Review Article

Risk assessment and management strategies for peri-implantitis in high-risk populations

Mohammed A. Batwa[1]*, Nassren F. Alenazi[2], Raed A. Aldubayyan[2], Mohammed A. Alshehri[3], Abdulmajed A. Alanazi[4]

[1]Department of Periodontics, Al Thager Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[2]College of Dentistry, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[3]Dental Department, Dent Clinics, Abha, Saudi Arabia
[4]College of Dentistry, Alfarabi Colleges, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

*Correspondence:
Dr. Mohammed A. Batwa,
E-mail: mbatwa@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Peri-implantitis is a multifactorial condition characterized by inflammation and progressive bone loss surrounding dental implants, often leading to implant failure. High-risk populations, including patients with systemic conditions such as diabetes or undergoing cancer treatments, face an elevated susceptibility due to impaired immune responses and altered bone metabolism. Understanding the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying the disease is essential for effective risk assessment and management. Dysbiosis of the microbial biofilm, immune system dysregulation, and systemic factors like oxidative stress and cytokine imbalances are critical contributors to disease progression. These factors necessitate the development of targeted strategies for prevention and intervention. Risk assessment models have evolved to include advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence and decision tree regression to predict peri-implantitis in vulnerable individuals accurately. These tools incorporate systemic, local, and implant-specific parameters to enable personalized treatment planning and early intervention. Innovative management strategies have also emerged, ranging from adjunctive antimicrobial therapies, such as glycine powder air-polishing and localized drug delivery systems, to host modulation therapies and regenerative techniques. The use of advanced biomaterials, such as implants coated with bioactive peptides or antimicrobial nanoparticles, has further improved osseointegration and reduced infection rates. Regenerative approaches, including the application of growth factors like platelet-derived growth factor and bone morphogenetic proteins, have shown significant potential in repairing peri-implant defects and restoring functional stability. Emerging technologies, such as nanotechnology and bioengineered implants, offer new possibilities for real-time health monitoring and sustained therapeutic delivery at implant sites. These advancements, coupled with a deeper understanding of peri-implantitis etiology, provide a framework for optimizing outcomes in high-risk populations, addressing both the local and systemic challenges posed by the disease.

Keywords: Peri-implantitis, Dental implants, Risk assessment, Regenerative therapies, Antimicrobial strategies

INTRODUCTION

Peri-implantitis is an inflammatory condition affecting the hard and soft tissues surrounding dental implants, leading to progressive bone loss and eventual implant failure. With the increasing prevalence of implant-supported restorations, peri-implantitis has emerged as a significant clinical challenge in dental practice. Various studies have emphasized its multifactorial etiology, with risk factors including poor oral hygiene, smoking, systemic conditions such as diabetes mellitus, and genetic predispositions.[1] These risks are further amplified in high-risk populations, where systemic and behavioral factors contribute to heightened susceptibility.

The pathogenesis of peri-implantitis is similar to periodontitis, characterized by bacterial biofilm accumulation and an exaggerated immune response that results in tissue destruction. However, the unique anatomical and functional characteristics of implants, such as the lack of a periodontal ligament, make the disease progression and management distinct from natural teeth.[2] While some studies have elucidated the microbiological and immunological underpinnings of peri-implantitis, gaps remain in understanding its risk stratification and targeted interventions. High-risk populations, including individuals with systemic diseases or compromised immunity, present unique challenges in peri-implantitis management. For instance, diabetes mellitus exacerbates inflammatory responses, increasing the risk of peri-implant disease.[3] Similarly, smoking compromises vascularity and impairs healing, further complicating the prognosis of peri-implant conditions. The presence of these risk factors necessitates tailored approaches to both prevention and treatment.

Management strategies for peri-implantitis have evolved over the years, ranging from mechanical debridement and antimicrobial therapies to advanced surgical interventions. However, the effectiveness of these treatments varies, particularly in high-risk groups where conventional therapies may be inadequate. Recent advancements in biomaterials, laser therapy, and systemic adjuncts have shown promise in improving outcomes, but their application requires further validation through robust clinical trials.[4] Identifying and mitigating risks in susceptible populations is crucial to improving the long-term success of implant therapies. This review aims to explore the intricacies of peri-implantitis in high-risk populations, focusing on the mechanisms underlying increased susceptibility, risk assessment methodologies, and innovative management strategies. By synthesizing current evidence, this review seeks to guide clinicians in optimizing care for vulnerable patient groups.

REVIEW

Peri-implantitis presents a complex interplay of biological, behavioral, and environmental factors, particularly in high-risk populations. Its pathophysiology involves a disruption of homeostasis at the implant interface, driven by bacterial biofilm formation and a dysregulated host immune response. In high-risk groups, such as smokers and individuals with systemic conditions like diabetes mellitus, this dysregulation is further amplified, leading to accelerated disease progression. Evidence suggests that smoking not only impairs the vascular supply critical for tissue repair but also alters the microbial composition, favoring pathogenic species.[5] These combined effects result in a more aggressive disease phenotype and reduced treatment success rates.

Risk assessment is crucial for identifying individuals predisposed to peri-implantitis, enabling early interventions. Tools such as the periodontal risk assessment model have been adapted to evaluate peri-implant conditions, incorporating factors like systemic health, implant characteristics, and plaque control efficacy.[6] These frameworks highlight the importance of personalized care, emphasizing preventive measures and targeted therapies. For instance, antimicrobial protocols, combined with adjunctive therapies like laser treatment, show promise in mitigating disease severity, particularly in high-risk groups. Nevertheless, clinical studies underscore the need for long-term data to validate these approaches and optimize their implementation.

Pathophysiological mechanisms of peri-implantitis in high-risk populations

Peri-implantitis is a multifactorial disease influenced by microbial, immune, and systemic factors, particularly in high-risk populations such as cancer patients. It is initiated by microbial colonization at the peri-implant sulcus. Anaerobic bacteria like *Porphyromonas gingivalis*, *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, and *Treponema denticola* release proteolytic enzymes, lipopolysaccharides, and other virulence factors that disrupt the host's epithelial barrier and trigger inflammatory responses. These bacteria thrive in dysbiotic biofilms, leading to the degradation of connective tissue and alveolar bone.[7]

In cancer patients, systemic immunosuppression significantly exacerbates peri-implantitis. Chemotherapy suppresses neutrophil activity, reduces the recruitment of macrophages, and impairs the host's ability to control microbial invasion. This reduction in immune surveillance increases biofilm accumulation and the intensity of tissue inflammation. Radiotherapy, particularly for head and neck cancers, further amplifies the risk by impairing vascularization in peri-implant tissues. Reduced blood flow compromises nutrient delivery, tissue repair, and bone remodeling, predisposing the site to osteoradionecrosis and implant failure.[8] Radiation-induced osteoradionecrosis occurs due to the direct inhibition of osteoblast function and a shift toward osteoclast-mediated resorption. This imbalance disrupts bone turnover and weakens peri-implant bone structures. Additionally, the fibrotic changes caused by radiation reduce the elasticity of soft tissues, making them more prone to tearing and infection. These complications create a cascade of localized tissue breakdown that accelerates peri-implantitis in cancer patients.[8] Xerostomia, or dry mouth, is a frequent complication in cancer patients, particularly those undergoing radiotherapy for head and neck cancers. Salivary gland dysfunction reduces the natural flushing mechanism of saliva, leading to increased biofilm retention and microbial colonization around implants. This reduction in salivary antimicrobial activity facilitates the proliferation of pathogenic species that contribute to peri-implantitis. Additionally, xerostomia exacerbates mucosal irritation, which may increase susceptibility to soft tissue inflammation.[9] Nutritional deficiencies common in cancer patients further impair bone and tissue health. Deficiencies in calcium, vitamin D, and protein reduce bone mineral density and impair the regenerative capacity of peri-

implant tissues. Poor nutrition also weakens the immune response, reducing the patient's ability to counteract infection and inflammation at the implant site. Combined with the systemic effects of cancer therapy, these deficiencies create an environment that promotes the onset and progression of peri-implantitis.[9]

The use of medications such as bisphosphonates and denosumab in managing bone metastases or cancer-related skeletal issues further increases the risk of peri-implantitis. These agents inhibit osteoclast function, which is essential for bone turnover and repair. The resulting medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaw (MRONJ) is characterized by necrotic bone that is highly susceptible to infection and mechanical stress. This condition not only predisposes patients to peri-implant disease but also complicates its management due to impaired healing responses.[10] Moreover, inflammatory cytokines, such as TNF-α, IL-1β, and IL-6, play a central role in the pathogenesis of peri-implantitis. Elevated systemic levels of these cytokines in cancer patients undergoing therapy enhance osteoclastogenesis, leading to increased bone resorption. TNF-α, in particular, reduces the regenerative capacity of osteoblasts while promoting the recruitment and activation of osteoclasts. This disruption in the balance of bone homeostasis leads to rapid peri-implant bone loss. Furthermore, oxidative stress, a common consequence of cancer and its treatments, exacerbates tissue damage through the generation of reactive oxygen species that impair DNA and cellular integrity in peri-implant tissues.[11]

The interplay of local and systemic factors in cancer patients underscores the complexity of peri-implantitis in this high-risk population. The combination of biofilm-associated inflammation, impaired immune responses, and systemic complications such as MRONJ and osteoradionecrosis creates a unique clinical challenge. Comprehensive management strategies must address not only the microbial and local tissue factors but also the broader systemic conditions impacting these patients.

Risk assessment models

Accurately identifying individuals at risk for peri-implantitis is crucial for preventing implant failure and improving long-term outcomes. Risk assessment models integrate clinical, biological, and systemic factors to predict susceptibility and inform treatment strategies. These models have evolved to include traditional clinical parameters and advanced technologies like machine learning algorithms. Clinical tools such as the implant disease risk assessment (IDRA) are widely utilized for peri-implant risk stratification. IDRA considers systemic conditions like diabetes, local factors like the presence of plaque, and implant-related characteristics, including design and material. A retrospective study evaluating IDRA's performance demonstrated its utility in identifying high-risk patients, particularly when applied to cases involving multiple implants over extended periods.[12] Such tools emphasize individualized care by addressing the

interplay of host and environmental factors. Cox regression models have been employed to evaluate risk profiles associated with peri-implantitis, particularly in patients with systemic conditions or complex prosthetic reconstructions. One study utilized this model to assess peri-implantitis development in patients with full-arch zirconia prostheses. Findings highlighted that systemic conditions, including osteoporosis and cardiovascular disease, compounded the risk of peri-implantitis, emphasizing the need for preoperative systemic evaluations.[13]

Advanced technologies like artificial intelligence have revolutionized risk prediction for peri-implantitis. AI-based models analyze radiographic images to identify early signs of bone loss, microbial biofilm accumulation, and implant instability. These algorithms significantly enhance diagnostic accuracy and reduce time-intensive manual assessments. A systematic review of AI-based models concluded that these tools could predict peri-implant pathology with high specificity and sensitivity, offering a promising adjunct to traditional clinical evaluations.[14]

Decision tree regression models provide an additional layer of predictive power by incorporating a wide array of risk factors. A study leveraging this approach identified bruxism and peri-implant mucositis as key predictors of peri-implantitis. Such models are particularly valuable in complex cases where multiple interacting factors influence outcomes. By integrating demographic, systemic, and local variables, decision tree regression allows clinicians to develop tailored preventive strategies.[15] Systemic conditions like diabetes and their impact on implant survival have also been modeled to predict peri-implantitis risk. Diabetes significantly alters immune responses, impairs wound healing, and promotes inflammatory cytokine release, all of which increase susceptibility to peri-implant bone loss. Comprehensive reviews of anti-diabetic therapies and their influence on peri-implantitis risk have underscored the importance of optimizing glycemic control pre- and postoperatively. These models suggest that incorporating systemic management into risk assessments can improve both implant success and overall patient outcomes.[16]

Innovative management strategies

Managing peri-implantitis has shifted from conventional techniques toward integrating advanced therapies that address microbial control, tissue repair, and immune modulation. Recent developments focus on innovative approaches such as targeted antimicrobial treatments, host modulation, regenerative techniques, and biomaterial-based solutions to improve long-term outcomes. Adjunctive antimicrobial therapies have been widely adopted for controlling biofilms associated with peri-implantitis. Glycine powder air-polishing systems have proven effective in disrupting biofilms while preserving implant surfaces. A comparative study demonstrated that patients treated with air-polishing showed reduced

bleeding on probing and plaque indices compared to those managed with ultrasonic devices, confirming the efficacy of air-polishing in non-surgical peri-implantitis management.[17] These techniques ensure minimal invasiveness while delivering optimal biofilm control, making them suitable for patients with mild to moderate peri-implantitis.

Targeted drug delivery systems have gained attention for their ability to localize antimicrobial agents to peri-implant sites. Biodegradable microspheres containing antibiotics like minocycline or chlorhexidine provide sustained release at the affected areas, enhancing their antimicrobial effect without systemic side effects. Studies have shown that such delivery systems significantly reduce microbial loads and inflammation, improving peri-implant tissue health.[18] These advancements allow clinicians to manage infections efficiently without the risks associated with prolonged systemic antibiotic use.

Immune modulation therapy has emerged as a key strategy in peri-implantitis management. Subantimicrobial-dose doxycycline has been utilized to inhibit matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) involved in tissue degradation. Clinical trials have reported improvements in soft tissue stability and reductions in inflammatory markers when doxycycline was combined with mechanical debridement.[19] Immune modulation addresses the underlying inflammatory processes, providing a more holistic approach to disease control. Furthermore, biomaterials are playing a transformative role in the treatment of peri-implantitis. Titanium implants coated with bioactive peptides or antimicrobial nanoparticles offer dual benefits of promoting osseointegration while inhibiting bacterial colonization. Silver nanoparticle coatings, for instance, have shown strong antimicrobial activity and compatibility with surrounding tissues, making them particularly useful in high-risk patients.[20] This innovation reduces the likelihood of reinfection while supporting tissue regeneration.

Regenerative therapies represent the forefront of peri-implantitis treatment, focusing on reversing tissue and bone loss. The use of growth factors like platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) and bone morphogenetic proteins has been instrumental in promoting bone regeneration around implants. A recent study demonstrated that combining PDGF with guided bone regeneration techniques resulted in significant defect healing and improved implant stability.[21] Stem cell therapies are also being explored, with mesenchymal stem cells showing potential in regenerating both hard and soft tissues around peri-implant defects. Combining mechanical debridement with laser therapies has shown potential for enhancing microbial reduction and promoting healing. Lasers such as Er: YAG are being used to decontaminate implant surfaces effectively without damaging the titanium structure. Their ability to target biofilms and stimulate tissue repair simultaneously makes them a valuable adjunct in peri-

implantitis treatment, particularly in complex cases with significant bone loss.[19]

Future management strategies include bioengineered implants and nanotechnology-driven solutions. These implants integrate sensors capable of monitoring peri-implant health in real-time, providing early detection of infection or inflammation. Additionally, biofunctional coatings with sustained release of anti-inflammatory agents or growth factors are being developed to enhance peri-implant stability over the long term. Host modulation therapies also explore the potential of nutraceuticals such as omega-3 fatty acids and antioxidants to support tissue repair. These compounds have shown promise in reducing inflammation and enhancing tissue regeneration, especially when used as part of a comprehensive treatment protocol.[20] By integrating systemic health considerations with localized treatments, these strategies aim to optimize outcomes in patients with advanced peri-implantitis.

CONCLUSION

Peri-implantitis management requires a multifaceted approach integrating advanced antimicrobial, regenerative, and immune-modulating strategies. Emerging technologies such as localized drug delivery systems, bioengineered implants, and host modulation therapies are revolutionizing treatment protocols. By addressing the underlying microbial and inflammatory processes, these strategies improve outcomes and support tissue regeneration. Continued research and innovation are essential to optimize therapies for high-risk patients and enhance implant longevity.

REFERENCES

1. Albrektsson T, Zarb G, Worthington P, Eriksson A. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: a review and proposed criteria of success. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 1986;1(1):11-25.
2. Berglundh T, Persson L, Klinge B. A systematic review of the incidence of biological and technical complications in implant dentistry reported in prospective longitudinal studies of at least 5 years. J Clin Periodontol. 2002;29:197-212.
3. Javed F, Romanos GE. Impact of diabetes mellitus and glycemic control on the osseointegration of dental implants: a systematic literature review. J Periodontol. 2009;80(11):1719-30.
4. Heitz-Mayfield LJ, Lang NP. Comparative biology of chronic and aggressive periodontitis vs. peri-implantitis. Periodontology 2000. 2010;53(1):1.
5. Lindhe J, Meyle J; Group D of European Workshop on Periodontology. Peri-implant diseases: consensus report of the sixth European workshop on

periodontology. J Clin Periodontol. 2008;35(8):282-5.

6. Sanz M, Chapple IL; Working Group 4 of the VIII European Workshop on Periodontology. Clinical research on peri-implant diseases: consensus report of Working Group 4. J Clin Periodontol. 2012;39(12):202-6.

7. Plemmenos G, Piperi C. Pathogenic molecular mechanisms in periodontitis and peri-implantitis: Role of advanced glycation end products. Life. 2022;12(2):218.

8. Monje A, Kan JY, Borgnakke W. Impact of local predisposing/precipitating factors and systemic drivers on peri-implant diseases. Clin Implant Dentistry Relat Res. 2023;25(4):640-60.

9. Maney P, Schiavo JH, Mascarenhas F, Dragonas P. Risk factors for peri-implantitis. Curr Oral Health Rep. 2020;7:234-48.

10. Mazel A, Belkacemi S, Tavitian P, Stéphan G, Tardivo D, Catherine JH, et al. Peri-implantitis risk factors: A prospective evaluation. J Investig Clin Dent. 2019;10(2):e12398.

11. Das D, Shenoy N, Shetty S. Understanding the risk of peri-implantitis. J Health All Sci. 2024;14(01):23-37.

12. Vilela N, Gurgel BC, Rostant CM, Schey KC, Vekariya KM, da Silva HDP, et al. Performance of the Implant Disease Risk Assessment in Predicting Peri-Implantitis: A Retrospective Study. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2024;9.

13. Luo J, Zhang Y, Yu Z, Jiang X, Li J, Chen B, et al. A retrospective single cohort study on the 5–13 year clinical outcomes of implant-supported cross-arch fixed dental prostheses with monolithic zirconia-based frameworks. J Prosthodont. 2024;10.

14. Alqutaibi AY, Algabri RS, Alamri AS, Alhazmi LS, Almadani SM, Alturkistani AM, et al. Advancements of artificial intelligence algorithms in predicting dental implant prognosis from radiographic images: A systematic review. J Prosthet Dent. 2024;27:727-3.

15. Shahapur SG, Patil K, Manhas S, Datta N, Jadhav P, Gupta S. Predictive Factors of Dental Implant Failure: A Retrospective Study Using Decision Tree Regression. Cureus. 2024;16(12):e75192.

16. Ghorbani H, Minasyan A, Ansari D, Ghorbani P, Wood DA, Yeremyan R, et al. Anti-diabetic therapies on dental implant success in diabetes mellitus: a comprehensive review. Front Pharmacol. 2024;15:1506437.

17. Memè L, Bambini F, Pizzolante T, Sampalmieri F, Bianchi A, Mummolo S. Evaluation of a single non-surgical approach in the management of peri-implantitis: glycine powder air-polishing versus ultrasonic device. Oral Implantol. 2024;16(2):67-78.

18. Golub LM, Lee H-M, Bacigalupo J, Gu Y. Host modulation therapy in periodontitis, diagnosis and treatment—status update. Front Dent Med. 2024;5:1423401.

19. Santostasi N, Gerardi D, Rinaldi F. Relationship between interleukin 1 (IL-1) genetic polymorphism and periimplantitis: systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2024;28(10):3566-82.

20. Abouchenari A, Tajbakhsh N, Shahbaz A, Alamdari-Mahd G. Advancements in dental implant technology: the impact of smart polymers utilized through 3D printing. Synthesis Sintering. 2024;4(2):108-23.

21. Yadalam PK, Sharma S, Natarajan PM, Ardila CM. Gradient boosting-based classification of interactome hub genes in periimplantitis with periodontitis–an integrated bioinformatic approach. Front Oral Health. 2024;5:1462845.