

Lecture 8: Biomaterials (Cements)

By Dr Cheryl Fu



- Different permanent and temporary cements and their uses
- Bonding/luting mechanisms
- Clinical steps for cementing a permanent crown (glassy vs crystalline vs metallic)

Reading: Chapter 30
Contemporary fixed
prosthodontics +

Dental Luting Cements: An Updated Comprehensive Review

[Artak Heboyan](#),^{1,*} [Anna Vardanyan](#),¹ [Mohmed Isaqali Karobari](#),^{2,3} [Anand Marya](#),^{4,5} [Tatevik Avagyan](#),⁶
[Hamid Tebyaniyan](#),⁷ [Mohammed Mustafa](#),⁸ [Dinesh Rokaya](#),^{9,*} and [Anna Avetisyan](#)¹⁰



Divided into temporary and permanent cements

- Temporary cements such as zinc oxide eugenol/eugenol free cements covered in temporization

Permanent cements can then be classified in many ways:

- **Composition:**
 - Resin based vs Water based (GIC, zinc polycarboxylate and zinc phosphate)
- **Bonding mechanism**
 - Non adhesive luting vs micromechanical retention vs molecular adhesion



A Review of Dental Cements

Kipp Wingo, DVM, DAVDC¹

“A term sometimes used to refer to final placement of a fixed prosthodontic restoration is to “lute” the restoration. It derives from the Latin lutum, which means mud or clay. A “luting agent” is the substance—such as cement, wax, or clay—that coats a joint area to make a tight seal. Historically, luting agents were used to mechanically link restorations to a prepared tooth.”

- Luting cements work based of mechanical friction by
- Traditionally for cast restorations
- The luting cement powder sets into a hardened matrix
- However luting cements generally have solubility issues due to the matrix consisting of ionic salts



Micromechanical bonding

- Resin cements
- Etching dentin/enamel (Phosphoric acid)
- Etching glassy ceramics (hydrofluoric acid)
- Sand blasting metal/zirconia crowns



- Physical forces such Van der Waals or chemical ionic bonding.
- 10-MDP
- At the moment cements still require other methods of retention (parallel walls)
- Can not rely solely on this.



Ideal Properties of Cements

- Low film thickness
- Suitable working time and setting time
- High compressive strength
- Similar elastic modulus as dentin
- Biocompatible
- Plaque/caries inhibition
- Low solubility
- Low microleakage
- Easy removal of excess
- High retention



Biocompatible and Antimicrobial Effects

- Cements should ideally not interact with bodily tissues, and not cause sensitivity or allergic reactions
- Antimicrobial effects to prevent marginal caries. However evidence is inconclusive whether low level fluoride or other antimicrobial agents can provide long term inhibition. (Will the fluoride etc still be there in 10 years?)



Suitable working and setting time

- Ideally enough time to mix the cement, seat and clean up excess in appropriate time
- Benefit of tack cure resin cement.
- However if excess resin cement is not fully removed before final cure, will be extremely hard to remove excess




- Solubility of cements in the oral environment (water) can lead to microleakage at the marginal interface and possible loss of retention.
- Zinc phosphate and zinc polycarboxylate have high solubility
- Resin cements have low solubility



Microleakage/Solubility

Mean and standard deviation values of microleakage of the cements in restorations with open margins (mm)

Cement	N	Mean \pm SD
Fleck ^{a,b,c}	15	3.32 \pm 0.70
Fuji Plus ^{a,d}	15	0.92 \pm 0.53
G-Cem ^{b,d,e}	15	2.08 \pm 1.10
Panavia F2.0 ^{c,e}	15	0.64 \pm 0.78
Total	60	1.74 \pm 1.32





Fleck = zinc phosphate

**HOWEVER ITS NOT
APPROPRIATE TO
SAY RESIN CEMENTS
ARE PERFECT**

Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Microleakage of the Cements in Restorations With Closed Margins (mm)

Cement	N	Mean \pm SD
Fleck ^{a,b}	15	1.92 \pm 1.23
Fuji Plus ^{a,c}	15	0.77 \pm 0.88
G-Cem ^{c,d}	15	1.25 \pm 1.07
Panavia F2.0 ^{b,d}	15	0.18 \pm 0.14
Total	60	1.03 \pm 1.11



Microleakage of Four Dental Cements in Metal Ceramic Restorations With Open Margins



Film thickness

- Low film thickness preferred
- ADA states a maximum film thickness of 25µm for luting cements
- Associated with better seating of crown and possibly lower marginal discrepancies.

[Influence of types and surface treatment of dental alloy and film thickness of cements on bond strength of dental luting cements].

Hibino Y¹

Table 4 Correlation coefficients between film thickness and tensile bond strength of dental luting cements

Alloy	Cement		
	DURELON	Fuji Ionomer TYPE I	PANAVIA EX
Au-Ag-Cu	-0.76	-0.87	-0.89
Ag-Pd	-0.78	-0.83	-0.92
Ag-Pd (hardened)	-0.78	-0.86	-0.86
Ni-Cr	-0.78	-0.85	-0.90






Fig. 8 Effect of film thickness on tensile bond strength of adhesive resin cement to different dental alloys

Elastic modulus and compressive strength

- If cement has a similar elastic modulus as dentin, there will be less stress concentration at the interface
- Some studies claim that fracture of ceramic restoration begin at the cement layer.
- Fracture load of zirconia crowns may not be greatly affected by cement type
- However chemical adhesion may be more important for lithium disilicate crowns



Weak adhesion between ceramic and resin cement impairs the load-bearing capacity under fatigue of lithium disilicate glass-ceramic crowns

Lucas Saldanha da Rosa ^a, Helder Callegaro Velho ^a, João Paulo Mendes Tribst ^b,
Luiz Felipe Valandro ^a, Cornelis Johannes Kleverlaan ^c, Gabriel Kalil Rocha Pereira ^a

Conclusion

The chemical adhesion between cement and ceramic is essential for better fatigue behavior of lithium disilicate crowns with a simplified anatomy, especially in the occlusal portion, but the restoration performance is impaired when such adhesion is compromised. There is an increase in crown and cement stress concentration with the progressive loss of chemical bonding of the crown's walls.

Fracture resistance of monolithic zirconia crowns: The importance of the compressive strength of the dental cements used.

Compressive Strength




FIGURE 30-4 ■ Compressive strength of luting agents. In the studies cited, higher strength values were reported with the resin cements and glass ionomers than with zinc phosphate or polycarboxylate. Resin-modified glass ionomer exhibited greater variation than did other cements. *ANSI/ADA*, American Dental Association/American National Standards Institute. (From Rosenstiel SF, et al: Dental luting agents: a review of the current literature. *J Prosthet Dent* 80:280, 1998.)




- Lithium disilicate crowns cemented adhesively with resin cement had a higher failure load compared to GIC. Additionally, fewer cases of debonding.

Effect of Different Luting Agents on the Retention of Lithium Disilicate Ceramic Crowns


Nicola Mobilio ^{1*}, Alberto Fasiol ¹, Francesco Mollica ² and Santo Catapano ¹

Table 1. Mean failure loads (standard deviation) in N.

Groups	Mean (sd)
Composite group	306.6 (193.8)
GIC group	94.7 (48.2)



- Mixed literature regarding zirconia crowns
- Some suggest MDP containing cements promoted better bond strength
- Some found no differences
- We will review zirconia bonding towards the end of this lecture




Bond strength and stability of 3 luting systems on a zirconia-dentin complex

Sebnem Begum Turker, DDS, PhD ▪ Mutlu Ozcan, PhD ▪ Gamze Mandali, DDS, PhD ▪ Isil Damla, DDS ▪ Burcu Bugurman, DDS
Luiz Felipe Valandro, PhD

Table 2. Median and mean values (\pm SD) of shear bond strength (MPa) failure before and after aging procedure. Based on the results of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U-tests ($\alpha < .05$).

	Immediate test		After aging		Mann-Whitney	
	Median ($P = 0.0001$; Kruskal-Wallis = 21.3)	Mean (\pm SD)	Median ($P = 0.016$; Kruskal-Wallis = 8.27)	Mean (\pm SD)	U-tests	P value
GI	2.93	→ 3.4 (1.23)	4.02	4.7 (3.4)	44	0.650
RMGI	8.37	→ 9.2 (3.80)	4.66	6.2 (3.7)	24	0.049
MDP	17.65	↗ 16.9 (6.40)	9.79	11.3 (6.4)	24	0.049

Abbreviations: GI, glass ionomer; RMGI, resin-modified glass ionomer; MDP, resin cement containing 10-methacryloyloxydecyl dihydrogen phosphate.



Retention




FIGURE 30-3 ■ Crown retention studies: effect of luting agent. In the six in vitro studies cited, researchers evaluated the effect of luting agent on crown retention. The data were normalized as percentages of the retention value with zinc phosphate cement. Adhesive resins had consistently greater retention than did zinc phosphate. Conventional resins and glass ionomers yielded less consistent results. (From Rosenstiel SF, et al: Dental luting agents: a review of the current literature. J Prosthet Dent 80:280, 1998.)



- Basic composition:
 - Zinc oxide + Eugenol + Rosin + Zinc Acetate
- Low strength + high solubility in oral environment
- A potential “sedative” effect for the pulp and otherwise biocompatible
- Issues with eugenol inhibiting resin polymerization
- Temporary cement



Zinc Phosphate

- Basic composition:
 - Zinc oxide + magnesium oxide + phosphoric acid + water + buffers
- Popular cement for use in traditional cast restorations, (has been around since 1800s)
- Acceptable film thickness of 25um
- Ease of removal of the excess material after setting
- Potential issues with biocompatibility due to the inclusion of phosphoric acid (pH 2 at time of cementing). However generally well tolerated if preparation is not too close to the pulp
- Acceptable working time of about 5 minutes



Zinc Polycarboxylate

- Basic composition
 - Zinc oxide + polyacrylic acid
- Attempts to address some biocompatibility issues from zinc phosphate by changing to polyacrylic acid
- Also exhibits some adhesion to the tooth surface through chelation of calcium (but not to cast metal surfaces)
- Potentially technique sensitive due to mixing of viscous powder and liquid (mitigated via capsules)
- Additionally very short working time of under 3 minutes
- Indicated for high retention preps, or close to pulp horns




Glass ionomer cement (GIC)

- Basic composition
 - Polycarboxylate + fluorialuminosilicate glass + water + tartaric acid
- Good biocompatibility + theoretically anticariogenic
- Aesthetic due to translucency of the cement
- Potential for water absorption during early setting which would lead to erosion of the weakened material
- Ionic bonding to tooth structure
- Concerns regarding possible post-op sensitivity not supported by literature when manufacturer followed



Resin modified glass ionomer


- Basic composition
 - GIC + resin
- Due to the inclusion of resin and corresponding photoactivators, some of the issues of GIC cement were improved
- Resin matrix improves the mechanical properties such as compressive and fracture strength compared to unmodified GIC
- Also suggest improvement in retention and bond strength
- Could be harder to remove excess. (Remember to tack cure)
- Some studies say it is contraindicated for all ceramic crowns (risk of fracture after water absorption)

- 
- Latest generation of resin-modified glass ionomer cement
 - Excellent handling, consistency and bond strength
 - Easy clean-up and one-step application, saving chair time
 - Ideal for cementation of zirconia, PFM and lithium disilicate restorations
 - High fluoride release
 - Moisture tolerant, no isolation required



Resin based cements

- Basic composition
 - Resin + filler (lower filler ratio for lower film thickness)
- Similar to restorative composite (exactly the same steps required)
- Offers micromechanical retention
- Very high compressive strength
- Least soluble
- Technique sensitive (moisture control)
- May be more expensive
- Self cure, dual cure or light cure options
- Removal of excess may be difficult if not removed at tack cure stage



Special mention: Panavia

Panavia

- Resin cement with bifunctional monomer, 10-methacryloyloxydecyl dihydrogen-phosphate (MDP)
- 10-MDP is able to interact with metal oxides via the hydrophilic phosphoric acid end group
- 10-MDP also facilitate a chemical bond with dentin through the formation of MDP-Ca insoluble salts



STRUCTURE OF ADHESIVE MONOMER MDP




TABLE 30-2 Indications for and Contraindications to Luting Agent Types

Restoration	Indication	Contraindication
Cast crown, metal-ceramic crown, partial FDP	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	—
Crown or partial FDP with poor retention	1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
MCC with porcelain margin	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	—
Casting on patient with history of post-treatment sensitivity	Consider 4 or 7	2
Pressed, high-leucite, ceramic crown	1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Slip-cast alumina crown	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7	5
Ceramic inlay	1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Ceramic veneer	1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Resin-retained partial FDP	1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Cast post-and-core	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	4, 7

Key

LUTING AGENT TYPE	CHIEF ADVANTAGES	CHIEF CONCERNS	PRECAUTIONS
1. Adhesive resin	Adhesive, low solubility	Film thickness, history of use	Moisture control
2. Self-etch adhesive resin	Low solubility, ease of use, bonding to dentin	Film thickness	Moisture control
3. Glass ionomer	Translucency	Solubility, leakage	Avoid early moisture exposure
4. Reinforced ZOE	Biocompatible	Low strength	Only for very retentive restorations
5. Resin ionomer	Low solubility, low microleakage	Water sorption, history of use	Avoid with ceramic restorations
6. Zinc phosphate	History of use	Solubility, leakage	Use for “traditional” cast restorations
7. Zinc polycarboxylate	Biocompatible	Low strength, solubility	Do not reduce powder-to-liquid ratio

FDP, Fixed dental prosthesis; MCC, metal-ceramic crown; ZOE, zinc oxide–eugenol.



- After ensuring permanent crown seats fully (covered in other lecture, and consent from patient to cement.
- Zirconia vs Lithium Disilicate crowns





Glassy ceramic crowns


Lithium disilicate, etc.

- Lab steps:

- Prior to returning the crown, the lab may have already etched the internal fitting surface with hydrofluoric acid (eg ceram etch 9% hydrofluoric gel)



1% HF 20 s



1% HF 120 s




Glassy ceramic crowns

Lithium disilicate, etc.

- Lab steps:

- Prior to returning the crown, the lab may have already etched the internal fitting surface with hydrofluoric acid (eg ceram etch 9% hydrofluoric gel)
- Silane coupling agent eg 3-methacryloxypropyltri-methoxysilane (MPS) forms bridge between the organic compounds in resin cements and inorganic ceramic molecules, hence improving the bond strength. Also increase surface energy and contact angle decreased for better resin/adhesive contact.



Influence of the Multiple Layers Application and the Heating of Silane on the Bond Strength between Lithium Disilicate Ceramics and Resinous Cement




Uriel Paulo Coelho Silva¹ Andréa Peixoto Maia² Isaias Donizeti Silva³ Milton Edson Miranda²
William Cunha Brandt^{3,*}

Zirconia:

- Lab steps:

- Not able to be etched
- Micromechanical surface treatments
 - Airborne particle abrasion to increase surface roughness (Pressure ~1 bar)
- Chemical surface treatments
 - Hot acid treatment (eg sulfuric acid and hydrogen peroxide)
 - Silica coating (aluminum oxide particle coated with silica)

Effects of airborne-particle abrasion protocol choice on the surface characteristics of monolithic zirconia materials and the shear bond strength of resin cement



Glassy ceramics

- After try in completed
- Fitting surface cleanser: Katana or Ivoclean
- Otherwise can use phosphoric acid to remove saliva contaminants





Protocol for Removal of Clinically Relevant Contaminants from Glass Ceramic-based Restorations



Thorsten Bock^a / Mutlu Özcan^b

IAAD WORKING INSTRUCTIONS

Question: What is the best cleaning method to remove saliva, blood, and silicone disclosing medium contaminants from etched and silanized bonding surfaces of glass ceramic restorations?


Answer: During intraoral try-in of ceramic restorations, the bonding surfaces may come in contact with saliva or occasionally blood.^{1,5} The resulting persistent protein contamination from saliva in particular was shown to hinder adhesion of resin cements to glass ceramics.^{1,5-7,9} Similarly, the use of silicone-based materials during checking the fit of indirect glass ceramic restorations contaminates

the bonding surfaces with silicone residues, also impeding adhesion of resin cements.^{5,10,11} Water spray, alcohol, and acetone do not seem effective in removing saliva residues from glass ceramics,^{1,5,7} but 35% to 37% phosphoric acid gel application presented effective cleaning.^{1,3-5} Several studies also demonstrated that cleaning pastes with particles (eg, Ivoclean) could also remove saliva contaminants from both glass and oxide-based ceramic surfaces.²⁻⁴ Since durable adhesion of glass-ceramic restorations is crucial, especially in minimally invasive restorations, the following surface cleaning sequence can be recommended to eliminate contaminants from ceramic surfaces, based on the available scientific reports.



What about zirconia?

Cleaning Zirconia Surface Prior To Bonding: A Comparative Study of Different Methods and Solutions

Taiseer A. Sulaiman, DDS, PhD ¹, Ali Altak, DDS,¹ Awab Abdulmajeed, DDS, MS ²,
Brandon Rodgers, BS,¹ & Nathaniel Lawson, DMD, PhD ³

¹Division of Comprehensive Oral Health, Adams School of Dentistry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

²Department of General Practice, School of Dentistry, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia

³Division of Biomaterials, University of Alabama School of Dentistry, Birmingham, Alabama

Conclusion: Air-borne particle, zirconia cleaning solutions and hydrofluoric acid are feasible to decontaminate the zirconia surface from saliva prior to bonding the restoration.

Air-borne particle abrasion: best outcome to restore previous uncontaminated surface bond strengths.
Followed by HF acid or intaglio cleaners



Glassy ceramics

Variolink® Esthetic LC

Eingliederung von Inlays (Stärke < 2 mm) (Glaskeramik, z. B. IPS e.max®)

Einprobe

1. Auftragen der Try-In-Paste
2. Einprobe der Restauration
3. Reinigung nach der Einprobe
4. Trockenlegung
5. [Red arrow pointing to step 5]

Restoration

1. H₂O
2. LUFT! *in clean*
3. Monobond Etch & Prime (20 s)
4. H₂O (40 s)
5. LUFT! (10 s)

Präparation

1. H₂O
2. LUFT!
3. Total Etch optional (15-30 s) / 15 s
4. H₂O
5. LUFT!
6. Adhese Universal (20 s)
7. LUFT! (Plätzenbildung vermeiden)
8. Bluephase Style (10 s)

Befestigung

Variolink Esthetic LC

1. Auftragen der Paste
2. Einprobe der Restauration

Bluephase Style

3. 2 s
4. Restauration bis zum Ende der abschließenden Polymerisation fixieren

Liquid Strip

5. [Application]
6. 10 s*
7. Polieren

Fluor Protector

8. [Application]




* pro Segment und mm Keramik



Glassy ceramics




Variolink® Esthetic LC



Eingliederung von Inlays (Stärke < 2 mm) (Glaskeramik, z. B. IPS e.max®)



DUAL CURE DENTAL ADHESIVE SYSTEM
PANAVIA F 2.0

Cementation of ceramic oxide restorations: PROCERA™, IN-CERAM™, CERCON™ and other zirconia prostheses.

		
<p>Mix equal amounts of ED PRIMER II A&B and apply to the tooth. Then, wait 30 sec. *ED PRIMER II initiates set of cement.</p>	<p>Gently air dry.</p>	<p>Dispense equal amounts of paste A&B.</p>

	
<p>Mix paste A&B for 20 sec.</p>	<p>Apply the mixture of the paste to the sandblasted crown.</p>

3

Cementation of ceramic oxide restorations: PROCERA™, IN-CERAM™, CERCON™ and other zirconia prostheses.




3


Cementation of ceramic oxide restorations: PROCERA™, IN-CERAM™, CERCON™ and other zirconia prostheses.

DUAL CURE DENTAL ADHESIVE SYSTEM
PANAVIA™ F 2.0

Cementation of ceramic oxide restorations: PROCERA™, IN-CERAM™, CERCON™ and other zirconia prostheses.



Remove excess cement.
(For easy clean up, partially light-cure the excess cement for 2-3 sec. with conventional halogen or LED light, then remove the excess.)



Light cure the margins.
20sec. per surface
(Conventional halogen or LED light)
5sec. per surface
(Plasma arc or fast halogen light)

OR









Self cure material by applying
OXYGUARD II to the margins. Then,
wait 3 min.



Metal crowns/PFM crowns

DUAL CURE DENTAL ADHESIVE SYSTEM
PANAVIATM F 2.0

Cementation of precious & semi-precious metal crowns, PFM crowns, bridges, inlays and onlays.

<p>1</p> 	<p>2</p> 	<p>3</p> 
<p>Sandblast, wash & dry.</p>	<p>Apply ALLOY PRIMER to internal surface of precious metal restoration.</p>	<p>Mix equal amounts of ED PRIMER II A&B. Apply to the tooth. Then, wait 30 sec. *ED PRIMER II initiates set of cement.</p>
<p>4</p> 	<p>5</p> 	<p>6</p> 
<p>Gently air dry.</p>	<p>Dispense equal amounts of paste A&B.</p>	<p>Mix paste A&B for 20 sec.</p>

1
Cementation of precious & semi-precious metal crowns, PFM crowns, bridges, inlays and onlays.





Metal crowns/PFM crowns

1
Cementation of precious & semi-precious metal crowns, PFM crowns, bridges, inlays and onlays.


DUAL CURE DENTAL ADHESIVE SYSTEM
PANAVIA F 2.0

Cementation of precious & semi-precious metal crowns, PFM crowns, bridges, inlays and onlays.

<p>7</p> 	<p>8</p> 
<p>Apply mixture of the paste.</p>	<p>Remove excess cement. (For easy clean up, partially light-cure the excess cement for 2-3 sec. with conventional halogen or LED light, then remove the excess.)</p>

9-a

Conventional halogen, LED 20 s
Plasma arc, fast halogen 5 s




Light cure the margins.
20sec. per surface
(Conventional halogen or LED light)
5sec. per surface
(Plasma arc or fast halogen light)

OR

9-b



3 min



Self cure material by applying OXYGUARD II to the margins. Then, wait 3 min.




Guidelines



Rely X Unicem 2 Automix

- Another cement available in clinic



Two types of tips



Rely X Unicem 2 Automix

- Marketed as a “dual curing, self-adhesive resin cement for indirect restorations”
- Resin cement (like Variolink aesthetic), but it is self adhesive and does not require etching and bonding.
- Think of it like “self-etch adhesives” vs “two step etch and rinse adhesives”
- Achieves demineralization via acidic monomers (carboxylic acid or phosphoric acid functional groups).
- Methacrylated phosphoric esters
- However due to limited demineralization and infiltration, may not have good bond strength to enamel.
- Dual cure with a setting time of about 6 minutes



- **Instructions for use:**
 - Clean tooth, rinse and slightly dry with 2-3 bursts of air, but DO NOT OVERDRY.
 - After appropriate cleaning and pretreatment of the fitting surface, dispense into the crown with the “standard tip”.
 - Continue with steps for clean up as per regular resin cements



- **Benefits:**
 - Simplified clinical procedure
 - Cementation of root canal glass fibre posts (due to shape of root canal and C factor, lower polymerization shrinkage may be beneficial)
- **Disadvantages**
 - Long term bond strength may be lower than that of conventional resin cements (Mixed results)

Skupien JA, Sarkis-Onofre R, Cenci MS, MORAES RR, Pereira-Cenci T. A systematic review of factors associated with the retention of glass fiber posts. Brazilian oral research. 2015 Jun 16;29:1-8.

Sarkis-Onofre R, Skupien JA, Cenci MS, Moraes RR, Pereira-Cenci T. The role of resin cement on bond strength of glass-fiber posts luted into root canals: a systematic review and meta-analysis of in vitro studies. Operative dentistry. 2014 Jan 1;39(1):E31-44.

Thanks for listening



Anything you want to recap?