SUMMARY:
The success of the implantologic treatment depends on many factors of surgical, prosthetic and prophylactic nature. The kind of the implantologic system is of particular importance so far as it fits to the specific clinical case (the kind of the prosthetic restoration, the bone type). The combined support, both on natural teeth and implants, is criticized by a number of authors. The most impartial assessment of the functional suitability of the implantologic treatment however, is the time proof.
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PURPOSE:
This study shows a long (14 years) functional suitability of a bridge on a combined support, both natural teeth and an implant.

INTRODUCTION:
There are publications about using combined support, natural teeth and implants, in the literature. But the current rules for planning and building of the prosthetic restoration on implants do not recommend combined support. There are clinical cases at which this approach is possibly the minimum invasive one, and the idea of minimum invasivity is one of the contemporary tendencies in implantology.

METHODS AND MATERIALS:
A 49-years old patient, female. In 1995 one implant is placed in 37region. The followed surgical protocol is that of the SIP-system. The metal-ceramic bridge restoration is on combined support –natural teeth 34, 35 and implant 37. The teeth have no periodontal problems, pathologic mobility or inflammation signs. They are endodontically treated. The patient hasn’t visited the dental practice for prophylaxis for more than 8 years.

RESULTS:
The patient visits the dental practice for the first time 8 years after the placement of the implant and its loading – the reasons are fractured ceramic coating of the bridge and caries of all teeth. All the remaining teeth are put to endodontic and prosthetic (metal-ceramic crowns) treatment. (fig. 1.) The oral hygiene level of the patient is high. 6 years later however, begin problems with the non vital teeth, due to their imprecise treatment. There is no X-ray or clinical evidence about bone resorption around the implant.

DISCUSSION:
The presented clinical case is not a rule’s exception. Combining natural teeth and implants as a support is a smart decision at patients, which dentition is periodontally healthy, but predisposed to caries. This saves us from placing many implants. In cases like this, should be followed the rule for prevailing of the supports of one kind and placing of bridges with reduced forms. The significant for this clinical case is that the endodontically treated teeth are functionally suitable less time than the implants, used as a support for extension of the tooth row together with natural teeth.

Fig. 1. OPG after completion of the endodontic and prosthetic treatment- 8 years after the placement of the implant
CONCLUSIONS:
The individual approach to every case is very important in implantology. Bulgarian implantologic school is richly experienced in combining natural teeth and implants as a support for fixed restorations. The main principles of the combined support can be resumed as follows:
- Combining of supports only in periodontally healthy patients.
- Including teeth, belonging to adjacent groups.
- Prevailing of implantologic or periodontal block.
- Reducing of the vestibular-lingual dimension of the bridge parts.
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