

Investigation on influence of dental implants

**A Thesis Submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

By

Pooyan Rahmanivahid

School of Engineering and Design

Mechanical Engineering

Brunel University

September 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not be completed without Prof. Esat supervision and inspiration.

I would like to thank Mr Keith Withers, Dr. Mahmoud Chizari, and Miss. Saba Eshraghi for their help and assistance throughout this project.

I would like to thank my other half; Gazelle, this work would not be done without her support.

And especially to God who made all things possible.

ABSTRACT

Osseointegration is defined as the direct physical and practical relation between the living tissue and implant surface. Although, success rate of dental implants is high, implant failure occurs. Overloading implants from occlusal forces are known as one of the main reasons.

In order to have successful implant, a dynamic balance must be provided between mechanical and biological elements (Isidor, Flemming 1996).

Şimşek et al. reported bone quality, oral sanitation, host medical condition and biomechanical parameters as the main reasons for implants failure. Also, implant fixture micromotion and inappropriate stress in the bone implant interface is known as the potential reasons for early bone loss and implant failure (Şimşek, Barış 2006).

Even so, implant position in jawbone, bone density; biomaterial properties of implant surface, treatment technique, loading history and patient clinical status are the influential factors in implant success (Brunski, J.B. 1999).

Although there are many studies on stress distribution of implants in bone-implant interface, majority are limited to current implants in the market. However, current designs have been developed by marketing purposes rather than scientific considerations. Therefore, there is need to introduce and analyse new designs in order to optimize implant structure. Recent investigations have shown reliability of FEA method in simulating human jawbone situation.

This research aims to develop a new dental implant with better life expectancies and introduce an optimized implant based on FEA stress analyses and experimental tests.

Therefore, based on literature recommendations a series of new design factors are defined and analysed. In this study, a primary design is created in AutoCAD and

yields to 3 different implants developed in SolidWorks. Branemark MK IV was selected as the bench model to play role of control group. Then, CT-scan images of human jawbone are imported to MIMICS to create a host bone model. Implant and jawbone models are assembled in 3-Matic and exported to Abaqus for final analyses. A series of loadings are defined to examine implant performance in different conditions.

Branemark and C-3 implants are manufactured from Titanium for experimental analyses. Mechanical tests on sawbone foam blocks and cadavers are targeted to portray realistic performance.

This research demonstrates C-3 model as the optimized dental implant, which presents a new design profile and better performance in low bone densities.

The FEA and experimental results validate the benefit of the new design compare to the conventional ones. Furthermore, results can provide a basis for future designers to develop further optimizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background.....	3
1.2. Purpose of Study.....	5
1.3. Thesis Outline.....	6
2. Literature Review	7
2.1. Human Jawbone.....	8
2.1.1. Occlusal Forces.....	10
2.1.2. Mechanical Properties.....	14
2.1.3. Osseointegration.....	20
2.1.4. Bone Remodelling.....	22
2.1.5. Crestal Resorption.....	26
2.2. Dental Implants.....	30
2.2.1. Thread Geometry.....	34
2.2.2. Thread Pitch.....	45
2.2.3. Implant Diameter.....	48
2.2.4. Implant Length.....	52
2.2.5. Implant Outline.....	54
2.2.6. Surface Material.....	57
2.2.7. Anchorage	60
2.2.8. Abutment and Crown.....	65
2.2.9. Insertion Protocols.....	68
2.2.10. Microstrains and Micromotions.....	70
2.2.11. Failure Mechanism.....	74

2.2.12. Stress Distribution.....	77
2.3. Conclusion.....	91
3. Methodology	92
3.1. Finite Element Analysis.....	95
3.1.1. Primary Design.....	99
3.1.2. Design Development.....	103
3.1.3. Jawbone Modelling.....	110
3.1.4. Assembling.....	114
3.1.5. Final Analyses.....	116
3.1.5.1. Analyses Method.....	118
3.1.5.2. Material Properties.....	121
3.1.5.3. Boundary Conditions.....	124
3.1.5.4. Loading Settings.....	126
3.1.5.5. Error Analyses.....	129
3.2. Experimental.....	130
3.2.1. Sawbone Test.....	134
3.2.2. Cadaver Test.....	139
3.3. Conclusion.....	142
4. Results.....	145
4.1. Finite Element Analyses.....	145
4.1.1. Static Compressive Loading.....	147
4.1.2. Cyclic Compressive Loading.....	152
4.1.3. Static Horizontal Loading.....	157
4.1.4. Pull-out Displacement.....	162

4.1.5. Push-in Displacement.....	167
4.2. Experimental Results.....	172
4.2.1. Sawbones.....	172
4.2.2. Cadavers.....	178
4.3. Conclusion.....	179
5. Discussion.....	181
6. Conclusion.....	196
References.....	201
Appendix.....	213

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig.2.1-1. <i>Classification of bone quality</i>	8
Fig.2.1.2-1. <i>Orientations in bone samples taken from the mandible</i>	16
Fig. 2.1.2-2. <i>Ultimate stresses (MPa) of human cortical bone according</i>	18
Fig.2.1.4-1. <i>Four commercial implant system: Ankylos, Bicon, ITI, Nobel Biocare</i>	24
Fig.2.1.4-2. <i>Dimensions of four hypothetical implants</i>	24
Fig.2.1.4-3. <i>Elastic moduli distribution of four commercially and four hypothetical implants</i>	25
Fig.2.2.1-1. <i>Four thread-form configurations of stepped screw implant and their bodies</i>	35
Fig.2.2.1-2. <i>Max Von-Mises stress in the bone implant interface</i>	36
Fig.2.2.1-3. <i>Maximum Von-Mises stress in the bone-implant interface</i>	36
Fig.2.2.1-4. <i>The circumferential length of a single thread projected onto the sagittal plane</i>	37
Fig.2.2.1-5. <i>Implant threads design parameters</i>	38
Fig.2.2.1-6. <i>Total contact area of the implants</i>	38
Fig.2.2.1-7. <i>Maximum and average stresses of the first mandible thread</i>	39
Fig.2.2.1-8. <i>Statistical distribution of nodal stresses within the first mandible threads</i>	39
Fig.2.2.1-9. <i>(A) Correlation between thread length and total thread area</i>	39
Fig.2.2.1-10. <i>The profile of the thread</i>	41
Fig.2.2.1-11. <i>Hybrid Dual Tread Screw (HDTS) Implant</i>	42
Fig.2.2.1-12. <i>Implant tests under compression axial load</i>	42
Fig.2.2.1-13. <i>Analytical Model for HDTS Implant</i>	43
Fig.2.2.1-14. <i>The Max Cortical Shear Stress Distribution for the Two</i>	44

Fig.2.2.2-1. <i>Schematic representation of the screw parameters.....</i>	<i>46</i>
Fig.2.2.2-2. <i>Response curve of thread pitch to Max EQV stresses in jaw.....</i>	<i>47</i>
Fig.2.2.3-1. <i>Stress relieve for different implant diameters.....</i>	<i>49</i>
Fig.2.2.3-2. <i>Subcrestal stress of Implant per stepped Cylindrical-implant.....</i>	<i>51</i>
Fig.2.2.3-3. <i>Subcrestal stress of Cortical per stepped Cylindrical.....</i>	<i>51</i>
Fig.2.2.3-4. <i>Subcrestal stress of Cancellous per stepped Cylindrical.....</i>	<i>51</i>
Fig.2.2.4-1. <i>Stress relieve for different implant length.....</i>	<i>53</i>
Fig.2.2.5-1. <i>Predicted amount of bone failure area for vertical load.....</i>	<i>56</i>
Fig.2.2.5-2. <i>Details of tensile and compressive stress regions which.....</i>	<i>56</i>
Fig.2.2.6-1. <i>Push-out loads (N) decrease as average surface roughness.....</i>	<i>57</i>
Fig.2.2.7-1. <i>Conical and Cylindrical Branemark, Conical and Cylindrical.....</i>	<i>62</i>
Fig.2.2.7-2. <i>Isochromatic fringe orders of conical and cylindrical.....</i>	<i>62</i>
Fig.2.2.7-3. <i>Principal strains (10^{-6}) around implants.....</i>	<i>63</i>
Fig.2.2.7-4. <i>Compressive and tensile strains (10^{-6}).....</i>	<i>63</i>
Fig.2.2.8-1. <i>Different implant–abutment attachment methods.....</i>	<i>66</i>
Fig.2.2.11-1. <i>Finite element results of Oyola and Brunski.....</i>	<i>75</i>
Fig.2.2.12-1. <i>Bone fraction material properties, Young modulus.....</i>	<i>78</i>
Fig.2.2.12-2. <i>Bone fraction material properties, Shear modulus.....</i>	<i>79</i>
Fig.2.2.12-3. <i>Bone fraction material properties, Poisson ratio.....</i>	<i>79</i>
Fig.2.2.12-4. <i>3D solid model of implant, abutment, metal framework.....</i>	<i>80</i>
Fig.2.2.12-5. <i>Applied loads and boundary conditions of FEM model.....</i>	<i>81</i>
Fig.2.2.12-6. <i>Stress distribution within the implant under static.....</i>	<i>81</i>

Fig.2.2.12-7. <i>Stress distribution in the cortical and spongy bone in static</i>	82
Fig.2.2.12-8. <i>FEM model of IMZ implant and jawbone segment</i>	83
Fig.2.2.12-9. <i>Despite variations in integration patterns, stress was</i>	84
Fig.2.2.12-10. <i>Stress contour plot: alternating osseointegration pattern for</i>	84
Fig.2.2.12-11. <i>Distribution of stresses within implant and abutment</i>	85
Fig.2.2.12-12. <i>Maximum stress value within cortical bone for different bone qualities</i>	86
Fig.2.2.12-13. <i>Solid models of the commercial implant systems</i>	86
Fig.2.2.12-14. <i>Von-Mises stress contours for implants in maxillary and mandibular</i>	88
Fig.2.2.12-15. <i>Von-Mises (A, Top) and principal (B, Top) stresses for cortical interface</i>	89
Fig.3.1.1-1. <i>Zimmer and MegaFix dental implant systems</i>	99
Fig.3.1.1-2. <i>Plastic wall roll- plugs</i>	100
Fig.3.1.1-3. <i>Primary design of implant in AutoCAD software</i>	101
Fig.3.1.2-1. <i>V-5 dental implant model in SolidWorks</i>	103
Fig.3.1.2-2. <i>V-5 dental implant thread and lockers model</i>	104
Fig.3.1.2-3. <i>T-3 dental implant model in SolidWorks</i>	105
Fig.3.1.2-4. <i>T-3 dental implant thread and lockers model</i>	105
Fig.3.1.2-5. <i>C-3 dental implant model in SolidWorks</i>	106
Fig.3.1.2-6. <i>C-3 dental implant thread and lockers model in SolidWorks</i>	107
Fig.3.1.2-7. <i>Branemark MK IV</i>	108
Fig.3.1.2-8. <i>Branemark IV dental implant model in SolidWorks</i>	108
Fig.3.1.2-9. <i>Branemark IV dental implant threads model in SolidWorks</i>	109
Fig.3.1.3-1. <i>Axial, Sagittal and Coronal views of the Jawbone</i>	110

Fig.3.1.3-2. Filled up position of left second molar in full human jawbone model in MIMICS.....	112
Fig.3.1.3-3. Quarter jawbone with cortical and cancellous layers in MIMICS.....	113
Fig.3.1.3-4. Position of second molar in quarter mandible model.....	113
Fig.3.1.4-1. Branemark implant inserted vertically into quarter jawbone model in 3-Matic.....	114
Fig.3.1.4-2. Volumetric mesh in 3-Matic.....	115
Fig.3.1.5-1. Volumetric meshed models of implant inserted in full and quarter jawbone.....	117
Fig.3.1.5.2-1. Material properties of Titanium implant in Abaqus.....	122
Fig.3.1.5.2-2. Material properties of Cortical bone in Abaqus.....	123
Fig.3.1.5.2-3. Material properties of Cancellous bone in Abaqus.....	123
Fig.3.1.5.3-1. Boundary fixations of the model in Abaqus.....	125
Fig.3.1.5.4-1. Use of -0.01mm displacement as function of load in Abaqus.....	127
Fig.3.2-1. Primary manufactured models: Titanium actual size.....	130
Fig.3.2-2. Adjustable torque driver.....	131
Fig.3.2-3. Adjustable torque driver and attachment tools.....	131
Fig.3.2-4. Torque driver and implant connection converter.....	132
Fig.3.2-5. Titanium implant manufacturing process.....	132
Fig.3.2-6. Titanium made C-3 and Branemark implants.....	133
Fig.3.2-7. Implant insertion fixture.....	133
Fig.3.2.1-1. Sawbone blocks used in the experiment.....	134
Fig.3.2.1-2. Pre-drilled sockets in sawbone blocks by use torque driver.....	136
Fig.3.2.1-3. Sawbone block fixture.....	136
Fig.3.2.1-4. Instron fixture.....	137

Fig.3.2.1-5. <i>Implants block-samples under loading in Instron machine</i>	137
Fig.3.2.1-6. <i>Implants were inserted into the sawbone blocks for cyclic-pullout test</i>	138
Fig.3.2.2-1. <i>Cadaver test fixture</i>	139
Fig.3.2.2-2. <i>Implant inserted in sheep jawbone</i>	140
Fig.3.2.2-3. <i>Implant inserted in lateral side of sheep jawbone</i>	140
Fig.3.2.2-4. <i>Animal test fixture</i>	141
Fig.3.2.2-5. <i>Animal test in Instron machine</i>	141
Fig.4.1.1-1. <i>Von-Mises distribution of 150 N Static force in cancellous bone</i>	146
Fig.4.1.1-2. <i>Von-Mises distribution of 150 N Static force in cancellous bone and V-5</i>	147
Fig.4.1.1-3. <i>Von-Mises distribution of 150 N Static force in cancellous bone and T-3</i>	148
Fig.4.1.1-4. <i>Von-Mises distribution of 150 N Static force in cancellous bone and C-3</i>	149
Fig.4.1.2-1. <i>Von-Mises stress of 50 N Cyclic force in cancellous bone and Branemark</i>	151
Fig.4.1.2-2. <i>Von-Mises stress of 50 N Cyclic force in cancellous bone and for V-5 implant</i>	152
Fig.4.1.2-3. <i>Von-Mises stress of 50 N Cyclic force in cancellous bone and T-3 implant</i>	153
Fig.4.1.2-4. <i>Von-Mises stress of 50 N Cyclic force in cancellous bone and C-3 implant</i>	154
Fig.4.1.3-1. <i>Von-Mises stress of Horizontal force in cancellous bone and Branemark implant</i>	156
Fig.4.1.3-2. <i>Von-Mises stress of Horizontal force in cancellous bone and V-5implant</i>	157
Fig.4.1.3-3. <i>Von-Mises stress of Horizontal force in cancellous bone and T-3implant</i>	158
Fig.4.1.3-4. <i>Von-Mises stress of Horizontal force in cancellous bone and C-3implant</i>	159
Fig.4.1.4-1. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pullout displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous and</i>	161
Fig.4.1.4-2. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pullout displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous and V-5</i>	162
Fig.4.1.4-3. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pullout displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous and T-3</i>	163

Fig.4.1.4-4. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pullout displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous and C-3</i>	164
Fig.4.1.5-1. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pushin displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous bone</i>	166
Fig.4.1.5-2. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pushin displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous bone and V-5</i>	167
Fig.4.1.5-3. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pushin displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous bone and T-3</i>	168
Fig.4.1.5-4. <i>Von-Mises stress for Pushin displacement of 0.1 mm in cancellous bone and C-3</i>	169
Fig.4.2.1-1. <i>Cyclic and Pullout test on Sawbone 10 GP</i>	171
Fig.4.2.1-2. <i>Cyclic and Pullout test on Sawbone 15 GP</i>	172
Fig.4.2.1-3. <i>Cyclic and Pullout test on Sawbone 20 GP</i>	173
Fig.4.2.1-4. <i>Cyclic and Pullout test on Sawbone 30 GP</i>	174
Fig.4.2.1-5. <i>Cyclic and Pullout test on Sawbone 40 GP</i>	175
Fig.4.2.2-1. <i>Average extension under cyclic tensile loading in cadaver test</i>	176
Fig.4.2.2-2. <i>Final pullout strength vs induced extension in sheep jawbone</i>	176

LIST OF TABLES

Table.2.1.1-1. <i>Allocation and properties of muscle trusses assigned to the FE model</i>	10
Table.2.1.1-2. <i>Bite force in other subject groups</i>	12
Table.2.1.1-3. <i>Bite force and occlusal contact area of healthy persons</i>	12
Table 2.1.2-1 <i>Elastic properties of materials used in 3-D FEM</i>	16
Table.2.1.2-2. <i>Mechanical and Material properties from different studies</i>	16
Table.2.1.2-3. <i>Elastic moduli and shear moduli measured on bone in the mandible.</i>	17
Table.2.1.2-4. <i>Comparison of elastic moduli and shear moduli for edentulous and</i>	17
Table.2.1.2-5 <i>E_i is modulus of elasticity in the i direction, ν_{ij} is Poisson's ratio</i>	18
Table.2.1.4-1. <i>Average bone density in internal remodeling region at steady state</i>	24
Table.2.1.2-1. <i>Max EQV stresses in jawbone and implant–abutment complex</i>	46
Table.2.2.5-1. <i>Geometric properties of 5 implant systems evaluated</i>	55
Table.2.2.6-1. <i>Chemical composition of Y-TZP</i>	58
Table.2.2.6-2. <i>Mechanical resistance of the studied implants in different</i>	59
Table.2.2.6-3. <i>Grade 3 titanium Chemical composition and mechanical properties</i>	59
Table.2.2.7-1. <i>Isochromatic fringe orders around the neck of implants under</i>	62
Table.2.2.8-1. <i>Table-Manufacturer's recommended torque values</i>	68
Table.2.2.10-1. <i>Displacement data for single-implant model with diameter of 3.75 mm</i>	71
Table.2.2.10-2. <i>Displacement data for single-implant model with diameter of 5 mm</i>	71
Table.2.2.10-3. <i>Displacement data for double-implant model with diameter of 3.75 mm</i>	72
Table.2.2.12-1. <i>Fatigue theories and formulas used in fatigue life predictions</i>	80
Table.2.2.12-2. <i>Maximum Von Mises stresses after static and dynamic loads (MPa)</i>	82
Table.2.2.12-3. <i>Geometric properties of 5 implants</i>	87

Table 2.2.12-4 <i>Highest tensile, compressive and Von Mises stress values</i>	90
Table.3.1.2-1. <i>V-5 implant system specifications</i>	104
Table.3.1.2-2. <i>-3 T model fins specifications</i>	106
Table.3.1.2-3. <i>C-3 model fins specifications</i>	107
Table.3.1.2-4. <i>Branemark MK IV specifications</i>	108
Table.3.1.2-5 <i>Geometrical properties of implant models</i>	109
Table.3.1.5-1-1. <i>Unit system defined for Abaqus users</i>	120
Table.3.1.5-2-1 <i>Material properties for different components in Abaqus</i>	122
Table.3.2.1-1 <i>Material and Mechanical properties of closed cells sawbones</i>	135
Table.4.2.1-1. <i>Primary mechanical test results on 40 GP foam block</i>	170
Table.4.2.1-1. <i>Specification criteria of pullout test in 10 GP blocks</i>	171
Table.4.2.1-2. <i>Specification criteria of pullout test in 15 GP blocks</i>	172
Table.4.2.1-3. <i>Specification criteria of pullout test in 20 GP blocks</i>	173
Table.4.2.1-4. <i>Specification criteria of pullout test in 30 GP blocks</i>	174
Table.4.2.1-5. <i>Specification criteria of pullout test in 40 GP blocks</i>	175
Table.4.2.2-1. <i>Mechanical specification of cadaver test</i>	176
Table.5-1. <i>Stress and strain magnitudes of Branemark</i>	181
Table.5-2. <i>Stress and strain magnitudes of V-5 implant.</i>	184
Table.5-3. <i>Stress and strain magnitudes of T-3 implant</i>	186
Table.5-4. <i>Stress and strain magnitudes of C-3 implant.</i>	189
Table.5-5. <i>Geometrical properties implant models</i>	190