International Journal of Enhanced Research in Medicines & Dental Care (IJERMDC),
ISSN: 2349-1590, Vol. 13 Issue 7, July 2026

Diagnosis and Treatment Planning in Dental Implants: A Comprehensive Narrative Review

Dr. Ankush Chambyal[1], Dr. Ritika[2]

ABSTRACT

Dental implant therapy has become the preferred treatment modality for replacing missing teeth because of its predictable long-term outcomes, preservation of alveolar bone, and superior functional and esthetic results. However, the long-term success of implant therapy depends not only on surgical expertise but also on meticulous diagnosis and comprehensive treatment planning. Appropriate patient selection, detailed medical and dental evaluation, clinical examination, radiographic assessment, prosthetically driven implant positioning, and identification of local and systemic risk factors are fundamental to successful implant rehabilitation. Advances in cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), digital workflows, computer-guided implant surgery, and artificial intelligence have significantly improved diagnostic precision and treatment predictability while reducing surgical complications. A multidisciplinary approach integrating periodontology, prosthodontics, oral surgery, and radiology facilitates individualized treatment planning and enhances long-term clinical outcomes. This narrative review summarizes the current evidence regarding diagnostic principles, patient evaluation, radiographic assessment, prosthetically driven planning, implant selection, and emerging digital technologies in implant dentistry. Emphasis is placed on evidence-based protocols that enable clinicians to achieve predictable functional, biological, and esthetic outcomes while minimizing complications and ensuring long-term implant survival.

Keywords: Dental implants; Diagnosis; Treatment planning; Cone-beam computed tomography; Osseointegration; Prosthetically driven implantology.

INTRODUCTION

Dental implant therapy has become the preferred treatment modality for replacing missing teeth because of its predictable long-term outcomes, preservation of alveolar bone, and superior functional and esthetic results. However, the long-term success of implant therapy depends not only on surgical expertise but also on meticulous diagnosis and comprehensive treatment planning. Appropriate patient selection, detailed medical and dental evaluation, clinical examination, radiographic assessment, prosthetically driven implant positioning, and identification of local and systemic risk factors are fundamental to successful implant rehabilitation. Advances in cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), digital workflows, computer-guided implant surgery, and artificial intelligence have significantly improved diagnostic precision and treatment predictability while reducing surgical complications. A multidisciplinary approach integrating periodontology, prosthodontics, oral surgery, and radiology facilitates individualized treatment planning and enhances long-term clinical outcomes. This narrative review summarizes the current evidence regarding diagnostic principles, patient evaluation, radiographic assessment, prosthetically driven planning, implant selection, and emerging digital technologies in implant dentistry. Emphasis is placed on evidence-based protocols that enable clinicians to achieve predictable functional, biological, and esthetic outcomes while minimizing complications and ensuring long-term implant survival.

LITERATURE SEARCH METHODOLOGY

This narrative review was prepared following a structured literature search of electronic databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Articles published in English between January 2010 and June 2025 were primarily considered, with emphasis on systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, clinical practice guidelines, and consensus statements from recognized organizations such as the International Team for Implantology (ITI), the European Association for Osseointegration (EAO), and the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology (AAOMR). Landmark studies published before 2010 were included where they established fundamental concepts in implant diagnosis and treatment planning. Search terms included dental implants, implant diagnosis, treatment planning, cone-beam computed tomography, prosthetically driven implant placement, bone quality, soft tissue management, digital implant dentistry, and computer-guided implant surgery. Articles not published in English, case reports, conference abstracts, and studies with inadequate methodological quality were excluded (11–13).

Diagnosis in Dental Implant Therapy

Accurate diagnosis is the cornerstone of successful implant therapy. Although advancements in implant design and surgical techniques have significantly improved clinical outcomes, inappropriate diagnosis and treatment planning remain among the most common causes of implant failure (14). Implant diagnosis should be comprehensive and individualized, considering the patient's systemic health, local oral conditions, esthetic expectations, functional demands, and long-term maintenance requirements.

The primary objective of diagnosis is to determine whether implant therapy is indicated and, if so, to identify the most appropriate treatment approach. This involves evaluating both patient-related and site-specific factors. Patient-related factors include age, medical status, periodontal history, oral hygiene practices, smoking habits, parafunctional activities, and patient expectations. Site-specific evaluation focuses on bone volume, bone quality, soft tissue characteristics, occlusion, interarch space, and the relationship of the proposed implant site to adjacent teeth and vital anatomical structures (15,16).

Contemporary implant treatment planning follows a prosthetically driven concept, in which the planned definitive restoration dictates the position, angulation, depth, and number of implants. This philosophy ensures optimal emergence profile, esthetic integration, favorable force distribution, and ease of maintenance. Failure to follow prosthetically driven principles may compromise esthetics, increase biomechanical complications, and adversely affect peri-implant tissue health (17).

A multidisciplinary approach involving the periodontist, prosthodontist, oral and maxillofacial surgeon, orthodontist, and dental laboratory technician is often necessary to achieve optimal treatment outcomes, particularly in patients with complex restorative or esthetic requirements (18).

Patient Evaluation

Comprehensive patient evaluation forms the foundation of successful implant therapy. Every patient should undergo a systematic assessment that includes medical history, dental history, psychosocial evaluation, and clinical examination. The information obtained during this phase guides treatment planning and assists in identifying factors that may influence osseointegration, wound healing, and long-term implant survival (19).

Medical History

A detailed medical history should be obtained before initiating implant therapy. Several systemic diseases influence bone metabolism, immune response, and wound healing, thereby affecting implant success. Well-controlled systemic conditions generally do not contraindicate implant placement; however, poorly controlled diseases require medical consultation and stabilization before treatment (20).

Diabetes mellitus is one of the most extensively investigated systemic conditions in implant dentistry. Numerous studies have demonstrated that patients with well-controlled diabetes exhibit implant survival rates comparable to healthy individuals. Conversely, poor glycemic control has been associated with delayed osseointegration, impaired wound healing, increased susceptibility to peri-implantitis, and greater marginal bone loss (21).

Smoking is another major risk factor affecting implant outcomes. Tobacco use reduces blood supply, impairs neutrophil function, decreases collagen synthesis, and negatively affects osteoblast activity. Smokers exhibit higher rates of early implant failure, peri-implant bone loss, and biological complications than non-smokers. Smoking cessation before implant surgery and throughout the healing period significantly improves prognosis (22).

Patients receiving antiresorptive medications such as bisphosphonates or denosumab should be evaluated carefully because of the potential risk of medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaw (MRONJ). The duration of therapy, route of administration, and underlying systemic condition should be assessed in consultation with the patient's physician before implant placement (23).

Other important medical considerations include cardiovascular diseases, bleeding disorders, immunosuppressive conditions, previous radiotherapy to the head and neck region, chemotherapy, osteoporosis, autoimmune diseases, and long-term corticosteroid therapy. These conditions do not necessarily preclude implant treatment but require individualized risk assessment and careful treatment planning (20,23).

Dental History

A thorough dental history provides valuable information regarding factors that contributed to tooth loss and helps identify potential risks for future implant complications. The clinician should determine whether tooth loss resulted from periodontal disease, dental caries, trauma, endodontic failure, root fracture, congenital absence, or failed prosthodontic treatment (24).

Patients with a previous history of periodontitis remain at increased risk for peri-implant diseases compared with periodontally healthy individuals. Therefore, active periodontal disease should be treated before implant placement, and patients should be enrolled in a supportive periodontal maintenance program to ensure long-term peri-implant health (25).

Additional aspects of the dental history include oral hygiene practices, frequency of dental visits, previous implant failures, history of orthodontic treatment, parafunctional habits such as bruxism, patient compliance, and esthetic expectations. Understanding these factors allows clinicians to formulate realistic treatment objectives and improve long-term treatment outcomes (16,24).

Clinical Examination

Clinical examination is a fundamental component of implant diagnosis and treatment planning. It complements the information obtained from the patient’s medical and dental history and enables the clinician to evaluate local anatomical factors that may influence implant placement and long-term prognosis. A comprehensive examination should include both extraoral and intraoral assessment, with particular emphasis on hard tissue, soft tissue, occlusion, and esthetic parameters.^26

Extraoral Examination

Extraoral assessment provides valuable information regarding facial symmetry, skeletal relationships, lip support, facial profile, temporomandibular joint (TMJ) function, and muscular activity. These factors are particularly important in patients requiring full-mouth rehabilitation or implant-supported complete prostheses. Evaluation of the smile line is also essential because patients with a high smile line are more likely to exhibit esthetic complications associated with peri-implant soft tissue recession or prosthetic discrepancies.^27

The clinician should assess mandibular movements, muscle tenderness, and signs of temporomandibular disorders, as these conditions may influence prosthetic design and occlusal planning. Functional abnormalities should be addressed before definitive implant rehabilitation whenever possible.^28

Intraoral Examination

A systematic intraoral examination should be performed to assess the condition of the remaining dentition, periodontal tissues, edentulous ridges, mucosa, tongue, and oral hygiene status. Particular attention should be directed toward identifying active carious lesions, periodontal inflammation, occlusal discrepancies, and pathological lesions that may compromise implant therapy.^29

The morphology of the edentulous ridge should be carefully evaluated. The clinician should determine ridge width, ridge height, mucosal thickness, vestibular depth, and the presence of undercuts or sharp bony contours. These findings help determine whether additional augmentation procedures such as guided bone regeneration (GBR), ridge expansion, or soft tissue grafting are required before implant placement.^30

Interarch space is another critical consideration because inadequate restorative space may compromise prosthetic design, whereas excessive interarch space may require modifications in prosthetic components or soft tissue replacement. Diagnostic casts and intraoral scans can assist in evaluating restorative space and occlusal relationships during treatment planning.^31

Occlusal Analysis

Occlusal evaluation is indispensable because dental implants lack a periodontal ligament and therefore exhibit minimal physiological mobility compared with natural teeth. Consequently, occlusal forces are transmitted directly to the surrounding crestal bone, making implants more susceptible to overload if occlusion is poorly designed.^32

The occlusal examination should include assessment of centric occlusion, centric relation, overbite, overjet, occlusal wear facets, parafunctional habits, and existing prosthetic restorations. Bruxism, clenching, and other parafunctional activities increase the risk of mechanical complications such as screw loosening, prosthetic fracture, implant fracture, and marginal bone loss.^33

Modern implant prosthodontics recommends an implant-protective occlusion characterized by light centric contacts, elimination of premature contacts, reduced cusp inclination, narrow occlusal tables in posterior restorations, and minimization of lateral forces. These principles help reduce biomechanical stress and improve long-term implant survival.^34

Esthetic Evaluation

Esthetic assessment has become increasingly important as patient expectations continue to rise. Successful implant therapy should restore not only function but also harmonious integration with the surrounding dentition and facial appearance. Evaluation should include smile line, lip mobility, gingival display, gingival biotype, papillary architecture, crown proportions, and the relationship between adjacent teeth and the proposed implant site.^35

Patients presenting with a thin gingival phenotype are more susceptible to recession and soft tissue discoloration around implants. Therefore, recognition of the gingival phenotype before surgery assists clinicians in selecting appropriate surgical techniques and determining whether soft tissue augmentation is indicated to improve esthetic outcomes.^36Diagnostic Casts and Digital Evaluation

Diagnostic casts remain valuable tools in implant treatment planning despite the widespread use of digital technologies. Conventional stone casts permit evaluation of occlusal relationships, interarch space, implant angulation, and restorative requirements. Wax-ups performed on diagnostic casts help visualize the final prosthesis and facilitate communication among clinicians, laboratory technicians, and patients.^37

Digital intraoral scanners have increasingly replaced conventional impressions in implant dentistry. Digital impressions improve patient comfort, eliminate inaccuracies associated with impression materials, and allow seamless integration with CAD/CAM systems for virtual treatment planning and prosthesis fabrication.^38

Virtual implant planning software combines intraoral scans with CBCT datasets, allowing clinicians to evaluate bone availability, prosthetic requirements, and anatomical limitations simultaneously. This digital workflow enables prosthetically driven implant placement and enhances the accuracy of surgical guide fabrication.^39

The integration of digital photography, facial analysis, and Digital Smile Design (DSD) software further enhances esthetic planning by allowing visualization of the proposed prosthetic outcome before treatment begins. This approach improves patient communication and facilitates interdisciplinary collaboration among restorative dentists, periodontists, and laboratory technicians.^40

Radiographic Assessment

Radiographic examination is an indispensable component of diagnosis and treatment planning in implant dentistry. It provides critical information regarding bone quantity and quality, anatomical limitations, pathological conditions, and the spatial relationship between the proposed implant site and adjacent structures. Appropriate radiographic assessment minimizes surgical complications, improves implant positioning, and enhances long-term treatment outcomes.^41

The choice of radiographic modality depends on the complexity of the case, anatomical considerations, and the amount of information required for treatment planning. Conventional two-dimensional imaging techniques remain useful for initial evaluation; however, three-dimensional imaging using cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) has become the standard of care in complex implant cases because of its superior diagnostic accuracy.^42

Intraoral Periapical Radiography

Intraoral periapical radiographs (IOPA) provide high-resolution images of individual teeth and localized alveolar bone. They are useful for evaluating periapical pathology, periodontal bone levels, root morphology, residual root fragments, and adjacent teeth before implant placement.^43

Periapical radiographs are also valuable during the postoperative phase for assessing implant position, crestal bone levels, osseointegration, and peri-implant bone changes during follow-up. The paralleling technique is preferred because it minimizes distortion and provides reproducible images for longitudinal comparison.^44

Despite their advantages, periapical radiographs provide only two-dimensional information and cannot accurately evaluate buccolingual ridge width or the relationship of the implant site to vital anatomical structures. Consequently, their use should be complemented by advanced imaging when additional diagnostic information is required.^41

Panoramic Radiography

Panoramic radiography (orthopantomography) provides a comprehensive overview of the maxillofacial region and is commonly used during the initial stages of implant treatment planning. It allows simultaneous evaluation of the maxillary and mandibular arches, residual dentition, impacted teeth, maxillary sinuses, mandibular canal, mental foramen, and other anatomical landmarks.^45

Panoramic imaging is particularly useful for screening patients with multiple missing teeth or extensive restorative needs. It enables the clinician to identify gross anatomical variations and pathological lesions before proceeding with more detailed imaging.^46

However, panoramic radiographs are associated with image magnification, distortion, and superimposition of anatomical structures. These limitations reduce measurement accuracy and make panoramic imaging insufficient as the sole radiographic investigation for implant placement in anatomically demanding situations.^47

Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT)

Cone-beam computed tomography has revolutionized implant diagnosis by providing three-dimensional visualization of the jaws with high spatial resolution and relatively low radiation exposure compared with conventional computed tomography. CBCT enables precise evaluation of bone dimensions, morphology, and anatomical structures, making it the preferred imaging modality for implant treatment planning in many clinical situations.^48
CBCT provides accurate information regarding:

* Alveolar bone height and width.
* Buccolingual ridge morphology.
* Bone angulation.
* Maxillary sinus anatomy.
* Inferior alveolar nerve canal.
* Mental foramen.
* Incisive canal.
* Nasopalatine canal.
* Lingual undercuts.
* Bone defects and pathological lesions.

The availability of multiplanar reconstruction allows clinicians to visualize cross-sectional images that cannot be obtained with conventional radiographs. This facilitates accurate measurement of available bone and assists in determining implant length, diameter, and angulation while reducing the risk of injury to vital anatomical structures.^49

The American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology recommends CBCT whenever three-dimensional information is necessary for implant treatment planning, particularly in cases involving limited bone volume, sinus augmentation, ridge augmentation, or proximity to vital structures.^50

Nevertheless, the principle of ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) should always be followed when prescribing CBCT. The smallest field of view capable of providing the required diagnostic information should be selected to minimize radiation exposure.^51

Bone Quality and Quantity Assessment

Adequate bone volume and density are prerequisites for achieving primary implant stability and successful osseointegration. Comprehensive assessment of the alveolar ridge allows clinicians to determine whether implant placement can be performed without augmentation procedures or whether bone grafting is required before implant insertion.^52

Bone evaluation should include assessment of vertical height, buccolingual width, ridge morphology, cortical thickness, trabecular density, and the proximity of adjacent anatomical structures. Clinical examination should always be correlated with CBCT findings to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the implant site.^53

Bone Quantity

Bone quantity refers to the available alveolar bone volume for implant placement. Successful implant placement generally requires sufficient bone to completely surround the implant while maintaining a safe distance from adjacent teeth and vital anatomical structures.^54

Clinically, adequate bone dimensions contribute to favorable implant stability, reduced stress concentration, preservation of crestal bone, and long-term peri-implant tissue health. When bone volume is inadequate, augmentation procedures such as guided bone regeneration, ridge splitting, block grafting, or sinus floor elevation may be indicated before implant placement.^55

Bone Quality
Bone quality reflects the structural characteristics of cortical and trabecular bone and has a significant influence on primary stability, healing, and long-term implant success. Dense cortical bone generally provides greater primary stability, whereas porous trabecular bone may require modified drilling protocols and prolonged healing periods.^56

Lekholm and Zarb Classification
Lekholm and Zarb classified bone quality into four categories based on the proportion of cortical and trabecular bone:^57
* Type I: Homogeneous compact cortical bone.
* Type II: Thick cortical bone surrounding dense trabecular bone.
* Type III: Thin cortical bone surrounding dense trabecular bone.
* Type IV: Thin cortical bone surrounding sparse trabecular bone.

Type II bone generally demonstrates the highest implant survival rates because it provides excellent primary stability and favorable vascularity. Type IV bone, commonly encountered in the posterior maxilla, has been associated with reduced implant stability and an increased risk of early implant failure.^58

Misch Bone Density Classification
Misch further classified bone density into five categories based on tactile sensation during osteotomy preparation:^59

* D1: Dense cortical bone.
* D2: Thick porous cortical bone with coarse trabecular bone.
* D3: Thin cortical bone with dense trabecular bone.
* D4: Thin cortical bone with fine trabecular bone.
* D5: Immature, non-mineralized bone.

Knowledge of bone density assists clinicians in selecting the appropriate implant design, drilling sequence, insertion torque, and loading protocol to maximize primary stability and promote successful osseointegration.^60

Soft Tissue Assessment
Successful implant therapy depends not only on adequate osseointegration but also on the establishment and maintenance of healthy peri-implant soft tissues. The peri-implant mucosa serves as a biological seal that protects the underlying supporting bone from bacterial invasion and mechanical trauma. Therefore, careful assessment of soft tissue characteristics is an essential component of implant diagnosis and treatment planning.^61

The clinical evaluation of soft tissues should include assessment of the gingival phenotype, width of keratinized mucosa, mucosal thickness, vestibular depth, frenal attachments, papillary architecture, and the presence of inflammation or recession. These parameters influence surgical planning, esthetic outcomes, and long-term peri-implant health.^62

Gingival Phenotype
The gingival phenotype has a significant influence on the esthetic and biological outcomes of implant therapy. It is generally classified as either thin or thick based on tissue thickness and morphology. Patients with a thin phenotype are more susceptible to soft tissue recession, discoloration of restorative components, and marginal bone remodeling following implant placement.^63

In contrast, a thick gingival phenotype demonstrates greater resistance to recession and provides improved masking of implant components. Thick tissues are also associated with more predictable papillary fill and long-term esthetic stability. When a thin phenotype is present in esthetically demanding areas, soft tissue augmentation procedures such as connective tissue grafting may be indicated to improve tissue volume and reduce the risk of recession.^64

Width of Keratinized Mucosa
The importance of keratinized mucosa around dental implants has been extensively investigated. Although successful osseointegration can occur in its absence, several clinical studies have demonstrated that an adequate band of keratinized

mucosa is associated with improved plaque control, reduced mucosal inflammation, decreased bleeding on probing, and greater patient comfort during oral hygiene procedures.^65

Current evidence suggests that approximately 2 mm of keratinized mucosa, including at least 1 mm of attached mucosa, is desirable for maintaining peri-implant tissue health. When keratinized tissue is insufficient, free gingival grafts or apically positioned flap procedures may be considered to increase the width of keratinized mucosa before or after implant placement.^66

Peri-Implant Soft Tissue Stability

Long-term esthetic success depends on maintaining stable peri-implant soft tissues. Factors influencing soft tissue stability include implant position, buccal bone thickness, implant-abutment connection, prosthetic emergence profile, surgical technique, and patient-related risk factors such as smoking and periodontal disease.^67

Special attention should be paid to the facial bone plate in the anterior maxilla, where thin buccal bone is prone to remodeling after tooth extraction. Immediate implant placement combined with appropriate bone grafting and soft tissue augmentation has been shown to reduce post-extraction tissue collapse and improve esthetic outcomes in carefully selected cases.^68

Prosthetically Driven Treatment Planning

Modern implant dentistry emphasizes a prosthetically driven approach, in which the definitive prosthetic restoration determines implant position rather than the available bone alone. This concept ensures optimal esthetics, function, hygiene access, and biomechanical load distribution while minimizing restorative complications.^69

Treatment planning should begin with visualization of the final prosthesis. The clinician must determine the ideal tooth position, occlusal scheme, emergence profile, and esthetic requirements before selecting implant dimensions and surgical approach. Diagnostic wax-ups or digital simulations are valuable tools for translating restorative objectives into surgical planning.^70

Three-dimensional implant positioning should satisfy the following principles:
* Adequate mesiodistal spacing from adjacent teeth.
* Appropriate buccolingual positioning to establish a natural emergence profile.
* Correct apicocoronal depth for optimal soft tissue contours.
* Parallelism between adjacent implants whenever possible.
* Preservation of surrounding bone and papillae.^71

Failure to follow prosthetically driven principles may result in compromised esthetics, screw access problems, excessive cantilevers, food impaction, speech difficulties, and increased mechanical complications. Therefore, restorative planning should always precede surgical implant placement.^72

Implant Selection

Selection of the appropriate implant system should be based on patient-specific anatomical, prosthetic, and functional requirements. Factors influencing implant selection include available bone volume, bone density, implant site, occlusal load, esthetic demands, and restorative design.^73

Implant Length

Standard implants ranging from 8–12 mm are most commonly used because they provide adequate surface area for osseointegration. However, advances in implant design have demonstrated that short implants may also achieve predictable long-term outcomes in selected cases with limited vertical bone height, thereby avoiding complex augmentation procedures.^74

Implant Diameter

Implant diameter should correspond to the available ridge width and anticipated functional load. Narrow-diameter implants are useful in areas with limited mesiodistal space, particularly the mandibular incisors and maxillary lateral incisors. Wide-diameter implants may provide improved primary stability in molar regions or fresh extraction sockets but require sufficient surrounding bone.^75

Implant Surface Characteristics

Contemporary implant surfaces are designed to accelerate osseointegration through surface roughening and chemical modifications. Moderately rough hydrophilic surfaces have demonstrated faster bone formation, increased bone-to-implant contact, and improved early implant stability compared with traditional machined surfaces.^76

Selection of implant geometry, thread design, and connection type should also be individualized according to bone quality and prosthetic requirements. Internal conical connections and platform-switching concepts have been associated with improved crestal bone preservation and reduced micromovement at the implant-abutment interface.^77

Timing of Implant Placement

The timing of implant placement following tooth extraction is one of the most critical decisions in implant treatment planning. Appropriate timing influences osseointegration, peri-implant tissue stability, esthetic outcomes, treatment duration, and the need for additional augmentation procedures. The decision should be based on the presence of infection, availability of bone and soft tissue, esthetic requirements, and the patient's systemic and local conditions.^78

According to the ITI Consensus Classification, implant placement can be categorized into four types based on the healing interval after tooth extraction: immediate placement (Type 1), early placement with soft tissue healing (Type 2), early placement with partial bone healing (Type 3), and delayed placement after complete bone healing (Type 4).^79

Immediate Implant Placement

Immediate implant placement refers to insertion of the implant directly into the extraction socket during the same surgical appointment. This protocol offers several advantages, including reduction in treatment time, preservation of alveolar ridge dimensions, decreased number of surgical procedures, and improved patient acceptance.^80

Successful immediate implant placement requires careful case selection. The extraction socket should have intact bony walls, adequate apical bone for primary stability, absence of uncontrolled acute infection, and sufficient soft tissue volume. Primary implant stability remains the most important determinant of success in immediately placed implants.^81

Although immediate placement helps preserve ridge contours, physiological remodeling of the facial bone plate still occurs. Therefore, simultaneous bone grafting of the jumping gap and, where indicated, connective tissue grafting are often recommended to minimize ridge resorption and optimize esthetic outcomes.^82

Early Implant Placement

Early implant placement is generally performed between 4 and 16 weeks after tooth extraction. This protocol allows resolution of soft tissue inflammation and partial bone healing while limiting excessive ridge resorption. Early placement has demonstrated highly predictable esthetic and functional outcomes, particularly in the anterior maxilla.^83

Compared with immediate placement, early implant placement is associated with improved soft tissue management, reduced risk of infection, and easier achievement of primary stability. However, treatment duration is slightly prolonged because of the healing period following extraction.^84

Delayed Implant Placement

Delayed implant placement is performed after complete healing of the extraction socket, usually 4–6 months following tooth extraction. This protocol is traditionally considered the most predictable approach because mature bone is available for implant placement and residual infection has completely resolved.^85

Delayed placement is particularly indicated in patients with extensive bone destruction, chronic periapical pathology, traumatic extractions, severe periodontal defects, or when ridge preservation procedures have been performed. The primary disadvantage is progressive alveolar ridge resorption, which may necessitate additional bone augmentation procedures before implant placement.^86

Loading Protocols

Loading protocol refers to the interval between implant placement and functional restoration. Selection of an appropriate loading protocol depends on primary implant stability, bone quality, implant design, prosthetic considerations, occlusal loading, and patient-related factors.^87

Immediate Loading

Immediate loading involves placement of the definitive or provisional prosthesis within 48 hours of implant insertion without a prolonged healing period. This protocol provides immediate restoration of esthetics and function while improving patient satisfaction and reducing treatment duration.^88

Successful immediate loading requires high primary stability, generally achieved with insertion torque greater than 35 Ncm and favorable implant stability quotient (ISQ) values. It is most predictable in patients with adequate bone quality, sufficient implant length, and absence of uncontrolled parafunctional habits.^89

Numerous systematic reviews have demonstrated survival rates comparable to conventional loading when appropriate case selection and strict surgical protocols are followed.^90

Early Loading

Early loading involves functional restoration between 1 week and 2 months after implant placement. This protocol combines shorter treatment duration with a relatively low risk of implant failure and has gained increasing popularity in contemporary implant dentistry.^91

Conventional Loading

Conventional loading remains the most widely accepted protocol, particularly in patients with compromised bone quality or limited primary stability. Restoration is typically performed after 3 months in the mandible and 4–6 months in the maxilla, allowing complete osseointegration before functional loading.^92

Although treatment time is longer, conventional loading continues to demonstrate excellent long-term survival rates and remains the preferred protocol in medically compromised patients and complex augmentation cases.^93

Risk Assessment

Comprehensive risk assessment is essential for predicting implant prognosis and minimizing biological and mechanical complications. Individual risk factors should be identified before treatment and incorporated into the overall treatment plan.^94

Diabetes Mellitus

Diabetes mellitus affects wound healing, collagen synthesis, angiogenesis, and immune function. Current evidence indicates that well-controlled diabetic patients exhibit implant survival rates comparable to healthy individuals. However, poorly controlled diabetes increases the risk of delayed osseointegration, peri-implantitis, and marginal bone loss.^95

Measurement of glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) before implant therapy is recommended to assess glycemic control. Elective implant placement should ideally be performed after achieving satisfactory metabolic control in consultation with the patient's physician.^96

Smoking

Smoking remains one of the strongest modifiable risk factors affecting implant success. Nicotine-induced vasoconstriction, impaired immune response, reduced osteoblastic activity, and delayed wound healing contribute to increased implant failure and peri-implant bone loss.^97

Clinical studies consistently demonstrate significantly higher rates of implant failure among smokers than non-smokers. Smoking cessation before surgery and throughout the healing period substantially improves implant prognosis.^98

History of Periodontitis

Patients previously treated for periodontitis may successfully receive dental implants, provided periodontal disease is controlled and supportive periodontal therapy is maintained. Nevertheless, these individuals remain at greater risk of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis compared with periodontally healthy patients.^99

Regular supportive periodontal maintenance, meticulous plaque control, and early intervention for peri-implant inflammation are essential to preserve long-term implant success in this patient population.^100

Bruxism

Bruxism is characterized by repetitive jaw-muscle activity involving clenching or grinding of the teeth. Excessive occlusal loading may contribute to screw loosening, prosthetic fracture, veneer chipping, implant fracture, and marginal bone loss, particularly in patients with multiple implants supporting fixed prostheses.^101

Occlusal splints, implant-protective occlusal schemes, and regular follow-up appointments are recommended for patients with parafunctional habits to minimize biomechanical complications.^102

Digital Workflow

Digital dentistry has transformed implant diagnosis and treatment planning by integrating advanced imaging technologies, intraoral scanning, computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM), and three-dimensional (3D) printing. Compared with conventional workflows, digital protocols improve diagnostic accuracy, treatment efficiency, patient comfort, and communication among clinicians, laboratory technicians, and patients.^103

The digital wor

Virtual treatment planning also improves interdisciplinary communication and allows clinicians to evaluate different treatment options before initiating therapy. Diagnostic wax-ups can be digitally generated, permitting visualization of the anticipated esthetic and functional outcomes. Furthermore, digital records simplify patient education and informed consent by providing realistic three-dimensional simulations of the proposed treatment.^105

Digital impressions have largely replaced conventional elastomeric impression techniques in implant prosthodontics. Intraoral scanners eliminate the discomfort associated with conventional impressions, reduce the possibility of dimensional inaccuracies, and facilitate rapid transfer of digital data to the dental laboratory. Numerous clinical studies have demonstrated that digital impressions provide excellent accuracy for single implants and short-span implant-supported prostheses.^106

Artificial Intelligence in Implant Dentistry

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as an innovative tool in implant dentistry, with applications in diagnosis, radiographic interpretation, treatment planning, and prediction of treatment outcomes. Machine learning algorithms can analyze large datasets obtained from CBCT images, intraoral scans, and electronic health records to assist clinicians in clinical decision-making.^107

Deep learning systems have demonstrated promising accuracy in the automatic identification of anatomical landmarks, mandibular canal tracing, localization of the mental foramen, assessment of bone quality, and detection of pathological lesions on CBCT images. These technologies reduce operator variability and improve diagnostic consistency, particularly in complex implant cases.^108

AI-assisted treatment planning software can also recommend implant dimensions, identify optimal implant positions, evaluate bone availability, and estimate the risk of surgical complications. Although these systems do not replace clinical judgment, they serve as valuable adjuncts that enhance diagnostic precision and treatment predictability.^109

Recent studies have also explored AI-based prediction models for implant survival and peri-implant disease. By incorporating variables such as smoking status, diabetes, periodontal history, bone quality, and implant characteristics, machine learning algorithms may help identify patients at increased risk of implant failure and enable individualized treatment planning.^110

Despite these advances, ethical considerations, data privacy, algorithm transparency, and the need for external validation remain important challenges before widespread clinical implementation. Future developments should focus on integrating AI into routine clinical practice while maintaining clinician oversight and patient safety.^111

Guided Implant Surgery

Computer-guided implant surgery represents one of the most significant advancements in modern implant dentistry. Using virtual treatment planning software, implants can be positioned prosthetically before surgery, and the planned position can be accurately transferred to the patient using static surgical guides or dynamic navigation systems.^112

Static computer-guided surgery employs stereo lithographically fabricated surgical templates that direct the osteotomy according to the virtual treatment plan. These guides improve surgical accuracy, reduce operator variability, and minimize deviations in implant position, angulation, and depth. They are particularly beneficial in anatomically challenging cases and esthetically demanding regions.^113

Dynamic navigation systems provide real-time tracking of surgical instruments during implant placement. Unlike static guides, dynamic navigation allows intraoperative modifications while maintaining high levels of accuracy. Clinical studies have demonstrated that dynamic navigation achieves implant positioning comparable to static guided surgery while providing greater surgical flexibility.^114

Guided implant surgery offers numerous clinical advantages, including reduced surgical trauma, flapless implant placement where appropriate, shorter operative time, improved patient comfort, decreased postoperative morbidity, and enhanced prosthetic accuracy. However, clinicians should recognize that guided surgery does not eliminate the need for sound clinical judgment and meticulous surgical technique.^115

Maintenance and Follow-up

Long-term success of implant therapy depends not only on successful osseointegration but also on regular maintenance and supportive peri-implant care. The incidence of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis increases significantly in patients who fail to attend maintenance visits or maintain adequate oral hygiene.^116

Maintenance protocols should be individualized according to the patient's risk profile. Clinical evaluation should include assessment of plaque accumulation, bleeding on probing, probing depth, suppuration, implant mobility, occlusion, and prosthetic integrity. Standardized periapical radiographs should be obtained periodically to monitor crestal bone levels and detect early peri-implant bone loss.^117

Professional maintenance includes mechanical debridement using implant-compatible instruments, reinforcement of oral hygiene instructions, removal of residual cement when applicable, occlusal adjustment, and early management of biological or prosthetic complications. Patients with a history of periodontitis, smoking, diabetes, or poor plaque control require more frequent maintenance visits because of their increased susceptibility to peri-implant disease.^118

Early diagnosis and management of peri-implant mucositis are essential because inflammation confined to the soft tissues is reversible. If left untreated, peri-implant mucositis may progress to peri-implantitis, characterized by progressive bone loss and potential implant failure.^119

Future Perspectives

Rapid advances in biomaterials, digital technology, regenerative medicine, and artificial intelligence continue to reshape implant dentistry. Future implant treatment planning is expected to become increasingly personalized through the integration of patient-specific biological, genetic, radiographic, and clinical data into comprehensive digital treatment platforms.^120

Novel implant surface modifications, bioactive coatings, growth factors, stem-cell-based regenerative therapies, and customized biomaterials may further enhance osseointegration and accelerate healing. Simultaneously, improvements in AI-assisted diagnostics and robotic implant surgery have the potential to improve treatment precision while reducing operator-dependent variability.^121

The continued integration of digital workflows, virtual reality, augmented reality, and machine learning into clinical practice will further enhance diagnostic accuracy, improve interdisciplinary communication, and optimize patient outcomes. Nevertheless, successful implant therapy will continue to rely on careful diagnosis, evidence-based treatment planning, and sound clinical judgment rather than technology alone.^122

CONCLUSION

Successful implant therapy begins with comprehensive diagnosis and meticulous treatment planning. Thorough evaluation of systemic health, dental history, clinical findings, radiographic assessment, bone quality, soft tissue characteristics, occlusal factors, and patient expectations allows clinicians to formulate individualized treatment plans that maximize functional and esthetic outcomes. Contemporary implant dentistry increasingly emphasizes prosthetically driven planning supported by CBCT imaging, digital workflows, and guided surgery to achieve optimal implant positioning and long-term success.

Although technological advances have significantly improved treatment predictability, they should complement—not replace—clinical expertise and evidence-based decision-making. Careful patient selection, risk assessment, regular maintenance, and supportive peri-implant care remain essential for preserving peri-implant tissue health and ensuring long-term implant survival. Continued research and technological innovation are expected to further refine diagnostic strategies and treatment planning protocols, ultimately improving the quality and predictability of implant rehabilitation.

Conflict of Interest
no conflict of interest.

Funding
No funding received.

REFERENCES

1. Brånemark PI, Zarb GA, Albrektsson T, editors. Tissue-Integrated Prostheses: Osseointegration in Clinical Dentistry. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing; 1985.
2. Buser D, Sennerby L, De Bruyn H. Modern implant dentistry based on osseointegration: 50 years of progress, current trends and open questions. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):7–21.
3. Berglundh T, Armitage G, Araujo MG, et al. Peri-implant diseases and conditions: Consensus report of Workgroup 4 of the 2017 World Workshop on the Classification of Periodontal and Peri-Implant Diseases and Conditions. J Clin Periodontol. 2018;45(Suppl 20):S286–S291.
4. Schwarz F, Derks J, Monje A, Wang HL. Peri-implantitis. J Periodontol. 2018;89(Suppl 1):S267–S290.
5. Buser D, Martin W, Belser UC. Optimizing esthetics for implant restorations in the anterior maxilla: anatomic and surgical considerations. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):43–61.
6. Misch CE. Dental Implant Prosthetics. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Elsevier Mosby; 2015.
7. Tyndall DA, Price JB, Tetradis S, et al. Position statement of the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology on selection criteria for the use of radiology in dental implantology. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;113(6):817–826.
8. Jacobs R, Quirynen M. Dental cone beam computed tomography: justification for use in planning oral implant placement. Periodontol 2000. 2014;66(1):203–213.
9. Joda T, Gallucci GO, Wismeijer D, et al. Augmented and virtual reality in dental medicine: A systematic review. Comput Biol Med. 2019;108:93–100.
10. Tahmaseb A, Wismeijer D, Coucke W, Derksen W. Computer technology applications in surgical implant dentistry: a systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29(Suppl):25–42.
11. Greenhalgh T, Thorne S, Malterud K. Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews? Eur J Clin Invest. 2018;48(6):e12931.
12. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Worthington HV. Interventions for replacing missing teeth: treatment planning. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;(3):CD006387.
13. Sanz M, Chapple IL, Working Group 4 of the VIII European Workshop on Periodontology. Clinical research on peri-implant diseases. J Clin Periodontol. 2012;39(Suppl 12):202–206.
14. Misch CE. Contemporary Implant Dentistry. 3rd ed. St. Louis: Mosby Elsevier; 2008.
15. Buser D, Chen ST, Weber HP, Belser UC. Early implant placement following single-tooth extraction in the esthetic zone. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2008;28(5):441–451.
16. Dawson A, Chen S. The SAC Classification in Implant Dentistry. Berlin: Quintessence Publishing; 2009.
17. Morton D, Gallucci G, Lin WS, et al. Group 2 ITI Consensus Report: Prosthodontics and implant dentistry. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2018;29(Suppl 16):215–223.
18. Avila-Ortiz G, Elangovan S, Kramer KWO, Blanchette D, Dawson DV. Effect of alveolar ridge preservation after tooth extraction. J Dent Res. 2014;93(10):950–958.
19. Lang NP, Lindhe J, editors. Clinical Periodontology and Implant Dentistry. 7th ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell; 2022.
20. Romanos GE, editor. Advanced Implant Dentistry. Cham: Springer; 2021.
21. Chrcanovic BR, Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Diabetes and oral implant failure: a systematic review. J Dent Res. 2014;93(9):859–867.
22. Naseri R, Yaghini J, Feizi A. Levels of smoking and dental implant failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Periodontol. 2020;47(4):518–528.
23. Ruggiero SL, Dodson TB, Fantasia J, et al. Medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaw—2014 update. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2014;72(10):1938–1956.

24. Lindhe J, Meyle J. Peri-implant diseases: Consensus Report of the Sixth European Workshop on Periodontology. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(Suppl 8):282–285.
25. Renvert S, Quirynen M. Risk indicators for peri-implantitis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2015;26(Suppl 11):15–44.
26. Lindhe J, Lang NP. Clinical Periodontology and Implant Dentistry. 7th ed. Wiley-Blackwell; 2022.
27. Coachman C, Calamita MA. Digital Smile Design: A tool for treatment planning and communication in esthetic dentistry. Quintessence Dent Technol. 2012;35:103–111.
28. Okeson JP. Management of Temporomandibular Disorders and Occlusion. 8th ed. Elsevier; 2020.
29. Carranza FA, Newman MG, Takei HH, Klokkevold PR. Carranza's Clinical Periodontology. 14th ed. Elsevier; 2023.
30. Urban IA. Vertical and Horizontal Ridge Augmentation. Quintessence Publishing; 2017.
31. Misch CE. Dental Implant Prosthetics. 2nd ed. Elsevier; 2015.
32. Kim Y, Oh TJ, Misch CE, Wang HL. Occlusal considerations in implant therapy: clinical guidelines. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16(1):26–35.
33. Lobbezoo F, Ahlberg J, Glaros AG, et al. Bruxism defined and graded. J Oral Rehabil. 2013;40(1):2–4.
34. Klineberg I, Kingston D. Occlusion and Clinical Practice: An Evidence-Based Approach. Elsevier; 2015.
35. Belser UC, Grütter L, Vailati F, Bornstein MM, Weber HP, Buser D. Outcome evaluation of early placed maxillary anterior single-tooth implants using the Pink Esthetic Score and White Esthetic Score. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(2):140–151.
36. Kan JYK, Rungcharassaeng K, Lozada JL, Zimmerman G. Facial gingival tissue stability after immediate implant placement. J Periodontol. 2011;82(10):1424–1432.
37. Jivraj S, Chee W. Treatment Planning in Implant Dentistry. Br Dent J. 2006;201:77–89.
38. Mangano FG, Admakin O, Bonacina M, Lerner H, Rutkunas V, Mangano C. Trueness and precision of intraoral scanners. BMC Oral Health. 2021;21:109.
39. Tahmaseb A, Wismeijer D, Coucke W, Derksen W. Computer technology applications in surgical implant dentistry: A systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29(Suppl):25–42.
40. Joda T, Gallucci GO, Wismeijer D, Zitzmann NU. Augmented and virtual reality in dental medicine: A systematic review. Comput Biol Med. 2019;108:93–100.
41. Tyndall DA, Price JB, Tetradis S, et al. Position statement of the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology on selection criteria for the use of radiology in dental implantology. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;113(6):817–826.
42. Jacobs R, Quirynen M. Dental cone beam computed tomography in implant planning. Periodontol 2000. 2014;66(1):203–213.
43. White SC, Pharoah MJ. Oral Radiology: Principles and Interpretation. 8th ed. Elsevier; 2019.
44. Lang NP, Lindhe J. Clinical Periodontology and Implant Dentistry. 7th ed. Wiley-Blackwell; 2022.
45. Whaites E, Drage N. Essentials of Dental Radiography and Radiology. 6th ed. Elsevier; 2021.
46. Misch CE. Dental Implant Prosthetics. 2nd ed. Elsevier; 2015.
47. Scarfe WC, Farman AG. What is cone-beam CT and how does it work? Dent Clin North Am. 2008;52(4):707–730.
48. Bornstein MM, Scarfe WC, Vaughn VM, Jacobs R. Cone beam computed tomography in implant dentistry. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29(Suppl):78–86.
49. Chan HL, Misch K, Wang HL. Dental imaging in implant treatment planning. Implant Dent. 2010;19(4):288–298.
50. Tetradis S, et al. AAOMR clinical recommendations for CBCT in implant dentistry. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;113(6):817–826.
51. European Commission. Radiation Protection No. 172: Cone Beam CT for Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology. Luxembourg; 2012.
52. Buser D, Martin W, Belser UC. Optimizing esthetics for implant restorations in the anterior maxilla. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):43–61.
53. Sclar AG. Soft Tissue and Esthetic Considerations in Implant Therapy. Quintessence Publishing; 2003.
54. Urban IA. Vertical and Horizontal Ridge Augmentation. Quintessence Publishing; 2017.
55. Wang HL, Boyapati L. PASS principles for predictable bone regeneration. Implant Dent. 2006;15(1):8–17.
56. Javed F, Romanos GE. The role of primary stability for successful immediate loading of dental implants. J Dent. 2010;38(8):612–620.
57. Lekholm U, Zarb GA. Patient selection and preparation. In: Brånemark PI, Zarb GA, Albrektsson T, editors. Tissue-Integrated Prostheses. Quintessence; 1985.
58. Trisi P, Rao W. Bone classification and implant stability. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1999;14(5):689–696.
59. Misch CE. Contemporary Implant Dentistry. 3rd ed. Mosby Elsevier; 2008.
60. Turkyilmaz I, McGlumphy EA. Influence of bone density on implant stability. J Oral Rehabil. 2008;35(5):350–358.
61. Berglundh T, Lindhe J. Dimension of the peri-implant mucosa. J Clin Periodontol. 1996;23(10):971–973.
62. Lindhe J, Meyle J. Peri-implant diseases: Consensus Report of the Sixth European Workshop on Periodontology. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(Suppl 8):282–285.

63. De Rouck T, Eghbali R, Collys K, De Bruyn H, Cosyn J. The gingival biotype revisited. Clin Oral Investig. 2009;13(3):239–249.
64. Zucchelli G, Mounssif I. Periodontal plastic surgery. Periodontol 2000. 2015;68(1):333–368.
65. Lin GH, Chan HL, Wang HL. The significance of keratinized mucosa on implant health: A systematic review. J Periodontol. 2013;84(12):1755–1767.
66. Wennström JL, Derks J. Is there a need for keratinized mucosa around implants? Clin Oral Implants Res. 2012;23(Suppl 6):136–146.
67. Buser D, Chappuis V, Belser UC, Chen S. Implant placement post extraction in esthetic sites. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):73–97.
68. Cosyn J, De Bruyn H. Immediate implant placement and provisionalization. J Clin Periodontol. 2009;36(2):193–212.
69. Belser UC, Schmid B, Higginbottom F, Buser D. Outcome analysis of implant restorations. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):30–42.
70. Coachman C, Paravina RD. Digitally enhanced esthetic dentistry. Quintessence Dent Technol. 2016;39:103–118.
71. Buser D, Martin W, Belser UC. Optimizing esthetics for implant restorations. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):43–61.
72. Gallucci GO, Hamilton A, Zhou W, et al. Implant placement and restoration planning. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2018;29(Suppl 16):181–193.
73. Misch CE. Contemporary Implant Dentistry. 3rd ed. Mosby Elsevier; 2008.
74. Srinivasan M, et al. Short dental implants versus longer implants with augmentation: A systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2014;25(8):100–110.
75. Klein MO, Schiegnitz E, Al-Nawas B. Narrow-diameter implants: A systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2014;25(6):675–687.
76. Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T. Effects of titanium surface topography on osseointegration. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):172–184.
77. Lazzara RJ, Porter SS. Platform switching: A new concept in implant dentistry. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2006;26(1):9–17.
78. Chen ST, Buser D. Clinical and esthetic outcomes of implants placed in post-extraction sites. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(Suppl):186–217.
79. Hämmerle CHF, Chen ST, Wilson TG Jr. Consensus statements and recommended clinical procedures regarding placement of implants in extraction sockets. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):26–28.
80. Tonetti MS, Jung RE, Avila-Ortiz G, et al. Management of extraction sockets and timing of implant placement. Periodontol 2000. 2019;79(1):181–203.
81. Buser D, Chappuis V, Belser UC, Chen S. Implant placement post extraction in esthetic sites. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):73–97.
82. Araújo MG, Lindhe J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16(2):212–218.
83. Chen ST, Darby I, Reynolds EC. Early implant placement after tooth extraction. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):12–27.
84. Buser D, Martin W, Belser UC. Optimizing esthetics in implant therapy. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2004;19(Suppl):43–61.
85. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Polyzos IP, Felice P, Worthington HV. Timing of implant placement after tooth extraction. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010;(9):CD007878.
86. Avila-Ortiz G, et al. Alveolar ridge preservation after tooth extraction. J Dent Res. 2014;93(10):950–958.
87. Gallucci GO, Benic GI, Eckert SE, et al. Consensus statements and clinical recommendations on implant loading protocols. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29(Suppl):287–290.
88. Esposito M, Grusovin MG, Willings M, Coulthard P, Worthington HV. Immediate versus conventional loading of dental implants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;(3):CD003878.
89. Javed F, Romanos GE. Primary stability and immediate loading. J Dent. 2010;38(8):612–620.
90. Papaspyridakos P, Chen CJ, Chuang SK, Weber HP, Gallucci GO. Implant loading protocols: A systematic review. J Dent Res. 2014;93(7 Suppl):103S–109S.
91. Gallucci GO, Hamilton A, Zhou W, et al. Evidence-based loading protocols. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2018;29(Suppl 16):181–193.
92. Misch CE. Dental Implant Prosthetics. 2nd ed. Elsevier; 2015.
93. Buser D, Sennerby L, De Bruyn H. Modern implant dentistry. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):7–21.
94. Renvert S, Polyzois I. Risk indicators for peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis. Periodontol 2000. 2018;76(1):139–147.
95. Chrcanovic BR, Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Diabetes and implant outcomes. J Dent Res. 2014;93(9):859–867.
96. American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2024;47(Suppl 1):S1–S350.

97. Naseri R, et al. Smoking and dental implant failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Periodontol. 2020;47(4):518–528.
98. Bain CA. Smoking and implant failure. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1996;11(6):756–759.
99. Renvert S, Quirynen M. Risk indicators for peri-implantitis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2015;26(Suppl 11):15–44.
100. Berglundh T, Armitage G, et al. Peri-implant diseases and conditions. J Clin Periodontol. 2018;45(Suppl 20):S286–S291.
101. Lobbezoo F, Ahlberg J, et al. Bruxism defined and graded. J Oral Rehabil. 2013;40(1):2–4.
102. Manfredini D, Poggio CE. Prosthetic complications associated with bruxism. J Prosthodont Res. 2017;61(1):2–9.
103. Joda T, Ferrari M, Brägger U, Zitzmann NU. Patient-reported outcome measures of digital workflows in implant dentistry. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2017;28(7):894–899.
104. Tahmaseb A, Wismeijer D, Coucke W, Derksen W. Computer technology applications in surgical implant dentistry: A systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29(Suppl):25–42.
105. Coachman C, Paravina RD. Digitally enhanced esthetic dentistry. Quintessence Dent Technol. 2016;39:103–118.
106. Mangano FG, Hauschild U, Veronesi G, et al. Trueness and precision of intraoral scanners. BMC Oral Health. 2021;21:109.
107. Schwendicke F, Samek W, Krois J. Artificial intelligence in dentistry. J Dent Res. 2020;99(7):769–774.
108. Lee JH, Kim DH, Jeong SN, Choi SH. Detection and diagnosis of dental diseases using deep learning. J Dent Res. 2018;97(1):37–43.
109. Revilla-León M, Gómez-Polo M, Vyas S, et al. Artificial intelligence applications in implant dentistry. J Prosthet Dent. 2023;129(5):677–685.
110. Ding H, Wu J, Zhao W, et al. Machine learning for predicting dental implant outcomes: A systematic review. Clin Oral Investig. 2023;27:3359–3372.
111. Topol EJ. Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again. New York: Basic Books; 2019.
112. Block MS, Emery RW. Static and dynamic navigation for implant placement. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016;74(2):269–277.
113. Vercruyssen M, Fortin T, Widmann G, et al. Accuracy of guided implant surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2014;25(Suppl 16):116–135.
114. Block MS, et al. Dynamic navigation for implant surgery. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2017;75(7):1377–1386.
115. D'Haese J, Ackhurst J, Wismeijer D, et al. Current state of computer-guided implant surgery. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):121–133.
116. Heitz-Mayfield LJA, Salvi GE. Peri-implant mucositis. J Clin Periodontol. 2018;45(Suppl 20):S237–S245.
117. Renvert S, Polyzois I. Clinical approaches to peri-implant disease maintenance. Periodontol 2000. 2018;76(1):181–190.
118. Monje A, Blasi G. Significance of supportive implant therapy. Periodontol 2000. 2019;81(1):129–139.
119. Schwarz F, Derks J, Monje A, Wang HL. Peri-implantitis. J Clin Periodontol. 2018;45(Suppl 20):S246–S266.
120. Giannobile WV, Lang NP. Future developments in implant dentistry. J Dent Res. 2016;95(7):739–741.
121. Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Future perspectives of implant surfaces and regenerative therapies. Periodontol 2000. 2019;81(1):7–19.
122. Buser D, Sennerby L, De Bruyn H. Modern implant dentistry based on osseointegration: Current trends and future directions. Periodontol 2000. 2017;73(1):7–21.