A new index for rating aesthetics of implant-supported single crowns and adjacent soft tissues – the Implant Crown Aesthetic Index
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Abstract

Objectives: The important item of aesthetics is rarely included in evaluation studies. The aim of this study was to develop and validate an index for rating aesthetics of implant-supported single crowns and adjacent soft tissues.

Material and methods: Nine items were selected, which have an influence on the aesthetic result. The items are based on the anatomic form, colour and surface characteristics of the crown and on the anatomic form, colour and surface characteristics of the peri-implant soft tissues. Two oral-maxillofacial surgeons and two prosthodontists rated 24 implant-supported single-tooth restorations and adjacent soft tissues on a form with the nine items of the rating index. The rating was carried out twice by each of the examiners. Weighted Cohen’s $\kappa$ was calculated to express the intra- and interobserver agreement.

Results: Intraobserver results indicated that the agreement between the first and second rating of both the prosthodontists was good (both 0.7) and that the agreement of the oral-maxillofacial surgeons was moderate (0.49 and 0.56). The best interobserver agreement was found between the two prosthodontists (0.61, good agreement).

Conclusions: The Implant Crown Aesthetic Index is an objective tool in rating aesthetics of implant-supported single crowns and adjacent soft tissues. The rating is best be carried out by one prosthodontist to have the highest reliability.
crown. The index of the California Dental Association includes for example secondary caries. Also the Ryge criteria (Ryge 1980) are used many times in evaluation studies, but mainly in rating aesthetics and marginal integrity of composite restorations. Both indices ignore the adjacent mucosa, which can influence the aesthetic result to a high degree and is often compromised in implant treatment (Chang et al. 1999). Jemt (1999) introduced an index to assess the height of interproximal mucosa adjacent to single-implant restorations, but did not take the entire peri-implant contour and surface structure into account. An objective rating score, with a division in different items, not only gives insight in the aesthetic result of a specific treatment, but also facilitates analysis in order to improve surgical and/or prosthetic treatment. It is also possible to compare the aesthetic result as a function of time in order to analyse the stability of a treatment procedure.

The aim of this study was to develop and validate an index for rating aesthetics of implant-supported single crowns and adjacent soft tissues. The hypothesis is that there is a satisfactory validation of the index.

Material and methods

Out of the literature nine items were selected, which have an influence on the aesthetic result (California Dental Association 1977; Chang et al. 1999; Moberg et al. 1999; Touati et al. 1999). The items are based on the anatomic form, colour and surface characteristics of the crown and on the anatomic form, colour and surface characteristics of the peri-implant soft tissues. The nine selected items were:

- **mesiodistal dimension of the crown:** the mesiodistal dimension must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a five-point rating scale (grossly undercontoured, slightly undercontoured, no deviation, slightly overcontoured, grossly overcontoured);
- **labial convexity of the crown:** convexity of the labial surface of the crown must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a five-point rating scale (grossly undercontoured, slightly undercontoured, no deviation, slightly overcontoured, grossly overcontoured);
- **colour and translucency of the crown:** colour and translucency of the crown must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a three-point rating scale (gross mismatch, slight mismatch, no mismatch);
- **position of the labial margin of the peri-implant mucosa:** the labial margin of the peri-implant mucosa must be at the same level as the contralateral tooth and in harmony with the adjacent teeth, a judgement can be given on a three-point rating scale (deviation of 1.5 mm or more, deviation less than 1.5 mm, no deviation);
- **position of the incisal edge of the crown:** the position must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a five-point rating scale (grossly undercontoured, slightly undercontoured, no deviation, slightly overcontoured, grossly overcontoured);
- **colour and surface of the labial mucosa:** colour (redness) and surface characteristics of the mucosa at the alveolar bone must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a five-point rating scale (grossly undercontoured, slightly undercontoured, no deviation, slightly overcontoured, grossly overcontoured);
- **colour and surface of the labial mucosa:** colour (redness) and surface characteristics of the mucosa at the alveolar bone must be in harmony with the adjacent and contralateral tooth, a judgement can be given on a three-point rating scale (gross mismatch, slight mismatch, no mismatch).

It has been decided to use the adjacent and contralateral tooth as a reference and not the generally accepted rules for shape and position of teeth. These rules are derived from young female patients and cannot be applied to all patients, since the proportions between the general shape of the face, size, sex and other teeth have to be maintained (Touati et al. 1999).

Penalty points were given to each of these items if not matching to the desired situation: one penalty point for minor (slight) deviations and five penalty points for major (gross) deviations. The total score leads to a judgement about aesthetics:

- 0 penalty points = excellent;
- 1 or 2 points = satisfactory;
- 3 or 4 points = moderate;
- 5 or more points = poor aesthetics.

It can be noticed that one major deviation automatically leads to a poor aesthetic result and can never be accepted as moderate or satisfactory.

In Fig. 1a–c examples are given of the index for rating aesthetics.

To test the reliability of the newly developed index intra- and interobserver agreement must be calculated (Landis & Koch 1977). Four examiners (two oral-maxillofacial surgeons and two prosthodontists) underwent familiarisation with the index, followed by calibration. After this 24 slides of implant-supported single-tooth restorations in the aesthetic region of the maxilla were selected to participate in the study. Each of the 24 implant-supported single-tooth restorations and the adjacent soft tissues were rated on a form with the nine items of the rating index. The rating was carried out twice by each of the examiners. There was a 2-week time interval period between the ratings to prevent recollection of the first rating. Weighted Cohen’s $k$ has been calculated to express the intra- and interobserver agreement. $k$ represents the observed proportion of nonchance agreement.

Results

The intraobserver agreement and weighted Cohen’s $k$ are listed in Table 1. It can be noticed that there was a good agreement between the first and second ratings of the
prosthodontists and that the prostodontists were more consistent in their scores. The interobserver agreement and weighted Cohen’s $\kappa$ are listed in Table 2. The best agreement was noticed between the two prosthodontists.

**Discussion**

The intraobserver results [Table 1] indicate that the agreement between the first and second ratings of both the prosthodontists is good [both 0.7] and that the agreement of the oral-maxillofacial surgeons is moderate [0.49 and 0.56] according to the procedure of Landis & Koch (1977). The intraobserver agreement of the prosthodontists is better than the agreement of the oral-maxillofacial surgeons. The making of the implant crown is the last part of the total implant treatment. Prosthodontists are daily involved with prosthetic restorations and evaluation of the total treatment. This experience could be a reason why prosthodontists are more consistent in their scores than oral-maxillofacial surgeons. The best interobserver agreement (Table 2) was found between the two prosthodontists (good agreement). All the other calculated weighted Cohen’s $\kappa$ show a moderate agreement. Again, the experience of the prosthodontists could be an important factor.

The rating has been carried out on slides projected on a screen. In this way the observation settings are standardised, without interference of the possible opinion of the patient. On the other hand, real colour and surface characteristics are more difficult to examine on slides. Also, a good comparison with the contralateral tooth is not always possible on slides if this tooth is not in the direct vicinity, e.g. with the rating of bicuspids. In this case, the adjacent teeth alone were used for comparison.

It has been chosen to use the adjacent and contralateral tooth as a reference and not the generally accepted rules for shape and position of teeth. One should always take into account the harmony with other teeth, even if gross deviations exist with aesthetic principles.

**Table 1. Intraobserver agreement and weighted Cohen’s $\kappa$ (general over all items)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed agreement (%)</th>
<th>Cohen’s $\kappa$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosthodontist 1</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosthodontist 2</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of agreement: $<0.2 = $ poor, $0.21–0.4 = $ fair, $0.41–0.6 = $ moderate, $0.61–0.8 = $ good, $0.81–1 = $ very good.

**Table 2. Interobserver agreement and weighted Cohen’s $\kappa$ (general over all items)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed agreement (%)</th>
<th>Cohen’s $\kappa$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1 vs. surgeon 2</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1 vs. prosthodontist 1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1 vs. prosthodontist 2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 2 vs. prosthodontist 1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 2 vs. prosthodontist 2</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosthodontist 1 vs. prosthodontist 2</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of agreement: $<0.2 = $ poor, $0.21–0.4 = $ fair, $0.41–0.6 = $ moderate, $0.61–0.8 = $ good, $0.81–1 = $ very good.

Fig. 1. [a] Implant-supported single-tooth restoration in position 21. Labial convexity of the crown is slightly overcontoured, slight mismatch in colour of the crown, slight deviation in position of the labial mucosal margin, and the labial surface of the mucosa is slightly undercontoured. The total score is four points on the index, which means moderate aesthetics. [b] Implant-supported single-tooth restoration in position 11. The mesiodistal dimension of the crown is slightly overcontoured. The total score is one point on the index, which means satisfactory aesthetics. [c] Implant-supported single-tooth restoration in position 21. The mesiodistal dimension of the crown is slightly overcontoured, a slight mismatch in colour of the crown, slight deviation in position of the labial mucosal margin and a gross mismatch in colour and surface of the mucosa. The total score is eight points on the index, which means poor aesthetics.
Zusammenfassung

Ein neuer Index zur Bewertung der Ästhetik von implantatgetragenen Einzelkronen und der angrenzenden Weichgewebe – der Implantat Kronen Ästhetik Index

Ziele: Der wichtige Faktor Ästhetik wird kaum in Untersuchungen miteinbezogen. Das Ziel dieser Studie war, einen Index zur Bewertung der Ästhetik von implantatgetragenen Einzelkronen und der angrenzenden Weichgewebe zu entwickeln und zu werten.


Resultate: Die Resultate innerhalb der Untersucher zeigten, dass die Übereinstimmung zwischen der ersten und der zweiten Bewertung bei beiden Prothetikern gut war (beide 0.7) und dass die Übereinstimmung bei den Kieferchirurgen mässig ausfiel (0.49 und 0.56). Die beste Übereinstimmung zwischen zwei verschiedenen Untersuchern wurde zwischen den beiden Prothetikern gefunden (0.61, gut Übereinstimmung).

Schlussfolgerungen: Der Implantat Kronen Ästhetik Index stellt ein objektives Werkzeug zur Bewertung der Ästhetik von implantatgetragenen Einzelkronen und der angrenzenden Weichgewebe dar. Die Bewertung wird am besten durch einen Prothetikspezialisten durchgeführt, um die höchste Zuverlässigkeit zu erhalten.

Resultate und epidemiologie.


Die Bewertung einer Implantat Kronen Ästhetik Index ist eine wichtige Maßnahme in der Kieferorthopädie und der Rehabilitation. Sie ermöglicht den Patienten und den Behandlungsteam die Auswahl der richtigen Implantat Kronen und die optimale Ästhetikversorgung der Patienten. Es ist wichtig, dass die Ästhetik die Zentrale im Behandlungsgeschehen bleibt.


