ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

Exploring the Role of Soft Tissue Management in Implant Prosthodontics

Dr. B Eswaran[1] ; Dr. Ponsekar Abraham[2] ; Dr. T Vaishnavi[3] ; Dr. V Vishnupriya[4]

[1] Professor,
[2] HOD of Prosthodontics,
[3] Junior Resident,
[4] Junior Resident,
Department of Prosthodontics ,
Thai Moogambigai Dental College and Hospital, Chennai.

Corresponding Author:

*Dr. T Vaishnavi
Junior Resident,
Department of Prosthodontics,
Thai Moogambigai Dental College and Hospital, Chennai
Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research Instituite

Abstract:- Implant prosthodontics has transformed dental rehabilitation by providing reliable solutions for missing teeth, emphasizing the crucial role of soft tissue management in achieving both functional and aesthetic outcomes. The peri-implant mucosa, formed during the healing process, acts as a biological seal, essential for maintaining implant health and preventing bacterial infiltration. This review highlights the significance of soft tissue management, including techniques like autogenous gingival grafts and digital tools, and discusses innovative approaches such as one-step peri-implant emergence profiles. Key challenges include managing complications like peri-implantitis and peri-implant mucositis, which are often linked to bacterial infections and plaque accumulation. Effective management strategies involve meticulous oral hygiene, mechanical debridement with non-metal tools, and advanced treatments for severe cases, such as flap surgeries and regenerative techniques. The review underscores the importance of patient selection, radiographic evaluation, and the biological principles of soft tissue healing around implants. Ongoing research and clinical trials are crucial for optimizing these approaches and achieving superior results in implant therapy.

Keywords:- *Implant Prosthodontics, Soft Tissue Management, Peri-Implantitis, Dental Implants, Regenerative Techniques.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Dental implants have significantly advanced the field of prosthodontics, providing patients with reliable and durable solutions for missing teeth. These implants not only restore function and aesthetics but also enhance overall quality of life. While osseointegration is crucial for the mechanical stability of implants, the health and condition of the surrounding soft tissues are equally important for long-term success. Proper soft tissue management is a critical aspect of implant therapy, influencing both immediate outcomes and the longevity of the implant.[1,2]

The soft tissue surrounding dental implants, known as the peri-implant mucosa, is formed during the healing process following implant placement or abutment connection. This tissue serves as a biological seal—often referred to as the "transmucosal attachment"—which prevents the infiltration of bacterial products to the underlying bone, thereby safeguarding the osseointegration of the implant. This concept is fundamental to modern implant dentistry, underscoring the importance of creating and maintaining a healthy soft tissue barrier.[3]

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

Though peri-implant mucosa shares some clinical and histological features with gingival tissue around natural teeth, there are significant differences. Both tissues are covered by a keratinized epithelium followed by a thin barrier epithelium similar to the junctional epithelium of natural gingiva. However, while the supracrestal fibers around natural teeth insert into the cementum, the collagen fibers surrounding implants originate from the periosteum of the bone crest and run parallel to the implant surface, forming what is termed as a "connective adhesion."[4,5]

Understanding these techniques and their indications is essential for clinicians striving to optimize implant therapy and achieve superior results. This article discusses the role of soft tissue management in implant prosthodontics.

II. PATIENT SELECTION, RADIOGRAPHIC EVALUATION, AND SOFT TISSUE CONSIDERATIONS

The primary goal of implant treatment is to achieve successful osseointegration and maintain supportive anatomy at the implant site for the prosthesis. Patient selection involves assessing systemic health, bone condition, and local site factors. Implant placement is typically recommended after complete maturation of the facial dentoskeletal structure due to the higher rate of crestal bone resorption in young individuals.[6] Smoking is contraindicated as it hinders healing and osseointegration, while osteoporosis, despite causing bone fragility, is not a complete contraindication. Implants are not recommended for patients undergoing cytotoxic chemotherapy, and consultations with the patient's physician are advised for those on systemic medications. Implant treatment alternatives should be considered for patients with oral lichen planus or high cancer risk due to lower success rates. Proper radiographic evaluation, such as peri-oral radiographs, helps assess bone structure and local pathologies, and bone augmentation procedures can be planned if the residual bone is inadequate.[7] Diagnostic imaging methods like CT, orthopantomography (OPG), occlusal radiography, intraoral periapical radiography (IOPAR), conventional tomography, and cone-beam CT (CBCT) are utilized to guide implant placement, with CBCT being the preferred modality recommended by the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology (AAOMR) for evaluating dental implant sites. Healthy soft tissue around the implant is crucial for both functional and esthetic success, requiring a mucosal thickness of 3-4 mm and specific measurements for crown and apical components.[8] Adequate keratinized attached mucosa (around 2 mm) and attached gingiva (1 mm) are essential to minimize bone resorption, angular defects, plaque accumulation, and peri-implant mucositis. Soft tissue corrections, such as augmentation and graft techniques, are often necessary before implant placement, particularly in cases of ridge resorption or high frenal attachment, to ensure optimal tissue stability and esthetic outcomes.[9]

- *Soft Tissue Thickness Augmentation Techniques*

Soft tissue dehiscence (STD) in the esthetic zone, characterized by the apical displacement of the mucosal margin relative to the ideal gingival position of natural teeth, is a common complication in implant prosthodontics. These defects, often resulting from incorrect implant placement, especially in the buccal-palatal direction, lead to an unstable mucosal margin and increase the risk of recession. The primary goals of STD treatment are to fully cover the dehiscence and achieve a buccal soft tissue thickness of over 2 mm, enhancing the esthetic outcome and the stability of the implant crown.[10]

Several surgical approaches for STD treatment include muco-gingival techniques, guided bone regeneration (GBR), and combined prosthetic-surgical methods. A particularly effective approach involves a sequence of prosthetic and surgical interventions, including a coronally advanced flap with a connective tissue graft. This method prepares the tissue pre-surgery, conditions it post-surgery, and ends with the final crown placement, resulting in full coverage and increased soft tissue thickness, as demonstrated by long-term studies.[11,12]

The main risk factors for STD are implant malpositioning and a thin soft tissue phenotype. Careful planning with CBCT evaluations, guided implant placement, and connective tissue grafts can reduce these risks, providing enhanced esthetic and functional outcomes. Guided implant placement minimizes positioning errors, supports soft tissue integrity during surgery, and allows for precise provisional crown adjustments, thereby promoting successful long-term results in implant therapy.[13]

- *Keratinized Tissue Augmentation Techniques*

In posterior areas of the mouth where esthetic concerns are minimal, the primary goal of peri-implant soft tissue management is to increase the height of keratinized tissue and deepen the vestibular fornix, thereby improving plaque control. This is particularly important in lower posterior regions where implants often present with shallow fornix depth and insufficient keratinized tissue, allowing elastic and mobile alveolar mucosa to extend directly to the mucosal margin of the implant crown. This situation hampers effective brushing and elevates the risk of peri-implantitis due to the tissue's inability to maintain stability during hygiene procedures.[14,15]

Due to its healing characteristics, which often result in a misaligned mucogingival line and a keratosis-like appearance, the free gingival graft is best suited for areas without esthetic demands, making it an ideal choice for posterior implant sites.[16]

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

➢ *Biological Principles of Soft Tissue Healing Around Dental Implants*

The biological basis for soft tissue healing around dental implants involves several key aspects, including gingival shrinkage, peri-implant tissue seal, keratinized gingiva, tissue thickness, and the relationship with the underlying alveolar bone. After implant placement, soft tissue reorganization leads to gingival shrinkage, particularly in the anterior aesthetic zone, influenced by collagen fiber orientation.[17] A satisfactory peri-implant soft tissue seal forms around the implant, similar to natural teeth, with collagen fibers providing structural and defensive roles. The necessity of keratinized gingiva around implants is debated; while some studies suggest implants perform similarly in keratinized and non-keratinized zones, a keratinized band may aid in plaque control and reduce peri-implant diseases. The concept of biological width applies to peri-implant tissues, affecting the positioning of gingiva and crestal bone. Consistent peri-implant tissue dimensions, regardless of implant design, highlight the importance of maintaining the alveolar crest for soft tissue support.[18] Gingival thickness often mirrors the underlying bone's contour, with thicker biotypes providing more stability. Although immediate implant placement does not interfere with socket healing, evidence does not strongly support implants preserving surrounding bone height, as the stability of interseptal bone is more influenced by the periodontal ligaments of adjacent teeth than by the implant itself.[19]

➢ *Managing the Soft Tissue Around Implants*

Effective management of soft tissue around dental implants hinges on several crucial factors. Implant placement must align with the anatomical position to predict the healed tissue's final position accurately, ensuring long-term success. Misplaced implants, such as those positioned apically relative to adjacent teeth, can lead to complications due to compromised sites from previous extractions or infections, necessitating bone augmentation to achieve stable soft tissue outcomes.[20,21] Surgical techniques for soft tissue augmentation, such as autogenous grafts from the patient's palate, have proven effective in increasing tissue volume. While there is no conclusive evidence that keratinized gingiva is crucial for maintaining peri-implant health, a stable band of attached gingiva is beneficial for long-term stability and patient comfort. Research indicates that no single surgical technique surpasses others; rather, adherence to biological principles is paramount for achieving successful outcomes.[22]

During implant placement for an optimal emergence profile, immediate implantation is ideal when there are no contraindications, allowing for direct control over the emergence profile. Proper implant placement is crucial, with the implant depth ideally 3-4 mm apical to the gingival zenith of the restoration, maintaining an interproximal distance of at least 2-3 mm from adjacent teeth or implants, and preferring a palatal bodily position for better control. Axial inclination should be parallel to adjacent teeth or implants for optimal screw access, and a thick soft tissue biotype (≥2.0 mm) is preferred to ensure gingival health and aesthetics. In favorable conditions, placing a temporary crown immediately post-implantation helps maintain bone stability and guides tissue healing. To record the emergence profile, the temporary crown is removed, and the profile is recorded with flowable composite, followed by a conventional impression with the composite in place. The final restoration should be fabricated based on the recorded emergence profile, ensuring proper screw access and avoiding excessive pressure on soft tissues, with ongoing monitoring of gingival health for necessary adjustments. In cases of unfavorable conditions such as shallow implant placement (less than 2 mm from the gingival zenith), buccal implant positioning limiting emergence profile creation, facial implant inclination leading to aesthetic and bone issues, or a thin gingival biotype prone to recession, clinical protocols differ. Treatment options include accepting a compromised outcome and manipulating the emergence profile with restoration design or considering soft tissue augmentation through grafting to improve tissue volume. Treatment planning must account for timing, whether immediate or delayed implantation is suitable based on tissue conditions, and surgical techniques, such as connective tissue grafts, may be required. The final restoration should be designed to complement the augmented tissues and achieve the desired emergence profile.[23,24]

➢ *Postoperative Soft Tissue Complications and Their Management*

Postoperative complications around dental implants often arise from issues with osseointegration, with failure typically marked by significant bone loss (>1.0 mm in the first year and <0.2 mm annually thereafter).[25] Common complications include peri-implantitis, peri-implant mucositis, and various lesions such as peripheral giant cell granuloma and malignant tumors.[26] Peri-implant mucositis is a reversible inflammatory response without bone loss, while peri-implantitis involves inflammation and bone loss. Both conditions are linked to bacterial infections, with bacterial flora in peri-implantitis closely resembling that in periodontal diseases. Causes of infection include plaque accumulation, cement excess, and occlusal stress. Effective management involves maintaining excellent oral hygiene, mechanical debridement with non-metal tools, and sometimes antiseptic treatments like chlorhexidine.[27] Advanced cases may require flap surgeries, regenerative techniques, or localized antibiotic delivery. Regular follow-up and thorough cleaning are crucial for preventing and managing these conditions.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

Peri-implant mucositis generally has a good prognosis with non-surgical treatment, while peri-implantitis, often requiring surgery, tends to have a poorer prognosis.[28,29,30]

- *Importance of Full-Thickness Flaps*

The use of full-thickness flaps during the second stage of implant placement plays a critical role in achieving optimal soft tissue management and enhancing aesthetic outcomes. These flaps, such as the rotated split palatal flap, provide predictable primary closure, which is essential for proper healing and minimizing complications. Additionally, techniques like the palatal sliding strip flap improve soft tissue contours and facilitate the formation of papillae between implants and adjacent teeth, contributing to an enhanced aesthetic result. Proper flap management has also been linked to significant crestal bone regeneration, with studies showing statistically significant improvements in bone levels.[31] Furthermore, using full-thickness flaps during membrane removal and implant exposure helps reduce complications related to shallow vestibules and insufficient keratinized tissue, which can otherwise impact the success of the implant. Although some practitioners advocate for minimally invasive approaches to reduce patient discomfort and recovery time, full-thickness flaps remain a reliable and effective technique, supported by evidence, for achieving successful implant outcomes, both functionally and aesthetically.[32]

- *Flap Crest*

The flap crest plays a vital role in the successful placement of dental implants, especially in cases of bone deficiency or prior alveolar crest defects. The design and management of the flap can greatly impact both surgical outcomes and aesthetic results. Flap designs that extend to or beyond the alveolar crest are crucial for minimizing postoperative gingival recession, which is essential for maintaining aesthetics around implants.[33] In guided bone regeneration (GBR), elevating the flap allows for the precise placement of titanium micromesh and membranes, contributing to successful bone regeneration and implant integration. Additionally, bone augmentation techniques like sinus/alveolar crest tenting (SACT) enable implant placement in atrophic ridges without the need for grafts, further underscoring the importance of managing the flap to optimize bone volume.[34] GBR with bioresorbable membranes has shown substantial increases in crest width, facilitating implant placement in previously inadequate sites. However, while proper flap management is essential, improper techniques can lead to complications such as gingival recession or inadequate bone healing, highlighting the need for meticulous planning and execution in implant surgeries to ensure successful outcomes.[35]

- *Flap and Flapless Techniques*

The choice between flap and flapless techniques during implant placement plays a crucial role in clinical outcomes, particularly regarding bone preservation and soft tissue healing. Flapless implant placement has been associated with less crestal bone loss compared to flap techniques, with studies showing that flapless procedures result in no bone resorption, while flapped implants experienced an average crestal bone loss of 0.29 mm. Patients who underwent flapless procedures also reported less postoperative pain and discomfort. In terms of aesthetics, flapless techniques led to less recession of the peri-implant mucosa, with significant differences observed at 3 months post-surgery, which is especially important in visible areas.[36] While both techniques show similar healing of biological width, flapless approaches demonstrate lower soft tissue retraction, suggesting better preservation of the peri-implant soft tissue architecture. However, flap techniques may still be necessary in complex cases where access and visibility are critical, highlighting the need for a tailored approach based on individual patient conditions.[37]

- *Thin Gingival Biotype*

The thin gingival biotype during implant placement presents unique challenges and risks, particularly with regard to peri-implant health and aesthetic outcomes. A thin biotype is associated with an increased susceptibility to complications such as bone loss and peri-implantitis. It is considered a significant risk factor for additional bone loss around implants, especially in patients with a history of periodontitis, as implants placed in individuals with thin mucosal tissues tend to experience greater crestal bone loss compared to those with thicker biotypes. From an aesthetic perspective, the biologic height-width ratio of buccal supra-implant mucosa is critical for achieving desirable outcomes, and thin biotypes require careful management to maintain a stable buccal cervical line. Autogenous block grafting has proven effective in maintaining volume in thin biotype patients, indicating that surgical interventions can mitigate some risks. Additionally, thin biotypes are more prone to severe peri-implantitis, with notable associations between biotype thickness and clinical parameters such as bleeding on probing and marginal bone loss. While thin gingival biotypes present challenges, proactive management strategies such as grafting and careful monitoring can help mitigate these risks and enhance implant outcomes.[38,39]

- *Advances*

Soft tissue management is a critical aspect of implant prosthodontics, influencing both aesthetics and the longevity of implant restorations, and advances in technology have significantly improved our ability to manage soft tissues and achieve optimal outcomes. CAD/CAM technology enhances precision and accuracy by allowing for the creation of highly customized restorations with seamless fits and optimal soft tissue integration, improving both functional and aesthetic outcomes.[40]

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

Digital impressions further streamline the process, providing highly accurate records without traditional impression materials, which enhances patient comfort and ensures better capturing of the subtle contours of soft tissues, leading to restorations that blend seamlessly with surrounding tissue. Smile designing engages patients in the planning process, ensuring their aesthetic preferences are met while enabling clinicians to develop tailored treatment plans that address both functional and cosmetic needs. Esthetically, implant placement is closely tied to the management of the emergence profile, as the contour of the soft tissues surrounding the implant is crucial for achieving a natural-looking restoration. In cases of inadequate soft tissue volume, augmentation procedures such as connective tissue grafts or subepithelial connective tissue grafts can enhance the aesthetic outcome by increasing soft tissue thickness and contour. Integrating these technologies—digital impressions, smile designing, and CAD/CAM technology—into a seamless digital workflow allows clinicians to streamline the treatment process, improve accuracy, and develop personalized treatment plans based on the visualization of the final result. This holistic approach not only enhances patient satisfaction by addressing individual needs and expectations but also ensures the creation of highly aesthetic restorations that harmonize with the surrounding tissues, ultimately elevating both the function and esthetics of implant prosthodontics.[41,42]

III. CONCLUSION

Effective soft tissue management in implant prosthodontics is crucial for both aesthetic and functional success, as it significantly impacts the stability and long-term success of dental implants. The stability of peri-implant soft tissue is essential for achieving lasting clinical outcomes and visual satisfaction, with customized healing abutments playing a key role in preserving soft tissue architecture over time. Emerging methods, including autogenous gingival grafts and digital tools, are enhancing the quality of peri-implant soft tissues, while innovative techniques like one-step formation of peri-implant emergence profiles help ensure that soft tissue contours are accurately transferred to final restorations for optimal aesthetic results. Managing complications such as peri-implantitis requires a thorough understanding of surgical techniques and ongoing patient care, with specific challenges presented by the posterior region, which can be mitigated with customized healing abutments. Despite these advancements, continuous research and clinical trials are essential to validate and refine these approaches, aiming to achieve the best possible outcomes in implant prosthodontics.

REFERENCES

[1]. Maurizio, De, Francesco., Elisabetta, Ferrara., Francesco, Inchingolo., Grazieli, Dalmaschio., Alberto, Pispero., Angelo, Michele, Inchingolo., Gianna, Dipalma., Tiziano, Testori., Gianluca, Martino, Tartaglia., Biagio, Rapone. (2024). (1) Soft-Tissue Management Dental Implants with Digitally Customized Healing Abutments: A Pilot Study. Prosthesis, doi: 10.3390/prosthesis6030042

[2]. https://blog.iti.org/clinical-insights/soft-tissue-management-around-dental-implants/

[3]. Teresa, Chanting, Sun., Tsung-Kai, Chang. (2024). (2) Soft tissue management around dental implant in esthetic zone – the current concepts and novel techniques. Journal of Dental Sciences, doi: 10.1016/j.jds.2024.03.003

[4]. Jose EP, Paul P, Reche A. Soft Tissue Management Around the Dental Implant: A Comprehensive Review. Cureus. 2023 Oct 31;15(10):e48042. doi: 10.7759/cureus.48042. PMID: 38034248; PMCID: PMC10688389.

[5]. Thoma DS, Gil A, Hämmerle CHF, Jung RE. Management and prevention of soft tissue complications in implant dentistry. Periodontol 2000. 2022;88:116– 129

[6]. C H, Y. S. (2011). Soft Tissue Biology and Management in Implant Dentistry. InTech. doi: 10.5772/17515

[7]. Ricardo Palacios-Banuelos, Prosthetic and soft tissue considerations around anterior maxillary implants, Dentistry Review Volume 4, Issue 2, June 2024, 100089

[8]. De Francesco M, Ferrara E, Inchingolo F, Dalmaschio G, Pispero A, Inchingolo AM, Dipalma G, Testori T, Tartaglia GM, Rapone B. Soft-Tissue Management Dental Implants with Digitally Customized Healing Abutments: A Pilot Study. *Prosthesis*. 2024; 6(3):596-618.

[9]. (2023). (5) Alternative soft tissue management techniques in posterior region of immediate implant. RSBO, doi: 10.21726/rsbo.v20i1.2020

[10]. Zaki, A. Peri-implant soft tissue management: a clinical guide. *Br Dent J* 237, 252 (2024).

[11]. Avila-Ortiz G, Gonzalez-Martin O, Couso-Queiruga E, Wang HL. The peri-implant phenotype. *J Periodontol* 2020; 91: 283-288.

[12]. Cosyn J, Sabzevar MM, De Bruyn H. Predictors of inter-proximal and midfacial recession following single implant treatment in the anterior maxilla: a multivariate analysis. *J Clin Periodontol* 2012; 39: 895-903.

[13]. Evans CD,Chen ST. Esthetic outcomes of immediate implant placements. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2008; 19: 73-80. Epub 2007 Oct 22.

[14]. (2022). (7) Soft Tissue Management on Pontic and Implant Sites Before Implants Insertion. Cureus, doi: 10.7759/cureus.24621

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

[15]. Giannobile WV, Jung RE, Schwarz F; on behalf of the Groups of the 2nd Osteology Foundation Consensus Meeting. Evidence-based knowledge on the aesthetics and maintenance of peri-implant soft tissues: Osteology Foundation Consensus Report Part 1—Effects of Soft Tissue Augmentation Procedures on the Maintenance of Peri-implant Soft Tissue Health. *Clin Oral Impl Res* 2018; 29(Suppl. 15): 7-10.
[16]. Lindhe J, Lang NP. Clinical Periodontology and implant Dentistry 6th Edition Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
[17]. Mazzotti C, Stefanini M, Felice P, Bentivogli V, Mounssif I, Zucchelli G. Soft-tissue dehiscence coverage at peri-implant sites. *Periodontol 2000* 2018; 77: 256-272.
[18]. Nabers JM. Free gingival grafts. *Periodontics* 1966; 4: 243-245.
[19]. Perussolo J, Souza AB, Matarazzo F, Oliveira RP, Araujo MG. Influence of the keratinized mucosa on the stability of peri-implant tissues and brushing discomfort: A 4-year follow-up study. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2018; 29: 1177-1185.
[20]. Roccuzzo M, Grasso G, Dalmasso P. Keratinized mucosa around implants in partially edentulous posterior mandible: 10-year results of a prospective comparative study. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016; 27: 491-496.
[21]. Souza AB, Tormena M, Matarazzo F, Araujo MG. The influence of peri-implant keratinized mucosa on brushing discomfort and peri-implant tissue health. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016; 27: 650-655.
[22]. Stefanini M, Felice P., Mazzotti C.,Marzadori M.,Gherlone EF.,Zucchelli G. Transmucosal Implant Placement with Submarginal Connective Tissue Graft in Area of Shallow Buccal Bone Dehiscence: A Three-Year Follow-Up Case Series. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2016**; 36** :621-30.
[23]. Justina Gervyte, Stomatologija, Baltic Dental and Maxillofacial Journal, 2023, Vol. 25, No. 2
[24]. Thoma DS, Naenni N, Figuero E. Effects of soft tissue augmentation procedures on peri-implant health or disease: A systematic reviewand meta-analysis. *Clin Oral Impl Res.* 2018; 29(Suppl. 15): 32-49.
[25]. Zucchelli G, Mazzotti C, Mounssif I, Marzadori M , Stefanini M. Esthetic treatment of peri-implant soft tissue defects: a case report of a modified surgical-prosthetic approach. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2013a; **33**: 327-335.
[26]. Zucchelli G, Mazzotti C, Mounssif I, Mele M, Stefanini M , Montebugnoli L. A novel surgical-prosthetic approach for soft tissue dehiscence coverage around single implant. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2013b; 24: 957-962.
[27]. Zucchelli G, Felice P, Mazzotti C, Marzadori M, Mounssif I, Monaco C, Stefanini M.5-year outcomes after coverage of soft tissue dehiscence around single implants: A prospective cohort study. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2018; 11(2): 215-224.
[28]. Zucchelli G., De Sanctis M. Treatment of multiple recession-type defects in patients with esthetic demands. *J Periodontol*. 2000; 71(9):1506-1514.
[29]. Zucchelli G, Mele M, Stefanini M, Mazzotti C, Marzadori M, Montebugnoli L , De Sanctis M. Patient morbidity and root coverage outcome after subepithelial connective tissue and de-epithelialized grafts: a comparative randomized-controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol* 2010; 37: 728-738.
[30]. Fernando, Suárez-López, del, Amo., Shan-Huey, Yu., Gilberto, Sammartino., Anton, Sculean., Giovanni, Zucchelli., Giulio, Rasperini., Pietro, Felice., Giorgio, Pagni., Vincenzo, Iorio-Siciliano., Maria, Gabriella, Grusovin., Giovanni, E., Salvi., Alberto, Rebaudi., Giuseppe, Luongo., Jack, T., Krauser., Martina, Stefanini., Andrea, Blasi., Jaafar, Mouhyi., Faten, Ben, Amor., Fatme, Mouchref, Hamasni., Konstantinos, Valavanis., Alain, Simonpieri., Ahmed, M., Osman., Erda, Qorri., Rosario, Rullo., Arzu, Naipoglu., Vincenzo, Bruno., Gaetano, Marenzi., Francesco, Riccitiello., Roberta, Gasparro., Nikos, Mardas., Gianrico, Spagnuolo., Gianrico, Spagnuolo., Leonzio, Fortunato., Hom-Lay, Wang. (2020). (10) Peri-implant Soft Tissue Management: Cairo Opinion Consensus Conference. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, doi: 10.3390/IJERPH17072281
[31]. Mathews, Dp. (2000). 9. Soft tissue management around implants in the esthetic zone.. International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry,
[32]. Rakesh, V, Somanathan., Antonín, Simůnek., Josef, Bukac., Tomas, Brazda., Dana, Kopecka. (2007). 8. Soft tissue esthetics in implant dentistry.. doi: 10.14712/18059694.2017.80
[33]. Lazzara, Rj. (1993). 5. Managing the soft tissue margin: the key to implant aesthetics.. Practical periodontics and aesthetic dentistry : PPAD,
[34]. Carlos, E., Nemcovsky., Zvi, Artzi., Ofer, Moses. (1999). 1. Rotated Split Palatal Flap for Soft Tissue Primary Coverage Over Extraction Sites With Immediate Implant Placement. Description of the Surgical Procedure and Clinical Results. Journal of Periodontology, doi: 10.1902/JOP.1999.70.8.926
[35]. Philippe, Adriaenssens., Marc, Hermans., A, Ingber., V, Prestipino., Philippe, Daelemans., Chantal, Malevez. (1999). 2. Palatal sliding strip flap: soft tissue management to restore maxillary anterior esthetics at stage 2 surgery: a clinical report.. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants,
[36]. Marina, Tsoukaki., Christos, D.R., Kalpidis., Dimitra, Sakellari., Lazaros, Tsalikis., George, Mikrogiorgis., Antonis, Konstantinidis. (2012). 2. Clinical, radiographic, microbiological, and immunological outcomes of flapped vs. flapless dental implants: a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. Clinical Oral Implants Research, doi: 10.1111/J.1600-0501.2012.02503.X

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24NOV622

[37]. Janet, Stoupel., Chun-Teh, Lee., Jaclyn, Glick., Elena, Sanz-Miralles., Cody, Chiuzan., Panos, N., Papapanou. (2016). 4. Immediate implant placement and provisionalization in the aesthetic zone using a flapless or a flap-involving approach: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Periodontology, doi: 10.1111/JCPE.12610

[38]. Juan, Blanco., Célia, Coutinho, Alves., Vanesa, Nuñez., Luis, Aracil., Fernando, Muñoz., Isabel, Ramos. (2010). 3. Biological width following immediate implant placement in the dog: flap vs. flapless surgery.. Clinical Oral Implants Research, doi: 10.1111/J.1600-0501.2009.01885.X

[39]. Luis-Antonio, Aguirre-Zorzano., Francisco-Javier, Vallejo-Aisa., Ruth, Estefanía-Fresco. (2013). 1. Supportive periodontal therapy and periodontal biotype as prognostic factors in implants placed in patients with a history of periodontitis. Medicina Oral Patologia Oral Y Cirugia Bucal, doi: 10.4317/MEDORAL.19136

[40]. Tomas, Linkevicius., Algirdas, Puisys., Olga, Svediene., Rokas, Linkevicius., Laura, Linkeviciene. (2015). 5. Radiological comparison of laser-microtextured and platform-switched implants in thin mucosal biotype. Clinical Oral Implants Research, doi: 10.1111/CLR.12544

[41]. Jain A, Bhushan P, Mahato M, Solanki BB, Dutta D, Hota S, Raut A, Mohanty AK. The Recent Use, Patient Satisfaction, and Advancement in Digital Smile Designing: A Systematic Review. Cureus. 2024 Jun 16;16(6):e62459. doi: 10.7759/cureus.62459. PMID: 39022468; PMCID: PMC11251929.

[42]. Jafri Z, Ahmad N, Sawai M, Sultan N, Bhardwaj A. Digital Smile Design-An innovative tool in aesthetic dentistry. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res. 2020 Apr-Jun;10(2):194-198. doi: 10.1016/j.jobcr.2020.04.010. Epub 2020 Apr 18. PMID: 32373450; PMCID: PMC7193250.