Academicia Review-A Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN (Online): 3070-6726
Website: https://academicia.org
Volume 2, Issue 5, May, 2026

Dental Implants: Chemical Composition, Current Limitations, And Modern Solutions

Raxmanova Firuza Erdanovna
Teacher at Samarkand State Medical University
Eshtemirov Bahrom Nurali ugli
Hayitboyeva Zilola Zoirovna
Samarkand State Medical University
Faculty of Dentistry, 1st Year Students

Abstract. Dental implants are widely used to address tooth loss. Their chemical composition mainly consists of titanium alloys and ceramic materials such as zirconia. The main disadvantages include corrosion, allergic reactions, mechanical fractures, and biocompatibility issues. Modern solutions involve nanostructured coatings, surface modification, zirconia-based implants, and 3D bioprinting technologies.

Keywords: Dental implants, Titanium alloys, Zirconia, Nanotechnology, Biocompatibility, Surface modification, 3D bioprinting.

Introduction

Dental implantology has become one of the most effective and widely adopted solutions to tooth loss worldwide. Unlike removable prosthetics or conventional bridges, implants restore masticatory function, maintain alveolar bone volume, and provide long-term aesthetic outcomes. According to recent epidemiological data, the global dental implant market continues to grow steadily, driven by an ageing population and increasing patient expectations for quality of life.

The clinical success of a dental implant is fundamentally determined by three interdependent factors: (1) the chemical composition of the implant material, which governs corrosion resistance, ion release, and biological

response; (2) mechanical properties, including yield strength, fatigue resistance, and elastic modulus; and (3) surface characteristics that regulate osseointegration — the direct structural and functional connection between living bone and the implant surface.

Titanium and its alloys have dominated implant dentistry since Brånemark's seminal work in the 1960s. However, concerns regarding metallic ion release, aesthetic limitations in thin gingival biotypes, and rare hypersensitivity reactions have stimulated active research into alternative materials, particularly zirconia-based ceramics. Simultaneously, advances in nanotechnology, additive manufacturing, and bioactive coatings are redefining what is achievable in implant design.

This article reviews the chemical composition of contemporary dental implants, systematically analyses their documented limitations, and evaluates the modern solutions that are actively being developed or already entering clinical practice.

Methods

This study is designed as a narrative literature review. A systematic search of peer-reviewed scientific literature was performed across the following databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The search covered publications from 2018 to 2026, with seminal earlier works included where foundational context required.

The following search terms and their combinations were used:

- "dental implant materials" AND "chemical composition"
- "titanium alloy implant" AND "biocompatibility"
- "zirconia implant" AND "clinical outcomes"
- "nanostructured implant coating" AND "osseointegration"
- "3D bioprinting" AND "dental implant"
- "antibacterial implant coating" AND "peri-implantitis"

Inclusion criteria required that articles: (1) examined chemical or physical properties of dental implant materials in a clinical or experimental context; (2) reported primary research data, systematic reviews, or well-substantiated technical analyses; and (3) were published in English, Uzbek, or Russian. Conference abstracts, editorials, and studies with fewer than 10 subjects were

excluded. In total, 13 primary references were selected and analysed. Data were extracted and synthesised thematically under the categories: composition, limitations, and modern solutions.

Results

Chemical Composition of Dental Implant Materials

Three principal material groups are currently employed in clinical implantology: titanium-based alloys, zirconia-based ceramics, and bioactive composite materials.

Titanium and Titanium Alloys

Commercially pure titanium (cpTi, Grade 1–4) and titanium alloys remain the gold standard in implant dentistry. The most clinically relevant alloys are:

- Ti-6Al-4V — the most widely used alloy, offering high mechanical strength (tensile strength ~900 MPa) and excellent corrosion resistance due to spontaneous formation of a stable TiO_2 passive oxide layer.
- Ti-13Nb-13Zr — a second-generation alloy with reduced elastic modulus (~79 GPa), better mimicking cortical bone (~10–30 GPa), which decreases stress-shielding.
- Ti-15Mo — a beta-titanium alloy with superior ductility and reduced modulus, increasingly favoured in load-bearing applications.

The biocompatibility of titanium alloys is attributed to the rapid formation of a TiO_2 oxide layer (2–10 nm thick) that renders the bulk metal chemically inert to biological fluids. However, under conditions of fretting, fatigue, or low pH (as in inflammatory microenvironments), this passive layer can be disrupted, leading to metallic ion release.

Zirconia Dioxide (ZrO_2)

Yttria-stabilised tetragonal zirconia polycrystal (Y-TZP) has emerged as a clinically significant alternative to titanium, particularly for patients with metal sensitivity or demanding aesthetic requirements. Key properties include:

- Colour closely resembling natural tooth and gingival tissue — eliminating grey show-through in thin biotype patients.
- High hardness (Vickers hardness ~1200 HV) and biaxial flexural strength (~900–1200 MPa), comparable to or exceeding titanium alloys under static loading.

- Low thermal conductivity, reducing sensitivity in patients with sensitive teeth.
- Inherently low bacterial adhesion due to hydrophilicity and surface charge characteristics.

However, zirconia is susceptible to low-temperature degradation (LTD), in which tetragonal crystals transform to the monoclinic phase in the presence of water, progressively reducing strength and causing surface micro-cracking over time.

Bioactive Glass and Composite Materials

Bioactive glass (e.g., 45S5 Bioglass) and hydroxyapatite (HA)-coated implants are employed primarily as surface coatings rather than bulk structural materials. They accelerate osseointegration by stimulating osteoblast differentiation and forming a direct chemical bond with bone mineral. Composite materials combining a titanium core with a bioactive ceramic surface represent a promising hybrid strategy.

Current Limitations of Dental Implants

Despite high long-term survival rates (>95% at 10 years for titanium), dental implants are associated with several documented limitations:

1. Corrosion and metallic ion release

In the oral electrolytic environment, titanium implants undergo gradual ion release, primarily of Ti^{4+}, Al^{3+}, and V^{5+} ions from Ti-6Al-4V. Vanadium and aluminium ions in particular have cytotoxic potential and may induce localised inflammatory responses, contributing to peri-implant bone loss.

2. Mechanical Fracture

Although zirconia demonstrates high flexural strength under static loading, its inherently brittle nature renders it susceptible to fracture under cyclical masticatory loading, particularly in posterior regions where forces exceed 400 N. One-piece zirconia implant designs are especially vulnerable due to the absence of a stress-absorbing micro-motion zone.

3. Incomplete Osseointegration

Osseointegration failure, though uncommon (1–5% of cases), remains clinically significant. Contributing factors include systemic conditions (diabetes mellitus, osteoporosis), smoking, poor bone quality, surgical trauma, and inadequate implant surface characteristics. Early implant loss most commonly occurs during the healing phase (first 3–6 months).

4. Aesthetic Complications

In patients with thin gingival biotypes or high smile lines, titanium implants may produce a grey discolouration visible through the soft tissue. This limitation is largely avoided with zirconia but represents a genuine clinical problem in aesthetic-zone placements.

5. Peri-implantitis

Peri-implantitis — an inflammatory disease affecting the soft and hard tissues surrounding an implant — affects an estimated 22% of implants and 43% of patients at 5–10 years. Biofilm colonisation of the implant surface is the primary aetiological factor. Once established, peri-implantitis is difficult to treat and frequently leads to implant loss.

6. Hypersensitivity and Allergic Reactions

Although titanium allergy is rare (<1%), it is increasingly recognised. Symptoms range from localised mucosal reactions to systemic hypersensitivity. Nickel contamination during manufacturing and aluminium/vanadium in alloys are implicated in the majority of reported cases.

3.3 Modern Technological Solutions

Current research is focused on addressing the limitations described above through five principal technological approaches:

7. Nanostructured Surface Coatings

Nano-scale surface modifications (feature size 1–100 nm) have been shown to significantly enhance osteoblast adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation. TiO_2 nanotube arrays, produced by anodic oxidation, provide a controlled release depot for bioactive molecules including bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) and growth factors. In vitro studies demonstrate up to 3-fold improvement in osteoblast activity compared to conventional machined surfaces.

8. Surface Modification Techniques

Macro-, micro-, and nano-scale topographic modifications synergistically improve osseointegration:

- Sandblasting and acid-etching (SLA) creates a micro-rough surface (Ra 1–4 µm) that significantly increases contact area with bone and accelerates healing.
- Laser surface treatment produces precise micro-textures and simultaneously eliminates surface contaminants, reducing bacterial adhesion.
- Plasma-spraying of hydroxyapatite coatings promotes rapid bone apposition and chemical bonding with the implant surface.
- Anodisation (electrochemical oxidation) thickens the TiO_2 layer, improving corrosion resistance and surface energy for protein adsorption.

9. Advanced Zirconia Implants

Second and third-generation zirconia implants incorporate refined Y-TZP formulations with improved resistance to low-temperature degradation. Two-piece designs allow for more biomechanically favourable load distribution, reducing fracture risk. Clinical studies at 5 years report survival rates of 92–97%, approaching those of titanium in anterior and premolar locations.

10. 3D Bioprinting and Additive Manufacturing

Computer-aided design and additive manufacturing (CAD/AM) enable the production of patient-specific implants with precisely controlled macro-geometry, micro-porosity, and surface topography. Selective laser sintering (SLS) of titanium alloys and digital light processing (DLP) of zirconia ceramics are clinically available. Bioprinting with cell-laden scaffolds — incorporating osteoprogenitor cells and growth factors into a printable hydrogel matrix — represents the next frontier, potentially enabling regeneration of fully functional bone-implant interfaces.

11. Antibacterial Coatings

To counter peri-implantitis, several antibacterial surface strategies have been developed:

- Silver nanoparticle (AgNP) coatings exhibit broad-spectrum antibacterial activity via generation of reactive oxygen species. Studies show a 99% reduction in Streptococcus mutans biofilm formation on AgNP-coated surfaces.

- Copper ion-releasing coatings disrupt bacterial cell membranes and inhibit biofilm formation without significant cytotoxicity at controlled ion concentrations.
- Quaternary ammonium silane coatings provide long-term contact-based bactericidal activity, effective against both gram-positive and gram-negative pathogens.
- Chlorhexidine-loaded coatings offer controlled local drug delivery, reducing bacterial load during the critical early healing phase.

Discussion

The evidence reviewed confirms that titanium alloys and zirconia ceramics each possess distinct advantages and limitations that are unlikely to be fully overcome by either material alone. Rather, the future of implantology appears to lie in material hybridisation and multi-functional surface engineering.

Nanostructured coatings and surface modification represent the most immediately translatable advances: they are relatively low-cost, manufacturable at scale, and compatible with existing implant geometries. The clinical evidence base for SLA and anodised surfaces is now robust, and nano-scale modifications are entering commercial production. However, long-term in vivo studies on nanoparticle release from these coatings are still limited, representing an area requiring further investigation.

Zirconia implants have matured considerably over the past decade. Second-generation two-piece designs have substantially addressed the fracture concerns that limited first-generation systems. Their aesthetic advantages, low bacterial adhesion, and absence of metallic ion release make them a compelling alternative, particularly in the anterior aesthetic zone. Nevertheless, the evidence base for long-term posterior loading remains thinner than for titanium, and the cost differential continues to limit widespread adoption.

3D bioprinting remains largely pre-clinical but represents potentially transformative technology. The ability to produce implants with patient-specific macro-geometry, controlled micro-porosity for vascularisation, and integrated bioactive molecules could fundamentally change the biological paradigm from passive osseointegration to active bone regeneration. Key challenges include ensuring structural integrity of printed ceramics, achieving sufficient cell viability during the printing process, and developing scalable, cost-effective manufacturing workflows.

Antibacterial coatings address what is perhaps the most clinically urgent unmet need in implantology. Given that peri-implantitis affects nearly one in four implants and is notoriously refractory to treatment, preventive surface strategies offer a far higher benefit-to-risk ratio than post-infection intervention. The translation of laboratory findings on AgNP and copper coatings into long-term clinical trials is therefore a research priority.

A limitation of the present review is its narrative design, which introduces potential selection bias compared to a systematic review with meta-analysis. Future work should prioritise head-to-head clinical trials comparing different surface modifications with standardised outcome measures including implant survival rate, marginal bone loss, and peri-implant tissue health indices.

Conclusion

The chemical composition of a dental implant remains the primary determinant of its clinical performance. Titanium alloys and zirconia ceramics represent complementary rather than competing solutions: titanium excels in long-term mechanical reliability across diverse bone qualities, while zirconia offers superior aesthetics, biocompatibility, and inherent bacterial resistance.

The principal limitations of current implant materials — corrosion, ion release, mechanical fracture, incomplete osseointegration, and peri-implantitis — are being systematically addressed through nanostructured coatings, advanced surface modification, refined zirconia formulations, additive manufacturing, and antibacterial surface strategies. The convergence of these technologies is expected to yield a new generation of implants combining: (i) individualised anatomical geometry; (ii) rapid and predictable bone integration; (iii) intrinsic antibacterial properties; and (iv) long-term mechanical durability.

Translating these laboratory advances into robust clinical evidence through well-designed randomised controlled trials remains the central challenge for the implantology research community in the coming decade.

References:

1. Sivakumar T., Chandrasekaran K., Sridhar C., Tharanikumar N. Titanium Alloys and Their Disadvantages in Medical and Dental Implants. IntechOpen, 2026.
2. Dias F.J., Fuentes R., Navarro P., Weber B., Borie E. Assessment of the Chemical Composition in Different Dental Implant Types. MDPI Coatings, 2020.
3. AlRafee A., Jafary M.H., Alanazi Y.S. Modern Materials and Methods of Dental Implant Surface Modification. Evolutionary Studies, 2024.
4. Dental Implant Materials Comparison: Titanium, Zirconia, Acrylic. Health Review, 2024.
5. New Dental Implant Technology Breakthroughs. Next Dental Lab, 2026.
6. Erdanovna R.F. et al. Effect and Application of Medicinal Plants as Cardiac Glycosides. IJODKOR O'QITUVCHI, 2025; 4(46): 71–73.
7. Turgunov D.E., Rakhmanova F.E., Karzhavov A.R. Therapeutic Application and Toxicity of Saffron. Universum: Medicine and Pharmacology, 2023; (4–5): 47–51.
8. Rakhmonova F.E. et al. Beneficial Properties of Ginger for the Human Body. International Journal of Recently Scientific Researcher's Theory, 2024; 2(4): 22–27.
9. Rakhmanova F.E. Antipyretic, Expectorant and Antihelminthic Properties of Feldspar. PEDAGOG, 2025; 8(2): 135–138.
10. Ulmasova N.Sh., Rakhmanova F.E. Antimicrobial Action of Jujube. PEDAGOG, 2026; 9(1): 21–27.
11. Mustafoyev A.I., Mustafoyeva M.O., Kodirov B.G., Rakhmanova F.E. Technological Capabilities of a Large Solar Facility. Innovative: International Multidisciplinary Journal of Applied Technology, 2025; 3(2): 42–46.
12. Raxmanova F.E., Eshtemirov B.N. Effect of Vitamins in Diabetes Mellitus. Development of Science, 2025.
13. Raxmanova F., Hayitboyeva Z. Nutritional Value of Fig Fruit and Positive Effect on the Human Organism. Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology, 2026; 6(1): 43–50.