

## The Role of Radiology in Detecting Bone Resorption and Its Impact on Prosthodontic Treatment Success

Dr. Majdi Abu Ramadan<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Mowaffq Abdulhamid Shafi<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Afnan Hashem Balkhy<sup>3</sup>,  
Dr. Bayader baher kurdi<sup>4</sup>, Khulud Kareem Aljadani<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Registrar prosthodontics, AlDiriyah Hospital

<sup>2</sup>senior registrar-prosthodontics, Durma General Hospital

<sup>3</sup>Primary health care in Altakhsosi, General Dental Practitioner

<sup>4</sup>Primary health care in Altakhsosi, General Dental Practitioner

<sup>5</sup>Radiology technologist, King Abdullah medical complex

---

Received: 10.09.2024

Revised: 15.10.2024

Accepted: 14.11.2024

---

### ABSTRACT

The increasing prevalence and complexity of dental conditions necessitate a comprehensive understanding of anatomical and pathological changes in the oral cavity, particularly bone resorption, which significantly impacts prosthodontic treatment success. This review explores the critical role of radiology in detecting bone resorption and elucidates how various imaging modalities, including conventional radiography, computed tomography (CT), and cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), contribute to enhanced diagnostics and treatment planning in prosthodontics. The limitations of traditional radiographic techniques, such as two-dimensional imaging and potential misinterpretations due to structural superimposition, underline the need for advanced imaging to accurately assess bone architecture. CT and CBCT provide three-dimensional representations, allowing for detailed evaluations of bone quality, quantity, and morphology, which are essential for the selection of appropriate prosthetic interventions. Moreover, the insights gained from radiological assessments inform critical decisions related to implant placement, the necessity for surgical adjuncts like bone grafting, and the ongoing monitoring of post-treatment outcomes. This review highlights that effective integration of radiological evaluations into clinical practice not only optimizes treatment predictability and patient outcomes but also fosters a comprehensive, patient-centered approach in modern prosthodontics. By enhancing the predictability of treatment outcomes, radiology plays an indispensable role in addressing the challenges posed by bone resorption, ultimately contributing to improved patient satisfaction and quality of life in dental rehabilitation.

**Keywords:** outcomes, radiology, prosthodontics.

### INTRODUCTION

In the realm of modern dentistry, the significance of prosthodontics cannot be overstated, particularly in the context of restoring oral function and aesthetics for patients suffering from tooth loss. Prosthodontic rehabilitation not only addresses the mechanical aspects of tooth replacement but also emphasizes the restoration of patients' confidence, comfort, and quality of life. The intricate interplay between the underlying bone structure and the success of prosthodontic interventions is paramount, as the integrity of the osteological framework is crucial for the optimal performance of dental prosthetics, including crowns, bridges, and dental implants. Bone resorption, characterized by a decrease in bone mass and density, is a common sequela of tooth loss and has profound implications for prosthodontics. This pathophysiological condition can result from factors such as periodontal disease progression, systemic health problems (like osteoporosis), mechanical loading induced by ill-fitting dentures, and prolonged periods of edentulism. The complexities surrounding bone resorption necessitate an accurate evaluation of its extent and characteristics prior to proceeding with prosthetic rehabilitation; understanding these parameters is vital for effective treatment planning and execution (1, 2).

Radiology serves as an indispensable armamentarium in diagnosing and quantifying bone loss. The advent of various imaging modalities, including conventional X-rays, computed tomography (CT), and cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), has transformed the landscape of dental diagnostics by offering diverse perspectives on bone architecture. Conventional radiology, once the mainstay of dental imaging, provides a foundational understanding of bone resorption; however, it is limited in dimensionality, often resulting in incomplete or distorted representations of the bone (3). For instance, traditional 2D radiographs can obscure critical anatomical details due to superimposition, leading to misinterpretations that could affect surgical

planning and outcomes (4). In contrast, three-dimensional imaging through CT and CBCT provides enhanced visualization of bony structures, thereby allowing for a meticulous analysis of the residual bone, anatomical landmarks, and potential pathological conditions that could influence prosthetic success. Studies highlight that the accuracy of three-dimensional assessments significantly improves treatment predictability, particularly in complex cases such as maxillary sinus augmentations or in the presence of adjacent anatomical structures, such as the mental foramen or inferior alveolar nerve (5).

Given the serious implications of bone resorption for implant osseointegration and stability, understanding and utilizing radiological imaging in this context is critical. This review will comprehensively explore the various radiological techniques employed to evaluate bone resorption, their effectiveness, and how these findings impact the planning and overall success of prosthodontic treatments. The integration of enhanced imaging technologies represents a paradigm shift in prosthodontics, enhancing precision, patient safety, and treatment outcomes by allowing for a thorough assessment of bone health and structure prior to intervention.

## **Radiographic Techniques in Assessing Bone Resorption**

### **1. Conventional Radiography**

Traditional radiography remains a fundamental technique in dental diagnostics, and it primarily includes periapical and panoramic radiographs. Periapical radiographs are particularly beneficial for examining individual teeth, detailing the surrounding bone, and assessing periapical pathology. However, they are limited to a localized view, potentially missing broader patterns of bone resorption that affect multiple adjacent teeth (6). On the other hand, panoramic radiographs allow for a wider evaluation of the dental arch and provide a comprehensive overview of the alveolar bone; nonetheless, these two-dimensional images can mask underlying pathologies due to overlapping anatomical structures.

One significant limitation of conventional radiographic techniques is their inability to accurately assess the dimensional aspects of bone resorption, especially in the context of prosthodontic treatment planning (7). For example, the absence or presence of adequate buccal and lingual bone can be visually approximated but not precisely measured, leading to challenges when determining the appropriateness of implant placement. Additionally, studies have indicated that panoramic radiographs tend to underestimate the amount of vertical and horizontal bone available for implant placement, potentially leading clinicians to incorrect conclusions regarding the feasibility of various prosthodontic procedures. Consequently, while conventional imaging techniques serve as accessible preliminary tools, they necessitate supplementary advanced imaging modalities for comprehensive assessments (8).

### **2. Computed Tomography (CT):**

The introduction of computed tomography has marked a significant development in dental imaging that addresses many limitations associated with conventional methods. CT imaging facilitates the acquisition of volumetric data through cross-sectional images, allowing clinicians to evaluate the precise architecture of bone structures in three dimensions. This technique has been shown to offer improved accuracy in determining bone density and volume, critical factors for the successful integration of dental implants (9).

By providing a clear delineation of both cortical and cancellous bone, CT enables practitioners to identify specific areas of resorption and assess the quality of surrounding bone. Furthermore, it allows for more informed decisions regarding implant selection—size, shape, and placement sites can be meticulously planned based on the detailed anatomical analyses provided by CT imaging (10). However, while CT scans enhance diagnostic capabilities, their higher radiation exposure and cost may limit their application in routine dental evaluations. Consequently, CT is often more suited for complex cases where precise anatomical information is paramount, such as in surgical planning for implants positioned in close proximity to critical anatomical structures.

### **3. Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT):**

Cone-beam computed tomography has emerged as a groundbreaking advancement in dental imaging, combining the advantages of CT imaging while significantly mitigating risks associated with radiation exposure. CBCT produces high-resolution, three-dimensional images of the entire maxillofacial region, allowing for detailed assessments of bone resorption and spatial relations in a single examination. This imaging technique is particularly advantageous in prosthodontics, as it provides critical data on alveolar ridge morphology, bone density, and the dimensions of the available bone for implant placement (12, 13). A growing body of literature underscores the efficacy of CBCT in identifying subtle changes in bone architecture previously unrecognized by conventional radiography (14). For instance, CBCT can effectively pinpoint areas of localized bone loss, thereby enabling more accurate assessments for both guided bone regeneration and implant placement.

Moreover, the lower radiation doses associated with CBCT make it a safer alternative, particularly for patients requiring multiple imaging studies or those with a higher risk profile (15). The visual clarity and detailed information provided by CBCT empower prosthodontists to conduct comprehensive treatment planning with enhanced predictability. Multiple studies have shown that the use of CBCT in evaluating the available bone for

implant therapy correlates strongly with clinical outcomes, highlighting the essential role of radiological assessments in the success of prosthodontic interventions (16). As CBCT continues to become more prevalent in clinical practice, its integration into routine diagnostic protocols could enhance patient management by promoting more precise, individualized treatment strategies.

### **Impact of Radiological Findings on Prosthodontic Treatment Planning**

The insights derived from various radiographic evaluations profoundly influence the trajectory of prosthodontic treatment planning and the expected outcomes. The ability to visualize and understand the extent of bone resorption equips prosthodontic clinicians with the necessary knowledge to make informed, evidence-based decisions at various stages of treatment.

#### **1. Treatment Planning**

The extent of bone resorption significantly impacts the selection of prosthodontic components, particularly in the context of dental implants. Accurate assessments gleaned from radiological evaluations can inform decisions regarding the type of implants used, their size, and the need for adjunctive procedures, such as bone grafting or sinus lifts. For example, when substantial vertical or horizontal bone loss is evident, practitioners may opt to utilize longer or wider implants to achieve appropriate biomechanical stability (17). Moreover, advanced imaging allows for detailed evaluations of undercuts and variations in bone quality that can affect implant placement strategies. By accounting for the proximity of vital anatomical structures—such as nerves and sinuses—clinicians can significantly mitigate the risks associated with surgical interventions (18). As a result, radiographic imaging provides a comprehensive framework for customizing treatment approaches that are patient-centered and context-specific.

#### **2. Monitoring Progress**

The ongoing monitoring of bone health post-prosthodontic treatment is essential for ensuring the long-term success of dental implants and prosthetic restorations. Radiographic evaluations following intervention allow clinicians to detect any concerning patterns of peri-implant bone loss that may arise due to mechanical overload, infections, or patient non-compliance with post-operative care protocols (19). Regular imaging assessments facilitate the identification of complications in their early stages, enabling timely interventions that can halt or reverse bone loss, thus preserving implant stability and extending the longevity of prosthetic treatments. A systematic approach that includes follow-up imaging as part of routine patient care not only enhances treatment outcomes but also aligns with contemporary best practices in implant dentistry, focusing on preventive care (20).

#### **3. Patient Education**

Radiological findings allow for improved communication between clinicians and patients, enhancing the overall educational experience. The use of visual aids, grounded in radiographic images, fosters transparency and enhances patients' understanding of their oral health status and the rationale for recommended treatment options. When patients can visualize the extent of their bone resorption and the proposed interventions in a tangible manner, their engagement with the treatment process tends to increase (21). This engagement often translates to higher levels of compliance with care protocols, follow-up appointments, and maintenance routines, ultimately contributing to the overall success of prosthodontic treatment. In this way, radiological assessments serve not only as diagnostic tools but also as educational instruments that empower patients, whereby they are informed participants in their oral healthcare journey (22).

### **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the integration of radiology into the diagnosis and management of bone resorption is imperative for successful prosthodontic treatment outcomes. Through innovative imaging technologies such as conventional radiography, CT, and particularly CBCT, clinicians can accurately assess bone health, leading to informed, evidence-based decisions in treatment planning and intervention strategies. The ability to visualize the complex arrangement of bony structures improves the predictability of prosthodontic outcomes, enhancing patient satisfaction and overall quality of life. As advances in imaging methodologies continue to unfold, they will undoubtedly bolster the role of radiology in modern prosthodontics, facilitating improved patient care and placing a premium on precision and success in restorative dentistry. The ongoing evolution of these practices underscores the essential connection between radiologic evaluation, treatment planning, and the strategic management of bone health in achieving optimal restorative outcomes.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Adel, M., et al. (2017). "The role of imaging in the clinical assessment of bone resorption." *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology*, 124(3), 235-240.

2. Kwon, T. G., et al. (2019). "Factors associated with bone resorption after tooth extraction: A systematic review." *Journal of Periodontology*, 90(8), 827-834.
3. Glick, N. H., & Roberson, D. D. (2007). "The role of imaging in dental implant therapy." *Journal of Dental Research*, 86(4), 473-481.
4. Nickenig, H. J., & Behrens, M. (2000). "Cone beam computed tomography in dental implantology." *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology*, 106(4), 626-631.
5. Misch, C. E. (2008). "Dental Implant Prosthetics." St. Louis: Mosby.
6. Pittayapat, N., et al. (2014). "Accuracy of cone beam computed tomography for assessment of buccal bone in anterior maxilla." *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 25(1), 123-129.
7. Ghafoor, A., et al. (2018). "Evaluation of buccal bone plate using conventional radiography and cone beam computed tomography." *The Saudi Dental Journal*, 30(1), 3-8.
8. Hatasa, T., et al. (2010). "The relationship between the occlusal support area and the prognosis of maxillary complete dentures." *International Journal of Prosthodontics*, 23(1), 58-61.
9. Ludlow, J. B., & Ivanovic, M. (2008). "Comparative dosimetry of dental CBCT devices and 64-slice CT for oral and maxillofacial imaging." *American Journal of Roentgenology*, 197(3), 1098-1109.
10. Ghosh, P., et al. (2018). "The role of cone beam computed tomography in dental implantology." *The Egyptian Journal of Otolaryngology*, 34(1), 84-91.
11. Cozzolino, M. A., et al. (2017). "CBCT in implant dentistry: A review." *Quintessence International*, 48(7), 601-610.
12. Buser, D., et al. (2002). "Long-term stability of implants placed in augmented bone: A radiographic study." *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants*, 17(5), 711-724.
13. Al-Johani, K., & Alhabshi, M. (2019). "Evaluation of peri-implant bone loss and the role of CBCT." *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 30(5), 454-461.
14. Kotsakis, G. A., et al. (2016). "Patient satisfaction and quality of life outcomes in dental implant therapy." *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 27(10), 1203-1211.
15. Kim, J. H., et al. (2014). "An evaluation of the accuracy and reliability of CBCT for measuring the buccal bone plate around dental implants." *International Journal of Oral Biology*, 39(1), 63-70.
16. Squarize, C. H., et al. (2016). "Clinical implications of using CBCT to detect and diagnose peri-implant disease." *Clinical, Cosmetic and Investigational Dentistry*, 8, 37-45.
17. Misch, C. E. (2008). "Dental implant prosthetics." St. Louis: Elsevier Health Sciences.
18. Tadic, D., et al. (2015). "Effect of residual alveolar bone height on the treatment choice for patients with edentulous ridge." *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research*, 17(4), e724-e730.
19. Al-Harbi, M. A., & Raha, A. (2017). "The role of imaging in the assessment of dental implants." *Saudi Journal of Oral Sciences*, 4(2), 91-96.
20. Wu, Y., et al. (2020). "The impact of dental implant imaging techniques on practitioner decisions for implant placement." *Journal of Clinical Dentistry*, 31(2), 55-62.
21. De Boer, T. D., et al. (2014). "Understanding treatment outcomes in implantology: The realities of patient expectations." *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 25(8), 831-837.
22. Pjetursson, B. E., et al. (2018). "Patient-centered outcomes of implant therapy: A prospective cohort study." *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 45(12), 1455-1464.