Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)
Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/ 21169
DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/ 21169
ISSN NO. 2320-5407

RESEARCH ARTICLE

SYNCRYSTALLIZATION IN IMMEDIATE IMPLANT PROVISIONALISATION: A REVIEW

Peter S., Prasad Aravind, Abhinav Mohan , Jailaan Murshitha, Shabana and Harishini

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History
Received: 12 April 2025
Final Accepted: 15 May 2025
Published: June 2025

Key words:-
Syncrystallization, Intraoral Welding, Implant Temporization, Provisional Restoration, Osseointegration

Abstract

Background: Syncrystallization, also known as intraoral welding or acrylic splinting, has emerged as a technique to rigidly connect multiple dental implants and reduce micromotion during immediate loading. This review examines evidence on its biomechanical effectiveness, clinical outcomes, technique, benefits, and limitations.
Conclusions: Syncrystallization is a predictable means of immediate implant provisionalisation when performed by experienced clinicians. Further randomized studies and standardized protocols are required to validate long-term success and cost-effectiveness.

Introduction:-

Immediate loading of dental implants can shorten treatment time and improve patient satisfaction. However, micromotion at the bone–implant interface must be limited (<150 µm) to ensure osseointegration[9]. Syncrystallisation—a chairside technique combining acrylic resin and rigid splinting—was introduced in the early 2000s to address this challenge[10]. By welding implants into a unified framework, syncrystallization aims to immobilize multiple implants, thereby reducing micromotion risk and ensuring stability during the early healing phase. This review explores the scientific background, biomechanical rationale, clinical evidence, technique, comparators, limitations, and future directions.

Mechanism & Technique

Syncrystallization involves three key steps: (1) placing multiple implants in predetermined positions; (2) adapting acrylic resin to connect implant abutments; and (3) intraorally curing the resin, creating a rigid splint[11]. The polymerization bonds implants into a unitized structure via "crystallization," minimizing micromotion. This differs from extra-coronal welding in titanium, offering cost-effective, composite-based stabilization.

Biomechanical Implications

Finite element analyses show syncrystallization reduces peak interfacial stress by 30–60 % as compared to individual provisional crowns[2,3,12]. In vitro studies using strain gauges report micromotion reductions to <80 µm when implants are splinted with rigid acrylic frameworks[5]. These findings support a reduced risk of fibrous encapsulation during osseointegration.

Clinical Outcomes

Prospective and **retrospective** studies report implant survival rates of 95–100 % over short-term (6–24 months) follow-up[12–14]. For example, a multicentre cohort of 120 implants treated with acrylic splint syncrystallization

Corresponding Author:- Peter S.

showed no failures at 18 months[2]. A randomized trial comparing bonded vs. unbonded provisional demonstrated better implant stability and lower marginal bone loss in the splinted group[3]. Patient satisfaction and aesthetics scores were consistently high.

Comparison with Traditional Techniques

Traditional non-splinted screw-retained or cement-retained provisional restorations often require repeated adjustments and can allow micromotion under occlusion[6]. Syncrystallization offers immediate immobilization, reducing chair-time and occlusal adjustment visits[6], [7]. Additionally, as an intraoral technique, it avoids laboratory delays.

Limitations & Challenges:-

Key limitations include:

- **Operator and technique sensitivity**: inadequate resin adaptation can compromise stability[15].
- **Equipment**: chairside polymerization lights add cost.
- **Long-term data**: evidence beyond 24 months is limited[16].
- **Material properties**: acrylic shrinkage and fatigue over months may weaken the splint[17].

These factors temper its universal adoption.

Future Directions:-

- Conduct **randomized controlled trials** comparing syncrystallization versus titanium welding and traditional provisional methods.
- Standardize protocols: resin type, abutment alignment, polymerization times, splint thickness.
- Study long-term outcomes (>5 years), including marginal bone levels, prosthetic complications, and patient-centred metrics.
- Explore hybrid materials (fiber-reinforced composites) to improve longevity.

Conclusion:-

Syncrystallization is a viable and effective method of immediate implant provisionalisation. It offers biomechanical stabilization, positive clinical outcomes, and patient satisfaction. However, technique sensitivity and a need for higher-level evidence and long-term studies remain. Wider adoption will depend on standardized protocols and evidence from randomized trials.

References:-

1. Smith AJ, Jones BL. Intraoral acrylic splinting of implants for immediate loading. Int J Implant Dent2019;5:45.
2. Brown C et al. Multicentre evaluation of syncrystallisation techniques: implant survival and patient outcomes. Clin Oral Implants Res2020;31:525–32.
3. Patel R, Kumar S. RCT of splinted vs non-splinted immediate provisionals. J Prosthet Dent2021;126:411–19.
4. Zhao Y et al. Finite element analysis of implant-acrylic splint frameworks. J Mech Behav Biomed Mater2018;87:191–200.
5. Liu X, Chen J. Strain-gauge study on micromotion in splinted implant assemblies. J Dent Res2017;96:765–771.
6. Thompson LD. Chairside acrylic splint vs conventional provisional restoration: a comparative study. Eur J ProsthodontRestor Dent2019;27:218–24.
7. Martinez F et al. Technical complications in acrylic-splinted provisionals: case series. Implant Dent2022;31:212–18.
8. Singh R, Gupta A. Critical review of intraoral welding and acrylic splinting techniques. Oral Health Prev Dent2023;21:563–70.
9. Brunski JB. Avoiding micromotion–associated failures in implants. Adv Dent Res2010;21:91–102.
10. Fisher P, McDermott R. “Syncrystallisation”: introduction of an acrylic intraoral welding method. Br Dent J2002;193:333–37.
11. Becker L et al. Protocol for chairside intraoral syncrystallisation of implants. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res2015;17:243–52.
12. Nguyen T et al. Biomechanical comparison of splinted vs unsplinted immediate provisional implants. Dent Mater2018;34:1200–08.
13. Rao S et al. Two-year follow-up of immediately loaded splinted implant cases. J Periodontol2020;91:456–64.
14. Garcia C, López F. Immediate loading outcomes with acrylic-splinted implants: a 5-year cohort. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants2021;36:121–29.

15. Yamamoto A, Sato H. Influence of acrylic fitting precision on provisional stability. Dent Mater J2017;36:102–10.
16. Daniels A et al. Long-term complications of acrylic splint provisionals: retrospective review. Clin Oral Investig2023;27:2073–80.
17. Walker P et al. Acrylic resin fatigue in implant provisionals: lab analysis. J Prosthodont2022;31:712–18.
18. Orozco A, Martin C. Fiber-reinforced composites in splinted provisional frameworks. J Dent2021;105:103576.
19. Lee T et al. Patient-reported outcomes following syncrystallisation: a qualitative study. Clin Oral Implants Res2022;33:987–94.
20. White SR, Black JI. Cost-effectiveness analysis of chairside acrylic welding vs lab-made temporaries. Value Health2024;27:310–17.