www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)
(Int Peer Reviewed Journal)
Vol. 05, Issue 02, February 2025, pp : 973-981

e-ISSN : 2583-1062
Impact Factor : 7.001

OSSEOINTEGRATION- PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE – A CHRONICAL REVIEW

Dr. B. Lakshmanarao[1], Dr. K. Udaya Bhanu[2], Dr. V. Lalitha Sankeerthana[3], Dr. K. Vyshnavi[4]

[1]Prof & HOD, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, A.P., India.

[2,3,4]P. G. Student, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, A.P., India.

Corresponding Author: Dr. B. LakshmanaRao. Bathala

Mail: kushulubathala@gmail.com

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS38691

ABSTRACT

Osseointegration, the direct structural and functional connection between living bone and an implant, has revolutionized dentistry, orthopedics, and prosthetic rehabilitation. The concept was accidentally discovered by Per-Ingvar Brånemark in 1952, when he observed that titanium fused irreversibly with bone. This led to the first successful dental implant placement in 1965, establishing the foundation for modern implantology. In the present era, osseointegration has been enhanced by advanced surface modifications, such as sandblasting, acid etching, nanocoatings, and bioactive materials, improving implant stability and reducing healing times. 3D imaging, guided surgery, and digital workflow integration have further refined implant placement and outcomes. Beyond dentistry, osseointegrated limb prostheses have provided amputees with superior mobility and quality of life.

The future of osseointegration is driven by nanotechnology, smart biomaterials, tissue engineering, and artificial intelligence (AI). Bioactive coatings, stem cell therapy, and gene editing hold promise for accelerating bone integration and enhancing implant longevity. 3D printing and patient-specific implants are poised to improve customization and success rates, while AI-driven diagnostics and robotic-assisted surgeries will optimize treatment planning. In conclusion, osseointegration has evolved from a serendipitous discovery to a cornerstone of modern medicine, with future advancements set to further revolutionize regenerative therapies, implantology, and prosthetic integration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Osseointegration is the direct structural and functional connection between living bone and the surface of a load-bearing artificial implant without any fibrous tissue interface. It is a crucial biological process that allows the stable anchorage of dental implants, orthopedic prostheses, and other biomedical devices. [1]

Stages of Osseointegration

Osseointegration is the biological process by which a dental implant forms a stable and functional connection with the surrounding bone. It is essential for the long-term success of dental implants. This process occurs in several stages: [2]

1. Hemostasis and Clot Formation (Minutes to Hours)

After implant placement, the surgical trauma triggers an immediate hemostatic response, leading to blood clot formation around the implant. This clot serves as a scaffold for cellular migration and the initiation of wound healing.

Key events:

Platelet aggregation and release of growth factors such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) and transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β).

Formation of a fibrin matrix, which acts as a provisional extracellular matrix (ECM) for cellular attachment.

Activation of the coagulation cascade to stabilize the clot.

2. Inflammatory Phase (Hours to Days) [3]

The immune system responds by recruiting inflammatory cells (neutrophils, macrophages) to remove debris and prevent infection.

Key events:

Neutrophils dominate early (first 24 hours), releasing cytokines and clearing debris.

Macrophages replace neutrophils and release key signaling molecules like vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) to stimulate angiogenesis.

Pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-1, IL-6, TNF-α) recruit osteoprogenitor cells.

3. Proliferative Phase – New Bone Formation (Days to Weeks) [4]

This is the critical stage where osteogenesis begins.

Key events:

Osteoblast differentiation: Mesenchymal stem cells differentiate into osteoblasts, depositing unmineralized bone matrix (osteoid).

Angiogenesis: Blood vessels proliferate to support new bone formation.

Woven bone formation: Initially, immature woven bone forms, which has a disorganized structure but provides initial stability.

4. Remodeling and Maturation (Weeks to Months) [5]

The woven bone is gradually replaced with lamellar bone, which is stronger and more structured.

Key events:

Bone remodeling: Osteoclasts resorb immature bone while osteoblasts deposit mature bone.

Bone-implant contact (BIC) increases, improving mechanical stability.

Corticalization: The trabecular bone near the implant may become more cortical, enhancing long-term stability.

5. Functional Loading and Long-Term Adaptation (Months to Years) [6]

Once osseointegration is achieved, the implant undergoes continuous remodeling in response to functional forces.

Key events:

Wolff's Law: Bone adapts to mechanical stress by remodeling in response to functional loading. Bone density and strength increase around the implant. A dynamic balance is maintained to prevent peri-implant disease.

Types of Osseointegration

Osseointegration can be classified based on different criteria such as bone-implant contact, healing mechanism, and implant surface interaction. Below are the key types of osseointegration:

I. Based on Bone-Implant Contact

A. Functional Osseointegration [7]

Occurs when the implant is mechanically stable and capable of load-bearing without micromotion.

Achieved through direct contact between bone and implant, leading to successful long-term integration.

Example: Titanium dental and orthopedic implants.

B. Histological Osseointegration [2]

Defined by bone growth directly onto the implant surface without intervening fibrous tissue.

Confirmed through microscopic examination showing bone-implant contact (BIC).

II.Based on Healing Mechanism

A. Primary Osseointegration (Direct Osseointegration)

Occurs immediately after implant placement, where bone cells migrate to the implant surface.

Requires high initial stability and minimal micromotion (<100 μm).

Seen in immediate and early loading protocols. [8]

B. Secondary Osseointegration (Remodeling Osseointegration)

Occurs over time as woven bone is replaced by mature lamellar bone. Involves bone remodeling and secondary stability. Common in delayed loading implants.[9]

III. Based on Implant Surface Interaction

A. Contact Osseointegration

Direct bone apposition onto the implant surface.

Enhanced by surface modifications (e.g., SLA, nano-coatings, HA coatings). [10]

B. Distance Osseointegration

Bone forms at a distance from the implant surface and gradually fills the gap. Slower than contact osseointegration, often requiring longer healing periods. [11]

Osseointegration varies based on mechanical stability, healing patterns, and bone-implant interactions. Modern implant designs focus on accelerating osseointegration using biocompatible materials and surface modifications to improve long-term implant success.

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)
(Int Peer Reviewed Journal)
Vol. 05, Issue 02, February 2025, pp : 973-981
e-ISSN : 2583-1062
Impact Factor : 7.001

History and Discovery of Osseointegration

Osseointegration, the direct structural and functional connection between living bone and an implant, was discovered accidentally by Swedish orthopedic surgeon Per-Ingvar Brånemark in 1952. His discovery revolutionized dental implantology, orthopedics, and prosthetics.

1. The Accidental Discovery (1952)

Brånemark was conducting bone healing and blood circulation research at Lund University, Sweden. He implanted titanium chambers into rabbit bones to study bone regeneration under a microscope.

Key Observation: When he attempted to remove the titanium chambers after the experiment, he found that the bone had fused permanently with the titanium—something previously thought impossible. This was the first evidence of osseointegration. [12]

2. Early Experiments and Animal Studies (1952–1965)

Brånemark and his team conducted further experiments in dogs and rabbits, confirming that:

*Titanium was biocompatible and did not trigger an immune response. Bone would integrate permanently with titanium implants. Load-bearing was possible after healing.

First Formal Use of the Term "Osseointegration" (1965). Brånemark coined the term “osseointegration” to describe the stable, functional bond between bone and titanium. [13]

3. First Human Clinical Trials (1965)

Gosta Larsson – The First Osseointegrated Dental Implant Patient

In 1965, Brånemark placed the first titanium dental implants in Gosta Larsson, a Swedish man with severe edentulism (tooth loss). The implants successfully osseointegrated, providing stable support for fixed dentures. [14]

4. Expansion into Dentistry and Orthopedics (1970s–1980s)

A. Dental Implant Revolution

Brånemark’s research led to the commercialization of dental implants in the 1970s and 1980s, proving that: Titanium implants could replace missing teeth permanently. Osseointegrated implants had a success rate of >90% over 10+ years. [15]

B. Osseointegration in Orthopedics

In the 1980s, osseointegrated limb prostheses were introduced for amputees, allowing direct skeletal attachment of prosthetic limbs. [16]

5. Modern Advancements (1990s–Present)

Titanium Surface Modifications: Sandblasting, acid-etching, and nanocoatings improved osseointegration speed.

Zirconia and 3D-Printed Implants: Biocompatible materials emerged as alternatives to titanium.

Stem Cells & Growth Factors: Bioactive implants enhanced bone regeneration.

Digital and AI Technologies: 3D-guided implant placement improved precision and long-term success. [17]

Osseointegration started with Brånemark’s accidental discovery in 1952 and evolved into a global standard for dental and orthopedic implants. Advances in biomaterials, nanotechnology, and tissue engineering continue to improve its success.

Factors Affecting the Success of Osseointegration

Osseointegration is influenced by multiple biological, mechanical, and environmental factors. Understanding these factors is crucial to improving the longevity and success of dental implants and orthopedic prostheses. Below is a detailed breakdown of the factors affecting osseointegration:

1. Implant-Related Factors

A. Implant Material

The choice of implant material significantly influences osseointegration. Titanium (Ti) and its alloys, particularly Ti-6Al-4V, are widely used due to their biocompatibility, corrosion resistance, and ability to integrate with bone tissue.

Pure Titanium (CpTi): Forms a protective oxide layer (TiO_2), promoting osteoblast attachment.

Titanium Alloys (Ti-6Al-4V): Improved mechanical properties compared to pure titanium but may release aluminum and vanadium ions, which can affect biocompatibility.

Zirconia (ZrO_2): Ceramic alternative with excellent biocompatibility, though its osseointegration potential is slightly lower than titanium. [14]

B. Implant Surface Topography and Coating

Implant surface roughness and coatings can enhance cell adhesion, osteoblast differentiation, and bone growth.

Machined (smooth) surfaces – Lower bone-to-implant contact (BIC), slower osseointegration.

Moderate roughness (1-2 μm, SLA, RBM surfaces) – Ideal for promoting bone growth and mechanical stability.

Nano-textured surfaces – Improve early bone cell attachment.

Hydroxyapatite (HA) coating – Mimics bone mineral and accelerates osseointegration.

Plasma-sprayed titanium surfaces – Enhance osteoconduction by increasing surface area. [2]

2. Biological Factors

A. Bone Quality and Quantity

Osseointegration is highly dependent on the quality and density of the recipient bone.

Type I Bone (Dense cortical bone) – Best osseointegration potential due to high stability.

Type II & III Bone (Mixed trabecular & cortical) – Good osseointegration, but requires careful surgical technique.

Type IV Bone (Porous trabecular bone) – Poor osseointegration due to low bone density, often found in the posterior maxilla. [18]

B. Host Systemic Health

Certain systemic conditions can impair osseointegration:

Diabetes Mellitus: Delayed healing due to poor vascularization and reduced osteoblast function.

Osteoporosis: Reduced bone mineral density affects mechanical stability.

Smoking: Nicotine causes vasoconstriction, reducing blood supply and impairing bone healing.

Radiation Therapy: Damages bone vascularity, increasing the risk of implant failure. [19]

3. Surgical and Mechanical Factors

A. Surgical Technique

Atraumatic implant placement minimizes damage to the bone microenvironment and promotes osseointegration.

Drilling Speed & Temperature: Excessive heat (>47°C) can cause thermal necrosis, leading to implant failure.

Primary Stability: Achieved by precise implant site preparation; high initial stability improves long-term osseointegration.

Minimally Invasive Techniques: Guided surgery and flapless techniques reduce trauma and improve healing. [20]

B. Loading Protocol

The timing of functional loading can influence implant success:

Immediate Loading (≤48 hrs): Beneficial in dense bone but may risk failure in poor bone quality.

Early Loading (3–6 weeks): Allows some osseointegration before applying occlusal forces.

Delayed Loading (≥3 months): Preferred for compromised bone conditions to ensure complete osseointegration. [21]

4. Environmental and Lifestyle Factors

A. Nutrition and Bone Metabolism

Calcium and Vitamin D Deficiency: Affects bone mineralization and osteoblastic activity.

Protein Deficiency: Impairs collagen synthesis, delaying bone healing.

Bisphosphonates (used for osteoporosis): Reduce bone turnover, increasing the risk of osteonecrosis of the jaw (ONJ). [22]

B. Smoking and Alcohol Consumption

Smoking: Nicotine causes vasoconstriction, reducing blood flow and impairing bone healing.

Alcohol: Affects osteoblast differentiation and reduces bone mineral density, leading to poor implant success. [23]

Effect of Implant Surface Modifications on Osseointegration

Implant surface modifications play a critical role in enhancing osseointegration by influencing cell attachment, proliferation, and bone formation at the bone-implant interface. The primary goal of surface modification is to improve bone-to-implant contact (BIC) and accelerate the healing process. Various modifications have been explored, including changes in surface roughness, chemistry, and coatings.

1. Surface Topography and Roughness

Surface roughness is classified into macro-, micro-, and nano-scale modifications, each affecting osseointegration differently.

A. Macro-Scale Roughness (>10 µm)

Threaded and porous designs increase primary stability by enhancing mechanical interlocking with bone. Commonly used in porous titanium or 3D-printed implants for better bone ingrowth. [24]

B. Micro-Scale Roughness (1–10 µm)

Created using sandblasting, acid etching, or grit blasting, which increases implant surface area for better osteoblast adhesion. Sandblasted, Large-grit, Acid-Etched (SLA) surfaces have shown higher BIC compared to machined (smooth) surfaces.[3]

C. Nano-Scale Roughness (<1 µm)

Nanostructured titanium surfaces (created by anodization or nanoparticles) mimic natural bone and improve protein adsorption and osteoblast differentiation. Titanium nanotubes have been shown to enhance early osseointegration. [25]

2. Implant Surface Chemistry Modifications

A. Hydroxyapatite (HA) Coating

HA mimics the natural mineral component of bone, leading to faster bone deposition and better osseoconductivity. Plasma-sprayed HA coatings improve initial bone bonding, but long-term stability depends on coating thickness and adhesion strength. [26]

B. Calcium Phosphate (CaP) Coating

Enhances bone growth factors, leading to increased early bone formation.

Bioactive CaP coatings have been shown to reduce healing time and improve implant stability. [27]

C. Titanium Plasma Spray (TPS)

Increases surface area for better bone-implant interlocking. Commonly used in orthopedic and dental implants. [28]

3. Biochemical Surface Modifications

A. Bioactive Peptides and Growth Factor Coatings

Bone Morphogenetic Proteins (BMPs) stimulate osteogenesis, enhancing bone healing and osseointegration. RGD peptides (Arg-Gly-Asp sequence) improve cell adhesion and increase osteoblast attachment. [29]

B. Hydrophilic Modifications

Hydrophilic surfaces (e.g., SLActive® implants) accelerate early healing by enhancing blood clot formation and fibrin network stability. Hydrophilic SLA surfaces have demonstrated faster osseointegration compared to standard SLA implants. [30]

4. Novel and Experimental Modifications

A. Graphene and Carbon-Based Coatings

Graphene oxide-coated implants have shown antibacterial properties and enhanced osteoblast differentiation. [31]

B. Silver and Antimicrobial Coatings

Silver nanoparticles reduce bacterial adhesion and lower the risk of peri-implant infections. Chitosan coatings provide both antibacterial and bioactive properties. [32]

Effect of Systemic Diseases on Osseointegration

Systemic diseases significantly impact bone metabolism, immune response, and vascularization, which can affect the osseointegration of dental and orthopedic implants. Conditions such as diabetes, osteoporosis, autoimmune diseases, and cancer can impair bone healing, leading to delayed osseointegration and increased implant failure rates.

1. Diabetes Mellitus (DM) and Osseointegration

Mechanism of Impairment

Diabetes, particularly uncontrolled Type 1 and Type 2 DM, negatively affects osseointegration due to:

Reduced Bone Formation – Hyperglycemia inhibits osteoblast differentiation and mineralization, slowing bone healing.

Increased Bone Resorption – High glucose levels stimulate osteoclast activity, leading to poor bone quality.

Microvascular Dysfunction – Reduced blood supply to bone delays healing and increases implant failure rates.

Impaired Immune Response – Increased susceptibility to infections around the implant site.

Clinical Evidence

Studies have shown that implant failure rates in diabetic patients are twice as high as in non-diabetics. However, well-controlled diabetes has shown similar success rates to healthy individuals. [33]

2. Osteoporosis and Osseointegration

Mechanism of Impairment

Osteoporosis is a metabolic bone disease characterized by low bone mineral density (BMD), leading to:

Reduced Primary Stability – Low-density trabecular bone provides less mechanical anchorage for implants.

Delayed Bone Remodeling – Osteoblast activity is reduced, while osteoclast activity is increased.

Higher Implant Failure Risk – Weakened bone structure compromises implant integration and long-term stability.

Clinical Evidence

Osteoporotic patients have lower bone-to-implant contact (BIC), increasing implant failure risks. Bisphosphonates (BPs), used for osteoporosis treatment, can cause osteonecrosis of the jaw (ONJ), delaying osseointegration. [34]

3. Autoimmune Diseases and Osseointegration

A. Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA)

Chronic inflammation increases osteoclast activity, leading to bone loss and impaired osseointegration. Corticosteroids and DMARDs (Disease-Modifying Anti-Rheumatic Drugs) suppress bone remodeling. [35]

B. Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE)

Patients exhibit increased osteoclast activity, leading to delayed osseointegration and higher implant failure. [36]

4. Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) and Osseointegration

Mechanism of Impairment

Renal osteodystrophy leads to abnormal bone turnover, affecting implant stability. CKD patients often suffer from delayed wound healing and increased infection risks. [37]

5. Cancer and Osseointegration

Effect of Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy

Radiotherapy (RT) in the head and neck region reduces vascularization, leading to delayed osseointegration and higher implant failure. Chemotherapy impairs osteoblast function and suppresses the immune system, increasing infection risks.[38]

6. Smoking and Alcohol Consumption

A. Smoking

Nicotine causes vasoconstriction, reducing blood flow to the bone. Smokers have 2–3 times higher implant failure rates compared to non-smokers. [39]

B. Alcohol

Chronic alcohol consumption interferes with bone metabolism, leading to delayed bone healing and osseointegration failure. [40]

Systemic diseases such as diabetes, osteoporosis, autoimmune disorders, CKD, and cancer can significantly impair osseointegration by affecting bone metabolism, immune function, and vascularization. While well-controlled conditions can improve implant outcomes, proper preoperative evaluation, modifications in surgical techniques, and medical management are crucial for successful osseointegration.

Future Aspects of Osseointegration

The future of osseointegration is driven by advanced biomaterials, nanotechnology, bioactive coatings, digital dentistry, and tissue engineering. The goal is to enhance bone-implant integration, reduce healing time, prevent complications, and improve long-term success rates. Below are some promising advancements:

1. Advanced Biomaterials for Improved Osseointegration

A. 3D-Printed and Customized Implants

3D-printed titanium and zirconia implants mimic natural bone architecture, promoting faster bone ingrowth. Patient-specific implants ensure better fit, reducing implant failures. [41]

B. Bioactive and Smart Materials

Smart implants can respond to biomechanical changes, releasing bioactive molecules when needed. Bioresorbable metals (e.g., magnesium implants) degrade naturally, reducing the need for removal surgeries. [42]

2. Nanotechnology and Surface Modifications

A. Nanostructured Implant Surfaces

Nanotopography (e.g., titanium nanotubes, nanopatterning) enhances osteoblast adhesion, differentiation, and faster osseointegration. Nanocoatings with growth factors accelerate bone healing. [43]

B. Antibacterial and Bioactive Coatings

Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) and graphene oxide coatings reduce infections. Calcium phosphate and bioactive glass coatings promote mineralization. [44]

3. Biological and Genetic Approaches

A. Stem Cells and Tissue Engineering

Mesenchymal Stem Cells (MSCs) and Bone Morphogenetic Proteins (BMPs) are being explored to regenerate bone around implants. Scaffold-based tissue engineering enables bone growth in deficient areas. [45]

B. Gene Therapy for Enhanced Bone Healing

Genetic modification of osteoblasts to increase bone formation around implants. CRISPR-based gene editing could optimize implant integration. [46]

4. Digital and AI-Based Approaches

A. AI and Machine Learning for Implant Planning

AI algorithms analyze bone quality, patient factors, and implant design to optimize treatment success. Predictive modeling helps in early diagnosis of implant failures. [47]

B. Robotics and Guided Surgery

Robotic-assisted implant placement improves precision and reduces errors. Augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) technologies enhance surgical planning. [48]

5. Biomechanical and Load-Bearing Innovations

A. Immediate Loading and Dynamic Implants

Smart implants with built-in sensors monitor bone healing and implant stability in real time. Self-adjusting implants can distribute forces dynamically to optimize load-bearing. [49]

B. Hybrid and Soft-Tissue Integrated Implants

New designs integrate peri-implant soft tissue to reduce implant-related inflammation and peri-implantitis. [50]

The future of osseointegration lies in biotechnology, nanotechnology, digital dentistry, and artificial intelligence. Emerging smart implants, bioactive coatings, gene therapy, and AI-driven diagnostics promise to enhance implant longevity, improve patient outcomes, and minimize complications.

2. CONCLUSION

Osseointegration has evolved from a serendipitous discovery in the 1950s into a fundamental principle in dental implantology, orthopedics, and prosthetic rehabilitation. The early findings of Per-Ingvar Brånemark laid the groundwork for modern implantology, proving that titanium could achieve a permanent bond with bone. Over the decades, technological advancements such as surface modifications, digital workflows, and guided implant placement have significantly improved implant stability, reduced healing time, and enhanced long-term success rates.

Looking ahead, nanotechnology, bioactive coatings, smart implants, stem cell therapy, and AI-driven diagnostics are set to further revolutionize osseointegration. These innovations aim to accelerate bone healing, improve implant longevity, and provide patient-specific solutions, ensuring better functional and aesthetic outcomes. As research continues, osseointegration will play an increasingly crucial role in regenerative medicine, personalized healthcare, and next-generation prosthetic development. The journey from accidental discovery to cutting-edge innovation highlights the remarkable potential of osseointegration, making it one of the most transformative advancements in modern medical science.

3. REFERENCES

[1] Parithimarkalaignan S, Padmanabhan TV. Osseointegration: An Update. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2013 Jan 11;13(1):2–6. doi: 10.1007/s13191-013-0252-z.

[2] Albrektsson T, Branemark P-I, Hansson H-A, Lindström J. Osseointegrated titanium implants. Requirements for ensuring a long-lasting direct bone-to-implant anchorage in man. Acta Orthop Scand. 1981;52:155–170. doi: 10.3109/17453678108991776.

[3] Buser, D., B.K. Schenk, S. Steinemann, J.P. Fiorellini, C.H. Fox, H. Stich. Influence of surface characteristics on bone integration of titanium implants. J Biomed Mater Res 1991;25:889-902.

[4] Paul RT Kuzyk, Emil H Schemitsch. The basic science of peri-implant bone healing. Indian J Orthop. 2011 Mar-Apr;45(2):108–115. doi: 10.4103/0019-5413.77129.

[5] Schenk RK, Buser D. Osseointegration: a reality. Periodontology 2000. 1998;17:22–35. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0757.1998.tb00120.x.

[6] Fabio Cozzolino, Davide Apicella , Guixue Wang , Antonio Apicella, Roberto Sorrentino. Implant-to-bone force transmission: a pilot study for in vivo strain gauge measurement technique. J Mecha Behav Biomed Mater 2019; 90: 173-81.
[7] Brånemark PI, Zarb C, Albrektsson T. Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw. Scandinavian J Plastic and Reconstructive Surg 1969; 3(2): 81-100.
[8] Duyck J. Immediate loading: Balancing risks and benefits. Periodontology 2000 2010;53(1): 195–208.
[9] Berglundh T. Bone healing around implants placed in fresh extraction sockets: An experimental study in dogs. Clinical Oral Implants Research 2003; 14(1): 20–28.
[10] Coelho PG, et al. (2009). Surface treatment impact on osseointegration. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 11(1): 41–49.
[11] Javed F, et al. (2013). Effect of implant surface topography on osseointegration. Implant Dentistry, 22(6): 675–682.
[12] Brånemark PI. (1983). Osseointegration and its experimental background. Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 50(3): 399–410.
[13] Brånemark PI, et al. (1969). Intra-osseous anchorage of dental prostheses: Experimental studies. Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 3(2): 81–100.
[14] Brånemark PI, et al. (1977). Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of edentulous jaw: Experience from a 10-year study. Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 11(Suppl 16): 1–132.
[15] Adell R, et al. (1981). A 15-year study of osseointegrated implants in the treatment of edentulism. International Journal of Oral Surgery, 10(6): 387–416.
[16] Brånemark R, et al. (2001). Osseointegrated implants for limb prostheses: A new concept for amputees. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 107(1): 48–58.
[17] Coelho PG, et al. (2009). Surface treatment impact on osseointegration. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 11(1): 41–49.
[18] Misch CE. (1999). Bone density: A key determinant for implant success. International Journal of Oral Implantology, 8(7): 151-59.
[19] Javed F, Romanos GE. (2010). The effect of systemic disease on osseointegration. Journal of Periodontology, 81(11): 1321–1332.
[20] Eriksson AR, Albrektsson T. (1983). Temperature threshold levels for heat-induced bone tissue injury: A vital-microscopic study in the rabbit. Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 50(1): 101–107.
[21] Esposito M. (2007). Timing of implant loading: A systematic review. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 18(Suppl 3): 121–134.
[22] Shanbhag S, et al. (2019). The influence of systemic conditions on osseointegration. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 30(Suppl 18): 14–23.
[23] Chrcanovic BR, et al. (2015). Smoking and dental implant failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Dentistry, 43(5): 487–498.
[24] Le Guéhennec L, et al. (2007). Surface treatments of titanium dental implants for rapid osseointegration. Dental Materials, 23(7): 844–854.
[25] Puckett S, et al. (2010). Nanotextured titanium surfaces for enhancing osteoblast adhesion and differentiation. Acta Biomaterialia, 6(6): 2352–2359.
[26] Coelho PG, et al. (2009). Osseointegration of hydroxyapatite-coated implants in humans. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 20(7): 754–760.
[27] Zhao G, et al. (2005). High surface energy enhances cell response to titanium substrate. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A, 74(1): 49–58.
[28] Piattelli A, et al. (1998). Bone response to titanium plasma-sprayed implants: A histological study in rabbits. Biomaterials, 19(2): 149–157.
[29] Liu Y, et al. (2006). RGD-functionalized implant surfaces increase peri-implant bone formation in vivo. Biomaterials, 27(31): 5623–5629.
[30] Lang NP, et al. (2011). Osseointegration of hydrophilic implants under immediate and early loading conditions. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 22(3): 277–286.
[31] Ding X, et al. (2014). Graphene-based materials in regenerative medicine. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 78: 58–71.
[32] García-Contreras R, et al. (2011). Antibacterial activity of silver nanoparticles against Streptococcus mutans. Materials Science and Engineering C, 31(6): 937–942.

[33] Javed F, Romanos GE. (2010). Diabetes and osseointegration: A systematic review. Journal of Periodontology, 81(11): 1534–1541.
[34] Shanbhag S, et al. (2019). The influence of systemic conditions on osseointegration. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 30(Suppl 18): 14–23.
[35] Gomes-Filho JE, et al. (2019). Impact of rheumatoid arthritis on peri-implant bone healing. Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 46(2): 277–283.
[36] Petri M, et al. (2016). Bone metabolism in lupus: Implications for implant therapy. Lupus, 25(4): 452–460.
[37] Monje A, et al. (2019). Osseointegration in patients with chronic kidney disease: A systematic review. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 30(4): 231–242.
[38] Chrcanovic BR, et al. (2016). Dental implants in irradiated patients: A systematic review. Journal of Oral Rehabilitation, 43(5): 337–349.
[39] Chrcanovic BR, et al. (2015). Smoking and dental implant failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Dentistry, 43(5): 487–498.
[40] López-Pintor RM, et al. (2017). The effect of alcohol consumption on bone healing around dental implants. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Dentistry, 9(8): e1021–e1028.
[41] Alvarez K, Nakajima H. (2009). Biomedical applications of titanium and its alloys. Journal of the Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials, 2(3): 288-295.
[42] Staiger MP, et al. (2006). Magnesium and its alloys as orthopedic biomaterials: A review. Biomaterials, 27(9): 1728–1734.
[43] Puckett S, et al. (2010). Nanotextured titanium surfaces for enhanced osseointegration. Acta Biomaterialia, 6(6): 2352–2359.
[44] Ding X, et al. (2014). Graphene-based materials in regenerative medicine. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 78: 58–71.
[45] Dimitriou R, et al. (2011). Bone regeneration: Current concepts and future directions. BMC Medicine, 9(1): 66.
[46] Evans CH, et al. (2009). Gene therapy for bone healing. Expert Review of Molecular Medicine, 11: e18.
[47] Meisel K, et al. (2021). Artificial intelligence in dental implantology: Applications and future prospects. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 32(7): 819-832.
[48] Block MS, Emery RW. (2016). Implant placement accuracy using dynamic navigation. International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants, 31(2): 402-407.
[49] Geckili O, et al. (2013). Immediate vs. early loading of dental implants: A meta-analysis. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 15(2): 157-164.
[50] Buser D, et al. (2017). Influence of implant design on soft tissue integration. Periodontology 2000, 73(1): 84-98.