The Use of Computed Tomography for Pre-Operative Planning in Dental Implant Placement

Abdulrahman Y. Alshebel[1], Waleed K. Almohaya[2], Nada M. Jaber[3], Sara A. Aljahdali[4], Shahad S. AlAhmadi[5], Fahad F. Alharbi[6], Mesfer Alahmari[7], Huda S. Almodhiy[8]

Health Affairs at the Ministry of National Guard

Abstract

This study evaluates the role of Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) in pre-operative planning for dental implant placement in a tertiary hospital setting. A total of 50 patients underwent CBCT-guided implant placement, allowing for precise visualization of bone structures and enhanced surgical predictability. The findings demonstrated significant improvements in implant placement accuracy, reduced complications, and high patient satisfaction. CBCT was found to be an indispensable tool in implantology, despite concerns about radiation exposure. Future research should focus on reducing radiation doses and exploring the use of CBCT in more complex scenarios.

Keywords: Dental Implantology, Cone Beam Computed Tomography, Pre-Operative Planning, Implant Placement Accuracy, Patient Satisfaction, Radiation Exposure

Introduction

Dental implantology has revolutionized the field of dentistry, offering a predictable and highly effective solution for the replacement of missing teeth. Successful implant placement largely depends on accurate pre-operative planning, which requires a detailed understanding of the patient's unique anatomical structures, bone quality, and quantity (Buser, 2009). Traditionally, two-dimensional imaging modalities, such as panoramic radiographs, have been used for this purpose, but these often come with limitations, such as image distortion and difficulty in visualizing critical anatomical landmarks (Hou et al., 2022).

Computed Tomography (CT) imaging, especially Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), has gained widespread acceptance in recent years as a superior tool for pre-operative evaluation in dental implantology. CT imaging allows for three-dimensional visualization of bone volume, density, and the spatial relationship of anatomical structures, which are essential for effective implant placement (Pauwels et al., 2015). The use of CT in pre-operative planning offers increased accuracy and safety by providing detailed cross-sectional images of the maxillofacial region, thereby allowing for precise implant positioning and reducing the risk of complications such as nerve damage or sinus perforation (Aumnakmanee et al., 2018).

Moreover, CT imaging enhances surgical predictability and can improve outcomes by facilitating the customization of treatment plans based on individual patient needs. For patients with limited bone volume or complex anatomical challenges, CT-guided planning is particularly valuable, as it allows clinicians to determine the ideal implant size, angulation, and position (Scarfe et al., 2006). This paper aims to evaluate the role of computed tomography in pre-operative planning for dental implant placement, highlighting its impact on accuracy, safety, and overall treatment outcomes.

Literature Review

The use of imaging modalities in dental implantology has evolved significantly over the years. Traditionally, two-dimensional imaging, such as panoramic and periapical radiographs, was the standard for pre-operative assessment. However, these imaging techniques are associated with various limitations, such as distortion, magnification errors, and the inability to provide comprehensive details about the bone's three-dimensional structure (Hou et al., 2022). Consequently, these limitations often led to inaccuracies in implant placement, which could potentially result in complications like nerve injury or implant failure.

With the introduction of Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), implantology has experienced a significant advancement in pre-operative planning. CBCT provides three-dimensional imaging that allows clinicians to assess bone quality, bone volume, and proximity to critical anatomical structures with a high level of accuracy (Pauwels et al., 2015). Several studies have highlighted the advantages of CBCT over conventional radiography. For instance, Pauwels et al. (2015) demonstrated that CBCT offers superior visualization of the maxillofacial region, which is crucial for determining the optimal implant position and avoiding complications.

Aumnakmanee et al. (2018) emphasized the importance of accurate pre-operative planning in reducing the risk of complications, such as damage to the inferior alveolar nerve or maxillary sinus perforation. The author argued that CT imaging, particularly CBCT, provides a level of detail that is unattainable with traditional imaging techniques, thus enhancing the safety and predictability of implant surgeries. Similarly, Scarfe et al. (2006) discussed how CBCT facilitates the customization of treatment plans, especially for patients with challenging anatomical conditions, such as limited bone height or density.

The accuracy of CBCT in assessing bone quality has also been a focus of research. According to Jacobs et al. (2018), CBCT allows for the precise measurement of bone density, which is essential for evaluating the primary stability of dental implants. Primary stability is a critical factor for the long-term success of implants, and inadequate assessment can lead to implant failure. Studies have shown that CBCT imaging provides reliable data on bone density, which helps in selecting the appropriate implant type and size, thereby increasing the chances of successful osseointegration (Aumnakmanee et al., 2018; Jacobs et al., 2018).

In addition to bone assessment, CBCT has been instrumental in identifying vital anatomical structures, such as the mandibular canal, mental foramen, and maxillary sinus. A study by Bertram et al. (2018) found that CBCT significantly improved the identification of these structures compared to panoramic radiography, thus reducing the risk of intraoperative complications. Accurate identification of these structures is crucial for avoiding nerve injury, sinus perforation, and other complications that could compromise implant success and patient safety.

Moreover, CT imaging has been shown to enhance the predictability of outcomes in complex cases, such as those involving multiple implants or full-arch rehabilitations. Ganz (2015) highlighted that CBCT-guided implant surgery enables a more accurate transfer of the virtual treatment plan to the actual surgical site through computer-assisted techniques and surgical guides. This approach minimizes deviations from the planned implant position, thereby improving the overall accuracy and success rate of the procedure.

Despite its numerous advantages, the use of CBCT is not without limitations. Radiation exposure is a concern, particularly when compared to traditional two-dimensional imaging (Pauwels et al., 2015). However, advances in technology have led to the development of low-dose CBCT protocols that significantly reduce radiation exposure while maintaining image quality. Clinicians must weigh the benefits of enhanced diagnostic accuracy against the potential risks of increased radiation exposure, particularly for younger patients or those requiring multiple scans (Jacobs et al., 2018).

In conclusion, the literature strongly supports the use of computed tomography, particularly CBCT, as a valuable tool in pre-operative planning for dental implant placement. CBCT offers enhanced visualization of the maxillofacial region, accurate assessment of bone quality and quantity, and improved identification of vital anatomical structures, all of which contribute to safer and more predictable implant outcomes. The benefits of CBCT in enhancing surgical accuracy and reducing complications make it an indispensable tool in modern implantology, despite concerns regarding radiation exposure.

Methodology

This study was conducted in the dental department of a tertiary hospital, focusing on patients undergoing dental implant placement. A total of 50 patients, aged between 25 and 70 years, were included in the study. The inclusion criteria were patients with partial edentulism requiring dental implants, adequate bone volume for implant placement as determined by initial radiographic evaluation, and no contraindications for implant surgery. Patients with systemic conditions that could affect bone healing, such as uncontrolled diabetes or osteoporosis, were excluded.

The study involved a pre-operative assessment using Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) to evaluate bone quality, bone volume, and proximity to critical anatomical structures. The CBCT scans were performed using a standardized protocol to ensure consistency across all patients. The imaging data were analyzed to determine the optimal implant position, angulation, and size. The use of CBCT allowed for precise identification of anatomical landmarks, including the mandibular canal, mental foramen, and maxillary sinus, to minimize the risk of complications.

All implant surgeries were performed by experienced oral surgeons under local anesthesia. A surgical guide, generated from the CBCT data, was used to ensure accurate transfer of the pre-operative plan to the surgical site. The implant placement was conducted using a flapless approach whenever possible to reduce surgical trauma and promote faster healing. Post-operative CBCT scans were taken to assess the accuracy of implant placement compared to the pre-operative plan.

Data collection included both quantitative and qualitative measures. Quantitative data consisted of bone density measurements, implant position accuracy, and post-operative outcomes such as implant stability and osseointegration. Qualitative data were collected through patient interviews to assess their satisfaction with the treatment process, including their experience with the imaging procedure and overall surgical outcome.

The primary outcome measures were the accuracy of implant placement, as determined by comparing the planned and actual implant positions, and the rate of complications such as nerve injury or sinus perforation.

Secondary outcomes included patient satisfaction, implant stability (measured using resonance frequency analysis), and the incidence of post-operative complications.

Data analysis was performed using statistical software. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics, bone density, and implant stability. The accuracy of implant placement was analyzed using paired t-tests to compare the planned and actual implant positions. Patient satisfaction scores were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify common themes regarding their experience with the CBCT-guided implant procedure.

Findings

The findings from the study demonstrated the effectiveness of CBCT-guided planning in improving implant placement accuracy and patient outcomes. The results are presented in the following tables.

Table 1: Patient Demographics and Bone Density

Parameter	Value
Number of Patients	50
Age Range (years)	25-70
Mean Age (years)	47.3
Male Patients (%)	56
Female Patients (%)	44
Mean Bone Density (HU)	825.4

Table 2: Implant Position Accuracy

Parameter	Planned Position (Mean)	Actual Position (Mean)	p-value
Mesio-Distal Deviation (mm)	0	0.5	0.032
Buccal-Lingual Deviation (mm)	0	0.7	0.028
Apico-Coronal Deviation (mm)	0	0.6	0.041

Table 3: Implant Stability and Complications

Parameter	Value
Mean Implant Stability Quotient	72.5
Nerve Injury Cases	0
Sinus Perforation Cases	1
Implant Failure Rate (%)	2

Table 4: Patient Satisfaction

Satisfaction Aspect	% of Patients Satisfied
Pre-operative Imaging Process	94
Surgical Experience	90
Overall Satisfaction with Implant Outcome	92

Summary of Findings

The study found that CBCT-guided planning significantly improved the accuracy of implant placement, as indicated by the low deviation values between the planned and actual implant positions (Table 2). The use of CBCT allowed for precise identification of anatomical structures, which contributed to the low rate of complications, such as nerve injury (0%) and sinus perforation (2%) (Table 3). Patient satisfaction was high, with 94% of patients reporting a positive experience with the pre-operative imaging process and 92% expressing satisfaction with the overall implant outcome (Table 4).

The statistical analysis demonstrated that the deviations between planned and actual implant positions were minimal and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that CBCT-guided planning enhances the precision of implant placement. Additionally, the mean implant stability quotient of 72.5 suggests good primary stability, which is crucial for successful osseointegration.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that CBCT-guided planning significantly improves the accuracy of dental implant placement and enhances patient outcomes. The low deviation between the planned and actual implant positions underscores the precision achieved through CBCT imaging, supporting its role as an essential tool for pre-operative planning. The minimal mesio-distal, buccal-lingual, and apico-coronal deviations (Table 2) highlight the enhanced predictability of implant surgery, which is crucial for reducing complications and improving the success rate of implant procedures.

One of the major advantages of using CBCT for implant planning is its ability to provide three-dimensional visualization of anatomical structures, which facilitates the accurate assessment of bone quality and quantity. As highlighted in the literature, traditional two-dimensional imaging techniques often fall short in providing the comprehensive details needed for successful implant planning (Hou et al., 2022). The findings of this study align with previous research, showing that CBCT provides a higher level of accuracy in assessing bone density and proximity to critical anatomical structures, which is crucial for avoiding complications like nerve injury or sinus perforation (Aumnakmanee et al. 2018; Jacobs et al., 2018).

The use of CBCT also contributed to the high level of patient satisfaction observed in this study. The qualitative data collected through patient interviews revealed that patients appreciated the thoroughness of the pre-operative imaging process, which helped them understand the surgical procedure better and feel more confident about the outcome. The high percentage of patients satisfied with the imaging process (94%) and the overall surgical experience (90%) indicates that CBCT not only enhances clinical outcomes but also contributes to a positive patient experience.

Another important aspect of this study was the use of CBCT-generated surgical guides, which played a significant role in ensuring the accurate transfer of the pre-operative plan to the surgical site. This approach minimized deviations and improved the predictability of implant placement, particularly in complex cases involving multiple implants or challenging anatomical conditions. These findings are consistent with Ganz (2015), who emphasized the benefits of computer-assisted techniques and surgical guides in achieving precise implant positioning.

The findings also showed that the rate of complications was low, with no cases of nerve injury and only one instance of sinus perforation (Table 3). This further supports the use of CBCT as a valuable tool for minimizing risks during implant surgery. The ability to accurately identify vital anatomical structures, such as the mandibular canal and maxillary sinus, is critical in reducing the likelihood of complications and ensuring the long-term success of implants (Bertram et al. 2018)

However, it is important to note that the use of CBCT is associated with increased radiation exposure compared to traditional two-dimensional imaging. While advances in low-dose CBCT protocols have helped mitigate this concern, clinicians must continue to carefully weigh the benefits of enhanced diagnostic accuracy against the potential risks of radiation exposure, particularly for younger patients or those requiring multiple scans (Pauwels et al., 2015). Future studies could explore the long-term effects of repeated CBCT exposure and investigate ways to further reduce radiation doses without compromising image quality.

In conclusion, the results of this study provide strong evidence that CBCT-guided planning improves the accuracy of dental implant placement, reduces the risk of complications, and enhances patient satisfaction. The three-dimensional visualization and detailed assessment of anatomical structures offered by CBCT make it an indispensable tool in modern implantology. Despite concerns regarding radiation exposure, the benefits of CBCT in achieving predictable and successful implant outcomes make it a highly valuable imaging modality for dental practitioners. Future research should focus on further refining CBCT technology to reduce radiation exposure and exploring its application in more complex clinical scenarios.

References

1. Buser, D. (2009). Years of guided bone regeneration in implant dentistry. *Chicago: Quintessence*, 10.

2. Hou, X., Xu, X., Zhao, M., Kong, J., Wang, M., Lee, E. S., ... & Jiang, H. B. (2022). An overview of three-dimensional imaging devices in dentistry. *Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry*, *34*(8), 1179-1196.

3. Aumnakmanee, S., Yodpiji, N., Jantong, N., &Jongprasithporn, M. (2018). Finite element analysis of dental implant prosthetics. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, *5*(3), 9525-9534.

4. Pauwels, R. (2015). Cone beam CT for dental and maxillofacial imaging: dose matters. *Radiation protection dosimetry*, *165*(1-4), 156-161.

5. Scarfe, W. C., Farman, A. G., &Sukovic, P. (2006). Clinical applications of cone-beam computed tomography in dental practice. *Journal-Canadian Dental Association*, *72*(1), 75.

6. Jacobs, R., Salmon, B., Codari, M., Hassan, B., & Bornstein, M. M. (2018). Cone beam computed tomography in implant dentistry: recommendations for clinical use. *BMC oral health*, *18*, 1-16.

7. Bertram, F., Bertram, S., Rudisch, A., &Emshoff, R. (2018). Assessment of Location of the Mandibular Canal: Correlation Between Panoramic and Cone Beam Computed Tomography Measurements. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*, *31*(2).

8. Ganz, S. D. (2015). Three-dimensional imaging and guided surgery for dental implants. *Dental Clinics*, *59*(2), 265-290.