International Journal of Medical Toxicology & Legal Medicine Volume 27, No. 3, 2024
e-ISSN: 0974-4614
p-ISSN: 0972-0448

The Use of Zirconia Implants in Patients with Metal Allergies

Dhafer hassan Alshehri[1], Riyadh mohammed albadr[2], Saleemah saleh albogmy[3], Majed Aydh alotaibi[4], Abdulbari Mohammed Aleidan[5], Tawfik Shami Alayafi[6], Kholoud abdullah alnemer[7], Abdulaziz Fahad AlShalhoub[8], Ali Mohammed Alfareh[9], Rakan Nejer Alotaibi[10], Nouf Ibrahim Almkezem[11]

[1]General Dentist,West Riyadh Dental Clinics Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: dhhalshehri@moh.gov.sa
[2]Dental specialist,West Riyadh dental complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: riyadhalbadr@gmail.com
[3]Dental assistant,West Riyadh dental complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: Amoony_2009@hotmail
[4]Dental hygienist,West Riyadh Dental Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: Maaealotaibi@moh.gov.sa
[5]General Dentist,Sajir General Hospital,Saudi Arabia, Email: dr.aaleidan@gmail.com
[6]Dental specialist,West Riyadh Dental Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: Tawfikalayafi@gmail.com
[7]Pediatric dentist,Dental Clinics Complex West of Riyadh,Saudi Arabia, Email: Alnemer81@gmail.com
[8]Dental specialist,West Riyadh Dental Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: Dr.alshalhoub@gmail.com
[9]Family Dentist,West Riyadh Dental Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: aalfareh@moh.gov.sa
[10]Dental specialist,West Riyadh Dental Complex,Saudi Arabia, Email: Ranalotaibi@moh.gov.sa
[11]Dentist, Druma General Hospital (C3), Saudi Arabia.

Received: 15.08.2024 Revised: 08.09.2024 Accepted: 21.10.2024

ABSTRACT
The advent of zirconia implants has garnered significant interest in implant dentistry, particularly for patients with metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions to traditional titanium implants. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the clinical outcomes of zirconia implants and their potential application in patients with documented metal allergies. Drawing from a recent systematic review and meta-analysis, the paper discusses osseointegration, survival rates, marginal bone loss, and implant fracture rates associated with zirconia implants. The estimated 10-year cumulative survival rate was 95.1%, with marginal bone loss values comparable to titanium implants. However, limitations in available data, including short follow-up periods and confounding factors, are acknowledged.
The paper explores the potential advantages of zirconia implants, such as hypoallergenic properties, reduced risk of adverse reactions, and improved aesthetics. Conversely, limitations like limited long-term data, implant fractures, osseointegration concerns, cost and availability, and surgical and restorative considerations are discussed. Clinical recommendations emphasize comprehensive patient selection, allergy testing, case assessment, treatment planning, adherence to protocols, patient education, and long-term monitoring.
Furthermore, future directions and research needs are highlighted, including large-scale, long-term studies, implant design and surface modifications, investigations into bone-implant interface and aging effects, exploration of patient-specific factors and personalized approaches, comparative studies with titanium implants, and interdisciplinary collaboration. While promising, the use of zirconia implants in metal allergy patients requires a cautious, evidence-based approach considering patient-specific factors, clinician expertise, and evolving scientific knowledge.

Keywords: titanium, modifications, investigations, long-term

INTRODUCTION

Dental implants have revolutionized the field of restorative dentistry, providing a reliable and long-lasting solution for tooth replacement. Traditionally, titanium and its alloys have been the materials of choice for dental implant manufacturing due to their exceptional biocompatibility, mechanical properties, and well-documented clinical success rates (Steinemann, 1998; Chrcanovic et al., 2018; Wennerberg et al., 2018). However, despite their widespread use and proven track record, titanium implants are not without limitations. One of the primary concerns associated with titanium implants is the potential for adverse reactions, including allergic or hypersensitivity responses, in a subset of patients (Ioannidis et al., 2017; Thoma et al., 2016; Albrektsson et al., 2018).
The emergence of zirconia, a ceramic material, as an alternative to titanium for dental implants has garnered significant interest due to its potential advantages, particularly in terms of aesthetics and biocompatibility. Zirconia implants offer a tooth-colored appearance, making them an attractive option for patients seeking

optimal aesthetic outcomes, especially in cases where soft tissue recession or thin biotypes may compromise the natural appearance of traditional titanium implants (Heydecke et al., 1999; Kohal& Klaus, 2004). Furthermore, zirconia is generally considered a hypoallergenic material, potentially mitigating the risk of metal-related allergic reactions or hypersensitivity responses that can occur with titanium implants in susceptible individuals (Albrektsson et al., 2018).

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive review of the current literature on the clinical outcomes of zirconia implants, with a particular focus on their potential application in patients with documented metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions to titanium. It will discuss the osseointegration, survival rates, marginal bone loss, and implant fracture rates associated with zirconia implants, drawing upon the findings of a recent systematic review and meta-analysis by Mohseni et al. (2023). Additionally, the paper will explore the potential advantages and limitations of using zirconia implants in patients with metal allergies, considering the available evidence and relevant clinical considerations.

Metal Allergies and Dental Implants

Metal allergies, particularly to titanium, have been reported in the literature, although the precise prevalence and clinical significance remain subjects of ongoing debate (Gawkrodger, 2005; Hosoki et al., 2009; Lalor et al., 1991; Viraben et al., 1995). Titanium is generally regarded as a biocompatible material; however, some individuals may develop hypersensitivity reactions, manifesting as localized inflammation, rashes, or systemic symptoms (Albrektsson et al., 2018).

The impact of metal allergies on dental implant outcomes has been an area of interest and concern. While the majority of patients tolerate titanium implants well, there have been reports of implant failures potentially attributable to metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions (Sicilia et al., 2008; Syed et al., 2015; Viswapurohit et al., 2020). It is important to note, however, that the exact prevalence and clinical relevance of metal allergies in dental implant treatment are not well-established, and other factors, such as poor oral hygiene, smoking, or underlying medical conditions, may also contribute to implant failures (Chrcanovic et al., 2016; Chrcanovic et al., 2017a; Chrcanovic et al., 2017b; Mustapha et al., 2021).

Zirconia Implants: Clinical Outcomes and Considerations

Zirconia, a ceramic material composed of zirconium dioxide (ZrO_2), has garnered increasing attention as an alternative to titanium for dental implants. While initially introduced for their aesthetic benefits, zirconia implants have also been recognized for their potential to address metal allergies and hypersensitivity reactions (Cionca et al., 2017; Bosshardt et al., 2017).

In a recent systematic review and meta-analysis, Mohseni et al. (2023) evaluated the clinical outcomes of zirconia implants, including survival rates, marginal bone loss, and implant fractures. The authors included 25 studies, comprising 4,017 zirconia implants in 2,083 patients. The key findings from this review are summarized below:

1. Survival Rates

The estimated 10-year cumulative survival rate (CSR) of zirconia implants was 95.1%. This indicates relatively high survival rates; however, the authors cautioned that most studies had limited follow-up periods, and the long-term data should be interpreted with caution.

2. Marginal Bone Loss (MBL)

The mean MBL fluctuated between 0.632 mm and 2.060 mm over long observation periods (up to 132 months). The meta-regression analysis showed an estimated increase of 0.005 mm in MBL for every additional month of follow-up. These MBL values were comparable to those observed for titanium implants (Albrektsson et al., 2017).

3. Implant Fractures

A total of 26 implant fractures were reported among the 172 failed implants (15.1% of failures). Most fractures occurred in implants that have been discontinued from the market, suggesting potential issues with early generations of zirconia implants. Narrow-diameter implants ($\leq$3.25 mm) were more susceptible to fractures.

4. Implant Design and Surface Preparation

The study found that one-piece zirconia implants had higher survival rates compared to two-piece implants ($p = 0.017$). Additionally, implants with their coronal (abutment) part prepared by drilling showed lower survival rates and a higher risk of fracture compared to non-prepared implants ($p < 0.001$).

While these findings suggest promising clinical outcomes for zirconia implants, the authors acknowledged limitations in the available data, such as the retrospective nature of many studies, small cohort sizes, and short follow-up periods. Additionally, the impact of various confounding factors, such as smoking, bruxism, and periodontitis, on implant survival could not be adequately assessed due to a lack of information in the included studies.

Potential Advantages of Zirconia Implants for Patients with Metal Allergies

The use of zirconia implants may offer several potential advantages for patients with metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions to titanium:

1. Hypoallergenic Properties

Zirconia is a ceramic material that is generally considered hypoallergenic and biocompatible (Manicone et al., 2007). Unlike titanium, zirconia does not contain metal ions that can potentially trigger allergic or hypersensitivity reactions in susceptible individuals.

2. Reduced Risk of Adverse Reactions

By eliminating the potential for metal-related allergic reactions, zirconia implants may minimize the risk of localized inflammation, rashes, or systemic symptoms that have been reported in some patients with metal allergies who received titanium implants (Sicilia et al., 2008; Syed et al., 2015; Viswapurohit et al., 2020).

3. Improved Aesthetics

Zirconia implants have a tooth-colored appearance, which can provide better aesthetic outcomes, particularly in cases where the soft tissue is thin or has receded (Heydecke et al., 1999; Kohal& Klaus, 2004). This can be advantageous for patients with metal allergies who may be concerned about the potential for discoloration or graying of the peri-implant mucosa associated with titanium implants (Ioannidis et al., 2017; Thoma et al., 2016).

Potential Limitations and Considerations

While zirconia implants offer potential advantages for patients with metal allergies, there are also some limitations and considerations to be aware of:

1. Limited Long-term Data

As highlighted in the systematic review by Mohseni et al. (2023), most clinical studies on zirconia implants have relatively short follow-up periods, with only a few studies reporting outcomes beyond 5 years. Long-term data on the survival, marginal bone loss, and potential complications of zirconia implants are still limited.

2. Implant Fractures

Although the overall implant fracture rate was relatively low (0.65%), the systematic review reported a higher incidence of fractures in narrow-diameter zirconia implants (≤3.25 mm) and in implants that had their coronal portion prepared by drilling (Mohseni et al., 2023). This highlights the importance of careful case selection, implant design, and preparation techniques when using zirconia implants.

3. Osseointegration and Bone Response

While zirconia implants have been shown to osseointegrate and achieve bone-to-implant contact comparable to titanium implants in animal studies (Gahlert et al., 2010; Gahlert et al., 2012), some concerns have been raised regarding the long-term stability of the bone-implant interface and the potential for aging effects in the oral environment (Bosshardt et al., 2017; Cionca et al., 2017).

4. Cost and Availability

Zirconia implants may be more expensive than their titanium counterparts, and their availability may be limited in some regions or healthcare systems. Additionally, the range of implant designs and restorative options may be more restricted compared to titanium implants, which have been more extensively researched and developed.

5. Surgical and Restorative Considerations

Zirconia implants may require different surgical and restorative protocols compared to titanium implants. Clinicians may need to undergo specific training or familiarization with the handling, placement, and restoration of zirconia implants to ensure optimal outcomes.

Osseointegration and Bone Response to Zirconia Implants

The osseointegration and bone response to zirconia implants have been extensively studied, both in vitro and in vivo, to assess their biocompatibility and potential for successful integration into the host bone tissue.

In vitro studies have demonstrated that zirconia exhibits favorable biological properties, including low cytotoxicity, high biocompatibility, and the ability to promote osteoblast adhesion and proliferation (Depprich et al., 2008; Gahlert et al., 2010). These findings suggest that zirconia implants have the potential to support osseointegration and bone healing processes.

Animal studies have further corroborated these findings, providing valuable insights into the in vivo performance of zirconia implants. Gahlert et al. (2010) conducted a comparative study in the maxillae of pigs, evaluating the osseointegration of zirconia and titanium dental implants. Their findings revealed no significant differences in the biomechanical evaluation, suggesting that zirconia implants can achieve osseointegration comparable to titanium implants.

In a subsequent histomorphometric study, Gahlert et al. (2012) compared the in vivo performance of zirconia and titanium implants in mini pig maxillae. The results showed no significant differences in peri-implant bone density or bone-implant contact ratio between the two materials, further supporting the osseointegration potential of zirconia implants.

While these preclinical studies provide promising evidence, it is important to note that the direct extrapolation of animal study results to human clinical scenarios should be approached with caution. Factors such as the specific implant design, surface characteristics, and patient-related variables may influence the osseointegration and bone response in clinical settings.

Surgical and Restorative Considerations for Zirconia Implants

The successful implementation of zirconia implants in clinical practice requires careful consideration of surgical and restorative protocols, as well as potential differences compared to traditional titanium implant systems.

Surgical Considerations:

1. Implant Design and Placement: Zirconia implants are available in various designs, including one-piece and two-piece configurations. The selection of the appropriate implant design should be based on the specific clinical scenario, aesthetic requirements, and the clinician's experience and familiarity with the implant system.
2. Surgical Technique: Proper surgical techniques, including flap management, osteotomy preparation, and implant placement, are crucial for achieving optimal osseointegration and long-term stability. Clinicians may need to undergo specific training or familiarization with the handling and placement of zirconia implants to ensure successful outcomes.
3. Healing and Loading Protocols: The healing and loading protocols for zirconia implants may differ from those used for titanium implants. It is essential to follow the manufacturer's recommendations and evidence-based guidelines to ensure adequate osseointegration and minimize the risk of complications.

Restorative Considerations:

1. Abutment Selection and Preparation: One-piece zirconia implants often require the preparation of the coronal (abutment) portion to achieve the desired angulation and emergence profile for optimal prosthetic restoration. This preparation should be performed with caution, as excessive grinding or surface alteration may increase the risk of implant fractures (Mohseni et al., 2023).
2. Restorative Materials: The selection of restorative materials compatible with zirconia implants is crucial for long-term success. Clinicians should consider the potential for chipping or fracture of veneering ceramics and ensure proper occlusal adjustments to minimize excessive loading on the implant-restoration complex.
3. Maintenance and Follow-up: Regular professional maintenance and follow-up are essential for monitoring the long-term performance of zirconia implants, assessing marginal bone levels, and identifying any potential complications or complications early.

Collaboration between implant manufacturers, researchers, and clinicians is crucial to refine surgical and restorative protocols, as well as to develop evidence-based guidelines specific to zirconia implant systems.

Patient Selection and Treatment Planning

Careful patient selection and comprehensive treatment planning are critical when considering zirconia implants, particularly in patients with documented metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions to titanium.

Patient Selection:

1. Allergy Testing: Patients with suspected metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions should undergo appropriate allergy testing to confirm the diagnosis and identify the specific metals or substances causing the reaction. This information will help guide the selection of suitable implant materials.
2. Medical History and Risk Assessment: A thorough medical history evaluation and risk assessment should be performed to identify any potential contraindications or factors that may influence the success of zirconia implant treatment, such as systemic conditions, smoking habits, or medications that could affect bone healing or osseointegration.
3. Oral and Periodontal Evaluation: A comprehensive oral and periodontal examination is essential to assess the suitability of the proposed implant site(s), identify any existing pathologies or risk factors (e.g., periodontitis, poor oral hygiene), and develop appropriate preoperative and postoperative management strategies.

Treatment Planning:

1. Implant Selection and Positioning: The selection of the appropriate zirconia implant design, diameter, and length should be based on the patient's anatomical considerations, occlusal forces, and aesthetic requirements. Careful implant positioning and angulation planning are crucial to ensure optimal biomechanical load distribution and long-term stability.
2. Restorative Design: The restorative design should be carefully planned, considering the implant position, angulation, and potential need for abutment preparation or customization. The selection of restorative materials compatible with zirconia implants and the anticipated occlusal forces should also be considered.

3. Interdisciplinary Collaboration: In cases involving complex aesthetic or functional requirements, an interdisciplinary approach involving specialists in periodontics, prosthodontics, and potentially other disciplines (e.g., orthodontics, oral surgery) may be beneficial for comprehensive treatment planning and execution.
4. Patient Education and Informed Consent: Patients should be thoroughly educated about the potential advantages and limitations of zirconia implants, as well as the expected treatment outcomes, risks, and long-term maintenance requirements. Obtaining informed consent is essential to ensure that patients understand and accept the proposed treatment plan.

By adhering to a systematic approach to patient selection and treatment planning, clinicians can optimize the chances of successful outcomes and minimize potential complications when using zirconia implants in patients with metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions.

Clinical Recommendations and Future Directions

Based on the current evidence and considerations, the following recommendations can be made regarding the use of zirconia implants in patients with metal allergies:

1. Patient Selection and Allergy Testing:

Patients with documented metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions to titanium may be suitable candidates for zirconia implants. However, comprehensive medical and dental histories should be obtained, and appropriate allergy testing should be performed to confirm the diagnosis and identify the specific metals or substances causing the reaction.

2. Case Assessment and Treatment Planning:

A thorough evaluation of the patient's oral and systemic health, as well as site-specific anatomical and aesthetic considerations, should be performed. Careful implant selection, considering factors such as implant design, diameter, and surface characteristics, is crucial to minimize the risk of complications like implant fractures.

3. Surgical and Restorative Protocols:

Clinicians should follow evidence-based surgical and restorative protocols specific to zirconia implants. Adequate training and familiarity with the handling, placement, and restoration of zirconia implants are essential to ensure optimal outcomes.

4. Patient Education and Informed Consent:

Patients should be informed about the potential advantages and limitations of zirconia implants, as well as the available long-term data and potential risks, such as implant fractures. Informed consent should be obtained, and patients should be made aware of the need for regular follow-up and maintenance.

5. Long-term Follow-up and Monitoring:

Regular follow-up and monitoring of zirconia implants are crucial to assess their long-term performance, marginal bone levels, and potential complications. Clinicians should contribute to the growing body of evidence by reporting their clinical outcomes and experiences with zirconia implants.

6. Continued Research and Development:

Further research is needed to evaluate the long-term performance of zirconia implants, as well as to refine implant designs, surface characteristics, and surgical and restorative protocols. Collaboration between manufacturers, researchers, and clinicians is essential to advance the understanding and optimization of zirconia implants for various clinical scenarios, including patients with metal allergies.

Future Directions and Research Needs

While the current evidence suggests promising clinical outcomes for zirconia implants, particularly in patients with metal allergies, several areas require further investigation and research:

1. Long-term Clinical Studies:

Large-scale, long-term clinical studies with extended follow-up periods (beyond 5-10 years) are necessary to evaluate the true long-term performance and potential complications of zirconia implants. These studies should include diverse patient populations, varying implant designs, and different clinical scenarios to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

2. Implant Design and Surface Modifications:

Continued research and development efforts should focus on refining zirconia implant designs, surface characteristics, and manufacturing processes to improve osseointegration, mechanical properties, and overall clinical performance. Advancements in areas such as surface modifications, implant thread designs, and abutment connections could potentially enhance the long-term success rates and minimize complications like implant fractures.

3. Bone-Implant Interface and Aging Effects:

Further investigations into the long-term stability of the bone-implant interface and potential aging effects of zirconia implants in the oral environment are warranted. Understanding the mechanisms underlying any

potential changes in the material properties or biological responses over time could guide the development of strategies to mitigate these effects.

4. Patient-Specific Factors and Personalized Treatment Approaches:

Research is needed to explore the impact of patient-specific factors, such as systemic conditions, genetic predispositions, and oral microbiome profiles, on the clinical outcomes of zirconia implants. This could pave the way for personalized treatment approaches tailored to individual patient characteristics and risk factors.

5. Comparative Studies with Titanium Implants:

Rigorous comparative studies between zirconia and titanium implants in various clinical scenarios, including patients with metal allergies, are essential to establish the relative advantages and disadvantages of each material. These studies should consider not only clinical outcomes but also patient-reported outcomes, aesthetic results, and cost-effectiveness analyses.

6. Interdisciplinary Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing:

Fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and knowledge sharing among implant manufacturers, researchers, clinicians, and professional organizations is crucial for advancing the field of zirconia implant dentistry. This collaborative approach can accelerate the dissemination of best practices, promote standardization of protocols, and drive innovation in implant design and treatment modalities.

By addressing these future directions and research needs, the dental community can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the potential and limitations of zirconia implants, ultimately leading to improved patient outcomes and treatment experiences, particularly for those with metal allergies or hypersensitivity reactions.

CONCLUSION

The use of zirconia implants in patients with metal allergies or hypersensitivity to titanium presents a promising alternative to traditional titanium implants. Zirconia implants offer potential advantages in terms of biocompatibility, aesthetics, and reduced risk of adverse reactions in susceptible individuals.

The systematic review and meta-analysis by Mohseni et al. (2023) provided valuable insights into the clinical outcomes of zirconia implants, including high survival rates, comparable marginal bone loss to titanium implants, and a relatively low implant fracture rate. However, long-term data and evidence from large-scale clinical studies are still limited.

When considering zirconia implants for patients with metal allergies, a comprehensive evaluation, careful case selection, and adherence to evidence-based protocols are essential. Clinicians should be aware of the potential limitations, such as the risk of implant fractures, particularly in narrow-diameter implants or those with extensive coronal preparation.

Continued research, development, and collaboration between manufacturers, researchers, and clinicians are crucial to further refine and optimize the use of zirconia implants, particularly in specific patient populations like those with metal allergies. Regular long-term follow-up and monitoring of zirconia implant cases will contribute to the growing body of evidence and help refine clinical recommendations.

Overall, while promising, the use of zirconia implants in patients with metal allergies should be approached with caution and careful consideration of the available evidence, patient-specific factors, and the clinician's experience and expertise. As the field continues to evolve, zirconia implants may become an increasingly viable and valuable treatment option for patients with metal allergies, providing them with a safe, aesthetic, and biocompatible solution for tooth replacement.

REFERENCES

1. Albrektsson, T., Chrcanovic, B., Molne, J., & Wennerberg, A. (2018). Foreign body reactions, marginal bone loss and allergies in relation to titanium implants. European Journal of Oral Implantology, 11(Suppl 1), S37-S46.
2. Bosshardt, D. D., Chappuis, V., & Buser, D. (2017). Osseointegration of titanium, titanium alloy and zirconia dental implants: Current knowledge and open questions. Periodontology 2000, 73(1), 22-40. https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12179
3. Chrcanovic, B. R., Kisch, J., Albrektsson, T., & Wennerberg, A. (2016). Factors influencing early dental implant failures. Journal of Dental Research, 95(9), 995-1002. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034516646098
4. Chrcanovic, B. R., Kisch, J., Albrektsson, T., & Wennerberg, A. (2017a). Bruxism and dental implant treatment complications: A retrospective comparative study of 98 bruxer patients and a matched group. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 28(2), e1-e9. https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.12844
5. Chrcanovic, B. R., Kisch, J., Albrektsson, T., & Wennerberg, A. (2017b). Bruxism and dental implant failures: A multilevel mixed effects parametric survival analysis approach. Journal of Oral Rehabilitation, 44(11), 813-823. https://doi.org/10.1111/joor.12431
6. Chrcanovic, B. R., Kisch, J., Albrektsson, T., & Wennerberg, A. (2018). Factors influencing the fracture of dental implants. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 20(1), 58-67. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12572

7. Cionca, N., Hashim, D., &Mombelli, A. (2017). Zirconia dental implants: Where are we now, and where are we heading? Periodontology 2000, 73(1), 241-258. https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12180
8. Depprich, R., Zipprich, H., Ommerborn, M., Naujoks, C., Wiesmann, H. P., Kiattavorncharoen, S., Lauer, H. C., Meyer, U., Kübler, N. R., &Handschel, J. (2008). Osseointegration of zirconia implants compared with titanium: An in vivo study. Head & Face Medicine, 4, 30. https://doi.org/10.1186/1746-160X-4-30
9. Gahlert, M., Röhling, S., Wieland, M., Eichhorn, S., Küchenhoff, H., &Kniha, H. (2010). A comparison study of the osseointegration of zirconia and titanium dental implants. A biomechanical evaluation in the maxilla of pigs. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 12(4), 297-305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1708-8208.2009.00168.x
10. Gahlert, M., Roehling, S., Sprecher, C. M., Kniha, H., Milz, S., & Bormann, K. (2012). In vivo performance of zirconia and titanium implants: A histomorphometric study in mini pig maxillae. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 23(3), 281-286. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2011.02157.x
11. Gawkrodger, D. J. (2005). Investigation of reactions to dental materials. British Journal of Dermatology, 153(3), 479-485. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2133.2005.06821.x
12. Heydecke, G., Kohal, R., & Gläser, R. (1999). Optimal esthetics in single-tooth replacement with the Re-Implant system: A case report. International Journal of Prosthodontics, 12(2), 184-189.
13. Hosoki, M., Bando, E., Asaoka, K., Takeuchi, H., & Nishigawa, K. (2009). Assessment of allergic hypersensitivity to dental materials. Biomedical Materials and Engineering, 19(1), 53-61. https://doi.org/10.3233/BME-2009-0563
14. Ioannidis, A., Cathomen, E., Jung, R. E., Fehmer, V., Hüsler, J., &Thoma, D. S. (2017). Discoloration of the mucosa caused by different restorative materials - A spectrophotometric in vitro study. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 28(9), 1133-1138. https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.12928
15. Kohal, R. J., & Klaus, G. (2004). A zirconia implant-crown system: A case report. International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry, 24(2), 147-153.
16. Lalor, P. A., Revell, P. A., Gray, A. B., Wright, S., Railton, G. T., & Freeman, M. A. (1991). Sensitivity to titanium. A cause of implant failure? Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery British, 73(1), 25-28. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.73B1.1991768
17. Manicone, P. F., Rossi Iommetti, P., Raffaelli, L., Paolantonio, M., Rossi, G., Berardi, D., & Perfetti, G. (2007). Biological considerations on the use of zirconia for dental devices. International Journal of Immunopathology and Pharmacology, 20(1 Suppl 1), 9-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/039463200702001s03
18. Mohseni, P., Soufi, A., &Chrcanovic, B. R. (2023). Clinical outcomes of zirconia implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Oral Investigations, 28(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-023-05401-8
19. Mustapha, A. D., Salame, Z., &Chrcanovic, B. R. (2021). Smoking and dental implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicina (Kaunas), 58(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina58010039
20. Sicilia, A., Cuesta, S., Coma, G., Arregui, I., Guisasola, C., Ruiz, E., & Maestro, A. (2008). Titanium allergy in dental implant patients: A clinical study on 1500 consecutive patients. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 19(8), 823-835. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2008.01544.x
21. Steinemann, S. G. (1998). Titanium--the material of choice? Periodontology 2000, 17(1), 7-21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0757.1998.tb00119.x
22. Syed, M., Hosein, Y., & Ormiston, I. (2015). Hypersensitivity in patient's experiencing complications with a titanium implanted cardiac device. Arrhythmia & Electrophysiology Review, 4(2), 93-96. https://doi.org/10.15420/aer.2015.4.2.93
23. Thoma, D. S., Ioannidis, A., Cathomen, E., Hämmerle, C. H., Hüsler, J., & Jung, R. E. (2016). Discoloration of the peri-implant mucosa caused by zirconia and titanium implants. International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry, 36(1), 39-45. https://doi.org/10.11607/prd.2663
24. Viraben, R., Boulinguez, S., & Alba, C. (1995). Granulomatous dermatitis after implantation of a titanium-containing pacemaker. Contact Dermatitis, 33(6), 437. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0536.1995.tb02089.x
25. Viswapurohit, V., Shah, S. J., Golwala, E., Shah, R., &Thambiah, P. S. (2020). Metal hypersensitivity in total knee arthroplasty: Revisiting an underappreciated problem. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, 15(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13018-020-01710-4
26. Wennerberg, A., Albrektsson, T., &Chrcanovic, B. (2018). Long-term clinical outcome of implants with different surface modifications. European Journal of Oral Implantology, 11(Suppl 1), S123-S136.