

**MICROROUGHNESS AND BACTERIAL ADHESION
OF MONOLITHIC ZIRCONIA AND LITHIUM
DISILICATE VENEERS WITH DIFFERENT
FINISHING TECHNIQUES AND MARGIN DESIGNS**

THESIS SUBMITTED TO FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
AINSHAMS UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR
DOCTOR DEGREE IN FIXED PROSTHODONTICS

BY

MOHAMED ADEL ANWAR ABDELAZIZ

Assistant lecturer of fixed prosthodontics
Faculty of Dentistry, Assiut university

**AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY
2017**

Supervisors

Prof. Tarek Salah Morsi

Professor & Head of Fixed Prosthodontics department
FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

Ass. Prof. Amr Saleh EL-Etreby

Associate professor of Fixed Prosthodontics
FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

Dedication

To the most precious, supportive, and sincere people in my life

To my family

*“Without your endless love and encouragement,
I would have never been able to be who I am or where I am
Thanks for supporting me throughout the rough way”*

Acknowledgement

First of all, I feel thankful to Allah for giving me the guidance and internal support in all my life and in every step that I made until this study was completed.

*I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. **Tarek Salah Morsi** Professor and Head of Fixed Prosthodontics Department , Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for his valuable ideas, stimulating discussions, enlightening guidance, and keen supervision that he has kindly given me throughout the research program, which was instrumental in achieving the completion of this study.*

*Also I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. **Amr Saleh El-Etreby** associate professor of Fixed Prosthodontics Faculty of Dentistry Ain Shams University, for his great help and constant support in the completion of this study.*

List of CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables.....	i
List of Figures.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature.....	3
Aim of the study.....	32
Materials and Methods.....	33
Results.....	70
Discussion.....	102
Summary	111
Conclusion.....	112
References.....	113
Arabic Summary.....	

List of tables

Table (1) Materials used in this study.....	Page 34
Table (2) Samples grouping.....	36
Table (3) Description of mean and standard deviation of surface roughness (Ra) of all laminates.....	71
Table (4) Description of mean and standard deviation of bacterial adhesion (CFU/ml) of all laminates.....	72
Table (5) Effect of variables (margin design, material and finishing method) on bacterial adhesions and surface roughness.....	73
Table (6) Comparison of surface roughness between different Finishing methods.....	74
Table (7) Comparison of bacterial adhesions between different Finishing methods.....	77
Table (8) Comparison the surface roughness between laminates made from different materials	80
Table (9) Comparison the bacterial adhesions between laminates made from different materials	84
Table (10) Comparison the surface roughness between different Margin designs	88
Table (11) Comparison bacterial adhesion between different Margin designs	93
Table (12) Results of the correlation between surface roughness (Ra) and bacterial count.....	98

List of Figures

Figure (1) Express™ STD VPS Putty impression material	37
Figure (2) Amount of laminate reduction.....	37
Figure (3) Duplicating material	39
Figure (4) Epoxy resin material.....	39
Figure (5) Pouring epoxy resin material into molds	40
Figure (6) Samples after removal from molds.....	40
Figure (7) Scanning of master sample using Identica blue scanner.....	41
Figure (8) Defining job details.....	43
Figure (9) Determining scan depth	44
Figure (10) Scan data.....	44
Figure (11) Setting numeric parameters.....	45
Figure (12) Margin line detection	45
Figure (13) Setting insertion axis	45
Figure (14) Designing the laminate	46
Figure (15) CAM software (Nesting and spruing).....	46
Figure (16) Katana zirconia blank (A) before milling and (B) after milling	47
Figure (17) Ceramill therm furnace for zirconia sintering	47
Figure (18) Laserdenta milling machine CAM	48
Figure (19) Ring before and after investment pouring	49
Figure (20) Renfert Vacuum mixer.....	49

Figure (21) EP3000 press furnace	51
Figure (22) Divesting.....	51
Figure (23) Laminates finished after separation from sprues	51
Figure(24) Glazing of Lithium disilicate laminates.....	53
Figure (25) Sandblasting of epoxy resin	56
Figure (26) Laminates in ultrasonic cleaner	55
Figure (27) Etching of the fitting surface of laminates	55
Figure (28) Silane application.....	56
Figure (29) Seating of laminates	56
Figure (30) Laminates after cementation and removal of cement excess	56
Figure (31) Soflex finishing kit	57
Figure (32) Optrafine finishing kit.....	59
Figure (33) Surface roughness measuring technique using profilometer ...	61
Figure (34) sputter-coating device with gold-palladium alloy.....	62
Figure (35) scanning electron microscopy	62
Figure (36) Filtration of saliva with a cellulose acetate filter	63
Figure (37) Tryptone Soya Broth	64
Figure (38) Adjusting optical density of the buffer using spectrophotometer....	65
Figure (39) Centrifugation of broth	65
Figure (40) Micro-pipette.....	66
Figure (41) General purpose bacteriological incubator.....	66
Figure (42) Maxi-Mix III type 65800 vortex shaker	66
Figure (43) Mitis-salivarius agar	68
Figure (44) Solidified Mitis-salivarius agar in petri dish.....	68
Figure (45) Colony counting using the colony counter	68

Figure (46) Bar chart describes the surface roughness when different finishing methods used to finish zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design	75
Figure (47) Box plot describes the effect of finishing methods on surface roughness of (A) Zirconia laminates and (B) Lithium disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design.....	75
Figure (48) Bar chart describes the surface roughness when different finishing methods used to finish zirconia andlithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design.....	76
Figure (49) Box plots illustrates the effect of finishing methods on surface roughness of (A)Zirconia laminates and (B) Lithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design	76
Figure (50) Bar chart describes the bacterial adhesion when different finishing methods used to finish zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design	78
Figure (51) Box plot illustrates the effect of finishing methods on bacterial adhesion of (A)Zirconia laminates and (B) Lithium Disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design.....	78
Figure (52) Bar chart describes the bacterial adhesion when different finishing methods used to finish zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design.....	79
Figure (53) Box plot illustrates the effect of finishing methods on bacterial adhesion of (A)Zirconia laminates and (B) Lithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design	79
Figure (54) Bar chart describes the comparison in surface roughness of zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	80

Figure (55) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of glazed laminates made on vertical margin design.....	81
Figure (56) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of Soflex finished laminates made on vertical margin design	81
Figure (57) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of Optra fine finished laminates made on vertical margin design.....	81
Figure (58)) Bar chart describes the comparison in surface roughness of zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ, Optrafine OF, Sof-Lex SL).....	82
Figure (59) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of glazed laminates made on horizontal margin design.....	82
Figure (60) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of Soflex finished laminates made on horizontal margin design	83
Figure (61) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on surface roughness of Optrafine finished laminates made on horizontal margin design.....	83
Figure (62) Bar chart describes the comparison in bacterial adhesion of zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on vertical margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	84
Figure (63) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of glazed laminates made on vertical margin design.....	85
Figure (64) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of Soflex finished laminates vertical margin design.....	85
Figure (65) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of Optrafine finished laminates vertical margin design.....	86
Figure (66) Bar chart describes the comparison in bacterial adhesion of zirconia and lithium disilicate laminates made on horizontal margin design	

when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	86
Figure (67) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of glazed laminates horizontal margin design.....	87
Figure (68) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of Soflex finished laminates horizontal margin design.....	87
Figure (69) Box plot illustrates the effect of material on bacterial adhesion of Optrafine finished laminates vertical margin design.....	88
Figure (70) Bar chart describes the comparison in surface roughness of zirconia laminates made on different margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL)	89
Figure (71) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of glazed zirconia laminates.....	89
Figure (72) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of Soflex finished zirconia laminates.....	90
Figure (73) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of Optrafine finished zirconia laminates.....	90
Figure (74) Bar chart describes the comparison in surface roughness of lithium disilicate laminates made on different margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	91
Figure (75) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of glazed Lithium disilicate laminates.....	91
Figure (76) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of Soflex finished Lithium disilicate laminates.....	92
Figure (77) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on surface roughness of Optrafine finished Lithium disilicate laminates.....	92

Figure (78) Bar chart describes the comparison in bacterial adhesion of zirconia laminates made on different margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	93
Figure (79) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of glazed Zirconia laminates.....	94
Figure (80) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of Soflex finished Zirconia laminates.....	94
Figure (81) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of Optrafine finished Zirconia laminates.....	95
Figure (82) Bar chart describes the comparison in bacterial adhesion of lithium disilicate laminates made on different margin design when different finishing methods used (Glazed GZ ,Optrafine OF ,Sof-Lex SL).....	95
Figure (83) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of glazed Lithium disilicate laminates.....	96
Figure (84) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of Soflex finished Lithium disilicate laminates.....	96
Figure (85) Box plot illustrates the effect of margin design on bacterial adhesion of Optrafine finished Lithium disilicate laminates.....	97
Figure (86) Scatter Histogram of the correlation between Ra and Bacterial count.....	98
Figure (87) SEM micrographs of glazed Zirconia laminate surface at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....	99
Figure (88) SEM micrographs of Zirconia laminates surface after polishing with Optrafine system at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....	99
Figure (89) SEM micrographs of Zirconia laminates surface after polishing with Soflex system at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....	100
Figure (90) SEM micrographs of lithium disilicate laminates surface after glazing at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....	100

Figure (91) SEM micrographs of lithium disilicate laminates surface after polishing using Optrafine finishing system at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....101

Figure (92) SEM micrographs of lithium disilicate laminates surface after polishing using Soflex finishing system at (A) 100x (B) 2000x.....101

Introduction

Dental ceramics are the most natural appearing replacement material for missing tooth substance available in a range of shades and translucencies to achieve natural like appearance. The increased popularity of ceramic materials is attributed to their excellent aesthetics, chemical stability and biocompatibility ⁽¹⁾. It also provide smooth surface that is easily cleaned and not highly susceptible to surface staining resulting in less bacterial adhesion.

In the clinic the dentist often needs to adjust final restoration by grinding the outer surface before insertion which results in breaking the glazed layer producing a rough surface that needs reglazing or polishing. Some studies suggested that a polished surface may be as acceptable as a glazed surface ⁽²⁾. Many ceramists prefer polishing instead of glazing, to control the surface luster. Some authors found that the fracture toughness of polished porcelain was greater than that of glazed porcelain and both types of finish equally resist staining by coffee ⁽³⁾.

Accumulation of bacteria on marginal area of enamel and restorative material may lead to periodontal disease or secondary caries which represent primary reason for restoration replacement. So every effort should be made to prevent plaque or even minimize plaque accumulation on restorative materials. ⁽⁴⁾

The formation of oral biofilms has been closely correlated with the occurrence of oral diseases ⁽⁵⁾. Thus, it is obvious that extensive plaque formation on dental restorations may contribute to the occurrence of secondary caries lesions or induces periodontal inflammation, which indicates the demand for dental materials with low susceptibility to biofilm

formation. Numerous factors influencing dental plaque formation, surface roughness (Ra) and surface free energy have been regarded as the most important factors ⁽⁶⁾. The formation of the salivary pellicle, i.e. the adsorption of salivary constituents to tooth and restorative surfaces, is regarded as the first step in plaque formation. The pellicle plays a decisive role in microbial adhesion as its constituents may interact with oral microorganisms, either by direct interaction with receptors located on the microorganisms, or indirectly by influencing the thermodynamic conditions for microbial adhesion. Pellicle formation is followed by the adhesion of facultative anaerobic pioneer bacteria such as *Streptococcus gordonii*, *Streptococcus oralis* and *Streptococcus sanguinis* ⁽⁷⁾. Early colonizing bacteria play a pivotal role for the subsequent adhesion of cariogenic microorganisms such as *Streptococcus mutans* and periodontal pathogens such as *Tannerella forsythensis*, *Porphyromonas gingivalis* and *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans*, which may induce gingival and periodontal inflammation ⁽⁸⁾.