ISSN: 2581-5989
PubMed - National Library of Medicine - ID: 101738774

International Journal of Dental Science and Innovative Research (IJDSIR)

IJDSIR : Dental Publication Service

Available Online at: www.ijdsir.com

Volume – 3, Issue – 6, November - 2020, Page No. : 305 - 311

A Review on Clinical Performance and Failures of Zirconia Based Fixed Partial Denture

[1]Dr. M.A.Eswaran.,M.D.S, Asst Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Thai Moogambigai Dental College And Hospital, Chennai- 600107.

[2]Dr. Rathika Rai., M.D.S, Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Thai Moogambigai Dental College And Hospital,Chennai- 600107.

[3]Dr. Harish Kumar.S, Junior Resident, Department of Prosthodontics, Thai Moogambigai Dental College And Hospital,Chennai- 600107.

[4]Dr. Raj Kumar.P, Junior Resident, Department of Prosthodontics, Thai Moogambigai Dental College And Hospital,Chennai- 600107.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Raj Kumar.P, Junior Resident, Department of Prosthodontics, Thai Moogambigai Dental College And Hospital,Chennai- 600107.

Citation of this Article: Dr. M.A.Eswaran, Dr. Rathika Rai, Dr. Harish Kumar.S , Dr. Raj Kumar. P ., “A Review on Clinical Performance and Failures of Zirconia Based Fixed Partial Denture” IJDSIR- November - 2020, Vol. – 3, Issue - 6, P. No. 305 – 311.

Type of Publication: Review Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Zirconia has been utilized in clinical dentistry for a few decades and there are numerous reviews concerning the scientific overall performance and survival rates of zirconia-based restorations. This research paper becomes to review the literature posted from 2000 to 2020 concerning the scientific overall performance and also the explanations for failure of zirconia FPDs. Zirconia crowns are made up of solid monolithic zirconia ceramic material. Its use as dental restorative material became popular within the first 2000s with the arrival of CAD-CAM technology.

Keyword: Zirconia crown, Clinical performance, Failures of zirconia, FPD, Metal ceramic FPD.

Introduction

A denture that's luted or otherwise securely retained to natural teeth, tooth roots and implant abutments that furnish the primary support to the prosthesis. Conventional FPDs are the foremost commonly used sort of fixed partial dentures. The planning involves fabrication of a tough and fast denture, which takes support from abutments on either side of the edentulous space. The planning may vary according to the condition of the abutments but the abutments on either side should be able to support the fixed denture.

Zirconia FPD is high flexural strength and fracture resistance. Towards the very best of the last century, a climate of non-acceptance of metal alloys within the

mouth emerged among some dentists and within the dental product industry and, given the increasing demand for aesthetic treatments, these factors have driven the event of latest all-ceramic prosthetic rehabilitations (1). Clinical trials have shown that metal-ceramic FPDs have the power of long lasting (2). All-ceramic fixed partial dentures are regularly utilized in clinical dentistry. Great clinical execution for all-ceramic frameworks has been accounted for particularly whenever they're used inside the anterior region (3). However, fractures of posterior all-ceramic FPDs occurred and are reported as a main explanation for failure for these restorations (4). To beat this issue, pottery with various syntheses and fortifying glasslike stages are grown, very glass-invaded zirconia-hardened alumina, a lithium-disilicate-based glass-ceramic, and zirconia-based materials. The majority of the zirconia-based ceramic frameworks that are at present used in dentistry are yttrium-balanced out zirconia polycrystals (3Y-TZP) (5).

Searches completed in PubMed databases are enriched through hand searches to become aware of appropriate publications. The key phases used have been: “zirconia” and “fixed dental prosthesis”, “zirconia” and “crown”, “zirconia” and “fixed partial denture” and “humans”, “zirconia” and “crown” and “humans”, “crown” and “all-ceramics”.

Twelve research projects based totally on zirconia, framework design, and porcelain veneering approach met the inclusion criteria. Of the research identified, one became a randomized clinical observation with three-twelve months’ follow-up results; the others are cohort potential research. Clinical complications included core fracture, veneer fracture, abutment failure, and framework fracture. One observed pressed ceramics because of the veneering material and determined no chipping of veneering porcelain after three years.

Discussion

Metal ceramic (FIG 1) is a dental restorative material, its strength, aesthetic appearance ,biocompatibility and fabrication perfection makes it still one of the best materials for crowns and bridges production. Zirconia crowns are made from zirconium dioxide ,a very durable type of metal that’s related to titanium, although it is categorized as a type of ceramic crown . According to research of English reviewed literature was performed through PubMed to urge all the clinical studies on the performance & failures of the zirconia Fixed Partial Denture utilizing the catchphrases "zirconia" (FIG2) "Fixed Partial Dentures", "crown", all ceramic", "ZrO2", "core crack", "disappointments" and "clinical execution". The PubMed searches were conducted that focus on research articles published from 2000 to 2020. The electronic search was supplemented by manual exploring through the references of the chosen articles for possible inclusion of some articles. Randomized controlled clinical trials, longitudinal prospective and retrospective cohort studies was the focus of this review. Then the whole text articles were obtained for assessment. Articles that specialize in the restoration of teeth using zirconia-based restorations are included in this review.

Figure 1: Metal Ceramic Crown

Figure 2: Zirconia Crown

Clinical Performance of Single Crowns

In the 3-year review clinical investigation of 168 zirconia single crowns (FIG 3) by Ortorp et al. (6), the clinical result was good (worthy) as indicated by the CDA assessment. Most crowns (78%) were set in the premolar or molar territory. Extraction of the five projection teeth happened due to one root crack and four endodontic and periodontal confusions. Four facade breaks were watched also, two crowns were changed from this issue. Loss of maintenance accounted for 12 crowns and four new crowns were revamped. The relentless agony happened in one patient and another crown was revamped for this patient. The total endurance rate was 92.7% following 3 years. Çehreli et al (7). contemplated the clinical exhibition of zirconia crowns in the premolar and molar locales and revealed no clinical indication of negligible staining, diligent agony and optional caries. The clinical result was adequate as indicated by the CDA assessment. The great outcomes were obtained for the third investigations as no disappointments were recorded from the fifty crowns seen inside the gathering of single crowns (8).

Figure 3: Single Crown

Clinical Performance Of Zirconia Fixed Partial Dentures

The reasons for disappointment were veneer crack, ceramic core break, projection tooth crack, secondary caries, and restoration dislodgement. Veneer break was found in 11 investigations either announced as minor or significant chipping, and the facade break rate could be as high as 25%. The pace of facade break was fluctuated as certain examinations did exclude minors contributing the disappointment rate. High auxiliary caries rates were seen in two examinations utilizing a zirconia crown (FIG 4) created with a CAM system (9). Fracture of the projection teeth and endodontic issue were found in 4(10,12) and 11 studies (11,12) individually. As indicated by the reasons for disappointments previously referenced, the material-related variables that included in the disappointment improvement of zirconia every single fired prosthesis were the break opposition of core and veneering earthenware production, holding among core and veneering materials, and edge al inconsistency of zirconia-based rebuilding efforts.

Figure 4: Zirconia Crown

Core Fracture

Ceramic is a brittle material. The fracture resistance of ceramics is generally represented by their fracture strength and fracture toughness. Therefore, fracture toughness is more practical because it's an inherent material property and will not be changed with the various testing conditions and environments (13). Poor core wettability by the porcelain-veneered, which ends up in poor engagement between materials and poor micromechanical interlocking. The causes of Core fracture (FIG 5) observed from the reviewed studies weren't from the fabric itself but the fracture occurred from a trauma and parafunctional habit. The connector size of Zirconia framework may be a minimum of 9 mm square to face up to clinical loading within the posterior teeth (9).

Figure 5: Core Fracture

Veneer Fracture

Crack of veneering pottery or dental porcelains may be isolated into two gatherings, break of a veneering itself and crack began from the interfaces between the core and veneering porcelains. Therefore, compositions of veneering porcelains aren't varied much between different brands (14). Veneer chipping (FIG 6) generally occurs as an aesthetic defect of little importance and is definitely corrected by polishing; it often goes not noticed by patients (15). Many factors affect the core-veneer bond strength of zirconia-based prostheses like sorts of core or veneering ceramic, surface finish of the core, application of a liner and a way of veneering application. For a Zirconia core and a reliable veneering artistic got from an equal producer, the bond quality of a bilayer ran between 26 to 37 MPa which resembled the facade qualities. For all other ceramic materials, the bond strength ranged between 32 to 45 MPa. Different brands of veneering ceramics also produced various numbers of bond strength once they were used with an equivalent zirconia core ceramic (16). A diminished security quality between the zirconia core and facade could even be brought about by a moderate cooling rate during sintering of facade and liner materials (19).

Although there are some many Zirconia core ceramics available for framework fabrication, there's limited information about previously mentioned factors that might affect bonding between zirconia cores and veneering ceramics. The strain of determination of a Zr core and a harmonious veneering earthenware isn't clear in any event, producing gives a stock of viable materials for both core and veneering pottery. Theoretically, the differences within the coefficient of linear thermal expansion are evaluated as a primary guideline for material selection for a layer composite (9).

Figure 6: Veneer Fracture

Title	Conventional Fpds (Fig 7)	Zirconia Fpds
Indications	• Patients With Periodontally Sound Teeth. • Short And Straight Edentulous Span. • Absence Of Any Uncorrectable Soft Tissue Defect. • Presence Of Proper Salivation.	• Anterior And Posterior All Ceramic Crowns And Bridges Requiring High Strength. • Implant Abutments • Orthodontic Brackets
Contraindication	• Poor Hygiene. • Inability To Control Humidity. • Parafunctional Habits. • More Than Two Pontics.	• Reduced Interocclusal Distance • Deep Vertical Overlap • Opposing Supra-Erupted Teeth • Parafunctional Habits
Advantage	• Reduction Of Tooth Structure • Minimum Chair Time	• High Strength • Biocompatible • Excellent • Insulation • Best Esthetic • Optimal Strength
Disadvantage	• Debonding • Small Retentive Area	• More Expensive • Ceramic Is Tough Bond Between The Ceramic Veneer And Zirconia Framework Is The Weakest Component Of The Layered Structure

Figure 7: Conventional FPD

Marginal Discrepancy of Zirconia-Based Restorations

Marginal discrepancy (FIG 8) of all-ceramic restorations may be a vital factor that affects the longevity of dental restorations. Excessive marginal gap width could lead to cement leakage, secondary caries, periodontal and endodontic complications which could compromise the survival of a restoration or an Abutment tooth (17).

Zirconia-based restorations are basically fabricated using two methods, the CAD/CAM system and therefore the CAM only system. Currently, CAD and computer-aided machine systems (CAD-CAM) are generally available for processing of all-ceramic prostheses, especially for zirconia-based dental prostheses. Additionally, span length, framework configuration, and veneering ceramic could affect the fit of zirconia FPDs. Even though there has been some inconsistency between the results obtained from a variety of studies, the CAD-CAM system seemed to provide more accurate marginal and internal fit of

zirconia frameworks compared to the CAM system (18,19). The outcomes from two in vivo examinations additionally detailed a complexity (dental caries) which may be an outcome from an inadmissible edge manufactured from a CAM framework (9). Hard machining is accountable to be more foreseeable for more complex geometry and or longer span FPDs than the pre-sintered zirconia frameworks because there is no firing reduction related to the invention process (18,21). However, the persistent milling time and more wear rate of the milling tools are its major drawbacks of post-sintered milling.

Figure 8: Marginal Discrepancy

Conclusion

Concluded that zirconia-based restoration is a promising prosthodontic alternative to metal- based restoration & excellent clinical performance supported observation and in vitro investigations. zirconia frameworks are shown that they might provide robust support to a veneering layer due to their high fracture resistance. Because all zirconia frameworks were fabricated from different CAD-CAM systems, it appeared that these CAD-CAM systems could also provide acceptable frameworks in terms of planning and accurate margin. The causes of veneering fracture regarding the veneer properties might be the differences in thermally incompatible, elastic and viscoelastic behaviours of core and veneering ceramics, or a firing pattern of veneering materials. Due to its repeated occurrence in many studies, future research is essentially required to clarify this failure of zirconia and to scale back the fracture incident.

References

1. Agustín-Panadero R, Román-Rodríguez JL, Ferreiroa A, Solá-Ruiz MF, Fons-Font A. Zirconia in fixed prosthesis. A literature review. J Clin Exp Dent. 2014; 6(1): e66-73.
2. Campbell SD, Sozio RB. (1988). Evaluation of the fit and strength of an all-ceramic fixed partial denture. J Prosthet dent ;59[3]:301-6.
3. Haselton DR, Diaz-Arnold AM, Hillis SL. Clinical assessment of high-strength all-ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2000; 83:396-401.
4. Olsson KG, Furst B, Andersson B, Carlsson GE. A long-term retrospective and clinical follow-up study of In-ceram alumina FPDs. Int J Prosthodont 2003; 16:150-6.
5. Denry I, Kelly JR. State of the art of zirconia for dental applications. Dent Mater 2008; 24:299-307.
6. Ortorp A, Kihl ML, Carlsson GE. A 3-year retrospective and clinical follow-up study of zirconia single crowns performed in a private practice. J Dent 2009; 37:731-6.
7. Çehreli MC, Kokat AM, Akça K. CAD/CAM Zirconia vs. slip-cast glass-infiltrated Alumina/Zirconia all-ceramic crowns: 2-year results of a randomized controlled clinical trial. J Appl Oral Sci 2009; 17:49-55.
8. Beuer F, Stimmelmayr M, Gernet W, Edelhoff D, Gu ¨h JF, Naumann M. Prospective study of zirconia-based restorations: 3-year clinical results. Quintessence Int 2010; 41:631-7.
9. Premwara Triwatana, BSc, DDS, MS, Noppavan Nagaviroj, DDS, MSc, Chantana Tulapornchai, DDS,

MSc Clinical performance and failures of zirconia-based fixed partial dentures: a review literature J Adv Prosthodont 2012; 4:76-8

10. Sua′rez MJ, Lozano JF, Paz Salido M, Martl′nez F. Three-year clinical evaluation of In-Ceram Zirconia posterior FPDs. Int J Prosthodont 2004; 17:35-8.
11. Vult von Steyern P, Carlson P, Nilner K. All-ceramic fixed partial dentures designed according to the DC-Zirkon technique. A 2-year clinical study. J Oral Rehabil 2005; 32:180-7.
12. Roediger M, Gersdorff N, Huels A, Rinke S. Prospective evaluation of zirconia posterior fixed partial dentures: four-year clinical results. Int J Prosthodont 2010; 23:141-8.
13. Hertzberg RW. Deformation and fracture mechanics of engineering materials. 4th ed. New York; USA; John Wiley & Sons Inc; 1995. p. 326-7.
14. Suputtamongkol K, Tulapornchai C, Teanchai C. Composition and properties of three dental porcelains. Mahidol Dent J 2008; 28:1-8.
15. Heintze SD, Rousson V. Survival of zirconia and metal supported fixed dental prostheses: a systematic review. Int J Prosthodont. 2010; 23:493-502.
16. Aboushelib MN, Kleverlaan CJ, Feilzer AJ. Microtensile bond strength of different components of core veneered all-ceramic restorations. Part II: Zirconia veneering ceramics. Dent Mater 2006; 22:857-63.
17. Felton DA, Kanoy BE, Bayne SC, Wirthman GP. Effect of in vivo crown margin discrepancies on periodontal health. J Prosthet Dent 1991; 65:357-64.
18. Bindl A, Mo¨rmann WH. Fit of all-ceramic posterior fixed partial denture frameworks in vitro. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2007; 27:567-75.
19. Taskonak B, Borges GA, Mecholsky JJ Jr, Anusavice KJ, Moore BK, Yan J. The effects of viscoelastic parameters on residual stress development in a zirconia/glass bilayer dental ceramic. Dent Mater 2008; 24:1149-55.
20. Beuer F, Aggstaller H, Edelhoff D, Gernet W, Sorensen J. Marginal and internal fits of fixed dental prostheses zirconia retainers. Dent Mater 2009; 25:94-102.
21. Kohorst P, Brinkmann H, Li J, Borchers L, Stiesch M. Marginal accuracy of four-unit zirconia fixed dental prostheses fabricated using different computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing systems. Eur J Oral Sci 2009; 117:319-25.