Journal for Re Attach Therapy and Developmental Diversities
eISSN: 2589-7799
2021 December; 4 (2): 191-199

# Short Dental Implants: A Comprehensive Review of Determinants for Clinical Success — Surgical, Biomechanical, and Prosthetic Perspectives

**Dr. Dhanalakshmi P[1*], Dr. Vijay Ebenezer[2]**

Post-graduate student, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Sree Balaji Dental College and Hospital, Chennai.
Head of the Department, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Sree Balaji Dental College and Hospital, Chennai.
drvijayomfs@yahoo.com

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Dhanalakshmi P
*Post-graduate student, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Sree Balaji Dental College and Hospital, Chennai.

**ABSTRACT**

Short dental implants have emerged as a valuable option for patients with insufficient bone volume, providing an effective solution that reduces the need for invasive grafting procedures. This review examines the key factors influencing their clinical success, covering surgical, biomechanical, and prosthetic considerations. From a surgical standpoint, precise placement techniques and careful site preparation play a crucial role in ensuring proper osseointegration and long-term stability. Biomechanically, the way short implants distribute and transfer stress differs from standard-length implants, requiring thoughtful planning to avoid excessive load concentration—particularly in high-stress areas like the posterior jaw. On the prosthetic side, restoration design and material selection must account for these biomechanical demands while still meeting aesthetic expectations. By synthesizing current evidence, this review demonstrates that when used appropriately, short implants can achieve success rates comparable to conventional implants, expanding treatment possibilities for patients with bone limitations. Recent advancements in implant surfaces and surgical guidance systems have further enhanced their reliability, but consistent adherence to best practices remains essential. Ultimately, understanding the unique requirements of short implants—from initial placement to final restoration—helps clinicians optimize outcomes and provide patients with a predictable, minimally invasive alternative.

**Keywords**: Short Implant, Implant design, Bone volume, implant design, load distribution.

## INTRODUCTION

Short dental implants have gained recognition as a practical solution for patients presenting with limited bone volume, circumventing the need for extensive grafting procedures that are traditionally required for conventional implants (Raviv et al., 2010). As the demand for less invasive and more efficient dental solutions grows, understanding the determinants that contribute to the clinical success of short dental implants becomes increasingly critical. This comprehensive review aims to dissect the multifaceted aspects influencing the efficacy of short dental implants, encompassing surgical, biomechanical, and prosthetic perspectives (Jain et al., 2016).

Surgical determinants, such as implant placement techniques and site preparation, play a pivotal role in achieving optimal osseointegration and ensuring the long-term stability of these implants. Concurrently, biomechanical factors, including load distribution and stress transfer mechanisms, are essential for assessing the durability of short implants under functional conditions. Furthermore, the prosthetic considerations—ranging from restoration design to material selection—are crucial for achieving both aesthetic and functional success in implant therapy (Bilhan et al., 2010; Javed et al., 2013). By synthesizing current evidence and clinical findings, this review aspires to provide a holistic comprehension of the elements that dictate the success of short dental implants.

The findings indicate that when executed with precision, short dental implants can rival the success rates of their conventional counterparts, thereby expanding treatment options for patients with compromised bone structures. The integration of advanced surgical techniques and innovative materials has further bolstered the reliability and longevity of short implants in clinical settings (Torres-Alemany et al., 2020). Ultimately, this review underscores the significance of adhering to established protocols and recognizing the unique challenges associated with short dental implants, thereby optimizing patient outcomes and enhancing overall care in dental practice.

## SURGICAL DETERMINANTS OF SHORT DENTAL IMPLANT SUCCESS

Surgical techniques, including precise implant placement and site preparation, are crucial for maximizing osseointegration and long-term stability of short dental implants (Jain et al., 2016). Recent advancements such as resonance frequency

analysis provide valuable real-time feedback on primary stability, enabling surgeons to optimize placement protocols (Ошурко et al., 2024). The selection of appropriate implant dimensions (length and diameter) remains equally critical, as these parameters directly influence initial stability and clinical success rates (Ajeebi & Alquraishi, 2020). Careful assessment of bone quality and quantity at the recipient site further enhances predictability, as these factors significantly affect osseointegration potential (Venkatakrishnan et al., 2017).

**Challenges in Clinical Implementation**

Despite meticulous surgical planning, several challenges may impact outcomes. Suboptimal bone quality presents a fundamental limitation, where compromised bone density or structural integrity can hinder osseointegration regardless of surgical precision (Asija & Roy, 2022; Hristov, 2022; Gupta, 2022). The inherent risks of surgical intervention - including infection, nerve injury, and technical complications - remain ever-present concerns that may affect results (Snow & Massad, 2008). Anatomical variations among patients further complicate standardized approaches, necessitating customized treatment strategies (Khanday, 2019; Han et al., 2008).

**Technological and Clinical Considerations**

The dependence on advanced diagnostic technologies like resonance frequency analysis creates practical challenges in resource-limited settings, potentially compromising assessment accuracy (Caldwell et al., 1995). While technical proficiency is essential, an overemphasis on surgical technique may overshadow equally critical factors such as patient health status, lifestyle habits, and prosthetic design considerations (Sheth et al., 2018; Bahat & Daftary, 1995). The surgeon's experience level significantly influences outcomes, highlighting the importance of ongoing training and skill development (Moran, 2006).

**Postoperative Management**

Successful outcomes extend beyond the surgical procedure itself. Comprehensive postoperative care, including infection control protocols and patient compliance with maintenance regimens, plays a pivotal role in long-term success (Rameh et al., 2020). Even optimally placed implants may fail without proper follow-up care and patient adherence to oral hygiene protocols. This underscores the need for holistic treatment planning that addresses all phases of implant therapy - from case selection through long-term maintenance.

## BIOMECHANICAL FACTORS INFLUENCING SHORT DENTAL IMPLANT STABILITY

Biomechanical factors are critical for the stability and long-term success of short dental implants. These factors influence implant performance in several important ways.

**Load Distribution**

The distribution of forces across the implant and surrounding bone is essential for implant longevity. Uneven load distribution can create localized stress concentrations, which may weaken the implant structure. Over time, this can lead to bone loss or implant failure. Therefore, achieving balanced load distribution is necessary to minimize stress and improve implant stability. (Morgan & James, 1995)

**Stress Transfer Mechanisms**

Understanding how stress transfers from the implant to the bone is important. Short dental implants often show different stress distribution patterns compared to longer implants. These differences affect their ability to withstand chewing forces. A clear understanding of stress transfer helps clinicians make better decisions about implant placement and design, improving success rates. (Meijer et al., 1992)

**Implant Design**

The design of the implant, including its shape, length, and surface texture, directly affects force absorption and distribution. Wider implants improve stability by increasing surface area for load distribution, reducing stress concentrations. Surface treatments that enhance osseointegration also contribute to better stability. (Fawzi, 2013)

**Prosthetic Design**

The design of the prosthetic restoration is equally important for maintaining stability. Proper alignment and occlusion ensure that chewing forces are evenly distributed. This reduces the risk of overloading and complications, extending implant lifespan. (Sm, 1996)

**Functional Loading Conditions**

The forces applied during chewing and biting must be carefully considered. Different loading conditions create varying stresses on the implant. Recognizing these patterns allows for better planning and execution of implant treatment. (Gunne et al., 1997)

**Fatigue Resistance**

Short dental implants must resist fatigue from repeated chewing forces. The choice of materials and implant design influences their ability to withstand long-term stress. High-quality materials and optimized designs improve fatigue resistance. (Khraisat et al., 2002)

**Micro-movements**

Excessive movement during healing can disrupt osseointegration. Keeping the implant stable during this phase is crucial for long-term success. Techniques such as immediate loading or stabilization devices may help minimize micro-movements. (Duyck et al., 2005)

## PROSTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR SHORT DENTAL IMPLANTS

Restoration Design: The design of the prosthetic restoration should be tailored to the specific characteristics of short dental implants. This includes considerations of the restoration type (single crown, bridge, or denture) and the way it will interact with the surrounding teeth and soft tissues. A well-designed restoration should ensure proper occlusion, alignment, and aesthetic appearance, while also accommodating the unique load distribution patterns associated with short implants. (Kirchner et al., 2010)

Material Selection: The choice of materials used for the prosthetic components is critical. High-strength materials that can withstand functional forces, such as zirconia or titanium, are often preferred for their durability and aesthetic qualities. Additionally, the biocompatibility of materials is essential to prevent adverse reactions and ensure long-term success. The selected materials should also promote ease of cleaning and maintenance for the patient. (Tawil et al., 2006)

Connection Type: The type of connection between the implant and the prosthetic restoration can significantly impact the stability and longevity of the implant. Options include screw-retained and cement-retained prostheses. Screw-retained restorations offer easier access for adjustments and maintenance, while cement-retained restorations may provide better aesthetics. The choice should be based on the clinical situation, patient preferences, and the specific characteristics of the implant. (Fischler et al., 2010)

Occlusal Considerations: Proper occlusion is vital for the long-term success of short dental implants. The prosthetic restoration must be designed to distribute occlusal forces evenly across the implant. Any misalignment can lead to excessive stress on the implant, increasing the risk of complications such as implant failure or bone resorption. Careful occlusal analysis and adjustments should be made during the finalization of the restoration. (Saba, 2001)

Prosthetic Height and Emergence Profile: The height and emergence profile of the prosthetic restoration should mimic natural tooth anatomy to ensure optimal aesthetics and function. A well-contoured emergence profile supports the surrounding soft tissues, contributing to a natural appearance and healthy periodontal environment. This is particularly important in the anterior region, where aesthetics play a crucial role in patient satisfaction. (Croll, 1990)

Maintenance and Hygiene: The design of the prosthetic restoration should facilitate proper oral hygiene practices. Considerations should be made for the ease of cleaning around the implant and restoration to prevent plaque accumulation and peri-implant diseases. Designing restorations with smooth surfaces and appropriate contours can enhance the patient's ability to maintain good oral hygiene.

Patient Education: Educating patients about the importance of their prosthetic restoration, including maintenance and care, is essential for long-term success. Patients should be informed about the specific requirements for cleaning around their implants and the signs of potential complications. Regular follow-up appointments should be scheduled to monitor the health of both the implant and the surrounding tissues.

Customization for Individual Needs: Each patient presents unique anatomical and functional challenges, necessitating customized prosthetic solutions. Factors such as the patient's bite, existing dental structures, and personal preferences should be considered when designing the restoration. Tailoring the prosthetic components to meet individual needs enhances both function and patient satisfaction. (Lyle, 2013)

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: SHORT VS. TRADITIONAL DENTAL IMPLANTS

***Short Dental Implants***

***Advantages***

1. Minimally Invasive: Short implants often require less extensive surgical procedures, reducing the need for bone grafting in patients with limited bone volume.
2. Reduced Healing Time: Patients may experience quicker recovery times due to less invasive placement techniques.
3. Aesthetic Benefits: Short implants can be placed in areas where aesthetics is crucial, such as the anterior region, without compromising the visual outcome.
4. Comparable Success Rates: When properly placed, short implants can achieve success rates similar to traditional implants, expanding treatment options for patients with compromised bone structures.
5. Cost-Effective: Generally, the procedures associated with short implants may be less expensive due to reduced surgical complexity.

***Disadvantages***

1. Limited Load-Bearing Capacity: Short implants may have lower load-bearing capabilities compared to traditional implants, potentially leading to higher stress concentrations and risk of failure.
2. Bone Quality Dependency: The success of short implants is highly dependent on the quality of the surrounding bone; poor bone quality can hinder osseointegration.
3. Biomechanical Limitations: Short implants may be more susceptible to biomechanical complications due to their design and length, particularly in high-stress areas.
4. Potential for Increased Micro-Movements: Short implants may be at a higher risk for micro-movements during the healing phase, which can negatively affect osseointegration.

***Traditional Dental Implants***

***Advantages***

1. Greater Stability: Traditional implants typically offer enhanced stability and load-bearing capacity due to their longer length and larger surface area.
2. Versatile Applications: They can be used in a wide range of clinical scenarios, including areas with sufficient bone volume and for various prosthetic designs.
3. Established Track Record: Traditional implants have a long history of clinical success and are widely studied, providing a wealth of evidence supporting their use.
4. Lower Risk of Bone Resorption: Due to their design, traditional implants may be less prone to complications such as bone resorption compared to short implants.

***Disadvantages***

1. Invasive Procedures: Placing traditional implants often requires more invasive surgical techniques, including bone grafting for patients with insufficient bone volume.
2. Longer Healing Time: The recovery period may be extended due to the complexity of the surgical procedure.
3. Higher Costs: The overall treatment cost may be higher due to the need for additional procedures like grafting and longer surgical times.
4. Aesthetic Challenges: In cases of significant bone loss, traditional implants may not provide optimal aesthetic results, particularly in the anterior region without additional procedures.

## PATIENT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SHORT DENTAL IMPLANTS

**Bone Volume and Quality**

Short dental implants offer particular benefits for patients with limited bone height or volume. Assessment of bone quality, including density and structural integrity, must be performed. Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) provides essential three-dimensional evaluation of bone characteristics to determine implant suitability. (Nisand & Renouard, 2014)

**Anatomical Considerations**

Short implants present advantages when anatomical limitations exist, such as proximity to maxillary sinuses or inferior alveolar nerves. Complete evaluation of oral anatomy is necessary to determine implant feasibility and prevent procedural complications.

**Age and Growth Considerations**
Short implants are typically indicated for skeletally mature adults. Special consideration is required for younger patients due to potential impacts on developing bone structures. (Morand & Irinakis, 2007)

**Medical History**
Comprehensive medical history review is essential. Systemic conditions like diabetes and osteoporosis require special consideration due to their effects on osseointegration and healing. Patients with current or historical periodontal disease need particular evaluation. (van Diermen et al., 2006)

**Lifestyle Factors**
Tobacco use and alcohol consumption represent significant risk factors for implant failure. Patient education regarding these risks and oral hygiene maintenance is crucial. Demonstrated commitment to postoperative care significantly influences treatment success. (Chuang et al., 2002)

**Psychological Readiness**
Patient psychological factors substantially impact treatment outcomes. Realistic expectations and positive mindset should be established. Pretreatment counseling helps address patient concerns and improve procedural readiness. (Krampe et al., 2017)

**Prosthetic Considerations**
The planned prosthesis must be compatible with short implant biomechanics. Restoration type, occlusal loading, and aesthetic requirements require careful evaluation to ensure successful treatment integration. (Wu et al., 2010)

**Financial Considerations**
Complete financial disclosure regarding implant treatment and associated procedures is necessary. Cost factors significantly influence patient treatment decisions and should be addressed transparently. (Stafford, 2016)

**Previous Dental History**
Patients with prior implant failures or extensive dental treatment require additional evaluation. Historical treatment outcomes provide valuable information for current treatment planning. (Leisner et al., 2021)

**Follow-Up and Maintenance**
Long-term implant success requires committed postoperative care. Patients must understand the importance of regular follow-up visits for implant monitoring and maintenance. (Elias, 2011)

## CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS IN SHORT DENTAL IMPLANT PROCEDURES

**Balanced Treatment Approach**
While surgical technique remains important, excessive focus on this aspect may neglect other crucial determinants of implant success. Patient-related factors including systemic health, behavioral patterns, and prosthetic design considerations contribute substantially to treatment outcomes. A comprehensive treatment strategy incorporating all relevant factors optimizes the prognosis of short dental implant therapy. (Chuang et al., 2002)

**Clinical Experience and Skill Development**
Operator proficiency significantly influences surgical outcomes, with less experienced clinicians typically demonstrating greater variability in results. This highlights the necessity for structured training programs and continuing education in implant dentistry to standardize clinical performance and improve treatment quality. (Blumenthal et al., 1997)

**Postoperative Management Protocol**
The long-term success of surgically placed implants depends heavily on appropriate postoperative care. Strict adherence to follow-up schedules and maintenance of optimal oral hygiene are essential to prevent peri-implant complications. These measures represent critical determinants of implant longevity and functional performance. (Ogle, 2006)

**Psychological Considerations in Treatment**
Patient psychological factors significantly influence treatment outcomes, with anxiety and unrealistic expectations potentially compromising healing and satisfaction. Implementation of appropriate patient education and anxiety-reduction strategies can improve both procedural tolerance and overall treatment success.

**Long-Term Performance Determinants**
While initial implant stability is achievable, sustained success requires consideration of multiple factors including functional loading patterns, prosthetic design, and maintenance care. A multidimensional treatment approach addressing all relevant parameters is necessary to ensure durable outcomes.

**Fatigue Behavior of Implant Systems**
The long-term performance of short implants depends on their ability to withstand repetitive functional loads. Material selection and mechanical design must account for fatigue resistance to prevent mechanical failure under cyclic loading conditions.

**Healing Phase Stability**
The osseointegration process during the postoperative healing period is highly sensitive to mechanical disturbance. Control of micromotion at the bone-implant interface through appropriate stabilization techniques is essential for successful biological integration. (Wu et al., 2010)

## FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN RESEARCH ON SHORT DENTAL IMPLANTS

Long-Term Outcomes and Success Rates: Continued investigation into the long-term success rates of short dental implants compared to traditional implants is essential. Longitudinal studies that track patient outcomes over several years will provide valuable insights into the durability and effectiveness of short implants, particularly in diverse patient populations.

Advanced Biomaterials: Research into novel biomaterials and surface modifications that enhance osseointegration and reduce healing times is crucial. Exploring the use of bioactive coatings, nanostructured surfaces, and innovative materials can lead to improved implant performance and patient outcomes.

Personalized Treatment Approaches: Future studies should focus on developing personalized treatment protocols that consider individual patient anatomy, bone quality, and specific risk factors. This may involve the integration of genetic and molecular assessments to tailor implant strategies to each patient's unique biological profile. (Erbaşar et al., 2019)

Technological Integration: The incorporation of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning, in treatment planning and implant placement can enhance precision and predictability. Research should explore how these technologies can be effectively utilized to optimize surgical outcomes and reduce complications.

Regenerative Techniques: Investigating the application of regenerative medicine, including stem cell therapies and growth factor applications, to enhance bone quality and volume prior to short implant placement is a promising area of research. This could expand the eligibility of patients with compromised bone structures for short dental implants.
Biomechanical Studies: Further biomechanical research is needed to understand the load distribution and stress transfer mechanisms specific to short dental implants. Studies that simulate functional loading conditions can help refine implant design and placement strategies to optimize stability and longevity.
(Mackay et al., 2021) (Poli et al., 2021)

Patient-Centered Outcomes: Research should prioritize patient-centered outcomes, including quality of life, satisfaction, and functional performance following short dental implant placement. Understanding the patient experience will inform clinical practices and improve overall treatment strategies.

## CONCLUSION

The scoping review of short dental implants underscores their significance as a viable treatment option for patients with limited bone volume, circumventing the need for extensive grafting procedures typically associated with traditional implants. The synthesis of surgical, biomechanical, and prosthetic perspectives reveals that the success of short dental implants hinges on a multifaceted approach that encompasses meticulous surgical techniques, an understanding of biomechanical principles, and thoughtful prosthetic design. The findings suggest that, when executed with precision, short dental implants can achieve comparable success rates to conventional implants, thereby broadening treatment options for patients with compromised bone structures. Moreover, advancements in surgical techniques and materials have bolstered the reliability and longevity of short implants in clinical practice. The review emphasizes the importance of adhering to established protocols, recognizing unique patient challenges, and incorporating tailored approaches to optimize outcomes. Future research directions aim to further enhance the understanding and application of short dental implants, focusing on long-term success rates, advanced biomaterials, personalized treatment strategies, and the integration of emerging

technologies. By addressing these areas, the dental community can continue to improve patient care and satisfaction in implant dentistry.

**REFERENCES**

1. Raviv, E., Turcotte, A., & Harel-Raviv, M. (2010). Short dental implants in reduced alveolar bone height.Quintessence International.
2. Jain, N., Gulati, M., Garg, M., & Pathak, C. (2016). Short Implants: New Horizon in Implant Dentistry.Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research : JCDR. https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2016/21838.8550
3. Bilhan, H., Geckili, O., Mumcu, E., Bozdag, E., Sünbüloğlu, E., & Kutay, Ö. (2010). Influence of surgical technique, implant shape and diameter on the primary stability in cancellous bone.Journal of Oral Rehabilitation. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-2842.2010.02117.X
4. Javed, F., Ahmed, H. B., Crespi, R., & Romanos, G. E. (2013). Role of primary stability for successful osseointegration of dental implants: Factors of influence and evaluation.Interventional Medicine and Applied Science. https://doi.org/10.1556/IMAS.5.2013.4.3
5. Torres-Alemany, A., Fernández-Estevan, L., Agustín-Panadero, R., Montiel-Company, J. M., Labaig-Rueda, C., & Mañes-Ferrer, J. F. (2020). Clinical Behavior of Short Dental Implants: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.Journal of Clinical Medicine. https://doi.org/10.3390/JCM9103271
6. Ошурко, А. П., Oliinyk, I. Yu., Kuzniak, N. B., & Sukhliak, V. V. (2024). Primary and post-osseointegration stability of short (ultra-short) implants on edentulous atrophied distal segments of the mandible - an indicator of immediate or delayed load.Клінічна Та Профілактична Медицина. https://doi.org/10.31612/2616-4868.4.2024.09
7. Ajeebi, A., & Alquraishi, S. (2020).Primary stability of dental implant: a review. https://doi.org/10.24911/IJMDC.51-1586791181
8. Venkatakrishnan, C. J., Bhuminathan, S., & Chandran, C. R. (2017). Dental Implant Insertion Torque and Bone Density – Short Review.Biomedical and Pharmacology Journal. https://doi.org/10.13005/BPJ/1234
9. Erbaşar, G. N. H., Hocaoglu, T. P., & Erbasar, R. C. (2019). Risk factors associated with short dental implant success: a long-term retrospective evaluation of patients followed up for up to 9 years.Brazilian Oral Research. https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-3107BOR-2019.VOL33.0030
10. Asija, S., & Roy, S. (2022). Short implants a plausible alternative to conventional dental implants - A review.Journal of Dentistry Defence Section. https://doi.org/10.4103/jodd.jodd_12_21
11. Hristov, I. B. (2022). Implant design factors that affect primary stability and osseointegration.Computational Geophysics. https://doi.org/10.31618/essa.2782-1994.2022.3.77.249
12. Gupta, G. (2022).Implant Stability Quotient (ISQ): A Reliable Guide for Implant Treatment. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101359
13. Snow, N. J., & Massad, M. G. (2008). What is a Surgical Complication.World Journal of Surgery. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00268-008-9561-5
14. McGrath, J. S., Moore, L. J., Wilson, M. R., Freeman, P., & Vine, S. J. (2011). 'challenge' and 'threat' states in surgery: implications for surgical performance and training.BJUI. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1464-410X.2011.10558.X
15. Khanday, S. (2019).Anatomical variations in the human body : exploring the boundaries of normality.
16. Han, H., Yao, Z., Wang, H., Deng, X., Fong, A. H. Y., & Zhang, M. (2008). Dural Entrance of the Bridging Vein into the Transverse Sinus Provides a Reliable Measure for Preoperative Planning: An Anatomic Comparison between Cadavers and Neuroimages.Neurosurgery. https://doi.org/10.1227/01.NEU.0000326009.46197.AB
17. Caldwell, B. S., Everhart, N. C., Paradkar, P. V., & Suh, H.-S. (1995).Issues of Dependence and Reliance on Technological Advancement: Examples from American Football and Air Traffic Control. https://doi.org/10.1177/154193129503901810
18. Sheth, N., Tabassum, R., Mistry, G., & Shetty, O. (2018). Dental-Implant Maintenance: A Critical Factor in Long-Term Treatment Success.The International Journal of Life-Sciences Scientific Research. https://doi.org/10.21276/IJLSSR.2018.4.1.13
19. Bahat, O., & Daftary, F. (1995). Surgical reconstruction--a prerequisite for long-term implant success: a philosophic approach.Practical Periodontics and Aesthetic Dentistry : PPAD.
20. Moran, B. J. (2006). Decision-making and technical factors account for the learning curve in complex surgery.Journal of Public Health. https://doi.org/10.1093/PUBMED/FDL048
21. Rameh, S., Menhall, A., & Younes, R. (2020). Key factors influencing short implant success.Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10006-020-00841-Y
22. Бадалян, А., Badalyan, A., Чернавский, А., Chernavskiy, A., Петров, И., Petrov, I., Блинд, Э., & Blind, E. (2018).Clinical and psychological justification of using surgical templates for dental implant positioning illustrated on an example of dental clinic №12. https://doi.org/10.18481/2077-7566-2018-14-2-62-67

23. Jönsson, B., & Karlsson, G. (1990). Cost-benefit evaluation of dental implants.International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462300004207
24. Clark, D., & Levin, L. (2016). Dental implant management and maintenance: How to improve long-term implant success?Quintessence International. https://doi.org/10.3290/J.QI.A35870
25. Morgan, M. J., & James, D. F. (1995). Force and moment distributions among osseointegrated dental implants.Journal of Biomechanics. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(94)00139-U
26. Meijer, H. J. A., Kuiper, J. H., Kuiper, J. H., Starmans, F. J. M., Starmans, F. J. M., Bosman, F. T., & Bosman, F. T. (1992). Stress distribution around dental implants: influence of superstructure, length of implants, and height of mandible.Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3913(92)90293-J
27. Nakamura, T. (1997). The quality of bone.Journal of UOEH. https://doi.org/10.7888/JUOEH.19.157
28. Fawzi, S. (2013). The Effect of Dental Implant Design on Bone Induced Stress Distribution and Implant Displacement.International Journal of Computer Applications. https://doi.org/10.5120/12976-0023
29. Sm, P. (1996). Prosthesis design and treatment planning for the partially edentulous implant patient.Journal of Oral Implantology.
30. Gunne, J., Rangert, B., Glantz, P.-O., & Svensson, A. (1997). Functional loads on freestanding and connected implants in three-unit mandibular prostheses opposing complete dentures: an in vivo study.International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants.
31. Khraisat, A., Stegaroiu, R., Nomura, S., & Miyakawa, O. (2002). Fatigue resistance of two implant/abutment joint designs.Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. https://doi.org/10.1067/MPR.2002.129384
32. Duyck, J., Vandamme, K., Geris, L., Van Oosterwyck, H., De Cooman, M., Vander Sloten, J., & Naert, I. (2005). The effect of micromotion on tissues surrounding immediately loaded implants.Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering. https://doi.org/10.1080/10255840512331388425
33. Kirchner, B. P., Meurer, T., & Waizenegger, J. A. (2010).A method and system for designing a dental restoration.
34. Tawil, G., N, A., & Younan, R. (2006). Influence of prosthetic parameters on the survival and complication rates of short implants.International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants.
35. Fischler, T., Fischler, E., Bächler, M., Bächler, J., & Schaffner, R. (2010).Connection of a prosthesis structure with an implant structure.
36. Saba, S. (2001). Occlusal stability in implant prosthodontics -- clinical factors to consider before implant placement.Journal of The Canadian Dental Association.
37. Croll, B. M. (1990). Emergence profiles in natural tooth contour. Part II: Clinical considerations.Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3913(90)90223-Y
38. Lyle, D. M. (2013). Implant maintenance: is there an ideal approach?Compendium of Continuing Education in Dentistry.
39. Nisand, D., & Renouard, F. (2014). Short implant in limited bone volume.Periodontology 2000. https://doi.org/10.1111/PRD.12053
40. Morand, M., & Irinakis, T. (2007). The Challenge of Implant Therapy in the Posterior Maxilla: Providing a Rationale for the Use of Short Implants.Journal of Oral Implantology. https://doi.org/10.1563/1548-1336(2007)33[257:TCOITI]2.0.CO;2
41. van Diermen, D. E., Brand, H. S., & Vissink, A. (2006). The importance of adequate medical history taking in dentistry.Nederlands Tijdschrift Voor Tandheelkunde.
42. Chuang, S.-K., Wei, L. J., Douglass, C. W., & Dodson, T. B. (2002). Risk Factors for Dental Implant Failure: A Strategy for the Analysis of Clustered Failure-time Observations.Journal of Dental Research. https://doi.org/10.1177/154405910208100814
43. Krampe, H., Salz, A.-L., Kerper, L. F., Krannich, A., Schnell, T., Wernecke, K.-D., & Spies, C. (2017). Readiness to change and therapy outcomes of an innovative psychotherapy program for surgical patients: results from a randomized controlled trial.BMC Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1186/S12888-017-1579-5
44. Wu, H., Li, J., P, D., Lx, Q., Lin, Y., & Luo, J. (2010). A long-term retrospective clinical study of short dental implant restoration.Chinese Journal of Stomatology. https://doi.org/10.3760/CMA.J.ISSN.1002-0098.2010.12.003
45. Stafford, G. L. (2016). Short implants had lower survival rates in posterior jaws compared to standard implants.Evidence-Based Dentistry. https://doi.org/10.1038/SJ.EBD.6401205
46. Leisner, L. C., Kronsteiner, D., & Rammelsberg, P. (2021). Effect of previous implant failure on the prognosis of subsequent implants: A retrospective study.Clinical Oral Implants Research. https://doi.org/10.1111/CLR.13762
47. Elias, C. N. (2011).Factors Affecting the Success of Dental Implants. https://doi.org/10.5772/18746
48. Sheen, D., & Nikoyan, L. (2021). Placement of Short Implants: A Viable Alternative?Dental Clinics of North America. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CDEN.2020.09.001
49. Puigdellívol-Sánchez, A., Sala-Blanch, X., Reina, M. A., & Prats-Galino, A. (2022).Anatomical Variability and Biomedical Imaging for Spinal Anesthesia Individualization. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8871-0.ch006

50. Blumenthal, P. D., Gaffikin, L., Affandi, B., Bongiovanni, A., McGrath, J. A., & Glew, G. (1997). Training for norplant implant removal: Assessment of learning curves and competency.Obstetrics & Gynecology. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0029-7844(96)00484-X
51. Ogle, O. E. (2006). Postoperative care of oral and maxillofacial surgery patients.Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Clinics of North America. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMS.2005.09.005
52. Rosenberger, P. H., Jokl, P., & Ickovics, J. R. (2006). Psychosocial factors and surgical outcomes: an evidence-based literature review.Journal of The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. https://doi.org/10.5435/00124635-200607000-00002
53. Mackay, B., Marshall, K., Grant-Jacob, J. A., Kanczler, J. M., Eason, R. W., Oreffo, R. O. C., & Mills, B. (2021). The future of bone regeneration: integrating AI into tissue engineering.Biomedical Physics & Engineering Express. https://doi.org/10.1088/2057-1976/AC154F
54. Poli, P. P., Muktadar, A. K., Souza, F. Á., Maiorana, C., & Beretta, M. (2021). Computer-guided implant placement associated with computer-aided bone regeneration in the treatment of atrophied partially edentulous alveolar ridges: A proof-of-concept study.Journal of Dental Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JDS.2020.02.010
55. Vercruyssen, M., Cox, C., Naert, I., Jacobs, R., Teughels, W., & Quirynen, M. (2016). Accuracy and patient-centered outcome variables in guided implant surgery: a RCT comparing immediate with delayed loading.Clinical Oral Implants Research. https://doi.org/10.1111/CLR.12583
56. Heo, Y. Y., Heo, S.-J., Chang, M. W., & Park, J.-M. (2008). The patients' satisfaction following implant treatment.The Journal of Korean Academy of Prosthodontics. https://doi.org/10.4047/JKAP.2008.46.6.569