Infectious risks for oral implants: a review of the literature
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Abstract: The use of oral implants in the rehabilitation of partially and fully edentulous patients is widely accepted even though failures do occur. The chance for implants to integrate can for example be jeopardised by the intra-oral presence of bacteria and concomitant inflammatory reactions. The longevity of osseointegrated implants can be compromised by occlusal overload and/or plaque-induced peri-implantitis, depending on the implant geometry and surface characteristics. Animal studies, cross-sectional and longitudinal observations in man, as well as association studies indicate that peri-implantitis is characterised by a microbiota comparable to that of periodontitis (high proportion of anaerobic Gram-negative rods, motile organisms and spirochetes), but this does not necessarily prove a causal relationship. However, in order to prevent such a bacterial shift, the following measures can be considered: periodontal health in the remaining dentition (to prevent bacterial translocation), the avoidance of deepened peri-implant pockets, and the use of a relatively smooth abutment and implant surface. Finally, periodontitis enhancing factors such as smoking and poor oral hygiene also increase the risk for peri-implantitis. Whether the susceptibility for periodontitis is related to that for peri-implantitis may vary according to the implant type and especially its surface topography.

The high clinical success rate of some implant designs in (partially) edentulous patients, as demonstrated in well-designed long-term prospective studies, has led to the widespread acceptance and use of oral implants (for review see van Steenberghe et al. 1999). Besides a number of patient-related factors such as smoking [Bain & Moy 1993], bone quality [Jaffin & Berman 1991; Hutton et al. 1995], systemic diseases or chemotherapy, surgical trauma or bacterial contamination during implant surgery are factors associated with early failures [impaired healing, i.e. during the healing phase and thus before loading]. Overload [defined as a situation in which the functional load applied to the implants exceeds the capacity of the bone-implant interface to withstand it] is another important cause of early implant failure, once the prosthesis is installed. Factors associated with late failures of implants are less well understood and seem to be related to both the peri-implant environment and host parameters. Lesions similar to those associated with teeth, such as peri-implantitis, gingival hyperplasia, fistulae and bone loss, are related to microbial plaque accumulation. The pres-
The present review will focus on peri-implantitis and the microbial factors associated with its prevalence.

Epidemiological studies from the late eighties indicated that there was no universal susceptibility to periodontitis. Only 5 to 20% of the population suffers from severe forms of periodontitis [Hugoson & Jordan 1982; Brown & Löe 1993]. Late implant failures also cluster in a small subset of individuals [Tonetti 1998; Esposito et al. 1998]. Weyant & Burt (1993) examined the survival rate of oral implants in a group of 598 consecutive patients from the U.S. Veterans Administration registry. Over a period of 5.5 years, a total of 81 implants out of 2098 were removed in 45 out of 598 subjects. The probability for the removal of a second implant increased by 30% in patients who had already lost one implant.

Impaired healing/early implant infection

An early implant failure or impaired healing corresponds to the inability to establish osseointegration. The latter is defined as a “direct structural and functional connection between ordered living bone and the surface of a load-carrying implant” (Brånemark 1985). Although an early failure can be caused by different factors [e.g. traumatic surgery, overheating during drilling, etc.], this paper will only deal with the role of bacteria. An early failure should however not be confused with peri-implantitis [see later], a term referred to as an “inflammatory process affecting the tissues around an osseointegrated implant in function, resulting in loss of supporting bone” (Albrektsson & Isidor 1994).

Per-operative contamination

Possible sources of direct bacterial contamination during surgery [infection of the implant or the bony socket] are: the surgical instruments, the gloves, the air in the operating room, the air expired by the patient, the saliva in the oral cavity and the peri-oral skin. Such infections can result in an abscess around an implant [Fig. 1], eventually accompanied by a fistula [Piattelli et al. 1995]. The radiographic image after this type of infection, characterised by a “peri-apical” radiolucency around implants, should not be confused with scars resulting from drilling too apically or from heat-induced aseptic bone necrosis [Piattelli et al. 1998].

To prevent contamination from the oral cavity, several ideas have been proposed [Brånemark et al. 1985; Asmall 1986; Albrektsson et al. 1986; Babbush 1986; Haanaes 1990]. The reduction of the salivary flow by atropine, the supine position of the patient, and the protection of the surgical plane by the orally pediculated flap can avoid contamination of the wound, at least in the anterior part of the oral cavity and only if two distinct surgical aspirations are used [one for the wound and one for the oral cavity]. Furthermore, the salivary microbial load can be reduced by 95% via a preoperative rinse with chlorhexidine [Altonen et al. 1976; Veksler et al. 1991]. Disinfection of the peri-oral skin with a chlorhexidine-alcohol solution can only partially reduce the microbial load on this surface [van Steenberghe et al. 1997]. To deal with the skin and mucosae of the nares, a perforated cap should be installed over the patient’s nose (van Steenberghe et al. 1997).
Steenberghe et al. 1997]. When all the above-mentioned precautions are taken, the administration of prophylactic antibiotics prior to implant placement [Dent et al. 1997] is no longer necessary. This is proven by our own observation that the incidence of non-integrating implants (circa 2%) or local infections did not increase when the routine administration of antibiotics was replaced by an occasional prescription (e.g. when wound contamination with saliva occurred because of uncontrolled jaw movements or coughing).

In a prospective multi-centre study on the use of osseointegrated oral implants in partially edentulous patients, the few early failures concentrated in subjects with high plaque and gingivitis indices. It was hypothesised that either peri-operative contamination and/or airborne infections interfered with the osseointegration process, or that the concomitant gingivitis was responsible [van Steenberghe et al. 1990]. Some people still believe that infection control during periodontal surgery is impossible, since performed in a contaminated area. This indicates confusion between contamination by eventually pathogenic commensals, and foreign [e.g. from other parts of the body] or exogenous bacteria. Therefore, even proctologic and gynaecological interventions do involve strict sterility measures.

**Infected recipient site**

Infections/inflammatory processes within the jawbone in the immediate vicinity of an integrating implant, such as peri-apical lesions [Sussman & Moss 1993] around neighbouring teeth, cysts and/or root remnants, or foreign bodies [e.g. endodontic material], can interfere with osseointegration. Shaffer and co-workers (1998) published a series of cases where the installation of an implant close to a tooth with endodontic pathosis (persisting or treated) resulted in a dramatic extension of that peri-apical lesion (Fig. 1) and a subsequent failure of the implant. Whether the direct extension of bacterial endotoxins, the inflammatory cells, or the bacteria themselves are responsible for the contamination of the implant remains unknown. A thorough examination of the radiographs prior to implant insertion together with the evaluation of the vitality of neighbouring teeth is recommended. One should especially realise that radiographic findings do not always reflect the actual size of an inflammatory process [a peri-apical abscess, granuloma or cyst]. Indeed, mechanically induced medullary defects in cadaver mandibles, for example, cannot be evidenced on traditional radiographs unless the defects reach the cortical bone [Bender & Seltzer 1961; Schwartz & Foster 1971; Regan & Mitchell 1962; Wengraf 1964; Merritt et al. 1984; Van der Stelt 1985]. In a recent report, Farman and co-workers (1998) compared the accuracy of a panel of endodontists and oral diagnosticians in the estimation of the size of peri-apical radiolucencies on analogue or digital images (the latter with and without enhancement). Although better estimations were obtained with the digital/enhanced images, the underestimations still ranged from 0.5 to 2 mm (mesio-distal measurement) and from 2.5 to 4 mm (superior-inferior measurements). Finally, radiographic evaluation of peri-apical lesions is also jeopardised by the large variations in diagnostic abilities among observers [Goldman et al. 1974; Brynolf 1971]. Peri-apical lesions are even missed on tomograms [Haring & Lind 1996].

**Early infections**

Signs of infections [swelling, fistulae and pain] during the healing period of a still submerged 2-stage implant can also be confined to the soft tissues. The most frequently reported causes are a residual suture, a poorly seated cover screw, or trauma from an inadequately relieved denture, a protruding implant or trauma by antagonistic teeth [Wortington et al. 1987; Lekholm et al. 1985; Esposito et al. 1999].

**Peri-implantitis**

The causal relationship between bacterial plaque accumulation and gingivitis or periodontitis is well established [Löe et al. 1965; Slots 1977; Listgarten & Helldén 1978; Slots et al. 1978]. Certain bacteria have been isolated in significantly larger quantities from diseased periodontal sites than from healthy sites [Loesche & Syed 1978], and have been called periodontopathic [Slots & Rams 1991; Socransky & Haffajee 1992; Wolff et al. 1994].

**Animal studies on peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis**

The tissue response to microbial build-up around teeth and oral implants has been investigated in several animal experiments [for review see: Schou et al. 1992; Mombell & Lang 1998; Berglundh 1999].

**Gingivitis versus peri-implant mucositis**

Several papers [Berglundh et al. 1992; Leonhardt et al. 1992; Ericsson et al. 1992; Abramsson et al. 1998a] compared, after a period of undisturbed plaque formation, the microbiological and histological changes of the gingiva around both teeth and implants within the same animal. During plaque formation the microbial composition shifted around both abutment types towards a higher proportion of periodontopathogens, including motile organisms and spirochetes. Biopsies also indicated a similar inflammatory infiltrate around teeth and abutments [size, location, composition] [Berglundh et al. 1992; Leonhardt et al. 1992]. If the period of undisturbed plaque formation was extended to 3 months, the infiltrated connective tissue in the peri-implant mucosa had a similar composition as around the teeth, but it extended further apically [Ericsson et al. 1992]. Abramsson and co-workers (1998a) even prolonged the plaque accumulation period to 5 months and reported similar soft tissue inflammatory reactions around 3 examined implant systems [Astra Tech, Bränemark system and ITI]. None of the above-mentioned studies resulted in peri-implantitis. Pontoriero and co-workers (1994) even repeated the classical experimental gingivitis model [3 weeks of undisturbed plaque formation, Löe et al. 1965] in humans [20 partially edentulous patients rehabilitated by means of implants]. During the 3-week period that the subjects refrained from oral hygiene, the degree of gingivitis increased com-
### Table 1. Microbiota around successful and failing implants: Considered are: dark field microscopy data (proportions), the number of colony forming units (CFU; anaerobic and aerobic growth conditions and their ratio), the proportion of Gram-negative anaerobic rods, and culture data (detection frequency or proportion) and sorted by intra- or inter-patient comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Imp status</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sgn</th>
<th>PPd</th>
<th>CFU 10^6 or % Specific bacteria: % flora/freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli et al. 1987</td>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>hc</td>
<td>f. intra</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>p, r, s, r</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoforado et al. 1990</td>
<td>Brånemark</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>f. intra</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli &amp; Lang 1992</td>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>hc</td>
<td>f./p. intra</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>c, r, p</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augthun &amp; Conrads 1997</td>
<td>IMZ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>/ Fi</td>
<td>r, s</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>2002/1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonhardt et al. 1999</td>
<td>Brånemark</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>p. inter</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker et al. 1990</td>
<td>Brånemark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>f. intra</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg et al. 1991</td>
<td>Brånemark</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>f. intra</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** S = soft tissue sample, Microbial analyses: = culture, = DNA, = tissue sample, M/TP implant radiolucent, S-= suppression, I-= implant loss before implantation, H-= implant loss after implantation.

### Discussion

Periodontitis versus peri-implantitis

Another series of animal studies compared the clinical, histological and microbiological changes around teeth with those around implants, after enhanced plaque accumulation caused by means of subgingival ligatures (Hickey et al. 1991; Lindhe et al. 1992; Leonhardt et al. 1992; Schou et al. 1993, 1996; Lang et al. 1993, Akagawa et al. 1993, Ericsson et al. 1995; Tillmanns et al. 1997, 1998; Hanisch et al. 1997, Eke et al. 1998). The placement of these ligatures nearly always resulted in a dramatic marginal bone destruction around both teeth and implants. The respective connective tissue lesions around ligated implants extended directly into the bone, whereas around teeth intact periodontal fibres usually separated both lesion and bone. These soft and hard tissue changes (clinically characterised by increased probing depth and severe loss of "attachment") were associated with significant shifts in the composition of the subgingival flora including:

- increase in the total viable counts (in comparison to health, for gingivitis around implants and teeth \( \times 8 \) and \( \times 30 \) respectively, for peri-implantitis \( \times 60 \) and periodontitis \( \times 100 \)),
- increase in the proportion/detection frequency of *Porphyromonas gingivalis*, *Prevotella intermedia*, *Fusobacterium nucleatum* species [from below 1% to \( >100 \)% respectively], the data on *Actinobacillus actinomycetemcomitans* are contradictory,
- decrease in the proportion of *Streptococcus* (from 40% and 60% to 0.2% and 0.5% around implants and teeth respectively),
- decrease in the proportion of all cocci and dramatic increase in the proportion of motile organisms and spirochetes,
- increase in the proportion of Gram-negative anaerobic rods.

Between teeth and implants, however, significant differences in microbiology...
could never be detected for any of the above-mentioned conditions.

Experimental marginal tissue breakdown around implants, induced by subgingival ligature placement, seems to have microbial similarities with periodontitis. This can suggest that peri-implantitis is induced and promoted by the same mechanisms as in periodontitis. It is however also possible that the deepened pockets, easily created with ligatures around implants, have favoured this microbial shift. The lack of cementum with inserting collagen fibres around implants (where they run parallel to the titanium surface, for review see Berglundh 1999), could indeed enable a more rapid down-growth of plaque and epithelium than around teeth. Moreover, the firm contact between ligatures and tissues (especially around implants) could also have induced a foreign body reaction (a non-specific inflammatory response), which is somewhat different from chronic adult periodontitis. Indeed, Rovin and co-workers (1999) reported that around implants, have favoured this microbial shift. The lack of cementum with inserting collagen fibres around implants (where they run parallel to the titanium surface, for review see Berglundh 1999), could indeed enable a more rapid down-growth of plaque and epithelium than around teeth. Moreover, the firm contact between ligatures and tissues (especially around implants) could also have induced a foreign body reaction (a non-specific inflammatory response), which is somewhat different from chronic adult periodontitis. Indeed, Rovin and co-workers (1966) reported that periodontal breakdown in rats after ligature insertion even around teeth was partially due to the local irritation by the ligature. The latter rather mimics the acute foreign body reaction in patients after subgingival penetration of, for example, a toothpick splinter. Under these conditions also, teeth showed an extreme inflammatory process accompanied by rapid bone loss. The misleading role of ligatures is also underlined by a study of Klinge (1991), in which the installation of the ligatures was, in contrast to the above-mentioned studies, not forceful. The corresponding bone loss around Brånemark implants with ligatures in this study remained around 1 mm versus 3 mm for ligated teeth. The latter may explain the apparent discrepancy between animal studies and clinical observations. The hypothesis of a foreign body reaction is also supported by the observations of Warrer and co-workers (1995), who reported a pronounced crestal bone loss when ligatures were placed around implants without surrounding gingiva (a condition in which the resistance to an apical migration of the ligature is very low so that the chance for a foreign body reaction increases). Moreover, the similarity in subgingival load around ligated teeth and implants, while the amount of bone loss around the implants is much higher, indicates that other factors are responsible for peri-implantitis. In nearly all animal studies, implants with ligatures showed, both clinically as well as histologically, more bone loss than implants with massive plaque accumulation but without ligatures (Schou et al. 1993; Warrer et al. 1995). Finally, one should realise that upon removal of the ligatures from the deep pockets, a distinct healing process occurs although the pathogenic species remain. This healing is characterised by a separation of the inflammatory cell infiltrate in the peri-implant mucosa from the alveolar bone by a dense, about 1 mm wide, connective tissue capsule (Marinello et al. 1995). Thus only the removal of the ligature [like after removal of a foreign body] converts the active destructive lesion in a resting non-aggressive lesion.

Clinical data

Subgingival flora around failing implants

Table 1 summarises the most significant microbiological data on failing implants. A distinction was made between early failures (implant loss within first 6 months of function, probably representing already initially non-integrated implants) and initially well-integrated implants demonstrating progressive marginal bone loss. These data should be compared to data from successful implants in both partially and fully edentulous subjects (Tables 2, 3 and 4). Healthy peri-implant pockets are colonised by high proportions of coccoid cells, a low ratio anaerobic/aerobic species, a low number of Gram-anaerobic species, and low detection frequencies for periodontopathogens (Adell et al. 1986; Lekholm et al. 1986a; Bower et al. 1989; Ong et al. 1992; George et al. 1994, see also Tables 2, 3 and 4). Mombelli and co-workers (1987) evaluated fully edentulous patients with overdentures on 2 or 4 hollow cylinder titanium implants with a plasma-sprayed surface (ITI). They compared 5 subjects with only successful implants [pockets ≤5 mm and no marginal bone loss] with 7 subjects with both successful and failing implants [probing depth ≥6 mm, radiographically detectable bone loss, suppuration]. Failing implants harboured a higher proportion of anaerobic species (6/1 ratio anaerobic/aerobic), of motile organisms [8%] and spirochetes [11.5%] and of P. intermedia and Fusobacterium species. Leonhardt and co-workers (1999) examined the microbiota around successful and failing (defined as ongoing bone loss beyond the 3rd thread) Brånemark system implants [inter-subject comparison], in both fully and partial edentulous patients. Failing implants harboured more frequently A. actinomyctecemcomitans, P. gingivalis and P. intermedia, especially in partially edentulous patients. Similar findings were reported by Augstun & Conrads (1997) for failing IMZ implants [cyindrical, plasma-sprayed titanium] with, however, a high detection frequency for A. actinomyctecemcomitans [16/18], by Sbordone and co-workers (1995) and Listgarten & Lai (1999) for different implant types and by Sanz and co-workers (1990) for sapphire implants.

The peri-implantitis data published by Rosenberg and co-workers (1991) or Becker and co-workers (1990) should be interpreted with some caution since most failures, including mobility assessment as a criterion (Table 1), occurred before or shortly after insertion of the final prosthesis and could represent cases of undiagnosed non-integration. Rosenberg and co-workers (1991) claim distinct differences between bacterial profiles of infected and overloaded implants. The latter were characterised by the absence of motile rods, spirochetes and classical periodontopathogens and a predominance of Gram-positive organisms similar to what is observed in periodontal health. This claim means that dark field microscopy could be a helpful tool for the differentiation between peri-implantitis and overload as the cause of implant loss. Other papers also support these observations (Quirynen & Listgarten 1990).

In a longitudinal study, a single implant with clinical signs of peri-implantitis could be followed over time (Mombelli et al. 1988). In comparison to the successful implants, the failing implant [pocket of 6 mm and pus formation] harboured shortly after installation 2 logs more anaerobic CFU (colony forming unit) species, fusiforms (>10%), motile rods (>9%), an initial increase in Actinomyces odontolyticus followed by
an increase in Fusobacterium counts and spirochetes [from the moment of pus formation].

Implants with peri-implantitis thus reveal a complex microbiota encompassing conventional periodontal pathogens. They confirm the bacterial shifts detected in animal studies after the induction of experimental peri-implantitis. Species such as A. actinomyctetemcomitans, Peptostreptococcus micros, Campylobacter rectus, Fusobacterium and Capnocytophaga are often isolated from failing sites, but can also be detected around healthy peri-implant sites (see later, Table 2). These bacteria are commonly associated with progressive periodontitis and possess virulence factors, which could be pertinent to peri-implantitis [Slots & Genco 1984]. Other species such as Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Enterobacteriaceae species, Candida

albicans or staphylococci are also frequently detected around implants [Alcoforado et al. 1990]. These organisms are uncommon in the subgingival area, but have been associated with refractory periodontitis [Slots & Rams 1991]. High proportions of Staphylococcus aureus and Staphylococcus epidermidis have been reported in other papers on oral implants [Rams et al. 1990]. The relative resistance of these organisms to commonly utilised antibiotics [Slots et al. 1988], suggests that their presence might represent an opportunistic colonisation secondary to systemic antibiotic therapy.

The above-mentioned observations are somehow in contrast with the data of Salcetti and co-workers [1997] who were not able to detect “significant” differences in subgingival microbiota between successful and failing implants within the same patient. Still, patients with failing implants showed higher detection frequencies for: P. micros, Prevotella nigrescens and F. nucleatum.

Treatment studies
The therapeutic outcomes of therapies for peri-implantitis can underline the role of specific bacteria in the aetiology of this infection. Strategies that aimed to reduce the anaerobic bacteria, either by mechanical debridement of the peri-implant pocket, or with local or systemic antibiotics indeed improved the clinical conditions [for review see Ericsson et al. 1996; Mombelli & Lang 1998, Esposito et al. 1999, Mombelli 1999]. The combination of debridement with systemic use of ornidazole [Mombelli & Lang 1992], amoxicillin in combination with metronidazole [Ericsson et al. 1996] or tetracycline fibre placement [Flemmig 1994] seem very promising. These studies propose the following requirements for the treatment of peri-implantitis:

- reduction of bacterial colonisation on implant surface,
- removal of bacterial mass (mechanically),
- introduction of an ecology [more aerobic condition via pocket resection] that suppresses the anaerobic segment of the subgingival flora.

A number of reports documented the clinical and radiological assessment of successful regenerative treatment of peri-implantitis lesions [Jovanovic 1993; Lehmann et al. 1992; Hämerle et al. 1995; Mattout et al 1995]. However, histological evidence of a true re-osseointegration, i.e. the reestablishment of an intimate bone-to-implant contact, on a previously infected surface in man and in animals is still lacking [Jovanovic et al. 1995; Persson et al. 1999; Wetzel et al. 1999].

Susceptibility for peri-implantitis versus periodontitis
Malmstrom and co-workers [1990] reported on a partially edentulous patient who was rehabilitated by implants after an unsuccessful treatment of a rapidly progressive, early onset periodontitis [the anamnesis included smoking and a chemotactic defect in the patient's neu-
Table 2. Intra-subject comparison of subgingival flora around implants and teeth in partially edentulous patients. Considered are: dark field microscopy data (proportions), and culture data (detection frequency for specific bacteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>sub</th>
<th>site</th>
<th>Abutment</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>PPD</th>
<th>Cocci</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Motile</th>
<th>Spiro</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>Pg</th>
<th>Pi</th>
<th>Fn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lekholm et al. 1986a</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>18 m</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apse et al. 1989</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>16 m</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirynen &amp; Listgarten 1990</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>&gt;1 y</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koka et al. 1993</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonhardt et al. 1993</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohavi et al. 1994</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>&gt;6 m</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/29</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29</td>
<td></td>
<td>16/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli et al. 1995</td>
<td>ITIb</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>6/80</td>
<td>32/80</td>
<td>41/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papaioannou et al. 1996</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>3 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 R</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengel et al. 1996</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>12 m</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sbordone et al. 1999</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>2 y</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3/25</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10/25</td>
<td>4/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>3/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hultin et al. 2000</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Implant</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/43</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>6/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32/185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>24/222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System: ITIb=Bonefit, Brå=Brånemark system; sub=subjects (A=adult, R=rapidly progressing periodontitis), Time=loading time for implants in months (m) or years (y); PPD=pocket probing depth; Bacterial morphotypes: cocci=spirochetes; Microbial analyses: d=immunoblot assay.
Within the first 2 months of subgingival healing, 3 maxillary and 1 mandibular implant had to be removed due to recurrent abscesses. A comparable case was presented by Fardal and co-workers [1999].

Afterwards, many authors misquoted the first paper, to prove that patients susceptible to periodontitis are also susceptible to peri-implantitis. Several other publications, however, proved the opposite. Nevins & Langer [1995] published data on the survival rate of Brånemark system\textsuperscript{®} implants (with a machined surface) in a group of partially edentulous patients with a clinical diagnosis of recalcitrant periodontitis (defined as no positive response to routine periodontal therapy and continuing loss of periodontal support). In contrast to what could be expected, both the survival rate and the stability of the peri-implant tissues were comparable to what is generally reported for that implant system. Comparable observations were made in 2 papers from our group. In a first study, 5 partially edentulous patients with rapidly progressive periodontitis were rehabilitated by means of Brånemark system\textsuperscript{®} implants [Fig. 2]. The aggressive marginal bone loss around the teeth (0.45 mm/year) was not reflected by signs of peri-implantitis around the implants (0.05 mm bone loss/year) in the immediate vicinity (van Steenberghe et al. 1999a). Fig. 2 shows even a remarkable regeneration/remineralisation of peri-implant bone after extraction of a neighbouring tooth with terminal periodontitis. In a second study (Quirynen et al. 2001), a randomly selected group of partially edentulous patients rehabilitated with Brånemark system\textsuperscript{®} implants for at least 5 years, were screened for bone loss around teeth and implants. Previous [before implant installation] or ongoing bone loss around teeth (scored clinically and/or radiographically) could not be correlated with bone loss around the implants. These data, together with the observations in long-term clinical studies (Adell et al. 1981, 1986; van Steenberghe et al. 1990, Lindquist et al. 1997), indicate that some implant configurations and surfaces may be more resistant to loss of “attachment” than teeth.

These observations are, however, in contrast to reports on implants with a rougher surface. Ellegaard and co-workers [1997] followed Astra and ITI system implants inserted in periodontally compromised partially edentulous patients (defined as subjects with tooth loss due to progressive periodontitis but who had received a thorough periodontal therapy). About 76–86% of the implants, depending on the implant type, remained free from radiographic bone loss ≥1.5 mm at 36 months. After 5 years of loading, 45% of the ITI implants displayed marginal bone loss of 1.5 mm or more even though all patients participated in a periodontal supportive care program. Comparable data were reported in a recent longitudinal multi-centre study on the same implant type (Brocard et al. 2000). The comparison of these results with those obtained for a population at low risk for periodontitis and using the same implant system [Buser et al. 1997], suggests that some implant types inserted in patients prone to periodontitis may pose an increased risk for marginal soft and hard tissue problems.

Factors influencing the subgingival microbiota around implants

The presence of teeth and their periodontal status

Bacteria that normally reside in the oral cavity (i.e. the indigenous microbiota) can select from different ecosystems for their habitat. On the basis of physical and morphological criteria, the oral cavity can be divided into five major ecosystems (called niches), each with distinct ecological determinants: the buccal epithelium, the dorsum of the tongue, the supragingival tooth surface, the periodontal pocket (with its crevicular fluid, the root cementum and the pocket epithelium) and the tonsils. Most pathogenic species (with the exception of spirochetes who limit themselves to the pocket) are able to colonise all these niches [Petit et al. 1994; von Troil-Lindén et al. 1995; Danser et al. 1994, 1996]. Some periodontopathogens (F. nucleatum and P. intermedia) are involved in the aetiology of tonsilitis [Brook et al. 1997], while others can even colonise the maxillary sinus [Wald 1998]. Even in the edentulous mouth of infants or of denture wearers, the proportions of periodontopathogens – with the exception of A. actinomycetemcomitans and F. gingivalis (Könönen et al. 1992; Danser 1996) – can be high. Since most pathogens are found in more than one niche, it is reasonable to assume that transmission between these intra-oral niches (called translocation) occurs. The existence of such a translocation was illustrated by the clinical and microbiological benefits of a one-stage full-mouth disinfection or a one-stage full-mouth root planing when compared to a standard [quadrant per quadrant] periodontal therapy [Quirynen et al. 1999a; Mongardini et al. 1999; Quirynen et al. 2000]. It also explains why guided tissue regeneration is more successful when performed in an oral cavity with a reduced microbial load [Nowzari et al. 1996; Slots et al. 1999] and why the application of local antibiotics is especially successful when all pathogenic pockets are involved in the therapy [Mombelli et al. 1997]. In all these conditions, the elimination of most pathogenic species from the oro-pharyngeal cavity within a short period of time significantly reduced the chance for intra-oral bacterial translocations. Periodontal pockets play a crucial role as a microbial reservoir. Indeed, after a total tooth extraction, most periodontopathogens disappear from the oral cavity [Danser et al. 1994].

Such an intra-oral translocation of bacteria of course explains why pathogenic species originating from the periodontal pockets will colonise the peri-implant pockets in partially edentulous patients. Indeed, studies in the early nineties by Apse and co-workers [1989], and Quirynen & Listgarten [1990] illustrated that the remaining teeth in partially edentulous patients act as “reservoirs” for the colonisation of recently installed implants (Table 2). This similarity in microflora between teeth and implants in partially edentulous patients has since been confirmed by several studies, especially when the probing depth around both abutment types was comparable (Table 2). The proportion of spirochetes and motile organisms around both abutment types are similar as well as the number of colony forming.
units. Even in the detection frequency of pathogenic species only minor differences between both abutment types could be detected (Table 2). This similarity appears soon after implant insertion. Leonhardt and co-workers (1993) detected periodontopathogens in the subgingival peri-implant environment, already 1 month after abutment connection. All studies in Table 2 corroborate the concept that the microflora present in the oral cavity before implant insertion determines the composition of the newly established microflora around implants. The latter was also confirmed in a study where the presence of 23 subgingival species around both teeth and implants was examined via whole genomic DNA probes in a checkerboard assay [Lee et al. 1999a].

The periodontal status of the remaining teeth influences the composition of the subgingival flora around implants [Quirynen et al. 1996a]. When 31 partially edentulous patients with different periodontal conditions for natural dentition were examined, phase-contrast microscopy confirmed the transmission hypothesis. Going from healthy over chronic to refractory periodontitis, the number of coccoïd cells significantly decreased in pockets around both teeth and implants, whereas the number of spirochetes and motiles significantly increased for both abutment types even above the 20% threshold level for disease [Listgarten et al. 1986]. A DNA analysis showed an absence of the most suspicious periodontopathogens [P. gingivalis, Treponema denticola and C. rectus] in the healthy group, but a frequent detection of them around both teeth and implants in the chronic and especially in the refractory group, at least in deep pockets (Quirynen et al. 1996a). Sanz and co-workers [1990] examined partially edentulous patients rehabilitated with endosteal sapphire ceramic implants and observed significantly higher numbers and percentages of suspected periodontopathogens around implants and teeth with signs of gingival inflammation. In these diseased sites, the proportion of Gram-negative anaerobic rods increased to 40%.

When partially edentulous patients are compared to fully edentulous patients (without remaining teeth in both jaws but rehabilitated with implants), the impact of remaining teeth becomes even more striking. Rehabilitated fully edentulous patients (Table 3) are characterised by significantly lower proportions of motile organisms (3% vs. 11.4%) and spirochetes (0.9% vs. 2.7%) and very low detection frequencies for pathogenic species [Mombelli et al. 1988; Apse et al. 1989; Quirynen & Listgarten 1990; Mombelli & Mericske-Stern 1990; Papaioannou et al. 1995; Danser et al. 1997]. In these 6 studies on fully edentulous patients rehabilitated with implants, P. gingivalis and A. actinomycesetemcomitans could never be detected (0/75). The detection frequency for P. intermedia [7/75] seems also reduced but not for F. nucleatum. Lee and co-workers [1999b] examined the microflora (using whole genomic DNA probes) of the tongue, teeth (if present) and implants, pre- and post-implantation in partially and fully edentulous patients. They observed a great similarity in plaque composition between samples from the 3 above-mentioned niches and concluded that, besides the teeth, the tongue should also be considered as an additional bacterial source. The similarity in subgingival plaque composition was the greatest between implants and neighbouring teeth. The observation that implants in fully edentulous patients harbour a subgingival flora similar to that of the adjacent mucosal surface was also confirmed by a study from Danser and co-workers [1997]. Smedberg and co-workers [1993] examined 18 subjects with a removable denture in the maxilla and could not detect significant differences in the pattern of microbial composition of the peri-implant pocket and that of the biofilm on the corresponding mucosal side of the maxillary prosthesis. All data corroborate the concept that the bacteria colonising implants in edentulous patients originate primarily from the surface of the oral mucous mem-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Bacterial morphotypes in %</th>
<th>Detection frequency specific bacteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli et al. 1988</td>
<td>ITI hc</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>Cocci Other Motile Spiro</td>
<td>Aa Pg Pi Fn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apse et al. 1989</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0/8 0/8 1/8 2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirynen &amp; Listgarten 1990</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>&gt;1 y 2.6</td>
<td>0/13 0/13 0/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli &amp; Mericske-Stern 1990</td>
<td>ITI hc</td>
<td>18/36</td>
<td>&gt;2 y 2.9</td>
<td>0/34 0/34 4/34 4/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papaioannou et al. 1995</td>
<td>Brå OD</td>
<td>108/198</td>
<td>30 m 3.1</td>
<td>0/20 0/20 2/20 20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papaioannou et al. 1995</td>
<td>Brå FFP</td>
<td>30/63</td>
<td>44 m 3.6</td>
<td>0/75 0/75 7/75 26/62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danser et al. 1997</td>
<td>Brå/IMZ</td>
<td>20/91</td>
<td>5.6 y 3.6</td>
<td>13.1 14.2 3.3 1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System: ITI hc=Ti plasma-coated hollow cylinder; Brå=Brånemark system (OD=overdenture, FFP=full fixed prostheses); sub=subjects; imp=implants; Time=loading time for implants in months (m) or years (y); PPD=pocket probing depth; Bacterial morphotypes: spiro=spirochetes; Microbial analyses: *=culture.
studies pointing to a positive correlation. Several studies indicated that, already one month after a full dental extraction, A. actinomyctecomonits and P. gingivalis could no longer be detected [Danser et al. 1994, 1997]. The data in Table 3 also suggest that, even after the replacement of the teeth by implant-supported prostheses, A. actinomyctecomonits and P. gingivalis remain below detection level or have permanently disappeared from the oral cavity. During treatment planning this can be an argument to extract a tooth with advanced periodontitis, since the pocket could act as a reservoir for pathogenic species colonising the implants.

Probing pocket depth

During abutment installation [two-stage implants] or during implant insertion [one-stage systems], the periodontologist decides upon the future peri-implant pocket depth by trimming more or less the mucoperiosteal flap and/or by the use of a post-surgical healing pack to maintain some pressure during healing. So far, the importance of the probing pocket depth around oral implants has not received much attention. Recently, Papaioannou and co-workers [1995] examined the relationship between the subgingival flora around successful implants and their periodontal parameters. Plaque samples from 561 implants were analysed by means of differential phase-contrast microscopy (DPCM), and compared to the sample site’s probing depth, bleeding tendency on probing, and plaque and gingivitis indices. From these clinical parameters only the probing depth was found to be closely related to the pathogenicity of the flora, the deeper the pocket, the higher the proportion of spirochetes and motile organisms. In an additional study, it was observed that the subgingival flora around implants in partially edentulous patients with chronic periodontitis remained apathogenic as long as the pockets were below 4 mm in depth [Quirynen et al. 1996a]. These observations were consistent with studies pointing to a positive correlation between the probing depth around teeth and the proportion of spirochetes (e.g. Listgarten & Helldén 1978; Listgarten et al. 1986).

The impact of the probing depth on the subgingival microbiota was also reported for the one-stage ITI implants by Mommbelli & Mericske-Stern (1990). They observed that the relative proportion of Capnocytophaga and A. odontolyticus around implants, supporting overdentures in edentulous patients, correlated positively with the probing depth. Others reported (for different implant systems) a positive correlation between probing depth and the occurrence/proportion of spirochetes [Keyes & Rams 1983; Lekholm et al. 1986b; Palmisano et al. 1991], BANA hydrolysing bacteria [Palmisano et al. 1991] or anaerobic species [Krekeler et al. 1986; Keller et al. 1998]. George and co-workers [1994] reported a positive correlation between probing depth and/or intra-oral exposure time and the presence of P. gingivalis, P. intermedia and A. actinomyctecomonits. These observations should encourage the periodontologist to prevent the presence of deep peri-implant pockets during second-stage surgery, at least when aesthetics and phonetics allow. The trimming of the soft tissues should however not go beyond 3 mm since, in animals at least, the existence of a minimal biologic width has been well documented [Berglundh & Lindhe 1996].

Surface roughness of transmucosal part of the implant

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) clearly revealed that the initial colonisation of an intra-oral hard surface starts from surface irregularities [such as cracks, grooves, or abrasion defects] and subsequently spreads out from these areas as a relatively even monolayer of cells. With time, plaque areas develop at the irregularities which alternate with less extensively colonised surrounding areas [Lie 1979; Nyvad & Fejerskov 1990]. Thus initial adhesion, especially supragingivally, preferably starts at locations where bacteria are sheltered against shear forces, because the change from reversible to irreversible attachment can be established more easily and thus more frequently in these sites. Moreover, at surface irregularities and other stagnant sites, bacteria, once attached, can survive longer because they are protected against naturally occurring removal forces [Newman 1974] or oral hygiene measures [Quirynen 1986]. Finally, one should keep in mind that a roughening of the surface also increases the area available for adhesion by a factor $\geq 3 \times$.

Numerous in vivo studies examined the effect of surface roughness on plaque formation and the resulting periodontal inflammation. An overview of these studies [Quirynen & Bollen 1995; Quirynen et al. 1999b] produce the following general statements:

- Rough surfaces [crowns, implant abutments and denture bases] accumulate and retain more plaque [thickness, area and colony forming units]. This is less obvious in patients with optimal oral hygiene or when plaque was scored with crude indices.

- After several days of undisturbed plaque formation, rough surfaces harbour a more mature plaque characterised by an increased proportion of motile organisms and spirochetes.

- As a consequence of the former, crowns with rough surfaces were more frequently surrounded by an inflamed periodontium, characterised by a higher bleeding index, an increased crevicular fluid production and/or an increased inflammatory infiltrate.

The same applies to plaque formation on implant abutment surfaces. A pilot study reported a faster supragingival plaque formation on titanium abutments ($R_s=0.3 \mu m$), when compared to teeth [Quirynen 1986]. In a second study, plaque formation on standard ($R_s=0.3 \mu m$) and roughened abutments ($R_s=0.8 \mu m$) was evaluated after 3 months of habitual oral hygiene [Quirynen et al. 1993]. Supragingivally, rough abutments harboured significantly fewer cocci (64% vs. 81%), which is indicative of a more mature plaque. Subgingivally, rough surfaces harboured $2.5 \times$ more bacteria, with a slightly lower density of coccoid organisms. Two more recent studies examined the effect of abutment smoothening. A smoothening below a $R_s=0.2 \mu m$ showed no further significant changes, either in the total amount or in the peri-
odontal pathogenicity of adhering bacteria [Quirynen et al. 1996b; Bollen et al. 1996]. The $R_a$ value of 0.2 μm was therefore suggested as a threshold surface roughness, below which bacterial adhesion cannot be further reduced [Bollen & Quirynen 1997]. These observations were confirmed by an in vivo study on the initial supragingival plaque formation [first 24 hours] on titanium specimens [with $R_a$ values ranging from 0.1 to 2.4 μm], intra-orally fixed in an acrylic denture [Rimondini et al. 1997]. Whereas smooth surfaces hosted comparable amounts of bacteria, the rough surface harboured significantly higher numbers.

These data might be considered as contradictory to the observations of Gatewood and co-workers (1993). They glued small pieces [6.5 by 2 mm] of teeth [with a smooth enamel part and a fairly rough part of cementum] and of implants [with a smooth collar and a plasma-sprayed endosseous surface] in ≥6 mm deep periodontal pockets [21 days post-scaling] in such a way that the smooth part remained supragingivally. The test pieces were removed surgically after several days and SEM pictures were made to analyse subgingival plaque maturation. No significant differences could be detected between the cementum and the rough implant surfaces. This could have been expected since the test pieces were inserted in pockets with an established microbiota and all 3 test surfaces were fairly rough, so that the impact of the surface smoothness disappeared.

The $R_a$ values for the percutaneous part of most implant systems range from 0.1 to 0.3 μm, which is within the range of a smooth enamel surface and/or polished restorative materials [Quirynen et al. 1994a]. Scanning electron microscopy revealed that the Steri-Oss® abutment was highly polished with an equally smooth surface and minor irregularities. The IMZ®, Bräunemark®, Astra Tech® and Core-Vent® abutments have clear milling marks, created during manufacturing. The Bonefit® has a large number of scratches. The hardness of the different implants showed some variation, the Bräunemark® abutment having the softest surface [Vickers hardness 155 kg/mm²] and the Steri-Oss® implant the hardest [340 kg/mm²]. This limited hardness of commercially pure titanium abutments [enamel and porcelain have hardness values of more than 400 kg/mm², Willems et al. 1991] explains the risk of surface roughening during habitual or professional cleaning. An in vitro study on IMZ® abutments reported a dramatic increase in surface roughness after a single episode of scaling with either titanium alloy or stainless-steel-tipped curettes [Fox et al. 1990]. The use of plastic scalers, in contrast, did not change the surface and should be advocated. An in vitro study on different abutments showed that a cleaning with plastic scalers, rubber cups and pumice, or with an air-powder abrasive system, resulted in a smoothening of the milling marks [McCullum et al. 1992; Mengel et al. 1998]. In an animal study on 25 used Bräunemark® abutments harbouring large amounts of calculus, ultrasonic scaling or scaling with metal instruments were found to significantly increase the surface roughness, whereas polishing with a lour of pumice, tooth brushing or scaling with plastic instruments had no effect on the surface profile [Speelman et al. 1992]. A single application of a fluoride prophylactic agent can also result in a significant increase of the $R_a$ through pitting corrosion by the hydrofluoric acid or the combination of fluoride and hydrogen ions from the acid [Pröbster et al. 1992]. The use of an air-powder abrasive system cannot be advocated because it may even result in severe marginal bone loss around implants [Bergendal et al. 1990].

So far, all above-mentioned studies were dealing with the permucosal part of the implants. It is evident that, due to marginal bone because of overload or peri-implantitis, the endosseous part of the implant will one day come into contact with the subgingival flora. From that moment on, the variety in surface roughness between implant systems becomes even more relevant [Wennerberg et al. 1991 for review, Buser 1999].

The implant surface roughness also has an impact on the quality of the soft tissue sealing. In 2 longitudinal studies in which highly polished abutments were followed over 3 months to 1 year, with regular pocket probing, it appeared that a certain surface roughness is needed for an optimal soft tissue sealing. An intra-subject comparison showed that, while the commercially available abutments [$R_a$ value 0.31 μm] maintained a stable clinical attachment level, highly polished titanium or ceramic test abutments demonstrated a mean loss in attachment of ≥0.5 mm in this short observation period [Quirynen et al. 1996b; Bollen et al. 1996]. This difference can be explained by the interaction between surface texture and fibroblast and/or epithelial cell attachment and proliferation [Könönen et al. 1992; Chehroudi et al. 1992; Guy et al. 1993; Cochran et al. 1994; Hormia & Könönen 1994; Mustafa et al. 1998; Brunette & Chehroudi 1999]. Thus, the original idea to highly polish the abutment surface to limit the bacterial adhesion could not be pursued, since this negatively affects the soft tissue attachment.

**Intra-oral exposure time (Table 4)**

The impact of the intra-oral exposure time on the composition of the subgingival flora around implants is different for partially and fully edentulous patients [Table 4].

Koka and co-workers (1993) followed the changes in composition of the marginal and subgingival plaque around osseointegrated implants during the first month after second-stage surgery. Already within 2 weeks, both the detection frequency and the number of different periodontopathogens in the marginal area around both implants and neighbouring teeth appeared comparable. The subgingival flora around the implants also showed a shift towards a composition similar to the one around the teeth. The latter shift only became obvious after 1 month, indicating a slower subgingival colonisation after supragingival plaque formation, as is also known for teeth.

Mombelli and co-workers (1988) followed the subgingival plaque maturation around ITI [one-part titanium plasma-coated hollow cylinder] implants supporting an overdenture in 5 fully edentulous patients [full denture wearers for many years] via subgingival samplings at weekly intervals during the first 8 weeks after implant installation, followed by monthly samplings for up to
Table 4. Longitudinal changes in subgingival flora around implants including: dark field microscopy data (proportions or frequency), and culture data (detection frequency for specific bacteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Oral status</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bacterial morphotypes: % (freq*)</th>
<th>Detection freq. specific bacteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cocci</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli et al. 1988</td>
<td>ITI hc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fully edent</td>
<td>1 w</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli &amp; Mericske-Stern 1990</td>
<td>ITI hc</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>fully edent</td>
<td>25–36 m</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombelli et al. 1995</td>
<td>ITIb/Brå</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>part edent</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>3/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/20*</td>
<td>5/20*</td>
<td>0/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonhardt et al. 1993</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>part edent</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/18</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>13/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sbordone et al. 1999</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>part edent</td>
<td>12 m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengel et al. 1996</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>part edent</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koka et al. 1993</td>
<td>Brå</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>part edent</td>
<td>2 w</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System: ITI hc = Ti plasma-coated hollow cylinder; ITIb = Bonefit, Brå = Brånemark system; sub = subjects (fully/partially edentulous), imp = implants; Time = loading time for implants in weeks (w) or months (m); Bacterial morphotypes: spiro = spirochetes; Microbial analyses: c = culture, d = dna, i = immunoblot assay.
6 months. During the entire period, no significant changes were observed for successful implants (with >95% of the flora being cocci, 46% to 72% being Gram-positive facultative cocci, and a 1/1 ratio for anaerobic/aerobic species). Spirochetes and motile organisms were hardly detected. The detection frequency of A. actinomycetemcomitans [0], P. gingivalis [0] and P. intermedia [1/9] were also negligible. The same group published microbiological data on the same implant system and under comparable conditions, but now with follow-up data up to 5 years (Mombelli & Mericske-Stern 1990). After 2 years, still 83% of the flora consisted of cocci and still no spirochetes could be detected. At this time, motile organisms did appear (5.6%) but the ratio anaerobic/aerobic remained 1/1. Again, periodontopathogens were only infrequently detected. Nine patients (18 implants) were followed for another 3 years. The further changes over time were again insignificant. The total anaerobic and aerobic counts as well as the relative proportion of Gram-negative anaerobic rods were related to the local plaque index and the relative proportion of Capnocytophaga and A. odontolyticus, correlated with the probing depth. The same examiners also followed the early subgingival plaque formation around ITI Bonefit and Brånemark implants inserted in partially edentulous patients [n=20, aged 35–65 years] that previously had been successfully treated for moderate or advanced periodontitis (Mombelli et al. 1995). After 6 months exposure, a considerable number of peri-implant pockets became colonised by periodontopathogens (for P. gingivalis 2 out of 4, for P. intermedia 7 out of 13, and for spirochetes 5 out of 12 patients with these species around their teeth).

In another longitudinal study, a group of partially edentulous patients [n=19, aged 19–73 years], rehabilitated via the Brånemark system after relative suppression of the periodontal infection (still 25% bleeding upon probing teeth, high detection frequency of periodontopathogens), was followed (Leonhardt et al. 1993). In this group, periodontopathogens could already be detected around the implants 1 month after abutment connection. After 3 years the implants frequently harboured periodontopathogens [4/17 A. actinomycetemcomitans, 4/17 P. gingivalis and 9/17 P. intermedia. The microbial load around these implants could, however, not be linked with marginal bone loss, except that 3 implant sites that lost >0.5 mm bone all harboured P. intermedia.

Sbordone and co-workers (1999) also examined the colonisation of Brånemark implants in partial edentulous patients with a history of periodontitis. The detection frequencies for periodontopathogens [including spirochetes] was already high after 1 year and further increased slightly during the second year. Krekeler et al. (1986) also reported an additional shift to a more anaerobic flora after the first year of loading.

From these studies one can conclude that in partially edentulous patients minor changes do occur with time, resulting in:

- an increase in the number of colony forming units,
- an increase in the proportion of motile organisms and especially of spirochetes,
- a slight additional increase in the detection frequency of other pathogenic species.

The impact of the intra-oral exposure time on the subgingival micro-flora around implants was also examined in a cross-sectional study where more than 500 implants were split into 5 categories according to different loading periods (Papaioannou et al. 1993). Changes in microbial composition over time were only observed around implants from partially edentulous patients. In the latter group, a significant shift towards a more pathogenic flora (with a higher proportion of spirochetes and motile organisms) was detected. Similar observations were made when the subgingival plaque maturation around implants was studied, in a cross-sectional design, via whole genomic DNA probes (Lee et al. 1999a).

The passive fit of implant components

The discrepancies between implant components, especially those located subgingivally, offer an ideal environment for de novo plaque formation and/or for plaque retention during cleaning. The size of the gap between implant and abutment of 9 different systems, including those with conical interfaces, was found to range between 1 and 10 µm (Jansen et al. 1997) and 49 µm (Binon et al. 1992) depending on whether or not the rounded edges of the abutment margin were included. Although the marginal discrepancies of these prefabricated parts are significantly smaller compared to those of other dental restorations (ranging from 50 to 150 µm), it still allows microbial leakage (Wahl et al. 1992; Quirynen & van Steenberghe 1993; Quirynen et al. 1994b; Jansen et al. 1997). This micro-leakage is comparable for different implant systems and decreases significantly when the closing torque is increased (Gross et al. 1999). As observed by Ericsson and co-workers (1995) in the Labrador dog model, such a bacterial leakage results in an inflammatory cell infiltrate (called abutment ICT) in the peri-implant mucosa at the borderline between abutment and implant, irrespective of the oral hygiene. The clinical relevance of this gap and/or leakage is very limited since many studies, both longitudinal and cross-sectional, concerning the Brånemark system prove that marginal bone loss is a rare complication (for review, see van Steenberghe et al. 1999b). The absence of a correlation between the degree of internal implant contamination and marginal bone loss (Persson et al. 1996) also refutes the concept that leakage can induce peri-implantitis. The gap between the abutment and the prosthetic supra-structure (sometimes located subgingivally in order to improve aesthetics), shows even larger discrepancies (Binon et al. 1992), especially for cemented restorations (Keith et al. 1999).

Foreign body reaction in peri-implant pocket

Peri-implantitis can be provoked by the subgingival impaction of a foreign body. Cement remnants can lead to an acute peri-implantitis process with local swelling, soreness, exudation on probing, and significant bone destruction (Pauletto et al. 1999). After the removal of the excess cement, the healing will
often be uneventful, although the bony defect might remain. The material used as abutment portion of the implant is critical for both the location and quality of the soft tissue sealing and the underlying bone. In dogs, abutments from gold alloy or porcelain led to a significant marginal bone loss until the soft tissue barrier could be established on the titanium implant surface (Abrahamsson et al. 1998b).

**Oral hygiene**

The patient’s oral hygiene has a significant impact on the stability of the marginal bone around osseointegrated implants. Even in fully edentulous patients, poor oral hygiene is related to increased peri-implant bone loss, especially in smokers (Lindquist et al. 1997). Some authors tentatively attempted to distinguish between the morphology of the real anatomy of the bony defect (Jacobs & van Steenbergh 1997). Others tried to make a distinction between both pathologies based on the subgingival flora. However, the marginal bone loss due to overload is often accompanied by attachment loss and deepening of the pockets. After some time, the newly created anaerobic environment will inevitably harbour a periopathogenic flora so that a distinction between both is no longer possible. Thus, the presence of a pathogenic subgingival flora after occlusal overload might simply reflect a surinfection of a favourable environment, which can contribute to further marginal bone loss, although the latter remains unproven.

**Peri-implantitis versus mechanical overload**

As of today, the relative importance of microbial factors and/or mechanical overload for the development and progression of bone loss around osseointegrated oral implants remains controversial. Stress concentrations in the marginal bone resulting from occlusal "overload" may cause marginal bone loss (van Steenbergh 1999a). Overload is dependent on many factors, such as the load magnitude, direction, rate/frequency and the geometry of the prosthetic superstructure, the flexibility of the connecting devices and the quality of the surrounding bone. There are animal data (Hoshaw et al. 1994; Isidor 1996, 1997) and especially clinical investigations (Lindquist et al. 1988; Naert et al. 1992a,b; Quirynen et al. 1992, 1998) which clearly demonstrate that marginal bone loss can become larger than the average 0.1 mm after the first year or bone remodelling when long cantilevers or para-functions (bruxing/clenching) are present. Some authors tentatively attempted to distinguish between the morphology of bony defects resulting from unfavourable biomechanical factors and from peri-implantitis. This is not an easy task because the two-dimensional radiographic picture is often a poor reflection of the real anatomy of the bony defect (Jacobs & van Steenbergh 1997). Others tried to make a distinction between both pathologies based on the subgingival flora. However, the marginal bone loss due to overload is often accompanied by attachment loss and deepening of the pockets. After some time, the newly created anaerobic environment will inevitably harbour a periopathogenic flora so that a distinction between both is no longer possible. Thus, the presence of a pathogenic subgingival flora after occlusal overload might simply reflect a surinfection of a favourable environment, which can contribute to further marginal bone loss, although the latter remains unproven.

**Conclusion**

The oral status, the implant configuration and surface in particular have an impact on the pathogenicity of the peri-implant flora. Whether osseointegration is at risk depends on the defence mechanism, the duration of the infection, the implant design and its surface characteristics. Indeed, some implants seem to be more at risk for occlusal overload, while other systems are more prone to plaque build-up. Basic research and long-term clinical trials are needed to obtain a better differential diagnosis of the cause of marginal bone loss. Implants in partially edentulous patients, in contrast to fully edentulous subjects, will easily be colonised by putative periodontal pathogens. It seems therefore reasonable that every partially edentulous patient receives appropriate periodontal screening and treatment prior to placement of dental implants and is maintained on an individualised recall schedule for supportive periodontal therapy afterwards. Conversely, it is still unknown whether a past history of periodontitis is a significant risk factor for implant survival in the same patient.

**Zusammenfassung**


**Résumé**

L’utilisation d’implants dentaires dans la réhabilitation partielle et totale de patients édentés est bien acceptée malgré la présence d’échecs. La chance d’intégration des implants peut par exemple être soumise à la présence de bactéries intra-buccales et de réactions inflammatoires concomitantes. La longévité des implants osseointégrés peut être mise en danger par une surcharge occlusale, une paroimplantite induite par la plaque dentaire ou les deux, dépendant de la géométrie de l’implant et des caractéristiques de sa surface. Des études chez l’animal, des observations croisées et longitudinales chez l’homme ainsi que des études d’association ont indiqué que la paroimplantite était caractérisée par une flore comparable à celle de la parodontite (grande proportion de bâtonnets Gram négatif anaérobies, d’organismes mobiles et de spirochètes) mais ce ne prouve pas nécessairement une relation de cause à effet. Cependant, afin de prévenir un tel changement bactérien, les mesures suivantes peuvent être prises en considération: santé parodontale dans le reste de la dentition (pour prévenir la translocation bactérienne), éviter les poches périimplantaires profondes et l’utilisation d’une surface assez lisse de l’implant et du pilier. Finalement, les facteurs augmentant le risque de la parodontite comme le tabagisme et la pauvre hygiène buccale peuvent aussi augmenter le risque de périimplantite. La susceptibilité à la parodontite pourrait être en relation avec celle de la périimplantite suivant le type d’implant et surtout suivant sa topographie de surface.

**Resumen**

El uso de implantes orales en la rehabilitación de pacientes parciales o totalmente edentulos es ampliamen-
te aceptado aunque existan fracasos. Las probabilidades de que los implantes se integren puede verse periódicamente, cada por ejemplo por la presencia de bacterias intraoral o la reacción inflamatoria concomitante. La longevidad de los implantes osteointegrados se puede comprometer por la carga occlusal y/o la periimplantitis inducida por placas, dependiendo de la geometría del implante y las características de la superficie. Los estudios animales, las observaciones transversales y longitudinales en el hombre, al igual que estudios de asociación indican que la periimplantitis está caracterizada por microbios comparables a los de la periodontitis. Los esquistos, organismos móviles y espiroquetas), pero esto no da por microbios comparables a los de la periodontitis. La longitud de los implantes osteointegrados se puede considerar las siguientes medidas: salud periodontal en la dentición remanente (para prevenir translocación bacteriana), evitar la profundización de bolsas periimplantarias, y el uso de un pilar y una superficie de implante relativamente suaves. Finalmente, los factores que estimulan la periodontitis tales como el tabaco y una pobre higiene oral aumentan el riesgo de periimplantitis. El que la susceptibilidad a la periodontitis esté relacionado con la de la periimplantitis puede variar de acuerdo con el tipo de implante y especialmente su topografía de superficie.

**Referencias**


Brook, I., Foote, P.A. & Slots, J. (1997) Immune re-
response to Fusobacterium nucleatum, Prevotella inter-
ity and progression of periodontal disease. Periodon-
the surface topography of micromachined titanium
substrata on cell behavior in vitro and in vivo.
Brynoli, I. (1971) Improved viewing conditions for
better roentgenodagnosis. Oral Surgery, Oral Medi-
cine and Oral Pathology 32: 608-811.
configurations on osseointegration and clinical im-
Buser, D., Mercille-Stern, R., Bernard, J.P., Behnke,
A., Behnke, N., Hirt, H.P., Belser, U.C. & Lang,
ITI implants. Part I: 8-year life table analysis of a
prospective multi-center study with 2535 implants.
The role of connective tissue in inhibiting epithelial
downgrowth on titanium-coated percutaneous im-
(1994) Attachment and growth of periodontal cells
on smooth and rough titanium. International
Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants 9: 289-
297.
bacteria colonizing the oral mucous membranes.
ScD Thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Neth-
erlands.
Danser, M.M., Van Winkelhoff, A.J., de Graaf, J., Loos,
of full-mouth extraction on periodontal pathogens
colonizing the oral mucous membranes. Journal of
Clinical Periodontology 21: 484-489.
Danser, M.M., Timmerman, M.F., van Winkelhoff,
odontal treatment on periodontal bacteria on the
oral mucous membranes. Journal of Periodontology
67: 478-485.
Danser, M.M., van Winkelhoff, A.J. & van der Velden,
U. (1997) Periodontal bacteria colonizing oral mu-
cous membranes in edentulous patients wearing den-
Dent, C.D., Olson, J.W., Farish, S.E., Bellome, J., Ca-
ence of prooperative antibiotics on success of endos-
sus implants up to and including stage II surgery: a
study of 1,643 implants. Journal of Oral and Max-
biota associated with experimental peri-implantitis
and periodontitis in adult Macaca mulatta mon-
therapy in periodontally compromised patients.
Clinical Oral Implants Research 8: 180-188.


Slots, J. & Genco, R.J. [1984] Black-pigmented Bacte- riosides species, Capnocytophaga species and Actinio-


