

Comparison of the Efficacy of the Two Most Used Imaging Methods in the Surgical Treatment Planning of All-On-4 and Its Variations

Erim Tandogdu (✉ erim.tandogdu@neu.edu.tr)

Near East University

Aysa Ayali

European University of Lefke

Mehmet Gagari Caymaz

Cyprus Health and Social Sciences University

Research Article

Keywords: CBCT, Panoramic radiography, All-on-4, M-4, V-4

Posted Date: May 10th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1629411/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background

This study aimed to analyze the difference between the measurements made according to certain anatomical signs of the maxillary jaw using panoramic radiography and CBCT to decide whether to use all-on-4, M-4, or V-4 configuration to prevent complications caused by incorrect measurements during the pre-surgical planning stage of the placement of implants in the all-on-4 technique.

Methods

A retrospective study was conducted with 50 patients with upper edentulous jaws suitable for the all-on-4 technique, who underwent preoperative panoramic radiography and CBCT evaluation for dental implant surgery. The shortest vertical distances between anatomical structures were measured. Measurements were made independently by two oral and maxillofacial surgeons, one experienced and the other inexperienced.

Results

A statistically significant difference was found between the mean values according to gender ($p = 0,045$). When the measurements made by the experienced surgeon and the inexperienced surgeon were compared, there was no significant difference between panoramic radiography and CBCT. In situations where bone measurements are required for deciding on all-on-4 or one of its configurations (M-4 and V-4), it was found that panoramic radiography gives significantly incorrect results compared to CBCT ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion

CBCT is more reliable than panoramic radiography and eliminates the margin of error in the planning of all-on-4 or its variations to be made by either an experienced or an inexperienced oral surgeon.

Background

Dental implants are regarded as the main treatment option in terms of rehabilitation of edentulous jaws because of their stable results and satisfactory success rates. [1, 2] In the all-on-4 treatment concept, a total of four implants are to be placed to withstand a full-arch prosthesis.[3] The implants, both anterior and posterior, converge towards the apex in angulation of 30 degrees. The apical divergence of the implants allows an increase in the anteroposterior spread, leading to improved prosthetic load distribution. [4] From a biomechanical viewpoint, at least 10mm of bone height is needed in the anterior maxilla to allow the fixed implant-supported prosthesis to be immediately loaded. [3] Nevertheless, this is

not always achievable because augmentation of bone height is a complex challenging surgical procedure, especially in the anterior maxilla areas with severe atrophy. In patients whose smile-line is high, the maxillary alveolar bone should be reduced to move the horizontal transition line apically to achieve an esthetically satisfactory result. [4] Such clinical situations could lead to inadequate alveolar bone height in the anterior maxilla, consequently obstructing the axial placement of at least 10mm implants. As a result, inclining the anterior implants permits longer implants to be placed distally, following the guidelines of the all-on-4 concept. Jensen et al. [3] introduced an M-shaped design, called M-4, where the anterior implants are tilted up to 30 degrees distally in the axial plane while extending into the lateral nasal rim. The other design, called V-4, is composed of four implants that are tilted in the direction of the midline in a V-shaped figure, where the anterior two implants engage apically in the maxillary midplane. [4]

In treatment planning, the constantly used imaging methods are panoramic radiography, intraoral radiography, computed tomography (CT), and cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT).

[5] From these modalities, panoramic radiography is usually used due to its advantages of providing cost-efficient, easily obtainable, and high-quality images. [6] CBCT not only acquires large amounts of data on relatively short exposure to radiation but also yields high-resolution images in multiple orthogonal planes, which is useful for accurate measurements. [7]

Even though a substantial number of publications are available on the applications of CBCT and panoramic radiography in dental implantology, there is still debate regarding the ideal imaging method for pre-surgical implant planning. [8]

Therefore, the present study aimed to analyze the difference between the measurements made according to certain anatomical signs of the maxillary jaw using panoramic radiography and CBCT to decide whether to use all-on-4, M-4, or V-4 configuration to prevent complications caused by incorrect measurements during the pre-surgical planning stage of the placement of implants in the all-on-4 technique. It also aimed to compare the measurements of a senior (experienced) and a junior (inexperienced) oral surgeon to evaluate whether experience significantly affects making an accurate measurement.

The first hypothesis in the current study is that there will be a notable difference between the CBCT and panoramic radiography measurements, and the second null hypothesis is that there will be a difference between the measurements of an experienced and an inexperienced oral surgeon in these measurements.

Materials And Methods

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol was approved by the Near East University Scientific Research Ethics Committee (project number NEU/2019/89-1304).

Study Setting and Grouping of Participants

A retrospective study was conducted in the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery with 50 patients (58% of the patients were male and 42% were female. The mean age of the patients was 62, the minimum age was 22, and the maximum age was 92) with upper edentulous jaws suitable for the all-on-4 technique, who had pre-operative panoramic radiography and CBCT assessment for dental implant surgery between September 2016 and August 2021.

Subsumption criteria were panoramic radiography and CBCT images showing the maxillary edentulous region clearly. Images showing artifacts, geometric distortion, and indeterminate anatomical structures were excluded from the study data.[9]

CBCT images were captured using Sirona Orthophos XG® 3D (Sirona, Salzburg, Austria) with 80 kV voltage, 12 mA current, 16 × 5 cm scan area, and 14 s scan time also panoramic radiographs were taken using the same device (Sirona Orthophos XG®; Sirona, Salzburg, Austria) using 1.2 magnification, 60 kV voltage, 4 mA current, and exposure time of 14 sec. All measurements were performed using the same software program Sirona Sidexis® v.4 (Sirona, Salzburg, Austria).

CBCT scans were viewed at 1:1 magnification in the coronal and sagittal planes. The vertical distances between anatomical structures were measured as:

1. Distance between the left and right nasal floors.
2. Distance between the right/left lateral nasal wall and right/left maxillary sinus.
3. Distance between the bottom of the left and/or right nasal floor and the alveolar crest.
4. Distance between the right/left maxillary lateral incisor tooth region and the right/left maxillary first molar tooth region.
5. Distance between the right/left maxillary lateral incisor tooth region and the right/left maxillary lateral incisor tooth region.

Measurements were made independently by two oral and maxillofacial surgeons, one experienced (More than 10 years in the field) and the other inexperienced (less than 5 years in the field), and mean values were used for analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with IBM SPSS V23. Relevance to normal distribution was evaluated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. One-way analysis of variance was used in the comparison of normally distributed data according to groups of three or more, and multiple comparisons were performed with the Tukey HSD test. An Independent two-sample *t*-test was used to compare normally distributed data according to paired groups. Analysis results were presented as mean

± standard deviation and median (minimum-maximum) for quantitative data. The significance level was taken as $P < 0.050$.

Results

After evaluating the eligibility criteria, the final sample consisted of 29 men (58%) and 21 women (42%) aged between 22 and 92 (mean 62 years). A statistically significant difference was found between the mean values of the lateral nasal wall and maxillary sinus (right) according to gender ($p = 0,045$). The mean for women was 5.5, while the mean for men was 6.0. A statistically significant difference was found between the mean values of the lateral nasal wall edge - maxillary sinus (left) according to gender ($p = 0,003$). The mean for women was 5.3, while the mean for men was 6.1. A statistically significant difference was found between the mean values of lateral incisor region (left) and lateral incisor region (right) according to gender ($p = 0,03$). The mean for women was 16.7, while the mean for men was 17.7. A statistically significant difference was found between the mean values of the nasal floor and the alveolar crest (left) by gender ($p = 0,021$). While the average of women was 12.9, the average of men was 14.1. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean values of other variables by gender ($p > 0,050$). The mean values of the distances by gender in panoramic radiography and CBCT images are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Comparison results by gender

	Gender		Total	Test Statistics	p
	Female	Male			
Between Nasal Floors	11,9 ± 2,3 12,1(4,1–16,1)	12,4 ± 2,3 12,3 (5,8–18,0)	12,2 ± 2,3 12,3 (4,1–18,0)	t=-1,728	0,085
Nose Edge- Maxillary Sinus (Right)	5,5 ± 1,7 5,4 (1,8–9,0)	6,0 ± 2,1 5,8 (2,7–11,8)	5,8 ± 2,0 5,5 (1,8–11,8)	t=-2,021	0,045
Nose Edge - Maxillary Sinus (Left)	5,3 ± 1,6 5,2 (2,3–9,4)	6,1 ± 1,8 6,0 (2,3–11,0)	5,8 ± 1,7 5,5 (2,3–11,0)	t=-3,051	0,003
Lateral Incisor Region – First Molar Region (Left)	19,1 ± 3,6 18,2(11,2–271)	20,1 ± 4,3 20,2 (8,3–28,0)	19,7 ± 4,1 19,5 (8,3–28,0)	t=-1,697	0,091
Lateral Incisor Region- First Molar Region (Right)	19,0 ± 3,3 19,1(9,6–27,5)	19,7 ± 4,3 19,7 (5,3–28,9)	19,4 ± 3,9 19,4 (5,3–28,9)	t=-1,296	0,196
Lateral Incisor Region (Left)- Lateral Incisor Region (Right)	16,7 ± 2,9 16,9(8,9–22,9)	17,7 ± 3,1 17,7(11,1–26,1)	17,3 ± 3,0 17,5 (8,9–26,1)	t=-2,182	0,030
Nasal Floor – Alveolar Crest (Right)	12,9 ± 3,8 12,8(5,1–21,2)	13,8 ± 3,4 13,8 (5,8–24,7)	13,4 ± 3,6 13,3 (5,1–24,7)	t=-1,723	0,086
Nasal Floor – Alveolar Crest (Left)	12,9 ± 3,8 12,8(5,3–22,0)	14,1 ± 3,6 13,7 (5,4–25,4)	13,6 ± 3,7 13,3 (5,3–25,4)	t=-2,334	0,021
Note: t: Independent t-test for two samples. Data are presented as mean value ± standard deviation/median (minimum-maximum) in millimeter. *P < 0.05 indicates a significant difference.					

When the measurements made by the experienced surgeon and the inexperienced surgeon were compared, there was no significant difference between panoramic radiography and CBCT ($p < 0,001$). However, there was a difference between all measurement regions in panoramic radiography and CBCT measurements. The mean values of the measurements are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Comparison results by groups

	Group				Test Statistics	p
	Experienced	Experienced	Inexperienced	Inexperienced		
	Panoramic	CBCT	Panoramic	CBCT		
Between Nasal floors	13,4 ± 2,0b 13,5 (9,8–18,0)	11,5 ± 1,7a 11,3 (8,5–15,3)	13,4 ± 2,0b 13,5 (9,8–17,9)	10,5 ± 2,2a 10,5 (4,1–14,1)	F = 25,711	< 0,001
Nose Edge - Maxillary Sinus (Right)	6,5 ± 2,0b 6,4 (2,4–11,2)	5,4 ± 1,8a 5,3 (1,8–11,8)	6,6 ± 1,7b 6,4 (2,4–11,2)	4,9 ± 1,5a 4,8 (2,3–11,8)	F = 9,138	< 0,001
Nose Edge - Maxillary Sinus (Left)	6,5 ± 1,7b 6,2 (2,7–11,0)	5,2 ± 1,5a 5,1 (2,3–10,9)	6,5 ± 1,7b 6,3 (2,7–11,0)	4,9 ± 1,5a 4,6 (2,3–10,9)	F = 13,587	< 0,001
Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Left)	21,2 ± 3,3b 21,2 (15,2–28,0)	17,9 ± 4,3b 18,0 (8,3–26,7)	21,3 ± 3,4b 21,2 (15,2–28,0)	18,3 ± 4,0a 17,9 (11,7–28,0)	F = 11,686	< 0,001
Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Right)	20,8 ± 3,3b 20,3 (14,4–28,9)	17,5 ± 4,1a 17,8 (5,3–27,5)	20,9 ± 3,3b 20,3 (14,4–28,0)	18,3 ± 3,9a 18,1 (11,1–27,5)	F = 10,998	< 0,001
Lateral Incisor Region (Left) - Lateral Incisor Region (Right)	19,0 ± 2,4b 18,9 (14,0–26,1)	15,4 ± 2,4a 15,3 (10,3–21,8)	19,0 ± 2,4b 18,9 (14,0–26,1)	15,7 ± 3,0a 15,4 (8,9–22,7)	F = 30,407	< 0,001
Nasal Floor – Alveolar Crest (Right)	14,6 ± 3,5b 14,5 (7,1–24,7)	12,2 ± 3,6a 12,2 (5,5–19,8)	14,6 ± 3,5b 14,4 (7,1–24,7)	12,2 ± 2,9a 12,5 (5,1–18,1)	F = 8,031	< 0,001

Note: F: Analysis of variance test statistics. Data are presented as mean value ± standard deviation/median (minimum-maximum) in millimeter. a-b: There is no difference between groups with the same letter (P < 0.05).

	Group				Test Statistics	p
	Experienced	Experienced	Inexperienced	Inexperienced		
	Panoramic	CBCT	Panoramic	CBCT		
Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left)	15,0 ± 3,7b 14,3 (6,7–25,4)	12,5 ± 3,5a 12,5 (5,4–21,2)	15,0 ± 3,7b 14,3 (6,7–25,4)	12,0 ± 2,9a 12,0 (5,3–18,0)	F = 10,364	< 0,001
Note: F: Analysis of variance test statistics. Data are presented as mean value ± standard deviation/median (minimum-maximum) in millimeter. a-b: There is no difference between groups with the same letter (P < 0.05).						

In situations where bone measurements are required for deciding on all-on-4 or one of its configurations (M-4 and V-4), it was found that panoramic radiography gives significantly incorrect results compared to CBCT ($p < 0.05$). ($p < 0.05$) [Table 3].

Table 3

Comparison of the Nasal Floor – Alveolar Crest (Right-left) and Lateral Incisor Region – First Molar Region (Right-left) groups by groups

Experienced Panoramic	Experienced CBCT	Inexperienced Panoramic	Inexperienced CBCT	Total	Test Statistics	p
Nasal Floor – Alveolar Crest (Right)	3 (6)a 13 (26)b 13 (26)b	3 (6)a 47 (94)	10 (20)ab 40 (80)	29 (14,5) 171 (85,5)	$\chi^2 = 12,382$	0,006
< 10						
≥ 10						
Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left)	3 (6) 12 (24) 38 (76)	3 (6) 47 (94)	11 (22) 39 (78)	29 (14,5) 171 (85,5)	$\chi^2 = 11,736$	0,051
< 10						
≥ 10						
Lateral Incisor Region – First Molar Region (Left)	0 (0)a 11 (22)b 39 (78)	0 (0)a 50 (100)	10 (20)b 40 (80)	21 (10,5) 179 (89,5)	$\chi^2 = 23,570$	< 0,001
< 15						
≥ 15						
Lateral Incisor Region – First Molar Region (Right)	1 (2)a 12 (24)b 38 (76)	1 (2)a 49 (98)	9 (18)b 41 (82)	23 (11,5) 177 (88,5)	$\chi^2 = 18,620$	< 0,001
< 15						
≥ 15						

Note: χ^2 : Chi-square test statistic. a-b: There is no difference between groups with the same letter (P < 0.05).

In the CBCT, according to the experienced surgeon, 12 out of a total of 50 cases were found to have a Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left) distance value of < 10. So, 24% of all-on-4 cases should be done with M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 10% of all-on-4 cases were found to be

suitable for the M-4 configuration and 14% for the V-4 configuration. In the Panoramic radiography group evaluated by the experienced surgeon, only 3 cases were found < 10. In other words, 9 cases were incorrectly measured.

In the CBCT group evaluated by the inexperienced surgeon, 11 of a total of 50 cases were found to have a Nasal Floor-Alveolar Crest (Left) distance value of < 10. Accordingly, 22% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 2% of all-on-4 cases were found to be suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 20% for the V-4 configuration. In the Panoramic radiography group evaluated by the inexperienced surgeon only 3 cases were found < 10. In other words, 8 cases were incorrectly measured.

No statistically significant difference was found between the distributions of Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Right) according to the Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) condition in each group ($p > 0,050$) in Table 4.

Table 4
Distribution of Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Right) groups according to the Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) condition

Group	Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Right)	Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right)		Total	p*
		< 10	≥ 10		
Experienced Panoramic	< 15	0 (0)	1 (2,1)	1 (2)	1,000
	≥ 15	3 (100)	46(97,9)	49 (98)	
Experienced CBCT	< 15	3 (23,1)	9 (24,3)	12 (24)	1,000
	≥ 15	10 (76,9)	28(75,7)	38 (76)	
Inexperienced Panoramic	< 15	0 (0)	1 (2,1)	1 (2)	1,000
	≥ 15	3 (100)	46(97,9)	49 (98)	
Inexperienced CBCT	< 15	2 (20)	7 (17,5)	9 (18)	1,000
	≥ 15	8 (80)	33(82,5)	41 (82)	
*Fisher's Exact test					

In the experienced surgeon CBCT group, 13 out of 50 cases, the Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) distance value was < 10. So, 26% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V- 4 configurations.

When looking at the A - P distance, it was seen that 6% of all-on-4 cases were suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 20% for the V-4 configuration. In the experienced surgeon panoramic group, only 3 cases were found. In other words, 10 cases were incorrectly measured [Table 5].

Table 5

Distribution of Lateral Incisor Region - First Molar Region (Left) groups according to the Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left) condition

	Lateral Incisor Region First Molar Region (Left)	Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left)		Total	p
		< 10	≥ 10		
Experienced Panoramic	≥ 15	3 (100)	47 (100)	50 (100)	—
Experienced CBCT	< 15	5 (41,7)	6 (15,8)	11 (22)	0,105
Experienced CBCT	≥ 15	7 (58,3)	32 (84,2)	39 (78)	
Inexperienced Panoramic	≥ 15	3 (100)	47 (100)	50 (100)	—
Inexperienced Panoramic	< 15	1 (9,1)	9 (23,1)	10 (20)	0,424
	≥ 15	10 (90,9)	30 (76,9)	40 (80)	
*Fisher's Exact test					

In the inexperienced surgeon CBCT group, of the total 50 cases, 10 had a Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) distance value of < 10. That is, 20% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 4% of all-on-4 cases were suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 16% for the V-4 configuration. In the inexperienced surgeon panoramic group, only 3 cases were found. In other words, 7 cases were incorrectly measured [Table 5].

Discussion

Different imaging techniques are available in maxillofacial radiology. Intraoral radiographs, panoramic radiographs, and CBCT are the most favored techniques in dental implant surgeries. The 2D nature of intraoral radiographs can cause anatomical proposition and dimensional distortion.[10] Isidor[11] expressed that because of superimposition, it was not feasible to spot an inadequate marginal bone height or lack of osseointegration on 2-dimensional images. In addition, many types of research have proven that the limited preoperative diagnostic capability of 2D imaging modality in dental implantology can cause implant failure.[12] 2D images demonstrate interproximal alveolar bone levels in the oro vestibular direction, which is a key specification for following the peri-implant bone.[13]

Panoramic radiographs enable a detailed 2-dimensional inspection of the jaws. The most important benefits of panoramic radiographs are a low radiation dose, comparatively lesser time of exposure, and

clarity of examination.[14] On the other hand, the lower image quality in comparison to intraoral radiographs and the existence of ghost images are some of the disadvantages of panoramic radiography.[15] Laster et al.[16] published that on panoramic radiography as a result of distortion and overlapping, horizontal measurements can be questionable.

One of the main problems associated with dental implant surgeries is the recovery of patients with the extremely atrophic maxilla.[17] Clinical research related to the number of implants required for rehabilitation of the edentulous jaws discovered the use of four implants led to an equivalent success level to rehabilitation processes with more implants.[18, 19] Jensen et al.[20] says that inclining anterior implants may also affect the identical pattern as inclining posterior implants which permits positioning of 50% longer implants. There are Two alignments with these features that have been reported. The first form is the M-4 design, in which the anterior implants are tilted posteriorly in the axial plane up to 30 degrees, reaching the lateral nasal rim. The second form, named V-4, which inserted in a V-shaped form and includes four implants that are angled to the midplane, with the two anterior implants apically joined in the maxillary midline.[21]

Jensen and Adams[3]in their research stated that compared to the standard all-on-4 configuration, the M-4 method could have more mechanical benefits and it is the choice for clinicians to achieve implant durability without exposing patients to further surgeries. He suggested that in maxillae when there is sufficient bone mass posterior to the nasal cavity, we should use the M-4 configuration, but when the anteroposterior bone mass is not adequate and is limited to the inter-canine area the V-4 configuration should be used. [3, 4]

When primary stability is of concern, all-on-4 different variations with tilted anterior implants can be considered beneficial because of the insertion of longer implants. Therefore, in this study, the standard all-on-4 treatment concept and its variations, which are intended to be applied to patients with the severely atrophic maxilla, were compared in terms of applicability with panoramic radiography and CBCT between the inexperienced surgeon and the experienced surgeon. In the CBCT, according to the experienced surgeon, 12 out of a total of 50 cases were found to have a Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Left) distance value of < 10. So, 24% of all-on-4 cases should be done with M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 10% of all-on-4 cases were found to be suitable for the M-4 configuration and 14% for the V-4 configuration. In the panoramic radiography group evaluated by the experienced surgeon, only 3 cases were found < 10. In other words, 9 cases were incorrectly measured. In the experienced CBCT group, 13 out of 50 cases, the Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) distance value was < 10. So, 26% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, it was seen that 6% of all-on-4 cases were suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 20% for the V-4 configuration. In the experienced surgeon panoramic group, only 3 cases were found. In other words, 10 cases were incorrectly measured. In the CBCT group evaluated by the inexperienced surgeon, 11 of a total of 50 cases were found to have a Nasal Floor-Alveolar Crest (Left) distance value of < 10. Accordingly, 22% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 2% of all-on-4 cases were found to be suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 20% for

the V-4 configuration. In the panoramic radiography group evaluated by the inexperienced surgeon only 3 cases were found < 10. In other words, 8 cases were incorrectly measured. In the inexperienced surgeon CBCT group, of the total 50 cases, 10 had a Nasal Floor - Alveolar Crest (Right) distance value of < 10. That is, 20% of all-on-4 cases should be done with the M-4 and V-4 configurations. When looking at the A - P distance, 4% of all-on-4 cases were suitable for the M-4 configuration, and 16% for the V-4 configuration. In the inexperienced surgeon panoramic group, only 3 cases were found. In other words, 7 cases were incorrectly measured.

This shows that in the majority of cases, it was determined that it was more suitable for the V- 4 concept due to the short A - P distance. At the same time, it was seen that the measurements made by the inexperienced surgeon and the experienced surgeon on panoramic radiography were similar and the margin of error was higher than that of CBCT. That is, CBCT has a lower margin of error to measure the A - P distance while planning all-on-4.

The results of implant treatment have become quite expectable in recent years.[22] However, the relationship of implants to fundamental vital anatomy landmarks can considerably alter the success of the surgical operation. Therefore, implant failure could limit the preoperative diagnostic examination to the panoramic imaging method.[12] Tang et al.[15] proposed that in situations where implant surgery presents any risks of damage for vital structures, using 3D imaging techniques could be advantageous. In a similar way, Dreiseidler et al.[23] stated that the image quality of CT and CBCT is higher than panoramic radiography, but them not being acquirable in every hospital because of their technical requirements and high cost are the main disadvantages for these imaging methods.

In recent studies, CBCT has been the choice of use in dental implant surgeries.[7] CBCT is favorable as a result of its high spatial resolution, short scanning time, and rapid image obtaining.[24] Monsour and Dudhia[25] proposed that patients experiencing CT examinations were exposed to a higher radiation dose than those who underwent examinations using panoramic radiography and CBCT.

Using of various imaging modalities for pre-implant assessment has been analyzed in numerous researches. Kopecka et al.[26] compared the use of CBCT and panoramic radiography in the evaluation of the bone height present for dental implant insertion surgeries. In post-mortem research, Hu et al.[27] used the maxillary region to compare measurement errors on CBCT images and panoramic radiographs and discovered that the average pre-surgical measurement error was significantly higher for panoramic radiography than CBCT. In his research, no statistically significant difference was found between the measurements made by the inexperienced oral surgeon and the experienced oral surgeon on panoramic radiography. However, a statistically remarkable difference was found between the values in CBCT measurements.

In a different research, Tang et al.[15] compared the magnification rate of CBCT and panoramic radiography in the assessment of various maxillofacial loci and stated that the distances calculated by panoramic radiography were closely correlated with those assessed by CBCT. In such cases, using CBCT

is recommended for more precise planning even though this study reveals that the average difference between CBCT and panoramic radiography was less than 1 mm.

Conclusions

The present study results revealed that CBCT is more reliable than panoramic radiography and eliminates the margin of error in the planning of all-on-4 or its variations (M-4 and V-4) to be made by either an experienced or an inexperienced oral surgeon. Further studies should review the availability of computer-aided implant surgery with a surgical guideline based on CBCT.

Abbreviations

CBCT

Cone-beam computed tomography

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study protocol was approved by the Near East University Scientific Research Ethics Committee (project number NEU/2019/89-1304).

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

Data available on request from the authors

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding:

The study did not receive funding or financial support to declare.

Authors' contributions:

ET and AA collected the data, and contributed to drafting the article; MGC analyzed the data and contributed to drafting and critical revision of the article. All the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgment:

Not applicable.

Author details

¹Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Near East University Faculty of Dentistry, Nicosia, Mersin-10, Turkey. ²Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, European University of Lefke Faculty of Dentistry, Lefke, Mersin-10, Turkey. ³Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Cyprus Health and Social Sciences University Faculty of Dentistry, Morphou, Mersin-10, Turkey.

References

1. Sorni M, Guarinos J, García O, Peñarrocha M. Implant rehabilitation of the atrophic upper jaw: a review of the literature since 1999. *Medicina Oral, Patologia Oral y Cirugia Bucal*. 2005 Apr 1;10:E45-56.
2. Ali SA, Karthigeyan S, Deivanai M, Kumar A. Implant rehabilitation for atrophic maxilla: a review. *The Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society*. 2014 Sep;14(3):196–207.
3. Jensen OT, Adams MW. The maxillary M-4: A technical and biomechanical note for all-on-4 management of severe maxillary atrophy—Report of 3 cases. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 2009 Aug 1;67(8):1739-44.
4. Jensen OT, Adams MW, Cottam JR, Parel SM, Phillips III WR. The All-on-4 shelf: maxilla. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2010 Oct 1;68(10):2520-7.
5. Tyndall DA, Price JB, Tetradis S, Ganz SD, Hildebolt C, Scarfe WC. Position statement of the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology on selection criteria for the use of radiology in dental implantology with emphasis on cone beam computed tomography. *Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology and oral radiology*. 2012 Jun 1;113(6):817 – 26.
6. Ahlqwist M, Halling A, Hollender L. Rotational panoramic radiography in epidemiological studies of dental health. Comparison between panoramic radiographs and intraoral full mouth surveys. *Swedish dental journal*. 1986 Jan 1;10(1–2):73–84.
7. Amarnath GS, Kumar U, Hilal M, Muddugangadhar BC, Anshuraj K, Shruthi CS. Comparison of cone beam computed tomography, orthopantomography with direct ridge mapping for pre-surgical planning to place implants in cadaveric mandibles: an ex-vivo study. *Journal of international oral health: JIOH*. 2015;7(Suppl 1):38.
8. Pertl L, Gashi-Cenkoglu B, Reichmann J, Jakse N, Pertl C. Preoperative assessment of the mandibular canal in implant surgery: comparison of rotational panoramic radiography (OPG), computed tomography (CT) and cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) for preoperative assessment in implant surgery. *Eur J Oral Implantol*. 2013 Mar 1;6(1):73–80.
9. Özalp Ö, Tezerişener HA, Kocabalkan B, Büyükkaplan UŞ, Özarslan MM, Kaya GŞ, Altay MA, Sindel A. Comparing the precision of panoramic radiography and cone-beam computed tomography in

- avoiding anatomical structures critical to dental implant surgery: A retrospective study. *Imaging science in dentistry*. 2018 Dec 1;48(4):269 – 75.
10. dos Santos Corpas L, Jacobs R, Quirynen M, Huang Y, Naert I, Duyck J. Peri-implant bone tissue assessment by comparing the outcome of intra-oral radiograph and cone beam computed tomography analyses to the histological standard. *Clinical oral implants research*. 2011 May;22(5):492–9.
 11. Isidor F. Histological evaluation of peri-implant bone at implants subjected to occlusal overload or plaque accumulation. *Clinical oral implants research*. 1997 Feb 1;8(1):1–9.
 12. Greenstein G, Cavallaro J, Romanos G, Tarnow D. Clinical recommendations for avoiding and managing surgical complications associated with implant dentistry: a review. *Journal of periodontology*. 2008 Aug;79(8):1317–29.
 13. Ritter L, Elger MC, Rothamel D, Fienitz T, Zinser M, Schwarz F, Zöller JE. Accuracy of peri-implant bone evaluation using cone beam CT, digital intra-oral radiographs and histology. *Dentomaxillofacial Radiology*. 2014 Sep;43(6):20130088.
 14. Suomalainen A, Pakbaznejad Esmaeili E, Robinson S. Dentomaxillofacial imaging with panoramic views and cone beam CT. *Insights into imaging*. 2015 Feb;6(1):1–6.
 15. Tang Z, Liu X, Chen K. Comparison of digital panoramic radiography versus cone beam computerized tomography for measuring alveolar bone. *Head & face medicine*. 2017 Dec;13(1):1–7.
 16. Ludlow JB, Laster WS, See M, Bailey LT, Hershey HG. Accuracy of measurements of mandibular anatomy in cone beam computed tomography images. *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology*. 2007 Apr 1;103(4):534 – 42.
 17. Ayali A, Altagar M, Ozan O, Kurtulmus-Yilmaz S. Biomechanical comparison of the All-on-4, M-4, and V-4 techniques in an atrophic maxilla: A 3D finite element analysis. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*. 2020 Aug 1;123:103880.
 18. Brånemark PI, Svensson B, Van Steenberghe D. Ten-year survival rates of fixed prostheses on four or six implants ad modum Brånemark in full edentulism. *Clinical oral implants research*. 1995 Dec;6(4):227–31.
 19. Gallucci GO, Morton D, Weber HP. Loading protocols for dental implants in edentulous patients. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*. 2009 Oct 2;24.
 20. Jensen OT, Adams MW. All-on-4 treatment of highly atrophic mandible with mandibular V-4: Report of 2 cases. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 2009 Jul 1;67(7):1503-9.
 21. Jensen OT, Adams MW, Butura C, Galindo DF. Maxillary V-4: Four implant treatment for maxillary atrophy with dental implants fixed apically at the vomer-nasal crest, lateral pyriform rim, and zygoma for immediate function. Report on 44 patients followed from 1 to 3 years. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*. 2015 Dec 1;114(6):810-7.
 22. Laster WS, Ludlow JB, Bailey LJ, Hershey HG. Accuracy of measurements of mandibular anatomy and prediction of asymmetry in panoramic radiographic images. *Dentomaxillofacial radiology*. 2005 Nov;34(6):343–9.

23. Dreiseidler T, Mischkowski RA, Neugebauer J, Ritter L, Zöller JE. Comparison of cone-beam imaging with orthopantomography and computerized tomography for assessment in presurgical implant dentistry. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*. 2009 Apr 1;24(2).
24. Klatt JC, Heiland M, Marx S, Hanken H, Schmelzle R, Pohlenz P. Clinical indication for intraoperative 3D imaging during open reduction of fractures of the mandibular angle. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2013 Jul 1;41(5):e87-90.
25. Monsour PA, Dudhia R. Implant radiography and radiology. *Australian dental journal*. 2008 Jun;53:S11-25.
26. Kopecka D, Simunek A, Streblov J, Slezak R, Capek L. Measurement of the interantral bone in implant dentistry using panoramic radiography and cone beam computed tomography: a human radiographic study. *The West Indian Medical Journal*. 2014 Sep;63(5):503.
27. Hu KS, Choi DY, Lee WJ, Kim HJ, Jung UW, Kim S. Reliability of two different presurgical preparation methods for implant dentistry based on panoramic radiography and cone-beam computed tomography in cadavers. *Journal of periodontal & implant science*. 2012 Apr 1;42(2):39–44.