Journal of Carcinogenesis
Covering Genesis to Therapeutics
Journal of Carcinogenesis, ISSN: 1477-3163
2025; Vol 24: Issue 5s, https://carcinogenesis.com/

Clinical Longevity of Direct vs. Indirect Composite Restorations

Mohammed Khalid Makki Al-Hashimi*[1], Rana jihad Abed[2]

[1]Uruk University, College of Dentistry, Department of Conservative Dentistry, Iraq

Email ID: mohammedkhalid1971@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Offering aesthetic, conservative, and functional benefits, composite resin restorations are a popular treatment modality in contemporary dentistry. One of the critical decisions in restorative care is choosing between direct and indirect techniques. This paper evaluates the clinical longevity of these restorations by exploring material properties, technique sensitivity, patient-centered outcomes, failure modes, and cost-effectiveness. Moreover, it examines advances in composite materials and their impact on the durability and success of restoration. On the other hand, Restoration choices should be based on a patient-specific approach, taking into account factors such as oral hygiene, occlusal dynamics, dysfunctional habits, and lesion size. Evidence-based comparisons between direct and indirect composites enable informed decisions and optimal clinical outcomes.

Keywords: *Restorations, computer-aided design, computer-aided manufacturing*

How to Cite: Mohammed Khalid Makki Al-Hashimi, Rana jihad Abed, (2025) Clinical Longevity of Direct vs. Indirect Composite Restorations, *Journal of Carcinogenesis*, *Vol.24, No.5s*, 391-393

1. INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, restorative dentistry has undergone a radical evolution, moving from amalgam and gold fillings to resin-based composite filling systems. Where offer a combination of function, aesthetics, and the natural appearance of the tooth while preserving more of its structure than traditional fillings.

Direct and indirect composite restorations have become the mainstay of conventional dentistry. They are placed and processed in a single dental visit. At the same time, indirect restorations are fabricated outside the mouth, often in a laboratory or using computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) systems, and then cemented into place. Both methods aim to mimic natural teeth in form and function.

Many factors play a significant role in Clinical longevity—the length of time a restoration remains functional and aesthetically acceptable without defect, including operator skill, material choice, patient behavior, and technological developments.

2. DIRECT COMPOSITE RESTORATIONS

2.1 Advantages

- Tooth permanence: only unhealthy tooth structure is removed compared to crowns.
- High efficiency: a single session is sufficient to complete the treatment, which provides patient comfort and reduced costs.
- Gradual repair: fixing the damaged portion of the tooth without the need for complete replacement.
- Color matching: a variety of color shades that match adjacent teeth.
- Immediate placement: ideal for emergencies, such as a tooth fracture.

2.2 Limitations

- Polymerization shrinkage: leads to the appearance of gaps, microscopic leaks, and postoperative sensitivity
- Erosion and discoloration: Due to high load in molars, composite fillings lose their luster and structural integrity.

- Operator dependency: Technique sensitivity may affect the quality and longevity of the filling.
- Low conversion degree: especially in deeper layers Intraoral processing may result in incomplete polymerization.

2.3 Clinical Longevity

Depends on the location of the teeth and the nature of the work performed, as follows

- Posterior teeth: 5-7 years, especially in high-stress areas.
- Anterior teeth and premolars: 7-10 years or more.
- Common defects include discoloration, cracking, secondary caries, and fractures.

On the other hand, using gradual layers, filling materials with enhanced polymerization depth for deep cavities.

3. INDIRECT COMPOSITE RESTORATIONS

3.1 Advantages

- Improved polymerization: improve the degree of conversion through laboratory curing techniques such as light, heat, and pressure.
- Precise fit: Digital scanning and computer-aided design (CAD/CAM) systems improve the accuracy of the restoration.
- Improved mechanical properties: Superior strength and corrosion resistance compared to composites used in clinics.
- Superior esthetics: Often used in smile design or full-mouth rehabilitation due to their translucency and natural luster.

3.2 Limitations

- Multiple visits required: The patient must return for bonding.
- Technically demanding bonding: Bonding processes are complex and sensitive to moisture contamination.
- Higher costs: Laboratory fees and additional time contribute to increased costs.
- Risks of debonding: Improper bonding technique can affect longevity.

3.3 Clinical Longevity

Clinical longevity depends on the location of the teeth and the nature of the work or stress applied to them, including:

- Posterior restorations: Average survival ranges from 7 to 12 years.
- Failure modes: These include loss of bonding, marginal leakage, fractures, or discoloration over time.

Clinical view: Indirect composite fillings with good bonding in non-stress-bearing areas can last as long as ceramic fillings, with the added advantage of being easy to repair.

4. FACTORS INFLUENCING LONGEVITY

Factor	Direct composite	Indirect composite
Occlusal load	Moderate resistance	High resistance
Moisture control	Essential	Critical
Operator skill	High influential	Consistent outcomes
Caries risk	Recurrence possible	Lower due to better seal
Flexural strength	-100MPa	-150-200MPa
Degree of conversion	-60-70%	-85-90%

Additional factors include patient habits (e.g., bruxism), oral hygiene, diet (acidic foods), and bite forces. 5. Technological Developments and Future Outlook

4.1 Bulk-Fill Composites Designed to be placed in thicker increments (up to 4–5 mm), reducing chair time and polymerization stress.

4.2 CAD/CAM Indirect Composites Digital systems allow precise fabrication using materials like Lava Ultimate and Cerasmart.

4.3 Nanohybrid and Nanofilled Composites Nano-fillers improve polishability, strength, and aesthetics, suitable for both anterior and posterior use.

4.4 Bioactive Composites Ion-releasing materials support remineralization and help prevent recurrent caries.

5. DECISION-MAKING CONSIDERATIONS

Success depends on individualized planning. Consider:

- Tooth location (anterior/posterior)
- Cavity size and depth
- Patient hygiene and dietary habits
- Aesthetic demand
- Time and cost constraints

Example Scenarios:

- Small Premolar Cavity: Direct
- Fractured Molar Cusp: Indirect Onlay
- Smile Makeover: Indirect Veneers or Composites

6. CLINICAL STUDIES AND EVIDENCE-BASED OUTCOMES

- Opdam et al. (2007): Class II direct composites showed 78% survival at 10 years.
- Frankenberger et al. (2008): Indirect composites reached 91% survival in low-stress areas.

Common Failures:

- Direct: Secondary caries, marginal breakdown.
- Indirect: Debonding, fracture.

7. CONCLUSION

Direct and indirect composites offer distinct advantages depending on clinical context. Direct options are ideal for small restorations with budget/time constraints. Indirect composites provide superior performance in extensive or esthetic cases.

Material innovation, especially with nano and bioactive technologies, continues to bridge the gap between the two. Clinicians must tailor treatments to each patient while staying updated on evolving evidence.

REFERENCES

[1] Opdam NJ, et al. (2007). "Longevity of posterior composite restorations: a systematic review." Dent Mater.
[2] Frankenberger R, et al. (2008). "Indirect composite restorations: a review of the literature." J Adhes Dent.
[3] https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27523636
[4] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/PMC5852929
[5] https://www.thejcdp.com/doi/10.5005/jcdp-11-3-25
[6] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/PMC3010022
[7] https://www.nature.com/articles/_6401237
[8] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/Comparison_of_Direct_and_Indirect_Resin_Co mposites.
[9] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dental_composite