



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 9, Issue, 4(D), pp. 25782-25784, April, 2018

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Review Article

DENTAL IMPLANTS IN DIABETIC PATIENTS

Rakshith Hegde., Swati Singh and Chethan Hegde

A.B Shetty Memorial Institute of Dental Sciences

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0904.1929>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 8th January, 2018
Received in revised form 21st
February, 2018
Accepted 05th March, 2018
Published online 28th April, 2018

ABSTRACT

Diabetes is one of the commonest metabolic syndrome which a clinician will come across during his or her practice. Theoretically it has been implied that the patient presents with poor wound healing and an impaired immune response hence not a very good candidate for elective surgical procedures including dental implants. Diabetes however is not considered an absolute contraindication for implant treatment. This article aims to include data about the recent clinical studies which have been done on diabetic patients and also the surgical protocol which is being followed.

Key Words:

Dental Implants, Diabetes Mellitus,
Review, metabolically compromised

Copyright © Rakshith Hegde., Swati Singh and Chethan Hegde, 2018, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The number of people with diabetes in the world is expected to approximately double between 2000 and 2030, based solely upon demographic changes. The greatest relative increases will occur in the Middle Eastern Crescent, sub-Saharan Africa, and India. The greatest absolute increase in the number of people with diabetes will be in India.¹

Diabetes is a chronic metabolic syndrome which is associated with abnormal metabolism of carbohydrates, proteins and fats. It is classified as type 1 type2 and gestational diabetes.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

An electronic search was performed on a personal computer (P.C) for work published till the year 2018 using keywords diabetes, implants, surgical techniques, dental implants. Search was performed on national library of medicine, chochrane oral healthcare research, and medline healthcare database. A total of 73 articles were screened.

Inclusion criteria included clinical trials and studies on diabetic patients. Animal studies and peer reviews were excluded. After screening a total of 13 articles were included in the review.

RESULT

After a thorough review of the articles they were arranged according to the chronological order of publication of the

study. The study methodology, sample size, nature of sample and the outcome was evaluated.

DISCUSSION

Majority of the studies have invariably shown that success rate of implants in diabetics is quite similar to that of the general population. However with higher sample size a few studies indicated a higher failure rate in diabetic patients. Diabetic patients show a higher incidence of mucosal infections, peri implantitis and a slower healing rate. Studies have shown a lower increase in bone density in diabetics in short term compared to healthy individuals. Delayed loading protocols have been shown to be more promising for these patients. Diabetic patients have shown a higher rate of soft tissue infections including peri implantitis and mucositis and the incidence has been correlated to a higher HbA1c levels. Although patients with well controlled diabetes showed a similar clinical outcome as compared to healthy individuals. It has been suggested to use chlorhexidine mouth wash in diabetic patients which has lead to a significant improvement in success rate. Surgical procedures such as flapless surgery and using growth factors such as in PRP have been speculated to improve the clinical outcome. Current studies tend to show no clinically significant difference with either of these protocols. There was no change in crestal bone levels or bone density using either of these techniques.

*Corresponding author: **Rakshith Hegde**
A.B Shetty Memorial Institute of Dental Sciences

author	Study design and follow up	Number of subjects per group	Diabetes type and nature	Implants placed/failed	Mean survival rate
1. Agrawal KK, Rao J <i>et al</i> ² 2017	parallel group, double-blinded RCT. Comparing flap vs flapless in delayed loading in controlled type 2 diabetics	92 (46 per group)	Type 2 controlled	3 /46 failed in flapless, 2/46 in full thickness flap	Survival rate was similar, post operative swelling lesser in flapless group
2. Eskow CC <i>et al</i> ³ June 2017	2 year prospective study on implant complication and survival in uncontrolled type 2 diabetics	24 patients	Type 2 uncontrolled (HbA1c 8-12 %)	2/57 implants	96.8 percent after 2 years , 29 percent showed periimplantitis
3. yadav <i>et al</i> ⁴ . Oct 2016	A Parallel Group RCT, Comparing crestal bone loss with flapless vs flap in controlled type 2 diabetics	88 patients	Type 2 controlled	100 percent success rate	Mean marginal bone loss similar (average of 1.5 mm) after 12 months
4. Dogan <i>et al.</i> ⁵ 2015	7 month clinical prospective study measuring inflammatory cytokines around implants in controlled diabetics	13 patients with diabetes, 7 healthy patients	Type 2 controlled	100 percent success	No difference seen
5. Ibrahim <i>et al</i> 2015 ⁶	RCT assessing bone height with and without prp in controlled diabetic patients	14 male patients receiving 2 implants each with and without prp	Type 2 controlled	100 percent success	No difference seen
6. Gómez-Moreno G <i>et al</i> ⁷ 2014	3 year prospective study for periimplant evaluation in type 2 diabetics	67 patients divided according to HbA1c levels (<6,6.1-8,8.1-10, >10.1)	Variable control	100 % success	Incidence of periimplantitis correlated to higher levels of HbA1c
7. khandelwal <i>at al.</i> ⁸ 2013	16 week randomised trial evaluating success of SLA vs Modified large grit SLA in moderately controlled diabetics	24 patients received 48 implants allocated to SLA and modified SLA	Moderately controlled type 2 (HbA1c 8-11 %)	100% success	No difference with radiofrequency analysis values using SLA or modified SLA implants
8. malik <i>et al.</i> ⁹ 2012	9 week prospective study evaluating bone density with and without prp in controlled diabetics	14 patients received 2 mini implants each, one without prp and other with prp	Type 2 well controlled	100 percent success	No difference in bone density with and without prp
9. Ibarajan A. <i>Et al</i> ¹⁰ 2012	Short term clinical study evaluating implants in controlled diabetics	5 patients	Type 2 controlled	100 percent success	No difference in incidence of bone loss or periimplantitis compared to healthy population
10. Oates TW <i>et al</i> ¹¹ 2009	6 week prospective study comparing implant stability in non diabetic with diabetic patients using RFA	10 non diabetic 20 diabetic	Variable control (8.1-12.5 % HbA1c)	100 percent success	Diabetic patients with HbA1c >8.5 % showed lower levels of implant stability at 6 weeks
11. Baishi <i>et al.</i> ¹² 2007	Clinical study evaluating stability of 18 immediately loaded dental implants in controlled diabetic using RFA	1 patient reviewing 18 immediately loaded implants	Well controlled type 2 diabetic, on insulin	100 % success rate	Implant stability decreased by 12.5% at 30 days but increased thereafter
12. Olson JW <i>et al.</i> ¹³ 2000	Clinical prospective study evaluating implant success in diabetic patients	89 male	Type 2 variably controlled	16/178 implants failed	88 % after 6 months
13. Morris HF <i>et al.</i> ¹⁴ 2000	Prospective 36 month study evaluating implant success rate in diabetic patients	633 patients receiving 2,887 implants	Type 2 variably controlled	-	9.1 percent failed in diabetics , 4.5 % failed in non diabetics

A shortcoming of this review has been the limited number of studies included. A lot of clinical trials had a small sample size and a small follow up period to significantly assess the outcome. More number of studies are required to assess clearly the affect of diabetes on long term success of dental implants.

Nonetheless the results have been promising. Dental implants are no longer an absolute contraindication for diabetic patients. A thorough assessment of diabetic control along with proper atraumatic surgical management of these patients would lead to a predictable clinical outcome.

References

1. Agrawal KK, Rao J, Anwar M, Singh K, Himanshu D. Flapless vs flapped implant insertion in patients with controlled type 2 diabetes subjected to delayed loading: 1-year follow-up results from a randomised controlled trial. *European journal of oral implantology*. 2017;10(4):403-13.
2. Eskow CC, Oates TW. Dental Implant Survival and Complication Rate over 2 Years for Individuals with Poorly Controlled Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Clinical implant dentistry and related research*. 2017 Jun 1;19(3):423-31.
3. Yadav R, Agrawal KK, Rao J, Anwar M, Alvi HA, Singh K, Himanshu D. Crestal Bone Loss under Delayed Loading of Full Thickness Versus Flapless Surgically Placed Dental Implants in Controlled Type 2 Diabetic Patients: A Parallel Group Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of Prosthodontics*. 2016 Oct 1.
4. Bozkurt Doğan Ş, Kurtiş B, Tşter G, Serdar M, Watanabe K, Karakış S. Evaluation of Clinical Parameters and Levels of Proinflammatory Cytokines in the Crevicular Fluid Around Dental Implants in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*. 2015 Sep 1;30(5).
5. Ibraheem EM, Eldeen AM. Impact of platelet-rich plasma on bone height changes around platform switched implants supporting mandibular overdentures in controlled diabetic patients. *Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences*. 2015 Dec 15;3(4):722.
6. Bozkurt Doğan Ş, Kurtiş B, Tşter G, Serdar M, Watanabe K, Karakış S. Evaluation of Clinical Parameters and Levels of Proinflammatory Cytokines in the Crevicular Fluid Around Dental Implants in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*. 2015 Sep 1;30(5).
7. Khandelwal N, Oates TW, Vargas A, Alexander PP, Schoolfield JD, Alex McMahan C. Conventional SLA and chemically modified SLA implants in patients with poorly controlled type 2 diabetes mellitus—a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical oral implants research*. 2013 Jan 1;24(1):13-9.
8. Malik A, Shaari R, Rahman SA, Aljuboori MJ. Influence of platelet-rich plasma on dental implants. Osseointegration in well-controlled diabetic patients. *Dental implantology update*. 2012 Dec;23(12):89-96.
9. Inbarajan A, Veeravalli PT, Vaidyanathan AK, Grover M. Short-term evaluation of dental implants in a diabetic

- population: an in vivo study. *The journal of advanced prosthodontics*. 2012 Aug 1;4(3):134-8.
10. Oates TW, Dowell S, Robinson M, McMahan CA. Glycemic control and implant stabilization in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Journal of dental research*. 2009 Apr;88(4):367-71.
 11. Baishi SF, Wolfinger GJ, Baishi TJ. An examination of immediately loaded dental implant stability in the diabetic patient using resonance frequency analysis (RFA). *Quintessence International*. 2007 Apr 1;38(4).
 12. Olson JW, Shernoff AF, Tarlow JL, Colwell JA, Scheetz JP, Bingham SF. Dental endosseous implant assessments in a type 2 diabetic population: a prospective study. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*. 2000 Nov 1;15(6).
 13. Morris HF, Ochi S, Winkler S. Implant survival in patients with type 2 diabetes: placement to 36 months. *Annals of Periodontology*. 2000 Dec 1;5(1):157-65.

How to cite this article:

Rakshith Hegde *et al.* 2018, Dental Implants in Diabetic Patients. *Int J Recent Sci Res*. 9(4), pp. 25782-25784.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0904.1929>
