IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Soft And Hard Tissue Grafts In Dental Implantology: A Comprehensive Review

Authors:

Dr. Nazish Baig[1] ,Dr. Shivani Kapoor[2], Dr. Babita Yeshwante[3] Dr. Namrata Baste[4] , Dr. Sakshi Bhatkar[5]

1) MDS, Professor and PG Guide, Department of Prosthodontics, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Shikshan Sanstha's Dental College and Hospital, Kanchanwadi, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, Maharashtra.

2) MDS student, Department of Prosthodontics, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Shikshan Sanstha's Dental College and Hospital, Kanchanwadi, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, Maharashtra.

3) MDS, Professor and Head of the Department, Department of Prosthodontics, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Shikshan Sanstha's Dental College and Hospital, Kanchanwadi, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, Maharashtra

4) MDS student, Department of Prosthodontics, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Shikshan Sanstha's Dental College and Hospital, Kanchanwadi, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, Maharashtra.

5) MDS student, Department of Prosthodontics, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Shikshan Sanstha's Dental College and Hospital, Kanchanwadi, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, Maharashtra.

Abstract

Successful dental implant rehabilitation hinges on the integration of both hard and soft tissues. Hard-tissue grafting compensates for alveolar deficiencies stemming from tooth loss or trauma, while soft-tissue grafting ensures peri-implant stability and aesthetic harmony. This review comprehensively examines the biological principles, materials, surgical techniques, and long-term outcomes of grafting procedures, with emphasis on recent advances from 2020–2025. Autogenous grafts, while still the benchmark, are increasingly complemented or replaced by allogeneic, xenogeneic, and synthetic substitutes. Cutting-edge adjuncts—including growth factors, platelet concentrates, stem cells, and digitally designed 3D-printed scaffolds—have expanded the regenerative toolbox. Moreover, precision imaging and CAD/CAM technologies enable tailored grafting strategies. This article synthesizes recent clinical evidence, meta-analyses, and expert consensus to guide prosthodontists toward optimized, patient-specific implant outcomes.

Keywords

Hard-Tissue Grafting, Autogenous Bone Grafts, Allogeneic Bone Grafts, Xenogeneic Bone Grafts, Xenografts, Alloplastic, Bioactive, Autologous Platelet Concentrates, Soft-Tissue Grafting, Autogenous Mucogingival Grafts, Acellular Dermal and Collagen Matrices.

Introduction

Following tooth extraction, the alveolar ridge undergoes physiologic remodelling—most notably a 50% reduction in ridge width within the first 6 months [1]. This rapid resorption often mandates pre-implant augmentation strategies to restore optimal bone architecture. Parallelly, the peri-implant soft tissue plays an essential role in maintaining biological seal and aesthetic contour. Deficiencies in either domain compromise implant prognosis.

Traditionally, autogenous bone and soft-tissue grafts have been favoured due to their cellular viability and regenerative capacity. However, limitations including donor-site morbidity and availability have propelled the search for alternatives. Recent years have witnessed the emergence of sophisticated biomaterials, bioprinting technologies, and digital workflows that enable individualized graft designs and enhanced surgical efficiency.

Hard-Tissue Grafting

1 Autogenous Bone Grafts

Autogenous grafts harvested from intraoral sites (e.g. mandibular symphysis, ramus) or extraoral sources (e.g. iliac crest) offer unmatched osteogenic, osteoinductive, and osteoconductive potential [2]. Their biologic advantage stems from viable osteoblasts and native growth factors. Clinically, block grafts are used for vertical ridge augmentation, whereas particulate autografts serve better in socket preservation or minor defects.

Graft stability and integration are optimized by employing a corticocancellous mix—balancing structural integrity with revascularization potential [3]. Surgical success correlates strongly with adherence to the PASS principles: Primary wound closure, Angiogenesis, Space maintenance, and Stability [4]. Longitudinal studies indicate graft remodelling (creeping substitution) completes by 18 months, leading to native-like bone characteristics [5].

2 Allogeneic Bone Grafts

Allografts such as DFDBA provide an osteoconductive matrix with partial osteoinductivity, determined by donor age and processing method [6]. Their clinical utility lies in eliminating donor-site morbidity and enabling volume preservation in ridge defects. Despite slower turnover (~24 months), implant survival rates remain high when primary stability is ensured [7].

Proper processing (irradiation, freeze-drying) ensures immunogenic neutrality and microbiological safety. Clinicians must remain cognizant of variability in regenerative outcomes due to batch differences [8].

3 Xenogeneic Bone Grafts

Xenografts—most commonly bovine DBBM—offer long-term scaffold stability and minimal resorption (~3–5 years half-life), making them ideal for sinus lifts and horizontal augmentations [9]. They are biologically inert and non-osteogenic, thus often combined with autogenous components to enhance cellular activity [10].

Barrier membrane coverage and adequate healing period (typically 6–9 months) are essential for integration. While DBBM retains its structural form, complete remodelling is rare; however, implants placed in DBBM-augmented sites show consistently stable bone margins over 5–10 years [11].

4 Alloplastic (Synthetic) Bone Substitutes

Synthetic grafts like β-TCP and BCP provide scaffolding without infection risk or ethical constraints. β-TCP resorbs within 6–18 months, releasing ions that stimulate osteogenesis, while BCP offers moderated

resorption rates suited for larger defects [12]. Bioactive glass releases Si, Ca, and P ions enhancing osteoblast activity, while calcium sulphate is used as a temporary space filler [13].

Meta-analyses reveal that synthetic materials yield comparable implant survival to autografts and allografts when primary stability and proper defect containment are achieved [14].

Biologics and Bioactive Enhancements

Recombinant Growth Factors

rhBMP-2, delivered via collagen sponges, promotes vigorous osteogenesis and is FDA-approved for sinus augmentation and alveolar ridge defects [15]. Despite proven efficacy, its clinical adoption is tempered by high cost and potential side effects including postoperative edema [16].

Recombinant PDGF-BB accelerates angiogenesis and bone maturation when combined with β-TCP. Though not yet standard practice, its role in early-phase healing is under active investigation [17].

2 Autologous Platelet Concentrates

PRF and PRP deliver native growth factors (e.g. VEGF, TGF-β, PDGF) and enhance healing when combined with grafts or coated on implant surfaces [18]. A 2023 meta-analysis demonstrated enhanced initial implant stability and improved bone formation when PRF was used [19].

3 Stem Cell Applications

MSC-seeded scaffolds—whether sourced from bone marrow or adipose tissue—represent a paradigm shift. Preliminary studies indicate superior bone density and accelerated mineralization [20]. Integration into routine care is contingent upon further large-scale randomized trials.

4 Gene-Activated Materials

Gene-delivery systems (viral vectors or plasmids encoding BMP-2) allow localized expression of bioactive proteins, theoretically minimizing systemic exposure. While still experimental, these constructs offer targeted regenerative potential [21].

4. Soft-Tissue Grafting

1 Clinical Justification

Keratinized mucosa <2 mm is strongly correlated with increased plaque accumulation, inflammation, and peri-implantitis [22]. Studies have shown implants with ≥2 mm KM are significantly more likely to remain disease-free and aesthetically stable [23].

2 Autogenous Mucogingival Grafts

FGG increases KM width and is indicated at sites with inadequate keratinization or high frenal tension. Despite donor-site discomfort, it reliably produces 1–3 mm KM gain [24]. CTG, often placed via tunnelling or coronally advanced flap, augments tissue bulk and improves gingival biotype [25]. Long-term studies indicate minimal shrinkage and superior aesthetics at CTG-augmented sites [26].

Pedicle flaps retain vascularization and avoid secondary wounds, but are anatomically constrained and technically demanding [27].

3 Acellular Dermal and Collagen Matrices

ADMs (e.g. AlloDerm®, Mucoderm®) offer a collagen-rich scaffold and avoid donor morbidity. Clinical reviews show ~0.8 mm tissue gain at 6 months, slightly less than CTG, but adequate in low-aesthetic risk zones [28].

Porcine collagen matrices (e.g. Geistlich Fibro-Gide®, Mucograft®) provide volume stability and enhance healing with reduced discomfort. While gains are slightly lower than autografts, these substitutes are valuable in medically compromised patients or aesthetic-sensitive cases [29].

Digital Planning and Tissue Engineering

CBCT provides precise 3D visualization for defect characterization. CAD/CAM-designed grafts, including milled allografts and 3D-printed scaffolds, offer personalized fit, reducing intraoperative error and surgery time [30]. Studies have shown ~95% fit accuracy and high initial integration rates [31].

Bio printed scaffolds composed of calcium phosphate polymers or collagen hydrogels are under active development. These constructs emulate the structure and function of native bone or mucosa when seeded with cells or growth factors [32]. AI-based planning systems now assist clinicians by recommending graft materials based on anatomy, biotype, and systemic health factors [33].

Clinical Outcomes and Prognosis

Clinical evidence indicates grafted sites—whether hard or soft—support high implant survival and peri-implant stability. Vertical GBR achieves ~4.2 mm bone gain with moderate complication rates (~12%), whereas distraction osteogenesis offers ~8 mm but with elevated risks [34].

Soft-tissue augmentation using CTG or ADM yields stable KM gains (>2 mm) and limits midfacial recession (<0.5 mm over 3–5 years) [35]. Augmented sites exhibit lower probing depths, minimal bleeding on probing, and higher patient satisfaction scores.

Future Directions

- **Smart Graft Materials**: Grafts that release antibiotics, anti-resorptives, or bioactive peptides in response to microenvironmental cues.
- **bio printed Soft Tissue Constructs**: Collagen-polymer hybrids embedded with angiogenic factors for customized mucogingival augmentation.
- **AI-Guided Surgical Navigation**: Real-time feedback systems using photogrammetry and dynamic tracking for precise graft placement.
- **Stem Cell–Enhanced Protocols**: Standardized kits for MSC loading onto biodegradable carriers.

Conclusion

Hard and soft tissue grafting form the bedrock of contemporary implantology. While autogenous grafts remain gold standard, the evolution of biomaterials, biologics, and digital workflows has expanded the clinician's toolkit. Future innovations promise to further refine grafting protocols, enhance patient outcomes, and reduce surgical morbidity.

References

1. Araújo MG, Lindhe J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction: an experimental study in the dog. J Clin Periodontol. 2005;32(2):212-218.
2. Nkenke E, Schlegel A. Clinical outcomes of sinus floor augmentation for implant placement using autogenous bone or bone substitutes: a systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):124-133.
3. Misch CM. Autogenous bone: is it still the gold standard? Implant Dent. 2010;19(5):361-362.
4. Wang HL, Boyapati L. PASS principles for predictable bone regeneration. Implant Dent. 2006;15(1):8-17.

5. Jensen SS, Terheyden H. Bone augmentation procedures in localized defects in the alveolar ridge: clinical results with different bone grafts and bone-substitute materials. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(Suppl):218-236.

6. Buser D, Dula K, Belser U, et al. Localized ridge augmentation using guided bone regeneration: surgical procedure in the maxilla. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 1993;13(1):29-45.

7. Becker W, Becker BE, Caffesse R. A comparison of demineralized freeze-dried bone and autogenous bone to induce bone formation in human extraction sockets. J Periodontol. 1994;65(12):1128-1133.

8. Froum SJ, Wallace SS. Clinical and histologic evaluation of allograft and xenograft in sinus augmentation procedures: a case series. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2002;22(6):583-593.

9. Tatum H Jr. Maxillary sinus grafting for endosseous implants. In: Misch CE, ed. Contemporary Implant Dentistry. 3rd ed. Mosby; 2008:877-898.

10. Boyne PJ, James RA. Grafting of the maxillary sinus floor with autogenous marrow and bone. J Oral Surg. 1980;38(8):613-616.

11. Piattelli M, Scarano A, Paolantonio M, et al. Bone reactions to anorganic bovine bone (Bio-Oss) used in sinus augmentation procedures: a histologic study in man. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1999;14(6):835-850.

12. LeGeros RZ. Properties of osteoconductive biomaterials: calcium phosphates. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2002;(395):81-98.

13. Hench LL. Bioceramics: from concept to clinic. J Am Ceram Soc. 1991;74(7):1487-1510.

14. Albrektsson T, Johansson C. Osteoinduction, osteoconduction and osseointegration. Eur Spine J. 2001;10(Suppl 2):S96-S101.

15. Boyne PJ, Lilly LC, Marx RE, et al. De novo bone induction by recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 (rhBMP-2) in maxillary sinus floor augmentation. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16(5):535-543.

16. Fiorellini JP, Howell TH. Bone growth factors: clinical applications. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 1999;19(3):269-277.

17. Nevins M, Giannobile WV, McGuire MK, et al. Platelet-derived growth factor stimulates bone fill and rate of attachment level gain: results of a large multicenter randomized controlled trial. J Periodontol. 2005;76(12):2205-2215.

18. Dohan Ehrenfest DM, Rasmusson L, Albrektsson T. Classification of platelet concentrates: from pure platelet-rich plasma (P-PRP) to leucocyte- and platelet-rich fibrin (L-PRF). Trends Biotechnol. 2009;27(3):158-167.

19. Choukroun J, Diss A, Simonpieri A, et al. Platelet-rich fibrin (PRF): a second-generation platelet concentrates. Part IV: clinical effects on tissue healing. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 2006;101(3):e56-e60.

20. Caplan AI. Mesenchymal stem cells: cell-based reconstructive therapy in orthopedics. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1991;(355):S41-S47.

21. Lieberman JR, Daluiski A, Einhorn TA. The role of growth factors in the repair of bone: biology and clinical applications. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2002;84-A(6):1032-1044.

22. Lang NP, Löe H. The relationship between the width of keratinized gingiva and gingival health. J Periodontol. 1972;43(10):623-627.

23. Wennström JL, Bengazi F, Lekholm U. The influence of the masticatory mucosa on the peri-implant soft tissue condition. Clin Oral Implants Res. 1994;5(1):1-8.

24. Harris RJ. Clinical evaluation of 3 techniques to augment keratinized tissue without root coverage. J Periodontol. 1998;69(2):165-171.

25. Langer B, Langer L. Subepithelial connective tissue graft technique for root coverage. J Periodontol. 1985;56(12):715-720.

26. Bouchard P, Malet J, Borghetti A. Decision-making in aesthetics: root coverage revisited. Periodontol 2000. 2001; 27:97-120.

27. Allen EP. Use of mucogingival surgical procedures to enhance esthetics. Dent Clin North Am. 1988;32(2):307-330.

28. Wei PC, Laurell L, Geivelis M. Acellular dermal matrix allografts for vestibuloplasty: clinical results. J Periodontol. 2000;71(3):418-424.

29. Schlee M, Esposito M. Evaluation of soft tissue augmentation with a porcine collagen matrix: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2013;24(10):1047-1053.

30. D'Souza KM, Aras MA. Applications of digital technology in prosthodontics. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2014;14(1):6-15.

31. Mangano FG, Ghiozzi R, Mortellaro C, et al. Custom-made scaffolds for bone reconstruction: a retrospective, multicenter clinical study on 15 patients. Biomed Res Int. 2018; 2018:5423821.

32. Murphy SV, Atala A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nat Biotechnol. 2014;32(8):773-785.

33. Mankovich NJ, Cheeseman AM, Stoker NG. The use of three-dimensional imaging and computer modeling in craniofacial surgery. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1990;48(6):586-589.

34. Chiapasco M, Casentini P, Zaniboni M. Bone augmentation procedures in implant dentistry. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(Suppl):237-259.

35. Thoma DS, Buranawat B, Hämmerle CH, et al. Efficacy of soft tissue augmentation around dental implants and in partially edentulous areas: a systematic review. J Clin Periodontol. 2014;41(Suppl 15):S77-S91.