

Assessment of Color Reproduction and Translucency of Monolithic All Ceramic Crowns of Three Margin Configurations using Two Different Cements

Thesis

*Submitted for the partial fulfillment of the Master Degree
requirements in Crown and Bridge Department,
Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University*

By

Fady Bassily Wadie Bassily

B.D.S

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, 2008

2014

Supervisors

Dr. Tarek Salah Morsi

Associate Professor of Fixed Prosthodontics

Head of Crown and Bridge Department

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Marwa Mohamed Wahsh

Lecturer of Fixed Prosthodontics

Crown and Bridge Department

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Amr Saleh El-Etreby

Lecturer of Fixed Prosthodontics

Crown and Bridge Department

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dedication

I lovingly dedicate this thesis to

My Dear Parents

Bassily & Iman

&

My beloved Wife

Barbara

For their endless

Love, Support and

Encouragement

Acknowledgment

First of all, I would like to thank **God** for this accomplishment.

My deepest appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor **Dr. Tarek Salah Morsi**, Associate Professor and Head of Crown and Bridge Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for all I have learned from him and for his continuous guidance and support.

I am specially grateful for the patience and assistance provided by **Dr. Marwa Mohamed Wahsh**, Lecturer at Crown and Bridge Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, and for her appreciated advice.

I also owe many thanks to **Dr. Amr Saleh El-Etreby**, Lecturer at Crown and Bridge Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for his valuable supervision and great encouragement throughout this project.

I would like to extend my appreciation and respect to **Dr. Amina Mohamed Hamdy**, Professor at Crown and Bridge Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University.

Last but not least, I wish to express my sincere thanks to all my colleagues and staff members. Special thanks should be given to **Dr. Ahmed Sabet**, Lecturer at Crown and Bridge Department, **Dr. Andy Gabra** and **Dr. Doaa Taha** for their helpful and valuable contribution.

List of Contents

List of tables.....	II
List of figures.....	V
Introduction.....	1
Review of literature	3
Aim of the Study	37
Materials & Methods.....	38
Results.	76
Disscusion.....	137
Summary and conclusion.	155
References.....	159
Arabic Summary	

List of tables

Table 1: Materials used in the study:	38
Table 2: Technical data of InCoris TZI blocks:	40
Table 3: Technical data of IPS e.max CAD blocks:	42
Table 4: Composition and specifications of Fuji I Capsules:	43
Table 5: Composition and specifications of G-cem capsules:	44
Table 6: Experimental factorial design:	46
Table 7: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between (L^*) values of the two materials:	77
Table 8: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-way ANOVA and Tukey's tests for comparison between (L^*) values of different finish lines:	79
Table 9: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between (L^*) values of the two cement types: ...	81
Table 10: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (a^*) values of the two materials:	83
Table 11: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (a^*) values of different finish lines:	85
Table 12: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (a^*) values of the two cement types:	87
Table 13: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between (b^*) values of the two materials:	89
Table 14: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-way ANOVA and Tukey's tests for comparison between (b^*) values of different finish lines:	91
Table 15: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between (b^*) values of the two cement types: ...	93
Table 16: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (ΔL^*) values of the two materials:	95

Table 17: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (ΔL^*) values of different finish lines:	97
Table 18: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (ΔL^*) values of the two cement types:	99
Table 19: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (Δa^*) values of the two materials:	101
Table 20: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (Δa^*) values of different finish lines:	103
Table 21: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (Δa^*) values of the two cement types:	105
Table 22: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (Δb^*) values of the two materials:	107
Table 23: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (Δb^*) values of different finish lines:	109
Table 24: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (Δb^*) values of the two cement types:	111
Table 25: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (ΔE) values of the two materials:	113
Table 26: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (ΔE) values of different finish lines:	115
Table 27: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (ΔE) values of the two cement types:	117
Table 28: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (TP) values of the two materials:	119

Table 29: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests for comparison between (TP) values of different finish lines:	121
Table 30: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between (TP) values of the two cement types:	123
Table 31: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between CR of the two materials:	125
Table 32: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-way ANOVA and Tukey's tests for comparison between CR of different finish lines:	127
Table 33: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Student's t-test for comparison between CR of the two cement types:	129
Table 34: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Wilcoxon signed-rank test for comparison between (ΔE) values before and after cementation:	131
Table 35: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Wilcoxon signed-rank test for comparison between (TP) values before and after cementation:	133
Table 36: Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of paired t-test for comparison between (CR) values before and after cementation:	135

List of Figures

Figure 1: inCoris TZI blocks.....	39
Figure 2: IPS e.max CAD blocks.	41
Figure 3: GC Fuji I Capsules.....	43
Figure 4: G-CEM Capsules.	44
Figure 5: Diagram showing the dimensions of the master die.	47
Figure 6: Diagram showing the three margin designs of the master dies: A-Knife edge, B-Chamfer and C-Radial Shoulder.....	48
Figure 7: Master dies with three margin designs: A-Knife edge, B- Chamfer and C-Radial Shoulder.	48
Figure 8: Cerec MC XL CAD/CAM System.	49
Figure 9: CEREC Optispray Powder.....	51
Figure 10: Optical Impression.....	52
Figure 11: The 360° Virtual die.	52
Figure 12: Preparation margin.....	53
Figure 13: Insertion axis.....	54
Figure 14: The proposed design of the crown.....	55
Figure 15: Milling Preview.	56
Figure 16: The inLab MC XL milling unit.....	57
Figure 17: Grinding Instruments: A- Step bur 20 and B- Pointed bur 20.....	58
Figure 18: Milled Zirconia crown before separation, coloring and sintering.	59
Figure 19: inCoris TZI Coloring Liquid.....	60
Figure 20: inFire HTC speed furnace.....	61
Figure 21: Zirconia crowns before Sintering (A) and after Sintering (B) showing the shrinkage that occurs after sintering.	61
Figure 22: Sintered Zirconia crowns seated on the metal dies with different margin designs: A-Knife edge,B-Chamfer and C- Radial Shoulder.....	62
Figure 23: Grinding Instruments: A-Step bur 12s, B- Cylinder bur 12s.	63
Figure 24: Milled Pre-crystallized lithium disilicate crown.....	64

Figure 25: Grinding instruments for the pre-crystallized lithium disilicate crowns: A-Margin finishing, B- Attachement smoothening and C- Surface finishing.....	65
Figure 26: IPS e.max CAD Crystall/Glaze paste.	65
Figure 27: Crystallized Lithium Disilicate crown.	66
Figure 28: Different dies used for color and translucency measurments: A-Composite die, B-White Teflon die and C-Black sprayed Stainless Steel die.	67
Figure 29: Composite resin die.	68
Figure 30: Vita EasyShade Compact.....	69
Figure 31: Vita EasyShade Compact showing color measurement.....	70
Figure 32: White teflon dies with different margin designs: A-Knife edge, B-Chamfer and C-Radial Shoulder	73
Figure 33: Dies used for Translucency measurments: A-White die, B-Black die.....	73
Figure 34: Measuring the color in the mid- buccal surface of the crown using the Vita EasyShade Compact: A-With the Black die, B- With the White die	74
Figure 35: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (L^*) values of the two materials.	78
Figure 36: Bar chart representing comparison between (L^*) values of different finish lines.....	80
Figure 37: Bar chart representing comparison between (L^*) value of the two cement types.	82
Figure 38: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (a^*) values of the two materials.	84
Figure 39: Bar chart representing comparison between (a^*) values of different finish lines.....	86
Figure 40: Bar chart representing comparison between (a^*) value of the two cement types.	88
Figure 41: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (b^*) values of the two materials.	90
Figure 42: Bar chart representing comparison between (b^*) values of different finish lines.....	92
Figure 43: Bar chart representing comparison between (b^*) value of the two cement types.	94

Figure 44: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (ΔL^*) values of the two materials.	96
Figure 45: Bar chart representing comparison between (ΔL^*) values of different finish lines.	98
Figure 46: Bar chart representing comparison between (ΔL^*) values of the two cement types.	100
Figure 47: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (Δa^*) values of the two materials.	102
Figure 48: Bar chart representing comparison between (Δa^*) values of different finish lines.	104
Figure 49: Bar chart representing comparison between (Δa^*) values of the two cement types.	106
Figure 50: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (Δb^*) values of the two materials.	108
Figure 51: Bar chart representing comparison between (Δb^*) values of different finish lines.	110
Figure 52: Bar chart representing comparison between (Δb^*) values of the two cement types.	112
Figure 53: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (ΔE) values of the two materials.	114
Figure 54: Bar chart representing comparison between (ΔE) values of different finish lines.	116
Figure 55: Bar chart representing comparison between (ΔE) values of the two cement types.	118
Figure 56: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (TP) values of the two materials.	120
Figure 57: Bar chart representing comparison between (TP) values of different finish lines.	122
Figure 58: Bar chart representing comparison between (TP) values of the two cement types.	124
Figure 59: Bar chart representing comparison between mean (CR) of the two materials.	126
Figure 60: Bar chart representing comparison between (CR) of different finish lines.	128
Figure 61: Bar chart representing comparison between (CR) of the two cement types.	130

Figure 62: Bar chart representing comparison between (ΔE) values before and after cementation.	132
Figure 63: Bar chart representing comparison between (TP) values before and after cementation.	134
Figure 64: Bar chart representing comparison between (CR) values before and after cementation.	136

Introduction

The ultimate goal of the restorative dentist is to restore a missing tooth structure to its natural form, function, and appearance at an acceptable level so as to positively impact the patient's self-esteem.

Ceramics have been advocated as the material of choice for superior esthetics and for matching the natural dentition. Clinically, it is important that ceramic restorations reproduce the translucency and color of the natural teeth as well as the size, shape and surface texture. (1)

In order to achieve a favorable shade match of a restoration, three major elements of color; hue, chroma, and value have been conventionally considered. Moreover, a fourth element, translucency has become an important factor for the clinical selection of restorative materials. Translucency is the property of a substance that permits the passage of light, but also disperses the light. The translucency of a restorative material provides an added “lifelike” vitality and a natural appearance to the completed restoration. (2)

The popularity of metal-ceramic restorations is largely due to predictable strength achieved with reasonable esthetics. The drawback of such restorations is increased light reflectivity because of the opaque porcelain needed to mask the metal substrate. All-ceramic materials offer an esthetic advantage as they can be made

Introduction

to match natural tooth structure accurately in terms of color, surface texture, and translucency. (3; 4)

Computer aided design / computer aided manufacture (CAD/CAM) technology has been used to fabricate infrastructures of all-ceramic restorations such as lithium disilicate and zirconia based ceramic materials. Zirconia has many advantages such as biocompatibility, low bacterial adhesion, traditional cementation and perfect mechanical properties but its main disadvantage is the high degree of crystalline content and so it appears opaque, that is why zirconia cores always need to be veneered with a more translucent material. (5)

Recently, polycrystalline translucent zirconia has attracted increasing attention because of its unique combination of mechanical and optical properties. Nano-crystalline materials are expected to achieve better translucency due to the decrease in light scattering. So more investigations are needed regarding the ability of accurate color reproduction of these monolithic materials. (6)

Review of Literature

I. Color and Translucency

A. Color

The color of an object is a complex result of its surface properties, its transmission properties, and its emission properties, all of which contribute to the mix of wavelengths in the light leaving the surface of the object. The color of an object depends on both the physics of the object in its environment and the characteristics of the perceiving eye and brain. Perception of color involves the participation of three factors that can effectively exist: (7)

The Object to be observed may have different physical behaviors in relation to the incident light. Some objects not only reflect light, but also transmit light or emit light themselves, which also contribute to the color.

The Observer can be visual or instrumental. Changes in color perception may occur based on age, duration of exposure of the eye, fatigue or illness related to color, such as color blindness.

Light source or illuminant, which may be a natural or artificial light source. According to its origin, light can change the perceived color of an object. When light interacts with a tooth, it may be reflected, scattered, or transmitted concurrent with the scattering of photons. The shade of dentin (the primary source of tooth color), enamel structure (thickness and translucency), tooth dimension, and surface texture