

# **Bond Strength of Different Resin Composites to Various Resin-Based Lining Materials**

## **Thesis**

Submitted to Operative Dentistry Department

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain Shams University in the partial fulfillment

of the requirements

of Master Degree in Operative Dentistry

**By**

**Mohamed Samy El Sayed Mahmoud**

B.D.S. Faculty of Dentistry

Mansoura University

2009

**Faculty of Dentistry**

**Ain Shams University**

**2018**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا  
إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ)

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة: الآية ٣٢

## **Supervisors**

Dr. Farid Mohammed Sabry El-Askary

Professor of Operative Dentistry

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Omaila Hassan Ghallab

Associate Professor of Operative Dentistry

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University



First of all, I would like to thank God all mighty for giving me the strength to accomplish this work.

I would like to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to **Prof. Farid El-Askary**. Professor of Operative Dentistry, Ain Shams University for giving me the privilege of working under his supervision, continuous support, encouragement and faithful guidance throughout this work.

I would also like to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to **Dr. Omaila Hassan Ghallab** Assistant Professor of Operative Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for her continuous support during the preparation of this work.

I can't forget to thank all members of my Family, especially, my Parents and my Wife for their continuous support and care.

## List of Contents

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
List of Tables .....	i
List of Figures .....	ii
Introduction .....	
Review of Literature.....	3
Aim of the Study .....	20
Materials and Methods .....	21
Results.....	32
Discussion .....	44
Summary and Conclusions .....	51
References.....	54
Arabic Summary .....	-





## List of Tables

<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>Table (1):</b>	Material/manufacturer, description, composition, and lot #. ....	21
<b>Table (2):</b>	Experimental variables to be investigated. ....	22
<b>Table (3):</b>	Interactions between experimental variables. ....	23
<b>Table (4):</b>	Two-Way ANOVA for the effect of resin composite type, lining material and their interaction on their four-point loading flexural strength.....	32
<b>Table (5):</b>	Means $\pm$ Standard Deviation (MPa) for the effect of resin composite type and lining material on their four-point loading flexural strength. ....	33
<b>Table (6):</b>	The % distribution of different failure modes in each group.....	34
<b>Table (7):</b>	Means $\pm$ Standard Deviation (MPa) for the effect of resin composite type on their cohesive bond strength .....	42
<b>Table (8):</b>	Means $\pm$ Standard Deviation (MPa) for the effect lining material on their cohesive bond strength .....	42

## List of Figures

<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>Figure (1):</b>	Split-mold used for the application of lining materials.....	23
<b>Figure (2):</b>	Application of the lining materials.....	25
<b>Figure (3):</b>	Removal of excess lining material. ....	25
<b>Figure (4):</b>	Light curing of the lining material from (a) top (b) sides. ....	25
<b>Figure (5):</b>	The cured lining material after removing the excess. ....	26
<b>Figure (6):</b>	The cured lining material was transferred into the second mold. ....	26
<b>Figure (7):</b>	Glass slide applied to extrude excess material before curing.....	27
<b>Figure (8):</b>	The bonded specimens after finishing.....	27
<b>Figure (9):</b>	The bonded materials placed between the loading pins .....	29
<b>Figure (10):</b>	Bar chart for the effect of resin composite type and lining base material on their four-point loading flexural strength.....	33
<b>Figure (11):</b>	Stacked-column chart for the percentage distribution of different failure modes in each group. ....	35
<b>Figure (12):</b>	SEM photo-micrographs of debonded surfaces of G-aenial Universal Flo side (a) and Ever X Posterior side (b) (100x), showing cohesive failure in ever x posterior with exposure of fibers (black star) associated with adhesive failure at interface (white star). ....	36
<b>Figure (13):</b>	SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of grandio side (a) and EverX posterior side (b) (100x), showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure in Grandio (black star), cohesive failure in EverX posterior (white star). ....	36
<b>Figure (14):</b>	SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of experimental ormocer side (a) everX posterior side(b) (100x) showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure in experimental ormocer at corner (black star), cohesive failure in everX posterior (white star). ....	37
<b>Figure (15):</b>	SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of Grandio side (a) X-tra base side(b) (100x) showing mixed failure, cohesive failure in Grandio (black star) associated with adhesive failure at interface (white star). ....	37

<b>Figure (16):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of G-aenial Universal Flo side (a) x-tra base side (b). (100x) showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure in G-aenial Universal Flo (black star), cohesive failure in x-tra base (white star).....	38
<b>Figure (17):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of experimental ormocer side (a) x-tra base side(b) (100x) showing mixed failure, cohesive failure in experimental ormocer at corner (black star) associated with mainly adhesive failure at interface (white star). ....	38
<b>Figure (18):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of G-aenial Universal Flo side (a) grandio flow side (b), (100x) showing mixed failure, cohesive failure in grandio flow (black star) associated with adhesive failure at interface (white star).....	39
<b>Figure (19):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of Grandio side(a) Grandio flow side(b) (100x) showing mixed failure, cohesive failure in Grandio (black star) associated with adhesive failure at interface (white star).....	39
<b>Figure (20):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of experimental ormocer side (a) Grandio flow side (b), (100x) showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure in experimental ormocer (black star), cohesive failure in Grandio flow (white star). ....	40
<b>Figure (21):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of G-aenial Universal Flo side(a) Fuji II LC side (b), (100x) showing cohesive failure in Fuji II LC(black star). ....	40
<b>Figure (22):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of Grandio side (a) Fuji II LC side (b). (100x) showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure Grandio (black star), cohesive failure in Fuji II LC (white star).....	41
<b>Figure (23):</b> SEM photo-micrograph of debonded surface of experimental ormocer side (a) Fuji II LC side(b) , (100x) showing cohesive failure in both materials, cohesive failure in experimental ormocer (black star), cohesive failure in Fuji II LC (white star).....	41



Resin composites are direct restorative tooth-colored materials that frequently used for aesthetic purposes in daily practice [1]. It has been reported that resin composites suffer from polymerization shrinkage, which remains a major drawback and a problem for their clinical durability as dental restorative materials [2]. The placement of resin composites requires several clinical steps to achieve best results, into which researchers and manufacturers continuously search for modifications. These modifications were focused on either to reduce clinical application steps, technique sensitivity or to overcome polymerization shrinkage of resin composite materials [3, 4].

In an effort to overcome some of the concerns associated with the traditional resin composite materials, high viscous flowable composites, fiber reinforced composites or ormocer were launched in the market in an attempt to shorten clinical application time, favor stress distribution at resin/tooth interface or reduce polymerization shrinkage as well as water sorption respectively [5-7]. By fusing nano-hybrid organic particles with ormocer technology that patent by VOCO Company, a new ormocer material was launched in the market in 2015 under the name “Admira Fusion”. The manufacturer claims that, by this new technology, the decrease in water sorption, the reduction of polymerization shrinkage percentage and the improvement of its biocompatibility became advantages over traditional resin composites [8].

New generation of packable or flowable resin composites, known as ‘bulk-fill’ composites, has been developed that allowed clinicians to light cure this material up to 4mm thick layer [9, 10].

One of the materials in this category is the fiber reinforced composite. The manufacturer of this product “GC incorporation” claims that in addition

to it is a “bulk fill” one, the presence of fibers enhanced its bonding with the overlying resin composite [11].

The use of underlying resin-based materials under resin composites have been found to be of great interest [12]. Nevertheless, continuous work has been reported in an attempt to improve the bonding between these underlying materials and the overlying resin composites. In a way to achieve these optimum properties of the layering technique, there should be a good and reasonable bond between the two materials being layered over each other [13-15]. Therefore, the bond strength between the two materials plays an important role for success of the restoration as a single restoration. If this could be achieved, the durability of layered restoration could be predictably increased [16].

In order to simplify the application procedures and reducing the clinical application time, bonding between underlying and overlying materials should be achieved without the use of any additional surface treatments or the application of intermediate adhesive layer. Accordingly, testing the bond strength between these two resin-based materials without any additional surface treatment or the application of intermediate adhesives might be of value.

Resin composite materials became the first choice used in direct anterior and posterior restorations owing to their satisfactory esthetic quality results, conservation of tooth structure, reparability and reasonable cost compared to indirect restorations. Despite the major developments in resin-based restorative materials, they all show a certain degree of volume reduction due to their contraction during polymerization [17, 18]. Polymerization of dimethacrylate-based composites is always accompanied by substantial volumetric shrinkage about 1% to 3% in packable composites and up to 6% in flowable composites [19].

Polymerization contraction is time-dependent and proceeds in two stages pre-gelation and post-gelation [20]. During that initial phase of polymerization (pre-gel phase), in which the newly formed polymer is still in a flexible state, the internal stress arising from shrinkage can be relieved by flow of the composite, reducing the stress at the tooth/resin interface [21]. After gelation, the elastic modulus starts to increase as the polymer is transformed from a viscous-plastic phase with flow into a rigid-elastic phase [22, 23]. In post-gel phase, flow ceases, resin composite no longer tends to deform and cannot consequently compensate for shrinkage stresses [24]. Therefore, post-gel polymerization results in clinically relevant stresses in resin composite-tooth interface and the surrounding tooth structure [25].

Shrinkage develops during polymerization due to a reduction in distance between monomer molecules as a result of formation covalent bonds, which reduces the free volume within the monomer structure producing packed polymeric molecule [26, 27]. Hence, high contraction stresses are created within the restoration by pulling it from the tooth surface causing marginal leakage, which results in margin discoloration, recurrent