Print

## Submitted

on September 20, 02:30 PM for osseo2014

## Proof

**CONTROL ID: 1842907** 

CONTACT (NAME ONLY): Atsushi Yagihara

**Abstract Details** 

CURRENT CATEGORY: Scientific PRESENTATION TYPE: Poster

## **Abstract**

**TITLE:** An experimental study: Influences of Dynamic and Static loading to the Implants in rats.

**AUTHORS (LAST NAME, FIRST NAME):** <u>Yagihara, Atsushi</u>; Kawasaki, Ryo; I Hitoshi; Kakumoto, Yoshimi; Takakuda, Kazuo

**ABSTRACT BODY:** The aim of this study is to investigate influences of dynam the osseointegrated titanium implants in rats.

Two pure titanium implants were placed into every 18 male SD (12 weeks old) between each implants were defined 5mm. Implant surface was cylindrical sha 1.5mm. All implant access halls were drilled 1.6mm diameter. Each implant wa springs, which stimulate a total 3.92N continuous load for 28 days. Next rats w groups: dynamic loading group (DL), static loading group (SL) and unloaded co loaded continuously with same device for four more weeks. DL was stimulated of 3 Hz for 1800 cycles, five days of week for four weeks. C was stimulated no weeks. After the experiment, they were sacrificed and tibial specimens were is implants; pull-out tests and evaluated histological and histomorphological meas Of all two rats' implants didn't result good osseointegration, therefore excluded important thing in this test is to confirm osseointegration first of all. We checked because implant design was cylinder type. Pull-out test: DL strength was signif to the others. SL and C were similar. Histological results: Bone formation arour all groups. Of all new bone formation was detected in DL group; found on both unloaded side. Histomorphological measurements: Compared all groups rate c (BIC). There was no significant difference in this study.

Within the limitation of this study, our results indicate that appropriate static loa not harm osseointegrated implant. Additionally dynamic loading amplify mecha and implant.