

Short Communication

Dural Retention: The Combined Retention Cement- and Screw-Retained Implant-Supported Prosthesis

Oumayma Mejri¹, Imen Kalghopum^{1*}, Maysa Jbeniany¹, Mohamed Chebil¹, Zohra Nouira¹, Mounir Cherif¹, Dalenda Hadyaoui¹

¹Department of Fixed Prosthodontics, University of Monastir, Tunisia

***Corresponding Author:** Imen Kalghopum

Department of Fixed Prosthodontics, University of Monastir, Tunisia

Article History

Received: 20.12.2022

Accepted: 25.01.2023

Published: 07.04.2023

Keywords: Implant, prosthesis, Dual/combined retention, screwretained prosthesis, cemented retained prosthesis.

Short Communication

The Simplicity is the major advantage of cement-retained restorations. They are easier to fabricate, offer easier delivery in the posterior area of the mouth, and have higher potential for passive fit. In addition, cementing can allow minor angle corrections to compensate for discrepancies between the implant inclination and the facial crown contour. The use of a provisional cement has been recommended as an alternative [1-3].

The screw-retained crown is fastened either to the abutment or directly to the implant. The main advantage of this restoration is retrievability. Retrievability allows for crown removal, which can facilitate soft-tissue evaluation, calculus debridement, and any necessary contour modification. However, the presence of occlusal access channels compromises their esthetics, ceramic strength, and occlusion. Prosthetic complications can be better addressed when the prosthesis is easily retrievable [4-6].

Dural Retention

The combined retention prosthesis defined as an implant supported fixed partial denture that includes a cement-retained fixed partial prosthesis superstructure with screw access channels designed to correspond to the screw access channels of the custom abutments to which it is cemented. However, dural retention combines the advantages of both the cement and screw retention mechanism, offering an additional design consideration [7-9].

1. This modality offers easy retrievability similar to traditional screw-retained prostheses.
2. Easy access and direct visualization of the implant platform for easy and complete removal of excess cement [10-12].
3. The combination of retention reduces stress on the prosthetic component and stress on the supporting implant compared to traditional screw-retained prostheses.
4. In laboratory, The fabrication of this type is easier than the screw retained prosthesis.
5. However, this dual retention restoration was indicated to used successfully in many cases: posterior Short span fixed partial denture, unilateral prostheses [13-15].
6. There are only a few clinical situations in which this technique was contra- indicated: Extreme inclination of the abutment. That make the placement and retrieval of the restoration very difficult. Also, this technique can not be used to restore unfavorably placed-implants.
7. According to the study of Nissan et al during 12-years, The combined prosthesis demonstrated an improved prosthetic survival rate and lower cost of maintenance, a lower number of biological and technical complications compared with a conventionally cemented prosthesis or screw retained prosthesis [12].

Copyright © 2023 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Oumayma Mejri, Imen Kalghopum, Maysa Jbeniany, Mohamed Chebil, Zohra Nouira, Mounir Cherif, Dalenda Hadyaoui (2023). Dural Retention: The Combined Retention Cement- and Screw-Retained Implant-Supported Prosthesis. *South Asian Res J Oral Dent Sci*, 5(2), 6-7.

CONCLUSION

Cemented and screw-retained implant prostheses, offer distinct advantages. Prosthesis retrieval is challenging with cemented restorations. A method to facilitate the retrieval and the passive fit of the prosthesis is described for both a unit implant and multi tooth retained restoration.

REFERENCES

1. Sailer, I., Mühlemann, S., Zwahlen, M., Hämmerle, C. H., & Schneider, D. (2012). Cemented and screw-retained implant reconstructions: a systematic review of the survival and complication rates. *Clinical oral implants research*, 23, 163-201.
2. Patzelt, S. B. M., Spies, B. C., & Kohal, R. J. (2015). CAD/CAM-fabricated implant-supported restorations: a systematic review. *Clinical oral implants research*, 26, 77-85.
3. Uludag, B., & Celik, G. (2006). Fabrication of a cement-and screw-retained multiunit implant restoration. *Journal of Oral Implantology*, 32(5), 248-250.
4. Rajan, M., & Gunaseelan, R. (2004). Fabrication of a cement and screw retained implant prosthesis. *J Prosthet Dent*, 34, 59-52.
5. Hebel, K. S., & Gajjar, R. C. (1997). Cement-retained versus screw-retained implant restorations: achieving optimal occlusion and esthetics in implant dentistry. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*, 77(1), 28-35.
6. Chee, W. (1999). Cemented versus screw-retained implant prostheses: which is better?. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, 14, 137-141.
7. Guichet, D. L., Caputo, A. A., Choi, H., & Sorensen, J. A. (2000). Passivity of fit and marginal opening in screw-or cement-retained implant fixed partial denture designs. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*, 15(2), 239-246.
8. Michalakakis, K. X., Hirayama, H., & Garefis, P. D. (2003). Cement-retained versus screw-retained implant restorations: a critical review. *International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 18(5), 719-728.
9. Wittneben, J. G., Millen, C., & Brägger, U. (2014). Clinical Performance of Screw-Versus Cement-Retained Fixed Implant-Supported Reconstructions-A Systematic Review. *International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 29(suppl), 84-98.
10. Millen, C., Brägger, U., & Wittneben, J. G. (2015). Influence of prosthesis type and retention mechanism on complications with fixed implant-supported prostheses: a systematic review applying multivariate analyses. *International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 30(1), 110-124.
11. Weber, H. P., & Sukotjo, C. (2007). Does the type of implant prosthesis affect outcomes in the partially edentulous patient?. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*, 22(7), 77-85.
12. Nissan, J., Snir, D., Rosner, O., Kolerman, R., Chaushu, L., & Chaushu, G. (2016). Reliability of retrievable cemented implant-supported prostheses. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*, 115(5), 587-591.
13. Chee, W., & Jivraj, S. (2006). Screw versus cemented implant supported restorations. *British dental journal*, 201(8), 501-507.
14. AlHelal, A., Kattadiyil, M. T., Clark, J. L., & AlBader, B. (2017). Diagnostic Classification and Design Considerations for Implant-Supported Fixed Partial Dentures and Screw Access Channel: The ABC/PBC and SAC Classifications. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*, 30(5), 490-495.
15. Guzaitis, K. L., Knoernschild, K. L., & Viana, M. A. (2011). Effect of repeated screw joint closing and opening cycles on implant prosthetic screw reverse torque and implant and screw thread morphology. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*, 106(3), 159-169.