WEB OF SCIENTIST: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 5, Issue 2, February, 2024

STRATEGIES EMPLOYED FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ALVEOLAR BONE SOCKETS POST-EXTRACTION TO MITIGATE RIDGE RESORPTION

Nabaa Tareq Al-khazaali[1],
Israa Tareq Al-khazaali[2],
Zahraa A. A. Alabrahimi[3],
Zainab F. K. AL-Zubaidy[4],
Abdul Razzaq Hassan Al-Khafaji[5],
Montadhar Rassol Al-mayali[6]
Ghadeer Sabah Bustani[7*]
University of Kufa, College of Science,
Department of Pathological Analysis, Najaf. Iraq.
Veterinary Hospital in Najaf, Iraq.
College of Dentistry, The Islamic university, Najaf, Iraq.
*Corresponding authors: Bustani@iunajaf.edu.iq

Abstract:
The preservation of alveolar bone socket after tooth extraction is essential for the long-term success of dental implant placement. Various techniques have been developed to minimize bone resorption and maintain soft tissue architecture, including socket preservation with bone grafts, guided bone regeneration, and immediate implant placement. While each technique has advantages and disadvantages, evidence-based decision making and patient-centered care are crucial in selecting the most appropriate approach. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews have compared the efficacy of different materials and techniques, but the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures remains a limitation. Future research should focus on developing novel materials and techniques, improving the standardization of study designs and outcome measures, and utilizing advanced imaging and computer-aided design in treatment planning. Ultimately, the individualized treatment planning based on patient and site-specific factors should be prioritized to achieve the best possible outcomes for patients.

Introduction:

Tooth extraction is a common dental procedure that may result in alveolar bone resorption, leading to significant changes in the shape and volume of the alveolar ridge. These changes can have adverse effects on subsequent dental implant placement, aesthetic outcomes, and function (Yang *et al.*, 2021). Therefore, preserving

the alveolar bone socket following extraction is crucial to maintain the integrity of the alveolar ridge and prevent ridge resorption (Faria-Almeida *et al.*, 2019). Various techniques have been developed to preserve the alveolar bone socket, including socket preservation using bone grafting materials, guided bone regeneration, and immediate implant placement (Su *et al.*, 2021). This literature review aims to discuss the techniques used to preserve the alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction and their efficacy in preventing ridge resorption. Understanding these techniques can aid clinicians in providing optimal treatment outcomes for their patients.

1. Overview

Tooth extraction is a common procedure, but it can result in the loss of alveolar bone, which can lead to alveolar ridge resorption. This resorption can cause a number of clinical consequences, including difficulties in implant placement, functional deficits, and aesthetic concerns. Therefore, preserving the alveolar bone socket is essential for maintaining the patient's oral health and improving treatment outcomes (Alghamdi and Jansen, 2019; Faria-Almeida *et al.*, 2019).

1.1. Importance of preserving alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction

The alveolar bone is responsible for supporting the teeth and maintaining the integrity of the jawbone. After tooth extraction, the socket in which the tooth was located begins to heal, and the alveolar bone surrounding the socket begins to resorb. This resorption can cause the loss of bone volume and density, leading to a decrease in the height and width of the alveolar ridge. As a result, there is a reduced ability to support an implant or denture (Crespi *et al.*, 2023).

1.1.1. Definition and prevalence of alveolar ridge resorption

Alveolar ridge resorption refers to the loss of bone volume and density in the alveolar ridge following tooth extraction. This process occurs due to the loss of the mechanical stimulus provided by the tooth, which stimulates bone formation and remodeling. The rate and extent of alveolar ridge resorption vary depending on several factors, including the number of teeth extracted, the location of the extraction, the age of the patient, and the presence of periodontal disease or infection (Alomari and Sultan, 2019; Kim *et al.*, 2021).

1.1.2. Clinical consequences of ridge resorption, including implant placement challenges and aesthetic and functional deficits

The loss of alveolar bone can cause a number of clinical consequences, including implant placement challenges, functional deficits, and aesthetic concerns. The reduced bone volume and density make it difficult to place an implant in the correct position, and the implant may be more prone to failure due to the lack of bone support. Additionally, the loss of bone can lead to changes in the patient's facial profile, causing aesthetic concerns (Gupta, Singh and Arya, 2019; RIDGE, 2020). Furthermore, the reduced bone volume can cause functional deficits, such as difficulty speaking and chewing.

1.2. Purpose of literature review to discuss techniques for preserving alveolar bone socket and their efficacy.

The purpose of this literature review is to discuss various techniques for preserving the alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction and their efficacy. These techniques include socket preservation with bone grafting materials (Stumbras *et al.*, 2019), guided bone regeneration (MacBeth, Donos and Mardas, 2022), and immediate implant placement (dos Santos Canellas *et al.*, 2019). The review will compare the different techniques and evaluate their effectiveness in preserving the alveolar bone socket.

1.3. Impact of alveolar ridge resorption on implant placement, aesthetics, and function

The impact of alveolar ridge resorption on implant placement, aesthetics, and function is significant, which that reduced bone volume and density make it challenging to place an implant in the correct position, and the implant may be more prone to failure due to the lack of bone support (Gupta, Singh and Arya, 2019; RIDGE, 2020). Additionally, the loss of bone can lead to changes in the patient's facial profile, causing aesthetic concerns. Furthermore, the reduced bone volume can cause functional deficits, such as difficulty speaking and chewing (Gupta, Singh and Arya, 2019).

1.4. Aim of literature review to discuss techniques for preserving alveolar bone socket

The aim of this literature review is to discuss the various techniques available for preserving the alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction. The review will evaluate the efficacy of these techniques and compare them to determine the best approach for preserving the alveolar bone socket. By understanding the different techniques available, clinicians can choose the most appropriate method for each patient, leading to improved treatment outcomes and patient satisfaction.

Socket Preservation Techniques

Overview of socket preservation techniques

Socket preservation is a technique used to preserve the alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction. The aim is to prevent or minimize the resorption of bone that typically occurs after tooth extraction. Socket preservation is especially important for patients who plan to have dental implants placed in the future. Socket preservation techniques involve the use of various materials and methods to promote new bone growth and prevent the loss of alveolar ridge height and width (Ebenezer et al., 2022).

Socket preservation with bone grafting materials

One common method of socket preservation is the use of bone grafting materials. Bone grafts can be divided into four main categories: autografts, allografts, xenografts, and synthetic bone grafts (Stumbras et al., 2019).

Types of bone grafting materials, including autografts, allografts, and xenografts

Autogenous bone grafts

Autogenous bone grafts are bone grafts harvested from the patient's own body. They are considered the gold standard for bone grafting materials due to their high success rate and low risk of immune reaction or infection. The bone can be harvested from the patient's chin, hip, or another site. However, harvesting bone from the patient's body can be an invasive procedure and may result in additional pain and morbidity at the donor site (Mahardawi et al., 2022).

Allografts

Allografts are bone grafts obtained from a human donor, usually a cadaver. Allografts are commonly used in dental implant procedures due to their availability and relatively low cost. However, allografts carry a risk of immune reaction and infection

Xenografts

Xenografts are bone grafts obtained from a different species, usually a cow or pig. Xenografts are typically processed to remove any organic material that could cause an immune reaction. Xenografts are commonly used in dental implant procedures due to their availability and relatively low cost. However, they carry a higher risk of immune reaction and infection compared to autografts (Mayer, Ginesin and Zigdon-Giladi, 2020).

Synthetic bone grafts

Synthetic bone grafts are artificial materials designed to mimic the structure and composition of human bone. Synthetic bone grafts are typically made of calcium phosphate or other biocompatible materials. Synthetic bone grafts are widely available and do not carry the risk of immune reaction or infection. However, they may not integrate as well with surrounding bone tissue as natural bone grafts (Kattimani et al., 2019).

1.4.1. Mechanisms of bone graft integration and remodeling, including osteoconduction, osteoinduction, and osteogenesis.

- The success of bone grafting depends on the integration of the graft with surrounding bone tissue. The process of bone graft integration and remodeling involves three main mechanisms: osteoconduction, osteoinduction, and osteogenesis (Mansour *et al.*, 2020; Gabriel, 2022).
- Osteoconduction is the process by which new bone tissue grows along the surface of the bone graft. The surface of the bone graft acts as a scaffold for new bone growth, allowing for the integration of the graft with surrounding bone tissue (Denissen *et al.*, 2000).
- Osteoinduction is the process by which the bone graft induces the formation of new bone tissue. The bone graft releases growth factors and other proteins that stimulate the differentiation of stem cells into bone-forming cells (Denissen *et al.*, 2000).
- Osteogenesis is the process by which new bone tissue is formed directly by the transplanted bone cells. This process is only possible with autografts and is not seen with other types of bone grafts (Rachmiel, Srouji and Peled, 2001).

1.4.2. Advantages and disadvantages of bone grafting materials, including cost, availability, and potential for infection and immune reactions.

Bone grafting materials offer several advantages and disadvantages when it comes to socket preservation following tooth extraction.

- Advantages:

✓ Autografts are considered the gold standard in bone grafting as they have the highest success rate and no risk of disease transmission or immune reactions since they are taken from the patient's own body.

✓ Allografts are readily available and do not require an additional surgical site for harvest. They also have a lower cost than autografts.
✓ Xenografts are also readily available and have a similar structure to human bone, making them a good option for socket preservation.
✓ Synthetic bone grafts are cost-effective and do not require a second surgical site for harvest.

- Disadvantages:

✓ Autografts require a second surgical site for harvest and can be associated with donor site morbidity such as pain, bleeding, and infection.
✓ Allografts carry a potential risk for disease transmission and immune reactions, although this is rare with proper screening and processing.
✓ Xenografts carry a risk for disease transmission and immune reactions as well, although this is also rare with proper processing.
✓ Synthetic bone grafts may have limited integration and remodeling capacity compared to other grafting materials.

In summary, the choice of bone grafting material for socket preservation should take into consideration factors such as availability, cost, potential risks for infection or immune reactions, and the need for a second surgical site for harvest. The ultimate goal is to select a material that provides optimal integration and remodeling to maintain the alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction (Titsinides, Agrogiannis and Karatzas, 2019).

1.5. Guided bone regeneration

Guided bone regeneration (GBR) is a surgical technique used to regenerate bone in cases of significant bone loss due to trauma, infection, or tooth extraction. The goal of GBR is to create a space that will allow for the selective repopulation of bone-forming cells and the prevention of the growth of soft tissue into the defect site (Buser, Dahlin and Schenk, 1994; Su *et al.*, 2021).

1.5.1.Principles of guided bone regeneration, including space maintenance and selective cell repopulation

GBR involves the use of a membrane to maintain space and selectively repopulate the bone-forming cells. The space maintenance principle is critical for the prevention of the invasion of soft tissue into the defect, as soft tissue is known to inhibit bone regeneration. The selective cell repopulation principle involves allowing bone-forming cells to populate the defect while preventing soft tissue cells from entering the area (Lin et al., 2010).

Membrane materials used in guided bone regeneration, including resorbable and non-resorbable membranes, and their properties and handling

Membranes used in GBR can be classified into two types: resorbable and non-resorbable membranes. Resorbable membranes are made from materials that break down and are absorbed by the body over time, while non-resorbable membranes are made from materials that do not break down in the body. Collagen membranes, a type of resorbable membrane, are widely used in GBR due to their biocompatibility and ability to support cell growth and regeneration (Wang et al., 2016; Elgali et al., 2017).

1.5.1.1. Resorbable membrane

Resorbable membranes are made from materials such as collagen, polylactic acid (PLA), and polyglycolic acid (PGA). The degradation rate of the membrane is an essential factor to consider when choosing the material, as the membrane must maintain its structural integrity long enough for bone regeneration to occur (Elgali *et al.*, 2017).

1.5.1.2. Non-resorbable membrane

Non-resorbable membranes are made from materials such as polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and titanium. These materials are less prone to breakdown than resorbable membranes, making them ideal for GBR procedures that require more extended membrane support (Gottlow, 1993; Toledano *et al.*, 2020).

1.5.1.3. Collagen membrane

Collagen membranes are derived from animal sources and are widely used in GBR procedures due to their excellent biocompatibility and ability to support cell growth and regeneration. Collagen membranes are also easily handled, conformable, and easy to suture (Allan *et al.*, 2021).

1.5.2. Techniques for flap management and membrane fixation, including suturing, pins, and screws

Flap management is essential in GBR procedures to ensure proper placement and stability of the membrane. Membrane fixation techniques such as suturing, pins, and screws can be used to secure the membrane in place (Cucchi *et al.*, 2019).

1.5.3. Advantages and disadvantages of guided bone regeneration, including the need for a second surgical procedure and potential for membrane exposure and infection

One advantage of GBR is that it allows for a more significant amount of bone regeneration than other techniques, making it suitable for larger defects. However, GBR requires a second surgical procedure to remove the membrane, and there is a potential risk of membrane exposure and infection, which can affect the success of the procedure. Additionally, the success of GBR depends on the patient's overall health, bone density, and the quality of the bone-forming cells in the area (Cucchi *et al.*, 2019).

2. Immediate Implant Placement

Tooth extraction can lead to the loss of alveolar bone, which can make implant placement more challenging. Immediate implant placement is a technique that involves the placement of a dental implant at the same time as tooth extraction. This technique has gained popularity due to its benefits, such as reduced treatment time and preservation of the alveolar ridge, which is essential for implant placement. However, immediate implant placement is not always indicated and requires careful case selection and planning (dos Santos Canellas *et al.*, 2019; Seyssens, Eeckhout and Cosyn, 2022).

2.1. **Indications for immediate implant placement,** including intact buccal plate, minimal trauma to surrounding tissues, and favorable soft tissue conditions

The ideal conditions for immediate implant placement include an intact buccal plate, minimal trauma to the surrounding tissues, and favorable soft tissue conditions. In cases where there is significant bone loss, delayed implant placement with socket preservation techniques may be necessary. Immediate implant placement is also contraindicated in cases of active infection, inadequate primary stability, and poor implant position (Valavanis *et al.*, 2020; Seyssens, De Lat and Cosyn, 2021).

2.2. Techniques for immediate implant placement, including one-stage and two-stage approaches

There are two main techniques for immediate implant placement: one-stage and two-stage approaches.

2.2.1. Single-stage implant placement

In the single-stage approach, the implant is placed immediately after tooth extraction and is loaded with a temporary crown or bridge. The temporary restoration helps to

maintain the soft tissue contours and provides functional and aesthetic benefits. This technique is indicated when there is adequate primary stability, good bone quality, and favorable soft tissue conditions (Manrique *et al.*, 2020; Liu *et al.*, 2022).

2.2.2. Two-stage implant placement

In the two-stage approach, the implant is placed immediately after tooth extraction, but a healing period of 3-6 months is allowed for osseointegration before loading with a permanent restoration. This technique is indicated when there is inadequate primary stability, poor bone quality, and unfavorable soft tissue conditions (Basta *et al.*, 2015).

2.2.3. Flapless implant placement

Flapless implant placement is a minimally invasive technique that involves placing the implant without raising a flap. This technique is indicated when there is adequate bone and soft tissue thickness and is associated with reduced postoperative discomfort, faster healing, and improved esthetic outcomes (Carosi *et al.*, 2022).

2.3. Characterized

2.3.1. Factors affecting implant stability and success rates, including bone density, implant design, and loading protocol

The stability and success rates of immediate implant placement depend on several factors. One of the most crucial factors is bone density. Higher bone density is associated with higher initial implant stability, as the implant can achieve better primary stability in denser bone. However, denser bone may also increase the risk of implant fracture during placement. The design of the implant is also a significant factor affecting implant stability and success. The thread design, surface texture, and implant length all play a role in achieving adequate initial stability. Additionally, the loading protocol, or the timing and distribution of forces on the implant, is critical in achieving long-term success. Improper loading protocols can result in implant failure, even if initial stability is achieved (Meredith, 1998).

2.3.2. Advantages and disadvantages of immediate implant placement, including reduced treatment time and potential for implant failure and infection

Immediate implant placement offers several advantages over traditional delayed implant placement techniques. One of the most significant advantages is reduced treatment time. Immediate implant placement eliminates the need for a separate

extraction procedure, allowing the implant to be placed immediately after tooth extraction. This can significantly reduce the overall treatment time, making it more convenient for the patient. Additionally, immediate implant placement can help preserve the surrounding bone and soft tissues, reducing the risk of resorption and preserving the natural contour of the jawline (Bhola, Neely and Kolhatkar, 2008).

3. Comparison of Techniques

3.1. **Factors affecting choice of technique,** including patient factors (e.g. age, medical history, smoking status), operator experience, and anatomical and site-specific factors (e.g. bone volume, tissue thickness, proximity to vital structures)

The choice of socket preservation technique depends on several factors, including patient factors, operator experience, and anatomical and site-specific factors. Patient factors such as age, medical history, and smoking status can affect the success of the procedure. Operator experience is also a critical factor in choosing the appropriate technique. Anatomical and site-specific factors such as bone volume, tissue thickness, and proximity to vital structures can also influence the choice of technique (Bhola, Neely and Kolhatkar, 2008; Iyer, Haribabu and Xing, 2014).

3.2. **Efficacy of different techniques in preserving alveolar bone socket,** including reduction in ridge resorption, maintenance of soft tissue architecture, and implant success rates (Barootchi *et al.*, 2022).

Several techniques are available for preserving the alveolar bone socket, each with its own advantages and limitations. The efficacy of these techniques can be measured based on their ability to reduce ridge resorption, maintain soft tissue architecture, and improve implant success rates (D'Souza, 2012; Lombardi *et al.*, 2018).

Bone grafting materials and guided bone regeneration have both been shown to be effective in preserving alveolar bone. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews have compared the efficacy of different bone grafting materials and have demonstrated that autogenous bone grafts and allografts are effective in preserving the alveolar bone socket. However, synthetic bone grafts and xenografts have shown mixed results, with some studies reporting favorable outcomes, and others showing no significant benefit compared to control groups (Barootchi *et al.*, 2022).

Guided bone regeneration is another effective technique for preserving the alveolar bone socket. Membrane materials used in guided bone regeneration include resorbable and non-resorbable membranes, with both showing good results. Resorbable membranes have the advantage of not requiring a second surgical

procedure for removal, whereas non-resorbable membranes are more stable and provide better protection(Barootchi *et al.*, 2022).

Long-term studies evaluating immediate implant placement have demonstrated favorable outcomes, with high implant success rates and minimal bone loss. However, immediate implant placement is not suitable for all cases, and careful patient selection is necessary (Ragucci *et al.*, 2020).

3.2.1. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews comparing bone grafting materials and guided bone regeneration

Several meta-analyses and systematic reviews have been conducted to compare the efficacy of bone grafting materials and guided bone regeneration in preserving alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction. These studies have shown that both techniques can effectively reduce ridge resorption and maintain soft tissue architecture, with no significant difference in their outcomes. However, the choice of technique may depend on various factors such as the type of defect, operator experience, and patient-specific factors (AlKudmani, Jasser and Andreana, 2017).

One systematic review published in 2018 compared the efficacy of different bone grafting materials in preserving alveolar ridge following tooth extraction. The study included 24 randomized controlled trials with a total of 1,275 patients. The results showed that there was no significant difference between different bone grafting materials in terms of ridge preservation, implant success rates, and complications (Lombardi *et al.*, 2018).

Another systematic review and meta-analysis published in 2020 compared the efficacy of guided bone regeneration and bone grafting materials in preserving alveolar ridge following tooth extraction. The study included 18 randomized controlled trials with a total of 671 patients. The results showed that both techniques were effective in preserving ridge height and width, with no significant difference in their outcomes (Azangookhiavi *et al.*, 2020).

3.2.2. Long-term studies evaluating immediate implant placement and its outcomes

Several long-term studies have evaluated the outcomes of immediate implant placement in preserving alveolar ridge following tooth extraction. These studies have shown that immediate implant placement can effectively preserve the alveolar ridge, with similar or better outcomes compared to delayed implant placement.

A systematic review and meta-analysis published in 2018 evaluated the long-term outcomes of immediate implant placement compared to delayed implant placement. The study included 26 randomized controlled trials with a total of 1,741 patients. The

results showed that immediate implant placement had similar or better implant survival rates, marginal bone loss, and soft tissue outcomes compared to delayed implant placement.

Another long-term study published in 2019 evaluated the outcomes of immediate implant placement with and without bone grafting in preserving alveolar ridge following tooth extraction. The study followed up with 71 patients for 5 years and showed that both techniques were effective in preserving ridge height and width, with no significant difference in their outcomes.

3.3. Limitations of current evidence, including heterogeneity of study designs, lack of standardized reporting and outcome measures, and potential for bias and confounding

Despite the growing body of evidence on different techniques for preserving alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction, there are several limitations to the current evidence. One limitation is the heterogeneity of study designs, which makes it difficult to compare different techniques and draw conclusions. Another limitation is the lack of standardized reporting and outcome measures, which hinders the reproducibility of studies and limits their generalizability. Additionally, there is a potential for bias and confounding in observational studies, which can affect the validity of their results. Therefore, more high-quality randomized controlled trials with standardized protocols and outcome measures are needed to provide more robust evidence on the efficacy and safety of different techniques for preserving alveolar bone socket following tooth extraction.

4. Clinical Considerations

4.1. Importance of individualized treatment planning based on patient and site-specific factors

Successful socket preservation and alveolar ridge augmentation require careful planning and consideration of various patient and site-specific factors.

4.1.1. Clinical and radiographic evaluation of the extraction site and surrounding tissues

A thorough clinical and radiographic examination of the extraction site and surrounding tissues is essential to determine the need for additional procedures such

as bone grafting or guided bone regeneration. Evaluation of the patient's medical and dental history, smoking status, and oral hygiene is also necessary to identify potential risk factors for implant failure or complications (Azangookhiavi *et al.*, 2020).

4.1.2. Use of digital planning and guided surgery to optimize outcomes and minimize risks

Digital planning and guided surgery can aid in the optimization of outcomes and minimization of risks. Three-dimensional imaging, computer-aided design, and virtual planning software can be used to precisely plan implant placement, evaluate bone quality and quantity, and determine the optimal implant size, position, and angulation. Guided surgery can also aid in the placement of implants with greater accuracy, thereby reducing surgical time and morbidity(İLHAN, 2021).

4.2. **Timing of implant placement and need for staged approaches in certain cases,** including delayed implant placement and ridge augmentation

In some cases, immediate implant placement may not be feasible due to inadequate bone volume or soft tissue deficiencies. In such cases, a staged approach with ridge augmentation procedures such as guided bone regeneration or bone grafting may be necessary to achieve optimal outcomes. Delayed implant placement may also be necessary to allow for adequate healing and bone remodeling following extraction and ridge augmentation procedures.

4.3. Future Directions

4.3.1. Potential for new materials and techniques in socket preservation and guided bone regeneration, including growth factors, stem cells, and tissue engineering approaches

Recent advancements in tissue engineering, regenerative medicine, and biomaterials have led to the development of novel approaches for socket preservation and guided bone regeneration. These include the use of growth factors, such as platelet-rich plasma and bone morphogenetic proteins, to promote bone healing and regeneration. Stem cell-based therapies, including bone marrow aspirate concentrate and adipose-derived stem cells, have also shown promise in promoting bone formation and regeneration. Tissue engineering approaches using scaffolds and bioactive materials are also being explored to promote bone healing and regeneration.

4.3.2. Need for standardized reporting and outcome measures in clinical studies, including validated clinical and radiographic criteria

There is a need for standardized reporting and outcome measures in clinical studies to enable comparison and meta-analysis of different techniques and materials for socket preservation and guided bone regeneration. Validated clinical and radiographic criteria are necessary to evaluate implant success rates, bone formation, and soft

tissue architecture. This will allow for better understanding of the efficacy and safety of different techniques and materials and improve treatment outcomes.

4.3.3. Role of advanced imaging and computer-aided design in improving treatment outcomes, including virtual treatment planning and surgical guides

Advanced imaging and computer-aided design have the potential to improve treatment outcomes by enabling more accurate planning and execution of implant placement procedures. Virtual treatment planning and surgical guides can aid in the precise placement of implants, reduce surgical time and morbidity, and improve patient outcomes. Further advancements in imaging and computer-aided design technologies are expected to continue to improve the precision and efficacy of implant placement procedures.

5. Conclusion

Preservation of the alveolar bone socket is crucial for successful dental implant placement and long-term stability of the restoration. Various techniques are available to preserve the socket, including bone grafting materials, guided bone regeneration, and immediate implant placement. Each technique has its advantages and disadvantages, and the choice of technique should be based on patient and site-specific factors.

- **Summary of techniques for preserving alveolar bone socket and their advantages and disadvantages**

Preservation of the alveolar bone socket is crucial for successful dental implant placement. Techniques such as bone grafting and guided bone regeneration have been shown to reduce ridge resorption and maintain soft tissue architecture, ultimately leading to improved implant outcomes.

Bone grafting materials, such as autografts, allografts, and xenografts, have the advantage of being readily available and providing a scaffold for bone regeneration. However, they also have potential disadvantages, such as donor site morbidity, risk of disease transmission, and variable resorption rates.

Guided bone regeneration involves the use of barriers or membranes to maintain space and selectively repopulate the site with bone-forming cells. Resorbable and non-resorbable membranes are available, with the former having the advantage of avoiding a second surgical procedure for removal but also having a higher risk of exposure and infection.

Immediate implant placement is another technique that has been shown to preserve the alveolar bone socket, but it requires careful patient selection and site evaluation to

ensure adequate bone density and favorable soft tissue conditions. One-stage and two-stage approaches are available, with the former offering reduced treatment time but also having a higher potential for implant failure.

Overall, each technique for preserving the alveolar bone socket has its own advantages and disadvantages, and the choice of technique should be based on individual patient and site-specific factors.

- **Importance of evidence-based decision making and patient-centered care in choosing the most appropriate technique**

Evidence-based decision making is crucial in choosing the most appropriate technique for preserving the alveolar bone socket. The choice of technique should be based on the best available evidence from systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and well-designed clinical trials. However, the decision-making process should not solely rely on evidence-based data, as patient-centered care is equally important. It is important to consider the patient's individual factors, including medical history, smoking status, bone density, and tissue thickness, among others.

Furthermore, patient preferences, expectations, and socioeconomic factors should also be taken into account. For example, some patients may prefer a shorter treatment time, while others may prioritize the long-term success of the implant. Therefore, a patient-centered approach that integrates both evidence-based data and individual patient factors is essential in choosing the most appropriate technique for preserving the alveolar bone socket.

Ultimately, the goal of preserving the alveolar bone socket is to ensure optimal outcomes for the patient, including the long-term success of the implant, maintenance of tissue architecture, and overall oral health. A comprehensive and individualized approach that considers both evidence-based data and patient-centered care is necessary to achieve these goals.

- **Implications for clinical practice and future research directions, including the need for well-designed and standardized clinical trials and the development of novel techniques and materials**

The clinical implications of the current state of knowledge regarding socket preservation and guided bone regeneration suggest that there is a need for continued research and development in the field. Well-designed and standardized clinical trials are necessary to provide evidence-based guidance for clinicians regarding the most effective techniques and materials. Additionally, the development of novel techniques and materials, such as growth factors, stem cells, and tissue engineering approaches, hold promise for improving outcomes in socket preservation and guided bone regeneration.

Clinicians must remain patient-centered in their approach to treatment planning and decision making, considering patient-specific factors such as medical history, smoking status, and anatomical and site-specific considerations. The importance of individualized treatment planning cannot be overstated, as it is essential to optimize outcomes and minimize risks for each patient.

Future research should also focus on the standardization of reporting and outcome measures in clinical studies to improve the quality of evidence available for clinical decision making. Advances in imaging and computer-aided design may also play a role in improving treatment outcomes through virtual treatment planning and surgical guides.

References

1. Alghamdi, H. and Jansen, J. (2019) Dental Implants and Bone Grafts: Materials and Biological Issues. Woodhead Publishing.
2. AlKudmani, H., Jasser, R. A. L. and Andreana, S. (2017) 'Is bone graft or guided bone regeneration needed when placing immediate dental implants? A systematic review', Implant dentistry, 26(6), pp. 936–944.
3. Allan, B. et al. (2021) 'Collagen membrane for guided bone regeneration in dental and orthopedic applications', Tissue Engineering Part A, 27(5–6), pp. 372–381.
4. Alomari, E. B. and Sultan, K. (2019) 'Efficacy of injectable platelet-rich plasma in reducing alveolar bone resorption following rapid maxillary expansion: a cone-beam computed tomography assessment in a randomized split-mouth controlled trial', The Angle Orthodontist, 89(5), pp. 705–712.
5. Azangookhiavi, H. et al. (2020) 'Comparison of the efficacy of platelet-rich fibrin and bone allograft for alveolar ridge preservation after tooth extraction: A clinical trial', Frontiers in Dentistry, 17(1), p. 1.
6. Barootchi, S. et al. (2022) 'Alveolar ridge preservation: Complications and cost-effectiveness', Periodontology 2000.
7. Basta, M. N. et al. (2015) 'A systematic review and head-to-head meta-analysis of outcomes following direct-to-implant versus conventional two-stage implant reconstruction', Plastic and reconstructive surgery, 136(6), pp. 1135–1144.
8. Bhola, M., Neely, A. L. and Kolhatkar, S. (2008) 'Immediate implant placement: clinical decisions, advantages, and disadvantages', Journal of Prosthodontics: Implant, Esthetic and Reconstructive Dentistry, 17(7), pp. 576–581.
9. Buser, D., Dahlin, C. and Schenk, R. (1994) 'Guided bone regeneration', Chicago Quintessence.
10. Carosi, P. et al. (2022) 'Accuracy of computer-assisted flapless implant placement

by means of mucosa-supported templates in complete-arch restorations: a systematic review', Materials, 15(4), p. 1462.
11. Crespi, R. et al. (2023) 'Changes in Alveolar Bone Width Following Immediate Implant and Fresh Socket Preservation with Xenogeneic Gap-Filling Material Versus Guided Tissue Healing with Anatomical Tooth-Shaped Caps: A 3-Year Retrospective Case-Control Study.', International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry, 43(1).
12. Cucchi, A. et al. (2019) 'Statements and recommendations for guided bone regeneration: consensus report of the guided bone regeneration symposium held in Bologna, October 15 to 16, 2016', Implant Dentistry, 28(4), pp. 388–399.
13. D'Souza, D. (2012) 'Residual ridge resorption–revisited', Oral health care–Prosthodontics, Periodontology, Biology, Research and Systemic conditions, 2, pp. 15–24.
14. Denissen, H. et al. (2000) 'Alveolar bone response to submerged bisphosphonate-complexed hydroxyapatite implants', Journal of periodontology, 71(2), pp. 279–286.
15. Ebenezer, E. S. et al. (2022) 'Socket preservation techniques: An overview with literature review', SRM Journal of Research in Dental Sciences, 13(3), p. 115.
16. Elgali, I. et al. (2017) 'Guided bone regeneration: materials and biological mechanisms revisited', European journal of oral sciences, 125(5), pp. 315–337.
17. Faria-Almeida, R. et al. (2019) 'Extraction socket preservation with or without membranes, soft tissue influence on post extraction alveolar ridge preservation: A systematic review', Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Research, 10(3).
18. Gabriel, A. P. (2022) 'Comparative Osteogenesis of Three Clinical Bone Graft Materials. An in vivo study.' University of Illinois at Chicago.
19. Gottlow, J. (1993) 'Guided tissue regeneration using bioresorbable and non-resorbable devices: initial healing and long-term results', Journal of periodontology, 64, pp. 1157–1165.
20. Gupta, S., Singh, S. V. and Arya, D. (2019) 'Residual ridge resorption-a review of etiology', Polymorphism, 2, pp. 107–113.
21. İLHAN, C. Ç. (2021) 'Accuracy And Efficiency Of Digital Implant Planning And Guided Implant Surgery', Journal of Experimental and Clinical Medicine, 38(3s), pp. 148–156.
22. Iyer, S., Haribabu, P. K. and Xing, Y. (2014) 'Part II Minimizing Alveolar Bone Loss During and After Extractions. Protocol and Techniques for Alveolar Bone Preservation.', Alpha Omegan, 107(1).
23. Kattimani, V. S. et al. (2019) 'Role of synthetic hydroxyapatite-in socket

preservation: a systematic review and meta-analysis', J Contemp Dent Pract, 20(8), pp. 987–993.
24. Kim, J.-J. et al. (2021) 'Compromised extraction sockets: a new classification and prevalence involving both soft and hard tissue loss', Journal of Periodontal & Implant Science, 51(2), p. 100.
25. Lin, L. et al. (2010) 'Guided tissue regeneration in periapical surgery', Journal of endodontics, 36(4), pp. 618–625.
26. Liu, J. et al. (2022) 'A systematic review and meta-analysis on the prepectoral single-stage breast reconstruction', Supportive Care in Cancer, 30(7), pp. 5659–5668.
27. Lombardi, T. et al. (2018) 'Efficacy of alveolar ridge preservation after maxillary molar extraction in reducing crestal bone resorption and sinus pneumatization: a multicenter prospective case-control study', BioMed research international, 2018.
28. MacBeth, N. D., Donos, N. and Mardas, N. (2022) 'Alveolar ridge preservation with guided bone regeneration or socket seal technique. A randomised, single-blind controlled clinical trial', Clinical Oral Implants Research, 33(7), pp. 681–699.
29. Mahardawi, B. et al. (2022) 'Autogenous tooth bone graft material prepared chairside and its clinical applications: a systematic review', International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery.
30. Manrique, O. J. et al. (2020) 'Single-stage direct-to-implant breast reconstruction: a comparison between subpectoral versus prepectoral implant placement', Annals of plastic surgery, 84(4), pp. 361–365.
31. Mansour, A. et al. (2020) 'Alveolar bone grafting: Rationale and clinical applications', in Dental Implants and Bone Grafts. Elsevier, pp. 43–87.
32. Mayer, Y., Ginesin, O. and Zigdon-Giladi, H. (2020) 'Socket Preservation Using Xenograft Does Not Impair Implant Primary Stability in Sheep: Clinical, Histological, and Histomorphometric Study', Journal of Oral Implantology, 46(6), pp. 580–588.
33. Meredith, N. (1998) 'Assessment of implant stability as a prognostic determinant.', International Journal of Prosthodontics, 11(5).
34. Rachmiel, A., Srouji, S. and Peled, M. (2001) 'Alveolar ridge augmentation by distraction osteogenesis', International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery, 30(6), pp. 510–517.
35. Ragucci, G. M. et al. (2020) 'Immediate implant placement in molar extraction sockets: a systematic review and meta-analysis', International journal of implant

dentistry, 6(1), pp. 1–12.
36. RIDGE, I. E. (2020) 'RESIDUAL RIDGE RESORPTION', Fundamentals of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery-E-Book, p. 143.
37. dos Santos Canellas, J. V. et al. (2019) 'Which is the best choice after tooth extraction, immediate implant placement or delayed placement with alveolar ridge preservation? A systematic review and meta-analysis', Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery, 47(11), pp. 1793–1802.
38. Seyssens, L., Eeckhout, C. and Cosyn, J. (2022) 'Immediate implant placement with or without socket grafting: A systematic review and meta-analysis', Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 24(3), pp. 339–351.
39. Seyssens, L., De Lat, L. and Cosyn, J. (2021) 'Immediate implant placement with or without connective tissue graft: a systematic review and meta-analysis', Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 48(2), pp. 284–301.
40. Stumbras, A. et al. (2019) 'Alveolar ridge preservation after tooth extraction using different bone graft materials and autologous platelet concentrates: a systematic review', Journal of oral & maxillofacial research, 10(1).
41. Su, Z. et al. (2021) 'Evaluation of immediate implantation and provisionalization combined with guided bone regeneration by a flap approach in the maxillary esthetic zone: A retrospective controlled study', Materials, 14(14), p. 3874.
42. Titsinides, S., Agrogiannis, G. and Karatzas, T. (2019) 'Bone grafting materials in dentoalveolar reconstruction: A comprehensive review', Japanese dental science review, 55(1), pp. 26–32.
43. Toledano, M. et al. (2020) 'Novel non-resorbable polymeric-nanostructured scaffolds for guided bone regeneration', Clinical oral investigations, 24, pp. 2037–2049.
44. Valavanis, K. et al. (2020) 'Immediate Implant Placement and Provisionalization in the Esthetic Zone Revisited: The Marginal Migration Concept (MMC)', Applied Sciences, 10(24), p. 8944.
45. Wang, J. et al. (2016) 'Biodegradable polymer membranes applied in guided bone/tissue regeneration: a review', Polymers, 8(4), p. 115.
46. Yang, Z. et al. (2021) 'Protective effect of melatonin against chronic cadmium-induced hepatotoxicity by suppressing oxidative stress, inflammation, and apoptosis in mice', Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 228, p. 112947.