The Use of Technical “Standard All-on-Four” in the Maxilla
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Abstract
Among the factors that should be considered for the rehabilitation of atrophic jaws is mainly the anatomy of edentulous jaw, which offers trouble installing fixtures in view of the proximity to the maxillary sinus and nasal cavity. There are several possibilities to rehabilitate atrophic arcs, autogenous grafts, distraction osteogenesis, angled and short implants have been widely used in clinical practice. Thus, advanced surgical techniques are disclosed in the literature, such as the all-on-four standard technique. This technique consists of inserting four implants for a complete rehabilitation, and inclining a previously straight distal implant 45°, allowing anchorage in better bone (jaw previous zones), use of longer implants and decreasing the size of the prosthetic cantilever. The purpose of this literature review was to evaluate the scientific articles who observed the behavior of dental implants installed by the all-on-four technique in the maxilla. Initially, using the key words, 62 articles were obtained. After applying the inclusion criteria, 19 articles were selected. In each study the following were evaluated parameters: success rate of angled and axial implants, bone loss, and prosthetic complications. Finally, seven studies contemplated the requirements to be in this review. The literature of the art “all-on-four” standard in edentulous jaws showed that both angulated and axial implants have high success rate (92.8% to 99.3%) and similar bone loss. Therefore, the all-on-four standard technique is a viable option in the medium- and long-term for immediate fixed prosthetic rehabilitation in atrophic jaws.
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Introduction
Ever since the first surgery done in 1965 by Branemark, dental implants have been widely used in oral rehabilitation. For more than 40 years, the method advocated by Branemark has undergone several modifications, both in its application and in its indications [1].

Some factors may be decisive for planning rehabilitation associated with dental implants. These include bone resorption due to unavailability of the alveolar processes, pneumatization of the maxillary sinuses, and superficiality of the foramen and mentoniano channel. These anatomical accidents associated with the quality and deficient bone quantity may limit or prevent the installation of implants, making them necessary procedures prior to the installation of fasteners.

Among the factors that should be considered for the rehabilitation of atrophic jaws is mainly the anatomy of edentulous jaw, which offers trouble installing fixtures in view of the proximity to the maxillary sinus and nasal cavity. There are several possibilities to rehabilitate atrophic arcs, autogenous grafts, distraction osteogenesis, angled and short implants have been widely used in clinical practice. Thus, advanced surgical techniques are disclosed in the literature, such as the all-on-four standard technique. This technique consists of inserting four implants for a complete rehabilitation, and inclining a previously straight distal implant 45°, allowing anchorage in better bone (jaw previous zones), use of longer implants and decreasing the size of the prosthetic cantilever. The purpose of this literature review was to evaluate the scientific articles who observed the behavior of dental implants installed by the all-on-four technique in the maxilla. Initially, using the key words, 62 articles were obtained. After applying the inclusion criteria, 19 articles were selected. In each study the following were evaluated parameters: success rate of angled and axial implants, bone loss, and prosthetic complications. Finally, seven studies contemplated the requirements to be in this review. The literature of the art “all-on-four” standard in edentulous jaws showed that both angulated and axial implants have high success rate (92.8% to 99.3%) and similar bone loss. Therefore, the all-on-four standard technique is a viable option in the medium- and long-term for immediate fixed prosthetic rehabilitation in atrophic jaws.
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Materials and Methods
This systematic review was performed using the following electronic databases: PubMed/Medline (NCBI), Web of Science (Thomson Reuters), the Cochrane Register of Controlled Clinical Trials (EBSCO), and Dentistry and Oral Sciences Source (DOSS; EBSCO), seeking articles related to the following terms: fixed
were rehabilitated and obtained a success rate of 96.7% for implants. Thus, 9 jaws rehabilitated a total of 19 jaws by using the All-on-four standard technique and of the 96 implants placed, only 1 angled implant was lost after 3 years, achieving a success rate of 98.8% for axial implants and 97.97% for angle implants. Di Ping et al. [13] obtained a success rate of 92.8% for implants after an average of 33.7 months of follow-up. This study evaluated 69 patients, rehabiliting 38 maxilla. Of the 152 implants placed, 11 implants were lost between the fourth and eighth weeks. The cases compared axial and angled implants do not present significant difference, which is in agreement with studies on biomechanical measurements, which showed that the tilted implants, when part of a prosthetic support, do not have a negative effect on the load distribution. In addition, logical biomechanical implants in the distal slope allow a reduction in the support arm length due to the posterior-most inclined position of the implants, resulting in more favorable stress distribution. Bone loss was evaluated by five authors [3,8,9,12,13]. In the study by Maló et al. [8], bone loss was considered according to changes in implant-abutment interface in periapical and panoramic radiographs after 1 year of follow-up, reaching an average of 0.9 (standard deviation (SD) 1 mm). Also, in 2007, Maló et al. [9] considered the changes in bone implant-abutment interface in panoramic and periapical radiographs and obtained a bone loss of 1.9 mm at 1 year follow-up. As in other studies, Maló et al. [3] evaluated bone loss considering the implant-abutment interface in periapical and panoramic radiographs, getting an average of 1.52 (standard deviation (SD) 0.3 mm) and 1.95 (standard deviation (SD) 12.44 mm) after 3 and 5 years of follow-up, respectively. Crespi et al. [12] compared the bone loss considering mesial and distal implant-abutment interface on panoramic radiographs after 3 years of follow-up, obtaining 1.10 (standard deviation (SD) 12.45 mm) for axial implants and 1.11 (standard deviation (SD) 0.32 mm) for angulated implants. There was no significant difference in 12, 24, and 36 months. Di et al. [13] also considered the mesial and distal marginal bone changes at the implant-abutment interface on panoramic radiographs to assess bone loss around the implants and obtained an average of 0.7 (standard deviation (SD) 0.2 mm) for axial implants and 0.8 (standard deviation (SD) 0.4 mm) for angulated implants after an average of 33.7 months of follow-up. Many authors claimed prosthetic complications, however minimal, that were easily resolved [3,8,10-13]. Maló et al. [8] reported prosthetic fracture in 4 different patients, but all were bruxism. Pomares et al. [10] reported 8 cases of fracture of the provisional acrylic prosthesis and 7 cases of porcelain permanent prosthesis fractures. Maló et al. [3] reported 5 cases of fracture of the denture acrylic, 2 cases of abutment screw loss, and 1 case of loss of occlusal screw; all occurrences were in temporary prosthesis. Babbush et al. [11] reported that no prosthetic complications give a rate of 100% prosthetic survival after 27 months. Crespi et al. [12] reported only two cases of fracture of fully acrylic dentures and in 3% of cases loosening the occlusal screw after 6 months of follow-up. Di et al. [13] reported loosening the screws of the pillars in 3 prostheses, 5 cloves of stock dropping of the acrylic denture base, and 3 fractures of acrylic dentures.

### Discussion

Success rates of reviewed literature were 92.8% and 99.3% for implants in maxilla; statistically significant differences were found in both studies. Malo et al. [8] 32 rehabilitated patients with the “all-on-four” standard technique, the 128 implants immediately loaded with a fully fixed denture acrylic angled implants in only 3 different patients were lost, increasing a success rate of 97.6% for implants one year follow up. Another study [9], using a computerized surgical guide (CAD-CAM), evaluated 23 patients, rehabilitating 18 jaws according to the All-on-four technique, achieving a success rate for implants of 97.2% at 1-year follow-up. In another study [3], 242 rehabilitated patients with 968 implants lost only 19 after 5 years, increasing the success rate to 98% for implants. Pomares et al. [10] evaluated 20 patients with advanced periodontitis and rehabilitated a total of 19 jaws by using the All-on-four standard technique, unless otherwise they planned maxillary ceramic prosthesis with low bone quality (type III and IV). Thus, 9 jaws were rehabilited and obtained a success rate of 96.7% for implants.
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