IJCNP, Volume 2, Issue 5, 2024 ISSN: 2995-536X
https://medicaljournals.eu/index.php/IJCNP

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COGNITIVE NEUROSCIENCE AND PSYCHOLOGY

Comparison of Zirconium and Titanium Dental Implants: A Scientific Review

Kamol Arslanov
Bukhara State Medical Institute
Department of Prosthodontics and Orthodontics

Abstract: Dental implants have revolutionized restorative dentistry, providing long-term solutions for tooth replacement. Titanium has been the gold standard for dental implants due to its biocompatibility, mechanical strength, and successful osseointegration. However, Zirconium implants have gained popularity as a metal-free alternative with potential aesthetic and biocompatibility advantages. This review compares the properties, performance, and clinical outcomes of Zirconium and Titanium dental implants

Key words: comparison, titanium, zirconium, popularity

Relevance. Dental implants serve as artificial roots for missing teeth, supporting prosthetic restorations. The success of dental implants depends on several factors, including biocompatibility, mechanical properties, and osseointegration. [1,2] Titanium (Ti) has been extensively used and studied for its excellent track record in these aspects. Zirconium (Zr) implants, primarily made from zirconia (ZrO_2), offer an alternative with distinct advantages and challenges. This article reviews and compares the two materials to inform clinical decision-making. [3,6]

Materials and Methods

Properties of Titanium and Zirconium Implants

Titanium

- Composition and Structure: Commercially pure titanium or titanium alloys (e.g., Ti-6Al-4V).
- Mechanical Properties: High tensile strength (~550 MPa for pure Ti), excellent fatigue resistance, and good ductility.
- Biocompatibility: Forms a stable oxide layer (TiO_2) that promotes osseointegration.
- Osseointegration: Proven track record with high success rates in various bone qualities. [4,8]

Zirconium

- Composition and Structure: Primarily zirconia (ZrO_2), often stabilized with yttria (Y-TZP).
- Mechanical Properties: High compressive strength (~1000-1200 MPa), lower tensile strength than titanium, and brittleness.
- Biocompatibility: Excellent biocompatibility with lower plaque affinity and good soft tissue response.
- Osseointegration: Comparable to titanium in animal and in vitro studies, with emerging clinical data supporting its efficacy. [5,8]

Comparison of Clinical Outcomes

Success Rates and Survival

Titanium Implants

Titanium implants have shown high survival rates, typically above 95% over 5-10 years, across various clinical studies. They perform reliably in both the anterior and posterior regions of the jaw, supporting single crowns, bridges, and overdentures .

Zirconium Implants

Zirconium implants, although newer, have demonstrated promising results. Clinical studies report survival rates above 90% over 3-5 years. The success is notable in the anterior regions, where aesthetic demands are higher. [7]

Aesthetic Considerations

Titanium

Titanium's metallic color can sometimes be visible through thin gingival tissue, especially in the aesthetic zone. This can be mitigated with techniques such as subgingival placement and use of ceramic abutments.

Zirconium

Zirconium's tooth-colored appearance provides superior aesthetics, particularly in the anterior region. This is a significant advantage in patients with high aesthetic demands .

Biocompatibility and Soft Tissue Response

Titanium

Titanium exhibits excellent biocompatibility with favorable soft tissue integration. However, some patients may develop peri-implantitis, an inflammatory response around the implant, potentially leading to implant failure.

Zirconium

Zirconium implants show superior soft tissue compatibility, with studies suggesting lower bacterial adhesion and reduced risk of peri-implantitis. The material's lack of metallic ions might contribute to better tissue health around the implant site .

Discussion

Advantages and Limitations

Titanium

Advantages:

- Proven long-term success and reliability.
- Superior mechanical strength and flexibility.

Limitations:

- Potential aesthetic issues in visible areas.
- Susceptibility to peri-implantitis in some cases.

Zirconium

Advantages:

- Excellent aesthetics due to tooth-like color.
- Potentially better soft tissue response and lower plaque affinity.

(Manfredini, Lombardo, Visentin, Arreghini, & Siciliani, 2019)Limitations:

- Lower tensile strength and higher brittleness compared to titanium.
- Limited long-term clinical data.

Conclusion

Both Titanium and Zirconium dental implants have their unique advantages and limitations. Titanium remains the gold standard due to its proven track record, excellent mechanical properties, and reliable osseointegration. Zirconium implants offer a promising alternative, especially for patients with high aesthetic demands and those concerned about metal allergies. Ongoing research and long-term clinical studies will further elucidate the comparative performance of these materials, guiding future clinical practices.

References:

1. Buser, D., Sennerby, L., & De Bruyn, H. (2017). Modern implant dentistry based on osseointegration: 50 years of progress, current trends and open questions. Periodontology 2000, 73(1), 7-21.
2. Pjetursson, B. E., Thoma, D., Jung, R., Zwahlen, M., & Zembic, A. (2012). A systematic review of the survival and complication rates of implant-supported fixed dental prostheses (FDPs) after a mean observation period of at least 5 years. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 23(Suppl 6), 22-38.
3. Andreiotelli, M., Wenz, H. J., & Kohal, R. J. (2009). Are ceramic implants a viable alternative to titanium implants? A systematic literature review. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 20(Suppl 4), 32-47.
4. Osman, R. B., & Swain, M. V. (2015). A critical review of dental implant materials with an emphasis on titanium versus zirconia. Materials, 8(3), 932-958.
5. Roehling, S., Astasov-Frauenhoffer, M., Hauser-Gerspach, I., Braissant, O., Woelfler, H., Waltimo, T., & Kniha, H. (2019). In vitro biofilm formation on titanium and zirconia implant surfaces. Journal of Periodontology, 90(4), 388-396.
6. Sailer, I., Zembic, A., Jung, R. E., Hämmerle, C. H., & Mattiola, A. (2007). Single-tooth implant reconstructions: esthetic factors influencing the decision between titanium and zirconia abutments in anterior regions. European

Journal of Esthetic Dentistry, 2(3), 296-310.

7. Depprich, R., Zipprich, H., Ommerborn, M., Naujoks, C., Wiesmann, H. P., Kiattavorncharoen, S., & Kübler, N. R. (2008). Osseointegration of zirconia implants: an SEM observation of the bone-implant interface. Head & Face Medicine, 4(1), 1-7.
8. Al-Radha, A. S. D., Dymock, D., Younes, C., & O'Sullivan, D. (2012). Surface properties of titanium and zirconia dental implant materials and their effect on bacterial adhesion. Journal of Dentistry, 40(2), 146-153.