

**SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS MODERN DENTAL IMPLANTATIONS WHEN  
PLANNING FIXED DENTAL PROSTHETICS**

*Safarov Murod Tashpulatovich,  
Musayeva Karima Alisherovna,  
Tashpulatova Kamilla Maratovna,  
Ruzimbetov Hayot Bazorboyevich,  
Abdunazarov Diyorbek Elbekovich*

*Department of Hospital Orthopedic Dentistry,  
Tashkent State Dental Institute*

**Annotation .** The paper examines the sociological aspects of dental implantation. A sociological survey of doctors from dental organizations, on the basis of which a modern description of clinical, organizational and economic problems of orthopedic treatment of teeth with using artificial supports

**Key words:** sociological method, dental implantation, absence teeth, orthopedic treatment.

Sociological method in the last decade received enough wide spreading at studying various problems of medicine and healthcare. Meaning applications method consists of using different opinions and then summarizing them. Use of professional opinion of orthopedic dentists for purposes of the research allowed us to form a sociological “focus” of the issue under study from the perspective of problems of dental implantation and factors influencing its quality.

**Target works:** study sociological aspects of modern features of the provision of dental services with positions of doctors and dentists.

Materials and methods

"Questionnaire studying professional opinions of dentists and orthopedists." Was interviewed 148 doctors working in public and private dental structures. Analysis of the results of the questionnaire survey of doctors was produced by principled signs comparisons: experience of work by specialties

"dentistry orthopedic", age of doctor and place of work (state (municipal) or private structures). The material was processed using traditional parametric methods of statistics.

Results and discussion

On the initial stage of carrying out surveys it was established that not all doctors have experience of dental prosthetics supported by implants. Specifically, the weight of such doctors was 21.2% among all respondents. This group was mainly

represented by doctors working in state (municipal) dental institutions and young specialists.

First question questionnaires appeared next: "On what level, in your opinion, is there in our country? modern implantology? Total All Respondents answered this question as follows: on Very high — 2.1%; on high — 7.8%; on average 67.4%; at low - 22.7%. Critical assessments of doctors give reason to believe that at the moment dental implantation as a method of treatment is receiving widespread spreading V domestic dentistry, But With From a systemic point of view, this direction is still Not formed on due level. Majority respondents gave average ratings. At the same time the fifth Some respondents rate dental implantology at a low level. The survey did not reveal neither one assessments "Very short level".

On basis ratings doctors Can to conclude, What dental implantation in domestic dentistry located V stages formation. Obviously, speech coming O preparation personnel, systemic issues continuity between medical specialists, new materials And technologies And etc. These questions, undoubtedly, influence the quality of orthopedic dental services using dental implants.

IN certain least corresponded assessments levels of dental implantation services in depending on the doctor’s place of work with grades based on previous question. Comparisons were produced between the assessments of doctors working in private and public sectors dentistry (Table 1)

Doctors working in private dental clinics structures inclined give more high assessments level providing services By dental implantation, provided in the organizations where they work in comparison with state (municipal) doctors structures. Most often doctors private Organizations *Table 1*

Doctors' assessments of the level of dental services provided implantation in dental organizations, being place their work (on 100 respondents doctors)

| Ratings level | Dental organizations |         |
|---------------|----------------------|---------|
|               | State (municipal)    | Private |
| Very high     | 11.3                 | 22.6    |
| High          | 13.5                 | 38.9    |
| Average       | 58.7                 | 28.8    |
| Short         | 16.5                 | 9.7     |
| Very short    | -                    | -       |

gave ratings of “very high” and “high”, which amounted to 22.6% And 38.9% respectively. IN state (municipal) institutions, these assessments were almost two times lower compared to private sector and amounted to 11.3% and 13.5%. Among

the ratings assigned by doctors in this survey group, the prevailing assessments "average" (58.7%) And "short" (16.5%).

It is obvious that sociological surveys allow get subjective assessments And approximate idea about the problem being studied. In addition, on assessments may be influenced by factors such as resource possibilities organizations, degree with the staff's commitment to corporate objectives, availability of information, age and work experience of the doctor and many other.

One of the most important factors in the system of ensuring the quality of medical care is the choice and compliance with medical diagnostic technologies and treatment. results analysis showed What 32.3% respondents are guided by the knowledge gained at commercial master classes; 24.2% of respondents indicated standards (patient management protocols), which are developed in the organization where they work; 18.6% of surveyed doctors use the knowledge gained on cycles promotion qualifications V universities; 14.5% use data from textbooks, teaching aids and manuals for doctors and 10.4% of respondents respondents use information from publications V scientific and practical magazines. Distribution answers on the question indicates on Availability Problems choice technologies treatment V practice work orthopedic dentists , in this case prosthetics on dental implants. This is due to the following systemic problems : lack of unified standards of medical care and regulations for the provision of dental care approved by the federal health authority for various diseases, lack of unity of scientific views on indications for dental implantation, which would be reflected in appropriate educational literature. Correct the choice of treatment technology and its compliance largely determine result medical interventions, How alone from the most important parameters quality medical help.

Structure of factors that, according to respondents doctors, reduce the effectiveness of orthopedic treatment for missing teeth implants (%) *Table 2*

Number of cases of orthopedic treatment of missing teeth at doctors state And private sectors dentistry

V year (on 100 respondents doctors)

| Number cases | Dental organizations |         |
|--------------|----------------------|---------|
|              | State (municipal)    | Private |
| Less 10      | 67.2                 | 51.3    |
| 11-20        | 18.4                 | 22.5    |
| 21-30        | 10.2                 | 14.6    |
| More 31      | 4.2                  | 11.6    |

boron doctors exactly implantation How method treatment lack of teeth. More than half of the surveyed orthopedic dentists (53.3%) indicated financial possibilities patient, How on main factor at choosing dental implantation as a method treatment, if alternatives are available. Presence of clinical indications for implantation in 22.1% of cases is the leading basis for doctors. In this In this case, doctors convince patients of the need orthopedic treatment on implants at availability financial opportunities. One of the factors in choosing a treatment technology is the age at which indicated by 13.6% of surveyed doctors. 11.0% of respondents identified the factor of the organization's technological capabilities. The presented structure shows that Dental implantation, in the absence of contraindications, is an alternative to many methods of orthopedic treatment of missing teeth. It's possible that this method of treatment, if it is economically accessible to the population, could be more widely used application V clinic orthopedic dentistry.

Questionnaire provided clarification deadline, V within whom respondent It has practice orthopedic treatment absence teeth on basis dental implantation The question was directed to assess the experience of doctors, as well as the relationship this attribute with other questions in the questionnaire. Generally structure answers respondents By this question presented as follows: less than a year - 1.8%; 1-3 of the year — 24.5%; 4-6 years — 38.3%; 7-10 years — 24.7%; eleven

years or more - 10.7%. It is obvious that this structure generally reflects the development trends of the area being studied V dentistry.

Revealed addiction period practices doctor orthopedic treatment of missing teeth using dental implants from length of service work By specialties. In state and municipal In dental institutions, dental implantation as a treatment method is not widespread enough expressed. Considering the fact that the work experience is close connected With age, doctors seniors age groups

The number of cases of treatment of missing teeth based on dental implantation per 1 orthopedic dentist per year, depending on work experience specialists rarely use this method of treating absence teeth, which accordingly affects frequency answers.

The result of prosthetics largely depends on the quality of the surgical stage of dental implantation. The following question was devoted to this aspect questionnaire: “What mistakes in the surgical stage have you encountered? encounter most often?” Structure The answers to this question are presented as follows way: improper fixation of the implant, complicating the fixation of the denture (43.1%); underestimation surgeon availability general somatic pathologies, influencing \_ on quality implantation (22.5%); wrong choice of dental implant (19.6%); defective osseointegration (11.2%); lack of comprehensive assessing the patient's health status before implantation (3.6%). Surgical errors noted by respondents stage

implantation, reflecting on results prosthetics, must be taken into account at planning events. By improvement quality dental treatment patients.

Degree of achievement of the planned result treatment is one of the objective and reliable indicators quality medical help. In this communications knowledge factors, influencing on effectiveness treatment allow consider their at development quality improvement plans. This was the aim of the next question in the survey, where respondents assessed factors that reduce the effectiveness of orthopedic treatment for missing teeth based on dental implantation. As a result of the analysis, the following was revealed structure answers (Fig. 1).

The first ranking place in the structure of all factors, reducing the effectiveness of orthopedic treatment. The absence of teeth on implants is caused by non-compliance with the rules of clinical observation by patients. The share of this factor according to the survey results orthopedic doctors made up 45.7%. To the result. The factor is determined by the medical activity and sanitary culture of patients. Dynamic monitoring of functioning implants in rehabilitation period V established deadlines allows significantly reduce the risk of complications. And adjust treatment.

On second place is revealed factor wrong choice designs dental prosthesis, on what indicated fourth part respondents doctors (24.6%). Clinical painting at partial or full tooth loss is varied and can be very complex. Even at availability two identical defects at various patients, the clinical picture does not repeat. In every specific case will their peculiarities, requiring solutions several orthopedic tasks. To these should include the condition of periodontal tissues, type defect dental row, peculiarities bite, availability somatic diseases and their local manifestations in cavities mouth. Hence, not maybe be definitely a standard solution, and in each specific case treatment should to plan after thorough studying the totality of all symptoms. Due to this extremely important is correct and individual an approach to choice designs prosthesis, where the main criterion is to ensure the necessary redistribution loads, not exceeding physiologically acceptable quantities. For everyone implant appropriate zones prosthesis.

On third place was noted technical imperfection of the implant design (15.6%). It is known what usage everyone type implant. It has their readings and contraindications. From here at determining the type and design of the implant is necessary consider following factors: specific readings and conditions for using this type of implant; complexity of the surgical and orthopedic stages treatment at his application; reliability. And the popularity of this implant design; whether the doctor has personal experience using this design implant. Only comprehensive grade everyone these factors allows you to optimally select a specific type and implant design. Fourth ranking place in structure of reasons that reduce the

effectiveness of orthopedic treatment, occupy errors surgical stage (14.1%), which were designated higher.

The presented structure allows us to reasonably come up To development criteria quality treatment.

High price treatment With using implants And necessity special conditions For implementation operational interventions create situation, at which given service turns out relatively less often By comparison With others species prosthetics. IN this communications introduced myself expedient estimate frequency cases orthopedic treatment With application dental implantation Evaluation produced V dependencies from places And length of service work doctor

The digital data presented in Table 2 is clearly demonstrate What majority doctors How in state (municipal) and private sector of dentistry has an orthopedic practice treatment of missing teeth on implants in less than 10 cases per year, which amounted to 67.2 and 51.3 per 100 respondents doctors respectively.

IN private dental structures There is a trend towards an increase in the number of cases of orthopedic treatment on implants: 11-20 cases per year meets at 22.5% respondents doctors; 21-30 — at 14.6% doctors. Fewer responses were required by “more than 31 cases,” which amounted to in the state (municipal) sector 4.2, in the private sector - 11.6 per 100 respondents respectively.

Of particular interest were the data from calculations of the average numbers cases treatment absence teeth on basis dental implantation, per doctor V year (Fig. 2).

Highest average number of cases treated per person doctor per year is registered in the 11-15 years of experience group, which is 14.2. For doctors with 6-10 years of experience this figure is 13.4 cases, in the experience group 16-20 years old - 9.1 cases. Lowest values given indicator identified V internship groups before 1 of the year And more 25 years, What amounted to 2.1 And 3.8 cases respectively.

On drawing 3 presented data calculations average numbers cases treatment absence teeth on basis dental \_ implantation on 1 dentist-orthopedist per year depending on the place of work. It was revealed that in On average, a doctor accounts for 7.8 cases of treatment per year, regardless of his place of work, length of service, age and other characteristics. Calculation data show that doctors of private data structures the rate is 38.6% more than that compared to government doctors (municipal) organizations, What amounts to 10.1 And 6.2 cases on 1 doctor V year respectively.

The next question in the survey directly followed from the objectives of this study and concerned doctors' choice the most important criteria for the quality of prosthetics various designs supported by implants. Analysis results survey showed What big Part respondents consider the most important criteria to be: recovery dental

row And occlusal dental relationships (46.7 per 100 respondents); Satisfaction \_ patients results treatment — 33.6 on 100 respondents; optimal load distribution on implant And surrounding fabrics — 29.7 on 100 respondents. In a smaller number of cases , criteria such as creating conditions for maximum rehabilitation of the patient within the framework of the diagnosis and compliance of the treatment result with aesthetic requirements, which amounted to 13.5 and 12.1 per 100 respondents doctors respectively.

The questionnaire also included a question in which respondents had to identify on which specialists effectiveness depends to the greatest extent orthopedic treatment of dentition defects with support on dental implants. Big Part respondents pointed to the tandem of a surgeon, dental orthopedist technology (62.3%). The remaining part of the surveyed doctors was divided in opinion: 19.8% pointed to the surgeon and 17.9% on orthopedic dentist.

**Conclusion :** Thus , the application of the sociological method first allowed identify quantitative characteristics V work doctors With dental implantations, and also assess their attitude to the factors influencing on the quality and effectiveness of treatment, criteria quality. All these data make it possible to take them into account when developing measures to improve treatment patients with missing teeth based on dental implantation .

#### References:

1. Tashpulatova K. et al. Technique for eliminating traumatic occlusion in patients using Implant-supported bridges //European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine. – 2020. – Т. 7. – №. 2. – С. 6189-6193.
2. Safarov M.T., Ro'zimbetov X.B., Tashpulatova K.M., Safarova N.T. (2023). Tish Implantatlarida To'liq Yoyli Protezlarning Biomexanikasi. *Conferences*, 35–36. извлечено от <https://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/1030>
3. Сафаров , М., Ахмаджонов, М., & Рuzимбетов, А. (2022). Изучение микробиологического статуса у больных с перимплантатами в области мостовидных протезов. *Conferences*, 138. извлечено от <https://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/111>
4. Tashpulatova K.M., Safarov M.T., & Ruzimbetov H.B. (2023). Hemodynamic Changes In The Mucous Membrane Of The Alveolar Ridge Of The Lower Jaw With Partial Defects Of The Dentition. ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ИДЕИ В МИРЕ, 34(4), 42–48. Retrieved from <https://www.newjournal.org/index.php/01/article/view/9797>
5. Safarov M.T., Tashpulatova K.M., & Ruzimbetov Kh.B. (2023). Analysis Of The Effectiveness Of Methods For Fixing Artificial Crowns And Bridges On Dental Implants. ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ИДЕИ В МИРЕ,

- 34(4), 36–38. Retrieved from <https://newjournal.org/index.php/01/article/view/9795>
6. Ташпулатова К.М., Сафаров М.Т., Шарипов С.С., Рузимбетов Х.Б. (2023). Среднесрочный Прогноз Эффективности Несъемных Зубных Протезов На Дентальные Имплантаты. *Conferences*, 101–103. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/1117>
  7. Сафаров М.Т., Широнова Ш., Ташпулатова К.М., Рузимбетов Х.Б. (2023). Адаптация Жевательных Мышц У Пациентов При Протезировании Мостовидными Протезами, Фиксированных На Дентальных Имплантатах. *Conferences*, 93–95. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/1113>
  8. Рузимбетов Х.Б., Сафаров М.Т., Ташпулатова К.М. (2023). Микробиологические Исследования При Воспалительных Осложнениях В Околоимплантатных Зонах. *Conferences*, 79–82. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/1107>
  9. Сафаров М.Т., Ташпулатова К.М., Рузимбетов Х.Б., Шакирова Д. (2023). Клинико-Рентгенографическое Исследование Изменений Твердых Тканей Вокруг Имплантата У Пациентов С Частичной Адентией. *Conferences*, 89–90. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/1111>
  10. Safarov M. T. et al. Evaluation of the Compensatory-Adaptive Mechanisms of Bridge Prosthetics at the Terminal Dentition Defects with the Use of Intraosseous Implants by the Method of Electromyography // *American Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*. – 2020. – Т. 10. – №. 9. – С. 657-659.
  11. Сафаров М. Т. и др. Микробиологический статус больных, пользующихся искусственными коронками с опорой на дентальные имплантаты при периимплантитах // *Conferences*. – 2023. – С. 376-379.
  12. Сафаров М.Т., Рузимбетов Х.Б., Сафарова Н.Т., Холбоев Х. (2023). Изучение Функциональной Эффективности Мостовидных Протезов, Фиксированных На Дентальных Имплантатах. *Conferences*, 372–374. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/902>
  13. Safarov, M., & Tashpulatova, K. (2022). Study Of The Microflora Of The Oral Cavity In Patients Using Dental Bridges With Dental Implants For Peri-Implantitis. *Conferences*, 172–173. извлечено от <http://journals.scinnovations.uz/index.php/aposo/article/view/78>
  14. Safarov M. T. et al. Permanent prosthetics on dental implants // *Eurasian Journal of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery*. – 2023. – Т. 2. – С. 70-74. <https://doi.org/10.57231/j.ejohns.2023.2.3.012>
  15. Safarov M. T., Akhmadzhonov M., Ruzimbetov A. Study of microbiological status in patients with perimplantitis in the area of bridges. – *Conferences*, 2022.



16. Safarov M. T., Tashpulatova K. M., Ruzimbetov H. B. To Question About Osteointegration Dental Implants And Ways Her Stimulations //TADQIQOTLAR. – 2023. – Т. 27. – №. 3. – С. 82-89.
17. Safarov M. T., Tashpulatova K. M., Ruzimbetov H. B. Modern Representation About Osteointegration Of Dental Implants //TADQIQOTLAR. – 2023. – Т. 27. – №. 3. – С. 98-106.
18. Safarov M. T., Tashpulatova K. M., Ruzimbetov H. B. The Problem Of Inflammation In Peri-Implant Tissue And Factors Affecting Its Course //TADQIQOTLAR. – 2023. – Т. 27. – №. 3. – С. 90-97.
19. Мусаева К. А. и др. Биомеханика несъемных полнодуговых протезов с опорой на имплантаты //Conferences. – 2023. – С. 370-372.
20. Мусаева, К. (2023). Prosthodontic treatment of patients with osteoporosis. Актуальные проблемы стоматологии и челюстно-лицевой хирургии 4, 1(02), 103. извлечено от <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/problems-dentistry/article/view/16170>
21. Мусаева К. А. К вопросу Ортопедической Реабилитации При Остеопорозе //Conferences. – 2022. – С. 90-91.
22. Мусаева, К., Асом, Б., & Салиев, С. (2018). Улучшение фиксации полных съемных пластиночных протезов в условиях выраженной атрофии в области верхнечелюстных бугров. Stomatologiya, 1(2(71)), 27–28. извлечено от <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/stomatologiya/article/view/1714>
23. Мусаева, К. (2017). Особенности стоматологического статуса пациентов с хроническими заболеваниями почек. Stomatologiya, 1(1(66)), 62–64. извлечено от <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/stomatologiya/article/view/2364>