Restoring Congenitally Missing Mandibular Central Incisor Using Lithium Disilicate Based Resin Bonded Prostheses: A Case Report
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ABSTRACT
This case report explains an alternative treatment procedure for congenitally missing mandibular right central incisor of a 17 years old female patient. Fabrication of all-ceramic resin bonded fixed partial dentures (RBFPDs) followed specific preparation design and features to accommodate two retainers. The Maryland Bridge was designed by using a copy milling system to protect the patient's aesthetic and dental integrity. The whole design was made with E-max press. Finishing of the treatment resulted in an esthetic and functional successful outcome with 1-year follow-up. RBFPD represents a minimally invasive, better aesthetics and durable treatment modality in young patients with single missing teeth when implant therapy is not the treatment choice.
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Introduction
Congenitally missing teeth are a restorative problem in clinical dentistry in respect of treatment planning and rehabilitation. Some of the challenges associated with the anterior mandible and surrounding anatomy requires potentially aesthetic problems. Proper diagnosis and treatment planning are needed for a multidisciplinary approach in order to meet the demands of a missing tooth. Current treatment modalities with different therapeutic approaches for missing mandibular incisors involve resin-bonded fixed dental prosthesis (RBFPD), orthodontic treatment, full- veneer fixed dental prosthesis (FDP), dental implant for a single tooth replacement, extraction of one or more incisors and restoration with an implant supported FDP, extraction of one or more teeth and restoration with an FDP from # 22 to 27, extraction of one or more teeth and restoration with a removable dental prosthesis (RDP) [1].

As reported in many studies, implant restorations are one of the predictable treatments for single tooth failure cases and give successful results [2]. Implant restorative treatments are considered the most conservative treatment approach since no modification of the adjacent teeth is needed [3]. The long-term success of dental implant therapy and functional outcome depends on many factors.

When implant treatment is not indicated, today, metal-ceramic and all ceramic resin bonded fixed partial (RBFPDs) with two-retainers design have been proposed as a conservative treatment approach for the replacement of missing teeth. This technique of bonded bridges was first presented by Brochette in 1963 [5]. Since then, there have been significant changes to RBFPDs regarding materials, design, tooth preparation [3]. For eliminating the problems related to metal frameworks, all-ceramic RBF PDs were introduced in the 90s. In Ceram Alumina (VITA Zahnfabrik,
Bad Sackingen, Germany), was used in the initial practices of all ceramic RBFPDs. And also lots of different ceramic materials including reinforced with leucite (IPS Empress), lithium disilicate (IPS Empress 2, IPS e.max) and zirconium oxide have been used in producing of RBFPDs [6].

In 1998, lithium disilicate (IPS Empress 2, Ivoclar Vivadent) was presented as a dental restorative material. Today, it has been updated and improved, and also called as the IPS e.max Press system [7]. Principally, this system includes two phases, phase I has homogeneously distributing lithium disilicate crystals (Li2O•SiO2) and lithium orthophosphate, in a glass matrix creates phase II [8] Existence of these crystals in the structure at high proportion increase the mechanical properties of the material [9]. Thought the content of the system was composed by lithium disilicate like the Impress II system, the physical properties and aesthetics of the system were increased thanks to the different firing technique used [10].

Thin veneers, inlay and onlay restorations, conventional and implant supported crowns and bridges with three units are suggested to perform by manufacturer. Lithium disilicate-reinforced glass ceramics are widely used clinically due to their esthetic properties. However, their use in the posterior region is limited, because of inadequate mechanical properties [10]. So that, zirconia reinforced CAD system is offered to restore posterior region. In the present case reports lithium disilicate, is used to produce an all ceramic RBFPD considering superior mechanical and optical properties.

**Case Report**

**Treatment planning**

A 17-year-old female presented to the Faculty of Dentistry Gazi University Ankara, displeased with her smile. She had congenitally missing mandibular right central incisor (Figure 1). After clinical examination, radiographs, photographs, study casts were performed. Periodontal conditions, presence of caries, occlusal interferences, smile, esthetics, and facial symmetry were appreciated. After the evaluation, the RBFPD was designed with a copy milling system to maintain the patient’s aesthetic and dental unity. The whole design was made with IPS E-max press.

**Teeth Preparations**

The diagnostic cast was waxed to model cast to assess the size and morphology of mandibular incisors. The preparation edges were drawn on the model cast and then reported on teeth limited only at enamel boundaries (Figure 2). The mandibular right lateral incisor and left central incisor teeth were prepared. 1mm supragingival reduction extending to the centre of the interproximal contact, with an incisal finish line 2mm short of the incisal edge and 0.5-mm lingual reduction of the enamel.

**Fabrication and cementation of restorations**

Lithium disilicate-based ceramic was used to provide ideal aesthetics. The RBFPD was produced with IPS e.max Press (Figure 3). The retainers of the bridge were then etched with hydrofluoric acid and concentration 9.5% and silane was applied. The teeth, under dam, were etched with 37% orthophosphoric acid and rinsed with distilled water and dried with air and then the bridge was cemented with a dual-cure resin cement, Panavia F 2.0 (Kuraray). Finishing of the treatment resulted in an aesthetic and functional successful outcome. The patient was followed-up clinically for one year (Figure 4).
Discussion
The survival rate of RBFPDs is still considerably less than that of conventional fixed partial dentures. The principle reason for failure is possible debonding of the framework from the abutment teeth. In Audenino et al. study, where cementation was performed under dam or with the simple use of cotton rolls, the estimated survival probability for the first debonding or failure, considering all the 100 cases, was 85% after 5 years. The use of dental dam during cementation reduced the risk of debonding by ten times [11].

In a study published in 2011, the success rate of single-retainer all-ceramic RBFPDs made from glass-infiltrated alumina ceramic, observed for 10 years, success rate was found 94.4% [12].

In Sailer et al. study, 35 RBFPDs with substructures fabricated from IPS Empress or IPS e. max Press and veneered with IPS e.max Ceram were performed on 28 patients and reported a survival rate of 100% at 6 years and only 5.7% of ceramic chipping occurred [13]. Also the same, Sun et al. reported 100% survival rate approximately 4-year clinical follow-up of 35 anterior RBFPDs fabricated from IPS e.max Press [14].

Sasse et al., performed a randomize clinical trial on thirty anterior zirconia ceramic (IPS e.max ZirCAD veneered with IPS e.max Ceram) RBFPDs were in the follow-up period (mean: 41.7 months; min. 9.4, max. 55.9) two debondings happened. 100% survival rate was reported after three years observation [15].

Conclusion
RBFPD represents a minimally invasive, better aesthetic and durable treatment modality in young patients with single missing teeth when implant therapy is not a treatment choice. By selecting the most suitable material, all-ceramic RBFPDs can provide aesthetic and minimally invasive restorations and when following a suitable clinical procedure, the survival rate of the RBFPDs is comparable to conventional FDPs.
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