implant-supported fixed prostheses. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2006;21(1):36-44.
12. Misch CE. *Dental Implant Prosthetics*. St. Louis Mo: Mosby 2005, P427-32.
13. Akça K, Iplikçioğlu H. Finite element stress analysis of the effect of short implant usage in place of cantilever extensions in mandibular posterior edentulism. *J Oral Rehabil* 2002;29(4):350-6.
14. Stegaroiu R, Sato T, Kusakari H, Miyakawa O. Influence of restoration type on stress distribution in bone around implants: A three-dimensional finite element analysis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1998;13(1):82-90.
15. Behneke A, Behneke N, d'Hoedt B. The longitudinal clinical effectiveness of ITI solid-screw implants in partially edentulous patients: A 5-year follow-up report. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2000;15(5):633-45.
16. Behneke A, Behneke N, d'Hoedt B, Wagner W. Hard and soft tissue reactions to ITI screw implants: 3-year longitudinal results of a prospective study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1997;12(6):749-57.
17. Romeo E, Lops D, Margutti E, Ghisolfi M, Chiapasco M, Vogel G. Long-term survival and success of oral implants in the treatment of full and partial arches: A 7-year prospective study with the ITI dental implant system. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2004;19(2):247-59.
18. Gotfredsen K, Holm B. Implant-supported mandibular overdentures retained with ball or bar attachments: A randomized prospective 5-year study. *Int J Prosthodont* 2000;13(2):125-30.
19. Behneke A, Behneke N, d'Hoedt B. A 5-year longitudinal study of the clinical effectiveness of ITI solid-screw implants in the treatment of mandibular edentulism. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2002;17(6):799-810.
20. Levy D, Deporter DA, Watson PA, Pilliar RM. Periodontal parameters around porous-coated dental implants after 3 to 4 years supporting overdentures. *J Clin Periodontol* 1996;23(6):517-22.
21. Wennström J, Zurdo J, Karlsson S, Ekestubbe A, Gröndahl K, Lindhe J. Bone level change at implant-supported fixed partial dentures with and without cantilever extension after 5 years in function. *J Clin Periodontol* 2004;31(12):1077-83.
22. Teixeira ER, Wadamoto M, Akagawa Y, Kimoto T. Clinical application of short hydroxylapatite-coated dental implants to the posterior mandible: A five-year survival study. *J Prosthet Dent* 1997;78(2):166-71.