Dental Amalgam Update—Part I: Clinical Efficacy

Author MICHAEL J. WAHL, DDS* Associate Editor EDWARD J. SWIFT, JR., DMD, MS

Dental amalgam use has been controversial ever since the Crawcour brothers of France introduced amalgam to the United States in 1833. It has been criticized for its alleged clinical shortcomings and biologic effects. As a result, we thought that it would be useful to provide an update on dental amalgam in two parts. Part I, presented here, focuses on the clinical aspects of dental amalgam, whereas Part II will focus on dental amalgam's biologic effects.

Bonded Amalgam Sealants and Adhesive Resin Sealants: Five-year Clinical Results

M. STANINEC, N. ARTIGA, S.A. GANSKY, G.W. MARSHALL, S. EAKLE

Quintessence International 2004 (35:351-7)

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study was to compare bonded amalgam pit and fissure sealants on unprepared teeth with conventional resin-based pit and fissure sealants over a 5-year period.

Materials and Methods: Two operators sealed 57 pairs of contralateral teeth with either conventional resin sealants or with bonded amalgam (Tytin, Kerr, Orange, CA, USA). Patients ranged in age from 6 to 25 years. Rubber dam isolation was used. For the amalgam sealants, enamel was etched with 32% phosphoric acid semi-gel and primed with All-Bond 2 Primer A & B mixture (BISCO, Inc., Schaumburg, IL, USA). Liner F base and catalyst (BISCO, Inc.) were mixed and applied in a thin layer, and the amalgam was immediately condensed. Patients were scheduled for yearly recalls over the next 5 years, and sealant retention was rated "A" (complete retention), "B" (partial retention, some grooves exposed, and none at risk for caries—slight loss), "C" (partial retention, some grooves exposed at risk for caries, and repair required), or "D" (total loss). Two trained evaluators worked together for the recall evaluations.

Results: Fifteen (58%) patients with 95 teeth (83%) were available for 5-year follow-up. Twelve (26%) amalgam sealants were rated A (no loss) versus 15 (30%) of resin sealants. Those rated B (slight loss) were 16 (34%) amalgam sealants versus 16 (32%) resin sealants. A C rating (repair required) was given to 19 (40%) amalgam sealants and 19 (38%) resin sealants. There were no D (total loss) ratings for either amalgam or resin sealants.

Conclusions: Amalgam pit and fissure sealants were retained as well as resin-based pit and fissure sealants after a period of 5 years.

COMMENTARY

One of the criticisms of amalgam has been that it is not or cannot be bonded to enamel or dentin, but this

*Private practice, 2003 Concord Pike, Wilmington, DE 19803, USA Contact for editorial questions: wahldentistry@aol.com study shows that amalgam can be bonded and retained even to unprepared enamel for at least a 5-year period. Other studies have confirmed that amalgam can be bonded to dentin. It therefore can be concluded that tooth preparation for bonded amalgam restorations can usually be performed exactly the same as for composite restorations. Extension for prevention and sharp line and point angles are no longer necessary for amalgam restorations, provided that they are bonded. Instead, rounded line angles, slot preparations, and minimally invasive preparation should be preferred for both bonded amalgam and resin-based composite restorations.

SUGGESTED READING

Alptekin T, Ozer F, Unlu N, et al. In vivo and in vitro evaluations of microleakage around Class I

amalgam and composite restorations. Oper Dent 2010;35:641–8.

- Evans DB, Neme A-ML. Shear bond strength of composite resin and amalgam adhesive systems to dentin. Am J Dent 1999;12:19–25.
- Gupta I, Gupta S, Kothari A. Revisiting amalgam: a comparative study between bonded amalgam restoration and amalgam retained with undercuts. J Contemp Dent Pract 2011;12:164–70.
- Imbery TA, Coudron J, Moon PC. Fracture resistance of extensive amalgam restorations retained by pins, amalgapins and amalgam bonding agents. Oper Dent 2008;33:666–74.
- Summitt JB, Burgess JO, Berry TG, et al. Six-year clinical evaluation of bonded and pin-retained complex amalgam restorations. Oper Dent 2004;29: 261–8.

Cross-sectional Radiographic Survey of Amalgam and Resin-based Composite Posterior Restorations

L. LEVIN, M. COVAL, S.B. GEIGER Quintessence International 2007 (38:511–4)

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study was to compare the failure rate of posterior resin-based composite proximal restorations with amalgam restorations in a young adult population.

Materials and Methods: One dentist evaluated bilateral bitewing radiographs in a population of 459 young adults aged 18 or 19 years and entering military service. A total of 918 bitewing radiographs and 14,140 proximal surfaces were examined. Of these, there were 650 (5%) restored interproximal surfaces.

Results: For amalgam restorations, 46 (8%) proximal surfaces had secondary caries, and 21 (4%) had overhanging margins. For the resin-based composites, secondary caries was observed in 40 (43%) proximal

surfaces and overhanging margins observed in 1 (1%).

Conclusions: Resin-based composite restorations had a significantly higher rate of secondary caries and a lower rate of overhanging margins than amalgam restorations. Overhangs were not a significant factor in restoration failure. The overall failure rate of the amalgam restorations was 12% versus 44% for the composites.

COMMENTARY

Although there have been great improvements in resin-based composites in the last few decades, most longevity studies have shown that amalgam restorations still last longer than resin-based composite restorations. Secondary caries is the most common reason for any kind of restoration failure, but lower rates of secondary caries are associated with amalgam restorations than with resin-based composite restorations.

SUGGESTED READING

- Antony K, Genser D, Hiebinger C, Windisch F. Longevity of dental amalgam in comparison to composite materials. GMS Health Technol Assess 2008;4: Doc12.
- Bernardo M, Luis H, Martin MD, et al. Survival and reasons for failure of amalgam versus composite posterior

restorations placed in a randomized clinical trial. J Am Dent Assoc 2007;138:775–83.

- Demarco FF, Corrêa MB, Cenci MS, et al. Longevity of posterior composite restorations: Not only a matter of materials. Dent Mater 2012;28:87–101.
- Mackert JR, Wahl MJ. Are there acceptable alternatives to amalgam? J Calif Dent Assoc 2004;32:601–10.

Prevalence of Cusp Fractures in Teeth Restored with Amalgam and with Resin-based Composite

M.J. WAHL, M.M. SCHMITT, D.A. OVERTON, M.K. GORDON

Journal of the American Dental Association 2004 (135:1127-32)

ABSTRACT

Objective: The authors determined the prevalence of cusp fractures in teeth with amalgam restorations versus those with composite restorations in a large general dental practice.

Materials and Methods: Two dentists examined 1,902 consecutive adult patients in a private general practice. Those patients had 10,869 restorations in posterior teeth with at least one virgin cusp or unrestored missing cusp (complete cusp fracture). Of these, 10,082 were amalgam and 787 were resin-based composite. For each restoration, patient age and gender, type of restoration, number of surfaces, and presence or absence of caries were recorded. Any tooth with both amalgam and composite restorations or with other types of restorations was excluded.

Results: Cusp fractures were significantly more prevalent in patients aged 55–86 years than in those aged 18–54 years for both amalgam-restored and composite-restored teeth. As expected, cusp fractures were less prevalent in teeth with single-surface restorations than in those with multisurface restorations, but the difference was significant only in younger patients with amalgam restorations. The findings were not affected by including teeth with caries as opposed to including only teeth without caries. The overall cusp fracture rates were 2.29% of amalgam-restored teeth versus 1.88% of composite-restored teeth, a difference that was not statistically significant.

Cusp fracture incidence was related to patient age and the number of restoration surfaces, but there was no relationship of cusp fracture to restoration type. Cusp fracture prevalence in amalgam-restored teeth was not significantly different than cusp fracture prevalence in composite-restored teeth.

Among all teeth examined, there were 13 times more amalgam-restored teeth examined as composite-restored teeth. Focusing only on teeth without cusp fractures, there were only 12 times more amalgam-restored teeth versus composite-restored teeth. (In a private general practice, this is probably typical—there are far more existing amalgam-restored teeth than composite-restored teeth in teeth with and without cusp fractures.) As a result, the incidence of cusp fractures in amalgam-restored teeth was actually slightly lower than in the composite-restored teeth, although the difference was not statistically significant.

Conclusions: There was no statistically significant difference in the cusp fracture incidence of teeth restored with amalgam restorations versus those restored with resin-based composite.

COMMENTARY

Complete cusp fractures are

commonly observed in most dental practices. Dental amalgam restorations are often blamed for these fractures, especially because so many—or most—teeth with such fractures have been previously restored with amalgam. This study gives a more likely explanation for this phenomenon. There are so many cusp fractures associated with amalgam restorations than composite restorations because there are so many more amalgam restorations than composite restorations overall, but not necessarily because of anything deleterious in the material used for the restoration. In prospective studies, teeth restored with amalgam restorations have not shown a high incidence of cusp fracture. Moreover, cusp fractures can also occur in teeth with any type of intracoronal restorations.

SUGGESTED READING

- Akerboom HBM, Advokaat JGA, Van Amerongen WE, Borgmeijer PJ. Long-term evaluation and rerestoration of amalgam restorations. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 1993;21:45–8.
- Browning WD, Dennison JB. Composite resins restorations: factors affecting placement and replacement. J Dent Res 1995;74(Spec Issue):42 [Abstract 247].
- Gruythuysen RJM, Kreulen CM, Tobi H, et al. 15-year evaluation of Class II amalgam restorations. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 1996;24:207–10.
- Mjör IA, Medina JE. Reasons for placement, replacement, and age of gold restorations in selected practices. Oper Dent 1993;18:82–7.
- Roberson TM, Bayne SC, Taylor DF, et al. Long term clinical failure of dental amalgam. J Dent Res 1989;68 (Spec Issue):208 [Abstract 216].

An Evaluation of Replacement Rates for Posterior Resin-based Composite and Amalgam Restorations in U.S. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS RECRUITS

J.W. SIMECEK, K.F. DIEFENDERFER, M.E COHEN Journal of the American Dental Association 2009 (140:200–9)

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study evaluated the replacement rate of amalgam and composite restorations in US Navy and Marine Corps recruits.

Materials and Methods: This study involved the dental records of 2,780 military recruits. These patients had been examined initially on entering the military and at least twice thereafter over a period of 2–4 years. Panoramic, bitewing, and any other necessary radiographs were used in addition to clinical examination. The authors recorded several variables for

analysis, including date of entry into military service; the number, type, and location of dental restorations present at the initial examination and whether the restorations were clinically acceptable at each exam; dates of recommendations for replacement restorations; and surfaces planned for replacement restoration.

Nonthird molar posterior teeth with amalgam or composite restorations were included in the analysis; teeth with multiple types of restoration were excluded. One-surface occlusal and multiple-surface restorations including the occlusal surface were evaluated. Restoration replacement was defined as those restorations recommended for replacement of a previously restored surface at the initial or any subsequent periodic examination. Restoration replacement was recommended due to secondary caries, defective restoration, or endodontic therapy.

Results: At initial examination, 964 (15.2%) of 6,341 amalgam restorations and 199 (17.4%) of 1,140 resin-based composite restorations needed replacement. Among initially clinically acceptable restorations, 14.2% of amalgam restorations and 16.7% of resin-based composite restorations required replacement during the follow-up years. Overall, replacement restorations were required for a total of 31.2% of 1,140 resin-based composite restorations and 27.3% of 6,341 amalgam restorations.

Conclusions: Among military recruits, amalgam restorations were five times more prevalent than resin-based composite restorations. Resin-based composite restorations needed replacement more frequently than amalgam restorations.

COMMENTARY

Although resin-based composite use has been increasing relative to dental amalgam, dental amalgam restorations were still far more prevalent than resin-based composite in this young population. Dentists in the United States still place more amalgam than composite for first-time posterior restorations. One reason is that the replacement rate of amalgam restorations is significantly lower than that of posterior resin-based composite restorations.

SUGGESTED READING

- Goldstein GR. The longevity of direct and indirect posterior restorations is uncertain and may be affected by a number of dentist-, patient-, and material-related factors. J Evid Based Dent Pract 2010;10:30–1.
- Makhija SK, Gordan VV, Gilbert GH, et al. Practitioner, patient and carious lesion characteristics associated with type of restorative material: findings from The Dental Practice-Based Research Network. J Am Dent Assoc 2011;142:622–32.
- Opdam NJ, Bronkhorst EM, Loomans BA, Huysmans MC. 12-year survival of composite vs. amalgam restorations. J Dent Res 2010;89:1063–7.
- Soncini JA, Maserejian NN, Trachtenberg F, et al. The longevity of amalgam versus compomer/composite restorations in posterior primary and permanent teeth: findings from the New England Children's Amalgam Trial. J Am Dent Assoc 2007;138:763–72.
- Trachtenberg F, Maserejian NN, Tavares M, et al. Extent of tooth decay in the mouth and increased need for replacement of dental restorations: the New England Children's Amalgam Trial. Pediatr Dent 2008; 30:388–92.

THE BOTTOM LINE

- Dental amalgam can be bonded to enamel and dentin successfully.
- Limited studies suggest that preparations for dental amalgam restorations can be similar to those for resin composite restorations in some cases, depending on the clinical conditions encountered.
- Dental amalgam restorations are associated with lower rates of secondary caries than resin composite restorations.
- Amalgam restorations are not associated with a high incidence of complete cusp fractures. The incidence of complete cusp fractures is the same with dental amalgam restorations as it is with resin composite restorations.
- The replacement rate of dental amalgam restorations is more favorable than the replacement rate of posterior resin composite restorations.

Copyright of Journal of Esthetic & Restorative Dentistry is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.