IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 24, Issue 6 Ser.5 (June 2025), PP 36-39
www.iosrjournals.org

Biomaterials In Implant Dentistry: A Review

Dr. Neeraj Giri[1], Dr. Annie Susan Thomas[2], Dr. Prabu P S[3], Dr.Bajisha V K[4], Dr. Reshma Anil Thomas[5]

(1,4,5) Second Year Postgraduate Student, Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor Dental College, Muvattupuzha Kerala.
(2) Head Of the Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor Dental College, Muvattupuzha, Kerala.
(3) Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor Dental College, Muvattupuzha, Kerala.

Abstract: *Biomaterials are integral to the success of dental implants, significantly impacting osseointegration, biocompatibility, mechanical stability, and esthetics[1]. Over the decades, innovations in materials science have led to the development of new implant materials and surface modifications aimed at improving biological and clinical outcomes[2]. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the biomaterials used in implant dentistry, highlighting their properties, classification, clinical applications, and recent advancements. Titanium and its alloys continue to dominate as implant materials due to their favorable biomechanical properties and excellent osseointegration[3]. Zirconia has emerged as a viable metal-free alternative, offering superior esthetics and acceptable biological compatibility[4]. Surface modifications such as sandblasting, acid etching, plasma spraying, and hydroxyapatite coating enhance the biological response and long-term implant success[5]. Recent trends include nanostructured surfaces and bioactive coatings that stimulate bone regeneration[6].*

Keywords: *Dental implants, Biomaterials, Titanium, Zirconia, Surface modification, Osseointegration, Implant dentistry*

Date of Submission: 06-06-2025 Date of Acceptance: 16-06-2025

I. Introduction

Dental implants are alloplastic materials surgically inserted into the jawbone to support prosthetic restorations and restore function and esthetics[1]. The long-term success of implants depends significantly on the choice of biomaterial, which influences osseointegration, biocompatibility, and host response[2,3]. Over time, biomaterials have evolved from inert metallic structures to surface-modified, bioactive, and even polymer-based systems aimed at enhancing biological performance[4,5]. Innovations such as yttria-stabilized zirconia and polyetheretherketone (PEEK) represent newer alternatives with improved mechanical and aesthetic profiles[6]. Understanding the characteristics, classifications, and biological interactions of implant biomaterials remains crucial in optimizing outcomes in implant dentistry[7].

II. History

Ancient Egyptians (2500 BC) used shells, wood, and ivory. Etruscans and Phoenicians (500–300 BC) used gold wires and ivory teeth. Mayans (600 AD) implanted shells. John Hunter (1700) attempted tooth transplantation.[1] Early implants used gold (Maggiolo, 1809), porcelain with platinum posts (Harris, 1887), and gutta-percha/rubber (Zamenski, 1890). Payne (1898) and Lambotte (1900s) experimented with metals like silver, brass, and magnesium.[1]

Greenfield (1911) introduced iridoplatinum baskets. Adams (1938) patented threaded cylindrical implants with healing caps.[1] Strock (1939) used vitallium screws. Formiggini and Zepponi (1940s) developed spiral implants. Linkow (1960s) introduced blade implants. Brånemark (1978) pioneered osseointegration with titanium implants.[1] Advances include screw-vent and IMZ implants, plasma-sprayed surfaces, and hydroxyapatite coatings. Current trends explore nanotechnology, rapid prototyping, biodegradable ceramics, and roxolid narrow-diameter implants.[1]

III. Rationale for Implant Biomaterials Selection

Dental implants have revolutionized restorative dentistry by offering a reliable solution for tooth replacement that preserves bone and restores function. The success of implants depends largely on osseointegration, which is influenced by implant material, surface properties, and surgical technique[15]. Innovations in biomaterials and surface modifications aim to improve implant stability, reduce healing time, and enhance long-term success[23]. The introduction of titanium and its alloys, along with bioactive coatings such as hydroxyapatite, has significantly improved biocompatibility and mechanical strength[1826]. Newer technologies like nanotechnology and additive manufacturing provide promising avenues for customizing implants to patient-specific needs[30]. Understanding the rationale behind these advances helps clinicians select appropriate implants and optimize treatment outcomes.

IV. Properties of Implant Biomaterials

Ideal implant biomaterials must exhibit excellent biocompatibility, mechanical strength, corrosion resistance, and osseoconductivity to support long-term function and integration[12,13]. They should be inert or bioactive, capable of withstanding intraoral forces without degrading or eliciting adverse tissue responses[14]. Mechanical properties like elastic modulus, tensile strength, and fatigue resistance are critical for mimicking the behavior of natural bone and withstanding masticatory loads[16]. Additionally, surface energy, roughness, and wettability influence cellular attachment and the healing response[19]. The ability of the material to form a stable interface with bone — without fibrous encapsulation — remains the cornerstone of implant success[26].

V. Classification of Implant Biomaterials

Implant biomaterials can be classified based on various parameters -

By composition[17,20]:

1. Metals and alloys – e.g., commercially pure titanium, titanium alloys, stainless steel, cobalt-chromium.
2. Ceramics – e.g., alumina, zirconia, hydroxyapatite.
3. Polymers – e.g., PEEK (polyether ether ketone), PMMA.
4. Composites – combinations of materials to enhance mechanical or biological properties.

By biological behavior[24]:

1. Bioinert – do not interact significantly with surrounding tissue (e.g., titanium, alumina).
2. Bioactive – stimulate a biological response and bond with tissues (e.g., hydroxyapatite, bioactive glass).
3. Bioresorbable – gradually degrade and are replaced by host tissue (e.g., tricalcium phosphate).

By mechanical role[19]:

1. Load-bearing materials – such as titanium, designed to withstand functional forces.
2. Non-load-bearing or space-maintaining materials – such as bone graft substitutes, scaffolds.

VI. Metals and Alloys

Metals and their alloys have been extensively used in implant dentistry due to their mechanical strength, corrosion resistance, and biocompatibility[17,20]. Among them, commercially pure titanium (cpTi) and titanium alloys (particularly Ti-6Al-4V) are the most widely accepted implant materials. Titanium exhibits excellent osseointegration properties and forms a stable oxide layer (TiO_2) that enhances its corrosion resistance and biocompatibility[20]. Cobalt-chromium and stainless steel were used in earlier implant systems but have largely been replaced due to inferior biocompatibility and increased risk of corrosion-related complications[21]. Zirconium-based alloys have gained attention due to their superior esthetics and reduced ion release[23].

VII. Yttria-Partially Stabilized Tetragonal Zirconia Polycrystals (Y-TZP)

Yttria-stabilized tetragonal zirconia polycrystals (Y-TZP) are advanced ceramic materials increasingly used as alternatives to titanium in implant dentistry due to their superior esthetics, high strength, and biocompatibility[27]. Stabilization with yttria (Y_2O_3) maintains the tetragonal crystal phase, which contributes to the material's transformation toughening ability — a mechanism that enhances fracture resistance[28]. Zirconia exhibits high flexural strength and fracture toughness compared to other ceramic materials, which enhances its resistance to crack propagation and mechanical failure under functional loading[27]. Additionally, it shows low plaque affinity and elicits a favorable soft tissue response, making it particularly suitable for use in the esthetic zone[28]. Its tooth-like white color eliminates the risk of grayish gingival discoloration commonly associated with metallic implants, thereby offering a significant esthetic advantage[29]. Although promising, concerns remain regarding the aging phenomenon (low-temperature degradation), which can reduce long-term reliability of Y-TZP implants[30]. Advances in processing methods and the development of hybrid zirconia materials aim to overcome these limitations[31].

VIII. Alumina Toughened Zirconia (ATZ) and Zirconia Toughened Alumina (ZTA)

Alumina Toughened Zirconia (ATZ) and Zirconia Toughened Alumina (ZTA) are composite ceramics developed to overcome the limitations of monolithic zirconia and alumina by combining their respective strengths[32].

In ATZ, zirconia is the primary phase reinforced with alumina particles, which improves hardness, wear resistance, and reduces the risk of low-temperature degradation seen in Y-TZP[33]. Conversely, ZTA consists predominantly of alumina with dispersed zirconia particles, which enhances fracture toughness while maintaining the inherent stability and biocompatibility of alumina[34].

Both materials exhibit superior mechanical performance and chemical stability, making them promising for dental and orthopedic applications. Their hybrid nature offers a balance between strength and aging resistance, though long-term clinical data in implant dentistry is still limited[34].

IX. Silicon Nitride

Silicon nitride (Si_3N_4) is an emerging ceramic biomaterial in implant dentistry, known for its high strength, fracture toughness, and excellent wear resistance[35]. Unlike many ceramics, silicon nitride demonstrates intrinsic antibacterial properties, reducing bacterial adhesion and biofilm formation on its surface[36]. This makes it particularly attractive in minimizing peri-implant infections.

It also shows favorable osteogenic potential, promoting bone cell adhesion and proliferation, while maintaining chemical stability in physiological environments[37]. Silicon nitride's surface chemistry supports protein adsorption and early bone response, which are crucial for successful osseointegration[38].

Despite its promising properties, the clinical application of silicon nitride in dental implants is still under investigation, and further long-term clinical studies are required to validate its performance compared to traditional materials[39].

X. Polymers

Polymers have been explored in implant dentistry primarily for temporary prostheses, abutments, and components where flexibility and shock absorption are desired[40]. Their ease of processing, lightweight nature, and potential for customization make them attractive; however, their low mechanical strength and limited osseointegration capacity restrict their use as implant bodies[41].

Most polymers are bioinert, and their surface energy does not naturally promote strong interactions with bone tissue. To enhance biological response, surface modifications and composite reinforcements have been employed[42]. Despite advances, the long-term success of polymers in load-bearing implant applications remains limited when compared to metals and ceramics.

Recent innovations like PEEK (polyetheretherketone) have renewed interest in polymers due to improved mechanical and biological behavior[43], which will be discussed further in the next section.

XI. Polyetheretherketone (PEEK)

Polyetheretherketone (PEEK) is a high-performance thermoplastic polymer that has garnered significant interest in implant dentistry due to its excellent mechanical properties, biocompatibility, and chemical stability[44]. It exhibits a modulus of elasticity similar to that of cortical bone, which may reduce stress shielding and promote better load transmission to surrounding bone[45].

PEEK is also radiolucent, allowing unobstructed radiographic evaluation, and is highly resistant to wear and corrosion[44]. However, one of its major drawbacks is its bioinert surface, which does not inherently support osseointegration[46]. To address this, surface treatments such as plasma spraying, bioactive coatings, and nanostructuring have been explored to enhance its osteoconductivity[47].

With ongoing research and clinical trials, PEEK holds promise as a viable alternative to metallic implants, particularly in patients with metal hypersensitivity or esthetic demands[45].

XII. Surface Characterization of Dental Implants

The surface characteristics of dental implants, including topography, chemistry, roughness, and wettability, play a crucial role in osseointegration and long-term implant success[48]. Modifications to implant surfaces, such as acid etching, sandblasting, plasma spraying, and anodization, aim to enhance surface roughness and increase the surface area available for bone contact[49]. These treatments promote osteoblast adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation, accelerating bone healing and integration[50]. Moreover, the surface energy and wettability influence protein adsorption and cell behavior, further affecting implant stability[51]. Advanced surface coatings incorporating bioactive molecules, antibiotics, or growth factors are being developed to improve biological responses and reduce the risk of peri-implantitis[52].

XIII. Conclusion

The selection and development of implant biomaterials are critical to the long-term success of dental implants. Advances in metals, ceramics, and polymers have significantly improved implant performance, biocompatibility, and esthetics. Surface modifications play a pivotal role in enhancing osseointegration and reducing complications such as peri-implantitis. Continued research and innovation in biomaterials and surface engineering hold promise for further improving clinical outcomes and expanding treatment possibilities in implant dentistry.

References

[1]. Zarb GA, Albrektsson T (1991) Osseointegration: a requiem for periodontal ligament? Int J Periodontal Restor Dent 11:88–91

[2]. Albrektsson T, Branemark P-I, Hansson H-A, Lindstro¨m J (1981) Osseointegrated titanium implants. Requirements for ensuring a long-lasting direct bone-to-implant anchorage in man. Acta Orthop Scand 52:155–170

[3]. Baier RE, Natiella JR, Meyer AE, Carter JM (1986) Importance of Implant Surface Preparations for Biomaterials with Different Intrinsic Properties. In: van Steenberghe D, Albrektsson T, Branemark P-I, Holt R, Henry P, Lide´n C, Excerpta Medica, Amsterdam, p 13–40

[4]. Eriksson RA (1984) Heat-induced bone tissue injury. An in vivo investigation of heat tolerance of bone tissue and temperature rise in the drilling of cortical bone. Thesis. University of Goteborg, Sweden, pp 1–112

[5]. Eriksson RA, Albrektsson T (1984) The effect of heat on bone regeneration. J Oral Maxillofacial Surg 42:701–711

[6]. Shajahan P A, Rohit Raghavan, Gouri S R, IMPLANT BIOMATERIALS- A LITERATURE REVIEW the journal of PROSTHETIC AND IMPLANT DENTISTRY Official Publication of Indian Prosthodontic Society Kerala State Branch Volume 2 Issue 1 / September–December 2018

[7]. A Review on Biomaterials in Dental Implantology; Hariprasad Ananth, Vinaya Kundapur, H. S. Mohammed, M. Anand, G. S. Amarnath, Sunil Mankar; International journal of Biomedical science; 2015; 11 (3): 113-120

[8]. Evolution of Implant Biomaterials: A Literature Review; R. Deepashree, V. Devaki, Balu Kandhasamy, R. Ajay; Journal of the Indian Academy of Dental Specialist Researchers;2017;4:65-7

[9]. Bio implant materials: Requirements, Types -and Properties; A review J. Daniel Glad Stephen, G. Lalit Kumar, R. Vinesh, G. Vikram; Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences; Special Issue 12: August 2017;18-26

[10]. Abraham CM. A brief historical perspective on dental implants, their surface coatings and treatments. Open Dent J. 2014 May 16;8:50-5. doi: 10.2174/1874210601408010050. PMID: 24894638; PMCID: PMC4040928.

[11]. R. Geoff Richards, PhD,* T. Fintan Moriarty, PhD,* Theodore Miclau, MD,‡ Robert T. McClellan, MD,‡ and David W. Grainger, PhD Advances in Biomaterials and Surface Technologies REVIEW ARTICLE J Orthop Trauma Volume 26, Number 12, December 2012

[12]. Brooks B, Brooks A, Grainger DW. Antimicrobial technologies in preclinical and clinical medical devices. In: Moriarty TF, Busscher HJ, Zaat SAJ, eds. Biomaterials Associated Infection: Immunological Aspects and Antimicrobial Strategies. New York, NY: Springer; 2012.

[13]. Wu P, Grainger DW. Drug/device combinations for local drug therapies and infection prophylaxis. Biomaterials. 2006;27:2450–2467.

[14]. Nejadnik MR, van der Mei HC, Norde W, et al. Bacterial adhesion and growth on a polymer brush-coating. Biomaterials 2008;29:4117–4121.

[15]. Saldarriaga FI, van der Mei HC, Lochhead MJ, et al. The inhibition of the adhesion of clinically isolated bacterial strains on multi-component crosslinked poly(ethylene glycol)-based polymer coatings. Biomaterials. 2007;28:4105–4112.

[16]. Maddikeri RR, Tosatti S, Schuler M, et al. Reduced medical infection related bacterial strains adhesion on bioactive RGD modified titanium surfaces: a first step toward cell selective surfaces. J Biomed Mater Res A. 2008;84:425–435

[17]. Broekhuizen CA, Sta M, Vandenbroucke-Grauls CM, et al. Microscopic detection of viable Staphylococcus epidermidis in peri-implant tissue in experimental biomaterial-associated infection, identified by bromodeoxyuridine incorporation. Infect Immun. 2010;78:954–96.

[18]. Zirconia Based Dental Biomaterials: Structure, Mechanical Properties, Biocompatibility, Surface Modification, and Applications as Implant REVIEW article Front. Dent. Med, 03 August 2021 Sec. Dental Materials

[19]. Textbook of essentials of periodontics and oral implantology by Dr Syed Wali Peeran and Dr Karthikeyan Ramalingam

[20]. Wong M , Eulenberger J, Schenk R, Hunziker E. Effect of surface topology on the osseointegration of implant materials in trabecular bone. J Biomed Mater Res. 1995;29:1567–75.

[21]. Park JY, Davies JE. Red blood cell and platelet interactions with titanium implant surfaces. Clin Oral Implant Res. 2000;12:530–9.

[22]. Ducheyne P, Cuckler JM. Bioactive ceramic prosthetic coatings. Clin Orthop Relat R. 1992;39(276):102–

[23]. Asbell Milton B. Dentistry. a historical perspective: being a historical account of the history of dentistry from ancient times with emphasis upon the United States from the colonial to the present period. Bryn Mawr Pa Dorrance & Co. 1988: 1–256.

[24]. Miloni Suresh Shah1 , Revathi Duraisamy1 , Sindhuja Devi S2 , Santhosh Kumar M P*3 Recent Advances in Implant Biomaterials - A Review Int. J. Res. Pharm. Sci., 2020, 11(4), 6962-6965

[25]. Estevam A. Bonfante1 | Ryo Jimbo2 | Lukasz Witek3 | Nick Tovar3 | Rodrigo Neiva4 | Andrea Torroni5 | Paulo G. Coelho Biomaterial...