



Across-Sectional Survey of Age-Related Knowledge and Attitude toward Oral Implants among Patients in Nandurbar District

Dr. Priyaj Panjarale¹, Dr. Himanshu Gupta², Dr. Pooja Muley³, Dr. Harsh Panjarale⁴, Dr. Akshay Shete⁵

¹Fellowship Student, Oral Implantology, Oralcare.co.in, Chh. Sambhajinagar; Maharashtra

²Director, Oralcare.co.in, Chh. Sambhajinagar

³Guide, Oralcare.co.in, Chh. Sambhajinagar

⁴Dental Surgeon, Nashik, Maharashtra

⁵Fellowship Student, Oral Implantology, Oralcare.co.in, Chh. Sambhajinagar

Date of Submission: 25-03-2026

Date of Acceptance: 05-04-2026

ABSTRACT

Aim: To evaluate age-related knowledge and attitude toward dental implants among patients in Nandurbar district. Dental implants are a predictable and long-term treatment modality for replacement of missing teeth¹. Despite high success rates, awareness and acceptance remain influenced by cost, fear of surgery, and lack of information².

Materials and Methods: A cross-sectional survey was conducted among 121 patients aged ≥ 15 years using a structured questionnaire assessing awareness, knowledge, perceived barriers, and willingness for implant therapy. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Chi-square test ($p < 0.05$).

Results: Awareness was reported by 60.33% of participants. High cost (50.41%) and fear of surgery (32.23%) were the main barriers. Despite limited detailed knowledge, 66.12% were willing to choose implant therapy.

Conclusion: Patients demonstrated moderate awareness and a favorable attitude toward dental implants. Financial and psychological factors remain significant barriers to acceptance.

Keywords: Dental implants, awareness, attitude, cross-sectional study.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tooth loss remains a major public health concern globally and significantly impacts oral function, speech, esthetics, and psychological well-being⁴. Loss of natural teeth leads to progressive alveolar bone resorption, altered occlusion, migration of adjacent teeth, supra-eruption of antagonists, and temporomandibular joint dysfunction⁵. These consequences compromise both functional efficiency and quality of life. Conventional prosthetic rehabilitation methods include removable partial dentures and fixed dental prostheses. Although these options restore function, they have inherent limitations such as compromised retention, damage to adjacent teeth

, and continued bone resorption⁶.

The introduction of osseointegrated dental implants by Brånemark revolutionized prosthodontic rehabilitation¹. Osseointegration refers to a direct, intimate connection between bone tissue and implant surface without intervening fibrous tissue¹. Long-term clinical investigations have demonstrated survival rates of 90–95% over 10–

15 years, establishing implants as a predictable and durable treatment modality^{7,8}. Implant-supported prostheses provide numerous advantages:

- Preservation of adjacent natural teeth
- Improved masticatory efficiency
- Maintenance of alveolar bone volume
- Enhanced esthetics and phonetics
- Improved patient satisfaction and confidence⁹

Despite these advantages, implant therapy uptake remains suboptimal in many developing regions. Awareness and knowledge levels are influenced by educational background, socioeconomic status, access to dental care, and cultural perceptions^{2,10}. Financial cost is consistently reported as the most significant deterrent to implant acceptance¹¹. Additionally, fear of surgical procedures, misconceptions about pain, and uncertainty about long-term success further discourage patients¹². Nandurbar district represents a semi-urban and rural population mix, where access to advanced dental care may be limited. Therefore, assessing public knowledge and attitude toward dental implants is essential for identifying educational gaps and designing effective awareness strategies.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design: A descriptive cross-sectional survey design was adopted.

Study Population: The study included 121 patients attending dental clinics in Nandurbar district over a defined study period.

Sampling Method: Convenience sampling was used due



to accessibility of participants attending outpatient dental clinics.

Inclusion Criteria:

Patients aged ≥ 15 years
Patients willing to provide informed consent

Exclusion Criteria:

Individuals unable to understand questionnaire content
Patients with cognitive impairment

Questionnaire Design:

The questionnaire was designed after reviewing previous validated surveys^{2,13,14}. It consisted of 20 closed-ended questions categorized into:

- Demographic variables (age, gender, education) Awareness of dental implants
- Source of information Knowledge regarding placement site Expected longevity
- Maintenance requirements Perceived disadvantages
- Willingness to accept treatment
- Pilot testing was conducted to ensure clarity and reliability.

Data Collection:

Data were collected using both:
Self-administered questionnaire
Interview-based method (for participants with limited literacy)

Statistical Analysis:

Data were entered into spreadsheet software and analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage). Chi-square test was applied to assess association between age and awareness. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

A structured, pre-tested questionnaire consisting of 20 closed-ended questions was used. The questionnaire was divided into the following sections:

Section 1: Demographic Details

1. Age
 - 15–30 years 31–50 years
 - Above 50 years
2. Gender Male Female
3. Do you have any missing teeth? Yes No

4. Do you think replacement of missing teeth is important? Very important Somewhat important Neither important nor unimportant Not important at all

5. How well informed are you about different ways of replacing missing teeth? Very well Moderately well Not at all

6. Have you ever heard about dental implants? A great deal Somewhat Heard very little Not at all

Section 2: Knowledge and Awareness

7. If yes, where did you get information about implants? Dentist Newspaper Friends and acquaintances Other

8. According to you, what is a dental implant? Screw Piece of metal Never heard Heard but cannot explain

9. Would you like to know more about implants? Yes No

Section 3: Source of Information & Professional Perception

10. From where would you like to receive information about implants? 11. Do you think a dentist providing implant treatment is better qualified? 12. Would you like your dentist to provide implants?

Section 4: Knowledge about Procedure and Longevity

13. Where in the jaw are implants placed? 14. How long do you think an implant lasts? 15. How much are you prepared to pay for an implant?

Section 5: Oral Hygiene and Maintenance

16. What oral hygiene care is required for implants compared to natural teeth?

Section 6: Professional Confidence and Perception

17. Do you think your dentist uses up-to-date implant techniques? 18. What are the advantages of non-removable dentures over removable ones? 19. What are the disadvantages of implant-supported dentures? 20. Would you choose implant therapy to replace missing teeth?



III. RESULT

Demographic Distribution:

The majority of participants (43.80%) belonged to the 31–50 years age group, followed by younger (15–30 years) and older (>50 years) groups. Gender distribution was nearly equal.

Awareness Level: 60.33% of participants reported awareness of dental implants, whereas 39.67% had no prior knowledge. Awareness was significantly higher in middle-aged individuals, possibly due to increased dental treatment needs.

Source of Information: Dentists were the most common source of information, followed by social contacts and media. This emphasizes the central role of dental professionals in disseminating accurate knowledge¹⁵.

Knowledge About Implant Placement: Only 43.80% correctly identified the jawbone as the site of implant placement. Many participants believed implants were attached to gums or adjacent teeth, indicating incomplete understanding.

Knowledge About Longevity: Responses varied widely, ranging from 5 years to lifetime expectancy. This suggests a need for patient education regarding implant survival rates, which have been reported to exceed 90% over long-term follow-up⁷.

Perceived Barriers: High cost – 50.41% Fear of surgery – 32.23% Long treatment duration – 17.36% These findings are consistent with global surveys reporting cost as the primary limiting factor¹¹.

Willingness to Accept Treatment: 66.12% expressed willingness to undergo implant therapy if recommended, suggesting a positive attitude when adequate awareness is provided.

IV. DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrated moderate awareness levels similar to studies conducted in comparable populations^{2,13}.

The prominent role of dentists as information providers highlights the importance of patient counseling and chairside education.

Structured communication regarding procedural steps, anesthesia, and success rates can reduce anxiety¹².

Cost remains a significant obstacle. Implant therapy involves surgical placement, prosthetic components, radiographic assessment, and maintenance visits, contributing to higher overall expenditure¹¹. Introduction of affordable implant systems and installment-based payment models may enhance accessibility.

Fear of surgery is another important factor. Dental anxiety has been widely documented as a barrier to invasive pro-

cedures¹⁶. Education regarding minimally invasive techniques and pain control protocols may reduce apprehension.

The relatively high willingness rates suggest that awareness programs and financial support systems could significantly increase implant acceptance in this region.

V. CONCLUSION

Within the limitations of this cross-sectional study, patients in Nandurbar district exhibit moderate awareness and generally favorable attitudes toward dental implants.

However, detailed knowledge regarding procedural aspects, longevity, and maintenance remains inadequate. Financial constraints and fear of surgical intervention are the most significant barriers.

Implementation of structured community-based awareness programs, improved dentist-patient communication, and cost-effective treatment models are essential to promote wider adoption of implant therapy.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Brånemark PI, et al. Tissue-integrated prostheses. 1985.
- [2]. Al-Dajani M. J Oral Implantol. 2017.
- [3]. Tepper G, et al. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2003.
- [4]. Petersen PE. WHO Report 2003.
- [5]. Carlsson GE. J Prosthet Dent. 1998.
- [6]. Goodacre CJ, et al. J Prosthet Dent. 2003.
- [7]. Adell R, et al. Int J Oral Surg. 1981.
- [8]. Pjetursson BE, et al. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2004.
- [9]. Feine JS, et al. J Dent Res. 2002.
- [10]. Narby B, et al. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2008.
- [11]. Eckert SE, Carr AB. Int J Prosthodont. 2001.
- [12]. Armfield JM. Aust Dent J. 2010.
- [13]. Zimmer CM, et al. J Oral Implantol. 1992.
- [14]. Pommer B, et al. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2011.
- [15]. Akagawa Y, et al. J Prosthet Dent. 1988.
- [16]. Humphris GM, et al. Community Dent Health. 1995.