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Abstract

Objectives: To evaluate the extent of bone fill over three years following surgical treatment of peri-implantitis with bone grafting with or without a membrane.

Material & Methods: In a non-submerged wound healing mode, 15 subjects with 27 implants were treated with a bone substitute (Algipore®) alone, and 17 subjects with 29 implants were treated with the bone substitute and a resorbable membrane (Osseoquest®). Implants with radiographic bone loss ≥1.8 mm following the first year in function, and with bleeding and/or pus on probing were included. Following surgery subjects were given systemic antibiotics (10 days) and rinsed with chlorhexidine. After initial healing the subjects were enrolled in a strict maintenance program.

Results:
Statistical analysis failed to demonstrate changes in bone fill between one and three years both between, and within procedure groups. Mean defect fill at three years was 1.3 ± (S.D.)1.3 mm if treated with bone substitute alone and 1.6 ± (S.D.)1.2 mm if treated with an adjunct resorbable membrane, (p=0.40). Plaque index decreased from approximately 40% to 10% remaining stable during the following two years.

Conclusion: Defect fill using a bone substitute with or without a membrane technique in treatment of peri-implantitis can be maintained over three years.
**Clinical Relevance**

**Scientific rationale:** Limited information is available regarding the long term prognosis of regenerative treatment of intraosseous defects following surgical treatment of peri-implantitis lesions in humans.

**Principal findings:** Over a follow-up period of three years, a similar extent of radiographic evidence of bone fill following placement of a bone graft material with or without a concomitant use of a resorbable membrane in osseous defects adjacent to implants was identified. No changes were observed between year one and year three and both procedures appear to provide stable results in regards to radiographic evidence of bone fill.

**Practical implications:** Bone fill obtained following surgical treatment of peri-implantitis lesions can be obtained, and remain stable if subjects comply with supportive therapy visits and maintain good oral hygiene.
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Introduction

It is well established that peri-implantitis has an infectious etiology. A complex biofilm around implants with peri-implantitis has been identified (Renvert et al. 2007, 2008, Shibli et al. 2008). The infection results in a pathology that includes soft tissue inflammation, and loss of implant surrounding alveolar bone. In the progression of peri-implantitis, severe bone lesions with crater formed defect characteristics can be found (Schwarz et al. 2007). Data suggest that the prevalence of peri-implantitis is high (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2006a, Fransson et al. 2009, Koldsland et al. 2010). Data also suggest that within the same subject with peri-implantitis the characteristics of the bony lesions are similar and that the rate of untreated lesions appear to increase over time (Fransson et al. 2010). There is no evidence that the implant surface characteristics can have an influence on the initiation of peri-implantitis (Renvert et al. 2011). Surgical treatment of peri-implantitis lesions with an intra bony component has a favorable treatment outcome (Schwarz et al. 2010).

Non-surgical therapy of peri-implantitis does not seem to be efficacious (Schwarz et al. 2006b, Renvert et al. 2009, Persson et al. 2010). Surgical intervention and cleaning of implants with hydrogen peroxide and adjunct systemic antibiotics have demonstrated limited success over a five year period (Leonhardt et al. 2003).

Resective surgery and implantoplasty of cases with peri-implantitis seems to be effective over a three year period (Romeo et al. 2005).

Different bone regenerative therapies have been used attempting to accomplish healing of peri-implantitis defects in humans. A useful surgical treatment modality
including bone grafts covered by ePTFE membranes in animal with experimentally
induced peri-implantitis is effective in the management of peri-implantitis (Schou et al.
2003, Fiorellini et al. 2007). Surgical treatment of circumferential defects around
implants in humans using bone grafting and collagen membranes have been shown
to be useful (Schwarz et al. 2009, 2010). Available data also suggest that surgical
treatment of non-submerged implants with bony dehiscence can successfully be
treated with a stiff non-resorbable membrane combined with a xenograft (De Boever
& De Boever 2005).

Other studies in humans have shown that surgical treatment of implants with bone
lesions that were ≥ 4 mm, and with circumferential crater defects can effectively be
treated with a mixture of autogenous and xenogenous bone (Wiltfang et al. 2010).
Almost complete bone fill in subjects with peri-implantitis treated with surgical
intervention using laser debridement and application of bone grafts with collagen
membrane coverage has been demonstrated (Romanos & Nentwig 2008). These
findings are supported by other studies demonstrating that surgical treatment of peri-
implant defects with bone graft substitutes combined with resorbable membrane
methods and submerged healing or regenerative treatment with a bone substitute
alone or in combination with a resorbable membrane in a non-submerged model
results in defect fill (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2007a, b). The aim of the present study was
to evaluate three-year stability of defect fill after surgical regenerative therapy of peri-
implantitis including the use of a bone graft material with, or with a resorbable
membrane in an non-submerged mode of wound healing.
Material and Methods

Study design

The study design was a human prospective case-control, single blinded, longitudinal study comparing the radiographic outcome after three years.

Study population

The Institutional Review Board at the University of Lund, Sweden approved the study. All participating individuals signed an informed consent. The CONSORT guidelines for clinical trials were followed (Figure 1). Study subjects were recruited from (I) individuals examined in a survey evaluating the prevalence of peri-implantitis 9-14 years following placements of Brånemark implants (Brånemark system®, Nobel Pharma, Göteborg, Sweden) and (II) subjects who had been referred for the treatment of peri-implantitis to the Clinic of Periodontology, Public Dental health Services and University of Kristianstad, Sweden. The present paper is a follow-up report based on the publication by Roos-Jansäter et al. 2007.

Thirty-eight consecutive consenting subjects scheduled by the surgeon for surgical treatment of peri-implantitis were enrolled. In order to be included the subject had a minimum of one osseo-integrated implant with peri-implantitis. In order to be included the subject must have an implant demonstrating a progressive bone loss of ≥ 3 threads (≥ 1.8 mm) following the first year of healing (Renvert et al. 2007). In addition, bleeding on probing with or without suppuration must be present at enrollment. This is in agreement with the consensus report of the 7th European Workshop on Periodontology (Lang & Berglundh 2011). Furthermore, efforts must first have been to treat the condition using a non-surgical protocol, and that such
treatments had failed. Subjects with radiographic evidence of horizontal bone loss only and without evidence of a vertical crater-like defect were not included.

All subjects had surgical regenerative treatment using a bone graft substitute (Algipore®, Friadent, Malmö, Sweden). The first 19 subjects were treated with the graft substitute that was covered with a resorbable membrane (Osseoquest®, W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc, Flagstaff, AZ). The next 19 subjects were treated with the bone graft substitute alone.

Clinical and Radiographic examination

At baseline and year-three, the same examiner (A-M.R.J) performed the radiographic examinations. At the time of assessment of the radiographs, the examiner had only access to coded radiographs. Radiographs were obtained of implants using individually made bite-blocks on an Eggen holder (Renvert et al. 1981). The bite-blocks were made of Provil® Novo, Putty Soft (Heraeus Kulzer, GmbH I, Hanau, Germany). The X-ray films (Kodak Insight, EKC, Rochester, NY) were supported by the bite-block to avoid displacement and curving of the films. Attempts were made to place the film parallel to the long axis of the implant examined. During the exposure the extension arm of the film holder was inserted into an acrylic track mounted on the long cone of the X-ray apparatus. Threads not supported by bone at the mesial and distal site of the implants were assessed. Plaque index was defined as visible or not visible at the implant. Probing pocket depth measurements were deferred at year three as the super-structures remained in place. Hence the values would not be comparable to pre-surgical baseline.
Surgical treatment

The study population and the surgical techniques have been described in detail previously (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2007a). All subjects received antibiotic coverage (amoxicillin 375 mg x 3 per day, and metronidazole 400 mg x 2 per day) during the first 10 days following surgery. Briefly, following removal of the supra-structure granulomatous tissue was removed. The exposed implant threads were carefully debrided, treated with hydrogen peroxide (3%), and rinsed with copious amounts of a saline solution. The osseous defects were filled with a bone graft substitute (Algipore®, Friadent, Malmö, Sweden). Before insertion of the Algipore® bone fill material, the bone graft material was mixed with blood from the subject. The first 19 consecutive subjects had a resorbable membrane (Osseoquest®, W.L. Gore & Associates, INC, Flagstaff, AZ), placed over the filled defect. The following 19 consecutive subjects were treated with the bone graft substitute without a resorbable membrane. The abutments were then reconnected and the flaps were sutured with non-resorbable sutures (Gore 5-0, W.L. Gore & Associates, INC, Flagstaff, AZ) and the supra-structures were remounted. The wound healing was performed in a non-submerged mode.

During the first 5 weeks all subjects rinsed with 0.1 % chlorhexidine. During the first 3 days all subjects also received an anti-inflammatory and analgesic drug (Ibuprofen 400 mg x 3 days). Six weeks after surgery the first supportive therapy was given, and the subjects were enrolled in a maintenance program with visits every third month. At the visits, full mouth plaque scores were obtained. Plaque was disclosed using an erythrosine dye (Top Dent Lifco Dental AB, Enköping, Sweden). Re-instruction in oral hygiene procedures was performed as necessary. Teeth and implants were cleaned.
using a rubber cup and a low-abrasive paste. During the follow-up period, none of the subjects was prescribed antibiotics.

**Statistical methods**

Parametric tests (independent t-tests, equal variance not assumed), and non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney U test, Wilcoxon test, and Pearson $\chi^2$) were performed to assess differences over time and between groups. Statistical significance was declared at $p < 0.05$. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to define if the data presented with normal distribution or not. The SPSS PASW 18.0 statistical software (SPSS Inc. Chicago IL) for PC was used in the analysis.

**Results**

Subject characteristics at study baseline are presented (Table 1). At baseline, a total of 38 subjects were enrolled. **Two subjects died before the 1-year control, leaving 17 subjects**, with 29 treated implants in the group receiving bone graft and membrane treatment and 19 subjects with 36 treated implants in the group treated with bone graft alone. **Four subjects in the group treated with bone graft alone were lost to follow-up during the 3-year period, leaving 15 subjects with 27 implants in this group after three years. In the present analysis only the 32 subjects who returned to the follow-up examination and had radiographs taken could be assessed. During the present study period, no clinical complications as a result of the interventions were found in any of the subjects.**

One subject in each group had received Astra implants (Astra Tech system®, Astra Tech, Mölndal, Sweden). These implant had the same thread distance between
threads as for the Brånemark implants (0.6 mm) other subjects had received machined surfaced implants (Brånemark system®, Nobelpharma, Göteborg, Sweden). Subject characteristics are presented (Table 1). Analysis by Mann-Whitney U test confirmed the lack of difference by study method.

The radiographic evidence of defect mean improvement with defect fill between baseline and year three at implants treated with bone graft and membrane was a mean gain of 1.6 mm (S.D. ± 1.2 mm, range: -1 to +7). The corresponding improvement with defect fill at implants treated with bone graft alone was a mean gain of 1.3 mm (S.D. ± 1.3, range -2 to +6 threads) (NS). Statistical analysis failed to demonstrate differences in the extent of defect fill (mean difference: 0.3 mm, S.E. diff: 0.3 mm, 95% CI: -1.0 to +0.4 mm, P = 0.34). In the group treated with bone graft material and membrane, a total of 15 implants (51.7%) had a defect fill >1.8 mm. In the group treated with bone graft alone, a total of 12 implants (44.4%) gained more than 1.8 mm in defect fill.

When the data were dichotomized in regards to change in the number of exposed threads as a gain if bone or bone fill could be identified at one or more previously exposed threads, or if no change had occurred or if one or more additional threads had been exposed three years after intervention statistical analysis (Pearson’s χ²) failed to demonstrate differences in gain/loss of thread exposure by surgical treatment modality (p = 0.89). The distribution of bone level changes in the two study groups between baseline and year three after surgery are presented (Table 2). Statistical analysis failed to demonstrate differences in the extent of defect fill both in regards to number of threads filled and defect fill in mm by study group assignment.
The distribution of bone level changes in the two study groups between baseline and year three after surgery are presented (Table 3).

Analysis by Mann-Whitney U test failed to demonstrate a difference in bone fill between year one and year three between the two study groups (P = 0.36). Within each study group related samples Wilcoxon signed rank test failed to demonstrate a difference in bone fill between year one and year three in the group receiving bone graft alone (P = 0.18), or in the group treated with bone fill and membrane (P = 0.42). Bone fill mean values, SD, and range of fill are presented (Table 4).

Non-parametric Wilcoxon test identified that plaque index continued to improve between year one and year three after surgery (p = 0.02). Statistical analysis (Mann-Whitney U test) failed to demonstrate differences in this change of plaque scores by intervention (p = 0.43). The distributions of changes in the mean % plaque scores at various time points up to year three are presented (Figure 4).

**Examples of treatment outcome at year three**

Background clinical information and radiographs from before treatment of peri-implantitis and at year three are presented for one selected case defined as a non-responding case, and from one case defined as successfully treated (Table 5). Intraoral radiographs taken immediately before and at three years after surgical treatment of peri-implantitis representing a non responding treatment outcome (Figure 5A and 5B) and a successfully treated case (Figure 6A and 6B) are shown. In these cases, the immediate postoperative wound healing was uneventful. The maintenance
protocol was highly effective as illustrated by the low plaque scores during the study period.

Discussion

In a previous report, one-year data following surgical treatment of peri-implantitis using a bone graft substitute demonstrated that the clinical conditions and radiographic conditions had improved (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2007a). These results had occurred in spite of the fact that a majority of the subjects included were smokers, and with a past history of periodontitis (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2007a). It has previously been discussed that a smoking history and having a history of periodontitis can negatively influence the outcome of surgical treatment and reconstruction of defects around dental implants (Roos-Jansåker et al. 2006b, Karoussis et al. 2004, Máximo et al. 2008). Smoking has also been considered as a risk factor during wound healing following implant placement (Sadig & Almas 2004). The fact that smoking may have a negative influence on regenerative procedures in the management of periodontitis is well established (Mayfield et al. 1998, Trombelli et al. 1997, Rosén et al. 1996, Tonetti et al. 1995, Kornman & Roberson 2000). It is therefore of interest that also in smokers, the use of a bone graft material placed in bone defects around implants can remain stable also at three years after intervention. Our findings are consistent with results reported elsewhere using bone substitutes in a non-smoking study population (Schwarz et al. 2008).

Subjects with a history of periodontitis and specifically in men with dental implants appear to be at risk for peri-implantitis. A history of smoking may be of less significance as a risk factor for peri-implantitis (Koldsland et al. in press). In spite of the accrued risk factors in the present study population it should be emphasized that both surgical study modalities resulted in a successful three-year outcome of surgical
treatment reestablishing bone fill around implants with a previous history of peri-

The importance of plaque control after periodontal therapy and supportive therapy
has been described extensively (i.e. Nyman et al. 1975, 1977, Rosling 1983, Rosling
et al. 2001). In the present study the post-surgical management was focused on a
strict oral hygiene program that continued during the study. Thus, the overall average
plaque score at year three was very low. This may explain the good results reported.
In a previous study using non-surgical management of peri-implantitis it was not
possible to reach a similar oral hygiene level which in part may explain the less
favorable clinical outcome (Renvert et al 2009, Persson et al. 2010). It is possible that
the surgical intervention in this study resulted in an improved soft tissue architecture
after wound healing facilitating oral hygiene measures. This may, in part, explain the
differences in plaque control efficacy in the present surgical intervention study
compared to the non-surgical intervention reported in previous papers. Nevertheless,
other studies employing surgical intervention in non-smokers with peri-implantitis
reported higher plaque scores. However, they also reported a gradual detoriation of
results primary obtained (Schwarz et al. 2006a). Higher plaque scores than reported
in the present study have also been reported in a long term retrospective study
(Matarasso et al. 2010). Thus, the surgical procedure and the wound healing may not
be effective without good plaque control during the follow up period.
The present follow-up, three years after surgical intervention comparing a bone
substitute with or without the adjunct treatment with a resorbable membrane
demonstrated that the additional effort to obtain stability did no seem to result in
enhanced three year results as assessed by radiographs. Our results are consistent
with those reported from studies of experimental healing in dogs (Nociti et al. 2000),
or in a non-human primate model (Schou et al. 2003). It is possible that the use of a
bone graft with the additional placement of a membrane may be more efficient in
specific bone lesions around implants (Schwarz et al. 2010). Although somewhat
better results have been presented in a 10-year follow clinical trial using bone grafts
with the adjunct use of resorbable membranes in comparison to not using such
membranes, the clinical relevance appeared to be negligible (Nygaard-Østby et al.
2010). The study by Nygaard-Østby et al. (2010) also identified that the resolution of
depth intra-bony periodontal defects requires a structured maintenance program
emphasizing high oral hygiene standards.

In the present study, the extent of bone fill obtained at one year after surgical
treatment using either a bone graft alone or bone graft and a resorbable membrane
could be maintained up to three years after treatment. Thus, provided oral hygiene is
excellent both procedures resulted in a clinically relevant defect fill. A pre-requisite for
a successful treatment outcome might also be the anatomy of bone defect. A well
defined crater-like defect might be the most reliable factor for stable conditions.

The limitation of using the radiographic assessment method used in the present
study is obvious. The radiographic evaluation does not allow distinguishing between
osseo-integration of the graft in direct contact to the implant, or if the bone graft
simply remains as a defect fill. However in comparison to the one year results (Roos-
Jansåker et al. 2007a) the present findings at three years demonstrated stable
results without progression of bone loss. Our results are consistent with histological
results obtained from animal studies demonstrating that hard tissue fill and osseo-
integration can occur in experimentally created defects around implants (Abushahba et al. 2008). This would also be the result at implants previously exposed to an infectious biofilm, and animal studies it has also been demonstrated that it is possible to obtain re-osseointegration on previously infected implant surfaces (Alhag et al. 2008).

The two cases identified with the similar age and clinical conditions, albeit with opposite gender represent examples of a successful and a non-successful treatment outcome of circumferential advanced lesions at implants placed in the maxilla. Both subjects had had a previous history of peri-implantitis at the same or other implants, and both of them were former smokers. At the time of surgical intervention in the study the clinical conditions were similar in both cases. The presences of circumferential defects with a significant vertical component were in both cases suitable for the assigned therapy. The study treatment was the same in both cases using a bone graft material without membrane coverage. Both subjects complied with the post-surgical instructions and maintained excellent oral hygiene. The differences identified between the two cases were that the subject with a non-successful outcome had a medical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and clinical lack of keratinized and attached mucosa at the buccal aspect of the implant in treatment. Furthermore, the infection at the implant appeared to harbor pathogens that are commonly therapy resistant. The present observations from these two cases and the observations made should only be used to suggest further studies on the role of keratinized attached tissues, systemic health, and local infection in relation to therapy in cases with peri-implantitis.
In conclusion, defect fill obtained at one year after surgical treatment with a bone graft and membrane or with bone graft alone remain stable between one and three years in cases on maintenance care.
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Table 1

Subject characteristics at study baseline (IDDM: diabetes mellitus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bone graft only including 15 subjects</th>
<th>Bone graft and membrane including 17 subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean: 65.6</td>
<td>Mean: 66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.: 7.4</td>
<td>S.D.: 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 54-76</td>
<td>Range: 55-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female: 57.9%</td>
<td>Female: 58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>Mean: 9.3</td>
<td>Mean: 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.: 3.6</td>
<td>S.D.: 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 6-17</td>
<td>Range: 6-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic conditions</td>
<td>Health: 64.7%</td>
<td>Health: 52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDDM: 5.9%</td>
<td>IDDM: 10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart disease: 17.6%</td>
<td>Heart Disease: 15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 11.8%</td>
<td>Other: 21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smokers</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never smoked</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of smoke years</td>
<td>Mean: 40.5</td>
<td>Mean: 38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.: 12.0</td>
<td>S.D.: 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 0-57</td>
<td>Range: 0-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth loss</td>
<td>Unknown: 43.8%</td>
<td>Unknown: 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodontitis: 56.3%</td>
<td>Periodontitis: 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>Edentulous maxilla: 94.1%</td>
<td>Edentulous maxilla: 78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edentulous mandible: 41.4%</td>
<td>Edentulous mandible: 26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total edentulous: 52.9%</td>
<td>Total edentulous: 36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bone loss at teeth if present</td>
<td>Mean: 69.5%</td>
<td>Mean: 69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.: 27.8%</td>
<td>S.D.: 35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 33-88%</td>
<td>Range: 21-88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.
Defect changes between baseline and year three after surgery (implant level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone level change (mm)</th>
<th>Bone graft and membrane including 29 implants</th>
<th>Bone graft alone including 27 implants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.
Defect changes between year one and year three of follow-up after surgery (implant level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone level change (mm)</th>
<th>Bone graft and membrane including 29 implants</th>
<th>Bone graft alone including 27 implants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Results of treatment at the implant level observed after three years compared to one year for implants treated with bone graft and membrane, or bone graft alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Bone graft and membrane</th>
<th>Bone graft alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defect fill (number of threads)</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td>2.5:-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defect fill (mm)</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.5:-1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Characteristic findings for two cases illustrating either a non-responding or a responding outcome of surgical treatment of peri-implantitis, and with an observation period of three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Non responding case</th>
<th>Responding case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender and age</td>
<td>Male, 68 years</td>
<td>Female, 69 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical /smoking</td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus (type II), former smoker</td>
<td>No systemic diseases reported, former smoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodontal therapy</td>
<td>No case history</td>
<td>Periodontal therapy in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-implantitis</td>
<td>Previous treatment at other implants</td>
<td>Previous treatment for peri-implantitis at this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implant(location and years in function)</td>
<td>14, 10 years</td>
<td>24, 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing pocket depth</td>
<td>mes: 4 mm, buc: 4 mm, dist: 4 mm, pal: 4 mm</td>
<td>mes: 6 mm, buc: 5 mm, dist: 5 mm, pal: 6 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone sounding</td>
<td>mes: 7 mm, buc: 8 mm, dist: 8 mm, pal: 6 mm</td>
<td>mes: 10 mm, buc: 12 mm, dist: 10 mm, pal: 11 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical procedure</td>
<td>Open flap debridement with Algipore treatment without membrane technique, antibiotic coverage</td>
<td>Open flap debridement with Algipore treatment without membrane technique, antibiotic coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline thread exposure (xray)</td>
<td>mes: 6 threads and dist: 6 threads</td>
<td>mes: 4 threads and dist: 5 threads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal destruction at surgery</td>
<td>mes: 3 mm, buc: 5 mm, dist: 2 mm, pal: 5 mm</td>
<td>mes: 0 mm, buc: 5 mm, dist: 0 mm, pal: 3 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical destruction assessed at surgery (depth)</td>
<td>mes: 2 mm, buc: 0 mm, dist: 3 mm, pal: 0 mm circumferential</td>
<td>mes: 3 mm buc: 0 mm, dist: 1 mm, pal: 2 mm circumferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 mesial thread exposure (xray)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 distal thread exposure (xray)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccal mucosa baseline</td>
<td>non keratinized, no change to year 3</td>
<td>keratinized 3 mm, no change to year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucosal recession baseline</td>
<td>Buccal: 4 mm, Pal: 2 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial findings at the time of surgery</td>
<td>Enterococcus positive, Antibiotic resistance consistent with Pseudomonas infection</td>
<td>S.epidermis, F.nucleatum, S.sanguinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial findings at year 3</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral hygiene</td>
<td>Excellent, plaque scores on average &lt; 10 %</td>
<td>Excellent plaque scores on average &lt; 10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legends

Figure 1.
CONSORT flowchart

Figure 2
Examples of radiographs taken from one subject at baseline, year one, and year 3 after follow-up.

Figure 3
Example of radiographs taken from another subject at baseline, year one, and year 3 after follow-up.

Figure 4
Mean plaque index from baseline to 3 years in Group 1 (bone graft substitute + membrane) and Group 2 (bone graft substitute).

Figure 5A
Baseline radiograph illustrating the alveolar bone conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 24) at a non-responding defect. Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 5.
Figure 5B
Radiograph from year three after surgical intervention and placement of bone graft material illustrating the alveolar conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 24) at a non-responding defect, and similar extent of bone defect and implant threads exposed as at baseline. Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 5.

Figure 6 A
Intra-oral radiograph from baseline illustrating the alveolar bone conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 14). Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 4. The opaque area visible on the radiograph is part of the stent used to standardize the positioning before image exposure.

Figure 6B
Radiograph from year three after surgical intervention and placement of bone graft material illustrating the alveolar conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 14), and in principle complete fill of crater defect with bone fill material used. Notice that no threads are exposed. Clinical details are presented in table 5. The image suggests
that the lesion has been filled with radiopaque material and this should not be interpreted as bone regeneration or “osseo-integration”.

Assessed for eligibility (n=38)

38 Individuals

Bone graft only

Allocated to intervention (n=19)
Received allocated intervention (n=19)

Lost to follow-up (4)

Analyzed (n=15)

Bone graft and membrane

Allocated to intervention (n=19)
Received allocated intervention (n=19)

Lost to follow-up (n=0)
2 subjects died unrelated to therapy

Analyzed (n=17)
Examples of radiographs taken from one subject at baseline, year one, and year 3 after follow-up.
Example of radiographs taken from another subject at baseline, year one, and year 3 after follow-up.
Mean plaque index from baseline to 3 years in Group 1 (bone graft substitute + membrane) and Group 2 (bone graft substitute).
Baseline radiograph illustrating the alveolar bone conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 24) at a non-responding defect. Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 5.
Radiograph from year three after surgical intervention and placement of bone graft material illustrating the alveolar conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 24) at a non-responding defect, and similar extent of bone defect and implant threads exposed as at baseline. Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 5.
Intra-oral radiograph from baseline illustrating the alveolar bone conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 14). Notice the number of implant threads not supported by bone and the crater defect. Clinical details are presented in table 4. The opaque area visible on the radiograph is part of the stent used to standardize the positioning before image exposure.
Radiograph from year three after surgical intervention and placement of bone graft material illustrating the alveolar conditions at the implant (replacing tooth 14), and in principle complete fill of crater defect with bone fill material used. Notice that no threads are exposed. Clinical details are presented in table 5. The image suggests that the lesion has been filled with radiopaque material and this should not be interpreted as bone regeneration or "osseo-integration".