

The impact of mucosal phenotype on marginal bone levels around tissue level implants: A prospective controlled trial

Carlos Garaicoa-Pazmino, DDS., MS^{*†}, Gustavo Mendonca, DDS., MSc., Ph D[‡], Alice Ou, RDH., MS[‡], Hsun-Liang Chan, DDS., MS[‡], James Mailoa, DDS., MS[§], Fernando Suarez-Lopez del Amo, DDS., MS^{||}, Hom-Lay Wang, DDS., MS, Ph D[‡]

* *Department of Periodontology, School of Dentistry, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR*

† *School of Dentistry, Universidad de Especialidades Espiritu Santo, Guayaquil, Ecuador*

‡ *Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, MI, USA*

§ *Private Practice, Makassar, Indonesia*

|| *Private Practice, Tacoma, Washington*

Conflict of Interest and Source of Funding: This study was supported by the Applied Science Research Grant from the Osseointegration Foundation of the Academy of Osseointegration (Arlington Heights, IL, USA). Dental implants were kindly donated by BioHorizons® (Birmingham, AL, USA). The authors do not have any direct or indirect financial interests in the products or information identified in this paper except for Dr. Hom-Lay Wang, who occasionally receives honoraria for speaking on behalf of BioHorizons®.

Corresponding author:

Hom-Lay Wang, DDS, MSD, PhD

Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine

University of Michigan School of Dentistry

1011 North University Avenue

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1078, USA.

TEL: + 1 734 763-3383

FAX: + 1 734 936-0374

e-mail address: homlay@umich.edu

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/JPER.20-0458](https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.20-0458).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract word count: 191

Total word count: 3685

Running title: Mucosal phenotype effect on tissue level implants MBL

One sentence summary: For tissue level implants, thin and thick peri-implant mucosal phenotypes achieved similar clinical parameters and radiographic marginal bone levels.

Total number of tables and figures: Two tables and four figures

Number of references: 42

Keywords: Phenotype, dental implant, soft tissue therapy, peri-implant endosseous healing, alveolar bone loss.

Author contributions: CG, GS, AO, HLC, JM, FS and HLW contributed to the conception and design of the work. CG, GS, AO, HLC, JM, FS, and HLW were involved in treatment procedures and data collection; CG and HLC analyzed the data; CG and HLW designed the schematic illustrations; and CG, HLC, JM, FS and HLW collaborated on manuscript writing.

Abstract

Background: The aim of this one-year prospective clinical trial was to compare clinical parameters and marginal bone levels around tissue level implants with a partially smooth collar between patients with thin (≤ 2 mm) and thick (> 2 mm) vertical mucosal phenotypes.

Methods: Thirty patients needing a single dental implant were recruited and allocated to thin ($n = 14$) or thick ($n = 16$) phenotype groups. Post-restoration, clinical (probing depth, recession, width of keratinized mucosa, bleeding on probing, suppuration, implant mobility, plaque index, and gingival index) and radiographic bone level measurements were recorded at different timepoints for one year.

Results: Twenty-six patients (13 per group) completed the one-year examination. No implants were lost (100% survival rate). There were no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) between thin and thick vertical mucosal phenotypes for any clinical parameter or for the radiographic marginal bone level.

Conclusion: Tissue level implants at one year of function placed in thin vertical mucosa achieved similar clinical parameters and radiographic marginal bone levels as those in thick tissue. The

formation of the peri-implant supracrestal tissue height plays a key role in MBL than mucosal thickness in tissue level implant.

Introduction

A recent literature review proposed that the peri-implant mucosal phenotype (i.e., horizontal and/or vertical mucosal thickness) may influence bone remodeling around dental implants.¹ An animal study has correlated the presence of angular bony defects with thin peri-implant supracrestal tissue height (STH).² Defined by Avila-Ortiz et al., the peri-implant STH is composed of the sulcular epithelium, junctional epithelium, and the supracrestal connective tissue around an implant; the authors stated that STH affects bone remodeling independently from implant level design or prosthetic features.³ In dogs, a surgically-induced thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) phenotype produced slightly more bone resorption, implying that a minimum mucosal thickness is required to allow the formation of a stable STH.⁴ In a series of prospective trials on humans, Linkevicius and coworkers have shown that implant sites in subjects with a thin ($\leq 2\text{ mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotype develop more radiographic bone loss than sites in subjects with a thick ($> 2\text{ mm}$) phenotype.⁵⁻⁸

Several authors have suggested that marginal bone loss can be mitigated by platform switching, or the lateral positioning of the implant platform-abutment interface away from the alveolar bone and toward the center of the implant.⁹⁻¹¹ Vanderweghe and DeBruyn concluded that platform switching reduces marginal bone loss by up to 30% only in sites where the peri-implant mucosa is thicker than 4.22 mm.¹² Linkevicius et al. found platform switching does not prevent radiographic bone loss in sites with a thin mucosal phenotype.⁶ A systematic review by Hsu et al. reported a mean marginal bone loss of 0.36 mm within the first year of function in platform-switched implants and a trend toward less bone resorption at sites with a thick horizontal mucosal phenotype.¹³

The vertical positioning of the implant platform with respect to the alveolar crest (e.g., subcrestal, equicrestal, or supracrestal) at time of placement¹⁴ as well as prosthetic factors that create vertical distance between bone and restorative components (e.g., abutment height, crown contours)¹⁵ can also affect post-surgical bone remodeling. Several researchers have argued that the marginal bone is preserved not by having thick mucosa but by using an abutment over 2-3 mm tall.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Pico et al. demonstrated that marginal bone loss is twice as severe when short (1 mm) instead of tall (3 mm) abutments were used on platform-switched implants placed equicrestally, regardless of mucosal phenotype.¹⁸ Over-contoured crowns (emergence angle > 30°) placed on bone level implants have four times more radiographic bone loss than tissue level implants due to patient's reduce ability to clean these restorations during self-perform mechanical plaque control.¹⁹ As most studies find that thin vertical and horizontal mucosal phenotypes and a lack of keratinized mucosa increase the risk of peri-implant diseases, the current clinical dogma is to place implants in sites with thick and adequate keratinized mucosa (KM), whether these conditions are natively present or surgically enhanced.^{20,21-24} Scarce material exists on the impact of mucosal phenotype on the marginal bone level (MBL) around tissue level implants.²⁵ The aim of this prospective clinical trial is to compare clinical parameters and MBL around implants with a 1.8 mm supracrestal smooth collar between patients with a thin (≤ 2 mm) vertical mucosal phenotype and those with a thick (> 2 mm) presentation.

Materials and Methods

This prospective cohort study was reviewed and approved by the University of Michigan Health Science Institutional Review Board (IRB) (HUM00095933), registered in ClinicalTrials.gov (ID:NCT02925078), and conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1964 as revised in 2013. Research subjects were recruited from new or active patients receiving dental care at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry from November 2016 through December 2019. Prior to

enrollment, each subject received information about the study design and signed an informed consent. A summary of this study timeline is depicted in Figure 1A.

Patient selection

Patients who were eligible for the study fulfilled all seven of the following criteria: (1) aged > 18 years, (2) partially edentulous at a maxillary or mandibular premolar or first molar region, (3) adjacent teeth present mesial and distal to the edentulous site, (4) residual bone height > 9 mm and bone width > 5 mm, (5) more than 2mm width of KM, (6) optimal oral hygiene (full-mouth plaque scores of < 10%)²⁶, and (7) clinical gingival health on an intact or reduced periodontium. Exclusion criteria included any of the following: (1) need for bone augmentation, (2) current smoking or smoking cessation of less than one year, (3) current or planned pregnancy, (4) uncontrolled systemic disease, (5) conditions known to alter bone metabolism (e.g., diabetes, osteopenia, osteoporosis, hyperparathyroidism), (6) current or historical use of oral or intravenous bisphosphonates, (7) history of radiation therapy, (8) need for active periodontal therapy, or (9) poor oral hygiene. Figure 1B shows the experimental flowchart for this study.

Presurgical screening

Patients were allocated to the thin (≤ 2 mm) or thick (> 2 mm) vertical mucosal phenotype group at a presurgical screening appointment.⁸ Under local anesthesia, an endodontic file with a rubber stopper was used to measure the vertical mucosal thickness of the edentulous site at the mid-crestal region. Standardized intraoral radiographs and a cone-beam computerized tomogram (CBCT) were taken to confirm adequate ridge dimensions that precluded advanced grafting. Customized putty bite blocks were fabricated for each patient to ensure reproducibility of standardized digital intraoral radiographs. Preliminary alginate impressions were taken to fabricate

study models, and a surgical guide was made based on ideal prosthetic positioning, which was confirmed through CBCT analysis.

Surgical protocol

Each implant placement (IP) was performed by an experienced periodontist (author HLW) under local anesthesia with 2% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine and 2% lidocaine with 1:50,000 epinephrine for hemostasis. Intrasulcular incisions were made around the teeth adjacent to the edentulous site, and a mid-crestal incision was made bisecting the width of KM. A full-thickness flap was raised on the buccal and lingual/palatal aspects of the edentulous site to expose the alveolar ridge. A dental caliper^{†1} and a periodontal probe^{#2} were used to measure mucosal thickness at 3mm apical to the incision line on the buccal flap (horizontal mucosal thickness) and vertical mucosa height in the center of the ridge at the time of surgery (Figure 2A).

Osteotomies were performed following the manufacturer's drilling sequence using a surgical guide. After site preparation was completed, a dental implant^{**3} was placed in the premolar or first molar region; the smooth-rough junction along the implant collar was surgically positioned at the crest such that only the machined portion was supracrestal. 3.8 mm diameter, 3.5 mm platform implants or 4.5 mm diameter, 4.6 mm platform fixtures were placed based upon available ridge width. Fixture length ranged between 9-12 mm based on anatomical variations. Following placement, a 4 mm tall healing abutment with a regular emergence profile (<30°) was seated, and

†1 Backhaus dental implant caliper, ProDent® USA, East Brunswick NJ, USA

University of North Carolina (UNC) manual probe with 1 mm markings, Hu-Friedy®, Chicago, IL, USA

** Tapered Tissue Level implant, BioHorizons®, Birmingham, AL, USA

interrupted dense polytetrafluoroethylene^{††4} sutures were used to close each surgical site. A standardized periapical radiograph was taken post-surgically.

Postoperative instructions

Subjects were instructed to rinse with warm salt water once a day for two weeks. All subjects were prescribed amoxicillin 500 mg tid for 10 days. If an allergy to amoxicillin was reported, the patient was prescribed a five-day dose pack of azithromycin 250 mg. Additionally, ibuprofen 600 mg was prescribed for swelling and pain control. Sutures were removed two weeks postoperatively; checks to ensure proper healing were performed one and four months post-implantation.

Prosthetic protocol

All restorative treatment was completed by author GM. Final crown impressions were performed three to five months after implant placement. Crown delivery occurred two to four weeks post-impression. Custom abutments and screw-retained implant prostheses were used. Proper occlusion, flat or slightly convex crown contours, and sealed crown margins were achieved and/or confirmed at the final restorative visit. Post-delivery adjustments were made based on patient need.

Clinical assessment

Clinical measurements including probing depths (PD) , recession (REC), bleeding on probing (BOP), suppuration (SUP), plaque index (PLI), gingival index (GI) at 6 sites (mesio-buccal, mid-buccal,

^{††} dPTFE, Osteogenics Biomedical, Lubbock, TX, USA

disto-buccal, mesio-lingual, mid-lingual and disto-lingual) were recorded using a University of North Carolina (UNC) manual probe[#], and implant mobility. Mean values among the 6 sites were obtained at the time of implant crown delivery (CD) as well as six months (T6) and 12 months (T12) post-restoration. Additionally, width of KM was recorded post-surgically at mid facial during IP from mid-buccal mucosal margin to the mucogingival margin. Supportive implant therapy using mechanical instrumentation was also performed at T6 and T12.

Radiographic assessment

Standardized radiographs were taken at crown impression, CD, T6, and T12; a new CBCT scan was taken at T12. Radiographic measurements included distance from first implant thread to bone-implant contact (BIC) (1st Thread-BIC) – pathologic bone remodeling and implant platform to BIC (Platform-BIC) - physiologic bone remodeling; these were taken at the time of implant placement (IP) through T12 (Figure 2C). Preoperative and postoperative bone width (BW) of the buccal and palatal/lingual plates were measured from CBCT images using a computer software^{##}. All measurements were collected by authors CGP and JM after intra- and inter-examiner calibration. Using the Kappa test, the inter- and intra-examiner agreements were calculated to be 0.79 and 0.85, respectively.

Statistical analysis

A test significance level (α) of 5% was used, and the power analysis was 80%. Sample size for each group was calculated using a computer program with two-sided equivalence for difference of

^{##} Blue Sky Bio, Libertyville, IL, USA

proportions in two group design^{§§}. According to a previous study,⁸ mean bone loss around an implant placed in a thin tissue biotype (μ_1) is 1.450 mm; an implant placed in a thick tissue biotype has 0.170 mm of mean bone loss (μ_2). The difference in means between the two groups ($\mu_1 - \mu_2$) is 1.280 mm with a common standard deviation (σ) of 1.160 mm. Based on these figures, the sample (n) needed in each group in this present study was calculated to be 14 patients. A non-parametric analysis for longitudinal data (Brunner-Langer model) was performed for all clinical and radiographic measurements. ANOVA-type statistics were used to detect differences between groups at a 95% confidence interval.

Results

A total of 30 patients were identified—16 were allocated to the thick tissue group (> 2 mm vertical mucosal height), and 14 were allocated to the thin tissue group (\leq 2 mm vertical mucosal height). Three patients in the thick tissue group dropped out of the study (one reported financial limitation, one moved away, and one was lost for unknown reasons); one patient from the thin tissue group was dismissed due to noncompliance. Twenty-six patients (13 per group) completed the one-year study. A summary of the baseline demographic data is presented in Table 1. No statistical difference was noted between groups at baseline demographic, clinical and radiographic parameters ($p > 0.05$). Figure 3 documents the treatment and follow up of a patient with a thick vertical mucosal phenotype (Figure 3A) and one with a thin vertical mucosa phenotype (Figure 3B).

Clinical findings

^{§§} nQuery Advisor[®], version 7.0; Statsols, Los Angeles, CA, USA

In the thick vertical tissue group, the intra-operatively mean mid-buccal and mid-lingual bone width immediately following implant placement was 1.65 ± 0.98 mm and 1.65 ± 0.82 mm, respectively. In the thin vertical tissue group, the corresponding measurements were 1.04 ± 0.64 mm and 1.69 ± 0.75 mm, respectively. There were no significant differences noted in buccal ($p = 0.072$) or lingual ($p = 0.902$) bone thickness between the two groups immediately following implant placement.

Normal healthy clinical parameters (e.g. PD <4 mm, ≥ 2 mm KM and <0.5 mm REC) were observed in both thin (≤ 2 mm) and thick (> 2 mm) vertical tissue height groups for all recorded measurements (Table 2). Between CD and T12, the mean PD in the thin tissue group increased by 0.65 mm (CD = 2.47 mm, T12 = 3.13 mm, $p < 0.001$); mean PD deepened by 1.35 mm (CD = 2.12 mm, T12 = 3.46 mm, $p < 0.001$) in the thick phenotype group (Figure 4A). Deeper PDs were found around implants with thick mucosa compared to those with thin phenotypes from CD-T6 and CD-T12 ($p < 0.05$). Midfacial PD and REC values, however, did not differ between groups from CD-T12 ($p = 0.195$) (see Supplemental Figure 1 in online Journal of Periodontology). Mean REC values remained ≤ 0.3 mm and did not differ between groups at any timepoint ($p > 0.05$) (Table 2A, Figure 4B).

There was a trend toward higher PLI (thin group = 0.26 ± 0.23 mm, thick group = 0.13 ± 0.13 mm), BOP (thin group = 42.31%, thick group = 34.62%), and GI (thin group = 0.58, thick group = 0.35) in the thin phenotype compared to the thick at one year post-restoration, but none of these differences were statistically significant (Table 2A; Figures 4C, 4D, and 4E). The width of KM decreased by approximately 1 mm in both groups from implant placement to crown delivery (IP-CD) (thin: $p < 0.05$; thick: $p < 0.05$) and remained stable from crown delivery to one year post-restoration (CD-T12) ($p > 0.05$) (Figure 4F). No statistically significant difference in mean KM width between the thin and thick mucosal groups were detected at all time points ($p = 0.687$). No mobility of any implant was detected at any timepoint.

A subset analysis was performed to examine the influence of horizontal mucosal thickness (thin <1mm and thick \geq 1mm) on PD, KM, BOP and GI (Table 2B), no statistical significance difference ($p > 0.05$) was found between groups.

Radiographic findings

At T12, the mean mid-buccal bone width obtained through a CBCT evaluation was 1.73 ± 0.74 mm in the thick tissue group and 1.37 ± 0.43 mm in the thin tissue group, and no statistically significant difference presented between phenotypes ($p = 0.151$) (Table 2C). From implant placement through one year of function (IP-T12), there was no significant change in mid-buccal bone width between groups ($p > 0.05$).

A statistically significant apical positioning of the marginal bone level from IP-CD was noted in both thin (0.52 ± 0.43 mm, $p < 0.001$) and thick (0.33 ± 0.52 mm, $p = 0.022$) phenotype groups using this implant design (Table 2C). Slightly less bone remodeling occurred in the thick biotype group, but this tendency did not reach statistical significance under comparison ($p = 0.277$). From CD-T12, there was a non-significant ($p > 0.05$) MBL change of 0.26 ± 0.44 mm in the thin vertical tissue group and a non-significant change of 0.28 ± 0.57 mm for the thick vertical tissue group. At one year (T12), the radiographic MBL for the thin and thick vertical tissue phenotypes was 1.69 ± 0.54 mm and 1.59 ± 0.83 mm, respectively; this difference between groups was not significant (Table 2C, Figure 4G). The mean MBL change from IP-T12 was statistically significant at 0.78 ± 0.66 mm (thin group) and 0.61 ± 0.71 mm (thick group), but there was no significant difference between the groups ($p = 0.591$).

We compared results from quartile phenotypic extremes to check for hidden trends. Four of the thinnest sites (mean vertical tissue height: 1.33 ± 0.28 mm) were evaluated against four of the thickest sites (mean vertical tissue height: 3.00 ± 0.40 mm). At T12, a slighter greater MBL was noted

in the thin group (1.92 ± 0.52 mm) compared to the thick group (1.42 ± 0.97 mm), but neither this difference nor the ones for clinical parameters reached statistical significance between the group extremes ($p > 0.05$).

A subset analysis was performed to examine the influence of horizontal mucosal thickness (thin <1 mm and thick ≥ 1 mm) on MBL (Table 2D), no statistical significance difference ($p > 0.05$) was found between groups although both groups showed significant MBL changes from IP up to T12 were noted in both groups.

Discussion

Although most clinical studies²⁷⁻³⁰ have previously evaluated MBL changes occurs around tissue level implants, the present prospective study did not find significant clinical or MBL changes in tissue level implants when taking into consideration of thin and thick mucosal phenotypes. These results differ from those reported by most clinical studies^{5, 7, 8, 31-33} and systematic reviews,^{21, 34} which have indicated that thicker mucosa moderates bone remodeling. The main differences between other studies and this clinical trial are the type of implant used and the implant platform depth relative to the alveolar crest. We employed a tissue level implant placed supracrestally (smooth collar placed above the crest) whereas others followed bone level implants placed equicrestally or subcrestally (roughened collar below the crest).

Linkevicius et al. reported that rough-surfaced implants placed 1.5 mm subcrestally surrounded by thin vertical mucosa compared to epicrestally placed implants.^{8, 31} Soft tissue tenting over 2 mm healing abutments and subcrestal implant placement can significantly reduce crestal bone loss, compared to vertical soft tissue thickening by tenting of epicrestally placed implants. Ercoli et al. have noted that subcrestal implant positioning of a platform-switched implant generates less crestal bone loss than a equicrestally placed implant with a tenting healing abutment.¹⁴ In a

randomized clinical trial, Linkevicius and associates observed less reduction of MBL when implants were placed subcrestally compared to epicrestally placed implants.³²

Formation of the peri-implant STH, along with implant design (polished collar, laser-microtexturing),^{35, 36} fixture positioning (supracrestal), and prosthetic features (particular abutment lengths, gently contoured crowns),^{15, 16} has likely influenced the outcomes of this study and dwarfed any effects of the native mucosal thickness. Linkevicius et al. determined that platform switching did not maintain crestal bone loss in patients with thin tissue phenotypes.³⁶ Conversely, Wallner and coworkers reported that mucosal phenotype does not affect marginal bone loss.³⁵ In the present study, minimal but statistically significant MBL increases were noted in both groups from implant placement through timepoints up to one year. The statistically relevant resorption occurred prior to crown delivery, signifying that formation of the peri-implant STH causes the greatest alterations in MBL (Table 2C). No implant in either phenotypic group displayed radiographic bone loss beyond physiological bone remodeling after one year in function. These findings suggest that the peri-implant STH is re-established regardless of mucosal phenotype prior to the prosthetic phase and is maintained during function in tissue level implants with a 1.8 mm tall polished collar. The biological response may differ for bone level implants, as evidenced by studies from the Linkevicius and van Eekeren groups that linked thin phenotypes to greater bone loss.^{5-8, 25}

This study did not find differences in clinical or radiographic measurements between thin and thick vertical tissue phenotypes; this may imply that once peri-implant STH is established with relative health, the influence of mucosal phenotype may be neutralized. Although implants in the thin tissue group trended toward greater BOP, PLI, and GI score compared to those in the thick group, no statistical differences were found between groups in BOP, PLI, or GI, and no peri-implant disease was diagnosed for any fixture at any time. Additionally, correlations between intra-operative and CBCT outcomes should be interpreted carefully. A slight increase in buccal bone width was noted after 1-year of implant placement in CBCT evaluation when compared to intra-operative

measurements. The difference may be caused by the CBCT scattering or beam hardening. Furthermore, these differences address the limitations between the chosen non-invasive (CBCT) and invasive (surgical re-entry) techniques.

Thin peri-implant mucosa may raise the risk for peri-implant diseases. In a cross-sectional study, Mailoa et al. noted significantly greater midfacial recession in sites with peri-implantitis (0.79 ± 2.22 mm) as well as in those with a thin vertical mucosal phenotype (0.71 ± 1.53 mm).³⁷ To prevent such biological complications, soft tissue augmentation is currently endorsed to correct thin phenotypes.^{23, 38} Mucosal autografts or allografts can thicken soft tissue⁷ and improve esthetics.³⁸ Soft tissue augmentation around bone level implants with thin phenotypes results in significantly less radiographic bone loss compared to non-grafted sites.^{7, 24}

Implants lacking KM are associated with plaque accumulation, tissue inflammation, recession, and attachment loss, though not with radiographic bone loss.^{39, 40} In this trial, we ensured that a sufficient band of KM (≥ 2 mm) was present at the time of implantation. Irrespective of phenotype or adequate initial KM, we noted an approximately 1 mm reduction in KM width from implantation to crown delivery, which may be due to coronally flap repositioning around the polish collars that triggers a slight loss of KM. Nonetheless, post-crown delivery, the peri-implant tissues remained stable for up to one year. One study using the same implant type as in the present study determined that KM width is unchanged up to three years if flap was positioned in the bone level.⁴¹

Scarce evidence is available related to influence of horizontal mucosal thickness on the clinical and radiographic parameters. Results from this study indicated there is no difference between thin (< 1 mm) and thick (≥ 1 mm) with regards to MBL and clinical parameters recorded. More study in this area is needed to further validate these findings. Nonetheless, it has been demonstrated that horizontal mucosal thickness is inversely correlated with the integrity and thickness of the buccal bone.⁴² The present data was in line with this observation which showed buccal thickness of 0.57 mm and 1.21 mm in thin (< 1 mm) and thick (≥ 1 mm) horizontal tissue phenotypes, respectively.

This trial tracked implants for 12 months post-crown delivery; a longer follow-up may reveal soft tissue and MBL changes that do not appear until later. Although we assessed signs of inflammation, we did not directly evaluate peri-implant diseases or the influence of tissue phenotype on them. These results apply only to one type of tissue level implant; future studies should analyze various implant designs, placement depths, and prosthetic features to clarify the effect of tissue phenotype in other scenarios.

Conclusion

Within the limitations of this study, tissue level implants at one year of function placed in thin vertical mucosa achieved similar clinical parameters and radiographic MBL as those in thick vertical tissue; the native soft tissue phenotype does not impact implant health possibly because peri-implant STH is rapidly established in the implant design we used. Longitudinal studies are required to confirm the impact of mucosal thickness in different implant designs and surgical and prosthetic situations.

Acknowledgements:


The authors would like to thank Dr. Debby Hwang (Ann Arbor, Michigan) for critically review of this paper and Juan Luis Gomez (stHalley Statistics, Valencia, Spain) for his support with the statistical analysis. Additionally, Andrea Frantz and Michelle Arnett are gratefully acknowledged for their support as research coordinators.

Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Experiment timeline and flowchart.

Figure 1A. Study timeline


Figure 1A



Author 1

Figure 1B. Flow chart of patient allocation, intervention and post-operative follow-ups

Figure 1B




Author

Figure 2. Illustration of clinical and radiographic measurements

Figure 2A and 2B. A) A periodontal probe and B) a dental caliper were used to measure mucosal thickness and alveolar ridge width


Figure 2A and 2B



Autho

Figure 2C. Diagram to illustrate radiographic measurements included distance from first implant thread to bone-implant contact (BIC) (1st Thread-BIC) and implant platform to BIC (Platform-BIC)

Figure 2C




Authoi

Figure 3. Clinical cases illustration in both treatment groups.

Figure 3A. Thick tissue phenotype group. A) Baseline, intra-operative, 6 month and 12 months post-operative documentation of a dental implant with thick (> 2mm) mucosal phenotype. B) Pre-operative and 12 months post-operative CBCT evaluation of a dental implant with thick (> 2mm) mucosal phenotype


Figure 3A



Auth

Figure 3B. Thin tissue phenotype group. A) Baseline, intra-operative, 6 month and 12 months post-operative documentation of a dental implant with thin (≤ 2 mm) mucosal phenotype. B) Pre-operative and 12 months post-operative CBCT evaluation of a dental implant with thin (≤ 2 mm) mucosal phenotype

Figure 3B




Authc

Figure 4. Clinical and radiographic outcomes between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) mucosal phenotypes



Figure 4



Author

Table 1. Baseline demographic data

Table 1. Baseline demographic data

Variables		Thin group (n=13)	Thick group (n=13)
Age (years)		56.54 (10.39)	56.54 (13.30)
Gender (%)	<i>Female</i>	5 (38.46%)	5 (38.46%)
	<i>Male</i>	8 (61.53%)	8 (61.53%)
Vertical mucosal thickness (mm)	<i>Preoperative</i>	1.77 (0.72)	2.42 (0.49)
	<i>Intraoperative</i>	1.9 (0.48)	2.42 (0.45)
Horizontal mucosal thickness (mm)	<i>Intraoperative</i>	0.65 (0.24)	0.99 (0.43)
	<i>Maxilla</i>	2 (15.38%)	6 (46.15%)
Implant location (%)	<i>Mandible</i>	11 (84.61%)	7 (53.84%)
	<i>Molar</i>	9 (69.23%)	5 (38.46%)
Replaced tooth (%)	<i>Premolar</i>	4 (30.76%)	8 (61.53%)
Pre-operative CBCT			
Ridge Width (mm)		7.45 (1.11)	6.85 (1.27)

Table 2: Mean differences in clinical and radiographic measurements between vertical and horizontal mucosal phenotypes

Table 2A. Mean differences in clinical measurements between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotypes

Table 2A. Mean differences in clinical measurements between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotypes

Variable	Timeline	Thin	Thick	Thin - Thick (mm)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
PD (mm)	CD	2.47 (0.46)	2.12 (0.25)	0.35
	T6	3.42 (0.37)	3.36 (0.42)	0.06
	T12	3.13 (0.45)	3.46 (0.53)	0.33
	CD-T6	0.96 (0.57)*	1.24 (0.43)*	0.28
	T6-T12	-0.29 (0.26)*	0.10 (0.51)	0.36*
	CD-T12	0.65 (0.62)*	1.35 (0.58)*	0.70*
	IP	3.96 (1.65)	3.92 (1.36)	0.04
KM (mm)	CD	2.77 (1.24)	2.92 (1.05)	0.15
	T6	3.00 (1.35)	3.00 (0.93)	0.00
	T12	2.96 (1.13)	2.96 (1.12)	0.00
	IP-CD	-1.19 (1.15)*	-1.00 (0.96)	0.11
	IP-T6	-0.96 (1.35)*	-0.92 (0.86)	0.26
	IP-T12	-1.00 (1.47)*	-0.96 (1.03)	0.26
	CD-T6	0.23 (0.73)	0.08 (0.28)	0.15
CD-T12	0.19 (0.63)	0.04 (0.14)	0.15	
T6-T12	-0.04 (0.59)	-0.04 (0.32)	0.00	

	CD	0.03 (0.09)	0.00 (0.00)	0.02
	T6	0.03 (0.06)	0.00 (0.00)	0.03
	T12	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.05)	0.01
REC (mm)	CD-T6	0.00 (0.07)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00
	T6-T12	0.00 (0.00)	0.02 (0.05)	0.02
	CD-T12	-0.04 (0.59)	0.02 (0.05)	0.06
	CD	19.23 (24.39)	3.84 (9.99)	15.39
	T6	33.33 (24.62)	29.48 (22.72)	3.85
	T12	42.31 (24.17)	34.62 (22.01)	7.69
BOP (%)	CD-T6	15.28 (39.22)	25.64 (25.11)*	10.36
	T6-T12	8.33 (18.12)	5.13 (32.19)	3.20
	CD-T12	23.08 (39.40)*	30.77 (23.42)*	7.69
	CD	0.20 (0.29)	0.10 (0.30)	0.10
	T6	0.10 (0.24)	0.10 (0.30)	0.00
	T12	0.26 (0.23)	0.13 (0.33)	0.13
PLI (Score)	CD-T6	-0.10 (0.29)	-0.01 (0.18)	0.09
	T6-T12	0.15 (0.36)*	0.03 (0.22)	0.12
	CD-T12	0.06 (0.35)	0.02 (0.23)	0.04
	CD	0.09 (0.13)	0.03 (0.06)	0.06
	T6	0.36 (0.32)	0.33 (0.25)	0.03
	T12	0.58 (0.31)	0.35 (0.25)	0.23
GI (Score)	CD-T6	0.29 (0.38)*	0.31 (0.26)*	0.02
	T6-T12	0.22 (0.36)*	0.31 (0.26)	0.21
	CD-T12	0.49 (0.34)*	0.31 (0.26)*	0.17

PD: Probing depths; KM: Keratinized mucosa (post-surgically); REC: Recession; BOP: Bleeding on probing; PLI: Plaque index; GI: Gingival index; IP: Implant placement; CD: Crown delivery; T6: 6-month follow-up; T12: 12-month follow-up; SD: Standard deviation

* $p < 0.05$

Table 2B. Mean differences in clinical measurements between thin (< 1mm) and thick (≥ 1mm) horizontal mucosal phenotypes

Table 2B. Mean differences in clinical measurements between thin (<1mm) and thick (≥1mm) horizontal mucosal phenotypes.

Variable	Timeline	Thin	Thick	Thin - Thick (mm)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
<i>PD (mm)</i>	CD	2.31 (0.47)	2.27 (0.29)	0.04
	T6	3.43 (0.38)	3.31 (0.42)	0.12
	T12	3.21 (0.54)	3.43 (0.46)	0.22
	CD-T6	1.11 (0.57)*	1.09 (0.43)*	0.08
	T6-T12	-0.22 (0.27)*	0.19 (0.58)	0.30
	CD-T12	0.90 (0.71)*	1.17 (0.63)*	0.26
<i>KM (mm)</i>	IP	3.97 (1.61)	3.90 (1.35)	0.06
	CD	2.91 (1.24)	2.75 (0.98)	0.15
	T6	3.09 (1.32)	2.85 (0.82)	0.24
	T12	3.09 (1.13)	2.75 (0.98)	0.34
	IP-CD	-1.06 (1.41)*	-1.15 (0.97)	0.09
	IP-T6	-0.88 (1.26)*	-1.05 (0.86)*	0.18
<i>REC (mm)</i>	IP-T12	-0.88 (1.41)*	-1.15 (0.97)*	0.28
	CD-T6	0.19 (0.66)	0.10 (0.32)	0.09
	CD-T12	0.19 (0.57)	0.00 (0.00)	0.19
	T6-T12	0.00 (0.55)	-0.10 (0.32)	0.10
	CD	0.02 (0.08)	0.00 (0.00)	0.02
	T6	0.02 (0.06)	0.00 (0.00)	0.02
	T12	0.02 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	0.00
	CD-T6	0.00 (0.06)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00
	T6-T12	0.00 (0.00)	0.03 (0.06)	0.02
	CD-T12	0.00 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	0.02

BOP (%)	CD	15.63 (23.15)	5.00 (11.25)	0.10
	T6	34.38 (23.15)	25.93 (23.73)	0.09
	T12	40.63 (21.92)	35.00 (25.40)	0.06
	CD-T6	18.75 (36.45)*	24.07 (25.15)*	0.01
	T6-T12	6.25 (17.08)	7.41 (38.29)	0.03
	CD-T12	25.00 (36.51)*	30.00 (24.60)*	0.04
PLI (Score)	CD	0.21 (0.29)	0.06 (0.10)	0.17
	T6	0.11 (0.24)	0.08 (0.21)	0.03
	T12	0.21 (0.21)	0.17 (0.28)	0.04
	CD-T6	-0.10 (0.26)	0.02 (0.19)	0.14
	T6-T12	0.09 (0.29)*	0.08 (0.33)	0.03
	CD-T12	0.00 (0.28)	0.11 (0.31)	0.13
GI (Score)	CD	0.05 (0.10)	0.07 (0.12)	0.01
	T6	0.39 (0.29)	0.28 (0.28)	0.11
	T12	0.52 (0.31)	0.37 (0.27)	0.16
	CD-T6	0.33 (0.34)*	0.24 (0.28)*	0.12
	T6-T12	0.14 (0.36)	0.07 (0.38)	0.05
	CD-T12	0.47 (0.32)*	0.30 (0.28)*	0.17

PD: Probing depths; KM: Keratinized mucosa (post-surgically); REC: Recession; BOP: Bleeding on probing; PLI: Plaque index; GI: Gingival index; IP: Implant placement; CD: Crown delivery; T6: 6-month follow-up; T12: 12-month follow-up; SD: Standard deviation

* $p < 0.05$

Table 2C. Mean differences in radiographic measurements between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotypes

Table 2C. Mean differences in radiographic measurements between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotypes

Variable	Timeline	Thin	Thick	Thin - Thick (mm)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
IP intraoperative bone width	Buccal	1.04 (0.64)	1.65 (0.98)	0.61
	Lingual	1.69 (0.75)	1.65 (0.82)	0.00
	Average	1.37 (0.58)	1.65 (0.71)	0.28
	IP	0.90 (0.61)	0.98 (0.69)	0.08
	CD	1.43 (0.56)	1.31 (0.68)	0.12
	T6	1.50 (0.61)	1.51 (0.91)	0.01
	T12	1.69 (0.54)	1.59 (0.83)	0.10
MBL (mm)	IP-CD	0.52 (0.43)*	0.33 (0.52)	0.2
	IP-T6	0.60 (0.67)*	0.53 (0.75)	0.07
	IP-T12	0.78 (0.66)*	0.61 (0.71)	0.18
	CD-T6	0.07 (0.37)	0.20 (0.59)	0.13
	CD-T12	0.26 (0.44)	0.28 (0.57)	0.02
	T6-T12	0.19 (0.34)	0.08 (0.38)	0.61
	T12 CBCT bone width (mm)	Buccal	1.96 (0.63)	1.95 (0.74)
Lingual	2.52 (1.00)	1.80 (0.69)	0.57	
Average	2.24 (0.79)	1.92 (0.60)	0.32	

IP: Implant placement; MBL: Marginal bone level; CBCT: Cone beam computerized tomogram; CD: Crown delivery; T6: 6-month follow-up; T12: 12-month follow-up; SD: Standard deviation

* $p < 0.05$

Table 2D. Mean differences in radiographic measurements between thin (< 1mm) and thick (≥ 1mm) horizontal mucosal phenotypes

Table 2D. Mean differences in radiographic measurements between thin (<1mm) and thick (≥1mm) horizontal mucosal phenotypes

Variable	Timeline	Thin	Thick	Thin - Thick (mm)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
IP intraoperative bone width	Buccal	1.15 (0.88)	1.65 (0.81)	0.50
	Lingual	1.75 (0.81)	1.55 (0.72)	0.20
	Average	1.45 (0.70)	1.6 (0.60)	0.15
	IP	1.06 (0.67)	0.76 (0.58)	0.30
	CD	1.46 (0.60)	1.21 (0.63)	0.25
	T6	1.73 (0.74)	1.13 (0.67)	0.60
	T12	1.87 (0.61)	1.26 (0.65)	0.82
MBL (mm)	IP-CD	0.41 (0.51)*	0.45 (0.45)*	0.05
	IP-T6	0.68 (0.75)*	0.38 (0.60)*	0.30
	IP-T12	0.82 (0.72)*	0.50 (0.58)*	0.32
	CD-T6	0.27 (0.52)	-0.08 (0.35)	0.35
	CD-T12	0.41 (0.47)	0.05 (0.48)	0.37
	T6-T12	0.14 (0.30)	0.12 (0.45)	0.02
T12 CBCT bone width (mm)	Buccal	2.03 (0.71)	1.84 (0.64)	0.19
	Lingual	2.32 (0.83)	2.01 (1.02)	0.31
	Average	2.17 (0.72)	1.92 (0.71)	0.25

IP: Implant placement; MBL: Marginal bone level; CBCT: Cone beam computerized tomogram; CD: Crown delivery; T6: 6-month follow-up; T12: 12-month follow-up; SD: Standard deviation

* $p < 0.05$

Supplemental Figure 1. Clinical outcomes of midfacial sites between thin ($\leq 2\text{mm}$) and thick ($> 2\text{mm}$) vertical mucosal phenotypes

References

1. Hammerle CHF, Tarnow D. The etiology of hard- and soft-tissue deficiencies at dental implants: A narrative review. *J Clin Periodontol* 2018;45 Suppl 20:S267-S277. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12955
2. Abrahamsson I, Berglundh T, Wennstrom J, Lindhe J. The peri-implant hard and soft tissues at different implant systems. A comparative study in the dog. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 1996;7:212-219. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9151585>
3. Avila-Ortiz G, Gonzalez-Martin O, Couso-Queiruga E, Wang HL. The peri-implant phenotype. *J Periodontol* 2020;91:283-288. doi:10.1002/JPER.19-0566
4. Berglundh T, Lindhe J. Dimension of the periimplant mucosa. Biological width revisited. *J Clin Periodontol* 1996;23:971-973. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051x.1996.tb00520.x
5. Puisys A, Linkevicius T. The influence of mucosal tissue thickening on crestal bone stability around bone-level implants. A prospective controlled clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2015;26:123-129. doi:10.1111/clr.12301
6. Linkevicius T, Puisys A, Steigmann M, Vindasiute E, Linkeviciene L. Influence of vertical soft tissue thickness on crestal bone changes around implants with platform switching: A comparative clinical study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2015;17:1228-1236. doi:10.1111/cid.12222
7. Linkevicius T, Puisys A, Linkeviciene L, Peciuliene V, Schlee M. Crestal bone stability around implants with horizontally matching connection after soft tissue thickening: A prospective clinical trial. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2015;17:497-508. doi:10.1111/cid.12155
8. Linkevicius T, Apse P, Grybauskas S, Puisys A. The influence of soft tissue thickness on crestal bone changes around implants: a 1-year prospective controlled clinical trial. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2009;24:712-719. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19885413>
9. Lazzara RJ, Porter SS. Platform switching: a new concept in implant dentistry for controlling postrestorative crestal bone levels. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2006;26:9-17. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16515092>
10. Al-Nsour MM, Chan HL, Wang HL. Effect of the platform-switching technique on preservation of peri-implant marginal bone: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2012;27:138-145. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22299090>
11. Iorio-Siciliano V, Marenzi G, Blasi A, et al. Influence of platform-switched, laser-microtextured implant on marginal bone level: A 24-month case series study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2016;31:162-166. doi:10.11607/jomi.4130
12. Vandeweghe S, De Bruyn H. A within-implant comparison to evaluate the concept of platform switching: a randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Oral Implantol* 2012;5:253-262. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23000709>

13. Hsu YT, Lin GH, Wang HL. Effects of platform-switching on peri-implant soft and hard tissue outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2017;32:e9-e24. doi:10.11607/jomi.5140
14. Ercoli C, Jammal G, Buyers M, et al. Influence of apico-coronal implant placement on post-surgical crestal bone loss in humans. *J Periodontol* 2017;88:762-770. doi:10.1902/jop.2017.160802
15. Galindo-Moreno P, Leon-Cano A, Monje A, Ortega-Oller I, O'Valle F, Catena A. Abutment height influences the effect of platform switching on peri-implant marginal bone loss. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016;27:167-173. doi:10.1111/clr.12554
16. Spinato S, Stacchi C, Lombardi T, Bernardello F, Messina M, Zaffe D. Biological width establishment around dental implants is influenced by abutment height irrespective of vertical mucosal thickness: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2019;30:649-659. doi:10.1111/clr.13450
17. Blanco J, Pico A, Caneiro L, Novoa L, Batalla P, Martin-Lancharro P. Effect of abutment height on interproximal implant bone level in the early healing: A randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2018;29:108-117. doi:10.1111/clr.13108
18. Pico A, Martin-Lancharro P, Caneiro L, Novoa L, Batalla P, Blanco J. Influence of abutment height and implant depth position on interproximal peri-implant bone in sites with thin mucosa: A 1-year randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2019;30:595-602. doi:10.1111/clr.13443
19. Katafuchi M, Weinstein BF, Leroux BG, Chen YW, Daubert DM. Restoration contour is a risk indicator for peri-implantitis: A cross-sectional radiographic analysis. *J Clin Periodontol* 2018;45:225-232. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12829
20. Monje A, Galindo-Moreno P, Tozum TF, Suarez-Lopez del Amo F, Wang HL. Into the paradigm of local factors as contributors for peri-implant disease: Short communication. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2016;31:288-292. doi:10.11607/jomi.4265
21. Suarez-Lopez Del Amo F, Lin GH, Monje A, Galindo-Moreno P, Wang HL. Influence of soft tissue thickness on peri-implant marginal bone loss: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Periodontol* 2016;87:690-699. doi:10.1902/jop.2016.150571
22. Diaz-Sanchez M, Soto-Penalosa D, Penarrocha-Oltra D, Penarrocha-Diago M. Influence of supracrestal tissue attachment thickness on radiographic bone level around dental implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Periodontol Res* 2019;54:573-588. doi:10.1111/jre.12663
23. Lin GH, Curtis DA, Kapila Y, et al. The significance of surgically modifying soft tissue phenotype around fixed dental prostheses: An American Academy of Periodontology best evidence review. *J Periodontol* 2020;91:339-351. doi:10.1002/JPER.19-0310

24. Thoma DS, Naenni N, Figuero E, et al. Effects of soft tissue augmentation procedures on peri-implant health or disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2018;29 Suppl 15:32-49. doi:10.1111/clr.13114
25. van Eekeren P, van Elsas P, Tahmaseb A, Wismeijer D. The influence of initial mucosal thickness on crestal bone change in similar macrogeometrical implants: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2017;28:214-218. doi:10.1111/clr.12784
26. O'Leary TJ, Drake RB, Naylor JE. The plaque control record. *J Periodontol* 1972;43:38. doi:10.1902/jop.1972.43.1.38
27. van Eekeren P, Tahmaseb A, Wismeijer D. Crestal bone changes in macrogeometrically similar implants with the implant-abutment connection at the crestal bone level or 2.5 mm above: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016;27:1479-1484. doi:10.1111/clr.12581
28. Fernandez-Formoso N, Rilo B, Mora MJ, Martinez-Silva I, Diaz-Afonso AM. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone maintenance around tissue level implant and bone level implant: a randomised controlled trial. A 1-year follow-up. *J Oral Rehabil* 2012;39:830-837. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2842.2012.02343.x
29. Lee SY, Piao CM, Koak JY, et al. A 3-year prospective radiographic evaluation of marginal bone level around different implant systems. *J Oral Rehabil* 2010;37:538-544. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2842.2010.02083.x
30. Kadkhodazadeh M, Heidari B, Abdi Z, Mollaverdi F, Amid R. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone levels around dental implants with different designs after 1 year. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2013;71:92-95. doi:10.3109/00016357.2011.654245
31. Linkevicius T, Apse P, Grybauskas S, Puisys A. Reaction of crestal bone around implants depending on mucosal tissue thickness. A 1-year prospective clinical study. *Stomatologija* 2009;11:83-91. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19996674>
32. Linkevicius T, Puisys A, Linkevicius R, Alkimavicius J, Gineviciute E, Linkeviciene L. The influence of submerged healing abutment or subcrestal implant placement on soft tissue thickness and crestal bone stability. A 2-year randomized clinical trial. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2020 Apr 6. doi:10.1111/cid.12903 Online ahead of print
33. Vervaeke S, Dierens M, Besseler J, De Bruyn H. The influence of initial soft tissue thickness on peri-implant bone remodeling. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 2014;16:238-247. doi:10.1111/j.1708-8208.2012.00474.x
34. Akcali A, Trullenque-Eriksson A, Sun C, Petrie A, Nibali L, Donos N. What is the effect of soft tissue thickness on crestal bone loss around dental implants? A systematic review. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2017;28:1046-1053. doi:10.1111/clr.12916
35. Wallner G, Rieder D, Wichmann MG, Heckmann SM. Peri-implant bone loss of tissue-level and bone-level implants in the esthetic zone with gingival biotype analysis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2018;33:1119-1125. doi:10.11607/jomi.6641

36. Linkevicius T, Puisys A, Svediene O, Linkevicius R, Linkeviciene L. Radiological comparison of laser-microtextured and platform-switched implants in thin mucosal biotype. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2015;26:599-605. doi:10.1111/clr.12544
37. Malloa J, Arnett M, Chan HL, George FM, Kaigler D, Wang HL. The association between buccal mucosa thickness and periimplant bone loss and attachment loss: A cross-sectional study. *Implant dentistry* 2018;27:575-581. doi:10.1097/ID.0000000000000803
38. Thoma DS, Buranawat B, Hammerle CH, Held U, Jung RE. Efficacy of soft tissue augmentation around dental implants and in partially edentulous areas: a systematic review. *J Clin Periodontol* 2014;41 Suppl 15:S77-91. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12220
39. Lin GH, Chan HL, Wang HL. The significance of keratinized mucosa on implant health: a systematic review. *J Periodontol* 2013;84:1755-1767. doi:10.1902/jop.2013.120688
40. Iorio-Siciliano V, Blasi A, Sammartino G, Salvi GE, Sculean A. Soft tissue stability related to mucosal recession at dental implants: a systematic review. *Quintessence Int* 2020;51:28-36. doi:10.3290/j.qi.a43048
41. Guarnieri R, Di Nardo D, Gaimari G, Miccoli G, Testarelli L. Implant-gingival unit stability around one-stage implant with laser-microgrooved collar: Three-year result of a prospective study. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2019;39:875-882. doi:10.11607/prd.3983
42. Schwarz F, Sager M, Golubovic V, Iglhaut G, Becker K. Horizontal mucosal thickness at implant sites as it correlates with the integrity and thickness of the buccal bone plate. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016;27:1305-1309. doi:10.1111/clr.12747