

Proceedings of the 6th ITI Consensus Conference

Abstract

The 6th ITI Consensus Conference was held in Amsterdam on 17–19 April 2018. In preparation for the conference, 21 systematic reviews were written. They were divided into five main topics in dental implantology—surgery, prosthodontics, patient-reported outcomes, complications/risk and digital technologies. Based on these review papers, the working groups prepared consensus statements, clinical guidelines and recommendations for future research.



The International Team for Implantology (ITI) is a not for profit association of professionals in implant dentistry. The objectives of the

ITI are the promotion and dissemination of knowledge about implant dentistry and to serve dental professionals by fostering learning, discussion and exchange.

Every 5 years, the ITI conducts a consensus conference to review the current state of evidence in areas of topical interest in dental implantology. The 6th ITI Consensus Conference was held in Amsterdam on 17–19 April 2018. Five major topics comprising surgery, prosthodontics, patient-reported outcomes, complications/risk and digital technologies were identified. In total, 21 systematic reviews were prepared by 80 authors and co-authors in preparation for the consensus workshop (Table 1). The 153 invited participants and observers were divided into five working groups (Figure 1). Their discussion and deliberations over the 3-day workshop culminated in consensus statements, clinical recommendations and recommendations for future research, the results of which are published in this supplement.



FIGURE 1 Participants of the 6th ITI Consensus Conference

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2018 The Authors. *Clinical Oral Implants Research* Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

TABLE 1 List of systematic reviews

	Authors	Title of review
Group 1: Surgical Group leader: Ronald Jung		
Paper 1	Papaspyridakos P, De Souza A, Vazouras K, Gholami H, Pagni S, Weber, HP	Survival rates of short dental implants (≤ 6 mm) compared with implants longer than 6 mm in posterior jaw areas: A meta-analysis
Paper 2	Schiegnitz E, Al-Nawas B	Narrow diameter implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 3	Jokstad A, Ganeles J	Systematic review of clinical and patient-reported outcomes following oral rehabilitation on dental implants with a tapered compared to a non-tapered implant design
Paper 4	Chappuis V, Avila-Ortiz G, Araújo M, Monje A	Medication-related dental implant failure: Systematic review and meta-analysis
Group 2: Prosthetic Group leader: Dean Morton		
Paper 1	Lin WS, Eckert S.	Clinical performance of intentionally tilted implants versus axially positioned implants: A systematic review
Paper 2	Gallucci G, Hamilton A, Zhou W, Buser D, Chen ST	Implant placement and loading protocols in partially edentulous patients: A systematic review
Paper 3	Roehling S, Schlegel KA, Woelfler H, Gahlert M	Performance and outcome of zirconia dental implants in clinical studies: A meta-analysis
Paper 4	Daudt Polido W, Aghaloo T, Emmett T, Taylor TD, Morton D	Number of implants placed for complete-arch fixed prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 5	Sailer I, Strasding M, Valente NA, Zwahlen M, Liu S, Pjetursson BE	A systematic review of the survival and complication rates of zirconia-ceramic and metal-ceramic multiple-unit fixed dental prostheses
Paper 6	Pjetursson BE, Valente NA, Strasding M, Zwahlen M, Liu S, Sailer I	A systematic review of the survival and complication rates of zirconia-ceramic and metal-ceramic single-crowns (SCs)
Group 3: PROMS (patient reported outcome measures) Group leader: Jocelyne Feine		
Paper 1	Wittneben JG, Wismeijer D, Brägger U, Joda T, Abou-Ayash, S	Patient-reported outcome measures focusing on aesthetics of implant- and tooth-supported fixed dental prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 2	Yao CJ, Cong C, Bornstein MM, Mattheos N	Patient reported outcome measures of edentulous patients restored with implant-supported removable and fixed prostheses: A systematic review
Paper 3	Huynh-Ba G, Oates T, Williams MAH	Immediate loading vs. early/conventional loading of immediately placed implants in partially edentulous patients from the patients' perspective: A systematic review
Group 4: Complications/risks Group leader: Lisa Heitz-Mayfield		
Paper 1	Hashim D, Cionca N, Combescure C, Mombelli A	The diagnosis of peri-implantitis: A systematic review on the predictive value of bleeding on probing
Paper 2	Salvi GE, Monje A, Tomasi C	Long-term biological complications of dental implants placed either in pristine or in augmented sites: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 3	Schimmel M, Srinivasan M, McKenna G, Müller F	Effect of advanced age and/or systemic medical conditions on dental implant survival: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 4	Rocuzzo M, Layton DM, Rocuzzo A, Heitz-Mayfield LJ	Clinical outcomes of peri-implantitis treatment and supportive care: A systematic review
Group 5: Digital technologies Group leader: Daniel Wismeijer		
Paper 1	Joda T, Derksen W, Wittneben JG, Kuehl, S	Static computer-aided implant surgery (s-CAIS) analysing patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), economics and surgical complications: A systematic review
Paper 2	Flügge T, van der Meer WJ, Gimenez Gonzalez B, Vach K, Wismeijer D, Wang P	The accuracy of different dental impression techniques for implant-supported dental prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Paper 3	Fokas G, Vaughn VM, Scarfe W, Bornstein MM	Accuracy of linear measurements on CBCT images related to pre-surgical implant treatment planning: A systematic review
Paper 4	Tahmaseb A, Wu V, Wismeijer D, Coucke W, Evans, C	The accuracy of static computer-aided implant surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Group 1 addressed the influence of implant design—length, diameter and taper—on survival and success of dental implants. The influence of systemic conditions and medications on implant outcomes was also discussed. Group 2 reviewed the evidence for orientation of implants (axial vs. intentionally tilted), ceramic implants and the numbers of implants required in edentulous indications. Zirconia as a restorative material for single-crown and multiple-unit fixed dental prostheses was examined. In addition, the evidence for combinations of implant placement and subsequent loading was discussed, and a new classification system that combines placement and loading protocols was proposed. Group 3 reviewed the evidence for patient-reported outcome measures on aesthetic outcomes of fixed tooth and implant prostheses, and the patient-reported outcomes for removable and fixed prostheses, and immediate placement and loading. In group 4, the predictive value of bleeding on probing and the outcomes of peri-implantitis treatment followed by supportive care was reviewed. In addition, the outcomes for implants placed in augmented sites and the influence of advanced age and systemic medical conditions was deliberated on. Group 5 examined the outcomes of computer-aided implant surgery, the accuracy of different implant impression techniques, the accuracy of linear measurement of cone beam CT images and the accuracy of static computer-aided implant surgery.

In this special issue of *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, the systematic reviews and the consensus statement/clinical recommendation reports are published. We are pleased to present the proceedings of the consensus conference to advance the science of dental implantology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the leaders of the working groups—Drs Ronald Jung, Dean Morton, Jocelyne Feine, Lisa Heitz-Mayfield and Daniel Wismeijer—for their effort in guiding the authors in the preparation of the review papers and for leading the subsequent discussion in their respective working groups. We would like to extend our appreciation to Dr Lisa Heitz-Mayfield, Editor in Chief of this journal, for her invaluable advice during the review process and for preparing this supplement. We are also grateful for the tireless support of

Dr Friedrich Buck, Executive Director of the ITI and the entire organizing team at ITI Headquarters. These proceedings were supported by the ITI Foundation, Basel, Switzerland.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they are both members of the Board of the International Team for Implantology (ITI), the organiser of the consensus conference, but this fact does not lead to any conflict of interest in regard to the content of this article or the content of the conference.

Keywords

aesthetics, bone augmentation, CBCT, Consensus Conference, dental implant, digital dentistry, edentulous patients, immediate loading, implant failure, loading protocols, medically compromised, narrow diameter implants, patient-reported outcome measures, peri-implantitis, prosthodontics, surgery, systematic review, tapered implants, tilted implants, zirconia implants

Daniel Wismeijer¹

Stephen T. Chen²

¹Department of Oral Implantology and Prosthetic Dentistry, Academic Center for Dentistry Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²Melbourne Dental School, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic., Australia

Correspondence

Daniel Wismeijer, ACTA Department of Oral Implantology and Prosthetic Dentistry, Gustav Mahlerlaan 3004, 1081 LA Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Email: d.wismeijer@acta.nl

How to cite this article: Wismeijer D, Chen ST. Proceedings of the 6th ITI Consensus Conference. *Clin Oral Impl Res.* 2018;29(Suppl. 16):5–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.13301>