



Maurizio Cannata, Tommaso Grandi, Rawad Samarani, Luigi Svezia, Giovanni Grandi



Maurizio Cannata, DDS
Private practice, Rende (Cosenza), Italy

Tommaso Grandi, DDS
Private practice, Modena, Italy


Rawad Samarani, DCD, DES
Assistant, Department of Periodontology, Saint-Joseph University, Beirut, Lebanon

Luigi Svezia, DDS
Private practice, Modena, Italy

Giovanni Grandi, MD
Department of Medical Sciences of Mother, Child and Adult, Obstetrics and Gynecology Unit, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy

Correspondence to:
Tommaso Grandi DDS,
Via Contrada 323, 41126 Modena, Italy
Email: t.grandi@grandiclinic.com
phone: +39 3337095223

1



J Dental Care,



18
5 (),

»,
«
Branemark.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.


)6,7.
()
(),
9,10.

(10 (10)
)

CONSORT

(MC, TG RS),

(www.consort-statement.org/)



30

Dental Care, JDIcon (JDIcon, JDEvolution, J 12

JDEvolution 2 0,2% 3 1 45 (. 1a-1c).



1 2 3). (Roche SpA, (MC, TG RS), 12

1 (, Abbott SRL, 500 250

30

Fig 2



JDI-con




copyright by
not for publication
Quintessenz

Fig 3


JDEvolution




1
(LS).
JPG, 600 dpi TIFF
Image
J 1.42 ().
0,01 (GG),
StatView (5.01.98, SAS Institute Inc,).
30 90 45 t-
t-
(ANOVA).



	(n=45) (%)	(n=45) (%)
	25 (55.6%)	22 (48.9%)
	52.3 ± 16.8 (23-79)	51.2 ± 17.3 (25-75)
10	9 (20.0%)	8 (17.8%)
10	4 (8.9%)	6 (13.3%)
	38/67 (57.8%)	40/72 (53.3%)
Implants inserted in incisor sites	7 (10.4%)	8 (11.1%)
	4 (6%)	7 (9.7%)
Implants inserted in premolar sites	31 (46.3%)	29 (40.3%)
	25 (37.3%)	28 (38.9%)
	10.4 ± 1.6	10.8 ± 1.8
	4.3 ± 0.8	4.1 ± 0.7
	16 (23.9%)	14 (19.4%)
	45 (67.1%)	47 (65.3%)
	6 (9%)	11 (15.3%)
	22 (32.8%)	31 (43.1%)
	25 (37.3%)	36 (50.0%)
	2 (4.4%)	3 (6.7%)
	32 (71.1%)	28 (62.2%)
	13 (28.9%)	17 (37.8%)





	1	1	1	P
	N Mean ± SD (95% CI)	N Mean ± SD (95% CI)	N Mean ± SD (95% CI)	
	45 0.03 ± 0.06 (-0.03; 0.09)	44 0.59 ± 0.61 (-0.02; 1.20)	44 0.56 ± 0.53 (0.03; 1.09)	0.0001
	45 0.02 ± 0.05 (-0.03; 0.07)	44 0.62 ± 0.65 (-0.03; 1.27)	44 0.60 ± 0.62 (0.02; 1.22)	0.0001
p	0.393	0.822	0.745	

30

	Grandi	Cannata	Samarani	P-value
Drop-out	0/30 (0%)	1/30 (3.3%)	0/30 (0%)	0.600
Patients with implant failure	1/30 (3.3%)	0/30 (0%)	0/30 (0%)	0.364
Patients with complications	2/30 (6.7%)	2/30 (6.7%)	0/30 (0%)	0.351
Bone loss	0.32 ± 0.51	1.19 ± 0.75	0.35 ± 0.58	0.0001

1,27)
 ± 0,53 (95% 0,03; 1,09) 0,56
 0,60 ± 0,62 (95% 0,02; 1,22)
 = 0,743; 2). (P
 3
 8
 1 : P = 0,0001
 0,2%
 2
 10
 0,2%
 0,26; 1,48)
 (P = 0,0001), 3.
 4,4%, 0,0; 95% : -3,1; 3,1; P
 = 1,000) 6,7% 0%, P = 0,351)
 3.

(P = 0,395).
 0,03 ± 0,06 (95%
 -0,03; 0,09) 0,02 ± 0,05 (95%
 -0,03; 0,07) 1
 1
 0,61 (95% -0,02; 1,20) : 0,59 ±
 (95% -0,03; 1,20) 0,62 ± 0,65 0,56
 (95% -0,03; 1,20) 0,62 ± 0,65



0,60
 (1)
 1
 ()
 (0,51) (1,10)
)7.
) (1,14
 (0,24 9.)
 1
 10. 5
 1,13 1,21

1. Branemark PI, Hansson BO, Adell R, Breine U, Lindstrom J, Hallen O, Ohman A. Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw. Experience from a 10-year period. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Suppl* 1977; 16: 1–132.
2. Albrektsson T, Zarb G, Worthington P, Eriksson, RA. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants. A review and proposed criteria for success. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 1986; 132:11–25.
3. Hermann JS, Schoolfield JD, Schenk RK, Buser D, Cochran DL. Influence of the size of the microgap on crestal bone changes around titanium implants. A histometric evaluation of unloaded non-submerged implants in the canine mandible. *J Periodontol* 2001; 72:1372–1383.
4. King, GN, Hermann JS, Schoolfield JD, Buser D, Cochran DL. Influence of the size of the microgap on crestal bone levels in non-submerged dental implants: a radiographic study in the canine mandible. *J Periodontol* 2002; 73:1111–1117.
5. Duyck J, Rønold HJ, Van Oosterwyck H, Naert I, Vander Sloten J, Ellingsen JE. The influence of static and dynamic loading on marginal bone reactions around osseointegrated implants: an animal experimental study. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2001; 12:207–218.

6. Gracis S, Michalakis K, Vigolo P, Vult von Steyern P, Zwahlen M, Sailer I. Internal vs external connections for abutments/reconstructions: a systematic review. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2012;23:202–216.
7. Pozzi A, Tallarico M, Moy PK. Three-year post-loading results of a randomised, controlled, split-mouth trial comparing implants with different prosthetic interfaces and design in partially posterior edentulous mandibles. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2014;7:47–61.
8. Felice P, Barausse C, Blasone R, Favaretto G, Stacchi C, Calvo M, Marin C, Buti J, Esposito M. A comparison of two dental implant systems in partially edentulous patients: 1-year post-loading results from a pragmatic multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2014;7:397–409.
9. Pessoa RS, Sousa RM, Pereira LM, Neves FD, Bezerra FJ, Jacques SV, Sloten JV, Quirynen M, Teughels W, Spin-Neto R. Bone Remodeling Around Implants with External Hexagon and Morse-Taper Connections: A Randomized, Controlled, Split-Mouth, Clinical Trial. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2016 Jun 29. doi: 10.1111/cid.12437. [Epub ahead of print].
10. Esposito M, Maghaireh H, Pistilli R, Grusovin MG, Lee ST, Trullenque-Eriksson A, Gualini F. Dental implants with internal versus external connections: 5-year post-loading results from a pragmatic multicenter randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2016;9:129–141.