OsteoBiol® by Tecnoss

Comparison of two xenograft materials used in sinus lift procedures: material characterization and in vivo behavior

LABORATORY TESTS

140

MP Ramírez Fernández[1]
P Mazón[2]
SA Gehrke[3]
JL Calvo-Guirado[1]
PN De Aza[4]

1 | Cátedra Internacional de Investigación en Odontología, Universidad Católica San Antonio de Murcia, Guadalupe, Murcia, Spain
2 | Departamento de Materiales, Óptica y Tecnologia Electrónica, Universidad Miguel Hernández, Elche, Alicante, Spain
3 | Biotecnos Research Center, Santa Maria (RS), Brazil
4 | Instituto de Bioingenieria, Universidad Miguel Hernandez, Elche, Alicante, Spain

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
Materials
2017;10(6)

ABSTRACT

Loss of teeth in the posterior maxillary area can lead to severe maxillary sinus pneumatization, and in this anatomical situation, it can be very difficult to obtain a suitable primary stability of implants. Maxillary sinus augmentation is a predictable method to increase posterior maxillary bone height, allowing to place dental implants in case of a residual alveolar ridge with a reduced bone volume. In sinus lift procedures, several types of graft materials can be used. The aim of this study was to characterize the physico-chemical properties of two xenografts deproteinized at different temperatures and compare how the physico-chemical properties influence the material's performance in vivo by a histomorphometric study in retrieved bone biopsies following maxillary sinus augmentation in 10 clinical cases. The two materials were a bovine HAs scaffold (BBM) consisting of a highly porous network with an average pore size of 0.5 mm, and a porcine HAS scaffold (PBM) formed by small grains of 500 μm on average. The X-ray diffraction analysis revealed the typical structure of hydroxyapatite (HA) for both materials. Both xenografts were porous, with intraparticle pores. Strong differences were observed in terms of porosity, crystallinity, and calcium/phosphate ratio. Histomorphometric measurements on the bone biopsies showed statistically significant differences. Both xenografts showed to be characterized by an excellent biocompatibility, with similar characteristics to natural bone. At the 6 months follow-up, the success rate of the 10 partially edentulous patients was 100%. By the end of the healing period, the increased bone volumes were stable and it was evident a bone gain for both xenografts. At the moment of implant insertion, the augmented sites treated with PBM showed less dense new bone than BBM. The sintered HA xenografts exhibited greater osteoconductivity, but were not completely resorbable. The non-sintered HA xenografts induced about 25.92 ± 1.61% of new bone and a high level of degradation after six months of implantation. Differences in the physico-chemical characteristics (porosity, crystallinity and composition) found between the two HA xenografts determined a different behaviour for this material.

CONCLUSIONS

At the end of the study and after the evaluation of the results, the Authors concluded that *"the HAs assessed herein are shown to be biocompatible and osteoconductive when used for maxillary sinus elevation purposes. PBM displayed a high level of degradation over the study period"*. Anyway, more histological and histomorphometrical studies are needed to better understand the resorption times of these biomaterials.

Grafted with

BONE SUBSTITUTE
OsteoBiol® *mp3®*

MEMBRANE
OsteoBiol® *Evolution*

LAB