

## Introduction:

The aim of this study was to compare the fracture resistance of combined tooth-implant or implant-implant supported three-unit provisional restorations in vitro in a 2-year simulation.

## Materials and methods:

Two situations were simulated:

- a) tooth-implant: molars were embedded in a PMMA resin (Palapress Vario, Kulzer, GER) and fixed at a distance of 10 mm to dental exercise implants (ITI-Straumann, Titanium, GER), simulating a combined three-unit tooth-implant supported oral situation with one missing molar tooth. The roots of the teeth were covered with a 1 mm thick layer of a polyether impression material (Impregum, 3M Espe, GER) to simulate the function of the periodontium. Implants were fixed rigidly without polyether.
- b) implant-implant: two implants were fixed rigidly in a distance of 10mm without polyether.




Figure 1: Specimen design

Identical three-unit FPDs (n=8) of provisional fixed partial denture materials (VITA CAD-Temp (VITA, GER) and Protemp™ 4 (3M Espe) were fabricated and luted with the temporary luting cement RelyX™ Temp NE (3M Espe). The restorations were stored for 14 days in distilled water, thermally cycled and mechanically loaded (TCML) in an artificial oral environment (TC: 5°/55°C, 1200x, ML: 240000x50N/1.6Hz). After TCML the FPDs were loaded to fracture at the center of each pontic (steel ball, d=12.5 mm, v=1mm/min; Zwick 1446, GER). The fracture pattern was characterized and medians (25%/75%) were calculated (Mann-Whitney-U-Test;  $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

## Results:

In group a) two FPDs of Protemp™ 4 failed during TCML. Median Fracture resistance of surviving bridges (1308N) was not significantly different from VITA CAD-Temp (1539N).

In group b) three VITA CAD-Temp FPDs failed during TCML.

The remaining FPDs provided significantly lower (958N) fracture resistance values compared to Protemp™ 4 (1766N, p=0.019)





Figure 2: Fracture Results (Median, 25%/75%)

System	Fracture pattern	3M Experimental	
		tooth-implant	implant-implant
FPD #			
1	AC		
2	A		
3	A		
4	CD		
5	C		
6	C		
7	A		
8	D		
FPD #			
1	CD		
2	D		
3	D		
4	ABCD		
5	D		
6	D		
7	CD		
8	D		

Table 1: Fracture Pattern (grey: failure during TCML)



A. Fracture on the implant side  
B. Fracture between pontic and implant  
C. Fracture on the tooth side  
D. Fracture between pontic and tooth.  
For the implant-implant situation failure pattern A is equivalent to C and B to D.

## Discussion:

After TCML both tested materials showed fracture resistance higher than 960N.

Both materials could be sufficient for a short to medium-term clinical application for implants with some limitations, due to the appearing fractures.

This study was supported by 3M Espe.