Content available at: https://www.ipinnovative.com/open-access-journals

International Journal of Oral Health Dentistry

Journal homepage: www.ijohd.org

Review Article

Unveiling the potential of barrier membranes in implant dentistry: A comprehensive review

Himanshu Aeran[1,*], **Varun Kumar**[1], **Jyotsna Seth**[1], **Manas Aeran**[1]

[1] *Dept. of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Seema Dental College and Hospital, Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India*

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:
Received 25-07-2023
Accepted 17-08-2023
Available online 16-10-2023

Keywords:
Barrier membranes
Implant dentistry
Guided tissue regeneration
Guided bone regeneration
Biocompatibility
Mechanical stability
Selective permeability
Expanded polytetrafluoroethylene
Collagen membranes
Pericardium membranes

A B S T R A C T

Barrier membranes have emerged as crucial tools in guided tissue regeneration (GTR) and guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures, specially transforming the landscape of implant dentistry. An overview of the key characteristics, types, and clinical implications of barrier membranes in implant dentistry has been described. These membranes create a controlled environment that facilitates tissue and bone regeneration around dental implants, enhancing treatment outcomes. The article delves into the ideal attributes of barrier membranes, including biocompatibility, mechanical stability, selective permeability, and more. It also explores various forms of barrier membranes, such as expanded polytetrafluoroethylene (ePTFE), collagen, and pericardium membranes, highlighting their unique advantages and considerations. The clinical applications, drawbacks, and future directions of these membranes are discussed, shedding light on their role in managing complex cases. The evolving landscape of advanced biomaterials, bioactive coatings, patient-specific approaches, and smart membranes points toward an exciting future for barrier membranes in implant dentistry, promising further advancements in guided regeneration techniques.

1. Introduction

In the dynamic field of implant dentistry, the quest for successful and lasting outcomes has led to the evolution of innovative techniques and materials. One such advancement that has significantly influenced the practice of implantology is the utilization of barrier membranes.[1] These specialized membranes play a pivotal role in creating a conducive environment for guided tissue and bone regeneration, crucial for achieving optimal osseointegration and implant stability.[2]

Barrier membranes act as protective shields, separating the implant site from surrounding soft tissues and encouraging the growth of bone-forming cells while impeding the infiltration of unwanted cells. They offer a strategic solution to addressing bone defects and irregularities, fostering the healing process in a controlled and directed manner.[3]

Guided bone regeneration (GBR) reigns supreme as the go-to method for addressing bony defects. A pivotal aspect of the GBR process involves the incorporation of barrier membranes. In the present day, a plethora of diverse membrane substances are at the disposal of implant clinicians, contingent upon the specifics of each clinical scenario.[2] Nevertheless, making the optimal choice among these membranes can occasionally prove to be a daunting and bewildering task.

Hence, this article aims to offer an overview of the diverse range of membranes accessible and explore their applicability in different clinical scenarios.

* *Corresponding author*.
E-mail address: drhimanu4@gmail.com (H. Aeran).

https://doi.org/10.18231/j.ijohd.2023.031

2. What is the purpose of utilizing a membrane?

The purpose of using a barrier membrane in implant dentistry is to create a controlled environment that promotes guided bone regeneration & guided tissue regeneration. Membranes find their application in GBR procedures to function as both biological and mechanical barriers. They serve to slow down the infiltration of non-bone forming cells like epithelial cells while facilitating the gradual migration of bone-forming cells into the affected areas. As bone defects undergo healing, a competition unfolds between soft-tissue and bone-forming cells to populate the surgical site.[2] However, soft-tissue cells exhibit a considerably faster migration rate compared to their bone-forming counterparts. As a result, the core objective of utilizing barrier membranes revolves around enabling specific cell repopulation, thereby directing the diverse tissue proliferation that transpires throughout the healing journey.[4]

Beneath the membrane's presence, the process of regeneration unfolds, characterized by angiogenesis and the migration of osteogenic cells. The initial blood clot supersede by the woven bone as vascular ingrowth takes place, leading to its eventual transformation into resilient lamellar bone capable of withstanding loads.[5] This, in turn, facilitates the comprehensive regeneration of both hard and soft tissues. In cases where a barrier membrane is omitted, the absence of proper space preservation could lead to the integration of soft tissues and hindered bone development.[6]

3. Ideal Characteristics of Membrane

1. Biocompatibility: Membranes should be well-tolerated by the surrounding tissues, minimizing the risk of adverse reactions or inflammation.[6]
2. Selective permeability: The membrane's selective permeability is fundamental in allowing the diffusion of essential nutrients, oxygen, and growth factors while preventing the infiltration of undesirable cell types. This property supports the desired cell population, such as osteoblasts, to promote bone formation.[7]
3. Mechanical stability: The membrane should exhibit mechanical stability throughout the healing process. It must retain its structural integrity to provide a physical barrier between the soft and hard tissues, safeguarding the regenerating site from external forces.[4]
4. Cell-exclusion properties: An effective barrier membrane should prevent the migration of non-osteogenic cells, such as epithelial cells, from populating the defect site. This property encourages the selective growth of bone-forming cells, ultimately contributing to successful regeneration.[7]
5. Degradation rate: Resorbable barrier membranes should degrade at an appropriate rate, aligning with the healing process.[2]
6. Ease of Handling: Barrier membranes should be user-friendly and easy to manipulate to a desirable shape & size during surgical procedures.[8]
7. Compatibility with graft materials: Barrier membranes are often used in conjunction with bone graft materials. An ideal membrane should exhibit compatibility with various graft types and remain effective in maintaining space and guiding tissue regeneration when combined with these materials.
8. Biodegradability: For resorbable membranes, biodegradability is essential. The membrane should break down into biocompatible byproducts that can be absorbed by the body without causing adverse reactions.
9. Promotion of angiogenesis: An ideal barrier membrane should encourage angiogenesis, the formation of new blood vessels. This supports the delivery of nutrients and oxygen to regenerating tissues, aiding in their development and vitality.[2]
10. Clinically predictable: The membrane's performance should be predictable and consistent across different clinical scenarios. This ensures that dental professionals can confidently choose and use the membrane for a variety of cases.

4. Types of Membranes

1. Non-resorbable membranes
   - (a) Expanded polytetrafluoroethylene
   - (b) High-density polytetrafluoroethylene
   - (c) Titanium mesh
   - (d) Titanium-reinforced PTFE
2. Resorbable membranes
   - (a) Polymeric membranes
   - (b) Collagen membranes
   - (c) Pericardium membranes
   - (d) Platelet rich-fibrin
   - (e) Acellular dermal matrix

4.1. Non-resorbable membranes

Non-resorbable membranes showcase remarkable biocompatibility, elevated mechanical potency, and heightened rigidity. They typically excel in maintaining space more effectively than resorbable counterparts. Nonetheless, non-resorbable membranes tend to experience a higher occurrence of wound dehiscence, and they bear the drawback of necessitating a subsequent second surgical intervention.[7] This subsequently leads to heightened morbidity, escalated expenses, and increased discomfort for the patient. Non-resorbable membranes include:-

4.1.1. Expanded polytetrafluoroethylene

The expanded PTFE membrane (e-PTFE), a pioneer in implant dentistry, and the gold standard for bone regeneration.[9] Its origins trace back to 1969, and by the early 1990s, it had firmly established itself as the go-to for bone regeneration protocols. The e-PTFE membrane undergoes a sintering process that weaves pores ranging from 5 to 20 μm into the very fabric of the material.[10]

The e-PTFE membranes unfold with distinct characteristics on each side: on one facet, a thickness of around 1 mm coupled with 90 percent porosity acts as a shield against epithelial growth; while on the opposite side, a sleeker 0.15 mm thickness therefore 30 percent porosity create a nurturing haven for burgeoning bone and halt the intrusion of fibrous tissue.[11–14]

The e-PTFE membrane act as a protective barrier. It stands as a guard, blocking fibroblasts and other connective tissue cells from entering the bone defect.[15] This gives room for the cells with bone-growth potential to slowly fill the defect, like a slow but steady wave of restoration.[16]

A prevalent drawback associated with e-PTFE is its relatively large pore size, which can facilitate the movement of microorganisms and consequently result in infections.[15,17] With an average pore size ranging from 5 to 20 μm, and pathogenic bacteria typically being less than 10 μm in diameter, the potential for microorganisms to traverse the highly porous e-PTFE membrane when exposed becomes a common complication.[18,19]

4.1.2. High-density polytetrafluoroethylene

Due to the complications associated with e-PTFE membranes, a higher density material, measuring less than 0.3 microns, was developed in the early 1990s, known as Cytoplast. This high-density PTFE, often termed dense PTFE or d-PTFE, emerged as a response. Notably, d-PTFE exhibited a lower susceptibility to bacterial colonization compared to e-PTFE membranes, leading to a decreased risk of infections. The inherent advantages of these membranes lie in their high density and small pore sizes obviating the need for soft-tissue closure.[20] This membrane's composition prevents the passage of bacteria while facilitating oxygen diffusion and the movement of minute molecules.[21] Furthermore, due to the absence of tissue ingrowth, the removal process for d-PTFE membranes is notably simplified.

According to Bartee, the utilization of d-PTFE proves particularly advantageous when achieving primary closure poses challenges due to tension. This scenario is often encountered in procedures like alveolar ridge preservation, managing substantial bone defects, and performing immediate post-extraction implant placements.[10] In such instances, d-PTFE membranes offer the benefit of being left exposed, effectively preserving both soft tissue and the position of the mucogingival junction. This approach could potentially contribute to enhanced healing outcomes, as it eliminates the necessity for extensive releasing incisions that might compromise blood supply and lead to the loss of keratinized tissue.[17] Employing d-PTFE membranes could, therefore, serve as a means to promote more effective healing in these scenarios.[22]

4.1.3. Titanium mesh

Titanium, a widely favored material in dentistry and various medical domains, finds applications both in its pure metallic form and as an alloy blended with non-precious metals like aluminum, vanadium, or nickel.[23] Both the pure metal and its alloys exhibit excellent biocompatibility, robust mechanical strength, long-lasting durability, low density, and resistance to corrosion.[24] Moreover, titanium stands as a bioinert substance, capable of serving as a steadfast metal due to its swift development of a protective passive layer.

The primary benefits of the titanium mesh lie in its ability to uphold and conserve the targeted regeneration space without collapsing. Notably flexible, it can be bent and molded to accommodate diverse requirements.[25] This adaptability enables its utilization in aiding bone regeneration even in situations where space preservation isn't a concern. The mesh's perforations ensure it doesn't obstruct the direct blood supply originating from the periosteum to the underlying tissues and the bone grafting material. Furthermore, it boasts full biocompatibility with oral tissues, contributing to its suitability for use in oral procedures.[23]

The application of titanium mesh extends to two distinct approaches: It can be employed prior to dental implant insertion (known as the staged approach) to augment bone volume. Alternatively, it can be utilized alongside dental implant placement (referred to as the non-staged approach).

4.1.4. Titanium-reinforced PTFE

In order to enhance the firmness of both e-PTFE and d-PTFE membranes, titanium was incorporated into the PTFE membrane structure. This infusion of titanium resulted in heightened structural stability, rendering these membranes more amenable to customization for a precise fit within the defect. Such membranes prove especially valuable in managing sizable bony defects.[26]

4.2. Drawbacks of non-resorbable Membranes

While both clinical and experimental studies have showcased remarkable treatment outcomes through the utilization of non-resorbable membranes in GTR and GBR procedures, it's important to acknowledge that there exist specific complications associated with their usage.[7]

1. Wound dehiscence can arise due to incomplete coverage or gingival recession during the healing process.[22]

2. Premature exposure of barrier membranes to the oral environment, followed by bacterial colonization, might lead to the early removal of these membranes.[26]
3. Wound infections that occur after the exposure of e-PTFE membranes have the potential to undermine the outcomes of grafting procedures.
4. The requirement for a secondary surgical intervention to extract the bio-inert membrane.[27]
5. Because of the inherent rigidity of non-resorbable membranes, additional stabilization through the use of mini screws and tacks is frequently necessary.[28]

5. Resorbable Membrane

Resorbable membranes gradually degrade over time, eliminating the need for a second surgical intervention to remove the membrane. They are particularly suited for smaller defects and cases where extended barrier function is not required.[2] The advantage of resorbable membranes lies in their ability to integrate with surrounding tissues, promoting natural healing processes. One significant drawback is its unpredictable rate of resorption, which could potentially impact the extent of bone formation.[7] Resorbable membranes crafted from xenogeneic collagen have gained prominence and are extensively employed in contemporary implant dentistry for guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures.[3] Resorbable membranes include:-

5.1. Polymeric membranes

Polymeric membranes are integral components of modern implant dentistry, playing a pivotal role in guided tissue regeneration (GTR) and guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures.[29] These membranes are constructed from various biocompatible polymers and have revolutionized the way clinicians approach complex cases involving bone defects and implant placements.[30]

Polymeric membranes consist of synthetic polymers such as polyesters, polyglycolides (PGAs), polylactides (PLAs), or their copolymers. The beauty of these artificial substances lies in their ability to be reliably replicated in nearly limitless quantities.[31] Polymeric membranes demonstrate their significance by adeptly preserving alveolar bone within extraction sockets and preventing the onset of alveolar ridge defects. Additionally, they play a crucial role in elevating the process of ridge augmentation around exposed implants.[32]

PGA, PLA, and their copolymers offer a significant clinical benefit: they have the capacity to undergo full biodegradation, ultimately breaking down into carbon dioxide and water via the Krebs cycle.[33] This unique characteristic negates the need for a subsequent surgical procedure for their removal.

5.2. Collagen membranes

Collagen barrier membranes stand as an essential component in the realm of implant dentistry, specifically within the realm of guided tissue regeneration (GTR) and guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures. These resorbable membranes, crafted from type 1 or combination of Type1 & Type3 collagen, a protein abundant in the body, hold significant promise for promoting successful tissue regeneration and enhancing the outcomes of implant treatments.

Collagen materials for use as barrier membranes offer a multitude of advantages. These encompass capabilities like hemostasis,[34] inducing chemotaxis in periodontal ligament fibroblasts and gingival fibroblasts,[35] minimal immunogenicity, straightforward manipulation and adaptation, direct impact on bone formation,[36] and the potential to enhance tissue thickness. As a result of these qualities, collagen material emerges as an optimal selection for a bioresorbable GTR or GBR barrier.

Collagen takes up more than half of the protein content within the human body. The degradation of a collagen membrane, executed through enzymatic reactions, mirrors the natural turnover of tissue.[37] In contemporary times, collagen membranes predominantly stem from allogenic or xenogeneic sources, gaining significant traction in the realm of implant dentistry.[34] These membranes serve as support structures for osteoconduction, bolster platelet aggregation, ensure clot stability, and even draw fibroblasts for effective healing.[35] The resorption of collagen membranes transpires at varied rates, influenced by the degree of cross-linking, a manipulation achieved during the manufacturing process. This carefully controlled resorption occurs by way of inflammatory cell biodegradation.

An array of forms awaits when it comes to collagen barriers:

1. Collagen plugs:- They find their primary application in managing bleeding and sustaining the blood clot within extraction sites. Collagen plugs typically possess a soft, pliable, sponge-like texture that swiftly soaks up blood, effectively generating an artificial clot. Within this collagen structure, platelet aggregation takes place, leading to the discharge of bone-growth factors through platelet degranulation. These collagen plugs are designed to be resorbed within approximately 10–14 days.[7]
2. Collagen tape:- A delicate and flexible version of collagen serves a purpose in promoting haemostasis and is well-suited for minor graft sites. Additionally, collagen tape takes on significance in sinus graft procedures, frequently serving as the foundational layer in grafting techniques.[2]
3. Regular collagen membranes:- These collagen barriers typically undergo resorption within a span of three to four months. They find their primary application in

guided bone regeneration for bony defects of small to medium sizes Ideally, achieving primary closure is advisable to minimize graft-related complications.[38]

4. Extended collagen membranes:- These collagen barriers have a resorption timeline of four to six months and are best suited for addressing more extensive bony defects that demand extended healing durations. To accommodate this, these membranes undergo modification by elevating their cross-link density. Nonetheless, it's important to note that collagen membranes designed for prolonged action have demonstrated a heightened host-tissue reaction, compromised vascularization, and a potential for tissue dehiscence.

5.3. *Pericardium membranes*

Pericardium membranes, derived from the pericardial sac surrounding the heart, represent a distinctive biomaterial finding application in the realm of implant dentistry. These membranes, harnessed from a natural source, offer an alternative option for guided tissue regeneration (GTR) and guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures, presenting unique advantages and considerations.[1]

Pericardium membranes are derived from the pericardial tissue of animals, commonly bovine or porcine sources. Through a rigorous processing protocol that includes cleaning, sterilization, and preservation, the pericardial tissue is transformed into a biocompatible and safe membrane for clinical use.[24] Their surfaces exhibit porosity, promoting cellular attachment and growth, while simultaneously maintaining a higher density that limits soft tissue infiltration. Pericardium membranes, in contrast to collagen membranes, exhibit a longer duration of resorption.

5.4. *Platelet rich-fibrin*

The utilization of platelet-rich fibrin (PRF) is experiencing a surge in popularity within GBR procedures. This second-generation platelet concentrate offers notable advantages such as reduced costs, the omission of extra reactive agents, and a higher platelet concentration when compared to platelet-rich plasma. The PRF technique involves the centrifugation of the patient's whole blood, leading to the separation of three layers. The lower layer, containing red blood cells, is discarded. The upper layer, clear in colour, is known as platelet-poor plasma.[2] The middle layer, serving as the fibrin matrix, is employed as a membrane in bone regeneration procedures.

5.5. *Acellular dermal matrix*

Acellular dermal matrix (ADM) stands as a human biocompatible connective-tissue matrix (allograft), crafted through a cell-removal process within the dermis. This manufacturing approach ensures the absence of cells, thereby eliminating the potential transmission of viruses.[7] Moreover, the acellular composition of this membrane guarantees the absence of inflammatory responses or rejection. In its inert state as an allograft, when employed as a membrane, ADM assumes the role of a structural framework that facilitates the migration of fibroblasts and vascularization.[2]

6. Drawbacks of Resorbable Membranes

1. Variable Resorption Rate: The rate at which resorbable membranes break down can vary, making it challenging to predict their longevity and potentially leading to premature degradation.
2. Limited Mechanical Stability: Resorbable membranes may lack the robust mechanical stability of non-resorbable options, increasing the risk of displacement and compromised barrier function.
3. Timing Challenges: The timing of membrane resorption might not always align perfectly with the optimal tissue regeneration process, affecting overall procedure success.
4. Inconsistent Guided Regeneration: Resorbable membranes might not consistently prevent the infiltration of unwanted cells, potentially hindering the intended tissue and bone formation.
5. Lack of Long-Term Support: In cases requiring extended barrier function, resorbable membranes might not provide sustained support throughout the entire healing period.
6. Surgical Removal: While resorbable membranes eliminate the need for a secondary removal procedure, their resorption might not always occur uniformly. This can result in remnants of the membrane remaining in the surgical site, potentially leading to complications.
7. Healing Complications: In certain cases, resorbable membranes can induce inflammatory responses during the resorption process, affecting the overall healing environment.
8. Sensitivities and Allergies: Some patients might develop sensitivities or allergies to the materials in resorbable membranes, necessitating careful consideration before their use.

7. Clinical Implications and Future Directions

Barrier membranes have revolutionized the field of implant dentistry by enabling clinicians to enhance bone regeneration and implant stability. The choice between resorbable and non-resorbable membranes depends on factors such as defect size, patient characteristics, and surgical requirements. Advances in biomaterial science continue to drive the development of novel membrane materials and designs, further improving clinical outcomes.[39–41]

8. Conclusion

In the realm of implant dentistry, barrier membranes stand as indispensable tools for achieving successful guided tissue and bone regeneration. Their varied compositions and degradation behaviours cater to a wide range of clinical scenarios, allowing clinicians to tailor their approach to individual patient needs. A comprehensive understanding of the ideal characteristics, resorbable and non-resorbable options, and various membrane types equips dental professionals with the knowledge required to navigate the complexities of implant procedures and contribute to optimal patient outcomes.

9. Source of Funding

None.

10. Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Liu J, Kerns DG. Suppl 1: Mechanisms of guided bone regeneration: A review. *Open Dent J*. 2014;8:56–65.
2. Resnik R. The use of barrier membranes in implant dentistry; 2018. Available from: https://glidewelldental.com/education/chairside-magazine/volume-13-issue-1/barrier-membranes-implant-dentistry.
3. Alauddin MS, Hayei NAA, Sabarudin MA, Baharin NHM. Barrier membrane in regenerative therapy: a narrative review. *Membranes (Basel)*. 2022;12(5):444.
4. Bunyaratavej P, Wang HL. Collagen membranes: a review. *J Periodontol*. 2001;72(2):215–29.
5. Chou AH, Legeros RZ, Chen Z, Li Y. Antibacterial effect of zinc phosphate mineralized guided bone regeneration membranes. *Implant Dent*. 2007;16(1):89–100.
6. Nishibori M, Betts NJ, Salama H, Listgarten MA. Short-term healing of autogenous and allogeneic bone grafts after sinus augmentation: a report of 2 cases. *J Periodontol*. 1994;65(10):958–66.
7. Naung NY, Shehata E, Sickels JEV. Resorbable versus nonresorbable membranes: when and why? *Dent Clin North Am*. 2019;63(3):419–31.
8. Dahlin C, Gottlow J, Linde A, Nyman S. Healing of maxillary and mandibular bone defects using a membrane technique. An experimental study in monkeys. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg*. 1990;24(1):13–9.
9. Dahlin C. Scientific Background of guided bone regeneration. In: Buser D, Dahlin C, Schenk R, editors. Guided bone regeneration in implant dentistry. Chicago, IL: Quintessence Publ; 1994.
10. Buser D, Bragger U, Lang NP, Nyman S. Regeneration and enlargement of jaw bone using guided tissue regeneration. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 1990;1(1):22–32.
11. Buser D, Dula K, Belser U, Hirt HP, Berthold H. Localized ridge augmentation using guided bone regeneration. 1. Surgical procedure in the maxilla. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1993;13(1):29–45.
12. Becker W, Lynch SE, Lekholm U, Becker BE, Caffesse R, Donath K, et al. A comparison of ePTFE membranes alone or in combination with platelet-derived growth factors and insulin-like growth factor-I or demineralized freezedried bone in promoting bone formation around immediate extraction socket implants. *J Periodontol*. 1992;63(11):929–40.
13. Becker W, Dahlin C, Lekholm U, Bergstrom C, Steenberghe DV, Higuchi K, et al. Five-year evaluation of implants placed at extraction and with dehiscences and fenestration defects augmented with ePTFE membranes: results from a prospective multicenter study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 1999;1(1):27–32.
14. Buser D, Dula K, Belser UC, Hirt HP, Berthold H. Localized ridge augmentation using guided bone regeneration. II. Surgical procedure in the mandible. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1995;15(1):10–29.
15. Nevins M, Mellonig JT. Enhancement of the damaged edentulous ridge to receive dental implants: a combination of allograft and the GORE-TEX membrane. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1992;12(2):96–111.
16. Dahlin C, Lekholm U, Becker W, Becker B, Higuchi K, Callens A. Treatment of fenestration and dehiscence bone defects around oral implants using the guided tissue regeneration technique: a prospective multicenter study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1995;10(3):312–8.
17. Becker W, Dahlin C, Becker BE. The use of e-PTFE barrier membranes for bone promotion around titanium implants placed into extraction sockets: a prospective multicenter study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1994;9(1):31–40.
18. Lazzara RJ. Immediate implant placement into extraction sites: surgical and restorative advantages. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1989;9(5):332–43.
19. Nyman S, Lang NP, Buser D, Bragger U. Bone regeneration adjacent to titanium dental implants using guided tissue regeneration: a report of two cases. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1990;5(1):9–14.
20. Murphy KG. Postoperative healing complications associated with Gore-Tex Periodontal Material. Part I. Incidence and characterization. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1995;15(4):363–75.
21. Murphy KG. Postoperative healing complications associated with Gore-Tex Periodontal Material. Part II. Effect of complications on regeneration. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1995;15(6):548–61.
22. Simion M, Baldoni M, Rossi P. A comparative study of the effectiveness of e-PTFE membranes with and without early exposure during the healing period. *Int J Periodont Restorat Dent*. 1994;14:166–80.
23. Gavini G, Santos MD, Caldeira CL, Machado MEL, Freire LG, Iglecias EF, et al. Nickel-titanium instruments in endodontics: a concise review of the state of the art. *Braz Oral Res*. 2018;32(1):e67. doi:10.1590/1807-3107bor-2018.vol32.0067.
24. García-Martínez E, Miguel V, Martínez-Martínez A, Manjabacas MC, Coello J. Sustainable lubrication methods for the machining of titanium alloys: An overview. *Materials (Basel)*. 2019;12(23):3852. doi:10.3390/ma12233852.
25. Karre R, Kodli BK, Rajendran A. Comparative study on Ti-Nb binary alloys fabricated through spark plasma sintering and conventional P/M routes for biomedical application. *Mater Sci Eng C Mater Biol Appl*. 2019;94:619–27.
26. Zitzmann NU, Naef R, Scharer P. Resorbable versus nonresorbable membranes in combination with Bio-Oss for guided bone regeneration. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 1997;12(6):844–52.
27. Selvig KA, Kersten BG, Chamberlain AD, Wikesjö UM, Nilvéus RE. Regenerative surgery of intrabony periodontal defects using ePTFE barrier membranes: scanning electron microscopic evaluation of retrieved membranes versus clinical healing. *J Periodontol*. 1992;63(12):974–8.
28. Tempro PJ, Nalbandian J. Colonization of retrieved polytetrafluoroethylene membranes: morphological and microbiological observations. *J Periodontol*. 1993;64(3):162–8.
29. Pihlstrom BL, Mchugh RB, Oliphant TH, Ortiz-Campos C. Comparison of surgical and nonsurgical treatment of periodontal disease: a review of current studies and additional results after 61/2 years. *J Clin Periodontol*. 1983;10(5):524–41.
30. Rasmusson L, Sennerby L, Lundgren D, Nyman S. Morphological and dimensional changes after barrier removal in bone formed beyond the skeletal borders at titanium implants: a kinetic study in the rabbit tibia. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 1997;8(2):103–16.
31. Simon BI, Hagen SV, Deasy MJ, Faldu M, Resnansky D. Changes in alveolar bone height and width following ridge augmentation using bone graft and membranes. *J Periodontol*. 2000;71(11):1774–91.

32. Piattelli A, Scarano A, Coraggio F. Early tissue reactions to polylactic acid resorbable membranes: a histological and histochemical study in rabbit. *Biomaterials*. 1998;19:889–96.
33. Arx TV, Jensen SS, Bornstein MM, Schenk RK. Membrane durability and tissue response of different bioresorbable barrier membranes: a histologic study in the rabbit calvarium. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*. 2005;20(6):843–53.
34. Wang HL, Carroll MJ. Guided bone regeneration using bone grafts and collagen membranes. *Quintessence Int*. 2001;32(7):504–15.
35. Postlethwaite AE, Seyer JM, Kang AH. Chemotactic attraction of human fibroblasts to type I, II, and III collagens and collagenderived peptides. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1978;75(2):871–5.
36. Locci P, Calvitti M, Belcastro S, Pugliese M, Guerra M, Marinucci L, et al. Phenotype expression of gingival fibroblasts cultured on membranes used in guided tissue regeneration. *J Periodontol*. 1997;68(9):857–63.
37. Schlegel AK, Mohler H, Busch F, Mehl A. Preclinical and clinical studies of a collagen membrane (Bio-Gide). *Biomaterials*. 1997;18(7):535–8.
38. Rothamel D, Schwarz F, Sculean A, Herten M, Scherbaum W, Becker J. Biocompatibility of various collagen membranes in cultures of human PDL fibroblasts and human osteoblast-like cells. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2004;15(4):443–9.
39. Pitaru S, Tal H, Soldinger M, Noff M. Collagen membranes prevent apical migration of epithelium and support new connective tissue attachment during periodontal wound healing in dogs. *J Periodontal Res*. 1989;24(4):247–53.
40. Miller N, Penaud J, Foliguet B, Membre H, Ambrosini P, Plombas M. Resorption rates of 2 commercially available bioresorbable membranes: a histomorphometric study in a rabbit model. *J Clin Periodontol*. 1996;23(12):1051–9.
41. Owens KW, Yukna RA. Collagen membrane resorption in dogs: a comparative study. *Implant Dent*. 2001;10(1):49–58.

Author biography

Himanshu Aeran, Director Principal, Professor and Head https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7723-7108

Varun Kumar, Professor https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5478-9591

Jyotsna Seth, Professor https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5356-2563

Manas Aeran, PG 2nd Year Student

Cite this article: Aeran H, Kumar V, Seth J, Aeran M. Unveiling the potential of barrier membranes in implant dentistry: A comprehensive review. *Int J Oral Health Dent* 2023;9(3):158-164.