EGYPTIAN
DENTAL JOURNAL

Vol. 63, 1871:1876, April, 2017

I.S.S.N 0070-9484

Fixed Prosthodontics, Dental materials, Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics

www.eda-egypt.org • Codex : 144/1704

EFFECT OF DIFFERENT SURFACE TREATMENTS ON THE SHEAR BOND STRENGTH OF SOME INDIRECT ESTHETIC RESTORATIONS TO DENTIN

Salah A Youssef* *and* Ahmed M Hassan **

ABSTRACT

Aim of the study: The aim of this study was directed to evaluate the effect of air abrasion, hydrofluoric acid, and combination of air abrasion and hydrofluoric acid on the shear bond strength between dentin and CEREC, VITA VM7, and E-max.

Materials and methods: 90 human lower molars were used. The teeth were divided into three groups (n=30) according to the surface treatment (air abrasion, hydrofluoric acid, and air abrasion + hydrofluoric acid. Each group was then subdivided into three subgroups (n=10) according to the ceramic material (CEREC, E-max, and VITA VM7). Shear bond strength was determined by compressive mode of force applied at ceramic-tooth interface. The collected data were analyzed using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's post-hoc test.

Results: The highest mean shear bond strength value was recorded with CEREC group treated by hydrofluoric acid (8.01) while the least mean shear bond strength was recorded with Cerec group but when treated by air abrasion alone, it was (4.33).

Conclusion: Hydrofluoric acid etching for various types of ceramic restoration results in the highest shear bond strength to dentin.

INTRODUCTION

The prime concern of nowadays practice is to restore teeth and recovering esthetic with maximum preservation of the remaining tooth structure as much as possible. In this field, indirect ceramic restorations accomplish this concept. [1]. The superior esthetic of all ceramic restorations has resulted in the increased demand for these restorations [2]. Computer aided design/computer aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) techniques are used frequently nowadays not only for simple veneer but also for more complicated fixed prostheses [3,4]. The pressed ceramic IPS Empress has emerged strongly in the field of all ceramic restorations due to its high resistance to fracture and wear [5]. Despite of the introduction of modern systems for indirect ceramic restoration conventional layering ceramic is still in service [6]. Long lasting esthetic restoration is the main goal

* Lecturer of Crown and Bridge. Faculty of Dental Medicine. Al-Azhar University. Assiut branch. Crown and Bridge Department.
** Department of Restorative Dental Sciences, Al-Farabi Colleges, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

of both dentists and patients. In order to achieve strong bond of the adhesive to the ceramic surface, micromechanical interlocking to the ceramic surface is essential. This requires surface activation for the ceramics [7]. Many surface treatments are used nowadays to create surface alteration of the esthetic restorations to enhance bonding to tooth structure. To create such alteration the surface of the restoration may be etched, silanated, or sandblasted. [8]. Etching the ceramic surface with hydrofluoric acid produces a porous surface with larger surface area available for bonding. These pores facilitate the penetration of the adhesive to create microretention [7]. Also, sandblasting is used to produce the same effect with different techniques [9]. Application of silane coupling agent has been resulted in better wetting of the ceramic surface allowing for better bond strength [10]. All the above mentioned techniques are used solely or in combination with each other in order to increase the bond strength of indirect ceramic restoration to the prepared tooth structure. Obtaining good bonding between the restoration and the prepared tooth structure has its positive reflectance to decrease the marginal discoloration. Also microleakage will be decreased with its associated dilemma. In case of good bonding, tooth and restoration will act as a one unit (tooth-restoration complex) so; the fracture resistance will be higher. The aim of this study was to evaluate the shear bond strength of three ceramic materials bonded to the prepared teeth with three different techniques. The null hypothesizes tested are; 1) there is no effect of the ceramic type on the bond strength to the prepared tooth, 2) there is no effect of bonding technique on the bond strength to the prepared tooth, and 3) the interaction between ceramic type and bonding technique has no effect on the bond strength to the prepared tooth.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Ninety freshly extracted human lower molar teeth were selected. The inclusion criteria were extracted molars free of caries or restorations and apparently free of any developmental defects. The exclusion criteria were any carious molars or molars have previous restoration or developmentally affected. The teeth were manually scaled to remove any calculus or soft tissue remnants and stored in normal saline solution at room temperature during the study (not more than 3 months). All teeth were embedded into auto polymerizing resin limited to the cervical line. The occlusal third of the teeth was grounded using diamond stone under water coolant to make flat dentin surface ready for cementation. The teeth were then randomly divided into three groups according to the type of surface treatment (n=30). The first group was subjected to air abrasion, the second group was subjected to hydrofluoric acid, while the third group was subjected to both air abrasion and hydrofluoric acid. Successively, each group was further subdivided into three subgroups (n=10) according to the type of the ceramic. The first subgroup was restored with Cerec, the second subgroup was restored with I.P.S. Empress, while the third subgroup was restored with VM7. For all tested materials a standardized 30 discs were prepared with 5mm diameter and 3mm height. Al materials used in this study are listed in table (1)

Preperation of ceramic samples

For Cerec samples, the discs were prepared by direct grinding of the ready-made blocks. While for I.P.S. samples, wax pattern was constructed then invested in phosphate bonded investment. While for VM7 a brass split counter die was constructed to provide 5x3 mm mold space, and the firing shrinkage was compensated by applying a second layer of body porcelain, yielding a final total thickness of 3 mm verified with a digital caliper.

Procedures of cementation

For each group, the samples were randomly divided into three subgroups according to the surface treatment. For the first subgroup, the bonding

TABLE (1) The materials used in the study

No	Material	Specifications	Manufacturer	Batch No.
1	CEREC Blocs Ceramics for CEREC	CAD CAM CEREC system	Sirona the dental company Germany https://www1.dentsplysirona.com	11810
2	VITA VM7	The VITADURVEST powder	Bad Sackingen, Germany https://www.vita-zahnfabrik.com	10200801
3	E-max press medium opacity	Empress 2	(Ivoclar Vivadent. Schaan, Liechtenstein www.ivoclarvivadent.com	0346
4	Ultradent Porcelain Etch	Hydrofluric acid	Ultradent Products, South Jordan, UT, USA. https://www.ultradent.com	10050
5	Ultradent Silane	Silane coupling agent	Ultradent Products, South Jordan, UT, USA. https://www.ultradent.com	110403
6	Dyract Cem plus	Adhesive resin cement (chemically cured)	Dentsply Germany http://www.dentsply.eu/	050103

surface of the ceramic block was treated with 9% hydrofluoric acid for 4 minutes. The bonding surface of the second subgroup was air abraded with 50 μm grain sized aluminum oxide particles at 200 kPa pressure for 14 sec. The third subgroup was subjected to air abrasion with 50 μm grain sized aluminum oxide particles at 200 kPa pressure for 14 sec. and then etched with 9%hydrofluoric acid for 4 min.

All the treated samples were then rinsed with tapping water for 10 sec. , silanated with silane coupling agent and air thinned for 5 seconds. The prepared tooth surfaces were then etched for 20 seconds with 35% phosphoric acid gel, rinsed for 10 seconds, and lightly dried with gentle air to ensure that the dentin surface remained moist. The prepared dentin surfaces of the teeth were then primed.

The silanated ceramic discs were then bonded to the dentin surface using autopolymerizing resin cement (Dyract cem plus). The ceramic was placed on the center of the dentin surface and a fixed vertical load (5 kg) was applied to the ceramic surface to create a uniform cement layer. The excess cement was removed with a sharp hand instrument, after initial setting of the cement. The shear bond test was done after 24 hours.

Shear Bond Strength Test procedure

A circular interface shear test was designed to evaluate the bond strength. All samples were mounted on a computer controlled materials testing machine (Model LRX-*P*lus; Lloyd Instruments Ltd., Fareham, UK) with a load cell of 5 kN and data were recorded using computer software (Nexygen-MT; Lloyd Instruments). Shear bond strength was determined by compressive mode of force applied at ceramic-tooth interface using a monobevelled chisel shaped metallic rod attached to the upper movable compartment of the testing machine traveling at cross-head speed of 0.5 mm/min.

Statistical analysis

The collected data were analyzed using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Tukey's post-hoc test was used for comparison between the means when ANOVA test is significant. For all groups, the significance level was set at $P \leq 0.05$. Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS 20.0 for windows.

RESULTS

The results of mean shear bond strength values and standard deviations of all groups are listed in table 2. The highest mean shear bond strength value was recorded for Cerec group treated by hydrofluoric acid (8.01) while the least shear bond strength was recorded also for Cerec group but when treated by air abrasion alone (4.33). Regarding the tested materials, two-way ANOVA revealed no significant difference among the material groups ($P > 0.05$). However the Cerec group yielded the highest mean shear bond strength value, while VM7 group showed the least mean shear bond strength value. For surface treatment subgroups, two-way ANOVA revealed a significant difference among different surface treatments ($P < 0.001$). Post hoc Tukey test showed a significant difference between subgroups treated with air abrasion and subgroups treated with hydrofluoric acid ($p < 0.001$), as well as subgroups treated with air abrasion followed by hydrofluoric acid ($p < 0.05$), while there was no statistical significant difference between subgroups treated with hydrofluoric acid and subgroups treated with air abrasion followed by hydrofluoric acid ($p > 0.05$). Regardless the tested materials, surfaces treated with hydrofluoric acid showed the highest mean shear bond strength value, while those treated with air abrasion alone gave the lowest mean shear bond strength value. Two-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect of the interaction between the materials and surface treatments on the mean shear bond strength values ($p < 0.05$).



Fig. (1) The effect of different surface treatment on the shear bond strength of the tested material to dentin

TABLE (2) Descriptive statistics for shear bond strength values

Ceramic	Surface treatment	Mean	SD
Cerec	Air abrasion	4.33	0.61
	Hydrofluoric acid	8.01	1.62
	Air abrasion and Hydrofluoric acid	7.43	0.98
Empress	Air abrasion	4.93	0.76
	Hydrofluoric acid	6.64	1.00
	Air abrasion and Hydrofluoric acid	6.45	0.54
VM7	Air abrasion	6.00	0.42
	Hydrofluoric acid	6.34	0.92
	Air abrasion and Hydrofluoric acid	5.43	0.77

DISCUSSION

Nowadays, there are increased demands for the esthetic restorations. Despite the increased use of CAD/CAM system, there is some limitations face the dentist due to its high cost and limited materials. On the other hand it offers easy and time saving technique to fabricate indirect esthetic restoration [11]. IPS Empress also has been used successfully for single unit restoration or even three units fixed bridge [12]. To improve the bond strength between indirect ceramic restoration and tooth structure, silane coupling agent is advocated. Application of a silane coupling agent to the pretreated ceramic surface provides a chemical covalent and hydrogen bond and is a major factor for a sufficient resin bond to silica-based ceramic. Silanes are bifunctional molecules that bond silicone dioxide with the OH groups on the ceramic surface. They have a degradable functional group that copolymerizes with the organic matrix of the resin [13]. The ceramic bonding systems are based on the mechano-chemical bonding between the luting materials and ceramic restorations [12].

Many studies have reported high bond strength of ceramics to dentin when the ceramics were treated by hydrofluoric acid [12,14,15]. This was in agreement with our study. They explained this result by attacking the residual glass in the ceramics by the hydrofluoric acid glass leaving behind a surface of rod shaped crystals, which enhanced the degree of mechanical interlocking possible. Other study [14] correlates this result to the preferential dissolution of the glassy phase from ceramic matrix that generates a micromechanically retentive surface texture and promotes the formation of hydroxyl group on the ceramic surface. Another study used atomic force microscopy to investigate the surface of ceramics after treatment with hydrofluoric acid. They found a very distinct surface texture enhances the bond strength [15].

Air abrasion technique showed the lowest mean bond strength value. This result was in disagreement with another study [16] who inferred that air abrasion technique can produce good bond strength. This disagreement may be due to their study was performed to repair fractured porcelain with flowable composite while this study investigated the bond between the ceramics and tooth structure. The explanation of our result may be due to the high hardness of the ceramic surface to be efficiently etched with air abrasion technique. The resulted abraded surface was smoother than those obtained after etching with hydrofluoric acid (HF) with subsequent lower bond strength values. Though HF acid was reported to provide good bond strength, it is one of the most harmful compounds to handle for clinical as well as for laboratory use. [12]

Regarding the ceramic material the highest mean bond strength values were obtained for Cerec system. This was in disagreement with other study which found no difference between the dentin bond strength of the Cerec and IPS Empress [17]. A main difference between our study and the afford mentioned one was that, they performed there samples on standardized mesio-occlusal cavities, while we performed this study on a flat dentin surface. The geometry of the bonded area may affect the bond strength strongly.

CONCLUSION:

Hydrofluoric acid etching for various types of ceramic restoration results in the highest shear bond strength to dentin. The shear bond strength of the ceramic materials to dentin depends to a great extent on the surface treatment.

REFERENCES

1. Girary F, Duzdar L, Oksuz M, Tanboga I. Elevation of the bond strength of resin cements used to lute ceramics on laser-etched dentin. Photomed Laser Surg. 2014;32:413-21.

2. Anchieta R, Rocha E, de Almeida E, Junior A, Martini A. Bonding all-ceramic restorations with two resins cement technique: a clinical report of three-year follow up. Eur J Dent. 2011;5:478-85.

3. Ab-Ghani Z, Jaafar W, Foo S, Ariffin Z, Mohamad D. Shear bond strength of computer-aided design and computer aided manufacturing feldspathic and nano resin ceramics blocks cemented with three different generations of resin cement. J Conserv Dent. 2015;18:355-9.

4. Poggio C, Pigozzo M, Ceci M, Scribante A, Beltrami R, Chiesa M. Influence of different luting protocols on shear bond strength of computer aided design/computer aided manufacturing resin nanoceramic material to dentin. Dent Res J (Isfahan). 2016;13: 91-7

5. Boaventura J, Nishida R, Elossais A, Lima D, Reis J, Campos E, et al. Effect finishing and polishing procedures on the surface roughness of IPS Empress 2 ceramic. Acta Odontol Scand. 2013;71:438-43.

6. Borba M, de Araujo M, de Lima E, Yoshimura H, Cesar P, Griggs J, et al. Flexural strength and failure modes of layered ceramic structures. Dent Mater. 2011;27:1259-66.

7. Jetti R, Balasubramaniam M, Chidambaranathan A, Sirnivasan S. Evaluation of shear bond strength of feldspathic CAD/CAM ceramic with dentin using 2 bonding agents and 2 surface treatments-An invitro study. J Clin Diagn Res. 2015;9:36-9

8. Moezizadeh M, Ansari Z, Fard M. Effect of surface treatment on micro shear bond strength of two indirect composites. J Conserv Dent. 2012;15:228-32

9. Peumans M, Valjkova E, De Munck J, Mishevska C, Van Meerbeek B. Bonding effectiveness of luting composites to different CAD/CAM materials. J Adhes Dent. 2016:23. Doi 10.3290

10. Sattabansuk V, chanchairerk P, Punsukumtana L, Burrow M. Effect of mechanical and chemical surface treatment on the resin-glass ceramic adhesion properties. j Investig Clin Dent. 2016;9. Doi 10.1111

11. Sannino G, Germano F, Arcuri E, Arcuri C, Barlattani A. CEREC CAD/CAM Chairside System. Oral & Implantology. 2014;7(3):57-70

12. Pattanaik S, Wadkar A. PEffect of etchant variability on shear bond strength of all ceramic restorations - an in vitro study. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2011;11:55-62.

13. Yoo JY, Yoon HI, Park EJ. Porcelain repair- Influence of different systems and surface treatments on resin bond strength. J Adv Prosthodont. 2015;7:343-8.

14. Matinlinna JP, Vallittu PK. Bonding of resin composites to etchable ceramic surfaces-an insight review of the chemical aspects on surface conditioning. J Oral Rehabil 2007;34:622-30.

15. Zaghloul H, Elkassas DW, Haridy MF. Effect of incorporation of silane in the bonding agent on the repair potential of machinable esthetic blocks. Eur J dent 2014;8:44-52.

16. Erdemir U, Sancakli HS, Sancakli E, et al. Shear bond strength of a new self-adhering flowable composite resin for lithium disilicate-reinforced CAD/CAM ceramic material. J Adv Prosthodont 2014;6:434-443.

17. Öztürk AN, İnan Ö, İnan E, Öztürk B. Microtensile Bond Strength of Cad-Cam and Pressed-Ceramic Inlays to Dentin. European Journal of Dentistry. 2007;1:91-6.