

Original Research Article

Hygroscopic expansion influence on cuspal deflection of tooth composite restoration

Abstract

Introduction: Polymerization shrinkage can result in gap formation between the composite material and tooth structure with subsequent plaque accumulation, which affect the esthetic quality of a restoration and initiate periodontal diseases.

Aim: The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of hygroscopic expansion on the cuspal deflection of tooth composite restoration.

Study design: Invitro study using human premolars.

Place and Duration of Study: Preventive and operative dental sciences in Alfarabi Dental sciences, Riyadh, KSA between July and September 2017.

Materials and Methods: Eighty (80) human premolars extracted for orthodontic reasons and divided into two main groups (40 each) according to the restorative material, the first main group randomly divided into two groups according to bonding used (20 each), subdivided into four equal subgroups (5 teeth per each) according to immersion in normal saline, Specimens were stored in water for four-time interval (immediate, 2, 4 & 12) weeks. Cuspal deflection was detected by digital caliper.

Results: There was a significant difference between the last two groups which filled with composite resin while the control teeth showed no significant difference. The cavities which restored with silorane (P90) resin-based composites and bonded with its consensual adhesive recorded the least Cuspal deformations.

Conclusions: Cuspal deformation was decreased by hygroscopic expansion in teeth restored with a hydrophobic resin composite, while a hydrophilic composite restoration shows over-compensated the polymerization shrinkage causing tooth expansion.

Key words:

Cusp deflection Periodontal diseases Hygroscopic expansion.

Introduction

Patients look for the best color-matching restorations and composite resins can satisfy this goal⁽¹⁾. The major disadvantage of visible light-cured composites is polymerization shrinkage produces contraction stresses in the resin composite restoration, with subsequent plaque accumulation, which affect the esthetic quality of a restoration and initiate periodontal diseases⁽²⁾. As the elastic modulus of the composite increases during curing, an internal stress and deformation is induced in the surrounding tooth structure⁽³⁾. This stress is exhibited as bond failure, cuspal deflection, enamel microcracking, pulpal irritation, secondary caries, plaque accumulation with subsequent periodontal diseases initiation and postoperative sensitivity, which in turn can lead to restoration failure requiring restoration⁽⁴⁾. These are believed to cause microleakage, postoperative sensitivity, recurrent caries and eventual loss of the restorations which in turn affect the gingival health. In addition, gaped resin can lead to plaque accumulation and superficial degradation with subsequent gingival inflammation⁽⁵⁾. Low surface hardness resulted in failure of restorations^(6,7). Teeth restored incrementally show less gingival microleakage compared with bulk restored teeth. Incremental restoration with the plasma arc light had significantly increased gingival microleakage compared with the turbo – boosted halogen curing light, this gingival microleakage resulted in plaque accumulation and periodontal diseases initiation⁽⁸⁾. When the adhesive strength exceeds the contraction stress, the restoration maintains an internal tension that pulls the cavity walls together, reducing the intercusp distance (i.e., cuspal deflection)⁽⁹⁾. The magnitude of this inward cuspal movement appears to depend mainly on the cavity size, type, and the type of composite used.⁽¹⁰⁻¹²⁾ Cuspal deflection may result over time in micro-cracks propagation, enamel cracks, crazing, ultimate decrease in fracture resistance of the restored tooth, and, in extreme cases, cusp fracture^(1,13-15). Cuspal deflection can be perceived clinically by the patient as postoperative sensitivity. It is also expected that absorption of water will be accompanied by a hygroscopic expansion of composite which may be able to compensate for the effect of polymerization shrinkage and relieve stresses⁽¹⁶⁾. In contrast to the rather rapid polymerization contraction and stress development, the hygroscopic relief will proceed slowly and might even take days^(17,18). The rate and magnitude of hygroscopic expansion of a resin material depend

on several variables such as the nature of the resin, the type of filler, filler loading, filler-matrix adhesion and the volumetric ratio between the filler and matrix⁽¹⁹⁻²¹⁾.

Aim of the study

This in vitro study to evaluate the effect of hygroscopic expansion on the cusp deflection of tooth composite restoration.

Materials and Methods:

Eighty (80) human premolars extracted for orthodontic reasons stored in normal saline were used. The selected teeth were placed 3 mm below the cemento-enamel junction in an acrylic mold with dimensions of 15 mm internal diameter, 25 mm external diameter, and 20 mm height. The teeth set in the acrylic mold were fixed with a vice and a large mesio-occluso-distal cavity (MOD) cavity was prepared. The mesiodistal proximal box was extended 0.5 mm bucco-lingually, and the width of the axial and gingival walls of the box was 1 mm. The width and depth of the pulpal wall of the MOD cavities were 2 × 3 mm. The central groove was the reference point for cavity depth. The reference point for measuring the specimens before and after the procedure was two metal tips (cut from dental needle C-K Ject, Korea, Queens Singapore) for each specimen (0.5 × 4 mm) that was fixed (using Clearfill SE Bond) horizontally and perpendicular to the long axis of the specimen at the cusp tip of the tooth, one buccally and the other lingually. The end of this tip was located beyond the buccal and lingual tooth contour by 2 mm to be measured by digital caliper to calculate the cusp deflection. The specimens were divided into two main groups (40 each). The first main group was restored with hydrophilic one (Silorane) while the second main group was restored with a hydrophobic resin composite (Z 350). The restoration of the cavities with the restoration followed the manufactured instructions. Each main group divided into two groups according to bonding used (G-bond & composite consensual adhesive) (20 each), subdivided into four equal subgroups as follows:

group A: Using low shrinkable resin composite (Filtek™ P90 Silorane shade A2; 3M ESPE, St Paul, MN, USA) with its adhesive system.

group B: Using low shrinkable composite (Filtek P90 Silorane shade A2; 3M ESPE) with G-bond (GC, Tokyo, Japan).

group C: Using Filtek™ Z350 (3M ESPE) composite with Adhe SE (Ivoclar Vivadent, Schaan, Liechtenstein).

group D: Using Filtek Z350 (3M ESPE) composite with G-bond (GC). Specimens were stored in water for four-time interval (immediate, 2, 4 & 12) weeks. Each group will be further divided into equal subgroup (5 teeth each) according to immersion in normal saline. Cuspal deflection was detected by digital caliper. The reading of the cusp deflection was The buccal and lingual cusp movements were recorded for 2000 s and the measured value (as a function of time) was stored on a computer through a data acquisition board. The results were statistically analyzed using ANOVA followed by Student–Newman–Keuls post hoc tests ($p = 0.05$).

Result:

The cavities which restored with the silorane (P90) resin-based composites recorded less cuspal deflection than the methacrylate-based (Filtek Z350) group. The cavities which restored with silorane (P90) resin-based composites and bonded with its consensual adhesive recorded the least Cuspal deformations. While methacrylate-based (Filtek Z350) group **bonded with G bond recorded the highest cuspal deflection**. There was a statistical significant difference ($P < 0.05$), between group A (P90 with its adhesive) and both group D (Filtek Z350 with adhesive), and group C (Filtek Z350 with G-bond). Regarding interaction between group C (Filtek Z350 with G-bond) and group D (Filtek Z350 with adhesive) results revealed that there were no statistically significant differences ($p > 0.05$).

Discussion:

The composite shrinkage creates stresses within the material at the tooth structure interface, that might manifest clinically as cuspal deflection, which in turn compromises the synergism of the bond at the tooth restoration interface possibly leading to bacterial microleakage and ultimately to marginal discoloration, secondary caries, pulpal inflammation and plaque accumulation with subsequent periodontal diseases^(22,23). Deflection of the cusps through light irradiation of the restorative resin-based composite material will only occur if there is sufficient resistance to polymerization shrinkage associated with the adhesive properties at the tooth/restoration interface. Typical resin composites applied in restorative dentistry exhibit volumetric shrinkage values from less than 1- 6%, depending upon the formulation and the curing condition^(24,25). Recently, a new category resin matrix for dental composite was developed based on

ring-opening monomers⁽²¹⁾. This hydrophobic composite is derived from the combination of siloxane and oxirane, and thus has the name silorane⁽²²⁾. The major advantages of this innovative restorative material are its reduced shrinkage and its mechanical properties comparable to those of methacrylate-based composites⁽²⁴⁾. In the current study, all the cavities which restored with resin-based composite exhibited cuspal deflection. The significant increase in cuspal deflection of cavities restored with the methacrylate-based (Filtek Z350) compared with the Silorane (P90) resin-based composites might be attributed to many factors, firstly the ring opening chemistry of the Siloranes enables at the first-time shrinkage values lower than 1 % volumetric shrinkage and increased mechanical parameters as E-Modulus and flexural strength comparable to the methacrylate based composites⁽²⁶⁾.secondary, increased hydrophobicity of the Siloranes which lead to decreased water sorption, solubility, and associated diffusion coefficient compared with conventional methacrylate-based composites⁽²⁷⁾. The specimens of the composite (Filtek Z350 Silorane (P90) which bonded with (G-bond) recorded high cuspal deflection than those bonded with adhesive this may That is attributed to Voids were consistently found throughout the G Bond adhesive layer and may be due to the lack of HEMA and phase separation. G Bond does not contain HEMA, a low viscous monomer that increases dentine wetting and solubility of other adhesive monomers that may account for short and thick resin tags. Furthermore, acetone, a co-solvent in G-Bond, may induce phase separation and precipitation of adhesive components due to the changing water: acetone ratio during evaporation⁽²⁸⁾. This lead to the formation of the hybrid layer of comparable thickness to two-step self-etch adhesive (silorane adhesive system) but might be of lower strength hence, cannot withstand functional and shrinkage stresses which leads to more cusp deflection.

Conclusion:

Cuspal deformation was decreased by hygroscopic expansion in teeth restored with a hydrophobic resin composite, while a hydrophilic composite restoration shows over-compensated the polymerization shrinkage causing tooth expansion.

References:

1. Roberson TM, Heymann HO, Swift EJ. Sturdevant's art and science of operative dentistry. St Louis: Mosby; 2002.
2. A. R. Yazici, Ç. Çelik, and G. Ozgünaltay, "Microleakage of different resin composite types," Quintessence International, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 790–794, 2004. View at Google Scholar .
3. Sakaguchi RL, Douglas WH, Delong R, Pintado MR. wear of a posterior composite in an artificial mouth: a clinical correlation. Dental Materials 1986; 2:235–40.
4. Kleverlaan CJ, Feilzer AJ. Polymerization shrinkage and contraction stress of dental resin composites. Dent Mater. 2005;21:1150–57.
5. Kwona Y, Ferracane JA. Effect of layering methods, composite type, and flowable liner on the polymerization shrinkage stress of light cured composites. Dent Mater. 2012;28:801–09.
6. Brannstrom M. Infection beneath composite resin restorations: can it be avoided? Oper Dent. 1978 Autumn;12(4):158–63. [PubMed]
7. Phillips RW. Bonding agents and adhesives. Adv Dent Res. 1988 Aug;2(1):150–4.
8. G. Abbas, G.J.P. Fleming, E. Harrington, A.C.C. Shortfall, F.J.T. Burke. Cuspal movement and microleakage in premolar teeth restored with a packable composite cured in bulk or in increments. J Dent, 2003, 31, 437-444
9. Karaman E, Ozgunaltay G. Cuspal deflection in premolar teeth restored using current composite resins with& without resin-modified glass ionomer liner. Oper Dent 2013;38:282–9.
10. Suliman AA, Boyer DB, Lakes RS. Cusp movement in premolars resulting from composite polymerization shrinkage. Dent Mater 1993;9:6–10.
11. Tantbirojn D, Versluis A, Pintado MR, et al. Tooth deformation patterns in molars after composite restoration. Dent Mater 2004;20:535–42.
12. Gonzalez-Lopez S, Vilchez Diaz MA, de Haro-Gasquet F, et al. Cuspal flexure of teeth with composite restorations subjected to occlusal loading. J Adhes Dent 2007;9:11–5.
13. Lee MR, Cho BH, Son HH, et al. Influence of cavity dimension and restoration methods on the cusp deflection of premolars in composite restoration. Dent Mater 2007;23: 288–95.
14. Karthick K, Sivakumar K, GeethaPriya P, Shankar S. Polymerization shrinkage of composites - a review. JIADS 2011;2:32–6.

15. Badran O, Kamel F, Mobarak E. Strain profile on premolar teeth restored with resin composite systems of different shrinkage values. Oper Dent. Faculty of Oral & Dental Medicine: Cairo University; 2011.
16. F. Keyf and F. Yalcin, "The weight change of various light-cured restorative materials stored in water," Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 72–79, 2005.
17. van Noort R. What's in a number? Today's Dentist. 1988;1:1–5.
18. Yap AU, Wang HB, Siow KS, Gan LM. Polymerization shrinkage of visible-light-cured composites. Oper Dent. 2000 Mar-Apr;25(2):98–103. [PubMed]
19. Hirasawa T, Hirano S, Hirabayashi S, Harashima I, Aizawa M. Initial dimensional change of composites in dry and wet conditions. J Dent Res. 1983 Jan;62(1):28–31. [PubMed]
20. Øysæd H, Ruyter IE. Water sorption and filler characteristics of composites for use in posterior teeth. J Dent Res. 1986 Nov;65(11):1315–8. [PubMed]
21. Floyd CJ, Dickens SH. Network structure of Bis-GMA and UDMA-based resin systems. Dent Mater. 2006 Dec;22(12):1143–9. [PubMed]
22. Schneider LF, Cavalcante LM, Silikas N. Shrinkage stresses generated during resin-composite application. J. of Dent Bio(Review Article)2010(pg1-14)2010.
23. Cara RR, Fleming GJP, Palin WM, Walmsley AD, Burke FJT. Cuspal deflection and microleakage in premolar teeth restored with resin-based composites with and without an intermediary flowable layer. Journal of Dent 2007;35:482-9.
24. De Gee AJ, Davidson CL, Smith A. A modified dilatometer for continuous recording of volumetric polymerization shrinkage of composite restorative materials. Journal of Dent 1981;9:36-42.
25. Lee MR, Cho BH, Son HH, Chung-Moon Um, In-Bog Lee. Influence of cavity dimension and restoration methods on the cuspal deflection of premolars in composite restoration. Dent Mater 2007; 23:288-95 .
26. Ilie N, Hickel R. Macro-, micro- and nano-mechanical investigations on silorane and methacrylate-based composites. Dent Mater 2009;25:810-19.
27. Hashimoto M, De Gee A, Feilzer A. Polymerization contraction stress in dentin adhesives bonded to dentin and enamel. Dent Mater 2008;24:1304-10.
28. Atai M and Watts DC. A new kinetic model for the photopolymerization shrinkage-strain of dental composites and resin-monomers. Dent Mater 2006;22: 785-91.

table (1) list of the materials which were used in this study

Composite	Trad name	Manufacture
low shrinkable composite	Filtek™ P90 Silorane	(3M ESPE, St Paul, MN, USA)
	Filtek adhesive	(3M ESPE, St Paul, MN, USA)
	G-bond	(GC, Tokyo, Japan)
low shrinkable composite	Filtek™ Z350 (3M ESPE)	3M ESPE
	Adhe SE	(Ivoclar Vivadent, Schaan, Liechtenstein)

Table (2) cuspal deflection of the tooth restored with composite restoration under water with different storage times.

composite	bonding	Immed	2w	4w	12 w
silorane	g bond	-2.8	-1.2	-0.4	-0.2
	adhesive	-4.3	-1.6	-0.6	-0.4
z350	g bond	-5.3	-2.1	-1.1	-0.6
	adhesive	-6.9	-4.2	-2.3	-0.8

Figure (1): Histogram of the mean score (5 each) of cuspal deflection of the tooth restored with composite restoration underwater with various storage times.

