

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/116796/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Chin, J. S., Lynch, C. D., Rees, J., Locke, M., Thomas, M. B. M. and Addy, L. D. 2018. Teaching of implant dentistry in undergraduate dental schools in the UK and Ireland. *British Dental Journal* 225 (8) , pp. 763-768. 10.1038/sj.bdj.2018.867

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2018.867>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Table 1. Teaching formats used in undergraduate implant programme (n=16)		
Teaching format used	Number of schools	Percentage
Phantom head training	14	88%
Lecture programme	13	81%
Symposium	6	38%
Patient treatment	5	31%

Box 1. Recommended textbooks and references for undergraduate implant programmes
1. Hobkirk J, Watson R M, Searson L. <i>Introducing dental implants</i> . Churchill Livingstone, 2003.
2. Palmer R. Clinical Guide Series. <i>A clinical guide to implants in dentistry</i> . BDJ books, 2000.
3. Handelsman M. <i>Surgical guidelines for dental implant placement</i> . <i>Br Dent J</i> . 2006; 201 : 139-152.
4. Palmer RM. <i>Risk management in clinical practice. Part 9. Dental implants</i> . <i>Br Dent J</i> . 2010; 209 : 499-506.
5. Malet J, Mora F, Bouchard P. <i>Implant dentistry at a glance</i> . Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
6. Various authors. <i>ITI treatment guide series</i> . Quintessence Publishing.

Table 2. Available resources for providing an undergraduate implant programme (n=16)		
Resource	Number of respondents	Percentage
Selected papers	11	69%
Blackboard available seminars	8	50%
Video/DVD	5	31%
Other	3	19%
Internet based programmes	2	13%
CAL programmes	1	6%

None	2	13%
------	---	-----

Table 3. Clinical experience provided by dental schools in the undergraduate implant programme (n=16)

Type of clinical experience	Number of respondents	Percentage
Observation		
Live surgery	12	75%
Restorative implant procedures	10	63%
Direct clinical experience		
Treatment planning	13	81%
Restorative implant procedures	5	31%
Surgical implant placement	1	6%

Table 4. The types of cases treated by students in the undergraduate implant programme

Types of cases	Number of respondents	Percentage
Restorative implant procedures		
Removable edentulous cases	4	50%
Single unit	3	37.5%
Short span bridgework	1	12.5%
Surgical implant placement		
Single unit	1	100%

Table 5. Type of support received by implant companies for the provision of implant training for undergraduate implant teaching (n=15)

Type of support	Number of respondents	Percentage
Provision of simulated models for surgery and implant restoration	14	93%
Provision of implants	7	47%
Provision of restorative components	7	47%
Laboratory funding support	2	13%

Table 6. Implant companies principally involved in supporting undergraduate programmes

Implant company	Number of respondents
-----------------	-----------------------

Straumann	8
Nobel Biocare	7
Dentsply	4
3i Biomet	3

Table 7. Current challenges to the provision of implant training at an undergraduate level

Issues	Number of respondents
Funding	12
Lack of available time within existing teaching curricula	9
Limited numbers of suitably trained teaching staff	4
Limited patients	1
Lack of clinical space	1
Lack of consensus as to what level of implant training undergraduates should receive	1

Table 8. Views of respondents on possible changes within existing prosthodontics teaching programmes in response to the development of teaching programmes in implant dentistry

Area of prosthodontics	Decrease as a result of implant programme	Stay the same	Increase as a result of implant programme
Removable prosthodontics	13%	81%	6%
Fixed conventional bridgework	38%	56%	6%
Resin retained bridgework	6%	94%	0%
Occlusion	0%	94%	6%

Table 9. The type of implant restorations dental schools thought

undergraduates will be/should be involved in restoring in five years' time

Type of restoration	Number of respondents	Percentage
Implant overdenture with ball or stud attachments	12	75%
Single tooth anterior	4	25%
Single tooth posterior	3	19%
Implant overdenture with bar attachment	3	19%
Simple implant retained bridges	1	6%