(ISSN: 0973-7049(P))

The Bioscan AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF LIFE SCIENCES

21(3, 890-898, 2026 www.thebioscan.com

Nanotechnology in Maxillofacial Prosthodontics: Trends and Future Directions

Gracika Kathuria[1], Dr. Arpita Paul[2*], Aditi Mishra[3], Anveer Kaur[4], Dr Sumathi K Nitin[5]

[1,3]BDS Student, Manav Rachna Dental College, MRIIRS
[2*]Senior Lecturer, Manav Rachna Dental College, MRIIRS
[4]BDS Intern, Luxmibai Institute of Dental and Health Sciences, Patiala, Punjab
[5]Reader, Dept of Prosthodontics and Crown &Bridge, Hitkarini Dental College & Hospital, Jabalpur -482002, Madhya Pradesh
***Corresponding Author: Dr Arpita Paul,** arpitapaul312@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i03.pp890-898

KEYWORDS
Nanotechnology; Maxillofacial Prosthodontics; Nanoparticles; Maxillofacial Silicone; Nanocomposites; Craniofacial Implants; Tissue Engineering; 3D Bioprinting; Antimicrobial Nanoparticles; Regenerative Prosthodontics.

Received on: 17/07/2026

Revised on: 28/08/2026

Accepted on: 07/09/2026

Published on: 14/09/2026

Abstract

Maxillofacial prosthodontics provides prosthetic rehabilitation for patients with congenital, developmental, traumatic, and acquired craniofacial defects. Silicone elastomers remain the principal materials for extraoral facial prostheses because of their flexibility, biocompatibility, ease of manipulation, and ability to reproduce the texture of facial soft tissues. Nevertheless, inadequate mechanical strength, color instability, ultraviolet degradation, surface deterioration, microbial colonization, and limited clinical longevity continue to compromise long-term outcomes. Nanotechnology has emerged as a promising approach for modifying prosthetic materials and implant interfaces at the molecular and nanoscale levels.

This narrative review aims to summarize the current applications of nanotechnology in maxillofacial prosthodontics, critically discuss available evidence, identify emerging trends, and explore future opportunities for nanoengineered materials, implant surfaces, tissue engineering, drug delivery, additive manufacturing, biosensing, and regenerative rehabilitation.
Nanotechnology represents an important emerging platform for improving the durability, biological performance, and functionality of maxillofacial prostheses. However, most evidence remains laboratory-based, and considerable uncertainty persists regarding long-term stability, nanoparticle release, cytotoxicity, standardization, manufacturing reproducibility, and regulatory approval. Future research should prioritize standardized protocols, clinically relevant aging models, long-term clinical trials, and integration of nanotechnology with digital dentistry, additive manufacturing, artificial intelligence, and regenerative medicine.

1. INTRODUCTION

Maxillofacial prosthodontics occupies a unique position at the intersection of prosthodontics, reconstructive surgery, biomaterials science, and rehabilitation medicine. Patients requiring maxillofacial prostheses may present with defects resulting from head and neck malignancies, trauma, congenital anomalies, burns, infection, or developmental disorders. Depending on the location and extent of tissue loss, rehabilitation may involve auricular, orbital, nasal, midfacial, or larger facial prostheses. The objectives extend beyond restoration of appearance and include psychological rehabilitation, social reintegration, speech and swallowing support, protection of exposed tissues, and restoration of functional facial structures.

Silicone elastomers have become the principal materials for many extraoral maxillofacial prostheses because their flexibility, translucency, and relatively skin-like texture permit reproduction of facial soft tissues. However, currently available silicones remain imperfect. Their clinical service life is affected by ultraviolet radiation, atmospheric oxygen, temperature fluctuations, pigmentation instability, mechanical fatigue, surface degradation, and microbial contamination. Progressive deterioration may manifest as loss of elasticity, changes in hardness, tearing, discoloration, marginal deterioration, and loss of intimate adaptation to the underlying tissues. These limitations have stimulated continuous research into material modification.

Nanotechnology provides an attractive strategy because materials exhibit distinctive physicochemical behavior when engineered at the nanometer scale. Nanoparticles possess a high surface-area-to-volume ratio and can alter polymer matrices, surface energy, optical behavior, mechanical properties, and biological interactions. Nanoparticles have consequently been investigated throughout dentistry for antimicrobial applications, implant surface modification, restorative materials, prosthetic materials, drug delivery, and tissue engineering.[1-3]

Within maxillofacial prosthodontics, the most developed area of research is nanoparticle modification of silicone elastomers. Titanium dioxide, zinc oxide, silicon dioxide, cerium oxide, silver, zirconium-containing materials, and other nanoparticles have been investigated to improve mechanical properties, color stability, ultraviolet resistance, and antimicrobial activity. A systematic review by Sonnahalli and Chowdhary identified 21 eligible studies and concluded that nanoparticle incorporation could improve several physical, mechanical, and biological properties of maxillofacial silicone, although the evidence was predominantly laboratory-based.[4]

The application of nanotechnology is not restricted to silicone. Nanoengineered implant surfaces may influence osteoblast adhesion and osseointegration; nanofibrous scaffolds can reproduce aspects of extracellular matrix architecture; nanocomposite hydrogels can combine structural and biological functions; and nanoparticle-based delivery systems may provide controlled release of therapeutic molecules.[5–9]

The convergence of nanotechnology with digital dentistry, additive manufacturing, artificial intelligence, tissue engineering, and regenerative medicine therefore presents an opportunity to move maxillofacial prosthodontics from conventional tissue replacement toward biologically interactive and potentially regenerative rehabilitation.

2. NANOTECHNOLOGY: BASIC CONCEPTS RELEVANT TO MAXILLOFACIAL PROSTHODONTICS

Nanotechnology generally involves the manipulation and engineering of materials at approximately 1–100 nm in at least one dimension.[8] At this scale, changes in surface area, particle morphology, surface charge, crystallinity, and interfacial interactions can substantially alter material behavior. Nanomaterials relevant to maxillofacial prosthodontics can broadly be divided into:

2.1 Metallic Nanoparticles

Examples include:

- Silver nanoparticles
- Gold nanoparticles
- Copper nanoparticles
- Platinum nanoparticles

Among these, silver nanoparticles have received particular attention because of their antimicrobial properties.

2.2 Metal Oxide Nanoparticles

Important examples include:

- Titanium dioxide (TiO_2)
- Zinc oxide (ZnO)
- Cerium oxide (CeO_2)
- Zirconium dioxide (ZrO_2)

These materials have been investigated for UV protection, optical modification, reinforcement, and antimicrobial effects.

2.3 Silica-Based Nanoparticles

Nano-silica may function as a reinforcing filler within polymeric matrices. Its surface chemistry can be modified to improve compatibility with silicone.

2.4 Carbon-Based Nanomaterials

Graphene, graphene oxide, carbon nanotubes, and nanodiamonds possess exceptional mechanical and physicochemical properties. Their potential in craniofacial biomaterials is substantial, although their routine clinical use in maxillofacial prostheses remains experimental.

2.5 Nanostructured Biological Materials

Nano-hydroxyapatite, bioactive glass nanoparticles, nanocellulose, and nanofibrous polymer scaffolds are particularly relevant to tissue engineering and craniofacial bone regeneration.

3. MECHANICAL ENHANCEMENT OF MAXILLOFACIAL SILICONE

The principal limitation of conventional maxillofacial silicone is that improvement in one property may occur at the expense of another. For example, increasing filler concentration may improve hardness but compromise flexibility. Similarly, conventional pigments and opacifiers may influence color stability without adequately protecting the polymer from ultraviolet degradation. Nanoparticles offer an alternative because their very small dimensions and large specific surface area permit relatively efficient interaction with polymer chains.

Potential effects include:

1. Reinforcement of the silicone matrix;
2. Modification of surface characteristics;
3. Uv absorption or scattering;
4. Alteration of optical properties;
5. Antimicrobial activity;
6. Modification of hardness and elasticity;
7. Improved resistance to environmental degradation.

4. NANOTECHNOLOGY IN MAXILLOFACIAL SILICONE ELASTOMERS

4.1 Nano-silica

Silicon dioxide nanoparticles have been investigated extensively as reinforcing fillers. Zayed et al. evaluated surface-treated SiO_2 nanoparticles in A-2186 maxillofacial silicone at concentrations between 0.5% and 3% by weight. Their study demonstrated significant improvements in tear strength, tensile strength, elongation, and Shore A hardness, with the 3% concentration producing an overall improvement in the tested mechanical properties.[10]

The reinforcing effect is attributed to interactions between the nanoparticles and silicone matrix. Surface treatment can improve dispersion and reduce nanoparticle agglomeration, thereby enhancing stress transfer across the polymer-filler interface. However, increased filler concentration should not automatically be interpreted as clinically superior. Excessive nanoparticle loading can increase stiffness, compromise flexibility, alter optical properties, or promote agglomeration. Thus, an optimum concentration rather than maximum concentration is likely to be clinically desirable.

4.2 Titanium dioxide and zinc oxide

TiO_2 and ZnO have been studied for both mechanical and optical effects. A 2021 in-vitro study investigating particle size demonstrated that the size and concentration of nano-TiO_2 and nano-ZnO influenced hardness, color stability, and surface roughness after artificial aging. Twenty-nanometer TiO_2 demonstrated favorable maintenance of properties in the investigated A-2186 silicone, suggesting that nanoparticle size is an important design variable rather than simply the chemical identity of the nanoparticle.[11]

4.3 Hardness

Hardness is clinically relevant because an excessively hard facial prosthesis may feel unnatural and produce unfavorable tissue interaction, whereas insufficient hardness may compromise handling and structural stability. Çevik evaluated silica, silanized silica, and TiO_2 nanoparticles in RTV maxillofacial silicones and reported that nanoparticle type influenced Shore A hardness. Importantly, two years of dark storage still resulted in changes in hardness, indicating that nanoparticle incorporation does not necessarily eliminate time-dependent material aging.[12] This finding illustrates a critical point: nanotechnology should be viewed as a means of optimizing material performance rather than as a complete solution to polymer degradation.

5. NANOTECHNOLOGY FOR COLOR STABILITY AND OPTICAL PERFORMANCE

Color is one of the most important determinants of success in facial prostheses because even a mechanically excellent prosthesis may be clinically unacceptable if its color does not match the surrounding tissues.
Silicone color degradation results from pigment instability, environmental exposure, ultraviolet radiation, oxidation, and changes in the polymer itself.

5.1 Nano-oxides as UV-protective agents

Nanoparticles such as TiO_2, ZnO, and CeO_2 can interact with ultraviolet radiation through absorption and scattering mechanisms. The systematic review by Sonnahalli and Chowdhary found evidence that several nanoparticles could improve color stability of maxillofacial silicone.[4] A subsequent systematic review and meta-analysis specifically evaluating color stability found comparatively homogeneous data for TiO_2, although substantial heterogeneity existed among other nanoparticle studies.[13].

5.2 Titanium dioxide nanocoating

An important development has been the use of nanoparticles as surface coatings rather than as bulk fillers.
Bishal et al. investigated TiO_2 nanocoating deposited by atomic layer deposition onto maxillofacial silicone. After artificial accelerated aging, the TiO_2-coated specimens demonstrated significantly less color change than the uncoated controls. The investigators reported that the TiO_2 nanolayer remained detectable after artificial aging.[14]
This approach is particularly interesting because surface modification may reduce the need to alter the bulk mechanical properties of the silicone.

6. ANTIMICROBIAL NANOTECHNOLOGY

Microbial colonization is an important problem for maxillofacial prostheses. The prosthesis is exposed to skin secretions, moisture, environmental contaminants, and repeated handling. Candida species and bacterial biofilms may colonize prosthetic surfaces.

6.1 Silver nanoparticles

Silver nanoparticles have strong antimicrobial activity because silver ions and nanosilver surfaces can interfere with microbial membranes, proteins, enzymes, and nucleic acids. Meran et al. evaluated Ag nanoparticle coatings on silicone facial prosthetic materials. The study investigated both antifungal efficacy against Candida albicans and compatibility with human dermal fibroblasts. Silver nanoparticle coatings reduced fungal activity while maintaining fibroblast compatibility under the conditions tested.[15]
These findings are encouraging, but they should not be extrapolated directly to long-term clinical effectiveness.

6.2 Antimicrobial mechanisms

Potential mechanisms include:
- Disruption of microbial cell membranes;
- Interaction with sulfhydryl groups of proteins;
- Generation of reactive oxygen species;
- Interference with microbial respiration;
- Interaction with nucleic acids;
- Inhibition of biofilm development.

6.3 Disinfection and nanoparticle-modified silicone

An additional consideration is whether conventional cleaning and disinfection procedures alter the performance of nanoparticle-modified silicone. Recent in-vitro research has specifically investigated the effects of chemical disinfectants on silver nanoparticle-containing maxillofacial silicone, emphasizing the importance of evaluating color, hardness, and surface roughness after clinically relevant maintenance procedures.[16] Future research should therefore evaluate not only the initial antimicrobial activity of nanoparticles but also the durability of that activity after repeated cleaning, disinfectant exposure, ultraviolet aging, mechanical manipulation, and artificial perspiration.

7. NANOSTRUCTURED IMPLANT SURFACES IN MAXILLOFACIAL PROSTHODONTICS

Implant-retained maxillofacial prostheses have improved retention and patient confidence, particularly for auricular, orbital, and nasal prostheses. However, the long-term success of these systems depends on stable bone-implant integration and healthy peri-implant soft tissues.

7.1 Biological significance of Nanotopography

At the bone-implant interface, cells interact with surface characteristics at the micro- and nanoscale. Nanostructured surfaces can modify protein adsorption, cell adhesion, cytoskeletal organization, and osteoblastic differentiation. A systematic review of nanostructured titanium surfaces found that the majority of included studies reported favorable effects on osteoblast proliferation, although the authors emphasized the need for standardized investigations to identify the optimal surface configuration.[17]

7.2 Titanium Surface Modification

Techniques used to generate nanoengineered titanium surfaces include:

- Anodization;
- Acid Etching;
- Nanostructured Calcium Phosphate Deposition;
- Nanotube Formation;
- Ion Implantation;
- Biomimetic Coatings.

These approaches aim to improve the biological response without compromising mechanical integrity. Mendonça et al. reviewed advances in dental implant surface technology and highlighted the increasing importance of surface chemistry and topography in biological integration.[18]

7.3 Relevance to craniofacial implants

Although much of the evidence originates from conventional dental implant research, the biological principles are directly relevant to craniofacial implants. Improved osseointegration may potentially:

- increase implant stability;
- shorten healing periods;
- improve load tolerance;
- reduce failure;
- enhance retention of implant-retained facial prostheses.

Nevertheless, craniofacial implant sites differ from intraoral implant sites with respect to bone quality, loading, hygiene, soft-tissue environment, and prosthetic forces. Therefore, direct clinical extrapolation should be made cautiously.

8. NANOTECHNOLOGY IN CRANIOFACIAL TISSUE ENGINEERING

The most transformative future application of nanotechnology may be its ability to support regeneration rather than simply replacement of missing tissue. Tissue engineering traditionally combines cells, scaffolds, and biological signaling molecules. Nanotechnology adds the ability to control these components at a scale comparable with native extracellular matrix. Langer and Vacanti established the conceptual framework of tissue engineering as a means of developing biological substitutes capable of restoring or improving tissue function.[19] Nanotechnology has subsequently provided new strategies for controlling cellular microenvironments.

8.1 Nanofibrous scaffolds

Electrospinning can produce fibers ranging from micrometer to nanometer dimensions. Such structures may reproduce important features of the extracellular matrix and provide high surface area for cellular interaction.[20]

Nanofibrous scaffolds may be fabricated from:

- Pcl;
- Pla;
- Plga;
- Collagen;
- Gelatin;
- Chitosan;
- Composite Polymers.

8.2 Nanotopography and Stem-Cell Differentiation

Cells respond not only to biochemical signals but also to physical characteristics of their substrate. Nanotopography can influence:

- Cell Adhesion;
- Focal Adhesion Formation;
- Cytoskeletal Organization;
- Proliferation;
- Differentiation;
- Extracellular Matrix Production.

Dalby and colleagues demonstrated the importance of nanotopographical cues in controlling stem-cell fate, highlighting the possibility of engineering materials that actively direct cellular behavior.[21]

8.3 Nano-hydroxyapatite

Nano-hydroxyapatite resembles the mineral phase of natural bone and can provide osteoconductive characteristics. It may be incorporated into polymeric scaffolds to create composites combining:

- Polymer Flexibility;
- Structural Support;
- Mineral Bioactivity;
- Osteogenic Potential.

Such materials are particularly relevant to reconstruction of maxillofacial bone defects.

9. NANOCOMPOSITE HYDROGELS

Hydrogels have attracted substantial attention in regenerative medicine because their hydrated structure resembles the biological environment surrounding cells. Nanocomposite hydrogels incorporate nanoparticles into hydrogel networks to improve mechanical properties and introduce additional biological or physicochemical functions.[22] Potential applications in maxillofacial rehabilitation include:

- Soft-Tissue Regeneration;
- Wound Healing;
- Bone Regeneration;
- Localized Drug Delivery;
- Incorporation Of Growth Factors;
- Cell Encapsulation.

Nanocomposite hydrogels can potentially be engineered to respond to specific biological stimuli, creating dynamic materials rather than passive scaffolds.

10. NANOTECHNOLOGY-BASED DRUG DELIVERY

Nanotechnology offers the possibility of localized and controlled delivery of therapeutic molecules.

Nanocarriers can be designed to transport:

- antibiotics;
- anti-inflammatory drugs;
- growth factors;
- genes;
- proteins;
- anticancer agents.

Farokhzad and Langer described the potential of nanotechnology to transform controlled drug delivery by improving spatial and temporal control of therapeutic molecules.[23] In maxillofacial prosthodontics, potential applications include localized delivery around craniofacial implants, treatment of peri-implant inflammation, postoperative wound management, and regenerative tissue engineering.

10.1 Growth-factor delivery

Growth factors such as bone morphogenetic proteins and vascular endothelial growth factor could theoretically be delivered from nanoengineered scaffolds to promote bone formation and vascularization. However, uncontrolled exposure to potent growth factors may result in adverse effects. Therefore, controlled release rather than simply increasing growth-factor concentration is a major objective.

10.2 Antimicrobial delivery

Nanoparticle-based delivery may permit sustained antimicrobial concentrations at the prosthesis-tissue or implant-tissue interface while minimizing systemic exposure.

11. NANOTECHNOLOGY-BASED DRUG DELIVERY

Digital dentistry has transformed the design and fabrication of maxillofacial prostheses. Three-dimensional imaging, CAD/CAM, facial scanning, virtual planning, and additive manufacturing permit improved reproduction of complex anatomy. The next step is the development of printable nanocomposite materials.

11.1 Nano-reinforced printable materials

- Potential Materials Include:
- Nano-Hydroxyapatite Composites;
- Graphene-Containing Polymers;
- Bioactive Glass Nanocomposites;
- Nanoparticle-Reinforced Photopolymers;
- Antimicrobial Nanoparticle-Containing Materials.

The objective is to combine printability with appropriate mechanical, optical, and biological properties.

12.2 3D Bioprinting

Three-dimensional bioprinting differs from conventional prosthetic printing because living cells and bioactive materials may be incorporated into the construct. Potential craniofacial applications include:

- Auricular Cartilage Regeneration;
- Nasal Cartilage Regeneration;
- Craniofacial Bone Regeneration;
- Soft-Tissue Reconstruction.

Recent reviews have emphasized the growing role of advanced biomaterials and bioprinting in craniofacial and dental tissue engineering.[24] Nevertheless, vascularization, long-term mechanical stability, cellular viability, printing resolution, and regulatory requirements remain major barriers to clinical translation.

12. NANOTECHNOLOGY-BASED DRUG DELIVERY

The development of smart prosthetic materials represents a longer-term direction. Nanomaterials can contribute to miniaturized sensors capable of detecting biochemical or physical changes. Potential parameters include:

- temperature;
- pH;
- microbial activity;
- inflammatory markers;
- tissue oxygenation;
- mechanical strain;
- implant stability.

A future implant-retained facial prosthesis could theoretically incorporate nanosensors that communicate with an external device and identify early biological or mechanical complications. Such systems remain largely experimental and should not be presented as established clinical technology.

13. SELF-HEALING AND STIMULI-RESPONSIVE NANOMATERIALS

Conventional silicone prostheses are passive materials. Once a crack or tear develops, the material cannot biologically or chemically repair itself. Self-healing nanocomposites are being investigated in broader biomaterials research. These materials may use reversible chemical bonds, microcapsules, supramolecular interactions, or dynamic polymer networks to restore structural integrity after damage. Stimuli-responsive materials may react to:

- Temperature;
- Ph;
- Light;
- Electrical Signals;
- Mechanical Stress.

The long-term vision is a facial prosthesis capable of sensing environmental changes and responding to them. However, the transition from experimental self-healing materials to clinically acceptable facial prostheses will require extensive testing for toxicity, durability, skin compatibility, color stability, and repeated healing cycles.

14. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND NANOTECHNOLOGY

Artificial intelligence may accelerate nanomaterial development by identifying relationships between composition, particle size, concentration, surface characteristics, and material performance. Machine-learning models could potentially predict:

- Optimal Nanoparticle Concentration;
- Mechanical Behavior;
- Color Stability;
- Degradation Patterns;
- Biological Responses;
- Antimicrobial Effectiveness.

This approach may reduce the number of empirical experiments required during material development. AI may also facilitate individualized prosthetic fabrication by integrating facial scanning, CBCT, photographic data, tissue characteristics, and material properties.

The future could therefore involve a workflow in which:

Patient imaging → AI-based defect analysis → virtual prosthetic design → selection of nanoengineered material → digital fabrication → quality prediction → long-term monitoring This represents a convergence of prosthodontics, computational design, nanomaterials science, and precision medicine.

15. NANOTOXICOLOGY AND BIOCOMPATIBILITY

The potential benefits of nanomaterials must be balanced against possible biological risks. Nanoparticle toxicity is influenced by:

- Particle Size;
- Morphology;
- Surface Area;
- Surface Charge;
- Chemical Composition;
- Solubility;
- Concentration;
- Route And Duration Of Exposure.

Nanomaterials may interact with cellular membranes and intracellular structures differently from their bulk counterparts. Nel et al. emphasized that nanoscale materials may generate biological effects through oxidative stress, inflammation, and other cellular mechanisms.[25] Oberdörster et al. similarly highlighted the importance of understanding nanoparticle-specific toxicological behavior.[26]

For maxillofacial prostheses, safety assessment should include:

- Cytotoxicity;
- Genotoxicity;
- Inflammatory Response;
- Skin Sensitization;
- Nanoparticle Release;
- Systemic Exposure;
- Degradation Products;
- Long-Term Tissue Compatibility.

A particularly important issue is whether nanoparticles remain permanently immobilized within the silicone or are released during aging, cleaning, abrasion, and mechanical manipulation.

16. MANUFACTURING AND STANDARDIZATION CHALLENGES

Clinical translation requires reproducible manufacturing. Variables that can influence nanoparticle performance include:

- •Particle Size;
- •Particle Shape;
- •Concentration;
- •Surface Functionalization;
- •Dispersion Method;

- •Mixing Technique;
- •Polymer Chemistry;
- •Curing Conditions.

Nanoparticle agglomeration can result in uneven mechanical properties and unpredictable biological behavior. Standardized protocols are therefore required for:

- •Nanoparticle Characterization;
- •Dispersion Analysis;
- •Mechanical Testing;
- •Color Measurement;
- •Accelerated Aging;
- •Microbial Testing;
- •Cytotoxicity Assessment;
- •Nanoparticle Release Testing.

Without standardized methodology, comparison between studies remains difficult.

17. CLINICAL TRANSLATION: FROM LABORATORY TO PATIENT

The majority of evidence concerning nanoparticle-modified maxillofacial silicones originates from laboratory studies. The 2020 systematic review specifically noted that the available evidence was predominantly in vitro and that clinical studies were necessary to establish whether laboratory improvements translate into improved prosthesis longevity.[4] This distinction is critical. An increase in tensile strength in a laboratory specimen does not necessarily mean that a facial prosthesis will remain clinically intact for a longer period. Similarly, reduced color change under an accelerated aging chamber does not perfectly reproduce sunlight, sweat, cosmetics, cleansing agents, pollution, temperature variation, and mechanical manipulation experienced by a patient.

Future studies should therefore use clinically relevant:

- •artificial perspiration;
- •UV exposure;
- •thermal cycling;
- •repeated disinfection;
- •mechanical fatigue;
- •skin-contact conditions;
- •microbial biofilms.

Ultimately, randomized or prospective clinical studies are required.

18. CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The development of nanotechnology in maxillofacial prosthodontics can be conceptualized across five progressive stages.

Stage I: Material reinforcement

Nanoparticles are incorporated into conventional silicone to improve mechanical properties.

Stage II: Surface engineering

Nanocoatings are applied to provide UV protection, antimicrobial properties, or altered surface behavior.

Stage III: Bioactive prosthetic materials

Nanomaterials begin to interact actively with tissues and biological processes.

Stage IV: Regenerative prosthodontics

Nanoengineered scaffolds, stem cells, growth factors, and bioprinting are combined to regenerate tissues.

Stage V: Intelligent prostheses

Nanosensors, AI, wireless communication, responsive materials, and regenerative systems are integrated into a single personalized rehabilitation platform.

The fifth stage remains largely conceptual, but it provides a useful framework for directing research.

19. ADVANTAGES OF NANOTECHNOLOGY IN MAXILLOFACIAL PROSTHODONTICS

The principal potential advantages are summarized below:

- Improved Mechanical Strength;
- Improved Tear Resistance;
- Enhanced Color Stability;
- Ultraviolet Protection;
- Antimicrobial Activity;
- Improved Surface Characteristics;
- Enhanced Implant-Bone Interaction;
- Controlled Drug Delivery;
- Regenerative Potential;
- Compatibility With Additive Manufacturing;
- Potential For Smart Monitoring;
- Possibility Of Personalized Prosthetic Rehabilitation.

20. LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT EVIDENCE

Despite promising findings, several limitations must be recognized.First, most studies on nanoparticle-modified maxillofacial silicone are in vitro. Second, different studies use different silicone systems, nanoparticle concentrations, particle sizes, aging protocols, and testing methods. Third, laboratory aging cannot completely replicate the complex environment encountered clinically. Fourth, there is no universally accepted nanoparticle concentration that provides the best balance between mechanical reinforcement, flexibility, color stability, and biological safety. Fifth, long-term nanoparticle release and systemic exposure remain inadequately characterized. Finally, the majority of regenerative and smart-material applications remain experimental and should not yet be considered established treatment modalities.

Future research should focus on the following areas:

Studies should report particle size, morphology, concentration, surface treatment, dispersion method, and characterization techniques. Testing should combine UV exposure, thermal cycling, perspiration, mechanical fatigue, and repeated disinfection. Long-duration cellular, animal, and clinical studies are necessary to establish nanoparticle safety.Clinical trials should investigate whether nanoparticle modification actually increases prosthesis service life and patient satisfaction. Research should investigate printable nanocomposites compatible with digital maxillofacial prosthesis fabrication. Nanofibrous scaffolds, nanocomposite hydrogels, stem cells, growth factors, and bioprinting should be studied as integrated systems rather than isolated technologies. Future investigations should also consider the environmental impact of nanoparticle-containing materials during manufacturing, disposal, and degradation.

Table 1. Major Nanomaterials Investigated in Maxillofacial Prosthodontics

Nanomaterial	Principal property	Potential application	Evidence status
TiO_2	UV protection, optical modification	Silicone, surface coatings	In vitro
ZnO	UV protection, antimicrobial activity	Silicone modification	In vitro
SiO_2	Mechanical reinforcement	Silicone elastomers	In vitro
CeO_2	UV/oxidative protection	Silicone modification	Experimental
Ag	Antimicrobial activity	Prosthetic coatings	In vitro
ZrO_2	Mechanical reinforcement	Nanocomposites	Experimental
Nano-hydroxyapatite	Osteoconductivity	Bone regeneration	Preclinical/experimental
Graphene/graphene oxide	Mechanical and biological activity	Advanced composites	Experimental
Carbon nanotubes	Mechanical reinforcement	Experimental biomaterials	Experimental
Bioactive glass nanoparticles	Osteogenic/bioactive activity	Craniofacial scaffolds	Preclinical

Table 2. Applications of Nanotechnology in Maxillofacial Prosthodontics

Clinical/research area	Nanotechnology approach	Expected benefit
Facial prostheses	Nano-reinforced silicone	Improved mechanical properties
Color stability	TiO_2/ZnO/CeO_2	Reduced photodegradation
Antimicrobial protection	Ag, ZnO and other nanoparticles	Reduced microbial colonization
Implant retention	Nanostructured titanium	Improved biological integration
Bone regeneration	Nano-hydroxyapatite	Osteoconductive environment
Tissue engineering	Nanofibrous scaffolds	ECM-mimetic architecture
Drug delivery	Polymeric/metallic nanocarriers	Controlled local release
3D printing	Nanocomposite bioinks	Improved mechanical/biological performance
Biosensing	Nano-biosensors	Real-time monitoring
Smart prostheses	Responsive nanomaterials	Adaptive behavior

Table 3. Evidence Level for Major Applications

Application	Current evidence	Clinical readiness
Nano-silica reinforced silicone	In vitro	Low-moderate
TiO_2 for color stability	In vitro/systematic review	Low-moderate
Ag nanoparticle antimicrobial coatings	In vitro	Low

Application	Current evidence	Clinical readiness
Nanostructured titanium	In vitro/in vivo implant literature	Moderate
Nanofibrous scaffolds	Preclinical	Low
Nano-hydroxyapatite scaffolds	Preclinical/experimental	Low–moderate
Nanoparticle drug delivery	Broad biomedical evidence	Experimental for maxillofacial prosthodontics
Nano-enabled 3D bioprinting	Experimental	Low
Nanosensors in facial prostheses	Experimental	Very low
Self-healing facial prostheses	Experimental	Very low

21. CONCLUSION

Nanotechnology has emerged as a promising platform for addressing several longstanding limitations of maxillofacial prosthodontic materials. The strongest current evidence concerns modification of silicone elastomers with nanoparticles and nanocoatings. Titanium dioxide, zinc oxide, silicon dioxide, cerium oxide, and silver-based systems have demonstrated potential to improve selected mechanical, optical, environmental, and antimicrobial characteristics. In particular, nano-silica has demonstrated mechanical reinforcement, while TiO_2 nanocoatings have shown promising protection against color degradation under artificial aging. Silver nanoparticle coatings have also demonstrated antifungal activity against Candida albicans while maintaining fibroblast compatibility in vitro. Nanotechnology also provides an important platform for improving craniofacial implant interfaces. Nanostructured titanium surfaces can influence protein adsorption and osteoblast behavior and may contribute to enhanced osseointegration.

The longer-term potential of nanotechnology extends beyond modification of existing prosthetic materials. Nanofibrous scaffolds, nanocomposite hydrogels, nano-hydroxyapatite, controlled drug-delivery systems, and nanoengineered bioinks may ultimately facilitate regenerative approaches to craniofacial reconstruction. The integration of these technologies with digital imaging, CAD/CAM, additive manufacturing, artificial intelligence, and biosensing could create a new generation of individualized maxillofacial rehabilitation. The future of nanotechnology in maxillofacial prosthodontics therefore lies not simply in adding nanoparticles to existing materials but in developing functionally integrated, biologically informed, digitally manufactured, and patient-specific prosthetic systems. Translational research that connects material science with clinical prosthodontics will be essential for converting promising nanoscale concepts into safe, predictable, and clinically meaningful rehabilitation.

6. REFERENCES

- Priyadarsini S, Mukherjee S, Mishra M. Nanoparticles used in dentistry: A review. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res. 2018;8(1):58-67. doi:10.1016/j.jobcr.2017.12.004.
- Moraes G, Zambom C, Siqueira WL. Nanoparticles in dentistry: A comprehensive review. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2021;14:752.
- Kaur P, Kaur G, Kaur S, et al. Applications of nanomaterials in dentistry: A review. J Int Soc Prev Community Dent. 2023.
- Sonnahalli NK, Chowdhary R. Effect of nanoparticles on color stability and mechanical and biological properties of maxillofacial silicone elastomer: A systematic review. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2020;20(3):244-254. doi:10.4103/jips.jips_429_19.
- Ratner BD, Hoffman AS, Schoen FJ, Lemons JE, editors. Biomaterials Science: An Introduction to Materials in Medicine. 4th ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2020.
- Gaharwar AK, Peppas NA, Khademhosseini A. Nanocomposite hydrogels for biomedical applications. Biotechnol Bioeng. 2014;111(3):441-453. doi:10.1002/bit.25160.
- Dalby MJ, Gadegaard N, Oreffo ROC. Harnessing nanotopography and nanomedicine for stem cell fate control. Nat Mater. 2014;13:558-569.
- Freitas RA Jr. Nanodentistry. J Am Dent Assoc. 2000;131(11):1559-1565.
- Sharma S, Cross SE, Hsueh C, Wali RP, Stieg AZ, Gimzewski JK. Nano-characterization in dentistry. Int J Mol Sci. 2010;11:2523-2545.
- Zayed SM, Alshimy AM, Fahmy AE. Effect of surface treated silicon dioxide nanoparticles on some mechanical properties of maxillofacial silicone elastomer. Int J Biomater. 2014;2014:750398. doi:10.1155/2014/750398.
- Mohan AS, Vijayamohan M, Babu AS, Krishnapriya VN. Effect of particle size of nano-oxides on color stability and mechanical properties of maxillofacial silicone elastomers: An in vitro study. Int J Prosthodont. 2021;34(1):54-60. doi:10.11607/ijp.6593.
- Çevik P. Evaluation of Shore A hardness of maxillofacial silicones: The effect of dark storage and nanoparticles. Eur Oral Res. 2018;52(2):99-104. doi:10.26650/eor.2018.469.
- Khindria SK, Bhat V, Kaur K, et al. The color stability of maxillofacial silicones: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2021.
- Bishal AK, Wee AG, Barão VAR, Yuan JCC, Landers R, Sukotjo C, et al. Color stability of maxillofacial prosthetic silicone functionalized with oxide nanocoating. J Prosthet Dent. 2019;121(3):538-543. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2018.06.007.
- Meran Z, Besinis A, De Peralta T, Handy RD. Antifungal properties and biocompatibility of silver nanoparticle coatings on silicone maxillofacial prostheses in vitro. J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater. 2018;106(3):1038-1051. doi:10.1002/jbm.b.33917.
- Kaur G, et al. The effect of chemical disinfectants on maxillofacial silicone with the addition of silver nanoparticles: An original research. Cureus. 2024;16:e66484. doi:10.7759/cureus.66484.
- Goldman M, Juodzbalys G, Vilkinis V. Titanium surfaces with nanostructures influence on osteoblasts proliferation: A systematic review. J Oral Maxillofac Res. 2014;5(3):e1. doi:10.5037/jomr.2014.5301.

- Mendonça G, Mendonça DBS, Aragão FJL, Cooper LF. Advancing dental implant surface technology—from micron-to nanotopography. Biomaterials. 2008;29(28):3822-3835.
- Langer R, Vacanti JP. Tissue engineering. Science. 1993;260(5110):920-926.
- Sill TJ, von Recum HA. Electrospinning: applications in drug delivery and tissue engineering. Biomaterials. 2008;29(13):1989-2006. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2008.01.011.
- Dalby MJ, Gadegaard N, Tare R, et al. The control of human mesenchymal cell differentiation using nanoscale symmetry and disorder. Nat Mater. 2007;6:997-1003.
- Gaharwar AK, Rivera C, Wu CJ, Chan BK, Schmidt G. Transparent, elastomeric and tough nanocomposite hydrogels. Acta Biomater. 2011;7(10):4139-4148.
- Farokhzad OC, Langer R. Impact of nanotechnology on drug delivery. ACS Nano. 2009;3(1):16-20. doi:10.1021/nn900002m.
- Xu H, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Zhao Z, Xue T, Wang J, et al. 3D bioprinting advanced biomaterials for craniofacial and dental tissue engineering: A review. Mater Des. 2024;112886. doi:10.1016/j.matdes.2024.112886.
- Nel A, Xia T, Mädler L, Li N. Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel. Science. 2006;311(5761):622-627.
- Oberdörster G, Oberdörster E, Oberdörster J. Nanotoxicology: An emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. Environ Health Perspect. 2005;113(7):823-839.
- Mitragotri S, Anderson DG, Chen X, Chow EK, Ho D, Kabanov AV, et al. Accelerating the translation of nanomaterials in biomedicine. ACS Nano. 2015;9(7):6644-6654.
- Place ES, Evans ND, Stevens MM. Complexity in biomaterials for tissue engineering. Nat Mater. 2009;8(6):457-470.
- Bose S, Roy M, Bandyopadhyay A. Recent advances in bone tissue engineering scaffolds. Trends Biotechnol. 2012;30(10):546-554.
- Rezwan K, Chen QZ, Blaker JJ, Boccaccini AR. Biodegradable and bioactive porous polymer/inorganic composite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Biomaterials. 2006;27(18):3413-3431.
- Ma PX. Biomimetic materials for tissue engineering. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2008;60(2):184-198.
- Anselme K. Osteoblast adhesion on biomaterials. Biomaterials. 2000;21(7):667-681.
- Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T. Effects of titanium surface topography on bone integration: A systematic review. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2009;20(Suppl 4):172-184.
- Le Guehennec L, Soueidan A, Layrolle P, Amouriq Y. Surface treatments of titanium dental implants for rapid osseointegration. Dent Mater. 2007;23(7):844-854.
- Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A. Oral implant surfaces: Part 1—review focusing on topographic and chemical properties of different surfaces and in vivo responses to them. Int J Prosthodont. 2004;17(5):536-543.
- Webster TJ, Siegel RW, Bizios R. Osteoblast adhesion on nanophase ceramics. Biomaterials. 1999;20(13):1221-1227.
- Webster TJ, Ergun C, Doremus RH, Siegel RW, Bizios R. Enhanced functions of osteoblasts on nanophase ceramics. Biomaterials. 2000;21(17):1803-1810.
- Murphy SV, Atala A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nat Biotechnol. 2014;32(8):773-785.
- Daly AC, Prendergast ME, Hughes AJ, Burdick JA. Bioprinting for the biologist. Cell. 2021;184(1):18-32.
- Mota C, Puppi D, Chiellini F, Chiellini E. Additive manufacturing techniques for the production of tissue engineering constructs. J Tissue Eng Regen Med. 2015;9(3):174-190.
- Libbrecht MW, Noble WS. Machine learning applications in genetics and genomics. Nat Rev Genet. 2015;16(6):321-332.
- Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44-56.
- Wang J. Electrochemical biosensors: Towards point-of-care cancer diagnostics. Biosens Bioelectron. 2006;21(10):1887-1892.
- Li J, Mooney DJ. Designing hydrogels for controlled drug delivery. Nat Rev Mater. 2016;1:16071.
- Lee K, Silva EA, Mooney DJ. Growth factor delivery-based tissue engineering: General approaches and a review of recent developments. J R Soc Interface. 2011;8(55):153-170.
- Hubbell JA. Biomaterials in tissue engineering. Biotechnology (N Y). 1995;13(6):565-576.
- Roco MC. Nanotechnology: convergence with modern biology and medicine. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2003;14(3):337-346.
- Muzzarelli RAA. Chitins and chitosans for the repair of wounded skin, nerve, cartilage and bone. Carbohydr Polym. 2009;76(2):167-182.
- Ventola CL. Medical applications for 3D printing: Current and projected uses. P T. 2014;39(10):704-711.
- Shastri VP, Lendlein A. Engineering of biomaterials for regenerative medicine. Adv Mater. 2009;21(31):3237-3241.