How do I remove, modify and reuse functional indirect restorations in the event of a complication?

In clinical practice, a frustrating and often challenging dilemma arises when complications occur in teeth with fixed restorations, a situation that is particularly trying in cases of recently completed treatment. A recent study found that 2 of the most common complications associated with conventional crowns (cast gold and porcelain-fused-to-metal) were the need for endodontic treatment (3%) and the occurrence of porcelain fracture (3%). For conventional fixed prostheses, endodontic treatment on abutments was needed in 11% of cases, and porcelain fracture occurred in 2% of cases.

During endodontic therapy, the restoration must be modified (i.e., perforated) to allow access to the root canal system and in many cases, significant coronal tooth or core structure must be removed to complete the endodontic treatment. To repair the endodontic access opening in a cast gold or porcelain-fused-to-metal crown, an indirect cast inlay best re-establishes the occlusal integrity of the original restoration. Use of amalgam for direct repair in a gold restoration causes considerable corrosion and produces noticeable changes in both the amalgam and the gold (non-gamma-2 amalgam corrodes slightly less than other amalgams). Large composite resin repairs do not provide a satisfactory long-lasting solution to the problem, although they can be resurfaced.

Complications related to porcelain fracture can be repaired directly with composite resin or by bonding new porcelain to the existing restoration. These techniques, although routinely used in clinical practice, can provide a less-than-desirable result.

Hence, it is legitimate to ask whether the restoration can be modified, removed, repaired and cemented and still remain functional.

One example would be a case in which nonsurgical endodontic therapy is required on a tooth restored with a gold crown or porcelain-bonded-to-metal restoration. First, I inform the patient that this procedure involves creating an access hole in the crown, completing the necessary treatment and then repairing the access opening as described above. I also explain that it might be possible to remove the restoration, repair it in the laboratory and replace it so that it functions as it did before the complication. However, I also point out the possible complications of this procedure and tell the patient that not all crowns and bridges can be removed.

Remove

Figure 1 illustrates a case of porcelain fracture in a functional 26-year-old fixed prosthesis; in addition, the porcelain no longer matches the remaining natural teeth. This was judged to be a suitable case for removal and repair of the prosthesis.

In my experience, the Metalift Crown and Bridge Removal System (Classical Practice Resources, Baton Rouge, La.) is suitable for gently removing single crowns (cast gold and porcelain-fused-to-metal) and fixed prostheses. An outline of the procedure follows:

- Make a pilot hole with a #1 high-speed bur.
- Establish a precision channel, into which a self-taping instrument threads the metal in the restoration (Fig. 2).
- After engaging the metal, the instrument pushes against the tooth or core material, breaks the cement layer and lifts the restoration.

Repair

Once the prosthesis has been positioned on a model (Fig. 3), occlusal perforations in metal can be repaired expeditiously in the laboratory with a laser welder (Figs. 4 and 5). If the perforation is large, a sprue of the same metal is placed in the perforation and is laser-welded to the restoration. For smaller perforations, wire of the same metal is used. Special care
and attention must be exercised to avoid overheating a porcelain-fused-to-metal restoration during laser-welding (the porcelain might pop off if overheated). The restoration is welded both internally and externally. The weld on the internal aspect of the restoration is then adjusted to fit the original die, if available. The occlusal aspect is also refined as necessary.

For an occlusal perforation in porcelain or repair of fractured porcelain, contaminants and moisture must first be removed by soaking the restoration in a “porcelain wash” for at least 4 hours (preferably overnight) or by overnight heat soaking at 200°C to 260°C. Platinum foil is then adapted to the internal aspect of the crown, and opaquer, porcelain and stain are applied. To avoid compromising the repaired porcelain, occlusion adjustment is best performed on the opposing tooth. Should there be difficulty in seating the restoration, the preparation may be relieved (Fig. 6).

**Rejoice**

I have successfully used this technique not only for restorations with cast metal occlusal surfaces but also for porcelain-fused-to-metal restorations with a porcelain occlusal surface. However, the method does not work for all ceramic restorations. Reuse of a functional restoration in cases of complication is of obvious advantage to the patient and enhances goodwill between the patient and the clinician.
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**Further Reading**


How can we restore abfraction lesions in a predictable and esthetically pleasing manner?

**Background**

Over the past 20 years, restorative procedures have become more elaborate and are now driven to a greater extent by esthetic considerations. In addition, patients are keeping their teeth longer and desire more esthetically pleasing outcomes, even as they present with more complex lesions, such as abfraction lesions (Fig. 1) in the maxillary anterior and premolar region. Abfraction lesions are angular, wedge-shaped defects found in the cervical regions of the teeth. They are thought to be caused by mechanical overloading initiated by cuspal flexure and failure of the dentin and enamel. They typically present on the labial aspect of the tooth.

Abfraction lesions present with an array of sequelae, including sensitivity to cold and mechanical stimulation because of exposure of the dentin, root caries because of inadequate removal of plaque from within the defect and gingival hyperplasia because of improper root architecture and emersion profile. These secondary signs and symptoms do not necessarily appear simultaneously.

Along with offering a predictable and esthetic restorative technique, the clinician needs to educate (and motivate) the patient, as well as providing a means to prevent additional lesions. Patients must understand the causes of abfraction (bruxism, clenching and toothbrush abrasion) and usually require the assistance of a well-fitted acrylic splint that is set up with mutually protected occlusion.

**Clinical Protocol for Treating Abfraction Lesions**

1. Administer topical and local anesthetic as for a routine restorative procedure.
2. Select the shade of the restoration before beginning any restorative procedure and before desiccation of the teeth.
3. Place a braided gingival retraction cord along the entire facial surface and into the col areas; use either size #0 or #00 cord (UltraPak, Ultradent Products, Inc., South Jordan, Utah), depending on the depth of the lesion. In areas where the lesion extends beyond 1 mm, perform gingivectomy using a microsmooth pass with a radiosurgical instrument (no. 113F,
Ellman International, Inc., Hewlett, N.Y.). A rubber dam can be placed as an alternative to the retraction cord; however, a dam becomes more cumbersome in cases of multiple abfraction lesions and can actually impede access during preparation and finishing.

4. Perform the initial preparation with a pencil diamond (model 2856-016, Brasseler, Savannah, Ga.) along the long axis of the tooth, placing a 0.7-mm chamfer margin at the gingival crest, such that it extends beyond the facio-proximal line angle into the embrasure area (Fig. 2). The coronal margin consists of a long bevel (1.5–2.0 mm) and typically extends to the middle third of the facial surface or at least 2 mm coronal to the lesion (depending on desired esthetics). Caries and softened dentin are removed using a #6 round bur (Premier, King of Prussia, Pa.) operated at slow speed.

5. The restorative phase consists of good isolation (cotton rolls, low-volume suction, etc.) and application of a self-etching primer system (Kuraray, Kurashiki, Okayama, Japan). As retention is a key factor in success, it is important to recognize that self-etching systems are capable of performing at the level of a total etch and prime system with regards to tensile bond strength.7,8 Prime the dentin until it appears as a glossy surface on drying (Fig. 3). Apply a thin layer of bond resin (Bisco, Itasca, Ill.), and light-cure for 20 seconds. Depending on the depth of the lesion, apply a flowable composite (Bisco) into the deeper areas of the preparation. Then, sculpt and shape a microhybrid composite (Kerr, Orange, Calif.) with a fine plastic instrument (IPC-A, Hu-Friedy, Chicago, Ill.) such that only minimal finishing is needed; light-cure for only 10 seconds to minimize shrinkage and reassess contours and margins.

6. Perform precise finishing at high speeds using both a pointed and a round-ended carbide finishing bur (ET6, 7653-012, Brasseler, Savannah, Ga.), followed by a composite polishing cup (Enhance, Caulk Dentsply, Milford, Del.) and finally a rubber cup or lens (Ivoclar Vivadent, Mississauga, Ont.). Before final finishing of the gingival and interproximal regions, remove the retraction cord. Lastly, pass floss between the adjacent contacts, followed by medium and fine metal sandpaper strips (Premier) to contour and finish the proximal margins. The restoration is completed with a final cure of 40 seconds.

This abfraction technique allows for increased bond surface area and strength, a hygienic periodontal response, increased resistance form, improved hard-tissue esthetics (Figs. 4a to 4c) and, in particular, reduced postoperative sensitivity, all of which will assist the clinician in the delivery of this type of restorative procedure and lead to greater patient satisfaction.
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QUESTION 3

What are the critical success factors for anterior single-tooth immediate-load implants?

Background

The use of dental implants to support a prosthesis is a well-established, successful, predictable treatment. Early research supported a 2-stage approach to implant placement, with delayed loading of the implant. This approach helped to prevent micro-movements that could interfere with osseointegration and also helped to avoid epithelial down-growth during healing, which might lead to subsequent implant failure.

The placement of dental implants has now evolved to allow immediate implant loading with placement of a provisional restoration. Recent studies have shown that success rates for immediate-load treatment can be comparable to those with the traditional approach. However, careful patient evaluation and treatment planning are necessary to optimize results.

The most important factors to consider when deciding if a particular patient is a candidate for immediate implant loading when restoring an anterior edentulous space are related to the surgery, the host, the implant and the patient’s occlusion.

Criteria for Treatment Success

Surgery-Related Criteria

The dental practitioner must ensure stability of the implant once it has been placed, to allow osseointegration to take place. Therefore, an implant must not be placed in soft spongy bone, and the operator must be experienced and have excellent surgical technique.

Host-Related Criteria

The quality and quantity of bone available to receive the implant are also crucial. Radiography must show good bone density, the future site of the implant must be clear of anatomic interference (such as sinuses or adjacent teeth) and free of infection, and bony defects must be absent. Intraorally there must be adequate buccal–lingual width as well as preservation of the cortical plate. If any of these factors is inadequate, a traditional 2-stage implant is recommended, as there may be a requirement for bone augmentation and additional healing time.

Metabolic diseases or other conditions could compromise healing. Therefore, systemic health concerns such as diabetes or a recent history of radiation therapy would contraindicate immediate loading. Current smokers and patients with poor oral hygiene are not candidates for this treatment strategy.
Implant-Related Criteria
Successful immediate-load implants have a screw type design with a roughened surface and should be a minimum of 10 mm in length.

Occlusion-Related Criteria
It is important that the provisional crown of an immediate-load implant not have any centric or excursive occlusal loading during the healing phase after implant placement. As well, parafunctional habits such as bruxism may be a strong contraindication to immediate loading.

Conclusions
There are no clear disadvantages to immediate-load implants except that the treatment cannot be delivered in all areas of the mouth. The advantages include shorter duration of treatment, ease of determining the ideal implant position (immediately after extraction), minimal invasiveness and tissue trauma, optimization of bone height and preservation of soft tissue, simplified prosthetic phase and, most important, increased patient comfort and psychological well-being. Immediate-load implants provide immediate improvement in appearance and immediate results. Therefore, before extraction or implant placement, the practitioner should consider whether an immediate-load implant will be suitable for the patient.

Immediate provisionalization of dental implants is a highly rewarding approach to treatment when cases are carefully selected, proper technique is applied, and hard- and soft-tissue considerations are methodically evaluated. Figures 1 to 5 are pre- and post-treatment images and radiographs of an immediate-load implant recently completed by the author.

Further Reading
When restoring the teeth of partially edentulous patients with removable partial dentures, do you consider placing implants to enhance the retention and stability of the prosthesis?

In general, removable partial dentures (RPDs) are retained by clasps, adhesive attachments, intracoronal or extracoronal attachments, telescope crowns or root caps. Selection of the appropriate retentive element depends on the remaining tooth substance (i.e., intact clinical crown, decayed tooth in need of a crown restoration, or with only the root being salvageable), the intramaxillary and intermaxillary relations and the patient’s esthetic preferences. For an intact, caries-free tooth intended as a retentive abutment, the best option is a clasp or an adhesive attachment, whereas a filled or decayed vital tooth is better restored with a crown or a telescope crown. For a nonvital tooth with a destroyed clinical crown, the root cap is the most appropriate solution because it offers greatest latitude with regard to the position of the clinical crown, which must be determined in advance with a diagnostic set-up.

Common complaints associated with RPDs, especially in bilateral free-end situations (Kennedy Class I), are lack of stability, poor retention and unesthetic clasping. The use of implants as retainers in partially edentulous patients has been mentioned only rarely in the literature but is a helpful adjunct in 2 situations:

1. when implants are indicated in addition to the natural teeth to improve retention, stability and support of the RPD; to allow simpler prosthesis design; and to enhance the patient’s comfort
2. when implants are inserted as an alternative to the natural teeth to facilitate retention of an RPD that is detached from the residual dentition and to replace a potential post when its prognosis is questionable.

Placement of an implant for an RPD restoration is appropriate when only a few teeth suitable for use as retainers are present and/or when the position of these abutments is unfavourable, e.g., grouped in one region instead of spread over the entire arch. In the latter situation, the supportive area is increased and the soft-tissue load reduced by placement of additional implants. When the RPD rests more on the teeth and implants than on the mucosal tissues, the extension of the prosthesis base can be reduced and the patient’s comfort enhanced.

In cases with residual anterior dentition (bilateral free end), either
caries-free or sufficiently restored (Fig. 1a), clasps are generally indicated but are frequently not acceptable to the patient because of esthetic concerns. With implants placed distal to the posterior teeth on each side, sufficient retention can be achieved and the need for clasps eliminated; the residual dentition then becomes detached from the restoration (Figs. 1b and 1c).

Implants are also indicated when the prognosis for an abutment is questionable or poor and the risk of failure must be minimized. In this situation, the clinician must decide upon the ideal implant position, which determines whether tooth extraction and immediate implant placement are required or whether an adjacent edentulous region is more suitable for implant insertion (Figs. 2a, 2b and 2c).

Single implants placed as additional support for an RPD are easily augmented by prefabricated attachments, such as ball abutments or locators. Because these attachments are positioned in line with the implant axis and the matrix abutment systems allow only limited divergence, the orientation of the implant must coincide with the path of insertion for the prosthesis. Otherwise, individual abutments such as telescope crowns are fabricated by the laboratory technician in a more complex procedure (Figs. 3a, 3b and 3c). These aspects must be considered during treatment planning and necessitate a thorough diagnosis at the outset to avoid mechanical complications and loss of retention capability because of component wear.
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