

Comparison of perceived masticatory ability in completely edentulous patients treated with thermoplastic complete denture versus single implant-retained mandibular overdenture: a single-center prospective observational study (#97425)

1

First revision

Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **29 May 2024** for the benefit of the authors .



Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for general guidance.



Custom checks

Make sure you include the custom checks shown below, in your review.



Raw data check

Review the raw data.



Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

If this article is published your review will be made public. You can choose whether to sign your review. If uploading a PDF please remove any identifiable information (if you want to remain anonymous).

Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

- 1 Tracked changes manuscript(s)
- 1 Rebuttal letter(s)
- 7 Table file(s)
- 1 Raw data file(s)
- 1 Other file(s)

! Custom checks

Human participant/human tissue checks

- ! Have you checked the authors [ethical approval statement](#)?
- ! Does the study meet our [article requirements](#)?
- ! Has identifiable info been removed from all files?
- ! Were the experiments necessary and ethical?



Structure and Criteria

Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. BASIC REPORTING
2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [Peerj standards](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (see [Peerj policy](#)).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.



The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip

Example

Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources

Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.

Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript

Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).

Comment on language and grammar issues

The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult. I suggest you have a colleague who is proficient in English and familiar with the subject matter review your manuscript, or contact a professional editing service.

Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions

I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC

Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript

I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.

Comparison of perceived masticatory ability in completely edentulous patients treated with thermoplastic complete denture versus single implant-retained mandibular overdenture: a single-center prospective observational study

Mostafa I Fayad^{Corresp., 1, 2}, Ihab I Mahmoud², Ahmed Atef Aly Shon^{2, 3}, Mohamed Omar Elboraey^{4, 5}, Ramy M Bakr⁶, Rania Moussa¹

¹ Substitutive Dental Sciences Department, College of Dentistry, Taibah University, Madina, Saudi Arabia

² Removable Prosthodontic Department, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt

³ Prosthodontic Department, Mouwsat Hospital, Medina, Saudi Arabia

⁴ Periodontology and Preventive Dental Science Department, College of Dentistry, Taibah University, Madina, Saudi Arabia

⁵ Oral Medicine, Periodontology, Oral Diagnosis and Radiology Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Tanta University, Tanta, Egypt

⁶ Removable Prosthodontic Department, College of Dentistry, Future University, Cairo, Egypt

Corresponding Author: Mostafa I Fayad

Email address: mifayad@taibahu.edu.sa

Background: This study aimed to compare the perceived masticatory ability (PrMA) in completely edentulous patients (EDPs) with thermoplastic conventional complete dentures (CDs) versus single implant-retained mandibular overdentures. **Methods:** The current study was conducted in the outpatient Prosthodontic Clinic, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt. PrMA was evaluated in 45 completely edentulous patients (46% males, mean age 50.4 ± 4.7 years) . Each patient received a thermoplastic PMMA complete denture (Polyan IC TM Bredent GmbH & Co.KG, Germany). The PrMA was evaluated at one-month and six-month intervals of denture use. An immediate loading single implant was placed into the mid-symphyseal for each patient, and the denture was adjusted. Subsequently, the PrMA was reevaluated after one month and six months. The data were collected and statistically analyzed using the SPSS®V25 to assess the changes in PrMA. **Results:** The PrMA demonstrated improvement after six months of thermoplastic conventional denture use. However, this improvement was not statistically significant ($p=0.405$). In addition, the PrMA showed a substantial increase following a single implant placement at one and six months ($p<0.001$) of the overdenture use compared to the conventional denture. The PrMA insignificantly improved ($p=0.397$) after six months of the single implant retained overdenture use. **Discussion:** The study's findings indicate that using immediate loading single implant-retained mandibular overdentures significantly improved PrMA in completely edentulous patients.

Comparison of perceived masticatory ability in completely edentulous patients treated with thermoplastic complete denture versus single implant-retained mandibular overdenture: a single-center prospective observational study

Mostafa I Fayad^{1,2*}, Ihab I Mahmoud², Ahmed Atef Shon^{2,3}, Mohamed Omar^{4,5}, Ramy M Bakr⁶, Rania Moussa^{1*}

¹Substitutive Dental Sciences Department, College of Dentistry, Taibah University, Madina, Saudi Arabia

²Removable Prosthodontic Department, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt

³Prosthodontic Department, Mouwsat Hospital, Madina, Saudi Arabia.

⁴Oral Medicine, Periodontology, Oral Diagnosis and Radiology Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Tanta University, Tanta, Egypt

⁵Periodontology and Preventive Dental Science Department, College of Dentistry, Taibah University, Madina, Saudi Arabia.

⁶Removable Prosthodontic Department, College of Dentistry, Future University, Cairo, Egypt.

Corresponding Author:

Mostafa Fayad¹

Mabad bn Khaled st. Alaridh, Madina , Saudi Arabia 42314

Email address: mifayad@taibahu.edu.sa

Comparison of perceived masticatory ability in completely edentulous patients treated with thermoplastic complete denture versus single implant-retained mandibular overdenture: A single-center prospective observational study

Abstract

Background: This study aimed to compare the perceived masticatory ability (PrMA) in completely edentulous patients (EDPs) with thermoplastic conventional complete dentures (CDs) versus single implant-retained mandibular overdentures.

Methods: The current study was conducted in the outpatient Prosthodontic Clinic, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt. PrMA was evaluated in 45 completely edentulous patients (46% males, mean age 50.4 ± 4.7 years). Each patient received a thermoplastic PMMA complete denture (Polyan IC TM Bredent GmbH & Co.KG, Germany). The PrMA was evaluated at one-month and six-month intervals of denture use. An immediate loading single implant was placed into the mid-symphyseal for each patient, and the denture was adjusted. Subsequently, the PrMA was reevaluated after one month and six months. The data were collected and statistically analyzed using the SPSS® V25 to assess the changes in PrMA.

Results: The PrMA demonstrated improvement after six months of thermoplastic conventional denture use. However, this improvement was not statistically significant ($p=0.405$). In addition, the PrMA showed a substantial increase following a single implant placement at one and six months ($p<0.001$) of the overdenture use compared to the conventional denture. The PrMA insignificantly improved ($p=0.397$) after six months of the single implant retained overdenture use.

Discussion: The study's findings indicate that using immediate loading single implant-retained mandibular overdentures significantly improved PrMA in completely edentulous patients.

Keywords: Perceived masticatory ability, Single implant, Overdenture, Complete denture, Thermoplastic denture base, Edentulous Patients

Introduction:

The main objective of prosthodontic rehabilitation is to restore and maintain oral function, especially the effectiveness of masticatory function (Liang et al. 2015). Edentulous patients wearing conventional dentures often experience a significant decrease in their ability to chew well, which impacts their quality of life. Furthermore, the complex neuromuscular skills required to overcome the limitations of dentures decline with age (Goiato et al. 2008).

Dentures with inadequate masticatory efficiency prevent wearers from effectively consuming high-fiber diets. Consequently, dentures must facilitate efficient chewing (van der Bilt 2011; van der Bilt & Fontijn-Tekamp 2004).

Denture wearers may experience limited chewing force due to the discomfort and pain that occurs when one or both dentures lose their retention or even fear of pain (Goiato et al. 2010).

The perception of chewing ability among individuals is strongly correlated with their oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL). Patients with higher oral health impact profile [OHIP] scores are more prone to having chewing problems and perceived difficulty (Khalifa et al. 2013). Improving masticatory performance in patients with CDs has also a beneficial effect on their overall well-being (Elmoula et al. 2018).

The masticatory function can be addressed from two perspectives: firstly, as the ability to objectively break down solid food, and secondly, as an individual's personal response when queried about their food-chewing experiences. Masticatory performance, the objective measure of masticatory function, is often assessed by determining an individual's ability to pulverize or grind a designated food item within a predetermined number of chewing cycles. The study examined the self-assessed masticatory function of the participants (defined as masticatory ability) through oral function interviews (Feizi et al. 2016; van der Bilt 2011).

Several objective techniques have been attempted to assess masticatory performance. However, they need specialized tools, materials, or intricate procedures. Experiments investigating masticatory performance have utilized natural foods, such as almonds, peanuts, and carrots, and synthetic materials as test substances. (Cunha et al. 2013; Goiato et al. 2008; Liedberg & Owall 1995; van der Bilt & Fontijn-Tekamp 2004).

Another commonly utilized approach to assess masticatory performance involves evaluating the capacity to thoroughly blend and manipulate a meal bolus. The masticatory performance has been assessed using two-colored chewing gum and paraffin wax as test meals. (Salleh et al. 2007; van der Bilt 2011).

Both subjective and objective methods can be effectively used in measuring masticatory performance. Elmoula et al. (2018) found a correlation between the subjectively evaluated PrMA and the objectively assessed masticatory efficiency.

The masticatory function of the complete-denture wearers is relatively poor compared to that of healthy dentate subjects. Complete-denture wearers need up to seven times more chewing strokes than subjects with a complete natural dentition to reduce the food to half the original particle size (Emami et al. 2013; Kumari et al. 2022). Other studies have reported that patients rehabilitated with CDs demonstrated significantly lower masticatory functions (Slagter et al. 1992; Wayler & Chauncey 1983)

When conventional denture therapy is inadequate, it is essential to examine treatment alternatives to improve the masticatory efficiency of complete denture wearers. An alternative method is the utilization of the injection-molded thermoplastic denture base (Fayad et al., 2023).

The injection-molded PMMA has a micro-crystalline structure, which ultimately facilitates the process of finishing and polishing. The use of the injection molding method for fabricating dentures resulted in enhanced quality and durability. This was attributed to the higher microhardness and reduced surface roughness compared to conventional denture bases (Moslehifard et al. 2022).

Thermoplastic denture bases exhibit superior aesthetics and are more embraced by patients than conventional dentures. They can serve as a substitute for individuals who have allergic reactions to polymethyl methacrylate. Due to their low weight and pliable characteristics, they can be effectively used on individuals with skeletal protuberances. The material's flexibility provided a targeted stress reduction level, eliminating denture-related problems that were causing oral discomfort (Singh et al. 2011).

→ It Could be further refined for better clarity and readability.

Another alternative to improve the masticatory functions for completely edentulous patients is implant placement to improve denture retention and stability, thereby improving masticatory performance (Bae et al. 2015; Fayad et al. 2016; Mohamed 2008). Despite the growing use of osseointegrated implants in rehabilitation, conventional CDs remain the most common treatment method for completely edentulous patients, especially in underdeveloped countries (Carlsson & Omar 2010).

Numerous clinical studies have shown that utilizing implant-supported or retained prostheses for rehabilitating the mandible in individuals without teeth has proven a highly effective and gratifying treatment (Kourtis et al. 2018). Nevertheless, there is an ongoing debate regarding the minimal number of implants required for this restoration. The single implant retained overdenture has become increasingly popular due to its simple technique (Mahoorkar et al. 2016).

It has been hypothesized that placing a single implant in the middle of the symphyseal region can effectively support an overdenture with a high success rate based on Albrektsson's success criterion (Albrektsson & Wennerberg 2019; Gjelvold et al. 2020). This treatment approach can also be a cost-effective therapeutic alternative to the traditional complete denture (Krennmair & Ulm 2001; Passia & Kern 2023).

In a study conducted by Liu et al. (2013) on the implant number required to retain mandibular implant-retained overdenture, it was found that a single implant is sufficient to support and distribute the load effectively to the mandibular bone in implant-retained overdentures.

To our knowledge, no studies have been conducted to evaluate the PrMA (assessed subjectively) among completely edentulous patients rehabilitated with a thermoplastic acrylic denture before and after the single implant placement for each patient. The study aimed to assess the changes in the PrMA with single implant placement in completely edentulous patients and the null hypothesis was that the placement of a single implant to retain a complete mandibular thermoplastic denture would not affect the PrMA. → It Could also be improved by fluency and clearness.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted at the Faculty of Dental Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt, using a prospective study design. The study was conducted over a period of

18 months, spanning from April 2022 to August 2023. The ethics committee at Al-Azhar University has approved the study protocol (Ethical Application Ref: (AUAREC20220004-12)). Prior to their enrollment in the study, all participants received a detailed explanation of the methodology. Subsequently, written consent was obtained from all participants. ✓

Patients' selection

All patients included in the study were free of any psychiatric problems or movement disorders. Patients who have previously had temporomandibular problems, including Myofascial Pain Dysfunction Syndrome (MPDS), trismus, trauma, TMJ dislocation, and ankylosis, were not included in the study. Furthermore, those with compromised oral diseases, local lesions, xerostomia, and resorbed or flabby ridges were not included.

^{researchers have} Prior research has determined that a sample size of 40 cases is adequate to conduct the study with a statistical power of 0.80, a confidence interval of 0.95, and an alpha level of 0.05 (Albert et al. 2003; ¹Goiato et al. 2010; ²Mohamed 2008; ³Tatematsu et al. 2004). Consequently, a higher sample size calculation was determined (⁴n=50) to compensate for the possibility of edentulous participants' withdrawal due to illness, death, or challenges with the research protocol.

A total of 50 completely edentulous patients were chosen randomly. Five patients withdrew from the study, so only 45 patients were evaluated. The group consisted of 21 males and 24 females, with an age range of 44-59 years (mean age 50.4 ± 4.77 years).

All patients received a new thermoplastic PMMA conventional complete denture (Polyan IC TM Bredent GmbH & Co.KG, Germany), with even occlusion and discomfort-free. The new CDs were delivered, and the PrMA (PrMA) was evaluated one month following the denture placement, with no reported pain or discomfort (Mathew et al. 2024; Rocha et al. 2023). ?

→ Results? This sentence doesn't fit here.

First stage-measurement of the PrMA

The subjective approach to evaluating masticatory ability was assessing the PrMA. The measurement was conducted using a perceived difficulty of chewing (PDC) index score devised by Khalifa et al. (2013). Participants were asked to report the level of difficulty they experienced while chewing fifteen commonly consumed hard and soft foods. The scoring of this index was determined based on (PDC) scale, with a range of scores from 0 (indicating very easy chewing) to

⊗ Redundancy

174 5 (indicating very difficult chewing that is actively avoided). A score of zero indicates very easy
 175 chewing and satisfactory conditions, whereas a total score of 75 signifies adverse conditions and
 176 the most difficult chewing.

177 The PrMA was measured for each patient after one month of conventional thermoplastics
 178 denture placement. The second measurement was conducted six months following the
 179 conventional thermoplastic denture placement, as recommended by Goiato (Goiato et al. 2010;
 180 Goiato et al. 2008). It was proposed that a minimum of five months was required to adequately
 181 assess patient adaptability and functional capacity with new CDs.

182 Mid-symphyseal single Implant Placement

183 Cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans of the mandible were performed for each
 184 patient using the Kodak 9500 cone-beam 3D System scanner manufactured by Carestream
 185 Dental/Kodak in the United States. For each patient, a mid-symphyseal dental implant was placed
 186 (Dentis, Dalseo-gu, Daegu, Korea). The mandibular denture was prepared for insertion following
 187 a two-day implant placement period. The locator attachment (Dentis, Dalseo-gu, Daegu, Korea)
 188 was affixed to the fixture and secured with a screwdriver.

189 The resilient cap was placed over the male part of the attachment and then moved to the
 190 base of the denture using a marker past placed on the cap. Subsequently, the lower denture was
 191 inserted in the patient's mouth, marking the corresponding cap area on the fitting surface of the
 192 denture. The resilient cap (female part) housing was formed on the fitting surface of the denture in
 193 the designated area using a round bur rotating at a low speed.

194 The denture was examined in the patient's mouth to ensure the absence of interference.
 195 Auto-polymerizing acrylic resin was placed in the space created in the denture base. A small
 196 amount of resin was injected intraorally into the dry metallic cap.

197 The denture was placed in the patient's mouth, and the patient was advised to close their
 198 mouth, causing the metal cap to be fitted into the base of the denture. After the acrylic resin had
 199 solidified, the denture was taken out of the mouth and examined, and any surplus material was
 200 eliminated using an appropriate bur.

201 Second stage-measurement of the PrMA

The **PrMA** was measured for each patient after one month of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement. The final measurement was conducted after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.

Statistical analysis

Data were collected, and the statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics V25 software (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). The level of statistical significance was set at 0.05 for all tests. The normality of continuous data was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Quantitative data were expressed as range (minimum and maximum), mean, standard deviation, and median. Descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were reported. The Mann-Whitney test was used to compare two groups with non-normally distributed quantitative variables, whereas the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare different groups with non-normally distributed quantitative variables. The Friedman tests were employed to compare quantitative variables that do not follow a normal distribution across more than two periods or stages. The post-hoc paired comparison was conducted utilizing the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The statistical significance of the obtained results was judged at the 5% level.

Results

The PrMA was evaluated among completely edentulous patients using a thermoplastic PMMA denture base at one month and six months of complete denture placement. After the placement of a single implant-retained mandibular overdenture, the PrMA was reevaluated at one month and six months.

The sample included 50 completely edentulous patients who were randomly selected. A total of 45 patients were assessed, with one patient being discharged due to medical issues and four patients opting not to continue with the study. The patients comprised 21 male and 24 female patients (Table 1). The mean age of the selected patients was 50.46 years, ranging from 44 to 59 years.

The mean and standard deviation of the PrMA measurements at different intervals are shown in Table (2). The PrMA for each participant was obtained by collecting each food PrMA score (from 0 to 5). The mean value for PrMA one month and six months following the placement

of the new denture was 37.8 ± 10.5 and 36.3 ± 10.3 , respectively. The mean value for PrMA after the single implant placement at one month and six months was 28.6 ± 8.4 and 26.9 ± 8.5 , respectively (Table 2).

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests which used to assess the normality of the data (Kim 2012; Kim 2013), showed that the data were not normally distributed, as illustrated in Table (3).

The nonparametric Friedman test was used for within-subject design due to the non-normal distribution of the data. The post-hoc paired comparison was done using the Wilcoxon signed rank test [30, 31]. The Friedman test (Table 4) showed a statistical significance difference between different measurements of PrMA at various intervals.

The multiple comparisons between different mean measurements of PrMA at different intervals (Table 5) showed no statistical difference in PrMA recorded after one month of denture insertion and PrMA recorded after six months of denture insertion [$P > 0.05$]. Mid-symphyseal single Implant placement resulted in a substantial increase in the PrMA. In addition, there was a highly statistically significant difference between the PrMA recorded before and after single implant placement [$P < 0.05$].

The study sample was subdivided into three subgroups based on age range: (1) < 47 (n=13), (2) from 47 - 52 (n=14), and (3) > 52 (n=18). The Mann-Whitney test (Table 6) was used to test the effect of gender on the PrMA at different intervals. The results showed no statistically significant effect of gender on the PrMA at different intervals. The Kruskal-Wallis test (Table 7) was used to test the effect of different age groups on the PrMA at different intervals. The findings indicated that gender did not have a statistically significant effect on the PrMA at various time intervals.

⊗ Could have a brief explanation of each table, highlighting the main findings.

Discussion

The results of the current study reported that the placement of a single mid-symphyseal implant significantly affected the PrMA of the study groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis has been rejected and there was strong evidence of a difference between the groups.

→ Methodology! (Exclusion criteria)

Patients with oral diseases that may compromise the masticatory function were excluded from the study. Due to the detrimental impact of xerostomia on quality of life and its correlation with decreased masticatory function (Moriya et al. 2012), patients with xerostomia were also excluded from the study.

In this study, the masticatory ability was assessed using questionnaires. However, this method lacks the required objectivity for repeatability. Consequently, it is more reasonable to evaluate masticatory function using a combination of questionnaires and clinical assessments. However, previous studies indicated that subjective assessments of a self-perceived chewing ability were as valid as objectively assessed masticatory efficiency. Both methods have proven to be equally effective in clinical practice (Limpuangthip et al. 2021).

In the case of a completely edentulous wearer, the subjective criteria may be more important than the chewing tests. Therefore, questionnaires are regarded as a valuable tool (Boretti et al. 1995). In addition, in complete denture wearers, the subjective criteria may be additionally explanatory as the complete denture quality has been significantly related to patient satisfaction and perceived chewing ability (Yamaga et al. 2013).

The perceived masticatory index for each participant was determined using natural test foods due to their regular consumption in daily life and familiarity with patients [32].

format this citation

The selection of the thermoplastic denture base material in this study was based on its utilization of the injection molding technique, which allows for a controlled polymerization process. The flask design facilitates a constant flow of material through the sprue channel, thereby compensating for polymerization shrinkage and yielding superior dimensional accuracy compared to compression molding (Khan et al. 2022). It also shows significantly better flexural strength and higher flexural modulus, resulting in minimal deformation before fracture (Patankar et al. 2022).

Multiple clinical studies have verified that the adaptation period for both new CDs and new mini-implant overdentures opposing maxillary CDs is typically one month. The PrMA was assessed one month after the placement of the denture, as documented by (Hayakawa et al. 2000; Poljak-Guberina et al. 2022; Topic et al. 2022). The second measurement was conducted after six months, as recommended by Goiato et al. [2, 5], who suggested that more than five months were needed to evaluate patient adaptation and functional capacity with new CDs.

It looks like it's part of the text. I suggest to rewrite it.

The immediate loading implant procedure has demonstrated reliability and effectiveness in various clinical contexts. It reduces the treatment time by the possibility of immediate functionality

of the implant by positioning within 48–72 hours after fixture placement (Mangano et al. 2017; Raes et al. 2018). Loading single implants has proven its efficacy and reliability as a treatment approach (Raes et al., 2018).

Single implant placement has been suggested to address some of the forthcoming limitations of using two or more implants. The two-implant overdenture has demonstrated efficacy and was proposed as the minimum standard of treatment that should be offered to completely edentulous mandible patients. However, the current increase in dental initial and ongoing maintenance makes the two-implant overdenture inaccessible to a significant number of financially disadvantaged elderly individuals. Studies anticipated the chair side time and the cost of fabricating the two-implant overdenture to be 1.75 times more than single-implant overdenture. However, both demonstrated adequate clinical efficacy and patient satisfaction (Mahoorkar et al. 2016). The novelty of the current study is that the treatment provided to the study group comprised the advantages of the resilient thermoplastic resin and its cushioning effect. This resulted in enhanced support and retention offered by the dental implant.

Reference?
If it's the same authors, it's suitable to rewrite the paragraph to be clearer.

After six months of denture placement, the results revealed an improvement in the masticatory function with a conventional complete thermoplastic denture. Furthermore, regarding single implant placement, an improvement was observed after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture. However, there was no statistically significant difference (table 5). The improvement may be attributed to increasing adaptation and subsequent denture stability after six months of use.

This result contradicts the findings of Hazari et al. (Hazari et al. 2015). They found a statistically significant difference after six months, which may be attributed to the different assessments and different thermoplastic materials used in their study. This improvement is highly significant since complete thermoplastic dentures offer a more straightforward and cost-effective treatment alternative compared with other treatment options, such as implant-supported dentures. Moreover, they offer a substantial improvement in stability and retention for patients who struggle with adapting to conventional mandibular dentures. These results are consistent with the study conducted by Berretin-Felix et al. (Berretin-Felix et al. 2008), who illustrated that the type of dental treatment used directly correlates with masticatory efficiency.

This study showed a highly significant difference in PrMA evaluated after six months of conventional denture placement compared to the perceived masticatory ability evaluated after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture. This aligns with the results of Rocha et al. (2023), who found that the treatment with mandibular overdentures supported by a single implant in the mandibular symphysis region improved masticatory efficiency over conventional CDs.

There was a significant difference between the evaluation of PrMA after six months of using conventional dentures and the assessment done one month after using a single implant retained mandibular overdenture (Table 3). This finding demonstrates the considerable enhancement following the placement of a single implant. Additionally, the masticatory function significantly improves after the treatment of mandibular implant overdentures. Most studies on implant treatment and oral function showed a significant improvement of the objective masticatory performance in the mandibular overdenture (Fontijn-Tekamp et al. 2004).

The study of Rocha et al. (Rocha et al. 2023) evaluated the masticatory function objectively and confirmed the importance of using a single implant to improve the masticatory function for completely edentulous patients.

The findings indicated that gender had no impact on the PrMA (Table 6), which aligns with the results of Elmoula et al. (7). In addition, the results showed that the various age groups within the study sample had an insignificant effect on the PrMA (Table 7). This result is inconsistent with the results of Haiari Hirai et al. (1994) who investigated the age-related changes in masticatory function in complete denture wearers. They found that both the masticatory performance and the chewing score decreased significantly due to aging. This finding may be attributed to the different age ranges of patients selected in this study.

The limitation of this study is that it did not assess the impact of alveolar ridge height and denture retention on the results. Furthermore, it is important to take into account the correlation between self-assessed masticatory ability (SAMA) and psychological status. The findings of the Roohafza et al. (2016) study provide evidence that participants with a higher score of depression, anxiety, and stress experience decreased masticatory ability.

Additionally, it is crucial to highlight the diagnostic aspect and preexisting preparation prior to denture fabrication. The human factors in planning and technical performance are decisive for rehabilitation success.

Therefore, future investigations should prioritize an integrated approach that encompasses many aspects and the incorporation of dental care with other treatments, such as nutritional counseling to improve eating habits and physiotherapy to improve patients' quality of life.

Conclusion

The study demonstrated a significant improvement in PrMA in completely edentulous patients after rehabilitation with single implant-retained mandibular overdentures.

References

- Albert TE, Buschang PH, and Throckmorton GS. 2003. Masticatory performance: a protocol for standardized production of an artificial test food. *J Oral Rehabil* 30:720-722.
- Albrektsson T, and Wennerberg A. 2019. On osseointegration in relation to implant surfaces. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 21 Suppl 1:4-7. 10.1111/cid.12742
- Bae JC, Jeong SH, Jeong CM, and Huh JB. 2015. Comparison of the Masticatory Functions of Complete Dentures and Implant-Retained Overdentures. *International Journal of Prosthodontics* 28:345-347. 10.11607/ijp.4070
- Berretin-Felix G, Nary Filho H, Padovani CR, Trindade Junior AS, and Machado WM. 2008. Electromyographic evaluation of mastication and swallowing in elderly individuals with mandibular fixed implant-supported prostheses. *J Appl Oral Sci* 16:116-121.
- Boretti G, Bickel M, and Geering AH. 1995. A review of masticatory ability and efficiency. *J Prosthet Dent* 74:400-403. 10.1016/s0022-3913(05)80381-6
- Carlsson GE, and Omar R. 2010. The future of complete dentures in oral rehabilitation. A critical review. *J Oral Rehabil* 37:143-156. 10.1111/j.1365-2842.2009.02039.x
- Cunha TR, Della Vecchia MP, Regis RR, Ribeiro AB, Muglia VA, Mestriner W, Jr., and de Souza RF. 2013. A randomised trial on simplified and conventional methods for complete denture fabrication: masticatory performance and ability. *J Dent* 41:133-142. 10.1016/j.jdent.2012.09.008
- Elmoula HA, Khalifa N, and Alhajj MN. 2018. Comparison between masticatory index and mixing index among complete denture wearers and associated factors: A multivariate analysis. *J Prosthet Dent* 120:35-42. 10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.09.009
- Emami E, de Souza RF, Kabawat M, and Feine JS. 2013. The impact of edentulism on oral and general health. *Int J Dent* 2013:498305. 10.1155/2013/498305
- Fayad M, Mahmoud I, Ismaiel M, Harby N, Quassem M, and Sakr H. 2016. Masticatory Efficiency Evaluation in Implant Retained Complete Overdenture With Different Occlusal Schemes. *Al-Azhar Dental Journal for Girls* 3:69-70. 10.21608/adjg.2016.5072
- Fayad MI, Mahmoud II, and Shon AA. 2023. Masticatory Efficiency and Perceived Masticatory Ability Evaluation in Completely Edentulous Patients Rehabilitated with A Thermoplastic Denture. *Al-Azhar Assiut Dental Journal* 6:13-21. 10.21608/aadj.2023.296412
- Feizi A, Keshteli AH, Khazaei S, and Adibi P. 2016. A new insight into masticatory function and its determinants: a latent class analysis. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 44:46-52. 10.1111/cdoe.12189

- Fontijn-Tekamp FA, Slagter AP, Van der Bilt A, Van't Hof MA, Kalk W, and Jansen JA. 2004. Swallowing thresholds of mandibular implant-retained overdentures with variable portion sizes. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 15:375-380. 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2004.01006.x
- Gjelvold B, Kisch J, Mohammed DJH, Chrcanovic BR, Albrektsson T, and Wennerberg A. 2020. Immediate Loading of Single Implants, Guided Surgery, and Intraoral Scanning: A Nonrandomized Study. *International Journal of Prosthodontics* 33:513-522. 10.11607/ijp.6701
- Goiato MC, Garcia AR, Dos Santos DM, and Zuim PR. 2010. Analysis of masticatory cycle efficiency in complete denture wearers. *J Prosthodont* 19:10-13. 10.1111/j.1532-849X.2009.00520.x
- Goiato MC, Ribeiro Pdo P, Garcia AR, and dos Santos DM. 2008. Complete denture masticatory efficiency: a literature review. *J Calif Dent Assoc* 36:683-686.
- Hayakawa I, Hirano S, Takahashi Y, and Keh ES. 2000. Changes in the masticatory function of complete denture wearers after relining the mandibular denture with a soft denture liner. *International Journal of Prosthodontics* 13:227-231.
- Hazari P, Bhoyar A, Mishra SK, Yadav NS, and Mahajan H. 2015. A Comparison of Masticatory Performance and Efficiency of Complete Dentures Made with High Impact and Flexible Resins: A Pilot Study. *J Clin Diagn Res* 9:ZC29-34. 10.7860/JCDR/2015/12207.6089
- Hirai T, Ishijima T, Koshino H, and Anzai T. 1994. Age-related change of masticatory function in complete denture wearers: evaluation by a sieving method with peanuts and a food intake questionnaire method. *International Journal of Prosthodontics* 7:454-460.
- Khalifa N, Allen PF, Abu-bakr NH, and Abdel-Rahman ME. 2013. Chewing ability and associated factors in a Sudanese population. *J Oral Sci* 55:349-357. 10.2334/josnurd.55.349
- Khan AA, Fareed MA, Alshehri AH, Aldegheishem A, Alharthi R, Saadaldin SA, and Zafar MS. 2022. Mechanical Properties of the Modified Denture Base Materials and Polymerization Methods: A Systematic Review. *Int J Mol Sci* 23. 10.3390/ijms23105737
- Kim HY. 2012. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (1). *Restor Dent Endod* 37:245-248. 10.5395/rde.2012.37.4.245
- Kim HY. 2013. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restor Dent Endod* 38:52-54. 10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52
- Kourtis S, Madianos P, Patras M, and Andrikopoulou E. 2018. Rehabilitation of the edentulous mandible with implant-supported overdentures on telescopic abutments and immediate loading. A controlled prospective clinical study. *J Esthet Restor Dent* 30:369-377. 10.1111/jerd.12406
- Krennmair G, and Ulm C. 2001. The symphyseal single-tooth implant for anchorage of a mandibular complete denture in geriatric patients: a clinical report. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 16:98-104.
- Kumari S, Khushboo B, Arvind A, Singh S, Ahsan A, and Singh CK. 2022. Assessment of Role of Complete Dentures in Improving the Chewing Efficiency of Edentulous Patients. *J Pharm Bioallied Sci* 14:S792-S795. 10.4103/jpbs.jpbs_187_22
- Liang S, Zhang Q, Witter DJ, Wang Y, and Creugers NH. 2015. Effects of removable dental prostheses on masticatory performance of subjects with shortened dental arches: A systematic review. *J Dent* 43:1185-1194. 10.1016/j.jdent.2015.05.008
- Liedberg B, and Owall B. 1995. Oral bolus kneading and shaping measured with chewing gum. *Dysphagia* 10:101-106.
- Limpuangthip N, Somkotra T, and Arksornnukit M. 2021. Subjective and objective measures for evaluating masticatory ability and associating factors of complete denture wearers: A clinical study. *J Prosthet Dent* 125:287-293. 10.1016/j.prosdent.2020.01.001
- Liu J, Pan S, Dong J, Mo Z, Fan Y, and Feng H. 2013. Influence of implant number on the biomechanical behaviour of mandibular implant-retained/supported overdentures: a three-dimensional finite element analysis. *J Dent* 41:241-249. 10.1016/j.jdent.2012.11.008

- Mahoorkar S, Bhat S, and Kant R. 2016. Single implant supported mandibular overdenture: A literature review. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc* 16:75-82. 10.4103/0972-4052.164881
- Mangano C, Raes F, Lenzi C, Eccellente T, Ortolani M, Luongo G, and Mangano F. 2017. Immediate Loading of Single Implants: A 2-Year Prospective Multicenter Study. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 37:69-78. 10.11607/prd.2986
- Mathew JE, Kurian N, Gandhi N, Daniel AY, Roy N, and Varghese KG. 2024. Comparative evaluation of masticatory efficiency, clinical performance, and patient satisfaction of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture versus conventional complete denture: A prospective in vivo study. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc* 24:61-68. 10.4103/jips.jips_393_23
- Mohamed GF. 2008. Clinical evaluation of the efficacy of soft acrylic denture compared to conventional one when restoring severely resorbed edentulous ridge. *Cairo Dental Journal* 24:313-323.
- Moriya S, Tei K, Muramatsu T, Murata A, Muramatsu M, Harada E, Inoue N, and Miura H. 2012. Factors associated with self-assessed masticatory ability among community-dwelling elderly Japanese. *Community Dent Health* 29:39-44.
- Moslehi E, Ghaffari T, Abolghasemi H, and Maleki Dizaj S. 2022. Comparison of Conventional Pressure-packed and Injection Molding Processing Methods for an Acrylic Resin Denture based on Microhardness, Surface Roughness, and Water Sorption. *Int J Dent* 2022:7069507. 10.1155/2022/7069507
- Passia N, and Kern M. 2023. The Single Midline Implant in the Edentulous Mandible-Current Status of Clinical Trials. *J Clin Med* 12. 10.3390/jcm12113773
- Patankar RC, More V, Jadhav R, Sabane A, Kadam P, and Gachake A. 2022. Comparative evaluation of flexural strength of denture base resin materials processed using compression molding technique, injection molding technique, and computer-aided design CAM technique: An in vitro study. *Dent Res J (Isfahan)* 19:100.
- Poljak-Guberina R, Poklepović-Peričić T, Guberina M, and Čelebić A. 2022. Duration and length of adaptation to new complete dentures: A survey based on patients' self-reported outcomes. *STOMATOLOGY EDU JOURNAL* 9:9. 10.25241/stomaeduj.2022.9(1).art.5
- Raes F, Eccellente T, Lenzi C, Ortolani M, Luongo G, Mangano C, and Mangano F. 2018. Immediate functional loading of single implants: a multicenter study with 4 years of follow-up. *J Dent Res Dent Clin Dent Prospects* 12:26-37. 10.15171/joddd.2018.005
- Rocha COM, Longhini D, Pereira RP, Lima ALO, Bonafe FSS, and Arioli Filho JN. 2023. Masticatory efficiency in complete denture and single implant-retained mandibular overdenture wearers with different occlusion schemes: A randomized clinical trial. *J Prosthet Dent* 129:888-894. 10.1016/j.prosdent.2021.06.028
- Roohafza H, Afshar H, Keshteli AH, Shirani MJ, Afghari P, Vali A, and Adibi P. 2016. Masticatory ability with depression, anxiety, and stress: Does there exist any association? *Dent Res J (Isfahan)* 13:211-216. 10.4103/1735-3327.182179
- Salleh NM, Fueki K, Garrett NR, and Ohshima T. 2007. Objective and subjective hardness of a test item used for evaluating food mixing ability. *J Oral Rehabil* 34:174-183. 10.1111/j.1365-2842.2006.01645.x
- Singh JP, Dhiman RK, Bedi RP, and Girish SH. 2011. Flexible denture base material: A viable alternative to conventional acrylic denture base material. *Contemp Clin Dent* 2:313-317. 10.4103/0976-237X.91795
- Slagter AP, Olthoff LW, Steen WH, and Bosman F. 1992. Comminution of food by complete-denture wearers. *J Dent Res* 71:380-386. 10.1177/00220345920710020601
- Tatematsu M, Mori T, Kawaguchi T, Takeuchi K, Hattori M, Morita I, Nakagaki H, Kato K, Murakami T, Tuboi S, Hayashizaki J, Murakami H, Yamamoto M, and Ito Y. 2004. Masticatory performance in 80-year-old individuals. *Gerodontology* 21:112-119.

Topic J, Poljak-Guberina R, Persic-Kirsic S, Kovacic I, Petricevic N, Popovac A, and Celebic A. 2022. Adaptation to New Dentures and 5 Years of Clinical Use: A Comparison between Complete Denture and Mini-implant Mandibular Overdenture Patients based on Oral Health-Related Quality of Life (OHRQoL) and Orofacial Esthetics. *Acta Stomatol Croat* 56:132-142. 10.15644/asc56/2/4

van der Bilt A. 2011. Assessment of mastication with implications for oral rehabilitation: a review. *J Oral Rehabil* 38:754-780. 10.1111/j.1365-2842.2010.02197.x

van der Bilt A, and Fontijn-Tekamp FA. 2004. Comparison of single and multiple sieve methods for the determination of masticatory performance. *Arch Oral Biol* 49:193-198.

Wayler AH, and Chauncey HH. 1983. Impact of complete dentures and impaired natural dentition on masticatory performance and food choice in healthy aging men. *J Prosthet Dent* 49:427-433. 10.1016/0022-3913(83)90289-5

Yamaga E, Sato Y, and Minakuchi S. 2013. A structural equation model relating oral condition, denture quality, chewing ability, satisfaction, and oral health-related quality of life in complete denture wearers. *J Dent* 41:710-717. 10.1016/j.jdent.2013.05.015

Table 1(on next page)

Gender Frequency

1
Table (1): Gender Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	21	46.7	46.7	46.7
	Female	24	53.3	53.3	100.0
	Total	45	100.0	100.0	

2

Table 2 (on next page)

The mean and standard deviation of the perceived masticatory ability measurements at different intervals.

Table (2) The mean and standard deviation of the perceived masticatory ability measurements at different intervals.

Evaluation intervals	Gender	Mean	SD	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Con1	Male	38.90	10.95	2.39	15.00	55.00
	Female	37.00	10.40	2.12	15.00	50.00
	Total	37.88	10.58	1.57	15.00	55.00
Con6	Male	37.19	10.26	2.23	15.00	53.00
	Female	35.62	10.66	2.17	15.00	50.00
	Total	36.35	10.39	1.54	15.00	53.00
impl1	Male	29.33	8.39	1.83	15.00	50.00
	Female	28.08	8.58	1.75	10.00	39.00
	Total	28.66	8.42	1.25	10.00	50.00
imp6	Male	27.52	9.00	1.96	13.00	43.00
	Female	26.45	8.21	1.67	9.00	38.00
	Total	26.95	8.50	1.26	9.00	43.00

Con1: The PrMA recorded after one month of thermoplastic complete denture placement.

Con6: The PrMA recorded after six months of thermoplastic complete denture placement.

Impl1: The PrMA recorded after one month of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.

Imp6: The PrMA recorded after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.

Table 3(on next page)

Tests of Normality.

Table (3) Tests of Normality.

Table (3) Tests of Normality.

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mast	.092	178	.001	.974	178	.002

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

1

2

Table 4(on next page)

Friedman Test

1 **Table (4) Friedman Test**

Ranks		Test Statistics			
	Mean Rank	N	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Con1	3.53	45	96.60	3.00	0.000
Con6	3.23				
impl1	1.72				
imp6	1.51				

- 2 Con1: The PrMA recorded after one month of thermoplastic complete denture placement.
3 Con6: The PrMA y recorded after six months of thermoplastic complete denture placement.
4 Impl1: The PrMA recorded after one month of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.
5 Imp6: The PrMA recorded after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.
6

Table 5(on next page)

Perceived masticatory ability means comparison at different intervals

Table (5): Perceived masticatory ability means comparison at different intervals .

(I) test	(J) test	Mean Difference		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
		(I-J)	Std. Error		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Con1	Con6	1.702	2.039	.405	-2.32	5.72
	Impl1	9.222*	2.015	.000*	5.24	13.20
	Impl6	10.933*	2.015	.000*	6.95	14.91
Con6	Con1	-1.702	2.039	.405	-5.72	2.32
	Impl1	7.519*	2.039	.000*	3.49	11.54
	Impl6	9.230*	2.039	.000*	5.20	13.25
Impl1	Con1	-9.222*	2.015	.000*	-13.20	-5.24
	Con6	-7.519*	2.039	.000*	-11.54	-3.49
	Impl6	1.711	2.015	.397	-2.26	5.68
Impl6	Con1	-10.933*	2.015	.000*	-14.91	-6.95
	Con6	-9.230*	2.039	.000*	-13.25	-5.20
	Impl1	-1.711	2.015	.397	-5.68	2.26

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Con1: The PrMA recorded after one month of thermoplastic complete denture placement.

Con6: The PrMA recorded after six months of thermoplastic complete denture placement.

Impl1: The PrMA recorded after one month of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.

Impl6: The PrMA recorded after six months of single implant-retained mandibular overdenture placement.

Table 6(on next page)

Relation between gender and PrMA

1 **Table (6): Relation between gender and PrMA**

	Sex			
	Male (n=21)	Female (n=24)	U	p
Con1				
Mean ± SD.	38.9 ± 11	37 ± 10.4	238.0	0.747
Median (Min. – Max.)	40 (15 – 55)	40 (15 – 50)		
Con6				
Mean ± SD.	37.2 ± 10.3	35.6 ± 10.7	233.0	0.658
Median (Min. – Max.)	40 (15 – 53)	40 (15 – 50)		
Impl1				
Mean ± SD.	29.3 ± 8.4	28.1 ± 8.6	249.50	0.954
Median (Min. – Max.)	30 (15 – 50)	30 (10 – 39)		
Impl6				
Mean ± SD.	27.5 ± 9	26.5 ± 8.2	238.0	0.746
Median (Min. – Max.)	28 (13 – 43)	28 (9 – 38)		

2 SD: **Standard deviation** U: **Mann Whitney test**
3 p: p value for comparing between **Male** and **Female**
4

Table 7 (on next page)

Relation between different age group and PrMA

Table (7): Relation between different age group and PrMA

	Less than 47 (n = 13)	Age 47 to 52 (n = 14)	More than 52 (n = 18)	H	p
Con1					
Mean ± SD.	36.9 ± 10.7	34.1 ± 11.9	41.6 ± 8.6	4.377	0.112
Median (Min. – Max.)	40 (15 – 55)	39 (15 – 54)	45 (20 – 55)		
Con6					
Mean ± SD.	35.6 ± 11.1	32.1 ± 11.9	40.2 ± 7.4	4.396	0.111
Median (Min. – Max.)	35 (15 – 53)	37.5 (15 – 50)	40 (15 – 50)		
Impl1					
Mean ± SD.	27.4 ± 7.3	26.4 ± 9.4	31.3 ± 8.1	2.110	0.348
Median (Min. – Max.)	30 (15 – 40)	30 (12 – 35)	30 (10 – 50)		
Impl6					
Mean ± SD.	25.6 ± 9.3	24.6 ± 8.9	29.7 ± 7.3	3.623	0.163
Median (Min. – Max.)	23 (13 – 43)	28 (11 – 38)	29 (9 – 43)		

SD: Standard deviation H: H for **Kruskal Wallis test**
 p: p value for comparison between the studied categories