

## Narrow (3.3 – 3.5 mm) short and extra-short implants

# Predictable management of combined atrophy

EDUARDO ANITUA,

### Literature

1. Lemos CA, Ferro-Alves ML, Okamoto R, Mendonça MR, Pellizzer EP. Short dental implants versus standard dental implants placed in the posterior jaws: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Dent*. 2016 Apr;47:8-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2016.01.005. Epub 2016 Jan 19. PMID: 26804969.
2. Papaspyridakos P, De Souza A, Vazouras K, Gholami H, Pagni S, Weber HP. Survival rates of short dental implants ( $\leq 6$  mm) compared with implants longer than 6 mm in posterior jaw areas: A meta-analysis. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2018 Oct;29 Suppl 16:8-20. doi: 10.1111/clr.13289. PMID: 30328206.
3. Bitaraf T, Keshtkar A, Rokn AR, Monzavi A, Geramy A, Hashemi K. Comparing short dental implant and standard dental implant in terms of marginal bone level changes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2019 Aug;21(4):796-812. doi: 10.1111/cid.12774. Epub 2019 May 1. PMID: 31044538.
4. Klein, M. O., Schiegnitz, E., & Al Nawas, B. Systematic review on success of narrow diameter dental implants. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants*, 2014;29(Suppl), 43–54.
5. Schiegnitz E, Al-Nawas B. Narrow-diameter implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2018;29 Suppl 16:21-40.
6. Anitua E, Saracho J, Begoña L, Alkhraisat MH. Long-Term Follow-Up of 2.5-mm Narrow-Diameter Implants Supporting a Fixed Prosthesis. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2016;18:769-77.
7. Anitua E, Errazquin JM, de Pedro J, Barrio P, Begoña L, Orive G. Clinical evaluation of Tiny® 2.5- and 3.0-mm narrow-diameter implants as definitive implants in different clinical situations: a retrospective cohort study. *Eur J Oral Implantol*. 2010;3:315-22.
8. Klein MO, Schiegnitz E, Al-Nawas B. Systematic review on success of narrow-diameter dental implants. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2014; 29 Suppl: 43-54.
9. Ortega-Oller I, Suarez F, Galindo-Moreno P, Torrecillas-Martinez L, Monje A, Catena A, Wang HL. The influence of implant diameter on its survival: a meta-analysis based on prospective clinical trials. *J Periodontol* 2014; 85: 569-580.
10. Pommer B, Mailath-Pokorny G, Haas R, Busenlechner D, Furhauser R, Watzek G. Patients' preferences towards minimally invasive treatment alternatives for implant rehabilitation of edentulous jaws. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2014; 7 Suppl 2: S91-109.
11. Pommer B, Mailath-Pokorny G, Haas R, Busenlechner D, Millesi W, Fürhauser R. Extra-short (< 7 mm) and extra-narrow diameter (< 3.5 mm) implants: a meta-analytic literature review. *Eur J Oral Implantol*. 2018;11 Suppl 1:S137-S146.
12. Maló PS, de Araújo Nobre MA, Lopes AV, Ferro AS. Retrospective cohort clinical investigation of a dental implant with a narrow diameter and short length for the partial rehabilitation of extremely atrophic jaws. *J Oral Sci*. 2017;59(3):357-363.
13. Amato F. Overcoming anatomical limitations: The new frontier of Implantology. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 2018; 39: 13-5.
14. Mijiritsky E, Barbu H, Lorean A, Shohat I, Danza M, Levin L. Use of implant-derived minimally invasive sinus floor elevation: A multicenter clinical observational study with 12- to 65-month follow-up. *J Oral Implantol* 2016; 42: 343-8.
15. Franceschetti G, Trombelli L, Minenna L, Franceschetti G, Farina R. Learning curve of a minimally invasive technique for transcrestal sinus floor elevation: A split-group analysis in a prospective case series with multiple clinicians. *Implant Dent* 2015; 24: 517-26.

16. Rajput N, Mohammed J. Minimally invasive transmucosal insertion and immediate provisionalization of one-piece implant in partially edentulous posterior mandible. *J Clin Diagn Res* 2013; 7: 2070-3.
17. Anitua E, Alkhraisat MH. Clinical performance of short dental implants supporting single crown restoration in the molar-premolar region: Cement versus screw retention. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2019; 34: 969–76.
18. Anitua E, Alkhraisat MH. Fifteen-year follow-up of short dental implants in the completely edentulous jaw: Submerged versus nonsubmerged healing. *Implant Dent* 2019 Dec; 28: 551-5.
19. Anitua E, Alkhraisat MH. 15-year follow-up of short dental implants placed in the partially edentulous patient: Mandible vs maxilla. *Ann Anat* 2019; 222: 88-93.
20. Anitua E, Piñas L, Begoña L, Orive G. Long-term retrospective evaluation of short implants in the posterior areas: clinical results after 10-12 years. *J Clin Periodontol* 2014; 41: 404-11.
21. Anitua E, Saracho J, Begoña L, Alkhraisat MH. Long-term follow-up of 2.5 mm narrow-diameter implants supporting a fixed prosthesis. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2016; 18: 769-77.
22. Anitua E, Errazquin JM, de Pedro J, Barrio P, Begoña L, Orive G. Clinical evaluation of Tiny® 2.5- and 3.0-mm narrow-diameter implants as definitive implants in different clinical situations: a retrospective cohort study. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2010; 3: 315-22.