Statement on the decision of the Berlin Regional Court regarding two-piece ceramic implants

In its ruling dated 6 June 2023 (case reference: 24 O 184/21), the Berlin Regional Court (LG) made a determination that diverged from the expert opinion procured, refusing to acknowledge the medical necessity of treatment involving two-piece ceramic implants. Conversely, the Ulm Regional Court, in its judgement of 28 July 2023 (Ref.: 3 O 75/22), affirmed the medical necessity based on the expert testimony presented.

In response to the Berlin Regional Court's decision of 6 June 2023, the Implantology Consensus Conference (KK) issues the following joint statement: "Two-piece ceramic implants fulfil the criteria of a medically necessary treatment modality provided that the same standards applied to titanium implants are adhered to during implant planning and indication determination."

A task force convened by the DGZI, comprising Dr Elisabeth Jacobi-Gresser, board member and continuing education officer, along with Assoc. Prof. Dr Stefan Röhling, board member, and including specialist lawyer for medical law and certified compliance officer Anja Mehling and Dr Alexander Raff, dentist and editor of the dental fee commentary Liebold/Raff/Wissing, unequivocally asserts its position on this matter.

Evidence supporting two-piece ceramic implants

Two-piece ceramic implants have emerged as a viable alternative to titanium implants, demonstrating equivalency in restoration while offering superior biocompatibility. Notably, they exhibit reduced bacterial adhesion

Fig. 1: Dr Elisabeth Jacobi-Gresser, Member of the Board and advanced training officer of the DGZI.

Fig. 2: Assoc. Prof. Dr Stefan Röhling, Member of the Board of the DGZI.

Fig. 3: Anja Mehling, specialist lawyer for medical law and certified compliance officer.

and heightened corrosion resistance compared to titanium counterparts. These advantageous material properties render them particularly suitable for patients prone to inflammation due to genetic predisposition, as evidenced by defined laboratory measurement parameters.

Moreover, patients with biotype 1, especially in aesthetically sensitive areas, stand to benefit from two-piece ceramic implants. Over the past 15 years, the utilisation of two-piece systems has facilitated more flexible prosthetic treatment options compared to one-piece systems. Expert experience, including long-term studies, has been amassed and recognised, even within academic settings.

> "Two-piece ceramic implants fulfil the criteria of a medically necessary treatment modality provided that the same standards applied to titanium implants are adhered to during implant planning and indication determination."

© adata – stock.adobe.com

Fig. 4: Dr Alexander Raff, dentist and editor of the dental tariff guide Liebold/Raff/Wissing.

Further advancements and enhancements in implant–abutment coupling have been integrated into various systems over several years. The culmination of these positive strides is reflected in an S3 guideline endorsing the utilisation of two-part ceramic implants as an alternative therapy following informed patient consent.

Material selection and health insurance coverage

The undersigned individuals emphasise the imperative that reimbursement authorities should not dictate the utilisation of two-piece ceramic implants in patient treatment. This determination should squarely rest upon patients and their attending dentists, contingent upon a robust and substantiated body of evidence.

Adhering to the tenets of the Berlin judgement would precipitate a significant impediment to medical treatment involving novel therapeutic methodologies lacking S3-level guideline endorsements. This would, in effect, impose substantial limitations on the adoption of emerging medical interventions.

contact

DGZI e.V.
Paulusstraße 1
40237 Düsseldorf
Germany
+49 211 1697077
sekretariat@dgzi-info.de
www.dgzi.de

DGZI e.V.