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 healthy persons 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 8–10% 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.