-

2000 12

-

2000 12











2000 12

		 	 	1	
•		 	 	4	
1.	• • •	 	 	••••• 4	
2.		 	 	•••••4	
•		 	 	8	
		 	 	•••••12	
		 	 	18	
		 	 	20	
		 	 	· · · · · · · · 22	
		 	 	23	

Table 1.	Names, numbers and characteristics of each groups · · · · ·	4
Fig. 1	Diagrams of longitudinally sectioned tooth showing cavity shapes	
	(shadowed) and schematic orientation of dentinal tubules to the	
	class cavity surfaces	5
Table 2.	Chemical components and instructions for use of the dentin	
	bonding systems used in this study	5
Table 3.	Inter-observer correlations of each groups, materials, and	
	parameters · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8
Table 4.	Scores(Mean $\pm$ SD) of resin tag penetration in pulpal floor of class	
	cavities. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	9
Fig. 2	Comparison of resin tag penetration into dentinal tubules. $\cdot$ · ·	9
Table 5	$Scores(Mean \pm SD)$ of the uniformity of the whole bonded	
	interfaces in Class cavities · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10
Fig. 3	Comparison of uniformity of the bonded layers	10
Table 6	$(Mean \pm SD)$ of blisters and porosities in the class	
	cavity corners	11
Fig. 4	Comparison of the formation of blister and porosity in the class	
	cavity corners	11

Fig. 5.1-5.5	Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic(CLSM) images
	at resin-dentin interfaces in pulpal floor of class cavity
	used for scoring the resin tag penetrations. Original
	magnification $\times 200 \cdots 23$
Fig. 6.1-6.5	Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic(CLSM) images
	at class cavity resin-dentin interfaces used for scoring the
	uniformity of the whole adhesive layer. Original magnification
	<b>×</b> 50 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Fig. 7.1-7.5	Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic(CLSM) images
	at class cavity corners(inner line angle) used for scoring
	the formation of blisters and porosities. Original magnification
	× 200 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

가 가가 30 . 2 3mm , 15 , ONE COAT . BOND(OCB) Syntac Sprint(SS), Scotchbond

\_

\_

-

multi-purpose(SBMP)

(rhodamine B) ,

. , , 가 가 0-4 가 , , ; 1. , 가 . 2. , SBMP OCB

,

.

,

,

# SBMP OCB 가 SS

. 3. , OCB7F SS

4.

SS가 SBMP

,

<sup>: , - ,</sup> , , .

1

, smear layer .<sup>1,2)</sup> 가 - (hybrid layer)



.

가

가

-

, 2 30 7ト4

<Table 1>

3

•

<T able 1> Names, numbers and characteristics of each group.

	Class	cavity
Group name		
n	15	15
Characteristics	Wet-bonding technique	Dry-bonding technique

ONE COAT BOND(OCB, Coltène<sup>®</sup>, Switzerland), Syntac<sup>®</sup> Sprint<sup>TM</sup>(SS, VIVADENT, Liechtenstein),

Scotchbond<sup>™</sup> Multi-Purpose(SBMP, 3M Dental Products, St. Paul, MN, USA) (Table 2).

,

2.

가.

,

handpiece cylindrical diamond bur 7, , 3mm7; (Figure 1). 7; 0.1% rhodamine B<sup>®</sup>(Aldrich Chem Co., Milw, WI, USA) . <Table 2>

- 4 -

1.



<Figure 1> Diagram of longitudinally sectioned tooth showing cavity shapes (shadowed) and schematic orientation of dentinal tubules to the class cavity surfaces.

<Table 2> Chemical components and instructions for use of the dentin bonding systems used in this study

Systems	LO	Т#	Compositions	Manufacturers ' instructions
Scotchbond <sup>™</sup> Multi-Purpose	etchant	9KR	10% maleic acid, water, polyvinyl alcohol thickener	etching 15s, rinsing 15s air-drying 10s
(3M, St Paul MN)	primer	9XB	HEMA, water, polyalkenoate copolymer	apply primer apply adhesive
	adhesive	8KT	Bis-GMA, HEMA	light curing 20s
ONE COAT BOND (Coltène <sup>®</sup> )	etchant adhesive	П649 П649	15% phosphoric acid HEMA, HPMA, Glycerol dimethacrylate, polyalkenoate methacrlized, UDMA, amorphous silica	etching 30s, rinsing 20s air-drying (removing excess moisture) apply adhesive(massage) 20s gentle air-thinning light curing 30s
Syntac <sup>®</sup> Sprint <sup>™</sup> (VIVADENT)	etchant adhesive	B20862 B17725	37% phosphoric acid HEMA, MMPAA, maleic acid, fluoride compound, water, acetone	etching 15s, rinsing 20s air-drying (removing excess moisture) apply adhesive 10s gentle air-thinning after 15s light curing 20s



. , 7ł 24 7ł,

.

Minitome<sup>®</sup>(Struers, Denmark) low-speed diamond saw

600grit silicone carbide paper5. Slide glassmountingBio-Rad MRC 600 confocal argon-crypton laser(Glattbrugg, Switzerland)?Leica<sup>Co.</sup> DMRBE microscope(Hidelberg, Germany). RhodamineB(ex. DD 488/568nm, em. LP 590nm)PL Fluotar 20×/0.50,5×/0.12?10×, TCS NTsystem(Hidelberg, Germany).

50

, 200

Fujix Pictography 3000 digital printer(Fuji, Tokyo, Japan)

가

가

가 가

0-4

- 6 -

가,	0-4				
(1)		(penet)			
		tag			0
4		(Figure 5.1-5.5)	,		
가 가		(200) 7	'F		
(2)	(u	nifo)			
		-			,
	0	4			
(Figure 6.1-6.5)	,	가 가			
-	(50 ) 가	· .			
(3)		(poros)			
				0	4
	(Fi	gure 7.1-7.5)	,		가
가		(200)	가		
가		가			

, ア		
가 5 가	가	
t-test		, one-way

ANOVA Tukey's multiple comparison test

.

1. 가

5 7 7 7 , 52.70% (Table 3).

•

<Table 3> Inter-observer correlations of each groups, materials, and parameters

Group	Dentin bonding systems	Parameter	Reliability (%)
	SBMP	penet	93.74
(wet bonding)		unifo	93.94
		p oros	59.41
	OC	penet	91.46
		unifo	79.56
		p oros	54.70
	SS	penet	68.49
		unifo	64.29
		p oros	69.71
	SBMP	penet	85.58
dry bonding)		unifo	62.84
		poros	66.18
	OC	penet	52.70
		unifo	65.23
		p oros	60.81
	SS	penet	65.71
		un <b>i</b> f o	58.82
		p oros	52.63

penet : resin penetration into dentinal tubules.

unifo : uniformity of bonded layers.

poros : blisters and porosities in cavity corners.

2. 가

									/			
		가						<	Table	4>	<ta< td=""><td>ble</td></ta<>	ble
6>, <fi< td=""><td>g. 2&gt;</td><td><f< td=""><td>ig. 4&gt;</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></f<></td></fi<>	g. 2>	<f< td=""><td>ig. 4&gt;</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></f<>	ig. 4>									
(1)					(Table	4, Fig	g. 2)					
SBI	MP	OCB	,	(		)	tag		가	(		)
		(p<0.	05).	(		)	SE	BMP	OCB		tag	
가	SS			(p<0.0	5).	(		)			가	
SBMP	OCI	3	tag	7	' SS		(p	< 0.05)	).			

-

•

<Table 4> Scores(Mean ± SD) of resin tag penetration in pulpal floor of class cavities.

Croup	Material						
Group	SBMP	OC	SS				
(wet)	$2.84 \pm 0.99$	$3.08 \pm 0.91$	$0.48 \pm 0.51$				
(dry)	1.96±0.93	$2.16 \pm 0.94$	0.64 ± 0.57				

Comparison among the groups: t-test,  $p{<}0.05$ 



<Figure 2> Comparison of resin tag penetration into dentinal tubules. Asterisk(\*) means statistically significant differences (p<0.05).

(2) (Table 5, Fig. 3) -가 SS ) OCB ( -(p<0.05). SBMP OCB ( ) -가 ( )

.

<Table 5> Scores(Mean ± SD) of the uniformity of the whole bonded interfaces in Class cavities.

Croup	Material					
Group	SBMP	OC	SS			
(wet)	$2.52 \pm 1.00$	2.84 ± 0.69	$2.16 \pm 0.69$			
(dry)	$2.12 \pm 0.73$	$2.52 \pm 0.71$	$2.24 \pm 0.78$			

Comparison among the groups: t-test, p<0.05



<Figure 3> Comparison of uniformity of the bonded layers. Asterisk(\*) means the statistically significant differences (p<0.05).



- 10 -

<Table 6> Scores(Mean ± SD) of blisters and porosities in class cavity corners.

a		Material	
Group	SBMP	OC	SS
(wet)	$2.00 \pm 0.76$	$2.16 \pm 0.47$	$2.08 \pm 0.81$
(dry)	$2.32 \pm 0.75$	$2.36 \pm 0.95$	$2.96 \pm 0.84$

Comparison among the groups: t-test, p<0.05



<Figure 4> Scores of blister and porosity in the cavity corners. Asterisk(\*) means statistically significant differences(p<0.05).

## in vitro

•

•

•

--. , . 2

, アト <sup>5)</sup>. アト ,

· , . <sup>11)</sup>. Maseki

> tag 가, <sup>12)</sup>. tag가

. 가 가

,





가

.

Syntac Sprint 가 Ferrari가 가 Syntac Sprint tag, 17) Syntac Sprint . acetone water acetone 'water-chaser' , . methacrylate monomer 가 re-wetting Syntac Sprint water . , acetone base Syntac original 18) 가 Syntac Sprint . 가 가 가 Scotchbond Multi-Purpose7 Syntac Sprint Scotchbond 가 Multi-Purpose , ONE COAT BOND , Syntac Sprint Scotchbond Multi-Purpose 가 가 , Scotchbond Multi-Purpose , 가 w ater \_ 10 가 \_ 가 acetone Syntac Sprint . Scotchbond Multi-Purpose 가 5,19) water base 가 15,20,21) , Scotchbond Multi-Purpose 가 water-base 10). Scotchbond Multi-Purpose 가 가 18) 가 , air-thinning , 1 . 가 가 tag , 가 가 . ONE COAT BOND Scotchbond Multi-Purpose ONE COAT Syntac Sprint 가 가 BOND silica , 가 20 가 , 가 ONE COAT BOND air-thinning

가

- 15 -

•

# , ONE COAT BOND

,



## ONE COAT BOND

.

,

가		Scotchbond	Multi-Purpose		
	19)				
,				가	

가

,



,



•



.

Eick JD. et al. The dentinal surface : Its influence on dentinal adhesion,
 Part ., Quintessence Int, 24:571-582, 1993.

2. Pashley DH et al. Permeability of dentin to adhesive agents, Quintessence Int, 24:618-631, 1993.

3. Van Meerbeek B, Braem M, Lambrechts P, Vanherle G. Morphological characterization of the interface between resin and sclerotic dentine. J Dent 22:141-146, 1994.

4. Schupbach P, Krejci I, Lutz F. Dentin bonding: effect of tubule orientation on hybrid layer formation, Eur J Oral Sci, 105:344-352, 1997.

5. Watson TF, De Wilmot DM. A confocal microscopic evaluation of the interface between Syntac adhesive and tooth tissue. J Dent 20:302-310, 1992..

6. Kanca J. Resin bonding to wet substrate. I. Bonding to dentin. Quint Int 23:39-41, 1992.

7. Vargas MA, Swift EJ Microleakage of resin composites with wet Vs dry bonding. Am J Dent 7:187-189, 1994.

8. Saunders WP ,Saunders EM. Microleakage of bonding agents with wet and dry bonding techniques. Am J Dent 9:34-36, 1996.

9. Santini A, Mitchell S. Effect of wet and dry bonding techniques on marginal leakage. Am J Dent 11:219-224, 1998.

10. Van Meerbeek B. et al. A TEM study of two water-based adhesive systems bonded to dry and wet dentin. J Dent Res 77(1):50-59, 1998.

11. Watson TF. Application of confocal scanning optical microscopy to dentistry. Brit Dent J 9:287-291, 1991.

12. Maseki T, Suda S, Okuyama C. Observation of the resin-dentin interface using CLSM. IADR Abst. #1435, 1998.

13. Gwinnett AJ. Moist Vs dry dentin: Its effect on shear bond strength. Am J Dent 5:318-320, 1992.

14. Kanca J. Wet bonding: Effect of drying time and distance. Am J Dent 9:273-276, 1996.

15. De Goes MF. Pachane GC. Garcia-Godoy F. Resin bond strength with different methods to remove excess water from the dentin. American Journal of Dentistry. 10(6):298-301, 1997 Dec.

16. Swift EJ, Bayne SC. Shear bond strength of a new one-bottle dentin adhesive. Am J Dent. 10:184-188, 1997.

17. Ferrari M. Goracci G. Garcia-Godoy F. Bonding mechanism of three "one-bottle" systems to conditioned and unconditioned enamel and dentin. American Journal of Dentistry. 10(5):224-30, 1997 Oct.

18. Santini A. Microleakage of resin-based composite restorations using different solvent-based bonding agents and methods of drying acid-etched dentin. American Journal of Dentistry. 12(4):194-200, 1999 Aug.

19. Prati C, Chersoni S, Moniorgi R, Pashley DH. Resin-infiltrated dentin layer formation of new bonding systems. Operative Dentistry. 23: 185-194, 1998.

20. ,

#### . 25(2):180-192, 2000.

21. Tay FR. Gwinnett AJ. Wei SH. The overwet phenomenon: an optical micromorphological study of surface moisture in the acid conditioned resin-dentin interface. American Journal of Dentistry. 9:43-48, 1996.

Fig. 5.1-5.5 Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic (CLSM) images at resin-dentin interfaces in pulpal floor of class cavity used for scoring the resin tag penetrations. Original magnification × 200 (R: resin filling, D: dentin) · · · · · 23 5.1. Score 0., 5.2. Score 1., 5.3. Score 2., 5.4. Score 3., 5.5. Score 4.

- Fig. 6.1-6.5 Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic (CLSM) images at class cavity resin-dentin interfaces used for scoring the uniformity of the whole adhesive layer. Original magnification × 50 (R: resin filling, D: dentin) · · 24 6.1. Score 0., 6.2. Score 1., 6.3. Score 2., 6.4. Score 3., 6.5. Score 4.
- Fig. 7.1-7.5 Standard confocal laser scanning microscopic (CLSM) images at class cavity corners (inner line angle) used for scoring the formation of blisters and porosities. Original magnification × 200 (R: resin filling, D: dentin) · · · · · 25
  7.1. Score 0., 7.2. Score 1., 7.3. Score 2.,
  7.4. Score 3., 7.5. Score 4.





<Fig. 5.1>

<Fig. 5.2>







<Fig. 5.4>



<Fig. 5.5>



<Fig. 6.1>





<Fig. 6.3>



<Fig. 6.4>



<Fig. 6.5>



<Fig. 7.1>



<Fig. 7.2>



<Fig. 7.3>



<Fig. 7.4>



<Fig. 7.5>

#### Abstract

# A confocal microscopic study on resin-dentin interfaces in one-bottle adhesive systems bonded to class cavities

Mo Ran Kim, D.D.S., M.S.D.

Department of Dentistry, The Graduate School of Dentistry, Yonsei University (Directed by Professor Sung Ho Park, D.D.S., M.S.D., Ph.D.)

<u>Objective</u>: The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of wet and dry bonding on resin-dentin interfaces of class restoration bonded with two one-bottle dentin bonding systems and one multi-step dentin bonding system using confocal laser scanning microscope(CLSM).

<u>Materials and Methods</u>: Thirty class cavities were prepared from freshly extracted caries-free human teeth. These teeth were divided into two groups based upon the status of remained surface moisture :Group , wet bonding; , dry bonding. Resin-dentin interfaces were produced with two Group one-bottle dentin bonding systems-ONE COAT BOND (OCB; Coltene $^{\mathbb{R}}$ ) and Syntac<sup>®</sup>Sprint<sup>™</sup> (SS; VIVADENT)-and one multi-step dentin bonding system-Scotchbond<sup>™</sup>multi-purpose(SBMP; 3M Dental Products)-as control according to manufacturers' instructions. Cavities were restored with Spectrum<sup>®</sup>(Dentsply). Specimens were immersed in saline for 24 hours and sectioned longitudinally disc. The resin-dentin with а low-speed diamond interfaces were microscopically observed using CLSM. The quality of resin-infiltrated dentin layers were evaluated by five dentists using 0-4 scale.

<u>Results</u>: Confocal laser scanning microscopal investigations using primer labeled with rhodamine B showed that the penetration of the primer occurred

along the cavity margins.

Statistical analysis using one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test revealed that the primer penetration of the group (wet bonding) was more effective than group (dry bonding) in SBMP(p=0.0022) and OCB(p=0.001). In SS there was no significant difference. In the group , the penetration quality and the bonding uniformity of OCB were superior to SS. In the group , the penetration quality of SBMP were superior to SS. And there was no significant difference in the penetration quality, bonding uniformity and the porosity among the other groups or materials.

Key words: one-bottle dentin bonding systems, confocal laser scanning microscopy, resin-dentin interfaces, wet-bonding techniques, overwet phenomenon.