

CEREC – THE MOST IMPORTANT CLINICALS STUDIES

SCIENTIFICALLY SECURE.



CONTENTS

Foreword and word of thanks	03
1 Long-term performance of CEREC restorations	04
1.1 Inlays/onlays	04
1.1.1 Long-term study of 2,328 chairside inlays/onlays	04
1.1.2 Eighteen-year study of 1,011 inlays/onlays	05
1.2 Veneers	06
1.3 Crowns	07
1.4 Comparison with other restoration types	08
1.4.1 Clinical comparison	08
1.4.2 Longevity and cost-effectiveness	09
1.4.3 Longevity and production costs	09
2 Precision	10
2.1 Image precision	10
2.1.1 Single tooth	10
2.1.2 Quadrant	10
2.2 Milling precision	11
2.2.1 Camera/milling unit	11
2.2.2 Marginal fit of restorations	11
3 Marginal gap	12
3.1 Adhesive interface	12
3.1.1 Materials	12
3.1.2 Marginal seal	13
3.1.3 Wear of the adhesive interface	13
3.2 Comparison of other restoration types	14
3.2.1 Enamel integrity	14
3.2.2 Margin quality	14
4 Occlusal design	15
4.1 Software	15
5 Aesthetics	16
5.1 Posterior teeth	16
5.2 Anterior teeth	17
5.2.1 Veneers	17
6 Ceramic materials	18
6.1 Strength/fracture toughness	19
6.2 Abrasion	20
CEREC publications	21

FOREWORD AND WORD OF THANKS

QUOD EST EST – WHAT IS, IS.

In the final analysis it all comes down to hard facts and evidence. This is precisely the purpose of the present compendium. Our aim is to summarize the latest clinical studies relating to CEREC so that you are in a position to interpret and evaluate the scientific findings.

CEREC certainly ranks as one of the most intensively scrutinized dental procedures – as evidenced in numerous clinical studies and a wide range of scientific publications.

For example, universities and scientifically oriented dental practices are continuously monitoring the survival rates of CEREC restorations (inlays, onlays, crowns and veneers) which were created and placed during a single appointment. The projected long-term survival rates are as high as 84.4 per cent after 18 years.

In terms of quality CEREC restorations are at least on a par with cast gold – and clearly superior to composite fillings and other laboratory-produced restorations.

Computer-aided dentistry has progressed enormously. The marginal gaps have reached laboratory standards. The design of the proximal contacts has become very reliable. The occlusal surfaces contained in the dental databases have been compiled by universities and renowned dental technicians. The CEREC system makes allowance for the patient's articulation and antagonists.

All that is needed is a good dentist – someone like you.

Over the past 20 years numerous persons have contributed to the further development of Professor Mörmann's original idea – i.e. to create high-quality ceramic restorations during a single appointment. This applies firstly to the members of the research teams at Siemens, Sirona, Vita Zahnfabrik, Ivoclar Vivadent, Merz, Zeiss and at numerous small and medium-sized enterprises. Secondly, more than 200 universities worldwide have conducted detailed research and made countless improvements – both large and small – to the CEREC procedure. Mention must also be made of the CEREC users, the CEREC instructors, the International Society for Computerized Dentistry and its national organizations. All these persons and organizations have played a pivotal role in ensuring that CEREC has become an integral part of modern dentistry. We would like to express our sincere thanks to all concerned. We would also like to thank the German Society for Computerized Dentistry for its expert help in the preparation of this compendium as well as the selection and interpretation of the scientific studies.

Your CEREC-Team

1 LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE OF CEREC RESTORATIONS


1.1 INLAYS/ONLAYS

1.1.1 LONG-TERM STUDY OF 2,328 CHAIRSIDE INLAYS/ONLAYS

This extensive study centred on 2,328 chairside CEREC inlays and onlays which had been fitted to a total of 794 patients in a dental practice. Between 1990 and 1997 the CEREC 1 system had been used; between 1997 and 1999 the CEREC 2 system was used.

Forty-four teeth were randomly selected and examined under a scanning electron microscope. The average margin width was $236 \mu\text{m} \pm 96,8 \mu\text{m}$.

The success rate after nine years was 95.5%. Only 35 restorations failed, due mainly to the extraction of the teeth. There was no correlation between failure and the size or location of the restorations.



Survival curve with regard to CP treatment

CONCLUSION

The long-term results (95.5% survival after nine years) are excellent, although CEREC 1 and CEREC 2 do not achieve today's level of clinical precision and the quality of the margins (created using macrofilled luting materials) does not conform to today's standards.

1.1.2 EIGHTEEN-YEAR STUDY OF 1,011 INLAYS/ONLAYS


This study centred on 1,011 CEREC inlays/onlays which had been fabricated for 299 patients between 1987 and 1990 using the CEREC 1 system. The majority of the restorations were made of VITA MK I ceramic; only a small number (22) were made of Dicor MGC. As from 1989 enamel etching (phosphoric acid) was deployed in combination with the dental adhesive Gluma. Glass ionomer cement was no longer used as the base layer. Areas close to the pulp were protected by means of a CaOH_2 liner.

The follow-up criteria were as follows: margin quality, change in vitality, tooth anatomy, complications, and failures.

The findings were categorized according to the following parameters: restoration size, restoration location, initial tooth vitality, and the use of dentin adhesive.

During the 18-year observation period 86 of the 1,011 restorations were lost. Ceramic fractures were the main cause (38%).

According to the Kaplan Meier estimator, the probability of success after 18 years was extremely high (84.4%). Premolars perform slightly better than molars, and 2- and 3-surface inlays better than 1-surface inlays. There is a significance between non-vital teeth (50%) and vital teeth (88%). The application of a functional dentin adhesive increased the success rate by 10% to 90%.



Kaplan-Meier estimator: Use of dentin adhesive, n = 1.011


CONCLUSION

CEREC restorations (including those of a larger size) display outstanding longevity. In many cases defect-oriented restorations and careful adhesive bonding provide the basis for dispensing with full crowns.

1 LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE OF CEREC RESTORATIONS

1.2 VENEERS

The durability of laboratory-produced ceramic veneers has already been extensively researched. A group of CEREC veneers and partial anterior crowns was observed over a period of 9.5 years. These restorations had been produced on the CEREC 1 and CEREC 2 systems using VITA Mark II (mainly) and Ivoclar ProCad. 509 of the veneers had been bonded to natural teeth; 108 had been used to repair/replace existing PFM or gold-composite restorations. After 9.5 years the restorations attached to prosthetic elements had a success rate of 91%, while those placed on natural teeth showed a success rate of 94%.



Ceramic build-ups comprising up to 2/3 of the veneer length do not far worse.

CONCLUSION

In terms of their longevity CEREC veneers do not differ from laboratory-produced veneers.

1.3 CROWNS

Following the introduction of CEREC 2 dentists were in a position to produce full crowns in addition to inlays and veneers.

In a further scientific study 208 CEREC crowns made of VITA Mark II were fitted to 136 patients using the adhesive bonding technique. Seventy of these crowns were placed on conventionally prepared teeth; 52 were placed on teeth with reduced stump preparations (low macroretention); and 86 crowns were placed on endodontically treated teeth. In this case the crowns included an additional post extending into the pulp cavity in order to achieve improved retention (endocrowns).

The main causes of failure were fractures, presumably due to inadequate dentin adhesion.

The “classic” crowns performed best of all (97.0% survival rate), followed by the “reduced” crowns (92.9%). The survival rate of the endocrowns was acceptable in the case of molars (87.1%) and relatively poor in the case of premolars (68.8%).

CEREC crowns also performed well in a study conducted in a dental practice. This study centred on 65 full crowns made of VITA Mark II which had been manually polished after the milling process and then bonded using dual-curing composite.

Three failures were observed in the period up to four years (two ceramic fractures, one debonding). The success rate according to Kaplan-Meier was 95.4%.

CONCLUSION

CEREC crowns made of VITA Mark II and Ivoclar ProCad achieve success rates which are comparable to those PFM crowns.

1 LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE OF CEREC RESTORATIONS

1.4 COMPARISON WITH OTHER RESTORATION TYPES

1.4.1 CLINICAL COMPARISON

Long-term comparison of CEREC, laboratory-fabricated ceramic and gold inlays over a period of 15 years.

For the past 15 years 358 two- and three-surface inlays have been under observation at Graz University in Austria. The following restorations were placed on vital teeth: 93 gold inlays cemented with zinc phosphate cement (= control group); 71 adhesively bonded gold inlays; 94 laboratory-fabricated ceramic inlays (Dicor, Optec, Duceram, Hi-Ceram); and 51 CEREC inlays (VITA Mark I). In addition, a number of non-vital teeth were treated: gold/cement (5); gold/adhesive (14); laboratory-fabricated ceramic (22); and CEREC (8).

The restorations were assessed according to the following criteria: loss or complete fracture; partial fracture of the restoration, the tooth or the cement/adhesive bond; secondary caries; loss of tooth vitality. A Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was carried out for each group. In all groups inlays placed on non-vital teeth performed worse than inlays placed on vital teeth.

Initially the study included a group of indirect composite inlays. However, these were excluded prematurely on account of their very poor performance.

There was no significant statistical difference between the gold inlay groups and the CEREC inlays (success rate of approx. 93% after 15 years). The laboratory-fabricated ceramic inlays were clearly inferior (68%).

CONCLUSION

In terms of longevity CEREC inlays are on a par with gold restorations. The laboratory-fabricated ceramic restorations performed worse.

The following ductile filling materials are used for posterior cavities: amalgam; glass ionomer and derivative products; and composites. In addition the following restoration types are available: gold inlays/onlays; composite inlays/onlays; laboratory-fabricated ceramic inlays/onlays; and CEREC inlays/onlays. Long-term studies have been carried out for each group.

These have revealed significant differences in longevity. The annual failure rate was determined for each restoration type. The ranking (from bad to good) is as follows:

7. Glass ionomer and derivative products (7.7%)
6. Amalgam (3.3%)
5. Composite fillings (2.2%)
4. Composite inlays/onlays (2.0%)
3. Ceramic inlays/onlays (1.6%)
2. Gold inlays/onlays (1.2%)
1. CEREC inlays/onlays (1.1%)

CONCLUSION

The success rates of CEREC restorations are marginally better than those of gold inlays/onlays.

1.4.2 LONGEVITY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS

In times of financial constraint it makes sense to evaluate the longevity and cost of dental restorations – not in isolation but in combination – in order to develop cost-effective restoration options for patients.


On the basis of billing data provided by a major German insurer the average fees and laboratory costs were determined for gold inlays (62), laboratory-fabricated ceramic inlays (87) and CEREC inlays (91). A meta analysis was then performed of ten suitable long-term studies from the period 1994 to 2003. This provided the basis for determining the statistical longevity of the various inlay types.

1.4.3 LONGEVITY AND PRODUCTION COSTS

Due to their higher production costs and slightly lower survival probability, laboratory-fabricated ceramic inlays are the least cost-effective option. Gold inlays and CEREC inlays have similar success rates. However, given the higher laboratory costs of gold inlays, CEREC inlays emerge from this study as the most cost-effective restoration type.

CONCLUSION

From an economic viewpoint CEREC inlays are preferable to all other inlay types.



Probability of failure in the four subgroups

2 PRECISION

2.1 IMAGE PRECISION

The precision of a milled CEREC restoration depends to a large extent on the quality of the data derived from the digital optical impression. The intraoral CEREC Bluecam has an innovative optical lens emitting blue light with a short wavelength.

2.1.1 SINGLE TOOTH

The scanning accuracy of CEREC Bluecam is approx. 19 μm . This high degree of precision is equivalent to that of the reference scanner*.

Repeat measurements were in the region of 10 μm and the user influence was less than 12 μm . The results were not dependent on the type of preparation.

2.1.2 QUADRANT

The images with CEREC Bluecam were taken in auto capture mode and approx. 4–6 exposures were required per quadrant. The software automatically triggers the exposure when the camera is positioned absolutely still above the tooth. CEREC Bluecam demonstrates a significantly improved quadrant precision in comparison to the CEREC 3D camera (34 μm as opposed to 42 μm). The low values of repeat measurements of approx. 13 μm demonstrate the high accuracy of the CEREC Bluecam. The user influence on the precision of the measurement results was extremely low (approx. 15 μm).

CONCLUSION

The CEREC Bluecam generates digital optical impressions with an unprecedented degree of measurement precision.

* Laserscan 3D Pro (Willytec, Munich).

Source: Mehl A. Investigation of the optical measurement precision of a new intraoral camera.

Unpublished study carried out by the Department of Computer-aided Restorative Dentistry, Zurich University.

2.2 MILLING PRECISION

2.2.1 CAMERA/MILLING UNIT

The precision of the CEREC system is determined by the resolution of the CEREC camera (25 μm) and the reproducibility of the milling unit ($\pm 30 \mu\text{m}$). Excluding user-induced influences (e.g. preparation, powdering and exposure technique), the precision of CEREC 3D is in the range $\pm 55 \mu\text{m}$.

2.2.2 MARGINAL FIT OF RESTORATIONS

The marginal accuracy of milled CEREC restorations has continuously improved with each successive software version (from CEREC 1 to current version of CEREC 3D). With regard to the hardware, the introduction of the step bur (tip diameter: 1 mm) represented a major improvement. Within the framework of this multi-centre trial (seven universities) the marginal fit and internal adaptation of CEREC full crowns were measured and compared with laboratory-fabricated ceramic crowns. A group of trained CEREC dentists and a group of non-trained assistants each designed and milled ten molar crowns on the basis of standard models. The crowns (made of the VITA Mark II and Ivoclar ProCad materials) were placed with the aid of Variolink. Empress ceramic crowns sourced from a reputable dental laboratory were also placed.

The marginal fit of the dentist's crowns ($61.6 \pm 27.9 \mu\text{m}$) and the assistants' crowns ($60.8 \pm 20.5 \mu\text{m}$) did not differ significantly. The margins of the laboratory-fabricated crowns were slightly wider ($69.1 \pm 26.9 \mu\text{m}$), which, however, was not statistically significant. With regard to their axial wall adaptation the CEREC crowns were clearly better than the laboratory crowns, whereas in terms of occlusal wall adaptation the laboratory crowns performed better.

OPERATOR	MARGIN	AXIAL WALL
Dentist	61.8 \pm 27.9 a	86.6 \pm 20.9 b
Assistant	60.8 \pm 20.5 a	88.2 \pm 19.1 b
Lab Tech	69.1 \pm 26.9 a	125.4 \pm 29.9 a

Mean values in microns \pm standard deviation. Groups that are significantly different are indicated by letters P < 0.05).

CONCLUSION

The marginal fit of CEREC crowns tends to be better than that of laboratory-fabricated ceramic crowns.

* This study has been carried out with the CEREC 3 camera. The improved image precision of CEREC Bluecam has therefore not been taken into consideration.

Source: Fasbinder DJ, Multi-Center Trial: Margin Fit and Internal Adaptation of CEREC Crowns. In: Mörmann WH (ed.), State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: Poster

3 MARGINAL GAP

3.1 ADHESIVE INTERFACE

The performance of the luting materials and the chosen bonding technique have a decisive impact on the success of all-ceramic restorations.

3.1.1 MATERIALS

Metal restorations rely principally on macroretention. By contrast etchable all-ceramic materials (silicates/disilicates) are luted directly to the hard dental tissues and rely on microretention. The bonding of CEREC restorations (VITA Mark II, Ivoclar Empress CAD) does not differ from the bonding of laboratory-fabricated inlays, onlays and veneers made of comparable materials. This procedure has remained virtually unchanged since the introduction of dentin adhesives in 1991.

The first step is the **CONDITIONING** (e.g. etching) of the enamel, dentin and ceramic with the goal of creating a clean micro-roughened surface.

This is followed by the application of a **PRIMER**, the function of which is to make the clean surface wettable for the hydrophobic bonding material. The third logical step is **BONDING** – i.e. the application of an unfilled bonding resin, which forms an intermediate layer between the tooth surface, the luting composite and the ceramic material.

Older adhesive systems consist of separate products for each of these steps. The newer systems try to reduce the number of bottles needed.

CONCLUSION

The adhesive bonding of silicate ceramics has been proved over a period of many years. The various materials must be carefully matched.

High-strength oxide ceramics such as inCeram, aluminium oxide and zirconium oxide do not lend themselves to etching and hence can be conventionally cemented. Self-adhesive luting materials have meanwhile become available.

Luting composites fall into three different categories: chemically cured, light-cured and dual-cured.

This ten-year study compared CEREC 2 inlays which had been luted either with chemically cured or dual-cured composites.

The success rate after ten years was 77% in the case of dual-cured composite and 100% in the case of chemically cured composite.

CONCLUSION

Dual-cured composites should be used only in situations in which chemically cured or light-cured composites are unsuitable.

3.1.2 MARGINAL SEAL

Shortly after the introduction of CEREC there were naturally no long-term studies to draw upon. It was therefore necessary to establish whether the width of the luting interface (i.e. the thickness of the luting composite layer) had any influence on the marginal seal.

All the investigations showed that it was advantageous to locate the restoration margin in the enamel. This in vitro study (which involved dye penetration tests) showed that the thickness of the luting composite layer did not have any influence on the marginal seal. Subsequent long-term studies of CEREC 1 and CEREC 2 restorations confirmed these findings.

CONCLUSION

The thickness of the luting composite layer does not have any influence on the marginal seal.

In relation to deep cavities the question is whether a liner plays a beneficial role for the protection of the pulp.

According to a study carried out by N. Krämer/Erlangen the occurrence of initial hypersensitivity doubled in cases where a liner was laid. The failure rate of ceramic inlays (in this case Empress) trebled when a liner was deployed.

CONCLUSION

The placement of liners under ceramic inlays/onlays is contra-indicated.

3.1.3 WEAR OF THE ADHESIVE INTERFACE

Various Empress inlays placed using Variolink low (low viscosity) and Tetric (high viscosity) were measured in order to determine the wear of the luting composite in highly loaded areas.

After 8 years the mean interfacial width had increased from 176 µm to 207 µm.

The two different composites did not exhibit any significant statistical differences.

CONCLUSION

Low-viscosity and high-viscosity composites are suitable for the placement of CEREC inlays and onlays.

	Enamel	Dentin	Etchable Ceramic	Non-Etchable Ceramic	Composite
1. Conditioner	35 to 37% H ₃ PO ₄	Self-conditioning Primer	5% HF	Coe Jet/Al ₂ O ₃ powder	Al ₂ O ₃ powder
2. Primer	Hydrophobic Bond	Self-conditioning Primer	Organic Silane		
3. Layer-forming Component	Hydrophobic Bond	Pre-cured Amphiphilic Bond	Hydrophobic Bond		
4. Luting Material	Luting Composite				

3 MARGINAL GAP

3.2 COMPARISON OF OTHER RESTORATION TYPES

Temporaries and methods of bonding labside and chairside produced ceramic inlays have a decisive influence on enamel defects and the margin quality.

3.2.1 ENAMEL INTEGRITY


Inlay cavities treated with temporaries demonstrate, after simulated temporary wear in a chewing simulator, a deterioration of the enamel integrity. In particular in both oral and vestibular surfaces cracks developed. By cavities treated immediately with chairside produced ceramic inlays no such enamel defects arose.

3.2.2 MARGIN QUALITY

The analysis of bonding systems demonstrated that conventional bonding is still superior to self-adhesive systems. Selective enamel etching as used with CEREC inlays enhances the bond with the hard tooth tissue and improves the quality of the enamel margin. In contrast to the general assumption a broader adhesive gap does not result in inferior margin quality.

CONCLUSION

Chairside produced CEREC inlays offer the treated tooth a reduced risk of enamel cracks, due to there being no provisional.



Measurement results of damage to the enamel marginal edge (with or without temporaries). Chairside ceramic treated cavities show fewer enamel cracks [TML: thermocycling and mechanical loading].

CONCLUSION

Immediate treatment without temporaries has a stabilizing effect on the tooth substance. Attainable bonding technology takes into account a broader adhesive gap.

4 OCCLUSAL DESIGN

4.1 SOFTWARE

The current version of CEREC 3D includes a variety of tools for mapping the patient's occlusion and articulation (static and functional) and for the automated design of the occlusal surfaces.


- The DENTAL DATABASE contains various sets of data which can be selected according to the specific situation.
- CORRELATION creates a precise and adjustable copy of the existing situation.
- REPLICATION enables the dentist to create an optical impression of any chosen occlusal surface (either contralateral in the patient's mouth or from a separate model). This optical impression can then be placed manually on the preparation.
- ANTAGONIST maps the static occlusion of the antagonists.
- ARTICULATION maps the surface of a functionally generated path (FGP).

By combining DENTAL DATABASE, CORRELATION/REPLICATION with the ANTAGONIST and ARTICULATION tools the dentist is in a position to create functional occlusal surfaces on the computer monitor – manually, semi-automatically or automatically. These occlusal surfaces require only very little subsequent adjustment.

The manual reworking requirement can be reduced from approx. 400 µm (DENTAL DATABASE) to approx. 5 µm (CORRELATION plus ANTAGONIST).

Provided that the equipment parameters are set properly, the dentist can dispense entirely with manual corrections.

To determine the occlusal contact precision of CEREC crowns and laboratory-made Empress crowns respectively, models of natural teeth were measured prior to preparation and after placement of the restorations. This comparison did not reveal any significant differences between the CEREC and Empress crowns.



Number of occlusal contacts of the casts before and after placement of the different crowns (contacts of the restorations excluded!).

CONCLUSION

Precise occlusal surfaces can be designed on the computer monitor. These require practically no subsequent adjustment in the patient's mouth.

5 AESTHETICS

5.1 POSTERIOR TEETH

CEREC inlays and onlays can be characterized with the help of ceramic stains. After they have been glazed they can be placed in the same way as laboratory-made ceramic restorations.


Due to the special qualities of the CEREC ceramics (chameleon-like shade adaptation; wide choice of lightness, translucency and colour shades), staining is not necessary in most situations.

The CEREC ceramics are easy to polish. In most cases the surface finish is in no way inferior to that of a glazed restoration.

Various studies testify to the good shade adaptation of CEREC ceramics. According to the criteria of the California Dental Association (CDA) 87% of the restorations were rated as excellent. According to the USPHS, the surface characteristics and shade adaptation of all the tested restorations were judged to be excellent or clinically good.

CONCLUSION

If the ceramic materials are correctly chosen and properly polished, laboratory staining and glazing are unnecessary in most cases.



Mathematical Proportion Guides

Sources: Sjögren G, Molin M, A 10-year prospective evaluation of CAD/CAM-manufactured (CEREC) ceramic inlays cemented with a chemically cured or dual-cured resin composite. Int J Prosthodont; 17/2004: 241–246

5.2 ANTERIOR TEETH

After they have been milled CEREC anterior crowns can be stained and glazed. Alternatively, they can be incisally trimmed and then layered using a transparent ceramic material (in cases where especially transparent incisal surfaces are required).

Thanks to their graduated shading intensities, polychromatic blocks (e.g. VITA Triluxe or Empress CAD Multi) make it easier to imitate the natural teeth.

Shading pastes (e.g. VITA Shading Paste, Ivoclar Shade and Stains Kit) and shading powders (e.g. VITA Akzent) permit the rapid characterization of anterior crowns. In simple applications shading and glazing can be combined in a single operation. Multiple firing operations are possible.

The CORRELATION program allows the shape of the restoration to be simulated prior to milling. In many cases it is possible to create and place chairside anterior crowns during a single appointment. More sophisticated layering techniques are possible.

However, these usually necessitate an indirect procedure using a physical impression and a cast model. Highly complex characterizations can be achieved in this way.

CONCLUSION

Anterior crowns pose a challenge which can be accomplished during a single appointment with the help of polychromatic blocks and various characterization techniques.

5.2.1 VENEERS

More and more CEREC users are offering veneers as part of their treatment repertoire. Partial anterior crowns and veneers are frequently used as a tooth-conserving alternative to a full crown. Characterization can be performed using the methods described for anterior crowns (ceramic stains in combination with transparent ceramic layering materials).

In addition, “background shading” can be used in order to achieve natural-looking results. In this case composite shading materials are applied to the rear surface of the milled veneer. After the veneer has been placed this shading is visible through the thin sliver of ceramic material.

Fine-tuning, contouring and high-gloss polishing are performed after the veneer has been bonded to the tooth. The time input corresponds to that of a CEREC inlay.

CONCLUSION

CEREC veneers are a fast, tooth-conserving alternative to anterior crowns.

Sources: Masek R, Ultimate CEREC Creations – Comprehensive Single Visit Esthetic Dentistry. In Mörmann WH (ed.) State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: 131–138 Reich S, The effect of multicoloured machinable ceramics on the esthetics of all-ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2002; 88: 44–49 Tsotsos S, Single-appointment, all-ceramic anterior restorations. Int J Comput Dent 2001; 4: 263–272 Wiedhahn K, CEREC Veneers: Esthetics and Longevity. In Mörmann WH (ed.) State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: 101–112

6 CERAMIC MATERIALS

VITA Mark II is the CEREC material with the longest track record. This feldspar ceramic is available in monochromatic blocks in a variety of 3D Master shades. This same material is also available in a polychromatic version (VITA Triluxe) with differently shaded layers.

The monochromatic CEREC Blocs as well as polychromatic CEREC Blocs PC available from Sirona are also made of feldspar ceramic. They are available in the most popular Classical and 3D Master shades.

The Ivoclar Empress CAD blocks (formerly called ProCad) consist of a leucite-reinforced glass ceramic material. They are available in the shades A-D, with two degrees of translucency respectively. Ivoclar also markets polychromatic blocks ("Multi").

The lithium disilicate glass ceramic blocks (e.max CAD LT) can be conventionally cemented.

6.1 STRENGTH

Dental ceramics can be divided into two categories according to their microstructure:

1. Aesthetic enamel-like ceramics with a glass content in excess of 50%. The physical characteristics (e.g. strength, hardness, abrasion properties, opacity, and colour shade) can be modified by the addition of fillers.
2. Polycrystalline ceramics for frameworks. These consist of particles with an identical crystalline structure. These relatively opaque materials are much stronger than glass ceramics.

Nearly all these versions are available as conventional laboratory ceramics and as machinable CEREC ceramics. Polycrystalline zirconium oxide and aluminium oxide ceramics are reserved exclusively for CAD/CAM systems.

AESTHETIC CERAMICS	CEREC/inLab
Feldspar	CEREC Blocs, Mark II
Glass/leucite	Empress CAD, Paradigm C
Lithium disilicate	e.max CAD LT, HT
FRAMEWORK CERAMICS	CEREC/inLab
Lithium disilicate	e.max CAD MO
MgAl ₂ O ₄ /lanthanum	inCeram Spinell
Al ₂ O ₃ /lanthanum	inCeram Alumina
Al ₂ O ₃ /ZrO ₃ /lanthanum	inCeram Zirconia
Al ₂ O ₃ (polycrystalline)	inCoris AI, AL-Cubes
ZrO ₂ Ytt	inCoris ZI, YZ-Cubes, e.max ZirCAD

CONCLUSION

CEREC and inLab systems can machine all the relevant types of dental ceramics and hence are future-compatible and universally deployable.

6 CERAMIC MATERIALS

6.2 ABRASION

Veneering ceramics in particular have been criticized for causing wear to the antagonists and for being more abrasion-resistant than tooth enamel.

As long ago as 1991 Krejci demonstrated that VITA Mark II displays the same abrasion properties as natural enamel.

The surfaces of CEREC do not need to be polished or glazed. There is no difference with regard to abrasive wear and tear of the tooth enamel.

The abrasiveness of VITA Mark II does not differ significantly from gold. The material itself is abraded at the same rate as gold.

CONCLUSION

CEREC ceramics do not damage the antagonists and display abrasive properties that are similar to gold.

Sources: Kelly R, Machinable Ceramics. In Mörmann WH (ed.) State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: 29–38
Krejci I, Wear of CEREC and Other Restorative Materials. In Mörmann WH (ed.) International Symposium on Computer Restorations, Berlin: Quintessence, 1991: 245–251
Al-Hiiyasat AS, Saunders WP, The abrasive effect of glazed, unglazed, and polished porcelain on the wear of human enamel, and the influence of carbonated soft drinks on the rate of wear. Int J Prosthodont 1997; 10: 269–282

CEREC PUBLICATIONS

The following list of publications relates to the CEREC procedure and to specific materials and methods for inlays, partial crowns (onlays, overlays), crowns and veneers. It does not include the inEOS scanner or inLab bridge restorations.

1 | ADHESIVE BONDING

- 1982 MÖRMANN WH: Kompositinlay: Forschungsmodell mit Praxispotential? Quintessenz 1982; 33: 1891–1900.
MÖRMANN WH, AMEYE C, LUTZ F: Komposit-Inlays: Marginale Adaptation, Randsichtigkeit, Porosität und okklusaler Verschleiss. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 1982; 37: 438–441.
- 1985 MÖRMANN WH: Keramikinlay – Die Seitenzahnfüllung der Zukunft Vortrag am 30. 3. 1985, Karlsruhe, „25 Jahre Akademie für Zahnärztliche Fortbildung, Karlsruhe“. 4. Internationales Quintessenz-Symposium 1985.
MÖRMANN WH, BRANDESTINI M, FERRU A, LUTZ F, KREJCI I: Marginale Adaptation von adhäsiven Porzellaninlays in vitro. Schweiz Mschr Zahnmed 1985; 95: 1118–1129.
- 1988 MÖRMANN WH: Innovationen bei ästhetischen Restaurationen im Seitenzahngebiet (Keramik): Computer-gestützte Systeme. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 1988; 43: 900–903.
- 1989 MÖRMANN WH, BRANDESTINI M, LUTZ F, BARBAKOW F: Chairside computer-aided direkt ceramic inlays. Quintessence Int 1989; 20: 329–339.
MÖRMANN WH, BRANDESTINI M: Die CEREC Computer Reconstruction Inlays, Onlays und Veneers. Quintessenz Berlin 1989.
- 1991 BRONWASSER P J, MÖRMANN W H, KREJCI I, LUTZ F: Marginale Adaptation von CEREC-Dicor-MGC-Restaurationen mit Dentinadhäsiven. Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed 1991; 101: 162–169.
FETT H, MÖRMANN W H, KREJCI I, LUTZ F: The effects of short bevels and silanization on marginal adaptation of computer machined mesio-occlusodistal inlays. Quintessence Int 1991; 22: 823–829.
Magne P, An in Vitro Evaluation of the Marginal and Internal Seals of CEREC Overlays. In Mörmann WH (ed.) International Symposium on Computer Restorations, Berlin: Quintessence, 1991: 425–440
Schmelz/Dentinhaftung.
- 1993 KÜMIN P, LÜTHY H, MÖRMANN W H. Festigkeit von Keramik und Polymer nach CAD/CIM-Bearbeitung und im Verbund mit Dentin. Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed 1993; 103: 1261–1268.
NOACK MJ, LOCKE LS, ROULET JF: Das Randverhalten adhäsiv befestigter und mittels Ultraschall eingesetzter Porzellaninlays in vivo. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 1993; 48: 720–723.
- 1994 PEUTZFELDT A: Effect of the ultrasonic insertion technique on the seating of composite inlays. Acta Odontol Scand 1994; 52: 51–54.
SCHERRER S S, DE RIJK W G, BELSER U C, MEYER J-M: Effect of cement film thickness on the fracture resistance of a machinable glass-ceramic. Dent Mater 1994; 10: 172–177.
- 1995 BESEK M, MÖRMANN W H, PERSI C: Die Aushärtung von Komposit unter zahnfarbenen Inlays. Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed 1995; 105: 1123–1128.
EL-BADRAWY W A, EL-MOWAFY O M: Chemical versus dual curing of resin inlay cements. J Prosthet Dent 1995; 73: 515–524.
SORENSEN JA, MUNKSGAARD EC: Ceramic inlay movement during polymerisation of resin luting cements. Eur J Oral Sci 1995; 103: 186–189.
- 1996 LOPRESTI JT, DAVID S, CALAMIA JR: Microleakage of CAD-CAM porcelain restorations. Am J Dent 1996; 9: 37–39.
LUTZ F: State of the art of tooth-colored restoratives. Oper Dent 1996; 21: 237–248.
MCCOMB D: Adhesive luting cements – classes, criteria, and usage. Comp 1996; 17: 759–774.
MEHL A, GODESCHA P, KUNZELMANN KH, HICKEL R: Randspaltverhalten von Komposit- und Keramik-inlays bei ausgedehnten Kavitäten. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 1996; 51: 701–704
- 1996 MOLIN M K, KARLSSON ST L, KRISTIANSEN M S: Influence of film thickness on joint bend strength of a ceramic/resin composite joint. Dent Mater 1996; 12: 245–249.
MUNACK J, GEURTSSEN W: Marginal adaptation and fit of CEREC I/II and Empress overlays. In: Mörmann WH (ed) CAD/CIM in aesthetic dentistry: CEREC 10 Year Anniversary Symposium. Chicago: Quintessence 1996: 571–579.
PERDIGAO J, LAMBRECHTS P, VAN MEERBEEK B, BRAEM M, VANHERLE G: Ultramorphological interactions between tooth structure and modern dentin adhesive systems. Academy of Dental Materials, Transactions. 1996; 9: 130–150.
- 1997 GEMALMAZ D, ÖZCAN M, YORUC, ALKUMRU H N: Marginal adaptation of a sintered ceramic inlay system before and after cementation. J Oral Rehabil 1997; 24: 646–651.
PASHLEY D H, CARVALHO R M: Dentine permeability and dentine adhesion. J Dent 1997; 25: 355–372.
SCHÜPBACH P, KREJCI I, LUTZ F: Dentin bonding: effect of tubule orientation on hybrid-layer formation. Eur J Oral Sci 1997; 105: 1–9.
ZELLWEGER U: Der Einfluss der Sauerstoff-Inhibitionschicht von Dentin-adhäsiven auf die Polymerisation verschiedener Abformmaterialien. Zahnmed Diss, Zürich 1997.
- 1998 COX CH F, HAFEZ A A, AKIMOTO N, OTSUKU M, SUZUKI S, TARIM B: Biocompatibility of primer, adhesive and resin composite systems on non-exposed and exposed pulps of non-human primate teeth. Am J Dent 1998; 10: 55–63.
MEHL A, PFEIFFER A, KREMERS L, HICKEL R: Randsichtigkeit von CEREC-II-Inlay-Restaurationen bei ausgedehnten Kavitäten mit stark geschwächten Höckern. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 1998; 53: 57–60.
MÖRMANN W H, BINDL A, LÜTHY H, RATHKE A: Effects of preparation and luting system on all-ceramic computer-generated crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1998; 11: 333–339.
PAMEIJER C H, STANLEY H R: The disastrous effects of the „total etch“ technique in vital pulp capping in primates. Am J Dent 1998; 11: 45–54.
ROSENSTIEL ST F, LAND M F, CRISPIN B J: Dental luting agents: a review of the current literature. J Prosthet Dent 1998; 80: 280–301.
SHORTALL A C, HARRINGTON E: Temperature rise during polymerization of light-activated resin composites. J Oral Rehabil 1998; 25: 908–913.
- 1999 FRANKENBERGER R, SINDEL J, KRÄMER N, PETSCHL A: Dentin bond strength and marginal adaptation: direct composite resin vs ceramic inlays. Oper Dent 1999; 24: 147–155.
MITCHELL CA, DOUGLAS WH, CHENG Y-S: Fracture toughness of conventional, resin-modified glass-ionomer and composite luting cements. Dent Mater 1999a; 15: 7–13.
MITCHELL CA, PINTADO MR, GEARY L, DOUGLAS WH: Retention of adhesive cement on the tooth surface after crown cementation. J Prosthet Dent 1999b; 81: 668–677.
PLATT J A: Resin cements: into the 21st century. Comp 1999; 20: 1173–1182.
- 2000 KNOBLOCH LA, KERBY RE, SEGHI R, BERLIN JS, LEE JS: Fracture toughness of resin-based luting cements. J Prosthet Dent 2000; 83: 204–209.
LANG H: Lichthärtung von Kompositen mit „Plasmalampen“. Dtsch Zahnärztl Z 2000; 55: 154–155
- 2001 SCHMID C, SCEPT S, HEIDEMANN D: Shear strength of composite bonded to porcelain: the influence of a silicone disclosing medium. Int J Comput Dent 2001; 4: 107–116.
- 2002 MJÖR IA, FERRARI M: Pulp-dentin biology in restorative dentistry. Part 6: Reactions to restorative materials, tooth-restoration interfaces, and adhesive techniques. Quintessence Int 2002; 33: 35–63.
- 2003 FRANKENBERGER R, KERN M: Dentin Adhesives create a positive bond to dental hard tissue. Int J Comput Dent 2003; 6: 151–162.
VAN MEERBEEK B, DE MUNCK J, YOSHIDA Y, INOUE S, VARGAS M, VIJAY P, VAN LANDUYT K, LAMBRECHTS P, VANHERLE G: Adhesion to Enamel and Dentin: Current Status and Future Challenges, Oper Dent 2003; 28: 215–235.
- 2005 KOSHIRO K, INOUE S, SANO H, DE MUNK J, VAN MEERBEEK B: In vivo degradation of resin-dentin bonds produced by a self-etch and an etch-and-rinse adhesive. Eur J Oral Sci 2005; 113: 341–348.
- 2006 Krejci I, Bonding of Ceramic Restorations – State of the Art. In Mörmann WH (ed.) State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: 39–45.

CEREC PUBLICATIONS

- SJÖGREN G: Marginal and internal fit of four different types of ceramic inlays after luting. An in vitro study. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1995; 53: 24–28.
- SORENSEN J A, MUNKSGAARD E CH: Interfacial gaps of resin cemented ceramic inlays. *Eur J Oral Sci* 1995; 103: 116–120.
- 1996 MUNACK J, GEURTSSEN W: Marginal adaptation and fit of CEREC I/II and Empress overlays. In: Mörmann WH (ed) *CAD/CIM in aesthetic dentistry: CEREC 10 Year Anniversary Symposium*. Chicago: Quintessence 1996: 571–579.
- VAN GOGSWAARDT D C, KOPPITSCH V, MARX R, LAMPERT F: Belastbarkeit von keramischen Einlage-füllungen bei verschiedenen Adhäsivschichtbreiten. *Stomatologie* 1996; 93: 293–296.
- 1997 GUZMAN A F, MOORE B K, ANDRESC J: Wear resistance of four luting agents as a function of marginal gap distance, cement type, and restorative material. *Int J Prosthodont* 1997; 10: 415–425.
- MÖRMANN W H, SCHUG J: Grinding precision and accuracy of fit of CEREC 2 CAD-CIM inlays. *J Amer Dent Assoc* 1997; 128: 47–53.
- SJÖGREN G, HEDLUND S-O: Filler content and gap width after luting of ceramic inlays, using the ultrasonic insertion technique and composite resin cements. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1997; 55: 403–407.
- SULAIMAN F, CHAI J, JAMESON L M, WOZNIAC W T: A comparison of the marginal fit of InCeram, IPS Empress and Procera crowns. *Int J Prosthodont* 1997; 10: 478–484.
- UNTERBRINK G L: Differenzierende Analyse der erforderlichen Genauigkeit bei laborgefertigten Restaurationen. *Phillip J* 1997; 11–12: 386–388.
- 1998 FISCHER J, GRÄBER H-G, LAMPERT F: Die Randschlussqualität von zahnfarbenen Klasse-II-Versorgungen. *ZWR* 1998; 107: 192–195.
- MAY KB, RUSSEL MM, RAZZOOG ME, LANG BR: Precision of fit: the Procera AllCeram crown. *J Prosthet Dent* 1998; 80: 394–404.
- 2001 SCHULTZ CH: Passgenauigkeit, marginale Adaptation und okklusale Abrasion von CEREC Inlays. *Med Diss, Zürich*: 2001.
- 2004 LUTHARDT RG, BORNEMANN G, LEMELSON S, WALTER MH, HULSA A: An innovative method for evaluation of the 3–D internal fit of CAD/CAM crowns fabricated after direct optical versus indirect laser scan digitizing. *Int J Prosthodont* 2004; 17: 680–685.
- 2006 Fasbinder DJ, Multi-Center Trial: Margin Fit and Internal Adaptation of CEREC Crowns. In: Mörmann WH (ed.), *State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC*, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: Poster.
- 2008 Reich S, Gozdowski S, Trentzsch L, Frankenberger R, Lohbauer U: Marginal Fit of Heat-pressed vs CAD/CAM Processed All-ceramic Onlays Using a Milling Unit Prototype. *Operative Dentistry* 2008; 33-6: 644–650.
- 7 | FINISHING, POLISHING, REPAIRS**
- 1991 SCHMID O, KREJCI I, LUTZ F: Ausarbeitung von adhäsiven zahnfarbenen Inlays aus Komposit und Keramik. *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed* 1991; 101: 177–184.
- 1995 FEHER A, MÖRMANN W: Die Ausarbeitung von Keramik-Restaurationen mit superfeinen Diamantinstrumenten. *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed* 1995; 105: 474–479.
- KREJCI I, LUTZ F, KREJCI D: Schall- / ultraschallbetriebene diamantierte Instrumente zur Kavitätenpräparation zum Konturieren und zum Finieren. *ZWR* 1995; 104: 781–786.
- MALONE W F P, TAYLOR TH D: Effects of ultrasonic scaling and periodontal curettage on surface roughness of porcelain. *J Prosthet Dent* 1995; 73: 227–232.
- 1996 KREJCI, I, LUTZ F, BAFELLI G, KILCHER B: Nondestruktive Politur mit einem neuentwickelten rotierenden Bürstchen. *ZWR* 1996; 105: 304–308.
- 1997 BOLLEN CM, LAMBRECHTS P, QUIRYNEN M: Comparison of surface roughness of oral hard materials to the threshold surface roughness for bacterial plaque retention: a review of the literature. *Dent Mater* 1997; 13: 258–69.
- 1998 DENEHY G, BOUSCHLICHER M, VARGAS M: Intraoral repair of cosmetic restorations. *Dent Clin North Am* 1998; 42: 719–737.
- 2001 TSOTSOS S: An indirect/direct method for contouring and finishing CEREC restorations. *Int J Comput Dent* 2001; 4: 37–45.
- 8 | CEREC CROWNS**
- 1996 BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Clinical and technical aspects of the CEREC InCeram crown. In: Mörmann, W. H. (ed): *CAD/CIM in Aesthetic Dentistry. CEREC 10 Year Anniversary Symposium*. Chicago: Quintessence 1996: 441–462.
- BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Klinische und technische Aspekte der CEREC InCeram Krone. *Quintessenz* 1996; 47, 775–792.
- BITZ M, MÖRMANNWH: Documentation of CEREC crowns via electronic communication. In: Mörmann, W. H. (ed): *CAD/CIM in Aesthetic Dentistry. CEREC 10 Year Anniversary Symposium*. Chicago: Quintessence 1996: 495–516.
- LAMPE K, LÜTHY H, MÖRMANN WH: Fracture load of all-ceramic computer crowns. In: Mörmann, W. H. (ed): *CAD/CIM in Aesthetic Dentistry. CEREC 10 Year Anniversary Symposium*. Chicago: Quintessence 1996: 463–482.
- 1997 BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Chairside Computer-Krone – Verfahrenszeit und klinische Qualität. *Acta Med Dent Helv* 2: 1997; 2: 293–300.
- DEVIGUS A: Die CEREC-2–Frontzahnkrone. *Dental Magazin* 1997; 3: 38–41.
- LAMPE K, LÜTHY H, MÖRMANN WH, LUTZ F: Bruchlast vollkeramischer Computerkronen. *Acta Med Dent Helv* 1997; 2: 76–83.
- 1998 MÖRMANN WH, RATHKE A., LÜTHY H: Der Einfluss von Präparation und Befestigungsmethode auf die Bruchlast vollkeramischer Computerkronen. *Acta Med Dent Helv* 1998; 3: 29–35.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A: Die CEREC-Computerkrone – erste klinische und wissenschaftliche Erfahrungen. *Dental Magazin* 1998; 16: 82–91.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A., LÜTHY H, RATHKE A: Effects of preparation and luting system on all-ceramic computer-generated crowns. *Int J Prosthodont* 1998; 11: 333–339.
- 1999 BINDL A, WINDISCH S, MÖRMANN WH: Full-Ceramic CAD/CIM Anterior Crowns and Copings. *Int J Comput Dent* 1999; 2: 97–111.
- 1999 BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Clinical evaluation of adhesively placed CEREC Endo-Crowns after 2 years – Preliminary results. *J Adhesive Dent* 1999; 1, 255–265.
- CHEN HY, HICKEL R, SETCOS JC, KUNZLEMANN KH: Effects of surface finish and fatigue testing on the fracture strength of CAD/CAM and pressed ceramic crowns. *J Prostet Dent* 1999; 82: 468–475.
- MALAMENT KA, SOCRANSKY SS: Survival of Dicor glass-ceramic dental restorations over 14 years: Part I. Survival of Dicor complete coverage restorations and effect of internal surface acid etching, tooth position, gender and age. *J Prosthet Dent* 1999; 81: 23–32.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A, RICHTER B, APHOLT W, TOTH RT: CEREC Computer Aided Design, Computer Integrated Manufacturing: full-ceramic crowns. *CAD/CIM Library, Vol 2*, Zurich: SFCZ Publishing 1999.
- TOTH RT, MÖRMANN W: CEREC 2 vollkeramische CAD/CIM Computerkronen – Konstruktion im Front- und Seitenzahnbereich. *CAD/CIM Bibliothek Band 1*, SFCZ-Verlag Zürich 1999.
- WINDISCH S, BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Passgenauigkeit von vollkeramischen CEREC CAD/CIM Frontzahnkronen und Frontzahnkronenkappen. *Acta Med Dent Helv* 1999; 3: 29–37.
- 2000 CHAI J, TAKAHASHI Y, SULAIMAN F, CHONG K, LAUTENSCHLAGER EP: Probability of fracture of all-ceramic crowns. *Int J Prosthodont* 2000; 13: 420–424.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A: The CEREC 3 – A quantum leap for computer-aided restorations: Initial clinical results. *Quintessence Int* 2000; 31: 699–712.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A, APHOLT W: CEREC 3 Computer-Restaurationen – erste klinische Erfahrungen. *Zahnärztliche Mitteilungen* 2000; 90: 2860–2869.
- POLANSKY R, ARNETZL G, HAAS M, KEIL C, WIMMER G, LORENZONI M: Restdentinstärke nach 1,2 mm-Stufenpräparation für CEREC-Kronen. *Int J Comput Dent* 2000; 3: 243–258.
- 2001 BESIMO CE, SPIELMANN H-P, ROHNER H-P: Computer-assisted generation of all-ceramic crowns and fixed partial dentures. *Int J Comput Dent* 2001; 4: 243–262.
- TSOTSOS S: Single-appointment, all-ceramic anterior restorations. *Int J Comput Dent*. 2001; 4: 263–72.
- 2002 BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: An up to 5-year Clinical Evaluation of Posterior InCeram CAD/CAM Core Crowns. *Int J Prosthodont* 2002; 15: 451–456.
- MCLAREN EA, TERRY DA: CAD/CAM systems, materials, and clinical guidelines for all-ceramic crowns and fixed partial dentures. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 2002; 23: 637–641.
- LAWN BR, DENG Y, LLOYD IK, JANAL MN, REKOW D, THOMPSON VP: Materials design of ceramic-based layer structures for crowns. *J Dent Res* 2002; 81: 433–438.
- REICH S, HORNBERGER H: The effect of multicolored machinable ceramics on the esthetics of all-ceramic crowns. *J Prosthet Dent* 2002; 88: 44–49.
- 2003 NAKAMURA T, DEI N, KOJIMA T, WAKABAYASHI K: Marginal and internal fit of CEREC 3 CAD/CAM all-ceramic crowns. *Int J Prosthodont* 2003; 16: 244–248.
- ZHAO YF, WANG HR, LI Y: The effect of tooth preparation design on the CAD/CAM all-ceramic coping crown's fitness. *Zhonghua Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi*. 2003; 38: 330–332. Chinese
- 2004 ATTIA A, KERN M: Influence of cyclic loading and luting agents on the fracture load of two all-ceramic crown systems. *J Prosthet Dent* 2004; 92: 551–556.
- BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Survival rate of mono-ceramic and ceramic-core CAD/CAM-generated anterior crowns over 2–5 years. *Eur J Oral Sci* 2004; 112: 197–204.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A: 3D-CAD/CAM für jedermann in Praxis und Labor *Zahnärztliche Mitteilungen* 2004; 94: 228–232.
- OTTO T: Computer-aided direct all-ceramic crowns: preliminary 1-year results of a prospective clinical study. *Int J Perio Rest Dent* 2004; 24: 447–455.
- REICH SM, WICHMANN M, RINNE H, SHORTALL A: Clinical performance of large, all-ceramic CAD/CAM-generated restorations after three years: a pilot study. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2004; 135: 605–612.
- WANG HR, ZHAO YF, ZHANG FM: Study on the occlusal surface design methods of CAD/CAM all-ceramic coping crown. *Sichuan Da Xue Xue Bao Yi Xue Ban*. 2004; 35: 280–282. Chinese
- 2005 BINDL A, MÖRMANN WH: Marginal and internal fit of all-ceramic CAD/CAM crown-copings und chamfer preparations. *J Oral Rehabil* 2005; 32: 441–447.
- BINDL A, RICHTER B, MÖRMANN WH: Survival of ceramic CAD/CAM crowns bonded to preparations with reduced macroretention geometry. *Int J Prosthodont* 2005; 18: 219–224.
- 9 | CEREC 3D APPLICATIONS AND CLINICAL ISSUES**
- 2000 HANSEN, S: Präparationen für CEREC 3: Gibt es noch Einschränkungen? *Int J Comput Dent* 2000; 3: 197–205.
- 2001 TSOTSOS S: Single-appointment, all-ceramic anterior restorations. *Int J Comput Dent* 2001; 4: 263–272.
- 2003 ENDER A., WIEDHAHN K, MÖRMANN WH: Chairside multi-unit restoration of a quadrant using the new CEREC 3D-Software. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 89–94.
- FRITSCH G: Correlation and Function in CEREC 3D – what is new? *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 83–88.
- KURBAD A, REICHEL K: All-ceramic primary telescopic crowns with CEREC inLab. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 103–111.
- MASEK R: Designing in 3D-a more visual approach to CEREC correlation. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 75–82.
- REISS B: Occlusal surface design with CEREC 3D. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 333–342.
- SCHENK O: CEREC Classic: The inlay with CEREC 3D step-by-step. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 67–73.
- SCHNEIDER O: CEREC veneers – Practical procedure and case presentation. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 283–292.
- SCHNEIDER W: CEREC 3D – a new dimension in treatment. *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 57–66.
- WIEDHAHN K: The CEREC 3D veneer program – is bad news good news? *Int J Comput Dent* 2003; 6: 95–101.
- 2004 FRITZSCHE G: Treatment of a single-tooth gap with CEREC 3D crown on an implant: A case report; *Int J Comput Dent* 2004; 7: 199–206.
- MACLEOD R: Chairside correlation in CEREC 3D software. *Int J Comput Dent* 2004; 7: 269–278.
- MASEK R: Margin isolation for optical impressions and adhesion. *Int J Comput Dent* 2005; 8: 69–76.
- MÖRMANN WH, BINDL A: 3D-CAD/CAM für jedermann in Praxis und Labor. *Zahnärztliche Mitteilungen* 2004; 94: 228–232.
- SCHNEIDER W: In the name of the crown: the CEREC 3D crown upgrade. *Int J Comput Dent* 2005; 8: 41–45.
- REICH S, WICHMANN M, BÜRGEL P: The self-adjusting crown (SAC). *Int J Comput Dent* 2005; 8: 47–58.
- WIEDHAHN K: CEREC 3D veneers with R2005 – veneers à la carte. *Int J Comput Dent* 2005; 8: 59–68.
- 2007 Masek R, Ultimate CEREC Creations – Comprehensive Single Visit Esthetic Dentistry. In Mörmann WH (ed.) *State of the Art of CAD/CAM Restorations, 20 Years of CEREC*, Berlin: Quintessence, 2006: 131–138.
- 10 | CEREC QUALITY GUIDELINES**
- 2001 PRÖBSTER L: Sind vollkeramische Kronen und Brücken wissenschaftlich anerkannt? Gemeinsame Stellungnahme von DGZMK und DGZPW. *Dtsch Zahnärztl Z* 2001; 56: 575–576.
- 2005 SCHWEIZERISCHE ZAHNÄRZTE GESELLSCHAFT SSO: Qualitätsleitlinien in der Zahnmedizin, Restaurative Zahnmedizin. *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed* 2005; 115: 71–91.

ALWAYS AT THE FOREFRONT OF INNOVATION!

As global innovation leader for dental equipment, we continuously invest in research and thus in the future of modern dentistry. By networking digital technologies with integrated solutions and optimizing the treatment workflow, we create improved treatment results, more comfort and safety for the patient as well as time and cost savings in everyday work. The combination of constant innovative power and globally growing sales and service structures makes Sirona the global market leader trusted by thousands of practices and labs around the world. **Enjoy every day. With Sirona.**



CAD/CAM systems

From pioneer to new standard. For almost 30 years we have been developing digital dentistry and creating new possibilities for the future practice and lab.



Imaging systems

Best image quality with the lowest dose. More than 100 years of developing x-rays for the dental practice make us the number 1 innovation partner.



Treatment centers

The business card of modern practices. We are striving to create the ideal ergonomic and innovative center. Individually tailored to the well-being and demands of the patient and dentist.



Instruments

Advantages that speak for themselves. We make sure that we provide the right balance of proven quality, individual ergonomics and innovative technology for user-friendly work.



Hygiene systems

Competence that gives you safety. When it comes to hygiene in the practice, we do not take any shortcuts.