

Department of Operative Dentistry and Periodontology University Hospital of Cologne



KÖLN

Protective Buffer Capacity of Restorative Dental Materials in Vitro M. Fuß¹, T. Attin², M.J. Noack¹

¹ Department of Operative Dentistry and Periodontology, University of Cologne

² Clinic for Preventive Dentistry, Periodontology, and Cariology, University of Zürich Centre of Dental Medicine

Aims of the study

Restored teeth are exposed to acids in their oral environment.

The aim of the study was to determine the buffer capacity of

typical and experimental dental materials during a simulated

carious and intrinsic erosive attack.





Materials and Methods

- Samples with a small cavity (130 µl) milled with CEREC MC XL (Sirona): 1.
 - Composites: Quixfil, Ceram X Mono¹,
 - Filtek Supreme², Apa Fill 3³ **PMMA**: Telio CAD⁷ (control 2)

Glas ionomer cement: Equia Fil⁸

- Dyract eXtra¹ Compomer: Enamel – Dentin-body
 - Beautifil flow⁴ Giomer:
- Experimental composite containing bio glass⁵
- 2. 80 µl acid attack: hydrochloric acid (pH 2.6) or lactic acid (pH 4.5)
- 3. pH changes: over 12 min with pH-electrode (In Lab nano, Mettler Toledo)
- 4. SEM images of surfaces
 - ¹Dentsply, ² 3M ESPE, ³Cumdente, ⁴Shofu, ⁵smartodont, ⁶Bisco, ⁷Ivoclar, ⁸GC



pH changes during a hydrochloric acid attack pH: changes during a lactic acid attack 12-12 11.5 11.5 11 11 10.5 10.5 10 9.5 Exp. Comp 10 Exp. Comp experimental experimental Composite 9 Composite 9.5 8.5 pН 9 pН Dyract Dyract 8.5 8 Filtek Supreme 6.5 Ceram X Enamel-Dentin 6 Enamel-Denti 7.5 Beautifil Apa Fill 3 Equia 5.5 Equia Eguia Quixfil Dyract eXtra Quixfil Dyract eXtra 5 Telio CAL Equia

Results





Conclusions

For the hydrochloric acid attack:

- 1. All dental materials tested: weaker buffering capacity than enamel-dentin-body
- 2. Bioactive glass-containing experimental composite and pulp capping liner: better clinically-relevant buffering capacity than enamel-dentin-body
- 3. Some materials like Equia and Dyract eXtra: performed better during hydrochloric acid attack than during lactic acid attack.

For the lactic acid attack:

- 1. Glass ionomer cement: weaker influence on the pH than all tested composites
- 2. Dyract eXtra, Telio CAD and Equia Fill: could not raise the pH efficiently compared to enamel-dentin-body
- 3. Beautifil, Ceram X Mono and ApaFill 3: buffer capacity comparable to enamel-dentin-body
- 4. Filtek Supreme: stronger buffering effect than enameldentin-body
- 5. Exp.composite and pulp capping liner: strongest influence on the pH

IADR General Session & Exhibition, Boston 2015