Micro castable attachments:
Application on removable anchored bar prosthesis
Nowadays dentists have to deal with patients having more and more detailed requests. Owing to the image of the traditional removable prosthesis, we know that patients increasingly ask for fixed prosthesis. But not always this could be the best solution. Some factors could affect the operational decisions of the dental team such as: implant positions, vertical dimensions, the type of bone to work on, previous prosthesis still present in the mouth and some more. It’s always important involving the patient explaining pros and cons of a given prosthetic project. Aesthetics and functionality are the two objectives to be fulfilled and only thorough a very good cooperation between dentist, dental technician and patient best results can be achieved. In this paper, the dental technician Carlo Borromeo will explain the procedure followed on a patient submitted to the insertion of 6 implants in the lower jaw. The proximity between implants and their position leads to discard the Toronto option. So the solution is opting for a bar with superstructure and mobile denture anchored using low-dimensional castable attachments proceeding with the traditional casting technique.

Work Phases

Patient aged 65 years wearing an upper removable prosthesis and an inferior Toronto. She travelled to remake
the prosthesis, complaining about all the problems observed (phonetic, reduced number of teeth in the upper quadrants).

The sample has come to the laboratory with implants already inserted and thus without the possibility of a pre-implant case evaluation. When the studying phase of the model has started, it has been noticed that implants were placed very close together and all in the front area. The possibility of re-doing a Toronto with longer extensions was discarded in order to avoid a cantilever too long in posterior areas. It is considered more appropriate to opt for a bar over structure and an anchored removable prosthesis. After monitoring (by the colleague who works with him since many years) and after verifying esthetic and functionality, the final tissue and implant-impression was taken over through an extra set up session. Then the model has been set up for the second time to verify centric dimension. Vestibular and lingual silicon masks are built with the analogue set on the model to guide the work until the end. As said before, the choice was producing a bar on 6 implants to anchor over a superstructure a total
The proximity between implants does not allow the insertion of connections such as bars or attachments of a certain dimension. We proceed with the insertion of 3 spherical attachments (1.8 mm OT CAP MICRO). The attachments are set in positions between the implants, 2 in the back and 1 in the front areas, which resulted to be more indicative, compared to the previous setting up. The procedure is complete with a chrome cobalt fusion. Fig. 1 to 32 showing the step-by-step procedure.

**Conclusion**

As we mentioned before today many patients have precise requests, which are often difficult to realize considering the situation in the mouth. A valid dental team has to inform the patient regarding the most suitable prosthesis procedure. This particular protocol saw the application of a standard procedure with attachments obtaining a high quality chrome cobalt bar.
for the lower prosthesis. The entire application was completed in a relevant short period of time with a considerable reduced price.
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