

In vitro Evaluation of Fracture Strength of Zirconia and Polyetheretherketone in Anterior Fixed Partial Denture Framework

Mehboob Raza Khan¹, Sanjay G Thete², Hiroj Bagde³, Ashwini Dhopte⁴, Amit Kumar Mishra⁵, Mona Ranjan⁶

¹Department of Prosthodontics, Dr. Rajesh Ramdasji Kambe Dental College and Hospital, Akola, Maharashtra, India.

²Department of Oral Pathology and Microbiology, Rural Dental College, PIMS (DU), Loni, Maharashtra, India.

³Department of Periodontology, Rama Dental College and Research Centre, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

⁴Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Rama Dental College and Research Centre, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

⁵Department of Prosthodontics, Vananchal Dental College and Hospital, Garhwa, Jharkhand, India.

⁶Vananchal Dental College and Hospital, Garhwa, Jharkhand, India.

Abstract

Background: The use of Zirconia in dentistry has increased the number of metal-free ceramic restorations that may be used with remarkable success and reliability. Crown/connector fractures are the most common clinical problems associated with Zirconia fixed partial dentures (FPDs). Becoming a high-performance, low elastic polymer, polyetheretherketone (PEEK), it has a shock-absorbing function and a reduced chance of fracturing. Zirconia's fracture strength is well known so that this work was aimed at evaluating PEEK's fracture strength and comparing it with Zirconia. **Aim and Objective:** This study was aimed at comparing the fracture strength in computer-based design, production with computer assistance, 3-unit Zirconia anterior, and PEEK frameworks. **Materials and Methods:** Prefabricated 3-unit anterior FPD dental models were produced and scanned in relation to 21, 22, and 23 using a 3-shape, Trios intraoral scanner, metallic die-milling employing base metal alloy. The same oral intrascanner has been utilized for metallic die scanning (3Shape, Trios). Five computer-aided design (CAD)/computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) Zirconia 3-unit frameworks were created and metallic die cement was employed for concrete purposes, including five PEEK 3-unit (B group), for bonding resin cement was used. The strength of the fracture was tested by a universal test equipment. The force was applied to the specimen with a crosshead speed of 0.5 mm/min until the catastrophic collapse took place. The average strength fracture value for each FPD was recorded and analyzed statistically by unpaired Student's *t*-test. **Results:** The average CAD/CAM Zirconia fracture strength is 1872 N + 12.55 N and the average CAD/CAM PEEK fracture strength is 2573 N + 13.33 N. The CAD/CAM PEEK fracture strength was higher than CAD/CAM Zirconia. Statistically, the values were significant by 1% ($P < 0.01$). **Conclusion:** PEEK could be an alternative metal-free, cosmetic material for replacing missing teeth since the value of the fractures was considerably higher compared to Zirconia.

Keywords: Fixed partial denture, Fracture strength, Polyetheretherketone, Zirconia.

INTRODUCTION

In clinical dentistry, a lost tooth is a typical occurrence due to several factors. Resin-bonded fixed partial dentures (FPDs), conventional FPDs, removable partial dentures, and implant-supported fixed prosthesis are the prosthetic alternatives for replacing missing anterior teeth. New materials have been developed to meet the requirement for esthetics in fixed prosthodontics. Metal ceramic and all ceramic are the most popular permanent materials utilized for anterior tooth replacement. Because metal shows through, metal ceramics create "graying" of the gingival margin and have the potential to trigger allergic or toxic reactions in the soft or hard tissues.^[1] Because of the use of these materials, metal-free options such as all-ceramic restoration and, more recently,

polyetheretherketone (PEEK) to replace missing anterior teeth have been developed.

When used for FPDs, all ceramic crowns such as the IPS empress and E-max give good esthetics but lacks the strength. Monolithic or bilayered ceramic crowns are available, Alumina, Zirconia, Zirconia toughened Alumina, Magnesium

Address for correspondence: Dr. Mehboob Raza Khan,
Dr. Rajesh Ramdasji Kambe Dental College and Hospital, Akola,
Maharashtra, India.
Email: mehboob35@gmail.com

Received: May. 25, 2022; **Accepted:** Jun. 26, 2022; **Published:** Sep. 01, 2022

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

How to cite this article: Khan MR, Thete SG, Bagde H, Dhopte A, Mishra AK, Ranjan M. *In vitro* Evaluation of Fracture Strength of Zirconia and Polyetheretherketone in Anterior Fixed Partial Denture Framework. J Res Adv Dent 2022;13(5):9-13.

Access this article online

Website:
www.jrad.co.in

DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.53064/jrad.2022.13.5.251>

Aluminate, and Lithium Di-Silicates are used in the core of bilayered restorations to replace teeth in the esthetic region. To create the final esthetic repair, veneering porcelain is put to the core once it has been manufactured. Fracture of the veneering ceramic from its core is the most prevalent failure of these bilayered crowns and bridges.^[2] All-ceramic FPD failures were formerly attributed to a lack of adherence to the underlying tooth substance before the introduction of silanation. Silanation allowed for a chemical bond to be formed between the etched porcelain and the tooth. Alternative ceramics like monolithic lithium disilicate, which have a lower fracture strength than monolithic Zirconia, are used in monolithic crowns. Mono-block restorations made of pure Zirconia (full contour Zirconia crowns) have the potential to improve mechanical stability, broaden the spectrum of indications, and improve dependability and load endurance.^[3] Despite good staining, they are nevertheless inferior to their lithium disilicate counterparts in terms of esthetics. As a result, their indications are confined to posterior single crowns and FDPs with a small span.

PEEK is a feasible alternative to Zirconia full contour crowns, which can not only withstand occlusal stress but also provide good esthetics when used in the anterior. PEEK is a sulfonated aromatic high-temperature thermoplastic polymer with extremely high mechanical strength. It is very inert, chemically resistant, has bone-like elasticity, and can sustain high temperatures. It also has a low plaque affinity and is non-allergic. PEEK is a commonly used biomaterial that works well as a bone substitute.^[4] Apart from physiological advantages, its esthetic qualities such as color resemblance to real teeth, radiolucency, rigidity, and light weight, make it an ideal material for dental restorations.

PEEK is widely utilized in the computer-aided design (CAD)/computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) fabrication of dental implants, provisional abutments, implant-supported bars, detachable prosthetic framework, and fixed dental prostheses.^[5] The PEEK structure is coated with microfilled veneering composite resin in FPDs. First, an opaque paste of the desired shade is applied to the framework and light cured for 10 min, then layers of deep dentin shade, dentin body, and incisal shades are applied, with periodic curing between each application.^[6]

There are few studies that evaluate the mechanical properties of PEEK in the literature. There have only been a few investigations on the fracture strength of PEEK to date. They compared Zirconia and PEEK material in the posterior tooth region in an *in vitro* study titled “Fracture strength of 3-unit implant-supported FPD with excessive crown height manufactured from different materials.” There is no scientific evidence that the anterior FPD framework consisting of Zirconia and PEEK has a high fracture strength.^[7]

This study was done to compare the fracture strength of a 3-unit CAD/CAM FPD frame made of Zirconia and PEEK attached to a metal die cemented through resin. The present null

hypothesis *in vitro* is that between the CAD/CAM anterior FPD Zirconia-PEEK frameworks, there is no significant variation in the fracture strength.

METHODS

Fabrication of prepared tooth model

A prefabricated 3-unit anterior FPD gypsum model was obtained from Bredent company. The model was digitally designed with a 60 taper in relation to 21, 22, and 23.

Fabrication of metallic die

The model was scanned with a Trios 3Shape intraoral scanner, and the STL file was then exported to the graft 3D Healthcare solution for metallic die production. The metallic die was digitally constructed to imitate the mouth state, with the teeth at a 30° angle to the floor, such that the specified load is subjected to cingulum. If not, the force will be applied to the crown's incisal edges. Cobalt chromium base metal alloy was used to 3D print the metallic die. For improved bonding and to avoid adhesive failure, the exterior surface of the metallic die was sandblasted with Al_2O_3 .

Fabrication of CAD/CAM zirconia and peek framework

Intraoral scanner was used to scan the metallic die (3Shape, Trios). A total of five 3-unit CAD/CAM PEEK and Zirconia frameworks were created. Exocad Dental DB 2.2 Valletta program was used to design the framework digitally. The connector between the central incisor and the lateral incisor measured 4.44 mm in height, 3.08 mm in width, and 11.01 mm in area, while the connector between the lateral incisor and the canine was 4.55 mm in height, 3.04 mm in width, and 11.12 mm in area. Dual cure resin cement was used to adhere the structure to the metallic die. To test the fracture strength of the metallic die and the framework, they were loaded.

Fracture strength evaluation

The fracture strength was assessed using a universal testing equipment (Servo Controlled, Model - F 100). With a 5 mm diameter spherical head installed in a computer-controlled universal testing equipment and a crosshead speed of 0.5 mm/min, all samples were subjected to compressive axial loading. The load was placed to the framework's lingual fossa until it failed catastrophically. Catastrophic failure was defined as the presence of visible cracks, load decreases, and chipping or fracture acoustic events. This was done for all samples, and the results were recorded and analyzed statistically. All the experimental procedures were conducted in accordance with the University College of Dentistry, University of Lahore, Pakistan.

RESULTS

The current *in vitro* study evaluates the fracture strength of the anterior FPD framework of 3 units CAD/CAM produced with Zirconia and PEEK compared to the present. All the samples in Group A (Zirconia) and Group B (PEEK) were subjected to compressive axial loading with a 5 mm diameter spherical head

mounted in a computer-controlled universal testing machine at a crosshead speed of 0.5 mm/min and the force at which the material fracture was noted with the load displacement curve. The values were tabulated as follows.

Statistical analysis

From the data obtained, the mean values for Group A and Group B were calculated. Statistical analysis was done with non-parametric unpaired Student's *t*-test to compare the mean value of fracture strength between the CAD/CAM Zirconia framework (Group A) and CAD/CAM PEEK framework (Group B).

Inference

Statistical analysis was done with non-parametric unpaired Student's *t*-test to compare the mean value of fracture strength between the CAD/CAM Zirconia framework (Group A) and CAD/CAM PEEK framework (Group B). The values obtained for PEEK (Group B) were higher than the values obtained for Zirconia (Group A). It is statistically significant by 1% ($P < 0.01$) (Table 1 and Graph 1).

- The highest fracture strength value for Zirconia was 1894 N.
- The highest fracture strength value for PEEK was 2650 N.
- The mean fracture strength value for Zirconia was 1872 N +12.55 N.
- The mean fracture strength value for PEEK was 2573 N +13.33 N.

DISCUSSION

Fixed prosthodontics is a branch of prosthodontics which is involved in replacing or rehabilitating teeth with no artificial replacements from the mouth. A FPD is a device which is securely attached to natural teeth/dental implant abutments that support the prosthesis primarily.

In the previous three decades, rehabilitation of teeth with crowns has increased considerably. The finished FPD is made of all ceramic, fused metal porcelain, or all-metal. All restorations may fail one or other way. FPDs may fail biologically, esthetically, mechanically, or a combination of all. A variety of various causes can result in the mechanical failure of restorations^[8,9] and also can vary depending on the type of fracture occurring.

Despite significant progress in the development of newer and stronger metal ceramic systems, the "gold standard" in prosthodontics has been maintained since the 1960s when they were launched. Metal ceramic crowns, in particular the fracture of the furnace porcelain, are prone to mechanical fracture. After 10 years of clinical services, Eliasson *et al.*^[10] reported 97%

survival in metal ceramic restorations. A thorough examination carried out by Goodacre *et al.*^[11] found that the veneering of porcelain fracture is the most frequent complication of metal ceramic prostheses. The strength being the advantage over the esthetics when compared to techniques, material properties, and uses when compared the metal ceramic crowns with all ceramics. Initially, the development of all ceramic crowns was not accepted well due to failures. All ceramic crowns were shown similar mechanical capabilities to that of metal ceramic crowns with the improvements of technology and materials at Zirconia core 2009 and 2012.^[12,13]

The purpose of this study was to analyze comparably the fracture strength of the Zirconia and PEEK CAD/CAM frame of the same thickness. The null hypothesis of the study was that the strength of CAD/CAM 3-unit FPD framework built out of Zirconia (Group A) and PEEK fractures was not significantly affected (Group B).

To avoid operator-based errors, all the procedures mentioned in methodology were performed by single operator.

For a therapeutically important *in vitro* load to failure test protocol for all ceramic restorations, Kelly provided several parameters which were followed in our study.^[14] This includes the preparation of teeth and the cementation of the crowns by trustworthy and most often used luting cement. The dentures have been digitally developed for all ceramic anterior teeth with a 6° taper in accordance with clinical recommendations. If the tooth preparation is done in a mistake, no precise taper model and perfect size reduction can be made manually. The metallic die was then digitally developed for standardization, and the Zirconia and PEEK framework were then designed. The crowns were glued by dual-cure resin cement which is the most frequent combining cement to cement all ceramic crowns.


CAD/CAM Zirconia's average fracture strength is 1872 N + 12.55 N and CAD/average PEEK's fracture strength is 2573 N +13.33 N.^[14] The CAD/CAM PEEK Framework fracture strength was substantially greater than the CAD/CAM Zirconia. Hence, the results support the rejection of the null hypothesis because significant differences were observed.

The maximum strength in the molar area is usually higher. In healthy and naturally occurring humans, a unilateral measurement in molar areas has an average bite force between 216 and 890 Newton. With the transducer positioned on the anterior teeth, the unilateral force recorded in the molar region is around 40%,^[15] and it is approximately 70% with the transducer in the premolar region. In the molar area, maximum occlusal forces have been observed up to 909 N.^[16-20] For

Table 1: Statistical result

Variables	Zirconia			Peek			<i>t</i> -test	<i>P</i> -value	Result
	N1	Mean	±SE	N2	Mean	±SE			
N	5	1872.00	12.55	5	2573.00	13.33	23.72	0.00	**

** $P < 0.01$ - Statistically significant at 1% level



Graph 1: Mean values of fracture strength of Zirconia and polyetheretherketone framework

the anterior teeth, therefore, the maximal mean strength is about 500 N. The prostheses need to handle this load at least double. This is because the restorations in the oral cavity are undergoing a reduction of force over time of about 50% of the initial value so that when they are placed in the mouth, the initial strength value must be roughly double the average of the principal forces developing in these locations. The thrust of 1000 N is thus very significant and the FPD framework of Zirconia and PEEK exceeds this threshold that has been extensively confirmed. Hence, both Zirconia and PEEK can be used as a framework material in anterior FPD.

In a study conducted by Zahran *et al.*,^[20] the result indicated that Zirconia crowns had mean fracture loads of 1459 N. The mean Zirconia group fracture load was 2077 N in a study by Manoharan *et al.*^[21] In a study by Att *et al.*,^[22] the mean fracture strength of Zirconia ranged from 1522 N to 1702 N. An *in vitro* study by Dornhofer *et al.*^[23] showed a mean fracture strength of 2527 N. A study by Stiesch-Scholz *et al.*^[24] showed a mean fracture strength of 1265 N. A study by Tinschert *et al.*,^[25] the mean fracture value of Zirconia was <2000 N and a study by Rountree *et al.*^[26] showed a mean fracture strength of 1816 N.

From the above-mentioned *in vitro* studies, the mean fracture load of Y-TZP-based all-ceramic FPDs is reported to be in the range of 1200 N–2600 N. The fracture strength of Zirconia framework obtained in this study also ranges within these values.

Different values are obtained in different studies. The rationale is similar, although in other investigations, techniques have been implemented in certain studies with regard to artificial ageing (thermal and mechanical cycles). The artificial aging processes are designed to imitate a patient's mouth that is constantly under mechanical stress and temperature variations.

The ceramic-ceramic frameworks cracked with the entire ceramic curve thickness. For all ceramic material, this is the predicted mechanism of fracture. Unlike Zirconia, PEEK framework did not fracture completely instead formation of a visible crack at the connector region was noted which could be due to the high flexural strength of the material. Regarding comparison between Zirconia and PEEK, there are two studies regarding the fracture strength of 3-unit FPD made of PEEK. Both the studies have

investigated the fracture strength in posterior region. Vahideh Nazari *et al.*^[7] in 2016 compared the fracture strength of bilayered Zirconia and PEEK framework veneered with composite. He concluded that at a given load, the fracture that occurred in zirconia involved both framework and veneering material whereas in PEEK, only the veneering material fractured and the framework remained intact which supports this study.

In summary, both Zirconia and PEEK can be used for replacing anterior tooth. And also based on the findings in the present study, PEEK seems to be interesting alternative for use as core material for restoration of anterior tooth region. Clinical studies with long-term follow-up are however, necessary to assess the clinical performance.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were based on the results obtained in the present *in vitro* investigation to assess the fracturing strength of the 3-unit CAD/CAM framework consisting of Zirconia and cemented PEEK using resin cement. The following conclusions:

- The CAD/CAM Zirconia framework has mean fracture strength of 1872 N.
- The CAD/CAM PEEK framework has a mean fracture strength at 2573 N.
- PEEK is a reliable material to be used as framework for FPD.

REFERENCES

1. Agustín-Panadero R, Román-Rodríguez JL, Ferreiroa A, Solá-Ruiz MF, Fons-Font A. Zirconia in fixed prosthesis. A literature review. *J Clin Exp Dent* 2014;6:e66.
2. Daou EE. The zirconia ceramic: Strengths and weaknesses. *Open Dent J* 2014;8:33.
3. Lægrend SJ, Nergård JM. Fracture Resistance of Monolithic Zirconia Crowns: The Importance of the Compressive Strength of the Dental Cements Used (Master's Thesis, UiT Norges arktiske universitet). CiteSeerX. Available from: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu> [Last accessed on 2022 May 23].
4. Najeeb S, Zafar MS, Khurshid Z, Siddiqui F. Applications of polyetheretherketone (PEEK) in oral implantology and prosthodontics. *J Prosthodont Res* 2016;60:12-9.
5. Sinha N, Gupta N, Reddy KM, Shastri YM. Versatility of PEEK as a fixed partial denture framework. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc* 2017;17:80.
6. Vaishnavi K, Nandini VV. Fabrication of Peek Crowns with Improved Esthetics-A. Available from: <http://repository-tnmgrmu.ac.in> [Last accessed on 2022 May 23].
7. Nazari V, Ghodsi S, Alikhasi M, Sahebi M, Shamshiri AR. Fracture strength of three-unit implant supported fixed partial dentures with excessive crown height fabricated from different materials. *J Dent (Tehran, Iran)* 2016;13:400.
8. Aslam A, Khan DA, Hassan SH, Ahmed B. Ceramic fracture in metal-ceramic restorations: The aetiology. *Dent Update* 2017;44:448-56.
9. Özcan M. Fracture reasons in ceramic-fused-to-metal restorations. *J Oral Rehabil* 2003;30:265-9.
10. Eliasson A, Arnelund CF, Johansson A. A clinical evaluation of cobalt-chromium metal-ceramic fixed partial dentures and crowns: A three-to seven-year retrospective study. *J Prosthet Dent* 2007;98:6-16.
11. Goodacre CJ, Bernal G, Rungcharassaeng K, Kan JY. Clinical complications in fixed prosthodontics. *J Prosthet Dent* 2003;90:31-41.
12. Pelaez J, Cogolludo PG, Serrano B, Lozano L, José F, Suárez MJ. A four-year prospective clinical evaluation of zirconia and metal-

- ceramic posterior fixed dental prostheses. *Int J Prosthodont* 2012;25:451-8.
13. Sailer I, Gottner J, Känel S, Hämmerle CH. Randomized controlled clinical trial of zirconia-ceramic and metal-ceramic posterior fixed dental prostheses: A 3-year follow-up. *Int J Prosthodont* 2009;22:553.
14. Kelly JR. Clinically relevant approach to failure testing of all-ceramic restorations. *J Prosthet Dent* 1999;81:652-61.
15. Bakke M. Bite force and occlusion. In: *Seminars in Orthodontics*. Vol. 12. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: WB Saunders; 2006. p. 120-6.
16. Mansour RM, Reynik RJ. *In vivo* occlusal forces and moments: I. Forces measured in terminal hinge position and associated moments. *J Dent Res* 1975;54:114-20.
17. Hellsing E, Hagberg C. Changes in maximum bite force related to extension of the head. *Eur J Orthod* 1990;12:148-53.
18. Helkimo E, Carlsson GE, Helkimo M. Bite force and state of dentition. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1977;35:297-303.
19. Hagberg C, Agerberg G, Hagberg M. Regression analysis of electromyographic activity of masticatory muscles versus bite force. *Eur J Oral Sci* 1985;93:396-402.
20. Kikuchi M, Koriotoh TW, Hannam AG. The association among occlusal contacts, clenching effort, and bite force distribution in man. *J Dent Res* 1997;76:1316-25.
21. Manoharan PS, Rajasimhan NV, Livingstone D, Arivarasan NK. Comparative analysis of fatigue resistance, fracture strength, and fracture patterns in ceramic crowns with zirconia and direct metal laser-sintered cores-an *in vitro* study. *J Adv Clin Res Insights* 2018;5:92.
22. Att W, Stamouli K, Gerds T, Strub JR. Fracture resistance of different zirconium dioxide three-unit all-ceramic fixed partial dentures. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2007;65:14-21.
23. Dornhofer R, Arnetzl GV, Koller M, Arnetzl G. Comparison of the static loading capacity of all-ceramic bridge frameworks in posterior teeth using three hard core materials. *Int J Comput Dent* 2007;10:315-28.
24. Kohorst P, Herzog TJ, Borchers L, Stiesch-Scholz M. Load-bearing capacity of all-ceramic posterior four-unit fixed partial dentures with different zirconia frameworks. *Eur J Oral Sci* 2007;115:161-6.
25. Tinschert J, Natt G, Mautsch W, Augthun M, Spiekermann H. Fracture resistance of lithium disilicate-, alumina-, and zirconia-based three-unit fixed partial dentures: A laboratory study. *Int J Prosthodont* 2001;14:231-8.
26. Rountree P, Nothdurft F, Pospiech P. *In-vitro* investigations on the fracture strength of all-ceramic posterior bridge of ZrO₂- ceramics. *J Dent Res* 2001;80:57.