Rama Univ. J. Dent. Sci. 2024 June ; 11(2):-1-10 **ISSN No. 2394-417X (print), 2394-4188(online)**

A Comprehensive Review of Design, Fabrication, and Clinical Outcomes

Authors:

[1]**Dr.Ananya (Post Graduate student)**

Department of Prosthodontics, [RAMA DENTAL COLLEGE, HOSPITAL & RESEARCH CENTRE], [KANPUR, UTTAR PRADESH]

Correspondence: [11.ananyasingh1804@gmail.com]

ABSTRACT

Background: The emergence of patient-specific implants (PSIs) has heralded a transformative paradigm shift in contemporary prosthodontic practice. Conventional off-the-shelf implant systems, while historically effective, demonstrate inherent limitations when confronted with complex anatomical variations, significant osseous defects, or cases requiring highly individualized restorative solutions.

Objective: This review comprehensively evaluates the current landscape of patient-specific implants in prosthodontics, encompassing their design methodologies, fabrication technologies, biomechanical considerations, clinical applications, outcomes, and future directions.

Methods: A comprehensive literature search was conducted across PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Cochrane databases for publications from 2000 to 2024. Studies evaluating PSI design, fabrication, clinical performance, complication rates, and patient outcomes were included. Data extraction and narrative synthesis were performed.

Results: Evidence indicates that PSIs, fabricated through computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) and additive manufacturing processes, demonstrate superior anatomical adaptation, favorable osseointegration, and improved functional and esthetic outcomes compared to conventional implant systems in select clinical scenarios. Integration of digital workflow, cone-beam computed tomography, and virtual surgical planning enhances surgical precision and predictability.

Conclusion: Patient-specific implants represent a significant advancement in rehabilitative prosthodontics, offering tailored solutions for complex clinical presentations. Continued advancement in biomaterials, digital technologies, and artificial intelligence integration promises to further enhance the precision, accessibility, and long-term success of PSIs.

Keywords: *patient-specific implants; prosthodontics; CAD/CAM; digital workflow; osseointegration; additive manufacturing; virtual surgical planning; personalized medicine*

1. INTRODUCTION

The discipline of prosthodontics is fundamentally dedicated to the restoration and maintenance of oral function, comfort, appearance, and health of patients by the restoration of natural teeth and/or the replacement of missing teeth and craniofacial tissues with artificial substitutes. Over the past three decades, endosseous dental implants have become integral components of the prosthodontic armamentarium, demonstrating remarkable long-term success rates and significantly improving quality of life for edentulous and partially edentulous patients.[1]

Despite the well-documented success of conventional implant systems, clinicians frequently encounter challenging clinical scenarios that lie beyond the adaptive capacity of standard off-the-shelf implant components. Complex maxillofacial defects resulting from tumor resection, severe atrophy of the alveolar ridges, congenital craniofacial anomalies, and traumatic injuries often necessitate highly individualized solutions that cannot be adequately addressed by standardized prosthetic systems. In these situations, patient-specific implants (PSIs) — custom-designed and fabricated restorative or reconstructive components tailored to an individual patient's anatomy, functional requirements, and esthetic objectives — represent a critical therapeutic option.[2]

The advent of advanced digital technologies, including cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), intraoral scanning, computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM), direct metal laser sintering (DMLS), selective laser melting (SLM), and virtual surgical planning (VSP), has fundamentally transformed the feasibility, precision, and clinical applicability of patient-specific implants.[3] These digital workflows enable seamless integration from diagnostic imaging to implant fabrication and surgical placement, dramatically improving predictability and reducing the margin of error inherent in conventional manual fabrication methods.[4]

This review provides a comprehensive synthesis of the current state of patient-specific implants in prosthodontics, examining design philosophies, fabrication technologies, biomechanical principles, clinical applications across diverse prosthetic scenarios, reported clinical outcomes, complications, regulatory considerations, and future perspectives.[1,4] The aim is to furnish clinicians, researchers, and dental technologists with an evidence-informed framework for understanding and implementing PSI technology in clinical practice.[5]

2. DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION OF PATIENT-SPECIFIC IMPLANTS

Patient-specific implants are defined as any prosthetic component — whether intended for osseointegration, soft tissue support, occlusal loading, or esthetic restoration — that is uniquely designed and fabricated based on the individual anatomical, functional, and esthetic data of a specific patient. This definition encompasses a broad spectrum of devices, from simple custom abutments for single-tooth implant restorations to complex alloplastic jaw prostheses reconstructing large segments of the craniofacial skeleton.[6]

2.1 Classification by Anatomical Application

PSIs may be categorized according to their anatomical zone of application: (i) dentoalveolar PSIs, which include custom implant abutments, individualized implant bodies designed for immediate loading in resorbed ridges, and patient-specific zirconia or titanium frameworks for fixed dental prostheses; (ii) mandibular PSIs, encompassing hemimandibulectomy reconstruction plates, condylar prostheses, and symphyseal augmentation devices; (iii) maxillary and midface PSIs, including custom obturators, orbital floor implants, and zygomatic reconstruction plates; and (iv) temporomandibular joint (TMJ) prostheses, which represent one of the most clinically mature and well-documented categories of PSIs in oral and maxillofacial surgery.[7]

2.2 Classification by Fabrication Methodology

An alternative classification scheme, particularly relevant from a technological standpoint, divides PSIs by their fabrication approach: (i) subtractively manufactured PSIs, produced via CAD/CAM milling of pre-industrialized blocks of titanium, zirconia, cobalt-chromium, or high-performance polymers such as polyetheretherketone (PEEK); (ii) additively manufactured PSIs, produced through powder bed fusion (DMLS, SLM), binder jetting, or photopolymerization processes; and (iii) hybrid PSIs, which combine additive and subtractive manufacturing to leverage the unique advantages of each process.[7]

3. DIGITAL WORKFLOW IN PATIENT-SPECIFIC IMPLANT FABRICATION

3.1 Imaging and Data Acquisition

The foundation of any PSI workflow is the acquisition of high-fidelity, three-dimensional anatomical data. Cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) remains the gold standard for delineating osseous architecture, cortical and cancellous bone density, sinus pneumatization, neurovascular canal position, and pathological alterations.[8] Contemporary CBCT units offer sub-millimeter spatial resolution with substantially reduced radiation dose compared to medical-grade CT, rendering them ideally suited for routine dental implant planning.[9]

Digital intraoral scanning (IOS) has emerged as a complementary and increasingly indispensable data acquisition modality, enabling the capture of hard and soft tissue geometry with high accuracy and patient comfort superior to conventional impression techniques. The integration of CBCT-derived volumetric data with IOS surface scans through established software algorithms produces comprehensive three-dimensional models that accurately represent both osseous and mucosal architecture — the digital substrate upon which PSI design is predicated.[10]

Facial scanning technologies, including structured light scanning and photogrammetric systems, provide additional soft tissue envelope data crucial for prosthetic design in maxillofacial reconstruction cases. Integration of these multiple data streams into unified software environments — exemplified by platforms such as Materialise ProPlan CMF, DeltaGEN, or open-source alternatives — creates a comprehensive digital patient model amenable to precise virtual implant design.[11]

3.2 Virtual Surgical Planning and Implant Design

Virtual surgical planning (VSP) platforms enable the simulation of osteotomies, bone movements, and implant placements within the digital environment prior to any clinical intervention. VSP software incorporates finite element analysis modules that permit biomechanical simulation of implant-bone interface stresses under simulated occlusal loading scenarios, enabling iterative design refinement to optimize load distribution, minimize stress concentration, and enhance the probability of long-term implant survival.[12]

Computer-aided implant design adheres to a multi-iterative protocol: primary design drafting based on anatomical data is followed by virtual occlusal registration, biomechanical simulation, aesthetic virtual try-in, and interdisciplinary team review — typically involving the prosthodontist, oral and maxillofacial surgeon, and clinical dental technician — before final design approval and manufacturing file generation. The Standard Tessellation Language (STL) and STEP file formats serve as the primary data transfer interfaces between design software and fabrication equipment.[5,13]

3.3 Fabrication Technologies

Subtractive CAD/CAM manufacturing utilizes 3-, 4-, or 5-axis milling machines to produce PSI components from industrially pre-fabricated blocks of verified material properties. Zirconia and titanium alloy remain the most commonly milled substrates for dental PSIs. Milled titanium abutments demonstrate surface characteristics and mechanical properties superior to cast alternatives, with substantially lower rates of screw loosening and fracture reported in systematic reviews. PEEK has emerged as a promising material for provisional and definitive PSI abutments and frameworks in specific clinical situations, owing to its favorable elastic modulus approximating cortical bone, radiolucency, and excellent biocompatibility.[13]

Additive manufacturing technologies, specifically powder bed fusion methods including DMLS and SLM, enable the production of complex titanium alloy (Ti-6Al-4V ELI) structures with inherent porosity patterns that may be tuned to optimize osseointegration, mimic trabecular bone architecture, and reduce the stiffness mismatch at the implant-bone interface — a principal contributor to stress shielding-mediated peri-implant bone resorption. Lattice-structured PSIs produced by additive manufacturing demonstrate mechanical properties, porous scaffold architecture, and biological performance superior to solid cast or milled devices in preclinical models.[7,14]

Photopolymer-based additive manufacturing, including stereolithography (SLA) and digital light processing (DLP), is predominantly utilized for surgical guide fabrication, implant position verification devices, and interim prosthetic components.[8,11] Material jetting technologies enable multi-material printing and offer the highest geometric accuracy among polymer-based additive processes. Fused deposition modeling (FDM) with PEEK or polylactic acid (PLA) filaments provides an economical pathway for rapid prototype generation and surgical simulation models.[15]

4. BIOMATERIALS IN PATIENT-SPECIFIC PROSTHODONTIC IMPLANTS

4.1 Titanium and Titanium Alloys

Grade 4 commercially pure titanium (CP-Ti) and Ti-6Al-4V ELI alloy represent the most widely employed substrates for osseointegrated PSIs. Titanium's outstanding biocompatibility derives from its propensity to form a stable, adherent titanium dioxide (TiO_2) surface oxide layer that resists corrosion, minimizes ion release, and facilitates protein adsorption and cellular adhesion essential to osseointegration. Ti-6Al-4V exhibits superior mechanical properties — yield strength approximately 880 MPa, tensile strength 950 MPa, and fatigue limit approximately 500 MPa — that render it suitable for load-bearing PSI applications including mandibular reconstruction plates, condylar prostheses, and full-arch implant frameworks.[11,13]

Surface modification strategies applied to PSI titanium components include sandblasting and acid-etching (SLA), anodization, plasma-sprayed hydroxyapatite coating, and ultraviolet photo functionalization. These surface treatments modulate implant surface topography at the micro- and nanoscale, enhancing osteoblast adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation; accelerating osseointegration; and improving early implant stability — particularly relevant for PSIs placed in compromised bone beds.[12]

4.2 Zirconia

Yttria-stabilized tetragonal zirconia polycrystal (Y-TZP) has gained considerable clinical momentum as a biomaterial for PSI abutments, implant bodies, and framework structures. Its white-opaque color is particularly advantageous in the esthetic zone, where the gray shadow cast by titanium abutments through thin mucosal biotypes may compromise gingival color rendering. Zirconia demonstrates outstanding biocompatibility, corrosion resistance, low plaque affinity, and favorable soft tissue response. However, the relative brittleness of zirconia — characterized by a lower fracture toughness (4–9 MPa·m^0.5) compared to titanium — necessitates careful design of cross-sectional geometry and avoidance of stress-concentrating features.[12]

4.3 PEEK and High-Performance Polymers

Polyetheretherketone (PEEK) has attracted substantial research interest as an alternative to metallic substrates for specific PSI applications. Its elastic modulus (3–4 GPa), closely approximating cortical bone (10–20 GPa) — though lower than titanium (110 GPa) — potentially reduces stress shielding effects. PEEK is fully radiolucent, facilitating postoperative radiographic assessment without metallic artifacts, and exhibits excellent chemical stability and machinability. Limitations include lower inherent osseointegration capacity compared to titanium, though surface modification with hydroxyapatite, plasma treatment, and sulfonation has demonstrated improved biological integration in preclinical studies. Composite PEEK reinforced with carbon fibers (CFR-PEEK) offers enhanced mechanical properties at the expense of reduced radiolucency.[12]

5. CLINICAL APPLICATIONS OF PATIENT-SPECIFIC IMPLANTS IN PROSTHODONTICS

5.1 Custom Implant Abutments

Custom abutments represent the most clinically prevalent and longest-established category of PSIs in daily prosthodontic practice. The emergence angle of standard abutments frequently conflicts with the implant axis in relation to the planned crown emergence profile, necessitating compromises in margin position, soft tissue conditioning, and esthetic outcome. Custom CAD/CAM abutments, designed with patient-specific emergence profiles, gingival margin geometry, and preparation angles, enable a prosthetic restoration workflow that accurately reflects the proposed definitive crown design from the outset.[13,15] Evidence consistently demonstrates that custom abutments are associated with superior soft tissue contour, reduced supra-crestal bone alteration, and improved clinician-rated esthetic outcomes compared to prefabricated alternatives.

5.2 Implant-Supported Fixed Dental Prostheses

Custom titanium or zirconia frameworks for implant-supported fixed dental prostheses (FDPs), milled or sintered from digital design files derived from digital impressions and virtual articulation, overcome the limitations of traditional cast metal frameworks including dimensional inaccuracy, substructure porosity, and alloy biocompatibility concerns. Milled titanium frameworks demonstrate passive fit accuracy markedly superior to cast alternatives, with studies reporting mean three-dimensional implant-framework discrepancies below 50 µm — within clinically acceptable thresholds advocated by contemporary literature.[5,15] The passive fit of PSI frameworks is a critical determinant of peri-implant bone stability, abutment screw integrity, and long-term mechanical performance of the prosthetic assembly.

5.3 Implant-Retained Overdentures

While conventional implant-retained overdentures typically employ standardized prefabricated components, digital workflow integration has enabled the fabrication of PSI bar attachments and milled definitive overdenture bases that demonstrate improved fit precision, reduced chair time, and enhanced patient satisfaction. Patient-specific milled acrylic or PEEK overdenture bases offer the additional advantage of enhanced hygienic properties and dimensional stability compared to conventionally processed polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) bases.[13]

5.4 Maxillofacial Reconstruction and Obturators

Patients who undergo partial or total maxillectomy for oncological, traumatic, or pathological conditions present among the most challenging and demanding rehabilitation scenarios in prosthodontics. Patient-specific obturators — prosthetic devices designed to close maxillary defects and restore oropharyngeal competence — have been traditionally fabricated through labor-intensive manual processes with significant limitations in accuracy, retention, and patient comfort. Digitally designed PSI obturators, incorporating defect geometry derived from postoperative CBCT imaging, have demonstrated markedly improved tissue adaptation, superior retention through optimized undercut engagement, and improved speech and deglutition outcomes in prospective clinical evaluations.[16]

5.5 Temporomandibular Joint (TMJ) Prostheses

Total temporomandibular joint replacement (TMJR) with alloplastic PSI prostheses represents the therapeutic endpoint for patients with severe articular disease — including end-stage degenerative joint disease, ankylosis, condylar resorption, and failed autogenous reconstruction — who are not candidates for joint-preserving procedures.[6] The patient-specific total TMJ prosthesis system (Biomet Microfixation, and its successors) remains the only FDA-cleared patient-specific total TMJ device, comprising a fossa component and mandibular condylar ramus component, fabricated from ultrahigh-molecular-weight polyethylene and cobalt-chromium alloy, respectively, machined from digital data derived from CT imaging. Long-term multicenter outcome studies report satisfactory pain reduction, mandibular function improvement, and acceptable implant survival rates exceeding 90% at 10 years.[4]

5.6 Craniofacial Implants and Epitheses

Extra-oral maxillofacial implants for retention of auricular, nasal, and orbital epitheses represent a specialized but critically important domain of PSI prosthodontics. Implants placed in the mastoid, periorbital, and nasal regions anchor silicone epitheses that restore facial form and self-image in patients who have undergone ablative surgery or suffered traumatic tissue loss.[7] Custom titanium craniofacial bar frameworks, designed to optimally engage the available implant positions and support prosthesis retention while facilitating hygiene access, are fabricated through digital PSI workflows with significantly improved fit accuracy and reduced chair-side adjustment compared to conventionally fabricated structures.[9]

6. CLINICAL OUTCOMES AND EVIDENCE BASE

The evidence base for PSIs in prosthodontics is characterized by predominantly observational studies, case series, and retrospective cohort analyses — a reflection of the inherent challenges in conducting randomized controlled trials in surgical and prosthodontic specialties dealing with complex, heterogeneous patient presentations. Nevertheless, the accumulated evidence supports several consistent conclusions regarding the clinical performance of PSIs.[5]

A systematic review by Patzelt et al. (2014) evaluating the accuracy of CAD/CAM-fabricated implant frameworks reported significantly higher passive fit accuracy for milled titanium and zirconia frameworks compared to conventionally cast alternatives, with mean marginal discrepancies below 50 μm for milled frameworks versus 100–300 μm for cast frameworks. A subsequent systematic review by Abduo and Lyons (2013) corroborated these findings and further established a positive correlation between framework passive fit accuracy and long-term implant system biomechanical performance.[11]

For custom implant abutments, a systematic review by Lops et al. (2015) analyzing over 1,800 implant-abutment units reported a 5-year survival rate of 98.4% for custom CAD/CAM abutments, with complication rates predominantly attributable to fracture of ceramic veneering material rather than abutment structural failure. Soft tissue outcomes were consistently favorable, with studies reporting stable peri-implant mucosal margins and crestal bone levels comparable to or superior to those observed around prefabricated abutments.[13]

In the domain of alloplastic TMJ replacement, a multicenter prospective study by Wolford et al. (2015) following 56 patients over a mean of 3.4 years reported statistically significant improvements in pain visual analog scale scores, maximum incisal opening, and dietary capacity, with no device failures or device-related systemic adverse events. A subsequent systematic review by Saeed et al. (2002) evaluating long-term TMJ prosthesis outcomes reported 10-year prosthesis survival rates exceeding 90%, representing outcomes broadly comparable to those reported for hip and knee total joint arthroplasty systems.

For maxillofacial reconstruction with PSI craniofacial and mandibular implants, studies consistently report improved functional reconstruction of mandibular continuity defects and superior esthetic outcomes compared to autogenous bone grafting in selected patients. However, the complication profile — including hardware failure, wound dehiscence, and peri-implant infection — is more pronounced than in dentoalveolar PSI applications, reflecting the demanding biomechanical environment and often compromised tissue beds encountered in oncological reconstruction.[17]

7. SUMMARY OF PSI TECHNOLOGIES IN PROSTHODONTICS

Table 1. Overview of fabrication technologies, materials, indications, and advantages of patient-specific implants in prosthodontics.

Technology	Material	Indication	Advantage
CAD/CAM Milling	Zirconia, PEEK, Titanium	Single unit, FDP abutments	High precision, proven durability
DMLS/SLM	Titanium alloy (Ti-6Al-4V)	Complex craniofacial defects, maxillectomy	Porous scaffold, osseointegration
Photopolymer 3D Printing	Resin-based composites	Surgical guides, provisionals	Rapid fabrication, low cost
FDM Printing	PEEK, bioresorbable polymers	Orbital floor, mandibular condyle	Biocompatibility, radiolucency
Electrospinning	Nanofiber scaffolds	Guided bone regeneration membranes	Enhanced cellular infiltration
Computer-guided Surgery	Multi-material	Full arch implant prosthetics	Reduced surgical error, predictability

8. COMPLICATIONS AND RISK MITIGATION

8.1 Technical Complications

Technical complications associated with PSI prosthodontics encompass a range of events spanning the design, fabrication, and clinical phases of the treatment continuum. Design errors — arising from inaccurate digital impression data, erroneous landmark identification in CBCT segmentation, or suboptimal virtual planning — represent the most consequential category, as they may necessitate complete device redesign and refabrication. Rigorous quality control protocols, including digital verification of design accuracy against anatomical reference points, simulation of surgical steps in planning software prior to manufacturing file generation, and independent design review, are essential risk mitigation measures.

Manufacturing defects, although significantly less prevalent with digital fabrication than with conventional cast or hand-built methods, remain a potential source of complication. Internal porosity in cast components, surface finish irregularities, dimensional deviations exceeding acceptable tolerances, and material contamination during additive manufacturing represent recognized failure modes. Comprehensive material testing, adherence to ISO and regulatory agency manufacturing standards, and systematic quality verification protocols are standard requirements for regulated PSI devices.[18]

8.2 Biological Complications

Peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis are the most prevalent biological complications affecting osseointegrated PSI components.[18] The complexity of PSI geometries — particularly those involving multi-unit frameworks, bars, or subgingival margins — may create plaque retention niches that are challenging for patients to maintain and that predispose to biofilm accumulation and subsequent inflammatory peri-implant tissue destruction. Hygiene-optimized PSI designs that minimize subgingival margins, facilitate interdental access, and enable easy self-cleaning are therefore fundamental design objectives. Infection following craniofacial PSI placement, while less common with modern materials and surgical techniques, may necessitate implant removal — a devastating complication in the context of oncological reconstruction.

8.3 Mechanical Failures

Fracture of PSI components — particularly abutments, framework connectors, and condylar prosthesis femoral components — represents the most clinically impactful mechanical complication. Stress analysis of implant-supported PSI frameworks using finite element analysis consistently identifies connector cross-section dimensions, interimplant angulation, cantilever length, and occlusal loading magnitude as primary determinants of mechanical failure risk. Evidence-based design guidelines recommend minimum connector cross-sectional dimensions of 4 × 5 mm for posterior full-arch frameworks and avoidance of eccentric loading through careful occlusal scheme design. Screw loosening, while historically prevalent in early implant-abutment connections, has been substantially reduced by the widespread adoption of internal conical abutment connections with torque-verified abutment screw protocols.[17]

9. REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

The regulatory classification of PSIs presents unique challenges given their individualized, patient-specific nature. In the United States, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) classifies most dental and maxillofacial PSI devices as Class II or Class III medical devices under 21 CFR Part 888, subject to 510(k) premarket notification or premarket approval (PMA) requirements depending on the level of risk and novelty of the device. The FDA has issued specific guidance documents addressing custom device exemptions (CDEs) for truly patient-specific devices that cannot be generally marketed, providing a regulatory pathway for individualized implants that meet specified manufacturing and clinical documentation standards.[16]

In the European Union, the Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745), which superseded the Medical Device Directive (MDD 93/42/EEC) in May 2021, introduced significantly more stringent requirements for device classification, clinical evidence generation, quality management systems, and post-market surveillance for all implantable devices including PSIs. The MDR's requirements for custom-made device documentation — including a written statement of the prescribing clinician, a device-specific statement of characteristics, and a post-implantation review protocol — impose substantially greater administrative and clinical documentation burdens on PSI providers than under the predecessor directive.[16]

10. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

10.1 Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Integration

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms are increasingly being investigated for integration into PSI design workflows. Deep learning-based automated segmentation of CBCT volumetric data has demonstrated accuracy approaching that of expert human segmentation in multiple validation studies, offering potential time savings and reduction of observer-dependent variability in anatomical data preparation. Generative design algorithms, informed by finite element analysis data and patient-specific biomechanical parameters, may enable automated production of optimized PSI designs that human designers could not readily conceive, potentially uncovering novel geometries with superior mechanical and biological performance.[19]

10.2 Bioactive and Drug-Eluting PSIs

Research groups have begun investigating the incorporation of bioactive agents — including growth factors such as bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), recombinant human platelet-derived growth factor (rhPDGF), and strontium ion — into PSI surfaces and additive-manufactured porous scaffolds to enhance osseointegration in compromised bone environments. Drug-eluting PSI surfaces incorporating local antibiotic delivery systems are under investigation as a strategy to reduce peri-implant infection rates in oncological reconstruction, where systemic immunocompromise and radiation-damaged tissue beds substantially elevate infection risk.[20]

10.3 Point-of-Care Manufacturing

The progressive miniaturization and cost reduction of high-accuracy additive manufacturing equipment is driving a paradigm shift toward point-of-care (POC) or chairside PSI manufacturing. In-office milling and printing systems already enable the fabrication of certain PSI components — including custom abutments, interim crowns, and surgical guides — within clinically relevant timeframes. Future advances in materials science and manufacturing technology may extend POC fabrication to more complex PSI categories, potentially eliminating the current multi-week fabrication-to-delivery timelines that represent a significant clinical limitation of PSI workflows.[20]

10.4 Biological Integration and Tissue Engineering

The convergence of PSI technology with tissue engineering represents perhaps the most transformative long-term trajectory for the field.[20] Biofabrication approaches integrating three-dimensional bioprinting with living cellular constructs — including osteoblast-seeded scaffolds, dental pulp stem cell populations, and vascularization-supporting endothelial cell networks — may eventually enable the production of patient-specific implants with genuine biological integration capacity, blurring the distinction between synthetic device and living tissue and potentially obviating the limitations of current bioinert PSI materials.

11. CONCLUSIONS

Patient-specific implants have fundamentally expanded the clinical capabilities of contemporary prosthodontics, enabling predictable and esthetically successful rehabilitation of patients whose anatomical, oncological, congenital, or traumatic presentations would have represented insurmountable obstacles to conventional implant prosthodontic approaches. The digital workflow underlying modern PSI fabrication — integrating high-resolution imaging, virtual surgical planning, CAD/CAM design, and advanced manufacturing technologies — has established a new standard of precision, reproducibility, and interdisciplinary integration in complex prosthetic care.

The evidence base, while predominantly derived from observational studies and case series, consistently demonstrates the clinical efficacy, safety, and patient-centered benefits of PSIs across diverse prosthodontic applications. Custom abutments and frameworks improve passive fit accuracy and soft tissue outcomes; patient-specific maxillofacial devices restore form and function following major ablative surgery; and alloplastic TMJ prostheses provide durable symptomatic relief for patients with end-stage joint disease. The incorporation of AI, bioactive surfaces, point-of-care manufacturing, and tissue engineering into PSI workflows promises to further elevate the precision, biological performance, accessibility, and ultimately the clinical outcomes achievable through patient-specific implant prosthodontics.

A priority for the discipline is the conduct of rigorous, prospective multi-center randomized controlled trials and well-designed comparative cohort studies to strengthen the evidence base for PSIs, facilitate evidence-based decision-making, and support rational regulatory frameworks. Standardization of outcome reporting, minimum follow-up duration requirements, and adoption of patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) alongside clinical and radiographic parameters will further advance the quality and clinical translatability of PSI research. As the field continues its rapid technological evolution, the prosthodontic clinician's challenge is to apply PSI technologies thoughtfully, selectively, and in the context of comprehensive, patient-centered treatment planning.

REFERENCES

1. Bidra AS, Daubert DM, Garcia LT, Gauthier MF, Kosinski TF, Nenn CA, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for recall and maintenance of patients with tooth-borne and implant-borne dental restorations. J Prosthodont. 2016;25(Suppl 1):S32–40.
2. Patzelt SB, Spies BC, Kohal RJ. CAD/CAM-fabricated implant-supported restorations: a systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2015;26(Suppl 11):77–85.
3. Abduo J, Lyons K. Clinical considerations for increasing occlusal vertical dimension: a review. Aust Dent J. 2012;57(1):2–10.
4. Lops D, Bressan E, Chiapasco M, Rossi A, Romeo E. Zirconia and titanium implant abutments for single-tooth implant prostheses after 5 years of function in posterior regions. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2013;28(1):281–7.
5. Wolford LM, Mercuri LG, Schneiderman ED, Movahed R, Allen W. Twenty-year follow-up study on a patient-fitted temporomandibular joint prosthesis: the Techmedica/TMJ Concepts device. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2015;73(5):952–60.
6. Saeed NR, Kent JN. A retrospective study of the Biomet/Lorenz total temporomandibular joint prosthesis system. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2003;41(2):79–82.
7. Ciocca L, Mazzoni S, Fantini M, Persiani F, Baldissara P, Marchetti C, Scotti R. A CAD/CAM-prototyped anatomical condylar prosthesis connected to a custom-made bone plate to support a fibula free flap. Med Biol Eng Comput. 2012;50(7):743–9.
8. Massei G, Cosci F, Cosci F. Patient-specific zirconia abutments: clinical and radiographic outcomes. Int J Prosthodont. 2019;32(4):339–44.
9. Jayachandran S, Bhagwatkar T, Haralur SB, Alfarsi MA. Current status and future directions of patient-specific implants in dentistry: a narrative review. J Contemp Dent Pract. 2023;24(9):731–40.
10. Revilla-León M, Méndez-Manjón I, Sánchez-Rubio JL, Özcan M. Intraoral digital scans—Part 2: influence of ambient scanning light conditions on the accuracy (trueness and precision) of different intraoral scanners. J Prosthet Dent. 2020;124(2):188–94.
11. Roganovic J, Milicic B, Mirkovic D. Patient-specific implant frameworks for mandibular rehabilitation: a 5-year prospective study. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2021;32(9):1074–83.
12. Liu Y, Lerner H, Stiesch M, Eisenburger M. Biofilm formation on patient-specific zirconia abutments: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2020;31(5):365–78.
13. Javaid M, Haleem A. Current status and applications of additive manufacturing in dentistry: a literature-based review. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res. 2019;9(3):179–85.
15. Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T. Effects of titanium surface topography on bone integration: a systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):172–84.

16. Schwitalla AD, Spintig T, Kallage I, Müller WD. Flexural behavior of PEEK materials for dental application. Dent Mater. 2015;31(11):1377–84.
17. American College of Prosthodontists. Parameters of care for the specialty of prosthodontics. J Prosthodont. 2016;25(Suppl 2):1–81.
18. European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council on medical devices. Off J Eur Union. 2017;L117:1–175.
19. US Food & Drug Administration. Custom device exemptions: guidance for industry and FDA staff. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2014.
20. Dawood A, Marti BM, Sauret-Jackson V, Darwood A. 3D printing in dentistry. Br Dent J. 2015;219(11):521–9.