ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul798

A Comprehensive Review of the Implant Platform Switching Concept

Suryanarayanan T.[1]; Jothivenkat S. A.[2]

[1,2] Department of Prosthodontics and Crown and Bridge
Adhiparashakthi Dental College and Hospital
Melmaruvathur, India

Publication Date: 2026/07/27

Abstract: This review article provides an exhaustive, critical analysis of the platform switching concept in dental implantology, focusing on its efficacy in mitigating marginal bone loss (MBL), ensuring soft tissue esthetics, and safeguarding long-term implant survival across diverse clinical scenarios. Material and Methods: A comprehensive comparative synthesis was conducted using data extracted from nine key contemporary publications, including landmark clinical trials, randomized split-mouth studies, and comprehensive meta-analyses spanning 2005 to 2016. These data pools were utilized to critically weigh historical consensus against rigid localized trial dynamics. Results: Traditional literature and large systematic meta-analyses firmly establish that shifting the implant-abutment junction (IAJ) perimeter inward toward the central axis relocates the inflammatory cell infiltrate (ICT) away from the bone crest, resulting in a statistically significant reduction in global MBL (mean savings ranging from 0.29 mm to 0.37 mm). This bone preservation scales proportionally with the magnitude of the horizontal mismatch. However, modern localized split-mouth randomized controlled trials reveal that when macro-diameters are isolated identically, micro-gap dynamics, surgical site trauma, healing times, and soft tissue biotypes heavily confound direct outcomes, often resulting in statistically equivalent MBL between switched and matched protocols during the initial healing phases. Conclusion: Platform switching remains a highly valuable prosthetic and surgical configuration to optimize long-term crestal bone architecture and interproximal esthetics. However, its bone-protective capabilities are multi-factorial and non-absolute, requiring careful clinical implementation tailored to individual mucosal dimensions and prosthetic spacing requirements.

Keywords: *Platform Switching, Crestal Bone Loss, Biologic Width, Marginal Bone Loss, Implant-Abutment Junction, Systematic Review, Dental Implantology.*

How to Cite: Suryanarayanan T.; Jothivenkat S. A. (2026) A Comprehensive Review of the Implant Platform Switching Concept. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(7), 1344-1347. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul798

I. INTRODUCTION

In the process of looking for stability and durability, the field of dental implantology has moved the current focus of scientific research from the macroscopic osmotic osseointegration to the microscopic interplay between the cervical area of the implant-abutment interface. For a long time, the union of the conventional two-piece implant with its restorative parts produced an absolutely predictable sequence of changes in the structure of the peri-implant crestal bone. It inevitably led to the loss of 1.5-2 mm of bone vertically down to the first thread of the implant during the first year after loading. This process of horizontal and vertical bone resorption was always considered as an unpreventable physiological necessity for providing a biologic width as the protective layer against the aggressive microorganisms in the mouth.

Nonetheless, although the functional survival rate was relatively high, the localised bone loss affected the height of interdental papillae and the long term aesthetic results especially in the anterior maxilla. The technique of platform switching (PLS) was introduced as an intervention measure. Platform switching involves the use of an abutment that is of smaller diameter attached to a neck of an implant that is of larger diameter hence creating a change in the conventional horizontal flush approach. Through this shift of the IAJ perimeter towards the centre, there is a protection of the crestal bone from the micro gap inflammation. This review article presents an in-depth analysis of platform switching in comparison with clinical data for the efficacy, limitations and reality of PLS

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul798

II. BIOLOGICAL AND MECHANICAL MECHANISMS OF CRESTAL BONE PRESERVATION

The basis for biological and mechanical aspects of platform switching involves manipulation of the local tissue reaction occurring in relation to the IAJ. The micro-gap in standard and platform matched systems occurs right at the outside end of the shoulder of the implant, where the bone crest is. There are various baseline mechanisms that have been discussed in both classic and modern literature in relation to why modifying this structure protects the bone.

A. Microbiological Containment and Inflammatory Relocation

The process of crestal bone resorption is largely dependent on an inflammatory cellular component that is formed in relation to the micro-gap, which has been contaminated with bacteria. The ICT is characterized by a distance that can be measured apically, coronally, and horizontally between 0.5 mm and 0.6 mm. With the application of the platform switching technique, the micro-gap is shifted away from the vertical bone-to-implant contact zone. As a result, the bacteria and bone resorption area will become centered, protecting the outer bone from inflammation.

B. Physical Extension of the Biologic Width

With the advent of the horizontal circular step, there is another area created whereby the biological width can be extended horizontally. Rather than the soft tissue having to stretch itself solely vertically along the implant body axis and at the same time having to absorb bone tissue, it can stretch horizontally due to the horizontal platform of the implant shoulder.

C. Biomechanical Stress Redistribution

FEA models have found that joining an abutment with a narrower diameter produces a dramatic change in strain vectors in response to functional loading. This helps to reduce stress concentrations in the sensitive cervical cortex due to displacement of the concentration zone from the interface with the bone to the interior of the abutment or abutment screw.

III. SYSTEMATICAL COMPARISON OF CLINICAL EVIDENCE AND STATISTICAL REALITIES

In order to determine the efficacy of this concept, one needs to look at early observations studies, strict localized randomized control trials (RCTs), and large scale meta-analysis across the core literature.

A. Early Consensus and Core Literature Evidence

The earliest literature review gave a consistent positive outlook about platform switching. The initial literature reviews included all historical data obtained from a series of small human and animal studies where changes in horizontal platform geometry led to minimal bone loss between 0.05 mm and 0.07 mm, providing good aesthetics. According to these literature reviews, early remodeling happens within the first month post-oral exposure, and any modification in the horizontal step would be a viable means of countering this process Furthermore, earlier prospective trials reported highly satisfactory aesthetic preservation when using wide-diameter implants combined with smaller-diameter, platform-switched prosthetic parts. The general agreement on early clinical research was that platform switching was definitely providing an effective bone protection mechanism, compared to the regular flush-joint designs.

B. The Modern RCTs' Challenge to the Bone Protection Mechanism

Although the past evidence appeared to indicate the obvious superiority of platform switching, modern randomized controlled trials have provided important clarifications. Enkling et al.'s prospective, single-blind, split-mouth RCT proved to be a turning point in this issue of the absolute nature of the bone protection mechanism of platform switching.

Two identical-diameter implants were placed side-by-side in the posterior part of the mandible of humans, where one randomly received a platform-switched abutment (3.3 mm diameter, leaving a 0.35 mm circular step) while the other got a platform-matched abutment (4 mm diameter). This way, geometry was the only independent variable used in this experiment. The 1-year radiographic and microbiological results showed some surprising outcomes:

- Equivalence in Marginal Bone Loss: During one year of loading, the mean radiographic vertical marginal bone loss in the platform switching group of implants was 0.53 ± 0.35 mm, while the platform matched group showed an almost equivalent loss of 0.58 ± 0.55 mm.
- Rejection of Hypothesis of Superiority: The mean individual difference of the two groups was only 0.05 ± 0.56 mm. The study has statistically ruled out the hypothesis of superior bone
- conservation advantage (>0.35 mm) over matching abutments.
- Time-Dependence Over Design-Dependence: Advanced statistical modeling (Brunner-Langer) proved that while crestal bone level alterations were heavily dependent on time ($P < 0.001$), they did not depend on the presence of platform switching ($P = 0.4$) [Enkling et al. 2011]. The primary remodeling occurred across both groups during the first 4 months, a period characterized by frequent surgical and prosthetic manipulation of the peri-implant mucosa.
- Identical Microbiological Loading: Real-time PCR tracking of total bacterial counts (TBC) within the internal cavities of both implant types showed no significant differences at 3, 4, or 12 months ($P = 0.982$), indicating that internal bacterial colonization and potential micro-gap pumping effects behaved identically, regardless of the outer shoulder design.
- The discrepancy between Enkling et al.'s results and earlier comparative studies highlight a critical clinical bias: prior human studies frequently compared implants of different diameters to establish their control and test

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul798

groups (e.g., comparing a wide 5.0 mm implant with a shifted abutment against a narrow 4.1 mm implant with a matched abutment). Consequently, the purported bone-protective effect was often heavily confounded by the macro-diameter of the implant itself rather than the horizontal mismatch aloneconservation advantage (>0.35 mm) over matching abutments.

- Time-Dependence Over Design-Dependence: Advanced statistical modeling (Brunner-Langer) proved that while crestal bone level alterations were heavily dependent on time ($P < 0.001$), they did not depend on the presence of platform switching ($P = 0.4$) [Enkling et al. 2011]. The primary remodeling occurred across both groups during the first 4 months, a period characterized by frequent surgical and prosthetic manipulation of the peri-implant mucosa.
- Identical Microbiological Loading: Real-time PCR tracking of total bacterial counts (TBC) within the internal cavities of both implant types showed no significant differences at 3, 4, or 12 months ($P = 0.982$), indicating that internal bacterial colonization and potential micro-gap pumping effects behaved identically, regardless of the outer shoulder design.

The discrepancy between Enkling et al.'s results and earlier comparative studies highlight a critical clinical bias: prior human studies frequently compared implants of different diameters to establish their control and test groups (e.g., comparing a wide 5.0 mm implant with a shifted abutment against a narrow 4.1 mm implant with a matched abutment). Consequently, the purported bone-protective effect was often heavily confounded by the macro-diameter of the implant itself rather than the horizontal mismatch alone.

C. Clarification Through Comprehensive Meta-Analyses

To bridge the gap between the optimistic reviews made at an earlier time and the strict individual RCTs, we need macro level insights provided by systematic reviews and meta-analysis. The largest ever meta-analysis by Chrcanovic et al. analyzed data collected from 28 human clinical publications, including 1,216 platform switched implants and 1,157 platform matched implants worldwide.

➢ *Macro Level Insights Helped us Learn More About the Method:*

- Rates of Implant Failures: Among the large sample of implants evaluated in the study, 16 failures were recorded for the platform switching group (1.32%), while 13 failures were noted among those belonging to the platform matching group (1.12%). It is clear from the information that platform switching does not affect the implant survival rate adversely and is very well biocompatible.
- Significant Reduction in Global MBL: Statistical analysis of pooled data revealed a global mean difference in marginal bone loss of -0.29 mm (95% CI -0.38 to -0.19; $P < 0.00001$) in favor of platform switching implants. This finding is supported by the results reported by Atieh et al., where the mean difference was -0.37 mm (95% CI -0.55 to -0.20; $P <$ 0.0001), and Santiago Junior et al., which showed a significant preservation of bone in favor of platform switching. While these results establish the fact of bone protection, it should be acknowledged that the magnitude of the benefit is quite low (0.29 mm to 0.37 mm).

The Mismatch-Time Relationship: Importantly, Chrcanovic et al. applied meta-regression in order to reveal two major clinical trends – greater variability of bone retention is observed with prolonged follow-up time ($P = 0.001$), and the higher degree of bone retention is correlated with the size of horizontal mismatch between the platform of an implant and abutment ($P = 0.001$). These findings are consistent with the conclusions made by Strietzel et al., which state that although the studies included in the analysis are highly heterogeneous, the impact of platform design on marginal bone levels is confirmed.

IV. DISCUSSION & CLINICAL APPLICATION

Platform Switching Assessment from Humanized and Practical Standpoint.

An assessment of platform switching in a more humanized and practical perspective suggests that the clinical effectiveness of dental implants is not merely a function of choosing either the matching platform or mismatching platform. The complexity of dental practice involves several clinical factors.

A. *The Confounding Roles of Surgical Site Manipulation and Tissue Biotypes*

As seen from the meticulous results by Enkling et al., the mere process of creating a surgical flap, performing an osteotomy, and finally connecting, disconnecting, and reconnecting the healing elements within the first 4 months constitutes a considerable amount of mechanical and biological injury to the area. The result will be an independent mucosal healing process and bone remodeling process, which will entirely negate any advantages of having an improved implant shoulder design within the initial functional phase.

Finally, the patient's natural biotype should not be ignored. With a thin soft-tissue biotype, the body will necessarily absorb some amount of crestal bone to achieve its needed vertical biologic width, whether there is a platform switch or not. The professional needs to realize that a good implant shoulder geometry simply augments, and does not substitute, proper soft-tissue management and surgical technique.

B. Strategic Indications for Clinical Practice

Despite the narrow margins of bone conservation documented in strict single-diameter trials, platform switching offers undeniable strategic advantages in targeted clinical scenarios:

- Limited Prosthetic Spaces: When it comes to interdental gaps such as replacing mandibular incisors or maxillary laterals, using an implant body with a wider platform for maximum mechanical anchoring and a prosthetic

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul798

platform with a narrow profile offers clinicians very important restorative clearance.

- The Esthetic Zone: For the upper jaw in the anterior region, where the bone preservation of even 0.3 mm makes a difference between having a healthy and vital interdental papilla or experiencing "black triangle" recession, the statistical advantages of using micro-gap implants emphasized by Chrcanovic et al. are worth its use.
- Wider Horizontal Mismatch: Given that meta-regressions demonstrate that the protective effect becomes more pronounced with the widening of the horizontal mismatch, clinicians need to deliberately choose implant-abutment combinations with a maximal horizontal offset and not those with insignificant sub-millimeter bevel designs.

V. CONCLUSION

From its accidental discovery as a prosthetic aberration in the middle of the 1980s up until today, the advancement in the development of the platform switching theory into one of the key principles in current dental implantology is definitely another important step towards comprehension of the processes taking place in peri-implant tissues. Under conditions of a scientifically isolated experiment, in which all identical-diameter implants are used for comparison, the geometry of the step does not serve as an absolutely impregnable barrier against bone resorption, since the vertical resorption process is highly dependent on the quality of surgical intervention, the treatment of the mucosa, and the healing period.

But in case of a broad study of patients' groups, platform switching provides statistically guaranteed advantages in optimization, minimizing marginal bone resorption. In order not to consider platform switching as a universal therapy, modern dentists should use it as part of their overall treatment approach.

REFERENCES

[1]. Atieh AH. Platform Switching for Marginal Bone Preservation Around Dental Implants: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Journal of Periodontology.
[2]. Santiago Junior JF, de Souza Batista VE, Verri FR, Honório HM, de Mello CC, Almeida DA dF, Pellizzer EP. Platform-switching implants and bone preservation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery.
[3]. Lazzara RJ, Porter SS. Platform Switching: A New Concept in Implant Dentistry for Controlling Postrestorative Crestal Bone Levels. The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry.
[4]. Strietzel FP, Neumann K, Hertel M. Impact of platform switching on marginal peri-implant bone-level changes. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Oral Implants Research.
[5]. Gupta S, Sabharwal R, Nazeer J, Taneja L, Choudhury BK, Sahu S. Platform Switching Technique and Crestal Bone Loss around the Dental Implants: A systematic review. Journal of International Society of Preventive & Community Dentistry.
[6]. Cappiello M, Luongo R, Di Iorio D, Bugea C, Cocchetto R, Celletti R. Evaluation of Peri-implant Bone Loss Around Platform-Switched Implants. The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry.
[7]. Chrcanovic BR, Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Platform switch and dental implants: A meta-analysis. Journal of Dentistry.
[8]. Enkling N, Jöhren P, Klimberg V, Bayer S, Mericske-Stern R, Jepsen S. Effect of platform switching on peri-implant bone levels: a randomized clinical trial. Clinical Oral Implants Research.
[9]. López-Marí L, Calvo-Guirado JL, Martín-Castellote B, Gómez-Moreno G, López-Marí M. Implant platform switching concept: An updated review. Medicina Oral, Patología Oral y Cirugía Bucal.