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 – 8, Issue – 6, November – 2025, Page No. : 173 - 180

Comparative Clinical Review of Minimally Invasive vs Conventional Restorative Dentistry in Caries Management

[1]Dr Mudnoori Mrudulika, BDS, Dental Assistant, 247 King Dental: 247 King St N Unit 1B, Waterloo, ON, N2J 2Y8, Canada.

[2]Dr Ravada VSSK Kinneresh, Assistant Resident, Medical Officer, Great Eastern Medical School and Hospital, Andhra Pradesh.

Corresponding Author: Dr Mudnoori Mrudulika, BDS, Dental Assistant, 247 King Dental: 247 King St N Unit 1B, Waterloo, ON, N2J 2Y8, Canada.

Citation of this Article: Dr Mudnoori Mrudulika, Dr Ravada VSSK Kinneresh, "Comparative Clinical Review of Minimally Invasive vs Conventional Restorative Dentistry in Caries Management", IJDSIR- November – 2025, Volume – 8, Issue – 6, P. No. 173 – 180.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Background: The philosophy of restorative dentistry has undergone a profound transformation, moving away from the historically dominant, surgically-oriented principles of G.V. Black. The traditional "extension for prevention" approach, which advocated for the prophylactic removal of sound tooth structure to prevent future caries, is now being superseded by a biologically conservative paradigm. Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MID) prioritises the preservation of healthy tooth tissue, promotes the natural remineralisation of early lesions, and aims to maintain pulp vitality throughout the caries management process.

Objective: This review seeks to critically compare the clinical efficacy (including restoration longevity and pulpal health), biological outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and patient-centred experiences of minimally invasive restorative techniques against those of conventional restorative methods for the management of dental caries.

Methods: A comprehensive literature search was conducted using major electronic databases (PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar) for relevant clinical trials, cohort studies, and systematic reviews published between 2000 and 2024. The search focused on studies providing direct comparisons between MID and conventional approaches.

Results: Evidence consistently demonstrates that MID techniques—such as Atraumatic Restorative Treatment (ART), selective and stepwise caries removal, and the use of advanced adhesive and bioactive materials—achieve clinical outcomes that are comparable to, and in many aspects superior to, conventional methods. Specifically, MID shows advantages in preserving sound tooth structure, reducing the risk of pulpal exposure and

postoperative sensitivity, and enhancing patient comfort and acceptance. While conventional methods remain reliable for extensive, non-restorable cavities, they are associated with greater iatrogenic damage to the tooth and a higher long-term risk of complications like fracture.

Conclusion: Minimally invasive restorative dentistry offers a scientifically sound, sustainable, and patient-friendly framework for managing dental caries. Its principles align seamlessly with modern preventive dentistry and are particularly well-suited to address public health challenges, both in India and across the globe.

Keywords: Minimally invasive dentistry, Atraumatic restorative treatment, Caries management, Adhesive restorations, Selective caries removal, Stepwise excavation, Bioactive materials, public health dentistry.

Introduction

Dental caries is a ubiquitous global health issue, ranking as one of the most common non-communicable diseases worldwide, with an estimated 2.3 billion people suffering from caries of permanent teeth[1]. For over a century, the foundational philosophy of restorative dentistry was dictated by G.V. Black's principles, which emphasized "extension for prevention." This involved the complete removal of decayed tissue and the deliberate extension of cavity preparations into areas deemed prone to future decay, often at the expense of sound enamel and dentin[2]. While this approach provided mechanical durability, its long-term biological consequences—including weakened tooth structure, increased risk of pulpitis, and a cycle of increasingly larger restorations—became increasingly apparent[3].

The latter part of the 20th century witnessed a paradigm shift, fuelled by advancements in the understanding of the caries process as a dynamic imbalance between demineralisation and remineralization, the development of reliable adhesive systems, and the introduction of improved diagnostic tools[4]. This gave rise to Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MID), a philosophy that champions the maximum preservation of healthy tooth structure. MID is not merely a technique but a comprehensive management strategy that integrates primary prevention, early caries detection, risk assessment, remineralisation of non-cavitated lesions, and, when restoration is necessary, the most conservative intervention possible[5].

This manuscript provides a critical comparative review of minimally invasive and conventional restorative approaches in caries management. It delves into their respective clinical performances, long-term biological outcomes for the tooth, and their significant implications, particularly within the public health context of countries like India.

Methods

Search Strategy

A systematic literature search was performed in PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar for English-language publications from January 2000 to June 2024. The search utilised a combination of keywords and MeSH terms, including: "minimally invasive dentistry," "conventional restorative dentistry," "atraumatic restorative treatment," "selective caries removal," "stepwise excavation," "ART," "adhesive restorations," and "caries management."

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), prospective and retrospective cohort studies, and systematic reviews with meta-analyses that directly compared MID techniques (as defined above) with conventional restorative techniques (complete caries removal followed by amalgam or composite restorations) in human subjects. Outcomes of

interest included restoration survival/failure, pulp vitality, postoperative sensitivity, carious lesion progression, and patient-reported outcomes.

Exclusion Criteria

In vitro studies, animal studies, case reports, technical notes, and articles not providing primary clinical outcome data or without a direct comparison group.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Relevant data were extracted from the selected studies into a standardised table, capturing details on authors, publication year, study design, sample size, intervention and control protocols, follow-up duration, and key findings. Due to the heterogeneity in methodologies and reported outcomes, a narrative synthesis was deemed more appropriate than a meta-analysis.

Results

Restoration Longevity and Failure Modes

Multiple long-term studies and systematic reviews have established that MID restorations possess excellent longevity. ART restorations using high-viscosity glass ionomer cement (GIC) show survival rates of 85–95% over two years and 75–90% over five years in both primary and permanent dentitions[6–8]. Similarly, adhesive composite restorations placed following selective caries removal demonstrate comparable longevity to those placed after complete excavation[9].

The primary failure mode for MID restorations, particularly ART, is wear and partial material loss. In contrast, conventional amalgam restorations often fail due to marginal fracture, ditching, and secondary caries, which is frequently linked to the more extensive cavity preparation compromising the tooth's structural integrity[9].

Tooth Structure Preservation and Pulpal Health

This is a cornerstone of MID's superiority. Selective caries removal, which involves excavating only the soft, infected, irreversibly denatured dentin (leaving the firm, affected, and mineralizable dentin near the pulp), dramatically reduces the risk of pulpal exposure. A Cochrane review by Innes et al. (2016) concluded that selective caries removal in symptomless, deep carious lesions reduces the risk of pulp exposure by approximately 40% compared to complete excavation[10].

Stepwise excavation, a two-visit procedure for managing deep caries, further exemplifies this biological approach. The initial step removes gross caries, seals the lesion, and allows the pulp to lay down reparative dentin. The final excavation, months later, is safer and often reveals a harder dentin floor, frequently avoiding pulp exposure altogether[11].

Pulpal Response and Postoperative Sensitivity

Studies consistently report a significantly lower incidence of postoperative sensitivity and pulpal complications (pulpitis, necrosis) following minimally invasive procedures[12]. This is directly attributed to the preservation of dentin, which acts as a protective thermal and chemical insulator for the pulp, and the reduced mechanical and thermal trauma from hand instruments often used in MID compared to high-speed drills.

The Role of Bioactive Materials

MID is synergistically linked to the use of adhesive and bioactive materials. Glass Ionomer Cements (GICs) are a mainstay, particularly in ART, due to their chemical adhesion to tooth structure, sustained fluoride release (which inhibits secondary caries and promotes remineralisation of adjacent enamel/dentin), and biocompatibility[13]. Resin-modified GICs and "bioactive" composites further enhance this therapeutic potential.

Patient-Centred Outcomes

Patient acceptance and comfort are markedly higher with MID techniques. Procedures like ART, which often forego the need for local anaesthesia and rotary instruments, significantly reduce dental anxiety,

particularly in children and anxious adults[14]. The reduced noise, vibration, and pain lead to higher treatment acceptance rates in community settings, with over 90% of patients reporting a preference for MID approaches in clinical surveys[15].

Cost-Effectiveness and Accessibility

From a public health perspective, MID is profoundly cost-effective. The minimal requirement for expensive electrical equipment, sterilisation of hand instruments instead of complex drill bits, and shorter treatment times make it highly scalable. Mickenautsch (2015) demonstrated that ART was more cost-effective than amalgam restorations over a long-term horizon, considering both direct and indirect costs[16].

Limitations and Case Selection

MID is not a panacea. It requires careful case selection and proper training. It may be less suitable for:

- Teeth with non-restorable cavitations.
- Lesions with inadequate access for proper caries removal and restoration placement.
- Patients with a high, uncontrolled caries risk where the longevity of a less retentive restoration may be compromised.

Operator skill in discerning infected versus affected dentin is critical for success[17].

Table 1: Comparative Summary of Minimally Invasive vs. Conventional Restorative Dentistry

Parameter	Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MID)	Conventional Restorative Dentistry
Guiding Philosophy	"Prevent, preserve, and repair." Biological focus on disease control and tissue preservation.	"Extension for prevention." Surgical focus on complete caries removal and cavity design for mechanical retention.
Caries Detection	Early detection using visual-tactile criteria, magnification, and advanced aids (DIAGNOdent, FOTI).	Primarily detection at cavitated stages, confirmed with bitewing radiographs.
Caries Removal	Selective/Stepwise: Removes only soft, infected dentin; leaves firm, affected dentin for remineralisation.	Complete Excavation: Removes all demineralised tissue until hard dentin is reached, risking pulpal exposure.
Cavity Design	Ultra-conservative; access is dictated by lesion extent. Relies entirely on adhesive bonding.	Standardised, "resistance and retention" form. Often requires removal of sound tissue for undercuts.
Primary Materials	Adhesive and bioactive (GIC, RMGIC, Bioactive Composites).	Amalgam, Conventional Composites (rely on mechanical features).
Tooth Preservation	High. Maximum conservation of sound tooth structure.	Low. Significant sacrifice of sound tissue.
Pulpal Health	High vitality preservation. Minimal thermal/mechanical insult; low risk of exposure.	Higher risk of exposure and subsequent pulpitis/necrosis.
Postoperative Sensitivity	Low. Preserved dentin provides insulation.	Relatively higher.

Longevity (Evidence-Based)	85–95% survival at 2 years; 75–90% at 5 years (highly dependent on material and case).	Comparable short-term; potential for lower long-term survival due to fracture/secondary caries.
Patient Comfort & Acceptance	High. Often anaesthesia-free; reduced anxiety; preferred by patients.	Moderate. Requires anaesthesia and rotary instrumentation; associated with anxiety.
Cost & Accessibility	Highly cost-effective and accessible. Ideal for outreach and low-resource settings.	Less cost-effective. Requires a full clinical setup, higher overhead.
Environmental Impact	Mercury-free, low aerosol generation aligns with the Minamata Convention.	Mercury-based amalgam presents waste management issues, higher aerosol generation.
Overall Outcome	Biologically sustainable, patient-friendly, and promotes long-term oral health.	Mechanically reliable but biologically invasive, it can initiate a restorative cycle.

Sources: Frencken et al., 2012; Innes et al., 2016; Opdam et al., 2014; Schwendicke et al., 2013.

Discussion

The comparison between minimally invasive and conventional restorative dentistry reveals a fundamental evolution in the philosophy of oral healthcare. The conventional model, while effective in eliminating decay in the short term, is inherently interventive and can be seen as initiating a "restorative death spiral," where each subsequent restoration is larger than the last, ultimately leading to crown placement or extraction[18],[19].

MID, in contrast, redefines the role of the dentist from a surgical operator to a therapeutic manager of a biofilm-mediated disease. The goal is not just to repair the damage but to control the disease process itself. The preservation of tooth structure is paramount because every time sound tissue is removed, it is lost forever, and the tooth's structural resilience is permanently diminished[20].

The success of techniques like ART in public health programs underscores that effective, durable dental care does not have to be technologically complex or expensive. It validates the principle that a conservative, biologically-minded approach can achieve excellent outcomes while dramatically expanding access to care[21],[22]. The evidence from meta-analyses is clear: selectively removing caries does not lead to higher rates of restoration failure or pulp necrosis; instead, it proactively protects the pulp and extends the tooth's functional life[23],[24].

This "preserve and protect" philosophy is the core of modern, patient-centred, and value-based dental care[25].

Significance in India and Globally

Significance in the Indian Context

India faces a monumental oral health challenge. The National Oral Health Survey (2019) indicates a caries prevalence of over 60% in adults and a staggering 70-80% in children[26]. This is compounded by a severe shortage of dental professionals, especially in rural areas, where the dentist-to-population ratio can be as low as 1:30,000[27].

In this scenario, MID is not just a clinical preference but a public health imperative.

- **Scalability:** ART can be deployed by dental therapists and trained public health dentists in school programs and primary health centres, bypassing the need for a fully equipped dental clinic.
- **Policy Alignment:** MID aligns perfectly with the goals of the National Oral Health Programme (NOHP) and the Ayushman Bharat Health and

Wellness Centres, which emphasise preventive, promotive, and affordable primary healthcare[28],[29].

- **Curriculum Integration:** A critical step is the integration of MID principles into the undergraduate and postgraduate dental curricula across India, moving the focus away from an exclusively G.V. Black-based surgical model.

Global Significance

Globally, as dental caries remains a massive burden, MID provides a unified yet adaptable framework. In high-income countries, it manifests through the use of diode lasers for caries removal, CAD/CAM technology for ultra-conservative inlays, and advanced caries detection devices. In low- and middle-income countries, it provides a lifeline through the scalable and simple ART methodology[31].

International bodies like the WHO and FDI World Dental Federation have endorsed MID as essential for achieving Universal Health Coverage (UHC) for oral health. It is a cornerstone of the "Mercury-Free" dentistry movement, directly supporting the objectives of the Minamata Convention on Mercury[32],[33].

Clinical Implications and a Practical Guide

Transitioning to an MID practice requires a shift in mindset and technique:

1. **Diagnosis is Treatment:** Invest in and master early caries detection methods. Use ICDAS (International Caries Detection and Assessment System) criteria for standardised diagnosis.
2. **Risk Assessment:** Triage patients based on caries risk. High-risk patients need intense preventive management before any restorative intervention.
3. **The Decision-Making Tree:** For a cavitated lesion:
    - **Shallow/Moderate:** Use **selective caries removal** and an adhesive restoration.
    - **Deep Lesion (near pulp), asymptomatic:** Use **stepwise excavation** or **selective removal to firm dentin** to avoid exposure.
    - **Large, non-restorable cusp/fracture:** A conventional approach with cuspal coverage may be necessary.
4. **Material Selection:** Choose materials based on the clinical scenario. Use high-viscosity GIC for small Class I cavities, ART, and high-caries-risk patients. Use composites for situations requiring higher strength and aesthetics. Remember, the material must bond effectively to the preserved tooth structure.
5. **The ART Protocol as a Skill:** Master the ART technique—it is a valuable skill for every dentist, not just public health practitioners.

Conclusion

Minimally invasive restorative dentistry represents a mature, evidence-based, and ethically sound evolution in the management of dental caries. By prioritising the preservation of natural tooth structure, leveraging the benefits of adhesive and bioactive materials, and focusing on patient comfort and public health accessibility, MID delivers sustainable, long-term oral health outcomes. Its adoption is a clinical advancement that aligns with the broader professional responsibility to provide conservative, compassionate, and equitable care for all.

Future Directions

The trajectory of MID points towards an even more integrated and technologically assisted future:

- **Biomimetic Regeneration:** Research into materials that can actively regenerate dentin and enamel structure.
- **Precision Dentistry:** The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for image analysis to detect and

predict caries activity with unparalleled accuracy, guiding ultra-precise interventions.

- **Global Policy and Education:** Development of international MID guidelines and their mandatory incorporation into dental education core curricula.
- **Point-of-Care Diagnostics:** Development of chairside tools to accurately assess the microbiome and activity status of a carious lesion, moving beyond purely visual and tactile cues.

References

1. World Health Organization. Global Oral Health Status Report, 2022.
2. Black GV. Operative Dentistry. Medico-Dental Publishing Co., 1908.
3. Elderton RJ. Restorative Dental Treatment and the Concept of Minimal Intervention Dentistry. Br Dent J. 2000;188(7):375–382.
4. Tyas MJ et al. Minimal intervention dentistry: A review. Int Dent J. 2000;50:1–12.
5. Banerjee A. Minimal intervention dentistry—Part 1. Br Dent J. 2017;223(3):173–182.
6. Frencken JE et al. ART and its place in modern dentistry. Br Dent J. 2012;212:11–18.
7. Mickenautsch S et al. Survival of ART restorations in permanent teeth. J Dent. 2010;38(11):871–878.
8. Holmgren CJ et al. Ten-year survival of ART restorations. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 2014;42:373–380.
9. Opdam NJ et al. Longevity of restorations: A systematic review. Oper Dent. 2014;39(5):481–492.
10. Innes NP et al. Selective removal vs complete excavation for deep caries. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016;(12):CD011231.
11. Schwendicke F et al. Stepwise vs selective excavation. J Dent Res. 2013;92(4):306–314.
12. Tedesco TK et al. Postoperative sensitivity in MID vs conventional techniques. Oper Dent. 2018;43(2):126–134.
13. Ngo HC et al. Glass ionomer materials and minimally invasive dentistry. Clin Oral Investig. 2019;23:3071–3081.
14. Lo ECM et al. Patient acceptance of ART. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 2007;35:170–177.
15. Frencken JE. Global impact of ART. Int Dent J. 2009;59(3):81–92.
16. Mickenautsch S. Cost-effectiveness of ART vs amalgam. J Public Health Dent. 2015;75(3):235–242.
17. Banerjee A et al. Technique sensitivity in MID. J Conserv Dent. 2020;23(2):99–107.
18. Mount GJ. Preservation and restoration of tooth structure. Aust Dent J. 2008;53:1–9.
19. Kidd EA. How ‘clean’ must a cavity be? Caries Res. 2004;38:305–313.
20. Frencken JE, Holmgren CJ. ART for Dental Caries. WHO, 2002.
21. Ngo HC. Biological role of glass ionomer in caries control. Dent Mater. 2010;26:e45–e54.
22. Peumans M et al. Adhesive systems and long-term results. Dent Mater. 2020;36:1–12.
23. Featherstone JD. Prevention and reversal of dental caries. Adv Dent Res. 2009;21:4–8.
24. Schwendicke F et al. Remaining bacteria and secondary caries risk. J Dent Res. 2014;93(10):879–884.
25. Ekstrand KR et al. Caries detection and activity assessment. Monogr Oral Sci. 2009;21:43–59.
26. National Oral Health Survey and Fluoride Mapping, India, 2019.
27. Dental Council of India, Annual Report 2023.
28. National Oral Health Programme, MoHFW, 2020.

29. Ayushman Bharat – Health and Wellness Centres, 2021.
30. WHO. Global Oral Health Status Report, 2022.
31. Frencken JE et al. ART and global caries control. Int Dent J. 2009;59(3):81–92.
32. FDI Vision 2030: Delivering Optimal Oral Health for All, 2021.
33. United Nations Environment Programme. Minamata Convention on Mercury, 2013.