Effect of 50 to 60°C Heating on Osseointegration of Dental Implants in Dense Bone: An In Vivo Histological Study
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Objectives: To evaluate, in vivo, the effects of bone temperatures increased up to 60°C introduced before implant insertion on titanium implant osseointegration.

Materials and Methods: Twenty-four acid etched and sandblasted implants (Cortex Dental Implants) were inserted in the inferior edge of sheep mandibles. Osteotomic sites were randomly divided into 3 groups before inserting the implant. In test 1 group and in test 2 group, implant sites were overheated, respectively, up to 50°C for 1 minute and 60°C for 1 minute, with an electronic controlled probe of 3 mm in diameter and 10 mm in length. Osteotomic sites in control group were not overheated. Implants were inserted according to standard procedures. After 2 months healing, % bone implant contact (%BIC) and infrabony pockets’ depth were measured. Unpaired t test was applied to find statistical differences between groups.

Results: No implant failure occurred. No statistical significant difference in %BIC was found among groups. Histological analysis showed that mean infrabony pockets were statistically deeper in 60°C group than in other groups.

Conclusions: Bone temperature up to 60°C for 1 minute does not seem to significantly impair titanium dental implant osseointegration. Bone damage signs evident in the 60°C group suggest that careful drilling procedure with sufficient irrigation is necessary to avoid periimplant infrabony pockets’ formation. More in vivo evaluations are needed to identify what is the value of bone temperature increase for irreversible inhibition of implant osseointegration. (Implant Dent 2014;23:516–521)
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B one drilling procedures are associated with the rise of temperature in the osteotomic site.1–3 Most of the studies on this topic were made in vitro, and different temperature values were observed. Temperature values ranging from 40°C–50°C to 130°C,5 during in vitro drilling procedures, were reported. The temperatures recorded by different authors are so diverse because there are many factors involved in frictional heat generation,6,7 and, among these, a careful irrigation could significantly reduce the in vitro bone temperature.8 The in vitro results about the risk of bone overheating during implant procedures were also supported by an in vivo study on human femoral cortex1 that showed temperature bone value of 89°C during implant site preparation under saline cooling. Overheating, during implant drilling procedure, could damage hard tissues, and temperatures between 47°C and 56°C have been considered to be responsible for irreversible bone injury according to many authors.9–11 The most cited paper, about the temperature threshold level for irreversible bone damage, is the study by Eriksson and Albrektsson,12 in which the authors focused their attention on the temperature level, beyond which, the bone loses its growth capacity inside customized bone growth chambers model. They demonstrated that heating the bone up to 47°C or 50°C for 1 minute is sufficient to impair the bone formation rate, whereas heating the bone up to 44°C for 1 minute did not invalidate bone regeneration properties. The bone growth chamber was a dividable titanium structure with a 1-mm wide transverse canal in which bone tissue should grow through. This titanium structure was inserted in rabbit tibia, and it was heated to the set temperature and, after 4 weeks, was removed to evaluate the bone growth into the canal. Obviously,
titanium dental implants have a macro and micro morphology extremely different from this type of structures. The authors did not measure bone to implant contact percentage (%BIC) around the titanium chamber after overheating. It is fundamental to evaluate the implant osseointegration instead of the bone growth inside a transverse canal. A recent study was the first investigation that histologically demonstrated the effects of overheating on osseointegration using titanium dental implants. The authors simulated true clinical conditions in which dental implants were inserted in osteotomic sites with insufficient cooling during drilling procedures, but the temperature values were not recorded. The frictional heat caused by careless surgical preparation, without sufficient irrigation, could be responsible for early perimplant bone resorption, but it is not clear what is the critical temperature that could impair the osseointegration process. Although these previously cited studies demonstrated that heat could damage bone regeneration or cause bone resorption, they never tested, directly, the effects of these temperatures on the development of osseointegration process around titanium dental implants. The aim of this study was, therefore, to histologically evaluate in vivo, in cortical bone, the effects of 2 different overheating temperatures on the development of osseointegration in the osteotomic sites before implant placement. The first temperature value tested was 50°C for 1 minute, the “null hypothesis,” value that should cause irreversible injury to bone regeneration properties according to Eriksson and Albrektsson. The second value was 60°C for 1 minute that should lead, according to the international literature, to a thermal bone necrosis.

**Materials and Methods**

The protocol for this study was submitted and approved by the Animal Ethical Committee at the Veterinary School of the University of Teramo (Teramo, Italy).

Three female sheep aged 4 to 5 years were randomly selected. Exclusion criteria were general contraindications (pregnancy, systemic disease) to implant surgery and active infection or severe inflammation in the area intended for implant placement. The animals were given thiopental (Thiopental; Hoechst, Austria) for induction of anesthesia as needed. After orotracheal intubation and ventilation, anesthesia was sustained with nitrous oxide-oxygen with 0.5% halothane. Physiologic saline was administered for fluid replacement.

The inferior edges of the mandible were exposed through a skin incision of 15 cm in length. The skin and facial layers were opened and closed separately. After dissection of the soft tissues exposing the bone edge, 4 implant sites were prepared in each (left and right) side of the mandibular inferior edge following the recommended manufacturer’s drill sequence under saline solution irrigation. The drilling speed was 1000 rpm for all groups. The osteotomic sites were randomly treated in 3 different modalities before inserting the implants. An electronically controlled device composed by a metal cylindrical electric probe 3 mm in diameter and 10 mm in length connected to a thermostat was used to apply the set temperature stimulation, before implant insertion, to simulate the clinical situation in which the drill overheats the surrounding bone. In group 1, the osteotomic sites were overheated up to 50°C for 1 minute, whereas in group 2 they were overheated up to 60°C for 1 minute. Control sites were not heated. Every 5 seconds, the hot probe was removed (for 20 seconds) and then it was reinserted for 5 seconds, because after 5 seconds the temperature of the probe decreased of 20°C. For this reason, it was waited that the temperature of the probe rose up again to the set temperature measured with a thermocouple before repositioning it back into the implant site. Temperature within the osteotomic site was measured after probe removal to check that the bone temperature was the selected one. This procedure was repeated 12 times for each site for a total of 60 seconds of permanence of the hot probe. Each animal received all the 3 treatments. Different treatments were randomly distributed in each animal. In a separate register, position data were reported (animal number, mandible side, and mesial or distal position) to recognize implant group pertains. Cover screws were placed over the heads of the fixtures. Twenty-four implants were positioned in the mandibles. One surgeon placed all implants. Titanium dental implants with rough surface (Dynamix; Cortex Dental Implants, Shlomi, Israel) 10 mm in length and 3.8 mm in diameter were used.

Surgical wounds were closed by a resorbable periosteo-muscular inner suture followed by a cutaneous silk 2-0 external suture. Each animal underwent an antibiotic systemic therapy for 5 days with 8 mL long-acting Clamoxyl (Pfizer Limited, Sandwich, United Kingdom). The sheep were sacrificed 2 months after implantation by an overdose of pentothal sodium (Thiopental).

The specimens were immediately fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin. After dehydration, the specimens were infiltrated with a methyl methacrylate resin from a starting solution of 50% ethanol/resin and subsequently 100% resin, with each step lasting 24 hours. After polymerization, the blocks were sectioned and then ground down to about 40 μm. Toluidine blue staining was used to analyze the different ages and remodeling pattern of the bone. The histomorphometric analysis was performed by digitizing the images from the microscope using a JVC TK-C1380 Color Video Camera (JVC Victor Company, Yokohama, Japan) and a frame grabber. The images were acquired with a x10 objective including the entire implant surface. Subsequently, the digitized images were analyzed using the computer-aided morphometric program (OsteoMeasure; OsteoMetrics, Inc., Atlanta, GA). To determine the bone-implant contact percentage (%BIC), the surface area of the implant was measured acquiring with a C1380 Color Video Camera (JVC) digitizing the images from the microscope using a JVC TK-C1380 Color Video Camera (JVC).

### Table 1. Average Values of %BIC of Each Group After 2 Months in Cortical Bone (Sheep Mandible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%BIC ± SD</th>
<th>%BIC Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>31.94 ± 18.01</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50°C</td>
<td>39.52 ± 7.85</td>
<td>39.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(test 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°C</td>
<td>27.23 ± 12.44</td>
<td>32.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(test 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BIC percentage represents the linear surface of the implant directly contacted by the mineralized bone matrix and this value was expressed as percentage of the total implant surface. The test group 2 showed lower %BIC value than other groups demonstrating a certain degree of bone loss.
analyzed by the image analysis software IAS 2000 (Delta Sistemi, Roma, Italy). For each section, the 2 most central sections were analyzed and morphometrically measured. The histomorphometric parameters calculated using the software were the %BIC, which represents the linear surface of the implant directly contacted by the mineralized bone matrix and infrabony pockets’ depth. The BIC value was expressed as percentage of the total implant surface. An unpaired \( t \) test was applied to test the statistical differences between the different groups using the statistical software GraphPad Prism 5 (www.graphpad.com).

**RESULTS**

No implant failure occurred after 2 months of healing.

**Histomorphometric Analysis**

The average %BIC for each group is reported in Table 1. The statistical comparison of %BIC value using unpaired \( t \) test revealed no statistical significant differences between the groups (Table 2). The average of infrabony pockets’ depth for each group is reported in Table 3. The infrabony pockets’ depth comparison between groups using unpaired \( t \) test showed statistical differences that are reported in Table 4.

**Histological Evaluation**

**Control group.** Implants in control group showed osseointegration, but in some cases crestal bone loss of about 0.5 mm was observed (Fig. 1). One implant had 100% bone contact on cortical portion. In 2 cases, bone chips trapped between implant threads and cortical bone wall were observed (possibly because of the absence of bone remodeling in that area). In 1 case, high %BIC value was present in the bone marrow and low %BIC at the cortical level.

**Test 1 group (50°C).** Implants in test 1 group (50°C for 1 minute) did not show any signs of hard tissue damage. Inflammatory cells were not present, and there were no infrabony pockets or excessive bone resorption (Fig. 2, A and B). Visible bone remodeling processes were normal for a healing period of 2 months. Secondary osteons were evident up to a distance of 1 mm from the interface. Implants bone contact was visible at the cortical level rather uniformly with some areas of small bone marrow gaps and woven bone in direct contact with the titanium surface. In 1 case, the bone grew up to completely cover the cover screw. Evident signs of implants osseointegration in the mandibular bone marrow, as bony

### Table 2. Statistical Comparison (Unpaired \( t \) Test) of Average %BIC value Between Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIC% Comparison</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group vs test 1</td>
<td>0.3532*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group vs test 2</td>
<td>0.5454*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test 1 vs test 2</td>
<td>0.0561*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical comparison showed no significant differences \( (P > 0.05) \) in BIC percentage between different groups (probably due to the small sample size). *Nonsignificant.

### Table 3. Average of Infrabony Pockets’ Depth in Each Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Infrabony Pockets’ Depth ± SD (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50°C (test 1)</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°C (test 2)</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average infrabony pocket was higher in the 60°C heated group, showing a damage of the crestal bone due to excessive overheating. These data suggest that careful drilling procedure with sufficient irrigation is necessary to avoid periimplant infrabony pockets’ formation.

### Table 4. Statistical Comparison (Unpaired \( t \) Test) of Infrabony Pockets’ Depth Average Between Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrabony Pockets’ Depth</th>
<th>Average Comparison</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group vs test 1</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group vs test 2</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test 1 vs test 2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implants inserted in heated bone sites up to 60°C for 1 minute (group test 2) showed significantly deeper infrabony pockets as compared to other groups. A temperature of 50°C for 1 minute reached during implant site preparation may cause crestal bone resorption (infrabony pockets) around the implant neck area. *Significant.
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**Fig. 1.** Representative case from control group without heating of the bone site. Implant present large areas of direct bone contact and areas of newly formed bone are in contact with titanium implant surface. The bone tissue grew above the cover screw on 1 side of the implant (toluidine blue—magnification \( \times 10 \)).
Trabeculae of varying thickness that covered implant surface, were observed.

**Test 2 group (60°C).** Implants in test 2 group (60°C for 1 minute) showed infrabony pockets of 1.07 mm average depth (Fig. 3). In all cases, cortical bone resorption and a subsequent newly composite bone formation that filled the resorption gap was evident, as if there had been an overdimensioned implant site preparation. This bone resorption had a conical shape. In the coronal part, it was larger and progressively decreased in diameter when approaching the medullary region. This was evident when analyzing the bone structure. At a distance from the implant surface, the bone had a mature lamellar pattern, whereas close to the interface immature composite bone was visible.

**DISCUSSION**

An elevated degree of osseointegration and the lack of periimplant bone loss are considered important parameters to evaluate titanium dental implants success.\textsuperscript{17} It has been reported\textsuperscript{18} that incorrect implant drilling procedures may induce temperature rise with resulting cell necrosis and degeneration of some proteins. Lack of primary stability, surgical trauma, or infection may induce early periimplant bone resorption during implant osseointegration processes.\textsuperscript{18,20} Early bone resorption around dental implants or implant failure could be caused by bone overheating during implant drilling procedure.\textsuperscript{21,22} Numerous studies evaluated the temperature rise during bone drilling \textit{in vitro}\textsuperscript{2–4,7,8} and a few \textit{in vivo}.\textsuperscript{1,12,14} It was also demonstrated that many factors are involved in heat generation such as osteotomy depth, mode of irrigation, and drill diameter.\textsuperscript{23} Some authors studied heat effects on bone cells \textit{in vitro} trying to clearly identify the temperature threshold level of irreparable bone injury. Rouiller and Majno\textsuperscript{9} showed hard tissue damage for a temperature of 55°C for 3 minutes. In another study, Green and Matthews (1981) set this critical temperature level at 56°C because it is the point of alkaline phosphatase denaturation. Eriksson et al\textsuperscript{11} showed that a bone temperature of 53°C for 1 minute caused changes in the blood flow, resorption of fat cells, and irreversible bone damage. Eriksson and Albrektsson\textsuperscript{15} demonstrated, \textit{in vivo}, that heating the bone up to 47°C or 50°C for 1 minute was sufficient to impair the bone growth into a transverse implant canal. This temperature was considered the threshold level for bone injury but the study did not clarify the effect of bone overheating, before implant insertion, on osseointegration processes around dental implants, because the aim was to evaluate the bone penetration within a canal in a flat titanium chamber. To our knowledge, the relationship between
bone temperature increase and implant osseointegration development has not been sufficiently evaluated up to now. Results from this study showed no significant differences in %BIC after a healing period of 2 months among different groups. Heating up to 60°C, the implant site for 1 minute does not prevent the osseointegration development in cortical bone. Results presented in this study are in agreement with those that showed in a recent in vivo investigation in rats, in which Yoshida et al. heated cranial bone up to 48°C for 15 minutes. They found that this thermal treatment did not obstruct bone formation after a healing period of 5 weeks. The authors concluded that heating bone tissue caused a delay in hard tissue formation in a temperature-dependent manner but new bone formation was in any case achieved. Frictional heat, during implant drilling procedures, could cause bone temperature to rise probably much higher than those tested in this study. High bone temperatures (above 100°C) during drilling procedures on cortical bone were reported in different in vitro investigations. Other authors found a bone temperature of 89°C drilling cortical bone in vivo and they assessed that temperatures measured in vitro were not applicable to the clinical situation where very high temperatures may develop, even if saline cooling is used. Furthermore, the same bur with the same irrigation method causes more temperature rise after multiple use: Chacon et al., in fact, showed that the temperature generated during implant drilling procedures increased after repeated drilling and sterilization. Osteotomic site temperature of 50°C or 60°C for 1 minute did not significantly impair titanium implant osseointegration, but only small infraubony pockets around implants. Careful drilling procedure with sufficient irrigation is necessary to avoid periimplant infraubony pocket formation. Further clinical investigations are needed to identify which temperature threshold could be responsible for complete inhibition of implant osseointegration in dense bone.

CONCLUSION

Implants inserted in heated bone sites up to 50°C for 1 minute did not show any sign of bone resorption, and this temperature could not be considered as a threshold level for temperature induced bone injury in dense bone.

Bone temperature up to 60°C for 1 minute does not seem to be able to significantly impair titanium implant osseointegration, but only small infraubony pockets around implants. Careful drilling procedure with sufficient irrigation is necessary to avoid periimplant infraubony pocket formation. Further clinical investigations are needed to identify which temperature threshold could be responsible for complete inhibition of implant osseointegration in dense bone.
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