



Gordon J. Christensen

# Clinicians Report®



August 2014, Volume 7 Issue 8: Addendum 1

A Publication of CR Foundation® • 3707 North Canyon Road, Building 7, Provo UT 84604 • 801-226-2121 • www.CliniciansReport.org



## Comparing Implants and Stimulating Their Use

### CR Survey

Results from a survey of a randomized group of CR subscribers describe the current state of implant use, practitioner experience, and opinions of the respondents about implant dentistry in 2014. (n=1129)

#### Respondents

1. 96% general practitioners (GPs),  
2% prosthodontists  
2% other
2. Do only prosthodontics: 61%  
Do prosthodontics and surgery 35%  
Neither: 4%
3. Place conventional and small: 48%  
Place only conventional: 40%  
Place only small diameter: 13%
4. Restore conventional and small: 35%,  
Restore only conventional: 65%  
Restore only small diameter: trace%

#### Small Diameter Implants

5. Small diameter implants placed:  
60% 3M ESPE MDI  
7% Intra-Lock  
5% Zest  
4% Glidewell  
3% Sterngold  
21% All others
6. Small diameter implants restored were nearly the same as #11 above.
7. Percentage of small diameter prosthodontic components that have failed:  
42% report 0% failed  
33% report 1–5% failed  
13% report 6–10% failed  
7% report 11–15% failed  
6% report 16% or more failed
8. Percentage of small diameter implants that have failed:  
21% report 0% failed  
40% report 1–5% failed  
20% report 6–10% failed  
10% report 11–15% failed  
9% report 16% or more failed
9. 95% will continue to place the small diameter brand they are using.
10. Difficulty of placing small diameter implants in health patients with acceptable bone quality and quantity:  
33% very easy  
53% easy  
14% moderately difficult  
trace% difficult

#### Conventional Diameter Implants

11. Conventional diameter brands placed:  
22% Implant Direct  
16% Nobel Biocare  
11% BioHorizons  
7% Hiossen  
6% Camlog  
5% Straumann  
5% Zimmer  
4% Ankylos Dentsply  
4% Astra Tech Dentsply  
20% All others
12. Conventional diameter brands restored:  
28% Nobel Biocare  
17% Straumann  
11% Biomet 3i  
8% Zimmer  
8% Implant Direct  
8% Astra Tech Dentsply  
5% BioHorizons  
15% All others
13. Percentage of conventional diameter prosthodontic components that have failed:  
33% report 0% failed  
61% report 1–5% failed  
4% report 6–10% failed  
1+% report 11% or more failed
14. Percentage of conventional diameter implants that have failed:  
22% report 0% failed  
65% report 1–5% failed  
11% report 6–10% failed  
2% report 11% or more failed
15. 96% will continue to place the conventional diameter brand they are using.
16. Difficulty of placing conventional diameter implants in healthy persons with acceptable bone quality and quantity:  
18% very easy  
62% easy  
20% moderately difficult  
trace% difficult

#### Summary of Survey

- **Implant Direct, Nobel Biocare, BioHorizons** were placed most by general practitioners.
- **Nobel Biocare, Straumann, and BioMet 3i** were restored most, indicating that referring dentists, mainly specialists, are using these brands most.
- **35% of general practitioners** are doing both implant placement and prosthodontics.
- **48% of general practitioners** placing implants are placing both conventional and small implants.
- **Both prosthodontic failure and conventional implant failure at five years** were relatively low at around 5% with prosthodontics failing more than implants.
- **Small implant success rate** was slightly lower than conventional.
- **Difficulty of placement** of conventional implants was judged to be easy, and small implants easy to very easy.