

Patients preference's in different types of esthetic treatment

Shahid Ali Wani¹, Ajmal Mir^{2*}, Mehnaz Rajab³

¹ Postgraduate Student, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Sardar Patel Postgraduate Institute of Dental and Medical Sciences, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

² MDS, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Government Dental College, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir

³ BDS, MR Ambedkar Dental College and Hospital, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Aim: Dental cosmetics have always had a large-scale impact on an individual's social life. A variety of dental treatment regimens ranging from composite resins to ceramics are available to enhance the oral aesthetic appearance.

Materials and Methods: The present study aimed to identify the preferred dental cosmetic treatment regimen used in department of Conservative and Endodontics. The sample included 434 patients, who were asked to mention their preferred aesthetic treatment. A close-ended, pre-designed questionnaire was used to collect the data. The questionnaire was made using the survey monkey which was distributed to the study participants using social networking sites like Whatsapp and E-mail. The response data were analyzed using SPSS.

Results: Out of 434 respondents included in the study, 140 were males and 294 were females. The majority of the participants had taken some form of esthetic dental treatment (n=230); of these composite buildups were the most common (n= 132), followed by bleaching (n=84), veneers (n=31) and pre-press veneers (lumineers) (n=11).

Conclusion: A significant proportion of participants preferred taking permanent treatment over the temporary treatment regimens.

Keywords: aesthetic treatment, bleaching, veneers, whitening

Introduction

Every individual aspires to have the best appearance for their lifetime. There are several options available for aesthetic treatments; professionals have alternatives ranging from composite resins to ceramics. In the past, the composite resin was the material of choice for cosmetic and conservative procedures [1]. Low durability and need for constant maintenance led the search for a better aesthetic option [2]. Porcelain is an outstanding option to avoid the numerous deficiencies of composite resin, and it significantly mimics the natural structure of dental foundations [3]. When properly made in accordance with a precise clinical protocol, porcelain restorations have a long clinical life. Nowadays, development in adhesive technologies has made possible a variety of more conservative restoration techniques [2, 4]. One among them was the minimal or virtually no preparation veneers. But the lack of clarity regarding the extent of veneer preparation creates miscommunication with patients and also within the dental profession [5, 6].

Numerous bleaching modalities are available for dental treatment like in-office bleaching, at-home bleaching, over-the-counter or combination technique either on vital or non-vital teeth [7, 8]. In-office bleaching is usually done using different concentrations of hydrogen peroxide bleaching agent (15 %, 30%, or 35 %) either heated or none heated. Protection of soft tissue by using gingival dam gel is mandatory to avoid burning of gum. The merits of this technique are that it shows faster results and not having to wear the tray as in as at-home bleaching [9, 10]. In-home bleaching, dentist needs to take impression of teeth which is sent to laboratory to obtain a model. A special custom tray

made of plastic (night guard) is used, on to which 10% carbamide peroxide (ADA), or 6%, to 15% hydrogen peroxide is applied [9, 12]. *Combination treatment* refers to the use of both techniques; in-office followed by at-home bleaching for 5 days for better results which also reduces chair time [9].

Failure in esthetic treatments has been reported in recent years. In a 12 years retrospective survey, the most common complication noted (48%) was fracture [13, 15]. It is an ultra-thin technique which allows the dentists to remove only 0.3mm of tooth structure [16]. A meta-analysis published in 2013 reported that the preparation design determines the outcome of the treatment [17]. To gain high aesthetic and functional restorations, the mechanical resistance of porcelain veneers is of great importance [19, 20]. The longevity and the success of the porcelain veneers depend on better stress distribution [21, 23]. Very few studies have focused on the impact of the preparation design, on the success and durability of the restoration, and at the same time, there are some very controversial results [24, 25]. The success of anterior indirect restoration depends on proper treatment planning and application of the operative protocol [27].

Ceramic veneers involving the incisal edge, proximal areas and larger parts of the palatal surface have been recognized as an alternative to full crowns in the anterior dentition [28, 29].

In the direct veneering technique, the composite resin is applied directly to tooth structure and artistically scalped to correct color and contour defects [30, 31]. The successful aesthetic and functional results are dependent primarily on the operator's understanding of adhesive technology and the

components of color, including their relationship to natural tooth structure and composite resin restorative materials [32, 34]. The aim of this study was to analyze the preferences of the patients towards aesthetic treatments and to identify potential factors influencing their choices.

Materials and Methods

A cross-sectional questionnaire study was designed in GDC, Srinagar, to evaluate patient's preferences towards aesthetic treatment in department of conservative dentistry and endodontics. This was a cross-sectional study done on patients above 18 years of age.

A pilot study was conducted on 20 patients to assess the reliability of the questionnaire. This was tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A definitive questionnaire was then prepared, which was sent to all the participants. Variables elicited were satisfaction with dental esthetics, cause of dissatisfaction, any previous dental esthetic treatment experience, type of treatment obtained and preference and any complications faced during or after the treatment.

The study was conducted between February 2019 to July 2019 for six consecutive months, employing a convenient sampling technique, selecting both males and females. Individuals below 18 years were not included in the study.

The empirical sample size determination was employed to determine the sample size, which came up to 390. Considering a non-response rate of 10%, a sample of 434 was finalized for the study. The questionnaire was sent along with photos sent through emails.

A five-point Likert scale was used to evaluate attitude related questions in evaluating perception of patients ranging from 0 being most negative and 4 ratings to be most positive.

The data so obtained was transferred to spreadsheets and analyzed using SPSS 19.0 version. A chi-square test was used to evaluate patient's perceptions towards dental esthetic therapy.

Results

The sample comprised of 434 respondents (140 males and 294 females). A 100% response rate was obtained. The sample had significantly more Saudis (n=421) compared to non-Saudis (n=13) (Chi-Square 63.21, $p < 0.001$). The sample comprised mainly of individuals in the 18-25 age group and 26-35 age group, including both males and females (Table 1). There was no significant difference noted in the numbers of males and females in either age group or nationality. The overall satisfaction score was 2.36 (SD +/- 1.3). There was no significant difference between the satisfaction scores of the males and females (Table 1).

The majority of the population had taken some form of esthetic dental treatment (n=230). Of these, composite buildup was the most common (n=132), followed by bleaching (n=84), veneers (n=31) and pre-press veneers (lumineers) (n=11). The majority of the surveyed population preferred permanent treatment (n=304) to temporary treatment (n=33). There was no significant difference between males and females in their experience of dental treatment (Table 3).

There were no significant differences in the incidence or pattern of complications between males and females. (Table 4)

Discussion

Out of the 434 subjects investigated, 67.7% were females and 32.2% males. Respondents were divided into four age groups for the sake of analysis. The first group was between 18-25 years constituting 30.4%, the second group was between 26-35 years making 32.7%, the third group was between 26-35 years forming 32.7% and the last group was more than 45 years which formed 17.1% of the sample. Based on the study results, 56.7% (246 of subjects) of participants were not satisfied with their own smile for the following reasons: 42.7% (105 subjects) complained of dental stains; 25.2% (62 subjects) complained of malposition of teeth, 5.7% (25 subjects) had some kind of tooth loss, 4.1% (18 subjects) had fractured tooth and 8.3% of subjects cited other reasons like diastema, calculus or gum problem. In this study, percentage of study population who were dissatisfied with their esthetics was higher than studies of REU in KSA conducted by Aldaij *et al.* [36] in which 44.5% of 1147 subjects were not satisfied with dental appearance, 42.7% of 1014 subjects dental school in Ankara, Turkey in the study of Akarslan *et al.* [37] were dissatisfied with teeth appearance, and 38.4% of 1129 subjects who were not satisfied with their smile in a study conducted by Majed *et al.* [38] The same findings were reported in yet another study conducted in Tamil Nadu, India by Arul mani *et al.* [39] wherein, 31% of 206 subjects were not confident with their smile [39].

Most of the studies conducted in this regard were consistent with our study findings of obtaining no significant difference between esthetic satisfaction scores between males and females. The Likert scale was chosen to evaluate the response owing to its ease of use.

In our sample, 29.1% reported that they suffered from some sort of complication following their aesthetic treatment. This number represents a much higher percentage in comparison with the majority of previous studies, where the reported complications ranged from 4%-7% [40, 44, 49]. The higher complication rate in our sample could be explained by many factors that were not assessed in our study, and have been shown to have significant effect on the outcome of the treatment. Those factors include the design of the restoration, proper dental preparation, the use of conventional treatment as opposed to the all-ceramic restorations, type of ceramics, the experience of the operators, and bruxism habits [40, 41, 46, 48]. Another aspect of the complications that were not assessed was their timing after the treatment because it has been reported that failures increase from 5% at 5 years and remain well under 10% at 10-13 years [48]. Lastly, many studies assessing the survival of the restorations and the complications rate do differentiate between failures such as fractures, and complications such as hypersensitivity [40, 41, 49]. Almost half of the reported complications in our sample were due to hypersensitivity 53.1%, followed by bad odor 31%, swelling 18.6%, broken or fallen down 17.9% and lastly followed by bleeding in 17.2%. In a previous study, sensitivity was experienced by patients only in the first 2 weeks [44], and the rest of the complications needed further questioning to clarify their effect on the treatment.

71.8% of our study participants recommended the use of dental esthetic treatment. This is in concordance with the reported increasing trend of using veneers [52]. Although previous national studies reported low knowledge and awareness of veneers [50-51], 86.9% of our sample chose

veneers as a favorite choice for esthetic treatment. The study result gives an overall view of the patient's perception of dental esthetic treatment but has to be interpreted with caution because it does not represent the whole population of this age group.

Conclusion

Based on the results that were obtained from our research, we concluded that majority of the participant's preferred permanent treatment over the temporary one; unlike for prep-less veneer which got very few responses. A greater number of female participants got aesthetic treatments than male participants. A major proportion of the sample (n=188) did not specify their reason for dissatisfaction (n=188).

References

1. Agustín-Panadero R, Solá-Ruíz MF. Vertical preparation for fixed prosthesis rehabilitation in the anterior sector. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2015; 114(4):474-8.
2. Coldea A, Swain MV, Thiel N. Mechanical properties of polymer-infiltrated-ceramic work materials. *Dent Mater*. 2013; 29(4):419-26.
3. Gürel G. Porcelain laminate veneers: minimal tooth preparation by design. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2007; 51(2):419-31.
4. Javaheri D. Considerations for planning esthetic treatment with veneers involving no or minimal preparation. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2007; 138(3):331-7.
5. Spitzangel FA, Horvath SD, Guess PC, Blatz MB. Resin bond to indirect composite and new ceramic/polymer materials: a review of the literature. *J Esthet Restor Dent*. 2014; 26(6):382-93.
6. Spear F, Holloway J. Which all-ceramic system is optimal for anterior for anterior esthetics? *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2008; (Suppl 139):19S-24S.
7. Leonard RH, Jr., Smith LR, Garland GE, Tiwana KK, Zaidel LA, Pugh G, Jr., *et al*. Evaluation of side effects and patients' perceptions during tooth bleaching. *Journal of esthetic and restorative dentistry: official publication of the American Academy of Esthetic Dentistry [et al]*. 2007; 19(6):355-64; discussion 65-6.
8. Greenwall-Cohen J, Greenwall LH. The single discoloured tooth: vital and non-vital bleaching techniques. *British dental journal*. 2019; 226(11):839-49.
9. Kihn PW. Vital tooth whitening. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2007; 51(2):319-31, viii.
10. Martini EC, Parreiras SO, Szesz AL, Coppla FM, Loguercio AD, Reis A. Bleaching-induced tooth sensitivity with application of a desensitizing gel before and after in-office bleaching: a triple-blind randomized clinical trial. *Clinical oral investigations*. 2019.
11. Martini EC, Parreiras SO, Acuna ED, Loguercio AD, Reis A. Does the Use of Reservoirs Have Any Impact on the Efficacy of At-Home Bleaching? A Systematic Review. *Brazilian dental journal*. 2019; 30(3):285-94.
12. LD, Cabirta Melon P, Garcia Sartal A, Rios Sousa I, Alonso de la Pena V. Influence of treatment duration on the efficacy of at-home bleaching with daytime application: a randomized clinical trial. *Clinical oral investigations*, 2018.
13. ZARoNe F, LeoNe R, Di Mauro MI, Ferrari M, SoRRenTiNo R. No- preparation ceramic veneers: a systematic review. *Journal of Osseointegration*. 2018; 10(1):17-22.
14. Schmidt KK, Chiayabutr Y, Phillips KM, Kojs JC. Influence of preparation design and existing condition of tooth structure on load to failure of ceramic laminate veneers. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2011; 105(6):374-82.
15. Gurel G, Sesma N, Calamita MA, Coachman C, Morimoto S. Influence of enamel preservation on failure rates of porcelain laminate veneers. *International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry*, 2013, 33(1).
16. Radz GM. Minimum thickness anterior porcelain restorations. *Dental Clinics of North America*. 2011; 55(2):353-70.
17. da Costa DC, Coutinho M, de Sousa AS, Ennes JP. A meta-analysis of the most indicated preparation design for porcelain laminate veneers. *J Adhes Dent*. 2013; 15(3):215-0.
18. Hong N, Yang H, Li J, Wu S, Li Y. Effect of Preparation Designs on the Prognosis of Porcelain Laminate Veneers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Operative dentistry*. 2017; 42(6):E197-213.
19. Calamia JR, The current status of etched porcelain veneer restorations, *J Philipp Dent Assoc*. 1996; 47(4):35-41.
20. De Boever JA, McCall WD Jr, Holden S, Ash MM Jr, Functional occlusal forces: an investigation by telemetry, *J Prosthet Dent*. 1978; 40(3):326-33.
21. Zarone F, Apicella D, Sorrentino R, Ferro V, Aversa R, Apicella A, Influence of tooth preparation design on the stress distribution in maxillary central incisors restored by means of alumina porcelain veneers: a 3D-finite element analysis, *Dent Mater*. 2005; 21(12):1178-88.
22. Alhekeir DF, Al-Sarhan RA, Al Mashaan AF, Porcelain laminate veneers: Clinical survey for evaluation of failure, *Saudi Dent J*. 2014; 26(2):63-7.
23. Borba M, de Araújo MD, de Lima E, Yoshimura HN, Cesar PF, Griggs JA, Della Bona A, Flexural strength and failure modes of layered ceramic structures, *Dent Mater*. 2011; 27(12):1259-66.
24. Seghi RR, Daher T, Caputo A, Relative flexural strength of dental restorative ceramics, *Dent Mater*. 1990; 6(3):181-4.
25. Jones DW. The strength and strengthening mechanisms of dental ceramics. In: Mclean JW, editor. *Dental Ceramics: Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Ceramics*, Chicago: Quintessence; 1983.
26. Turgut S, Bagis B, Ayaz EA, Achieving the desired colour in discoloured teeth, using leucite-based CAD-CAM laminate systems, *J Dent*. 2014; 42(1):68-74.
27. kihn PW, Barnes DM. The clinical evaluation of porcelain veneer: A 48-month clinical evaluation. *J Am Dent Assoc*, 1998; 29:211-221
28. Clyde JS, Gilmour A. Porcelain veneer: A preliminary review. *Br Dent J*, 1998; 164:9-14
29. Peumans M, Van Meerbeek B, Lambrechts P, Vanherle G. Porcelain veneers: a review of the literature. *J Dent*, 2000; 28:163-77.
30. Crispin BJ. Expanding the application of facial ceramic veneers. *J Calif Dent Assoc*, 1993; 21:43-54.
31. Christenses GJ. Veneering of teeth: State of the art. *Dent Clin North Am*, 1985; 29:373-391.
32. Arcari GM, Gil AMD, Baratieri LN, *et al*. Facetas

- estéticas com resinas compostas. *Rev Gaucha Odont*, 1991; 39:103-108.
33. Birnbaum NS. Heat-tempered composite resin laminate veneers in *Current Opinion in Cosmetic Dentistry*, 2nd ed. Philadelphia PA; Current Science, 1994.
34. Albers HF. *Tooth-Colored Restoratives*. Cotati; Alta Books, 1985.
35. Fahi NJ, Denehy GE, Jackson RD. Protocol for predictable restoration of anterior teeth with composite resins. *Pract Periodont and Aesthet Dent*. 1995; 7(8):13-21
36. Aldaj M, Alshehri T, Alzeer A, Alfayez A, Aldrees F, Almuhaya S, *et al*. Patient Satisfaction with Dental Appearance and Treatment Desire to Improve Esthetics. *J Oral Health Comm Dent*. 2018; 12(3): 90-95.
37. Akarslan ZZ, Sadik B, Erten H, Karabulut E. Dental esthetic satisfaction, received and desired dental treatments for improvement of esthetics. *Indian journal of dental research: official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research*. 2009; 20(2):195-200.
38. Majed D A, May AA, Raneem I A. Satisfaction of a Saudi Population with their Smiles. *Adv Dent & Oral Health*, 2017, 3(3).
39. Arulmani Thiyagarajan and Dhasarathi Kumar. "Dental Esthetics: Perception from Future Dental Professionals". *Acta Scientific Dental Sciences*. 2018; 2(4):03-05.
40. Granell-Ruiz M, Fons-Font A, Labaig-Rueda C, Martínez-González A, Román Rodríguez JL, Solá Ruiz MF, *et al*. A clinical longitudinal study 323 porcelain laminate veneers. Period of study from 3 to 11 years. *Population*, 2010, 3:12.
41. Beier US, Kapferer I, Burtscher D, Dumfahrt H. Clinical performance of porcelain laminate veneers for up to 20 years. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*, 2012, 25(1).
42. Burke FT. Survival rates for porcelain laminate veneers with special reference to the effect of preparation in dentin: a literature review. *Journal of esthetic and restorative dentistry*. 2012; 24(4):257-65.
43. Castelnuovo J, Tjan AH, Phillips K, Nicholls JI, Kois JC, of Washington U, of Dentistry S. Fracture load and mode of failure of ceramic veneers with different preparations. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2000; 83(2):171-80.
44. Chen JH, Shi CX, Wang M, Zhao SJ, Wang H. Clinical evaluation of 546 tetracycline-stained teeth treated with porcelain laminate veneers. *Journal of dentistry*. 2005; 33(1):3-8.
45. Fradeani M, Redemagni M, Corrado M. Porcelain laminate veneers: 6-to 12-year clinical evaluation--a retrospective study. *International journal of periodontics & restorative dentistry*. 2005; 25(1).
46. Petridis HP, Zekeridou A, Malliari M, Tortopidis D, Koidis P. Survival of ceramic veneers made of different materials after a minimum follow-up period of five years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Esthet Dent*. 2012; 7(2):138-52.
47. Shaini FJ, Shortall AC, Marquis PM. Clinical performance of porcelain laminate veneers. A retrospective evaluation over a period of 6.5 years. *Journal of oral rehabilitation*. 1997; 24(8):553-9.
48. Land MF, Hopp CD. Survival rates of all-ceramic systems differ by clinical indication and fabrication method. *Journal of Evidence Based Dental Practice*. 2010; 10(1):37-8.
49. Meijering AC, Creugers NH, Roeters FJ, Mulder J. Survival of three types of veneer restorations in a clinical trial: a 2.5-year interim evaluation. *Journal of dentistry*. 1998; 26(7):563-8.
50. Alfouzan A, Al-Sanie AA, Al-Dhafiri RA. Arab Societal Awareness of Dental Veneers. *The journal of contemporary dental practice*. 2018; 19(3):257-61.
51. Asaad RS, Alshwaer AA, Alahmadi SA, Alyamani MH, Alshaeri RM. Awareness of the population about ceramic laminate veneers in Saudi Arabia.
52. Sowmya S, Sunitha S, Dhakshaini MR, Raghavendraswamy KN. Esthetics with veneers: A review. *International Journal of Dental Health Concerns*. 2015; 1(1):1-5.