

# Dr Ansgar C Cheng

BDS, MS, FRCDC, FRACDS, FAM(S), FCDSS, MRACDS, Cert. Pros., Cert. MaxFac. Pros. Adj Associate Professor, National University of Singapore Chair, Prosthodontics, College of Dental Surgeons, Singapore



- Radiation effects & impact on osseointegration
- Modes of radiation & chemoradiation
- Clinical studies & patient selection
- Animal studies
- Human data
- Osteoradionecrosis
- HBO
- Timing of implant placement
- Irradiation of existing implants



## **Radiation effects**

- Reduced vasculature
- Loss of osteoprogenitor cells
- Fatty & fibrous degeneration
- Periosteum- accellular
- Loss of vasculature







## Why are these changes important?

- Implant anchorage (mechanical vs biologic)
- Response to infection (compromised)
- Remodeling apparatus (not fully functional)
- Response to occlusal forces (compromised)
- Osteolytic



### CHANGING METHODS OF RADIATION DELIVERY



### **Conventional radiation therapy (CRT)**

- 200 cGy per fraction
- Total doses
  - 7000 cGy definitive dose
  - 5000-6000 cGy post op



### Intensity modulated radiation therapy (IMRT)



multiple radiation beams (non-uniform intensities)

highly conformal doses to targets

limiting dose normal tissue structures.

### **RADIATION DELIVERY FACTORS**



### **Conventional radiation therapy**



#### **IMRT**





3 fields

5 fields

7 fields







## Chemoradiation

Combine with CRT or IMRT

• Concommitant chemoradiation is theoretically equivalent to an additional 1000 cGy (Kashibhatla, 2006).

## Consequences (particlularly with CRT): More short & long term side effects (mucositis, trismus, osteoradionecrosis

### **IMRT DOSIMETRY DIAGRAMS**





# Note the hot spot on anterior mandible (oval)

#### **IRRADIATION OF EXISTING IMPLANTS- BACKSCATTER**





Implants were placed simultaneous with tumor resection & reconstruction of this large mandibular defect with a fibula free flap. (6000 cGy post-op)



# Cumulative radiation effect (Fowler & Stern, 1963; Ellis, 1968)

These indices represent an attempt to account for variables of radiation delivery to indicate more accurately the true biologic response.





### **Issues to consider**

- Potential benefit to the patient
  - What are the objectives & wishes of the patient
  - Risk reward ratio
- Risk of osteoradionecrosis
  - Morbidity
- Short term success rates
- Long term success rates





# **Biologic viability (animal studies)**

- Hum and Larsen, (1990
- Weinlander et al, (2006)
- Nishimura et al, (1994)
- Asikainen et al, (1998)
- Ohrnell et al, (1997)
- Jacobsson et al, (1988)



# **Biologic viability (animal studies)** Asikainen, 1998

- Dogs received either 4000, 5000, or 6000 cGy
- 2/12 later TPS screw type implants were inserted
- 4/12 later the implants were loaded
- Success rates:
  - 4000 cGy group 100%
  - 5000 cGy group 20%
  - 6000 cGy group 0 %



## Weinlander et al, (2006)



- Dogs (partially edentulated mandible)
- Following a healing period 3 implants were placed
- All 7 dogs: radiation tx at 3/52 post implantation,
- Dose equivalent to 5000 cGy delivered in 4 fractions during 2/52

#### METHODS – HISTOMORPHOMETRIC CALCULATIONS



## • SEM of bone, soft tissue & implant



Histometry calculation yielded volume & boundary fractions for the implant, bone & soft tissue components

Weinlander et al, 2006

# RESULTS



Nishimura et al, 1995





5200 cGy





3/12 after implant placement the tissue samples were harvested & were evaluated with light & fluorescent microscopy (Fluorochrome labeling).

A steady decrease in biologic activity at the higher doses.

# RESULTS



#### Normal bone



### Irradiated bone Nishimura et al, 1995



lower doses irradiated specimens: (more woven bone) than normal specimens

### **ADDITIONAL ANIMAL STUDIES**



- Jacobsson et al (1988) Reduction in bone formation capacity, increase in bone resorption & reduction in the number of capillaries
- Ohrnell et al (1997) Bone marrow fibrosis, bone resorption, less bone adjacent to the implants, reduction in bone remodeling capacity
- Hum & Larsen (1990) Appositional bone index irradiated specimens < nonirradiated specimens</li>



- At higher doses virtually no bone is deposited on the surface. (Anchorage is mechanical)
- At lower doses a greater component of woven bone is seen in the interface
- Death of osteocytes, loss of osteoprogenitor cells & osteoclasts compromises the remodeling of bone at the bone implant interface (alter response to load)



- Poor blood supply in the marrow predisposes to infection, implant loss
- Mandible: doses above 6500 cGy may lead to osteoradionecrosis.
- At lower doses, radiation induced tissue effects significantly reduced the bone appositional index (compromise load bearing)



# Disclaimer

•No animal model truly reflects human biology. Lower form vertebrates (more tissue & vascular tolerant of radiation damage than humans)

 Using the mathematical biologic equivalent of human doses in a single administration or using fewer fractions with large doses, serves a mathematical purpose only (does not guarantee biologically equivalent outcomes)

•Animal studies have yet to be reported assessing the impact of chemoradiation on osseointegration.



# Based on these data, reasonable to assume that:

1. Load carrying capabilities of osseointegrated implants in irradiated bone < nonirradiated bone.

2. Success rates of osseointegrated implants in irradiated bone < nonirradiated bone.

Higher dose = lower success rates.

3. Mandible at higher doses (>6500 cGy with conventional fractionation) osteoradionecrosis risks become significant.

4. Because of compromise of the remodeling apparatus of bone, late failures should be expected

### **HUMAN STUDIES**



- Yerit et al, 2006
- Roumanas et al, 1997 (Maxilla)
- Roumanas et al, 2002 (Craniofacial sites)
- Nimi et al, 1998 (Maxilla)
- Esser et al, 1997 (Mandible, maxilla)
- Granstrom et al, 1994 (Craniofacial sites)
- Granstrom, 2005 (All sites)



# Yerit et al, 2006 (Data 1990-2003)\*

- Patients 71
- Dose 5000 cGY (Fields?)
- Number of implants 316
- Implant survival
  - Nonirradiated 95%
  - Irradiated sites 72%

\*HBO was not used



# Yerit et al, 2006 (Data 1990-2003)\*

Success rates – Irradiated (154 implants)

- 93% at 1 year
- 90% at 2 years
- 84% at 5 years
- 72% at 8 years followup. The survival rates for the 84 implants placed

Success rates - nonirradiated residual mandiblular (84 implants)

- 99% at one year
- 99% at 2 years
- 99% at 5 years
- 95% at 8 years followup



### Esser and Wagner, 1997

Post op dose (CRT) – up to 6000 cGy Opposed mandibular fields – **Symphysis?** Pts - 58 (from 1985-1995) Implants placed – 221 Implants lost – 32 Before loading - 18 After loading -17 Success rate 84.2%

### Granstrom, 2005

63% survival rate for 15 implants placed in the mandible

\*HBO was not used



Predictability-Maxilla — Roumanas et al, 1997\* — Nimi et al, 1998\*

0

55

63





### Osteoradionecrosis



Patient received 6600 cGy (SCC) of the lateral tongue. Implants were placed 3 years post Tx.



36 months after implant placement the patient developed an infection with the left implant.



Eventually, the patient developed an osteoradionecrosis, a pathologic fracture of the mandible & subsequently the mandible was resected.



**Predictability – Mandible** Role of hyperbaric oxygen

- Data unclear
- Appears to help (Granstrom et al 1993, 2005)

 Success rates appear to be higher & the risk of osteoradionecrosis risk may be reduced (depends on dose to the implant sites)

- 63% survival rate for 15 implants placed in the
- 100% survival rate for 30 implants placed in the

mandible mandible with pre-op HBO





### Granstrom 2005 -- All sites – 25 years

	Implants placed	Implants lost	ORN
Without HBO	291	117	5
With HBO	340	29	0

Does HBO following high doses of RT lead to biologic anchorage Vs mechanical anchorage?

### **IMPACT OF HBO**



- Periosteal blood supply vs revascularizing the marrow & repopulating it with stem cells
- Success rates improved over the short term particularly in ideal sites (anterior mandible)



Impact of time – After cancerocial doses of radiation do the tissues recover ?

- At cancericidal doses the irradiated tissues do not recover. With time the irradiated tissues continue to deteriorate & become less vascular, more fibrotic etc.
- The longer the time from radiotherapy the poorer the results (Granstrom, 2005)



## Recomendations

## Patient selection

- Edentulous patients
- Risk reward
- Tumor status 80% of recurrences occur (1<sup>st</sup> year)
- Check the dosimetry
- Longer implants
- More implants than the usual
- Favorable engineering
- (Splinting, Rigid frameworks, Limit cantilever)
- HBO



- Dosage < 5500 cGy
  - Implants can be inserted with little or no risk of osteoradionecrosis
  - Success rates will be probably be lower than normal
- Dosage ~ 5500-6500 cGy
  - Decision makers (patient factors) e.g. : fractionation, tissue responses, clinical findings, dental history etc..
    Success rates not well documented
- Dossge > 6500 cGy
  - The risk of osteoradionecrosis becomes significant & implants should not placed unless HBO is given.
    - In such patients the success rates have been in the 70-80% range (possible osteoradionecrosis)



Clinically significant ("newer implants") in the irradiated patient?

Probably not.

\*The major problem in the irradiated patient is loss of vasculature & with it the loss of osteoprogenitor cells (stem cells) in the marrow.

### REFERENCES



- Granstrom G, Bergstom K, Tjellstrom A, Branemark P-I. A detailed analysis of titanium implants lost in irradiated tissues. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1994. 9: 653 – 662
- Marx R, Ehler W, Tayapongsak P. Relationship of oxygen dose to angiogenesis induction in irradiated tissue. Am J Surg. 1994. 160: 519-524
- Store G, Granstrom G. Osteoradionecrosis of the mandible. A microradiographic study of cortical bone. Scand J PlastReconstr Hand Surg. 1999. 33: 307 314
- Larsen PE. Placement of dental implants in the irradiated mandible. A protocol involving hyperbaric oxygen. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1997. 55: 967 971
- Kashibhatla. Hw much radiation is chemotherapy worth in advanced head and neck cancer? Int J RadiatOncolBiol Phys 2007. 68:1491–1495
- Wang RR, Pillai K, Jones PK. In vitro backscattering from implant material during radiotherapy. 1996. J Prosthet Dent. 75: 626 632
- Granstrom G, Tjellstrom A, Albrektsson T. Post-implantation irradiation for head and neck cancer treatment. 1993. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 8: 495 501



- Roumanas ED, Nishimura RD, Davis KB. Clinical evaluation of implants retaining edentulous maxillary obturator prostheses. J Prosthet Dent. 1997. 77: 184 -90
- Roumanas E, Chang TL, Beumer J. Use of osseointegrated implants in the restoration of head and neck defects. Journal of the California Dental Association. September 2006
- Nimi A, Ueda M, Kaneda T, Maxillary obturator supported by osseointegrated implants placed in irradiated tissues: a preliminary report. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1998. 13: 407-11
- Beumer J, Curtis TA, Nishimura RD.Radiation therapy of head and neck tumors In Beumer J, Curtis TA, Marunick MT, (Eds.), Maxillofacial Rehabilitation: Prosthodontic and Surgical Considerations. Tokyo, IshiyakuEuroAmerica, p. 43-111
- Jacobsson M, Nannmark U, Sennerby L. Acute microvascular reactions to ionizing radiation in bone-anchored titanium implants: a vital microscopic study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1987. 2: 193-196
- Jacobsson M, Tjellstrom A, Albrekktson T, Thomsen P. Integration of titanium implants in irradiated bone. Histologic and clinical study. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol. 1988. 97: 337-340
- Hum S, Larsen P. The effect of radiation at the titanium/bone interface: Tissue integration in oral, orthopedic and maxillofacial reconstruction. Laney W, Tolman, eds. Chicago, 1990. Quintessence Publishing Co. p. 234



- Weinlander, M. Beumer, J., Kenney, B. Lekovic, V., Holmes, R., Moy, P., Plenk, H.: Histomorphometric and fluorescence microscopic evaluation of interfacial bone healing around 3 different dental implants before and after radiation therapy. Int. J. Oral and Maxillofac Implants. 2006. 21:212-224.
- Asikainen P, Klemetti E. Osseointegration of dental implants in bone irradiated with 40, 50 or 60 Gy doses. An experimental study with beagle dogs. Clin Oral Implants Res. 1998. 1: 75-9
- Granstrom G, Tjellstrom A, Branemark P-I, Fornander J. Bone-anchored reconstruction of the irradiated head and neck cancer patient. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1993. 108: 334 – 343
- Granstrom G. Radiotherapy, osseointegration and hyperbaric oxygen therapy. Periodontology 2000. 2003. 33: 145 -162
- Granstrom G. Osseointegration in irradiated cancer patients: An analysis with respect of implant failures. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2005. 63:579-585
- Nishimura R. Implants in irradiated bone. In: Proceedings of the First International Congress on Maxillofacial Prosthetics. Zlotolow I, Esposito S, Beumer J, eds. 1995
- Ohrnell L-O, Branemark P-I, Nyman J. Effects of radiation on the biomechanics of osseointegration. An experimental in vivo study in rats. 1997. Scand J Plast Reconstr Hand Surg. 31: 281 - 293