

EXPOSING MYTHS IN AESTHETIC OPERATIVE DENTISTRY- 2008

Van P. Thompson, DDS, PhD

Department of Biomaterials and Biomimetics, NYU College of Dentistry

1. PEARL Practice Based Research Network
 - a. Translation to practice
 - b. NIDCR plan clinical effectiveness studies
 - c. PEARL Network studies
 - i. Class I RBC Postoperative hypersensitivity – preop +, post-op new 18%
 - ii. Deep caries treatment outcomes
 - iii. Risk factors for osteonecrosis of the jaw
 - iv. Endodontic treatment and restoration outcomes ~ 20% failure at 3.9 yrs
 - v. Analgesic effectiveness
 - vi. Randomize clinical trial of hypersensitive noncarious cervical lesions
2. Caries detection, diagnosis and new modes of treatment
 - a. Occlusal hidden caries and change in caries presentation
 - b. European studies of OHC
 - c. Caries detection methods
 - i. Sensitivity and specificity
 - ii. Visual and radiographic examination
 - iii. Diagodent
 1. efficacy - Lussi AS, et al. (1999): “Performance and reproducibility of a laser fluorescence system for the detection of occlusal caries *in vitro*.” Caries Res 33: 261-266.
 2. limitations
 - iv. QLF systems
 1. visualization and quantification of lesion change
 - d. CAMBRA approach
 - i. Useful websites
 1. <http://oralhealth.dent.umich.edu/CDRAM/CariesHome.htm>
 2. www.db.od.mah.se/car/data/riskbasic.html
 3. www.dent.ucla.edu/ce/caries/index.html
 4. www.fdiworldental.org/resources/assets/guidelines/caries.html
 - ii. Fluoride as a therapeutic agent vs preventive -Baelum V, Machiulskiene V, Nyvad B, Richards A, Væth M. Application of survival analysis to carious lesion transitions in intervention trials. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2003; 31: 252–60.
 1. 5000 ppm dentifrice and spit do not rinse approach
 - iii. Salivary stimulation and xylitol products
 1. concern with xerostomia causing drugs and physician failure to caution
 - e. Caries classification systems
 - i. ICCS from ICDAS (ICDAS for research)
 1. Surface, caries location on surface, stage of lesion, *later activity*
 - f. Does all caries need to be remove in deep lesion:
 - i. Mertz-Fairhurst, EJ et al.: Clinical performance of sealed composite restorations placed over caries compared with sealed and unsealed amalgam restorations, JADA 115:689-694, 1987.
 - ii. Mertz-Fairhurst, EJ et al: Ultra conservative and cariostatic sealed restorations: Results at Year 10, JADA 129:55-66, 1998
 1. paired Class I molar and premolar lesions restored with caries radiographically present and not over 50% of dentin depth
 2. CompS/C – sealed composite over dentin caries (no dentin removed)
 3. AGS - minimum amalgam restoration and sealant placed
 4. AGU - conventional extension for prevention amalgam restoration

	(recurrent caries)-	(all failures)
CompS/C	1%	12%
AGU	17%	17%
AGS	2%	2%

5. CompS/C group - no progress of caries in sequential standardized radiographs
 - iii. Primary teeth - Ribeiro CCC, et al (1999): "A clinical, radiographic, and scanning electron microscopic evaluation of adhesive restorations on carious primary teeth", *Quintessence Int* 30:591-599.
 - iv. Key references
 1. Kidd EAM (2004): "How 'clean' must a cavity be before restoration?", *Caries Res* 38:305-313
 2. Maltz M, et al (2002): "A clinical, microbiologic, and radiographic study of deep caries lesions after incomplete caries removal", *Quintessence Int* 33:151-159.
 3. Thompson et al (2008): "Treatment of deep carious lesions by complete excavation or partial removal: A critical review", *JADA* 139: 705-712
 - g. Early lesion progression – Michigan study
 - i. Only a minor number progressed over 5 years
 - h. Sealant effectiveness
 - i. Evidence for care in technique
 - i. Ozone and clinical outcomes
 - i. Dahnhardt, J. E., T. Jaeggi, et al. (2006). "Treating open carious lesions in anxious children with ozone. A prospective controlled clinical study." *Am J Dent* 19(5): 267-70
 - ii. Dahnhardt, J. E., M. Gyax, et al. (2008). "Treating sensitive cervical areas with ozone. A prospective controlled clinical trial." *Am J Dent* 21(2): 74-6.
3. RMGI and Fluoride Release
- a. RMGI advantages
 - i. Strength, seal (water uptake and swelling, 2-4%)
 - b. Efficacy as a liner (P.E. Murray studies 2000-2004)
 - i. Pulpal inflammation and bacterial presence
 - ii. RMGI and IRM equivalence
 - iii. Indirect pulp cap equivalence to CaOH in humans – Costa CA, Giro EM, do Nascimento AB, Teixeira HM, Hebling J (2003): "Short-term evaluation of the pulpo-dentin complex response to a resin-modified glass-ionomer cement and a bonding agent applied in deep cavities", *Dent Mater* 19(8):739-46.
 - c. Affected caries and the low permeability layer
 - i. Dentin tubule calcification in affected dentin ahead of bacterial front
 - ii. RMGI placed before etching dentin (critical in deep lesions to limit hypersens.
 - d. Clinical role of fluoride release ?
 - i. Studies of GI restorations replacement rates
 1. Mjor, IA: "Glass-ionomer cement restorations and secondary caries: A preliminary report", *Quintessence Inter* 27:171-174, 1996.
 2. Mjor, I. A. (1998). "The location of clinically diagnosed secondary caries." *Quintessence Int* 29: 179-189.
 - ii. Clinical results with glass ionomers Class II tunnel preparations
 1. results all negative!!
 - a. Horsted-Bindslev P, Heyde-Petersen B, Simonsen P, Baelum V (2005). Tunnel or saucer-shaped restorations: a survival analysis. *Clin Oral Investig* 9(4):233-8.
4. Bonding to Dentin
- a. Basis of dentin bonding is penetration into collagen structure between tubules
 - i. Wet bonding (moist) is S.O.P.
 1. cotton pledget or light air
 2. surface can be re-wet if dentin opaque after drying
 - b. Dentin Bonding Critical Factors (one bottle = combined systems)
 - i. Wet/moist dentin

- ii. Application of primer/adhesive
 - iii. Gentle evaporation of solvent (6 cm or more distance to start)
 - iv. Adequate light cure – use a meter to check your light
 - v. Shiny surface on dentin = assure coverage
 - 1. reapply if necessary – excess removed with dry brush or pledget
 - vi. thick layers are useful as a “stress breaking liner”
- c. Total etch, and self etch approaches
 - i. Total etch decalcifies dentin
 - 1. 3 Step – etch, primer (dried), hydrophobic resin applied
 - 2. 2 Step – etch, multiple dried coats of primer/resin combination
 - a. Water permeable layer formed – problems for self cure and dual cure cements or composites
 - ii. Self etch
 - 1. 2 Steps with primer followed by hydrophobic resin
 - 2. 1 Step = primer + adhesive
 - a. Water permeable layer formed – self cure and dual cure problems
- d. Shrinkage stress and bonding agents
 - i. Increasing bonding agent thickness reduces the stress on the bond
 - 1. manufacturers adding thickening agents
- e. Reduction of bonds to dentin with time
 - i. Exposed collagen degradation
 - 1. attempt to inhibit with chlorhexidine
 - ii. Resin incorporation of water
 - 1. no bond degradation in oil storage of bonded tooth specimens
 - 2. manufacturers changing formulations
- f. Bleaching and interference with polymerization
 - i. Neutralization of peroxides with 10% sodium ascorbate for 10 min
- g. Systematic review of Clinical Trails – Peumans M, et al (2005): “Clinical effectiveness of contemporary adhesives: a systematic review of clinical trails,” Dent Mat 21: 864-881
 - i. Cervical dentin (CI V restoration retention)
 - 1. GI >3 Step etch + rinse > 2 step self etch > 2 step etch + rinse > 1 step self etch
- h. Self etch systems and bonds to enamel (reduced)

5. Bisphenol A (BPA) and Dental Resin Based Composites and Sealants

- a. Bisphenol A potentially a minor contaminate in composites and sealants
 - i. Almost all undetectable amounts
 - ii. Sealants concern as BPA is an estrogenic mimicking molecule but exposure is a placement if present
 - iii. Composite and sealants are only degraded to BPA very very small amounts in the mouth (estimate a few nanogram per year under the right enzymatic conditions)
- b. BPA body burden recently associated with cardiovascular disease and diabetes - Iain A. Lang; Tamara S. Galloway; Alan Scarlett; et al. (2008): “Association of urinary Bisphenol A concentration with medical disorders and laboratory abnormalities in adults,” JAMA 300:1303-1310.
 - i. Message is to note the daily burden in the population = 0.6-72 µg/d
- c. Sealant worst case (one time exposure – assumed 10 days)
 - i. 1 gm of sealant with 0.01% BPA (very high amount) = 10 µg/d over 10 days if all released.
 - ii. Ivoclar products have no BisGMA and hence no BPA contamination possible

6. Resin Based Composite (RBC) Restoration
 - a. ASK NOT WHAT COMPOSITE TO USE BUT HOW TO BEST USE THE COMPOSITE YOU HAVE
 - b.
 - i. technology has advanced to hybrid or blend materials
 1. particle size tending toward 1 or less (Point 4 from Kerr = $0.4 \mu\text{m}$)
 2. microfiller in $0.04 \mu\text{m}$ range included to increase filler, change handling
 3. variations are in method of filler manufacture and filler volume
 - c. RBC wear
 - i. Particle technology change: 4 year wear \leq amalgam wear in occlusal contacts
 - d. Major reason for failure in controlled clinical studies
 - i. Bulk fracture just as for amalgam (not recurrent caries)
 1. problem of low fracture toughness
 - e. RBC posterior usage and survival analysis
 - i. Survival now equivalent in insurance databases
 - ii. Do not change dentists
 - f. Technology to reduce fracture toughness (yet to be independently verified)
 - i. Ceram X use or irregular shape nanofillers
 - g. Polymerization shrinkage the major problem in RBC posterior usage
 - i. Preparation configuration and the "C" factor (ratio bonded:unbonded surface)
 1. worst case CI I, $C=5$
 2. pulpal floor or axial wall debond problem = fluid reservoir + flow path to pulp
 - ii. Shrinkage to bonded surface and not to the light source
 - iii. Fluid flow from pulp during curing process — Ciucchi B, et al (1997): "Volume of the internal gap formed under composite restorations in vitro," J Dent 25:305-12
 1. filling technique and bonding interaction
 - iv. Class I pulpal wall gaps in load cycled restorations
 - v. Flowable composite and shrinkage wall gaps - Cho, BH, et al. (2002): "Effect of Interfacial Bond Quality on the Direction of Polymerization Shrinkage Flow in Resin Composite Restorations" Oper Dent 27:297-304.
 - vi. Shrinkage stress measurements with flowable provided no advantage
 1. Braga RR, Hilton TJ, Ferracane JL (2003): "Contraction stress of flowable composite materials and their efficacy as stress-relieving layers", J Am Dent Assoc 2003; 134(6):721-8.
 - vii. Class II in vivo study showing axial wall debonds in extracted teeth
 1. Lopes GC et al (2004): " Effect of posterior resin composite placement technique on the resin-dentin interface formed in vivo", Quintessence Int 35:156-161.
 - viii. Shrinkage stress reduction with low modulus liner (RMGI)
 1. Ferracane J (2008): "Glass ionomer liner reduces contraction stress," Oper Dent 33, 247-257
 - ix. Ramped of delayed light (Soft Start) curing not more effective for stress reduction in vivo
 1. Chan DCN, Browning WD, Frazier KB, Brackett MG (2008): "Clinical evaluation of the soft-start (pulse-delay) polymerization technique in Class I and II composite restorations", Oper Dent 33:265-271
 - h. Manufacturers approaches to polymerization shrinkage (2.5-1.6% by volume)
 - i. Filler changes – particles sizes and careful size grading for best packing
 - ii. Resin technology
 1. Silorane technology in 3M/ESPE Filtek LS (low shrinkage)
 - a. Different bonding agent and polymerization mechanism
 - b. Extensive confirmation in laboratory studies
 - i. RBC cavity designs
 - i. Preserve enamel – use of slots when ever possible
 - j. Problem of RBC adaptation in cavity preparations

- i. NYU studies on proximal walls and pulpal floor in test dye
- ii. Studies on use of flowable and combination techniques to limit voids - Opdam NJM, et al (2003): "Voids and porosities in Class I micropreparations filled with various resin composites", Oper Dent 28: 9-14
 - 1. Flowable had poor adaptation
 - 2. "snow plow" technique best (uncured flow + syringable or use layer of uncured bonding agent + syringable)

7. All ceramic restorations

- a. Emerging problem of zirconia core restoration veneer chipping (large chips) in posterior restorations in 3 months to 3 year range
 - i. Not seen with metal-ceramic restorations
 - b. Monolithic ceramic inlays and onlay (Empress type) have good clinical results
 - c. Zirconia because of its high strength and fracture toughness is being used for extensive restorations (ignoring the emerging chipping problem)
 - d. Ceramics fail by two basic mechanisms
 - i. Thick - fail by surface damage
 - ii. Thin -flex and fail from undersurface (tensile zone)
 - iii. Layer crowns (alumina or zirconia core) to support veneering porcelain and prevent flexural failure
 - 1. alumina crowns fail by bulk fracture
 - 2. zirconia now failing in veneer (no framework exposure)
 - e. Laboratory duplication of zirconia chipping now possible
 - i. Working with a large number of manufacturers to solve this problem
 - f. General recommendation
- In high stress areas (molar teeth or posterior bridges) use metal ceramic restorations (MCR)