IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 24, Issue 6 Ser.6 (June 2025), PP 27-30
www.iosrjournals.org

Abutment Selection in Fixed Partial Dentures: An Overview of Clinical Criteria and Management of Complex Abutment Scenarios

[1]Dr. Pranjal Barman, [2]Dr. Rajesh Kumar, [3]Dr. Sunil Kumar M.V., [4]Dr. Rhythm Saxena, [5]Dr. Krishan Kumar

[1](PG Student, Department of prosthodontics, Jaipur Dental College/ MVGU, India)
[2](HOD, Department of prosthodontics, Jaipur Dental College/ MVGU, India)
[3](Professor, Department of prosthodontics, Jaipur Dental College/ MVGU, India)
[4](Reader, Department of prosthodontics, Jaipur Dental College/ MVGU, India)
[5](Sr. Lecturer, Department of prosthodontics, Jaipur Dental College/ MVGU, India)

Abstract:
Abutment selection plays a pivotal role in the long-term success of fixed partial dentures (FPDs). This review focuses on the diagnostic guidelines and clinical considerations essential for assessing appropriate abutment teeth, while also outlining approaches for handling complex situations such as tilted abutments, pier abutments, and scenarios involving cantilever design and canine replacement. Proper selection is guided by biomechanical principles, periodontal health, anatomical structure, and occlusal relationships. Understanding and applying evidence-based guidelines for abutment evaluation help clinicians optimize prosthesis design, functionality, and longevity. This article offers a clinical overview to assist practitioners in making informed decisions when confronted with routine and compromised clinical situations

Key Word*:. Abutment selection, Fixed partial denture, Tilted abutment, Pier abutment, Cantilever, Canine replacement .*

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

I. Introduction

The replacement of missing teeth is a foundational aspect of restorative dentistry, often pursued for both functional and esthetic improvements. Among available treatment modalities, fixed partial dentures (FPDs) are widely preferred for restoring single or multiple missing teeth due to their predictable performance and patient satisfaction [1,3].

An FPD is a non-removable prosthesis that gains support from adjacent teeth, roots, or implants. It consists of three main elements—retainers, pontics, and connectors—which work together to transfer masticatory forces to the supporting abutment teeth and surrounding tissues [2].

Throughout history, numerous civilizations have developed methods to restore lost teeth, reflecting a long-standing concern with dental function and appearance. Archaeological evidence from Egypt shows rudimentary prostheses made of gold and ivory as early as 2500 B.C [5]. The Etruscans later advanced these methods, creating fixed bridges using gold wires and natural teeth by 700 B.C. One particularly early example from Phoenicia illustrates the use of gold wiring to secure pontics in place—an early form of modern bridgework [6].

The 19th century introduced more structured techniques, including the Richmond crown, which utilized a dowel post and porcelain facing for improved support [7]. Over time, restorative materials have evolved from animal-derived substances to modern biocompatible materials. Milestones include the introduction of gold foil restorations in the late 18th century[8], the development of composite resins in the 1960s [9], and the emergence of glass ionomer cements (GICs) in the early 1970s [10].

While technologies have advanced, the success of FPDs continues to hinge on proper abutment selection. Factors such as root length, alignment, crown-to-root ratio, and periodontal condition must all be evaluated to ensure long-term function and stability [3,4]. This article provides an overview of these clinical criteria and discusses practical management strategies for abutment-related challenges in fixed prosthodontics.

II. CLINICAL CRITERIA FOR SELECTING ABUTMENT

The longevity and effectiveness of fixed partial dentures are significantly influenced by the proper selection of supporting abutment teeth. The following are the main clinical considerations that determine the appropriateness of an abutment tooth-

1. Diagnostic Casts and Radiographs

Mounted diagnostic casts aid in visualizing tooth alignment, occlusion, and path of insertion. Radiographs assess root morphology, bone support, and pulpal status [1,3].

2. Crown-to-Root Ratio (CRR)

An ideal CRR is 2:3; 1:1 is the minimum acceptable. Poor ratios may lead to abutment overload and failure [4].

3. Root Surface Area (Ante's Law)

According to Ante's Law, the total root surface area of abutments should equal or exceed that of the missing teeth. Multirooted and broad roots offer better support [3,4].

4. Root Form and Length

Abutment teeth with long roots, broad dimensions, or divergent root orientation are generally considered more suitable for providing structural support. Conical or fused roots are less stable under functional loads [4].

5. Arch Form and Span Length

The bending or flexing of a fixed prosthesis rises exponentially as the span length of the pontic increases, specifically following a cubic relationship. Long spans or curved arches may require secondary abutments [4].

6. Occlusal Anatomy and Load Distribution

Abutments must maintain proper occlusal contacts. Flattened occlusal surfaces increase stress and should be restored anatomically [3].

7. Periodontal Support and Mobility

Healthy periodontium and minimal tooth mobility (Miller Grade 0–1) are essential. Splinting may be required in mobile abutments [3,4].

8. Endodontic and Structural Integrity

Vital teeth are preferred. Endodontically treated teeth may serve as abutments if restored with adequate post and core systems and a ferrule [3].

9. Crown Height and Preparation Taper

A minimum clinical crown height of 4 mm is generally recommended to achieve optimal retention of the restoration. Over-tapered or short teeth may require crown lengthening or additional retentive features [3].

10. Span Deflection and Connector Thickness

As span length increases, deflection increases dramatically. This is managed by using thick, rigid connectors and limiting pontic numbers [4].

11. Other Considerations

Abutment selection should also consider root proximity, oral hygiene access, opposing dentition, and patient factors such as age, bruxism, and psychological status [3].

III. MANAGEMENT OF COMPLEX ABUTMENT SCENARIOS

In clinical practice, abutment selection often extends beyond ideal anatomical and periodontal conditions. Several complex scenarios require modified approaches to ensure long-term prosthodontic success. Below is an overview of key abutment challenges and their clinical management based on established literature.

1. Pier Abutment

A pier abutment is a natural tooth positioned between two missing teeth, serving as a central support within a fixed partial denture framework [11]. Rigid connectors are commonly used, but their use in long-span bridges involving a pier abutment may create a fulcrum effect, leading to stress concentration on terminal retainers [12,13].

To counter this, non-rigid connectors (e.g., key and keyway attachments) are recommended. They allow slight movement between prosthesis segments, isolating the middle abutment and minimizing stress transmission [12,14].

For optimal load direction, the keyway should be placed on the distal surface of the pier abutment, allowing the mesial force to seat the connector more securely [12,15].

2. Tilted Molar Abutments

Tilted abutments are commonly encountered due to early loss of adjacent teeth. Mandibular second molars often drift mesially into edentulous spaces, disrupting the common path of insertion [12,16].

Management strategies include:

- Orthodontic uprighting using fixed appliances, which reestablish alignment and periodontal health [12,17].
- Proximal half crowns, which preserve tooth structure and accommodate tilted orientation [12].
- Telescopic crowns, which consist of an inner coping and a superstructure retainer that compensates for path divergence [12,18,19].
- Non-rigid connectors, positioned to accommodate the tilt and prevent over-tapered preparations [12].

Orthodontic uprighting remains the preferred approach for moderate to severe tilts, as it allows for controlled force application and better long-term outcomes [12,20,21].

3. Cantilever Fixed Partial Dentures

A cantilever fixed partial denture is a type of prosthesis in which the artificial tooth (pontic) is anchored to supporting teeth on just one side, rather than being supported at both ends. This design forms a lever system, increasing stress on abutments, thus requiring careful planning [12].

Clinical Considerations

- Support**:** Strong periodontal support, sufficient crown height, and root form are essential. Two abutments are preferred in posterior cases due to higher occlusal forces [12,22].
- Occlusion: The pontic is designed to make contact only during centric occlusion, with no contact occurring during lateral or protrusive movements. A soft-tissue-supported opposing denture is more favorable [12,22].
- Retainers and Connectors**:** Full-coverage crowns with added grooves improve retention. U-shaped connectors are preferred for better stress distribution [12,23].
- Pontic Design**:** A narrow occlusal table and minimal tissue contact reduce loading and maintain hygiene [22].

Clinical Indications

- Maxillary Lateral Incisor**:** The canine may act as a single abutment if root support is sufficient. Occlusal contact on the pontic must be avoided [12,24].
- First Premolar**:** Requires sound second premolar and first molar as abutments with full-coverage retainers[12].
- Posterior Cantilever**:** Reduced-size pontic with light centric contact only. Recommended only when abutments have good crown height and periodontal support [12,24].
- Spring Cantilever**:** A spring cantilever bridge uses an abutment that is not directly next to the missing tooth area. A loop connector is used to connect the distant abutment to the pontic. It is mainly used in the anterior region to maintain spacing and esthetics, but it is unsuitable for the mandible due to tongue interference[24].

4.Canine Replacement Fixed Partial Dentures

Replacing a canine with a fixed partial denture (FPD) is challenging because the canine often lies outside the interabutment axis. The usual abutments—the lateral incisor and first premolar—are among the weakest teeth in the arch. Lateral incisors have the smallest root surface in the arch. First premolars may help due to two-root anatomy but require good periodontal health.

- Maxillary canine FPDs experience more stress as forces are directed outward (labially) against the weaker inner part of the arch. In contrast, mandibular canine FPDs experience forces directed inward (lingually) against the stronger outside curve , giving them a better prognosis.
- Fixed partial dentures used to replace canines are classified as complex and are recommended to replace no more than one adjacent tooth. Loss of a canine plus two adjacent teeth is best managed with a removable partial denture[12].

Clinical Strategies for Success

- Avoid cantilevering unless biomechanically justified.
- Splint adjacent teeth (e.g., central + lateral) for added support.
- In maxillary arches, it is advisable to incorporate stress breakers or designs that help reduce stress.
- Ensure excellent oral hygiene and occlusal control for long-term success [25].

IV. Conclusion

Choosing the right abutment tooth is essential for the long-term success of fixed partial dentures. A careful evaluation of factors like bone support, root shape, occlusion, and tooth condition helps ensure the restoration can withstand daily function. Treatment planning should be thorough and integrated with other dental specialties. Proper abutment selection and preparation play a key role in the durability and aesthetics of the prosthesis. Working with an experienced dentist ensures the best outcome for fixed partial denture treatment.

References

[1]. Subhashini MR, Abirami G, Jain AR. Abutment selection in fixed partial denture–a review. Drug Invention Today. 2018 Jan 1;10(1):111-5.

[2]. Zhao J, Wang X. Chapter 3 - dental prostheses. In: Shen JZ, Tomaž Kosmač, editors. Advanced Ceramics for Dentistry [Internet]. Butterworth-Heinemann; 2014. p. 23–49. Availablefrom: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123946195000031.

[3]. Shajahan PA, Raghavan R, Shilpa RS. Factors Influencing Abutment Selection in Fixed Partial Denture—A Review. Int. J. Innov. Sci. Res. Technol. 2022;7:1-5.
[4]. Reynolds JM. Abutment selection for fixed prosthodontics. Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 1968 May 1;19(5):483-8.
[5]. Hussain A, Khan F. History of dentistry. Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences. 2014 Jan;2(1):106.
[6]. Weinberger BW. An introduction to the history of dentistry. ST Lowis: Mosby; 1948.
[7]. Tylman SD. Theory and practice of crown and bridge prosthodontics. 4th ed. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby; 1965. Chapter 1, p. 21–32
[8]. Sweet AP. The amalgam war. *Dent Radiogr Photogr.* 1956;29:4–9.
[9]. Minguez N, Ellacuria J, Soler JI, Triana R, Ibaseta G. Advances in the history of composite resins. Journal of the History of Dentistry. 2003 Nov 1;51(3):103-5.
[10]. Herschfeld JJ. GV Black and the Search for a Better Amalgam. Bulletin of the history of dentistry. 1980 Oct;28(2):76-82.
[11]. The Glossary of Prosthodontic Terms 2023. Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 2023 Oct 1;130(4):e1–3.
[12]. Shillingburg HT**.** *Fundamentals of Fixed Prosthodontics*. 4th ed. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing; 2017. Chapter 7. p. 81–98.
[13]. Mishra A, Palaskar J, Madhav VN, Chopade SR. Pier abutment: Break the stress. Ann Prosthod Rest Dent. 2016 Oct;2:126-8.
[14]. Standlee JP, Caputo AA. Load transfer by fixed partial dentures with three abutments. Quintessence international. 1988 Jun 1;19(6).
[15]. Oruc S, Eraslan O, Tukay HA, Atay A. Stress analysis of effects of nonrigid connectors on fixed partial dentures with pier abutments. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2008 Mar 1;99(3):185-92.
[16]. Niraja Jaiswal, Jyoti Tembhurne, Arti Gangurde, Manish Chauhan. Conservative management of tilted abutment: A case report. Int J Appl Res 2021;7(1):169-171.
[17]. Norton LA, Proffit WR. Molar uprighting as an adjunct to fixed prosthesis. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1968 Feb 1;76(2):312-5.
[18]. Yadav K, Rathee M. Management of tilted molar abutment by telescopic crown: A case report. Indian J Appl Res. 2014;4:490-1.
[19]. Weaver JD. Telescopic copings in restorative dentistry. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 1989 Apr 1;61(4):429-33.
[20]. Khouw FE, Norton LA. The mechanism of fixed molar uprighting appliances. Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 1972 Apr 1;27(4):381-9.
[21]. Simon RL. Rationale and practical technique for uprighting mesially inclined molars. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1984;52:256–9.
[22]. Sharma A, Rahul GR, Poduval ST, Shetty K. Assessment of various factors for feasibility of fixed cantilever bridge: a review study. International Scholarly Research Notices. 2012;2012(1):259891.
[23]. Wright WE. Success with the cantilever fixed partial denture. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 1986 May 1;55(5):537-9.
[24]. Ewing JE. Re-evaluation of the cantilever principle. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 1957 Jan 1;7(1):78-92.
[25]. Kafalias MC. Upper cuspid replacement by a fixed partial denture. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 1974 Apr 1;31(4):384-7.