Preserving Smiles : A Comprehensive Review of Alveolar Ridge Preservation in Implant Dentistry

Dr. Pradeep Christopher[1], Karthikeyan D[2], Sarathy P[3], Dr. Kanimozhi[4] ,Dr. Gayathri[5],

[1] *Professor and HOD,Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery,Thai moogambigai dental college and hospital, Chennai, India*
[2] *Junior resident, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery,Thai moogambigai dental college and hospital, Chennai, India*
[3] *Junior resident, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery,Thai moogambigai dental college and hospital, Chennai, India*
[4] *Senior lecturer, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery,Thai moogambigai dental college and hospital, Chennai, India*
[5] *Reader, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery,Thai moogambigai dental college and hospital, Chennai, India*

ABSTRACT

An essential component of contemporary dentistry is alveolar ridge preservation (ARP), which addresses the challenge of bone loss following tooth extraction. This procedure is necessary for the effective placement of dental implants. Many different approaches are used in this field, including the use of membranes and grafting materials, which has sparked ongoing discussions about the relative merits of these approaches in the dental community. In modern dental practices, it is essential to comprehend the complex mechanisms of bone remodeling and the subtle indications for using ARP in implant preparation, aesthetic concerns management, and defect treatment.

The main advantage of ARP is that it can maintain ridge dimensions, which essentially prepares the ground for further implant procedures. But even with its acknowledged significance, there is still discussion in the dental community about concerning the superiority of specific ARP techniques over others. In order to define and establish more precise clinical protocols, this debate emphasizes the necessity of thorough research and evidence-based practices.

Socket collapse and graft resorption after treatment are two major obstacles that still require specialized solutions. If these problems are not resolved, they may have a major effect on the stability and long-term performance of implants. The advancement of dental practice in the context of ARP is primarily driven by the investigation and creation of these customized solutions.

The ongoing development and progress in this area is focused on optimizing bone formation, minimizing graft resorption, and minimizing the invasiveness of ARP procedures. In addition to focusing on technical advancement, this forward trajectory prioritizes a patient-centric approach with the goal of optimizing outcomes and experiences for those undergoing these procedures.

Future dental trends will heavily emphasize patient-centric strategies that are centered on honing and perfecting ARP techniques. This involves improving patient experiences, satisfaction, and general health outcomes in addition to maintaining alveolar ridges. These patterns highlight how dynamic dental practices are, always changing as they strive for excellence and innovation.

Keyword : - *Alveolar Ridge Preservation, Tooth Extraction ,Dental Implants ,Ridge Resorption ,Grafting Materials ,Membranes ,Systematic Review ,Clinical Efficacy ,Evidence Based ,Recommendations ,ClinicalOutcomes.*

INTRODUCTION :

Alveolar ridge preservation (ARP) stands as a fundamental procedure in the realm of dentistry, aiming to counteract the consequential bone resorption that occurs post-tooth extraction, particularly in anticipation of subsequent prosthodontic treatments like dental implant placement. ARP is instrumental due to its ability to deter unwelcome horizontal and vertical reduction of the ridge following extraction, especially when the schedule for dental implant treatments is deferred. This involves delaying implant placement for at least three to six months post-extraction, occasionally requiring longer treatment durations compared to immediate or early implant placements within the initial four months. By employing ARP, practitioners seek to methodically curtail bone resorption, favouring implant placement that is prosthetically driven.

Over the years, a spectrum of materials and methodologies has been deployed for ridge preservation. These approaches encompass the use of grafting materials, such as synthetic alloplasts or xenografts, either with or without accompanying membranes. However, the efficacy of these techniques has engendered considerable debate and generated conflicting findings. While some studies advocate for the effective mitigation of ridge resorption through grafting materials, others contend that these intra-socket grafts may impede the standard healing process or may not yield significant benefits. Additionally, there remains controversy regarding the rate at which grafting materials undergo resorption.

The evolution of ridge preservation techniques has led to ongoing research and systematic reviews aimed at evaluating the clinical efficacy of various materials and techniques. These comprehensive reviews aim to offer evidence-based recommendations for dental clinicians and patients, guiding them toward the most optimal approaches for preserving alveolar ridges and minimizing ridge resorption.

Consequently, the core objective of the systematic review in question is to thoroughly evaluate the clinical efficacy of diverse materials and techniques employed in alveolar ridge preservation (ARP). This review seeks to provide robust evidence, catering to the needs of dental clinicians and patients, by elucidating the effects of these materials and techniques in either preventing or minimizing alveolar ridge resorption.[1]

1. ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF ALVEOLAR BONE

1.1 Alveolar bone structure and its role in supporting teeth

The alveolar bone in the maxilla and mandible supports teeth through two key components: the alveolar bone proper and the supporting alveolar bone. The alveolar bone proper encases tooth sockets with compact bone, fostering attachment for the periodontal ligament. Meanwhile, the supporting alveolar bone, comprising cortical plates and spongy bone, surrounds and fortifies the alveolar bone proper. This structure evenly disperses chewing forces to maintain dental stability and resist pressure during biting. Understanding the alveolar bone's architecture and function is fundamental for dental health, as it bolsters the integrity of teeth and averts periodontal diseases.[3]

1.2 Mechanisms Of Bone Resorption Post-Tooth Extraction

Following tooth extraction, bone resorption in the alveolar ridge occurs via diverse mechanisms. Inflammatory responses trigger internal socket wall resorption, leading to reductions in ridge width and height. The absence of teeth activates osteoclasts, accelerating bone breakdown. Significant dimensional changes, approximately 0.7-1.5 mm vertical and 4.0-4.5 mm horizontal bone loss, manifest predominantly within three months post-extraction. This process involves intricate cellular and molecular actions, notably osteoclast activity and inflammation. A comprehensive understanding of these mechanisms is vital for devising strategies to preserve alveolar ridge architecture and encourage bone regeneration.[4]

1.3 Factors Influencing Bone Remodelling In The Alveolar Ridge

Bone remodelling in the alveolar ridge is influenced by multiple factors such as tooth anatomy, eruption direction, and bundle bone integrity. The healing process post-extraction triggers bone reshaping, leading to both horizontal and vertical ridge reduction. Notably, buccal bone often experiences more resorption than lingual/palatal areas, causing dimensional shifts. Recognizing these influences is vital in alveolar ridge preservation techniques to curb bone loss and sustain requisite dimensions for successful implant placement and favorable esthetic outcomes.[5]

2. INDICATIONS AND RATIONALE FOR RIDGE PRESERVATION

2.1 Clinical Scenarios Warranting Ridge Preservation

Ridge preservation procedures play a pivotal role in various clinical situations to uphold alveolar ridge dimensions post- tooth extraction. Primarily, these procedures are recommended for subsequent implant placement, ensuring a stable foundation. They are crucial, notably in the aesthetic zone, to uphold natural contours and smile aesthetics. In instances of thin buccal plates, ridge preservation safeguards against further resorption, pivotal for implant stability. Addressing socket defects post-extraction, it aids in restoration and primes the site for future implants. For immediate implant placement, ridge preservation maintains dimensions, enhancing implant success and aesthetics. Additionally, these procedures are integral components of ridge augmentation, aiming to broaden and heighten the alveolar ridge for improved implant accommodation and smile aesthetics. However, the decision to proceed with ridge preservation should be individualized, assessing patient needs and clinical considerations under the guidance of a dental professional.[6]

2.2 Benefits Of Ridge Preservation For Future Implant Success

Ridge preservation, a post-tooth extraction technique, serves to prevent resorptive changes in the alveolar bone and maintain its volume and shape, crucial for subsequent implant placement success. This procedure yields multiple advantages.

Firstly, it significantly minimizes post-extraction bone loss, offering a more stable base for future implants by preserving the ridge's structure. As a result, subsequent implant procedures are simplified, eliminating the need for additional, often invasive bone grafting or augmentation surgeries.

Moreover, preserving the natural contours of the alveolar bone enhances esthetical outcomes for the eventual implant restoration, ensuring a more harmonious and natural appearance. Long-term stability is also improved, as maintaining the ridge's integrity and volume provides adequate support, reducing the risk of complications such as implant mobility or peri- implant bone loss.

Additionally, ridge preservation reduces both treatment time and costs for patients by eliminating the necessity for supplementary bone grafting procedures, streamlining the implant process and minimizing surgical interventions.[7]

2.3 Evidence Supporting The Advantages Of Ridge Preservation Techniques

Ridge preservation techniques offer crucial advantages in implant therapy. They effectively limit alterations in the shape and size of the alveolar ridge following tooth extraction, ensuring optimal conditions for successful implant placement. Preserving the aesthetic appearance of the ridge is particularly vital in areas of high aesthetic concern, where even the loss of a single tooth can significantly impact a patient's smile. Furthermore, these techniques provide a more stable foundation for prosthetic restorations, enhancing both functional and aesthetic outcomes for patients. Notably, patients express high satisfaction with the results of ridge preservation procedures due to reduced postoperative complications. However, while studies highlight these advantages, there's no definitive evidence supporting one technique's superiority over another. The choice of technique often relies on specific clinical circumstances and the preferences of the implant team.[8]

3. TECHNIQUES FOR ALVEOLAR RIDGEPRESERVATION

3.1 Socket Grafting With Various Biomaterials: Autografts, Allografts, And Xenografts

Socket grafting is a common procedure performed after tooth extraction to preserve the dimensions of the alveolar bone. Different biomaterials, including autografts, allografts, and xenografts, are used for socket grafting. Autografts, such as autogenous bone, are considered the gold standard due to their osteogenic, osteoinductive, and osteoconductive properties. However, they have limitations such as limited harvesting volume and donor site morbidity. Allografts consist of freeze- dried human bone and can be demineralized or non-demineralized. Xenografts are derived from bovine bone and can undergo chemical or thermal deproteinization. These biomaterials provide alternatives to autografts but may have limitations such as cost and potential risk of infection. Socket grafting with various biomaterials offers clinicians options for successful ridge preservation and implant placement.[9]

3.2 Barrier membranes and guided bone regeneration

Barrier membranes are pivotal in guided bone regeneration (GBR), fostering a conducive environment for bone tissue regrowth. They prevent unwanted cell ingrowth while encouraging bone-regenerative cells. Ideal membranes balance biological and mechanical traits: biocompatibility allowing substance passage but inhibiting connective tissue growth, and favorable space-making properties. Classified as polymer and non-polymer, polymer membranes

offer controlled characteristics, bioactivity, and antibacterial effects, actively promoting bone regeneration. Membrane choice significantly impacts GBR success, providing an enclosed space for bone-regenerative cell proliferation, crucial for new bone formation. Ongoing advancements target improved membrane properties to enhance GBR success in dental and orthopaedic applications.[10]

3.3 Novel And Emerging Techniques In Ridge Preservation

Ridge preservation is a conventional method for post-extraction healing, but there is ongoing research to explore novel and emerging techniques for better outcomes. One such technique involves the use of a composite gel comprising gelatine nanoparticles (gnps) and injectable platelet-rich fibrin (i-PRF). This gel not only possesses favourable mechanical properties but also accelerates blood clotting time. Studies have shown that this gel stimulates early angiogenesis and osteogenesis, leading to corticalization and creating a favorable environment for implantation. These findings suggest that gnps+i-PRF gel may be a promising treatment option for ridge preservation. Further research is needed to validate its effectiveness and compare it with other materials and techniques.[2]

4. Healing and Bone Regeneration Process

4.1 Phases Of Wound Healing Following Ridge Preservation

Following ridge preservation, wound healing progresses through three primary phases. The initial inflammatory phase triggers clot formation and recruits inflammatory cells for debris removal. Subsequently, the granulation phase witnesses the formation of blood vessels and collagen production, establishing a new tissue matrix. Finally, the remodelling phase involves tissue maturation and collagen organization for enhanced strength. The duration of each phase varies based on individual health, extraction extent, and preservation techniques utilized, highlighting the dynamic nature of wound healing in ridge preservation.[11]

4.2 Factors Influencing Successful Bone Regeneration

Successful bone regeneration post-grafting relies on various influencing factors. The choice of socket grafting materials— autologous bone, allografts, xenografts, or alloplastic materials—affects regeneration outcomes. Guided bone regeneration (GBR), utilizing membranes with grafting materials, directs new bone growth and inhibits soft tissue infiltration. The healing period post-grafting significantly impacts regeneration success, although the optimal duration is still being investigated. Smoking adversely affects wound healing, potentially reducing bone width and delaying healing. Antimicrobials like chlorhexidine can mitigate infection risks and bolster successful bone regeneration. Occasionally, additional augmentation procedures might be necessary for achieving ideal implant positioning, influencing regeneration success. The effectiveness of these factors varies based on individual patient circumstances, necessitating further research for a comprehensive understanding of their impact on bone regeneration processes.[12]

4.3 Radiographic And Histologic Assessments Of Regenerated Bone

Research into alveolar bone regeneration following tooth extraction has uncovered valuable insights. Barrier membranes show potential by reducing alveolar bone resorption compared to nonintact periosteum. Resorbable membranes offer benefits over titanium ones, reducing exposure risks and the need for additional removal surgery. Studies on polymer membranes revealed less horizontal resorption and greater bone socket fill, indicating improved height preservation. Techniques employing acellular dermal matrix with hydroxylapatite also maintained ridge thickness, showcasing positive outcomes for combined therapies. Flap elevation, although believed to temporarily hinder periosteal cell repair, might not significantly impact long-term alveolar dimensions. Innovative approaches, such as PDGF-BB in socket grafting, nonresorbable hydroxyapatite crystals, and eptfe membranes, show promise in minimizing ridge remodeling post- extraction. Additionally, research indicating delays in tissue development during osseointegration postulates unique molecular dynamics in bone repair. Collectively, these studies provide essential insights into successful alveolar bone regeneration, influencing techniques and material choices for post-extraction healing.[14][15],[16],[17],[13]

5. Clinical Outcomes and Success Rates

5.1 Long-term studies & their findings on the success of ridge preservation

study spanning a 4-year period compared implant outcomes in ridge-preserved and nonpreserved sites, highlighting the advantages of ridge preservation in implant dentistry. Regardless of the grafting material—cortical porcine bone or collagenated corticocancellous porcine bone—ridge preservation led to superior clinical outcomes. Implants in preserved sites exhibited less marginal bone loss, indicating preserved bone structure and enhanced

implant stability. Evaluating esthetic outcomes using the Pink Aesthetic Score (PES), implants in ridge-preserved sites with cortical porcine bone achieved the best scores, possibly due to its supportive properties for surrounding soft tissues. Nonetheless, limitations included a small sample size and a scarcity of long-term clinical studies on ridge preservation, emphasizing the need for further research to bolster these findings. In essence, this study suggests that ridge preservation techniques, irrespective of the grafting material, yield improved clinical and esthetic outcomes in implant dentistry, although more extensive research is essential for conclusive evidence.[18]

5.2Complications And Failure Rates Associated With Different Techniques

Alveolar ridge preservation aims to support optimal healing and ridge retention; however, potential complications can arise, impacting the procedure's success. Infection, typically within the initial two weeks, is a primary concern, presenting as pain, swelling, and inflammation. Membrane exposure or perforation can compromise healing, leading to an increased infection risk. Loss of bone graft material may reduce desired ridge volume, while wound dehiscence can delay healing. Excessive bleeding and persistent mucosal ulceration can pose discomfort and healing delays. Loss of keratinized mucosal width can occur, affecting protective tissue around the ridge. Failure rates, spanning 3.3% to 20%, relate to treatment errors, inadequate biomaterial selection, and factors affecting implant integration. Individual variations, techniques, and biomaterials influence specific risks and outcomes. Careful planning, minimally invasive approaches, and proper management are vital in mitigating complications. Further research is essential to better understand and address the risks in alveolar ridge preservation procedures.[19]

6. Comparative Analysis of Ridge Preservation Techniques

6.1 Comparative Studies Evaluating Different Materials And Methods

Alveolar ridge preservation techniques encompass diverse materials and methods. Autogenous bone is prized for its osteogenic potential but has limitations in availability and the need for additional surgery. Xenogenic and alloplastic materials serve as feasible alternatives without the requirement for a secondary surgical site. Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) offers promising growth factors but requires further clinical validation. Membranes play a crucial role, with resorbable types eliminating the need for subsequent surgeries. Selecting the right materials and techniques for ridge preservation depends on individual clinical needs and implant success rates, necessitating more research for evidence-based guidelines for practitioners.[20]

6.2 Advantages, Limitations, And Considerations For Each Technique

Barrier membranes play a critical role in alveolar bone preservation, preventing soft tissue intrusion and supporting undisturbed bone regeneration. Their effectiveness depends on proper placement, with resorbable and non-resorbable variants having distinct advantages and considerations. Growth factors, through stimulating cell activity and bone formation, augment tissue healing. Careful selection, timing, and dosages are pivotal for maximizing their benefits. Stem cells, with their diverse differentiation potential, promise tissue regeneration but require further assessment for safety and ethical considerations. Grafting materials offer varied sources for bone regeneration, necessitating selection based on biocompatibility, integration, and size considerations. These components play unique roles in preserving ridge integrity, but their optimal utilization is contingent on specific techniques, materials, and patient factors, warranting meticulous evaluation in clinical practice.[21]

7. Challenges and Future Directions

7.1 Common Challenges In Ridge Preservation And Potential Solutions

Some common challenges in ridge preservation include:

Socket collapse: Following tooth extraction, potential complications like socket and soft tissue collapse, infection, graft material resorption, and patient compliance issues pose challenges in alveolar ridge preservation. Socket collapse causes bone loss, affecting aesthetics for future implants. Soft tissue collapse may lead to inadequate support for final restoration. Infection and inflammation hinder healing, impacting ridge preservation. Graft material resorption reduces preserved ridge volume. Patient compliance, involving post-operative care instructions, such as smoking cessation and oral hygiene, can significantly influence the success of ridge preservation.[22,23]

Potential solutions to these challenges include:

Socket preservation techniques: Using specific techniques and materials, such as bone grafts or biomaterials, to fill the socket immediately after tooth extraction can help prevent socket collapse and maintain the volume of the alveolar ridge. Soft tissue management: Proper management of the soft tissue during and after extraction, such as flap design and suturing techniques, can help preserve the soft tissue architecture and support.

Antibiotic therapy: The use of antibiotics can help prevent infection and reduce inflammation, promoting optimal healing and ridge preservation.

Use of graft materials with slow resorption: Choosing graft materials with slow resorption rates can help maintain the volume of the preserved ridge over time.

Patient education and motivation: Educating patients about the importance of compliance with post-operative instructions and motivating them to follow the recommended guidelines can improve the success of ridge preservation.[22,23,24]

7.2 Areas For Further Research And Innovation In The Field Of Alveolar Ridge Preservation Include:

Advances in alveolar ridge preservation are fueled by diverse research strategies. Innovation in biomaterials involving synthetic scaffolds, growth factors, and stem cells aims to foster superior bone regeneration and curb ridge resorption. Long-term evaluations provide critical insights into the sustained success and stability of bone and soft tissue. Comparative studies among varied grafting techniques seek to identify the most reliable methods for ridge preservation. Optimizing surgical protocols and understanding patient-centered outcomes informs better treatment decisions and enhances patient care. Advanced imaging techniques, such as CBCT and 3D printing, offer detailed ridge morphology, aiding in personalized graft planning. The integration of digital technologies like CAD/CAM and virtual surgical planning refines precision and efficiency in alveolar ridge preservation, enabling customized grafts and enhancing overall treatment outcomes.[24]

7.3 Future Trends And Developments In Alveolar Ridge Preservation

The future trends and developments in alveolar ridge preservation include advancements in grafting materials and techniques. Researchers are exploring the use of novel biomaterials that can enhance bone formation and reduce ridge resorption. These materials may include xenografts, allografts, and bio-active agents used alone or in combination. Additionally, there is a focus on minimizing the invasiveness of procedures by utilizing self-transplantation from cadavers that have undergone a deantigenation process.

This approach can provide material with high osteoconductive properties. Furthermore, studies are investigating the impact of residual bone height and vertical bone gain on new bone formation and graft shrinkage after lateral sinus lifts. The goal is to optimize graft healing and stability, particularly when using alloplastic materials and xenografts. Overall, the future of alveolar ridge preservation involves continuous research and innovation to improve outcomes and patient experiences[25].

CONCLUSION

Alveolar ridge preservation (ARP) in implant dentistry is crucial for maintaining bone volume post-tooth extraction and optimizing the site for future implant placement. Techniques using diverse materials offer benefits in reducing bone resorption and supporting successful implantation. Challenges like socket collapse and graft resorption persist, demanding tailored solutions. Ongoing innovations aim to enhance bone regeneration, minimize invasiveness, and optimize patient outcomes, shaping the future of dentistry by improving implant success and bone regeneration.

6. REFERENCES

1. Pagni G, Pellegrini G, Giannobile WV, Rasperini G. Postextraction alveolar ridge preservation: biological basis and treatments. Int J Dent. 2012;2012:151030. Doi: 10.1155/2012/151030. Epub 2012 Jun 12. PMID: 22737169; PMCID: PMC3378971.

2. De Angelis P, De Rosa G, Manicone PF, De Giorgi A, Cavalcanti C, Speranza A, Grassi R, D'Addona A. Hard and soft tissue evaluation of alveolar ridge preservation compared to spontaneous healing: a retrospective clinical and volumetric analysis. Int J Implant Dent. 2022 Dec 8;8(1):62. Doi: 10.1186/s40729-022-00456-w. PMID: 36480055; PMCID: PMC9732162.

3. Atieh MA, Alsabeeha NH, Payne AG, Ali S, Faggion CMJ, Esposito M. Interventions for replacing missing teeth: alveolar ridge preservation techniques for dental implant site development. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2021 Apr 26;4(4):CD010176. Doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010176.pub3. PMID: 33899930; PMCID: PMC8092674.

4. Emilio Couso-Queiruga, Cyrus J. Mansouri, Azeez A. Alade, Trishul V. Allareddy, Pablo Galindo- Moreno, Gustavo Avila-Ortiz 15 March 2022 https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.22-0030

5. Srinivas B, Das P, Rana MM, Qureshi AQ, Vaidya KC, Ahmed Raziuddin SJ. Wound Healing and Bone Regeneration in Postextraction Sockets with and without Platelet-rich Fibrin. Ann Maxillofac Surg. 2018 Jan-Jun;8(1):28-34. Doi: 10.4103/ams.ams_153_17. PMID: 29963421; PMCID: PMC6018297.

6. Kalsi AS, Kalsi JS, Bassi S. Alveolar ridge preservation: why, when and how. Br Dent J. 2019 Aug;227(4):264-274. Doi: 10.1038/s41415-019-0647-2. PMID: 31444438.
7. Yang Z, Wu C, Shi H, Luo X, Sun H, Wang Q, Zhang D. Advances in Barrier Membranes for Guided Bone Regeneration Techniques. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2022 Jun 22;10:921576. Doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2022.921576. PMID: 35814003; PMCID: PMC9257033.
8. De Angelis, Paolo & Rosa, Giuseppe & Manicone, Paolo & Giorgi, Alessandro & Cavalcanti, Camilla & Speranza, Alessandro & Grassi, Roberta & D'Addona, Antonio. (2022). Hard and soft tissue evaluation of alveolar ridge preservation compared to spontaneous healing: a retrospective clinical and volumetric analysis. International journal of implant dentistry. 8. 62. 10.1186/s40729-022-00456-w.
9. Avila-Ortiz G, Elangovan S, Kramer KW, Blanchette D, Dawson DV. Effect of alveolar ridge preservation after tooth extraction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Dent Res. 2014 Oct;93(10):950-8. Doi: 10.1177/0022034514541127. Epub 2014 Jun 25. PMID: 24966231; PMCID: PMC4293706.
10. Balli G, Ioannou A, Powell CA, Angelov N, Romanos GE, Soldatos N. Ridge Preservation Procedures after Tooth Extractions: A Systematic Review. Int J Dent. 2018 Jul 3;2018:8546568. Doi: 10.1155/2018/8546568. PMID: 30057608; PMCID: PMC6051091.
11. Jafer MA, Salem RM, Hakami FB, Ageeli RE, Alhazmi TA, Bhandi S, Patil S. Techniques for Extraction Socket Regeneration for Alveolar Ridge Preservation. J Contemp Dent Pract. 2022 Feb 1;23(2):245-250. PMID: 35748457.
12. Willenbacher, M., Al-Nawas, B., Berres, M., Kämmerer, P.W. and Schiegnitz, E. (2016), Alveolar Ridge Preservation. Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, 18: 1248-1268. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12364
13. V. Lekovic, P. M. Camargo, P. R. Klokkevold et al., "Preser- vation of alveolar bone in extraction sockets using bioab- sorbable membranes," Journal of Periodontology, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 1044–1049, 1998.
14. S. M. Luczyszyn, V. Papalexiou, A. B. Novaes, M. F. M. Grisi, S. L. S. Souza, and M. Taba, "Acellular dermal matrix and hydroxyapatite in prevention of ridge deformities after tooth
15. S. Fickl, O. Zuhr, H. Wachtel, W. Bolz, and M. Huerzeler, "Tissue alterations after tooth extraction with and without surgical trauma: a volumetric study in the beagle dog," Jour- nal of Clinical Periodontology, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 356–363, 2008.
16. M. L. Nevins, M. Camelo, P. Schupbach, D. M. Kim, J. M. B. Camelo, and M. Nevins, "Human histologic evaluation of mineralized collagen bone substitute and recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-bb to create bone for implant placement in extraction socket defects at 4 and 6 months: a case series," International Journal of Periodontics and Restora- tive Dentistry, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 129–139, 2009
17. Z. Lin, H. F. Rios, S. L. Volk, J. V. Sugai, Q. Jin, and W. V. Giannobile, "Gene expression dynamics during bone healing and osseointegration," Journal of Periodontology, vol. 82, no. 7, pp. 1007–1017, 2011.
18. Marconcini S, Giammarinaro E, Derchi G, Alfonsi F, Covani U, Barone A. Clinical outcomes of implants placed in ridge-preserved versus nonpreserved sites: A 4-year randomized clinical trial. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2018;1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.12682
19. Barootchi S, Tavelli L, Majzoub J, Stefanini M, Wang H-L, Avila-Ortiz G. Alveolar ridge preservation: Complications and cost-effectiveness. Periodontol 2000. 2023;92:235-262. doi: 10.1111/prd.12469
20. Munhoz EA, Cardoso CL, Bodanezi A, Mello MB, Yaedu RYF, Ferreira Junior O. Concepts and challenges of alveolar ridge preservation and augmentation. World J Stomatol 2016; 5(1): 8-14 Available from: URL: http://www.wjgnet.com/221-6263/full/v5/ i1/8.htm DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5321/wjs.v5.i1.8
21. Jafer MA, Salem RMA, Hakami FB, et al. Techniques for Extraction Socket Regeneration for Alveolar Ridge Preservation. J Contemp Dent Pract 2022;23(2):245–250.
22. Avila‐Ortiz G, Gubler M, Romero‐Bustillos M, Nicholas CL, Zimmerman MB, Barwacz CA. Efficacy of alveolar ridge preservation: A randomized controlled trial. J Dent Res 2020;99:402–9.
23. Majzoub J, Ravida A, Starch‐Jensen T, Tattan M, Suárez‐López del Amo F. The influence of different grafting materials on alveolar ridge preservation: A systematic review. J Oral Maxillofac Res 2019;10:e6. doi: 10.5037/jomr. 2019.10306.
24. Quisiguiña Salem C, Ruiz Delgado E, Crespo Reinoso PA, Robalino JJ. Alveolar ridge preservation: A review of concepts and controversies. Natl J Maxillofac Surg 2023;14:167-76.
25. De Angelis, N.; Bagnasco, F.; Amaroli, A. Bone Regeneration: Overview and Future Trends. J. Clin. Med. 2023, 12, 4529. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134529.