International Journal of Dental Sciences & Research

Survival Rates of Dental Implants in African Patients: A 5-Year Follow-Up Study

Dr. Evans Kofi Agbeno, Associate Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Cape Coast

Abstract

The success of dental implant therapy has been extensively documented in Western populations, yet limited evidence exists regarding implant survival rates in African patients. This prospective cohort study examines the 5-year survival rates of dental implants placed in African patients across multiple clinical settings, with particular attention to factors influencing implant success. A total of 847 implants placed in 412 patients across five African countries were monitored from 2018 to 2023. The overall cumulative survival rate was 94.2% at 5 years, with variations observed based on geographic location, bone quality, implant site, and patient-specific factors. Maxillary implants demonstrated a survival rate of 92.8% compared to 95.1% in the mandible. Factors such as smoking status, diabetes control, and oral hygiene compliance significantly influenced outcomes. The findings suggest that dental implant therapy can achieve comparable success rates in African populations when proper protocols are followed, though specific considerations related to bone density patterns, dietary factors, and healthcare accessibility must be addressed. This study provides crucial baseline data for clinicians treating African patients and highlights the need for culturally adapted treatment protocols and patient education strategies.

Keywords: Dental implants, survival rate, African patients, osseointegration, implant failure, longitudinal study

1. Introduction

Dental implant therapy has revolutionized the field of restorative dentistry, providing patients with a predictable and long-lasting solution for tooth replacement. Since the pioneering work on osseointegration by Brånemark in the 1960s, dental implants have become the gold standard for replacing missing teeth, with reported success rates exceeding 95% in well-controlled clinical studies (Buser et al., 2012). However, the vast majority of implant research has been conducted in European, North American, and Asian populations, leaving a significant knowledge gap regarding implant performance in African patients. This disparity in research representation has important clinical implications, as genetic, environmental, dietary, and healthcare access factors unique to African populations may influence implant outcomes in ways not yet fully understood.

The African continent presents a diverse landscape of patient populations, healthcare infrastructures, and socioeconomic conditions that may impact dental implant success. With over 1.4 billion people representing extraordinary genetic and cultural diversity, Africa encompasses a wide range of bone morphology patterns, dietary habits, disease prevalence, and oral health practices that distinguish these populations from those traditionally studied in implant research (Oginni et al., 2018). Furthermore, the prevalence of systemic conditions such as HIV/AIDS, diabetes, and endemic infectious diseases varies significantly across African regions and may influence healing responses and implant integration. Understanding how these factors affect implant survival is crucial for clinicians treating African patients and for developing evidence-based treatment protocols appropriate for these populations.

Recent demographic and economic trends indicate a growing demand for dental implant services in African countries. As urbanization increases and middle-class populations expand, more African patients are seeking advanced dental treatments, including implant-supported restorations (Nassar et al., 2019). Simultaneously, improvements in healthcare infrastructure and the training of implant specialists within Africa have made these treatments more accessible. However, the lack of region-specific outcome data means that treatment planning and patient counseling often rely on extrapolation from studies conducted in demographically different populations. This gap in evidence-based practice represents both a clinical challenge and a research priority.

Previous studies examining dental implant outcomes in African populations have been limited in scope, often featuring small sample sizes, short follow-up periods, or single-center designs that limit generalizability. A systematic review by Adeyemo et al. (2021) identified only 14 studies reporting implant outcomes in sub-Saharan African populations, with most featuring fewer than 100 implants and follow-up periods of less than 3 years. The heterogeneity in study designs, implant systems, and outcome reporting further complicates synthesis of existing evidence. Consequently, there remains an urgent need for well-designed, adequately powered studies with sufficient follow-up duration to establish reliable survival rate estimates for dental implants in African patients.

The present study was designed to address this knowledge gap by conducting a comprehensive 5-year follow-up investigation of dental implant survival rates in African patients across multiple clinical centers. The primary objective was to determine the cumulative survival rate of dental implants at 5 years post-placement in a diverse cohort of African patients. Secondary objectives included identifying patient-specific, implant-specific, and site-specific factors associated with implant failure, comparing survival rates across different African regions, and documenting the types and timing of complications encountered. By providing robust, long-term outcome data specific to African populations, this study aims to enhance evidence-based decision-making for clinicians and improve patient care standards across the continent.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study Design and Setting

This prospective multicenter cohort study was conducted across five clinical centers in four African countries: South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, and Egypt. The study period extended from January 2018 to December 2023, providing a full 5-year follow-up for all enrolled patients. The participating centers were selected based on their established implant dentistry programs, availability of trained specialists, and capacity to maintain standardized documentation and follow-up protocols. Each center obtained ethical approval from its respective institutional review board, and all participants provided written informed consent before enrollment. The study was registered with the Pan African Clinical Trials Registry and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki principles for medical research involving human subjects.

The geographic distribution of study centers was strategically designed to capture diversity in patient populations across different African regions. The South African center, located in Johannesburg, served as the primary coordinating site and enrolled the largest patient cohort. The Kenyan center in Nairobi represented East African populations, while the Nigerian center in Lagos provided data from West Africa. The Egyptian center in Cairo contributed a North African perspective, allowing for subgroup analyses based on geographic and potentially genetic variations. This multi-site approach enhanced the external validity of findings and provided insights into how regional factors might influence implant outcomes.

2.2 Patient Selection and Enrollment

Patient recruitment occurred between January 2018 and June 2018, with all implants placed within this 6-month window to ensure uniform follow-up timing. Inclusion criteria required patients to be of African descent, aged 18 years or older, presenting with one or more missing teeth requiring implant replacement, and able to commit to the 5-year follow-up protocol. Patients were required to have adequate bone volume for implant placement without requiring major augmentation procedures, or to be candidates for simultaneous bone grafting. Exclusion criteria included active periodontal disease, uncontrolled diabetes (HbA1c >8%), active malignancy, ongoing chemotherapy or radiation therapy to the head and neck region, severe osteoporosis, pregnancy or lactation, inability to provide informed consent, and current use of intravenous bisphosphonates.

A total of 456 patients were initially screened for eligibility, with 412 meeting all inclusion criteria and consenting to participate. The enrolled cohort comprised 189 males (45.9%) and 223 females (54.1%), with ages ranging from 21 to 74 years (mean age 47.3 ± 12.6 years). Baseline demographic data, medical history, smoking status, and oral hygiene habits were systematically documented using standardized case report forms. Particular attention was paid to recording conditions prevalent in African populations, including HIV status (with viral load and CD4 counts when applicable), sickle cell disease, and endemic infectious diseases. All patients underwent comprehensive clinical and radiographic examination prior to implant placement, including cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) when available, to assess bone quality and quantity.

2.3 Surgical Protocol and Implant Placement

All implant surgeries were performed by experienced implant surgeons with a minimum of 5 years of clinical experience in implant dentistry. To ensure consistency across centers, a standardized surgical protocol was implemented based on contemporary best practices and manufacturer recommendations. The implant systems used in the study included established brands with documented success in international markets, including Straumann (Basel, Switzerland), Nobel Biocare (Zürich, Switzerland), and Zimmer Biomet (Warsaw, Indiana, USA). The choice of implant system was determined by center preference and availability, with implant-specific variables recorded for subsequent analysis.

Preoperative antibiotic prophylaxis consisted of 2 grams of amoxicillin administered one hour before surgery, or 600 milligrams of clindamycin for penicillin-allergic patients, following established guidelines for infection prevention. Surgical procedures were performed under local anesthesia, with conscious sedation available for anxious patients. The surgical sites were prepared according to manufacturer protocols, with careful attention to drilling sequences, irrigation, and implant insertion torque. Initial stability was assessed and recorded using insertion torque values, with a minimum of 35 Ncm required for immediate loading protocols. Bone quality at each implant site was classified according to the Lekholm and Zarb classification system, providing standardized assessment of trabecular density and cortical thickness that could be correlated with outcomes.

A total of 847 implants were placed across the study cohort, with 392 implants (46.3%) placed in the maxilla and 455 implants (53.7%) in the mandible. The distribution by tooth position included 156 implants in the anterior region (18.4%), 348 in the premolar region (41.1%), and 343 in the molar region (40.5%). Immediate implant placement in extraction sockets was performed in 127 cases (15.0%), while the remaining implants were placed in healed sites. Simultaneous bone augmentation procedures were performed for 203 implants (24.0%), including guided bone regeneration with barrier membranes and particulate bone grafts, sinus floor elevation, and ridge augmentation procedures. The healing protocol varied based on bone quality and initial stability, with submerged healing for 3-6 months employed in 68% of cases and non-submerged healing in 32% of cases. Immediate loading was attempted in 89 implants (10.5%) that achieved primary stability exceeding 45 Ncm.

2.4 Prosthetic Protocol and Loading

Following the designated healing period, implants were assessed for osseointegration through clinical and radiographic evaluation before proceeding to prosthetic reconstruction. Integration was confirmed by absence of mobility, absence of persistent pain or discomfort, absence of peri-implant radiolucency on radiographs, and ability to withstand functional loading. Second-stage surgery for implant exposure was performed when necessary, and healing abutments were placed to allow soft tissue maturation over 2-4 weeks. Impression techniques varied according to prosthetic design, with both conventional and digital impression methods employed based on center capabilities and clinician preference.

The prosthetic reconstructions included single crowns for 534 implants (63.1%), fixed partial dentures for 247 implants (29.2%), and implant-supported overdentures for 66 implants (7.7%). Material selection for final restorations included porcelain-fused-to-metal crowns (48%), all-ceramic restorations (35%), and acrylic resin dentures (17%). All prosthetic work was completed by experienced prosthodontists or general dentists with advanced training in implant prosthodontics. Occlusal adjustments were carefully performed to ensure appropriate force distribution and minimize excessive loading, with particular attention to excursive movements and centric contacts. Patients received detailed oral hygiene instructions specific to implant maintenance, including proper brushing techniques, use of interdental cleaning aids, and recommendations for regular professional maintenance.

2.5 Follow-Up Protocol and Outcome Assessment

The follow-up protocol included systematic clinical and radiographic evaluations at 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, 12 months, and annually thereafter through 60 months post-loading. At each follow-up visit, implants were assessed for stability, signs of peri-implant disease, prosthetic complications, and patient satisfaction. Clinical parameters recorded included probing depths, bleeding on probing, suppuration, soft tissue health, and presence of plaque or calculus. Standardized periapical radiographs were obtained at baseline (post-loading) and annually to assess marginal bone levels. Bone level measurements were performed by calibrated examiners using digital measurement tools, with the implant-abutment junction serving as the reference point. Peri-implant bone loss was calculated as the difference between baseline and follow-up measurements, with progressive bone loss exceeding 2 millimeters after the first year considered a sign of implant distress.

The primary outcome measure was implant survival, defined as the implant remaining in situ regardless of condition at the end of the follow-up period. Implant failure was defined as implant mobility requiring removal, fracture of the implant body, removal due to persistent pain or infection, or removal due to progressive bone loss compromising implant stability. Secondary outcome measures included implant success based on strict criteria including absence of persistent pain, absence of peri-implant radiolucency, absence of mobility, bone loss less than

1.5 millimeters in the first year and less than 0.2 millimeters annually thereafter, and absence of irreversible complications. Prosthetic complications were documented separately and classified as minor (requiring simple adjustments) or major (requiring remake or significant intervention).

Patient compliance with the follow-up protocol was actively managed through appointment reminder systems, phone calls, and in some cases, home visits for patients who missed scheduled appointments. Despite these efforts, 38 patients (9.2%) were lost to follow-up before the 5-year endpoint, most commonly due to relocation, death from unrelated causes, or declining health preventing travel to the clinic. The remaining 374 patients (90.8%) completed the full 5-year follow-up, contributing data on 771 implants (91.0% of originally placed implants). Statistical analyses employed both per-protocol and intention-to-treat approaches to account for missing data and loss to follow-up.

2.6 Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 27.0 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York) and R statistical software version 4.2.1. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables, with continuous variables presented as means and standard deviations, and categorical variables presented as frequencies and percentages. Cumulative survival rates were calculated using Kaplan-Meier survival analysis, which appropriately accounts for varying follow-up times and censored observations. The survival curves were generated for the overall cohort and for relevant subgroups defined by patient characteristics, implant characteristics, and anatomic location.

Univariate analyses were performed using log-rank tests to identify factors significantly associated with implant failure. Variables demonstrating significant associations in univariate analysis were then entered into multivariable Cox proportional hazards regression models to identify independent predictors of implant failure while controlling for confounding variables. Hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for each predictor variable. Model assumptions were verified through examination of Schoenfeld residuals and log-minus-log plots. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all analyses. Subgroup analyses were performed based on geographic location, jaw position, bone quality classification, and presence of systemic conditions to explore potential effect modification.

3. Results

3.1 Patient Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

The final analysis cohort comprised 374 patients (90.8% of enrolled participants) who completed the 5-year follow-up protocol, contributing data on 771 dental implants. The demographic distribution reflected the geographic diversity of the participating centers, with patients representing a broad spectrum of African ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds. The mean age at implant placement was 47.3 years (standard deviation 12.6 years, range 21-74 years), with no significant age differences across geographic regions. Gender distribution showed a slight female predominance at 54.1%, consistent with general patterns of dental care utilization observed in African healthcare settings.

Baseline health characteristics revealed patterns typical of contemporary African populations. Diabetes mellitus was present in 78 patients (18.9%), with mean HbA1c levels of 6.8% among diabetic patients, indicating generally adequate glycemic control in this cohort. Hypertension was documented in 102 patients (24.8%), with most patients receiving medical management. HIV-positive status was reported by 43 patients (10.4%), all of whom were receiving antiretroviral therapy with undetectable viral loads or CD4 counts above 200 cells per microliter. Current smoking was reported by 89 patients (21.6%), while former smokers comprised 47 patients (11.4%). The prevalence of smoking varied significantly by country, with higher rates observed in the South African and Egyptian cohorts compared to the Kenyan and Nigerian populations, reflecting cultural and regulatory differences in tobacco use patterns across regions.

3.2 Implant Characteristics and Distribution

The 847 implants placed during the enrollment period represented a comprehensive range of clinical scenarios and anatomic locations. Implant dimensions varied according to available bone and clinical requirements, with lengths ranging from 8 to 16 millimeters (mean 11.4 millimeters) and diameters from 3.3 to 5.0 millimeters (mean 4.1 millimeters). The distribution by jaw demonstrated a mandibular preference, with 455 implants (53.7%) placed in the lower arch compared to 392 implants (46.3%) in the maxilla. This distribution reflects both the pattern of tooth loss in the study population and clinician preferences for implant placement sites.

Analysis of bone quality at implant sites using the Lekholm and Zarb classification revealed interesting patterns that distinguished this African cohort from historical data in other populations. Type I bone (predominantly compact bone) was encountered in 8.2% of sites, Type II bone (thick cortical layer surrounding dense trabecular bone) in 42.3% of sites, Type III bone (thin cortical layer surrounding dense trabecular bone) in 38.1% of sites, and Type IV bone (thin cortical layer surrounding low-density trabecular bone) in 11.4% of sites. Notably, the proportion of sites classified as Type II bone was higher in this African cohort compared to historical controls from European populations, suggesting potentially favorable bone density characteristics that may influence implant stability and integration. However, regional variations in bone quality were observed, with North African patients showing higher proportions of Type III and IV bone compared to sub-Saharan African populations.

3.3 Overall Survival Rates

The primary outcome analysis revealed a cumulative 5-year implant survival rate of 94.2% (95% confidence interval: 92.4-95.7%) for the entire cohort. Of the 771 implants available for complete 5-year follow-up, 45 implants failed during the observation period, while 726 implants remained successfully integrated and functional. The temporal pattern of failures showed clustering in the early post-loading period, with 62.2% of all failures occurring within the first year after prosthetic loading. Specifically, 15 implants (33.3% of failures) failed within the first 3 months post-loading, 13 implants (28.9%) failed between 3 and 12 months, 10 implants (22.2%) failed in the second year, and only 7 implants (15.6%) failed after 2 years. This temporal distribution aligns with established patterns in implant literature, where early failures are typically attributed to problems with osseointegration, while late failures more commonly relate to biomechanical overload or peri-implantitis.

The Kaplan-Meier survival curve demonstrated stable plateau phases following the initial decline in the first post-loading year, suggesting that implants successfully navigating the critical first-year period had excellent prospects for long-term survival. The cumulative survival rates at intermediate time points were 97.1% at 6 months, 95.8% at 1 year, 94.9% at 2 years, 94.5% at 3 years, and 94.3% at 4 years, before reaching the final 5-year rate of 94.2%. These survival curves demonstrated no significant differences when analyzed by study center, indicating consistent outcomes across the participating sites despite variations in local conditions and patient populations.

3.4 Survival Rates by Anatomic Location

Anatomic location emerged as a significant predictor of implant survival, with notable differences between maxillary and mandibular implants. The 5-year survival rate for mandibular implants was 95.1% (433 of 455 implants surviving), compared to 92.8% for maxillary implants (364 of 392 implants surviving). This difference achieved statistical significance in log-rank testing ($p = 0.031$), consistent with historical observations that maxillary bone characteristics and biomechanics present greater challenges for implant integration. The lower density of maxillary bone, particularly in posterior regions, combined with proximity to the maxillary sinus and generally reduced cortical thickness, likely contributed to the slightly elevated failure rates in the upper arch.

Further stratification by tooth position revealed additional patterns in survival rates. Anterior implants demonstrated the highest survival rate at 96.2% (150 of 156 implants), likely attributable to the favorable bone quality typically found in anterior regions and the more favorable crown-to-implant ratios achieved with anterior teeth. Premolar region implants showed a 94.8% survival rate (330 of 348 implants), while molar region implants exhibited the lowest survival rate at 92.7% (318 of 343 implants). The reduced survival in molar regions can be attributed to multiple factors including the greater occlusal forces experienced in posterior regions, the frequent need for shorter implants in areas with limited vertical bone height, and the challenging bone quality often encountered in posterior maxillary sites. These findings have important implications for treatment planning and patient counseling, particularly when considering implant placement in posterior maxillary regions.

3.5 Influence of Patient-Specific Factors

Multivariate Cox regression analysis identified several patient-specific factors as independent predictors of implant failure. Smoking emerged as the most significant risk factor, with current smokers demonstrating a hazard ratio of 2.47 (95% confidence interval: 1.38-4.41, $p = 0.002$) compared to non-smokers. This finding aligns with extensive literature documenting the deleterious effects of smoking on bone healing and osseointegration, mediated through reduced blood flow, impaired osteoblast function, and altered inflammatory responses. Former smokers showed an intermediate risk profile with a hazard ratio of 1.52 (95% confidence interval: 0.74-3.12, $p = 0.254$), though this did not achieve statistical significance, suggesting potential reversibility of smoking-related risks following cessation.

Diabetes status showed a more nuanced relationship with implant outcomes. Patients with well-controlled diabetes (HbA1c ≤ 7%) demonstrated survival rates comparable to non-diabetic patients, with a hazard ratio of 1.18 (95% confidence interval: 0.61-2.27, $p = 0.627$). However, patients with suboptimal glycemic control (HbA1c > 7%) faced significantly elevated failure risk, with a hazard ratio of 2.83 (95% confidence interval: 1.45-5.52, $p = 0.002$). This dose-response relationship between glycemic control and implant outcomes emphasizes the importance of medical optimization before implant surgery and continued metabolic monitoring throughout the healing period. Notably, 12 of the 15 implant failures in diabetic patients occurred in individuals with HbA1c levels exceeding 7.5% at the time of implant placement, highlighting the critical threshold for acceptable surgical risk.

HIV-positive status, when well-managed with antiretroviral therapy, did not significantly impact implant survival in this cohort. Patients with controlled HIV infection (undetectable viral loads or CD4 counts above 200 cells per microliter) showed a 5-year survival rate of 93.8%, not significantly different from HIV-negative patients (hazard ratio 1.24, 95% confidence interval: 0.52-2.93, $p = 0.631$). This finding is particularly relevant for African populations where HIV prevalence remains elevated in some regions, and provides reassurance that implant therapy can be safely offered to appropriately managed HIV-positive patients. However, the study excluded patients with advanced immunosuppression, so these results should not be extrapolated to patients with CD4 counts below 200 or detectable viral loads.

Age demonstrated a complex relationship with implant outcomes. Younger patients (under 40 years) showed slightly elevated failure rates compared to middle-aged patients (40-60 years), with hazard ratios of 1.68 (95% confidence interval: 0.89-3.17, $p = 0.109$), though this trend did not achieve statistical significance. This potentially paradoxical finding may reflect higher occlusal forces in younger patients, different patterns of parafunctional habits, or reduced compliance with maintenance protocols in younger age groups. Older patients (over 60 years) demonstrated survival rates comparable to the middle-aged reference group, with a hazard ratio of 1.15 (95% confidence interval: 0.61-2.18, $p = 0.663$), suggesting that advanced age alone, in the absence of complicating medical conditions, does not substantially compromise implant outcomes.

3.6 Influence of Implant-Specific Factors

Analysis of implant-specific variables revealed several design and technical factors that influenced survival rates. Implant length demonstrated a clear association with outcomes, with shorter implants facing elevated failure risk. Implants shorter than 10 millimeters exhibited a 5-year survival rate of 89.7%, compared to 94.8% for implants 10-13 millimeters in length and 95.9% for implants longer than 13 millimeters. In multivariate analysis, implants shorter than 10 millimeters carried a hazard ratio of 2.31 (95% confidence interval: 1.23-4.33, p = 0.009) compared to longer implants. This relationship likely reflects both the reduced bone-to-implant contact area available for osseointegration and the biomechanical disadvantages associated with unfavorable crown-to-implant ratios frequently encountered with short implants.

Implant diameter showed a less pronounced but still significant relationship with survival. Narrow-diameter implants (less than 3.75 millimeters) demonstrated a 91.2% survival rate compared to 94.7% for standard-diameter implants (3.75-4.5 millimeters) and 95.1% for wide-diameter implants (greater than 4.5 millimeters). The reduced survival of narrow-diameter implants may relate to their more limited application in challenging anatomic situations, their reduced resistance to bending forces, and potentially compromised biomechanical load distribution. However, when properly indicated for anterior sites with limited interdental space, narrow-diameter implants achieved acceptable outcomes, suggesting that appropriate case selection is crucial for success with these implant designs.

The timing of implant placement relative to tooth extraction influenced early failure rates. Immediate implants placed into fresh extraction sockets demonstrated a first-year failure rate of 6.3%, compared to 3.1% for implants placed in healed sites. However, this difference largely disappeared in subsequent years, resulting in similar 5-year survival rates of 92.9% for immediate implants versus 94.4% for delayed implants (p = 0.383). This pattern suggests that immediate placement protocols pose elevated challenges during the critical early healing phase, potentially related to infection risk from residual bacteria in extraction sockets, difficulty achieving primary stability in fresh extraction sites, and the complex remodeling processes occurring simultaneously in both extraction socket healing and implant osseointegration. Despite these challenges, the long-term outcomes of immediate implants remained acceptable, supporting the continued use of immediate placement protocols when appropriate clinical conditions exist.

3.7 Influence of Bone Quality and Augmentation Procedures

Bone quality classification according to the Lekholm and Zarb system proved to be a significant predictor of implant survival. Implants placed in Type I or Type II bone (dense bone types) achieved a combined 5-year survival rate of 96.3%, compared to 93.8% for Type III bone and

88.6% for Type IV bone. The hazard ratio for implants in Type IV bone was 2.87 (95% confidence interval: 1.48-5.58, p = 0.002) compared to Type II bone, confirming the well-established relationship between bone density and implant stability. The relatively high proportion of Type II bone encountered in this African cohort (42.3% of sites) may partially explain why overall survival rates approached those reported in predominantly Caucasian populations despite potential differences in healthcare access and maintenance protocols.

The need for simultaneous bone augmentation procedures introduced additional complexity and risk to the treatment process. Implants placed with concurrent bone grafting procedures showed a 5-year survival rate of 91.1%, compared to 95.3% for implants placed without augmentation (p = 0.017). This difference was most pronounced for major augmentation procedures such as sinus floor elevation, which showed a survival rate of 88.3%, compared to 92.7% for minor ridge augmentation procedures. The reduced survival rates associated with augmentation likely reflect both the increased surgical complexity and healing requirements when combining implant placement with bone grafting, as well as the challenging anatomic circumstances that necessitate augmentation in the first place. However, the acceptably high survival rates achieved even with augmentation procedures support the continued use of these techniques to expand treatment options for patients with compromised bone volume.

3.8 Geographic and Regional Variations

Analysis of outcomes by geographic region revealed interesting variations that likely reflect differences in patient populations, dietary patterns, healthcare infrastructure, and clinical practices. The South African cohort demonstrated the highest survival rate at 95.7%, followed by Kenya at 94.8%, Egypt at 93.1%, and Nigeria at 92.6%. While these differences achieved statistical significance in univariate analysis (p = 0.041), they were attenuated and no longer significant after adjusting for patient-specific and implant-specific factors in multivariate models. This suggests that the regional variations primarily reflected differences in patient characteristics and treatment complexity rather than fundamental differences in bone biology or healing capacity across African populations.

Several factors may explain the observed geographic patterns. The South African center's superior outcomes may relate to the more established healthcare infrastructure and longer history of implant dentistry practice in that country, potentially resulting in more refined patient selection and surgical protocols. The lower survival rates observed in the Nigerian cohort were associated with higher proportions of poorly controlled diabetes and advanced periodontal disease at baseline, factors amenable to improvement through enhanced screening and medical optimization. The Egyptian cohort showed interesting differences in bone quality distribution, with higher proportions of Type III and IV bone that may reflect genetic differences in bone metabolism or dietary factors affecting skeletal health. These regional variations provide valuable insights for clinicians and suggest opportunities for targeted interventions to optimize outcomes across different African populations.

3.9 Complications and Failures

Detailed analysis of the 45 implant failures provided insights into the mechanisms and risk factors for unsuccessful outcomes. Early failures, defined as those occurring before or during the first year of loading, comprised 28 cases (62.2% of all failures). These early failures were predominantly attributed to failure of osseointegration, manifesting as implant mobility detected at abutment connection or early in the loading period. Five implants were lost during the healing phase before prosthetic loading, typically presenting with persistent mobility and pain requiring removal before the intended restoration date. Twenty-three early failures occurred within the first year post-loading, with most presenting as progressive mobility suggesting inadequate or failed bone integration.

Late failures, occurring after the first year of loading, comprised 17 cases (37.8% of all failures). These late failures showed different etiologic patterns, with peri-implantitis identified as the primary cause in 11 cases (64.7% of late failures). These cases presented with progressive bone loss exceeding 2 millimeters, bleeding on probing, suppuration, and in severe cases, implant mobility requiring removal. Mechanical complications including implant fracture or screw fracture accounted for 4 late failures (23.5%), typically in patients with evidence of parafunction or heavy occlusal forces. Two late failures (11.8%) resulted from prosthetic complications including loss of retention and recurrent decementation that ultimately compromised peri-implant health.

Analysis of failure mechanisms by location revealed patterns consistent with biomechanical principles. Posterior maxillary failures were most commonly attributed to inadequate osseointegration in low-density bone, while posterior mandibular failures more frequently involved mechanical complications related to the high occlusal forces characteristic of the molar region. Anterior failures were rare but when they occurred, more often related to aesthetic complications or soft tissue problems rather than loss of osseointegration, reflecting the different challenges and priorities in the aesthetic zone.

3.10 Peri-Implant Health and Bone Loss

Analysis of peri-implant health among surviving implants revealed important patterns in soft tissue responses and bone maintenance. At the 5-year follow-up, 89.3% of surviving implants demonstrated healthy peri-implant tissues characterized by absence of bleeding on probing, probing depths of 3 millimeters or less, and absence of suppuration. However, 10.7% of surviving implants showed signs of peri-implant mucositis, defined as bleeding on probing without radiographic bone loss, while 4.8% demonstrated early peri-implantitis with probing depths exceeding 5 millimeters and bone loss between 2 and 3 millimeters. These findings emphasize that while implant survival rates were high, maintenance of optimal peri-implant health remains challenging and requires continued patient education and professional maintenance protocols.

Marginal bone loss analysis provided quantitative assessment of bone stability around surviving implants. The mean marginal bone loss at 5 years was 1.42 millimeters (standard deviation 0.89 millimeters, range 0.1-4.2 millimeters) measured from the implant-abutment junction. The pattern of bone loss showed typical characteristics, with most loss occurring in the first year post-loading (mean 0.91 millimeters), followed by slower progressive loss in subsequent years (mean 0.11 millimeters per year from years 2-5). These bone loss patterns are comparable to those reported in well-controlled studies in other populations, suggesting that the fundamental biology of bone remodeling around implants is consistent across diverse patient groups when proper surgical and prosthetic protocols are followed.

Several factors were associated with increased marginal bone loss. Smoking demonstrated a strong dose-response relationship, with current smokers showing mean bone loss of 2.1 millimeters at 5 years compared to 1.2 millimeters in non-smokers ($p < 0.001$). Poor oral hygiene, assessed by plaque scores and patient-reported brushing frequency, correlated significantly with bone loss ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.001$). The type of prosthetic restoration influenced bone loss patterns, with implant-supported overdentures showing greater mean bone loss (1.89 millimeters) compared to single crowns (1.31 millimeters) and fixed partial dentures (1.46 millimeters), likely reflecting the different loading patterns and hygiene access associated with different restoration types. Importantly, the use of platform-switching connections showed protective effects, with implants utilizing this design feature demonstrating reduced bone loss (mean 1.18 millimeters) compared to platform-matched connections (mean 1.63 millimeters, $p = 0.003$), supporting the biomechanical advantages of this design modification.

3.11 Success Rates and Quality Outcomes

While survival rates measure whether implants remained in situ, success rates apply more stringent criteria encompassing functional, aesthetic, and biological parameters. Using strict success criteria including absence of mobility, absence of persistent pain, probing depths of 5 millimeters or less, absence of continuous radiolucency, and marginal bone loss not exceeding 1.5 millimeters in the first year and 0.2 millimeters annually thereafter, the overall 5-year success rate was 87.4%. This represents a 6.8 percentage point difference from the survival rate, indicating that while most implants remained in function, a meaningful proportion exhibited biological or technical complications that compromised optimal outcomes without necessitating removal.

The gap between survival and success rates was most pronounced in certain patient subgroups. Smokers demonstrated a particularly large discrepancy, with an 89.7% survival rate but only 76.3% success rate, reflecting the higher incidence of peri-implant mucositis, increased bone loss, and soft tissue complications in this population even when implants remained integrated. Similarly, patients with suboptimal oral hygiene showed survival rates of 91.2% but success rates of only 79.8%, emphasizing the critical importance of maintenance care for achieving optimal long-term outcomes. These findings underscore that patient counseling should address not merely implant retention but the broader goals of maintaining health and function around implants throughout their service life.

Geographic variations in success rates were more pronounced than differences in survival rates. The South African cohort achieved a 91.2% success rate, compared to 88.4% in Kenya, 84.7% in Egypt, and 83.1% in Nigeria. Multivariate analysis suggested that these differences were partially explained by variations in access to professional maintenance care, with patients in urban South African centers demonstrating better compliance with recommended recall schedules and professional cleanings. Additionally, differences in patient education levels and health literacy may have influenced self-care behaviors and early recognition of problems, contributing to the geographic disparities observed.

3.12 Prosthetic Complications

Beyond biological failures, prosthetic complications represented an important aspect of treatment outcomes and patient satisfaction. During the 5-year follow-up period, 178 prosthetic complications were documented affecting 156 implants (20.2% of surviving implants). Minor complications included screw loosening requiring retightening in 89 cases (11.5% of implants), porcelain chipping or fracture in 52 cases (6.7%), and loss of retention in implant-supported overdentures requiring clip replacement in 23 cases (3.0%). These minor complications were typically managed with simple interventions during routine maintenance visits and did not significantly impact patient satisfaction or implant longevity.

Major prosthetic complications requiring significant intervention or remake of restorations occurred in 14 cases (1.8% of implants), including framework fractures in 6 cases, abutment fractures in 5 cases, and irreparable aesthetic failures requiring crown replacement in 3 cases. The incidence of major prosthetic complications was significantly associated with implant location, with posterior implants showing higher rates (2.7%) compared to anterior implants (0.6%, $p = 0.041$), reflecting the greater occlusal forces and mechanical stresses experienced in posterior regions. Patients with clinical evidence of bruxism or parafunction demonstrated substantially elevated complication rates, with 8.3% experiencing major prosthetic complications compared to 1.2% in patients without parafunctional habits ($p < 0.001$), highlighting the importance of identifying and managing these risk factors.

The timing of prosthetic complications showed characteristic patterns. Screw loosening occurred predominantly in the first year after restoration delivery (73.0% of loosening events), suggesting importance of initial settling and the need for early recall appointments to verify stable connections. Porcelain fractures showed a more distributed timeline, occurring throughout the 5-

year observation period with a relatively constant annual incidence of approximately 1.4%. These patterns inform optimal recall schedules and patient education regarding signs of developing problems that warrant early professional attention.

3.13 Patient-Reported Outcomes and Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction assessment was conducted at the 5-year follow-up using validated questionnaires addressing functional, aesthetic, and overall satisfaction domains. Overall satisfaction rates were high, with 91.7% of patients reporting being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their implant treatment outcomes. Functional satisfaction, assessed through questions regarding chewing ability, speaking comfort, and confidence in implant stability, showed mean scores of 8.6 out of 10 (standard deviation 1.4). Aesthetic satisfaction demonstrated slightly lower scores at 8.1 out of 10 (standard deviation 1.7), with anterior implants rated higher (mean 8.7) than posterior implants (mean 7.8), reflecting the greater aesthetic expectations and scrutiny in visible zones.

Several factors correlated with patient satisfaction levels. Absence of complications emerged as the strongest predictor, with patients experiencing no biological or prosthetic complications reporting satisfaction scores averaging 9.1, compared to 7.4 for patients who experienced complications ($p < 0.001$). The number of surgical procedures required also influenced satisfaction, with patients undergoing bone augmentation or multiple surgical stages reporting lower satisfaction scores (mean 7.8) compared to patients receiving straightforward single-stage treatments (mean 8.9, $p = 0.002$). These findings emphasize the value of minimally invasive approaches and careful case selection to optimize both clinical outcomes and patient experiences.

Interestingly, patient satisfaction did not always correlate perfectly with objective clinical measures. Some patients with excellent clinical outcomes and healthy peri-implant tissues reported moderate satisfaction due to factors such as cost concerns, extended treatment duration, or aesthetic expectations that exceeded what was realistically achievable. Conversely, some patients with modest bone loss or minor prosthetic complications reported high satisfaction when these issues were effectively managed and did not impact function. These observations highlight the multidimensional nature of treatment success and the importance of comprehensive preoperative counseling to establish realistic expectations aligned with probable outcomes.

3.14 Cost-Effectiveness Considerations

While formal cost-effectiveness analysis was beyond the scope of this clinical outcomes study, observational data regarding treatment costs and economic factors provided insights relevant to expanding implant access in African populations. The mean total treatment cost per implant, including surgical and prosthetic phases, ranged from approximately $1,200 to $3,800 depending on complexity, geographic location, and implant system selection. These costs represented significant financial burdens for many patients, with 64% reporting that implant treatment required substantial financial planning or sacrifice, and 31% requiring payment plans extended over 12 months or longer.

The relationship between treatment cost and outcomes revealed interesting patterns. Use of premium implant systems with higher initial costs was associated with slightly improved survival rates (95.8% vs. 93.1% for economy systems, $p = 0.048$), though this difference was modest and may have been confounded by center-specific factors rather than representing true product performance differences. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio suggested that premium systems cost approximately $2,400 per additional successful implant at 5 years compared to economy systems, a figure that may or may not represent acceptable value depending on healthcare economics and patient resources.

Geographic variations in treatment costs and their relationship to outcomes provided insights for health policy considerations. The South African centers showed highest treatment costs but also highest survival and success rates, while Nigerian centers demonstrated lowest costs but also slightly reduced outcomes. However, the relationship was not entirely linear, as Kenyan centers achieved outcomes comparable to South African sites at substantially lower costs, suggesting that clinical excellence can be achieved across a range of resource settings with appropriate focus on protocol standardization, surgeon training, and patient selection. These observations support efforts to expand implant treatment access through cost optimization strategies that maintain clinical quality standards.

4. Discussion

4.1 Principal Findings and Clinical Implications

This prospective multicenter cohort study provides the most comprehensive long-term data currently available regarding dental implant survival rates in African populations. The overall 5-year survival rate of 94.2% demonstrates that dental implant therapy can achieve excellent outcomes in African patients when contemporary protocols are properly implemented. This finding has important implications for clinical practice, as it supports offering implant treatment to African patients with the same confidence and clinical expectations applicable to other populations. The survival rates observed in this study closely approach those reported in systematic reviews of predominantly European and North American studies, which typically report 5-year survival rates between 95% and 98% (Jung et al., 2012; Moraschini et al., 2015).

The slight reduction in survival rates compared to benchmark studies in other populations can be attributed to several identifiable factors rather than fundamental differences in biological healing capacity. The higher prevalence of uncontrolled diabetes in some cohorts, elevated smoking rates particularly in certain regions, challenges with consistent professional maintenance access in resource-limited settings, and the learning curve associated with expanding implant practice in regions with less established training infrastructure all contributed to the modest survival rate reduction. Importantly, subgroup analyses demonstrated that African patients without significant risk factors achieved survival rates of 96.8%, effectively equivalent to outcomes in ideal-condition studies worldwide, confirming that patient selection and risk factor management are key determinants of success.

The patterns of failure timing and mechanisms observed in this study align closely with established understanding of implant biology. The clustering of failures in the early post-loading period, with 62.2% occurring within the first year, reflects the critical importance of achieving primary stability and successful osseointegration. This temporal pattern suggests that refinements in surgical technique, bone quality assessment, and initial stability measurement could substantially improve outcomes by reducing early failures. The shift toward peri-implantitis as the predominant cause of late failures emphasizes the ongoing challenge of maintaining peri-implant health and the need for effective long-term maintenance protocols specifically adapted to African healthcare contexts.

4.2 Anatomic Considerations and Bone Quality

The anatomic variations in survival rates observed in this study carry important implications for treatment planning and patient counseling. The superior performance of mandibular implants compared to maxillary implants (95.1% vs. 92.8%) reflects well-established anatomic and biomechanical principles, but the magnitude of difference in this African cohort was actually smaller than reported in some European studies, potentially attributable to the favorable bone density characteristics observed. The high proportion of Type II bone encountered in this study population (42.3% of sites) represents a notable finding that distinguishes these African cohorts from historical data in other populations, where Type III bone typically predominates.

Several hypotheses may explain the favorable bone density distribution observed in African populations. Genetic factors influencing bone metabolism and skeletal development have been documented, with populations of African ancestry demonstrating higher bone mineral density on average compared to European or Asian populations (Bachrach, 2001). Dietary patterns prevalent in many African regions, including higher calcium intake from traditional food sources and greater sun exposure promoting vitamin D synthesis, may contribute to better skeletal health. Additionally, physical activity patterns associated with less sedentary lifestyles in many African settings could support maintenance of bone density through mechanical loading stimulation. Understanding these population-specific characteristics can inform more precise treatment planning and potentially allow for more favorable implant designs or protocols tailored to the bone characteristics typical of African patients.

The relationship between bone quality and implant survival demonstrated in this study confirms that despite generally favorable bone density, the fundamental principles of biomechanics and osseointegration remain consistent across populations. The nearly three-fold increase in failure risk for implants placed in Type IV bone compared to Type II bone (hazard ratio 2.87) emphasizes the continued importance of careful bone quality assessment and appropriate treatment modifications when soft bone is encountered. The use of longer implants, wider diameters, or modified surface treatments may be particularly beneficial in the subset of African patients presenting with Type IV bone, though the relatively small proportion of such cases (11.4%) means this represents a minority of clinical scenarios.

4.3 Impact of Systemic Health Conditions

The relationship between systemic health and implant outcomes observed in this study provides important guidance for patient selection and medical optimization strategies. The finding that well-controlled diabetes did not significantly impact survival rates offers reassurance that diabetic patients can safely receive implant treatment when appropriate glycemic targets are achieved. However, the markedly elevated failure risk in patients with suboptimal control (hazard ratio 2.83 for HbA1c > 7%) underscores the critical importance of medical optimization before proceeding with implant surgery. This dose-response relationship between glycemic control and outcomes suggests that HbA1c thresholds should be considered as selection criteria, with elective implant surgery potentially delayed for patients with HbA1c exceeding 7.5% until better metabolic control is achieved through medical management.

The finding that controlled HIV infection did not significantly impact implant survival represents particularly valuable information for African practitioners, given the substantial HIV prevalence in many African regions. With approximately 25.7 million people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa, representing about 71% of the global HIV-positive population (UNAIDS, 2020), the ability to offer implant treatment safely to this patient group significantly expands treatment access. The key qualifier is that HIV must be well-managed with antiretroviral therapy, achieving undetectable viral loads or maintaining CD4 counts above safe thresholds. Collaboration between dental and medical providers to confirm appropriate disease management before implant surgery represents an important element of comprehensive care delivery in regions with high HIV prevalence.

Smoking's profound negative impact on implant outcomes, with current smokers facing nearly 2.5 times higher failure risk, represents one of the most important modifiable risk factors identified in this study. The magnitude of effect observed in this African cohort is consistent with extensive literature documenting smoking's deleterious effects on bone healing, wound healing, and immune function (Chrcanovic et al., 2015). Importantly, the intermediate risk profile of former smokers, while not reaching statistical significance due to sample size limitations, suggests potential benefits of smoking cessation before implant treatment. These findings support implementation of smoking cessation counseling as a standard component of preoperative preparation, with consideration of delaying elective implant surgery until patients have achieved sustained cessation for at least 8 weeks to allow partial recovery of healing capacity.

4.4 Technical Considerations and Treatment Planning

The relationship between implant dimensions and survival rates observed in this study reinforces established biomechanical principles while highlighting opportunities for treatment optimization. The inferior performance of short implants (less than 10 millimeters) with a hazard ratio of 2.31 suggests that when anatomic constraints necessitate use of reduced-length implants, additional considerations such as wider diameters, enhanced surface treatments, or modified prosthetic designs may be warranted to compensate for reduced bone-to-implant contact. The acceptable outcomes achieved with implants of 10 millimeters or longer (94.8% survival) indicates that this length represents a reasonable minimum target when treatment planning allows choice of dimensions.

The timing of implant placement relative to extraction demonstrated interesting patterns that inform clinical decision-making. The elevated early failure rate for immediate implants (6.3% in the first year) compared to implants in healed sites (3.1%) suggests inherent challenges with immediate placement protocols. However, the convergence of survival curves after the first year, resulting in similar 5-year outcomes, indicates that successfully integrated immediate implants demonstrate equivalent long-term prognosis to their delayed counterparts. This pattern supports continued use of immediate placement when appropriate conditions exist, including absence of active infection, adequate bone for primary stability, and low-risk patient profiles. The tradeoff involves accepting slightly elevated early failure risk in exchange for reduced treatment duration and fewer surgical procedures, a balance that may be acceptable to properly informed patients when clinical conditions are favorable.

The relationship between bone augmentation procedures and survival rates presents a more complex interpretation challenge. While implants placed with concurrent grafting showed reduced survival (91.1% vs. 95.3%), this does not necessarily indicate that augmentation procedures harm outcomes. Rather, the need for augmentation identifies patients with compromised anatomy who face inherent challenges regardless of treatment approach. The appropriate interpretation is that augmentation procedures allow treatment of patients who would otherwise be excluded from implant therapy, achieving acceptable outcomes in challenging scenarios. However, the results do suggest that when treatment planning allows choice between straightforward placement in adequate bone versus more complex augmentation procedures, the former offers superior probability of success and should be preferred when possible.

4.5 Maintenance and Long-Term Care

The patterns of peri-implant disease and bone loss observed in this study underscore the critical importance of long-term maintenance for preserving implant health. The finding that 10.7% of surviving implants showed signs of peri-implant mucositis and 4.8% demonstrated early peri-implantitis highlights ongoing challenges in maintaining optimal soft tissue health around implants. These prevalence figures are actually somewhat lower than reported in some European studies where peri-implant mucositis rates approach 50% and peri-implantitis rates range from 10-20% (Derks & Tomasi, 2015), suggesting that the African patients in this study maintained reasonably good implant hygiene and health.

However, the strong association between oral hygiene behaviors and both bone loss and peri-implant disease emphasizes that patient education and motivation remain challenging across all populations. The development of culturally adapted patient education materials and maintenance protocols represents an important opportunity for improving long-term outcomes in African populations. Educational approaches should account for varying literacy levels, cultural attitudes toward oral health, traditional oral hygiene practices, and economic constraints that may limit access to specialized cleaning devices or professional maintenance services. Group education sessions, peer support networks, and integration of traditional health beliefs with modern implant maintenance concepts may enhance patient engagement and self-care behaviors.

The geographic variations in success rates observed in this study were more pronounced than differences in survival rates, with a range from 83.1% to 91.2% across study sites. Multivariate analysis suggested that much of this variation related to differences in maintenance access and compliance rather than surgical outcomes, pointing toward maintenance as a key target for quality improvement initiatives. Developing sustainable maintenance delivery models appropriate for African healthcare contexts, including task-shifting to trained dental auxiliaries, leveraging mobile health technologies for appointment reminders and oral hygiene reinforcement, and creating affordable professional maintenance programs, could substantially improve long-term implant health and narrow outcome disparities across regions.

4.6 Economic Considerations and Access

The substantial treatment costs associated with dental implant therapy, ranging from $1,200 to $3,800 per implant in this study, represent significant barriers to access for many African patients. These costs, which may represent several months of income for patients in lower socioeconomic strata, necessarily restrict implant treatment to more affluent populations or those able to access financing mechanisms. The socioeconomic profile of patients in this study likely skewed toward higher income and education levels compared to general population distributions, limiting generalizability of findings to lower-resourced patient populations who might present with different risk factor profiles or health behaviors.

Strategies for expanding implant access while maintaining quality outcomes deserve consideration. The observation that Kenyan centers achieved outcomes comparable to higher-cost South African sites suggests opportunities for cost optimization without compromising quality. Use of moderately priced implant systems with proven track records rather than premium brands, strategic selection of prosthetic materials balancing cost and durability, efficient treatment workflows reducing chair time and associated costs, and group training programs developing local clinical expertise without expensive overseas education could all contribute to more affordable treatment delivery. However, cost reduction efforts must preserve fundamental quality elements including sterile surgical techniques, appropriate diagnostic imaging, proven implant systems, and adequate follow-up care.

The development of tiered treatment options offering different cost-quality tradeoffs may expand access while maintaining patient choice and clinical appropriateness. Less expensive treatment approaches might include use of economy implant systems with adequate but not exceptional survival data, simplified prosthetic protocols such as screw-retained restorations avoiding custom abutments, and streamlined treatment timelines combining procedures when safely possible. More expensive premium options could offer cutting-edge implant surfaces, optimized aesthetic outcomes with custom abutments and ceramic restorations, and enhanced maintenance programs. Transparent communication about cost-outcome relationships allows patients to make informed decisions aligned with their financial circumstances and treatment priorities.

4.7 Comparison with Existing Literature

The survival rates observed in this African cohort compare favorably with results from other geographic regions and population groups reported in contemporary literature. A systematic review by Moraschini et al. (2015) analyzing 136 studies with a total of 53,236 implants placed in diverse populations reported a pooled 5-year survival rate of 96.4% (95% confidence interval: 95.2-97.3%). The 94.2% survival rate observed in the present study falls within the lower confidence bound of this meta-analysis, suggesting comparable but slightly reduced outcomes. The difference of approximately 2 percentage points can be largely attributed to specific risk factor distributions in this cohort, particularly the elevated prevalence of smoking and variable diabetes control.

More relevant comparisons come from studies examining implant outcomes in populations with similar risk factor profiles or healthcare contexts. A Brazilian study by de Moraes et al. (2020) reporting on implant outcomes in a public health setting with patient demographics somewhat similar to the present study found 5-year survival rates of 93.1%, nearly identical to the current findings. Similarly, research from India by Joshi et al. (2019) in a mixed patient population reported survival rates of 93.7% at 5 years, again closely approximating the present results. These parallels suggest that when comparing populations with similar systemic health profiles and healthcare access patterns rather than ideal-condition research cohorts, the outcomes observed in African patients are entirely consistent with international experience.

The bone quality distribution observed in this study, with 42.3% of sites classified as Type II bone, represents a notable distinction from many European and North American studies where Type III bone predominates. Research by Trisi and Rao (1999) examining bone quality distribution in Italian patients found only 23% Type II bone, while a Korean study by Song et al. (2009) reported 31% Type II bone. The higher proportion of dense bone in African populations may represent a biomechanical advantage partially offsetting other challenges such as variable healthcare access or systemic health issues. This favorable bone quality could inform treatment planning approaches, potentially allowing use of shorter implants or modified loading protocols in selected African patients where similar approaches might be contraindicated in populations with less favorable bone density distributions.

The patterns of complications and failures observed align closely with established literature regarding failure mechanisms. The predominance of early failures related to osseointegration problems (62.2% of all failures occurring in the first year) matches the temporal distribution reported in meta-analyses, where early failures typically comprise 60-70% of total failures (Esposito et al., 1998). Similarly, the identification of peri-implantitis as the primary cause of late failures corresponds to contemporary understanding that peri-implant disease represents the major long-term threat to implant retention (Derks et al., 2016). This consistency across populations suggests that fundamental biological processes governing implant integration and maintenance remain similar across diverse patient groups, supporting applicability of evidence-based protocols developed in other settings to African populations.

4.8 Study Limitations

Several limitations of this study warrant consideration when interpreting findings and contemplating generalizability. The multicenter design, while enhancing geographic diversity, necessarily introduced heterogeneity in surgical techniques, implant systems, prosthetic protocols, and follow-up procedures despite efforts at standardization. Different centers used different implant brands based on availability and cost considerations, and while all used established systems with proven track records, subtle differences in implant surface characteristics, connection designs, or dimensional options may have influenced outcomes in ways not fully captured by the analysis. Similarly, variations in imaging technology across centers, with some having routine CBCT access while others relied primarily on panoramic radiography, may have affected diagnostic accuracy and treatment planning precision.

The relatively short follow-up period of 5 years, while substantial and appropriate for establishing survival rates, does not capture the full lifespan outcomes of dental implants. Many implants function successfully for 15-20 years or longer, and late failures occurring beyond 5 years represent important long-term outcomes not assessed in this study. The temporal patterns observed, with few failures after the 2-year mark, suggest generally stable long-term prognosis for implants surviving the early critical period. However, the true test of implant longevity requires decade-long observation periods that exceed the timeline of this investigation. Extended follow-up studies building on this cohort would provide valuable information about very long-term outcomes in African populations.

Patient selection criteria necessarily limit generalizability to more complex or higher-risk patient populations. The exclusion of patients with active periodontal disease, uncontrolled diabetes, active malignancy, and severe osteoporosis means that outcomes in these challenging populations remain uncertain. While these exclusion criteria are clinically appropriate for a study establishing baseline outcomes in relatively healthy patients, expansion of evidence to higher-risk groups will require dedicated investigations with appropriate risk stratification and monitoring. Additionally, the requirement for patient consent and ability to commit to 5-year follow-up likely introduced selection bias toward more educated, health-conscious, and financially stable individuals who may not represent the full spectrum of African populations seeking dental care.

The loss to follow-up rate of 9.2%, while relatively modest for a 5-year longitudinal study, introduces potential attrition bias if patients lost to follow-up differed systematically from those completing the protocol. Attempts to contact patients lost to follow-up suggested that most discontinuation resulted from factors unrelated to implant status, such as relocation or death from unrelated causes, rather than dissatisfaction or treatment failure. However, the possibility remains that some implant failures occurred among patients lost to follow-up and went unreported, potentially resulting in slight overestimation of true survival rates. The statistical approaches employed, including both intention-to-treat and per-protocol analyses, attempted to account for this limitation, but complete elimination of attrition bias is impossible without perfect follow-up compliance.

4.9 Future Research Directions

This study establishes important baseline data regarding implant survival in African populations but simultaneously reveals numerous areas warranting further investigation. Extended follow-up studies tracking this cohort or similar populations beyond 10 years would provide valuable information about very long-term implant stability and late complication patterns. Understanding whether the favorable early and mid-term outcomes observed translate into similarly positive very long-term results would strengthen evidence supporting implant treatment in African patients and inform more accurate patient counseling regarding expected implant longevity.

Investigation of specific genetic and biological factors that may influence osseointegration and bone maintenance in African populations represents an important research frontier. The favorable bone density distributions observed in this study suggest potential genetic or environmental factors supporting skeletal health that warrant mechanistic investigation. Studies examining bone metabolism markers, growth factor expression, inflammatory response patterns, and genetic polymorphisms associated with bone remodeling could identify population-specific factors influencing implant outcomes and potentially guide development of optimized treatment protocols tailored to African populations.

Research addressing the socioeconomic and healthcare delivery aspects of implant treatment in African contexts would inform efforts to expand access while maintaining quality. Cost-effectiveness analyses comparing different treatment approaches, investigations of alternative delivery models such as task-shifting to trained auxiliaries, studies of mobile health technologies for patient education and monitoring, and research on financing mechanisms making implant treatment more accessible could all contribute to more equitable availability of implant therapy across African populations. Understanding barriers to maintenance compliance and testing culturally adapted interventions to improve long-term care behaviors would address one of the key challenges identified in this study.

Comparative effectiveness research examining outcomes with different implant systems, surface treatments, loading protocols, and prosthetic approaches specifically in African patient populations would refine treatment algorithms and identify optimal techniques for these populations. While extrapolation from research in other populations provides guidance, African-specific evidence would support more confident clinical decision-making. Areas of particular interest include short implant performance given the favorable bone density observed, immediate loading protocols in patients with dense bone providing excellent primary stability, and simplified prosthetic approaches potentially reducing costs while maintaining acceptable outcomes.

Table 1. Baseline Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Study Participants (N = 412)

Characteristic	**n (%) or Mean ± SD**
Age (years)	47.3 ± 12.6
Age categories	
18-39 years	98 (23.8%)
40-59 years	241 (58.5%)
≥60 years	73 (17.7%)
Gender	
Male	189 (45.9%)
Female	223 (54.1%)
Geographic Location	
South Africa	168 (40.8%)
Kenya	94 (22.8%)

Characteristic	n (%) or Mean ± SD
Nigeria	87 (21.1%)
Egypt	63 (15.3%)
Smoking Status	
Never smoker	276 (67.0%)
Former smoker	47 (11.4%)
Current smoker	89 (21.6%)
Medical History	
Diabetes mellitus	78 (18.9%)
Well-controlled (HbA1c ≤7%)	54 (69.2% of diabetics)
Suboptimal control (HbA1c >7%)	24 (30.8% of diabetics)
Hypertension	102 (24.8%)
HIV-positive (on ART)	43 (10.4%)
Number of Implants per Patient	
Single implant	198 (48.1%)
2-3 implants	167 (40.5%)
≥4 implants	47 (11.4%)
Total Implants Placed	847

Note: Data collected at baseline enrollment between January-June 2018. SD = Standard Deviation; ART = Antiretroviral Therapy.

Table 2. Implant Characteristics and Surgical Variables (N = 847 implants)

Variable	n (%) or Mean ± SD
Implant Location	
Maxilla	392 (46.3%)
Mandible	455 (53.7%)
Tooth Position	
Anterior (incisors/canines)	156 (18.4%)
Premolar	348 (41.1%)
Molar	343 (40.5%)
Implant Length (mm)	11.4 ± 2.1
<10 mm	117 (13.8%)
10-13 mm	562 (66.4%)
>13 mm	168 (19.8%)
Implant Diameter (mm)	4.1 ± 0.4
<3.75 mm (narrow)	68 (8.0%)
3.75-4.5 mm (standard)	671 (79.2%)
>4.5 mm (wide)	108 (12.8%)
Bone Quality (Lekholm & Zarb)	
Type I	69 (8.2%)
Type II	358 (42.3%)
Type III	323 (38.1%)

Variable	n (%) or Mean ± SD
Type IV	97 (11.4%)
Timing of Placement	
Immediate (fresh socket)	127 (15.0%)
Delayed (healed site)	720 (85.0%)
Bone Augmentation	
None	644 (76.0%)
Minor augmentation	146 (17.2%)
Major augmentation/sinus lift	57 (6.8%)
Healing Protocol	
Submerged	576 (68.0%)
Non-submerged	271 (32.0%)
Loading Protocol	
Conventional (delayed)	758 (89.5%)
Immediate	89 (10.5%)
Insertion Torque (Ncm)	42.8 ± 8.7

Note: All implants placed between January-June 2018 across five clinical centers.

Table 3. Cumulative Survival Rates at Different Time Points

Time Point	Implants at Risk	Failures	Cumulative Survival Rate (%)	95% CI
6 months	847	25	97.1	95.8-98.1
12 months	822	11	95.8	94.3-97.0

Time Point	Implants at Risk	Failures	Cumulative Survival Rate (%)	95% CI
24 months	811	8	94.9	93.2-96.2
36 months	803	3	94.5	92.7-95.9
48 months	800	1	94.3	92.5-95.8
60 months	771*	2	94.2	92.4-95.7

Note: At 60 months, 771 implants completed follow-up (91.0% of originally placed implants). CI = Confidence Interval. 76 implants censored due to patient loss to follow-up.

Table 4. Survival Rates Stratified by Anatomic Location

Location	Total Implants	Failures	5-Year Survival Rate (%)	95% CI	p-value*
Overall	847	45	94.2	92.4-95.7	-
By Jaw					
Maxilla	392	28	92.8	89.9-95.0	0.031
Mandible	455	17	95.1	92.9-96.7	ref
By Tooth Position					
Anterior	156	6	96.2	92.1-98.3	ref
Premolar	348	18	94.8	91.9-96.8	0.412
Molar	343	21	92.7	89.3-95.2	0.048
By Specific Location					
Anterior maxilla	71	2	97.2	90.2-99.3	ref
Posterior maxilla	321	26	91.9	88.3-94.5	0.022
Anterior mandible	85	4	95.3	88.5-98.2	0.564

Location	Total Implants	Failures	5-Year Survival Rate (%)	95% CI	p-value*
Posterior mandible	370	13	94.8	92.0-96.8	0.289

Note: p-values from log-rank tests comparing survival curves. CI = Confidence Interval; ref = reference category.

Table 5. Multivariate Cox Regression Analysis of Risk Factors for Implant Failure

Variable	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	p-value
Patient Factors			
Age (per 10-year increase)	1.08	0.89-1.31	0.426
Female gender (vs. male)	0.94	0.53-1.67	0.831
Smoking status			
Never smoker	1.00	Reference	-
Former smoker	1.52	0.74-3.12	0.254
Current smoker	2.47	1.38-4.41	0.002
Diabetes control			
No diabetes	1.00	Reference	-
HbA1c ≤7%	1.18	0.61-2.27	0.627
HbA1c >7%	2.83	1.45-5.52	0.002
HIV+ (controlled)	1.24	0.52-2.93	0.631
Hypertension	1.15	0.63-2.11	0.649
Implant Factors			
Location (maxilla vs. mandible)	1.68	0.97-2.91	0.065

Variable	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	p-value
Posterior position (vs. anterior)	1.84	0.78-4.33	0.163
Implant length <10 mm	2.31	1.23-4.33	0.009
Narrow diameter (<3.75 mm)	1.73	0.82-3.66	0.149
Bone quality (Type IV vs. Type II)	2.87	1.48-5.58	0.002
Immediate placement	1.42	0.71-2.86	0.321
Bone augmentation performed	1.58	0.89-2.81	0.119
Immediate loading	1.21	0.56-2.63	0.629

Note: CI = Confidence Interval. All variables entered simultaneously in the multivariate model. Significant associations ($p < 0.05$) shown in bold.

Table 6. Complications and Reasons for Implant Failure (N = 45 failures)

Complication Type	n (%)	Timing
Early Failures (≤12 months post-loading)	28 (62.2%)	
Failed osseointegration	23 (51.1%)	Mean: 4.2 months
Early infection	3 (6.7%)	Mean: 2.8 months
Trauma	2 (4.4%)	Mean: 7.5 months
Late Failures (>12 months post-loading)	17 (37.8%)	
Peri-implantitis with bone loss	11 (24.4%)	Mean: 31.6 months
Implant fracture	3 (6.7%)	Mean: 42.3 months
Screw/abutment fracture	1 (2.2%)	38 months
Prosthetic complications leading to failure	2 (4.4%)	Mean: 28.5 months

Complication Type	n (%)	Timing
Failure Distribution by Location		
Maxilla	28 (62.2%)	
Mandible	17 (37.8%)	
Anterior	6 (13.3%)	
Posterior	39 (86.7%)	

Note: Timing presented as mean time from implant loading to failure.

Table 7. Marginal Bone Loss Around Surviving Implants (N = 726 surviving implants)

Time Point	Mean Bone Loss (mm)	SD	Range	% with >2mm Loss
6 months	0.43	0.31	0.0-1.8	0.4%
12 months	0.91	0.52	0.1-2.7	3.2%
24 months	1.13	0.68	0.1-3.4	8.1%
36 months	1.28	0.78	0.1-3.9	11.3%
48 months	1.36	0.85	0.1-4.1	13.7%
60 months	1.42	0.89	0.1-4.2	14.9%

Bone Loss by Patient Factors:

Factor	Mean 5-Year Bone Loss (mm)	SD	p-value*
Non-smoker	1.21	0.76	<0.001
Current smoker	2.08	1.12	ref
Good oral hygiene	1.14	0.68	<0.001
Poor oral hygiene	1.89	1.03	ref

Factor	Mean 5-Year Bone Loss (mm)	SD	p-value*
Platform-switching	1.18	0.71	0.003
Platform-matched	1.63	0.98	ref

Note: SD = Standard Deviation. p-values from independent t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests as appropriate. Bone loss measured from implant-abutment junction on standardized radiographs.

Table 8. Patient-Reported Outcomes and Satisfaction at 5 Years (N = 374 patients)

Outcome Measure	Mean ± SD	Range
Overall Satisfaction (0-10 scale)	8.4 ± 1.6	3-10
Very satisfied (9-10)	54.8%	
Satisfied (7-8)	36.9%	
Moderately satisfied (5-6)	6.1%	
Unsatisfied (<5)	2.2%	
Functional Satisfaction (0-10 scale)	8.6 ± 1.4	4-10
Chewing ability	8.7 ± 1.3	
Speaking comfort	8.9 ± 1.2	
Confidence in stability	8.4 ± 1.6	
Aesthetic Satisfaction (0-10 scale)	8.1 ± 1.7	3-10
Anterior implants	8.7 ± 1.4	
Posterior implants	7.8 ± 1.8	
Impact on Quality of Life		
Significant improvement	78.3%	

Outcome Measure	**Mean ± SD Range**
Moderate improvement	18.2%
No change	2.9%
Decline	0.6%
Would Recommend Treatment	
Definitely yes	68.4%
Probably yes	23.3%
Uncertain	6.1%
No	2.2%

Note: Satisfaction assessed using validated questionnaires at 5-year follow-up visit. SD = Standard Deviation.

5. Conclusion

This prospective multicenter study provides robust evidence that dental implant therapy achieves excellent 5-year survival rates of 94.2% in African patients when contemporary protocols are properly implemented. The outcomes observed compare favorably with international benchmarks and demonstrate that African patients can expect predictable, long-lasting results from implant treatment comparable to outcomes in other populations. The slightly reduced survival rates compared to ideal-condition studies in other regions can be attributed to identifiable risk factors including smoking, suboptimal diabetes control, and variable access to professional maintenance rather than fundamental differences in healing capacity or bone biology.

Several findings distinguish this African cohort from historical data in other populations and carry important clinical implications. The favorable bone density distribution, with 42.3% of implant sites classified as Type II bone, suggests biomechanical advantages that may partially offset other challenges encountered in African healthcare contexts. The finding that well-controlled HIV infection does not significantly impact implant survival provides crucial evidence supporting treatment access for HIV-positive patients managed with antiretroviral therapy, an important consideration given HIV prevalence patterns in African regions. The strong relationships between modifiable risk factors such as smoking and diabetes control with outcomes emphasize opportunities for improving results through medical optimization and risk factor management.

Geographic variations in outcomes, while statistically significant in univariate analysis, largely reflected differences in patient characteristics and risk factor distributions rather than fundamental regional differences in treatment efficacy. After adjustment for patient-specific and treatment-specific variables, regional differences were substantially attenuated, suggesting that standardized protocols can achieve consistent outcomes across diverse African settings. However, the more pronounced geographic variations in success rates compared to survival rates highlight maintenance as a critical target for quality improvement efforts, with development of sustainable, culturally appropriate maintenance delivery models representing an important priority for optimizing long-term outcomes.

The patterns of complications and failures observed align closely with established understanding of implant biology, with early failures predominantly reflecting osseointegration problems and late failures primarily resulting from peri-implantitis. This consistency across populations supports applicability of evidence-based treatment protocols developed internationally to African patient populations while recognizing the need for adaptations addressing specific population characteristics, risk factor distributions, and healthcare contexts. The temporal clustering of failures in the early post-loading period suggests opportunities for outcome improvement through refinements in patient selection, surgical technique, and initial stability optimization.

From a broader perspective, this study demonstrates the feasibility and value of conducting rigorous, well-designed clinical research in African settings. The successful collaboration among multiple centers across different countries, maintenance of standardized protocols and documentation, and achievement of excellent follow-up compliance establish a model for future multicenter research initiatives addressing other clinical questions relevant to African populations. As healthcare infrastructure continues to develop and clinical research capacity expands across African nations, the generation of population-specific evidence will support increasingly refined, evidence-based clinical practice benefiting African patients.

The findings from this investigation support several practical recommendations for clinicians treating African patients with dental implants. First, implant therapy can be confidently offered with expectations of outcomes comparable to international standards when patients are appropriately selected and contemporary protocols followed. Second, particular attention should be directed toward identifying and managing modifiable risk factors including smoking cessation, diabetes optimization, and oral hygiene education, as these factors significantly influence outcomes and represent opportunities for patient-level intervention. Third, recognition of the favorable bone density characteristics typical in many African patients may inform treatment planning decisions regarding implant dimensions and loading protocols. Fourth, development of sustainable maintenance programs adapted to local healthcare contexts and patient populations represents a critical priority for preserving long-term implant health.

In conclusion, dental implants represent a viable, predictable treatment option for African patients missing teeth, with 5-year survival rates of 94.2% comparable to outcomes achieved internationally. The success of implant therapy in African populations depends on appropriate patient selection, attention to systemic health optimization, adherence to established surgical and prosthetic protocols, and provision of long-term maintenance care. As implant dentistry continues to expand across African nations, the evidence generated by this study provides a crucial foundation for evidence-based practice and supports continued efforts to make this life-improving treatment accessible to African populations while maintaining high standards of clinical quality and patient care.

References

- Adeyemo, W. L., Kolawole, K. A., & Kasali, A. O. (2021). A systematic review of dental implant outcomes in sub-Saharan African populations. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants, 36*(4), 651-662. https://doi.org/10.11607/jomi.8234

- Bachrach, L. K. (2001). Acquisition of optimal bone mass in childhood and adolescence. *Trends in Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *12*(1), 22-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1043-2760(00)00336-2

- Buser, D., Janner, S. F., Wittneben, J. G., Brägger, U., Ramseier, C. A., & Salvi, G. E. (2012). 10-year survival and success rates of 511 titanium implants with a sandblasted and acid-etched surface: A retrospective study in 303 partially edentulous patients. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research*, *14*(6), 839-851. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1708-8208.2012.00456.x

- Chrcanovic, B. R., Albrektsson, T., & Wennerberg, A. (2015). Smoking and dental implants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Dentistry, 43*(5), 487-498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2015.03.003

- de Moraes, S. L., Verri, F. R., Santiago, J. F., Almeida, D. A., Mello, C. C., Pellizzer, E. P., & Santos, P. H. (2020). A 3-year clinical prospective study of success of implants in patients with a history of chronic periodontitis. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants, 35*(1), 89-96. https://doi.org/10.11607/jomi.7730

- Derks, J., Schaller, D., Håkansson, J., Wennström, J. L., Tomasi, C., & Berglundh, T. (2016). Effectiveness of implant therapy analyzed in a Swedish population: Prevalence of peri-implantitis. *Journal of Dental Research, 95*(1), 43-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034515608832

- Derks, J., & Tomasi, C. (2015). Peri-implant health and disease: A systematic review of current epidemiology. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 42*(S16), S158-S171. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12334
- Esposito, M., Hirsch, J. M., Lekholm, U., & Thomsen, P. (1998). Biological factors contributing to failures of osseointegrated oral implants: (I) Success criteria and epidemiology. *European Journal of Oral Sciences, 106*(1), 527-551. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0909-8836..t01-2-.x
- Joshi, N., Khandelwal, P., & Hadakar, S. (2019). Long-term survival rate of dental implants placed in Indian patients with chronic periodontitis: A 5-year retrospective study. *Journal of Indian Society of Periodontology, 23*(5), 445-451. https://doi.org/10.4103/jisp.jisp_178_19
- Jung, R. E., Zembic, A., Pjetursson, B. E., Zwahlen, M., & Thoma, D. S. (2012). Systematic review of the survival rate and the incidence of biological, technical, and aesthetic complications of single crowns on implants reported in longitudinal studies with a mean follow-up of 5 years. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 23*(Suppl 6), 2-21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0501.2012.02547.x
- Moraschini, V., Poubel, L. A., Ferreira, V. F., & Barboza, E. S. (2015). Evaluation of survival and success rates of dental implants reported in longitudinal studies with a follow-up period of at least 10 years: A systematic review. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, 44*(3), 377-388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijom.2014.10.023
- Nassar, P. O., Bombardelli, C. G., Walker, C. S., Neves, K. V., Todescan, S., & de Andrade, E. (2019). Periodontal evaluation of different dental implant-abutment interfaces: A systematic review. *Journal of Periodontal Research, 54*(5), 439-450. https://doi.org/10.1111/jre.12652
- Oginni, F. O., Adenekan, A. T., & Adekoya-Sofowora, C. A. (2018). Oral health status and treatment needs of patients attending a Nigerian teaching hospital. *African Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences, 47*(2), 177-184.
- Song, Y. D., Jun, S. H., & Kwon, J. J. (2009). Correlation between bone quality evaluated by cone-beam computerized tomography and implant primary stability. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants*, *24*(1), 59-64.
- Trisi, P., & Rao, W. (1999). Bone classification: Clinical-histomorphometric comparison. *Clinical Oral Implants Research, 10*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0501.1999.100101.x
- UNAIDS. (2020). *Global HIV & AIDS statistics—2020 fact sheet*. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet