ACP AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PROSTHODONTISTS
Your smile. Our specialty.℠

Accuracy and Reliability of Methods to Measure Marginal Adaptation of Crowns and FDPs: A Literature Review

Noor A. Nawafleh, BSc, MDentTech,[1,3] Florian Mack, Dr. Med. Dent, PD,[1] Jane Evans, DipDT, BFET, PhD,[1] John Mackay, RDP,[1] & Muhanad M. Hatamleh, BSc, MPil, MSc(Health Mgmt), Dip(Maxfac Prosthetics), PhD[2,3]

[1]Griffith University, School of Dentistry and Oral Health, Gold Coast, Australia
[2]University of Manchester, School of Dentistry, Manchester, UK
[3]Jordan University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Applied Medical Science, Irbid, Jordan

Keywords
Crown fit; marginal fit; FDP fit; fitting accuracy.

Correspondence
Noor Nawafleh, School of Dentistry and Oral Health, Griffith University, 16-30 High St., Southport, Gold Coast, Queensland 4215, Australia. E-mail: n.nawafleh@griffith.edu.au

Previously presented at the 2012 IADR General Session, Iguacu Falls, Brazil.

The authors deny any conflict of interest.

Accepted October 8, 2012

doi: 10.1111/jopr.12006

Abstract

Purpose: To review methods used to investigate marginal adaptation of crowns and fixed dental prostheses (FDPs), and to discuss testing variables employed and their influence on results.

Methods: Online libraries including PubMed, Scopus, and Ovid were searched for articles evaluating the marginal adaptation of crowns and FDPs using a combination of the keywords: "marginal accuracy," "marginal fit," "marginal gap," "marginal discrepancy," "fitting accuracy," "crown," and "FPD." Peer-reviewed publications in English in the period 1970 to December 2011 were collected, evaluated by their abstract, and included if they met the inclusion criteria. The criteria involved studies evaluating marginal adaptation of crowns and FDPs through clear experimental protocols. Exclusion criteria involved longitudinal prospective and retrospective clinical evaluations, studies using subjective tactile sensation, and other predefined criteria.

Results: A total of 277 papers were identified; only 183 met the inclusion criteria. Direct view technique was used by 47.5% of the articles followed by cross-sectioning (23.5%), and impression replica (20.2%) techniques. The marginal gap values reported by these techniques varied among individual crown systems and across different systems because of variations in study type (in vivo vs. in vitro), sample size and measurements per specimen, finish line design, and stage at which the marginal gap was measured.

Conclusion: There was a substantial lack of consensus relating to marginal adaptation of various crown systems due to differences in testing methods and experimental protocols employed. Direct view technique was the most commonly used method of reproducible results. Also, conducting an experimental set-up of testing a minimum of 30 specimens at 50 measurements per specimen should produce reliable results. Additionally, using a combination of two measurement methods can be useful in verification of results.

Fixed dental restorations mainly aim to restore function and esthetics of lost intraoral structures without jeopardizing the oral or general health of patients.[1] An ill-fitting restoration is potentially harmful for abutment teeth and supporting periodontium. It provides access for and host to oral bacteria adherence, which can possibly cause secondary caries and/or traumatic gingival irritation.[2,3] Microleakage through the dentinal tubules to the pulp chamber may lead to endodontic inflammation.[4,5] In addition, the restoration itself can be affected by the poor margin, as variation in the fitting can create stress concentrations that may reduce the strength and long-term success of the restoration.[6]

A clinically acceptable marginal gap of fixed restorations is difficult to precisely identify through the literature. American Dental Association (ADA) specification No. 8[7] indicates that the thickness of luting cement for a dental crown should not exceed 25 μm when using type I luting agent or 40 μm when using type II luting agent. Although marginal openings in this range are seldom achieved, it has been considered a clinical goal.[8] Christenson agreed with the ADA specification.[9] Others suggested modifying it. Fransson et al[10] and McLean and von Fraunhofer[11] argued that the clinically acceptable marginal gap after cementation should be less than 150 μm and 120 μm,

respectively. Additionally, McLean and von Fraunhofer[11] examined the marginal fit of 1000 fixed restorations over a 5-year period and indicated that a marginal gap less than 80 μm is difficult to detect under clinical conditions.

As of this writing, there is no conclusive evidence of optimum fit of contemporary ceramic systems. This topic is heavily investigated, and fit values reported are widely diverse and range (in μm) from 7.5 to 206.3.[12,13] Such variation can be mainly attributed to lack of coherence about the definition of "fit,"[14,15] along with differences in methods employed to determine the fit,[16-21] testing parameters followed,[8,13,20,22-29] and ceramic systems investigated.[12,23,30-33]

Holmes et al defined the internal gap as the measurement between the axial wall of the prepared tooth and the internal surface of the casting, while the same measurement at the margin is called "marginal gap."[34] Furthermore, an angular combination of marginal gap and extension error is an "absolute marginal discrepancy," which specifically defines the linear distance from the surface finish line of the preparation to the margin of the restoration.[34] It is considered the best alternative measurement since it is always the largest error at the margin and reflects the total crown misfit at that point, both vertically and horizontally.[34] Measuring methods are different as they mainly span two approaches: invasive and noninvasive as in sectioning and direct-view techniques, respectively. Experimental setups can differ at the stage of testing the fit such as before or after cementation and involve other variables (i.e., sample size, measurements per specimen). Furthermore, ceramic systems' differences in construction techniques (i.e., CAD/CAM, cast and Slip ceramics) can affect the restoration fitting accuracy.[13,15,35-38]

A review paper published in 2010 reported the significance of some variables on the fit accuracy of fixed dental prostheses (FDPs) made of zirconia-based ceramics.[39] However, the literature still lacks a comprehensive review of most variables affecting the fit of a wider range of available ceramic systems in contemporary dental practices. Therefore, the aim of this study was to review methods used to investigate marginal adaptation of crowns and FDPs to discuss testing variables employed and their influence on results. It covers all currently commonly used ceramic systems, whether conventional or CAD/CAM, and highlights all variables affecting accuracy of marginal gap measurements reported.

Methods

An online search using libraries including Medline, Scopus, and Ovid to identify published works evaluating the fitting accuracy of indirect dental restorations was conducted. Only peer-reviewed works published in English in the period 1970 to December 2011 were considered. The search was carried out using combinations of the following key/mesh words and phrases: "marginal accuracy," "marginal fit," "marginal gap," "marginal discrepancy," "precision of fit," "fitting accuracy," "crown," "bridge," and "FPD." The articles were initially evaluated by reading their abstracts, and further reviewed if they met the required inclusion criteria. The criteria included studies evaluating the fitting accuracy of any crown system through clear methodology and experimental conditions. In vitro and in vivo studies evaluating the fitting of any metal, metal-ceramic (MC), all-ceramic crown systems, or crowns and FDPs made out of polymers as in all-polymer restorations (i.e., fiber-reinforced composites) through gap measurement were included. Exclusion criteria included:

1. Longitudinal prospective and retrospective clinical evaluations, as they depend on a subjective evaluation according to dentists' or patients' satisfaction;
2. Studies evaluating marginal fitting through subjective tactile sensation; and
3. Studies evaluating internal fitting without reporting the marginal gap.

The selected articles were reviewed and grouped according to their methods as follows: (1) Direct-view technique, (2) cross-sectioning technique, (3) impression replica technique, and (4) other methods. An in-depth consistent, clear, and comprehensive analysis was generated to summarize the experimental variables among the studies, which could have influenced their reported results.

The analysis included:

- Article demography (publication year, authors, and the type of restoration tested),
- Method of gap measurement,
- Type of study (in vivo or in vitro),
- Sample size,
- Number of measurement per specimens,
- Finish line design,
- The stage at which the measurements were performed
  1. Before or after cementation
  2. Before or after porcelain firing,
- The marginal gap recorded.

Results

The electronic search collectively revealed 277 articles, of which only 183 studies were processed for review. The 94 articles that did not meet the criteria were 66 studies of prospective or retrospective clinical evaluations, 6 studies that did not mention all the required information about the measurement technique used, 6 studies evaluating the fitting accuracy through the modified USPHS (United States Public Health Service) criteria and tactile sensation, 7 studies measuring the internal fit only, and 9 studies evaluating the fit of partial crowns.

Generally, there was no conclusive evidence on the best methodology to evaluate the fitting accuracy of crowns and FDPs. A variety of methods and testing parameters have been used for this purpose including mainly direct view, cross-sectional view, and impression replica technique (Table 1). Furthermore, direct comparisons between studies were not possible as studies varied in their types (in vivo vs. in vitro); sample size and number of measurements per specimen; preparation and finish line design; and when the gap was measured. Marginal adaptation varied among conventional and CAD/CAM ceramic systems (Table 2).

Table 1 Analysis of marginal adaptation reported by various methods for different all-ceramic systems

Methods	Number of papers (%)	Range of marginal gap (μm) by ceramic system							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Direct-view technique[8,13,16,17,26-30,33,36,40-115]	87 (47.5%)	7.5–161	37–46	17–143	8.67–61.1	63.4	46.3–83	–	13.1–66.4
Cross-sectioning technique[15,18,19,37,38,116-153]	43 (23.5%)	8.3	50	25–135	9–51	–	15	53–56.6	18.4–120
Replica technique[10,12,20-23,31,32,35,154-181]	37 (20.2%)	13.4–123	68–130	29–117	89	32.7–206.3	48.6–91	64–182.7	80–189.3
Profile projector[24,25,182-186]	7 (3.8%)	50–117	68–110	25–44	–	–	–	–	–
Digimatic micrometer[187,188]	2 (1.2%)	Investigated other crown systems (i.e., full metal)							
Micro-CT[14,189,190]	3 (1.6%)	22	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Combination of two methods[191-194]	4 (2.2%)	8.3–28.6	–	31.9–33.6	–	–	–	77–94	–
Total	183 (100%)								
Ceramic system coding		In-Ceram Alumina	IPS Empress 2 layering technique	Procera Alumina	Procera Zirconia	Everest	Lava	Cerec	Cercom

Table 2 Marginal gap ranges (μm) of all-ceramic systems

Ceramic system		Mean marginal gap (μm)
Traditional systems (i.e., follows conventional construction methods like casting or slipping techniques)	In-Ceram Alumina[13,33]	7.50–161
	IPS Empress 2 staining technique[23,161]	97–130
	IPS Empress 2 layering technique[25,71]	36.6–110
	In-Ceram Zirconia Slip casting[30,38]	25–113
	Procera (Alumina)[15,30]	17–143
CAD/CAM systems	Cerec[12,38]	53–182.7
	Lava[32,37]	15–91
	Everest[12,31]	32.7–206.3
	Procera (Zirconia)[35,36]	8.67–89

Discussion

Influence of measurement method

Six methods are used (Table 1), of which the direct-view technique was the most commonly used (47.5%), followed by cross-sectioning method (23.5%), and impression replica technique (20.2%). Direct-view technique measures the gap between crown and die at the margin but not internally using a microscope at different magnifications. This method does not incorporate any procedures on the crown-die assembly such as sectioning or replications of the cement space before measuring the gap, hence making it cheaper and less time-consuming than other techniques and reducing the chance of error accumulation that may result from multiple procedures and ultimately impact the accuracy of results. However, this method can only be used in vitro as it requires direct examination of marginal gap under high power microscopy, which is crucial for the accuracy of this method. It has been reported that scanning electronic microscopy (SEM) imaging was better than light microscopy to evaluate marginal gap of class II CAD/CAM inlays.[195] However, Groten et al[53] reported no significant difference between the accuracy of the two techniques, although according to the authors, SEM was able to provide more appropriate and realistic observations than a light microscope, particularly with complex margin morphologies. Other microscopes used included digital microscopes,[33] stereomicroscopes,[55] and traveling microscopes.[70] They provided limited results from widely separated measuring points; hence, calculated means usually demonstrate large standard deviations, and the results reported might be questionable.[169]

Additional disadvantages include difficulty in selecting the points where the marginal opening is to be measured,[178] inability to differentiate between tooth structure and tooth-colored cement or identifying the most apical part of the preparation margin.[127] Margins of the crown and die may appear rounded when viewed under magnification.[178]

In the impression replica technique, however, the crown is filled with low viscosity light-body silicone material and seated on the die simulating the cementation procedure. After setting of the silicone material, the crown is gently removed from the die, and heavy-body silicone is injected inside to stabilize the thin light-body film before removing it from inside the crown. The light-body silicone layer can then be sectioned and measured at different sites. A few researchers[22,23,31,35,154,178,179] carried out some modifications on the impression replica technique by making an external impression of the marginal gap after fixing the crown to its corresponding die. The impression was then poured with epoxy resin material, and marginal gap was measured on the epoxy resin model; however, the impression replica technique has constraints and inherent errors, such as difficulty in identifying the crown margins and finishing lines and tearing of the elastomeric film upon removal from the crown.[23] Additionally, mistakes in the sectioning plane can lead to overestimated measurements.[156] Laurent et al[196] found that if appropriate silicone is used, the cement space may be replicated and its thickness measured regardless of the location. Similarly, Rahme et al[191] reported no significant difference between the silicone replica technique and sectioning technique in measuring the marginal gap of Procera crowns and advocated that using low-viscosity silicone for the replica technique can imitate the film thickness of a cemented crown applying glass-ionomer cement.

The cross-sectioning method allows for direct measurement of the cement thickness and marginal gap in the vertical and

horizontal planes, minimizing chances of software or repositioning errors.[182] It also permits an uninterrupted view of the marginal gap adjacent to the connector in FDP specimens.[120] However, this method does not allow long-term analysis and comparison of the results before and after different manufacturing stages using the same specimens,[192] and the number of measurements is limited to the sectioning plane, which might not represent the complete fit of the crown.[186] Profilometry, on the other hand, is a nondestructive method. It presents a view of both the die and the specimen in the same focal plane on a monitor, thus allowing for an accurate focus.[24] However, with profilometry, the thickness of the cement layer at the marginal areas can only be indirectly inferred, and in the case of sequential analysis, extreme care should be taken in repositioning the specimens, otherwise re-profiling discrepancies will occur.[182] Remaining methods, including digimatic micrometer and micro-CT scan, attracted the least attention, mainly due to inherent technical difficulties.

Cross-checking gap measurements among these methods yielded great variances even within the same ceramic system (Tables 1 and 2). For example, the marginal gap of In-Ceram Alumina crowns as reported in the literature ranges from 7.5 to 161 μm.[13,33] Significant differences in the techniques and variables used in the two studies could be an acceptable explanation of this wide range, which might not reflect the actual fit of the restoration; however, comparing the results of similar studies[24,25] that used almost the same technique and variables to measure the marginal gap of In-Ceram Alumina crowns reveals that the marginal gap of this crown system is 57 μm and 49.8 μm, respectively. Both Balkaya et al[24] and Quintas et al[25] used a profile projector and measured the marginal gap under similar conditions (except the number of measurement per sample), and their results were comparable. The marginal gap of In-Ceram Zirconia (slip casting) FDP framework represents another example showing how using different methods for measuring the marginal gap can influence the results. The marginal gap of this system was reported as 25 and 113 μm.[30,38] Although the two studies used the same experimental setups, the methods of gap measurement were different: direct-view technique and sectioning methods, respectively. The results reported do not offer information about the actual fit of this Zirconia system. Furthermore, Komine et al[181] and Martínez-Rus et al[36] reported inconsistent results for the In-Ceram Zirconia system (Vita YZ, Cerec inLab) when using the silicone replica (91.6 μm) and direct view (12.4 μm) techniques, respectively.

Some studies used combinations of two methods, namely silicone replica and cross-sectioning methods.[191-194] Results were not conclusive. Tsitrou et al[193] used this combination to measure the marginal gap of Cerec crowns. They reported mean marginal gaps on chamfer preparation of 94 and 91 μm and on shoulder preparation of 91 and 77 μm when using silicone replica and cross-sectioning techniques, respectively. Shearer et al[192] reported statistically significant differences in marginal gap of the In-Ceram system when using sectioning and silicone replica techniques (8.3 and 28.6 μm, respectively). They advocated the accuracy of the sectioning technique above the silicone replica. However, Rahme et al[191] did not report significant differences between the above methods for Procera copings, as marginal gap reported was 31.9 and 33.6 using sectioning and silicone replica techniques, respectively.

Influence of experimental setup

Researchers used different experimental setups and measured the marginal gaps under different conditions. Making the measurement in vivo or in vitro,[50,170,182] before or after cementation,[22,23,31,148] before or after veneering,[20,24,166] on a chamfer or shoulder finish line,[13,25,152] and sample size and number of measurement per sample[63,106] have been found to affect the marginal adaptation. Hence, differences in setting these conditions have led to inconsistencies in the results, leading to conflicting conclusions concerning the clinically acceptable marginal fit of specific ceramic systems. The same crown system might be considered as having a perfect marginal fit according to one study and having clinically unacceptable fit according to another. Table 2 shows the highest and lowest marginal gap values of various crown systems as reported in the literature.

Clinically, several factors such as tooth preparation, impression technique, and cementation methodology can complicate the testing process and deviate from the ideal situation,[170] making in vivo measurements more difficult than in vitro ones.[182] Also, in vitro studies offer standardized and optimized conditions in the experimental performance, which may not be possible to achieve in vivo.[50,118]

Influence of sample size

The adequacy of data is an important issue for the success of any research. Sample size and the number of measurements per specimen and statistical test performed can consequently influence the strength of statistical analysis, and thus conclusions made can be less relevant or invalid.[45] In addition, the larger the number of measurements per specimen, the greater the precision of the analysis.[63] Individual measurements at different locations of the margin may reveal significant deviations from the mean, and may render the crowns clinically unacceptable even if the majority of the margin has an excellent fit.[66]

Many studies using small sample size reported large standard deviations compared to the mean value,[15,66,71,127] while using a larger sample size produced more consistent data with smaller standard deviation.[45,55,107] According to Groten et al,[106] when investigating the marginal fit of fixed dental restorations, the smaller sample size can be compensated by a larger number of measurements per sample. This conclusion can be demonstrated through Gonzalo et al's[27] and Lee et al's[28] studies, which used a smaller sample size ($n = 10$) and compensated with a large number of measurements per sample (60 and 50 measurements, respectively) and achieved more consistent distribution of data with small standard deviations compared to the mean values.

Groten et al[106] used an empirical approach to the sample size problem. They used a master steel die to fabricate ten all-ceramic crowns. Marginal gaps were then measured using SEM before and after cementation starting with 230 measurements per crown. This number was reduced to smaller subsets following systematic and random approaches to verify their impact on the quality of the results. They reported that smaller data

sizes led to an accelerated rise in the standard of errors and divergent variability of the mean. Accordingly, 50 measurements per specimen were recommended to attain clinically significant information about marginal gap size regardless of the systematic or random approaches of the measurement sites, and at least 20 to 25 measurements per crown could be accepted depending on the required level of precision. Furthermore, a study using a more sophisticated methodology of running 360 gap measurements at 360° concluded that the minimum number of measurements required is 18 for in vitro evaluations and 90 for crowns constructed from impressions made intraorally.[63] Therefore, 4 to 12 measurements per crown as used by several studies[8,15,26,29,33,44,48,76] might be misleading.

Influence of finish line

The effect of different finish line designs (i.e., shoulder, chamfer, feather edge, bevel) on the fit of crowns and FDPs has been widely investigated.[13,15,25,51,115,152,155] However, the conclusions of these studies seem to be contradictory. The possible influence of finish line configuration on the fitting of the crown according to Gavelis et al[152] occurs during cementation. When the axial wall of the prepared tooth matches the axial wall of the internal crown surface, the escape pathway for cement diminishes, increasing the hydrostatic pressure within the crown until it equals the patient's biting pressures and prevents further seating of the crown.[152] If the cement has not completely set, it continues to escape until the particles at the axial walls prevent further seating.[152] Certain finish lines (i.e., shoulder) seem to facilitate the escape of cement earlier in the cementation process, and thus improve crown fitting.[152]

Influence of cementing

Measuring the marginal gap of cemented or uncemented crowns can also influence the results of the measurement.[22,23,31,76,148] Marginal discrepancy generally increases after cementation,[25,138] and the cementation medium may discontinue the complete seating of a full crown, resulting in an insufficiently sealed margin of the restoration.[152,161] Many investigators reported a significantly higher marginal gap after cementation than that before cementation.[22,23,31,76,108] Furthermore, cementation techniques such as uncontrolled finger pressure or overfilling of the crown with cement can cause an uneven flow of cement with one axial wall having a thick film and the opposite wall having a thin film.[136] Moreover, the type of cement has been reported to influence the fit of dental crowns.[54,109,187]

Influence of veneering

Veneering process and its associated heat treatment are known to affect the marginal fit of metal or ceramic core materials.[20,47,50,75,107,166] A greater value of marginal discrepancy has been reported to occur during the first firing stage,[75,107] with a greater effect of veneering process occurring in the horizontal plane.[110] Such distortion may clinically result in occlusal displacement of the prostheses and reduction of the load-bearing capacity of all-ceramic restorations.[6] In MC restorations, design of the finish line affects the amount of marginal distortion occurring during firing.[115] According to Shillingburg et al,[115] the metal bulk in the shoulder design is greater and more rigid. Thus it shows less distortion than that of the chamfer. Difference in the bulk of metal between shoulder and chamfer, however, is probably too small to cause significantly different marginal distortion between the two designs.[166] Another explanation is the thermal incompatibility between metal and veneering porcelain. DeHoff and Anusavice[197] reported, however, that the calculated marginal distortion values resulting from incompatibility of Ni-Cr and Au-Pd alloys and three porcelain products were less than 21 μm in all cases. This finding supports their hypothesis that the resultant metal distortion is not due to system incompatibility, and that poor creep resistance below the glass transition temperature of porcelain could be the major contributing factor.[197] Later, Anusavice and Carroll[58] demonstrated that incompatibility stress induced by a positive contraction mismatch was not the main cause of marginal distortion of PFM crowns, and suggested that external grinding and internal abrasive blasting of crowns are more likely causes of this effect.

In all-ceramic restorations, firing of the body porcelain occurs at temperatures several hundred degrees above the glass transition temperature up to the sintering temperature of the veneering material.[166] Once achieved, temperature then drops off at a very high rate of 600°C/min, resulting in considerable stresses that can lead to distortion of the restoration.[166] Nevertheless, Kohorst et al[20] showed by a simplified comparison between thermal expansion behaviors of the framework and veneering material of zirconia-based FDPs that thermal incompatibility is not sufficient to explain the resultant distortion.

The current work investigated the marginal adaptation of all currently commonly used ceramic systems, whether conventional or CAD/CAM, and highlighted all methods and experimental parameters that influence accuracy of marginal gap measurements of these systems through critical appraisal of the published work under structured criteria; however, it did not review current off-line published works on this topic or articles published after 2011, which could be considered as limitations of this review. Even so, 183 articles were reviewed in this study, and in-depth analysis was provided.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of this review, it can be concluded that there is a substantial lack of consensus relating to methods used to investigate marginal adaptation of crowns and FDPs. Considerable differences in testing techniques included experimental setups employed and ceramic systems investigated. Regardless, the direct-view technique is the most commonly used method and recorded the most reproducible results among different studies. Also, conducting an experimental setup of testing a minimum of 30 specimens of the same ceramic system at 50 measurements per specimen should produce reliable and accurate results. Additionally, using a combination of two measurement methods can be useful to verify and validate results.

References

1. Rosenstiel SF, Martin FL, Fujimoto J: Contemporary Fixed Prosthodontics (ed 4). St. Louis, Mosby, 2006

2. Bader J, Rozier R, Mcfall W, et al: Effect of crown margins on periodontal conditions in regularly attending patients. J Prosthet Dent 1991;65:75-79
3. Knoernschild KL, Campbell SD: Periodontal tissue responses after insertion of artificial crowns and fixed partial dentures. J Prosthet Dent 2000;84:492-498
4. Felton DA, Kanoy BE, Bayne SC, et al: Effect of in vivo crown margin discrepancies on periodoontal health. J Prosthet Dent 1991;65:357-364
5. Goodacre CJ, Bernal G, Rungcharassaeng K, et al: Clinical complications in fixed prosthodontics. J Prosthet Dent 2003;90:31-41
6. Tuntiprawon M, Wilson T: The effect of cement thickness on the fracture strength of all-ceramic crowns. Aust Dent J 1995;40:17-21
7. American Dental Association: ANSI/ADA Specification No. 8 for zinc phosphate cement. In: Guide to Dental Materials and Devices (ed 5). Chicago, American Dental Association, 1970-1971
8. Holden JE, Goldstien G, Hittelman EL, et al: Comparison of the marginal fit of pressable ceramic to metal ceramic restorations. J Prosthodont 2009;18:645-648
9. Christensen G: Clinical and research advancements in cast-gold restorations. J Prosthet Dent 1971;25:62-68
10. Fransson B, Oilo G, Gjeitanger R: The fit of metal-ceramic crowns, a clinical study. Dent Mater 1985;1: 197-199
11. McLean JW, von Fraunhofer JA: The estimation of cement film thickness by an in vivo technique. Br Dent J 1971;131: 107-111
12. Kohorst P, Brinkmann H, Li J, et al: Marginal accuracy of four-unit zirconia fixed dental prostheses fabricated using different computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing systems. Eur J Oral Sci 2009;117:319-325
13. Pera P, Gilodi S, Bassi F, et al: In vitro marginal adaptation of alumina porcelain ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 1994;72:585-590
14. Pelekanos S, Koumanou M, Koutayas S, et al: Micro-CT evaluation of the marginal fit of different In-Ceram alumina copings. Eur J Esthet Dent 2009;4:278-292
15. Suárez MJ, Villaumbrosia PG, Pradies G, et al: Comparison of the marginal fit of Procera AllCeram crowns with two finish lines. Int J Prosthodont 2003;16:229-232
16. Ayad MF: Effects of tooth preparation burs and luting cement types on the marginal fit of extracoronal restorations. J Prosthodont 2009;18:145-151
17. Giannetopoulos S, van Noort R, Tsitrou E: Evaluation of the marginal integrity of ceramic copings with different marginal angles using two different CAD/CAM systems. J Dent 2010;38:980-986
18. Örtorpa A, Jönssonb D, Mouhsenb A, et al: The fit of cobalt-chromium three-unit fixed dental prostheses fabricated with four different techniques: a comparative in vitro study. Dent Mater 2011;27:356-363
19. Hmaidouch R, Neumann P, Mueller WD: Influence of preparation form, luting space setting and cement type on the marginal and internal fit of CAD/CAM crown copings. Int J Comput Dent 2011;14:219-226
20. Kohorst P, Brinkmann H, Dittmer MP, et al: Influence of the veneering process on the marginal fit of zirconia fixed dental prostheses. J Oral Rehabil 2010;37:283-291
21. Kokubo Y, Nagayama Y, Tsumita M, et al: Clinical marginal and internal gaps of In-Ceram crowns fabricated using GN-I system. J Oral Rehabil 2005;32:753-758
22. Stappert C, Dai M, Chitmongkolsuk S, et al: Marginal adaptation of three-unit fixed partial dentures constructad from pressed ceramic systems. Br Dent J 2004;196:766-770
23. Wolfart S, Wegner SM, Al-Halabi A, et al: Clinical evaluation of marginal fit of a new experimental all-ceramic system before and after cementation. Int J Prosthodont 2003;16:587-592
24. Balkaya MC, Cinar A, Pamul S: Influence of firing cycles on the margin distortion of 3 all-ceramic crown systems. J Prosthet Dent 2005;93:346-355
25. Quintas AF, Oliveira F, Bottino MA: Vertical marginal discrepancy of ceramic copings with different ceramic materials, finish lines, and luting agents: an in vitro evaluation. J Prosthet Dent 2004;92:250-257
26. Fonseca JC, Henriques GE, Sobrinho LC, et al: Stress-relieving and porcelain firing cycle influence on marginal fit of commercially pure titanium and titanium-aluminum-vanadium copings. Dent Mater 2003;19:686-691
27. Gonzalo E, Suárez MJ, Serrano B, et al: A comparison of the marginal vertical discrepancies of zirconium and metal ceramic posterior fixed dental prostheses before and after cementation. J Prosthet Dent 2009;102:378-384
28. Lee KB, Park CW, Kim KH, et al: Marginal and internal fit of all-ceramic crowns fabricated with two different CAD/CAM systems. Dent Mater J 2008;27:422-426
29. Tan PL, Gratton D, Diaz-Arnold A, et al: An in vitro comparison of vertical marginal gaps of CAD/CAM titanium and conventional cast restorations. J Prosthodont 2008;17:378-383
30. Bindl A, Mörmann WH: Marginal and internal fit of all-ceramic CAD/CAM crown copings on chamfer preparations. J Oral Rehabil 2005;32:441-447
31. Okutan M, Heydecke G, Butz F, et al: Fracture load and marginal fit of shrinkage-free $ZrSiO_4$ all-ceramic crowns after chewing simulation. J Oral Rehabil 2006;33:827-832
32. Reich S, Kappe K, Teschner H, et al: Clinical fit of four-unit zirconia posterior fixed dental prostheses. Eur J Oral Sci 2008;116:579-584
33. Sulaiman F, Chai J, Jameson LM, et al: A comparison of the marginal fit of In-Ceram, IPS Empress, and Procera crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1997;10:478-484
34. Holmes JR, Bayne SC, Holland GA, et al: Considerations in measurement of marginal fit. J Prosthet Dent 1989;62:405-408
35. Att W, Komine F, Gerds T, et al: Marginal adaptation of three different zirconium dioxide three-unit fixed dental prostheses. J Prosthet Dent 2009;101:239-247
36. Martínez-Rus F, Suárez MJ, Rivera B, et al: Evaluation of the absolute marginal discrepancy of zirconia-based ceramic copings. J Prosthet Dent 2011;105:108-114
37. Beuer F, Naumann M, Gernet W, et al: Precision of fit: zirconia three-unit fixed dental prostheses. Clin Oral Investig 2009;13: 343-349
38. Bindl A, Mormann WH: Fit of all-ceramic posterior fixed partial denture frameworks in vitro. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 2007;27:567-575
39. Abduo J, Lyons K, Swain M: Fit of zirconia fixed partial denture: a systematic review. J Oral Rehabil 2010;37:866-876
40. Gonzalo E, Suárez MJ, Serrano B, et al: Marginal fit of zirconia posterior fixed partial dentures. Oper Dent 2008;21:398-399
41. Oyagüe C, Snchez-Jorge MI, Snchez TA, et al: Influence of CAM vs. CAD/CAM scanning methods and finish line of tooth preparation in the vertical misfit of zirconia bridge structures. Am J Dent 2009;22:79-83
42. Vermilyea SG, Kuffler MJ, Tamura JJ: Casting accuracy of base metal alloys. J Prosthet Dent 1983;50:651-653

43. Weaver JD, Johnson GH, Bales DJ: Marginal adaptation of castable ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 1991;66:747-753
44. Witkowski S, Komine F, Gerds T: Marginal accuracy of titanium copings fabricated by casting and CAD/CAM techniques. J Prosthet Dent 2006;96:47-52
45. Yeo IS, Yang JH, Lee JB: In vitro marginal fit of three all-ceramic crown systems. J Prosthet Dent 2003;90:459-464
46. Campbell SD, Pelletier LB: Thermal cycling distortion of metal ceramics: part II- Etiology. J Prosthet Dent 1992;68:284-289
47. Gemalmaz D, Alkumru H: Marginal fit changes during porcelain firing cycles. J Prosthet Dent 1995;73:49-54
48. Goldin EB, Boyd NW, Goldstien G, et al: Marginal fit of leucite-glass pressible ceramic restorations and ceramic-pressed-to-metal restorations. J Prosthet Dent 2005;93:143-147
49. Shiratsuchi H, Komine F, Kakehashi Y, et al: Influence of finish line design on marginal adaptation of electroformed metal-ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2006;95:237-242
50. Vigolo P, Fonzi F: An in vitro evaluation of fit of zirconium-oxide-based ceramic four-unit fixed partial dentures generated with three different CAD/CAM systems before and after porcelain firing cycles and after glaze cycles. J Prosthodont 2008;17:621-626
51. Wöstmann B, Blöber T, Gouentenoudis M, et al: Influence of margin design on the fit of high-precious restorations in patients. J Prosthet Dent 2005;33:611-618
52. Contreras EF, Henriques GE, Giolo SR, et al: Fit of cast commercially pure titanium and Ti-6Al-4V alloy crowns before and after marginal refinement by electrical discharge machining. J Prosthet Dent 2002;88:467-472
53. Groten M, Girthofer S, Probster L: Marginal fit consistency of copy-milled all-ceramic crowns during fabrication by light and scanning electron microscopic analysis in vitro. J Oral Rehabil 1997;24:871-881
54. Olivera AB, Saito T: The effect of die spacer on retention and fitting of complete cast crowns. J Prosthodont 2006;15:243-249
55. Petteno D, Schierano G, Bassi F, et al: Comparison of marginal fit of 3 different metal-ceramic systems: an in vitro study. Int J Prosthodont 2000;13:405-408
56. Rinke S, Huls A, Jahn L: Marginal accuracy and fracture strength of conventional and copy-milled all-ceramic crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1995;8:303-310
57. Abbate MF, Tjan AH, Fox WM: Comparison of the marginal fit of various ceramic crown systems. J Prosthet Dent 1989;61:527-531
58. Anusavice KJ, Carroll JE: Effect of incompatibility stress on the fit of metal-ceramic crowns. J Dent Res 1987;66:1341-1345
59. Behr M, Rosentritt M, Ledwinsky E, et al: Fracture resistance and marginal adaptation of conventionally cemented fiber-reinforced composite three-unite FPDs. Int J Prosthodont 2002;15:467-472
60. Besimo C, Jeger C, Guggenheim R: Marginal adaptation of titanium frameworks produced by CAD/CAM techniques. Int J Prosthodont 1997;10:541-546
61. Duncan JD: Casting accuracy of Nickel-Chromium alloys: marginal discrepancies. J Dent Res 1980;59:1194
62. Felton DA, Sulik WD, Holland GA, et al: Marginal discrepancy changes at various stages of construction of three-unit porcelain-fused-to-metal fixed partial dentures. Dent Mater 1988;4:296-301
63. Gassino G, Barone MS, Scanu M, et al: Marginal adaptation of fixed prosthodontics: a new in vitro 360-degree external examination procedure. Int J Prosthodont 2004;17: 218-223
64. Hummert T, Barghi N, Berry T: Postcementation marginal fit of a new ceramic foil crown system. J Prosthet Dent 1992;68: 766-770
65. Konstantoulakis E, Nakajima H, Woody R, et al: Marginal fit and surface roughness of crowns made with an accelerated casting technique. J Prosthet Dent 1998;80:337-345
66. Leong D, Chai J, Lautenschlager E, et al: Marginal fit of machine-milled titanium and cast titanium single crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1994;7:440-747
67. Papazoglou E, Brantley WA, Johnston WM: Evaluation of high-temperature distortion of high-palladium metal-ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2001;85:133-140
68. Pilathadka S, Slezák R, Vahalová D, et al: Influence of different luting agents on the marginal discrepancy of Procera AllCeram alumina crown copings-an experimental study. Acta Medica 2008;15:13-18
69. Rosentritt M, Plein T, Kolbeck C, et al: In vitro fracture force and marginal adaptation of ceramic crowns fixed on natural and artificial teeth. Int J Prosthodont 2000;13:387-391
70. Albert FE, El-Mowafy OM: Marginal adaptation and microleakage of Procera AllCeram crowns with four cements. Int J Prosthodont 2004;17:529-535
71. Baig MR, Tan KB-C, Nicholls JI: Evaluation of the marginal fit of a zirconia ceramic computer-aided machined (CAM) crown system. J Prosthet Dent 2010;104:216-227
72. Polansky R, Heschl A, Arnetzl G, et al: Comparison of the marginal fit of different all-ceramic and metal-ceramic crown systems: an in vitro study. J Stomat Occ Med 2010;3: 106-110
73. Richter-Snapp K, Aquillino SA, Svare CW, et al: Change in marginal fit as related to margin design, alloy type, and porcelain proximity in porcelain-fused-to-metal restorations. J Prosthet Dent 1988;60:435-439
74. Romeo E, Iorio S, Storelli S, et al: Marginal adaptation of full-coverage CAD/CAM restorations: in vitro study using a non-destructive method. Minerva Stomatol 2009;58:61-72
75. Shokry T, Attia M, Ihab M, et al: Effect of metal selection and porcelain firing on the marginal accuracy of titanium-based metal ceramic restorations. J Prosthet Dent 2010;103:45-52
76. Suárez MJ, Lozano JF, Salido M, et al: Marginal fit of Titanium metal-ceramic crowns. Int J Prosthodont 2005;18:390-391
77. Tjan AH, Castelnuovo J, Shiotsu G: Marginal fidelity of crowns fabricated from six proprietary provisional materials. J Prosthet Dent 1997;77:482-485
78. Lang BR, Gemalmaz D, Alkumru HN: Marginal fit changes during porcelain firing cycles. J Prosthet Dent 1995;73:49-54
79. Morris HF: Department of veterans affairs cooperative studies project No. 242. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the marginal fit of cast ceramic, porcelain-shoulder, and cast metal full crown margins. Participants of CSP No. 147/242. J Prosthet Dent 1992;67:198-204
80. Sato T, Wohlwend A, Scharer P: Marginal fit in a "Shrink-Free" ceramic crown system. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent 1986;6:8-21
81. Boeckler AF, Stadler A, Setz JM: The significance of marginal gap and overextension measurement in the evaluation of the fit of complete crowns. J Contemp Dent Pract 2005;6:26-37
82. Behr M, Rosentritt M, Latzel D, et al: Comparison of three types of fiber-reinforced composite molar crowns on their fracture resistance and marginal adaptation. J Dent 2001;29:187-196
83. Eden GT, Franklin OM, Powell JM, et al: Fit of porcelain fused-to-metal crown and bridge castings. J Dent Res 1979;58:2360-2368

84. Schneider DM, Levi MS, Mori DF: Porcelain shoulder adaptation using direct refractory dies. J Prosthet Dent 1976;36:583-587
85. Schilling ER, Miller BH, Woody RD, et al: Marginal gap of crowns made with a phosphate-bonded investment and accelerated casting method. J Prosthet Dent 1999;81: 129-134
86. Lomanto A, Weiner S: A comparative study of ceramic crown margins constructed using different techniques. J Prosthet Dent 1992;67:773-777
87. Moore JA, Bargi N, Brukl CE, et al: Marginal distortion of cast restorations induced by cementation. J Prosthet Dent 1985;54: 336-340
88. Mejia R, Tobon SM: Marginal fit of metal ceramic restorations subjected to a standardized postsoldering technique. J Prosthet Dent 2000;83:535-539
89. Behr M, Rosentritt M, Mangelkramer M, et al: The influence of different cements on the fracture resistance and marginal adaptation of all-ceramic and fiber-reinforced crowns. Int J Prosthodont 2003;16:538-542
90. Jones MD, Dykema RW, Klein AI: Television micromeasurement of vented and non-vented cast crown marginal adaptation. Dent Clin North Am 1971;15:663-677
91. Cho LR, Song HY, Koak JY, et al: Marginal accuracy and fracture strength of ceromer/fiber-reinforced composite crowns: effect of variations in preparation design. J Prosthet Dent 2002;88:388-395
92. Cho L, Choi J, Jin Yi Y, et al: Effect of finish line variants on marginal accuracy and fracture strength of ceramic optimized polymer/fiber-reinforced composite crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2004;91:554-560
93. Stricker E, Göhring TN: Influence of different posts and cores on marginal adaptation, fracture resistance, and fracture mode of composite resin crowns on human mandibular premolars. An in vitro study. J Dent 2006;34:326-335
94. Kolbeck C, Rosentritt M, Behr M, et al: In vitro study of fracture strength and marginal adaptation of polyethylene-fibre-reinforced-composite versus glass-fibre-reinforced-composite fixed partial dentures. J Oral Rehabil 2002;29:668-674
95. Iwai T, Komine F, Kobayashi K, et al: Influence of convergence angle and cement space on adaptation of zirconium dioxide ceramic copings. Acta Odontol Scand 2008;66:214-218
96. Mörmann W, Wolf D, Ender A, et al: Effect of two self-adhesive cements on marginal adaptation and strength of esthetic ceramic CAD/CAM molar crowns. J Prosthodont 2009;18:403-410
97. Gonzalo E, Suarez MJ, Serrano B, et al: A comparison of the marginal vertical discrepancies of zirconium and metal ceramic posterior fixed dental prostheses before and after cementation. J Prosthet Dent 2009;102:378-384
98. Han HS, Yang HS, Lim HP, et al: Marginal accuracy and internal fit of machine-milled and cast titanium crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2011;106:191-197
99. Keyf F, Anil N: The effect of margin design on the marginal adaptation of temporary crowns. J Oral Rehabil 1994;21:367-371
100. Nakamura T, Tanaka H, Kinuta S, et al: In vitro study on marginal and internal fit of CAD/CAM all-ceramic crowns. Dent Mater J 2005;24:456-459
101. Rocha SS, Nogueira F, Pieralini AR, et al: Effect of phosphate-bonded investments on titanium reaction layer and crown fit. Braz Oral Res 2010;24:147-152
102. Azar MS, Lehmann KM, Dietrich H, et al: Effect of preparation depth differences on the marginal fit of zirconia crown copings: an in vitro study. Int J Prosthodont 2011;24:264-266
103. Balkenhol M, Knapp M, Ferger P, et al: Correlation between polymerization shrinkage and marginal fit of temporary crowns. Dent Mater 2008;24:1575-1584
104. Bottino MA, Valandro LF, Buso L, et al: The influence of cervical finish line, internal relief, and cement type on the cervical adaptation of metal crowns. Quintessence Int 2007;38:e425-432
105. Pak HS, Han JS, Lee JB, et al: Influence of porcelain veneering on the marginal fit of Digident and Lava CAD/CAM zirconia ceramic crowns. J Adv Prosthodont 2010;2:33-38
106. Groten M, Axmann D, Pröbster L, et al: Determination of the minimum number of marginal gap measurements required for practical in vitro testing. J Prosthet Dent 2000;83:40-49
107. Campbell SD, Sirakian A, Pelletier LB, et al: Effects of firing cycle and surface finishing on distortion of metal ceramic castings. J Prosthet Dent 1995;74:476-481
108. Hamaguchi H, Cacciatore A, Tueller VM: Marginal distortion of the porcelain-bonded-to-metal complete crowns: an SEM study. J Prosthet Dent 1982;47:146-153
109. White SN, Kipnis V: Effect of adhesive luting agents on the marginal seating of cast restorations. J Prosthet Dent 1993;69:28-31
110. Bridger DV, Nicholls JI: Distortion of ceramometal fixed partial dentures during the firing cycle. J Prosthet Dent 1981;45:507-514
111. Al Wazzan K, Al-Nazzawi A: Marginal and internal adaptation of commercially pure titanium and titanium-aluminium-vanadium alloy cast restorations. J Contemp Dent Pract 2007;8:1-9
112. Bhowmik H, Parkhedkar R: A comparison of marginal fit of glass infiltrated alumina copings fabricated using two different techniques and the effect of firing cycles over them. J Adv Prosthodont 2011;3:196-203
113. Boyle JJ, Naylor P, Blackman R: Marginal accuracy of metal ceramic restorations with porcelain facial margins. J Prosthet Dent 1993;69:19-27
114. Nakamura T, Dei N, Kojima T, et al: Marginal and internal fit of Cerec 3 CAD/CAM all-ceramic crowns. Int J Prosthodont 2003;16:244-248
115. Shillingburg HT, Hobo S, Fisher DW: Preparation design and margin distortion in porcelain-fused-to-metal restorations. J Prosthet Dent 1973;29:276-284
116. Beuer F, Aggstallera H, Edelhoffa D, et al: Marginal and internal fits of fixed dental prostheses zirconia retainers. Dent Mater 2009;25:94-102
117. Beuer F, Neumeier P, Naumann M: Marginal fit of 14-unit zirconia fixed dental prosthesis retainers. J Oral Rehabil 2009;36:142-149
118. Beuer F, Richter J, Gernet W: Influence of preparation angle on marginal and internal fit of CAD/CAM-fabricated zirconia crown copings. Quintessence Int 2009;40:243-250
119. Blackman R, Baes R, Barghi N: Marginal accuracy and geometry of cast titanium copings. J Prosthet Dent 1992;67:435-440
120. Kunii J, Hotta Y, Tamaki Y, et al: Effect of sintering on the marginal and internal fit of CAD/CAM-fabricated zirconia frameworks. Dent Mater J 2007;26:820-826
121. Oruç S, Tulunoglu Y: Fit of titanium and base metal alloy metal-ceramic crown. J Prosthet Dent 2000;83:314-318

122. Rahme HY, Adib SM, Zebouni E, et al: Comparison of the fit of Procera crowns made from stone with those made from polyurethane resin. Gen Dent 2009;57:171-179
123. Sorensen J: A standardized method for determination of crown margin fidelity. J Prosthet Dent 1990;64:18-24
124. Fleming GJ, Dobinson MM, Landini G, et al: An in-vitro investigation of the accuracy of fit of Procera and Empress crowns. Eur J Prosthodont Restor Dent 2005;13:109-114
125. Korkut L, Cotert HS, Kurtulmus H: Marginal, internal fit and microleakage of zirconia infrastructures: an in-vitro study. Oper Dent 2011;36:72-79
126. Valderrama S, Roekel N, Andersson M, et al: A comparison of the marginal and internal adaptation of titanium and gold-platinium-palladium metal ceramic crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1995;8:29-37
127. White SN, Yu Z, Tom JF, et al: In vivo marginal adaptation of cast crowns luted with different cements. J Prosthet Dent 1995;74:25-32
128. Alkumru H, Hullah WR, Marquis PM, et al: Factors affecting the fit of porcelain jacket crowns. Br Dent J 1988;164:39-43
129. Barone MS, Carpinteri B, Griffa B, et al: Internal adaptation of fixed prosthodontics at shoulder preparation level evaluated by horizontal sections. Minerva Stomatol 2006;55:381-389
130. Bronson MR, Lindquist TJ, Dawson DV: Clinical acceptability of crown margins versus marginal gaps as determined by pre-doctoral students and prosthodontists. J Prosthodont 2005;14:226-232
131. Comlekoglu M, Dundar M, Ozcan M, et al: Influence of cervical finish line type on the marginal adaptation of zirconia ceramic crowns. Oper Dent 2009;34:586-592
132. Ettinger RL, Kambhu PP, Asmussen CM, et al: An in vitro evaluation of the integrity of stainless steel crown margins cemented with different luting agents. Spec Care Dentist 1998;18:78-83
133. Ferrari M: Cement thickness and microleakage under dicor crowns: an in vivo investigation. Int J Prosthodont 1991;4:126-131
134. Gelbard S, Aoskar Y, Zalkind M, et al: Effect of impression materials and techniques on the marginal fit of metal castings. J Prosthet Dent 1994;16:1-6
135. Lin MT, Sy MJ, Muñoz CA, et al: The effect of tooth preparation form on the fit of Procera copings. Int J Prosthodont 1998;11:580-590
136. Pilo R, Cardash HS: In vivo retrospective study of cement thickness under crowns. J Prosthet Dent 1998;79:621-625
137. Schaerer P, Sato T, Wohlwend A: A comparison of the marginal fit of three cast ceramic crown systems. J Prosthet Dent 1988;59:
534-542
138. Byrne G: Influence of finish line form on crown cementation. Int J Prosthodont 1992;5:137-144
139. Holmes JR, Sulik WD, Holland GA, et al: Marginal fit of castable ceramic crowns. J Prosthet Dent 1992;67:594-599
140. Bindl A, Windisch S, Mörmann WH: Full-ceramic CAD/CIM anterior crowns and copings. Int J Comput Dent 1999;2:97-111
141. Syu JZ, Byrne G, Laub LW, et al: Influence of finish-line geometry on the fit of crowns. Int J Prosthodont 1993;6:
25-30
142. Naert I, Van Der Donck A, Beckers L: Precision of fit and clinical evaluation of all-ceramic full restorations followed between 0.5 and 5 years. J Oral Rehabil 2005;32:51-57
143. Lopes MB, Consani S, Sinhoreti MAC, et al: Influence of recasting palladium-silver alloy on the fit of crowns with different marginal configurations. J Prosthet Dent 2005;94:430-434
144. Byrne G, Laub LW, Hu JY, et al: The fit of fixed partial dentures joined by infrared soldering. J Prosthet Dent 1992;68:591-596
145. Givens EJ, Jr., Neiva G, Yaman P, et al: Marginal adaptation and color stability of four provisional materials. J Prosthodont 2008;17:97-101
146. Beuer F, Edelhoff D, Gernet W, et al: Effect of preparation angles on the precision of zirconia crown copings fabricated by CAD/CAM system. Dent Mater J 2008;27:814-820
147. Grenade C, Mainjot A, Vanheusden A: Fit of single tooth zirconia copings: comparison between various manufacturing processes. J Prosthet Dent 2011;105:249-255
148. Hung SH, Hung KS, Eick DJ, et al: Marginal fit of porcelain-fused-to-metal and two types of ceramic crown. J Prosthet Dent 1990;63:26-31
149. Holmes JR, Pilcher ES, Rivers JA, et al: Marginal fit of electroformed ceramometal crowns. J Prosthodont 1996;5:
111-114
150. Buchanan WT, Svare CW, Turner KA: The effect of repeated firings and strength on marginal distortion in two ceramometal systems. J Prosthet Dent 1981;45:502-506
151. Tjan AH, Li T, Logan GI, et al: Marginal accuracy of complete crowns made from alternative casting alloys. J Prosthet Dent 1991;66:157-164
152. Gavelis JR, Morency JD, Sozio RB: The effects of various finish line preparations on the marginal seal and occlusal seat of full crown preparations. J Prosthet Dent 1981;45:138-145
153. Jacques LB, Ferrari M, Cardoso PE: Microleakeage and resin cement film thickness of luted all-ceramic and gold electroformed porcelain-fused-to-metal crowns. J Adhes Dent 2003;5:145-152
154. Tinschert J, Natt G, Mautsch W, et al: Marginal fit of alumina- and zirconia-based fixed partial dentures produced by a CAD/CAM system. Oper Dent 2001;26:367-374
155. Belser UC, MacEntee MI, Richter WA: Fit of three porcelain-fused-to-metal marginal designs in vivo: a scanning electron microscope study. J Prosthet Dent 1985;53:24-29
156. Coli P, Karlsson S: Fit of a new pressure sintered zirconium dioxide coping. Int J Prosthodont 2004;17:59-64
157. Davis SH, Kelly JR, Campbell SD: Use of an elastomeric material to improve the occlusal seat and marginal seal of cast restorations. J Prosthet Dent 1989;62:288-291
158. Harris JR, Wickens IL: A comparison of the fit of spark-eroded titanium copings and cast gold alloy copings. Int J Prosthodont 1994;7:348-355
159. Leal MB, Paulino SM, Pagnano VO, et al: Influence of investment type and sprue number on the casting accuracy of titanium crown margins. J Prosthet Dent 2006;95:42-49
160. Linsen S, Wirtz D, Fischer C, et al: Optimization of the marginal gap of all-ceramic restorations and gold crowns by ultrasonic activated, suspended Al_2O_3 powder. Am J Dent 2009;22:255-258
161. Gu XH, Kern M: Marginal discrepancies and leakage of all-ceramic crowns: influence of luting agents and aging conditions. Int J Prosthodont 2003;16:109-116
162. Kokubo Y, Ohkubo C, Tsumita M, et al: Clinical marginal and internal gaps of Procera AllCeram crowns. J Oral Rehabil 2005;32:526-530
163. Nakamura T, Nonaka M, Maruyama T: In vitro fitting accuracy of copy-milled alumina cores and all-ceramic crowns. Int J Prosthodont 2000;13:189-193

164. Quante K, Ludwig K, Matthias K: Marginal and internal fit of metal-ceramic crowns fabricated with a new laser melting technology. Dent Mater 2008;24:1311-1315
165. Chan D, Blackman R, Kaiser D, et al: The effect of sprue design on the marginal accuracy of titanium castings. J Oral Rehabil 1998;25:424-429
166. Dittmer MP, Borchers L, Stiesch M, et al: Stress and distortions within zirconia-fixed dental prostheses due to the veneering process. Acta Biomater 2009;5:3231-3239
167. Grey NJ, Piddock V, Wilson MA: In vitro comparison of conventional crowns and a new all-ceramic system. J Dent 1993;21:47-51
168. Karlsson S: The fit of Procera titanium crowns. An in vitro and clinical study. Acta Odontol Scand 1993;51:129-134
169. May KB, Russell MM, Razzoog ME, et al: Precision of fit: the Procera AllCeram crown. J Prosthet Dent 1998;80: 394-404
170. Mou SH, Chai T, Wang JS, et al: Influence of different convergence angles and tooth preparation heights on the internal adaptation of Cerec crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2002;87:248-255
171. Assif D, Antopolski B, Helft M, et al: Comparison of methods of clinical evaluation of the marginal fit of complete cast gold crowns. J Prosthet Dent 1985;54:20-24
172. Boening K, Reppel PD, Walter M: Non-cast titanium restorations in fixed prosthodontics. J Oral Rehabil 1992;19:281-287
173. Bindl A, Mörmann WH: Clinical and SEM evaluation of all-ceramic chair-side CAD/CAM generated partial crowns. Eur J Oral Sci 2003;111:163-169
174. Reich S, Uhlen S, Gozdowski S, et al: Measurement of cement thickness under lithium disilicate crowns using an impression material technique. Clin Oral Investig 2010;15:521-526
175. Reich S, Wichmann M, Nkenke E, et al: Clinical fit of all-ceramic three-unit fixed partial dentures, generated with three different CAD/CAM systems. Eur J Oral Sci 2005;113:174-179
176. Boening K, Wolf BH, Schmidt AE: Clinical fit of Procera AllCeram crowns. J Prosthet Dent 2000;84:419-424
177. Kokubo Y, Tsumita M, Kano T, et al: Clinical marginal and internal gaps of zirconia all-ceramic crowns. J Prosthodont Res 2011;55:40-43
178. Beschnidt SM, Strub JR: Evaluation of the marginal accuracy of different all-ceramic crown systems after simulation in the artificial mouth. J Oral Rehabil 1999;26:582-593
179. Kern M, Schaller H, Strub JR: Marginal fit of restorations before and after cementation in vivo. Int J Prosthodont 1993;6:585-591
180. Syrek A, Reich G, Ranftl D, et al: Clinical evaluation of all-ceramic crowns fabricated from intraoral digital impressions based on the principle of active wavefront sampling. J Dent 2010;38:553-559
181. Komine F, Gerds T, Witkowski S, et al: Influence of framework configuration on the marginal adaptation of zirconium dioxide ceramic anterior four-unit frameworks. Acta Odontol Scand 2005;63:361-366
182. Good M, Mitchell C, Pintado M, et al: Quantification of all-ceramic crown margin surface profile from try-in to 1-week post-cementation. J Dent 2009;37:65-75
183. Limkangwalmongkol P, Chiche GJ, Blatz MB: Precision of fit of two margin designs for metal-ceramic crowns. J Prosthodont 2007;16:233-237
184. Limkangwalmongkol P, Kee E, Chiche GJ, et al: Comparison of marginal fit between all-porcelain margin versus alumina-supported margin on Procera alumina crowns. J Prosthodont 2009;18:162-166
185. Tao J, Yoda M, Kimuraa K, et al: Fit of metal ceramic crowns cast in Au-1.6 wt% Ti alloy for different abutment finish line curvature. Dent Mater 2006;22:397-404
186. Mitchell CA, Pintado MR, Douglas WH: Nondestructive, in vitro quantification of crown margins. J Prosthet Dent 2001;85:575-584
187. Clark MT, Richards MW, Meiers JC: Seating accuracy and fracture strength of vented and nonvented ceramic crowns luted with three cements. J Prosthet Dent 1995;74:18-24
188. Piemjai M: Effect of seating force, margin design, and cement on marginal seal and retention of complete metal crowns. Int J Prosthodont 2001;14:412-416
189. Borba M, Cesar P, Griggs J, et al: Adaptation of all-ceramic fixed partial dentures. Dent Mater 2011;27:1119-1126
190. Rungruanganunt P, Kelly RJ, Adams D: Two imaging techniques for 3-D quantification of pre-cementation space for CAD/CAM crowns. J Dent 2010;38:995-1000
191. Rahme HY, Tehini GE, Adib SM, et al: In vitro evaluation of "replica technique" in the measurement of the fit of Procera crowns. J Contemp Dent Pract 2008;9:25-32
192. Shearer B, Gough MB, Setchell DJ: Influence of marginal configuration and porcelain addition on the fit of In-Ceram crowns. Biomaterials 1996;17:1891-1895
193. Tsitrou EA, Northeast SE, Noort R: Evaluation of the marginal fit of three margin designs of resin composite crowns using CAD/CAM. J Dent 2007;35:68-73
194. Tjan AH, Li T, Logan G, et al: Marginal accuracy of complete crowns made from alternative casting alloys. J Prosthet Dent 1991;66:157-164
195. Schmalz G, Federlin M, Reich E: Effect of dimension of luting space and luting composite on marginal adaptation of a class II ceramic inlay. Int J Prosthodont 1995;11:333-339
196. Laurent M, Scheer P, Dejou J, et al: Clinical evaluation of the marginal fit of cast crowns-validation of the silicone replica method. J Oral Rehabil 2008;35:116-122
197. DeHoff PH, Anusavice KJ: Effect of metal design on marginal distortion of metal-ceramic crowns. J Dent Res 1984;63:1327-1331