

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

I read the article, "Complete Mucostatic Impression: A New Attempt," by Bindhoo et al¹ published in your prestigious journal. As an academician, prosthodontist, and clinician, I humbly forward my opinion on that article.

Mucostatics is not just restricted to an impression procedure; it is a philosophy. The dentures fabricated with mucostatic impressions had short flanges (i.e., no peripheral seal). Retention was achieved with intimate contact of the denture base with underlying tissues depending upon the principle of surface tension without depending upon the peripheral seal. For the mucostatic impression technique, the denture bases should preferably be fabricated in metal, because a metal denture base has an intimate contact with underlying tissues as compared to acrylic resins (swaged aluminum technique).²⁻⁵ However, the authors developed a peripheral seal in their impression. They used acrylic resin as the denture base. I agree, hypermobile tissues should be recorded with minimal pressure to avoid their distortion, but that alone does not make the impression a mucostatic technique, as the physical properties (i.e., interfacial surface tension, Pascal's Law) involved in mucostatics are completely different. Therefore, the impression technique should have ideally been called, and the article titled, something along the lines of "minimal pressure technique" and not a "mucostatic impression."

Figure 7B within the article shows a definitive prosthesis. At a closer glance it appears that the mandibular prosthesis is a simple acrylic partial denture (a gum stripper!). I cannot

visualize any direct retainer, clasp assembly, precision or semi-precision attachment, or prepared guide planes. Any removable partial denture treatment is deemed incomplete until the insertion of a definitive cast partial denture. Acrylic partial dentures are interim partial dentures.⁶ Therefore, I feel the mandibular prosthesis is just an interim one and not a definitive prosthesis and should have been named as such.

Dhananjay S. Gandage

*Department of Prosthodontics, Rural Dental College,
Loni PMT Campus, Loni BK, India
dhan_gandage@hotmail.com*

References

1. Bindhoo YA, Thirumurthy VR, Kurien A: Complete mucostatic impression. A new attempt. *J Prosthodont* 2012;21:209-214
2. Academy of Denture Prosthetics: Final report on the clinical requirements of ideal denture base materials. *J Prosthet Dent* 1968;20:101-105
3. Moses CH: Physical considerations in impression making. *J Prosthet Dent* 1953;3:449-463
4. Campbell DD: Cast swaged aluminum denture. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1935;22:2082-2088
5. Granger E: *Practical Procedures in Oral Rehabilitation*. Philadelphia, Lipincott, 1962, pp. 33-53
6. Carr AB, McGivney GP, Brown DT: *McCracken's Removable Partial Prosthodontics* (ed 11). St. Louis, Elsevier Mosby, 2005

Copyright of Journal of Prosthodontics is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.