

An Up-to-date Systematic Review of the New Techniques and Treatment Methods in Restorative Dentistry

¹ALAMRI, HASSAN SULTAN S, ²SANYOUR, FAISAL OMAR A, ³ALGHABBAN, HATTAN FAHAD A, ⁴ALANAZI, IBRAHIM ABDULLAH, ⁵ALARJANI, MOHAMMED BADER M, ⁶ALSHEHRI, ALI ABDULRAHMAN A

Abstract: The purpose of this research was to forecast trends in restorative dental care over the next two decades as well as to determine therapy goals and equivalent residential or commercial properties of restorative materials.

Methods: Using the Delphi method, a panel of 3 specialists identified 8 key questions, which were sent out to specialists in restorative as well as preventive dentistry. In round 1 of this survey, 15 international specialists designed a more clear semantic interpretation of the vital inquiries and also the conclusion of corresponding products for 2 additional rounds. In round 2, 125 specialists from 35 nations ranked the products developed in round 1 using a Likert range. In round 3, the same 125 specialists obtained the ratings of round 2 and were asked to concur or disagree to these scores by re-voting on all key inquiries and things. A total of 105 professionals re-voted and finally took part in the complete survey. Among the 8 vital questions, two inquiries were picked for the here and now report: (Q1) "What will be the future role of restorative treatment?" as well as (Q6) "What will be the crucial qualities for clinical success of remediations?" For both inquiries and also the respective items, the experts were asked to examine the importance as well as the usefulness for later estimation of the scientific worth (i.e. the opportunity, where chance = significance + [significance – feasibility]).

Outcomes. The 3 items of highest possible significance for Q1 were "preservation of existing enamel and dentin tissue," "prevention of secondary decays," as well as "upkeep of the pulp vigor," as well as for Q6 they were "optimization of bond," "biocompatibility," and also "lessening technological level of sensitivity."

Keywords: restorative dental care, Restorative Dentistry.

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last 25 years, restorative dentistry has actually experienced impressive changes. Generally, caries has decreased in developed countries. However, cavities is not uniformly dispersed throughout the populace however adheres to a social gradient ^[1], which can be considered one aspect that causes a phenomenon described as decays polarization where the majority of carious lesions in a population are discovered in a small team of people (the "decay danger group") ^[2,3] Furthermore, the raising variety of elderly individuals in developed countries results in special dental health problems. Among others, these problems include those affecting restorative dental care such as origin cavities or dental disintegration, of which the occurrence generally seems to enhance ^[4,5] Furthermore, other variables such as the level of industrialization, academic condition, price levels, and visibility of government insurance program as well as compensation systems very influence primary oral medical care. Throughout the years, dental materials for restorative dental care have actually likewise gone through amazing modifications. The arrival of sticky dentistry together with resin composite products allowed not just the establishment of safety nets such as pit as well as fissure securing but also enabled less intrusive and extremely aesthetic remediations. However, new resin-based composite materials currently give only incremental developments due to a highly competitive market with the requirement for relatively short product cycles.

In which way will restorative dental care generally and restorative materials particularly adjustment in the future? A clarification of these trends would certainly be helpful for medical care authorities, education and learning staff at universities, and also dental business in order to establish the best structure and also to ensure that the capacities of dental students today along with restorative materials will certainly satisfy tomorrow's demands. One feasible approach for a commentary of patterns may be gotten to with a Delphi study. The study is a systematic interactive forecasting as well as consensus approach based upon independent input of selected professionals. Originally established throughout the cold war ^[6], Delphi surveys have actually been used for technical forecasting. It is currently widely used in fields such as education, service, economics, or social scientific research to get to consensus among experts. The Delphi study has actually likewise been used in dental care ^[7] for decision-making in the lack of quantitative scientific information.

The aim of the here and now research was to forecast fads in restorative dental care over the following twenty years and also to identify therapy goals and equivalent homes of restorative materials.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A panel of 3 specialists (group consisting of among the authors (M.J.N.)-- led by the experienced facilitator M.J.N.) recognized 8 key concerns, which were piloted with a team of 10 dental professionals working at the University of Cologne, Germany. Upon fine-tuning the 8 crucial questions, the Internet-based Delphi study was started with 20 hand-selected global experts in restorative and precautionary dentistry (round 1). Option requirements for these specialists were: (i) great command of English, (ii) know-how in operative/preventive dental care as shown by magazines (PubMed), (iii) expertise demonstrated by magazine of literary works testimonials or essays, and also (iv) directly known to the present writers in an expert capability. Fifteen specialists from 10 nations approved the invitation and took part in the first round of the Delphi study. All input obtained from the specialists was based on their personal viewpoint without any pre-readings or literary works suggestions offered by the existing authors. The participants received no reimbursement but were provided unique access to the results of the research before magazine.

Round 1 caused the growth of a survey including more clear semantic interpretations of the vital concerns and the completion of corresponding products for the two additional rounds.

For round 2, 175 experts were contacted of whom 125 agreed to participate based on their scientific interest in the results without being offered a reimbursement (response rate=71%). The selection criteria for experts in rounds 2 and 3 were: (i) good command of English, (ii) expertise in operative/preventive dentistry as indicated by publications (PubMed) and (iii) personally known to at least one of the present authors in a professional capacity. The distribution of experts, who covered 35 countries (located in Europe, North and South America, Asia, the Middle East, Australia, New Zealand, and Africa), as well as the experts' specialties. The design of the study required that all participants corresponded individually without officially knowing the identity of the other experts, in order to avoid a "band-wagon effect" in their responses.

The experts rated the closed-ended items developed in round 1 for the 8 key questions using a Likert scale (level of agreement 1 [low]–4 [high]). The complete questionnaire can be found in the online supplementary material of this publication.

In round 3, the same 125 experts received the ratings of round 2 and were asked to agree or disagree to these ratings by re-voting on all key questions and respective items. Finally, 105 experts took part in the complete survey (response rate = 84%). Among the 8 key questions, the following 2 questions were selected for this report in order to reflect on restorative dentistry in general and restorative materials in particular: (Q1) "What will be the future role of restorative treatment?" and (Q6) "What will be the key qualities for clinical success of restorations?". A detailed report regarding the ratings for all other key questions and items can be found in the online supplementary material of this publication.

For all items of the two key questions mentioned above, the experts were asked to rate "importance" and "feasibility" on a Likert scale (level of agreement 1 [low]–4 [high]). Based on the assumption that a high attraction for an item (i.e. a high "importance") combined with a low degree of expected fulfillment (i.e. low "feasibility") results in high scientific value (i.e. high "opportunity") for researchers and for dental companies, the "opportunity" was calculated based on the Harvard Business algorithm used for industrial product developments: $\text{opportunity} = \text{importance} + (\text{importance} - \text{feasibility})$ ^[8].

2.1. Statistics

For the analysis of the results, descriptive statistics were used. In order to obtain a ranking of "importance" and "feasibility" of items, mean values were calculated. The mean values for "importance" and "feasibility" then allowed for determination of "opportunity."

3. RESULTS

All 8 key questions developed by the experts in round 1 were considered important. This was expressed by the fact that the mean values of importance for all respective items ranged between 2.8 and 3.8 (Likert scale 1-4). However, two key questions were selected for this report: key question Q1 and Q6. The three most important items for key question Q1 (i.e. "What will be the future role of restorative treatment?") were "preservation of existing enamel and dentin tissue," "prevention of secondary caries," and "maintenance of pulp vitality" .

The three most important items for key question Q6 (i.e. "What will be the key qualities for clinical success of restorations?") were "optimization of adhesion," "biocompatibility," and "minimizing technical sensitivity" .

On one hand, an overlaying of ratings for "importance" with ratings for "feasibility" gives an impression of which items are important but have been fairly well addressed (items with a high importance but also with a high feasibility; i.e. items with a low opportunity). For Q1, these items were in particular "improvement of esthetics," "restoration of lost tooth-anatomy," and "repair of insufficient restorations," and for Q6 the items were "improved wear resistance," "reduction of treatment steps and components," and "improved color/shade stability" . On the other hand, this overlaying also gives an impression of which items are important but have not or have only insufficiently been addressed so far. Based on the Harvard Business algorithm (opportunity= importance+(importance – feasibility)) , items with the highest opportunity (i.e. with a high importance but a low feasibility) for Q1 were "pulp-dentin complex regeneration," "prevention of secondary caries or new lesions in the neighborhood of existing restorations," and "maintenance of pulp vitality." Items with the highest opportunity for Q6 were "lowered risk for secondary caries," "minimizing technical sensitivity," and "resistance to saliva and blood contamination."

4. DISCUSSION

The here and now investigation is based on a Delphi survey whose purpose was to give predictions by consensus amongst 125 specialists in operative/preventive dentistry on just how restorative dentistry and also restorative materials will certainly transform in the following twenty years.

The Delphi study technique was the methodology selected for this research study for two major factors. To start with, the technique permits the conversion of qualitative input into a quantitative quote and second of all, it enables the collection of independent inputs from experts before reaching consensus ^[7,9] As the professionals were not formally aware of each various other's involvement they were able to give an independent anonymous input. This can be considered a benefit over round table talk about- ions or agreement conferences, which bring a terrific likelihood that the most respected professionals lead the team towards their point of view--a sensation referred to as personal intimidation bias ^[7] Additionally, the Delphi survey permits the neglect of the geographical distance of participants ^[9,10]

Professionals of today research study were asked to rate the items pertaining to 2 dimensions, i.e. "relevance" and also "expediency." A comparable strategy has been utilized by other investigators in a Delphi study ^[11] These two measurements can be utilized to assess which of the things might have which level of "clinical worth" (i.e. "chance"). Hence, things with a low possibility explain facets being perceived as having a high value yet these aspects might currently remain in the process of being resolved or almost fixed. In today study, the specialists considered this mainly to be the instance for the things "improvement of esthetics," "repair of shed tooth makeup," and "fixing of insufficient restorations" .

as well as for the items "boosted wear resistance," "reduction of treatment steps and also components," as well as "improved color/shade stability" . Indeed, presently available material composite materials reveal suitable esthetics as well as dependable clinical results ^[12] This is primarily supported by the fact that today material composite products have actually become the product of selection also for posterior remediations in some if not most of the European nations ^[13] This trend appears to be validated by clinical researches on the durability of posterior reconstructions reporting that material composite restorations have equivalent annual failing prices (1-3%) compared to amalgam ^[12,14- 16] and also indirect restorations ^[14] . The major factor for failures reported in the clinical literature still seems to be additional cavities as well as an absence of mechanical toughness instead of absence of wear resistance or esthetic lasting results, which may have developed the skilled viewpoint of today research ^[12,17,18] .

Standing for efforts to develop bioactive restorative materials. It needs to be born in mind that the bioactive effect via such added constituents can compromise other essential and already-established buildings of these products such as esthetics and also mechanical homes.

For both key concerns of this record, a high possibility was also determined for the avoidance of second cavities (i.e. the product "prevention of second decays or brand-new sores in the community of existing reconstructions" for essential question Q1 and also the thing "decreased danger for second cavities" for essential question Q6). A reduction of additional caries or brand-new carious lesions in the neighborhood of existing repairs might be accomplished by fluoride launch from restorative products. Fluoride launch from restorative materials has the prospective to achieve a remineralization of the tooth compound as well as to avoid additional cavities or new carious sores. However, the clinical cavities preventive impact of fluoride-releasing dental materials has been gone over with much debate ^[22]. Nevertheless, there is assistance from sitting as well as clinical research study for a preventative result of fluoride-releasing products such as glass ionomers, resin-modified glass ionomers ^[23], and compomers ^[23,24] on the tooth material of adjacent teeth. Hence, fluoride-releasing resin composite materials might offer a similar advantage. Apart from fluoride, the launch of calcium and phosphate from resin composite products additionally has the intended objective of attaining a remineralization of the tooth material and to avoid additional caries or new rancid lesions.

Numerous current researches checked out restorative products consisting of calcium fluoride and/or calcium phosphate (Nano-) bits as well as aside from a likely remineralization of the tooth substance, these recently created compounds were reported to have appealing anti-bacterial residential or commercial properties incorporated with good load-/ stress-bearing capacities ^[25-30]. Different various other techniques for anti-bacterial restorative products can be found in the literature. Antibacterial resin composite materials may, as an example, include 12-methacryloyloxydodecylpyridinium bromide (MDPB) ^[31-34], methacryloxyethyl cetyl dimethyl ammonium chloride (DMAE-CB) ^[35], or cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) ^[36]. Additionally, antibacterial homes of resin composite products can likewise be supplied by, for example, the admixture of silver bits or silver-supported antibacterials, of alkylated ammonium chloride derivatives ^[31], or of chlorhexidine diacetate ^[28,31]. This broad variety of approaches for antibacterial restorative materials reported in the literary works supports the rating of today study, in which both products regarding avoidance of additional cavities were recognized as having a high chance.

For the second crucial question chosen for this report, 2 more items were recognized as having a high chance. These products were "lessening technical level of sensitivity" as well as "resistance to saliva as well as blood contamination". Actually, the use of resin composite products particularly is still susceptible to handling errors. According to a recently published literary works evaluation on the longevity of posterior resin composite restorations, their survival is influenced by clinical variables such as cavity size, high quality, as well as method of the driver, yet additionally socioeconomic, demonstration- graphic, as well as behavioral factors of the patient (decays danger) ^[12]. As a result, dental companies continuously pursue simplifications, such as reduced therapy steps for adhesive systems, the growth of self-adhesive/self-adherent material composites, or easy to apply bulk-fill products. Nonetheless, the technical level of sensitivity of material composite materials continues to be as well as is also closely related to the product saliva and/or blood contamination.

Regardless of a number of in vitro researches, systematic clinical research study on exactly how saliva contamination impacts restorative treatment utilizing different materials is unusual-most probably due to honest reasons. These in vitro researches exposed that for some of the examined adhesive systems as well as material compounds, saliva contamination appeared to be less problematic than contamination with blood ^[37-40]. Nonetheless, the bonding performance of these items will certainly still be endangered by contamination ^[37,38]. As every dental professional needs to handle unplanned dental caries contamination, the availability of either less saliva- and also blood-sensitive materials or quick as well as easy to use products could aid to raise the top quality of restorative dental care.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Standard material properties and esthetics will keep their importance but are already perceived to be on a high level.

Bioactivity toward the pulp-dentin complex and prevention of secondary caries were rated as having the highest potential for the improvement of future restorative treatment in general and as key properties for future restorative materials.

Minimizing technical sensitivity and increasing resistance to blood and saliva are desired but perceived as less likely to be achieved.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tickle M. Comparing the ability of different area measures of socio-economic status to segment a population according to caries prevalence. *Commun Dent Health* 2000;17:138–44.
- [2] Micheelis W. Oral health in Germany: an oral epidemiological outline. *Bundes gesund heitsblatt Gesund heits for schung Gesund heits schutz* 2011;54:1022–6.
- [3] Do LG. Distribution of caries in children: variations between and within populations. *J Dent Res* 2012;91:536–43.
- [4] Kreulen CM, Van't Spijker A, Rodriguez JM, Bronkhorst EM, Creugers NH, Bartlett DW. Systematic review of the prevalence of tooth wear in children and adolescents. *Caries Res* 2010;44:151–9.
- [5] Ganss C, Young A, Lussi A. Tooth wear and erosion: methodological issues in epidemiological and public health research and the future research agenda. *Commun Dent Health* 2011;28:191–5.
- [6] Helmer O, Rescher N. On the epistemology of the inexact sciences. *Manage Sci* 1959;6:25–52.
- [7] Cramer CK, Klasser GD, Epstein JB, Sheps SB. The Delphi process in dental research. *J Evid Based Dent Pract* 2008;8:211–20.
- [8] Ulwick AW. Turn customer input into innovation. *Harv Bus Rev* 2002;91–7.
- [9] Pill J. The Delphi method: substance, context, a critique and an annotated bibliography. *Socio-Econ Plan* 1971;9:57–71.
- [10] Clark LH, Cochran SW. Needs of older Americans assessed by Delphi procedures. *J Gerontol* 1972;27:275–8.
- [11] Randall RC, Vrijhoef MM, Wilson NH. Current trends in restorative dentistry in the UK: a Delphi approach. *J Dent* 2002;30:177–87.
- [12] Demarco FF, Correa MB, Cenci MS, Moraes RR, Opdam NJ. Longevity of posterior composite restorations: not only a matter of materials. *Dent Mater* 2012;28:87–101.
- [13] Seemann R, Pfefferkorn F, Hickel R. Behaviour of general dental practitioners in Germany regarding posterior restorations with flowable composites. *Int Dent J* 2011;61:252–6.
- [14] Manhart J, Chen H, Hamm G, Hickel R. Buonocore Memorial Lecture. Review of the clinical survival of direct and indirect restorations in posterior teeth of the permanent dentition. *Oper Dent* 2004;29:481–508.
- [15] Opdam NJ, Bronkhorst EM, Roeters JM, Loomans BA. A retrospective clinical study on longevity of posterior composite and amalgam restorations. *Dent Mater* 2007;23:2–8.
- [16] Opdam NJ, Bronkhorst EM, Loomans BA, Huysmans MC. 12-Year survival of composite vs. amalgam restorations. *J Dent Res* 2010;89:1063–7.
- [17] Van Nieuwenhuysen JP, D'Hoore W, Carvalho J, Qvist V. Long-term evaluation of extensive restorations in permanent teeth. *J Dent* 2003;31:395–405.
- [18] Brunthaler A, Konig F, Lucas T, Sperr W, Schedle A. Longevity of direct resin composite restorations in posterior teeth. *Clin Oral Investig* 2003;7:63–70.
- [19] Ferracane JL, Cooper PR, Smith AJ. Can interaction of materials with the dentin-pulp complex contribute to dentin regeneration? *Odontology* 2010;98:2–14.
- [20] Formosa LM, Mallia B, Camilleri J. The chemical properties of light- and chemical-curing composites with mineral trioxide aggregate filler. *Dent Mater* 2012;29:e11–9.
- [21] Jandt KD, Sigusch BW. Future perspectives of resin-based dental materials. *Dent Mater* 2009;25:1001–6.
- [22] Kotsanos N, Dionysopoulos P. Lack of effect of fluoride releasing resin modified glass ionomer restorations on the contacting surface of adjacent primary molars. A clinical prospective study. *Eur J Paediatr Dent* 2004;5:136–42.
- [23] Qvist V, Poulsen A, Teglers PT, Mjor IA. Fluorides leaching from restorative materials and the effect on adjacent teeth. *Int Dent J* 2010;60:156–60.

- [24] Lennon AM, Wiegand A, Buchalla W, Attin T. Approximal caries development in surfaces in contact with fluoride-releasing and non-fluoride-releasing restorative materials: an in situ study. *Eur J Oral Sci* 2007;115: 497–501.
- [25] Cheng L, Weir MD, Limkangwalmongkol P, Hack GD, Xu HH, Chen Q, et al. Tetracalcium phosphate composite containing quaternary ammonium dimethacrylate with antibacterial properties. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater* 2011;100:726–34.
- [26] Cheng L, Weir MD, Xu HH, Kraigsley AM, Lin NJ, Lin-Gibson S, et al. Antibacterial and physical properties of calcium-phosphate and calcium-fluoride nanocomposites with chlorhexidine. *Dent Mater* 2012;28: 573–83.
- [27] Cheng L, Weir MD, Zhang K, Wu EJ, Xu SM, Zhou X, et al. Dental plaque microcosm biofilm behavior on calcium phosphate nanocomposite with quaternary ammonium. *Dent Mater* 2012;28:853–62.
- [28] Cheng L, Weir MD, Zhang K, Xu SM, Chen Q, Zhou X, et al. Antibacterial nanocomposite with calcium phosphate and quaternary ammonium. *J Dent Res* 2012;91:460–6.
- [29] Xu HH, Moreau JL, Sun L, Chow LC. Nanocomposite containing amorphous calcium phosphate nanoparticles for caries inhibition. *Dent Mater* 2011;27:762–9.
- [30] Xu HH, Weir MD, Sun L, Moreau JL, Takagi S, Chow LC, et al. Strong nanocomposites with Ca, PO(4), and F release for caries inhibition. *J Dent Res* 2009;89:19–28.
- [31] Izutani N, Imazato S, Nakajo K, Takahashi N, Takahashi Y, Ebisu S, et al. Effects of the antibacterial monomer 12-methacryloyloxydodecylpyridinium bromide (MDPB) on bacterial viability and metabolism. *Eur J Oral Sci* 2011;119:175–81.
- [32] Imazato S, Ebi N, Tarumi H, Russell RR, Kaneko T, Ebisu S. Bactericidal activity and cytotoxicity of antibacterial monomer MDPB. *Biomaterials* 1999;20:899–903.
- [33] Ebi N, Imazato S, Noiri Y, Ebisu S. Inhibitory effects of resin composite containing bactericide-immobilized filler on plaque accumulation. *Dent Mater* 2001;17:485–91.
- [34] de Carvalho FG, Puppim-Rontani RM, Soares LE, Santo AM, Martin AA, Nociti-Junior FH. Mineral distribution and CLSM analysis of secondary caries inhibition by fluoride/MDPB-containing adhesive system after cariogenic challenges. *J Dent* 2009;37:307–14.
- [35] Ma S, Izutani N, Imazato S, Chen JH, Kiba W, Yoshikawa R, et al. Assessment of bactericidal effects of quaternary ammonium-based antibacterial monomers in combination with colloidal platinum nanoparticles. *Dent Mater* 2012;31:150–6.
- [36] Ehara A, Torii M, Imazato S, Ebisu S. Antibacterial activities and release kinetics of a newly developed recoverable controlled agent-release system. *J Dent Res* 2000;79:824–8.
- [37] Duarte S, Lolato AL, Buainain de Freitas CR, Dinelli W. SEM analysis of internal adaptation of adhesive restorations after contamination with saliva. *J Adhes Dent* 2005;7:51–6.
- [38] Yazici AR, Tuncer D, Dayangac B, Özgünaltay G, Önen A. The effect of saliva contamination on microleakage of an etch-and-rinse and a self-etch adhesive. *J Adhes Dent* 2007;9:305–9.
- [39] Eiriksson SO, Pereira PNR, Swift EJ, Heymann HO, Sigurdsson A. Effects of blood contamination on resin–resin bond strength. *Dent Mater* 2004;20:184–90.
- [40] Tachibana A, Castanho GM, Vieira SN, Matos AB. Influence of blood contamination on bond strength of a self-etch adhesive to dental tissues. *J Adhes Dent* 2011;13:349–58.