Dental Implants in Irradiated Bone: Challenges and Advancements in Head and Neck Cancer Rehabilitation

T.Nithyashree, Dr.Akash.
[1]*Undergraduate student, Meenakshi Ammal Dental College and Hospital, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*
[2]*Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Meenakshi Ammal Dental College and Hospital, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*

Abstract: Head and neck cancer survivors often face severe maxillofacial defects after radiation, making conventional prosthetics ineffective. Dental implants have emerged as the crucial, biologically sound solution for functional and aesthetic rehabilitation in this complex group. This literature review addresses the challenges of placing implants in irradiated bone, focusing on altered bone quality, compromised osseointegration, and the high risk of osteoradionecrosis (ORN). While overall implant survival is generally favorable, success demands meticulous, multidisciplinary planning. Key prognostic factors include the radiation dose and the implant site, with the mandible showing significantly greater success than the maxilla. Optimal timing remains debated, and the use of bone grafts is generally less favorable than local bone. Ultimately, a detailed benefit-risk analysis with advanced planning is essential to offer implant restoration, improving the survivor's quality of life.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although standard implant success rates are high, the prognosis is challenging for head and neck cancer survivors due to radiation therapy. While essential for survival, radiation has lasting negative effects on the oral region, including decreased vascularity and cellular activity, and a heightened risk of complications like osteoradionecrosis (ORN). These changes compromise bone quality and the environment necessary for implant integration, increasing the risk of failure. Given that oral rehabilitation is vital for quality of life, this review examines current knowledge on dental implants in irradiated bone, focusing on radiation-induced physiological changes, effects on osseointegration, ORN risk, and multidisciplinary planning.

II. CHANGES IN BONE QUALITY AND QUANTITY POST-RADIATION

Radiation profoundly impacts the bone and oral environment. Decreased vascularity from small vessel damage reduces oxygen and nutrient supply, which compromises cellular function and the healing vital for implant success. Separately, radiotherapy often induces chronic salivary gland dysfunction, leading to xerostomia and an altered saliva composition. These changes cause oral pathologies, which degrade the oral environment and ultimately reduce implant survival. Ata structural level, radiation alters the bone matrix composition (collagen, minerals), negatively affecting the bone's overall integrity and resilience. These structural changes, combined with reduced vascularity, result in decreased bone strength and altered stress distribution. This compromised strength and uneven loading at the implant interface can impair the bone's ability to withstand mechanical forces, potentially undermining long-term implant stability.

III. EFFECTS OF RADIATION ON OSSEOINTEGRATION

Osteoblast Activity: Reduced function of bone-forming cells prevents the establishment of a stable implant interface. BoneRemodeling: Disrupted resorption/formation balance compromises the adjacent bone's maturation and stability. Microenvironment: Altered local conditions lead to delayed or compromised healing after implant surgery.

IV. RISK OF OSTEORADIONECROSIS

Osteoradionecrosis (ORN) is severe bone necrosis in irradiated tissue, with the risk significantly increasing

after surgery like implant placement. ORN is caused by radiation damage to blood vessels, leading to poor blood flow and healing capacity. This limited regenerative potential makes successful implant placement extremely difficult. Understanding ORN is crucial for optimizing treatment planning.

V. DENTAL IMPLANTS' SURVIVAL IN IRRADIATED BONE

Implant Site: In spite of the mandible's susceptibility to ORN, implants show considerably increased survival rates in the irradiated mandible than the maxilla, where the failure risk can be five times greater. This is attributed to the mandible's higher bone density, better anatomy for primary stability, and the anterior region often being spared the full radiation dose.

Bone Augmentation: Implant placement in irradiated native bone is preferred over irradiated grafted bone, as grafting combined with radiation is a negative prognostic factor. The poor outcome in grafts is due to inadequate revascularization. For unavoidable large defects, vascularized bone flaps (free flaps) are the most reliable method, showing superior survival to non-vascularized grafts. The fibula and iliac crest free flaps offer the best bone quantity and quality for osseointegration.

Radiation Dose: Opinions vary concerning a clear radiation dose threshold that negatively affects implant survival. The risk and severity of ORN depend on the total dose, volume irradiated, and patient health. While lower doses are generally linked to better outcomes, precise dose distribution must be determined by a radiation oncologist before implant placement for optimal surgical planning.

The role of timing of implant placement

Primary placement allows osseointegration before radiation and avoids a second surgery, but risks delaying cancer therapy. Secondary placement allows for patient and prognosis evaluation, with implants typically delayed at least six months post-radiation. The benefit of longer delays is unknown. Conflicting evidence exists: while early placement (under 12 months) might be riskier, waiting decades may also be detrimental due to progressive vascular damage.

VI. APPLICATIONS IN PATIENT CARE

Use of implants is not contraindicated for irradiated patients, but successful management requires comprehensive planning that considers the radiation dose, timing, and Implant location. To secure informed consent, clinicians must thoroughly discuss the Potential risks and advantages emphasizing the markedly reduced survival rates in contrast to non-irradiated bone. Patients must be given a realistic expectation of both quality-of-life improvements and potential side effects throughout the treatment journey.

VII. CONCLUSION

Dental Implant-supported rehabilitation represents a feasible option for patients with head and neck cancer, post-radiotherapy offering functional stability and improved Well-being, but it needs a thorough, multidisciplinary approach. While longevity is generally lower than in non-irradiated patients, success is achievable. Negative prognostic factors include placement in the maxilla (versus the mandible), using bone grafts (instead of local bone), and high radiation doses. Optimal timing is debated, but placement is typically delayed by at least six months post-radiation. To mitigate the high risk of ORN and ensure success, precise planning, risk assessment, and staged placement are essential. Ultimately, restoration should only be offered after a thorough benefit-risk analysis and commitment to close follow-up.

REFERENCES

[1] Chambrone L, Mandia Jr J, Shibli JA, Romito GA, Abrahao M. Dental implants installed in irradiated jaws: a systematic review. Journal of dental research. 2013 Dec;92(12_suppl):119S-30S.

[2] Kende PP, Ranganath S, Landge JS, Sarda A, Wadewale M, Patil A, Singhavi HR. Survival of dental implants on irradiated jaws: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery. 2022 Sep;21(3):787-95.

[3] Dholam, Kanchan P.; Gurav, Sandeep V.. Dental implants in irradiated jaws: A literature review. Journal of Cancer Research and Therapeutics

8(Suppl 2):p S85-S93, January 2012. | DOI: 10.4103/0973-1482.92220

[4] Lee SM, Kim HS, Ahn KM. Survival rate of dental implants in the irradiated jaw bones of patients with oral and head & neck malignancies. Journal of implantology and applied sciences. 2023 Mar 31;27(1):12-9.

[5] Adaki, Raghavendra & Adaki, Shridevi & Agrawal, Manish & Sankeshwari, Banashree & Fulari, Deepti & Karagir, Amol. (2023). DENTAL IMPLANTS IN IRRADIATED BONE: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. 5. 10375-10384.

[6] Hamzaoui S, Sakout M and Bentahar O. Prevention of the Irradiated Patient in Dental Implantology. Am J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2023; 6(3): 1234.

[7] Beschnidt SM, Cacaci C, Dedeoglu K, Hildebrand D, Hulla H, Iglhaut G, et al. Implant success and survival rates in daily dental practice: 5-year results of a non-interventional study using CAMLOG SCREW-LINE implants with or without platform-switching abutments. Int J Implant Dent 2018;4:33

[8] Shokouhi B, Cerajewska T. Radiotherapy and the survival of dental implants: a systematic review. British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. 2022 May 1;60(4):422-9

[9] Schiegnitz E, Reinicke K, Sagheb K, König J, Al-Nawas B, Grötz KA. Dental implants in patients with head and neck cancer—A systematic review and meta-analysis of the influence of radiotherapy on implant survival. Clinical oral implants research. 2022 Oct;33(10):967-99.

[10] Wijbenga JG, Schepers RH, Werker PM, Witjes MJ, Dijkstra PU. A systematic review of functional outcome and quality of life following reconstruction of maxillofacial defects using vascularized free fibula flaps and dental rehabilitation reveals poor data quality. Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery. 2016 Aug 1;69(8):1024-36.

[11] Pompa, G., Saccucci, M., Di Carlo, G. et al. Survival of dental implants in patients with oral cancer treated by surgery and radiotherapy: a retrospective study. BMC Oral Health 15, 5 (2015).

[12] Granström G. Osseointegration in irradiated cancer patients: an analysis with respect to implant failures. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial SSurgery. 2005 May 1;63(5):579-85.