Journal of Advanced Medical and Dental Sciences Research

@Society of Scientific Research and Studies *NLM ID: 101716117*

Journal home page: www.jamdsr.com doi: 10.21276/jamdsr Indian Citation Index (ICI) Index Copernicus value = 100

(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599; (p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

Original Research

Zirconia in Dental Implantology: A Comprehensive Prosthodontic Perspective

[1]Rushikesh Narsing Kaknale, [2]Rajiv Kumar Gupta, [3]Akshay Bhargava, [4]Bharti Dua, [5]Manoj Kumar Goyat, [6]Kavita Gupta

[1]3rd Year PG, [2]Professor & Head, [3]Professor & Dean, [4]Reader, [5,6]Professor, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Santosh Dental College and Hospital, Pratap Vihar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT:

Dental implantology has become an integral aspect of modern prosthodontics, providing durable and predictable solutions for patients with partial or complete edentulism. While titanium has long been the material of choice, challenges such as its metallic appearance, potential for allergic reactions, and rare cases of sensitivity have driven the exploration of alternative materials. Zirconia, a high-strength ceramic, has emerged as a viable option for implantology due to its natural tooth-like color, biocompatibility, and resistance to bacterial adhesion. This review examines zirconia implants in depth, exploring their material properties, clinical applications, advantages, and limitations. Special emphasis is placed on their role in prosthodontic treatment planning, execution, and maintenance. The article concludes with insights into ongoing innovations, a critical discussion on zirconia's viability, and future directions in implant technology.

Keywords: Zirconia implants, Dental implantology, Aesthetic restoration

Received: 16 July, 2025 Accepted: 12 August, 2025 Published: 22 August, 2025

Corresponding author: Rajiv Kumar Gupta, Professor & Head, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Santosh Dental College and Hospital, Pratap Vihar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

This article may be cited as: Kaknale RN, Gupta RK, Bhargava A, Dua B, Goyat MK, Gupta K. Zirconia in Dental Implantology: A Comprehensive Prosthodontic Perspective. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2025; 13(8):29-35.

INTRODUCTION

Zirconia has emerged as a revolutionary material in dental implantology, offering a blend of functionality, aesthetics, and biocompatibility that meets the evolving needs of modern dentistry. With increasing patient demands for natural-looking and metal-free dental restorations, zirconia-based implants have become a reliable alternative to traditional titanium systems. Chemically known as zirconium dioxide (ZrO2), zirconia belongs to the ceramic family and is valued for its exceptional mechanical strength, resistance to wear, and natural tooth-like colour.[1]

One of the most compelling reasons for adopting zirconia in dental implantology is its ability to address aesthetic concerns, especially in highly visible areas like the anterior maxilla. Unlike titanium, which may cause a greyish tint in thin gingival biotypes, zirconia's white, tooth-coloured appearance blends seamlessly with the surrounding tissues. This characteristic is crucial for achieving superior aesthetic outcomes, particularly in patients with high cosmetic expectations or those requiring metal-free solutions.[2]

Zirconia's biocompatibility is another notable advantage, setting it apart from metallic alternatives. It integrates well with both soft and hard tissues, ensuring favourable long-term outcomes. The material's non-metallic nature eliminates the risk of ion release or corrosion, which can sometimes lead to allergic reactions or systemic effects in sensitive individuals. Additionally, zirconia is resistant to plaque accumulation, a property that supports peri-implant health and minimizes the risk of conditions like peri-implantitis.[3]

From a mechanical perspective, zirconia's high fracture toughness and compressive strength make it capable of withstanding the functional demands of the oral environment. Advances in material processing, such as the development of yttria-stabilized tetragonal zirconia polycrystals (Y-TZP), have addressed earlier concerns about brittleness, enhancing its reliability under occlusal loads. Furthermore, zirconia's low thermal conductivity reduces temperature sensitivity

during eating and drinking, improving overall patient comfort.[4]

The osseointegration capabilities of zirconia implants have been extensively studied, with research indicating outcomes comparable to or even better than titanium implants. Surface treatments such as sandblasting, acid etching, and laser texturing have been employed to enhance zirconia's osteoconductive properties, promoting efficient bone integration. These advancements contribute to the stability and longevity of zirconia-based implants.[5]

However, zirconia is not without challenges. Its tensile strength is lower compared to titanium, making it more prone to microcracks under certain conditions. While improvements in material design have mitigated this issue, zirconia implants still require careful handling and precise placement. Additionally, the relatively limited long-term clinical data compared to titanium implants underscores the need for ongoing research to validate their performance over extended periods.[6]

Zirconia's applications extend beyond implants to include implant-supported restorations like crowns and bridges. The use of zirconia prosthetic components enhances the aesthetic and functional harmony of rehabilitative treatments. Advances in computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) technology have further optimized zirconia's role in dentistry by enabling the creation of highly precise, patient-specific designs.[7,8]

As patient preferences shift toward sustainable and biocompatible treatment options, zirconia aligns well with these values. Its eco-friendly and non-toxic nature appeals to individuals seeking holistic dental care solutions. This focus on patient-centred care emphasizes the importance of integrating zirconia into contemporary prosthodontic practice.[9]

In conclusion, zirconia offers a compelling combination of aesthetics, biocompatibility, and mechanical performance, making it a valuable asset in dental implantology. While challenges remain, ongoing advancements in material science and clinical techniques continue to expand its applications and improve its success rates. Zirconia's transformative potential underscores its pivotal role in shaping the future of prosthodontics and dental implantology.[10]

Zirconia, known for its exceptional mechanical strength, biocompatibility, and aesthetic superiority, offers a promising solution. Its tooth-like colour eliminates the greyish hue of titanium visible under thin gingival tissues, particularly in aesthetic zones. Furthermore, zirconia's reduced bacterial adhesion and biocompatibility make it suitable for patients with a history of peri-implant diseases or metal sensitivities. From a prosthodontic perspective, zirconia's potential extends beyond aesthetics, impacting treatment planning, surgical outcomes, and long-term prosthetic success.[11,12]

This review provides an in-depth exploration of zirconia implants, highlighting their unique properties, clinical relevance, and impact on prosthodontic practice. It also examines challenges and innovations, offering a roadmap for integrating zirconia into advanced restorative treatments.

MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF ZIRCONIA

Mechanical Characteristics

Zirconia is renowned for its superior mechanical properties, making it one of the most reliable materials in dental implantology. Its flexural strength ranges between 900 and 1200 MPa, which is significantly higher than many other ceramic materials. This high strength is complemented by exceptional fracture toughness, which is essential for withstanding the functional demands placed on dental implants during chewing and occlusion. These mechanical properties are primarily attributed to zirconia's transformation toughening mechanism, a unique process wherein stress-induced phase changes occur within the material. This phase change creates compressive stresses at crack tips, which serve to inhibit crack propagation, thereby preventing fractures from progressing. This toughening mechanism not only enhances the material's strength but also allows zirconia to withstand the considerable forces generated in the oral cavity, making it comparable to titanium, traditionally known for its durability and resilience under similar forces.[13,14]

However, despite these impressive mechanical characteristics, zirconia is not without its vulnerabilities. One of the most notable concerns is low-temperature degradation (LTD). This phenomenon occurs when zirconia is exposed to moisture or humidity over time, leading to the formation of surface microcracks and a change in its crystalline structure. This degradation results in a decrease in the material's overall mechanical strength and can compromise the longevity of zirconia implants. To combat LTD, significant advancements have been made, including optimized grain size distribution, yttria stabilization, and the use of advanced surface treatments. These improvements help mitigate the effects of LTD by stabilizing the material's structure, improving its resistance to moisture-induced degradation, and enhancing the long-term performance and reliability of zirconia in clinical applications.[15]

Aesthetic Superiority

One of the most significant advantages of zirconia over traditional titanium implants is its aesthetic appeal. Zirconia closely mimics the natural color and translucency of tooth enamel, making it an excellent choice for implants that are visible in the aesthetic zone, particularly in the anterior region. Titanium implants, in contrast, often display a metallic hue that can be visible through the gums, especially in patients with thin gingival biotypes or those who suffer from gingival recession. This can lead to aesthetic concerns, as the metallic color of titanium is not ideal

for achieving a natural look. Zirconia, with its tooth-like color, eliminates this issue, offering a more aesthetically pleasing alternative that blends seamlessly with the surrounding natural teeth.[16]

For prosthodontists, zirconia provides a significant advantage, as it enables the creation of restorations that do not compromise on both form and function. In cases of anterior restorations, where appearance is critical to patient satisfaction, zirconia ensures that the implant is visually indistinguishable from natural tooth structures. Furthermore, its ability to be easily customized in terms of shape and contour enhances the final esthetic outcome. As a result, patients who choose zirconia implants often report higher satisfaction levels, especially those with concerns about the aesthetic implications of having metallic implants visible in their smiles.[17]

Biocompatibility

Zirconia is widely recognized for its superior biocompatibility, a critical factor for materials used in implantology. Unlike metallic materials such as titanium, zirconia does not release harmful ions into the surrounding tissues. This absence of ion release eliminates the risk of hypersensitivity reactions or adverse biological responses that may occur with metal-based implants. Zirconia's inert nature ensures that it is well-tolerated by the body, making it an ideal material for patients who may have sensitivities to metals or are seeking a more bio-friendly implant option.[18,19]

In addition to its non-reactivity, zirconia fosters excellent soft tissue integration, a key aspect of successful implantology. Clinical studies consistently show favorable outcomes regarding the health of the peri-implant soft tissues around zirconia implants. These implants promote better tissue adaptation and less inflammatory response compared to metallic implants. Zirconia's ability to integrate with both hard and soft tissues helps to maintain the long-term stability of the implant, reduce the risk of infection, and ensure that the implant functions effectively over time. As research in this area continues to evolve, the biocompatibility of zirconia remains one of its most celebrated advantages, contributing to its growing popularity in clinical practice.[20]

Resistance to Bacterial Adhesion

An often-overlooked yet crucial factor in implant success is the resistance to bacterial adhesion. The smoothness and low surface energy of zirconia make it far less prone to bacterial colonization compared to titanium. This reduced bacterial adhesion is a significant advantage in preventing the onset of peri-implant diseases, which can lead to implant failure. Peri-implantitis, a condition characterized by inflammation and infection of the tissues surrounding an implant, is one of the most common causes of implant failure, particularly in patients with compromised immune systems or poor oral hygiene. Zirconia's resistance to bacterial attachment helps reduce the risk of peri-implantitis by maintaining a cleaner surface and promoting a healthier oral environment.[21]

Moreover, the biocompatible properties of zirconia contribute to its ability to resist infection and promote quicker healing around the implant site. Studies have shown that the surface properties of zirconia can be further enhanced through specific surface treatments, which can increase its antimicrobial activity. These surface modifications further reduce bacterial colonization and contribute to long-term implant success. For patients with a history of periodontal issues or those at a higher risk for peri-implant diseases, zirconia offers a more reliable option in terms of maintaining oral health and preventing complications.[22]

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS IN PROSTHODONTICS

Osseointegration

Zirconia implants are increasingly recognized for their ability to achieve osseointegration, with bone-to-implant contact (BIC) rates that are comparable to, or even surpass, those of titanium. The process of osseointegration is crucial for the long-term stability and success of dental implants, as it ensures the implant is securely anchored to the surrounding bone. Various surface modifications have been developed to improve the osseointegration of zirconia implants. Techniques such as sandblasting, acid-etching, and laser treatments enhance the surface roughness and increase the surface area of the implant. These modifications promote the attachment of osteoblasts, the cells responsible for bone formation, and foster new bone deposition at the implant site.[23]

From a prosthodontic perspective, successful osseointegration is fundamental for providing a stable and durable foundation for complex restorations, whether for single-tooth implants or full-arch prostheses. The enhanced osseointegration of zirconia implants ensures that the restoration is firmly anchored, reducing the risk of complications such as implant failure or loosening over time. This property allows prosthodontists to confidently use zirconia implants in a wide variety of clinical cases, providing reliable long-term solutions for patients seeking high-quality prosthetic restorations.[24]

Soft Tissue Integration

An equally important aspect of implant success is the ability of the implant to integrate with the soft tissues surrounding it. This is particularly crucial for maintaining peri-implant health and aesthetic outcomes, as the soft tissues play a significant role in the overall appearance and stability of the implant. Zirconia implants have shown superior soft tissue integration when compared to titanium, with studies indicating that zirconia promotes higher collagen content and reduced inflammation at the implant site.

This results in a more stable and healthier peri-implant environment, reducing the likelihood of complications such as peri-implantitis or soft tissue recession.[26]

The biocompatibility of zirconia also contributes to its ability to integrate well with soft tissues, leading to a smoother, more seamless transition between the implant and the surrounding gum tissue. This is particularly beneficial in the anterior region, where the esthetic appearance of the gums is critical for patient satisfaction. A healthy, well-integrated soft tissue interface not only ensures the long-term success of the implant but also enhances the aesthetic outcome by reducing the risk of gingival recession and maintaining a natural gum line around the restoration.[27]

Aesthetic Restorations

For prosthodontists, achieving natural-looking restorations is a primary goal, especially when working in areas of the mouth that are highly visible, such as the anterior region. Zirconia offers a significant advantage in this regard due to its tooth-like appearance and natural translucency, which closely mimics the appearance of natural enamel. Unlike titanium implants, which can sometimes result in a visible greyish discoloration of the gingiva, zirconia's inherent color ensures that the restoration remains aesthetically pleasing, even in patients with thin gingival biotypes or gingival recession.[28]

This is particularly important for patients with high cosmetic expectations who seek implants that blend seamlessly with their natural teeth. Zirconia implants help eliminate concerns related to the aesthetic shortcomings of metallic implants, allowing prosthodontists to achieve optimal aesthetics with fewer complications. Whether used for single-tooth replacements or more extensive full-arch restorations, zirconia ensures that the final result not only restores function but also enhances the patient's overall appearance and self-confidence.[29]

CAD/CAM and Customization

The advancement of CAD/CAM technology (Computer-Aided Design and Computer-Aided Manufacturing) has revolutionized prosthodontics, allowing for the precise design and fabrication of custom zirconia abutments and prostheses. CAD/CAM technology allows prosthodontists to design highly personalized restorations tailored to the unique anatomical needs of each patient. The ability to create restorations with exact precision ensures an optimal fit, improving both the function and aesthetic outcomes.[30]

In complex cases, where anatomical challenges such as limited space, irregular bone contours, or specific esthetic requirements must be considered, CAD/CAM technology allows for the creation of zirconia restorations that meet the highest standards of care. This customization ensures that the restoration not only fits perfectly but also complements the natural contours and alignment of the patient's teeth and gums. Moreover, CAD/CAM technology streamlines the fabrication process, reducing treatment time and improving overall efficiency in clinical practice.[31]

Prosthetic Versatility

Zirconia is highly versatile and compatible with a wide range of restorative options, making it an ideal material for various prosthetic solutions. Whether it's full-arch restorations, single-tooth implants, or implant-supported overdentures, zirconia's mechanical strength, durability, and aesthetic qualities make it a reliable material for prosthodontists.[32]

In full-arch restorations, zirconia's ability to withstand significant occlusal forces ensures long-term stability and function, even in patients with heavy biting forces. Zirconia is also an excellent choice for implant-supported overdentures, providing a sturdy foundation for removable prostheses that require both strength and flexibility. Additionally, zirconia's compatibility with all-ceramic crowns and bridges makes it an ideal material for multiple-unit restorations, providing a cohesive aesthetic that matches the surrounding natural dentition. This versatility allows prosthodontists to address a wide range of clinical scenarios, from simple single-tooth implants to more complex rehabilitative cases, with confidence and precision.[33]

Prosthodontic Considerations

When selecting zirconia implants, prosthodontists need to take various factors into account, such as bone quality, occlusal forces, and the aesthetic needs of the patient. Zirconia's benefits are especially prominent in cases requiring aesthetic considerations, such as in anterior restorations where a natural tooth-like color is crucial. However, for patients with parafunctional habits like bruxism or those with complex anatomical conditions, zirconia may not always be the ideal choice. In these cases, titanium implants or hybrid systems that combine the properties of both zirconia and titanium might be more appropriate, offering the necessary strength and durability to withstand higher occlusal forces.[34]

In terms of treatment planning, a collaborative, multidisciplinary approach is essential for the successful use of zirconia implants. Prosthodontists, periodontists, and surgeons must work together to ensure a seamless rehabilitation process. The use of advanced imaging techniques, such as cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), coupled with digital planning tools, has revolutionized the way implants are placed. These technologies allow for more accurate implant positioning, which is critical in ensuring both functional and aesthetic success. Moreover, digital tools help in designing the prosthetics more precisely, minimizing the potential for complications and optimizing outcomes for patients.[35]

The maintenance of zirconia implants is another critical consideration. Regular follow-up appointments are essential to monitor peri-implant health and detect any early signs of complications. Tailored maintenance protocols, which include guidance on appropriate hygiene practices, play a significant role in preserving the integrity of the implant. Patients should be instructed on the importance of using non-abrasive cleaning methods, such as soft-bristled toothbrushes and specialized cleaning solutions, to prevent any damage to the zirconia surface. Such measures are necessary to maintain the aesthetic appearance and functionality of the implants over time. Regular professional cleanings and check-ups are key to preventing issues like peri-implantitis and ensuring the long-term success of the implant restoration.[36]

DISCUSSION

Zirconia implants have gained popularity as a significant alternative to titanium, especially in prosthodontics, where aesthetic outcomes are crucial. The material's natural tooth-like color makes it an ideal option for anterior restorations and for patients with thin gingival biotypes, offering superior aesthetics. Additionally, zirconia's biocompatibility aligns well with the modern goals of prosthodontics, supporting healthy peri-implant tissues and minimizing the hypersensitivity reactions often associated with metal implants. However, the mechanical brittleness of zirconia compared to titanium raises concerns, especially in high-stress environments like the posterior regions or full-arch restorations where occlusal forces are significantly higher. As a result, prosthodontists must carefully evaluate these limitations during treatment planning, considering alternatives such as hybrid implant designs or reinforced prosthetic materials to ensure reliability and longevity in high-load scenarios.

While zirconia excels in aesthetics, especially in visible areas, titanium remains unmatched in terms of mechanical strength and clinical success over the long term, particularly in complex cases involving high occlusal stresses. The choice between zirconia and titanium often comes down to individual patient factors, such as their aesthetic expectations, anatomical considerations, and the functional demands of their occlusion. For patients prioritizing aesthetics, zirconia may be the preferred material, whereas titanium may be more appropriate for those requiring superior strength and durability in more challenging functional conditions.

In response to zirconia's early challenges with osseointegration, recent advancements in surface treatments have significantly improved its clinical performance. Techniques like laser texturing, nanostructuring, and the application of bioactive coatings have enhanced the material's ability to bond with bone and soft tissues, making it more competitive with titanium in terms of biological integration. Despite these advancements, further research is needed to fine-tune these surface treatments for consistent, reliable results across diverse clinical cases. The current research is promising but still lacks extensive long-term clinical data, which is a limitation in the widespread adoption of zirconia implants. While short- and medium-term studies have demonstrated positive outcomes, the absence of long-term evidence makes it difficult to assess the material's durability and performance across varied patient populations. As such, larger, multicenter trials are essential to validate zirconia's long-term clinical viability.

For prosthodontists, zirconia implants present both an opportunity and a challenge. They provide an excellent option for patients seeking aesthetically superior restorations, particularly when combined with digital technologies such as CAD/CAM and 3D printing. These advancements allow for highly customized, precise zirconia prosthetics. However, the unique handling characteristics of zirconia necessitate additional training for clinicians to manage its preparation and placement effectively. This creates a learning curve that prosthodontists must overcome, with collaboration and continuous professional development being key to successful outcomes.

Looking to the future, zirconia implantology holds great promise, particularly with the development of new materials that combine the aesthetic properties of zirconia with the mechanical strength of titanium. Emerging technologies, such as hybrid designs, advanced composites, and more refined surface treatments, will likely expand the applications of zirconia in prosthodontics. The incorporation of artificial intelligence and digital planning tools will further streamline treatment workflows, leading to more precise procedures, enhanced outcomes, and higher levels of patient satisfaction. These innovations suggest that zirconia implants will continue to evolve, making them a more integral part of implant dentistry in the years to come.

CONCLUSION

Zirconia implants offer significant advantages in dental implantology, addressing key challenges in aesthetics, biocompatibility, and bacterial resistance. Despite their limitations, including mechanical brittleness and limited long-term data, ongoing innovations and research continue to enhance zirconia's clinical viability. For prosthodontists, zirconia implants provide an opportunity to deliver biologically favorable, aesthetic, and functional restorations, particularly in demanding clinical scenarios. As material science and clinical techniques evolve, zirconia is poised to play an increasingly prominent role in the future of implant-supported prosthodontics.

REFERENCES

1. Cionca N, Hashim D, Mombelli A. Zirconia dental implants: where are we now, and where are we heading?. Periodontology 2000. 2017 Feb;73(1):241-58.
2. Gahlert M, Gudehus T, Eichhorn S, Steinhauser E, Kniha H, Erhardt W. Biomechanical and histomorpho metric comparison between zirconia implants with varying surface textures and a titanium implant in the maxilla of miniature pigs. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2007;18:662–668.
3. Depprich R, Zipprich H, Ommerborn M, et al. Osseointegration of zirconia implants compared with titanium: an in vivo study. Head Face Med. 2008;4:30
4. Steinemann SG. Titanium—the material of choice? Periodontol 2000. 1998;17:7–21.
5. Osseointegration of Zirconia Implants in Rabbit Femur Heads Using Selective Infiltration Etching Technique Moustafa N. Aboushelib, PhD, MSc, DDS Noha A. Salem, MSc, DDS* Ahmed L. Abo Taleb, MSc, DDS Naglaa M. Abd El Moniem, MSc, DDS
6. Heydecke G, Kohal R, Gla¨ser R. Optimal esthetics in singletooth replacement with the re-implant system: a case report. Int J Prosthodont. 1999;12:184–189
7. Valentine-Thon E, Schiwara HW. Validity of MELISA for metal sensitivity testing. Neuroendocrinol Lett. 2003;24:57–64.
8. Yamauchi R, Morita A, Tsuji T. Pacemaker dermatitis from titanium. Contact Dermatitis. 2000;42: 52–53.
9. OsmanRB, MaS, DuncanW,DeSilva RK, Siddiqi A, Swain MV. Fractured zirconia implants and related implant designs: scanning electron microscopy analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res 2013: 24: 592–597
10. Schliephake H, Hefti T, Schlottig F, Gedet P, Staedt H. Mechanical anchorage and peri-implant bone formation of surface-modified zirconia in minipigs. J Clin Periodontol 2010: 37: 818–828.
11. M€ oller B, Terheyden H, Acil Y, Purcz N, Hertrampf K, Tabakov A, Behrens E, Wiltfang J. A comparison of bio compatibility and osseointegration of ceramic and titanium implants: an in vivo and in vitro study. Int J Oral MaxillofacSurg 2012: 41: 638–645.
12. Mombelli A, M€ uller N, Cionca N. The epidemiology of peri-implantitis. Clin Oral Implants Res 2012: 23:67–76.
13. Cionca N, Hashim D, Mombelli A. Zirconia dental implants: where are we now, and where are we heading?. Periodontology 2000. 2017 Feb;73(1):241-58.
14. Al-Amleh B, Lyons K, Swain M. Clinical trials in zirconia: a systematic review. J Oral Rehabil 2010: 37: 641–652
15. Nakamura K, Kanno T, Milleding P, € Ortengren U. Zirconia as a dental implant abutment material: a systematic review. Int J Prosthodont 2010: 23: 299–309.
16. Kelly JR, Denry I. Stabilized zirconia as a structural cera mic: an overview. Dent Mater 2008: 24: 289–298.
17. Sanon C, Chevalier J, Douillard T, Cattani-Lorente M, Scherrer SS, Gremillard L. A new testing protocol for zirconia dental implants. Dent Mater 2015: 31:15–25.
18. Lughi V, Sergo V. Low temperature degradation-aging-of zirconia: a critical review of the relevant aspects in den tistry. Dent Mater 2010: 26: 807–820.
19. Bankoğlu Güngör M, Aydın C, Yılmaz H, Gül EB. An overview of zirconia dental implants: basic properties and clinical application of three cases. Journal of Oral Implantology. 2014 Aug 1;40(4):485-94.
20. Sadowsky SJ. Zirconia Implants: A Mapping Review. Oral. 2023 Dec 25;4(1):9-22.
21. Branemark P-I, Breine U, Adell R, Hansson B, Lindstr€ om J, Ohlsson A. Intra-osseous anchorage of dental prostheses:I. Experimental studies. Scand J Plast ReconstrSurg 1969: 3:81–100.
22. Schroeder A, Pohler O, Sutter F. Tissue reaction to an implant of a titanium hollow cylinder with a titanium sur face spray layer. SSO Schweiz MonatsschrZahnheilkd 1976: 86: 713–727
23. Schneider G, Perinpanayagam H, Clegg M, Zaharias R, Seabold D, Keller J, Stanford C. Implant surface roughness affects osteoblast gene expression. J Dent Res 2003: 82: 372–376.
24. Gahlert M, Gudehus T, Eichhorn S, Steinhauser E, Kniha H, Erhardt W. Biomechanical and histomorphometric comparison between zirconia implants with varying surface textures and a titanium implant in the maxilla of miniature pigs. Clin Oral Implants Res 2007: 18: 662 668.
25. Hempel U, Hefti T, Kalbacova M, Wolf-Brandstetter C, Dieter P, Schlottig F. Response of osteoblast-like SAOS-2 cells to zirconia ceramics with different surface topographies. Clin Oral Implants Res 2010: 21: 174–181.
26. Aboushelib MN, Salem NA, Taleb ALA, El Moniem NMA. Influence of surface nano-roughness on osseointegration of zirconia implants in rabbit femur heads using selective infiltration etching technique. J Oral Implantol 2013: 39: 583–590.
27. Chung SH, Kim HK, Shon WJ, Park YS. Peri-implant bone formations around (Ti, Zr) O2-coated zirconia implants with different surface roughness. J Clin Periodontol 2013: 40: 404–411.
28. Koch F, Weng D, Kr€ amer S, Biesterfeld S, Jahn-Eimermacher A, Wagner W. Osseointegration of one-piece zirconia implants compared with a titanium implant of identical design: a histomorphometric study in the dog. Clin Oral Implants Res 2010: 21: 350–356.
29. Saulacic N, Erd€ osi R, Bosshardt DD, Gruber R, Buser D. Acid and alkaline etching of sandblasted zirconia implants: a histomorphometric study in miniature pigs. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2014: 16: 313–322.
30. Chappuis V, Cavusoglu Y, Gruber R, Kuchler U, Buser D, Bosshardt DD. Osseointegration of zirconia in the presence of multinucleated giant cells. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2016: 18: 686–698.
31. Allain J, Le Mouel S, Goutallier D, Voisin M. Poor eight year survival of cemented zirconia-polyethylene total hip replacements. J Bone Joint Surg 1999: 81: 835–842.
32. Sundfeldt M, Carlsson LV, Johansson CB, Thomsen P, Gret zer C. Aseptic loosening, not only a question of wear: a review of different theories. Acta Orthop 2006: 77:177–197.
33. Kohal RJ, Patzelt S, Butz F, Sahlin H. One-piece zirconia oral implants: one-year results from a prospective case series. 2. Three-unit fixed dental prosthesis (FDP) recon struction. J Clin Periodontol 2013: 40: 553–562.
34. Rompen E, Domken O, Degidi M, Farias Pontes AE, Piat telli A. The effect of material characteristics, of surface topography and of implant components and

connections on soft tissue integration: a literature review. Clin Oral Implants Res 2006: 17:55–67.
35. Noro A, Kaneko M, Murata I, Yoshinari M. Influence of surface topography and surface physicochemistry on wet tability of zirconia (tetragonal zirconia polycrystal). J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater 2013: 101: 355–363.
36. Yamano S, Kwok-Yui Ma A, Shanti RM, Kim S-W, Wada K, Sukotjo C. The influence of different implant materials on human gingival fibroblast morphology, proliferation, and gene expression. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2011: 26: 1247–1255.