


Adhoc®
The perfect fit




A unique product



Adhoc® is the ideal product for **screw-retained** restorations. Through an innovative manufacturing process **patented by Phibo®**, we get the best prostheses with **the perfect fit**.

- Fully digital workflow for a 100% customized rehabilitation
- Any type of rehabilitation in Cobalt-Chrome
- On any implant system,¹

¹ Check Phibo Library to see available implant platforms



A unique product

The perfect fit

Adhoc® means profitability and simplicity

Adhoc® makes your daily praxis much easier. The **digital workflow** together with **the perfect fit** result in multiple advantages.

- Less chair time for more patients, which lead into greater profitability
- Simple processes due to the CAD-CAM technology workflow
- Savings in intermediate abutments thanks to implant library


Adhoc® means
profitability & simplicity

The perfect fit

Exceptional fit

The milled connection guarantees a perfect fit of final prosthesis.


The exceptional fit results in a **higher stability in the connection** between the prosthesis and the implant. This provides long-term results in terms of **greater reliability and predictability.**




Excellent aesthetics

Thanks to an excellent porcelain adhesion.

The rugosity of the laser-sintered surface provides an **excellent porcelain adhesion**. This adhesion is much better than the obtained by a milled surface₁.



Cast/milled
with ceramics



Laser sintered
with ceramics

₁ See References section for scientific studies.
Follow ceramic load protocol for Cobalt-Chrome available in www.phibo.com

Excellent aesthetics

Benefits


Total versatility

Phibo® Library: the most extensive implant library in the market.

Thanks to Adhoc®, any type of restoration can be done on any implant system.

From single abutments to total edentulous bars, both on implant or abutment level.

phibo® library



Total versatility


Benefits

Lower risk of peri-implantitis

Adhoc® is a cement-free screw-retained solution.

Retained cement around an implant can lead to peri-implantitis, and in some cases, to implant failure.

Thanks to the Adhoc® solution, **this risk is minimized.**



Lower risk
of peri-implantitis

Axis®: we bend towards a perfect smile

The innovative angulated screw channel solution.

- Up to 20° in any direction
- Both for single and multiple unit restorations
- On implant and abutment level



Axis[®]: Just advantages for the dentist

- Easy handling and high aesthetics in anterior region
- Gain easy access in posterior regions with the angulated screw channel function
- Increased patient comfort
- Maintaining the same torque (35 Ncm) as with a straight screw channel

Aurea® Evo & Adhoc®

“the perfect couple”

You don't need to stick to only one part when you can have it all.

- Aurea® Evo, the exclusively designed implant that maintains the natural aesthetics over time
- Adhoc®, the most innovative CAD-CAM prosthetic solution in the market

Aurea® Evo & Adhoc®

“the perfect couple”

The perfect couple provides excellent aesthetics in the anterior region.

- Platform switching restorations₁
- Aurea® Evo intermediate abutments available
- Adhoc® provides excellent porcelain adhesion
- Angulated screw channel thanks to Axis®




₁ See References section for scientific studies.

Aurea® Evo & Adhoc®

“the perfect couple”

The perfect couple gives you easy access and optimal stability in the posterior region.

- **Easy access** with the Axis® angulated screw channel function
- The design of the implant tip and micro threads gives an **excellent primary stability**₁



₁ See References section for scientific studies.

References

Porcelain adhesion:

Liu Y, Wang Z, Gao B, Zhao X, Lin X and Wu J, Evaluation of mechanical properties and porcelain bonded strength of nickel-chromium dental alloy fabricated by laser rapid forming. *Lasers Med Sci.* (2010) Nov (25(6)): 799-804.

Microthread:

Palmer, R.M., Palmer, P.J. & Smith, B.J. (2000) A 5- year prospective study of Astra single tooth implants. *Clinical Oral Implants Research* 11: 179–182.

Abrahamsson, I. & Berglundh, T., 2006. Tissue characteristics at microthreaded implants: an experimental study in dogs. *Clinical implant dentistry and related research*, 8(3), pp.107–113.

Bratu, E.A., Tandlich, M. & Shapira, L., 2009. A rough surface implant neck with microthreads reduces the amount of marginal bone loss: a prospective clinical study. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 20(8), pp.827–832.

Hartog, den, L. et al., 2011. Single implants with different neck designs in the aesthetic zone: a randomized clinical trial. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, pp.no–no.

Lee, D.-W. et al., 2007. Effect of microthread on the maintenance of marginal bone level: a 3-year prospective study. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 18(4), pp.465–470.

Nickenig, H.-J. et al., 2009. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone levels adjacent to parallel-screw cylinder machined-neck implants and rough-surfaced microthreaded implants using digitized panoramic radiographs. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, pp. 1–5.

Shin, Y.-K. et al., 2006. Radiographic evaluation of marginal bone level around implants with different neck designs after 1 year. *The International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 21(5), pp.789–794.

Stein, A.E. et al., 2009. Effects of implant design and surface roughness on crestal bone and soft tissue levels in the esthetic zone. *The International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 24(5), pp.910–919.

Wennstrom, J. et al., 2005. Implant-supported single-tooth restorations: a 5-year prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 32(6), pp.567–574.

Mismatched Platform:

Albrektsson, T. et al., 1986. The long-term efficacy of currently used dental implants: a review and proposed criteria of success. *The International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 1(1), pp.11–25.

Berglundh, T. et al., 1991. The soft tissue barrier at implants and teeth. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 2(2), pp.81–90.

Ericsson, I. et al., 1995. Different types of inflammatory reactions in peri-implant soft tissues. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 22(3), pp.255–261.

Abrahamsson, I. et al., 1996. The periimplant hard and soft tissues at different implant systems. A comparative study in the dog. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 7(3), pp. 212–219.

Hermann, J. et al., 2000. Biologic width around titanium implants. A physiologically formed and stable dimension over time. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 11(1), pp.1–11.

Hermann, J. et al., 2001. Biologic Width around one- and two-piece titanium implants. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 12(6), pp.559–571.

Broggini, N. et al., 2003. Persistent acute inflammation at the implant-abutment interface. *J Dent Res*, 82(3), pp.232–237.

Hartman, G.A. & Cochran, D., 2004. Initial implant position determines the magnitude of crestal bone remodeling. *J Periodontol*, 75(4), pp.572–577.

Lazzara, R.J. & Porter, S.S., 2006. Platform switching: a new concept in implant dentistry for controlling postrestorative crestal bone levels. *The International journal of periodontics & restorative dentistry*, 26(1), pp.9–17.

Canullo, L & Rasperini, G., 2007. Preservation of peri-implant soft and hard tissues using platform switching of implants placed in immediate extraction sockets: a proof of concept study with 12- to 36-month followup. *The International journal of oral & maxillofacial implants*, 22(6), pp.995–1000.

Canullo, Luigi, Iurlaro, G. & Iannello, G., 2009. Double-blind randomized controlled trial study on post-extraction immediately restored implants using the switching platform concept: soft tissue response. Preliminary report. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 20(4), pp.414–420.

Rodríguez-Ciurana, X. et al., 2009. The effect of interimplant distance on the height of the interimplant bone crest when using platform-switched implants. *The International journal of periodontics & restorative dentistry*, 29(2), pp.141–151.

Tarnow, D.P., Cho, S.-C. & Wallace, S.S., 2000. The effect of inter-implant distance on the height of inter-implant bone crest. *Journal of Periodontology*, 71(4), pp.546–549.

Canullo, Luigi et al., 2010. Platform switching and marginal bone-level alterations: the results of a randomized-controlled trial. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 21(1), pp. 115–121.