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Three-body wear of different composites resins
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Abstract

Introduction: Low resistance of composite resins to abrasion is a primary concern in the application of these materials for posterior restorations which are prone to high occlusal loads. This study compared the wear resistance of three types of composites.

Methods: In this laboratory experiment, five specimens of each of the three types of composites (z250, Heliomolar, Opallis) were prepared separately in brass molds. Composites were placed in 1-mm layers and were cured for 40 seconds. Using an abrasive device, Pedeb 1, with a chrome-cobalt abraser, the specimens were abraded under a 20-MPa force, after 5000, 20000, 40000, 80000, 120000 abrasive rotations. Before and after all abrasion cycles, the specimens were weighed with an electronic balance with a precision of 10^-4 g. The collected data were analyzed using paired samples statistics t-test and ANOVA analysis.

Results: All the specimens showed a reduction pattern from the initial weights to weights after 120000 abrasive rotations. With more abrasive rotations, greater weight reduction occurs and this is of statistical significance. ANOVA analysis showed no significant difference between the three types of composites; yet, the z250 and Heliomolar groups were associated with the least and the greatest amount of wear, respectively.

Conclusions: In all specimens, significant weight reduction occurred after abrasion but there were no significant differences between the 3 types of composites.
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Introduction

During the recent years, the exceeding expectations of patients regarding the esthetic and strength of anterior and posterior restorations have resulted in an increase in application of composites for posterior restorations. Despite several advantages of composite resins, these restorative materials have certain problems for restoration of posterior teeth, namely low wear resistance (1). Although the failure of composite restorations has decreased, certain factors including high coefficient of thermal expansion, shrinkage stress due to polymerization, microleakage, wear, incomplete curing, recurrent caries, post-restoration sensitivity, color change, and others are still considered as possible reasons for composite restoration failure. Even though several solutions have been suggested for reducing composite wear, this problem still remains unsolved (1-3). It is noteworthy that the importance of wear from
the clinical point of view, is mainly related to loss ofesthetic and function of the restoration and there existslittle information regarding the systemic effects ofswallowed/inhaled particles cut off composite surfaceduring abrasion (4). Formerly, due to excessive wear ofcomposite restorations, these materials werecontraindicated for posterior applications in whichocclusal loads were higher. However, the composites
today are modified to be more resistant to wear (5).

Introduction of composite resins with great wearresistance has been a considerable improvement intooth-colored restorations (6). The amount of wear in
direct composite restorations is directly related to filler
density, polymerization quality, and efficiency of lightcuring unit. It has been proven that there is no relationbetween stiffness, modulus of elasticity, and wearresistance and abrasion behavior has been consideredasa failure of key elements in composites (2, 3, 6).

Therefore, abrasion, stiffness, and physical strengthof separate issues are assessed as a clinical quality. In a
study conducted by Kiremitici et al. beta-quartzglass insert-resin composite restorations showed a
promising two-year clinical performance (7). Xu et al.
appraised the three-body abrasion in an in vitro studyand demonstrated that composite resins reinforced withsilica whiskers had more abrasion resistance compared
to composites reinforced with glass particles (8).Nagarajan et al. reported that the differences in filler
density and chemical composition of glass fillers had noeffect on the wear behavior of medium filled
composites.

Nevertheless, wear rates of medium filledcomposites (with 75-76% filler) were significantlyhigher than highly filled composites (9). Knobloch etal. evaluated the two-body wear of 4 laboratory-
processed composites (Targis, Concept, Belleglass,Artglass) and 2 direct placement composites(Heliomolar, Herculite), using enamel as a positivecontrol. The amount of wear in concept was the least(limited to enamel) and all the other types ofcomposites were associated with significantly greateramounts of wear (10). Considering the increasingapplication of novel direct placement composites, thisstudy was designed to evaluate the wear resistance ofthe three types of direct composites.

Methods

In this experiment, the three types of compositeswere opted (Opallis, Heliomolar, Z250; all in shadeA3). Five specimens were provided from each group.Specimens were prepared in 2x10x10-mm cubes in a
brass mold. The mold consisted of two separate
symmetrical complementary pieces with 3 specimen
preparation sites, which could be fixed together by 2screws. The 3 specimen preparation sites were locatedat 1-cm distance from each other and had equal heightsand widths (1x1 mm), while the depths were variablesbetween 1-3 mm. The 2-mm deep site was used in thisexperiment. The composites were placed in layers
(1mm each) and the curing time was 40 seconds.

A low-power light curing unit was used (400 mW/cm²; Astralis7, Vivadent, Liechtenstein). In order
to provide a smooth surface and eliminate air contact,thespecimens were covered with a glass lamella duringcuring. Each specimen was numbered using a ¼ round bur on the inferior surface and they were all stored for14 days in normal saline in an incubator (37°C).

Before applying abrasive forces, all samples were
dried with air spray and drying paper. The samples’weights were measured with an electronic balance (Sartorius AG, Göttingen, Germany) with a
precision of 10⁻⁴ g and were collected. Each specimenwas located in an abrasive test device; Pedeb 1(designed and made by H.A.). Pedeb 1 is made of twoparts; a rotator on which samples are located, and a
pneumatic system.

The chrome-cobalt abraser with a cross section of1.98 mm² is attached to the latter and can constantlyapply a 4-kg force to the specimens. These two partsare fixed in a cabinet and a counter on the rotator calculates the number of rotations. To simulate three-
body abrasion, the reservoir at the site of specimenswas filled with an abrasive solution, prepared bydiluting toothpaste (Paveh, Pakhsan co., Iran) at a ratioof 1:2 with normal saline. The specimens were thenabraded under a 20-MPa force, for 5000, 20000,
40000, 80000, 120000 abrasive rotations. Following
each rotation cycle, all specimens were dried preciselyand weighed. To determine the significance of weightdifference between the specimens before abrasion andafter different abrasive rotations, paired samples
statistics t-test and ANOVA analysis were used.
Results

In all specimens, before 120000 rotations, weights were reduced and this reduction was statistically significant in all types of composites. In Z250 group, weights before abraison were significantly different with those after 5000 and 20000 abrasive rotations and so were the weights after 5000 rotations with those after 20000 rotations (table 1). In Helimolar and Opallis groups, weights after all abrasive rotations were significantly different with one another, except when the weights before abraison were compared to those after 5000 rotations. The least and the greatest amount of abrasion was found in z250 and Helimolar groups, respectively.

Table 1. The average of weight difference between each of the abrasion cycles and pre-abraison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abrasion Cycle</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>±SE</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Z250</td>
<td>0.00035±0.0002</td>
<td>0.00015</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helimolar</td>
<td>0.00006±0.000089</td>
<td>0.00004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opallis</td>
<td>0.00012±0.00013</td>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000</td>
<td>Z250</td>
<td>0.0004±0.00058</td>
<td>0.00025</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helimolar</td>
<td>0.0004±0.00028</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opallis</td>
<td>0.0003±0.00016</td>
<td>0.00007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40000</td>
<td>Z250</td>
<td>0.0007±0.00056</td>
<td>0.00025</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helimolar</td>
<td>0.0008±0.00038</td>
<td>0.00017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opallis</td>
<td>0.0005±0.00023</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80000</td>
<td>Z250</td>
<td>0.0008±0.00061</td>
<td>0.00027</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helimolar</td>
<td>0.0012±0.00042</td>
<td>0.00019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opallis</td>
<td>0.0009±0.00025</td>
<td>0.00011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120000</td>
<td>Z250</td>
<td>0.0011±0.00071</td>
<td>0.00032</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helimolar</td>
<td>0.0017±0.00061</td>
<td>0.00027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opallis</td>
<td>0.0013±0.00028</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The clinical abrasion of composite restorations in posterior teeth has been the primary concern in decision making for replacement of amalgam restorations with composites. Therefore, the manufacturers have applied different chemical modifications to enhance the abrasive behavior and physical-mechanical properties of composites.

Nevertheless, composites have remained sensitive and vulnerable to occlusal overloading (11, 12). This might be due to the fact that an ineliminable element of composites is the resin matrix which is greatly sensitive to abrasion.

Moreover, despite the fact that complete polymerization of composites, especially light-cured composites enhances wear resistance in these materials, the current light curing devices and techniques do not allow for complete polymerization of monomers into polymers (13-15). In order to provide sufficient wear resistance for composite materials, it is essential to minimize the distance between filler particles. Silanes can also play a quite efficient role.

Experiments have considered high polymerization contractions, air trapping in composite material, large size of restorations as other factors responsible for increasing wear and failure (7). As a result of time and cost-consuming nature of clinical studies, laboratory simulations have been used extensively; however, simulation of the exact conditions of mouth environment can be quite challenging. In certain situations, it might be possible to simulate more or less precise mechanisms of abrasion. In the current experiment, an abrasive device, pedeb 1, was used to create three-body abrasion.

Yap et al. used a stainless steel abrasor with a rough end (cross section 1mm²) and a 1.6-kg force to evaluate the abrasive behavior of composite materials. It is believed that while antagonists like enamel eventually polish the composite surface and create limited abrasion, a stainless steel can provide standard contact forces on specimens (11, 16).

In the present study, brass molds were used to prepare cube shaped specimens, all of which were stored in incubator for 14 days before abrasion. This is a common procedure in laboratory studies (7, 16, 17).
Studies have revealed that light curing units provide different degrees of polymerization in different depths. Hence, investigators assess the abrasion behavior of materials in different abrasive cycles.

The current study used 5000, 20000, 40000, 80000, 120000 abrasive rotations (18). Since every method and abrasive device has its own characteristics, the absence of studies on Pedeb 1 in literature does not allow for comparison of the current findings with other experiments.

Alaghehmand et al. used this device to evaluate the amount of wear in composites polymerized with either a halogen or a LED light-curing unit (19). The results were comparable in both groups. All specimens in the present study showed a reduction pattern from the initial weights to weights after 120000 abrasive rotations.

With more abrasive rotations greater weight reduction occurs and this is of statistical significance. The direct relation between abrasion and weight of specimens, approved in almost all previous studies, suggests weight as a potential factor for the evaluation of the amount of wear (7, 16-18).

ANOVA analysis showed no significant difference among the three types of composites; yet, the z250 and Heliomolar groups were associated with the least and the greatest amount of wear, respectively. High filler content (60%), fine size of filler particles (µm), and BCMA monomer with a high molecular weight might have resulted in the least amount of wear in z250 composite specimens.
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