Prosthesis and Implant Survival in Immediately Loaded Full Arch Restorations Using Fiber-Reinforced Versus Non-Reinforced Temporary Frameworks: A Randomized Clinical Trial

Research Article

Nermeen Ahmed Hassan^{1*}, Amr Hosni Elkhadem², Amal Kaddah³, Nada Sherin El Khourazaty⁴¹ Assistant Lecturer, Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.² Associate Professor, Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.³ Professor Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.⁴ Associate Professor, Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

Abstract

Objectives: To evaluate and compare prosthesis and implant survival in case of temporary fixed complete dentures reinforced with fiber resin frameworks versus those that were not reinforced with any framework in case of immediately loaded full arch restorations in completely edentulous patients.

Method and Materials: Thirty completely edentulous patients were randomly allocated into two parallel arm groups. Non-reinforced control group (NR) in which patients received non-reinforced all-on-4 immediately loaded fixed complete denture and Fiber reinforced group (FR) in which patients received all-on-4 fixed complete denture supported with glass-fiber reinforced resin framework. Prosthesis and implant survival were clinically evaluated after 4 months follow up period.

Results: A statistically significant difference for prosthesis and implant survival was found between both groups ($P > 0.05$). The prostheses survival after 4 months of immediate functional loading were 100% and 73.3% for FR and NR groups, respectively. The implant survival after 4 months of immediate functional loading were 95% and 81.1% for FR and NR groups, respectively.

Conclusions: Within the limitations of the study, it can be concluded that strengthening the fixed full arch restorations with fiber reinforced frameworks can help overcoming the problem of interim prosthesis fracture during the osseointegration period when used for immediate loading in completely edentulous patients. It can also provide rigid splinting of implants which can improve stress distribution over the supporting implants and hence increase the implant survival.

Keywords: Conversion Prosthesis; All-On-Four; Dental Implants; Fiber Reinforced Frameworks; Immediate Loading; Prosthesis Survival; Implant Survival.

Introduction

When a condition of full-arch edentulism occurs, there are many available rehabilitative options that can be selected according to the patient condition. The available options may be removable complete denture, implant-retained removable overdenture or implant-supported fixed prosthesis.[1] Unfortunately, the main disadvantage of the removable options is related to the patient's desire as many patients refuse to wear a "removable" prosthesis. Most of the patients prefer to use a fixed restoration as it is usually perceived as an actual body part of the patient. In addition, the increase in functional demand and social confidence is leading more and more patients towards the fixed implant-supported options.[2]

The "all-on-four" treatment concept was developed for completely edentulous patients to maximize the use of the remaining jawbone, allowing immediate function and avoiding regenerative procedures that increase the treatment costs and patient morbidity, as well as the complications inherent to these procedures.[3] The "all-on-four" concept in the mandible involves the placement of four implant inter-foraminally; two axially placed implants in the anterior region and two distally tilted implants in the premolar region to support a provisional fixed immediately loaded prosthesis.[4]

A conversion prosthesis can be used in such conditions which is made from the patient's removable complete denture and con-

*Corresponding Author:

Nermeen Ahmed Hassan,
Assistant Lecturer, Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.
E-mail: nermeen.hassan@dentistry.cu.edu.eg

Received: July 12, 2021

Accepted: November 05, 2021

Published: November 10, 2021

Citation: Nermeen Ahmed Hassan, Amr Hosni Elkhadem, Amal Kaddah, Nada Sherin El Khourazaty. Prosthesis and Implant Survival in Immediately Loaded Full Arch Restorations Using Fiber-Reinforced Versus Non-Reinforced Temporary Frameworks: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Int J Dentistry Oral Sci.* 2021;8(11):4949-4954.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.19070/2377-8075-210001000>

Copyright: Nermeen Ahmed Hassan©2021. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

verted into a fixed provisional prosthesis at the stage of implant placement.[5] The presence of such interim prosthesis offers psychological benefit and convenience for the patient. Moreover, the clinician has control over the amount of soft tissue pressure exerted as the patient does not need to wear a removable restoration during initial bone healing.[6]

An ideal provisional restoration should be strong, durable and aesthetic, and it ought not to produce excessive pressure to the underlying soft tissue, as undesirable transmucosal pressure can lead to interruption of healing at the grafted sites or implant osseointegration.[6]

Integration between dental implants and host tissue is strictly dependent upon control of micromovement at the bone/implant interface during the first healing period, and it could be critical in case of immediate implant loading. The control of micromovement could be achieved by ensuring that the implants have adequate primary stability at the time of placement and controlling the amount of applied occlusal forces as much as possible during the osseointegration period. In addition, splinting of the implants can help to stabilize the newly placed dental implants through improved stress distribution by cross-arch stabilization during the osseointegration process.[7]

Unfortunately, full arch fixed provisional restorations may fracture during function due to several reasons. It may be due to acrylic porosities and/or foreign materials embedded in the acrylic as "Air pockets" were noted in the cracked acrylic bases of many restorations.[8] Porosity in acrylic denture base resins is well documented in dental literature with up to 11% porosity associated with certain processing conditions.[9] Acrylic porosity is typically caused by volatilization of monomer, polymerization shrinkage, inadequate pressure during acrylic/monomer mixing and/or residual monomer.[8] Porosity in acrylic resins weakens the provisional restoration due to accumulation of internal stresses and may lead to distortion, warpage, and fracture of the acrylic base.[8] Such fracture during the healing period eliminates cross-arch stabilization and disrupts stress distribution patterns. Fractures can also occur due to flexural fatigue, which occurs after repeated flexing of the PMMA prosthesis.[10] This type of failure can be explained by the development of microscopic cracks in areas of stress concentration.[11]

Over the past decades, a number of attempts have been made to strengthen and improve the fracture resistance of polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) prosthesis using different reinforcement materials such as glass fibers, polyethylene fibers, nylon and metal.[12] Glass fiber reinforced frameworks (GFR) were introduced recently into the market. The GFRF material is a combination of glass fibers and a resinous matrix. It has an elastic modulus of about 26 GPa which is seven times higher than that of conventional PMMA. It also has greater hardness and impact strength than PMMA material. It was found that using glass fiber reinforced framework in maxillary complete dentures can readily provide mechanical reinforcement for the dentures and reduce denture deformation during occlusal loading.[11, 13]

Therefore, it was suggested that the glass fiber reinforced frameworks can strengthen the provisional prosthesis and might decrease the risk of fractures in case of immediately loaded 'all-on-4' cases. Nevertheless, the clinical effect of such frameworks

on the durability of the conversion prosthesis and on the survival of the implants supporting them, have not been fully elucidated. Accordingly, the aim of the present clinical study was to evaluate the effect of using fiber reinforced framework on the prosthesis and implant survival of immediately loaded full arch provisional prosthesis.

Materials and Methods

The trial was carried out in faculty of dentistry, Cairo university. The consort guidelines for improving the quality of randomized trials were followed in this trial. Written informed consent was applied for all patients enrolled in the trial. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the faculty of dentistry, Cairo University.

Participant selection and study design The study was conducted in the prosthodontic department, faculty of dentistry, Cairo university from February 2019 to September 2020 where completely edentulous patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria were recruited from the outpatient clinic of the department. The patients' age ranged from 45 y to 69 years old. Thirty participants were selected based on strict inclusion criteria that included the following:

- i. Completely edentulous patients with Angle's Class I maxillo-mandibular relationship.
- ii. Mandibular ridge, with no history of recent extraction.
- iii. Adequate zone of keratinized attached mucosa over the crest of the lower ridge.
- iv. Absence of any intra-oral pathological condition.
- v. Absence of any medical condition that could complicate the surgical phase or affect osseointegration.

The selected study design was set to be randomized controlled trial with two parallel arm groups. Simple randomization was followed so that the participants were randomly allocated into two groups: fiber reinforced framework (FR) group and non-reinforced (NR) group. The allocation ration was set to be 1:1. Allocation concealment was done using opaque sealed envelopes. The trial was single blinded as only the statistician was blinded. The investigator and the patients could not be blinded because the technique in both groups were different from each other.

Construction of complete dentures and Preparation of a Scan appliance

The pre-surgical preparation required the construction of conventional maxillary and mandibular complete dentures so that the mandibular denture would be used as a conversion prosthesis. The patient's denture was also used as a scan appliance by the addition of 6-8 gutta percha cones to act as radiopaque markers over the polished surfaces of the prosthesis on both facial and lingual surfaces. Double scan protocol was used in our study in which two cone beam conventional tomography (CBCT) images was produced for each case; One for the modified mandibular denture alone outside the patient mouth using denture exposure module and the other one was for the mandible while the patient was wearing the mandibular denture with the gutta percha cones.

Virtual planning and surgical guide fabrication

The implant planning was done using the BlueSky Bio 4 software. The CBCT of the mandibular denture was superimposed over that of the mandible using points over the gutta purcha cones as alignment points for proper orientation of the stent over the mandible. The “all-on-Four” concept was followed and four implants were planned to be placed interforaminally. Two straight implants planned to be placed in the lateral incisor/canine region and two distally tilted implants planned to be placed in the second premolar region. Endosseous implants (DENTIS Co., Headquarters, USA) were used in this study. The implants’ diameters used were 3.7 mm for the anterior implants and 4.2 mm for the posterior ones. The length ranged from 8 to 10 mm based on the available bone height.

A surgical guide was planned and then the 3D virtual guide was exported as STL file to the 3D printing machine (Phrozen shuffle XL™, Hsinchu, Taiwan).

Implant insertion

The surgical guide was fixed in place using three fixation screws; two screws placed in the buccal shelf area on both sides and one screw in the midline. The osteotomies were drilled and implants were inserted with 35 Ncm torque. The multiunit abutments were screwed to the implants and pick-up titanium cylinders were attached to the abutments. (Fig:1)

Adjustment of the conversion prosthesis and immediate loading

1) For the fiber reinforced group:

Fiber reinforced frameworks (Trilor arch Bioloren™, Saronno,

Italy) with 5.5mm thickness were used in this group. A soft sheet of wax was applied on a surface of the framework then this side was applied over the titanium cylinders so that the cylinders could make indentations in the wax surface. These indentations were used to mark the areas to be perforated in the framework. Then, the framework was seated intraorally over the titanium cylinders and checked for presence of any further interferences and pick-up of the cylinders into the framework was done by injecting flowable composite around the titanium cylinders. After that, the desired outline was drawn on the fiber reinforced framework (FRF) using a pencil and it was trimmed and finished to that outline. The trimmed framework was seated intraorally and the titanium cylinders were retightened to the multiunit abutments. (Fig:2)

A window was opened in the denture over the crestal area to create space for the framework. In addition, the lingual flange in the area of the framework was removed to facilitate denture seating over the bulky framework. The lingual flange distal to the framework was not removed to facilitate and guide the seating of the denture over the framework in the correct position. The window area included all areas of the placed implants and slightly distal to it. (Fig: 3a)

Finally, rubber dam sheet was applied over the mucosa through the titanium cylinders to protect the mucosa against any possible irritation during the pick-up procedure. The denture was seated over the framework and tooth shade self-cure acrylic resin (Acrostone; Acrostone Dental Manufacturer, Egypt) was injected in the window area and denture remained in place until complete hardening of the pickup material. This was followed by unscrewing of the pickup titanium cylinders and any deficient areas were adjusted by addition of more self-cure acrylic resin. (Fig:3b, c, d)

Figure 1. “(a) Fixing the surgical guide intraorally using pins, (b) implant torque at 35N.cm, (c) Insertion and tightening of the multiunit abutments manual implant insertion, (d) Titanium cylinders inserted and tightened over the multiunit abutments.”

Figure 2. “(a) Bioloren Trilor arch framework, (b) tracing the indented wax over the framework using pencil, (c) Trilor arch framework after drilling the 4 holes corresponding to the 4 titanium cylinders, (d) intraoral pick up of the framework by injecting flowable composite around the titanium cylinders, (e) trimming the fiber reinforced framework to accommodate the buccolingual width of the ridge, (f) “Trimmed fiber reinforced framework after seating and tightening intraorally”.

Finally the prosthesis was retightened intraorally and the occlusion was checked and refined. (Fig: 4)

2) For the Non- reinforced group:

Four separate holes were opened in the denture opposite to each titanium cylinder. The denture was checked for proper seating over the cylinders without interference or rocking. Rubber dam sheet was applied over the to prevent tissue irritation. Self-cure acrylic resin was injected in the window around the pickup cylinders. The denture remained in place until complete hardening of the pickup material. This was followed by unscrewing of the pickup Ti cylinders and any deficient areas were adjusted by addition of more self-cure acrylic resin.

For both groups, all flanges of the prostheses and all sharp areas were removed. The prostheses were finished, polished and re-screwed to the multiunit abutments using the prosthetic screws. The access holes were partially plugged with rubber pieces and then the access holes were completely closed with light-cured composite resin. The occlusion was checked in both centric and eccentric positions.

Outcome measures

Patients were followed up for 4 months and data was collected at the end of the four-month follow up period. As regards to prosthesis survival, the prosthesis was considered "Surviving", when it remained sound in place without any major fractures that affect function or required total removal of the prosthesis. On the other hand, for implant survival, implant was considered "surviving"

when there was no implant mobility, no pain during function, no exudates and no signs of peri-implantitis.

Statistical analysis

Owing to lack of RCT studies on short-term prosthesis survival for immediately loaded interim acrylic prostheses, clinical and practical aspects were considered to determine the design and sample size of this study. The required minimal number of 30 participants was selected based on a previous study comparing interim acrylic bases with and without cast metal base, which was more sensible approach than sample size calculation. [14]

Data was analyzed using IBM SPSS advanced statistics (version 25, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A binary logistic model was used to analyze the results. In this model, survived implant or prosthesis was coded as 1 while failed implant/prosthesis was coded as 0. Variables that had P-values of less than 0.05 were considered as significant predictors in this model. The statistical test used for analysis was chi-square test.

Results

Prosthesis survival

For the Fiber reinforced (FR) group, clinical examination of prostheses showed 100% survival for the prostheses of this group. All prostheses were perfectly functioning in place without major fractures.

Two cases exhibited detachment of the veneering acrylic teeth;

Figure 3. (a) Cutting a window in the mandibular denture for the pick-up procedure, (b) Finished fiber reinforced framework prosthesis after removal of flanges and polishing from fitting surface, (c) occlusal view of the prosthesis, (d) facial view of the prosthesis".

Figure 4. (a) Tightening of the fiber reinforced framework prosthesis intraorally, (b) Patient occlusion from front view."

Figure 5. (a) Tightening of the fiber reinforced framework prosthesis intraorally, (b) Patient occlusion from front view."

one in the anterior region and one in the premolar region after 2 months of function but these detachments did not affect neither the function nor the seating of the prosthesis intraorally. These cases were managed by bonding the detached part to the denture using flowable composite and since then no separation reoccurred. (Fig: 5)

For the non-reinforced (NR) group, clinical examination of the prostheses showed 73.3% survival for this group after four months of function. Four cases exhibited major fractures and detachment of the whole part of the prosthesis. The fractures in those cases did affect the function as large areas were separated and could not be re-attached since it was not in the veneering part but rather in the main bulk. Moreover, two other cases exhibited fractures of the acrylic part around titanium cylinders in the distal part of the prosthesis. However, the prostheses were still functioning in place, so they were considered surviving prostheses. Those cases were managed by removing the fractured part and the posterior end of the prosthesis was smoothed and all sharp areas were removed. (Table: 1)

Implant survival

Clinical examination of implants of both groups revealed 95% implant survival for the FR group and 81.1% for the NR group. For the NR group, the four cases that exhibited failed prostheses were excluded from the analysis as they were not functionally loaded for the whole 4 months follow up period. The posterior tilted implants were the most frequently failed implants in both groups. On the other hand, failure of the anterior implant solely was uncommon. They usually occurred as part of multiple implant failures of the same case rather than occurring solely unlike the posterior ones. (Table: 2)

Discussion

The aim of the current study was to evaluate the prosthesis and implant survival in case of immediately loaded full arch provisional restorations reinforced with fiber frameworks versus those that are non-reinforced. Based on the findings of this study, the use of fiber reinforced framework in fabrication of fixed provisional complete dentures caused 100% survival of the provisional prosthesis unlike the non-reinforced group in which the

survival rate was 73.3%. These results are in accordance with the results of the study conducted by Collaert et al., who evaluated the prosthesis survival in case of immediate functional loading of implants in full arch edentulous cases using glass fiber reinforced prosthesis. The results of his study displayed 100% survival rate for the prosthesis over three years follow up period. These findings can be explained on basis of the invitro study performed by Goldberg et al., who evaluated the ultimate force-to-failure distal to the terminal implant of a simulated implant-supported complete fixed dental prosthesis (ICFDP) reinforced with glass fiber compared with that of a conventionally fabricated prosthesis.[15] They found that the mean fracture load of the non-reinforced (NR) group was 1073 N while that for the fiber reinforced group was 1400 N. In the specimens of the NR group, the fracture initiated by excessive load application was able to propagate through the cross-section of the prosthesis, causing a complete fracture of the material. In comparison with the FR prosthesis, the presence of the glass fiber prevented the complete separation of the fractured segments. These results show that a glass fiber framework can reinforce the restoration and furthermore reduce the stress on the surrounding acrylic resin.[15]

Furthermore, the results agreed with the opinion of Gary Steen [16] who recommended the use of acrylic resin denture reinforced with a glass fiber composite resin impregnated mesh as a long term, durable restoration on the day of surgery. He focused on that the chemical bonding of the fiber to PMMA results in a homogeneous mass with high flexural strength and elasticity.

The results of this study also revealed fractures of the distal cantilevered part of the NR prostheses. This might be explained by the emergence of the titanium cylinders from the occlusal surface of the prosthesis causing inevitable thinning and weakening of the denture at these areas. As the acrylic resin (PMMA) lacks sufficient strength and rigidity in thin sections, fractures can easily occur in this areas which represent weak points of the denture. This problem was not evident in the FR group as the presence of the framework in the areas surrounding the titanium cylinders help in keeping these areas thick, thus resist fractures.

Moreover, the presence of the framework in the cantilevered part allows for minimal thickness of 5.5 mm in the distal areas which seems to provide more resistance to bending and deformation.

Table 1. Prosthesis Survival after 4 months.

	Failure		Survival		P-Value
	N	(%)	N	(%)	
Fiber reinforced group (n = 15)	0	0	15	-100	0.032 *
Non reinforced group (n = 15)	4	(26.7)	11	(73.3)	
* Statistically significant difference between groups (p<0.05)					

Table 2. Implant Survival after 4 months.

	Failure		Survival		P-Value
	N	(%)	N	(%)	
Fiber reinforced group (n = 60)	3	-5	57	-95	0.031 *
Non reinforced group (n = 44)	8	(18.9)	36	(81.1)	
* Statistically significant difference between groups (p<0.05)					

This works together with the inherent rigidity and strength of the framework material (compared to the non-reinforced resin) caused by the incorporation of glass fibers. Such reasons might explain the absence of distal fractures in the FR group.

The results of our study also showed that the implant survival in the FR group was higher than that in the NF group. This can be explained by the investigations of early failures done by Tarnow and his coworkers. They stated that rigid splinting and minimal lateral force application were critical factors for success.[17] Implants stabilized at initial placement by splinting and utilizing the widest antero-posterior distribution of the implants are able to resist the critical degree of micromovement at the bone-implant interface.[17, 18] Apparently, the reinforced provisional restoration used in this study seems to prevent macromovement and significant micromovement. In addition, it appears that it provides resistance to forces in all directions.

Failure of posterior implant was the most common type of failures especially in the NR group. This might be attributed to the loading of the cantilevered part of the prosthesis which cause a hinging effect that induces considerable stresses on the implants closest to the load application which is the distal one. When forces are applied on the distal cantilever parts, stiffness of the prosthesis material affects the amount of bending of the prosthesis which subsequently affects the amount of stresses generated on the terminal implants. The more bending and deformation of the cantilever part, the greater the stresses in the prosthesis and supporting terminal implants.[19] Therefore, failure of the most posterior implant was more evident in the NR group as the prosthesis was less rigid than that of the FR group.

It worth mentioning that the manipulation and pick up of the fiber reinforced framework into the denture was time consuming and quietly difficult compared to the non-reinforced one. More time and effort was relatively required in the FR group to obtain proper space in the denture to accommodate for the framework and remove the areas of interferences. Unfortunately, this thickness of the framework added large bulk to the prosthesis, especially in the lingual side.

In addition, opening a large window in the denture during pick up of the FR framework led to removal of larger areas of the occlusal surface of the originally located acrylic teeth compared to the NR group. Therefore, more time was required to adjust and refine the occlusal surface after pick-up of the framework in FR group, in opposite to refining the occlusal surface in NR group which was much easier.

Conclusion

Based on findings of this study, it can be concluded that strengthening the fixed full arch restorations with fiber reinforced frameworks can help overcoming the problem of interim prosthesis fracture during the osseointegration period when used for immediate loading in completely edentulous patients. It can also provide rigid splinting of implants which can improve stress distribution over the supporting implants and hence increase the implant survival.

Acknowledgment And Declarations

The present study was self-funded. None of the authors reports any conflict of interest.

References

- [1]. Emami E, Thomason JM. In individuals with complete tooth loss, the mandibular implant-retained overdenture increases patient satisfaction and oral health related quality of life compared to conventional dentures. *J Evid Based Dent Pract*. 2013 Sep;13(3):94-6. PubMed PMID: 24011002.
- [2]. Felton DA. Edentulism and comorbid factors. *J Prosthodont*. 2009 Feb;18(2):88-96. PubMed PMID: 19254297.
- [3]. Soto-Penalosa D, Zaragoza-Alonso R, Penarrocha-Diago M, Penarrocha-Diago M. The all-on-four treatment concept: Systematic review. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2017 Mar 1;9(3):e474-e488. PubMed PMID: 28298995.
- [4]. Maló P, Rangert B, Nobre M. "All-on-Four" immediate-function concept with Brånemark System implants for completely edentulous mandibles: a retrospective clinical study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2003;5Suppl 1:2-9. PubMed PMID: 12691645.
- [5]. Balshi TJ. The Imbler conversion prosthesis: a provisional fixed prosthesis supported by osseointegrated titanium fixtures for restoration of the edentulous jaw. *Quintessence Int*. 1985 Oct;16(10):667-77. PubMed PMID: 3911253.
- [6]. Siadat H, Alikhasi M, Beyabanaki E. Interim Prosthesis Options for Dental Implants. *J Prosthodont*. 2017 Jun;26(4):331-338. PubMed PMID: 26805651.
- [7]. Misch CE, Hahn J, Judy KW, Lemons JE, Linkow LI, Lozada JL, Mills E, Misch CM, Salama H, Sharawy M, Testori T, Wang HL; Immediate Function Consensus Conference. Workshop guidelines on immediate loading in implant dentistry. November 7, 2003. *J Oral Implantol*. 2004;30(5):283-8. PubMed PMID: 15587018.
- [8]. Singh S, Palaskar JN, Mittal S. Comparative evaluation of surface porosities in conventional heat polymerized acrylic resin cured by water bath and microwave energy with microwavable acrylic resin cured by microwave energy. *Contemp Clin Dent*. 2013 Apr;4(2):147-51. PubMed PMID: 24015000.
- [9]. Kasina SP, Ajaz T, Attili S, Surapaneni H, Cherukuri M, Srinath HP. To evaluate and compare the porosities in the acrylic mandibular denture bases processed by two different polymerization techniques, using two different brands of commercially available denture base resins - an in vitro study. *J Int Oral Health*. 2014 Feb;6(1):72-7. PubMed PMID: 24653607.
- [10]. Banerjee R, Banerjee S, Prabhudesai PS, Bhide SV. Influence of the processing technique on the flexural fatigue strength of denture base resins: an in vitro investigation. *Indian J Dent Res*. 2010 Jul-Sep;21(3):391-5. PubMed PMID: 20930351.
- [11]. Hirajima Y, Takahashi H, Minakuchi S. Influence of a denture strengthener on the deformation of a maxillary complete denture. *Dent Mater J*. 2009 Jul;28(4):507-12. PubMed PMID: 19721290.
- [12]. Heidari B, Firouz F, Izadi A, Ahmadvand S, Radan P. Flexural Strength of Cold and Heat Cure Acrylic Resins Reinforced with Different Materials. *J Dent (Tehran)*. 2015 May;12(5):316-23. PubMed PMID: 26877726.
- [13]. Hada T, Suzuki T, Minakuchi S, Takahashi H. Reduction in maxillary complete denture deformation using framework material made by computer-aided design and manufacturing systems. *J MechBehav Biomed Mater*. 2020 Mar;103:103514. PubMed PMID: 31778908.
- [14]. Thomé E, Lee HJ, Sartori IA, Trevisan RL, Luiz J, Tiossi R. A randomized controlled trial comparing interim acrylic prostheses with and without cast metal base for immediate loading of dental implants in the edentulous mandible. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2015 Dec;26(12):1414-20. PubMed PMID: 25238031.
- [15]. Goldberg J, Ronaghi G, Phark JH, Jivraj S, Chee W. Force-to-failure of a simulated implant-supported complete fixed dental prosthesis reinforced with glass fiber. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2017 Aug;118(2):172-176. PubMed PMID: 28159340.
- [16]. Steen G. Reinforced PMMA in full arch implant-supported reconstruction: toward access to care. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*. 2020 Oct;31:160.
- [17]. Tarnow DP, Emtiaz S, Classi A. Immediate loading of threaded implants at stage 1 surgery in edentulous arches: ten consecutive case reports with 1- to 5-year data. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1997 May-Jun;12(3):319-24. PubMed PMID: 9197096.
- [18]. Lundgren D, Laurell L. Biomechanical aspects of fixed bridgework supported by natural teeth and endosseous implants. *Periodontol*. 1994 Feb;4:23-40. PubMed PMID: 9673191.
- [19]. Taruna M, Chittaranjan B, Sudheer N, Tella S, Abusaad M. Prosthodontic perspective to all-on-4° concept for dental implants. *J ClinDiagn Res*. 2014 Oct;8(10):ZE16-9. PubMed PMID: 25478475.