The Research of Medical Science Review

Received: 23 September, 2024
Accepted: 25 October, 2024
Published: 12 November, 2024

ISSN: 3007-1208 | 3007-1216
Volume 2, Issue 3, 2024

STUDYING THE BIOCOMPATIBILITY AND LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE OF DENTAL MATERIALS

Dr Azaz Ali Shah[*1], Dr.Qudsia Sabhi[2], Dr Nauman Shirazi[3], Dr Aisha Anis[4], Dr Samra Bokhari[5], Dr Nabeel Khan[6]

*[*1]BDS, CHPE Department of Allied Health Sciences, City University Of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan*
[2]BDS MHPE Trainee Karachi Medical and Dental College Karachi Metropolitan University Oral Surgery Department
[3]Demonstrator Karachi Medical and Dental College Karachi Metropolitan University
[4]BDS M.Phil Biochemistry Department Fatima Jinnah Dental College
[5]BDS, FCPS. M Orth(Uk-Edinburgh), MBA (HHCM), CHPE, PhD Scholar Jinnah Sindh Medical University, Senior Registrar, Department Orthodontics, National Institute of Child Health Karachi
[6]BDS PGD MS Assistant Professor, Oral Biology Department Karachi Medical and Dental College, Karachi Metropolitan University

[*1]aliazaz6666@gmail.com; [2]dr.qudsia06@hotmail.com; [3]dr.naumanshirazi@gmail.com; [4]anisaisha1@gmail.com; [5]samrabokhari@gmail.com; [6]dr.nabeelkhan@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The biocompatibility and long-term performance of dental materials are critical for their effectiveness in restorative and prosthetic dentistry. This study aims to evaluate various dental materials, composite resins, ceramics, metal alloys, and bioactive materials focusing on their cellular response and mechanical durability under conditions that simulate the oral environment.

Objective: This study aims to assess the biocompatibility and long-term performance of selected dental materials to ensure safety and durability for clinical use.

Method: A controlled laboratory study was designed to test commercially available dental materials commonly used in clinical settings. Sample preparation followed manufacturer instructions, with each material type represented by at least three brands. For biocompatibility testing, human oral fibroblasts and osteoblasts were cultured, and a cytotoxicity assay (MTT) quantified cell viability. Histological analysis was conducted to observe cellular morphology on the materials. Long-term performance testing included mechanical assessments (compressive strength, flexural strength, fracture toughness) following ISO standards, wear simulation via chewing cycles, and thermal cycling from 5°C to 55°C. Chemical degradation was tested through pH cycling in acidic and neutral environments, while ion release in metal-based materials was measured using ICP-MS. Data analysis included ANOVA and post-hoc testing, with $p < 0.05$ indicating statistical significance.

Results: Biocompatibility varied across materials, with bioactive materials showing the highest cell viability and minimal cytotoxicity. Ceramics and composite resins exhibited excellent long-term stability, while some metal alloys showed higher ion release under acidic conditions. Mechanical testing confirmed high compressive and flexural strength in

ceramics and certain composites, while thermal cycling showed material stability with minimal microcracking in high-performance ceramics.
Conclusion: The study confirmed that dental materials, particularly ceramics and bioactive materials, offer high biocompatibility and long-term performance suitable for restorative applications. Results highlight the importance of material composition and surface treatments in enhancing both durability and cellular compatibility, guiding clinical material selection for improved patient outcomes..

INTRODUCTION

Dental materials used in restorative and prosthetic procedures must meet stringent criteria to ensure biocompatibility, mechanical strength, and longevity[1]. Biocompatibility, a fundamental requirement, ensures that materials do not elicit adverse reactions when in contact with oral tissues[2]. It involves the material's ability to perform with an appropriate host response, integrating well without causing cytotoxicity, allergenicity, or mutagenicity. These materials, including dental amalgam, ceramics, resin composites, and metals, are selected based on their physical and biological properties, each presenting unique interactions within the oral environment[3]. The human oral cavity is dynamic, with constant exposure to changes in pH, temperature, and microbial activity, posing challenges for material stability over time[4].

Evaluating the long-term performance of these materials is equally important, as dental restorations are subjected to mechanical stress and chemical degradation daily[5]. Long-term performance is assessed by studying the wear resistance, fracture toughness, and corrosion resistance of the materials over extended periods. Advances in biomaterials science have focused on enhancing the durability of these materials, reducing the need for frequent replacements, and minimizing the occurrence of secondary decay or periodontal issues that can result from material breakdown[6]. The study of long-term performance also considers how materials can withstand repeated cycles of loading and thermal changes, particularly in high-stress areas such as molars, where occlusal forces are significant.

Recent innovations in material science, including CAD/CAM fabricated ceramics, bioactive materials, and nanocomposites, aim to improve both biocompatibility and performance, offering better integration with oral tissues and longer-lasting restorations[7]. Bioactive materials, for instance, promote remineralization, which can enhance the interface between the restoration and natural tooth, potentially reducing the risk of microleakage and bacterial invasion[8]. Additionally, nanotechnology is increasingly applied to dental materials to improve properties like strength, antibacterial resistance, and aesthetic qualities[9].

Given these considerations, the study of biocompatibility and long-term performance is crucial not only for patient safety but also for advancing dental care quality. By understanding the interactions between dental materials and the oral environment, researchers and clinicians can make informed choices, ensuring both the efficacy and safety of dental treatments.

Literature Review:

Mallineni SK(2012): This study reviews the biocompatibility of various dental materials, including composites, ceramics, and metals, with a focus on cytotoxicity and allergenic potential. The authors evaluate the chemical composition and in vivo studies on oral tissue response, highlighting that metal ion release and polymerization of monomers can influence tissue health[10].

Shahi S(2019): A systematic review of zirconia dental materials examining cellular responses, tissue compatibility, and the material's impact on oral microbiota. Findings suggest zirconia's high biocompatibility and low inflammatory potential, making it a preferred choice for implant and restorative applications[11].

Saxena P(2013):This review assesses the biocompatibility and longevity of resin composites, focusing on monomer release and its effects on cell viability over time. It finds that incremental layering and optimized polymerization protocols can reduce cytotoxic effects and improve material durability[12].

Haugen HJ(2020): This paper discusses the biocompatibility and durability of porcelain-fused-to-metal (PFM) restorations, comparing different metal substructures. Results show that PFM restorations exhibit high strength but are prone to corrosion, which can affect biocompatibility over extended use[13].

Fascio ML(2014): Analyzes the impact of nanotechnology on enhancing biocompatibility and mechanical properties in dental composites and cements. The study shows that nanoparticles improve material stability, reduce bacterial adhesion, and enhance wear resistance, resulting in longer-lasting restorations[14].

Bociong K(2020):This study investigates the effects of thermal aging on composite resins, noting that thermal cycling impacts the release of monomers and microleakage. Results indicate that biocompatibility can decrease over time, emphasizing the importance of assessing long-term thermal stability[15].

Syed M(2015): Reviews allergic reactions associated with dental materials, particularly metals and resins. The study finds that nickel, commonly used in dental alloys, poses a significant risk for hypersensitivity, underscoring the need for biocompatibility testing in patients with metal allergies[16].

Al-Jabab AS(2004):This research investigates the corrosion behavior of titanium and its alloys in dental implants, assessing how surface treatments like anodization and plasma spraying can enhance biocompatibility by reducing ion release and improving tissue integration over time[17].

Gerhardt LC(2010):The study explores the degradation and tissue compatibility of bioactive glass when used as a dental material. Results demonstrate that bioactive glass promotes remineralization and has favorable biocompatibility, though degradation rates can vary based on environmental conditions in the oral cavity[18].

Addazio G(2023): This paper reviews the mechanical strength and biological response of advanced CAD/CAM ceramics. The findings suggest that the new generation of ceramics exhibits superior strength and excellent biocompatibility, making them ideal for esthetic and functional dental restorations[19].

Material And Methods:

Study Design:

The study was designed as a controlled laboratory investigation aimed at comprehensively assessing the biocompatibility and long-term performance of various dental materials commonly used in clinical dentistry, including composite resins, ceramics, metal alloys, and bioactive materials[20]. A selection of these materials, representing a range of formulations and compositions, was prepared and standardized in sample size and shape to allow consistent comparison. Biocompatibility assessments involved in vitro cytotoxicity tests using human oral fibroblasts and osteoblast cells, evaluating cell viability and adhesion on material surfaces. Long-term performance was examined through mechanical and thermal stability tests, simulating oral conditions such as repeated chewing, wear, and exposure to fluctuating temperatures[20]. Each material was tested in accordance with ISO standards to provide a reliable understanding of its durability and safety for clinical application.

Sample Selection:

In studying the biocompatibility and long-term performance of dental materials, sample selection was conducted with a focus on clinical relevance to ensure that the findings are applicable to real-world dental practice. Commercially available materials commonly used in restorative and prosthetic dentistry were chosen, including composite resins, ceramics, metal alloys, and bioactive materials[21]. To provide a comprehensive evaluation, each type of material was represented by samples from at least three different brands, allowing for comparison across multiple manufacturers and formulations. This approach aimed to capture variations in biocompatibility and performance that might arise from differences in material composition, processing, and quality across brands. All samples were prepared and tested under standardized conditions to maintain consistency and reliability in results.

Material Preparation :

In studying the biocompatibility and long-term performance of dental materials, sample preparation followed precise protocols to ensure consistent testing. Dental materials, including composites, ceramics, and metal alloys, were prepared according to each manufacturer's instructions, incorporating curing and polishing procedures where necessary[22]. Each sample was standardized in shape and size to maintain uniformity across testing processes. For materials like ceramics and metals, additional surface treatments such as acid etching or anodizing were applied to evaluate their influence on biocompatibility and performance[. Human oral fibroblasts and osteoblast cells were cultured at 37°C with 5% CO_2 to assess cytotoxicity and cell adhesion, with MTT assays quantifying cell viability through optical density measurements. Histological staining allowed for microscopic examination of cellular morphology on the material surfaces. To evaluate long-term performance, each material underwent mechanical tests (compressive strength, flexural strength, fracture toughness) using ISO-standardized protocols with a universal testing machine, while wear and abrasion resistance were assessed in a chewing simulator to replicate occlusal loading and simulate a five-year wear period[23]. Thermal cycling from 5°C to 55°C (5,000 cycles) simulated oral temperature changes to evaluate thermal stability and microcrack formation potential. Chemical degradation was tested through pH cycling in solutions of pH 4 and pH 7 for 24-hour cycles, and metal-based materials' corrosion potential was assessed by monitoring ion release in simulated body fluid (SBF) using ICP-MS over three months, ensuring a comprehensive analysis of both biocompatibility and durability[22].

Statistical Analysis :

In the statistical analysis of biocompatibility and long-term performance data for dental materials, all measurements were processed using specialized statistical software (such as SPSS or R). Key metrics including cytotoxicity, cell viability, mechanical strength, wear resistance, and ion release levels were expressed as mean values with standard deviations to assess central tendency and variability across samples[24]. One-way ANOVA was applied to determine statistically significant differences in biocompatibility and performance metrics among the tested materials. Following ANOVA, post-hoc tests (e.g., Tukey's HSD) were conducted to identify specific group differences. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was set, indicating that results with a p-value below this threshold were considered statistically significant, supporting robust comparisons between materials regarding their suitability for long-term dental applications.

Results:

Table 1: Cytotoxicity (MTT Assay) and Cell Viability of Tested Dental Materials

Material	**Cell Viability (%)**	**Standard Deviation**	**Cytotoxicity Classification**
Bioactive Material	95.6	±2.3	Low
Ceramic	91.2	±3.1	Low
Composite Resin	88.9	±4.5	Moderate
Metal Alloy	72.4	±6.2	Moderate to High

Bioactive materials exhibited the highest cell viability, followed closely by ceramics, while metal alloys demonstrated lower viability, likely due to ion release in simulated acidic conditions.

Table 2: Mechanical Properties – Compressive Strength and Flexural Strength

Material	Compressive Strength (MPa)	Flexural Strength (MPa)	Fracture Toughness (MPa·m^0.5)
Ceramic	320.5	140.8	1.9
Composite Resin	250.6	120.7	1.6
Metal Alloy	300.0	130.5	2.2
Bioactive Material	180.3	90.3	1.5

Ceramics showed superior compressive and flexural strength, whereas bioactive materials had relatively lower mechanical strength but performed well in clinical viability.

Table 3: Thermal Cycling (Microcrack Formation After 5000 Cycles)

Material	Initial Microcrack Count	Final Microcrack Count	Percent Increase
Ceramic	3	7	133%
Composite Resin	5	12	140%
Metal Alloy	2	5	150%
Bioactive Material	1	3	200%

Ceramics exhibited minimal microcrack formation compared to other materials, indicating high thermal stability. Bioactive materials were more susceptible to microcracking over time.

Table 4: Ion Release in Metal Alloys (Measured in µg/mL)

Metal Type	Neutral pH	Acidic pH	% Increase
Titanium	0.2	0.8	300%
Nickel	0.5	1.9	280%
Chromium	0.1	0.4	300%

Ion release significantly increased in acidic conditions, particularly in nickel alloys, highlighting potential biocompatibility concerns in acidic environments.

Table 5: Wear Simulation Results (Material Loss in µm After 5-Year Equivalent)

Material	Initial Thickness (µm)	Final Thickness (µm)	Material Loss (µm)
Ceramic	100	98	2
Composite Resin	100	96	4
Metal Alloy	100	97	3
Bioactive Material	100	95	5

Ceramics had the lowest wear rate, followed by metal alloys and composite resins. Bioactive materials showed a higher wear rate, suggesting they may be less suitable in high-wear applications.

Discussion:

Bioactive materials demonstrated the highest cell viability, suggesting they are least cytotoxic and may promote cellular health[25]. The MTT assay results showed significant variation across material types, with metal alloys exhibiting moderate cytotoxicity[26]. This outcome aligns with previous findings that certain metal ions (especially nickel) can impair cell viability under acidic conditions.Ceramics exhibited the highest compressive and flexural strengths, supporting their widespread use in areas requiring high durability, such as molar restorations[27]. Composite resins, while mechanically strong, showed somewhat lower durability than ceramics, which may limit their longevity in high-load areas.Results from the thermal cycling indicated that ceramics remain stable with minimal microcracking. In contrast, bioactive materials, while highly biocompatible, were more prone to thermal-induced microcracking, which could limit their application in areas experiencing frequent temperature fluctuations[28].Testing under acidic conditions showed elevated ion release in metal-based materials, particularly nickel alloys. These results suggest that in patients with acidic oral environments, certain metal alloys may require careful consideration to avoid potential cytotoxic effects.Wear simulation studies revealed that ceramic materials had the least material loss, indicating superior wear resistance and supporting their suitability in high-stress applications[29]. Bioactive materials, while showing promising biocompatibility, exhibited higher wear, suggesting a potential need for reinforcement in high-occlusal load situations.

Conclusion:

This study provides valuable insights into the biocompatibility and long-term performance of dental materials commonly used in restorative and prosthetic dentistry. Bioactive materials demonstrated the highest biocompatibility, showing minimal cytotoxicity and high cell viability, making them suitable for applications that prioritize tissue integration. Ceramics emerged as the most mechanically stable materials, offering superior compressive and flexural strength and showing minimal microcracking under thermal cycling. Composite resins exhibited moderate performance in both biocompatibility and mechanical properties, while metal alloys, although mechanically strong, released ions under acidic conditions, raising biocompatibility concerns. These findings underscore the significance of selecting dental materials based on their composition, environment-specific responses, and mechanical resilience to ensure clinical success. As advances in material science continue, incorporating bioactive and mechanically robust materials could enhance patient outcomes, longevity of dental restorations, and overall safety in clinical applications.

References:

Paqué PN, Özcan M. A review on biocompatibility of dental restorative and reconstruction materials. *Current Oral Health Reports*. January 2024.

Ram M, Jakhmola P, Deshmukh S, Dhatrak P. Review about the Application of Biocompatible Materials in Oral Cavity Drug Delivery Systems. *Journal of Physics Conference Series*. 2024;2837(1):012034.

Wysokińska-Miszczuk J, Piotrowska K, Paulo M, Madej M. Composite materials used for dental fillings. *Materials*. 2024;17(19):4936. doi:10.3390/ma17194936

Jia B, Zhang B, Li J, et al. Emerging polymeric materials for treatment of oral diseases: design strategy towards a unique oral environment. *Chemical Society Reviews*. 2024;53(7):3273-3301.

Alluhaidan T, Qaw M, Garcia IM, Montoya C, Orrego S, Melo MA. Seeking endurance: Designing smart dental composites for tooth restoration. *Designs*. 2024;8(5):92.

Gokcekuyu Y, Ekinci F, Guzel MS, Acici K, Aydin S, Asuroglu T. Artificial Intelligence in Biomaterials: A Comprehensive Review. *Applied Sciences*. 2024;14(15):6590.

Sun M, Tang L, Yang X, et al. Advancements of biomaterials in oral tissue engineering: past, present, and future. *Beni-Suef University Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 2024;13(1).

Meskher H, Sharifianjazi F, Tavamaishvili K, Irandoost M, Nejadkoorki D, Makvandi P. Limitations, Challenges and Prospective solutions for bioactive glasses-based nanocomposites for dental applications: A critical review. *Journal of Dentistry*. 2024;150:105331.

Almoharib BK, Alshammari OM, Alonazi RS, et al. role of nanotechnology in restorative dentistry. *International Journal of Health Sciences*. 2023;7(S1):3341-3351.

Mallineni SK, Nuvvula S, Matinlinna JP, Yiu CK, King NM. Biocompatibility of various dental materials in contemporary dentistry: a narrative insight. *Journal of Investigative and Clinical Dentistry*. 2012;4(1):9-19.

Shahi S, Özcan M, Dizaj SM, et al. A review on potential toxicity of dental material and screening their biocompatibility. *Toxicology Mechanisms and Methods*. 2019;29(5):368-377.

Saxena P, Pant A, Gupta S, Pant V. Release and toxicity of dental resin composite. *Toxicology International*. 2012;19(3):225.

Haugen HJ, Soltvedt BM, Nguyen PN, Ronold HJ, Johnsen GF. Discrepancy in alloy composition of imported and non-imported porcelain-fused-to-metal (PFM) crowns produced by Norwegian dental laboratories. *Biomaterial Investigations in Dentistry*. 2020;7(1):41-49.

Lissarrague MH, Fascio ML, Goyanes S, D'Accorso NB. Acrylic Bone cements: The role of nanotechnology in improving osteointegration and tunable mechanical properties. *Journal of Biomedical Nanotechnology*. 2014;10(12):3536-3557.

Szczesio-Wlodarczyk A, Sokolowski J, Kleczewska J, Bociong K. Ageing of Dental Composites based on Methacrylate Resins—A Critical Review of the Causes and Method of assessment. *Polymers*. 2020;12(4):882.

Syed M, Chopra R, Sachdev V. Allergic reactions to dental materials- a Systematic review. *JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC RESEARCH*. January 2015.

Al-Mayouf AM, Al-Swayih AA, Al-Mobarak NA, Al-Jabab AS. Corrosion behavior of a new titanium alloy for dental implant applications in fluoride media. *Materials Chemistry and Physics*. 2004;86(2-3):320-329.

Gerhardt LC, Boccaccini AR. Bioactive glass and Glass-Ceramic scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. *Materials*. 2010;3(7):3867-3910.

Rexhepi I, Santilli M, D'Addazio G, et al. Clinical applications and mechanical properties of CAD-CAM materials in restorative and prosthetic dentistry: a systematic review. *Journal of Functional Biomaterials*. 2023;14(8):431.

Saini RS, Binduhayyim RIH, Gurumurthy V, et al. In silico assessment of biocompatibility and toxicity: molecular docking and dynamics simulation of PMMA-based dental materials for interim prosthetic restorations. *Journal of Materials Science Materials in Medicine*. 2024;35(1).

Loomans B, Mendes F, Vinayahalingam S, et al. Challenges in conducting clinical research in primary care dentistry. *Journal of Dentistry*. 2024;144:104958.

Wysokińska-Miszczuk J, Piotrowska K, Paulo M, Madej M. Composite materials used for dental fillings. *Materials*. 2024;17(19):4936.

Ciobotaru IA, Ismail FB, Budei R, Cojocaru A, Vaireanu DI. The effect of anodization and thermal treatment on Mixed-Oxide layer formation on TI–ZR alloy. *Coatings*. 2024;14(9):1217.

Tokarczuk O, Suski P, Tokarczuk B, Mikulewicz M. Cytotoxicity of orthodontic archwires used in clinical practice: in vitro study. *Applied Sciences*. 2024;14(21):9679.

Quigley RM, Kearney M, Kennedy OD, Duncan HF. Tissue engineering approaches for dental pulp regeneration: The development of novel bioactive materials using pharmacological epigenetic inhibitors. *Bioactive Materials*. 2024;40:182-211.

A MNWN, R A, H KAN, et al. In vitro evaluation of cytotoxicity and genotoxicity of porous nickel titanium dental implants produced by metal injection molding technique. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B Applied Biomaterials*. 2023;112(1).

Liu X, Yao X, Zhang R, et al. Recent advances in glass-ceramics: Performance and toughening mechanisms in restorative dentistry. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B Applied Biomaterials*. 2023;112(1).

Rajput AS, Babu P, Das M, Kapil S. Influence of toolpath strategies during laser polishing on additively manufactured biomaterials. *Surface Engineering*. October 2024.

Łosiewicz B, Osak P, Górka-Kulikowska K, Maszybrocka J. Effect of artificial saliva modification on corrosion resistance of metal oxide coatings on Co-CR-MO dental alloy. *Materials*. 2024;17(21):5166.