



Review

Received July 1, 2026; Revised July 31, 2026; Accepted July 31, 2026, Published July 31, 2026

DOI: 10.6026/973206300224449

SJIF 2026 (Scientific Journal Impact Factor for 2026) = 8.478

2022 Impact Factor (2023 Clarivate Inc. release) is 1.9

Declaration on Publication Ethics:

The author's state that they adhere with COPE guidelines on publishing ethics as described elsewhere at <https://publicationethics.org/>. The authors also undertake that they are not associated with any other third party (governmental or non-governmental agencies) linking with any form of unethical issues connecting to this publication. The authors also declare that they are not withholding any information that is misleading to the publisher in regard to this article.

Declaration on official E-mail:

The corresponding author declares that lifetime official e-mail from their institution is not available for all authors

License statement:

This is an Open Access article which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. This is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

Comments from readers:

Articles published in BIOINFORMATION are open for relevant post publication comments and criticisms, which will be published immediately linking to the original article without open access charges. Comments should be concise, coherent and critical in less than 1000 words.

Disclaimer:

Bioinformation provides a platform for scholarly communication of data and information to create knowledge in the Biological/Biomedical domain after adequate peer/editorial reviews and editing entertaining revisions where required. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views or opinions of Bioinformation and (or) its publisher Biomedical Informatics. Biomedical Informatics remains neutral and allows authors to specify their address and affiliation details including territory where required.

Edited by P Kanguane

Citation: Gutierrez *et al.* Bioinformation 22(7): 4449-4451 (2026)

Machine learning for early detection and risk prediction in peri-implantitis: A review

Olena Gutierrez^{1,*}, Meryl Ovalles², Douglas Javier Silva Salas³, Diani Vazquez Garcia⁴, Ninoska J. Barrios Barrios⁵ & Valeria Dennis Ramirez Freire⁶

¹Department of Dentistry, American University (UAM), Managua, Nicaragua, America; ²Department of Dentistry, Santa Maria University, Caracas, Venezuela, America; ³Department of Dentistry, University Jose Antonio Paez, Valencia, Venezuela, America; ⁴Department of Dentistry, University of Medical Sciences of Villa Clara, Santa Clara, Cuba, Caribbean; ⁵Department of Dentistry, Central University of Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela, America; ⁶Department of Dentistry International University of Ecuador (UIDE), Quito, Ecuador, America; *Corresponding author

Affiliation URL:

<http://www.uam.edu.ni/>

<https://usm.edu.ve/odontologia/>

<https://salud.ujap.edu.ve/odontologia/>

<https://instituciones.sld.cu/ucmvc/>
<http://www.ucv.ve/estructura/facultades/facultad-de-odontologia.html>
<https://www.uide.edu.ec/carrera-de-odontologia/>

Author contact:

Olena Gutierrez - E-mail: olenamgutierrez@gmail.com
Meryl Ovalles - E-mail: meryl.ovalles@gmail.com
Douglas Javier Silva Salas - E-mail: douglasjavierss@gmail.com
Diani Vázquez García - E-mail: ddentist00@gmail.com
Ninoska J. Barrios Barrios - E-mail: barriosnino@hotmail.com
Valeria Dennis Ramirez Freire - E-mail: ramirez-valeria@javeriana.edu.co

Abstract:

Peri-implantitis causes progressive bone loss around dental implants and arises from interacting microbial, host, behavioral and implant factors. Conventional clinical and radiographic criteria capture this complexity only partially, whereas machine learning can integrate heterogeneous data across early detection, risk stratification and outcome prediction. Convolutional neural networks detect peri-implant bone loss on radiographs with high reported accuracy. Supervised models, such as random forests, combine clinical and patient-level data to estimate individual risk, often outperforming conventional statistics. Thus, data shows that evidence rests largely on small, single-center, retrospective datasets, so machine learning should augment rather than replace clinical judgment until standardized, externally validated models are available.

Keywords: Peri-implantitis, machine learning (ML), deep learning (DL), risk prediction, dental implants

Background:

Peri-implantitis is a plaque-associated inflammatory disease with progressive loss of supporting bone; it is common and multifactorial, reflecting interactions among the microbiome, host responses, systemic conditions, behaviors and implant factors [1]. Diagnosis relies mainly on bleeding or suppuration on probing, probing depth and radiographic bone loss, which may not capture the underlying biological drivers [2]. Modern implant dentistry generates large, heterogeneous datasets that machine learning can integrate to detect patterns that conventional statistics miss [4]. Therefore, it is of interest to describe the current machine learning approaches for the early detection and risk prediction of peri-implantitis.

Evidence synthesis:

The studies were methodologically heterogeneous. Findings were therefore synthesized narratively. This followed current recommendations for reporting artificial intelligence research in dentistry [5].

Search strategy:

Five databases were searched: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, Embase and IEEE Xplore. The search covered records published between January 2021 and March 2026. Disease terms included peri-implantitis, dental implant and marginal bone loss. Computational terms included artificial intelligence, machine learning, deep learning, convolutional neural network, random forest and predictive modeling. Reference lists were hand-searched.

Machine learning approaches:

Machine learning spans supervised methods, including random forest, support vector machines, logistic regression and extreme

gradient boosting and unsupervised clustering, with convolutional neural networks dominating image analysis; models are evaluated by accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, F1 score and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve [2].

Early radiographic detection:

Convolutional neural networks and segmentation models detect peri-implant marginal bone loss on periapical and panoramic radiographs without manual measurement and systematic review reports high pooled accuracy despite small, single-center studies [6]. A recent deep learning pipeline that segmented implants and classified peri-implant status across 7696 panoramic radiographs detected peri-implantitis with an F1 score of 0.835, demonstrating automated screening of routine images [7].

Risk prediction from clinical records:

Models built on structured records also estimate patient-level risk; in 942 implants, a random forest achieved areas under the curve of 0.840 for peri-implantitis and 0.872 for implant failure [8]. Across clinical and prosthetic variables, random forest best predicted peri-implantitis onset, with functional time and oral hygiene the most influential predictors [9]. Representative studies are summarized in Table 1.

Molecular and immune risk stratification:

Beyond imaging, molecular data support risk stratification; integrative microbiome and metatranscriptome profiling of peri-implant biofilms identified taxonomic and functional biomarkers that distinguish health from disease, with machine learning reaching an area under the curve of 0.85 [10]. Machine-learning-assisted immune profiling further stratifies patients into risk

groups with distinct immune and microbial signatures and treatment outcomes [3]. Risk models can also integrate clinical, behavioral and demographic variables, capturing nonlinear interactions among recognized risk factors such as smoking, diabetes, history of periodontitis and inadequate maintenance to improve individual risk estimation [1].

Prognosis and early-stage prediction:

For prognosis, a convolutional neural network trained on radiographs predicted dental implant loss with good discrimination, illustrating image-based prognostic modeling [11, 12]. Consistent with this direction, a machine-learning model has been developed and validated to predict peri-implant mucositis one year after implant placement [13] and an artificial neural network has been applied to the early diagnosis of peri-implantitis onset [14], extending data-driven prediction to the earliest and potentially reversible stage of peri-implant disease.

Table 1: Representative machine learning studies in peri-implant disease.

Data and sample	Reported performance	Primary task	References
942 implants; EHR clinical variables	AUC 0.840 (peri-implantitis); 0.872 (implant failure)	Risk prediction from clinical records	[8]
Clinical and prosthetic variables	Random forest best; AUC 0.71	Predicting peri-implantitis onset	[9]
7696 panoramic radiographs; CNN/U-Net	F1 0.835 for peri-implantitis detection	DL segmentation and detection	[7]
Dental radiographs (CNN)	Good discrimination for implant loss	Predicting implant-loss risk	[11]
Peri-implant biofilm microbiome and metatranscriptome	AUC 0.85 (integrated model)	Microbiome biomarker risk stratification	[10]
Radiographs across studies (review)	High reported accuracy; small single-center studies	Detecting peri-implant bone loss	[6]
Implant prediction models (review)	Limited external validity	Appraisal of prediction models	[12]

AUC: area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; CNN: convolutional neural network; DL: deep learning; EHR: electronic health record.

Validation, limitations and future directions:

A systematic appraisal found most implant prediction models limited by methodological quality, incomplete reporting, weak external validity and reliance on single-dataset internal resampling, with recurring predictors including implant position, length, age and history of periodontitis. External validation, calibration, transparent reporting and explainable models aligned with dental artificial intelligence reporting standards, together with prospective multicenter data, are therefore needed before clinical adoption.

Conclusion:

Machine learning can improve peri-implantitis detection, risk stratification and prognosis as a clinical support tool. Deep learning detects bone loss on radiographs and multimodal models sharpen individual risk assessment. Clinical translation still requires prospective multicenter studies and transparent, externally validated models.

References:

[1] Galarraga-Vinueza ME et al. J Periodontol. 2025 96:587 [PMID: 40489307]

[2] Neji G et al. J Clin Med. 2026 15:228 [PMID: 41517477]

[3] Wang CW et al. Theranostics. 2021 11:6703 [PMID: 34093848]

[4] Şalgáu CA et al. Ann Biomed Eng. 2024 52:2348 [PMID: 38884831]

[5] Schwendicke F et al. J Dent. 2021 107:103610 [DOI: 10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103610]

[6] Mugri MH. Diagnostics (Basel). 2025 15:655 [PMID: 40149998]

[7] Kibcak E et al. J Evid Based Dent Pract. 2025 25:102058 [PMID: 39947781]

[8] Rekawek P et al. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2023 38:576 [PMID: 37279222]

[9] Mameno T et al. Sci Rep. 2021 11:11090 [PMID: 34045590]

[10] Joshi AA et al. NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes. 2025 11:175 [PMID: 40858628]

[11] Huang N et al. J Clin Periodontol. 2022 49:872 [PMID: 35734921]

[12] Zhu Y et al. Int J Implant Dent. 2025 11:5 [PMID: 39847174]

[13] Liu L et al. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2026 37:806 [PMID: 41937253]

[14] Fan W et al. Open Life Sci. 2023 18:20220691 [PMID: 37671094]

Caveat Emptor is applicable among the literate community where required and possible. The publisher, its journal, editors and the internal/external reviewers take adequate steps to check, evaluate, correct, edit, revise and improve content where possible and required.