Scientific Review
Date of issue: January 2021

EV connection —a stable and tight fit

The EV connection is an internal, conical connection located below the marginal bone level contributing to the formation of the Soft Tissue Chamber, which allows for high esthetic results and including the Conical Seal Design that seals off the surrounding tissue. The Conical Seal Design has been a part of the Astra Tech Implant System since 1985. In 2006, One-position-only was added.

Reduced peak stress and a tight seal preserve the marginal bone

The internal connection, with an 11° tapered cone as the load bearing connection between implant and abutment, extends below the marginal bone crest, thus transferring the load deep into the bone. This conical construction results in a stable fit and the location contributes to stress distribution over a larger area which reduces peak stresses especially in the cortical bone, leading to a preservation of the marginal bone[1, 2].

The tight connection forms a seal that separates the inside of the implant from the surrounding tissues[3], minimizing micro-leakage and micro-movements thereby preventing bacterial leakage and thus tissue inflammation[4–15]. Comparisons generally favor internal conical connections over other connection types[11, 12, 16].

Precise installation with indexing and One-position-only

The internal cone guides the abutment into a quick and precise fitting[17–22] making x-rays to confirm seating unnecessary[23]. Continued development of the EV connection[3, 24–26] added indexing with the option of One-position-only for Atlantis abutments, which further simplifies the installation procedure, leading to predictable results.

Strong and stable construction with minimal complications

Abutment screw loosening is a rare phenomenon and the system has passed mechanical as well as assembly/disassembly tests fulfilling all requirements[27–30]. Strength evaluations with good results, including narrow implants[31, 32], are reported[24, 33–36]. Numerous theoretical and experimental studies have further characterized the Conical Seal Design using other methods[37–55].

Conclusion

The EV connection including Conical Seal Design, the Soft Tissue Chamber, and One-position-only, simplifies clinical procedures and helps preserve the marginal bone by forming an effective seal against bacterial colonization and transferring the load deeper down in the bone, thus reducing peak stresses. It ensures reliable function and long-term esthetics* in all clinical situations.

*See Scientific review "Soft Tissue Chamber", www.dentsplysirona.com/science

Dentsply Sirona

References

1. Hansson S. Implant-abutment interface: biomechanical study of flat top versus conical. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2000;2(1):33-41. Abstract

2. Hansson S. A conical implant-abutment interface at the level of the marginal bone improves the distribution of stresses in the supporting bone. An axisymmetric finite element analysis. Clin Oral Implants Res 2003;14(3):286-93. Abstract

3. Toia M, Galli S, Cecchinato D, Wennerberg A, Jimbo R. Clinical Evidence of OsseoSpeed EV Implants: A Retrospective Study and Characterization of the Newly Introduced System. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2019;39(6):863-74. Abstract

4. Jansen VK, Conrads G, Richter EJ. Microbial leakage and marginal fit of the implant-abutment interface. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 1997;12(4):527-40. Abstract

5. Zipprich H, Weigl P, Lauer H-C, Lange B. Micro-movements at the implant-abutment interface: measurements, causes and consequenses. Implantologie 2007;15:31-45.

6. Harder S, Dimaczek B, Acil Y, Terheyden H, Freitag-Wolf S, Kern M. Molecular leakage at implant-abutment connection–in vitro investigation of tightness of internal conical implant-abutment connections against endotoxin penetration. Clin Oral Investig 2010;14(4):427-32. Abstract

7. Baixe S, Fauxpoint G, Arntz Y, Etienne O. Microgap between zirconia abutments and titanium implants. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2010;25(3):455-60. Abstract

8. Aguirrebeitia J, Abasolo M, Vallejo J, Ansola R. Dental implants with conical implant-abutment interface: Influence of the conical angle difference on the mechanical behavior of the implant. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2013;28(2):e72-82. Abstract

9. Discepoli N, Ferrari Cagidiaco E, Landini G, Pallecchi L, Garcia-Godoy F, Ferrari M. Sealing effectiveness against Staphylococcus aureus of five different implant-abutment connections. Am J Dent 2018;31(3):141-43. Abstract

10. Berberi A, Maroun D, Kanj W, Amine EZ, Philippe A. Micromovement evaluation of original and compatible abutments at the implant-abutment interface. J Contemp Dent Pract 2016;17(11):907-13. Abstract

11. Zipprich H, Miatke S, Hmaidouch R, Lauer HC. A new experimental design for bacterial microleakage investigation at the implant-abutment interface: an in vitro study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2016;31(1):37-44. Abstract

12. Zipprich H, Weigl P, Ratka C, Lange B, Lauer HC. The micromechanical behavior of implant-abutment connections under a dynamic load protocol. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2018;20(5):814-23. Abstract

13. Berberi A, Tehini G, Rifai K, Bou Nasser Eddine F, Badran B, Akl H. Leakage evaluation of original and compatible implant-abutment connections: In vitro study using Rhodamine B. J Dent Biomech 2014;5:1758736014547143. Abstract

14. Berberi A, Tehini G, Rifai K, Bou Nasser Eddine F, El Zein N, Badran B, Akl H. In vitro evaluation of leakage at implant-abutment connection of three implant systems having the same prosthetic interface using rhodamine B. Int J Dent 2014;2014:351263. Abstract

15. Koutouzis T, Gadalla H, Lundgren T. Bacterial Colonization of the Implant-Abutment Interface (IAI) of Dental Implants with a Sloped Marginal Design: An in-vitro Study. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2016;18(1):161-7. Abstract

16. Koutouzis T. Implant-abutment connection as contributing factor to peri-implant diseases. Periodontol 2000 2019;81(1):152-66. Abstract

17. Davis DM, Watson RM. The use of two implant systems for providing implant supported overdentures in the mandible – a clinical appraisal. Eur J Prosth Rest Dent 1993;2(2):67-71. Abstract

18. Murphy WM, Barker GR, Gregory MC, Scott J. Experience with the Astra dental implant system. Dental Update 1992;19(4):143-6. Abstract

19. Palmer RM, Smith BJ, Palmer PJ, Floyd PD. A prospective study of Astra single tooth implants. Clin Oral Implants Res 1997;8(3):173-9. Abstract

20. Semper W, Heberer S, Mehrhof J, Schink T, Nelson K. Effects of repeated manual disassembly and reassembly on the positional stability of various implant-abutment complexes: an experimental study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2010;25(1):86-94. Abstract

21. Semper W, Kraft S, Kruger T, Nelson K. Theoretical optimum of implant positional index design. J Dent Res 2009;88(8):731-5. Abstract

22. Semper W, Kraft S, Kruger T, Nelson K. Theoretical considerations: implant positional index design. J Dent Res 2009;88(8):725-30. Abstract

23. Arvidson K, Bystedt H, Frykholm A, von Konow L, Lothigius E. A 3-year clinical study of Astra dental implants in the treatment of edentulous mandibles. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 1992;7(3):321-9. Abstract

24. Kofron MD, Carstens M, Fu C, Wen HB. In vitro assessment of connection strength and stability of internal implant-abutment connections. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon) 2019;65:92-99. Abstract

25. Rebeeah HA, Yilmaz B, Seidt JD, McGlumphy E, Clelland N, Brantley W. Comparison of 3D displacements of screw-retained zirconia implant crowns into implants with different internal connections with respect to screw tightening. J Prosthet Dent 2018;119(1):132-37. Abstract

26. Yilmaz B, Hashemzadeh S, Seidt JD, Clelland NL. Displacement comparison of CAD-CAM titanium and zirconia abutments to implants with different conical connections. J Prosthodont Res 2018;62(2):200-03. Abstract

27. Norton MR. Assessment of cold welding properties of the internal conical interface of two commercially available implant systems. J Prosthet Dent 1999;81(2):159-66. Abstract

28. Norton MR. An in vitro evaluation of the strength of an internal conical interface compared to a butt joint interface in implant design. Clin Oral Implants Res 1997;8(4):290-8. Abstract

29. Norton MR. An in vitro evaluation of the strength of a 1-piece and 2-piece conical abutment joint in implant design. Clin Oral Implants Res 2000;11(5):458-64. Abstract

30. Norton MR. In vitro evaluation of the strength of the conical implant-to-abutment joint in two commercially available implant systems. J Prosthet Dent 2000;83(5):567-71. Abstract

31. Hirata R, Bonfante EA, Anchieta RB, Machado LS, Freitas G, Fardin VP, Tovar N, Coelho PG. Reliability and failure modes of narrow implant systems. Clin Oral Investig 2016;20(7):1505-13. Abstract

32. Nelson K, Schmelzeisen R, Taylor TD, Zabler S, Wiest W, Fretwurst T. The impact of force transmission on narrow-body dental implants made of commercially pure titanium and titanium zirconia alloy with a conical implant-abutment connection: An experimental pilot study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2016;31(5):1066-71. Abstract

33. Foong JK, Judge RB, Palamara JE, Swain MV. Fracture resistance of titanium and zirconia abutments: An in vitro study. J Prosthet Dent 2013;109(5):304-12. Abstract

34. Dittmer S, Dittmer MP, Kohorst P, Jendras M, Borchers L, Stiesch M. Effect of implant-abutment connection design on load bearing capacity and failure mode of implants. J Prosthodont 2011;20(7):510-6. Abstract

35. Gigandet M, Bigolin G, Faoro F, Burgin W, Bragger U. Implants with original and non-original abutment connections. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2014;16(2):303-11. Abstract

36. Blum K, Wiest W, Fella C, Balles A, Dittmann J, Rack A, Maier D, Thomann R, Spies BC, Kohal RJ, Zabler S, Nelson K. Fatigue induced changes in conical implant-abutment connections. Dent Mater 2015;31(11):1415-26. Abstract

37. Manzoor B, Suleiman M, Palmer RM. The effects of simulated bone loss on the implant-abutment assembly and likelihood of fracture: an in vitro study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2013;28(3):729-38. Abstract

38. Abdelhamed MI, Galley JD, Bailey MT, Johnston WM, Holloway J, McGlumphy E, Leblebicioglu B. A Comparison of Zirconia and Titanium Abutments for Microleakage. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res 2015;17 Suppl 2:e643-51. Abstract

39. Al-Jadaa A, Attin T, Peltomaki T, Schmidlin PR. Comparison of three in vitro implant leakage testing methods. Clin Oral Implants Res 2015;26(4):e1-e7. Abstract

40. Hirata R, Bonfante EA, Machado LS, Tovar N, Coelho PG. Mechanical evaluation of four narrow-diameter implant systems. Int J Prosthodont 2014;27(4):359-62. Abstract

41. Mitsias ME, Thompson VP, Pines M, Silva NR. Reliability and failure modes of two Y-TZP abutment designs. Int J Prosthodont 2015;28(1):75-8. Abstract

42. Lavrentiadis G, Yousef H, Luke A, Flinton R. Changes in abutment screw dimensions after off-axis loading of implant-supported crowns: a pilot study. Implant Dent 2009;18(5):447-53. Abstract

43. Wiest W, Zabler S, Rack A, Fella C, Balles A, Nelson K, Schmelzeisen R, Hanke R. In situ microradioscopy and microtomography of fatigue-loaded dental two-piece implants. J Synchroton Rad 2015;22(6):1492-7. Abstract

44. Apicella D, Veltri M, Balleri P, Apicella A, Ferrari M. Influence of abutment material on the fracture strength and failure modes of abutment-fixture assemblies when loaded in a bio-faithful simulation. Clin Oral Implants Res 2011;22(2):182-8. Abstract

45. Dailey B, Jordan L, Blind O, Tavernier B. Axial displacement of abutments into implants and implant replicas, with the tapered cone-screw internal connection, as a function of tightening torque. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2009;24(2):251-6. Abstract

46. Dittmer MP, Dittmer S, Borchers L, Kohorst P, Stiesch M. Influence of the interface design on the yield force of the implant-abutment complex before and after cyclic mechanical loading. J Prosthodont Res 2012;56(1):19-24. Abstract

47. Muhlemann S, Truninger TC, Stawarczyk B, Hammerle CH, Sailer I. Bending moments of zirconia and titanium implant abutments supporting all-ceramic crowns after aging. Clin Oral Implants Res 2014;25(1):74-81. Abstract

48. Leutert CR, Stawarczyk B, Truninger TC, Hammerle CH, Sailer I. Bending moments and types of failure of zirconia and titanium abutments with internal implant-abutment connections: a laboratory study. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2012;27(3):505-12. Abstract

49. Hjerppe J, Lassila LV, Rakkolainen T, Narhi T, Vallittu PK. Load-bearing capacity of custom-made versus prefabricated commercially available zirconia abutments. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2011;26(1):132-8. Abstract

50. Hamilton A, Judge RB, Palamara JE, Evans C. Evaluation of the fit of CAD/CAM abutments. Int J Prosthodont 2013;26(4):370-80. Abstract

51. Freitas-Junior AC, Almeida EO, Bonfante EA, Silva NR, Coelho PG. Reliability and failure modes of internal conical dental implant connections. Clin Oral Implants Res 2013;24(2):197-202. Abstract

52. Brozovic J, Demoli N, Farkas N, Susic M, Alar Z, Gabric Panduric D. Properties of axially loaded implant-abutment assemblies using digital holographic interferometry analysis. Dent Mater 2014;30(3):e17-27. Abstract

53. Jörn D, Kohorst P, Besdo S, Rucker M, Stiesch M, Borchers L. Influence of lubricant on screw preload and stresses in a finite element model for a dental implant. J Prosthet Dent 2014;112(2):340-8. Abstract

54. Karl M, Taylor TD. Parameters determining micromotion at the implant-abutment interface. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2014;29(6):1338-47. Abstract

55. Imam AY, Moshaverinia A, McGlumphy EA. Implant-abutment interface: a comparison of the ultimate force to failure among narrow-diameter implant systems. J Prosthet Dent 2014;112(2):136-42. Abstract

To read more Scientific Reviews please see: www.dentsplysirona.com/implants/science

THE DENTAL SOLUTIONS COMPANY™

Dentsply Sirona

Dentsply Sirona does not waive any right to its trademarks by not using the symbols ® or ™. 32672128-USX-2101 © 2021 Dentsply Sirona. All rights reserved.