Implant Supported Mandibular Overdenture in Pre-existing Complete Denture Wearer- Acceptance, Function and Stability
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Abstract

Objective: This prospective study was done to assess the overall acceptance, improvement in masticatory performance and stability of implant supported overdenture among the patient who were complete denture wearer and had impaired function and stability of mandibular complete denture.

Material & Method: Eight complete denture wearer patients who had compromised function and stability of mandibular denture were included in the study. One-piece titanium implants were placed at canine-premolar regions of mandible, one implant on each side. Ball part of the implant was kept above the crest. Lower denture was modified and immediate loading was done after 48 hours. Acceptance, improvement in masticatory efficiency and stability of mandibular complete denture were recorded on 100 mm Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) on 2\textsuperscript{nd} day, 7\textsuperscript{th} day, after 6 weeks and after 3 months.

Result and Observation: Present study showed a better acceptance by the patients as 95 score was recorded on VAS scale and mean change from baseline was 60.00 ± 10.00, t’ value was 16.97 and ‘p’ value was found <0.001 after 3 months. In masticatory function mean change from baseline was 51.63 ± 8.62, t’ value recorded 16.94 and ‘p’ value was found <0.001. Similarly, improvement in stability was also found significant. Few minor postsurgical complications were encountered; however; no major complication noted.

Conclusion: In conclusion, Implant supported mandibular overdenture not only improves the stability & function but also increases the overall acceptance of this newly evolved prosthesis in compare to conventional complete denture. It can be a considered as a better alternative to the conventional removable complete denture.
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Introduction

Tooth loss is a serious life event. Although dental science has advanced and the rate of edentulism among the elderly is continually decreasing, edentulism is considered a major health problem, affecting millions of individuals throughout the world. It not only affects self-confidence,
but also has a dramatic impact on the quality of life. In
denture wearers, quality of life is measured by socio-
dental indicators. Locker defined these indicators as:
measures of the extent to which dental and oral disorders
disrupt normal social role functioning and bring about
major changes in behavior\(^1\). Therefore quality of life
affects denture wearers with regard to patient
satisfaction, nutrition and psycho-social aspects of life\(^2\).

When teeth are removed, “Mother Nature” assumes there
is no need for the bone that supports the teeth. Over time
the bone slowly, but progressively diminishes, the upper
and lower jaw bones resorb.

For decades the best solutions for the replacement of
missing teeth were bridges, removable partial or full
dentures\(^3\). Out of maxillary and mandibular complete
dentures, more than 50% of conventional mandibular
complete dentures have problems with retention and
stability, and mandibular denture produces significantly
more problems than maxillary dentures, primarily because
of poor prosthesis retention. Implant-supported or retained
dentures have been increasingly accepted as an alternative
to conventional dentures for oral rehabilitation of
edentulous patients\(^2\).

A good option to preserve the alveolar bone loss is the use
of overdentures. An overdenture is defined as a
prosthesis that covers and is partially supported by
natural teeth, tooth roots, and/or dental implants\(^2\).
Overdenture may be tooth supported or implant supported
overdentures. In tooth supported overdentures, retention of
teeth or tooth roots in the alveolar bone can improve bone
maintenance around and between these structures.
However, tooth borne overdentures have a number of
disadvantages e.g. caries of abutment teeth or periodontal
breakdown etc\(^3\).

Dental implants are being increasingly used as suitable
prosthodontic substitutes for natural teeth\(^4\). For general
application in the edentulous mandible, a treatment
concept utilising two or four implants to support a
mandibular overdenture has been proposed. Although
various studies conclude that treatment concepts with
either two or four implants result in a good treatment out-
come regarding prostodontic rehabilitation of the patient
with problems in their mandibular dentures, the two
implant overdenture is a preferred and cost effective
treatment option in the edentulous mandible for older
adults\(^5\).

In the recent past, surgical intervention in the form of
implants, improved the masticatory efficiency, and
stability of lower denture in patients with complete
dentures. MacEntee MI et al\(^5\) conducted a clinical trial of
patient satisfaction and prosthodontic needs with ball and
bar attachments for implant retained complete
overdenture. They found that receiving new dentures with
implant supports, improved satisfaction “within subject”
that was prompt, durable, substantial and statistically
significant\(^5,6\).

The present study was undertaken to assess overall
acceptance, improvement in masticatory performance and
stability of mandibular denture following the provision of
implant-retained mandibular overdenture.

**Material & Method**

Eight patients with completely edentulous jaws bearing
upper and lower complete dentures but having impaired
masticatory functions and stability of lower denture
particularly, reporting to the Department of Oral and
Maxillofacial Surgery at Punjab Government Dental
College and Hospital, Amritsar were included in the study.
This Prospective study was duly approved by institutional
ethical committee.

The patients were selected irrespective of sex, social
status, caste and creed.
Inclusion criteria were

- Patients with completely edentulous jaws wearing complete dentures.
- Residual bone height in the area between two mental foramina of mandible was sufficient
- Patients who were having good oral hygiene and well informed patients, who gave their consent for implant surgery.

Patients with poor oral hygiene, chronic smoker, with severe maxillomandibular discrepancy or immunocompromised status were excluded from the study. Preoperatively, a thorough clinical and radiological examinations (Orthopantomogram & Dentascan) were performed. (Fig.1)

**Leader** one piece non-submerged implants with ball attachments were used. Those were one-piece titanium implants with 3.2 mm diameter and 10 mm length. Under strict aseptic technique, surgical placements of two implants were done in mandibular canine-premolar regions, one in each side under local anesthesia with antibiotic prophylaxis. The implant was placed such that the ball (2.5 mm in diameter) remained above the crestal bone. (Fig.2)

After 48 hours of surgery, denture modification process was carried out by following steps:

- Space was created in the lower denture base to accommodate attachments by properly marking the sites with articulating paper corresponding to implants. (Fig.3)
- Nylon caps (receptacles) were placed on the ball part of the implants. (Fig.4)
- The denture was accurately positioned on the mandibular ridge and the Nylon caps were luted within the mandibular denture with autopolymerizing acrylic resin.

- Upper denture was inserted into patient’s mouth and patient was instructed to close dentures in centric occlusion till luting was furnished.
- After autopolymerizing resin was set, extra resin was ground off. (Fig.5)

During follow-up period, patients’ ratings of overall acceptance, improvement in masticatory efficiency and stability of mandibular complete denture were recorded on 100 mm Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) on 2nd day, 7th day, after 6 weeks and after 3 months. The VAS was anchored at each end as “completely dissatisfied” and “completely satisfied”.

---

**Fig.1: 2-D view (Dentascan)**

**Fig.2: Implants in position**
on VAS scale after 3 months of surgery. Furthermore, on 2nd day mean change from baseline (Conventional Denture) was 49.38 ± 8.2. ‘t’ value was 17.00 and ‘p’ value was found <0.001. However, after 3 months, mean change from baseline was 60.00 ± 10.00, t value 16.97 and ‘p’ value found <0.001, which was highly significant. (Table –I)

Similarly, masticatory efficiency was recorded 79-80 on VAS scale on 2nd day. However, it also increased to 87-95 in 3 months post-operatively. Statistical analysis on masticatory efficiency after 3 months showed mean change from baseline 51.63 ± 8.62, ‘t’ value recorded 16.94 and ‘p’ value found <0.001, which was significant as well. (Table –II)

Third parameter, stability was also assessed on VAS scale and found 75-87 on second post-operative day, which was increased to 87-95 after 3 months. In addition, statistical analysis of stability was also found significant. (Table –III)

Follow up was done for two years; no major complication like peri-implantitis, loosening of denture was noted. However, marginal bone loss of were noted around three implants. In addition, minor surgical complications like mild swelling and pain were noted in the immediate post-surgical period in all the patients. Further, two patients showed ecchymosis as well that resolved within a week.

Table –I: Overall Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Mean Change from Baseline</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.13 ± 8.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82.50 ± 2.67</td>
<td>49.38 ± 8.21</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86.25 ± 3.54</td>
<td>53.13 ± 9.23</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.25 ± 2.31</td>
<td>58.13 ± 8.43</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93.13 ± 2.59</td>
<td>60.00 ± 10.00</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table –II: Masticatory Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Mean Change from Baseline</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.75 ± 7.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.13 ± 3.18</td>
<td>44.38 ± 9.96</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86.25 ± 2.66</td>
<td>47.50 ± 9.26</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88 ± 2.36</td>
<td>50.13 ± 8.81</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90.38 ± 2.33</td>
<td>51.63 ± 8.62</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table –III: Stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Mean Change from Baseline</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.25 ± 5.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.63 ± 3.86</td>
<td>41.38 ± 7.86</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84.50 ± 4.11</td>
<td>45.25 ± 6.92</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87.63 ± 3.34</td>
<td>48.38 ± 5.68</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90.00 ± 3.30</td>
<td>50.75 ± 7.05</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.001; Highly Significant

Discussion

The present study was conducted in eight patients with completely edentulous jaws bearing upper and lower complete dentures but having compromised function and stability of lower denture particularly. The aim of the study was to assess the acceptance, improvement in masticatory performance and stability of mandibular denture following the provision of implant-retained mandibular overdenture.

Edentulous patients often experience problems with their mandibular complete dentures. Lack of stability and retention of their mandibular denture, together with a decreased chewing ability are the main complaints of these patients. Doundoulakis JH et al described implant-supported overdenture as an alternative to the complete mandibular denture and found that implants placed in the anterior mandible (anterior to the mental foramen) have a success rate better than 95%. Additionally, they observed that implant supported overdentures in the mandible provide predictable results with improved stability, retention, function and patient satisfaction compared with conventional dentures.

MacEntee MI et al did a clinical trial of patient satisfaction and prosthodontic needs with ball and bar attachments for implant retained complete overdenture. They found significant improvement in satisfaction amongst patients after receiving new dentures with mandibular implant supports, regardless of the attachment mechanism, and with or without a reinforcing framework. Moreover, Walton JN et al observed that there were no significant differences between mandibular IODs retained by either titanium caps on two 2.25-mm ball abutments or 2 metal clips on a round gold bar in the number of appointments or overall time required to fabricate the dentures, the number of adjustments needed after prosthesis placement, or overall patient satisfaction with their new dentures. In another study, Sadowsky SJ reviewed and elucidated that the solitary ball attachments appear to be less costly, less technique sensitive, and more accommodating of tapered arches.

Van Steenberghe et al (1987) were among the first authors to propose placement of only 2 implants in the edentulous mandible and reported 98% success rate, with up to 52 months of observation. Similarly, Mericske-Stern et al (1994) reported 97% implant survival with 2 implants (splinted or solitary), irrespective of keratinized tissue or duration of edentulism. However, Jemt et al (1996) reported 100% cumulative success rate for overdentures supported by 2 implants with the mean marginal bone loss of 0.5 mm during a 5-year period.
Implant loading time is considered to influence the treatment outcomes as well. According to conventional protocol, for two weeks after surgery the patients are not allowed to wear their mandibular dentures and the healing time of at least 3 months is required before connection of the overdenture to the implants. Traditionally one or two stage approach can be employed. However, number of experimental studies have shown that implant loading up to 3 months can produce equally satisfactory results in edentulous anterior mandible. Increased bone-to-implant contact at earlier healing times with newly designed implant surfaces were reported. Immediate (up to 2 days after surgery) and early (up to 3 months after surgery) loading protocols were proposed. Due to reduced overall treatment time & discomfort, high patient acceptance and better function they are gaining wider acceptance. Consequently, implant manufacturers extensively market one-piece implants for mandibular implant supported overdentures. Moreover, the one-stage procedure offers distinct advantages for elderly patients because of reduced surgical procedures and treatment cost.

The results of our study revealed marked improvement in masticatory efficiency, stability and overall acceptance of mandibular complete denture. The student 't' test was used for comparing the values at different time intervals. The results showed that overall acceptance, improvement in masticatory efficiency and stability of mandibular complete denture was highly significant (p value ≤ 0.001). The findings of the present study are in concurrence with the study of Mac Entee MI et al (2005) who did a clinical trial of patient satisfaction and prosthodontic needs with ball and bar attachments for implant retained complete overdenture and found improved satisfaction “within subject” was durable, substantial and statistically significant. Furthermore, Walton JN et al also found remarkable patients satisfaction with the improvement in function, comfort, and appearance with implants retained overdenture compared to their original conventional dentures.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, present study showed better stability and improved masticatory performance with implant supported mandibular overdenture. In addition, overall acceptance rate of implant supported overdenture was proved to be better than conventional removable denture. However before any definite conclusion can be drawn, a large number of samples and longer period of observations are required to evaluate long term improvement in masticatory efficiency and stability of implant retained mandibular overdenture.
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