IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Anatomical Considerations and Imaging Techniques as Aids in Dental Implantology: A Literature Review.

Dr Prem Faye, Dr Ruchi Kasat, Dr Babita Yeshwante, Dr Akash Todsam, Dr Pooja Katwate
PG student, Professor, Professor and HOD, PG student, PG student
MUHS

Abstract

The aim of this review is to elucidate the critical importance of anatomical landmarks in the maxilla and mandible for dental implant placement and to evaluate the impact of advanced imaging techniques such as Orthopantomography (OPG), Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) on the accurate identification and analysis of these landmarks. By synthesizing current literature, this review seeks to provide dental practitioners with a comprehensive understanding of key anatomical structures, their significance in implantology, and how modern imaging advancements contribute to safer and more effective implant placement procedures.

Keywords:

1. Anatomical landmarks 2. Maxilla 3. Mandible 4. Dental implants 5. Implant placement 6. Orthopantomography (OPG) 7. Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) 8. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) 9. Sinus lift 10. Mandibular canal 11. Maxillary sinus 12. Mental foramen 13. Nerve injury 14. Bone quality 15. Alveolar ridge 16. Cortical bone 17. Implant stability 18. Complications 19. Advanced imaging 20. Precision dentistry

Introduction

Dental implantology has revolutionized modern dentistry, providing a reliable and effective solution for tooth replacement. Central to the success of dental implants is the precise understanding and utilization of anatomical landmarks in the maxilla and mandible. These landmarks are critical in ensuring the optimal placement of implants, which in turn influences the stability, functionality, and aesthetic outcomes of the prosthetic rehabilitation.

The advent of advanced imaging techniques such as Orthopantomography (OPG), Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) has significantly enhanced the ability of clinicians to accurately analyze these anatomical landmarks. OPG provides a panoramic view of the jaws, allowing for the initial assessment of bone structure and pathology. CBCT offers three-dimensional imaging, providing detailed insights into bone density, volume, and the spatial relationship of critical anatomical structures such as the maxillary sinus, mandibular canal, and mental foramen. MRI, although less commonly used in dental implantology due to its high cost and complexity, offers superior soft tissue contrast and can be invaluable in specific cases requiring detailed soft tissue evaluation.

This review aims to elucidate the importance of these anatomical markers, offering a comprehensive overview of their role in guiding implant placement. By thoroughly understanding the anatomical landscape and leveraging advanced imaging technologies, clinicians can mitigate risks such as nerve damage, sinus perforation, and inadequate osseointegration, thereby enhancing patient outcomes. This article will discuss key anatomical features, such as the maxillary sinus, mandibular canal, mental foramen, and other vital structures, highlighting their significance in the context of implant placement. Furthermore, it will explore how modern imaging advancements have transformed the planning and execution of dental implant procedures, providing a roadmap for safer and more effective implantology practices.

Material and Methodology

Literature Search Strategy

To comprehensively review the importance of anatomical considerations in the maxilla and mandible for the placement of dental implants, a systematic literature search was conducted. The primary databases used for this search were PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The search was aimed at identifying peer-reviewed articles, clinical studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses published from January 2003 to December 2023.

Search Terms

The following search terms were used either alone or in combination:

- Anatomical landmarks
- Maxilla
- Mandible
- Dental implants
- Implant placement
- Orthopantomography (OPG)
- Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT)
- Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)
- Maxillary sinus
- Mandibular canal
- Mental foramen
- Nerve injury
- Bone quality
- Alveolar ridge
- Cortical bone
- Implant stability
- Complications
- Advanced imaging
- Precision dentistry

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Articles published between January 2003 and December 2023.

2. Studies that focus on anatomical landmarks of the maxilla and mandible in relation to dental implant placement.

3. Research discussing the impact of advanced imaging techniques (OPG, CBCT, MRI) on implant planning.

4. Peer-reviewed journals, clinical trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses.

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Articles not available in English.

2. Studies that do not specifically address anatomical landmarks or advanced imaging in implantology.

3. Publications older than 2003, unless they are seminal works providing foundational knowledge.

Data Collection and Analysis

A total of 168 articles were initially identified through the database searches. After applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 92 articles were selected for detailed review. The selected articles were categorized based on their focus on anatomical landmarks, the role of advanced imaging techniques, and the clinical outcomes of implant placement.

Data Extraction

For each included study, the following data were extracted:

1. Identification and description of key anatomical landmarks crucial for implant placement.

2. The role and benefits of OPG, CBCT, and MRI in identifying and evaluating these landmarks.

3. Clinical outcomes and recommendations based on the integration of anatomical knowledge and advanced imaging in implant planning and execution.

4. Short-term and long-term effects of incorrect implant placement on adjacent structures.

Data Synthesis

The extracted data were synthesized to provide a comprehensive understanding of how anatomical landmarks influence implant placement and how advancements in imaging technology have improved the precision and safety of these procedures. Key findings, trends, and gaps in the current knowledge were identified to form a cohesive narrative.

Quality Assessment

The quality of the included studies was assessed using criteria such as study design, sample size, methodology robustness, and the relevance of findings to the review's objectives. Studies were graded as high, moderate, or low quality based on these criteria.

Classification of Anatomical Landmarks for Implant Placement

Anatomical landmarks in the maxilla and mandible are crucial for successful dental implant placement. These landmarks can be classified based on their location and relevance to implant procedures. For a structured analysis, they are categorized into maxillary landmarks and mandibular landmarks.

Maxillary Landmarks

1. Maxillary Sinus:

- Location: Located above the posterior teeth in the upper jaw.

- Significance: Implant placement in the posterior maxilla must account for the sinus floor to avoid sinus perforation. Sinus lift procedures may be necessary to create adequate bone height for implants.

2. Incisive Canal:

- Location: Situated in the anterior part of the maxilla, behind the central incisors.

- Significance: Implants placed in the anterior maxilla should avoid the incisive canal to prevent damage to the neurovascular bundle.

3. Nasal Cavity Floor:

- Location:Found in the anterior maxilla, above the anterior teeth.

- Significance: Implant placement in the anterior maxilla must consider the nasal cavity floor to avoid penetration, which could lead to complications.

4. Zygomatic Process

- Location: Extends into the upper jaw near the maxillary molars.

- Significance: Proximity to the zygomatic process must be considered, especially in cases requiring zygomatic implants for patients with severe maxillary atrophy.

Mandibular Landmarks

1. Mandibular Canal:

- Location: Runs bilaterally from the mandibular foramen to the mental foramen.

- Significance: Critical for avoiding nerve injury, implant placement in the posterior mandible must be planned to avoid the mandibular canal.

2. Mental Foramen:

- Location:Located on the anterior surface of the mandible, usually below the second premolar.

- Significance: Careful planning is needed to avoid damaging the mental nerve, which exits the mandible at the mental foramen, especially for implants in the premolar region.

3. Submandibular Fossa:

- Location: Located on the lingual surface of the mandible, beneath the mylohyoid line.

- Significance:Awareness of the submandibular fossa is crucial to avoid perforation into the fossa during implant placement in the posterior mandible.

4. Lingual Nerve:

- Location: Runs close to the mandibular third molars, near the lingual surface.

- Significance: The lingual nerve must be considered to prevent sensory disturbances or damage during implant placement in the posterior mandible.

Additional Considerations

1. Alveolar Ridge:

- Maxilla and Mandible: The height, width, and quality of the alveolar ridge must be assessed in both the maxilla and mandible to ensure sufficient bone support for the implants.

2. Cortical Bone:

- Maxilla and Mandible: The thickness of the cortical bone impacts the primary stability of implants and must be evaluated for optimal implant anchorage.

Potential Damage to Adjacent Structures from Incorrect Dental Implant Placement

The incorrect positioning and placement of dental implants in the maxilla and mandible can lead to significant damage to adjacent anatomical structures. This damage can result in both short-term and long-term complications, affecting the patient's oral health, functionality, and quality of life. Understanding these potential risks underscores the importance of accurate implant placement and the role of advanced imaging techniques in mitigating these risks.

Maxillary Complications

1. Maxillary Sinus Perforation:

- Short-Term Effects: Sinusitis, infection, and discomfort.

- Long-Term Effects: Chronic sinus issues, persistent infections, and possible need for sinus surgery or implant removal.

2. Nasal Cavity Penetration:

- Short-Term Effects: Nasal bleeding, pain, and infection.

- Long-Term Effects: Chronic nasal problems, potential oro-antral fistula, and compromised implant stability.

3. Damage to Incisive Canal:

- Short-Term Effects: Nerve irritation causing pain and discomfort in the anterior palate.

- Long-Term Effects: Persistent numbness or tingling in the front teeth and palate, impacting speech and eating.

Mandibular Complications

1. Injury to the Mandibular Canal:

- Short-Term Effects: Immediate nerve damage causing severe pain, swelling, and sensory disturbances.

- Long-Term Effects: Permanent paresthesia or anesthesia of the lower lip and chin, leading to difficulties in speaking, eating, and significant patient distress.

2. Mental Foramen Damage:

- Short-Term Effects: Acute pain, numbness, and tingling in the lower lip and chin area.

- Long-Term Effects: Chronic sensory disturbances, affecting daily functions and possibly requiring surgical intervention to repair nerve damage.

3. Lingual Nerve Injury:

- Short-Term Effects: Loss of sensation or altered sensation on one side of the tongue, affecting taste and speech.

- Long-Term Effects: Persistent sensory deficits, impacting quality of life, and may lead to further surgical procedures to attempt nerve repair.

4. Submandibular Fossa Perforation:

- Short-Term Effects: Risk of sublingual hematoma, pain, and infection.

- Long-Term Effects: Compromised implant stability, chronic pain, and potential bone loss around the implant site.

General Complications

1. Bone Quality and Osseointegration:

-Short-Term Effects:Poor primary stability of the implant, leading to mobility and discomfort.

- Long-Term Effects: Failure of osseointegration, resulting in implant failure and the need for removal and possible bone grafting procedures.

2. Alveolar Ridge and Cortical Bone Damage:

- Short-Term Effects: Immediate bone fracture or resorption, leading to instability of the implant.

- Long-Term Effects: Progressive bone loss, compromising adjacent teeth and structures, necessitating extensive reconstructive surgery.

Discussion

The degree of osseointegration of the implant determines the outcome of implant therapy. The definition of osseointegration is "the apparent direct attachment or connection."
of osseous tissue without the need for intermediate connective tissue to an inert, alloplastic substance. While implant therapy is now the most effective method of replacing missing teeth in dentistry, there are some possible drawbacks. A significant portion of implants fail to integrate or endure long enough to perform their intended purpose. Implant insertion should therefore only be done after careful evaluation and treatment planning. A thorough and meticulous examination of the surgical site is necessary as part of the diagnosis and treatment planning process to find any deviations from normal in the maxilla and mandible's anatomic structures.

Conclusion

The placement of dental implants in the maxilla and mandible is a complex procedure that necessitates a thorough understanding of the anatomical landmarks to ensure success and avoid complications. This literature review highlights the critical importance of these anatomical considerations in guiding precise implant placement. Key structures such as the maxillary sinus, mandibular canal, mental foramen, and other vital landmarks must be carefully evaluated to mitigate risks such as nerve damage, sinus perforation, and inadequate osseointegration.

Advancements in imaging technologies, including Orthopantomography (OPG), Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), have significantly enhanced clinicians' ability to analyze these anatomical features with greater accuracy. These tools provide detailed, three-dimensional views of the bone and surrounding structures, enabling more precise planning and execution of implant procedures.

Understanding and utilizing these anatomical landmarks are paramount for minimizing short-term and long-term complications, improving implant stability, and ensuring the overall success of dental implants. By integrating advanced imaging techniques into the diagnostic and planning stages, dental practitioners can achieve higher success rates and better patient outcomes.

In conclusion, the meticulous consideration of anatomical landmarks and the application of advanced imaging technologies are indispensable in modern implantology. These practices not only enhance the precision of implant placement but also contribute to the long-term health and satisfaction of patients undergoing dental implant procedures. This review underscores the need for continuous education and adoption of technological advancements to optimize dental implant practices and outcomes.

Incorrect positioning and placement of dental implants can lead to a range of complications involving damage to adjacent anatomical structures in both the maxilla and mandible. These complications underscore the critical need for precise planning and execution in implant dentistry. Utilizing advanced imaging technologies such as OPG, CBCT, and MRI can significantly reduce the risk of such adverse outcomes by providing detailed anatomical insights, thereby enhancing the accuracy of implant placement and ensuring better short-term and long-term results for patients.

References

1. Pullen G, Debenham C. Short implants: Reality and predictability. Acad Dent Therap Stomato 2011 Jan:1-15.
2. Wood MR, Vermilyea SG. A review of selected dental literatureon evidence-based treatment planning for dental implants:Report of the Committee on Research in Fixed Prosthodontics of the Academy of Fixed Prosthodontics. J Prosthet Dent 2004;92: 447-62.
3. Khoury F. Augmentation of the sinus floor with mandibular bone block and simultaneous implantation: A 6-year clinical investigation. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 1998;14:557-64.
4. Raghoebar GM, Vissink A. Treatment for an endosseous implant migrated into the maxillary sinus not causing maxillary sinusitis: Case report. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2003;18(5):74.
5. Chappuis V, Suter VG, Bornstein MM. Displacement of a dental implant into the maxillary sinus: Report of an unusual
complication when performing staged sinus floor elevation procedures. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2009;29(1):
81-87.
6. Abrahams JJ, Hayt MW, Rock R. Sinus lift procedure of the maxilla in patients with inadequate bone for dental implants.
AJR Am J Roentgenol 2000 May;174:1289-92.
7. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Rees J, Karasoulos D, Felice P, Alissa R, et al. Effectiveness of sinus lift procedures for dental implant rehabilitation: A Cochrane systematic review. Eur J Oral Implantol 2010 Spring;3(1):7-26.
8. Juodzbalys G, Wang HL, Sabalys G. Anatomy of mandibular vital structures. Part I: Mandibular canal and inferior alveolar neurovascular bundle in relation with dental implantology. J Oral Maxillofac Res 2010 (Jan-Mar);1(1):e2.
9. Heasman PA. Variation in the position of the inferior dental canal and its significance to restorative dentistry. J Dent. 1988 Feb;16(1):36-39.
10. Levine MH, Goddard AL, Dodson TB. Inferior alveolar nerve canal position: A clinical and radiographic study. J Oral
Maxillofac Surg 2007 Mar;65(3):470-74.
11. Wadu SG, Penhall B, Townsend GC. Morphological variability of the human inferior alveolar nerve. Clin Anat 1997;10:82-87.
12. Tammisalo T, Happonen RP, Tammisalo EH. Stereographic assessment of mandibular canal in relation to the roots of impacted lower third molar using multiprojection narrow beam radiography. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg 1992;21:85-90.
13. Miller CS, Nummikoski PV, Barnett DA, Langlais RP. Cross-sectional tomography. A diagnostic technique for determining the buccolingual relationship of impacted mandibular third molars and the inferior alveolar neurovascular bundle. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1990;70:791-797.
14. Mraiwa N, Jacobs R, Moerman P, et al. Presence and course of the incisive canal in the human mandibular interforaminal region: Two-dimensional imaging versus anatomical observations. Surg Radiol Anat 2003;
25:416-423.
15. Pogrel MA, Smith R, Ahani R. Innervation of the mandibular incisors by the mental nerve. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 1997;55:961-963.
16. De Andrade E, Otomo-Corgel J, Pucher J, Ranganath KA, St George N Jr. The intraosseous course of the mandibular incisive nerve in the mandibular symphysis. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2001;21: 591-597.
17. Jacobs R, Mraiwa N, van Steenberghe D, Gimbals F, Quirynen M. Appearance, location, course, and morphology of the mandibular incisive canal: An assessmen on spiral CT scan. Dentomaxillofac Radiol 2002;
31:322-327.

18. Mraiwa N, Jacobs R, van Steenberghe D, Quirynen M. Clinical assessment and surgical implications of anatomic challenges in the anterior mandible. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2003;5:219-225.
19. Polland KE, Munro S, Reford G, et al. The mandibular canal of the edentulous jaw. Clin Anat 2001;14: 445-452.
20. Dario LJ. Implant placement above a bifurcated mandibular canal: A case report. Implant Dent 2002;11: 258-261.

21. Jacobs R, Mraiwa N, vanSteenberghe D, Gijbels F, Quirynen M. Appearance, location, course, and morphology of the mandibular incisive canal: An assessment on spiral CT scan. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol.* 2002;31:322–7. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Kong N, Hui M, Miao F, Yuan H, Du Y, Chen N. Mandibular incisive canal in Han Chinese using cone beam computed tomography. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2016;45:1142–6. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Do Carmo Oliveira M, Tedesco TK, Gimenez T, Allegrini S., Jr Analysis of the frequency of visualization of morphological variations in anatomical bone features in the mandibular interforaminal region through cone-beam computed tomography. *Surg Radiol Anat.* 2018;40:1119–31. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Panjnoush M, Rabiee ZS, Kheirandish Y. Assessment of location and anatomical characteristics of mental foramen, anterior loop and mandibular incisive canal using cone beam computed tomography. *J Dent (Tehran)* 2016;13:126–32. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. Kabak SL, Zhuravleva NV, Melnichenko YM, Savrasova NA. Study of the mandibular incisive canal anatomy using cone beam computed tomography. *Surg Radiol Anat.* 2017;39:647–55. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Parnia F, Moslehifard E, Hafezeqoran A, Mahboub F, Mojaver-Kahnamoui H. Characteristics of anatomical landmarks in the mandibular interforaminal region: A cone-beam computed tomography study. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal.* 2012;17:e420–5. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. Rosa MB, Sotto-Maior BS, Machado Vde C, Francischone CE. Retrospective study of the anterior loop of the inferior alveolar nerve and the incisive canal using cone beam computed tomography. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants.* 2013;28:388–92. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Chen Z, Chen D, Tang L, Wang F. Relationship between the position of the mental foramen and the anterior loop of the inferior alveolar nerve as determined by cone beam computed tomography combined with mimics. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 2015;39:86–93. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
29. Al-Mahalawy H, Al-Aithan H, Al-Kari B, Al-Jandan B, Shujaat S. Determination of the position of mental foramen and frequency of anterior loop in Saudi population. A retrospective CBCT study. *Saudi Dent J.* 2017;29:29–35. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
30. Greenstein G, Tarnow D. The mental foramen and nerve: Clinical and anatomical factors related to dental implant placement: A literature review. *J Periodontol.* 2006;77:1933–43. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
31.Angelopoulos, C., Thomas, S., Hechler, S., Parissis, N. & Hlavacek, M., 2008. Comparisonbetween digital panoramic radiography and cone-beam computed tomography for the identification of the mandibular canal as part of presurgical dental implant assessment. J. Oral Maxillofac. Surg. 66, 2130-2135.
32.Arisan, V., Karabuda, Z.C., Avsever, H., Ozdemir, T., 2013. Conventional multi-slice computed tomography (CT) and cone-bem CT (CBCT) for computer-assisted implant placement. Part I: relationship of radiographic gray density and implant stability. Clin. Implant. Dent. Relat. Res. 15, 893-906.
33.Braut, V., Bornstein, M. M., Lauber, R., Buser, D., 2012. Bone dimensions in the osterior mandible: a retrospective radiographic study using cone beam computed tomography. Part 1 - analysis of dentate sites. Int. J. Periodontics Restorative Dent. 32, 175-184. Braut, V., Bornstein, M. M., Kuchler, U., Buser, D., 2014. Bone dimensions in the posterior mandible: a retrospective radiographic study using cone beam computed tomography. Part 2 - analysis of edentulous sites. Int. J. Periodontics Restorative Dent. 34, 639-647.