COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF IMPLANT SUPERSTRUCTURES: MULTI-UNIT STRAIGHT ABUTMENTS AND MILLED ABUTMENTS.

Dildora Tulkin qizi Azimova
Accicent, Faculty of Therapeutic Dentistry
EMU University
Phone: +998 99 077 25 42

Annotation: Dental implant therapy has become a predictable and effective method for replacing missing teeth. The success of implant-supported prostheses depends not only on osseointegration but also on the design and characteristics of the prosthetic superstructure. Among the most commonly used restorative components are multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments. These abutments serve as intermediate structures between implants and prosthetic restorations, influencing biomechanics, esthetics, passive fit, and long-term clinical outcomes. This article presents a comparative analysis of multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments based on prosthetic design, biomechanical performance, clinical applications, esthetic considerations, maintenance requirements, and treatment outcomes.

Keywords: dental implants, implant prosthetics, multi-unit abutment, straight abutment, milled abutment, implant superstructure, CAD/CAM dentistry, prosthodontics, implant restoration.

The widespread use of dental implants has revolutionized modern prosthodontics by providing highly predictable solutions for the rehabilitation of partially and completely edentulous patients. Implant-supported restorations require precise integration of surgical and prosthetic principles to ensure long-term success.

One of the most critical components of implant-supported prostheses is the abutment, which connects the implant fixture to the definitive restoration.

Advances in implant dentistry have introduced various abutment designs aimed at improving biomechanical stability, prosthetic fit, esthetics, and patient satisfaction. Among these, multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments are widely utilized in contemporary clinical practice. Multi-unit straight abutments are commonly used in full-arch implant restorations and allow clinicians to create screw-retained prostheses with simplified restorative procedures. In contrast, milled abutments are individually customized using CAD/CAM technology to achieve optimal emergence profiles, esthetics, and soft tissue support.

Selecting the appropriate abutment type requires consideration of multiple factors, including implant angulation, prosthetic design, esthetic demands, tissue characteristics, and long-term maintenance requirements. This article aims to compare the characteristics, advantages, limitations, and clinical applications of multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments to assist clinicians in evidence-based decision-making.

In implant dentistry, selecting the right superstructure component is critical for the long-term mechanical and biological success of the prosthesis. When comparing Multi-Unit Straight Abutments and Milled (Customized/CAD-CAM) Abutments, the decision fundamentally shifts between treating an edentulous (toothless) arch with a splinted restoration or treating localized, highly esthetic single/segmental gaps.

Here is a comprehensive comparative breakdown of their structural features, clinical indications, and biomechanical characteristics.

Core Concepts & Definitions

- Multi-Unit Straight Abutment: A prefabricated, standardized component designed primarily for multi-unit, screw-retained restorations. It elevates the restorative platform from the implant fixture level up to the soft-tissue level. It

converts an internal implant connection into a standardized, non-engaging external cone.

- Milled Abutment (CAD-CAM Custom Abutment): A patient-specific component designed via laboratory software and milled from a solid blank (typically Titanium or Zirconia). It precisely mirrors the cross-section of a natural tooth root and shapes an individualized emergence profile through the gingiva.

Comparative Matrix

Feature / Metric	Multi-Unit Straight Abutment	Milled (CAD-CAM Custom) Abutment
Primary Indication	Full-arch or extensive segmented splinted bridges (e.g., All-on-4 / All-on-6).	Single crowns and short-span bridges, especially in the esthetic zone.
Retention Type	Strictly Screw-retained at the abutment level.	Cement-retained or Screw-retained (via ti-base link) at the implant level.
Connection Type	Non-engaging (allows passivity of fit over multiple divergent implants).	Engaging (for single units to prevent rotation) or Non-engaging (for multi-units).
Emergence Profile	Standardized, cylindrical. Cannot customize tissue support.	Highly customizable; perfectly replicates natural cervical anatomy.
Margin Placement	Fixed by the component height; uniform circumferential height.	Custom-milled to follow the exact undulating line of the gingival margin.

Feature / Metric	Multi-Unit Straight Abutment	Milled (CAD-CAM Custom) Abutment
Passivity of Fit	High (forgiving of minor surgical positioning discrepancies).	Dependent on the accuracy of the master model scan and framework milling.

Deep-Dive Analysis of Characteristics

Biomechanical Behavior & Passivity

Multi-Unit straight abutments are engineered to simplify full-arch rehabilitations. Because they are non-engaging, they eliminate the internal friction of the implant index, making it significantly easier to achieve a passive fit for large cast or milled frameworks.

Conversely, Milled abutments directly engage the implant connection for single teeth to prevent rotation under occlusal loading. When used for multi-unit structures, they require absolute precision during the CAD-CAM phase to avoid inducing micro-strains on the underlying implant fixtures.

Clinical and Laboratory Workflow

The multi-unit system transitions the clinical workflow from the *bone/fixture level* to the *tissue level*. Once the straight multi-unit is torqued in place, it is rarely removed. Impression-taking, temporization, and final delivery happen at the abutment level, which protects the delicate peri-implant hemidesmosomal tissue attachment from repeated disruption.

Milled abutments require a fixture-level impression (analog or digital). The dental technician designs the ideal emergence profile based on the surrounding soft tissue width and height, controling exactly where the junction between the crown and the abutment will sit.

Esthetic Considerations & Soft Tissue Management

This is where Milled Abutments hold a significant advantage:

The Esthetic Edge: Standardized multi-unit abutments have a round cross-section. If used in the anterior maxilla for a single tooth, they fail to support the interdental papillae properly, leading to dark triangles. A milled customized abutment can be shaped like a central incisor or premolar at the transmucosal level, guiding the soft tissue to heal with natural contours.

Furthermore, with customized milling, the cement margin can be placed exactly 0.5–1.0 mm subgingivally. This prevents visible metal display while ensuring that excess cement can be thoroughly cleaned, eliminating a primary risk factor for peri-implantitis.

Clinical Selection Guideline

Choose Multi-Unit Straight Abutments when:

- You are restoring a completely edentulous arch using multiple splinted implants.
- The patient requires an immediate loading protocol.
- The implants are relatively parallel, but you want to transition to a standardized, tissue-level restorative platform for easy maintenance.

Choose Milled Abutments when:

- You are restoring a single implant or a short bridge in the anterior esthetic zone.
- The soft tissue architecture requires custom support to recreate a natural emergence profile.
- You are managing cases with uneven gingival margins where prefabricated components would leave metal margins exposed.

The selection between multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments should be based on clinical requirements rather than preference alone.

Multi-unit straight abutments have become the standard of care in many full-arch rehabilitation protocols. Their ability to create a common restorative platform

facilitates passive fit and prosthetic retrievability. Since restorative procedures occur at the abutment level, repeated manipulation of the implant connection is minimized, potentially preserving peri-implant bone stability.

The simplified workflow associated with multi-unit abutments reduces chairside time and laboratory costs. Furthermore, maintenance procedures such as prosthesis removal and repair can be performed more easily compared with customized solutions.

Conclusion

In contrast, milled abutments represent the evolution of personalized implant prosthetics. Advances in digital dentistry allow clinicians to design abutments that precisely match individual soft tissue contours and prosthetic requirements. This customization improves emergence profiles, supports peri-implant tissues, and enhances esthetic integration.

The superior esthetic outcomes achieved with milled abutments are particularly important in the anterior maxilla, where even minor discrepancies may compromise patient satisfaction. Customized zirconia abutments additionally reduce the gray shine-through effect commonly associated with metallic restorations.

Multi-unit straight abutments and milled abutments are both reliable implant superstructures with proven clinical success. Multi-unit straight abutments offer simplicity, retrievability, reduced treatment complexity, and excellent suitability for full-arch implant restorations. Milled abutments provide superior customization, enhanced esthetics, improved soft tissue management, and individualized prosthetic solutions. The decision regarding abutment selection should be guided by patient-specific factors, prosthetic requirements, and clinical objectives. Neither system is universally superior; rather, each fulfills distinct clinical indications within modern implant dentistry.

References

1. Malo P., de Araujo Nobre M., Lopes A. Immediate loading rehabilitation with implant-supported fixed prostheses. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research*.

2. Aparicio C., Perales P., Rangert B. Tilted implants as an alternative to maxillary sinus grafting. *Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research*.

3. Joda T., Ferrari M., Bragger U. Digital implant prosthodontics. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*.

4. Sailer I., Makarov N., Thoma D.S. All-ceramic or titanium implant abutments. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants*.

5. Misch C.E. *Dental Implant Prosthetics*. Elsevier.

6. Buser D., Sennerby L., De Bruyn H. Modern implant dentistry concepts and clinical outcomes. *Periodontology 2000*.

7. Wittneben J.G., Joda T., Weber H.P. Screw-retained vs cement-retained implant prostheses. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Implants*.

8. Zembic A., Kim S., Zwahlen M. Systematic review of customized implant abutments. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*.

9. Carlsson G.E., Omar R. The future of complete dentures in oral rehabilitation. *Journal of Oral Rehabilitation*.

10. Goodacre C.J., Bernal G., Rungcharassaeng K. Clinical complications with implants and implant prostheses. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*.