Metal Ceramic and Porcelain-veneered Lithium Disilicate Dental Crowns: A Comparative Study using VFEA

Sukirti Dhital¹, Camila Rodrigues², Yu Zhang³, Jeongho Kim¹ ¹University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA, 06269

²Federal University of Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil, 97105-900

³University of Pennsylvania School of Dental Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA 19104

Background

Metal ceramic (MC) systems are one of the oldest bilayer dental restorative systems that are in use since 1960s. Owing to their wide grown popularity and high survival rates, these material systems are studied extensively. However, with the focus on aesthetics rising, MC systems are slowly being replaced by all ceramic systems. One of such all ceramic systems is porcelain-veneered lithium Fig. 1: Metal disilicate (PVLD) system. This is a new system that ceramic crowns has not been studied much, both clinically and computationally.

Results

 Table 1: Material Combination

Model	Veneer: Core	Bilayer System
Model 1	2:1	MC
Model 2	1:1	MC
Model 3	1:2	MC
Model 4	2:1	PVLD
Model 5	1:1	PVLD
Model 6	1:2	PVLD



Fig. 5: Slow cooling (~30°C/min) and fast

Aim

Both MC and PVLD systems fail due to chipping of the porcelain veneer layer, which is caused by the tensile residual stresses. This study compares the effects **cooling rates** (slow and fast) and veneer-core thickness ratios on the amount of residual and transient stresses produced in MC and PVLD restorations using viscoelastic finite element analysis (VFEA).

Materials and Methods

a) Thermomechanical properties

In this study, MC system had PoM/Metal and PVLD system had emax.Ceram/emax.CAD as veneer and core layers for the bilayer dental restoration. Thermal conductivity, density, specific heat, coefficient of thermal contraction (CTC), Young's modulus of each of these materials were measured at different temperatures (Fig. 2a-d).









82.36); (b) Model 2 (V: 13.62/C: 68.18); (c) Model 3 (V: 10.06/C: 56.69), and PVLD system: (d) Model 4 (V: 10.38/ C: 16.06); (e) Model 5 (V: 10.17/ C: 14.24); (f) Model 6 (V: 8.99/C: 12.70)



Fig. 2: Temperature dependent material properties: (a) Conductivity; (b) Specific heat; (c) Thermal contraction coefficient and (d) Modulus

b) Validation of VFEA

Bilayer plates of PVLD material system were fabricated and residual stresses in the emax.Ceram layer were measured by the Vickers indentation method (4.9 N for 5 s). Similar plates were then modeled in ABAQUS and VFEA was carried out. Simulated results were then compared with experimental data that showed an excellent match.



Fig. 7: Transient stress for slow cooling in MC system: (a) Model 1; (b) Model 2; (c) Model 3 and PVLD system: (d) Model 4; (e) Model 5; (f) Model 6



Fig. 8: Stress Contour for fast cooling in MC system: (a) Model 1 (V: 27.18/C: 85.73); (b) Model 2 (V: 23.52/C: 75.02); (c) Model 3 (V: 17.55/C: 62.85), and PVLD system: (d) Model 4 (V: 23.76 /C: 27.59); (e) Model 5 (V: 26.13/C: 18.43); (f) Model 6 (V: 26.53/C: 14.07)



Fig. 3: VFEA experimental verification plot

c) Viscoelastic finite element analysis of axisymmetric crowns 1/4th of the 3D axisymmetric bilayer crown models were run in ABAQUS, for different veneer to core ratios and cooling rates, for each material system.



Fig. 4: Finite element model of full dental crown and 1/4th simulated model, with appropriate boundary conditions

(d) (e)	(f)
---------	-----

Fig. 9: Transient stress for fast cooling in MC system: (a) Model 1; (b) Model 2; (c) Model 3 and PVLD system: (d) Model 4; (e) Model 5; (f) Model 6

Conclusion

- PVLD system showed lower stress than MC in both veneer and ulletcore layers in all conditions simulated.
- Slow cooling resulted in lower stresses.
- Decrease in veneer thickness decreased amount of stress in MC, but not in PVLD system.
- Maximum residual stress located at central fossa for PVLD and in the cusp area for MC crowns, affecting final failure mode.
- Longer clinical follow-ups of PVLD crowns are needed to validate all these conclusions.

Acknowledgement

This work was sponsored by funding from the United States National Institute of Dental & Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health (Grants Nos. 1R01 DE026279 and R01DE026772).