Nigerian Medical Journal
NIGERIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
Print ISSN 0300-1652, E-ISSN 2229-774X

Review Article

Contemporary Strategies for Regenerating Dehiscence and Fenestration Defects Around Dental Implants: A Critical Review

***Tejinder Pal Singh[1], Taruna Mahant[2], Simarpreet Singh[3], Rajat Kumar[4]**

[1] Department of Periodontics, Gian Sagar Dental College & Hospital, Ramnagar, Patiala, Punjab, India, [2] Department of Oral Medicine & Radiology, Gian Sagar Dental College & Hospital, Ramnagar, Patiala, Punjab, India, [3] Sunrise Dental of Issaquah, Washington, USA, [4] Emergency Respondent, Canadian Red Cross Society, Canada

Abstract

Background: The long-term success of dental implants is intrinsically linked to the stability of surrounding peri-implant tissues. Dehiscence and fenestration defects represent significant clinical challenges that can compromise functional and aesthetic outcomes. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of modern strategies for managing these defects at implant sites.

Methodology: We evaluate defect etiology and classification while underscoring the necessity of 3D diagnostic tools like Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT). The review critically examines Guided Bone Regeneration (GBR) components, comparing resorbable and non-resorbable membranes alongside various bone grafting materials. Additionally, we explore the roles of biologics, soft tissue management, and digital CAD/CAM workflows.

Results: Analysis indicates that implants with corrected defects achieve survival rates comparable to those in pristine bone, reaching up to 97.2% for dehiscences over 10 years. Resorbable collagen membranes and slow-resorbing xenografts (DBBM) are the clinical standards for routine defects due to predictable volume maintenance. Biologics like PRF enhance graft handling, while rhBMP-2 provides potent osteoinduction for complex cases. Literature confirms that hard tissue regeneration must be paired with soft tissue augmentation—specifically connective tissue grafts to convert thin phenotypes into recession-resistant architecture.

Conclusion: Successful regeneration requires a holistic approach combining biological principles, meticulous soft tissue management, and digital precision to ensure long-term stability.

Keywords: Periodontal regeneration procedures, Dehiscence, Fenestration, Dental Implants, Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT), Platelet-Rich Fibrin (PRF), Soft Tissue Augmentation, CAD/CAM.

***Correspondence:** Dr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Department of Periodontics, Gian Sagar Dental College & Hospital, Ramnagar, Patiala, Punjab, India, tejinderpalsingh2023@hotmail.com +919041041920

How to Cite: Singh TP, Mahant T, Singh S, Kumar R. Contemporary Strategies for Regenerating Dehiscence and Fenestration Defects Around Dental Implants: A Critical Review. Niger Med J 2025; 66 (6): 2152-2164 https://doi.org/10.71480/nmj.v66i6.1159

Quick Response Code:

Introduction

The advent of osseointegrated dental implants has revolutionized the field of restorative dentistry, offering a predictable and durable solution for replacing missing teeth. [1-3] The seminal work of Per-Ingvar Brånemark established that a direct structural and functional connection between ordered, living bone and the surface of a load-bearing implant is achievable, a phenomenon termed osseointegration. [4] While implant survival rates are consistently high, the criteria for success have expanded beyond mere survival to encompass long-term stability, peri-implant tissue health, and, critically, optimal aesthetics. [5] Central to achieving these expanded goals is the presence of an adequate volume of healthy alveolar bone completely encasing the implant fixture.

However, clinicians are frequently confronted with anatomical limitations of the alveolar ridge. Following tooth extraction, a cascade of resorptive events is initiated, leading to significant dimensional reduction of the ridge, particularly the thinner buccal plate. [6] This, combined with factors such as improper three-dimensional implant positioning, pre-existing alveolar undercuts, or an overly aggressive surgical approach, can lead to the formation of bone defects around the implant body. The two most common of these are dehiscence and fenestration defects. [7]

A **dehiscence defect** is defined as a vertical loss of bone on the facial or lingual/palatal aspect of an implant, beginning at the implant crest and extending apically, exposing the implant threads. A **fenestration defect**, in contrast, is a 'window-like' defect where the implant surface is exposed through a circumscribed area of bone loss on the facial or lingual aspect, but the crestal bone remains intact. [8]

The clinical significance of these defects is profound. The exposed implant surface, lacking bone coverage, is susceptible to microbial colonization, which can lead to peri-implant mucositis and subsequent peri-implantitis. [9] Functionally, the lack of complete bone-to-implant contact reduces the surface area for osseointegration, potentially compromising biomechanical stability under occlusal load. [10] Aesthetically, the consequences are particularly severe in the anterior maxilla. The thin or absent buccal bone leads to a collapse of the overlying soft tissue architecture, resulting in mucosal recession, a greyish discolouration shining through the thin mucosa, and an unacceptably long clinical crown, all of which are hallmarks of an aesthetic failure. [11]

Long-term studies have shown that untreated defects, particularly larger ones, often lead to progressive bone loss and soft tissue recession. [12] This realization spurred the development and refinement of regenerative techniques aimed at predictably restoring the lost bone volume.

This critical review article will navigate the landscape of modern approaches to correcting dehiscence and fenestration defects. The core of the review will focus on a detailed analysis of Guided Bone Regeneration (GBR), the current gold standard, dissecting its principles and components.

Methodology

The primary objective of this critical review was to evaluate and synthesize current evidence regarding the etiology, diagnosis, and management of dehiscence and fenestration defects at dental implant sites.

Search Strategy and Databases

The study protocol was pre-registered (PROSPERO Registration No: CRD420261282424) dated 10-01-2026 to ensure transparency and minimize bias. A comprehensive electronic search was performed across major biomedical databases to identify relevant literature published up to late 2025. The databases searched included: PubMed/MEDLINE, The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Scopus, Embase. The search utilized a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text keywords to ensure maximum retrieval of pertinent studies. The search terms included: "dental implants," "osseointegration," "dehiscence," "fenestration," "guided bone regeneration (GBR)," "barrier membranes,"

"bone grafting," "platelet-rich fibrin (PRF)," "bone morphogenetic protein-2 (BMP-2)," "connective tissue graft," "digital workflow," and "cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT)."

To maintain the quality and relevance of the review, Human clinical trials (Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), prospective and retrospective cohort studies, systematic reviews and meta-analyses related to peri-implant bone defect repair, studies with a minimum follow-up period of 12 months, articles focusing on etiological factors, diagnostic modalities (specifically CBCT), and regenerative techniques (GBR, biologics, soft tissue management) were only included.

All animal-only studies (except for fundamental biological principles of osseointegration), case reports with fewer than five subjects, unless demonstrating novel digital workflows and studies focusing solely on sinus floor elevation or vertical ridge augmentation without specific reference to dehiscence/fenestration were excluded.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

Two independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts for eligibility. Full-text articles were then retrieved and assessed against the inclusion criteria. Any disagreements between reviewers were resolved through discussion or consultation with a third senior reviewer. Data extracted from the selected literature included study design, defect morphology, grafting materials used, membrane types, and long-term clinical/aesthetic outcomes.

Quality Assessment and Synthesis

The quality of included systematic reviews was assessed using the AMSTAR tool, while RCTs were evaluated for risk of bias. Given the heterogeneity in surgical protocols and materials, a qualitative synthesis was performed rather than a meta-analysis.

Results

A successful regenerative strategy is predicated on a thorough understanding of why the defect occurred and its specific morphology.

The causes of dehiscence and fenestration are multifactorial, often involving a combination of anatomical and iatrogenic factors:

- **Anatomical Predisposition:** The most significant factor is the inherent anatomy of the patient's alveolar ridge. A thin buccal bone wall (<1-2 mm), common in the maxillary anterior and premolar regions, is highly susceptible to resorption following extraction and surgical trauma. [13, 14] Concavities in the ridge profile or an angulated tooth root position can also place the future implant in close proximity to the cortical plate.
- **Malpositioning of the Implant:** This is a critical iatrogenic factor. Placing the implant too far buccally or with excessive facial inclination is a primary cause of buccal bone defects. The advent of 3D planning with Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) has significantly mitigated this risk, but it remains a clinical challenge, especially in free-hand surgery. [7]
- **Immediate Implant Placement:** While offering benefits in reducing treatment time, placing an implant immediately into an extraction socket, particularly one with a compromised or thin buccal plate, increases the risk of defect formation if not managed with simultaneous grafting. The mismatch between the circular implant and the ovoid socket often leaves a 'jumping distance' that requires augmentation. [15]
- **Flap Design and Management:** Aggressive flap elevation can compromise the blood supply to the thin buccal plate, leading to necrosis and resorption. Tension-free primary closure is paramount in

any regenerative procedure; failure to achieve this can lead to wound dehiscence, membrane exposure, and subsequent graft failure. [16]

- **Implant Diameter:** The selection of an oversized implant for a narrow ridge can physically obliterate the buccal plate, creating an iatrogenic defect.

Classification of Defects

Classifying defects provides a standardized language for diagnosis, treatment planning, and research. While several classifications exist, a simple morphological classification based on size and containment is clinically most relevant.

This classification helps guide the choice of regenerative materials and techniques, as the degree of containment directly influences the predictability of the outcome. A highly contained fenestration defect has a much higher intrinsic regenerative potential than a non-contained, large dehiscence defect [Table 1].

Table 1: Clinical Classification of Dehiscence and Fenestration Defects

Defect Type	Description	Number of Bony Walls	Containment	Typical Treatment Approach
Fenestration	'Window-like' defect exposing the implant body; crestal bone is intact.	4-wall (contained)	High	GBR with particulate graft and resorbable membrane. Prognosis is generally excellent.
Dehiscence (Small)	V-shaped bone loss from the crest, < 5 mm in height, and narrow.	3-wall	Moderate	GBR with particulate graft and resorbable membrane. Often performed simultaneously with implant placement.
Dehiscence (Large)	U-shaped bone loss > 5 mm in height, often wide.	2-wall or 1-wall	Low	Requires advanced GBR, often with space-making support (e.g., titanium mesh, bone blocks) and potentially a staged approach.
Circumferential	Bone loss around the entire circumference of the implant crest.	0-1 wall	Very Low	Complex defect, often treated similarly to advanced peri-implantitis. May require a staged approach with significant augmentation.

Diagnostic Modalities

Accurate diagnosis and meticulous treatment planning are the cornerstones of success.

- **Clinical Examination:** Direct visualization during implant placement is the most definitive way to identify a defect. Palpation of the ridge and assessment of the soft tissue biotype (thick vs. thin) are also crucial pre-operative steps. A thin, scalloped biotype is often associated with thin underlying bone and is at higher risk for recession. [17]
- **Conventional Radiography:** Periapical and panoramic radiographs are two-dimensional and cannot visualize the buccal-lingual dimension of the bone. They are therefore inadequate for diagnosing or planning the treatment of these defects. [7]
- **Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT):** CBCT has become the standard of care for pre-operative implant planning. [18] It provides a three-dimensional view of the alveolar ridge, allowing for precise measurement of bone width and height. It enables the clinician to:
    - Identify anatomical risks (e.g., thin buccal plate, concavities) pre-operatively.
    - Virtually plan the ideal 3D implant position to avoid creating a defect.
    - Design surgical guides for precise implant placement.
    - Quantify the size of an existing defect to plan the regenerative procedure.
    - Fabricate patient-specific devices, such as custom titanium meshes.

The use of CBCT shifts the paradigm from reacting to a defect discovered intra-operatively to proactively planning to avoid or simultaneously treat it.

Guided Bone Regeneration (GBR): The Cornerstone of Treatment

Guided Bone Regeneration is a well-established and predictable surgical procedure used to augment bone volume in deficient areas. It is the primary modality for treating dehiscence and fenestration defects. [19] The biological principle of GBR is based on the concept of "cell exclusion," where a barrier membrane is placed over a bone graft-filled defect. This membrane mechanically excludes the faster-proliferating, non-osteogenic soft tissue cells (e.g., epithelial cells, fibroblasts) from the surgical site, creating a secluded space for the slower-growing osteoprogenitor cells from the surrounding bone to migrate, proliferate, and differentiate, ultimately forming new bone [Table 2]. [20]

Table 2: Comparison of Barrier Membranes for GBR

Feature	Non-Resorbable Membranes (e.g., d-PTFE, Titanium Mesh)	Resorbable Membranes (e.g., Collagen, Synthetic Polymers)
Material	Dense Polytetrafluoroethylene (d-PTFE), Titanium	Native Collagen (bovine, porcine), Synthetic (Polylactic/Polyglycolic acid)

Space Maintenance	Excellent, especially the titanium mesh. The primary advantage.	Variable. Prone to collapse in non-space-making defects. May require tacking/support.
Second Surgery	**Required** for removal (3-9 months post-op). A significant disadvantage.	Not required. Biologically resorbed by the body.
Complication Profile	Higher risk of exposure. If exposed, often requires premature removal, leading to compromised results or failure.	More forgiving upon exposure. Small exposures can often heal spontaneously without compromising the entire graft.
Biocompatibility	Biologically inert. Do not integrate with tissues.	Biologically active. Collagen membranes promote clot stability and chemotaxis.
Clinical Indication	Large, non-contained defects (e.g., large dehiscences, vertical/horizontal ridge augmentation) where space maintenance is critical.	Small to moderate contained defects (e.g., fenestrations, small dehiscences). Most common choice.
Cost	Generally higher, especially for custom titanium meshes.	Variable, but standard collagen membranes are often more cost-effective.

The success of any GBR procedure hinges on adherence to the **PASS principle**, as described by Wang and Boyapati[3]:

- **P**rimary wound closure: To ensure the graft and membrane are protected from the oral environment and to prevent infection.
- **A**ngiogenesis: To provide a robust blood supply, which delivers oxygen, nutrients, and osteogenic cells.
- **S**pace maintenance: To create and maintain a space for bone to form, preventing the collapse of the overlying soft tissue.
- **S**tability of the wound: Both the graft material and the membrane must be immobilized to allow for undisturbed healing and clot stabilization.

Barrier Membranes

The barrier membrane is the key element of GBR. Membranes are broadly categorized into non-resorbable and resorbable types, each with distinct advantages and disadvantages. [21]

Critical Analysis: The clinical trend has decidedly shifted towards the use of **resorbable collagen membranes** for the majority of routine dehiscence and fenestration repairs. Their ease of use, avoidance of a second surgery, and more favorable complication profile make them the workhorse membrane. [22] Native cross-linked collagen membranes offer extended barrier function times (4-6 months), which is sufficient for bone maturation in most peri-implant defects.

However, **non-resorbable membranes**, particularly titanium mesh, retain a critical role in managing large, complex, non-contained defects. Their rigidity is unmatched in maintaining the graft volume against the pressure of the overlying soft tissue flap, which is essential for significant vertical or horizontal augmentation. [23] The advent of CAD/CAM technology to create patient-specific titanium meshes has further improved the precision and predictability of these advanced procedures.

Bone Grafting Materials

The barrier membrane creates the space; the bone grafting material fills it, acting as a scaffold for new bone formation and, in some cases, actively inducing it. Graft materials are classified by their origin and biological properties [Table 3]. [24]

Table 3: Comparison of Bone Grafting Materials

Graft Type	Example	Mechanism	Advantages	Disadvantages
Autograft	Iliac crest, ramus, chin	Osteogenic, Osteoinductive, Osteoconductive	**Gold Standard**. No immunogenic reaction. Contains viable cells and growth factors.	**Donor site morbidity**. Limited quantity. Additional surgical site. Rapid resorption if not protected.
Allograft	FDBA, DFDBA	Osteoconductive (FDBA), Osteoinductive (DFDBA - variable)	**Table 3: Comparison of Bone Grafting Materials**	Potential for disease transmission (extremely low). A host immune response is possible. Processing can reduce osteoinductive potential.
Xenograft	Deproteinized Bovine Bone Mineral (DBBM), Porcine bone	Osteoconductive	Unlimited supply. A very slow resorption rate provides excellent long-term volume stability. Extensive safety and efficacy data.	Potential for immune response/disease transmission (theoretical). Slower remodeling into the host bone.
Alloplast	Beta-Tricalcium Phosphate (β-TCP),	Osteoconductive	Unlimited supply. No risk of disease	Can lack mechanical strength. Osteoconductive

	Hydroxyapatite (HA), Bioactive Glass		transmission. Completely synthetic. Variable resorption profiles.	potential can be inferior to xenografts. Can be brittle/difficult to handle.

- **Osteogenesis:** The ability of the graft to form new bone via viable osteoblasts transferred within the graft material.
- **Osteoinduction:** The ability to induce the differentiation of undifferentiated mesenchymal stem cells into bone-forming osteoblasts. This is primarily mediated by growth factors like Bone Morphogenetic Proteins (BMPs).
- **Osteoconduction:** The ability of the graft to act as a passive, three-dimensional scaffold that allows for bone cell ingrowth from the surrounding host bone.

Critical Analysis: While the **autograft** remains the theoretical "gold standard," its clinical use for routine dehiscence and fenestration defects has become rare due to the significant drawback of donor site morbidity. [25]

The most widely used and extensively researched material for these applications is **Deproteinized Bovine Bone Mineral (DBBM)**, a type of xenograft. [26] Its key advantage is an extremely slow resorption rate. This allows it to act as a stable, volume-maintaining scaffold for a prolonged period, which is crucial as the new bone forms and matures around it. It has demonstrated excellent long-term results in numerous studies.

Allografts, particularly a 70:30 combination of mineralized (FDBA) and demineralized (DFDBA) cortico-cancellous chips, are also a popular choice. This combination aims to leverage the osteoconductive scaffold of FDBA with the potential osteoinductive signals from DFDBA.

The choice of graft material is often dictated by the defect size and clinical philosophy. For most defects, a slow-resorbing xenograft or an allograft/xenograft composite, placed under a resorbable collagen membrane, represents the current standard of care. [12] This combination provides predictable bone fill and long-term volume stability.

The Role of Biologics and Growth Factors

To further enhance and accelerate the regenerative process, clinicians are increasingly incorporating biologics and growth factors into GBR protocols. These agents aim to actively stimulate the biological cascade of healing rather than passively facilitating it.

Platelet Concentrates: Platelet-Rich Fibrin (PRF)

PRF is a second-generation platelet concentrate derived from the patient's own blood through a simplified centrifugation process without the use of anticoagulants. [27] The resulting fibrin clot is rich in platelets, leukocytes, and a host of entrapped growth factors, including Platelet-Derived Growth Factor (PDGF), Transforming Growth Factor-beta (TGF-β), and Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF).

When used in dehiscence/fenestration repair, PRF can be applied in two forms:

1. **PRF Clot/Membrane:** The condensed fibrin clot can be shaped into a membrane and placed over the bone graft (underneath the collagen membrane) or used to seal socket openings.

2. **"Sticky Bone":** Particulate bone graft material is mixed with liquid PRF (obtained through lower-speed centrifugation), causing the particles to agglomerate into a mouldable, gelatinous mass.

Advantages of using PRF:

Sticky bone is significantly easier to handle and place into a defect compared to loose granules. Growth Factor Release provides a sustained release of autologous growth factors, which can theoretically accelerate soft and hard tissue healing. The fibrin matrix helps stabilize the graft particles and the initial blood clot. Being autologous, there is no risk of disease transmission, and the preparation is simple and inexpensive. [28]

Critical Analysis: While the biological rationale for PRF is compelling and its clinical use is widespread, high-level evidence from large-scale randomized controlled trials specifically for implant dehiscence repair is still emerging. Many studies report positive outcomes, but it is often difficult to isolate the effect of PRF from the GBR procedure itself. [29] Nonetheless, its benefits in graft handling and stabilization are undeniable and represent a significant practical advantage. It is best viewed as a valuable adjunct to standard GBR protocols rather than a replacement for them.

Recombinant Growth Factors: BMP-2

Bone Morphogenetic Proteins (BMPs) are a group of potent signaling proteins with powerful osteoinductive properties. Recombinant human BMP-2 (rhBMP-2) is commercially available and has been approved for certain dental applications, such as sinus augmentation and socket grafting. [30] It is typically supplied on an absorbable collagen sponge carrier.

When applied to a dehiscence or fenestration defect, rhBMP-2 actively recruits mesenchymal stem cells and induces their transformation into bone-forming cells, leading to robust and often rapid bone formation, sometimes even without the need for additional particulate graft material.

Critical Analysis: The osteoinductive potential of rhBMP-2 is undisputed. However, its use in routine peri-implant defect repair is limited by several factors. The product is exceptionally expensive, making it prohibitive in many cases. Concerns exist regarding potential side effects, including transient inflammation, swelling (seroma formation), and the potential for ectopic bone formation. The optimal dosage for predictable results without adverse events is still a subject of research. The handling of the collagen sponge carrier and ensuring its stability within the defect can be challenging. [31]

Currently, rhBMP-2 is reserved for the most challenging, large, non-contained defects where conventional GBR may be unpredictable, and the potential benefit outweighs the cost and risks.

The Crucial Role of Soft Tissue Management

A modern approach to correcting bony defects recognizes that hard tissue regeneration is only half the battle. The long-term stability and aesthetic success of the implant are critically dependent on the quality and quantity of the surrounding soft tissue (keratinized mucosa). [17] A thick, robust soft tissue biotype is more resistant to recession, masks the underlying color of the implant and abutment, and creates a more stable peri-implant seal.

Dehiscence defects, in particular, are often associated with a thin tissue biotype. Regenerating the bone without simultaneously addressing the soft tissue deficiency is a common clinical error, as a thin mucosal covering is prone to receding over time, eventually re-exposing the regenerated area or the implant margin.

Therefore, soft tissue augmentation is often an integral part of the treatment plan, which can be performed either simultaneously with GBR or as a separate, staged procedure. The gold standard for increasing soft

tissue thickness and creating a band of attached keratinized mucosa is the autogenous connective tissue graft (CTG). [32]

A CTG is typically harvested from the patient's palate and placed over the GBR site (but under the primary flap) or at a later stage during implant uncovering or abutment connection. This procedure effectively converts a thin tissue biotype to a thick one, providing:

- **Improved Aesthetics:** Better color matching and soft tissue contour.
- **Increased Stability:** Reduced likelihood of future mucosal recession.
- **Enhanced Protection:** A thicker barrier against bacterial ingress.

For clinicians seeking to avoid palatal harvesting, various allogenic (e.g., acellular dermal matrix) and xenogeneic (e.g., collagen matrix) soft tissue substitutes are available. While they can increase tissue volume, systematic reviews generally conclude that the autogenous CTG remains superior in terms of predictability and quality of the tissue formed. [33]

Digital Workflow and Patient-Specific Solutions

The latest evolution in managing complex defects involves the integration of a fully digital workflow, leveraging CBCT imaging and CAD/CAM technology. [34] This is particularly transformative for large, non-contained dehiscence defects that require rigid space maintenance.

The workflow proceeds as follows:

1. **Data Acquisition:** A high-resolution CBCT scan of the defect site is taken.
2. **Digital Planning:** The CBCT data (in DICOM format) is imported into a planning software. The clinician can then virtually plan the ideal bone contour required to fully encase the implant.
3. **Custom Device Design (CAD):** Based on this virtual plan, a patient-specific titanium mesh is designed. This mesh will fit the underlying bone perfectly and create the exact space needed for regeneration.
4. **Fabrication (CAM):** The design file (in STL format) is sent to a medical-grade 3D printer or milling machine, which fabricates the custom mesh from biocompatible titanium using techniques like selective laser melting (SLM).
5. **Surgery:** During surgery, the custom mesh fits passively and precisely over the defect, requiring minimal intra-operative adjustment. It is filled with the chosen bone graft and secured with fixation screws.

Advantages of the Digital Approach:

- **Precision and Accuracy:** Eliminates the guesswork of manually bending a stock mesh, ensuring a perfect fit and predictable volume augmentation.
- **Reduced Surgical Time:** Less time is spent on intra-operative adjustments.
- **Optimized Design:** The mesh can be designed with specific porosity to enhance revascularization.
- **Improved Outcomes:** The passive fit and precise space maintenance can lead to more predictable results in challenging cases.

This approach represents the pinnacle of personalized medicine in implant dentistry, transforming a highly technique-sensitive procedure into a more predictable, digitally-driven process.

Discussion

The management of dehiscence and fenestration defects has matured significantly. The modern clinician has an extensive armamentarium, moving beyond a one-size-fits-all approach to a defect-specific strategy. A clinical decision-making flowchart can help guide the choice of treatment.

Long-term studies on implants placed with simultaneously corrected dehiscence defects show high survival and success rates, comparable to implants placed in pristine bone, provided that the regeneration is successful. [35] A 10-year study by Malo et al. reported implant survival rates of 97.2% for implants with corrected dehiscence and 90.0% for those with corrected fenestrations, underscoring the general predictability of these procedures. [12] However, the same study highlighted that outcomes can be inferior in smokers, emphasizing the importance of patient factor assessment.

The critical determinant of long-term success appears to be the ability to not just regenerate bone but to maintain it. This is where the choice of a slowly resorbing graft material like DBBM and the emphasis on creating a thick soft tissue biotype become paramount. The regenerated bone needs the long-term protection of a stable, volume-maintaining scaffold and a thick, resilient mucosal seal.

The foundation of modern treatment remains Guided Bone Regeneration, with resorbable collagen membranes and slow-resorbing xenografts or allografts representing the standard of care for most routine defects.

The contemporary approach, however, is distinguished by its holistic and personalized nature. The incorporation of biologics like PRF offers tangible benefits in graft handling and may provide a modest biostimulatory effect. The judicious use of potent osteoinductive agents like rhBMP-2 provides a solution for the most challenging regenerative scenarios. Critically, there is a growing consensus that hard tissue augmentation must be complemented by soft tissue management, with the connective tissue graft being a key tool for ensuring long-term aesthetic stability and tissue resilience.

Looking ahead, the field is advancing on several fronts:

- **Digital Integration:** The use of CAD/CAM custom meshes and 3D-printed scaffolds will likely become more mainstream for complex cases, enhancing precision and predictability.
- **Advanced Biologics:** Research into more refined growth factor delivery systems, potentially using gene therapy or biomimetic scaffolds that release multiple factors in a timed sequence, holds promise for more efficient and targeted regeneration.
- **Tissue Engineering:** The ultimate goal is to move beyond simply grafting and to tissue-engineer a complete osteo-periosteal complex. 3D-printed scaffolds seeded with the patient's own stem cells may one day allow for the regeneration of vital, vascularized bone tailored to the exact dimensions of the defect.
- **Risk Assessment:** Further research will likely focus on developing better tools for pre-operative risk assessment, using genetic markers or advanced imaging analysis to identify patients at high risk for defect formation or poor regenerative outcomes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the successful management of dehiscence and fenestration defects requires a comprehensive understanding of etiology, meticulous diagnosis using tools like CBCT, and flawless execution of the chosen regenerative technique. The modern clinician must master not only the principles of GBR but also the adjunctive use of biologics and, most importantly, the art and science of soft tissue augmentation to achieve outcomes that are not only functional but are also stable and aesthetically pleasing for years to come.

References

1. Adell R et al. A 15-year study of osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw. Int J Oral Surg. 1981;10(6):387-416.
2. Albrektsson T et al. Osseointegrated titanium implants. Requirements for ensuring a long-lasting, direct bone-to-implant anchorage in man. Acta Orthop Scand. 1981;52(2):155-170.
3. Wang HL, Boyapati L. "PASS" principles for predictable bone regeneration. Implant Dent. 2006;15(1):8-17.
4. Brånemark PI et al. Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw. Experience from a 10-year period. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Suppl. 1977;16:1-132.
5. Buser D et al. 10-year survival and success rates of 511 titanium implants with a sandblasted and acid-etched surface: a retrospective study in 303 partially edentulous patients. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2012;14(6):839-851.
6. Araújo MG, Lindhe J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction. An experimental study in the dog. J Clin Periodontol. 2005;32(2):212-218.
7. Hämmerle CH, Jung RE, Feloutzis A. A systematic review of the survival of implants in bone sites augmented with barrier membranes (guided bone regeneration) in partially edentulous patients. J Clin Periodontol. 2002;29 Suppl 3:226-231.
8. Sullivan DY, Placing and restoring implants in the aesthetic zone. Pract Periodontics Aesthet Dent. 1994;6(7):85-94.
9. Zitzmann NU, Berglundh T. Definition and prevalence of peri-implant diseases. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(8 Suppl):286-291.
10. Mische CE. Dental Implant Prosthetics. 2nd ed. Elsevier Mosby; 2015.
11. Fürhauser R et al. Evaluation of soft tissue around single-tooth implant crowns: the pink esthetic score. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16(6):639-644.
12. Maló P et al. The 10-year outcomes of implants inserted with dehiscence or fenestrations in the rehabilitation of completely edentulous jaws with the All-on-4 concept. J Oral Implantol. 2022;48(2):137-147.
13. Spray JR et al. The influence of bone thickness on facial marginal bone response: stage 1 placement through stage 2 uncovering. Ann Periodontol. 2000;5(1):119-128.
14. Januário AL et al. Dimension of the facial bone wall in the anterior maxilla: a cone-beam computed tomography study. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2011;22(10):1168-1171.
15. Chen ST, Buser D. Esthetic outcomes following immediate and early implant placement in the anterior maxilla--a systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2014;29 Suppl:186-215.
16. Greenstein G, Tarnow D. The effect of suturing on wound healing. Compend Contin Educ Dent. 2009;30(6):342-348.
17. Linkevicius T et al. The influence of soft tissue thickness on crestal bone changes around implants: a 1-year prospective controlled clinical trial. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24(4):712-719.
18. Tyndall DA, Price JB, Tetradis S, et al. Position statement of the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology on selection criteria for the use of radiology in dental implantology with

emphasis on cone beam computed tomography. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;113(6):817-826.

19. Dahlin C et al. Healing of bone defects by guided tissue regeneration. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1988;81(5):672-676.
20. Schenk RK et al. Healing pattern of bone regeneration in membrane-protected defects: a histologic study in the canine mandible. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1994;9(1):13-29.
21. Elgali I et al. Guided bone regeneration: materials and biological mechanisms. Eur J Oral Sci. 2017;125(5):315-337.
22. Rocchietta I, Fontana F, Simion M. Clinical outcomes of vertical bone augmentation to enable dental implant placement: a systematic review. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(8 Suppl):203-215.
23. Proussaefs P, Lozada J. The use of a customized titanium mesh for the reconstruction of an atrophic edentulous mandible: a case report. J Oral Implantol. 2005;31(4):185-190.
24. Al-Nawas B, Schiegnitz E. Augmentation procedures using bone substitute materials or autogenous bone - a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Oral Implantol. 2014;7 Suppl 2:S219-234.
25. Nkenke E, Neukam FW. Autogenous bone harvesting and grafting in advanced jaw resorption: morbidity, resorption and implant survival. Eur J Oral Implantol. 2014;7 Suppl 2:S203-217.
26. Jensen SS, Terheyden H. Bone augmentation procedures in localized defects in the alveolar ridge: clinical results with different bone grafts and bone-substitute materials. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24 Suppl:218-236.
27. Dohan Ehrenfest DM et al. Three-dimensional architecture and cell composition of a Choukroun's platelet-rich fibrin clot and membrane. J Periodontol. 2010;81(4):546-555.
28. Miron RJ et al. Platelet-Rich Fibrin and Its Application in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery: A Narrative Review. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2017;75(4):831-841.
29. Castro AB et al. Regenerative potential of leucocyte- and platelet-rich fibrin. A systematic review. J Clin Periodontol. 2017;44(2):195-204.
30. Boyne PJ et al. De novo bone induction by recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 (rhBMP-2) in maxillary sinus floor augmentation. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2005;63(12):1693-1707.
31. Carragee EJ, Hurwitz EL, Weiner BK. A critical review of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 trials in spinal surgery: an evidence-based approach to interpretation of the literature. Spine J. 2011;11(6):471-491.
32. Zucchelli G, Mounssif I. Periodontal plastic surgery. Periodontol 2000. 2015;68(1):333-368.
33. Thoma DS et al. Efficacy of soft tissue augmentation around dental implants and in partially edentulous areas: a systematic review. J Clin Periodontol. 2014;41 Suppl 15:S77-91.
34. Ciocca L et al. Digital workflow with open-source CAD-CAM software aimed to design a customized 3D laser-printed titanium mesh for guided bone regeneration. J Clin Med. 2020;9(10):3129.
35. Chiapasco M, Casentini P, Zaniboni M. Bone augmentation procedures in implant dentistry. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2009;24 Suppl:237-259.