IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 24, Issue 7 Ser.2 (July 2025), PP 17-21
www.iosrjournals.org

Implant Esthetics: A Review

Dr.Reshma Anil Thomas[1], Dr. P.S Prabu[2], Dr. Annie Susan Thomas[3], Dr. Bajisha V.K.[4], Dr. Neeraj Giri[5]

[(1,4,5)] Postgraduate student, Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor dental college and Hospital, Muvattupuzha, Kerala., [2]Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor dental college and Hospital, Muvattupuzha, Kerala., [3]Head of Department, Department of Prosthodontics, Annoor dental college and Hospital, Muvattupuzha, Kerala.

Abstract: *This dissertation explores the critical factors influencing esthetic outcomes in dental implant therapy, focusing on both surgical and prosthetic considerations. Emphasis is placed on soft tissue management, implant positioning, and the role of biomaterials in achieving natural-looking results. A combination of clinical case studies and literature review highlights best practices for optimizing esthetics in the anterior region. The findings underscore the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to meet patient expectations for function and appearance. Ultimately, the study offers guidelines to enhance predictability and success in esthetically demanding implant cases.*

Keywords: *Esthetic, esthetics, dental midline, ala-tragal line*

Date of Submission: 25-06-2025 Date of Acceptance: 05-07-2025

I. Introduction

Esthetics is a fundamental, evolving aspect of dentistry that integrates both art and science to enhance individual beauty within functional and physiological limits. Successful esthetic treatment considers facial, dentolabial, dental, phonetic, and gingival factors to achieve optimal results while maintaining patient health and function. Esthetics, rooted in philosophy and defined as the study of beauty and artistic creation, transcends simple tooth shade matching or basic arrangement. A smile conveys diverse emotions and cultural meanings, making esthetic perception highly subjective and influenced by social, psychological, cultural, and media factors. Since their introduction, dental implants have revolutionized restorative dentistry, with advancements improving techniques, materials, and components. While replacing single missing teeth is routine, anterior implant-supported restorations remain technically challenging due to high esthetic and functional demands. Modern success goes beyond osseointegration; it requires harmonious integration of the restoration with surrounding tissues and dentition. Critical factors include alveolar bone volume, soft tissue morphology, precise implant positioning, provisional restoration phases, and careful selection of implant abutment and crown materials and design.

II. Dentolabial considerations

The incisal curve ideally follows a convex arc parallel to the curvature of the lower lip during a posed smile, known as a *consonant smile arc*. This alignment enhances esthetics and incisal guidance, though variations exist depending on individual lip curvature and dental class. A flat or reverse curve, often due to incisal wear, is esthetically less pleasing and can make the smile appear aged. In cases where lower lip curvature is asymmetrical, the horizontal plane should be the reference for incisal alignment. The smile line, defined by the upper lip's inferior border during a full smile, influences tooth and gingiva display. Smile lines are classified as low, average, or high. A high smile line (>3–4 mm gingival display) is considered a gummy smile and can result from factors such as a short upper lip, hypermobile lip, or excessive maxillary growth. Age and gender also influence incisor visibility: with age, upper incisor display decreases and lower incisor display increases; females typically show more upper incisors than males.

Smile design aims for a harmonious masticatory system where teeth, muscles, bones, gingiva, and joints function in balance. It requires evaluating both facial composition (e.g., interpupillary line, lips, facial proportions) and dental composition (tooth and gingival relationships). Ideal facial proportions follow classical esthetic rules—such as the face being five eyes wide and vertically divided into thirds. The face's shape (square, tapering, ovoid) and profile (straight, convex, concave) help determine tooth size and shape, highlighting the interplay between facial and dental esthetics in smile makeovers.

III. Pink and White esthetics

The Pink and White Esthetic Score (PES/WES) is a standard tool for evaluating the esthetic success of implant-supported restorations, especially in the anterior region. PES scores soft tissue features (papillae, gingival level, curvature, root convexity, scars), while WES evaluates the crown (form, outline, color, texture, translucency), with each category rated 0–2; scores of ≥6 (PES) and >12 (combined) indicate esthetic acceptability. Additional micro-esthetic factors like midline alignment, incisal curve, and tooth proportions further refine assessment. Extended systems like the IBOI Esthetic Score also consider implant-specific variables—positioning, angulation, depth, and tissue response—enhancing surgical and prosthetic planning for optimal results.

IV. Esthetic aspects in implant dentistry

In implant-prosthetic rehabilitation, optimal esthetics is achieved through a systematic approach integrating prosthetic, surgical, and orthodontic principles. Esthetic success depends on factors like smile line, tissue biotype, bone anatomy, and precise implant positioning in all dimensions. Misplacement or thin biotypes may require regenerative or orthodontic interventions, while customized abutments and provisional restorations help sculpt ideal gingival contours. Techniques such as platform switching, microthreads, and guided bone regeneration support bone preservation and soft tissue stability, ensuring functional and esthetic integration—especially in high smile-line or multiple implant cases

V. Single tooth replacement options

A single-tooth implant is a preferred treatment for replacing a missing tooth, offering long-term benefits over traditional fixed partial dentures (FPDs). Unlike FPDs, which often require the preparation of adjacent teeth and can lead to secondary complications, implants preserve natural tooth structure, maintain bone and soft tissue at the site, and support better hygiene and esthetics. However, they typically involve longer treatment times and may necessitate bone or soft tissue grafting.

Implant Placement Guidelines and Challenges

The success of a single-tooth implant depends on precise spacing and bone support. Implants should be placed 1.5–2.0 mm from adjacent teeth, 3.0 mm between implants, and with sufficient buccal and lingual bone support (minimum 1.5 mm facially, 1.0 mm lingually). Facial bone thickness under 1.0 mm increases the risk of bone loss and implant failure. Proper planning using these spatial guidelines is crucial, particularly in areas with limited bone volume.

Anterior Region Considerations

Replacing anterior teeth—especially in the maxillary arch—poses esthetic and emotional challenges. Patients are highly sensitive to esthetic imperfections and often prefer implants over FPDs to avoid altering adjacent healthy teeth. In the mandibular anterior region, space limitations typically require fewer implants to support multiple missing teeth (e.g., two implants for four incisors). In contrast, the premaxilla often demands complex soft and hard tissue management to achieve natural esthetics, making treatment more demanding.

VI. Dental implant prosthesis

In implant dentistry, patients expect high esthetics, function, minimal invasiveness, bone preservation, comfort, and cost-effectiveness. Prosthetic options vary by tooth loss extent: for single-tooth loss, implants offer the best long-term outcome but with higher cost and surgical risk; RPDs, FPDs, and resin-bonded bridges have functional or esthetic limitations. For partially edentulous patients, implants preserve bone and function better than RPDs or FPDs. In fully edentulous cases, implant-supported overdentures offer improved retention and cost-effectiveness, while fixed implant prostheses provide superior stability and bone maintenance but require more time and hygiene care.

Pre-prosthetic planning must evaluate space, bone, adjacent teeth, smile line, and esthetic parameters. Accurate implant placement is crucial. Impression transfers use closed or open tray copings, with open tray offering greater precision. The lab phase involves collaborative planning using articulators, abutment selection (e.g., UCLA, estheticone, CAD/CAM custom), and precise casting. Abutments and prostheses may be screw- or cement-retained; screw-retained types are retrievable but esthetically limited, while cement-retained types offer better esthetics but pose risks of excess cement and less retrievability. The final choice depends on clinical and esthetic priorities.

VII. Restorative materials

Contemporary implant restorations use materials like monolithic zirconia, lithium disilicate, metal-ceramics**,** and PMMA resins**.** Zirconia (e.g., BruxZir) is favored for strength and esthetics, with newer translucent types suitable for anterior use. Lithium disilicate (IPS e.max) and lithium silicate (Obsidian) offer high translucency but lower strength, ideal for anterior crowns and veneers. Metal-ceramics, enhanced with laser-sintered frameworks and Obsidian veneering, remain reliable for both anterior and posterior cases. PMMA is used for provisional restorations in full-arch workflows. Recommended materials include monolithic zirconia and glass-ceramics for anterior crowns and full-strength zirconia or metal-ceramics for posterior restorations.

VIII. Soft tissue conditioning

Soft tissue management has become essential in implantology, shifting focus from solely bone integration to esthetics and tissue health. Soft tissues protect against microbial and mechanical insults, support papilla formation, and enhance emergence profiles and long-term implant success. Adequate keratinized gingiva is critical for hygiene and healing. Papilla presence depends on bone-contact distances (ideally 5 mm), inter-implant spacing (≥3 mm), and tooth-implant spacing (≥1.5 mm). Various classification systems (Miller, Jemt, Salama, Meltzer, Wang & Shammari, Palacci & Ericsson) help assess soft tissue and ridge defects. Ridge deformities from early tooth loss often require Guided Bone Regeneration (GBR), which uses membranes and grafts to reconstruct bone and support implant placement.

IX. Treatment planning

Pre-Surgical Phase

Proper planning is key for successful anterior implant rehabilitation.

1. Study Model Evaluation

- Provides a 3D view of the patient's oral anatomy.
- Helps assess occlusion, interarch space, edentulous ridge, and adjacent teeth for implant positioning.

2. Radiographic Evaluation

- CBCT is used to evaluate bone quality and quantity.
- Bone density measured via Hounsfield units helps determine prognosis (based on Misch classification).

3. Soft & Hard Tissue Evaluation

- Gingival biotype:
  - Thin & scalloped (<1.5 mm): higher esthetic risk, recession, shadowing.
  - Thick & flat (>2 mm): more stable.
- Keratinized gingiva: ≥2 mm recommended.
- Bone volume: Assessed for grafting needs (vertical/horizontal augmentation, distraction osteogenesis, etc.).

Surgical Phase

Focuses on implant placement and tissue management to optimize esthetics.

1. Treatment Modalities

- Guided Implant Surgery: Uses CBCT & CAD-CAM for precise placement.
- Immediate Implant Placement: Ideal in the esthetic zone with appropriate temporization.

2. Ideal Implant Positioning

- **Mesio-distal**: ≥1.5 mm from adjacent teeth; ≥3 mm between implants.
- **Labio-palatal**:
  - Maintain ≥1 mm buccal and 0.8 mm palatal bone.
  - Placement depends on retention type (screw vs. cement).
- **Apico-incisal**:
  - Implant placed 2–3 mm apical to gingival zenith.
  - Creates "running room" for natural-looking emergence profile.

3. Soft Tissue Management

- Focus on papilla formation to avoid "black triangles".
- Maintain ≤5 mm from bone crest to contact point (Tarnow's guideline) for optimal papilla fill.

Post-Surgical Phase

This phase ensures long-term esthetics through prosthetic planning and tissue support.

1. Provisionalization

- Supports soft tissue shaping and emergence profile development.
- Can be removable or fixed.
- **Critical contour**: Area just below gingival margin—affects crown length and zenith.
- **Subcritical contour**: Between abutment and implant—affects tissue support and papilla formation.

2. Abutment Selection

- **Retention type**: Screw-retained (retrievable, esthetic risk if labial), Cement-retained.
- **Material choices**: Zirconia, PEEK, titanium, or hybrid.
- For compromised angulation, use **angulated or custom CAD-CAM abutments**.

3. Definitive Prosthesis & Follow-Up

- Provisional restoration guides final design.
- CAD-CAM enables precise replication.
- Evaluate esthetics and function using patient satisfaction and clinical indices.

X. Surgical techniques

Clinical Tissue Conditions in the Maxillary Anterior Region

Challenges

- Complex due to esthetic demands and thin bone anatomy.
- Tissue deficiencies may be **pathological** or **anatomical**.
- Historically focused on osseointegration over esthetics—Palacci first emphasized interproximal esthetics.

Soft Tissue Manipulation Before Implant Placement

Pre-Extraction Techniques

- **Orthodontic Forced Eruption**: Extrudes gingiva coronally, enhancing esthetics.
- **Root Sealing Technique**:
    - Preserves/augments keratinized gingiva before extraction.
    - Promotes soft tissue healing and reduces the need for grafts or GBR exposure.
    - Steps:
        - Crown reduced to gingival level; root sealed subcrestally.
        - Gingiva grows over root in ~2–4 weeks.
        - Later root is extracted with GBR if needed.

First Surgical Stage

- Implant insertion with hard/soft tissue reconstruction as needed.
- Techniques:
    - GBR, block grafts, connective/free gingival grafts, coronally positioned flap, frenectomy.
    - Aim: Seal wound, maintain keratinized tissue, prevent early exposure or failure.

Between First and Second Stage

Focus on **keratinized mucosa** augmentation and **papilla formation**.

- Procedures:
    - **Palatally rotated flap**, **free gingival grafts**, **vestibuloplasty**, **connective tissue grafts**.
- Literature suggests non-keratinized mucosa may increase inflammation if plaque is present.

Second Surgical Stage (Uncovering Implants)

- Key for soft tissue shaping and esthetic outcomes.
- Goals:
    - Assess osseointegration.
    - Connect healing abutments.
    - Sculpt gingiva and papilla.

Uncovering Techniques

- Circular Tissue Punch: Minimally invasive, used in good tissue sites.
- Papilla Formation Techniques:
    - Nemeskey Technique: U-shaped flap for single implants.
    - Tinti & Benfenati: For multiple adjacent implants, no vertical incisions.
    - Palacci Technique: Pedicle flap rotated into inter-implant space to simulate papilla.

Emergence Profile & Tissue Conditioning

Customized Healing Abutments

- Progressive diameters (5, 6, 7.5 mm) help shape soft tissue.
- Titanium or esthetic materials improve gingival adaptation.

Provisional Crowns

- Used to sculpt interproximal tissue and accelerate soft tissue conditioning.
- Jemt: More effective than healing abutments for papilla preservation.

Peri-implant Soft Tissue Complications

- Possible at any stage: early, during healing, or prosthetic phases.
- Issues include:

  - Screw loosening, abutment rotation, gingivitis, peri-implantitis, mucosal irritation, gingival recession.
- **Key Management Strategies**:
  - Maintain keratinized tissue.
  - Prevent inflammation.
  - Plan early for esthetic soft tissue design.

XI. Conclusion

Aesthetic success in dental implants depends on initial bone and soft tissue levels. Single tooth implants are generally predictable, aided by adjacent teeth that help recreate natural gingival architecture, but multiple missing teeth often require bone augmentation to achieve good aesthetics. Options for replacing missing anterior teeth include fixed partial dentures, resin-bonded dentures, and implants. Implants, though costly, preserve adjacent teeth and prevent bone resorption. Predictable outcomes rely on factors like patient selection, tooth and root positions, periodontal biotype, and bony anatomy, making careful planning essential.

References

[1]. Garber DA. The esthetic dental implant: letting restoration be the guide. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1995 Mar 1;126(3):319-25.
[2]. Testori T, Weinstein T, Scutellà F, Wang HL, Zucchelli G. Implant placement in the esthetic area: criteria for positioning single and multiple implants. Periodontology 2000. 2018 Jun;77(1):176-96.
[3]. Zucchelli G, Sharma P, Mounssif I. Esthetics in periodontics and implantology. Periodontology 2000. 2018 Jun;77(1):7-18.
[4]. El Askary AES. Multifaceted Aspects of Implant Esthetics: The Anterior Maxilla. Implant Dentistry. 2001 Sep;10(3):182–91.
[5]. Holst S, Blatz MB, Hegenbarth E, Wichmann M, Eitner S. Prosthodontic considerations for predictable single-implant esthetics in the anterior maxilla. Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2005 Sep 1;63(9):89-96.
[6]. Wang HL, Shotwell JL, Itose T, Neiva RF. Multidisciplinary treatment approach for enhancement of implant esthetics. Implant dentistry. 2005 Mar 1;14(1):21-9.
[7]. Al-Sabbagh M. Implants in the esthetic zone. Dental Clinics. 2006 Jul 1;50(3):391- 407.
[8]. Leblebicioglu B, Rawal S, Mariotti A. A review of the functional and esthetic requirements for dental implants. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 2007 Mar;138(3):321–9.
[9]. Bashutski JD, Wang HL. Common implant esthetic complications. Implant dentistry. 2007 Dec 1;16(4):340-8.
[10]. Brindis MA, Block MS. Orthodontic tooth extrusion to enhance soft tissue implant esthetics. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. 2009 Nov 1;67(11):49-59.
[11]. BIDRA AS. Three-Dimensional Esthetic Analysis in Treatment Planning for Implant Supported Fixed Prosthesis in the Edentulous Maxilla: Review of the Esthetics Literature. Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry. 2011 May 12;23(4):219–36.
[12]. Ioannou AL, Kotsakis GA, McHale MG, Lareau DE, Hinrichs JE, Romanos GE. Soft Tissue Surgical Procedures for Optimizing Anterior Implant Esthetics. International Journal of Dentistry. 2015;2015:1–9.
[13]. Fuentealba R, Jofré J. Esthetic failure in implant dentistry. Dental Clinics. 2015 Jan 1;59(1):227-46.
[14]. Cosyn J, Thoma DS, Hämmerle CHF, De Bruyn H. Esthetic assessments in implant dentistry: objective and subjective criteria for clinicians and patients. Periodontology 2000. 2016 Dec 21;73(1):193–202.
[15]. Hof M, Umar N, Budas N, Seemann R, Pommer B, Zechner W. Evaluation of implant esthetics using eight objective indices—Comparative analysis of reliability and validity. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2018 Jul;29(7):697-706.
[16]. Garabetyan J, Malet J, Kerner S, Detzen L, Carra MC, Bouchard P. The relationship between dental implant papilla and dental implant mucosa around single-tooth implant in the esthetic area: A retrospective study. Clinical Oral Implants Research. 2019 Dec;30(12):1229-37.
[17]. Ramani RS, Bennani V, Aarts JM, Choi JJ, Brunton PA. Patient satisfaction with esthetics, phonetics, and function following implant-supported fixed restorative treatment in the esthetic zone: A systematic review. Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry. 2020 Oct;32(7):662-72.
[18]. Wang I (Izzie), Barootchi S, Tavelli L, Wang H. The peri-implant phenotype and implant esthetic complications. Contemporary overview. Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry. 2021 Jan;33(1):212–23.
[19]. Mangal K, Dhamande MM, Sathe S, Godbole S, Patel RM. An overview of the Implant Therapy: The Esthetic Approach. International Journal of Current Research and Review. 2021;13(02):106–12.
[20]. Shanelec DA, Tibbetts LS. Implant Microsurgery: Immediate Implant Placement With Implant-Supported Provisional. Clinical Advances in Periodontics. 2022 Nov;1(3):161–72.