Journal of Oral Medicine and Dental Research

Genesis-JOMDR-5(4)-79
Volume 5 | Issue 4
Open Access
ISSN: 2583-4061

Implant Materials in Focus: A Comprehensive Review of Zirconia vs. Titanium and Their Impact on Peri-Implant Health

Tobias Steinherr[1*]
DDS, Specialist for Prosthodontic Dentistry & Biomaterials Kelowna, BC, Canada

[*]**Corresponding author:** Toias Steinherr. DDS, Specialist for Prosthodontic Dentistry & Biomaterials Kelowna, BC, Canada.

Citation: Steinherr T. Implant Materials in Focus: A Comprehensive Review of Zirconia vs. Titanium and Their Impact on Peri-Implant Health. J Oral Med and Dent Res. 5(4):1-7.

Received: September 25, 2024 | **Published:** October 10, 2024

Abstract

If given the choice, nearly 80% of patients would prefer zirconia implants over titanium, citing factors such as aesthetics, perceived strength, and reduced allergenicity [1]. Despite this clear patient preference, dental professionals overwhelmingly continue to use titanium implants, which still dominate the market due to their long history of successful use and extensive clinical data [2]. However, the growing number of patients with hypersensitivity to titanium and the rising awareness about the potential adverse effects of metal implants are driving a shift in both patient demand and clinical practice [3]. The demand for metal-free solutions is increasing rapidly, compelling dental professionals to reconsider the traditional reliance on titanium implants.

Keywords

Zirconia Implants; Titanium Implants; Biocompatibility Comparison; Clinical Implications

Introduction

If given the choice, nearly 80% of patients would prefer zirconia implants over titanium, citing factors such as aesthetics, perceived strength, and reduced allergenicity [1]. Despite this clear patient preference, dental professionals overwhelmingly continue to use titanium implants, which still dominate the market due to their long history of successful use and extensive clinical data [2]. However, the growing number of patients with hypersensitivity to titanium and the rising awareness about the potential adverse effects of metal implants are driving a shift in both patient demand and clinical practice [3]. The demand for metal-free solutions is increasing rapidly, compelling dental professionals to reconsider the traditional reliance on titanium implants.

With the rising incidence of peri-implantitis—a condition that significantly affects long-term implant stability and patient outcomes—clinicians are recognizing the need to prioritize biocompatibility alongside mechanical properties. While titanium has a well-established track record for durability and success, concerns about bio-corrosion and immune responses to titanium particles are prompting the dental community to explore zirconia as a more biocompatible alternative [4, 5]. Zirconia implants are now seen not just as an esthetic option, but as a potentially healthier choice, offering similar material strength and clinical outcomes without the drawbacks associated with titanium hypersensitivity [6]. The aim of this article is to provide an updated overview of the current understanding of zirconia and titanium dental implants, focusing on biocompatibility, bio-corrosion, and their implications for peri-implantitis. By synthesizing the latest research, we aim to clarify the advantages and limitations of each material to support informed clinical decision-making.

Material Characteristics and Biocompatibility

Zirconia Implants

Zirconia, or zirconium dioxide (ZrO_2), is a ceramic material known for its high fracture toughness and biocompatibility [7]. Its unique properties stem from its stable tetragonal crystal structure, which can transform to a monoclinic structure under stress, providing a mechanism known as transformation toughening. This property imparts high resistance to crack propagation, making zirconia suitable for load-bearing applications such as dental implants [7]. Furthermore, zirconia implants offer esthetic advantages due to their tooth-like color, which makes them ideal for anterior restorations where visibility is a concern [6]. Studies have also shown that zirconia has a lower affinity for bacterial adhesion compared to titanium, potentially reducing the risk of peri-implant infections [8].

One of the primary advantages of zirconia is its bio-inertness. Unlike titanium, which forms a passive oxide layer only at the surface, zirconia's oxide structure is inherent to the material itself, reducing the risk of ion release and subsequent inflammatory reactions [8]. This makes zirconia implants less likely to provoke adverse tissue responses, a significant factor in preventing peri-implantitis [9]. Recent clinical studies support these findings, demonstrating that zirconia implants maintain good bone and soft tissue integration in the posterior regions as well, providing comparable outcomes to titanium implants even in high-load areas [2, 10].

Titanium Implants

Titanium (Ti) has long been the material of choice for dental implants due to its excellent mechanical properties, including high strength and elasticity [11]. It forms a stable oxide layer (titanium dioxide, TiO_2) upon exposure to air, which protects the underlying metal from corrosion and enhances biocompatibility [12]. This oxide layer, however, can be compromised in the presence of fluoride, acidic environments, or mechanical wear, leading to the release of titanium ions. These ions can induce inflammatory responses in peri-implant tissues, contributing to conditions such as peri-implantitis [13].

Moreover, titanium's mechanical properties, while advantageous for load-bearing applications, can also be a drawback in patients with metal sensitivities. Although rare, hypersensitivity to titanium has been reported, which may result in localized inflammation and implant failure [3]. The immune response to titanium particles, particularly in patients with certain genetic predispositions, can further exacerbate these issues [14].

Biocompatibility Comparison

Both zirconia and titanium implants demonstrate good biocompatibility and long-term clinical success. However, zirconia's lower bacterial adhesion, reduced risk of ion release, and minimal inflammatory response make it an increasingly preferred choice for patients with metal sensitivities or high esthetic demands [8]. Titanium remains superior in terms of mechanical strength and flexibility, making it ideal for situations requiring robust load-bearing capacity [11].

Bio-Corrosion: Mechanisms and Clinical Implications

Corrosion Mechanisms

Corrosion is a critical factor that can compromise the longevity and stability of dental implants by releasing metal ions and degrading the implant surface. Zirconia implants, composed of stable zirconium dioxide (ZrO_2), exhibit exceptional resistance to corrosion due to their inert ceramic nature, which prevents the release of ions into the surrounding environment [7]. This inherent stability is maintained even in the challenging oral environment, characterized by varying pH levels and exposure to electrolytes [15].

In contrast, titanium relies on a protective oxide layer (titanium dioxide, TiO_2) for its corrosion resistance. However, this layer can be disrupted by exposure to acidic conditions, fluoride, or mechanical wear, leading to the release of titanium ions [13]. These ions can induce localized inflammatory responses, particularly in patients with metal sensitivities or genetic predispositions, potentially contributing to peri-implantitis [14, 16].

Impact on Implant Longevity

The differences in corrosion resistance between zirconia and titanium have significant implications for implant longevity. Titanium's susceptibility to corrosion and ion release can lead to structural degradation and increased risk of inflammatory complications, especially in patients with poor oral hygiene or systemic conditions [13]. Zirconia's superior corrosion resistance makes it a more stable long-term option, with studies showing comparable or even superior outcomes in terms of bone and soft tissue integration, particularly in challenging clinical scenarios [7, 15].

Clinical Consequences and Transition to Peri-Implantitis

The release of metal ions from titanium implants can exacerbate local inflammation and contribute to peri-implant diseases, such as peri-implantitis, which is characterized by progressive bone loss and implant failure [13]. Zirconia's reduced risk of ion release and lower bacterial adhesion may help mitigate these complications, making it a promising alternative for patients at higher risk of peri-implantitis [8]. The high prevalence of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis, as reported by Derks et al., highlights the need for a reassessment of implant material choices [5].

Peri-Implantitis: Material-Triggered Immune Response

Bio-Corrosion and Immune Response

Albrektsson and colleagues [17] argue that marginal bone loss around implants, often considered as peri-implantitis, may primarily be a manifestation of a foreign body reaction rather than an infectious disease like periodontitis [4]. When an implant is placed in bone, the body inevitably responds with an inflammatory reaction as part of the healing process. Over time, this response can stabilize, resulting in successful osseointegration. However, disturbances such as bio-corrosion, mechanical overload, or systemic health issues can disrupt this balance, leading to significant bone loss around the implant [4].

The bio-corrosion of titanium implants is a significant factor in triggering this foreign body reaction. Titanium ions released due to corrosion can elicit an immune response, particularly in patients with metal sensitivities or certain genetic predispositions, leading to heightened inflammatory reactions [13, 14]. This view challenges the traditional understanding of peri-implantitis as a bacteria-driven disease and supports the hypothesis that peri-implantitis is secondary to an initially aggravated foreign body response [4].

Long-Term Outcomes: Evidence from Zirconia Implants

In contrast, zirconia implants, which are bio-inert and less likely to release ions, have shown lower rates of peri-implantitis. A nine-year follow-up study reported no cases of peri-implantitis among patients with zirconia implants, highlighting the material's stability and its lower potential to trigger adverse immune responses [2]. This aligns with Albrektsson's hypothesis, suggesting that the reduced inflammatory potential of zirconia may prevent the foreign body reaction from progressing into peri-implantitis.

High Prevalence of Peri-Implant Mucositis and Peri-Implantitis

Despite advances in implantology, peri-implant diseases remain common. According to Derks et al., the prevalence of peri-implant mucositis is estimated to be 43% at the patient level and 22% at the implant level, while peri-implantitis affects approximately 19.8% of patients and 9.25% of implants [5]. The high prevalence of these conditions suggests that the inflammatory response to implant materials, compounded by factors such as poor oral hygiene and smoking, plays a significant role in their development [5]. The study also underscores that once the initial mucosal inflammation escalates due to a persistent foreign body reaction, it can progress to peri-implantitis, particularly around titanium implants [5].

Clinical Implications of Peri-Implantitis Treatments

The current approaches to managing peri-implantitis, including mechanical debridement, chemical decontamination, and surgical interventions, have shown inconsistent results. A review of various treatment modalities highlighted that no single protocol reliably resolves peri-implantitis, further

supporting the notion that peri-implantitis may not be primarily bacteria-driven [16]. This lack of a predictable treatment outcome could be due to the underlying foreign body response, which complicates the management of bone loss once the initial inflammatory reaction has been aggravated [4].

The evidence suggests that bio-corrosion, immune responses, and genetic factors play significant roles in the pathogenesis of peri-implantitis. These findings align with

Albrektsson's theory that peri-implantitis is more accurately described as a complication of a foreign body reaction rather than a primary infectious disease [4]. This necessitates a re-evaluation of implant material choices and treatment protocols to better address the underlying causes of peri-implant complications.

Discussion

The comparison between titanium and zirconia implants reveals a nuanced picture of their respective strengths and limitations. Titanium, known for its high mechanical stability and extensive clinical history, has been the material of choice for dental implants for decades [4]. It offers excellent osseointegration and durability, making it suitable for a wide range of clinical situations. However, the increasing prevalence of peri-implantitis and the challenges associated with managing this condition highlight the limitations of titanium's biological compatibility [13, 5]. As the number of implants placed annually continues to rise, so too does the incidence of peri-implant diseases, necessitating a re-evaluation of implant materials [5].

Albrektsson's hypothesis that peri-implantitis is primarily a foreign body reaction rather than an infectious disease is supported by evidence of the adverse immune responses triggered by titanium ions released during bio-corrosion [4, 17]. This inflammatory response, coupled with genetic predispositions in some patients, can lead to significant bone loss and implant failure [13, 14]. The traditional reliance on titanium may need to be reconsidered as the population of implant patients grows younger and more diverse, and as the need for long-term solutions that can endure for several decades becomes more pressing.

Zirconia, with its superior biocompatibility and esthetic advantages, offers a promising alternative. Studies have shown that zirconia implants are associated with less plaque accumulation, better blood flow around the implant site, and a more favorable connective tissue response, including the formation of perpendicular collagen fibers similar to those found around natural teeth [8, 9]. These biological benefits, combined with a reduced risk of hypersensitivity reactions, make zirconia an attractive option, especially for health-conscious patients seeking metal-free solutions [1, 3].

Despite these advantages, many clinicians remain hesitant to adopt zirconia implants, largely due to their familiarity and success with titanium. This reluctance is understandable, as transitioning to a new material requires significant adjustments to clinical protocols and techniques. However, the increasing demand for long-term, biologically compatible solutions suggests that it is time for the dental community to broaden its perspective [6]. Zirconia has proven to be a serious competitor to titanium, not only in terms of stability and clinical outcomes but also in providing superior esthetic and biological advantages that can lead to better long-term health for patients [2, 8].

The transition to zirconia is not hindered by a lack of scientific evidence but rather by a reluctance to leave the comfort zone of traditional materials. With the growing body of research supporting zirconia's efficacy

and the availability of training programs to help clinicians master the material's unique properties, now is the ideal time for dental professionals to consider integrating zirconia into their practices [6]. This shift could significantly reduce the incidence of peri-implant diseases and improve the overall quality of care.

Moreover, adopting zirconia implants offers a strategic advantage in an increasingly competitive market. By embracing this innovative material, dentists can differentiate themselves as leaders in high-tech, biologically compatible dentistry, appealing to a new demographic of health-conscious patients who are willing to invest in advanced treatment options [1]. As the dental field evolves, it is crucial for practitioners to stay ahead of the curve and not miss out on the opportunity to be part of this paradigm shift towards more biocompatible, long-lasting implant solutions.

Conclusion

It is understandable that experienced dentists, who have built their practices and reputations on the reliable use of titanium implants, may be hesitant to change. Titanium implants have a long track record of success, and many clinicians have developed comprehensive protocols tailored specifically to titanium's properties [4]. However, as younger patients are receiving implants earlier in life and life expectancy continues to increase, the demand for long-term solutions capable of lasting several decades becomes more pressing [3].

Furthermore, our definition of implant success needs reevaluation. Peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis, even if managed through diligent aftercare, should not be considered successful outcomes. True success should be defined as a stable, functional, and esthetic tooth replacement that remains free from biological complications beyond 5 or 10 years [5]. To achieve this, it is crucial to reconsider our choice of implant materials. Zirconia, with its superior biocompatibility, reduced plaque adhesion, and excellent soft tissue integration, offers numerous advantages over titanium. Beyond its biological benefits, zirconia implants—available in both one-piece and two-piece designs—provide versatile restorative options that can be easily customized to a patient's unique anatomical needs [7]. This adaptability allows for superior esthetic results without the need for complex technical protocols, making the restoration process more akin to that of natural teeth.

For clinicians, this represents a significant opportunity to differentiate themselves in an increasingly competitive market. Embracing zirconia not only addresses the growing demand for metal-free solutions but also positions forward-thinking practitioners as leaders in offering high-tech, health-conscious treatment options [1]. As more patients prioritize long-term health and are willing to invest in advanced dental care, zirconia implants could open the door to a promising new niche in the health market.

The transition to zirconia does come with a learning curve, as it requires adjustments to clinical protocols and techniques that have been optimized for titanium. However, there are now ample opportunities for training and mentorship to support dentists in making this transition smoothly. With proper guidance, clinicians can minimize early-stage challenges and avoid the frustration of initial failures [6]. By taking advantage of these resources, dentists can confidently incorporate zirconia implants into their practice and be prepared for the paradigm shift that is already underway in implant dentistry.

Every ambitious dentist should consider taking a closer look at zirconia and think strategically about how to integrate it into their everyday practice. Not only does it align with the future of dental medicine, but

it also offers a unique opportunity to stand out in a crowded market and meet the needs of an increasingly health-conscious patient population. The shift from titanium to zirconia represents not just an evolution in material science but a new era in dental implantology—one that prioritizes patient health and longevity without compromising on clinical outcomes or esthetics [1].

References

1. Gahlert M, Kniha H, Wölfler H, Jaquiéry C, Röhling S. (2018). Patient preference and knowledge of ceramic implants. Clin Oral Implants Res. 16: 135-53.
2. Brunello G, Rauch N, Becker K, Hakimi AR, Schwarz F, et al. (2022) Two-piece zirconia implants in the posterior mandible and maxilla: A cohort study with a 9-year follow-up. Clin Oral Implants Res. 33(12):1233-44.
3. Müller-Heupt LK, Schiegnitz E, Kaya S, Jacobi-Gresser E, Kämmerer PW, Al-Nawas B. (2022) The German S3 guideline on titanium hypersensitivity in implant dentistry: consensus statements and recommendations. Int J Imp Dent. 8(1):51.
4. Albrektsson T, Brånemark PI, Hansson HA, Lindström J. (1981) Osseointegrated titanium implants: Requirements for ensuring a long-lasting, direct bone-to-implant anchorage in man. Acta Orthop Scand. 52(2):155-70.
5. Derks J, Schaller D, Wennström JL, Tomasi C, Berglundh T. (2016) Effectiveness of implant therapy analyzed in a Swedish population: Prevalence of peri-implantitis. J Dent Res. 95(1):43-9.
6. Kajiwara N, Masaki C, Mukaibo T, Kondo Y, Nakamoto T, Hosokawa R. (2015) Soft tissue biological response to zirconia and metal implant abutments compared with natural tooth: Microcirculation monitoring as a novel bioindicator. Implant Dent. 24(1):37-41.
7. Spies BC, Schepke U, Schmidt KE. (2018) Clinical and microbiological results of titanium versus zirconia implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 29(6):734-51.
8. Roehling S, Gahlert M, Schlegel KA, Woelfler H. (2019) Zirconia compared to titanium dental implants in preclinical studies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 30(5):365-95.
9. Schwarz F, Becker J, Renvert S, Bostanci N. (2018) Peri-implantitis treatment: What is now considered as the gold standard? Periodontol. 79(1):189-212.
10. Jacobi-Gresser E, Huesker K, Schütt S. (2013) Genetic and immunological markers predict titanium implant failure: A retrospective study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 42(5):537-43.
11. Hilbe M, Gehrke P, Pozza G, Mücke T. (2021) Zirconia implants in the aesthetic zone: Clinical and histological evaluation of soft and hard tissue integration. J Clin Med. 10(8):1651.
12. Watanabe M, Liu L, Ichikawa T. (2023) Are Allergy-Induced Implant Failures Actually Hypersensitivity Reactions to Titanium? A Literature Review. Dentistry Journal, 11(11):263.
13. Olmedo DG, Tasat DR, Evelson P, Rebagliatti R, Guglielmotti MB. (2011) In vivo comparative biokinetics and biocompatibility of titanium and zirconium microparticles. J Biomed Mater Res Part A. 98A(4):604-13.
14. Müller, K., Valentine-Thon, E. (2006) Hypersensitivity to titanium: Clinical and laboratory evidence. Neuro Endocrinol Lett, 27 (Suppl 1):31-5.
15. Kohal RJ, Weng D, Bächle M, Strub JR. (2004) Loaded custom-made zirconia and titanium implants show similar osseointegration: An animal experiment. Journal of Periodontology. 75(9):1262-8.
16. Schwarz F, Derks J, Monje A, Wang HL. (2018) Peri-implantitis. Journal of Periodontology. 89(Suppl. 1): S267-90.
17. Albrektsson T, Canullo L, Cochran D, De Bruyn, H. (2013) Peri-implantitis: A complication of a foreign body or a man-made “disease.” Facts, Research and Problems. 24(2):899-906.