Chapter 4

Biological Foundations of Osseointegration: From the Bone–Implant Interface to Clinical Success

Kübra Aslantaş Akar[1]

Ladise Ceylin Has[2]

Abstract

This chapter offers a concise, multi-level overview of osseointegration, from cellular and molecular mechanisms to clinical applications. Originally defined by Brånemark and later refined by Albrektsson, osseointegration is now viewed as a dynamic healing cascade essential to implant success. Early healing stages—protein adsorption, osteogenic cell migration, and bone formation—are thoroughly outlined. Key implant surface modifications, including SLA, hydrophilic treatments, nanostructures, calcium phosphate coatings, and antimicrobial films, are examined for their effects on osteogenesis and biofilm control. The role of stable peri-implant soft tissue, particularly keratinized mucosa and mucosal thickness, is emphasized for its protective impact on marginal bone and esthetic outcomes.Peri-implantitis is explored through microbial and host-response interactions, with a focus on clinical risk factors, SIT protocols, and platform-switching strategies. Adjunctive laser treatments are briefly assessed based on current evidence.The chapter concludes by framing osseointegration as a dynamic, patient-specific process—integrating immunological compatibility, digital planning, and microbiome-based diagnostics—reflecting a shift toward biologically and technologically driven implant success.

1 Kafkas University Faculty of Dentistry, Department of Endodontics, Türkiye, kubraslantas.3@icloud.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3019-9300

2 Kafkas University Faculty of Dentistry, Department of Periodontology, Türkiye, ladiseceylinhas@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0092-9229

https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub732.c3048

Biological Foundations of Osseointegration: From Bone–Implant Interface to Clinical Success

1. Evolution and Definition of the Concept of Osseointegration

Osseointegration was first defined by Per-Ingvar Brånemark in 1969 through experimental studies as the direct and functional connection between bone tissue and an alloplastic surface such as titanium, without the interposition of fibrous tissue (Brånemark et al., 1969). This definition established the biological basis for the long-term rigid stability of dental implants.

In a 2009 editorial review, Albrektsson, Brunski, and Wennerberg redefined osseointegration as a "functionally stable, asymptomatic, and biologically acceptable bone–implant interface" (Albrektsson et al., 2009). This updated definition laid the foundation for modern clinical protocols that confirm the long-term biomechanical success of implants despite the absence of a periodontal ligament.

Around the same period, Albrektsson and Johansson proposed a hierarchical biological cascade of bone healing—osteoinduction → osteoconduction → osseointegration—demonstrating that osseointegration is not merely a static bone contact, but a healing process regulated at the cellular and molecular levels (Albrektsson & Johansson, 2001).

Since the 1990s, it has been shown that surface roughness and chemical modifications influence bone response at the micro- and nano-scale. The systematic review by Wennerberg and Albrektsson highlighted that moderately rough (Sa ≈ 1–2 μm) titanium surfaces significantly increase the bone-to-implant contact ratio and primary stability, though standard parameters for surface characterization are still lacking (Wennerberg & Albrektsson, 2009). These findings paved the way for the development of hydrophilic, nanostructured, and biomimetic surface designs.

Contemporary literature continues to debate whether osseointegration represents "controlled tissue adaptation" or a "foreign body reaction." A comprehensive historical overview published in 2024 emphasized that Brånemark's discovery opened the door to numerous fields—from craniofacial rehabilitation to limb prostheses—establishing osseointegration as a universal reference point in biomaterials science (Sharma et al., 2024).

1.1 Histobiology and Early Healing Phases

0–10 seconds: Protein adsorption and platelet activation

Immediately upon placement, the titanium implant surface is rapidly coated with plasma proteins, forming a provisional matrix rich in adhesion molecules such as fibrinogen, fibronectin, and vitronectin. The micro-roughness of the surface enhances platelet activation and growth factor release, directing the migration of osteogenic cells (Davies, 2003).

10 seconds – 48 hours: Fibrin clot formation, early inflammation, and osteoconduction

The stable fibrin clot is initially infiltrated by neutrophils, followed by macrophages. The transition to the M2 macrophage phenotype is crucial for peri-implant angiogenesis. Osteogenic precursors migrate along the residual clot toward the implant surface—a process termed "osteoconduction"—laying the biological foundation for transforming primary mechanical stability into biological stability (Shanbhag et al., 2015).

3–7 days: De novo bone formation (contact osteogenesis)

According to Davies' model, following osteoconduction, osteoblasts form an interface matrix on the implant surface, similar to a mineralized cement line, resulting in direct bone–implant contact. Histological findings are supported at the molecular level by evidence of downregulated inflammation-related genes and upregulated osteogenesis- and angiogenesis-related genes between days 4 and 7 in human tissue samples (Abrahamsson et al., 2023).

1–2 weeks: Woven bone formation and the transition from primary to secondary stability

Animal studies have shown that by day 14, implants with modified rough surfaces exhibit significantly higher bone–implant contact (BIC) ratios than machined surfaces. This stage is considered the critical window during which mechanical primary stability is gradually replaced by biological secondary stability (Bachate et al., 2020).

2–4 weeks and beyond: Lamellar bone formation and the biomechanics of early loading

In response to mechanical loading, woven bone is remodeled into lamellar bone matrix. Computational biomechanical models demonstrate that micromotion within an optimal range ($< 50\ \mu m$) supports bone formation, whereas excessive micromotion leads to fibrous tissue formation.

This underpins the concept of the "optimal micromotion window" in early osseointegration (Irandoust & Müftü, 2020).

2. Implant Surface Modifications and the Osseointegrative Response

2.1. Macro → Micro → Nano Hierarchy

Cell adhesion and differentiation at the bone–implant interface depend on the multiscale interplay between surface topography and chemistry. While macro-geometry (e.g., thread pitch, root form) influences primary stability, micro-roughness (Sa ≈ 1–2 μm) enhances osteoblast adhesion and nucleation rate. At the nanoscale, irregularities of 20–100 nm strengthen integrin signaling, promoting osteogenic cell phenotype commitment (Albrektsson & Wennerberg, 2019; Le Guéhennec et al., 2007).

2.2. Sandblasted, Acid-Etched (SLA) and Hydrophilic Variants

Conventional SLA surfaces not only retain residual Ca–P phases but also exhibit high surface energy that accelerates platelet degranulation and fibrin polymerization. Hydrophilic SLA modifications (e.g., SLActive) reduce atmospheric carbon contamination and have been shown to increase bone–implant contact (BIC) by 15–20% within the first 4 weeks (Zhao et al., 2005; Kaya, 2019).

2.3. Biomimetic Ca-P Coatings

Nanocrystalline hydroxyapatite layers precipitated via low-temperature wet chemistry mimic the chemical composition of bone matrix and activate calcium-dependent cell adhesion receptors. According to a review by Le Guéhennec et al., such coatings demonstrate the potential to enhance bone–implant contact by replicating natural bone matrix chemistry (Le Guéhennec et al., 2007).

2.4. Anodic Oxidation and Nanotubes

Titanium dioxide nanotubes (Ø ≈ 80–100 nm) formed through anodization modulate cell behavior by promoting osteoblast proliferation and reducing osteoclast activity. Their increased specific surface area also serves as a platform for loading and controlled release of antibacterial agents or growth factors (Yoshinari et al., 2010; Rasouli et al., 2018).

2.5. Antimicrobial and Bioactive Coatings

Thin films containing silver, zinc, chlorhexidine, or antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) aim to suppress initial biofilm colonization while maintaining minimal osteoblast cytotoxicity through tailored release profiles. AMP-coated implants have demonstrated up to 40% reduction in bone loss in in vivo peri-implantitis models (Yoshinari et al., 2010).

2.6. Cell–Protein Interactions and Surface Chemistry

High surface energy and hydrophilicity allow compact fibrinogen adsorption, facilitating RGD-dependent integrin $\alpha_5\beta_1$ activation. This pathway has been shown in vitro to upregulate phosphate transporter-1 (PiT-1) expression in osteoblasts, thereby accelerating mineralization (Albrektsson & Wennerberg, 2019).

Surface modification strategies have evolved into a dual design paradigm aimed at maximizing early osteogenic response while minimizing bacterial adhesion. In this context, hybrid surfaces combining hydrophilic nanostructured titanium and antimicrobial peptides are at the forefront of current translational research.

3. Peri-Implant Soft Tissue Management

3.1. Biological Seal (Soft-Tissue Seal)

The peri-implant mucosa includes an epithelial attachment (~2 mm) and a connective tissue zone (~1 mm), which together represent the implant analogue of the natural tooth's biological width (Abrahamsson et al., 1996). This barrier forms the first line of defense against the apical migration of bacteria and inflammatory mediators toward the bone–implant interface. Disruption of mucosal integrity—particularly at the implant–abutment junction—may trigger early marginal bone loss, especially in microgap-prone connection designs (Pieri et al., 2011).

3.2. Width of Keratinized Mucosa

Systematic reviews have shown that implants surrounded by ≥2 mm of keratinized mucosa are associated with significantly lower plaque index, mucosal inflammation scores, and soft tissue recession (Wennström & Derks, 2012). Inadequate keratinized mucosa complicates mechanical plaque control and may reinforce behavioral risk factors for peri-implantitis.

3.3. Vertical Mucosal Thickness

A vertical mucosal thickness of ≥2 mm is critical for marginal bone preservation, even in platform-switching abutments. Implants with <2 mm thickness demonstrate 0.5–0.8 mm of additional resorption within the first year (Linkevicius et al., 2015). This is largely due to the collagen-rich connective tissue buffering the implant–abutment microgap and limiting inflammatory infiltration.

3.4. Surgical and Periodontal Interventions

Connective tissue graft (CTG): When combined with two-stage sinus augmentation, CTG can reduce vestibular recession to ≤0.5 mm and preserve papillary height (Thoma et al., 2022).

Free gingival graft (FGG): On implants placed in mobile mucosa, FGG reduces plaque accumulation but may present esthetic limitations (Wennström & Derks, 2012).

EGF-enriched matrices: Epidermal growth factor (EGF)-based gels or collagen patches enhance epithelial migration and connective tissue maturation; however, in vivo evidence remains limited (Chappuis et al., 2017).

3.5. Prosthetic Design Parameters

Platform switching: Using abutments ≤0.3 mm narrower than the implant platform shifts the microgap away from the bone–mucosa interface, reducing marginal bone loss by up to 30% (Pieri et al., 2011)

Abutment material: Zirconia abutments enhance laminin-5 expression and mucosal vascularity compared to Ti-6Al-4V, although long-term clinical superiority remains unproven (Chappuis et al., 2017).

To sustain peri-implant health, a surgical design ensuring ≥2 mm of keratinized mucosa and mucosal thickness from the time of implant placement is recommended. Any soft tissue deficiency should be corrected early with connective tissue grafts. Prosthetically, platform switching should be employed, and the microgap should be positioned above the biological width.

4. Pathogenesis and Preventive Protocols of Peri-Implantitis

4.1. Microbial Dysbiosis and Host Response

Healthy peri-implant niches are predominantly colonized by Streptococcus and Veillonella species, whereas peri-implantitis lesions feature a shift toward pathogens such as Porphyromonas gingivalis, Tannerella forsythia, Fusobacterium nucleatum, and Filifactor alocis (Heitz-Mayfield & Mombelli, 2014). This shift promotes lipopolysaccharide-mediated activation of TLR-2/4 pathways, elevating IL-1β, TNF-α, and MMP-8 levels, and disrupting the RANKL/OPG balance in favor of osteoclastogenesis (Schwarz et al., 2018). Histologically, peri-implantitis lesions exhibit twice the polymorphonuclear cell infiltration and more extensive bone resorption lacunae than periodontitis lesions (Mombelli et al., 2012).

4.2. Clinical and Behavioral Risk Factors

A university-based cross-sectional study by Romandini et al. (2021) identified several individual and prosthetic risk factors for peri-implantitis. Moderate to severe periodontitis history, smoking, reduced number of remaining teeth, plaque accumulation, implant malposition, and unfavorable prosthetic design were significantly associated with increased peri-implant disease prevalence (Romandini et al., 2021). Additionally, <2 mm of keratinized mucosa, absence of platform switching, and exposure of rough implant surfaces are recognized as iatrogenic/polymicrobial triggers for marginal bone loss (Kim et al., 2022).

4.3. Supportive Implant Therapy (SIT) and Primary Prevention

Supportive Implant Therapy (SIT) plays a vital role in maintaining peri-implant health. Contemporary data indicate that regular professional maintenance significantly reduces the risk of peri-implantitis development (Ravidà et al., 2020). SIT protocols typically include mechanical debridement, low-abrasive air polishing, antiseptic irrigation (e.g., 0.12% chlorhexidine), and individualized oral hygiene instruction. Some studies suggest that adjunctive laser therapies may provide added benefits in reducing pocket depth and inflammation markers in cases of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis; however, evidence for bone regeneration remains limited and inconsistent (Chala et al., 2020).

4.4. Secondary Prevention: Abutment and Surface Design

The design of the implant–abutment interface is crucial for preserving marginal bone and preventing peri-implant disease. A systematic review by

Schwarz et al. (2018) reported that platform switching can reduce bacterial microleakage and limit peri-implant bone loss. Long-term clinical findings by Kim et al. (2022) support that implants with internal conical connections and platform switching exhibit more stable marginal bone levels and higher survival rates. These outcomes underline the importance of preserving both biomechanical harmony and microbial sealing for long-term implant success.

4.5. Clinical Recommendations

- **Primary prophylaxis:** A plaque index <15% and HbA1c <7% should be targeted prior to surgery.
- **SIT frequency:** In patients with a history of periodontitis, supportive implant therapy should be scheduled every 3–4 months; for healthy individuals, every 6 months is generally sufficient.
- **De novo lesions:** For probing depths of 4–6 mm, nonsurgical debridement combined with antimicrobial photodynamic therapy is advised; for >6 mm depths and/or bone loss, resective or augmentative surgical approaches are recommended.
- **Surface strategy:** Hydrophilic titanium with nanotubes or hybrid antimicrobial coatings may be preferred in high-risk patients.

5. Clinical Success Criteria and Evaluation of Osseointegration

5.1. Classical Definitions of Success

The initial clinical success criteria, based on the Brånemark system, included implant immobility, absence of pain or discomfort, no continuous peri-implant radiolucency, and the ability to function under load (Brånemark et al., 1977). Albrektsson et al. (1986) proposed a quantitative threshold of <0.2 mm marginal bone loss per year, which still forms the foundation of biological and functional implant success evaluation.

5.2. Modern Assessment Parameters

Current implantology no longer defines success solely based on bone level, but also considers function, esthetics, patient satisfaction, and soft tissue health. The 2007 ITI Consensus outlined four major criteria for clinical success:

Immobility (≥35 Ncm insertion torque / <50 μm micromotion)

Absence of infection signs (e.g., bleeding, suppuration, or probing depth >4 mm)

Marginal bone preservation (≤1.5 mm loss in the first year, ≤0.2 mm/year thereafter)

Patient satisfaction (meeting functional and esthetic expectations) (Buser et al., 2017).

5.3. Periotest and Resonance Frequency Analysis (RFA)

Two main quantitative methods are used to assess mechanical osseointegration:

Periotest: Values range from –8 to +50, with values <0 generally indicating successful osseointegration. However, results may be affected by mucosal thickness.

RFA (Osstell): Measures implant stability quotient (ISQ) via high-frequency resonance. ISQ >70 is typically considered suitable for early loading; ISQ <55 may require reevaluation (Ostman et al., 2005).

5.4. Soft Tissue Parameters

Keratinized mucosa ≥2 mm

Tissue thickness ≥2 mm

Bleeding index <1 (based on Mombelli & Lang scale)

These parameters are critical for preserving gingival phenotype, particularly in the esthetic zone (Zembic et al., 2009).

5.5. Esthetic Success: Pink Esthetic Score (PES) and White Esthetic Score (WES)

For restorations such as zirconia-supported ceramic crowns, a combined PES/WES score of ≥12 (out of 20) is considered the threshold for esthetic success (Belser et al., 2009). PES components include papilla fill, mucosal contour, and color harmony, while WES evaluates the form, texture, and translucency of the restoration.

5.6. Patient-Reported Outcomes

Recently, validated questionnaires such as the Oral Health Impact Profile (OHIP-14) have become central to assessing patient satisfaction with function, esthetics, confidence, and comfort. While biological and patient-reported outcomes are generally correlated, some studies suggest that esthetic satisfaction may be independent of objective parameters (Siadat et al., 2008).

6. Current Research Trends and Future Perspectives

6.1. Bioengineering and Surface Functionalization

Contemporary research focuses on the functionalization of implant surfaces not only for osteogenic potential but also for immunomodulatory and antimicrobial activity. For instance, interleukin-loaded nanotubes that enhance IL-10 secretion promote M1 to M2 macrophage polarization, thereby accelerating the resolution phase of healing (Hotchkiss et al., 2016). Simultaneously, silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) or antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) integrated into implant surfaces inhibit the adhesion of early colonizing anaerobes and offer a preventive strategy against peri-implantitis (Campoccia et al., 2013; Kazemzadeh-Narbat et al., 2010).

6.2. Patient-Specific Implants via 3D Bioprinting

Instead of traditional manufacturing methods, customized titanium alloy implants are being developed using high-resolution direct metal laser sintering (DMLS), tailored to the patient's unique bone morphology. These implants not only improve mechanical compatibility but also optimize surface porosity, promoting vascularization and cellular migration (Pessanha-Andrade et al., 2018). Increased surface area and porosity significantly enhance osteoconductive capacity.

6.3. The Concept of Immunointegration

While classical osseointegration emphasized bone–implant interaction, the emerging concept of "immunointegration" underlines the importance of harmonious engagement with the host immune system. For example, macrophages on nanostructured surfaces can suppress inflammatory signaling and enhance regenerative responses (Trindade et al., 2016).

6.4. Microbiome-Based Diagnostic Systems

Advancing molecular diagnostic technologies allow for rapid, DNA-based detection of microbial biofilm profiles around implants within hours—without reliance on traditional culture techniques. These tools pave the way for personalized antimicrobial prophylaxis and reduce unnecessary antibiotic use (Charalampakis & Belibasakis, 2015).

6.5. Future Outlook

Implantology is now understood as a multi-dimensional integration process involving immune compatibility, the oral microbiome, and patient-

specific anatomical features—not just mechanical stability or bone contact. In this context, the routine integration of immunomodulatory surfaces, digitally guided surgery, and molecular diagnostics is expanding the definition and clinical scope of osseointegration.

7. Conclusion

Osseointegration is not merely the starting point of modern implantology but a sustainable biological foundation for long-term, multidisciplinary clinical success. Today, this concept has evolved beyond a histological description of bone–implant contact and is viewed as a complex system integrating soft tissue management, immune adaptation, microbial stability, and patient-centered outcomes.

Brånemark's early concept of intrabony titanium stability has been broadened to include advanced surface modifications, immunological optimization, digital planning, and microbiome-based personalization. Osseointegration should thus be redefined not as static contact but as a dynamic, time-dependent biological adaptation process.

From a periodontological standpoint, successful osseointegration requires:

- Maintenance of peri-implant bone and soft tissue integrity
- Preservation of marginal bone levels
- Anatomical design favoring effective plaque control
- Patient satisfaction with long-term biological and functional outcomes

In this context, understanding early healing phases, selecting appropriate surface characteristics, ensuring adequate soft tissue thickness, and adhering to regular supportive care protocols are critical not only for initiating but also for sustaining osseointegration.

In conclusion, the future of osseointegration transcends traditional protocols. It is shaped by biology-respecting, patient-specific, and predictably guided therapies. With advances in biomaterials and digital technologies, the ultimate goal of implantology is not just osseous integration, but achieving harmonious coexistence between the implant and the host in a biologically intelligent manner.

Referances

Abrahamsson, I., Almohandes, A., Dionigi, C., & Berglundh, T. (2023). Early bone healing to implants with different surface characteristics: A pre-clinical in vivo study. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 34*(4), 312–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.14041

Abrahamsson, I., Berglundh, T., Wennström, J., & Lindhe, J. (1996). The peri-implant hard and soft tissues at different implant systems: A comparative study in the dog. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 7*(3), 212–219. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0501.1996.070303.x

Albrektsson, T., Brunski, J., & Wennerberg, A. (2009). A requiem for the periodontal ligament revisited. *The International Journal of Prosthodontics, 22*(2), 120–122.

Albrektsson, T., Johansson, C. (2001). Osteoinduction, osteoconduction and osseointegration. *European Spine Journal, 10*(Suppl 2), S96–S101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s005860100282

Albrektsson, T., Wennerberg, A. (2019). On osseointegration in relation to implant surfaces. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 21*(Suppl 1), 4–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12742

Albrektsson, T., Zarb, G., Worthington, P., & Eriksson, A. R. (1986). The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: A review and proposed criteria of success. *The International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants, 1*(1), 11–25.

Bachate, B., Gandhewar, M. A., Nagaral, S. M., & Patil, S. G. (2020). Wound healing around dental implants – A review of literature. *International Journal of Medical Oral Research, 5*(2), 15–16. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351328702

Belser, U. C., Grütter, L., Vailati, F., Bornstein, M. M., Weber, H. P., & Buser, D. (2009). Outcome evaluation of early placed maxillary anterior single-tooth implants using objective esthetic criteria: A cross-sectional, retrospective study in 45 patients with a 2- to 4-year follow-up using pink and white esthetic scores. *Journal of Periodontology, 80*(1), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2009.080435

Brånemark, P. I., Adell, R., Breine, U., Hansson, B. O., Lindström, J., & Ohlsson, A. (1969). Intra-osseous anchorage of dental prostheses. I. Experimental studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 3*(2), 81–100. https://doi.org/10.3109/02844316909036699

Brånemark, P. I., Hansson, B. O., Adell, R., Breine, U., Lindström, J., Hallén, O., & Ohman, A. (1977). *Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw: Experience from a 10-year period*. *Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery. Supplementum, 16*, 1–132.

Buser, D., Sennerby, L., & De Bruyn, H. (2017). Modern implant dentistry based on osseointegration: 50 years of progress, current trends and open questions. *Periodontology 2000, 73*(1), 7–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12185

Campoccia, D., Montanaro, L., & Arciola, C. R. (2013). A review of the biomaterials technologies for infection-resistant surfaces. *Biomaterials, 34*(34), 8533–8554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2013.07.089

Chala, M., Anagnostaki, E., Mylona, V., Chalas, A., Parker, S., & Lynch, E. (2020). Adjunctive use of lasers in peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis treatment: A systematic review. *Dentistry Journal, 8*(3), 68. https://doi.org/10.3390/dj8030068

Chappuis, V., Araújo, M. G., & Buser, D. (2017). Clinical relevance of dimensional bone and soft tissue alterations post-extraction in esthetic sites. *Periodontology 2000, 73*(1), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12167

Charalampakis, G., & Belibasakis, G. N. (2015). Microbiome of peri-implant infections: Lessons from conventional, molecular and metagenomic analyses. *Virulence, 6*(3), 183–187. https://doi.org/10.4161/21505594.2014.980661

Davies, J. E. (2003). Understanding peri-implant endosseous healing. *Journal of Dental Education, 67*(8), 932–949.

Heitz-Mayfield, L. J., & Mombelli, A. (2014). The therapy of peri-implantitis: A systematic review. *The International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants, 29*(Suppl), 325–345. https://doi.org/10.11607/jomi.2014suppl.g5.3

Hotchkiss, K. M., Reddy, G. B., Hyzy, S. L., Schwartz, Z., Boyan, B. D., & Olivares-Navarrete, R. (2016). Titanium surface characteristics, including topography and wettability, alter macrophage activation. *Acta Biomaterialia, 31*, 425–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2015.12.003

Irandoust, S., & Müftü, S. (2020). The interplay between bone healing and remodeling around dental implants. *Scientific Reports, 10*(1), 4335. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60735-7

Kazemzadeh-Narbat, M., Kindrachuk, J., Duan, K., Jenssen, H., Hancock, R. E., & Wang, R. (2010). Antimicrobial peptides on calcium phosphate-coated titanium for the prevention of implant-associated infections. *Biomaterials, 31*(36), 9519–9526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.08.035

Kaya, A. S. (2019). *SLA ve SLActive titanyum implantların neonatal sıçan kalvaryal osteoblast hücreleri üzerine etkilerinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü].

Kim, Y. M., Lee, J. B., Um, H. S., Chang, B. S., & Lee, J. K. (2022). Long-term effect of implant-abutment connection type on marginal bone loss

and survival of dental implants. *Journal of Periodontal & Implant Science, 52*(6), 496–508. https://doi.org/10.5051/jpis.2200960048

Le Guéhennec, L., Soueidan, A., Layrolle, P., & Amouriq, Y. (2007). Surface treatments of titanium dental implants for rapid osseointegration. *Dental Materials, 23*(7), 844–854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2006.06.025

Linkevicius, T., Puisys, A., Steigmann, M., Vindasiute, E., & Linkeviciene, L. (2015). Influence of vertical soft tissue thickness on crestal bone changes around implants with platform switching: A comparative clinical study. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 17*(6), 1228–1236. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12222

Mombelli, A., Müller, N., & Cionca, N. (2012). The epidemiology of peri-implantitis. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 23*(Suppl 6), 67–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2012.02541.x

Ostman, P. O., Hellman, M., & Sennerby, L. (2005). Direct implant loading in the edentulous maxilla using a bone density-adapted surgical protocol and primary implant stability criteria for inclusion. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 7*(Suppl 1), S60–S69. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1708-8208.2005.tb00076.x

Pessanha-Andrade, M., Sordi, M. B., Henriques, B., Silva, F. S., Teughels, W., & Souza, J. C. M. (2018). Custom-made root-analogue zirconia implants: A scoping review on mechanical and biological benefits. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials, 106*(8), 2888–2900. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbm.b.34147

Pieri, F., Aldini, N. N., Marchetti, C., & Corinaldesi, G. (2011). Influence of implant-abutment interface design on bone and soft tissue levels around immediately placed and restored single-tooth implants: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *The International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants, 26*(1), 169–178.

Rasouli, R., Barhoum, A., & Uludag, H. (2018). A review of nanostructured surfaces and materials for dental implants: Surface coating, patterning and functionalization for improved performance. *Biomaterials Science, 6*(6), 1312–1338. https://doi.org/10.1039/c8bm00021b

Ravidà, A., Siqueira, R., Saleh, I., Saleh, M. H. A., Giannobile, A., & Wang, H. L. (2020). Lack of clinical benefit of implantoplasty to improve implant survival rate. *Journal of Dental Research, 99*(12), 1348–1355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034520944158

Romandini, M., Lima, C., Pedrinaci, I., Araoz, A., Soldini, M. C., & Sanz, M. (2021). Prevalence and risk/protective indicators of peri-implant diseases: A university-representative cross-sectional study. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 32*(1), 112–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.13684

Schwarz, F., Derks, J., Monje, A., & Wang, H. L. (2018). Peri-implantitis. *Journal of Periodontology, 89*(Suppl 1), S267–S290. https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.16-0350

Shanbhag, S., Shanbhag, V., & Stavropoulos, A. (2015). Genomic analyses of early peri-implant bone healing in humans: A systematic review. *International Journal of Implant Dentistry, 1*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40729-015-0006-2

Sharma, S., Ravi Kiran, S., Kumar, P., Shankar, R., & Kumar Upadhyay, A. (2024). Per-Ingvar Brånemark (1929–2014): A homage to the father of osseointegration and modern dentistry. *Cureus, 16*(9), e68655. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.68655

Siadat, H., Alikhasi, M., Mirfazaelian, A., Geramipanah, F., & Zaery, F. (2008). Patient satisfaction with implant-retained mandibular overdentures: A retrospective study. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 10*(2), 93–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1708-8208.2007.00065.x

Thoma, D. S., Gil, A., Hämmerle, C. H. F., & Jung, R. E. (2022). Management and prevention of soft tissue complications in implant dentistry. *Periodontology 2000, 88*(1), 116–129. https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12415

Trindade, R., Albrektsson, T., Tengvall, P., & Wennerberg, A. (2016). Foreign body reaction to biomaterials: On mechanisms for buildup and breakdown of osseointegration. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 18*(1), 192–203. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12274

Wennström, J. L., & Derks, J. (2012). Is there a need for keratinized mucosa around implants to maintain health and tissue stability? *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 23*(Suppl 6), 136–146. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2012.02540.x

Wennerberg, A., & Albrektsson, T. (2009). Effects of titanium surface topography on bone integration: A systematic review. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 20*(Suppl 4), 172–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2009.01775.x

Yoshinari, M., Kato, T., Matsuzaka, K., Hayakawa, T., & Shiba, K. (2010). Prevention of biofilm formation on titanium surfaces modified with conjugated molecules comprised of antimicrobial and titanium-binding peptides. *Biofouling, 26*(1), 103–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/08927010903216572

Zembic, A., Sailer, I., Jung, R. E., & Hämmerle, C. H. (2009). Randomized-controlled clinical trial of customized zirconia and titanium implant abutments for single-tooth implants in canine and posterior regions: 3-year results. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 20*(8), 802–808. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2009.01717.x

Zhao, G., Schwartz, Z., Wieland, M., Rupp, F., Geis-Gerstorfer, J., Cochran, D. L., & Boyan, B. D. (2005). High surface energy enhances cell response to titanium substrate microstructure. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A, 74*(1), 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbm.a.30320