

Reading Jawbone Quality on CBCT: Architecture, Grey Values and Diagnostic Limits

A practical approach to cortical form, trabecular patterns, implant-site planning and uncertain marrow findings



Core message: CBCT provides high-value three-dimensional information about anatomy and mineralized structure. It does not provide universal Hounsfield units, directly measure marrow fat or independently predict biological healing. Interpretation must integrate image quality, clinical findings and the purpose of the examination.

Educational material for dental students, postgraduate trainees and academic teachers

What CBCT can show reliably

Cone beam computed tomography reconstructs a three-dimensional volume from many projection images. Its main strength in implant dentistry is geometric assessment of mineralized tissues and their relationship to critical anatomy. Cross-sectional views reduce the superimposition that limits panoramic imaging.

Finding	Clinical value	Important boundary
Ridge dimensions	Measures available height and width and reveals undercuts or concavities.	Measurements depend on orientation, voxel size and correct identification of boundaries.
Cortical plates	Shows continuity, thickness, fenestration and dehiscence patterns.	Very thin cortices may be affected by partial-volume averaging.
Trabecular pattern	Shows relative spacing, continuity and regional architecture.	Appearance changes with resolution, reconstruction and display settings.
Critical structures	Locates the mandibular canal, mental foramen, nasal floor and sinus boundaries.	Unclear canals or variants may require specialist interpretation.
Pathology and healing	Can demonstrate mineralized changes, radiolucency, sclerosis, sequestration or incomplete fill.	Soft-tissue disease may remain invisible until bone changes occur.
Prosthetic relationship	Supports restorative-driven implant position and angulation.	Imaging does not replace clinical space, occlusion or soft-tissue assessment.

Use the smallest appropriate field of view

The examination should answer a defined clinical question with an optimized protocol. A larger field may reveal more anatomy but increases the volume that must be interpreted and can increase exposure. Current guidance recommends CBCT only when the expected information will affect risk assessment or treatment decisions.

Primary use: CBCT maps anatomy and mineralized structure. It should be selected because it can change planning, not because a three-dimensional scan is routinely available.

Image formation changes apparent bone quality

The visual texture of bone is not a fixed property carried unchanged into the scan. Acquisition and reconstruction determine which structures are resolved and how their attenuation appears. A valid interpretation begins with an image-quality check.

Technical factor	Effect on appearance	Interpretive response
Voxel size	Larger voxels smooth fine trabeculae and thin cortices. Smaller voxels may improve detail but can increase noise and dose.	Select resolution for the diagnostic task and avoid comparing unlike protocols.
Field of view	Changes scatter conditions, resolution options and the anatomy included.	Use a limited field when it answers the question safely.
Exposure parameters	Insufficient exposure increases noise; excessive exposure adds dose without guaranteed benefit.	Apply device-specific optimization rather than a universal setting.
Patient motion	Produces double contours, blur and loss of small structural detail.	Check the whole volume before measuring or describing rarefaction.
Metal artifacts	Beam hardening and streaks can obscure the bone-implant interface.	Use artifact reduction cautiously and correlate with other views or imaging.
Reconstruction and display	Kernel, software processing, window and level alter contrast and edge appearance.	Preserve raw data and use consistent viewing conditions for comparison.
Partial-volume effect	One voxel may contain cortex, marrow and soft tissue, producing an averaged value.	Avoid small regions of interest near boundaries and very thin structures.

Implants create a difficult neighborhood

Titanium and other dense materials can produce streaking and blooming. Apparent gaps or areas of high density next to an implant may reflect artifact rather than tissue. Thin peri-implant defects can also be underestimated or missed.

Quality checkpoint: before describing bone as dense, sparse or abnormal, verify motion, metal artifact, voxel size, field of view and the reproducibility of the appearance across orthogonal planes.

Grey values are not universal Hounsfield units

Medical CT calibrates attenuation to a standardized Hounsfield scale. Dental CBCT systems usually do not provide equivalent calibration. Scatter, beam hardening, detector characteristics, field size and reconstruction can change voxel values for the same material.

Question	Defensible interpretation	Interpretation to avoid
Can a CBCT voxel value be called HU?	Only when a validated device-specific quantitative protocol establishes calibration and performance.	Relabeling software grey values as HU by default.
Can values be compared between scanners?	Not without cross-calibration and matched acquisition conditions.	Using one universal threshold across devices.
Can two scans of one patient be compared?	Potentially, when the same device, protocol, positioning and reconstruction are controlled.	Treating an uncontrolled change as biological remodelling.
Can an internal reference help?	A reference may support a cautious within-scan comparison if artifacts and anatomy are comparable.	Assuming that adjacent bone is a perfect quantitative standard.
Can grey value predict implant stability?	Associations may exist in specific research settings, but prediction is device- and protocol-dependent.	Selecting implant or loading solely from a grey-value threshold.

A number can look more precise than it is

Software may report many decimal places even when acquisition uncertainty is much larger. Region-of-interest placement, cortical inclusion and artifacts can change the result. Repeatability within a controlled workflow does not prove equivalence to CT-derived HU or bone mineral density.

Quantitative CBCT is an emerging field

Calibration phantoms, dual-energy approaches and device-specific algorithms may improve quantitative performance. These tools require validation for the exact scanner, protocol and clinical use before they support diagnostic thresholds.

Reporting rule: use the term CBCT grey value unless validated calibration justifies another unit. State the device and protocol when quantitative analysis is clinically relevant.

Bone quality is multidimensional

Bone quantity describes available geometry. Bone quality includes cortical architecture, trabecular organization, mineralization, vascularity, remodelling and mechanical behavior. CBCT samples some of these features but cannot display the complete biological state.

Dimension	How it is assessed	What it contributes
Geometry	CBCT height, width, shape and defect mapping.	Determines whether the planned implant can fit safely and prosthetically.
Cortical architecture	CBCT continuity and relative thickness.	Contributes to initial engagement and surgical strategy.
Trabecular architecture	CBCT pattern, spacing and continuity at available resolution.	Provides qualitative context for mechanical support.
Local mechanics	Drilling resistance, insertion torque and resonance frequency analysis.	Adds site-specific intraoperative information about primary stability.
Biology	History, examination, disease control, medication and healing response.	Frames remodelling, vascular and infection risk that imaging cannot measure directly.
Systemic skeletal status	DXA, fracture history and medical assessment.	Identifies osteoporosis risk but does not directly measure a jaw implant site.

A classification is a communication aid

Descriptive classifications of cortical thickness and trabecular pattern can support planning, but they simplify a continuum. Visual categories can show interobserver variation and should not be treated as histological diagnoses.

Primary stability remains procedural

A site that appears sparsely trabeculated may still provide adequate stability with an appropriate osteotomy and implant design. A radiographically dense site can be vulnerable to overheating or excessive compression. CBCT informs preparation but does not replace tactile and stability measurements.

Integrated view: combine geometry, architecture, surgical feedback and patient biology. No single imaging value captures bone quality.

Marrow adiposity: biology and imaging

Bone marrow contains adipocytes, hematopoietic tissue, vessels and stromal cells. Marrow adipose tissue changes with age, skeletal region, metabolic state and disease. Research links marrow fat with bone and endocrine biology, but the presence of marrow fat is not automatically pathological.

Method	What it can assess	Limitation in jawbone care
Histology	Direct cellular and tissue composition in a sampled specimen.	Invasive, local and subject to sampling and processing effects.
Water-fat MRI or MR spectroscopy	Fat fraction and aspects of marrow composition without ionizing radiation.	Availability, artifacts and validated jaw protocols remain limiting.
Calibrated medical CT	Attenuation-based information using standardized or quantitative protocols.	Ionizing radiation and limited specificity for cellular composition.
Dual-energy CT	Material-sensitive attenuation estimates under specialized protocols.	Not routine for dental implant assessment.
Dental CBCT	Mineralized anatomy and relative internal architecture.	Cannot directly quantify marrow fat or distinguish fat from other causes of low attenuation.

Low attenuation is not a tissue diagnosis

Reduced grey values can reflect normal marrow space, sparse trabeculation, partial-volume averaging, technical noise, healing tissue, osteolysis or artifact. CBCT alone cannot identify which cellular component occupies a marrow space.

Systemic associations require separate evidence

Age, obesity, diabetes and osteoporosis can influence marrow biology, but an individual CBCT region cannot be used as a surrogate laboratory test or as proof of systemic inflammation. Clinical and medical evaluation must stand on their own indications.

Terminology: describe the visible structural finding. Reserve a diagnosis of marrow adiposity for a validated method and a clinical context that can support it.

Focal rarefaction and the diagnostic differential

A focal area with sparse trabeculation or reduced radiological density can be important, but the image pattern is often non-specific. Location, border, internal structure, cortical response, symptoms and change over time guide the differential diagnosis.

Pattern or context	Possible explanation	Next step
Healed extraction site	Normal variation, incomplete osseous fill, scar-like tissue or residual pathology.	Compare with history, prior images and cortical integrity.
Periapical region	Endodontic disease, scar, cystic change or another lesion.	Evaluate the tooth, symptoms and appropriate dental imaging.
Around an implant	Artifact, peri-implantitis, overload, incomplete integration or osteonecrosis.	Correlate with probing, baseline images, symptoms and medication history.
Ill-defined rarefaction	Inflammation, marrow process, malignancy or artifact.	Seek oral and maxillofacial radiology review and further work-up.
Mixed sclerosis and lucency	Chronic infection, healing response, medication-related change or fibro-osseous disease.	Use the full clinical and radiological pattern.
Persistent unexplained pain	Odontogenic, neuropathic, musculoskeletal or other bone disease.	Avoid assigning causation from a subtle CBCT finding alone.

FDOJ and NICO require caution

Terms such as fatty degenerative osteonecrosis of the jaw and neuralgia-inducing cavitational osteonecrosis appear in the literature. Current reviews acknowledge inconsistent terminology and a lack of standardized diagnostic criteria. A single CBCT slice or low grey value cannot establish these entities or prove systemic effects.

Biopsy is not an automatic response

Tissue sampling may be appropriate when clinical and imaging features raise concern for neoplasia, infection or another disease in which histology will change management. It should not be performed solely to validate an unstandardized image label.

Diagnostic safety: describe what is visible, list reasonable differentials and recommend the next test or referral when the finding could alter care.

Implant planning from architecture to surgery

CBCT allows the restorative plan to be tested against ridge anatomy before surgery. Bone architecture can modify the expected drilling response and loading strategy, but definitive mechanical information emerges during osteotomy and implant placement.

Planning observation	Possible adaptation	Boundary
Thin buccal or lingual cortex	Adjust implant position, diameter or augmentation plan.	Avoid a prosthetically compromised position chosen only to remain within bone.
Sparse trabecular pattern	Consider osteotomy adaptation, implant geometry and protected healing.	Do not use aggressive compression that compromises vascularity.
Thick cortex	Plan adequate irrigation and device-specific preparation.	High torque does not guarantee favorable biology.
Anatomical concavity	Use cross-sectional planning and a guide when appropriate.	A guide does not remove the need for surgical verification.
Uncertain canal boundary	Review multiplanar images and obtain radiological consultation.	Do not rely on automated canal tracing alone.
Need for augmentation	Map recipient anatomy and compare staged or reduced-burden alternatives.	CBCT cannot determine graft vitality or future integration.

Loading depends on achieved stability

Immediate or early loading requires adequate primary stability, favorable implant distribution and controlled occlusal conditions. A preoperative image can support the plan but cannot guarantee insertion torque or resonance frequency values.

Postoperative CBCT needs a new indication

Routine CBCT after uncomplicated placement adds radiation without necessarily improving care. Use three-dimensional follow-up when symptoms, altered sensation, unclear two-dimensional findings, suspected complications or another defined question justify it.

Planning principle: use CBCT to anticipate anatomy and complexity. Confirm mechanics during surgery and monitor biology clinically over time.

A structured interpretation and reporting pathway

Step	Interpretive task	Output
1. Confirm indication	State the clinical question and whether the selected field answers it.	A focused reason for the examination.
2. Check technical quality	Assess motion, noise, metal artifacts, field coverage and resolution.	Known limits before measurements begin.
3. Review the whole volume	Inspect all included anatomy systematically in orthogonal planes.	Recognition of relevant and incidental findings.
4. Describe the implant site	Report ridge form, cortical plates, trabecular pattern and critical structures.	Actionable anatomy without unsupported biological claims.
5. Characterize abnormalities	Record location, size, border, internal structure and cortical effects.	A radiological description and prioritized differential.
6. Correlate and recommend	Integrate symptoms, history, prior imaging and treatment context.	A proportionate next step, referral or follow-up.

Example wording

- “Focal region of reduced trabecular density in the posterior mandible, without cortical expansion or destruction.”
- “CBCT grey values are relative and cannot determine marrow fat content or histological composition.”
- “Correlation with symptoms, extraction history and prior imaging is advised.”
- “Oral and maxillofacial radiology review is recommended because the finding is ill-defined and extends beyond the expected healing pattern.”

Persistent pain after implantation

Evaluate occlusion, peri-implant tissues, adjacent teeth, neurosensory function and mechanical complications. Use CBCT when a three-dimensional hard-tissue question remains. A subtle area of low attenuation should not automatically be designated as the pain generator.

Report with calibrated confidence: separate observation, interpretation and recommendation. State uncertainty when the imaging method cannot identify tissue composition.

Clinical synthesis and selected references

Clinical synthesis

- Use CBCT for a defined question that can change implant risk assessment or treatment planning.
- Interpret ridge dimensions, cortical form, trabecular pattern and critical anatomy in multiplanar views.
- Check motion, noise, voxel size, partial-volume effects and metal artifacts before judging bone quality.
- Do not treat routine CBCT grey values as standardized Hounsfield units.
- Avoid thresholds that have not been validated for the scanner, protocol and clinical task.
- Recognize that bone quality includes mechanics and biology that CBCT cannot measure directly.
- Do not diagnose marrow adiposity from CBCT attenuation alone.
- Describe focal rarefaction and use a differential diagnosis rather than an unsupported tissue label.
- Treat FDOJ or NICO terminology cautiously because standardized diagnostic criteria remain lacking.
- Review the whole acquired volume and seek specialist interpretation when findings exceed competence or remain uncertain.

Selected references

1. Tyndall DA, et al. Position statement of the American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology on selection criteria for radiology in dental implantology, with emphasis on cone beam computed tomography. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* 2012;113:817-826.
2. American Dental Association and American Academy of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology. Patient selection for dental radiography and cone-beam computed tomography. 2026 consensus recommendations.
3. Pauwels R, et al. CBCT-based bone quality assessment: are Hounsfield units applicable? *Dentomaxillofac Radiol.* 2015;44:20140238.
4. Selvaraj A, et al. Correlation between gray values of cone-beam computed tomograms and Hounsfield units of computed tomograms: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Imaging Sci Dent.* 2022;52:133-140.
5. Martins LAC, et al. Repeatability of gray value-based bone density measurement in cone beam computed tomography. 2025.
6. Wiecek K, et al. Methodological limitations of CBCT-derived gray values in post-surgical peri-implant defects. *J Clin Med.* 2026;15:4144.
7. Rios HF, et al. The use of cone-beam computed tomography in management of patients requiring dental implants: an American Academy of Periodontology best evidence review. *J Periodontol.* 2017;88:946-959.
8. Veldhuis-Vlug AG, Rosen CJ. Clinical implications of bone marrow adiposity. *J Intern Med.* 2018;283:121-139.
9. Li X, et al. Marrow adipose tissue imaging in humans. *Bone.* 2018;118:43-55.
10. Lechner J, et al. Fatty Degenerative Osteonecrosis of the Jaw: Bridging Molecular Insights and Clinical Practice - A Scoping Review. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2025;26:1853.

Educational use and limitations

This material supports structured interpretation and communication. It does not replace a formal radiology report, histopathology, medical diagnosis or specialist assessment. Imaging should be justified, optimized and interpreted within the patient's clinical context.

Funding statement

This work was co-funded by the European Union under grant agreement No. 2024-1-PL01-KA220-HED-000251208. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System (FRSE). Neither the European Union nor FRSE can be held responsible for them.