

## Effects of surface contamination on dental implants

Dr. Swapnil Suresh Jadhav<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Nilima Shripad Rajhans<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Senior Lecturer, Department of Periodontology and Oral Implantology, YCMM and RDF's Dental college, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor and Head of Department, Department of Periodontology and oral Implantology, YCMM and RDF's Dental College, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

### Abstract

Contamination of dental implants—occurring during manufacture, storage, handling, or surgery—includes organic (hydrocarbons, proteins), inorganic (mineral residues, particulates), and biological (saliva, blood, bacteria/biofilm) types. These contaminants alter surface chemistry and wettability, impair cell attachment and early osteoblastic responses, reduce bone-to-implant contact (BIC) in some settings, accelerate corrosion or microbially-driven deterioration, and may compromise long-term success. This article summarizes contamination types, mechanisms of harm, detection methods, prevention and decontamination strategies, and practical clinical recommendations.

**Keywords:** Contamination, Dental Implants, Peri-Implantitis

### Introduction

Dental implant surfaces are engineered (micro- and nano-topographies, chemical treatments) to promote osseointegration. However, their clinical performance can be negatively affected by surface contamination acquired at any stage from production to placement. Contaminants can modify surface wettability and chemistry, interfere with protein adsorption and cell adhesion, and facilitate bacterial colonization—ultimately affecting osseointegration and peri-implant health<sup>[1]</sup>.

### Types of contamination

#### 1. Manufacturing and packaging residues

Inorganic particulates (silicates, metal oxides, residues from blasting/etching) and process chemicals may be left after surface treatments. These residues can persist despite standard sterilization if not removed properly<sup>[1, 6]</sup>.

#### 2. Hydrocarbon and organic pellicle (atmospheric contamination)

Titanium surfaces attract airborne organic molecules (hydrocarbons, adsorbed organics) shortly after processing. This “aged” hydrocarbon pellicle changes wettability (becoming more hydrophobic) and reduces early cell interactions<sup>[2, 9]</sup>. Photofunctionalization or UVC can significantly reduce hydrocarbon load<sup>[4, 5]</sup>.

#### 3. Biological contamination (saliva, blood, soft-tissue debris)

Salivary and blood proteins, and microorganisms introduced during surgery or handling, deposit rapidly and can form a conditioning film that alters subsequent bacterial adhesion and host cell responses. Salivary contamination during placement has been associated with reduced BIC in vivo<sup>[3]</sup>.

#### 4. Bacterial biofilm and microbial contamination

Post-placement colonization by oral microbes lead to biofilm formation (peri-implant mucositis → peri-implantitis). Early bacterial contamination at surgery may increase risk of later complications; established biofilms are

difficult to remove and can require combined mechanical and chemical decontamination<sup>[8]</sup>.

#### 5. Re-used/remufactured components and dealer-sterilized items

Healing abutments and components that are cleaned/sterilized by third parties may retain proteinaceous or microbial residues; reuse without validated decontamination increases contamination risk<sup>[7]</sup>.

### Mechanisms — how contaminants cause harm

**1. Altered surface wettability and chemistry:** Adsorbed hydrocarbons change contact angle and lower hydrophilicity, decreasing protein adsorption patterns that favour osteogenic cell attachment<sup>[9]</sup>.

**2. Impaired cell function:** Hydrocarbon-laden titanium surfaces show reduced osteoblast activity and altered spreading/proliferation in vitro—critical for early osseointegration<sup>[2]</sup>.

**3. Physical masking and interference:** Large particulates or protein films can physically mask microtopographic cues designed to promote bone anchorage<sup>[6]</sup>.

**4. Microbial colonization and inflammation:** Biological contamination seeds biofilm formation, which triggers chronic inflammation and peri-implant bone loss when uncontrolled<sup>[8]</sup>.

### Detection and analysis methods

- **Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)** — visualizes particulates, biofilms, and surface topography<sup>[1]</sup>.
- **X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS)** — quantifies elemental surface chemistry and detects hydrocarbon contamination<sup>[9]</sup>.
- **Contact angle / wettability testing** — indirect measure of contamination<sup>[20]</sup>.
- **Microbiological assays** — detect bacterial presence and identity in biofilms<sup>[8]</sup>.

## Prevention and mitigation strategies

### Prevention (upstream)

- Strict manufacturing and packaging controls: validated cleaning after surface treatments, inert packaging, minimized time between processing and placement <sup>[1]</sup>.
- Single-use, sterile components and supply-chain verification to avoid reuse of contaminated parts <sup>[7]</sup>.

### In-clinic handling

- Minimize exposure of implant surfaces (open packaging only immediately prior to insertion). Use sterile instruments and avoid salivary/blood contact <sup>[3]</sup>.

### Surface activation and decontamination methods

- Photofunctionalization / UV treatment: reduces hydrocarbons and restores hydrophilicity—improves osteoblast responses <sup>[4,5]</sup>.
- Mechanical + chemical debridement for biofilm: combinations (air-abrasion, brushes, electrolytic methods, lasers) show variable efficacy; complete reosseointegration after peri-implantitis depends on thorough decontamination <sup>[8]</sup>.
- Sterilization validation: ensure that sterilization protocols remove proteinaceous residues from reused items <sup>[7]</sup>.

### Clinical implications & recommendations

- Avoid salivary contamination during placement, especially in grafted/augmented sites <sup>[3]</sup>.
- Use implants straight from sterile packaging; limit handling of the implant body. If contamination occurs, clean according to manufacturer guidance and consider adjunctive photofunctionalization <sup>[4,10]</sup>.
- For peri-implantitis cases, employ evidence-based combined mechanical and chemical decontamination; consider newer modalities (electrolytic systems, controlled lasers) when warranted <sup>[8]</sup>.
- Avoid reuse of critical sterile components unless a validated, documented reprocessing protocol is in place <sup>[7]</sup>.

## Conclusion

Contamination of dental implants is multifactorial (manufacture, environment, handling, and biological). Even small amounts of contaminants—particularly hydrocarbons and biological films—alter surface chemistry and cell interactions and can contribute to inferior osseointegration or later peri-implant disease. Prevention (packaging, handling), detection (SEM, XPS, wettability), and targeted decontamination (UV photofunctionalization, validated cleaning, combined mechanical/chemical biofilm removal) are essential to optimize outcomes.

## References

1. Dhaliwal J S, Rahman S U, Saimbi CS, Khan M U. Contamination of titanium dental implants. A narrative review. *SN Applied Sciences*,2020:2(3):1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2206-2>
2. Hayashi R, Ueno T, Migita S, Tsutsumi Y, Doi H, Ogawa T. Hydrocarbon deposition attenuates osteoblast activity on titanium implants. *Journal of Dental Research*,2014:93(7):698–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034514532062>
3. Jinno Y, Kitajima H, Ogawa T. Influence of salivary contamination on osseointegration of dental implants. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*,2019:30(8):777–785. <https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.13480>
4. Roy M E, Whiteside LA, Xu J, Owen JR. Photofunctionalization of titanium: Surface aging and hydrocarbon removal. *Plos one*,2016:11(3): e0151236. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151236>
5. Naaman Z, Dabbagh H, Sabbagh J. Ultraviolet A and Ultraviolet C light-induced reduction of surface carbon on titanium implants. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants*,2019:34(4):851–857. <https://doi.org/10.11607/jomi.7317>
6. Bonsignore LA, Goldberg J, Drobny TK. Surface contaminants inhibit osseointegration in a novel model. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A*, 2011:99(4),593–601. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jbm.a.33167>
7. Sahin, S. C., Tetik, E., & Gursoy, B. (2021). Evaluation of residual contamination on reused healing abutments sterilized by dealers. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research*,23(5):780–789. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cid.13027>
8. Ichioka Y, Takahashi N, Koyanagi T. Decontamination of biofilm-contaminated implant surfaces: Efficacy of combined protocols. *Clinical Oral Investigations*,2023:27(2),657–669. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-022-04792-1>
9. Kido D, Wada M, Ikeda M. Influence of surface contaminants and hydrocarbon pellicle on titanium wettability measurements. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*,2023:24(12):10356. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms241210356>
10. Choi S H, Kim JH, Lee J H, Lee D W. Effect of ultraviolet light treatment and storage methods on titanium surface carbon contamination. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*,2017:28(8),931–938. <https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.12898>