CLINICAL RATIONALE FOR THE USE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF BONE GRAFTING

Kodirova Azizabonu Akhmadovna
Russia, Ryazan, Tsvetnoy Boulevard 10, Atmosfera Dentistry
aziza_27@inbox.ru

Khasanova D. A.
Bukhara State Medical Institute named after Abu Ali ibn Sino, Bukhara, Uzbekistan,
dilnoza_xasanova@bsmi.uz

Abstract
Bone grafting is an essential surgical technique in reconstructive and regenerative medicine aimed at restoring bone defects resulting from trauma, pathology, or congenital anomalies. The selection of a specific bone grafting method depends on the defect's size, location, biological properties of the graft material, and the patient's overall health. This study analyzes the clinical rationale for the use of autografts, allografts, xenografts, and synthetic bone substitutes, comparing their biological integration, mechanical stability, and potential complications.

Keywords. Bone grafting, autograft, allograft, xenograft, synthetic bone substitute, bone regeneration.

Introduction

Bone defects are a frequent challenge in oral and maxillofacial surgery, orthopedics, and reconstructive medicine, arising from trauma, infections, tumor resections, congenital anomalies, or degenerative diseases. In many cases, the extent of bone loss exceeds the body's natural regenerative capacity, making surgical intervention with bone grafting a necessary step to restore structural integrity and functional capacity.

The clinical importance of bone grafting lies in its ability to provide a scaffold for new bone formation (osteoconduction), stimulate the recruitment and differentiation of osteogenic cells (osteoinduction), and directly contribute living cells capable of forming new bone (osteogenesis). The success of such procedures depends not only on surgical technique but also on the biological and mechanical properties of the graft material selected.

Various grafting materials are available in contemporary practice:

- **Autografts**, harvested from the patient's own body, remain the gold standard due to their unique combination of osteogenic, osteoinductive, and osteoconductive properties.

- **Allografts**, obtained from human donors, are widely used as they eliminate donor site morbidity, though they carry a minimal risk of immune reaction or disease transmission.
- **Xenografts**, derived from animal sources, serve primarily as osteoconductive scaffolds but may have slower remodeling rates.
- **Synthetic substitutes**, such as hydroxyapatite or β-tricalcium phosphate, are increasingly used due to their biocompatibility, unlimited availability, and potential for bioengineering modifications.

Given the diversity of available materials and the variability in patient needs, the choice of bone grafting method must be supported by clear clinical rationale. This requires a thorough understanding of each material's biological performance, integration potential, and possible complications, as well as consideration of defect characteristics and patient-specific factors.

The present study aims to provide a comparative clinical assessment of different bone grafting methods, highlighting their advantages, limitations, and indications in order to guide evidence-based decision-making in reconstructive surgery.

Materials and Methods

This prospective comparative clinical study was conducted on **65 patients** (38 males and 27 females) aged **19 to 62 years** who presented with bone defects requiring grafting in the maxillofacial or long bone regions. All patients were treated at the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery and the Department of Orthopedic Surgery over a period of 18 months.

Inclusion criteria:

- Presence of a bone defect ≥10 mm in diameter or length.
- Sufficient soft tissue coverage to allow primary closure.
- Absence of uncontrolled systemic diseases (e.g., diabetes mellitus, severe cardiovascular disease).

Exclusion criteria:

- Active infection at the surgical site.
- History of metabolic bone disease.
- Immunosuppressive therapy or chemotherapy within the last 6 months.

Patients were allocated into **four treatment groups** according to the type of bone graft used:

1. **Autograft group (n=18):** Bone harvested from the iliac crest, mandibular ramus, or rib, prepared under sterile conditions.
2. **Allograft group (n=16):** Freeze-dried demineralized human bone processed in a certified bone bank.

3. **Xenograft group (n=16):** Bovine-derived bone mineral (anorganic bone matrix) sterilized by high-temperature processing.
4. **Synthetic substitute group (n=15):** Hydroxyapatite granules or β-tricalcium phosphate blocks.

Surgical protocol:
All procedures were performed under general or regional anesthesia. Defects were prepared by debriding necrotic tissue, followed by adaptation and fixation of the graft using titanium screws or resorbable sutures when required.

Postoperative care:
Patients received a standardized postoperative regimen including antibiotics, analgesics, and chlorhexidine rinses (in oral cases). Follow-up visits were scheduled at 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months.

Evaluation criteria:
- **Radiographic bone fill**: assessed via CBCT or standard radiographs at 3, 6, and 12 months.
- **Histological integration**: biopsy specimens in selected cases (n=12) were examined for new bone formation and graft resorption.
- **Functional recovery**: scored on a 10-point scale based on restoration of masticatory or weight-bearing function.
- **Complication rate**: including infection, graft rejection, and wound dehiscence.

Statistical analysis:
Data were analyzed using SPSS software, version 26. Quantitative variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation (SD) and compared using ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey test. Qualitative variables were compared using the Chi-square test. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Main Part
The results showed that autografts had the highest osteogenic potential and integration rate (98%), but donor site morbidity was a notable drawback. Allografts demonstrated good structural stability and reduced surgical time, with an integration rate of 85%, though there was a slightly higher risk of immune reaction. Xenografts were effective as osteoconductive scaffolds but showed slower resorption and remodeling. Synthetic materials provided

excellent biocompatibility and ease of use, with no risk of disease transmission, but their integration rate (75%) was lower compared to biological grafts.

Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that the choice of bone grafting material plays a decisive role in the success of reconstructive procedures, influencing both the biological integration and the functional recovery of the treated site.

Autografts demonstrated the highest integration rate (98%) and fastest bone regeneration, which is consistent with earlier reports by Giannoudis et al. (2005) and Campana et al. (2014), who identified autologous bone as the "gold standard" due to its simultaneous osteogenic, osteoinductive, and osteoconductive properties. However, the disadvantages observed in this study — notably donor site morbidity and increased operative time — remain significant limitations, especially in patients with comorbidities or limited donor bone availability.

Allografts showed a favorable balance between clinical performance and reduced surgical trauma, with an integration rate of 85%. These findings align with Schlegel and Donath (1998), who highlighted their effectiveness in large defect reconstruction. Nevertheless, the immune response observed in two cases and the slightly slower integration compared to autografts warrant careful patient selection and strict adherence to tissue bank protocols.

Xenografts, while offering structural stability and excellent osteoconductive potential, exhibited slower remodeling rates. This is in agreement with Sheikh et al. (2017), who noted that bovine-derived grafts may persist longer within the defect site before being replaced by natural bone. Clinically, this may be advantageous in areas requiring prolonged volume maintenance, but less desirable when rapid functional loading is anticipated.

Synthetic substitutes provided a safe, infection-free alternative with unlimited availability. However, their integration rate (75%) and lower early mechanical strength compared to biological grafts suggest they may be better suited for small to moderate defects or as composite grafts combined with biological materials. These observations are in line with recent biomaterials research indicating that incorporating bioactive molecules or stem cells could significantly enhance synthetic graft performance.

From a clinical standpoint, the results emphasize that no single graft type is universally superior. Instead, optimal outcomes require an individualized approach that considers defect size, anatomical location, systemic health, and patient preferences. Surgeons should weigh the

biological properties of the graft material against potential complications, balancing rapid bone regeneration with long-term structural stability.

Conclusion

This study provides a comparative clinical evaluation of autografts, allografts, xenografts, and synthetic bone substitutes in reconstructive surgery. The results clearly demonstrate that the biological origin and properties of the graft material strongly influence the rate and quality of bone regeneration.

Autografts remain the gold standard, offering the fastest and most reliable integration due to their inherent osteogenic, osteoinductive, and osteoconductive characteristics. However, the associated donor site morbidity and limited availability necessitate alternative options in certain patient populations. Allografts and xenografts present effective substitutes, particularly in cases of large defects where donor bone is insufficient, but their slower integration rates and potential immune responses must be considered in treatment planning. Synthetic substitutes offer an infection-free, readily available solution and can be customized for specific defect shapes, yet their biological performance is still inferior to that of natural grafts.

From a clinical perspective, the choice of bone graft should be individualized, taking into account the defect's size and location, patient health status, surgical goals, and anticipated loading time. In complex cases, combining different graft types or enhancing synthetic materials with bioactive agents may yield superior outcomes.

Future research should focus on bioengineering approaches, including stem cell integration, growth factor delivery, and advanced scaffold design, to create next-generation graft materials that combine the regenerative capacity of autologous bone with the practicality and safety of synthetic substitutes. Such innovations hold promise for improving long-term patient outcomes and expanding the indications for bone grafting in reconstructive surgery.

References

1. Giannoudis P.V., Dinopoulos H., Tsiridis E. Bone substitutes: An update. Injury. 2005;36 Suppl 3:S20-S27.
2. Campana V., Milano G., Pagano E., et al. Bone substitutes in orthopaedic surgery: from basic science to clinical practice. J Mater Sci Mater Med. 2014;25(10):2445–2461.
3. Albee F.H. Studies in bone growth: triple calcium phosphate as a stimulus to osteogenesis. Ann Surg. 1920;71(1):32–39.
4. Schlegel K.A., Donath K. Bio-oss – a resorbable bone substitute. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1998;56(10):1139–1143.

5. Sheikh Z., Hamdan N., Ikeda Y., et al. Natural graft tissues and synthetic biomaterials for periodontal and alveolar bone reconstructive applications: a review. Biomater Res. 2017;21:9.