

**CLINICAL AND MECHANICAL EVALUATION OF A NEW
ALL-CERAMIC RESTORATIVE MATERIAL
TURKOM-CERA™**

**BANDAR MOHAMMED ABDULLAH AL-MAKRAMANI
B.D.S., H.D.D., MSc**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATIVE DENTISTRY
FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

AUGUST 2010

Abstract

The mechanical properties and clinical performance of Turkom-Cera system were evaluated in this study. The mechanical properties evaluated were; flexural strength, microhardness, shear bond strength, fracture resistance and marginal integrity.

The biaxial flexural strength and hardness of Turkom-Cera compared to two other all-ceramic systems (In-Ceram and Vitadur-N) were investigated. The Turkom-Cera exhibited significantly higher flexural strength (506.8 MPa) than In-Ceram (347.4 MPa) and Vitadur-N (128.7 MPa) ceramic materials. However, In-Ceram core has significantly higher hardness (1116.2 VHN) than Turkom-Cera (1002.1 VHN) and Vitadur-N (812.8 VHN) all-ceramic materials.

In order to find the optimal choice of luting cement and surface treatment for Turkom-Cera all-ceramic material, the shear bond strength of four different luting cements (zinc phosphate, glass ionomer, resin modified glass ionomer and resin cement) to the Turkom-Cera all-ceramic discs was evaluated. In addition, the effect of surface treatments (no treatment as control, sandblasting, silane application and combinations of these treatments) on the shear bond strength of resin cement to Turkom-Cera was also investigated. The shear bond strength increased significantly from zinc phosphate (0.92 MPa), glass ionomer (2.04MPa), resin modified glass ionoer (4.37 MPa) to resin cement (16.42 MPa). Sandblasting followed by silanization of the Turkom-Cera specimens provided the highest bond strength value (19.13 MPa). The control group exhibited significantly lower shear bond strength (10.83 MPa) than the other three groups. However, there were no significant differences in the shear bond strength of the sandblasting (16.42 MPa), silane (16.18 MPa) and sandblasting + silane (19.13 MPa) groups.

The occlusal fracture resistance of Turkom-Cera all-ceramic copings compared to Procera AllCeram and In-Ceram all-ceramic copings was evaluated using metal dies and natural teeth as a supporting structure. In both cases, using metal dies or natural teeth as a supporting structure, the mean load at fracture of Turkom-Cera (2184 N / 1341.9 N) was significantly more than Procera (1953.5 N / 975.0 N) ($P < 0.05$). There were no significant differences in the mean loads at fracture between In-Ceram (2041.7 N / 1151.6 N) and Procera and also between Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram ($P > 0.05$).

The effect of zinc phosphate, glass ionomer and resin cements on the occlusal fracture strength of Turkom-Cera all-ceramic copings were also assessed. The mean load at fracture of Turkom-Cera copings cemented with zinc phosphate, glass ionomer and resin cements were 1537.4 N, 1294.4 N, and 2183.6 N, respectively. There was a significant difference in the mean load at fracture between the three luting cements used ($P < 0.05$). The effect of marginal design (chamfer or shoulder) and artificial ageing (30-day water storage and 500 thermocycles) on the occlusal fracture resistance of Turkom-Cera copings were also investigated. There was no influence of the finish line design and artificial ageing used in this study on the occlusal fracture resistance of Turkom-Cera all-ceramic copings ($P < 0.05$).

The marginal adaptation of Turkom-Cera copings compared to In-Ceram and Procera copings was assessed. The mean marginal discrepancy for Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Procera were 49.2 μm , 71.5 μm and 34.4 μm , respectively. It was verified that there was a statistically significant difference among the marginal discrepancy of the three all-ceramic systems ($p < 0.05$). In this study, there were no significant differences in the mean marginal discrepancy of Turkom-Cera crowns between the chamfer (49.2 μm) and shoulder (44.0 μm) groups ($p > 0.05$).

A preliminary prospective study to evaluate the clinical performance of Turkom-Cera crowns was conducted. This study was carried out to complement the different mechanical tests that have been done on the Turkom-Cera all-ceramic material. In this study, 20 Turkom-Cera crowns were evaluated for a mean evaluation period of 21.5 months. During the whole observation period, 1 of the 20 Turkom-Cera crowns was found to have fractured after a service time of 14 months. The veneering porcelain chipped in 3 molar crowns, but did not compromise the integrity of the crowns. The other parameters were rated satisfactory according to the Modified United States Public Health Service (USPHS) criteria. All patients expressed satisfaction with their restorations and did not report any sensitivity during or after treatment.

Declaration

I certify that this thesis is based on my independent work, except where acknowledged in the text or by reference. No part of this work has been submitted for a degree or diploma to this or any other university.

Dr. Bandar Mohammed Abdullah AL-Makramani

Date:

Supervisor: **Prof. Dato' Dr. Abdul Aziz bin Abdul Razak**

Head

Biomaterial and Dental Technology Unit

Faculty of Dentistry,

University of Malaya,

Kuala Lumpur,

Malaysia.

Co-Supervisor: **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Abu-Hassan**

Dean

Faculty of Dentistry,

Universiti Teknologi MARA,

Selangor,

Malaysia.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I thank Allah, the Almighty, for granting me the will and strength to accomplish this modest research. I pray that Allah's blessing upon me continue throughout my life, and Allah's blessing and peace be upon the messenger Mohammad.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dato' Dr. Abdul Aziz bin Abdul Razak for his inspiration and continuous scientific suggestions throughout the preparation of this thesis. His efforts are deeply appreciated. His guidance, advice as well as fruitful assistance was of great help to me to finish this thesis. He was generous with his knowledge, experience and time in the supervision of this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Abu-Hassan, my co-supervisor, for his valuable help and support. I am grateful for the knowledge he generously shared with me, inexhaustible scientific advice and continuous encouragement. Thanks for providing your place of work at the laboratories of Universiti Teknologi MARA.

My great thanks and praise goes to the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, University of Malaya, Prof. Dato' Dr. Ishak bin Abdul Razak for all the care he has shown to facilitate the work of postgraduate students.

I also seize this opportunity to thank and appreciate the efforts and moral support presented by the Head, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Noor Hayaty Abu Kasim, and staff of the Department of Conservative Dentistry.

I am greatly indebted to University of Malaya for granting me the University of Malaya Fellowship Scheme Award 2007/2008.

I also wish to remember my dear friend, Dr. Ghassan for his valuable help, encouragement and support. I am also grateful to everyone who have helped, supported and encouraged me in the University of Sana'a.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to:

Mr. Nor Hasim, the Assistant Registrar, for his help and valuable advice during my study.

Mr. Zaini, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Malaya, for his great help in preparing most of the jigs used in this study.

Ms. Nor'aidah Abas, Ms. Maziah, Ms. Letchmy, Ms, Nurul, Ms. Halimah Rani, Ms. Florence, Ms. Saudah, and Ms. Yatimah for their great help and excellent cooperation during this work.

Mr. Rahim, Mr. Idris, Ms. Yvonne P.W., Mr. Ismail, and Ms. Zarina for their help and excellent cooperation during preparation and testing of specimens of this study.

Dr. Marhazlinda Jamaludin for her assistance with the statistical analysis.

My special thanks go to my wife, Reema, and my children, Afaf, Aziz and Mu'tasim who have always been an inexhaustible source of love, encouragement and support. I am grateful to them for being patient during the period of this work.

Lastly, I extend my acknowledgement to my parents and every member in my family for all that they have done for me.

CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Declaration	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of contents	viii
List of figures	xvi
List of tables	xxii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Objectives of the study	10
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
2.1 Background	13
2.2 Classification of currently available all-ceramic systems	15
2.2.1 Conventional Powder-Slurry Ceramic	15
2.2.2 Cast glass and polycrystalline ceramics	16
2.2.3 Pressable ceramics	18
2.2.4 Glass infiltrated ceramics	19
2.2.4.1 In-Ceram	20
2.2.4.2 Turkom-Cera Fused Alumina	22
2.2.5 Machinable (CAD/CAM) ceramics	23
2.2.5.1 CAD/CAM systems	23
2.2.5.1.1 The ceramic materials available for the Cerec System	25
2.2.5.2 Copy-milling technique	27
2.2.5.3 Procera AllCeram CAD/CAM system	28
2.3 Strength of All-Ceramic materials	30
2.3.1 In vitro strength tests for modern dental ceramics	31

2.3.2.1	Flexural strength test	33
2.4	Ideal properties of a luting agent	35
2.4.1	Adhesion	35
2.4.2	Working and setting time	36
2.4.3	Compressive and tensile strength	37
2.4.4	Solubility	37
2.4.5	Low-film thickness (low viscosity)	38
2.4.6	Biocompatibility	38
2.4.7	Anticariogenic properties	39
2.4.8	Radiopaque	40
2.4.9	Ease of manipulation	41
2.4.10	Aesthetic	41
2.5	Dental luting agents	42
2.5.1	Zinc phosphate cement	43
2.5.2	Glass ionomer and resin-modified glass ionomer cements	44
2.5.3	Resin-based cements	48
2.5.4	Self-adhesive resin luting cements	50
2.6	Factors affecting bonding to ceramics	52
2.6.1	Acid etching	53
2.6.2	Silane coupling agents	54
2.6.3	Air abrasion (sandblasting)	56
2.7	Marginal integrity of all-ceramic crowns	58
	CHAPTER THREE: FLEXURAL STRENGTH AND HARDNESS OF TURKOM-CERA COMPARED TO TWO OTHER ALL-CERAMIC MATERIALS	61
3.1	Introduction	62
3.2	Materials and methods	64
3.2.1	Materials used	64

3.2.2	Methods	64
3.2.2.1	Preparation of the disc specimens	64
3.2.2.1.1	Preparation of Turkom-Cera discs	64
3.2.2.1.2	Preparation of In-Ceram discs	66
3.2.2.1.3	Preparation of Vitadur-N discs	68
3.2.2.2	Grinding and polishing of the specimens	71
3.2.2.2.1	Preparing the specimens for biaxial flexural strength testing	71
3.2.2.2.2	Preparing the specimens for microhardness testing	73
3.2.2.3	Testing procedure	74
3.2.2.3.1	Biaxial flexural strength testing	74
3.2.2.3.2	Hardness testing	77
3.2.2.4	Statistical analysis	78
3.3	Results	79
3.3.1	Biaxial flexural strength	79
3.3.2	Vickers microhardness	81
3.4	Discussion	83
3.5	Conclusions	90
	CHAPTER FOUR: EFFECT OF LUTING CEMENTS AND SURFACE TREATMENTS ON THE BOND STRENGTH TO TURKOM-CERA ALL-CERAMIC MATERIAL	91
4.1	Introduction	92
4.2	Materials and methods	94
4.2.1	Materials used	94
4.2.2	Methods	95
4.2.2.1	Specimen preparation before surface treatment and bonding	95
4.2.2.2	Surface treatments and sample distribution	97
4.2.2.3	Bonding procedure	98

4.2.2.4	Testing procedure	103
4.2.2.5	Assessment of mode of failure	104
4.2.2.6	Statistical analysis	105
4.3	Results	106
4.3.1	Effect of luting cements on the shear bond strength	106
4.3.1.1	Testing mode of failure	107
4.3.2	Effect of surface treatments on the shear bond strength	109
4.3.2.1	Testing mode of failure	110
4.4	Discussion	112
4.4.1	Methodology	112
4.4.2	Effect of luting cements	116
4.4.3	Effect of surface treatments	118
4.4.4	Mode of failure	122
4.5	Conclusions	124
	CHAPTER FIVE: EVALUATION OF THE OCCLUSAL FRACTURE RESISTANCE OF TURKOM-CERA COMPARED TO TWO OTHER ALUMINA-BASED CERAMIC SYSTEMS (PART I): EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LUTING CEMENTS ON THE FRACTURE RESISTANCE OF TURKOM-CERA	125
5.1	Introduction	126
5.2	Materials and methods	128
5.2.1	Materials used	128
5.2.2	Methods	129
5.2.2.1	Preparation of the tooth	129
5.2.2.2	Construction of metal dies	131
5.2.2.3	Fabrication of all-ceramic copings	132
5.2.2.3.1	Fabrication of Turkom-Cera copings	132
5.2.2.3.2	Fabrication of In-Ceram copings	134

5.2.2.3.3	Fabrication of Procera AllCeram copings	136
5.2.2.4	Crown cementation procedures	138
5.2.2.5	Testing procedure	140
5.2.2.5.1	Effect of ceramic material on the fracture resistance	140
5.2.2.5.2	Effect of luting materials on the fracture resistance of Turkom-Cera	140
5.2.2.6	Assessment of mode of fracture	141
5.2.2.7	Data Collection and Analysis	143
5.3	Results	144
5.3.1	Effect of ceramic material on the fracture resistance	144
5.3.1.1	Testing mode of fracture	145
5.3.2	Effect of luting materials on the fracture resistance	147
5.3.2.1	Testing mode of fracture	148
5.4	Discussion	150
5.4.1	Methodology	150
5.4.2	Effect of ceramic materials	153
5.4.3	Effect of luting materials	155
5.5	Conclusions	158
	CHAPTER SIX: EVALUATION OF THE OCCLUSAL FRACTURE RESISTANCE OF TURKOM-CERA COMPARED TO TWO OTHER ALUMINA-BASED CERAMIC SYSTEMS (PART II): AN IN VITRO STUDY	159
6.1	Introduction	160
6.2	Materials and methods	162
6.2.1	Materials used	162
6.2.2	Methods	162
6.2.2.1	Specimen collection and storage	162
6.2.2.2	Preparation of teeth	163
6.2.2.3	Impression and die preparation	170

6.2.2.4	Fabrication of all-ceramic copings	172
6.2.2.5	Cementation	172
6.2.2.6	Water storage and thermocycling	173
6.2.2.7	Testing procedure	174
6.2.2.8	Statistical analysis	176
6.3	Results	177
6.3.1	Effect of ceramic material on the fracture resistance	177
6.3.1.1	Mode of fracture	179
6.3.2	Effect of finish line on fracture resistance of Turkom-Cera	180
6.3.3	Effect of water storage and thermocycling on the load at fracture of Turkom-Cera	181
6.4	Discussion	183
6.4.1	Methodology	183
6.4.2	Discussion of results	185
6.5	Conclusions	190
	CHAPTER SEVEN: MARGINAL INTEGRITY OF TURKOM-CERA COMPARED TO TWO OTHER ALL-CERAMIC MATERIALS: EFFECT OF FINISH LINE	191
7.1	Introduction	192
7.2	Materials and methods	194
7.2.1	Materials used	194
7.2.2	Methods	194
7.2.2.1	Specimen preparation	194
7.2.2.2	Marginal gap measurement	195
7.2.2.2	Measurement of reliability	199
7.2.2.3	Statistical analysis	200
7.3	Results	201
7.3.1	Effect of ceramic material on the marginal integrity	201

7.3.2	Effect of finish line on the marginal integrity of Turkom-Cera	203
7.4	Discussion	204
7.4.1	Methodology	204
7.4.2	Effect of ceramic materials	207
7.4.3	Effect of finish line	208
7.5	Conclusions	211
	CHAPTER Eight: CLINICAL EVALUATION OF TURKOM-CERA ALL-CERAMIC CROWNS	212
8.1	Introduction	213
8.2	Materials and methods	215
8.2.1	Subjects	215
8.2.2	Treatment	217
8.2.2.1	Preparation of teeth, impression making and pouring	217
8.2.2.2	Fabrication of Turkom-Cera copings and veneering	221
8.2.2.3	Try-in and cementation	221
8.2.3	Evaluation criteria	223
8.2.4	Reliability test	226
8.2.5	Statistical analysis	226
8.3	Results	227
8.4	Discussion	232
8.5	limitations	239
8.6	Conclusions	240
	CHAPTER NINE: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	241
9.1	Summary	242
9.2	Recommendation for further studies	248
	REFERENCES	252
	APPENDICES	288

APPENDIX I	289
APPENDIX II	298
APPENDIX III	301
APPENDIX IV	306
APPENDIX V	309
APPENDIX VI	315
APPENDIX VII	318
APPENDIX VIII	327
APPENDIX IX	329
PUBLICATIONS	331

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 (A & b)	The perspex mould used (A), and the perspex mould after 24 hours of placing Turkom-Cera alumina gel (B)	65
Figure 3.2 (A & b)	The dried Turkom-Cera non sintered discs (A), and sintering using the Programat p300 furnace (B)	65
Figure 3.3 (A & b)	Mixing the Turkom-Cera crystal powder (A) and the sintered Turkom-Cera discs with crystal powder on top (B)	66
Figure 3.4 (A & b)	Turkom-Cera disc before removal of excess crystals (A) and the finished Turkom-Cera disc after removal of excess crystals (B)	66
Figure 3.5	The perspex mould used for In-Ceram discs preparation	67
Figure 3.6	Preparation of the In-Ceram alumina slip and vibration using the In-Ceram Vitasonic unit	67
Figure 3.7	Vita In-Ceram furnace used for the firing of In-Ceram discs	68
Figure 3.8	The brass split mould and compactor used for the preparation of the Vitadur-N disc specimens	69
Figure 3.9	The brass split mould with the condensed slurry of Vitadur-N	69
Figure 3.10	Multimat-Touch & Press furnace used for the firing of Vitadur-N discs	70
Figure 3.11 (A & b)	The grinding machine used (A) and the diamond disc fixed in the grinding machine (B)	71
Figure 3.12 (A & b)	The ceramic discs fixed to the specimen holder (A) and the specimen holder during grinding (B)	72
Figure 3.13	The diamond paste, lubricant and polishing cloth used	72
Figure 3.14	Ultrasonic cleaner machine used	73
Figure 3.15	The Mitutoyo digital caliper used	73
Figure 3.16	Specimens for microhardness testing mounted inside the epoxy resin	74
Figure 3.17	Instron Universal Testing Machine	75
Figure 3.18 (A & b)	The 1.6 mm loading pin used (A) and the specimen's mounting jig used (B)	75

Figure 3.19	HMV Micro Hardness Tester used	77
Figure 3.20	Vickers diamond pyramid indenter while indent is being placed	78
Figure 3.21	Micrograph of Vickers indentation in one of the ceramic discs tested	78
Figure 4.1	Perspex mould with five holes of 10 mm diameter and 3 mm thickness	95
Figure 4.2 (A & b)	Turkom-Cera disc fixed to the plastic mould before embedding with the die stone	96
Figure 4.3	Turkom-Cera disc embedded in the die stone	96
Figure 4.4	Lapping the specimen with a Metaserv [®] 2000	97
Figure 4.5 (A & b)	Front (A) and lateral (B) views of the shear bond test apparatus used	99
Figure 4.6 (A & b)	Open (A) and closed (B) views of the cylindrical split brass mould used	99
Figure 4.7 (A & b)	Brass mould adapted to the bonding jig (A), and cement placement (B)	101
Figure 4.8	load application during bonding	102
Figure 4.9	Bonded specimen	102
Figure 4.10 (A & b)	Shear jig (A) attached to the Instron Universal testing Machine (B)	103
Figure 4.11	Specimen during shear bond strength testing	104
Figure 4.12	The mean shear bond strength (MPa) of the four treatment groups	109
Figure 5.1	Zinc phosphate cement Elite (left) and glass ionomer cement Fuji Plus (right) used	128
Figure 5.2	Panavia F resin luting cement (left) and Clearfil silane coupling agent (right) used in this study	129
Figure 5.3	The embedded tooth	130
Figure 5.4 a & b	The dental surveyor used for positioning and preparation of the tooth	130
Figure 5.5 a,b,c & d	Different views of the stone die	131

Figure 5.6	The acrylic patterns with their wax bases and the mounting jig	132
Figure 5.7	The six metal dies used	132
Figure 5.8 a & b	Taking impression of the metal die (a) and the stone dies (b)	133
Figure 5.9	Preparation of the In-Ceram slip using the In-Ceram Vitasonic unit	134
Figure 5.10 a,b & c	Application of the In-Ceram alumina slip (a) and firing using Vita Inceramat furnace (b and c)	135
Figure 5.11 a & b	Application of the In-Ceram glass powder (a) and firing using Vita Inceramat furnace (b)	135
Figure 5.12 a & b	The Procera AllCeram Scanner connected to a computer and modem (a) and the die during scanning process (b)	136
Figure 5.13 a,b,c & d	Determination of the finish line and coping design	137
Figure 5.14	Schematic drawings of Procera AllCeram fabrication	138
Figure 5.15	Application of the load during cementation using the Makramani Load	140
Figure 5.16	Loading of a crown with a 1.6 mm stainless steel bar	141
Figure 5.17	Description of modes of fracture	142
Figure 5.18	Most common mode of fracture for ceramic copings (minimal fracture)	154
Figure 6.1	The tooth embedded in the epoxy resin	163
Figure 6.2	The paralleling apparatus used	164
Figure 6.3 a & b	Two views of the specimen fixture	165
Figure 6.4	The jig used to fix the handpiece to the vertical arm of the apparatus	165
Figure 6.5	Schematic illustration of the paralleling apparatus	166
Figure 6.6	The jig used to set the degree of taper	167
Figure 6.7	The diamond bur oriented at 3° to the vertical axis	167
Figure 6.8	The tooth during axial preparation	168

Figure 6.9 a & b	The tooth before (a) and after (b) occlusal reduction	169
Figure 6.10 a & b	Occlusal (a) and buccal views (b) of the finished preparation	169
Figure 6.11 a & b	The impression material, tooth model and plastic cap (a); and impression of the prepared tooth (b)	170
Figure 6.12 a & b	Boxing of the impression (a) and pouring with die stone (b)	171
Figure 6.13	The die numbered according to its respective tooth	171
Figure 6.14	Specimens during thermocycling	174
Figure 6.15	The universal testing machine used	175
Figure 6.16	The specimen during testing	175
Figure 7.1	Front view of the holding jig used	195
Figure 7.2	Specimen fixed in the holding jig	196
Figure 7.3	The upper screw connected to the digital torque control motor	196
Figure 7.4	The computer system used to record the measurements	197
Figure 7.5	The jig-coping-tooth assembly on the table of the stereomicroscope	198
Figure 7.6	Marginal discrepancy image of one specimen (x30) on computer monitor	199
Figure 7.7	Marginal discrepancy evaluation using Cell [^] B image processing software	200
Figure 7.8	Marginal integrity (μm) of the three tested ceramics (Mean + SD)	201
Figure 7.9	Marginal gap (μm) of the Turkom-Cera with two finish lines	203
Figure 8.1	Buccal view of prepared lower right first molar	218
Figure 8.2	The cast after sectioning	219
Figure 8.3	The master casts mounted on the articulator	220
Figure 8.4	The provisional crown on lower right first molar	220
Figure 8.5	Distribution of the Turkom-Cera crowns done in relation to observation time in months	227

Figure I.1	A Turkom-Cera Fused Alumina kit	289
Figure I.2	Preparation of the stone die	290
Figure I.3 A & B	Holding and heating the foils (A), and dipping of the die in the silicone putty (B)	291
Figure I.4 A,B & C	Removing the die (A), cutting the foils (B), and placing the red foil on the stone die (C)	291
Figure I.5 A & B	Adapting the red foil on the die using the heated transparent foil	292
Figure I.6	The diagram showing the adaptation of a single or double red plastic foil	292
Figure I.7 A & B	Isolating the stone die with varnish (A) and separating oil (B)	293
Figure I.8 A & B	Applying the alumina gel to the margin area (A), and dipping the die in the gel (B)	294
Figure I.9 A,B & C	The die after applying alumina gel (A), removing the excess alumina (B), and removing the coping from the stone die (C)	294
Figure I.10 A,B & C	Sintering (A), finishing (B), and adjusting the coping (C)	295
Figure I.11 A & B	Applying the crystal powder to the sintered alumina coping	296
Figure I.12 A,B & C	Two views of the crystal hardened coping (A & B), and removing the excess crystal (C)	297
Figure II.1	Histogram of biaxial flexural strength (MPa)	298
Figure II.2	Histogram of Vickers microhardness (VHN)	299
Figure III.1	Histogram of shear bond strength (MPa) (Effect of luting cements)	301
Figure III.2	Histogram of shear bond strength (MPa) (Effect of surface treatments)	304
Figure IV.1	Histogram of the load at fracture (N) (Effect of ceramic materials)	306
Figure IV.2	Histogram of the load at fracture (N) (Effect of luting cements)	307
Figure V.1	Histogram of load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera, In-ceram and Procera	309

Figure V.2	Histograms of the effect of finish line on load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera copings	310
Figure V.3	Histograms of the effect of water storage and thermocycling on load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera copings	312
Figure VI.1	Histogram of marginal integrity (μm) of Turkom-Cera, In-ceram and Procera	315
Figure VI.2	Histograms of the effect of finish lines on marginal integrity (μm)	316

List of Tables

Table 3.1	The mean and median biaxial flexural strength (MPa) of Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Vitadur N	79
Table 3.2	Comparison of biaxial flexural strength (MPa) between Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Vitadur N by Kruskal Wallis Test	80
Table 3.3	Multiple pairwise comparisons of bi-axial flexural strength (MPa) using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	81
Table 3.4	The mean Vickers microhardness (VHN) of Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Vitadur N	81
Table 3.5	Comparison of Vickers microhardness (VHN) between Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Vitadur N by One Way ANOVA	82
Table 3.6	Multiple pairwise comparisons of microhardness (VHN) by Tukey's HSD	82
Table 4.1	Luting materials used	94
Table 4.2	The mean and median shear bond strength (MPa) for the four luting cements used	106
Table 4.3	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Elite, Fuji I, Fuji Plus and Panavia F by Kruskal Wallis Test	106
Table 4.4	Multiple pairwise comparisons of shear bond strength (MPa) of the four luting cements using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	107
Table 4.5	Distribution of modes of failure in each treatment group (Elite, Fuji I, Fuji Plus and Panavia F)	108
Table 4.6	Descriptive summary for modes of failure and shear bond strengths (MPa) (effect of luting cements)	108
Table 4.7	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between the four surface treatments by One Way ANOVA	109
Table 4.8	Multiple pairwise comparisons of shear bond strength (MPa) of the four surface treatments using Tukey's HSD Test	110
Table 4.9	Distribution of modes of failure in each treatment group	111
Table 4.10	Descriptive summary for modes of failure and shear bond strengths (MPa) (effect of surface treatments)	111
Table 5.1	Luting materials used in this study	128
Table 5.2	Modes of fracture	142

Table 5.3	The mean load at fracture (N) of Procera AllCeram, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram copings	144
Table 5.4	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Procera AllCeram, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram by One Way ANOVA	144
Table 5.5	Multiple pairwise comparisons of load at fracture (N) using Scheffe's Test	145
Table 5.6	Distribution of modes of fracture in each treatment group (Procera, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram)	146
Table 5.7	Descriptive summary for modes of fracture and mean load at fracture (N) (effect of ceramic materials)	146
Table 5.8	The mean and median load at fracture (N) of the three luting cements used	147
Table 5.9	Comparison of load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera copings between Elite, Fuji I and Panavia F cements by Kruskal-Wallis Test	147
Table 5.10	Multiple pairwise comparisons of load at fracture (N) using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	148
Table 5.11	Distribution of modes of fracture in each treatment group (Elite, Fuji I and Panavia F)	149
Table 5.12	Descriptive summary for modes of fracture and mean load at fracture (N)	149
Table 6.1	The mean load at fracture (N) and standard deviation for Procera AllCeram, Turkom-Cera, and In-Ceram copings	177
Table 6.2	Comparison of load at fracture between Procera AllCeram, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram copings by One Way ANOVA	178
Table 6.3	Multiple pairwise comparisons of fracture load (N) using Tukey HSD Test	178
Table 6.4	Distribution of modes of fracture in each treatment group (Procera, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram)	179
Table 6.5	Descriptive summary for modes of fracture and mean load at fracture (N)	180
Table 6.6	The mean and median load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera (Chamfer) and Turkom-Cera (Shoulder) groups	181
Table 6.7	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Turkom-Cera (Chamfer) and Turkom-Cera (Shoulder) groups by Mann-Whitney Test	181

Table 6.8	The mean and median load at fracture (N) of Turkom-Cera (no aging) and Turkom-Cera (with aging) groups	182
Table 6.9	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Turkom-Cera (no aging) and Turkom-Cera (with aging) groups using the Mann-Whitney Test	182
Table 7.1	Compare marginal integrity (μm) between Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Procera AllCeram copings by One Way ANOVA	202
Table 7.2	Multiple pairwise comparisons of marginal integrity (μm) of Turkom-Cera, In-Ceram and Procera AllCeram copings using Tukey's HSD Test	203
Table 7.3	Comparison of marginal integrity (μm) of the two groups using Independent t-test	204
Table 8.1	Location and observation time of the 20 crowns placed in 16 patients	216
Table 8.2	Overview of the clinical protocol	217
Table 8.3	Criteria for Modified USPHS rating used in this study	224
Table 8.4	Criteria for postoperative sensitivity and patient satisfaction	225
Table 3.5	The mean time \pm SD (month) in service for all restorations	228
Table 8.6	Scores of clinical evaluation (%) at baseline, year 1 and year 2	228
Table 8.7	Postoperative sensitivity in 16 crowns placed on vital teeth	231
Table 8.8	Results of patient satisfaction	231
Table II.1	Normality test for biaxial flexural strength	298
Table II.2	Comparison of biaxial flexural strength (MPa) between Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	298
Table II.3	Comparison of biaxial flexural strength (MPa) between Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	299
Table II.4	Comparison of biaxial flexural strength (MPa) between In-Ceram and Vitadur N using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	299
Table II.5	Normality test for Vickers hardness	300
Table II.6	Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Vickers microhardness	300

Table II.7	Multiple Comparisons of Vickers microhardness (VHN) mean values using Tukey HSD Test	300
Table III.1	Normality test for shear bond strength (effect of luting cements)	301
Table III.2	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Elite and Fuji I using Mann-Whitney U Test with Bonferroni correction	301
Table III.3	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Elite and Fuji Plus using Mann-Whitney U Test with Bonferroni correction	302
Table III.4	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Elite and Panavia F using Mann-Whitney U Test with Bonferroni correction	302
Table III.5	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Fuji I and Fuji Plus using Mann-Whitney U Test with Bonferroni correction	302
Table III.6	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Fuji I and Panavia F using Mann-Whitney U Test with Bonferroni correction	303
Table III.7	Comparison of shear bond strength (MPa) between Fuji Plus and Panavia F using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test	303
Table III.8	Chi-square test between treatment groups ((Elite, Fuji I, Fuji Plus and Panavia F) and modes of failure	303
Table III.9	Normality test for shear bond strength (effect of surface treatments)	304
Table III.10	Levene's Test of equality of error variances	304
Table III.11	Multiple comparisons between the 4 treatment groups using Tukey HSD	305
Table III.12	Chi-square test between treatment group and mode of fracture	305
Table IV.1	Shapiro-Wilk test for the load at fracture (Effect of ceramic materials)	306
Table IV.2	Levene's Test of equality of error variances	306
Table IV.3	Multiple Comparisons of load at fracture (N) between Procera, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram copings using Scheffe's Test	307

Table IV.4	Chi-square test between treatment group (Procera, Turkom-Cera and In-Ceram) and modes of fracture	307
Table IV.5	Shapiro-Wilk test for the load at fracture (Effect of luting cements)	308
Table IV.6	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Elite and Fuji I using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	308
Table IV.7	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Elite and Panavia F using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	308
Table IV.8	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Fuji I and Panavia F using Mann-Whitney Test with Bonferroni correction	308
Table IV.9	Chi-square test between treatment group and modes of fracture	308
Table V.1	Levene's Test of equality of error variances	309
Table V.2	Multiple Comparisons of load at fracture (N) using Tukey's HSD	309
Table V.3	Chi-square test between treatment groups and modes of fracture	310
Table V.4	Shapiro-Wilk test for the effect of finish line design on load at fracture of Turkom-Cera copings	311
Table V.5	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Turkom-Cera (Chamfer) and Turkom-Cera (Shoulder) groups using the Mann-Whitney Test	311
Table V.6	Shapiro-Wilk test for the effect of water storage and thermocycling on load at fracture of Turkom-Cera copings	312
Table V.7	Comparison of load at fracture (N) between Turkom-Cera (no aging) and Turkom-Cera (with aging) groups using Mann-Whitney Test	312
Table V.8	Teeth dimensions (mm) and load at fracture (N) for Procera group specimens with chamfer finish line	313
Table V.9	Teeth dimensions (mm) and mean load at fracture (N) for Turkom-Cera group specimens with chamfer finish line	313
Table V.10	Teeth dimensions (mm) and mean load at fracture (N) for In-Ceram group specimens with chamfer finish line	313
Table V.11	Teeth dimensions (mm) and mean load at fracture (N) for Turkom-Cera group specimens with shoulder finish line	314

Table V.12	Teeth dimensions (mm) and mean load at fracture (N) for Turkom-Cera group specimens subjected to artificial ageing	314
Table VI.1	Shapiro-Wilk test for marginal integrity of Turkom-Cera, In-ceram and Procera	315
Table VI.2	Test of homogeneity of variances	315
Table VI.3	Multiple Comparisons of marginal integrity by Tukey's HSD Test	316
Table VI.4	Shapiro-Wilk test for the effect of finish lines on marginal integrity	317