



Review Article

ISSN: 2581-3218
IJDR 2019; 4(2): 90-93
© 2019, All rights reserved
www.dentistryscience.com

A Comparative study of Different Impression Materials and Techniques of Dental Implant at The Second Stage of Procedure

Hussameldien Hussien¹, Natashekara Mallesh²

¹ BDS, MFDS (RCS Ed.), MFGDP (UK), MSc R&A (UoM).

² Professor, BDS, MDS (OMFS), MFDS RCPS Glasg., MFGDP (UK), FICOI, FPFA (USA), Dip ICNOG (Itall), Oral Maxillofacial Surgeon & Implantologist

Abstract

Background of the study: Dental implants are one of the most sought-after choice of treatment for restoration and rehabilitation of missing teeth. However, the accuracy of the removable or fixed superstructures over the dental implants is influenced for a major proportion by the impression techniques and materials. This paper discusses the comparison of the accuracy of different impression materials and techniques used in the second stage of the dental implant treatment in vivo. **Objective:** The objective of the paper is to study the comparison of the accuracy of different impression materials and techniques used in the second stage of the dental implant's treatment in vivo. **Search methodology:** Electronically key searched in scientific literature databases. **Selection criteria:** Based on the set inclusion and exclusion criteria such as studies conducted in partial edentulous arches, in the age group of 30 to 55 years. **Data collection and analysis:** A total of 248 literatures were found to be relevant to the framed topic and were scrutinised based on the dejected criteria and 18 kinds of literature obtained were taken into consideration. **Main Result:** Among the different impression materials taken into the comparative study, it was observed that polyvinyl siloxane exhibited a dimensional accuracy slightly greater than polyether. However, light body putty exhibited greater accuracy than medium body putty. Various impression techniques were compared to evaluate the dimensional accuracy of the impression. It was observed that the open tray technique and splinted impression technique produced a more dimensionally stable impression than the other techniques. **Authors Conclusion:** this study to assess the accuracy of various impression material and methods has concluded that while impression techniques influence the accuracy of the impression, the impression materials namely the Polyvinyl siloxane and polyether exhibit no significant difference with a slight preference to the polyvinyl siloxane. Hence the choice of impression material is at the discretion of the dentist performing the treatment and also this area requires further studies to establish conclusive evidence.

Keywords: Corrective orthodontics, Mediators of inflammation, Tooth movement, Lymphokines.

INTRODUCTION

Dental implants are a novel, evolving and convenient method for replacement of missing teeth, the success of which is determined by many factors that are not limited to those factors under the control of the surgeon performing the treatment. While patient selection, selection of implant type, size and form, recommending appropriate superstructures as necessary and pre-surgical treatment planning play an important role, these decisions call for sound knowledge and clear evidence to back up the clinical decision, without which the wrong choice in any one of the treatment steps may prove implant failure. However, one important step in the dental implant treatment that has an influential role in the outcome of the treatment is the impression. The dimensional accuracy and outcome of the impression are determined by various variables, such as the choice of impression material, choice of impression technique, the presence of coping, open or closed tray technique and angulation of implants.

Study design

In order to perform the study, a PICO framework was formulated, and the topic of the paper was rephrased accordingly. The PICO framework for the topic of interest chosen is outlined.

Pico framework

- P- Implant impression techniques and materials
- I - Comparison of accuracy
- C- Literature review of scientific databases

***Corresponding author:**

Dr. Natashekara Mallesh
Professor, BDS, MDS (OMFS),
MFDS RCPS Glasg., MFGDP
(UK), FICOI, FPFA (USA), Dip
ICNOG (Itall), Oral
Maxillofacial Surgeon &
Implantologist
Email:
hussameldien@hotmail.com

O- Study to facilitate knowledge sharing and avoid/minimise the errors in impression procedure.

Databases searched: The keywords were thoroughly searched in scientific databases including the Cochrane library of databases, PubMed Central, Wiley online library and Google Scholar. The key terms used for the search were dental implants, impression materials, impression techniques, accuracy and success.

Eligibility criteria: The inclusion criteria for the study were observational studies pertaining to the accuracy of implant impression materials and techniques, conventional impression techniques, impressions taken with implant fixture, studies conducted in the mandibular arch for partial edentulousness, and the age group of 30 to 50 years. Exclusion criteria formulated were complete edentulous, dual arch impressions and the All-on-four technique.

Search strategy: A thorough screening of the literatures obtained were performed manually and electronically, omitting the duplicates were performed for a total of 248 literatures. Irrelevant scientific articles or those that did not fit into the inclusion criteria were removed during the screening step

Data extraction: Only the articles that fulfilled the chosen criteria were considered, and a total of 18 literatures were found to be relevant to the topic of interest and were chosen as the reference list for writing the study for the topic chosen.

DISCUSSION

The main objective of this study is to provide a broad perspective on the comparative study of the dimensional stability, surface details and accuracy of different impression techniques and materials in dental implant treatment, to enable the dentist to perform every step of the dental implant treatment with negligible errors and as accurate as possible. For this knowledge sharing and study of the literature was performed to arrive at a competing and conclusive result.

Impression materials

Among the many impression materials used such as the impression plaster, alginate, wash impression (zinc oxide eugenol), polysulphide, condensation silicone and other materials, polyvinyl siloxane and polyether materials are used often. So, studies comparing the dimensional stability of these two materials (polyvinyl siloxane and polyether) will be elaborated. Studies comparing these materials showed no significant difference in the accuracy of the impressions obtained [1, 15].

Polyether versus Vinyl Polysiloxane

Lee H *et al.* conducted a study on the effect of subgingival depth of implant placement and the dimensional accuracy of different consistencies of polyvinyl siloxane and polyether materials. It was concluded that putty light body combined with polyvinyl siloxane impressions were more dimensionally stable than medium body polyether [15]. Another study was conducted to study the influence of implant position, tray type and impression material on the outcome of the accuracy of implant impressions by Gokcen Rohlig B *et al.* in 2014. It was observed that between the polyvinyl siloxane medium body and polyether impression materials, there was no discrepancy between the materials and in the accuracy of the impression obtained [11].

Impression techniques studied

While the common dental implant impression materials have been reviewed in detail, a significant portion of the accuracy is determined by the impression technique. The most commonly used impression techniques are splinted or non-splinted methods, open tray or closed

tray techniques, transfer or pick-up impressions and other recent advances. However, extensive studies have already summarised the accuracy and comparison of each of the dental implant impression techniques.

▪ Splint versus non-splint technique

The impressions for the dental implant with copings, require an accuracy of the highest order. When the number of superstructures involved are increased, a greater degree of accuracy is required to obtain an impression which enables cast fabrication with negligible errors or distortions [2, 3, 6]. Heeje Lee *et al.* conducted a systematic review to study the accuracy of implant impression techniques and the clinical factors affecting the accuracy of the impression. It was observed that although no study definitively pointed out the superiority of either of the techniques, the splinted technique displayed greater accuracy than non-splinted methods in the study, with seven studies supporting the splinted method as compared to the three studies supporting the non-splinted technique [14]. However, splinted technique exhibits a greater accuracy in dental implants treatment transfer of impression copings.

▪ Open tray versus closed tray technique

When multiple implant impression copings or a full arch rehabilitation is performed, the open tray technique of impression or closed tray technique is the most commonly used form of impression technique. Balouch F *et al.* conducted an experimental study to determine the dimensional accuracy of the open and closed tray implant impression technique in angled implants. It was observed that the measurement of dimensional accuracy and coefficient of variation displayed a significant difference in the assessment, thereby concluding that the closed tray technique produces a more dimensionally accurate impression with a lower coefficient of variation than the open tray technique [3, 4, 5, 15].

Yet another in vivo comparative research study was conducted by Gallucci GO *et al.* in 2011 to compare the accuracy outcomes of the open tray and closed tray impression techniques in partially edentulous patients treated with implants. The study measured the outcomes subjectively and objectively. While subjective measures of patient comfort showed no difference in the outcome, objective measurement of the 2 techniques was made using micro-computed tomography scanning. The quantitative measures showed no significant difference in the open and closed tray techniques when the abutments of the implants were placed parallel or when the angulation was less than 10 degrees [18].

▪ Transfer versus pick up

The difference between these impression techniques is that the transfer technique is performed with a closed tray, and the impression copings are left intraorally, whilst in the pick-up impression technique, the open tray method is used and the copings are unscrewed to be removed along with the impression [2, 3, 16]. However, when comparing the accuracy between the two techniques, only two relevant studies were found, and they were not conclusive in proving the accuracy of the transfer impression technique.

▪ Angulation

To study the influence of the angulation of implants on the accuracy of the impression, Reddy S *et al.* conducted a study to compare the accuracy of impressions taken with polyvinyl siloxane and polyether in parallel and angulated implants. It was observed that the impression material had no influence on the accuracy of parallel implants while a similar result was concluded in implants with angulations of 10- 15 degrees [8]. However, implants with angulations greater than 15 degrees were considered for this study, thereby not conclusively proving the point. In order to further study the influence of angulation of implants on the accuracy of impressions, Vojdani M *et al.* conducted a study

comparing 3 impression materials (polyvinyl siloxane, polyether and vinyl siloxane ether), on parallel and non-parallel implants with angulations up to 30 degrees. It was observed that the choice of impression materials among the 3 mentioned did not affect the dimensional accuracy of impressions in cases of parallel implants [9]. However, in non-parallel implants, polyvinyl siloxane exhibited greater dimensional accuracy of impressions than vinyl siloxane ether and polyether.

Parameswari G. *et al.* conducted an extensive in vitro study to evaluate the accuracy of various impression materials and impression techniques in recording impressions for multiple implants placed unilaterally in a partially edentulous mandible. The study established its conclusion that the impression materials, polyvinyl siloxane and polyether, produced impressions of similar dimensional accuracy. Whilst impression techniques, both open and closed tray, had no influence of parallel implants. For non-parallel implants of angulation up to 15 degrees, the open tray custom impression technique produced a more dimensionally accurate impression [12]. The study thereby establishes that angulation of implants has an influence on the accuracy of the impressions.

▪ Coping

To understand the influence of coping on the accuracy of the impression details, Kwon JH *et al.* conducted a study to compare the dimensional accuracy of casts fabricated from impressions taken both with and without copings. The group was split into a coping, and no coping group, and the impressions were made. The linear and rotational distortions of each implant site in the outcome were measured and calculated with the Mann Whitney U test(6). It was observed that greater distortion values were recorded in impressions with no coping, than within impressions with coping, thereby indicating the influence of coping on the dimensional accuracy of implant impressions. However, a single study with linear measurements does not necessarily prove the significance of impressions with dental implant coping.

One other study was conducted by Rashidan N *et al.* in 2012, to study the influence of implant coping shapes on the accuracy of the impression. The study concluded that the shape of the impression coping had more influence on the impression inaccuracy than the impression technique or material [10]. However, the study was not conducted with various impression techniques to produce a comparative conclusion of the coping shape and impression technique.

▪ Other techniques

More recent advancements of impression techniques is the snap-fit plastic impression coping technique wherein the closed tray technique is used, but the copings are removed with the impression [14]. Further studies are needed to evaluate the efficacy and accuracy of this implant impression technique.

To compare the efficacy and accuracy of impressions obtained by various impression methods and techniques, Papaspyridakos *et al.* conducted a comparative review study in vitro and in vivo, with impressions obtained by open and closed tray techniques, splinted and non-splinted techniques, as well as polyvinyl siloxane and polyether impression materials. It was observed that the dimensional accuracy of the dental implant impressions was greater in splinted techniques than in non-splinted techniques. Furthermore, the impressions obtained by open tray techniques were more accurate than the closed tray techniques. The study also concluded that the impression material had no influence on the accuracy of the impression for dental implants [17]. The study was extensive and covers important factors influencing the outcome and dimensional stability of impressions taken for dental implant treatment. However, the study does not take into account the influence of coping, angulations of implant abutments, the inter-implant distance on the accuracy of impressions taken for dental implant

treatment, and hence cannot conclusively establish the factors influencing the outcome of implant impressions. Also, the variables taken for this comparative study are 2 comparable measures, thereby questioning the credibility of the study, since third or fourth measures or methods are available or evolving. This may prove to be more significant than the measures used for comparison.

One other study was conducted by Sonam Gupta *et al.*, to comparatively evaluate the different impression techniques and impression materials on the accuracy of open tray implant impressions. It was observed that polyether produced greater dimensionally accurate impressions than the polyvinyl siloxane [13]. Also, among the impression trays, they seemed to have produced no statistically significant differences when custom and stock trays were used, thereby indicating that impression trays had no influence on the outcome of the accuracy of impressions.

RESULTS

From the above detailed reviewing of various pertinent scientific articles obtained from reliable scientific databases, it is evident that the dimensional accuracy and outcome of the impressions taken for dental implant treatment is influenced by variable measures such as the impression material, impression techniques (e.g. open tray or closed tray), transfer or pick up impressions, splinted or non-splinted techniques, relation and angulation of adjacent implants, and abutments with or without impression coping. Among the 5 studies found pertinent to the impressions materials and their impact on accuracy, it has been observed that the choice of impression material has no significant impact on the accuracy of the impressions. Two studies have favoured polyvinyl siloxane, and 1 study found polyether produced more accurate impressions. However, amongst the 2 impression materials considered for the discussion (polyvinyl siloxane and polyether), a slightly greater dimensional accuracy was observed in putty light body polyvinyl siloxane impressions than in medium body polyether. However, the difference is not significant to conclusively prove the point of the supremacy of one material over the other.

Among the impression techniques, while 3 studies have found closed tray technique to produce more accurate impressions than the open tray technique, a conflicting result was observed in 2 studies favouring the open tray technique, while 1 study has indicated that the impression technique has no influence on the accuracy of implant impressions, thereby giving rise to the dilemma of the choice of open versus closed tray techniques. Between the choice of impressions using splinted or non-splinted techniques, 4 studies have proved that the splinted technique produces impressions that are more dimensionally accurate than those obtained by the non-splinted technique. Among the choice of transfer versus pick up impressions to transfer the copings of dental implants, it has been observed that only 2 relevant studies were sourced and they did not conclusively prove the accuracy of one impression method over the other.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The extensive study of the literature and the results with regards to the topic obtained by scientific data and research have been established. While not all results have been conclusively evident, they have sufficiently established results that are backed up, however further research is required. Among the 5 studies that elaborated on the choice of impression material, no significant difference was observed between polyvinyl siloxane and polyether. Hence, they may require more extensive studies conducted in vivo or on impression materials with a change in their composition, to prove the point of dimensional accuracy. Also, the results of open versus closed tray techniques have been controversial, necessitating the need for more studies in this regard. The choice of splinted versus non-splinted impression techniques has been conclusively established, favouring the splinted technique for a greater dimensionally accurate impression. However, among the decision of

transfer versus pick up impression methods, it has been observed that no studies have conclusively established the choice of transfer or pick up impression method, and hence requires further extensive and elaborate studies to arrive at a conclusion.

CONCLUSION

Dental implants have been in use for nearly 3 decades and have become the bread and butter of prosthetic rehabilitation. Hence, they require extensive research studies to make an informed decision and to update themselves with the recent advancements continuously. The aim of this study is to aid the clinician in updating the scientific data available and help them make an informed decision which helps them clinically to produce more dimensionally stable and accurate impressions by studying the influence of factors and comparing the accuracy of 2 variable measures, on the outcome of an impression. From the exhaustive studies of scientific literature and consideration of articles taken for the study, it has been concluded that among the impression materials, polyvinyl siloxane exhibits a slightly higher dimensional accuracy of the obtained impression, when compared to polyether. Among the impression techniques, the open tray technique and splinted technique impression method produce a more dimensionally accurate impression, provided the implants are parallel or with lesser axial angulation (less than 15 degrees), and appropriate coping shapes are selected.

REFERENCES

1. Enkling N, Bayer S, Jöhren P, Mericske-Stern R. Vinylsiloxanether: a new impression material. Clinical study of implant impressions with vinylsiloxanether versus polyether materials. *Journal of Clinical implant dentistry and related research* YR: 2012 VL: 14 NO: 1.CC: Oral Health. PG: 144-151. PM: PUBMED 19793332
2. Filho HG, Mazaro JV, Vedovatto E, Assunção WG, dos Santos PH. The accuracy of impression techniques for implants. Part 2 - Comparison of splinting techniques. *Journal of prosthodontics*.YR: 2009 VL: 18 NO: 2 CC: Oral Health PG: 172-176. PM: PUBMED 19178624
3. Wöstmann B, *et al.* Influence of impression technique and material on the accuracy of multiple implant impressions. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2008.
4. Balouch FA, Jalalian EA, *et al.* Comparison of Dimensional Accuracy between Open-Tray and Closed-Tray Implant Impression Technique in 15° Angled Implants. *J Dent Shiraz Univ Med Sci*, 2013; 14(3):96-102.
5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30607227>. Siadat H, Saeidi Z, Alikhasi M, Zeighami S. Comparative evaluation of the effect of impression materials and trays on the accuracy of angulated implants impressions. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2018 Nov 1;10(11):e1096-e1102. doi: 10.4317/jced.55227. eCollection 2018 Nov. PMID: 30607227.
6. Jahandideh Y, Moghaddam AA, Pourkhalili H. Accuracy of Implant Abutment Level Impression with and without Impression Coping. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2018; 19(11):1352-1357. PMID: 30602640
7. Gao H, Liu J, Liu X, Tan J. An implant impression technique involving abutment transition from interim prostheses to definitive restorations in the esthetic zone. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2018.
8. Reddy S, Prasad K, Vakili H, Jain A, Chowdhary R. Accuracy of impressions with different impression materials in angulated implants. *Niger J Clin Pract*. 2013; 16(3):279-84. doi: 10.4103/1119-3077.113447. PubMed PMID: 23771446.
9. Vojdani M, Torabi K, Ansarifard E. Accuracy of different impression materials in parallel and nonparallel implants. *Dent Res J (Isfahan)*. 2015; 12(4):315-22.161429. PubMed PMID: 26288620; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4533188.
10. Rashidan N, Alikhasi M, Samadzadeh S, Beyabanaki E, Kharazifard MJ. The accuracy of implant impressions with the different impression coping types and shapes. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2012; 14(2):218-25. Epub 2009 Oct 5. PubMed PMID: 19804420.
11. Gökçen-Rohlig B, Ongül D, Sancakli E, Sermet B. Comparative evaluation of the effects of implant position, impression material, and tray type on implant impression accuracy. *Implant Dent*. 2014; 23(3):283-8. PubMed PMID: 24844388.
12. Parameshwari G, Chittaranjan B, Sudhir N, Anulekha-Avinash CK, Taruna M, Ramureddy M. Evaluation of the accuracy of various impression techniques and impression materials in recording multiple implants placed unilaterally in a partially edentulous mandible- An in vitro study. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2018; 10(4):e388-e395. doi: 10.4317/jced.54726. eCollection 2018 Apr. PubMed PMID: 29750102; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5937963.
13. Gupta S, Narayan AI, Balakrishnan D. In Vitro Comparative Evaluation of Different Types of Impression Trays and Impression Materials on the Accuracy of Open Tray Implant Impressions: A Pilot Study. *Int J Dent*. 2017; 2017:6306530. doi:10.1155/2017/6306530. Epub 2017. PubMed PMID: 28348595; PubMed Central. PMCID: PMC5350296.
14. Heeje Lee, Joseph S. So, J.L. Hochstedler and Carlo Ercoli. The accuracy of implant impressions: A systematic review. Louisiana State University, School of Dentistry, New Orleans, La; University of Rochester Eastman Dental Center, Rochester, NY.
15. Lee H, Ercoli C, Funkenbusch PD, Feng C. Effect of subgingival depth of implant placement on the dimensional accuracy of the implant impression: an in vitro study. *J Prosthet Dent* 2008; 99:107-13.
16. Wenz HJ, Hertrampf K. Accuracy of impressions and casts using different implant impression techniques in a multi-implant system with an internal hex connection. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2008; 23:39-47.
17. Papaspyridakos P, Chen CJ, Gallucci GO, Doukoudakis A, Weber HP, Chronopoulos V. Accuracy of implant impressions for partially and completely edentulous patients: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2014; 29(4):836-45. doi: 10.11607/jomi.3625.
18. Gallucci GO, Papaspyridakos P, Ashy LM, Kim GE, Brady NJ, Weber HP. Clinical accuracy outcomes of closed-tray and open-tray implant impression techniques for partially edentulous patients. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2011; 24(5):469-72.