Marginal Integrity of Glass Ionomer and All Ceramic Restorations

by

Christopher Mark Hanson
Lieutenant, Dental Corps
United States Navy

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Comprehensive Dentistry Graduate Program
Naval Postgraduate Dental School
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
in Oral Biology

June 2015

Naval Postgraduate Dental School
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
Bethesda, Maryland

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER'S THESIS

This is to certify that the Master's thesis of

Christopher Mark Hanson

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the Master of Science degree in Oral Biology at the June 2015 graduation.

Thesis Committee:

Ye, Ling, D.D.S., Ph.D.
LCDR, DC, USN
Thesis Supervisor, Dental Research Department

Molinaro, Joseph, D.D.S, M.S.
CAPT, DC, USN
Program Director, Comprehensive Dentistry Department

Kooistra, Scott, D.D.S
CAPT, DC, USN
Operative Dentistry Department

Huber, Jayson, D.D.S., M.S.
LCDR, DC, USN
Comprehensive Dentistry Department

Arena, Marc, D.M.D., M.S.
CAPT, DC, USN
Department Head, Comprehensive Dentistry Department

Munro, Glenn, D.D.S., MBA
CAPT, DC, USN
Dean, Naval Postgraduate Dental School

The author hereby certifies that the use of any copyrighted material in the thesis manuscript titled:

Marginal Integrity of Glass Ionomer and All Ceramic Restorations

is appropriately acknowledged and, beyond brief excerpts, is with the permission of the copyright owner.

Christopher Mark Hanson
Lieutenant, Dental Corps
Comprehensive Dentistry Graduate Program
Naval Postgraduate Dental School
JUN 2015

ABSTRACT

MARGINAL INTEGRITY OF GLASS IONOMER AND ALL CERAMIC RESTORATIONS

Christopher Mark Hanson D.D.S.,
COMPREHENSIVE DENTISTRY 2015

Thesis directed by: Ye, Ling, D.D.S., Ph.D.
LCDR, DC, USN
Thesis Supervisor, Dental Research Department
Naval Postgraduate Dental School

INTRODUCTION: As the use of GI and All Ceramic Restorations (ACRs) increases, there will be greater incidence of these restorative materials in direct contact at the external cavosurface margin. There is insufficient research to evaluate the performance of glass ionomer (GI) when it is in contact with an ACR and simultaneously exposed to the oral environment.

OBJECTIVE: The purpose of this study is to evaluate the marginal integrity of a ceramic inlay when bonded to a GI restoration, as compared to that of a ceramic inlay bonded to cementum.

METHODS: Mesial-occlusal (MO) ceramic inlay preparations will be made in forty teeth. Gingival cavosurface margins will be placed 2 mm below the cemento-enamel junction (CEJ). Twenty teeth will be restored to the CEJ using GI. Ceramic inlays will be milled using CAD/CAM, thermocycled, and examined at 200x magnification. Quantitative marginal analysis will be performed on the restorations.

RESULTS/CONCLUSIONS: This study is pending receipt of supplies from WRNMMC DRP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACR	All Ceramic Restoration
AMR	All Metal Restoration
ART	Atraumatic Restorative Treatment
DME	Deep Margin Elevation
GI	Glass Ionomer
MCR	Metal Ceramic Restoration
MO	Mesial-Occlusal
NIDCR	National Institute for Dental and Craniofacial Research

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Metal casting utilizing the lost wax technique probably dates back to ancient China or Egypt. The first use of indirect cast metal dental restorations is generally attributed to Dr. Swasney in 1890 (Asgar, 1998). With the introduction of improved casting methods by Taggert and Jamieson in 1907, precision casting of full gold crowns became readily attainable (Schulein, 2005). Since that time, indirect extra-coronal cast metal dental restorations have demonstrated a well-documented history of success (Small, 2008; Hagman, 1976). The first indirect cast restorations were typically fabricated out of gold. They exhibited a coefficient of thermal expansion, wear characteristics and strength very similar to natural teeth (Hinman, 1907; Macdonald, 1907). However, their disadvantages included poor esthetics and the high cost of gold.

Ceramics are defined as non-organic, non-metallic materials created by heating minerals at high temperatures (Shenoy & Shenoy, 2010). Dental ceramics are composite materials whose structure can vary from amorphous to polycrystalline. A ceramic can be classified by the ratio of glass to crystalline present in its composition. This ratio will determine the microstructure and type of internal structure exhibited by the ceramic. The microstructure of the ceramic will define the characteristics and physical properties of the material (Giordano &McLaren, 2010).

As the desire for tooth-colored restorations increased, the metal ceramic restoration (MCR) gained popularity (Christensen, 2009). The first MCRs were developed by Weinstein in the 1950's. The first MCRs were composed of porcelain powders using 11-15% percent K_2O and subjected to temperatures of 700-1200 C°. The MCR appeared more like a natural tooth, while providing the strength necessary to function well under occlusal load (Christiansen, 2003).

However, the high opacity and occasionally visible metal margins left practitioners searching for a better esthetic option (Helvey, 2010).

CHAPTER II: Review of the Literature

Indirect All -Ceramic Restorations

Indirect all-ceramic restorations (ACRs) were introduced independently by Horn, Simonsen, and Calamia in the early 1980s (Spear & Holloway, 2008). They appealed to patients who desired a metal-free restoration (Fasbinder, 2006). The ACR represented a significant esthetic improvement over all-metal and metal-ceramic restorations (Kelly, 2004). Ceramic materials with high aluminosilicate glass, such as feldspathic porcelain, contain fillers such as leucite, nepheline, or albite added to improve their physical properties. These high glass content ACRs appear very similar to natural teeth. However, due to the irregular microstructure of the glass matrix infused with fillers, they do not possess fracture resistance comparable to natural teeth. This limited ACRs composed primarily of glass to anterior areas (Kelly & Benetti, 2011).

To improve the physical properties of the ACR, filler particles such as lithium disilicate, alumina, and spinel were added to the glass matrix. This gives greater strength to the restoration (Kelly, 2008). With a high filler content and lower glass content, these ceramics have greater fracture resistance. These improved ceramics can be used in areas with significant lateral and protrusive forces applied to them, but where esthetics is still important (Spear & Holloway, 2008).

Most recently, ceramics with a polycrystalline structure have been introduced. Instead of glass, these ceramics are composed of a strong matrix of alumina or zirconia. An additive, known as a dopant, such as yttrium, cerium, and aluminum can be added to the zirconia matrix, while magnesium is added to a matrix composed of alumina (Komine, Blatz & Matsumura, 2010). These dopants are added to improve the optical appearance of the well-ordered structure of these ACRs (Luthard, Sandkuhl & Reitz, 1999). The polycrystalline structure has a much higher resistance to fracture than the less dense and irregular composition of glass-containing ACRs (Griggs, 2007).

The development of Computer Aided Design/Computer Aided Manufacturing (CAD/CAM) of ceramic restorations have the increased ability of dentists to deliver high quality ACRs (Miyazaki, Hotta, Kunii, Kuriyama, & Tamaki, 2009; Griggs, 2007). CAD/CAM ceramic restorations can often be made in one appointment. This eliminates the need to fabricate a physical master impression, stone casts, and provisional restoration (Mormann, 2006). By using the CAD/CAM system, the dentist is able to keep the milling process in-office, thus bypassing the need for the dental laboratory (Beuer, Schwieger & Edelhoff, 2008). The milling process is faster, and most importantly, CAD/CAM restorations have become more accurate in terms of anatomic appearance, and interproximal and occlusal contacts (Rocca, Bonnafous, Rizcalla & Krejci, 2010). Research has shown that the long term acceptability and marginal integrity of single crowns fabricated by CAD/CAM technology are similar to single crowns fabricated by traditional laboratory methods over a 3 year time period (Wittneben, Wright, Weber, & Gallucci, 2009).

Resin Bonding

The ACR has benefited from advances in resin bonding (Hopp & Land, 2013). A considerable advantage of the ACR is the dentist is able to adjust the shade of the final result by using resin cements (Öztürk & colleagues, 2013). There is an increasing range of shades in resin cements that can be used to modify the shade and value of the restoration. The resin cement can also block out any potential imperfections present in the prepared tooth from being externally visible (Nie, Agustin & Douglas, 2014).

Modern bonding techniques involve treating the prepared tooth with phosphoric acid and a resin bonding agent (Magne, Schlichting, Maia & Baraterie, 2010). The ACR is etched with hydrofluoric acid, which exposes surface area for mechanical retention. The restoration is then treated with silane to act as a coupling agent between the restoration and bonding resin cement (Oba & colleagues, 2014). The silane agent forms a covalent hydrogen and chemical bond between the organic matrix of the resin and the exposed hydroxyl group on the surface of the treated ceramic (Anchieta, Rocha, Almeida, Freitas-Junior & Martini, 2011).

The Use of Glass Ionomer in Restorative Dentistry

Glass ionomers (GIs) were developed to combine the favorable physical and esthetic properties of resin composites with the fluoride release of silicate cements (Wilson & Kent, 1972). GI is created when a strontium or calcium alumino-flouro-silicate glass powder is mixed with a polyalkenoic acid (Mitra, 1989). The first GIs set using only a chemical reaction initiated by mixing the acid and base (Wilson and Prosser, 1984).During the setting process, the acid groups are neutralized by the glass powder. GI performs well in the presence of moisture and has low solubility when completely set (Croll, 2001). Water is the medium that facilitates ionic exchange (Mitra, 1991). This reaction causes the release of fluoride ions. The amount of fluoride released by GI cement into the prepared tooth was found to be statistically greater than the fluoride output of other silicon-phosphate cements (Swartz, Phillips & Clark, 1984).

The addition of a photo-polymerizabale resin to traditional glass ionomer yields resin-modified glass ionomer (RMGI) (Croll & Helpin, 1994; Uno & Finger, 1996). The inclusion of resin in the GI system decreases the setting time. RMGI enhances the cohesive strength of the restorative material while maintain the tensile and compressive strength of traditional GI (Mitra, 1991; Mitra & Kedrowski, 1994). A recent improvement of RMGI is known as a nano-ionomer

(Carvalho& colleagues, 2012). The decreased size of the filler particles results in a GI with high polishability and better esthetic results (Croll, 2007).

Decreasing the base-to-acid ratio will yield a GI that can be used as luting cement. Glass ionomer has been used successfully as luting cement for many years (Nicholson & Croll, 1997; Hill & Lott, 2011), especially for pediatric patients in need for the delivery of stainless steel crowns and orthodontic bands (Croll & Helpin, 1994).Another useful application of GI is as a liner under direct restorations (Davidson, 1994). GI liners have positive clinical performance when used to cover dentin prior to the acid etching step when placing direct composite restorations (McLean &Wilson, 1977). Glass ionomer can also be an excellent choice as a liner when a restoration is close to the pulp of the tooth (Prabhakar, Subhadra, Kurthukoti & Shubha, 2008; Rusin, Agee, Suchko & Pashley, 2010). The low modulus of elasticity, and potential for self-repair following the inevitable micro-fractures seen in the setting process, make GI an excellent layer between tooth structure and a more brittle direct restorative materials (Ferrari, 1999).

Unlike resin composites, which rely on acid etching and micromechanical retention, GI bonds chemically to tooth structure via chelation (Mount, 1991). In this process, calcium ions chelate carboxyl groups on polyacrylic acid to form cross-linked chains of polymers. Carboxyl groups present on the polymer chains bond with ions on the surface of tooth structure and the alumino-silicate powder (Mason & Ferrari, 1994). Over the first 2-3 days, calcium ions are substituted for aluminum ions, forming an even tighter polymer chain. Over the next month, available silicate ions react with water to create covalent bonds, increasing the strength of the tooth-to-GI bond (Khoroushi & Keshani, 2013).

The ability of GI to provide extended fluoride release is of great advantage (Croll & Nicholson, 2002). The slow and continuous release of fluoride by GI has an anti-cariogenic effect adjacent to the margins of indirect restorations (Tantbirojn, 1997). Recurrent decay is a major cause of failure of dental restorations (Kopperud, Tveit, Gaarden, Sandvik & Espelid, 2012; Mjor, 1996). This occurs when cariogenic bacteria colonize the area between restoration and tooth surface. The acid released by these bacteria causes a drop in the local pH, which demineralizes tooth structure (Torii & colleagues, 2001). Fluoride-releasing dental materials inhibit the drop in pH at the cavosurface margin (Mayanagi, Igarashi, Washio, Domon-Tawaraya & Takahashi, 2014).

The positive performance of GI makes it a frequently used restorative material (Frencken, Leal, & Navarro, 2012). GI has a coefficient of thermal expansion similar to enamel and dentin (Bullard, Leinfelder & Russell, 1988; Majety & Pujar, 2011). A similar coefficient of thermal expansion decreases microleakage and postoperative sensitivity (Weiner, 2011).

GI's ability to bond to tooth structure through chelation makes it very effective when there is minimal enamel left for bonding (Croll & Nicholson, 2002). In areas of buccal or lingual cervical recession, GI provides a tooth colored restoration with good marginal adaptation (Siegward, Christiane & Valentin, 2010), when resin-based composite is not clinically ideal, but an amalgam or gold restoration is not desired.

The fluoride releasing properties of GI make it an excellent choice for patients with high caries risk. Patients with extensive treatment needs often require multi-phased treatment plans. GI can provide an esthetic and functional restoration in the disease control phase of treatment, prior to initiation of the corrective phase. Similarly, GI is the most commonly utilized restorative material in atraumatic restorative treatment (ART) (Frencken, Songpaisan, Phantumvanit & Pilot, 1994; Smales &Yip, 2002) This technique consists of removing gross decay and placing a restoration to protect the tooth and inhibit further decay (Frenken & colleagues, 2012). ART is often used in low-income areas, and in countries where modern dental treatment may not be affordable or available (Frenken, 2010).

Research indicates that Class II resin-based composite and GI restorations have the highest success rate when the cervical margins are placed in enamel due to the presence of more enamel rods available for bonding (Demarco, Ramos, Mota, Formolo & Justino, 2001; Franco & colleagues, 2006). However, the success rate of Class II restoration decreases when the cervical margins are placed on dentin (Dietrich, Lösche, Lösche, & Roulet, 1999).

To improve the longevity of restoration, the sandwich technique was developed to use GI as a base under a resin composite restoration (Van Dijken, Kieri & Carlen, 1999). The technique can improve the marginal adaptation of Class II resin composite restorations when gingival margins are located in dentin (Dietrich, Lösche, Lösche, & Roulet, 1999). The "closed sandwich" technique uses GI as the restorative material on the internal aspect of the preparation, and maintains resin-based composite as the restorative material at the entire cavosurface margin. The "open sandwich" variation maintains the glass ionomer as the external cavosurface margin at the cervical area (Kirsten, Rached, Mazur, Vieira, & Souza, 2013; Suzuki & Jordan, 1990).

Marginal Integrity in Dental Restorations

The success of indirect dental restorations is directly related to the marginal adaptation. Open margins collect plaque and have increased leakage and failure rates (Gardner, 1982). Marginal integrity is expressed as the micromillimeter gap between dental restoration and fixed margin of the tooth (Saltzberg, Cervalo, Holstein, Groom & Gottsegen, 1976). The margins of dental restorations can be evaluated clinically using radiographs and tactile examination

(Dedmon, 1982). Marginal integrity is often measured in the laboratory using dye penetration and electron microscopy (Glyn Jones, Grieve & Youngson, 1988).

. The margins of an AMR made from gold have been found to reach 7 to 65 μmillimeters (Lofstrom & Barakat, 1989). The marginal integrity of the MCR has been found to range from 6 to 34 μmillimeters (Donovan & Prince, 1985). Variance in marginal integrity in MCR can depend on the type of metal used to fabricate the coping. At their inception, the ACR did not have the ability to completely cover the margin. Instead of the crown fitting perfectly, the early ACR relied upon the luting cement to seal the cavosurface margin. When the CAD/CAM ACR entered into use, their marginal integrity left room for improvement, with have marginal integrity ranging from 63- 161 μmillimeters (Sulaiman, Chai, Jameson &Wozniak, 1997). But, as the scanning and milling technology has improved, current marginal integrity of ACR's has been reported to range from 40 to 60 micromillemeters (Baig, Tan & Nicholls, 2010).

Challenging Restorative Conditions

Full coverage indirect restorations are often indicated after teeth have been subjected to a series of direct restorations. Often these restorations have increased in size and depth at each dental encounter (Hickel, Brüshaver & Ilie, 2012). By the time an indirect restoration is indicated, the margin is often sub-gingival. The ideal location of an ACR is one with ample enamel present to bond with the resin cement (Della Bona & Kelly, 2008). As the margin of the ACR extends towards the CEJ, there is decreasing enamel available. If ideal bonding cannot be achieved on the external cavosurface margin, the longevity of the restoration may be compromised (Demarco, Corrêa, Cenci, Moraes & Opdam, 2012). Dental restorations have the highest success rate when they are placed above CEJ (Lüscher, Lutz, Ochsenbein & Mühleman, 1978; Lefever, Gregor, Bortolotto & Krejci, 2012; Poggio, Chiesa, Scribante, Mekler, &

Colombo, 2013). However, there are many situations when this is not possible to place restorations above CEJ.

When the margin of a restoration approaches the alveolar bone, the biologic width is violated (Nethravathy, Vinoth & Thomas, 2013; Rosenberg, Cho & Garber, 1999). The biological width is the area of the gingival tissue connected to the tooth above the height of the alveolar bone (Garguilo, Wentz & Orban, 1961). Restorations should allow for at least 2-3mm of biologic width (Vacek, Gher, Assad, Richardson & Giambarresi, 1994). If biologic width is violated, periodontal bone loss and gingival inflammation can occur (Ingber, Rose & Coslet, 1977).Corrective Crown Lengthening (CCL) is a surgical procedure to remove hard and soft periodontal tissue for a more accessible margin. This procedure involves gaining access and surgically removing supporting bone to allow for a more supragingival margin and reestablishing biologic width (Garguilo, Wentz & Orban, 1961). Although this is a proven technique, there are possible disadvantages. Surgical complications such as post-operative bleeding and bacterial infection can occur. Post-operative sensitivity and decreased ability to perform oral hygiene at the surgical site immediately following the operation has been noted (Hoexter, 2006). Poor gingival esthetic results and gingival recession can occur, resulting in a "black triangle" surrounding the restored area (Nugala, Kumar, Sahitya & Krishna, 2012).

Margins that are placed with cavosurface above the gingiva are believed to have higher success rates. One study found that subgingival margins with restorative overhangs lead to changes in the types of bacteria found in the adjacent periodontium (Lang, Kiel & Anderhalden, 1983). A supragingival margin makes the impression taking process easier and more accurate. A restorative margin that is above the gingiva is easier to verify for proper fit. Removing excess luting and cement and polishing the margins of the indirect restoration are also better accomplished when the margin is in accessible location (Nugala, Kumar, Sahitya & Krishna, 2012).

Recently, non-surgical techniques have been developed to place restorative margins in a more ideal location. Deep margin elevation (DME), also termed proximal box elevation (PBE), involves placing a resin-based composite to relocate the gingival margin in a more coronal location. With the gingival margin more accessible, it can be isolated with a rubber dam. With the margin more coronally, the dentist has better access and moisture control (Magne & Spreafico, 2012).

The PBE technique has been used to raise proximal dentin margins prior to scanning for indirect dental restorations. Using this composite placement technique, PBE could be used as an alternative to other restorative techniques, such as placing the margin of the direct restoration in a very subgingival location (Frankenberger & colleagues, 2013). PBE has been shown to provide marginal integrity comparable to when ceramic restorations are placed in dentin (Zaruba, Göhring, Wegehaupt, & Attin, 2013). However, by placing a layer of direct restorative material at the cavosurface margin prior to an indirect restoration, the practitioner introduces another restorative interface that could leak. When using techniques such as PBE, there are concerns that there will be an increase in failure between the additional layer of restorative material (Roggendorf & colleagues, 2012).

Summary

The ACR has many qualities that contribute to its increasing use in modern dentistry. It has an appearance very similar to natural tooth structure (Pollington, 2011). Advances in the science of dental materials are resulting in improved and stronger ACRs that can be placed in areas with significant occlusal forces applied to them. CAD/CAM technology makes a strong and esthetic ACR available in one visit (Walia, Thomas, Sandu & Santos, 2009). This makes the CAD/CAM ACR a treatment option that appeals to both patients and providers.

GI has seen increased use since the 1970s (Torii & colleagues, 2001; Wilson & Kent, 1972). Its physical properties and bonding capabilities make GI a good choice for restoration when extensive tooth structure has been lost (Croll & Nicholson, 2002). In particular, GI has been used to successfully repair and extend the longevity of indirect restorations (Carlson, Naguib, Cochran & Lund, 1990). The use of fluoride releasing GI helps to remineralize teeth (Wiegand, Buchalla & Attin, 2007). Techniques such as the open sandwich restoration have demonstrated the success of GI when used at the cervical margin (Kirsten, Rached, Mazur, Vieira, & Souza, 2013).

Both direct and indirect restorations are most successful when placed in a supragingival location with sufficient enamel at the cavosurface margin (Beznos, 2001). Recent techniques such as DME and PBE have demonstrated the use of resin- based composites to place cavosurface margins in a more accessible location. Repairing existing direct and indirect restorations with direct restorative materials can be successful (Smales & Hawthorne 2004).

The ACR and GI are often used in conjunction. GI is frequently used for the delivery of the ACR, as a liner and base to support all ceramic restorations (Snyder, Lang & Razzoog, 2003). . As the use of both glass ionomer and all ceramic restorations increases in dentistry, there will be greater incidence of these restorative materials being used in direct contact. There are documented situations when there is consistent marginal failure when two different direct restorative materials are joined together (Brown, Swartz, Cochran & Phillips, 1993). However, there is not sufficient research present to evaluate the performance of GI when it is in direct contact with an ACR, and simultaneously exposed to the oral environment as an external cavosurface margin. Therefore, purpose of this study is to evaluate the marginal leakage of a ceramic inlay when bonded to a direct GI restoration, as compared to that of a ceramic inlay bonded to cementum.

CHAPTER III: MATERIALS AND METHODS

This *in vitro* study quantifies and compares the marginal integrity of all-ceramic inlays cemented to tooth structure; each mesial-occlusal (MO) cavity preparation includes a superficial (enamel) and deep (cementum) gingival margin. The independent variables are: (1) margin depth (two levels [enamel and cementum]); and (2) restorative material for margin elevation (two levels [GI and RMGI]). The dependent, or outcome, variable is marginal integrity, measured as the percentage of gingival cavosurface margin visibly closed when viewed at 200x magnification.

Sample Size Determination. Using a sample size calculator developed by the University of British Columbia Department of Statistics (http://www.stat.ubc.ca/~rollin/stats/ssize/n2.html) with the following assumptions:

α (Type I error):	0.05
Sigma (common S.D.):	15% of the mean
Power:	0.80
Two-sided Test	

The sample size needed to detect a 20% difference between mean values was calculated to be n = 9. For ease in statistical calculations, we elected to increase the sample size to n = 10.

Specimen Preparation. Forty caries-free, non-restored, extracted human third molars are obtained from the National Institute for Dental and Craniofacial Research (NIDCR) (approved Material Transfer Agreement). The teeth are cleaned of any contaminants or biologic debris and stored in 0.5% chloramine T at 4° C for up to six months until ready for use. Twenty-four hours before beginning the study, all specimens are transferred to deionized water at 4° C. .

The buccal-lingual and mesial-distal dimensions (at the CEJ) of each specimen are measured using a digital micrometer (Mitutoyo, Tokyo, Japan) and an area (mm^2) calculated. Specimens are assigned to four treatment groups (Table 1) such that the mean dimensional areas of all groups were equal.

Table 1. Treatment groups (n = 10 restorations).

Group	Margin Placement	Deep Margin Elevation	DME Material
1 (Positive Control)	Enamel	--	None
2 (Negative Control)	Cementum	--	None
3	Cementum	Yes	Fuji II LC
4	Cementum	Yes	Fuji IX

Standardized MO ceramic inlay preparations are placed (33% of overall width at buccal-lingual dimension of isthmus, 33% of overall occlusal depth, and 25% of overall depth at the gingival cavosurface margin). Twenty teeth have 2 mm deep marginal elevation (DME) placed using either a self-cured GI (Fuji IX, GC America, Alsip, Illinois) or light-cured RMGI (Fuji II LC, GC America, Alsip, Illinois). Forty lithium disilicate porcelain ceramic inlays will be milled from CEREC Block PC (Sirona, Charlotte, North Carolina), scanned by the CEREC Omnicam, and milled by CEREC inLab MC XL system.

List of Procedures in Chronological Order

1. The intaglio surface of the inlays are treated using 5% hydrofluoric acid for 60 seconds, rinsed with water for 60 seconds, and treated with a silanating agent for 60 seconds.
2. The inlays are cemented with a dual-cured resin bonding system (Nexus NX3, Kerr, Charlotte/North Carolina), following the manufacturer's instructions.
3. The margins of the restorations are polished according to the manufacturer's recommendations.

Following 24 hours storage in distilled water at room temperature, the specimens are subjected to thermal cycling (10,000 cycles; 5° C / 55° C). Following thermocycling, the restorations were sectioned in half in the buccal-lingual dimension. The sections are examined under a digital microscope (Hi-Rox) at 200x magnification.

Quantitate marginal analysis is performed on both the interface between the ACR and either the GI or cementum composing the terminal margin of the tooth. Each interface is classified as either possessing a closed or open margin, measured as the percentage of gingival cavosurface margin visibly closed. A closed margin is defined as having complete continuity between restorative materials, or between restorative materials and tooth structure. An open margin indicates there is a gap between restorative materials.

Statistical Analysis. Mean (± standard deviation) marginal integrity (percentage of closed margins) is calculated for each material (glass ionomer or resin-modified glass ionomer) and substrate (enamel or cementum). Mean values are compared via a two-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) and, where indicated, Scheffe HSD post-hoc tests. Statistical analyses re performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 18 computer software (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL). All significance levels are set at $\alpha = 0.05$. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference in the marginal integrity of ceramic inlays cemented to GI or tooth structure.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The study proposal was approved by the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Department of Research Programs in September 2014. . The funding for the project was allocated in May 2015. Extracted teeth to be used as test specimen are being collected from NIDCR. Data collection will begin as soon as the supplies are available.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Although we have yet to complete our data collection, it is highly likely that the results of this test will resemble similar studies that see no difference in marginal integrity of indirect restorations cemented to direct restorative material, when compared with dentin and cementum (Frankenberger & colleagues, 2013). There is no doubt that the best margin of a bonded ACR will have the best success when cemented to an enamel margin with perfect isolation. However, in the clinical practice, there are many situations when it is not possible to place cavosurface on enamel. The focus of this study is to examine what the best treatment option will be when the dentist must decide to keep the cavosurface margin on cementum or an existing GI restoration.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

The completion of this study will give guidance to dentists when dealing with this common and challenging clinical situation in clinical practice.

REFERENCES

Anchieta R.B., Rocha E. P., Almeida E. O., Freitas-Junior A.C., Martini A.P. (2011). Bonding all-ceramic restorations with two resins cement techniques: a clinical report of three-year follow-up. *European Journal of Dentistry,* 5, 478-485.

Asgar, K. (1998). Casting Metals in Dentistry: past-present-future. *Advanced Dental Restorations, 2*(1), 33-43.

Baig M.R., Tan K.B., Nicholls J.I. (2010). Evaluation of the marginal fit of a zirconia ceramic computer-aided machined (CAM) crown system. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 104*(4), 216-227.

Beuer F., Schweiger J., Edelhoff D. (2008). Digital dentistry: an overview of recent developments for CAD/CAM generated restorations. *British Dental Journal, 204*(9), 505-511.

Beznos C. (2001). Microleakage at the cervical margin of composite Class II cavities with different restorative techniques. *Operative Dentistry, 26*(1), 60-69.

Brown K.B., Swartz M.L., Cochran M.A., Phillips R.W. (1993). The glass-ionomer-lined cervical composite restoration: as in vitro investigation. *Operative Dentistry, 18*(1), 17-27.

Bullard R.H., Leinfelder K.F., Russell C.M. (1988). Effect of coefficient of thermal expansion on microleakage. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 116*(7), 871-874.

Carlson T.J., Naguib E.A., Cochran M.A., Lund M.R. (1990). Comparison of glass-ionomer cements used to repair cast restorations. *Operative Dentistry, 15*(5), 162-166.

Carvalho F.G., Sampaio C.S., Fucio S.B., Carlo H.L., Correr-Sobrinho L., Puppin-Rontani R.M. (2012). Effect of chemical and mechanical degradation on surface roughness of three glass ionomers and a nanofilled resin composite. *Operative Dentistry. 37*(5), 509-517.

Christensen G.J. (2003). The confusing array of tooth-colored crowns. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 134(*9), 1253-1255.

Christensen G. J. (2009). Porcelain-fused-to-metal versus zirconia-based restorations. 2009. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 140*(8), 136-139.

Croll T.P. (2001). Rapid setting, encapsulated glass-ionomer restorative cement. *Compendium, 22*(5), 442-448.

Croll T.P. (2007). Nanofilled resin-modified glass ionomer restorative cement. *Contemporary Esthetics, 11*, 14-17.

Croll T.P., Helpin M.L. (1994). Space maintainer cementation using light-hardened glass ionomer/resin restorative cement. *Journal of Dentistry for Children, 61*, 246-248.

Croll T.P., Nicholson J.W., (2002). Glass ionomer cements in pediatric dentistry: review of the literature. *Pediatric Dentistry, 24*(5), 423-429.

Davidson C.L (1994). Glass ionomer bases under posterior composites. *Journal of Esthetic Dentistry,* 6, 223-226.

Dedmon, H.W. (1982). Disparity in expert opinion on size of acceptable margin openings. *Operative Dentistry, 7*, 97–101.

Della Bona A., Kelly J.R. (2008). The clinical success of all-ceramic restorations. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 139*(9 Suppl), 8S-13S.

Demarco F.F., Corrêa M.B., Cenci M.S., Moraes R.R., Opdam N.J. (2012). Longevity of posterior composite restorations: not only a matter of materials. *Dental Materials, 28*(1), 87-101.

Demarco F.F., Ramos O.L., Mota C.S., Formolo E., Justino L.M. (2001). Influence of different restorative techniques on microleakage in Class II cavities with gingival wall in cementum. *Operative Dentistry, 26*(3), 253-259.

Dietrich T., Lösche A.C., Lösche G.M., Roulet J.F. (1999). Marginal adaptation of direct composite and sandwich restorations in Class II cavities with cervical margins in dentine. *Journal of Dentistry, 27*(2), 119-128.

Donovan T., Prince J. (1985). An analysis of margin configurations for metal-ceramic crowns. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 53*, 153-157.

Fasbinder D., (2006). Clinical performance of chairside CAD/CAM restorations. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 137*(Suppl), 22S-31S.

Ferrari M. (1999). Use of glass-ionomers as bondings, linings, or bases. Cited In: Davidson CL, Mjor IA, eds. Advances in Glass-Ionomer Cements. Berlin/Chicago: Quintessence Publishing Company, 137-148.

Franco E.B., Benetti A.R., Ishikiriama S.K., Santiago S.L., Lauris J.R., Jorge M.F., Navarro M.F. (2006). 5-year clinical performance of resin composite versus resin modified glass ionomer restorative system in non-carious cervical lesions. *Operative Dentistry, 31*(4), 403-408.

Frankenberger R., Hehn J., Hajtó J., Krämer N., Naumann M., Koch A., Roggendorf M. (2013). Effect of proximal box elevation with resin composite on marginal quality of ceramic inlays in vitro. *Clinical Oral Investigations, 17*(1), 177-183.

Frencken J.E. (2010). The ART approach using glass-ionomers in relation to global oral health care. *Dental Materials, 26*(1), 1-6.

Frencken J.E., Leal S.C., Navarro M.F (2012). Twenty-five-year atraumatic restorative treatment (ART) approach: a comprehensive overview. *Clinical Oral Investigations, 16*(5), 1337-1346.

Frencken J.E., Peters M.C., Manton D.J., Leal S.C., Gordan V.V., Eden E. (2012). Minimal intervention dentistry for managing dental caries - a review: Report of a FDI task group. *International Dental Journal, 62*(5), 223-2243.

Frencken J.E., Songpaisan Y., Phantumvanit P., Pilot T. (1994). An atraumatic restorative treatment (ART) technique: evaluation after one year. *International Dental Journal, 44*(5), 460-464.

Gardner F.M. (1982). Margins of complete crowns--literature review. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. 48*(4), 396-400.

Gargiulo A., Wentz F., Orban B. (1961). Dimensions and relations of the dentogingival junction in humans. *Journal of Periodontology 32,* 261-267.

Giordano R., McLaren E.A. (2010). Ceramics overview: classification by microstructure and processing methods. *Compendium of Continuing Education in Dentistry, Nov-Dec, 31(9*), 682-684, 686, 688.

Glyn Jones J., Grieve A.R., Youngson C.C. (1988). Marginal leakage associated with three posterior restorative materials. *Journal of Dentistry, 16*(3), 130-134.

Griggs J.A. (2007). Recent advances in materials for all-ceramic restorations. *Dental Clinics of North America, 51*(3), 713-727.

Hagman H. C. (1976). The evolution of metal castings for dentistry. *Bulletin of Historical Dentistry, 24*(2), 98-105.

Helvey, G. (2010). A history of dental ceramics. *Compendium of Continuing Education in Dentistry, 31*(4), 310-311.

Hickel R., Brüshaver K., Ilie N., (2013). Repair of restorations-criteria for decision making and clinical recommendations. *Dental Materials, 29*(1), 28-50.

Hill E, Lott J. (2011). A clinically focused discussion of luting materials. *Australian Dental Journal, 56*(1 Suppl), 67-76.

Hinman T. P. (1907). Methods of filling teeth with gold inlays. *Items of Interest, 29* (1), 5861.

Hoexter D.L. (2006). Assuaging postoperative effects of periodontal surgery. *Dentistry Today, 25*(4), 94-97.

Hopp C., Land M., (2013). Considerations for ceramic inlays in posterior teeth: a review. *Clinical, Cosmetic, and Investigational Dentistry, 18*(5), 21-32.

Ingber J.S., Rose L.F., Coslet J.G. (1977). The "biologic width"--a concept in periodontics and restorative dentistry. *Alpha Omegan, 70*(3), 62-65.

Kelly J.R. (2004). Dental ceramics: Current thinking and trends. *Dental Clinics of North America, 48*(2), 513-530.

Kelly J.R. (2008). Dental ceramics: What is this stuff anyway? *Journal of the American Dental Association, 139*(9 Suppl), 4S-7S.

Kelly J.R., Benetti P. (2011). Ceramic materials in dentistry: historical evolution and current practice. *Australian Dental Journal, 56*(1 Suppl), 84-96.

Khoroushi M., Keshani F. (2013). A review of glass-ionomers: From conventional glass-ionomer to bioactive glass-ionomer. *Journal of Dental Research,10*(4), 411-420.

Kirsten G.A., Rached R.N., Mazur R.F., Vieira S., Souza E.M. (2013). Effect of open-sandwich vs. adhesive restorative techniques on enamel and dentine demineralization: an in situ study. *Journal of Dentistry, 41*(10), 872-880.

Komine F., Blatz B., Matsumura H. (2010). Current status of zirconia-based fixed restorations. *Journal of Oral Science, 52*(4), 531-539.

Kopperud S.E., Tveit A.B., Gaarden T., Sandvik L., Espelid I. (2012). Longevity of posterior dental restorations and reasons for failure. *European Journal of Oral Science, 120*(6), 539-548.

Lang N.P., Kiel R.A., Anderhalden K. (1983). Clinical and microbiological effects of subgingival restorations with overhanging or clinically perfect margins. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 10*(6), 563-578.

Lefever D., Gregor L., Bortolotto T., Krejci I. (2012). Supragingival relocation of subgingivally located margins for adhesive inlays/onlays with different materials. *Journal of Adhesive Dentistry 14*(6), 561-567.

Lofstrom L.H., Barakat M.M., (1989). Scanning electron microscopic evaluation of clinically cemented cast gold restorations. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 61*(6), 664-669.

Lüscher B., Lutz F., Ochsenbein H., Mühleman H.R. (1978). Microleakage and marginal adaptation of composite resin restorations, Journal *of Prosthetic Dentistry, 39*,409–413.

Luthard R.G., Sandkuhl O., Reitz B. (1999). Zirconia-TZP and alumina advanced technologies for the manufacturing of the single crown. *European Journal of Prosthodontic Restorative Dentistry,* 7, 113-119.

Macdonald F.W. (1907).The evolution of the "inlay"' in dentistry. *American Dental Journal,* 6 (8), 50710.

Magne P., Schlichting L.H., Maia H.P., Baratieri L.N. (2010). In vitro fatigue resistance of CAD/CAM composite resin and ceramic posterior occlusal veneers. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 104*(3), 149-157.

Magne P., Spreafico R. C., (2012). Deep margin elevation: A paradigm shift. *American Journal of Esthetic Dentistry 2*(2), 86.

Majety K., Pujar M., (2011). In vitro evaluation of microleakage of class II packable composite resin restorations using flowable composite and resin modified glass ionomers as intermediate layers. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry, 14*(4), 414-417.

Mason P.N., Ferrari M. (1994). In vivo evaluation of glass ionomer cement adhesion to dentin. *Quintessence International, 25,* 499-504.

Mayanagi G., Igarashi K., Washio J., Domon-Tawaraya H., Takahashi N. (2014). Effect of fluoride-releasing restorative materials on bacteria-induced pH fall at the bacteria-material interface: An in vitro model study. *Journal of Dentistry, 42*(1), 15-20.

McLean J.W., Wilson A.D. (1977). The clinical development of the glass ionomer cement. Some clinical applications. *Australian Dental Journal, 22*(2), 120-127.

Mitra S.B. (1991). Adhesion to dentin and physical properties of a light cured glass-ionomer liner/base. *Journal of Dental Restorations, 70*(1) 72-74.

Mitra S.B. (1989). Property comparisons of a light-cure and a self-cure glass ionomer liner. *Journal of Dental Restorations, 68,* 274.

Mitra S.B., Creo A.L. (1989). *Fluoride release from light-cure and self-cure glass ionomers. Journal of Dental Restorations, 68,* 274.

Mitra S.B., Kedrowski B.L. (1994). Long-term mechanical properties of glass ionomers. *Dental Materials, 10*(2), 78-82.

Miyazaki T., Hotta Y., Kunii J., Kuriyama S., Tamaki Y. (2009). A review of dental CAD/CAM status and future perspectives from 20 years of experience. *Dental Materials Journal, 28*(1), 44-56.

Mjör I.A. (1996). Glass-ionomer cement restorations and secondary caries: a preliminary report. *Quintessence International, 27*(3), 171-174.

Mormann, W.H. (2006). The evolution of the CEREC system. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 137,* 7s-13s.

Mount G.J. (1991). Adhesion of glass-ionomer cement in the clinical environment. *Operative Dentistry, 16*, 141-148.

Nethravathy R., Vinoth S.K., Thomas A.V., (2013). Three different surgical techniques of crown lengthening: A comparative study. *Journal of Pharmacy and Bioallied Science, 5*(Suppl 1), S14-S16.

Nicholson J.W., Croll T.P., (1997). Glass-ionomer cements in restorative dentistry. *Quintessence International, 28*(11), 705-714.

Niu E., Agustin M., Douglas R.D., (2014). Color match of machinable lithium disilicate ceramics: Effects of cement color and thickness. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 111*(1), 42-50.

Nugala B., Kumar B.S., Sahitya S., Krishna P.M. (2012). Biologic width and its importance in periodontal and restorative dentistry. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry 15*(1), 12-17.

Oba Y., Koizumi H., Nakayama D., Ishii T., Akazawa N., Matsumura H. (2014). Effect of silane and phosphate primers on the adhesive performance of atri-n-butylborane initiated luting agent bonded to zirconia. *Dental Materials Journal, 33*(2), 226-232.

Öztürk E., Chiang Y.C., Coşgun E., Bolay Ş., Hickel R, Ilie N. (2013). Effect of resin shades on opacity of ceramic veneers and polymerization efficiency through ceramics. *Journal of Dentistry, 41*(Suppl 5), 8-14.

Poggio C., Chiesa M., Scribante A., Mekler J., Colombo M. (2013). Microleakage in Class II composite restorations with margins below the CEJ: in vitro evaluation of different restorative techniques. *Medicina Oral Patología Oral y Cirugía Bucal, 18*(5), 793-798.

Pollington S. (2011). Novel glass-ceramics for dental restorations. *Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice, 12*(1), 60-67.

Prabhakar A.R., Subhadra H.N., Kurthukoti A.J., Shubha A.B., (2008). Sealing ability and thermal diffusivity of cavity lining materials: an in vitro study. *Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, 26*(Suppl 2), S62-67.

Rocca G., Bonnafous F., Rizcalla N., Krejci I. (2010). A technique to improve the esthetics aspects of CAD/CAM composite resin restorations. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 104*(4), 273-275.

Rosenberg E.S., Cho S.C., Garber D.A. (1999). Crown lengthening revisited. *Compendium of the Continuing Education in Dentistry, 20*(6):527-32, 534, 536-538.

Rusin R.P., Agee K., Suchko M., Pashley D.H. (2010). Effect of a new desensitizing material on human dentin permeability. *Dental Materials, 26*(6), 600-607.

Saltzberg, D.S., Ceravolo, F.J., Holstein, F., Groom, G., & Gottsegen, R. (1976). Scanning electron microscope study of the junction between restorations and gingival cavosurface margins. J*ournal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 36*,517.

Schulein T.M. (2005). Significant events in the history of operative dentistry. *Journal of the History of Dentistry, 53*(2), 69.

Shenoy A., Shenoy N. (2010). Dental ceramics: An update. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry. Oct;13*(4), 195-203.

Siegward DH, Christiane R, Valentin R. (2010). Clinical performance of cervical restorations-A meta-analysis. *Dental Materials, 26*(12), 993-1000.

Smales R.J, Hawthorne W.S. (2004). Long-term survival of repaired amalgams, recemented crowns and gold castings. *Operative Dentistry, 29*(3), 249-253.

Smales R.J., Yip H.K. (2002). The atraumatic restorative treatment (ART) approach for the management of dental caries. *Quintessence International, 33*(6), 427-432.

Small B.W. (2008). Cast gold: The standard of care for operative dentistry. *Inside Dentistry, 4*(2).

Snyder M.D., Lang B.R., Razzoog M.E. (2003). The efficacy of luting all-ceramic crowns with resin-modified glass ionomer cement. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 134*(5), 609-612.

Spear F., Holloway J. (2008). Which all ceramic system is optimal for anterior esthetics? *Journal of the American Dental Association, 139* (Supplement), 19S-24S.

Sulaiman F., Chai J., Jameson L.M., Wozniak W.T. (1997). A comparison of the marginal fit of In-Ceram, IPS Empress, and Procera crowns. *International Journal of Prosthodontics, 10*(5),478-484.

Suzuki M., Jordan R.E. (1990). Glass ionomer-composite sandwich technique. *Journal of the American Dental Association, 120(*1), 55-57.

Swartz M.L., Phillips R.W., Clark H.E. (1984). Long-term fluoride release from glass ionomer cements. *Journal of Dental Restorations, 63*(2), 158-160.

Tantbirojn D., Douglas WH., Versluis A. (1997). Inhibitive effect of a resin-modified glass ionomer cement on remote enamel artificial caries. *Caries Research, 31*(4), 275-280.

Torii Y., Itota T., Okamoto M., Nakabo S., Nagamine M., Inoue K. (2001). Inhibition of artificial secondary caries in root by fluoride-releasing restorative materials. *Operative Dentistry, 26*(1), 36-43.

Uno S., Finger W.J., Fritz U. (1996). Long-term mechanical characteristics of resin-modified glass ionomer restorative materials. *Dental Materials, (I),* 64-69.

Vacek J.S., Gher M.E., Assad D.A., Richardson A.C., Giambarresi L.I. (1994). The dimensions of the human dentogingival junction. *International Journal of Periodontics Restorative Dentistry, 14*(2),154-165.

Van Dijken J.W., Kieri C., Carlén M. (1999). Longevity of extensive class II open-sandwich restorations with a resin-modified glass-ionomer cement. *Journal of Dental Research, 78*(7), 1319-1325.

Walia S., Thomas P.M., Sandu H., Santos G.C. (2009). Restoring esthetics with metal free ceramics: A case report. *Journal of the California Dental Association, 75*(5), 353-355.

Weiner R., (2011). Liners and bases in general dentistry. *Australian Dental Journal, 56*(1), 11-22.

Wiegand A., Buchalla W., Attin T. (2007). Review on fluoride-releasing restorative materials-fluoride release and uptake characteristics, antibacterial activity and influence on caries formation. *Dental Materials, 23*(3), 343-362.

Wilson A.D., Kent B.E. (1972). New translucent cement for dentistry. The glass ionomer cement. *British Dental Journal, 132*(4), 133-135.

Wilson, A.D., Prosser H.K. (1984). A survey of inorganic and polyelectrolyte cements. *Brittish Dental Journal,* 157, 449-454.

Wittneben J.G., Wright R.F.,Weber H.P., & Gallucci G.O. (2009). A systematic review of the clinical performance of CAD/CAM single-tooth restorations. *International Journal of Prosthodontics, 22*(5), 466-471.

Zaruba M., Göhring T.N., Wegehaupt F.J., Attin T. (2013). Influence of a proximal margin elevation technique on marginal adaptation of ceramic inlays. *Acta Odontologica Scandinavica, 71*(2), 317-324.