

1 **Survival rate of dental implants installed by residents attending an**  
2 **implantology Program in Brazil: a 52-month retrospective analysis**

3 Myungjin Kang <sup>a</sup>

4 Henrique Smanio Neto <sup>a</sup>

5 André Antonio Pelegrine <sup>a</sup>

6 Cecilia Pedroso Turssi <sup>b</sup>

7 Juliana Trindade Clemente-Napimoga <sup>c</sup>

8 Marcelo Henrique Napimoga <sup>c\*</sup>

9

10

11 <sup>a</sup> Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic, Instituto São Leopoldo Mandic, Implantology,  
12 Campinas, SP, Brazil

13 <sup>b</sup> Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic, Instituto São Leopoldo Mandic, Restorative  
14 Dentistry, Campinas, SP, Brazil

15 <sup>c</sup> Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic, Instituto São Leopoldo Mandic, Laboratory of  
16 Neuro-Immune Interface of Pain Research, Campinas, SP, Brazil

17

18 Reprint requests and correspondence to:

19 Marcelo H. Napimoga, DDS, PhD (<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4472-365X>)

20 Laboratory of Neuroimmune Interface of Pain Research, Faculdade São Leopoldo  
21 Mandic

22 R. José Rocha Junqueira, 13 Campinas/SP, 13045-755, Brazil

23 Telephone/fax: +55 19 3211 3600

24 E-mail: [marcelo.napimoga@gmail.com](mailto:marcelo.napimoga@gmail.com) or [marcelo.napimoga@slmandic.edu.br](mailto:marcelo.napimoga@slmandic.edu.br)

25

26 **Short Title:** Survival rate of dental implants installed by implantology  
27 residents

28 **Abstract**

29 The aim of this study was to identify any associations between predictor variables,  
30 mainly risk factors and dental implant outcome. Dental records were reviewed from  
31 January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2020. The inclusion criteria was all implant surgery  
32 made using Intraoss brand. Data collected from the patients' medical charts included:  
33 implant loss, gender, diabetes, smoking, continuous use of medication, type of implant  
34 connection system, implant position (maxilla or mandible), previous bone grafting and  
35 type of prosthetic provisioning (temporary prosthesis, immediate prosthesis or  
36 permanent prosthesis). It was evaluated the cumulative survival rate of 1,164 dental  
37 implants made by residents attending an implantology residency in a university setting.  
38 One thousand forty-eight dental implants were placed on 471 patients seen by  
39 residents. The cumulative survival rate was 2.5%. Furthermore, the association of  
40 implant losses to the variables tested using the chi-square and G tests showed no  
41 statistically significant association. Based on Kaplan-Meier curve analysis, with a 95%  
42 confidence interval up to 52 months of implant placement, it revealed that the overall  
43 survival rate was 90.5%. Therefore, this study showed high survival rates of implants  
44 installed by residents of implantology at Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic using  
45 Intraoss implants. The implant failure was not correlated with any of the variables  
46 tested.

47

48 **Key words:** Implantology; dentistry; dental implant; implant survival; education.

49

50

51 **Introduction**

52 The use of dental implants is considered one of the prominent scientific  
53 breakthrough and predictable treatment options to restore partially and totally  
54 edentulous patients. Thus, the large-scale use of dental implants, which demonstrate  
55 predictable long-term results from a functional, aesthetic and peri-implant health point  
56 of view, has high survival rates well demonstrated in the literature [1]. Recent studies  
57 reported 86% to 98% survival rates for dental implants after 5 years of follow-up [2,3]  
58 and around 90% even after 10 years of follow-up [4,5].

59 Implant-related complications have been categorized into two main types:  
60 biological and technical. Among the biological complications, some of the patient-  
61 related risk factors include: smoking and systemic diseases such as uncontrolled  
62 diabetes mellitus (DM); and periodontitis; which are all characterized as patient-related  
63 risk factors for implant failure [6,7]. From a technical point of view, clinical training in  
64 implant dentistry provides to graduate dental students advanced skills. Although many  
65 studies report the success of implant rehabilitations, there is limited literature on the  
66 survival of implants performed by residents students. A recent study evaluated the  
67 survival rates of implants and prostheses placed by undergraduate students in a dental  
68 hospital. The study was a retrospective university/hospital based study and included  
69 patients visiting the dental hospital. Of the 86,000 patients who visited Saveetha  
70 Dental College, a total of 79 patients were enrolled in the study according to the  
71 inclusion criteria of patients who had undergone implant surgery by undergraduate  
72 students. The survival rate from implants placed was 92.4% [8]. Another study based  
73 in the rehabilitation of patients with implants at the University of Alberta (Canada) by  
74 undergraduate students, evaluated 289 implants in 189 patients, with only 1 loss.  
75 Therefore, a high survival rate of 99.7% was verified [9].

76 The Brazilian implant industry (Intraoss, Itaquaquecetuba, Brazil) has different  
77 implant abutment connections such as external connection, internal connection and  
78 tapered connection, all of them fabricated from grade 5 medical titanium. Previous  
79 reports that have evaluated implants of this company demonstrated an effective  
80 bacterial seal at the implant/abutment interface between an external hexagon and a  
81 tapered connection system [10]. Besides, the dental implant surface treatment  
82 positively affected the early events of the interaction between titanium and osteoblastic  
83 cells [11].

84 Hence, the aim of this single-center study was to investigate retrospectively the  
85 survival rate of Intraoss implants performed by implantology resident students in  
86 Brazil.

87

## 88 **Material and Methods**

### 89 *Ethics*

90 The research project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of  
91 Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic, registration number # 49980221.7.0000.5374. All  
92 patients included in this study provided informed consent prior to implant treatment.

93

### 94 *Study subjects*

95 The present study is a single-arm, retrospective observational study based on  
96 the dental implants performed by resident students in Implantology at São Leopoldo  
97 Mandic (Brazil) between January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2020, based on the data  
98 available in the medical records of patients. This observational study was conducted  
99 according to the guidelines of Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in  
100 epidemiology (STROBE).

101

102 *Inclusion criteria*

103 Patients between 17 and 82 years of age whose records indicated that they  
104 received Intraoss dental implants system between January 1, 2018, and December  
105 31, 2020.

106

107 *Exclusion criteria*

108 The exclusion criteria were patients whose records indicated that they received  
109 another dental implant system during the analyzed period.

110

111 *Data Collection and Analyses*

112 Data collected from the patients' medical charts were submitted to descriptive  
113 and inferential analyses, using chi-square and G tests, to investigate the association  
114 between implant loss and gender, diabetes, smoking, continuous use of medication,  
115 type of implant connection system, implant site (maxilla or mandible), previous bone  
116 grafting and type of prosthetic provisioning (temporary prosthesis, immediate  
117 prosthesis or permanent prosthesis). The implant survival rate was estimated using  
118 the Kaplan-Meier curve. The level of significance was set at 5% and statistical  
119 calculations was performed using SPSS 23 (SPSS INC., Chicago, IL, USA) and  
120 BioEstat 5.0 (Fundação Mamirauá, Belém, PA, Brazil).

121

122 **Results**

123 During the 2018 – 2020 period, residents in Implantology at São Leopoldo  
124 Mandic performed a total of 3,875 implants. According to the inclusion criteria, a total  
125 of 1,164 dental implants, which had been installed in the oral cavity of 742 patients

126 were included in the study. Of the total number of patients included in this study 254  
127 (34.2%) were male and 486 (65.5%) were female. For two (0.3%) patients, information  
128 regarding gender was non-existent. The age of the patients ranged from 17 to 82 years  
129 old (average:  $55.1 \pm 11.5$  years). Only one of the 742 patients had no information  
130 regarding age.

131 Fifty-four (7.3%) out of the 742 patients had diabetes, with 26 (3.5%) being male  
132 and 28 (3.8%) female, while 680 (91.6%) had no diabetes and for 8 patients this  
133 information was unavailable.

134 Smoking was identified in 96 (12.9%) of the 742 patients, of whom 40 (5.4%)  
135 were men and 56 (7.5%) were women. Non-smokers summed 643 (86.7%) patients  
136 and three others had no information about smoking. Sixteen (2.2%) patients were both  
137 smokers and diabetics.

138 Of the 742 patients, 354 (47.7%) were on continuous medication, of which 109  
139 (31.9%) were men, 244 (32.9%) were women and one had gender uninformed. Non-  
140 users of medication totaled 385 (51.9%) patients and other three did not have  
141 information on this aspect.

142 In the oral cavity of the 742 patients, 1,164 implants were installed, indicating  
143 an average of 1.6 implants per patient. The maximum number was six implants in the  
144 same patient. Of the 1,164 implants installed, 907 (77.9%) were tapered connection  
145 system, 174 (14.9%) were external connection and 80 (6.9%) were internal  
146 connection. For three implants the system was unknown.

147 Of the 1,164 implants, 605 (52.0%) were installed in the maxilla, 530 (45.5%)  
148 in the mandible, and for 27 of them the location was not indicated. Bone grafting  
149 procedures preceded the installation of 278 (23.9%) of the 1,164 implants, while for

150 the remaining 886 there was no grafting or this information was non-existent (for three  
151 implants).

152 The mean time of implant installation prior to the data collection was 14.2  
153 months ( $\pm$  10.2 months), with the shortest time being one month and the longest 52  
154 months. Figure 1 is a histogram showing the number of implants that had been  
155 installed within each 6-month period. More than half (601) of the 1,164 implants,  
156 corresponding to 51.6%, had been installed up to 12 months prior to the data  
157 collection, while 992 (85.2%) had been installed up to 24 months previously. For two  
158 implants, there was no information on the installation time.

159 Among the 1,164 implants, 385 (33.1%) received a temporary prosthesis, 257  
160 (22.1%) received an immediate prosthesis and 364 (31.3%) received a permanent  
161 prosthesis. Provisionalization information was absent for 158 implants.

162 Of the 1,164 implants installed, 29 (2.5%) failed. Investigating the association  
163 of implant losses with valid responses (excluding cases with no information) there was  
164 no statistically significant association with gender, diabetes, smoking, continuous use  
165 of medication, type of implant system, implant placement site, previous bone grafting  
166 and type of prosthetic provisioning (Table 1).

167 Among the 29 implants that failed, in one of them no information about the  
168 installation time was present. The same lack of information occurred within an implant  
169 that did not fail. Therefore, of the 1,164 implants installed, 1,162 implants were  
170 considered for estimating the survival rate. Figure 2 shows the Kaplan-Meier curve,  
171 with a 95% confidence interval up to 52 months after implant placement, and reveals  
172 that the overall survival rate was 90.5%. Table 2 indicates the survival rates in the  
173 other time intervals and presents the confidence intervals (95%).

174

175 **Discussion**

176 This study showed the high survival rate of Intraoss implants system made by  
177 residents in Implantology Program at São Leopoldo Mandic (Brazil), up to 52 months  
178 and none of the independent variables tested positively correlated with the implant  
179 failure. This retrospective study included 742 patients who received a total of 1,164  
180 implants showing a cumulative failure rate of 2.5%. Based on Kaplan-Meier curve  
181 analysis, with a 95% confidence interval up to 52 months of implant placement,  
182 revealed that the overall survival rate at this time was 90.5%.

183 Some individual biological factors are known to potentially impair implant  
184 prognosis. A meta-analyses based on implant- and patient-related data showed a  
185 significant increase in the relative risk of implant failure in patients who smoked >20  
186 cigarettes per day compared with non-smokers [12]. In the present study we did not  
187 observe a positive association of smoking and dental implant failure, however, we did  
188 not have the information of how many cigarettes were used per day by each patient,  
189 which might biased the results. Importantly, it cannot be ruled out that the lack of  
190 association between smoking and failure can be partly attributed to the time since  
191 implant placement in our study was up to 52 months. In addition, when working with a  
192 dichotomous assessment (yes vs. no for smoking) it is difficult to show effects that are  
193 known to be more expressive, thus, if number of cigarettes/packs categorizes it may  
194 favors finding an association.

195 The long-term hyperglycemia of diabetes usually leads to failure, damage,  
196 and/or dysfunction of many tissues and organs mainly due to the correlation between  
197 glycemic control and the development of microvascular and macro-vascular  
198 complications [13]. Previous results already demonstrated that diabetic patients  
199 presented a statistically significant higher risk of dental implant failure and higher



200 marginal bone loss than non-diabetic patients, mainly type 1 diabetes [14]. Our results  
201 have not demonstrated any statistical significance regarding diabetes and dental  
202 implant failure, however the data about the presence or absence of diabetes was  
203 based only on patient's information since no laboratorial test was made, and thus this  
204 data may be carefully analyzed. However, another study verified no association  
205 between implant loss and different variables such as bone augmentation, time of  
206 implant placement, diabetes and smoking, corroborating our results [15]. Besides, in  
207 a previous study several parameters similar to those evaluated here did not yield any  
208 significant association with implant failures [16].

209         Clinical training in implant dentistry for graduate students contributes to the  
210 development of advanced skills in dental students. Data from a study performed by  
211 undergraduate students who carried out the rehabilitation of patients with implants at  
212 the University of Alberta (Canada), who installed 289 implants in 189 patients, with  
213 only 1 loss occurred, and therefore, a survival rate of 99.7% was achieved [9]. On the  
214 other hand, On the other hand, the influence of surgeons' dental/implant education  
215 and its relevance to treatment outcome on implant failure rates has been shown to be  
216 important. In a previous study the rates obtained at International University of  
217 Catalonia (Barcelona, Spain) resulted in overall cumulative rates of 4.9% and 10.8%  
218 at the implant and patient levels, respectively, over a 7-year period [15]. The success  
219 rate for Harvard School of Dental Medicine periodontology residents was 96.48%  
220 during the 4-year study period [17]. Nonetheless, an interesting study analyzed the  
221 implant outcomes and the clinical training at Louisiana State University Health Science  
222 Centera (USA), showing that the advanced group (94.2%) had the best implant  
223 outcomes followed by the intermediate group (89.38%) and beginner group (88.6%)  
224 clearly demonstrating that increased clinician training improves clinical outcomes [16].

225 Moreover, an interesting analysis demonstrated that clinicians' age and years of  
226 experience as dentists or as specialist were not found to be predictors to early implant  
227 failure rate however, the number of implants placed during the postgraduate training  
228 was found to be significantly predicting early failure rate of implants [18]. In the present  
229 study, of the 1,164 implants installed by residents in implantology, 29 (2.5%) failed up  
230 to 52 months after implant placement. It reveals an overall survival rate of 90.5% at  
231 this time. Thus, the present data is very close to published data by several universities  
232 worldwide during the residency training.

233         Important to point out that a limitation of the study was the retrospective timeline  
234 of up to 52 months and the fact that the implants included had been present for variable  
235 times as well as almost 85% of the installed implants had up to 2 years. The lower  
236 number of implants installed more than 3 years induced the largest confidence interval  
237 observed (Table 2).

238         The present study showed high survival rates made by residents of  
239 implantology at Faculdade São Leopoldo Mandic using Intraoss dental implants, and  
240 the implant failure had no association with any of the variables tested.

241

242

### 243 **Acknowledgements**

244 This work was supported in part by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento  
245 Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) - Research Productivity Fellowship to MHN and  
246 JTCN; Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) -  
247 #001.

### 248 **Author Contributions section**

249 M.K., T. C.-N., A.A.P., H.S.N., M. H. N. designed research  
250 M.K. performed research

251 C.P.T. performed the statistical analysis  
252 M.K., H.S.N., A.A.P., C.P.T., J.T.C-N., M.H.N. wrote the paper  
253 All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

254

255 **Conflicts**

256 The company Intraoss financed the research and awarded a Scientific Scholarship to

257 M.K.

258

259 **Table 1** – Absolute and relative frequencies (%) of implant loss according to sex, diabetes, smoking,  
 260 continuous use of medications, type of implant system, location of installation, previous bone grafting  
 261 and type of prosthetic provisioning.

Independent Variable	Implant loss		p-value
	Y	N	
Gender			
Male	11 (2.7%)	398 (97.3%)	0,755*
Female	18 (2.4%)	735 (97.6%)	
	29	1.133	
Diabetes			
Y	2 (2.5%)	78 (97.5%)	0,966**
N	26 (2.4%)	1.047 (97.6%)	
	28	1.125	
Smoking			
Y	6 (3.8%)	154 (96.2%)	0,274*
N	23 (2.3%)	978 (97.7%)	
	29	1.132	
Continuous use of medications			
Y	12 (2.1%)	555 (97.9%)	0,416*
N	17 (2.9%)	577 (97.1%)	
	29	1.132	
Implant System			
Tapered connection	21 (2.3%)	886 (97.7%)	0,704**
External connection	5 (2.9%)	169 (97.1%)	
Internal connection	1 (1.3%)	79 (98.7%)	
	27	1.134	
Implant placement site			
Maxila	11 (1.8%)	594 (98.2%)	0,132*
Mandible	17 (3.2%)	513 (96.8%)	
	28	1.107	
Previous bone grafting			
Y	7 (2.5%)	271 (97.5%)	0,895*
N	21 (2.4%)	862 (97.6%)	
	28	1.133	
Prosthesis			
Temporary prosthesis	8 (2.1%)	377 (97.9%)	0,543**
Immediate prosthesis	5 (1.9%)	252 (98.1%)	
Definitive prosthesis	10 (2.7%)	354 (97.3%)	
	23	983	

278 For each independent variable, cases without information were disregarded for  
 279 applying the analyses. \* = p-value of the chi-square test; \*\* = p value referring to the  
 280 G test

281

282

283

284 **Table 2** - Survival rate and confidence interval (95% CI) according to implant  
 285 placement period.

Time (months)	Survival rate	CI (95%)
1 a 6	98.84%	97.97% a 99.34%
7 a 12	98.27%	97.15% a 98.95%
13 a 18	96.46%	94.68% a 97.66%
19 a 24	95.51%	93.08% a 97.10%
25 a 30	95.51%	93.08% a 97.10%
31 a 36	95.51%	93.08% a 97.10%
37 a 42	90.48%	74.51% a 96.66%
43 a 48	90.48%	74.51% a 96.66%
49 a 52	90.48%	74.51% a 96.66%

286

287 **Legends**

288 **Figure 1:** Histogram of the installation time of the evaluated implants.

289 **Figure 2:** Kaplan Meier curve for the event of implant loss in the sample evaluated.

290

291 **References**

292 1. Buser D, Janner SFM, Wittneben J-G, Brägger U, Ramseier CA, Salvi Ge. 10-  
 293 Year survival and success rates of 511 titanium implants with a sandblasted  
 294 and acid-etched surface: a retrospective study in 303 partially edentulous  
 295 patients. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2012; 14(6):839–851.

296 2. Jung RE, Zembic A, Pjetursson BE, Zwahlen M, Thoma DS. Systematic review  
 297 of the survival rate and the incidence of biological, technical, and aesthetic  
 298 complications of single crowns on implants reported in longitudinal studies with  
 299 a mean follow-up of 5 years. Clin Oral Implants Res 2012; 23: 2–21.  
 300 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2012.02547.x>

301 3. Zhang L, Lyu C, Shang Z, Niu A, Liang X. Quality of Life of Implant-Supported  
 302 Overdenture and Conventional Complete Denture in Restoring the Edentulous

- 303 Mandible: A Systematic Review. *Implant Dent.* 2017; 26(6): 945-950. doi:  
304 10.1097/ID.0000000000000668.
- 305 4. van Velzen FJ, Ofec R, Schulten EA, Ten Bruggenkate CM. 10-year survival  
306 rate and the incidence of peri-implant disease of 374 titanium dental implants  
307 with a SLA surface: a prospective cohort study in 177 fully and partially  
308 edentulous patients. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 2015; 26(10): 1121-1128. doi:  
309 10.1111/clr.12499.
- 310 5. Moraschini V, Poubel LA, Ferreira VF, Barboza Edos S. Evaluation of survival  
311 and success rates of dental implants reported in longitudinal studies with a  
312 follow-up period of at least 10 years: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac*  
313 *Surg.* 2015; 44(3):377-388. doi: 10.1016/j.ijom.2014.10.023.
- 314 6. Meijer HJA, Boven C, Delli K, Raghoobar GM. Is there an effect of crown-to-  
315 implant ratio on implant treatment outcomes? A systematic review. *Clin Oral*  
316 *Implants Res.* 2018, 29: 243–252.
- 317 7. Adler L, Buhlin K, Jansson L. Survival and complications: A 9- to 15-year  
318 retrospective follow-up of dental implant therapy. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2020; 47: 67–  
319 77.
- 320 8. Sriram K, Duraisamy R, Mp SK. Survival Rates of Implants Placed by  
321 Undergraduate Students: A Retrospective Study. *J Long Term Eff Med*  
322 *Implants.* 2020; 30(3): 173-178. doi:  
323 10.1615/JLongTermEffMedImplants.2020035941.
- 324 9. Naito M, Lung K, Linke B. Retrospective Analysis of the Survival of Dental  
325 Implants Placed by Dental Students: A 10-Year Chart Review. *J Can Dent*  
326 *Assoc.* 2020 Sep;86:k11

- 327 10. Costa GN, Martinez EF, Ruellas AM, Peruzzo DC, Joly JC, Napimoga MH.  
328 Microbiological Sealing Analysis of a Tapered Connection and External  
329 Hexagon System. *Int J Dent.* 2017; 2017: 3849085. doi:  
330 10.1155/2017/3849085.
- 331 11. Alencar MAS, Martinez EF, Figueiredo FC, Lima e Silva ARD, Protazio JE,  
332 Bertamoni M, Peruzzo DC, Napimoga MH. The Evaluation of Osteoblastic Cell  
333 Behavior on Treated Titanium Surface. *Open Dent J.* 2019; 14: 1-6. doi:  
334 10.2174/1874210602014010001.
- 335 12. Naseri R, Yaghini J, Feizi A. Levels of smoking and dental implants failure: A  
336 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2020; 47(4): 518-528.  
337 doi: 10.1111/jcpe.13257.
- 338 13. Cohen A, Horton ES. Progress in the treatment of type 2 diabetes: New  
339 pharmacologic approaches to improve glycemic control. *Curr Med Res Opin.*  
340 2007; 23: 905–917.
- 341 14. Al Ansari Y, Shahwan H, Chrcanovic BR. Diabetes Mellitus and Dental  
342 Implants: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Materials (Basel).* 2022;  
343 15(9): 3227. doi: 10.3390/ma15093227.
- 344 15. Lázaro-Abdulkarim A, Lazaro D, Salomó-Coll O, Hernandez-Alfaro F, Satorres  
345 M, Gargallo-Albiol J. Failure of Dental Implants and Associated Risk Factors in  
346 a University Setting. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants.* 2022; 37(3): 455-463. doi:  
347 10.11607/jomi.9204.
- 348 16. Sonkar J, Maney P, Yu Q, Palaiologou A. Retrospective study to identify  
349 associations between clinician training and dental implant outcome and to  
350 compare the use of MATLAB with SAS. *Int J Implant Dent.* 2019 9; 5(1):28. doi:  
351 10.1186/s40729-019-0182-6.

- 352 17. Zupnik J, Kim SW, Ravens D, Karimbux N, Guze K. Factors associated with  
353 dental implant survival: a 4-year retrospective analysis. *J Periodontol.* 2011;  
354 82(10): 1390-1395. doi: 10.1902/jop.2011.100685.
- 355 18. Mordechai F, Tali C, Jonathan M, Ori P, Yaron B, Ram S, Guy T. The effect of  
356 type of specialty (periodontology/oral surgery) on early implant failure: a  
357 retrospective "Big-Data" study from a nation-wide dental chain in Israel. *Clin*  
358 *Oral Investig.* 2022 Jun 27. doi: 10.1007/s00784-022-04565-z.






Figure 1

Survival Function ( $S_t$ ) - with confidence interval




Figure 2