BDIZ EDI

European Association of Dental Implantologists

Bundesverband der implantologisch tätigen Zahnärzte in Europa e.V.

Guideline

Digital workflow in implant dentistry

Update

19th European Consensus Conference (EuCC)
2024

2024

European Association of Dental Implantologists (BDIZ EDI)
Lipowskystr. 12 · 81373 Munich
Tel. +49 89 720 69 888 · Fax +49 89 720 69 889
office@bdizedi.org
www.bdizedi.org

CONTENT

1	Methods	Page 4
2	Problem	Page 5
3	Digital diagnosis	Page 5
4	Digital impression and imaging	Page 6
5	CAD/CAM-supported grafting techniques	Page 7
6	Digitally driven implant placement	Page 8
7	Digital lab procedures	Page 9
8	AI in implant dentistry	Page 10
9	Conclusion	Page 11
10	References	Page 12

Guideline 2024
Update digital workflow in implant dentistry

19th European Consensus Conference (EuCC) 2024

29 January 2024

Authors: Jörg Neugebauer, PhD, DMD
Hans-Joachim Nickenig M.Sc., PhD, DMD
Joachim E. Zöller, PhD, MD, DMD

Chairman: Professor Dr J. Neugebauer (Germany)

Participants: Ch. Berger (Germany)
Dr E. Çerekja (Albania)
Professor Dr D. Edelhoff (Germany)
Dr Vikas Gowd (India)
Dr F. Kasapi (Macedonia)
Dr. V. Knorr (Germany)
Professor Dr P. Kobler (Croatia)
Professor Dr Dr V. Konstantinović (Serbia)
Professor Dr K. Krasny (Poland)
Dr. S. Liepe (Germany)
Dr. W. Neumann (Germany)
Professor Dr H.J. Nickenig (Germany)
Professor Dr H. Özyuvacı (Turkey)
Dr B. Singh (Nepal)
W. Tomkiewicz (Poland)
Dr Dr M. Tröltzsch (Germany)
Dr J. W. Vaartjes (The Netherlands)
Professor Dr A. Wojtowicz (Poland)

1. METHODS

1.1 Objective

The purpose of this guideline is to offer recommendations for clinicians engaging in implant dentistry, enabling them to correctly assess potential indications (and any limitations) for a digital workflow.

1.2 Introduction

This consensus guideline covers the various digital procedures for diagnosis, surgical preparation, digital implant planning and prosthetic rehabilitation typically used in accordance with the indications recommended by the European Consensus Conference on implantology (EuCC, Cologne, Germany, February 10th, 2024).

All consensus recommendations in this paper should be considered as guidelines only. The patient's specific situation is always an important consideration and may justify a deviation from the recommendations of this consensus paper.

1.3 Background

Digital procedures to improve or simplify the implant prosthetic workflow are presented for various treatment steps. To ensure an acceptable treatment outcome, the selection of the appropriate digital procedure for each indication is necessary.

1.4 Literature search

The Cochrane Library, EMBASE, DIMDI and Medline literature databases were used to conduct a systematic search of recent published data on digital workflows and directly related topics. Selective search criteria were used, including terms such as *digital, implant, cad/cam, grafting, guided surgery, abutment, superstructure, surgical guide, printing, AI.* The publications identified by the search were screened by reading their abstracts; those irrelevant to the subject were identified and excluded. Articles found to be potentially relevant were obtained in full-text form. Multiple review papers with meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) as well as other prospective or retrospective systematic clinical studies proved to be available on the subject.

1.5 Procedure for developing the Consensus Conference guidelines

A preliminary version on which the EuCC based its deliberations was prepared and authored by Jörg Neugebauer, Steinbeis University, Magdeburg and Interdisciplinary Department for Oral Surgery and Implantology and Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Plastic Surgery at the University of Cologne, Germany. The preliminary report was then reviewed and discussed by the sitting committee members in five steps as follows:

- Reviewing the preliminary draft
- Collecting alternative proposals
- Voting on recommendations and levels of recommendation
- Discussing non-consensual issues
- Final voting

2. PROBLEM

Complex implant/prosthetic treatment can be performed in various stages with the support of digital technology. Today the aim in selected cases has been to improve the treatment efficiency and outcome by using a fully digital workflow [27, 28]. Various concepts are in use, but the innovation cycles and outcomes should be considered for complication-free use in daily practice.

3. DIGITAL DIAGNOSIS

3.1 Introduction

Routine implantological diagnosis is still based on panoramic imaging, which has limitations in terms of measurement accuracy and the possibility to determine the available bone supply, especially in the posterior maxilla [21, 62]. Due to the invasiveness of ionizing radiation, 3D diagnosis should be decided by individual basis [36].

3.2 Cone-beam CT

The adjunctive use of 3D data based on cone-beam technology provides more information to help avoid problems and perform a more detailed diagnosis [16]. Various indication for immediate implant placement, control of grafting procedures and anatomical evaluation are proven [52]. Scanning parameters such as voxel size vary depending on the device used and result in discrepancies at the subclinical level, which might influence the subsequent process chain [69]. State-of-the-art devices with a low-dose protocol allow implant planning with reduced radiation doses without decreasing the accuracy of guided implant placement [53].

4. DIGITAL IMPRESSION AND IMAGING

Digital information other than x-ray can contribute to the overall prosthetic diagnosis based on function and aesthetics.

4.1 Definition

Digital impressions are taken as chairside scans to generate the data to fabricate surgical guides, master casts and implant superstructures.

4.2 Current observations

Digital impressions and CAD/CAM procedures save time and provide stable and predictable outcomes [78]. There is no difference in terms of clinical outcomes between conventional and digital impressions, even in full-arch cases [20, 41]. The accuracy of full-arch scanning by IOS differs based on clinical scenarios such as scanning strategies [40, 75].

Digital scanning was found to be more time-efficient and convenient than conventional impression-taking for implant-supported restorations [43]. No significant differences were found in radiographic marginal bone loss between treatments performed with digital scans and conventional impressions [60].

New technologies like spectrophotogrammetry might have a great potential to improve the workflow for full mouth or multiple implants cases [55].

4.3 Prevention of complications

- Precise scanning of full arches requires specific scanning strategies.
- The transfer of the occlusal situation and the articulation is still not established on a routine basis.
- Significant accuracy differences were found between the IOS, which requires individual selection for the various treatment protocols [75].

5. CAD/CAM-SUPPORTED GRAFTING TECHNIQUES

5.1 Introduction

To reduce donor-site morbidity, various kind of allogeneic or xenogeneic block grafts were presented in the past [32]. There has been controversy regarding the evidence for their outcomes [7, 9]. Alternatively, a titanium mesh is used to stabilize the graft, but this requires intensive intraoperative adaptation to the defect. Custom dental implants made by copy-milling and segmented CBCT data were presented in the past but have not become established as routine clinical procedures [34, 59, 64].

5.2 Custom-made bone block and implants

To improve outcomes and simplify workflows, the use of CAD/CAM technology and cone-beam volumetric data for custom-made bone blocks and the shaping of titanium-meshes and implants are recommended [12, 13, 38, 66].

To improve the outcome various techniques of 3D-printed scaffolds with the option of the use of stem-cells or BMP are under scientific evaluation [10].

5.3 Current observations

Reports on the clinical outcomes are still controversial [19, 33].

The exposure rate for CAD/CAM titanium mesh is lower than for conventional shaping, but a high exposure rate of 31% was still observed [24, 81].

5.4 Prevention of complications

Specific soft-tissue management is necessary for 3D-printed titanium meshes.

6. DIGITALLY DRIVEN IMPLANT PLACEMENT

6.1 Introduction

Various systems for guided surgery are available, using static guided surgery and dynamic guided surgery [15, 48]. The accuracy of surgical guides shows no significant difference to dynamic guided surgery [3, 44]. Moreover, computer-guided surgery can effectuate accurate implant placement and less post-surgical discomfort [78]. By using surgical guides, more reproducible and more accurate results can be achieved in comparison to free-hand placement [29, 49, 50, 70].

6.2 Current observations

Discrepancies between planned and actual implant positions can be up to about 1 mm crestally and around 2 mm in the apical region, with an angular deviation of about 5 degrees [15, 68]. These results have been confirmed by RCTs [74].

- Surgical guides strictly supported by soft tissue in the edentulous jaw are not inferior [73].
- Bone-supported surgical guides exhibit lower accuracy [15].
- No difference was observed for GS or FH in respect of MBL changes [76, 79].

Flap and flapless approaches provided similar implant survival rates, but the flap technique provided a slightly better MBL than the flapless approach [72].

Further evidence regarding more clinically relevant outcomes of efficacy (implant survival and success, prosthetically and biologically correct positioning), long-term prognosis and cost is currently scarce [63].

Flapless procedures show less buccal bone resorption in immediate-implant cases [42, 54].

New technologies with augmented reality-supported navigation could provide better accuracy than conventional navigation and free-hand procedures [76, 79].

6.3 Prevention of complications

- There are greater deviations with longer implants and shorter sleeves [67].
- Conventional guides or guides based on optical scans are more accurate than guides designed based on CBCT data [61].
- For completely edentulous jaws, fixation with mini-implants or anchor screws increases accuracy [15].
- Keyless systems seem to offer greater precision than key systems [23].
- Case selection for type of guided surgery requires previous experience in conventional procedures in order to be able to switch if required.
- Minimally invasive therapies such as flapless surgery require specific training to achieve an optimal outcome [46, 73].
- Greater deviations may occur in individual operator and patient situa tions, depending on the fixation and the type of edentulism [11, 23, 57].
- Learning curve for guided surgery should be done with simple cases.

7. DIGITAL LAB PROCEDURES

7.1 Digital printing

7.1.1 Introduction

Various printing techniques are available for manufacturing surgical implant guides, implant analogue models, metallic primary frameworks, secondary ceramic or polymer superstructures [56].

7.1.2 Current observations

For clinically acceptable accuracy of implant analogue casts, various technical parameters must be considered [26]. Depending on the printer technology, accuracy may change under light exposure [80].

7.2 CAD/CAM abutments

7.2.1 Definition

Custom CAD/CAM abutments can be produced by chairside procedures with prefabricated inserts or by milling centres on the original or on a copy of the implant interface [30]. No information is available regarding the precision and quality of the two procedures [37]. Pre-milled interface show higher accuracy than individual processed designs [4].

7.2.2 Current observations

Custom CAD/CAM abutments offer many options for ideal design in terms of biomechanical and material parameters. The use of custom CAD/CAM abutments does not guarantee that subgingival cement residue is avoided, although a reduction in cement residue has been shown after crown cementation [77].

The use of custom CAD/CAM abutments showed advantages in soft-tissue stability in a multicentre prospective clinical trial after a two-year follow-up [39]. Controversial data indicate no improvement in clinical performance or patient satisfaction compared to the use of stock zirconia abutments [58, 65].

Special emphasis should be placed on the precision of the implant/abutment interface. Initial research in vitro has demonstrated no difference in terms of implant adaptation of stock vs. one-piece CAD/CAM abutments [8]

7.2.3 Prevention of complications

- Care must still be taken to always carefully remove cement residue after intraoral cementation.
- The use of resin-based luting agents in combination with air-abrasion of titanium inserts and zirconia copings provided stable retention of two-piece CAD/CAM abutments [22].
- Screw-retained crown abutments might be favourable from a biological point of view, with a risk of mechanical complications.

7.3 CAD/CAM superstructures

7.3.1 Definition

Various CAD/CAM fabrication procedures such as milling or selective laser melting are available [30, 35]; they require the validation of workflows. Studies on the precision of screw-retained CAD/CAM superstructures showed improved accuracy in comparison to conventional or copy-milled superstructures, with no relevant differences between the materials used [1, 17, 18, 31].

The marginal fit of implant-supported frameworks manufactured by AM or SM methods is in the clinically acceptable range [47, 71].

7.3.2 Current observations

The available data indicate promising results for CAD/CAM-fabricated implant-supported restorations; nonetheless, current evidence is limited due to the quality of available studies and the paucity of data on long-term clinical outcomes of five years or more [25, 51].

7.3.3 Prevention of complications

- When using CAD/CAM technology, it is recommended to follow a validated workflow.
- If one step in the workflow is changed, it is recommended to revalidate the complete workflow.
- Due to the flexibility of the mandible, non-precious metal frameworks should be used for full-arch reconstruction. For ceramic veneering high elasticity alloy should be used.

8. AI IN IMPLANT DENTISTRY

8.1 Introduction

A growing number of studies employ deep learning in implant dentistry, mainly in digital imaging with radiographs [6]. AI models using panoramic and periapical radiographs can accurately identify and categorize dental implant systems or detect changes in marginal bone levels [5, 14]. Segmentation procedures of anatomical structures are improved by AI support [2].

8.2 Current observations

New algorithms may determine critical structures like the IAN canal and the available bone for AI implant planning [6]. The benefits compared with conventional approaches is not proven [45].

9. CONCLUSION

Digital technologies are improving in implant dentistry with good clinical outcomes and improvements in PROMs. Specific parameters for individual workflows must be considered by the healthcare provider.

Cologne, 10 February 2024

Professor Dr Dr Joachim E. Zöller
Vice President

Professor Dr Jörg Neugebauer
Chairman of EuCC

10. REFERENCES

1. Abduo J, Lyons K, Bennani V, Waddell N, Swain M. Fit of screw-retained fixed implant frameworks fabricated by different methods: a systematic review. Int J Prosthodont 2011; 24: 207-220.
2. Abesi F, Jamali AS, Zamani M. Accuracy of artificial intelligence in the detection and segmentation of oral and maxillofacial structures using cone-beam computed tomography images: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pol J Radiol 2023; 88: e256-e263.
3. Aghaloo T, Hadaya D, Schoenbaum TR, Pratt L, Favagehi M. Guided and Navigation Implant Surgery: A Systematic Review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 38: 7-15.
4. Alonso-Perez R, Bartolome JF, Pradies G. Original vs compatible stock abutment- implant connection: An in vitro analysis of the internal accuracy and mechanical fatigue behaviour. J Prosthodont Res 2022; 66: 476-483.
5. Alqutaibi AY, Algabri RS, Elawady D, Ibrahim WI. Advancements in artificial intelligence algorithms for dental implant identification: A systematic review with meta-analysis. J Prosthet Dent 2023; 10.1016/j.prosdent.2023.11.027.
6. Altalhi AM, Alharbi FS, Alhodaithy MA, Almarshedy BS, Al-Saaib MY, Al Jfshar RM, Aljohani AS, Alshareef AH, Muhayya M, Al-Harbi NH. The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Dental Implantology: A Narrative Review. Cureus 2023; 15: e47941.
7. Amorfini L, Migliorati M, Signori A, Silvestrini-Biavati A, Benedicenti S. Block allograft technique versus standard guided bone regeneration: a randomized clinical trial. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2014; 16: 655-667.
8. Apicella D, Veltri M, Chieffi N, Polimeni A, Giovannetti A, Ferrari M. Implant adaptation of stock abutments versus CAD/CAM abutments: a radiographic and Scanning Electron Microscopy study. Ann Stomatol (Roma) 2010; 1: 9-13.
9. Araujo PP, Oliveira KP, Montenegro SC, Carreiro AF, Silva JS, Germano AR. Block allograft for reconstruction of alveolar bone ridge in implantology: a systematic review. Implant Dent 2013; 22: 304-308.
10. Avanzi IR, Parisi JR, Souza A, Cruz MA, Martignago CCS, Ribeiro DA, Braga ARC, Renno AC. 3D-printed hydroxyapatite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering: A systematic review in experimental animal studies. J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater 2023; 111: 203-219.
11. Balaguer-Marti JC, Canet-Lopez A, Penarrocha-Diago M, Romeo-Rubio M, Penarrocha-Diago M, Garcia-Mira B. Influence of Splint Support on the Precision of Static Totally Guided Dental Implant Surgery: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 38: 157-168.
12. Blume O, Back M, Born T, Smeets R, Jung O, Barbeck M. Treatment of a bilaterally severely resorbed posterior mandible due to early tooth loss by Guided Bone Regeneration using customized allogeneic bone blocks: A case report with 24 months follow-up data. J Esthet Restor Dent 2018; 30: 474-479.
13. Blume O, Donkiewicz P, Palkovics D, Gotz W, Windisch P. Volumetric Changes of a Customized Allogeneic Bone Block Measured by Two Image Matching Tools: Introduction of a Novel Assessment Technique for Graft Resorption. Acta Stomatol Croat 2021; 55: 406-417.
14. Cha JY, Yoon HI, Yeo IS, Huh KH, Han JS. Peri-Implant Bone Loss Measurement Using a Region-Based Convolutional Neural Network on Dental Periapical Radiographs. J Clin Med 2021; 10.
15. D'Haese J, Ackhurst J, Wismeijer D, De Bruyn H, Tahmaseb A. Current state of the art of computer-guided implant surgery. Periodontol 2000 2017; 73: 121-133.
16. D'Souza KM, Aras MA. Types of implant surgical guides in dentistry: a review. J Oral Implantol 2012; 38: 643-652.
17. de Franca DG, Morais MH, das Neves FD, Barbosa GA. Influence of CAD/CAM on the fit accuracy of implant-supported zirconia and cobalt-chromium fixed dental prostheses. J Prosthet Dent 2015; 113: 22-28.
18. de Franca DG, Morais MH, das Neves FD, Carreiro AF, Barbosa GA. Precision Fit of Screw-Retained Implant-Supported Fixed Dental Prostheses Fabricated by CAD/CAM, Copy-Milling, and Conventional Methods. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2017; 32: 507-513.
19. Draenert FG, Kammerer PW, Berthold M, Neff A. Complications with allogeneic, cancellous bone blocks in vertical alveolar ridge augmentation: prospective clinical case study and review of the literature. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol 2016; 122: e31-43.
20. Floriani F, Lopes GC, Cabrera A, Duarte W, Zoidis P, Oliveira D, Rocha MG. Linear Accuracy of Intraoral Scanners for Full-Arch Impressions of Implant-Supported Prostheses: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Eur J Dent 2023; 17: 964-973.
21. Fortin T, Camby E, Alik M, Isidori M, Bouchet H. Panoramic images versus three-dimensional planning software for oral implant planning in atrophied posterior maxillary: a clinical radiological study. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2013; 15: 198-204.
22. Gehrke P, Alius J, Fischer C, Erdelt KJ, Beuer F. Retentive strength of two-piece CAD/CAM zirconia implant abutments. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2014; 16: 920-925.
23. Gourdache I, Salomo-Coll O, Hernandez-Alfaro F, Gargallo-Albiol J. Dental Implant Positioning Accuracy Using a Key or Keyless Static Fully Guided Surgical System: A Prospective Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Int J Prosthodont 2023; 0: 0.
24. Gu C, Xu L, Shi A, Guo L, Chen H, Qin H. Titanium Mesh Exposure in Guided Bone Regeneration Procedures: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2022; 37: e29-e40.
25. Ioannidis A, Pala K, Strauss FJ, Hjerppe J, Jung RE, Joda T. Additively and subtractively manufactured implant-supported fixed dental prostheses: A systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res 2023; 34 Suppl 26: 50-63.
26. Jin G, Shin SH, Shim JS, Lee KW, Kim JE. Accuracy of 3D printed models and implant-analog positions according to the implant-analog-holder offset, inner structure, and printing layer thickness: an in-vitro study. J Dent 2022; 125: 104268.
27. Joda T, Bragger U. Complete digital workflow for the production of implant-supported single-unit monolithic crowns. Clin Oral Implants Res 2014; 25: 1304-1306.
28. Joda T, Bragger U. Digital vs. conventional implant prosthetic workflows: a cost/time analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 1430-1435.
29. Kang S, Hou Y, Cao J, Li S, Xue P, Jiang Y. Comparison of implantation accuracy among different navigated approaches: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 0: 1-33.
30. Kapos T, Evans C. CAD/CAM technology for implant abutments, crowns, and superstructures. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2014; 29 Suppl: 117-136.
31. Katsoulis J, Mericske-Stern R, Enkling N, Katsoulis K, Blatz MB. In vitro precision of fit of computer-aided designed and computer-aided manufactured titanium screw-retained fixed dental prostheses before and after ceramic veneering. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 44-49.
32. Keith JD, Jr., Petrungaro P, Leonetti JA, Elwell CW, Zeren KJ, Caputo C, Nikitakis NG, Schopf C, Warner MM. Clinical and histologic evaluation of a mineralized block allograft: results from the developmental period (2001-2004). Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2006; 26: 321-327.
33. Kloss FR, Offermanns V, Donkiewicz P, Kloss-Brandstatter A. Customized allogeneic bone grafts for maxillary horizontal augmentation: A 5-year follow-up radiographic and histologic evaluation. Clin Case Rep 2020; 8: 886-893.
34. Kohal RJ, Hurzeler MB, Mota LF, Klaus G, Caffesse RG, Strub JR. Custom-made root analogue titanium implants placed into extraction sockets. An experimental study in monkeys. Clin Oral Implants Res 1997; 8: 386-392.
35. Koutsoukis T, Zinelis S, Eliades G, Al-Wazzan K, Rifaiy MA, Al Jabbari YS. Selective Laser Melting Technique of Co-Cr Dental Alloys: A Review of Structure and Properties and Comparative Analysis with Other Available Techniques. J Prosthodont 2015; 24: 303-312.
36. Kunzendorf B, Naujokat H, Wiltfang J. Indications for 3-D diagnostics and navigation in dental implantology with the focus on radiation exposure: a systematic review. Int J Implant Dent 2021; 7: 52.
37. Lins L, Bemfica V, Queiroz C, Canabarro A. In vitro evaluation of the internal and marginal misfit of CAD/CAM zirconia copings. J Prosthet Dent 2015; 113: 205-211.
38. Lizio G, Corinaldesi G, Marchetti C. Alveolar ridge reconstruction with titanium mesh: a three-dimensional evaluation of factors affecting bone augmentation. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2014; 29: 1354-1363.
39. Lops D, Bressan E, Parpaiola A, Sbricoli L, Cecchinato D, Romeo E. Soft tissues stability of cad-cam and stock abutments in anterior regions: 2-year prospective multicentric cohort study. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 1436-1442.
40. Ma J, Zhang B, Song H, Wu D, Song T. Accuracy of digital implant impressions obtained using intraoral scanners: a systematic review and meta-analysis of in vivo studies. Int J Implant Dent 2023; 9: 48.
41. Mahat NS, Shetty NY, Kohli S, Jamayet NB, Patil P. Clinical outcomes of implant-supported and tooth-supported fixed prostheses fabricated from digital versus analogue impression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Evid Based Dent 2023; 24: 142.
42. Majid OW. Does flapless immediate implant placement lead to significant preservation of buccal bone compared to flap surgical protocol? Evid Based Dent 2023; 10.1038/s41432-023-00934-z.
43. Manicone PF, De Angelis P, Rella E, Damis G, D'Addona A. Patient preference and clinical working time between digital scanning and conventional impression making for implant-supported prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Prosthet Dent 2022; 128: 589-596.
44. Marques-Guasch J, Bofarull-Ballus A, Giralt-Hernando M, Hernandez-Alfaro F, Gargallo-Albiol J. Dynamic Implant Surgery-An Accurate Alternative to Stereolithographic Guides-Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Dent J (Basel) 2023; 11.
45. Mohammad-Rahimi H, Motamedian SR, Pirayesh Z, Haiat A, Zahedrozegar S, Mahmoudinia E, Rohban MH, Krois J, Lee JH, Schwendicke F. Deep learning in periodontology and oral implantology: A scoping review. J Periodontal Res 2022; 57: 942-951.
46. Moraschini V, Velloso G, Luz D, Barboza EP. Implant survival rates, marginal bone level changes, and complications in full-mouth rehabilitation with flapless computer-guided surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2015; 44: 892-901.
47. Nazarifar AM, Davoudi A. Marginal Accuracy of CAD/CAM Frameworks Fabricated by Presintered Cobalt-Chromium Alloy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 38: 181-191.

48. Neugebauer J, Stachulla G, Ritter L, Dreiseidler T, Mischkowski RA, Keeve E, Zoller JE. Computer-aided manufacturing technologies for guided implant placement. Expert Rev Med Devices 2010; 7: 113-129.
49. Nickenig HJ, Eitner S, Rothamel D, Wichmann M, Zoller JE. Possibilities and limitations of implant placement by virtual planning data and surgical guide templates. Int J Comput Dent 2012; 15: 9-21.
50. Nickenig HJ, Wichmann M, Hamel J, Schlegel KA, Eitner S. Evaluation of the difference in accuracy between implant placement by virtual planning data and surgical guide templates versus the conventional free-hand method - a combined in vivo - in vitro technique using cone-beam CT (Part II). J Craniomaxillofac Surg 2010; 38: 488-493.
51. Patzelt SB, Spies BC, Kohal RJ. CAD/CAM-fabricated implant-supported restorations: a systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26 Suppl 11: 77-85.
52. Pickert FN, Spalthoff S, Gellrich NC, Blaya Tarraga JA. Cone-beam computed tomographic evaluation of dimensional hard tissue changes following alveolar ridge preservation techniques of different bone substitutes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Periodontal Implant Sci 2022; 52: 3-27.
53. Pita A, Thacker S, Sobue T, Gandhi V, Tadinada A. Newly Developed Low Dose 180-degree CBCT Protocol Reduces Radiation Dose Without Compromising Diagnostic Value. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 38: 1161-1167.
54. Pitman J, Christiaens V, Callens J, Glibert M, Seyssens L, Blanco J, Cosyn J. Immediate implant placement with flap or flapless surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Periodontol 2023; 50: 755-764.
55. Pozzi A, Carosi P, Gallucci GO, Nagy K, Nardi A, Arcuri L. Accuracy of complete-arch digital implant impression with intraoral optical scanning and stereophotogrammetry: An in vivo prospective comparative study. Clin Oral Implants Res 2023; 34: 1106-1117.
56. Pradies G, Moron-Conejo B, Martinez-Rus F, Salido MP, Berrendero S. Current applications of 3D printing in dental implantology: A scoping review mapping the evidence. Clin Oral Implants Res 2023; 10.1111/clr.14198.
57. Putra RH, Yoda N, Astuti ER, Sasaki K. The accuracy of implant placement with computer-guided surgery in partially edentulous patients and possible influencing factors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Prosthodont Res 2022; 66: 29-39.
58. Raee A, Alikhasi M, Nowzari H, Djalalinia S, Khoshkam V, Moslemi N. Comparison of peri-implant clinical outcomes of digitally customized and prefabricated abutments: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2021; 23: 216-227.
59. Rasia-dal Polo M, Poli PP, Rancitelli D, Beretta M, Maiorana C. Alveolar ridge reconstruction with titanium meshes: a systematic review of the literature. Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal 2014; 19: e639-646.
60. Reis I, Chamma-Wedemann CN, Silva IAO, Spin-Neto R, Sesma N, da Silva EVF. Clinical outcomes of digital scans versus conventional impressions for implant-supported fixed complete arch prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Prosthet Dent 2023; 10.1016/j.prosdent.2023.09.023.
61. Reyes A, Turkyilmaz I, Prihoda TJ. Accuracy of surgical guides made from conventional and a combination of digital scanning and rapid prototyping techniques. J Prosthet Dent 2015; 113: 295-303.
62. Riecke B, Friedrich RE, Schulze D, Loos C, Blessmann M, Heiland M, Wikner J. Impact of malpositioning on panoramic radiography in implant dentistry. Clin Oral Investig 2015; 19: 781-790.
63. Romandini M, Ruales-Carrera E, Sadilina S, Hammerle CHF, Sanz M. Minimal invasiveness at dental implant placement: A systematic review with meta-analyses on flapless fully guided surgery. Periodontol 2000 2023; 91: 89-112.
64. Saeidi Pour R, Freitas Rafael C, Engler M, Edelhoff D, Klaus G, Prandtner O, Berthold M, Liebermann A. Historical development of root analogue implants: a review of published papers. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2019; 57: 496-504.
65. Schepke U, Meijer HJ, Kerdijk W, Raghoebar GM, Cune M. Stock Versus CAD/CAM Customized Zirconia Implant Abutments - Clinical and Patient-Based Outcomes in a Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2017; 19: 74-84.
66. Schlee M, Rothamel D. Ridge augmentation using customized allogenic bone blocks: proof of concept and histological findings. Implant Dent 2013; 22: 212-218.
67. Schneider D, Schober F, Grohmann P, Hammerle CH, Jung RE. In-vitro evaluation of the tolerance of surgical instruments in templates for computer-assisted guided implantology produced by 3-D printing. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 320-325.
68. Shen P, Zhao J, Fan L, Qiu H, Xu W, Wang Y, Zhang S, Kim YJ. Accuracy evaluation of computer-designed surgical guide template in oral implantology. J Craniomaxillofac Surg 2015; 43: 2189-2194.
69. Spin-Neto R, Gotfredsen E, Wenzel A. Impact of voxel size variation on CBCT-based diagnostic outcome in dentistry: a systematic review. J Digit Imaging 2013; 26: 813-820.
70. Takacs A, Hardi E, Cavalcante BGN, Szabo B, Kispelyi B, Joob-Fancsaly A, Mikulas K, Varga G, Hegyi P, Kivovics M. Advancing accuracy in guided implant placement: A comprehensive meta-analysis: Meta-Analysis evaluation of the accuracy of available implant placement Methods. J Dent 2023; 139: 104748.
71. Thakur J, Parlani S, Shivakumar S, Jajoo K. Accuracy of marginal fit of an implant-supported framework fabricated by 3D printing versus subtractive manufacturing technique: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Prosthet Dent 2023; 129: 301-309.
72. Turkyilmaz I, Benli M, Schoenbaum TR. Clinical Performance of 11,646 Dental Implants Using Surgical Guides and Two Different Surgical Approaches: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2023; 38: 16-29.
73. Van de Wiele G, Teughels W, Vercruyssen M, Coucke W, Temmerman A, Quirynen M. The accuracy of guided surgery via mucosa-supported stereolithographic surgical templates in the hands of surgeons with little experience. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 1489-1494.
74. Vercruyssen M, Coucke W, Naert I, Jacobs R, Teughels W, Quirynen M. Depth and lateral deviations in guided implant surgery: an RCT comparing guided surgery with mental navigation or the use of a pilot-drill template. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015; 26: 1315-1320.
75. Vitai V, Nemeth A, Solyom E, Czumbel LM, Szabo B, Fazekas R, Gerber G, Hegyi P, Hermann P, Borbely J. Evaluation of the accuracy of intraoral scanners for complete-arch scanning: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. J Dent 2023; 137: 104636.
76. Wang F, Wang Q, Zhang J. Role of Dynamic Navigation Systems in Enhancing the Accuracy of Implant Placement: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Clinical Studies. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2021; 79: 2061-2070.
77. Wasiluk G, Chomik E, Gehrke P, Pietruska M, Skurska A, Pietruski J. Incidence of undetected cement on CAD/CAM monolithic zirconia crowns and customized CAD/CAM implant abutments. A prospective case series. Clin Oral Implants Res 2017; 28: 774-778.
78. Xiang B, Yu J, Lu J, Yan Z. Comparisons between Digital-Guided and Nondigital Protocol in Implant Planning, Placement, and Restorations: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. J Evid Based Dent Pract 2023; 23: 101919.
79. Yogui FC, Verri FR, de Luna Gomes JM, Lemos CAA, Cruz RS, Pellizzer EP. Comparison between computer-guided and freehand dental implant placement surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2021; 50: 242-250.
80. Yousef H, Harris BT, Elathamna EN, Morton D, Lin WS. Effect of additive manufacturing process and storage condition on the dimensional accuracy and stability of 3D-printed dental casts. J Prosthet Dent 2022; 128: 1041-1046.
81. Zhou L, Su Y, Wang J, Wang X, Liu Q, Wang J. Effect of Exposure Rates With Customized Versus Conventional Titanium Mesh on Guided Bone Regeneration: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Oral Implantol 2022; 48: 339-346.

BDIZ EDI

European Association of Dental Implantologists

Bundesverband der implantologisch
tätigen Zahnärzte in Europa e.V.

Lipowskystr. 12
81373 Munich
GERMANY

Tel. +49 89 720 69 888
Fax +49 89 720 69 889
office@bdizedi.org
www.bdizedi.org