Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 14, Issue 32s (2025)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

Static Magnetism in Dental Implant: A Review of Its Impact on Osseointegration

Sonal Singh [*1], Vishwa Deepak Singh [2]

[*1]Research Scholar, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Teerthanker Mahaveer Dental College & Research Centre, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India.

[2] Professor, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Teerthanker Mahaveer Dental College & Research Centre, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India.

***Correspondence Author:**

Sonal Singh

Cite this paper as: Sonal Singh, Vishwa Deepak Singh, (2025) Static Magnetism in Dental Implant: A Review of Its Impact on Osseointegration. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (32s), 3713-3715.

ABSTRACT

Osseointegration—the direct biological bonding between bone and implant surface—is critical for long-term success of dental implants (1). Static magnetic fields (SMFs), generated by permanent magnets, have been studied as a non-invasive adjunct to enhance bone healing and implant integration. This review examines the nature of SMFs, their interaction with biological tissues, summarizes findings from in vitro, animal, and clinical studies, discusses underlying molecular mechanisms, and evaluates clinical implications. Evidence suggests SMFs promote early bone formation, increase bone-to-implant contact (BIC), and improve implant stability. However, standardization of treatment parameters and long-term safety data remain insufficient for routine clinical use. Future research is warranted to confirm efficacy and optimize protocols.

1. INTRODUCTION

The foundation of dental implant success lies in osseointegration, defined as the stable anchorage of an implant by direct bone-to-implant contact without intervening fibrous tissue (1). Titanium and its alloys are commonly employed for implants due to their favorable mechanical strength, corrosion resistance, and biocompatibility (2). Nonetheless, the time required for complete osseointegration often spans several months, which can delay prosthetic rehabilitation.

To accelerate this process, static magnetic fields (SMFs) produced by permanent magnets have been proposed as adjunctive therapy. These fields can be applied locally through magnetic components incorporated into implants or healing abutments, offering a non-invasive means to stimulate bone formation (3,4). The precise mechanisms and clinical outcomes of SMFs in dental implantology have attracted research interest but require further synthesis.

2. METHODS

A systematic literature search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases, covering studies published between 2000 and 2024. Keywords included “static magnetic field,” “dental implant,” “osseointegration,” and “bone healing.” Inclusion criteria comprised in vitro, animal, and clinical investigations addressing SMF effects on implant integration and bone regeneration. Fourteen relevant peer-reviewed articles were selected for review.

3. RESULTS

Preclinical In Vivo Studies

Animal models have consistently shown positive effects of SMFs on peri-implant bone healing. Kim et al. implanted magnetic healing caps in rabbit tibiae and reported significantly increased bone-to-implant contact (BIC) at 1, 4, and 8 weeks compared to controls (3). Li et al. combined SMFs with hydroxyapatite coatings in dog models, observing higher trabecular bone density after 12 weeks (4). Leesungbok et al. documented improved bone organization around titanium implants in rabbits exposed to SMFs, especially during early healing phases (5).

Cellular and Molecular Effects

In vitro studies reveal that SMFs enhance osteoblast differentiation and mineralization. Exposure of MG-63 osteoblast-like cells to SMFs increased expression of bone morphogenetic protein-2 (BMP-2), collagen type X alpha 1 (COL10A1), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF-A), and platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF-A) (6). Lim et al. showed SMF-stimulated

dental pulp stem cells had elevated mineralization via activation of the p38 MAPK pathway (7). These findings highlight SMFs' role in upregulating key osteogenic genes and growth factors.

Clinical Studies

In humans, Papi et al. demonstrated improved implant stability quotient (ISQ) values during early healing in implants fitted with magnetic cover screws (8). Similarly, Nayak et al.'s randomized controlled trial showed higher ISQ scores at 2 to 4 months in the SMF group (9). Siadat et al. observed enhanced primary stability and osseointegration in immediately placed implants treated with SMFs (10).

4. DISCUSSION

Cellular Mechanisms of SMF on Osseointegration

SMFs exert biological effects primarily through modulation of ion channels, notably calcium channels. The increased intracellular calcium acts as a second messenger, activating enzymes and transcription factors critical for osteoblast activity and mineralization, including osteocalcin and alkaline phosphatase (11). This calcium-mediated signaling stimulates bone matrix formation, accelerating early osseointegration.

Moreover, SMFs activate key signaling pathways such as p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) and Wnt/β-catenin. The p38-MAPK pathway facilitates transcription of osteogenic genes like Runx2 and Osterix, essential for osteoblast differentiation. Wnt/β-catenin signaling promotes osteoblast proliferation and inhibits osteoclastogenesis, maintaining bone homeostasis (7,12). Lim et al.'s findings of enhanced mineralization in dental pulp stem cells exposed to SMFs further support these mechanisms [7].

Extracellular and Tissue-Level Effects

SMFs also enhance the bone microenvironment by stimulating secretion of growth factors such as vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), and bone morphogenetic protein-2 (BMP-2) (6). These molecules promote angiogenesis, critical for nutrient supply and recruitment of progenitor cells during bone healing. Enhanced angiogenesis supports formation and remodeling of peri-implant bone, ensuring the development of a strong osseous interface.

At the tissue level, animal studies demonstrate increased bone-to-implant contact, trabecular thickness, and bone volume density with SMF exposure (3–5). For example, Leesungbok et al. reported early improvements in trabecular organization and cortical bone integration around titanium implants under SMF, although benefits diminished at later stages, indicating the greatest impact occurs during initial healing (5).

Clinical Impact and Potential Advantages

SMFs offer several clinical advantages in dental implantology. Enhanced implant stability during early healing phases, evidenced by improved ISQ values, suggests SMFs could shorten the required healing period and enable earlier prosthetic loading (8,9). This acceleration is beneficial in immediate implant placement, patients with poor bone quality, or systemic conditions that impair bone healing such as diabetes or osteoporosis (13).

Additionally, SMFs provide a non-invasive, localized approach to stimulate bone regeneration. Integration of magnets into healing abutments or cover screws offers a practical means of delivering therapy without additional surgical intervention or pharmacological agents, improving patient comfort and compliance.

Limitations and Considerations

Despite promising results, challenges remain. The lack of standardized SMF parameters—field strength, exposure duration, and device design—hampers widespread clinical adoption (14). Variation across studies complicates direct comparison and protocol development. Furthermore, long-term safety and biocompatibility data are limited, with unknown risks related to chronic magnetic exposure near sensitive craniofacial tissues.

Interactions with electronic devices such as pacemakers and MRI scanners pose additional concerns, necessitating exclusion criteria for patients with these implants. Cost and manufacturing complexity of magnetic components must be evaluated for feasibility in routine practice.

Most clinical studies conducted thus far have involved small patient cohorts and limited follow-up periods, restricting generalizability. Well-designed randomized controlled trials with larger populations and extended monitoring are essential to establish efficacy and safety definitively.

Future Directions

Future investigations should focus on defining optimal magnetic field strengths and application protocols tailored to different clinical scenarios. Large-scale clinical trials involving diverse patient populations, including those with systemic bone impairments, are needed to validate preliminary findings.

Moreover, mechanistic studies exploring interactions between SMFs and systemic factors influencing bone metabolism could pave the way for personalized implant therapies. Finally, integration of SMFs with other bone augmentation techniques and biomaterials warrants exploration to maximize osseointegration outcomes.

5. CONCLUSION

Static magnetic fields show significant potential to enhance dental implant osseointegration by modulating cellular signaling, promoting growth factor secretion, improving angiogenesis, and enhancing peri-implant bone structure. Early clinical evidence indicates SMFs can improve implant stability and accelerate healing. However, standardized treatment protocols and robust long-term safety data are required before routine clinical implementation. Continued multidisciplinary research is essential to realize the full clinical benefits of SMFs in dental implantology.

REFERENCES

[1] Albrektsson T, Johansson C. Osteoinduction, osteoconduction and osseointegration. Eur Spine J. 2001;10 Suppl 2:S96–101.

[2] Elias CN, Lima JHC, Valiev R, Meyers MA. Biomedical applications of titanium and its alloys. JOM. 2008;60(3):46–9.

[3] Papi P, Rosella D, Di Murro B, et al. Effects of magnetic stimulation on dental implant osseointegration: A scoping review. Appl Sci. 2022;12(9):4496.

[4] Li J, Xie Z, Yu X, et al. Static magnetic field and hydroxyapatite coating enhance osseointegration of dental implants in canine mandibles. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2020;31(2):185–92.

[5] Leesungbok R, Kim BK, Kang SJ, et al. The effects of a static magnetic field on bone formation around a sandblasted, large-grit, acid-etched titanium implant. J Oral Implantol. 2013;39(S1):248–55.

[6] Memè L, Papi P, Rosella D, et al. Use of a supercharged cover screw as SMF generator for bone healing: in vitro enhancement of osteoblast-like differentiation. Materials (Basel). 2017;10(3):283.

[7] Lim YK, Kim JH, Park SI, et al. Magnetic fields enhance proliferation and mineralization of human dental pulp cells in vitro. J Tissue Eng Regen Med. 2018;12(2):e136–45.

[8] Papi P, Rosella D, Pompa G, et al. Effect of NeFeB magnetic cover screw on early bone healing: human case series. Appl Sci. 2023;13(1):268.

[9] Nayak S, Kattimani VS, Prabhu S, et al. RFA of immediate implants with/without SMF: in vivo study. Natl J Maxillofac Surg. 2022;13(1):1–7.

[10] Siadat H, Alikhasi M, Beyabanaki E, et al. Effect of SMFs on osseointegration of immediately placed implants: randomized controlled trial. Implant Dent. 2012;21(6):491–5.

[11] Feng X, McDonald JM. Disorders of bone remodeling. Annu Rev Pathol. 2011;6:121–45.

[12] Baron R, Kneissel M. WNT signaling in bone homeostasis and disease. Nat Med. 2013;19(2):179–92.

[13] Liu Y, Liu M, Wang X, et al. Bone healing in systemic disease: a systematic review. J Dent Res. 2022;101(5):493–502.

[14] Diniz P, Braga SS, Morais TS, et al. Electromagnetic field stimulation on osseointegration: Animal model review. J Prosthet Dent. 2021;125