An Up-to-date Systematic Review of the New Techniques and Treatment Methods in Restorative Dentistry

Waad Mosaad Almugren, Doaa Makki Alharbi

Abstract: Restorative oral treatments today truly encompass all the disciplines that dentistry has to offer in an incorporated inter-disciplinary method to accomplish optimal dental health, function and aesthetics for our patients. That's where our expertise and experience in all aspects of restorative dentistry along with the other disciplines assists us to achieve the best possible long-term outcomes for our patients. Naturally, dental implants, implant dentistry, periodontal treatment, aesthetic dentistry, orthodontics, endodontics, cosmetic dental treatments all play a crucial function in getting the very best outcomes for our patients. Restorative oral treatment may consist of a variety of treatments from tooth bleaching, braces, root treatments, fillings, crowns, bridges, veneers, plastic gum surgery, bone and gum restoring & grafting, and more! Dentistry has quickly developed throughout the last number of years, where innovative techniques have in fact altered the conventional treatment strategies as applications of brand-new oral products supply better outcomes, so the primary objective of this evaluation is to list and separate the New Techniques and Treatment Methods in Restorative Dentistry.

Keywords: Dental treatments, Plastic gum surgery, patients, Treatment Methods, Restorative Dentistry.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dentistry has rapidly developed throughout the last couple of years, where innovative strategies have actually changed the traditional treatment techniques as applications of brand-new oral materials provide much better results. The current century has suddenly required on dentistry a brand-new paradigm concerning expected requirements for modern patient care. Traditional methods and procedures that have actually served the occupation well are being questioned within the context of evidence-based rationales and emerging information/technologies. Within the field of corrective dentistry, the incredible advances in dental materials research study have led to the current schedule of esthetic adhesive repairs, conducting the occupation into the "post-amalgam era" [1]. Clinicians have been using particular requirements to select dental materials i.e. (i) analysis of the problem, (ii) factor to consider of requirement, and (iii) available products and their residential or commercial properties [2]. Resin composites as direct/indirect restorative materials have actually been utilized to re-location missing tooth structure, (e.g. hypoplasia) or as a direct filling product [3,4] .The current pattern towards "minimally intrusive dentistry" and in action to the growing patient demand for esthetic, resin composites are the product of option for the repair of anterior teeth [5] .Throughout the last half century that applications of composites have ended up being so demanding that the customizing of well-bonded, long lasting user interfaces (or 'inter- stages') between the matrix and reinforcement has ended up being a crucial concern. The use of coupling representatives, chemically reactive with matrix and reinforcement, and/or chemical adjustment of the surface areas of one or both constituents has been the most successful ways of chemically bonding the matrix to the encapsulated reinforcement. Generally, the dental composites utilized for direct esthetic remediation consists of generally polymer matrix and dispersed strengthening inorganic filler particles [6] .The advancement of methacrylate monomer, bisphenol-A-glycidyl- methacrylate (Bis-GMA) monomer and dental composites by Bowen [7,8] and their introduction to restorative dentistry was so successful that they were soon accepted as an esthetic filling material [9,10] , nevertheless; their residential or commercial properties are affected by the size and volume of filler particle, the resin composition, the matrix-filler bonding, and the polymerization conditions [11] .Composite restorations and veneers are isotropic, having no particular filler orientation. However, these composites have enhanced particularly in terms of wear, through decrease in size of the filler particles and using fiber fillers [12].

1.1 Concept of fiber reinforced composites:

Fiber enhanced composites (FRCs) are common composite products made of a polymer matrix that is strengthened by great thin fibers. The polymeric matrix, consisting of polymerized monomers, has the function of holding the fibers together in the composite structure. The matrix might affect the compressive strength; interlaminar shear and inplate shear residential or commercial properties, interaction between the matrix and the fiber and flaws in the composite [13,14]

.Numerous production techniques have been used for particles/fibers enhanced polymers, including injection molding [15] , compressive molding [16] , hydrostatic extrusion and self-reinforced (die-drawing) [17,18] .The recently used fibers with their residential or commercial properties are given up Table 1.

Table 1: Types of fibers and their properties

Sr. no.	Fibers	Properties	References
1	Carbon/epoxy	Good fatigue and tensile strength and have increased modulus of elasticity, but they are not esthetically acceptable	[19,20]
2	Polyaramide	Cannot be easily cut or polished and there is difficulty in handling them	[21,22]
3	Ultra High Molecular Weight Polyethylene (UHMWPE)	Poor adhesion with the polymer matrix and thus do not give sufficient strength	[23,24]
4	Glass	Improved adhesion to the polymer matrix with better mechanical properties and also have good esthetic appearance	[12,25–29]

1.2 Glass fiber enhanced composites:

They are amorphous (non-crystalline), homogenous and structurally a three dimensional network of silica, oxygen and other atoms arranged arbitrarily [30] .For oral applications, polycarbonate, polyurethane and acryl base polymers, such as poly-methyl-methacrylate (PMMA) and bisphenol-A glycidyl methacrylate (Bis-GMA) were generally enhanced with glass fibers and are normally dealt with by silane coupling agent to improve chemical bonds in between fiber and polymer matrix [31-37] .The capability of the fiber reinforcement to integrate with the resin composite is important in their effectiveness. The physical qualities of the rein-forced glass fiber based composite and tooth are comparable, for that reason, failure of these composites is less likely compared with resin-based composites. Resin-based composites have inadequate physical residential or commercial properties to allow it to be used for repaired prosthodontic application. Resin impregnated with fibers can be utilized for this purpose, which can be made either in lab with traditional style of tooth preparation or straight at the chair-side. The composition of commercially available enhanced glass fiber oral composites is given up Table 2. These industrial glass fiber strengthened products created for core-build up showed 10% improvement in their physical homes compared to conventional products.

GFRC has gained its application in dentistry and presently it has actually extensively been utilized in fixed-partial denture, endodontic post systems, and orthodontic set retainers. However, the authors might not discover an unique updated evaluation paper which covers the main aspects of reinforced glass fiber dental composites. For that reason, the function of this review is to arrange this subject into its part and offer evidence-based concepts that are sound from an oral point of view. The post concentrates on peer-review just and vital analysis of this material runs out scope. The initial evaluation began with a MEDLINE, Book Chapters, Conference/Symposium's procedures, and PhD Thesis with in-vitro and clinical trial findings search for citations indexed from 1964 to 2014. The search was restricted to dental, biomaterials and materials journals and all citations were collected and duplicates were discarded. Wherever possible the complete texts of papers were acquired from the journals. Where it was not possible to get a particular journal, the abstracts, where available digitally were taken a look at. Therefore the addition criteria for posts were: (i) glass fiber strengthened resin composites and their applications with respect to dentistry. We included lab based analysis, in-vitro and in-vivo testing with clinical trials on enhanced glass fiber dental restorative composites. (ii) All papers in a foreign language where an abstract in English was offered. Literature not published in commonly readily available, refereed journals or in a foreign language was not examined though any place possible an abstract was sought for these. The gray literature, that is details not reported in the regular scientific literature, was rejected. Referrals in documents were inspected and cross-matched with those from the original MEDLINE search. Where extra referrals were discovered which satisfied the addition requirements, these were included in the review. For addition in this evaluation, an article had to fulfill the following requirements: Articles falling out of the scope of dental applications including fiber reinforcement in other oral products such as glass ionomer cements, impression products, oral implant abutments, crowns, orthopedic applications and product sciences were omitted. After application of the search technique, two inspectors evaluated the titles and abstracts of the articles and carried out the choice by consensus with the goal of matching the database searches.

The initial search strategy resulted in more than 300 short articles. The overall number of papers which met the inclusion criteria for the review was 153. The majority of the methodical evaluation took the type of types and properties of reinforced glass fiber composites [29,30,38-43], in- fluence of factors [44-47] such as orientation of fibers [12,48-54], amount of fibers [51,55], impregmentation of fibers with polymers [56-66], adhesion of fibers with polymers [45,65,68-74], result of contents [38, 75,76], circulation of fibers [14,20,30,77-80] , and water absorption [81-90] .These studies examined a variety of locations such as the mechanical, physical [92-108] , thermal [12] and biological properties [109-111] of the enhanced glass fiber composites. The clinical applications consisting of prosthodontics [115-130] , endodontics [105,130-- 132] , tooth remediation [89,133-138], orthodontic retainer and space maintainer [63,139-150] , and periodontal splints [151-153] were carefully consisted of. Non-automated manual searches were likewise conducted on the references within the picked articles.

Table 2: Composition of commercially available reinforced glass fiber composites

FRC Core material	Manufacturer	Composition	Fabrication procedure
Preimpregnate E-d glass FRC	Vectris Pontic, Ivoclar Vivadent, Schaan, Liechtenstein	Bis-GMA (24.5%), Triethyleneglycol dimethacrylate (6.2%), Decandiol dimethacrylate (0.3%) Urethane dimethacrylate (0.1%) Highly dispersed silica (3.5%) Catalysts and stabilizers (b0.3%) Pigments (b0.1%), Preimpregnated E-glass fibers (65.0%)	Initial polymerization for 1 min with a light-curing unit (Targis QuickTM, Ivoclar-Vivadent). Final polymerization in a light and heat curing unit (Targis PowerTM, Ivoclar-Vivadent) for 25 min
Preimpregnate S-d glass FRC	FiberKor, Pentron Corporation, Wallingford, CT, USA	Preimpregnate S-glass fibers d (≃60%) in a 100% Bis-GMA matrix	Initial polymerization for 1 min with a light-curing unit (Targis QuickTM, Ivoclar-Vivadent). Final polymerization in a light and heat curing unit (Targis PowerTM, Ivoclar-Vivadent) for 25 min
Impregnated E-glass FRC	Stick StickTech, Turku, Finland	E-glass fibers impregnated with poly(methyl methacrylate)	

2. KINDS OF GLASS FIBERS

In the development of fibers it is required to take into consideration the requirements and criteria of fibers, which are determined by the purpose and the production innovation residential or commercial properties. For that reason, glass is manufactured in different systems, which attend to qualitatively different residential or commercial properties in various fibers. Table 3 shows the various kinds of glass fibers depending upon the distinctions in their composition and their residential or commercial properties [38] . The parts of glass fibers that have been utilized in construction of numerous oral home appliances can be categorized into 6 classifications depending upon their composition and application [39,40] .

1 Glass A (neutral)-it is a high-alkali glass including 25% soda and lime. The advantage of this glass fiber is that it is more affordable than other types of fiberglass and can be utilized as filler for plastics when no rigid requirements are required. The shortcomings are that the composition has low chemical resistance to water and alkaline media and low strength.

2 Glass C (chemically resistant)-- this was established for engineering area, in which product is in contact with aggressive media, mostly acids. These fibers have great rust resistance. However, the disadvantages are that it has inferior technological homes in molding glass beads and fiber and has low strength and can not be used as insulating products.

3 Glass D (low dielectric permittivity)-- this kind of glass has a low dielectric constant with exceptional electrical residential or commercial properties and utilized as an enhancing material in electronic boards and radar real estate. Nevertheless, they are defined by a low level of strength and chemical resistance.

4 Glass S-- this is a high-strength and elasticity modulus glass with low dielectric permittivity and has better corrosion resistance to acids. This glass is labor consuming and costly due to its production procedures and the life span of these glass fibers is low, for that reason, their usage is limited.

5 Glass AR-- These glassfibers helped to improve the structural and technological residential or commercial properties, and enhance the fracture resistance and impact strength. The high melting and high zirconium contents are limiting their location of application.

6 Glass E (electrical grade)-- this is calcium--aluminum-- borosilicate glass with low alkali content. It manifests much

better electrical insulation and strongly withstands attack by water. The concern related to this fiber is because of the presence of unpredictable parts (boron oxide and fluorine) which results in the disturbance of the chemical homogeneity of the glass and contaminates the environment. Nevertheless, more than 50% of the glass fibers utilized for support is E- glass [41,42] .The E- glass fibers have actually been used primarily for oral applications [43] .They are a mix of amorphous stages and silicon oxide, calcium oxide, barium oxide, aluminum oxide and some oxides of alkali metals. They have trace quantities of Na_2O, MgO, TiO_2, Fe_2O_3, and Fl [29] The E-fiber utilized in oral application has a density of 2.54 g/cm^{-3} and the reported tensile strength and E-modulus of these fibers is 3.4 GPa and 73 GPa, respectively [39] .The S-glasses are likewise amorphous, but vary in structure and has higher hardness and modulus to E-glass and greater resistance to plastic contortion than E- glasses [30] .The reported tensile strength and modulus of elasticity is 800 MPa and 66 GPa, respectively. Silica oxide, aluminum oxide and magnesium oxide are greater in material than E-glass, but they have small amount of alkali and earth alkali ions [29] .

Table 3: Composition in wt % of various glass fibers

Components	**A-glass**	**E-glass**	**C-glass**	**AR-glass**	**R-glass**	**S-glass**
SiO2	71	53-55	56–58	62	75.5	62-65
Al2O3	3	14-16	12	0.8	0.5	20-25
CaO	8.5	20-24	17-22	5.6	0.5	-
MgO	2.5	20-24	2-5	-	0.5	-
B2O	-	6-9	-	-	20	0-1
K2O	-	<1	0.4	-	3.0	0-1
Na2O	15	<1	0.1-2	14.8	-	0.2

3. INFLUENCE OF FACTORS

Certain factors which can influence the properties of GFRC [44-47] are given in Table 4.

Orientation of fiber the glass fibers can be set up in various directions; (i) unidirectional fiber laminates, (ii) alternate brief and long fiber (bidirectional) injection molding and (iii) textile materials (woven, knitted and braided fabrics) laminates. The unidirectional constant fibers are anisotropic (have various homes in various instructions) that can have advantages in numerous applications. Bidirectional are available in numerous fabric structures, such as linen, and twill weave. They provide orthotropic (same properties in two instructions with various residential or commercial properties in the third, orthogonal instructions) properties, fiber weave is an example of the bidirectional support of polymers and random (sliced) oriented fibers provide isotropic residential or commercial properties. Unidirectional longitudinal GFRC materials to the maximum when stress is exerted along the instructions of the fiber, their strength lowers when the stress is applied at an angle to the instructions of the fiber, for that reason unidirection al glass fiber has significantly greater strength than a bidirectional fiber. Sliced fibers and hairs were discontinuously distributed in the matrix, which each fiber or whisker was much shorter than the measurements of the composite specimen. Hybrid fiber composites are a mix of 2 or more types of fibers [12] .Previous researches on GFRC orientation has focused upon the impacts of the question of fiber reinforcement directionality (i.e. random or longitudinal orientation) [48] .It is extensively accepted that orientation of the glass fiber long axis perpendicular to an applied force will lead to strength reinforcement. Forces that are parallel to the long axis of the fibers, nevertheless, pro- duce matrix-dominated failures and consequently yield little actual support. Design strategies are periodically used to provide multi-directional reinforcement to lessen the highly anisotropic habits of unidirectional fiber reinforcement [49] .The multidirectional support, however, is accompanied by a decline in strength in any direction when compared to unidirectional fiber [50] .In many circumstances glass fiber reinforcement (GFR) has actually been positioned in the center of a composite specimen. Mechanical residential or commercial properties of GFRC also depend on the direction of fibers in the polymer matrix. Continuous unidirectional fibers revealed the highest strength and tightness for the composite, however just in one instructions, i.e. in the direction of the fibers. Therefore, the enhancing result of unidirectional fibers is anisotropic in contrast to woven fibers which enhance the polymer in 2 directions and the composite also has orthotropic mechanical homes. If the fibers are orientated arbitrarily, the mechanical residential or commercial properties are the same in all instructions and the mechanical homes are isotropic. A composite with the longer fibers exhibited lower wear volumes and use rates. This could be warranted thinking about that the complete strength of the GFRC might not have been utilized with fibers of length less than the crucial length. The crucial length of a glass fiber depends on the fiber strength and interfacial shear strength. In addition, brief fibers might be easily clustered and lead to a weak area in the composite [51] .In theory, enhancing impact of the fiber fillers is based not just on tension transfer from polymer matrix to fibers but also on the behavior of individual fibers as fracture stoppers. It is possible that the 3 mm fibers oriented parallel to each other had strength of constant unidirectional GFRC [50] Garoushi et al. [46] and Manhart et al. [51,52] studied the wear resistance of numerous industrial dental composites, and it was found that short glass fibers could be quickly eliminated from the matrix leading to increased wear. Xu et al. [53] showed that increasing the glass fiber length typically increased the GFRC supreme strength and fracture resistance. These residential or commercial properties have clinical significance and would impact the longevity of repair.

Table 4: Factors influencing the properties of reinforced glass fiber composites

Influencing factors
➢ Orientation of fiber
➢ Quantity of fiber (volume fraction)
➢ Surface treatment (sizing)

➢ Impregnation of fiber with matrix polymer
➢ Adhesion of fiber to the matrix polymer
➢ Properties of fiber vs. Properties of matrix polymers

The glass fiber orientation likewise affects thermal habits of the composite. The thermal coefficient differs inning accordance with the direction of the fiber. This might have clinical significant impact, e.g. on the adhesion of veneering composite on the GFRC framework of the fixed partial denture and the adhesion of the GFRC home appliance to the tooth compound [12] .The orientation of fibers produces an impact on direct shrinkage stress. In case of constant unidirectional GFRC products, the shrinking stress along the fiber was low, whereas the main shrinkage happened in the transverse direction to the fiber direction. Much like the constant unidirectional GFRCs, the bidirectional GFRC showed little shrinking pressure in either instructions. GFRC with arbitrarily oriented fibers showed low polymerization shrinking, but somewhat higher than the bidirectional GFRC. The brief fibers were likewise reliable in restricting the shrinkage [54] matrix. Generally the volume portion of fiber in GFRCs is high, approximately 60 vol.%, however, in dentistry fiber fraction is reasonably low. The factor is because of the fact that glass fiber need to be covered with a layer of unfilled polymer or with a layer of particulate filler composite. Lassila and Vallitu [55], and Callaghan et al. [51] have actually reported the wear behavior of GFRC with different concentration of fiber volume. It was discovered that with 7.6 wt.% glass fiber the specimen is potentially packed with a lot of fibers resulting in a cluster of fibers with little matrix. Ther e are significant interactions between glass fibers leading to a poor bonding between fibers and matrix. If these are being pulled out of matrix along with matrix being removed from around the fibers causing a high wear rate. The high concentration of glass fibers might result in the premature fiber fracture, in addition to a substantial amount of fibers plucking. The ideal amount of fiber for superior wear resistance is between 2.0 and 7.6 wt.% for the matrix. There are substantial interactions in between fibers resulting in a bad bonding in between fibers and matrix.

3.1 Impregmentation of fiber with polymer matrix:

GFR works just when the load can be moved from the matrix to the reinforcing stage and this can be accomplished just when the fiber is fully attained by bonding to the matrix, and in dental composites this is generally fertilized [56] . A degree of impregnation of GFR utilized in oral applications affects properties of FRC. Poor impregnation produces voids in between the matrix and the fiber and the load bearing capability of GFRC is reduced [57] .In addition, the mechanical properties such as flexural strength and modulus of GFRC remains far from the oretically determined worths. Another problem with bad impregnation is water sorption. Fractures and spaces in the laminate allow water to enter, which decreases the bond strength and can cause hydrolytic deterioration of polysiloxane network of GFRC [58-61] .It also causes discoloration due to penetration of oral microbes into deep spaces of badly fertilized GFRC. These spaces also function as oxygen tanks, which enabled oxygen to inhibit radical polymerization of the utilized acrylic resin inside the GFRC. The total degree of impregnation of the GFRC can be gotten if the fibers are pre-impregnated with polymers, monomers and/or mix of both. The pre-impregnation of the fiber not just affects the degree of impregnation but it likewise affects the adhesive properties of the finally polymerized GFRC. If the fibers are pre-impregnated with a light polymerizable bifunctional acrylate or methacrylate monomers the polymer matrix is highly cross-linked in nature and the bond is based on complimentary extreme polymerization and on inter-diffusion of the monomers of the new resin. The bonding between the GFRC substrate and resin can be based upon unreacted carbon-carbon double bonds of the functional groups on the surface of polymer matrix. However, the possibility to get totally free extreme polymerization bonding is low because of fairly small number of unreacted carbon-carbon double bonds on the polymer surface area [62,63] .

Another possibility for sticking new resin on the aged composite substrate is based upon inter-diffusion of monomers to the substrate. The bonding based upon the inter-diffusion of the monomers can be acquired if the substrate is a partly non- cross-linked polymer [64] and the monomers of the new resin have a dissolving ability of the linear phases of the substrate such as semi-interpenetrated polymer network (semi-IPN). In semi-IPN polymer the direct phases and the cross-linked polymer network are not bonded chemically together. This independency of the semi-IPN polymer is a crucial property when a sufficient bonding based on the monomer interdiffusion is a demand. This can be the scenario when GFRC structure needs repair work in the mouth or when finally polymerized lab produced GFRC work is abided by the tooth substance by composite luting cements or by low-viscosity light treating adhesive resins. The preimpregnation matrix of the novel GFR consists of direct polymer phases, which are suggested to improve the bonding of aged FRC structure substrate to brand-new composite resin by the IPN bonding system. In dentistry semi-IPN has been used including linear polymer and the cross-linked polymer however they are not bonded chemically together as a single network. It has been effectively used in acrylic resin polymer teeth and denture base polymers and in removable dentistry [64,66] .

3.2 Adhesion of fiber to polymer matrix:

Dependable adhesion in between glass fiber and polymer matrix could be obtained with silane coupling representative. It has actually been reported that a condensation reaction between silanol group and an inorganic molecule such as glass fiber resulting in an additional boost in bonding strength and less water sorption will happen [45,67] .The development of an IPN layer between the matrix and the glass fiber was recommended to be further

improving the adhesion between them. IPN structure was formed from direct polymer of the sizing, which is partially or completely dissolved by bi- or multifunctional acrylate monomers of the matrix [65] .The adhesion between the glass fiber and resin matrix affects the strength, without adequate adhesion the glass fiber serves as an inclusion in the matrix, which actually weakens the composite. One of the main concerns in clinical durability is the quality of adhesion between the GFRC and other polymer matrix mainly because of significant distinctions between deformation habits and other composites leading to comprehensive tension concentration near the bi-material user interface [68-71] .The interfacial forces holding the two parts together may emerge from van der Waals forces, chemical bonding, electrostatic attraction or mechanical interlocking. The adhesion bond strength is strongly related to the kind of bonding, viscosity of the adhesive and its chemical structure and mechanical homes of bonded substrates [72].Additionally, considering that any decision of the adhesion strength involves measurement of a fracture stress, state of tension throughout the whole adhesion joint plays an important role [73]
.It is presumed that the interfacial bonding in between GFRC and particulate filled composite (PFC) is based upon the resin which will not be impacted by including the filler offering the increased viscosity of the PFC will not affect wetting of the GFRC surface area. Considering that its use in dentistry is extremely often reinforced with unidirectionally aligned fibers the nature of their reaction is inherently orthotropic. The interfacial/inter-laminar shear strength is typically the weakest link in their mechanical action. The actual system of bonding between PFC and GFRC investigation can either be chemical bonding, mechanical interlocking or a mix of the two [74] .The cured GFRC exhibits reasonably smooth surface and the adhesion strength increases with filler loading, therefore, mechanical interlocking plays only bit part in establishing adhesive bond.

4. EFFECT OF CONTENTS

Glass fiber structure is very important, particularly the content of alkali, earth-alkali ions; boron oxide responds with the oxides of ions of water leading to leaching from boron oxide from glass surface. The leaching of glass forming representative impacts its strength by interrupting the glass supporting web- work. B2O3 exists in 6-9 wt.% in E-glass fibers and b 1 wt.% in S-glass fibers [38,75] .The rust of glass surface area can be decreased by the correct treatment of the glass fiber. To overcome this issue pre- fertilized (Pre-preg) GFRC have been used. They are preimpregnated with its matrix and do not need moistening prior to use. Alternatively, the fertilized fibers as made are glass fibers fertilized with highly porous PMMA polymer matrix that needs the extra process of moistening with a solvent-free resin or a liquid- powder resin mix. Table 2 reveals the composition of some commercially readily available GFRC [76] .

4.1 Distribution of fibers:

The distribution of glass fibers display different residential or commercial properties, depend upon its application. Either these fibers are equally distributed or lie in a particular zone. If these fibers are similarly dispersed, it enhances the fatigue resistance however if they lie at one place then they can increase the stiffness and strength [77] .

It has been reported that resin materials reinforced with short glass fiber, arbitrarily dispersed, acquired higher values of flexural strength, fracture durability, and compressive strength [78] .Brief fibers randomly distributed provide an isotropic reinforcement in numerous directions instead of one direction [14,79] .Positioning of unidirectional E-glass fiber in the same study did show substantial result on strength and modulus of flexibility of FRC materials [33] .In the majority of circumstances in the oral literature, fiber reinforcement has actually been positioned in the center of a composite specimen
[20] .Yet from engineering applications, it is known that the position and orientation of the reinforcement within a building
and construction affects mechanical homes [23,80] .

4.2 Water absorption of GFRC matrix:

A liquid and moisture environment, such as saliva in the mouth, can cause "rust" effects in the surface area of GFRC arising from water that diffuses through the polymer matrix [81] .This can cause a decrease of the mechanical properties and changes in the composite structure, since the surface area of the glass fibers is affected by the hydrolysis of alkali and earth alkali oxides in the glass and leaching of ions. The structure of the glass is a vital aspect for the hydrolytic stability of the glass fibers. The silanization which helps to bond the fibers to the polymer matrix likewise influences the hydrolytic stability of the composite [82] .It has been reported that there is a possible deteriorative result of water to the interfacial adhesion in between the polymer matrix to the glass fibers through rehydrolysis of silane coupling representative [83,84] .The water sorption is likewise impacted by the impregnation of fibers with a resin, if there are regions in which the fibers are not completely embedded with resin, there will be voids in the structure of cured composite that increase water sorption [85,86] .In conclusion, water has a plasticizing effect resulting from the interaction with the polymer structure [87] .Lots of studies on the water sorption of GFRC have actually been performed, and it has actually been concluded that water sorption reduces the mechanical homes including flexural strength and the load bearing capacity of denture base polymers [88,89] .

Flaws in the interphase resin/material support interfere in transmission force in between fiber and matrix. Additionally, voids of improperly impregnated fibers end up being an addition body in the splinting. The oxygen could hinder resin matrix polymerization, reduce load-bearing capability of the FRC and increase water absorption that triggers negative impact in mechanical homes [90] .

4.3 Evidence based results:

During the last few years various homes of GFRC have actually been reported and it has actually been shown that a considerable quantity of data have actually been gathered, which assists to form the base for the so called "proof based therapy" [91] .The evidence based lead to this evaluation are given in Table 5.

4.4 Mechanical properties:

Mechanical homes of polymer base products have two facets; (i) related to the macroscopic behavior and (ii) related to the molecular habits, which includes chemical structure and physical structure. Frequently used mechanical methods are compressive strength, flexural strength, elastic modulus, and fatigue resistance. The outcomes and details gotten from these techniques offer some explanation why a product has stopped working and how it can be enhanced [92] .

Table 5: Various properties of reinforced glass fiber composites

Properties
-Mechanical o Strength, stiffness, toughness and fatigue resistance
-Visco-elasticity
-Adhesive Failures
-Thermal

The stronger the fiber-resin interfaces in GFRC system, the greater the static, impact and tiredness properties. The solidity and diametric tensile strength increased with the incorporation of silanated filler particles or fiber [93] .Mechanical residential or commercial properties such as strength, stiffness, toughness and tiredness resistance depend upon the geometry of the support. The performance of the fiber reinforcement (Krenchel's element) varies in FRC laminates with different fiber orientation [94] .The mechanical residential or commercial properties of GFRC structure with continuous unidirectional fiber can express better outcomes compared with strengthen- ment with other fiber such as brief and random. Krenchel [95] suggested that the efficiency of the fiber reinforcement (Krenchel's factor, worth 0 to 1) approximates the strength of FRCs. The strengthening effectiveness of unidirectional fibers is theoretically 1 (100%), which indicates that rein- requiring homes can be gotten in one instructions [96] .The reported cases [97] showed that the flexural properties of GFRC endodontic posts are higher than the metal post and just like dentin. Continuous bidirectional (woven, weave) fibers have strengthening fibers in 2 directions, for that reason, reinforcing the polymer similarly in 2 directions [Krenchel's factor 0.5 (50%) or 0.25 (25%)] Nevertheless, the woven fibers add durability to the polymer, act as crack stoppers, and are especially appropriate in cases where the direction of the load is unidentified or where there is no area for unidirectional fibers. If the fibers are oriented arbitrarily as in a fiber mat or as in chopped short FRCs, the mechanical properties are the same in all instructions and are so-called isotropic three-dimensionally (Krenchel's aspect
0.38 (38%) in 2 measurements and 0.2 (20%) in three dimensions) [21,30] .The research study was carried out to assess the fixed and vibrant fracture load of GFRC kept with tooth structure and the gotten lead to both conditions were 195.80 N and 190.57 N, respectively. Different studies have described various typical forces during mastication i.e. 14 N [98] 45 N
[99] and 120 N [100] .The GFRC has adequate and appropriate strength for clinical application under typical mastication
loads [101] .At first preimpregnated GFRC formulas based on polycarbonate matrix and E-glass fibers displayed a flexural strength and compression modulus 297-426 MPa and 965 MPa, respectively. The flexural strength and modulus is greater with high fiber amount compared with low fiber quantity i.e. 339 MPa versus 300 MPa, respectively, and the modulus, 6 GPa and 3 GPa, respectively [102] .The light treating polymerization has an influence on firmness and flexural properties. The greater the degree of monomer conversion, the much better is the strength. The reported mechanical testing in tension was significantly enhanced by the addition of the resin. The

strength of the FRC specimen has actually risen from 18.9 MPa to 43.4 MPa [103] .

Viscoelasticity:

Khan et al. [104] studied the viscoelastic habits of GFRC and resin based composite (RBC) and it was found that the viscoelastic habits of GFRC was close to dentin (17 GPa) structure as compared to RBC. The worths for GFRC and RBC were 15.32 GPa and 9.34 GPa, respectively.

Adhesive failure:

La Bell et al. [105] examined the adhesion of different post systems including metal (titanium), carbon-FRC and GFRC posts. Contrary to the other posts, there were no adhesive (post-cement) failures with the separately formed GFRC posts, whereas for metal and carbon-FRC the failure rate was 70% and 55%, respectively, which recommends better interfacial adhesion of cement to these posts. Kadam et al. [106] also reported that the adhesive failure was observed in between the cement-dentine interfaces, followed by the post-cement user interface, which reveals trouble in bonding in between post- cement-- dentine user interfaces. The kind of luting system likewise considerably affected bond strength. Adhesively luted GFRC posts attained greater bond strengths than traditionally luted posts [107] .The failure mechanism likewise depends upon the strategy utilized for the fiber post placement. The sealing homes of a one-step obturation post-placement method have actually been compared to a two- step technique and it was observed that the seal of root canals accomplished with the one-step obturator is less effective than the two-step treatment. In fact, with the one-step treatment, spaces were observed in between the sealer and the intraradicular dentine. On the contrary with the two- action treatment less interfacial flaws can be found [108] .

Thermal residential or commercial properties:

The direct coefficient of thermal growth (LCTE) depends on the orientation of glass fibers. Continuous unidirectional strengthened fibers have 2 coefficients of thermal growth. One in the direction of fibers gives lower LCTE because of the mechanical restraints enforced by the fibers. The second in the direction perpendicular to the fibers instructions gives higher worths of the polymer matrix. This is due to the rigid fibers that primarily prevent expansion of the matrix in the longitudinal instructions, thus the resin matrix is required to broaden more than regular in the transverse instructions. The reported worth of LCTE for unidirectional glass fiber was 5.0 × 10 − 6 ° C − 1 [12] .

4.5 Biocompatibility:

Microbial adhesion was observed with glass fibers covered with saliva. It was discovered that adherence of Streptococcus mutans to brief glass fiber-reinforced filling material was considerably lower compared with dentin and enamel; however, saliva finish significantly decreased the adhesion for FRC products [96] Another study showed same outcomes and it was observed that the impregmentation of hydrophobic resins with glass fibers lowered the adhesion of microbes on surface area. A research study conducted with Yeast albicans showed that E-glass fiber reinforcement does not appear to increase the adhesion of oral yeast on the surface of material [109] Ballo [110] assessed the biocompatibility of GFRC and found cell expansion and differentiation on BisGMA/TEGDMA rein- forced with E-glass fibers and cultured cell formed a multicellular layer on the surface as displayed in Fig. 8. It has been reported formerly about the biocompatible problems of BisGMA, for that reason to use as oral implant, the degree of conversion of BisGMA is necessary to think about. This can be acquired by extending the photopolymerization time in combination with heat-induced post-curing [111] before implantation. In this same study, they found biomechanical bonding of bone with FRC and micro-CT scans shows bone trabeculae on the surface of FRC implant. The new bone apposition was detected between the implant threads which suggests great biocompatibility of the FRC implants.

5. CLINICAL APPLICATIONS

GFRC are a group of new materials with minimal industrial clinical information. Nevertheless, with biocompatible fibers and matrix systems, fibrous composites have discovered application as biomaterial. In addition to biocompatibility, the factors affecting the use of fibrous composite in dentistry are; esthetics, non-corrosive, durability, metal allergic reaction, and chair side handling [112-- 115] .GFRC has been presented as a new product for a treatment alternative in esthetic and metal totally free dentistry and shown to be helpful in dentistry. A crucial function of composites is their ability to customize the material until it meets the style requirements, makings GFRC highly ideal for a vast array of oral applications. These oral applications are arranged in Table 6 .

Prosthodontic application:

Glass fibers were checked as support for denture base in 1960s. Since then, different research studies [115-119] have been performed and the strength of glass fiber composite has been examined. Fiber reinforce- ment is presently being used to boost the effective use of oral devices in case of denture base polymers. Different types of fibers may be used to obtain fortifying of provisionary partial dentures; nevertheless, numerous research studies reveal that glass fibers occur to bring out far more efficient results [120] .The very first prosthodontic application of the speculative thermoplastic GFRC was the fabrication of a single tooth replacement bonded FPD. These prostheses were formed in the laboratory and then bonded to the tooth. The structure was treated with PMMA monomer prior to delivery. The mode of failure for this frame-work looked like either an adhesive debonding in between the GFRC and the bonding composite or cohesive separation of the GFRC near the bonded surface. This separation was most likely due to the swelling of the polycarbonate matrix by the PMMA monomer that was used to treat the internal element of the GFRC prior to bonding [121,122] .A comparative research study was performed to examine the bonding of polymer matrix with denture base polymers consisting of numerous kinds of fibers consisting of carbon, aramide, woven polyethylene and glass fibers and it was discovered that glass fibers yielded better results in terms of esthetics and ease of bonding to the polymer matrix [123,124] .GFRC based on S-glass fibers with heat dealt with Bis-GMA/TEGDMA matrix displayed great physical homes, but they did not properly bond to composites and were hard to handle, whereas with light activated Bis-GMA optimal combination of managing characteristics and physical properties was attained [122,125] .The GFRC including detachable dentures revealed increased tiredness resistance compared with metals. However, in-vitro research study showed that while fatigue resistance of the GFRC was increased, the relatively low flexural modulus might restrict their clinical usage where high rigidity of the material is required [126] Mechanical fatigue that takes place medically, might likewise contribute to the decrease in mechanical properties of GFRCs after aging [127] .

GFR FPDs (fixed partial dentures) are considered as a promising alternative to cast metal resin-bonded FPDs. They offer the possibility of producing adhesive, esthetic, and metal-free tooth replacements at a reduced biological expense. The placement of the fiber at the tensile side of the beam is the most efficient place for support. Their use for resin-bonded FPDs is supported for their beneficial flexible modulus compared to metal and better adhesion of the composite luting representative to the structure. In-vitro research study showed that fiber support increases the fracture strength of resin composite to a level that justifies the clinical use of the material in unsupported applications [128] .Compared to metal- ceramic and all ceramic FPDs, the needed preparation on abutment teeth is minimally invasive [129] .Moreover, using GFRC minimizes the risk of allergic or poisonous negative effects of metal alloys. The post-curing provides better mechanical properties in lesser time. A clinical trial reported that the success rate of 71% and a survival rate of 78% after 5 years were found for GFRC FDPs in the posterior area [130] .

Endodontic application:

The rigidness of the post ought to be equivalent or near to that of root dentin to distribute the occlusal forces equally along the length of the root. GFRC endodontic posts have been introduced to be used instead of metal alloys and ceramics. It was found that premade GFRC posts showed lower flexural homes than a separately polymerized product. Nevertheless the mechanical residential or commercial properties depend upon the structure, structure and size of endodontic posts. The separately polymerized GFRC material showed nearly the exact same degree of conversion after light polymerization as monomer resin without fibers. The individually formed FRC post product with a semi-IPN polymer matrix bonded better to composite resin luting cement than the prefabricated posts with a cross-linked polymer matrix [105] .There is less danger to loss of retention due to greater bond strength worths of IPN posts than premade FRC posts [130] .

The mechanical residential or commercial properties of fiber-reinforced posts have actually been widely evaluated and reported, however, high irregularity has been observed in outcomes which are expected due to the products constituting the post: normally, glass fiber-reinforced posts are defined by a thermosetting polymer matrix strengthened with high performance fibers; the fibers are typically parallel to the post axis so the higher strength and elastic modulus occur along this direction. However, the last mechanical properties are likewise highly impacted by structural integrity, measurements, density, fiber distribution, volume fraction, voids, and the internal bond between fiber and matrix [131,132] .Their strength and flexible modulus depend on the type of tensions they undergo. Tensile, shear, flexural or compressive stresses lead to different values of flexible modulus or optimal strength for the very same composite material. Furthermore these values depend likewise on the angle between the fiber and the load direction.

Tooth repair application:

Just recently, brief GFRC (everX Posterior) has actually been presented as an oral corrective composite resin [133] .The composite resin is planned to be used as base filling material in high tension bearing locations particularly in big cavities of vital and non-vital posterior teeth. It consists of a mix of a resin matrix, arbitrarily orientated E-glass fibers and inorganic particulate fillers. The resin matrix consists of Bis- GMA, TEGDMA and PMMA forming a semi-IPN (net- poly(methyl meth- acrylate)- inter-net-poly(bis-glycidyl-A-dimethacrylate)) which offers good bonding homes and improves toughness of the polymer matrix. The in-vitro studies showed improvements in the load bearing capacity, the flexural strength and fracture strength of oral composite resin reinforced with brief E-glass fiber fillers in contrast with traditional particle filler corrective composite resin [89,134-136] .The short glass fiber composite resin has also exhibited control of the polymerization shrinkage tension by fiber orientation and, therefore, limited microleakage was lowered compared with standard particle filler restorative composite resins.

On the basis of the abovementioned studies it is recommended that short glass fiber composite resin could be used to fulfill the requirements for the ideal posterior repairs. It is meant to be utilized as bulk sub- structure product which will be covered by a layer of particle filler composite. It is hard to anticipate clinical long-lasting efficiency from only laboratory experiments. One year clinical report showed great clinical efficiency of an unique material mix of bulk short glass fiber composite base and surface layer of particle filler composite in high tension bearing areas after 1 year [137] .The brief glass fiber based composite revealed considerably greater fracture durability (4.6 MPa · m − 1), flexural strength (124 MPa) and flexural modulus (9.5 GPa) than all other relative composite materials. Treating depth was discovered 4.6 mm which was similar to other bulk fill composites and higher than particulate based composites. They also showed lower percentage of shrinkage pressure (0.17%) compared with other tested composites [138] .

Orthodontic application:

Fallis [139] introduced GFRC wire for specific functions with affordable patient acceptance and structural stability. Burstone and Kuhlberg [140] provided a brand-new clinical use of GFRC to make an esthetic linking bar made use of as an adjunct for active tooth motion. In this application, bonding and fracture characteristics of GFRC under masticatory forces would be of terrific significance. Meiers et al. [141] and Freudenthaler et al. [142] revealed excellent bond strength of FRC to enamel and an excellent bonding of orthodontic attachments to GFRC, respectively. On the other hand, an issue with rigid connection of teeth is independent physiologic tooth movement during function in contrast to the fundamental brittleness and rigidity of composites. Therefore, the outcomes of clinical reports on direct splinting of oral segments with composite were regularly discouraging, demonstrating damage or fracture of the adhesive within a few weeks or months [143,144] .A 6 year clinical trial compared the bond failure and damage rates of two kinds of bonded lingual orthodontic retainers i.e. glass fiber retainers and multistranded stainless-steel (MST) wire. The outcomes revealed that maxillary detachment rates were 21.42% for the glass fiber retainer group and 22.22% for the MST group; the mandibular detachment rates were 11.76% for the glass fiber retainer group and 15.62% for the MST group. The maxillary breakage rates were 7.14% for the glass fiber retainer group and 16.66% for the MST group; the mandibular damage rates were 8.82% for the glass fiber retainer group and 15.62% for the MST group. The glass fiber retainer and multi-stranded stainless-steel retainers revealed similar lead to terms of bond failure and breakage [145] .

Burstone and Kuhlberg [140] have actually promoted the use of GFRCs for both passive and active orthodontic applications. Initially long, continuous fibers were saturated with resin and bonded to the teeth as retainers. These first- generation retainers were too rigid to permit tooth movement; therefore, the fibers and bonding adhesives were technically unsatisfactory. Recently glass fiber package (EverStick Ortho *) pre-impregnated with a PMMA polymer providing both micromechanical and chemical adhesion [63] Both the retainer material and the composite appear to be important in successful bonding of linguistic retainers [146, 147] .

There are minimal reports on the clinical efficacy, style and building and construction, of GFRC space maintainers. Wetness contamination has actually been reported to be one of the primary reasons for failure of the GFRC space maintainer [148] .Earlier the GFRC was put only on the lingual surface area to lessen the occlusal forces acting on it. However, there was a high failure rate, which was most likely due to a change in the offered occlusogingival measurement and debonding at the enamel-composite user interface was likewise observed as early as 3 months. Mainly the GFRC area maintainers were placed on baby teeth, the existence of prismless enamel could adversely affect the retention of resin. Fracfture of the GFRC frame is the other considerable type of failure due to possible supraeruption of the opposing tooth and its impingement on the fiber frame [149] Nidhi et al. [150] assessed the clinical effectiveness of GFRC and Band and Loop space maintainers with time intervals of 5 months and it was shown that the GFRC space maintainers revealed a higher success however the distinction was statistically nonsignificant. This research study showed that GFRC area maintainer can be used as an alternative to the standard area maintainer for short-term space upkeep.

Table 6: Clinical (dental) applications of reinforced glass fiber composites

Applications	
Prosthodontic	Removable dentures, fixed partial dentures
Endodontic	Root canal posts
Restorative dentistry	Provisional restorations
Periodontology	Periodontal splints

Periodontal application:

Due to intrinsic rigidity of resins, the composites as splints are prone to failure. To overcome this constraint, reinforcement has actually been introduced with resin-based composites. The advancement of strengthened glass fiber composites has actually enabled clinicians to replace metal wires and basic resin composites as gum splints that are esthetic and easy in style and execution and have the capacity for exceptional resilience [151] .Various types of industrial glass fiber splints are available for the function of conservative splinting and indirect prosthesis. These fiber strengthened splints have adequate mechanical strength, acceptable esthetics, do not disturb the occlusion and permit keeping appropriate oral health [152,153] .

6. CONCLUSIONS

This review paper attempts to systematically discuss about glass fiber enhanced composite systems with respect to oral applications. This evaluation was not intended to be exhaustive and authors think that within the restrictions (dentistry), this review provides a good insight into the proof offered. It is concluded that GFRC products offer a combination of strength and modulus that is either comparable to oral tissues. The specific mechanical and physical strength and particular modulus of these fiber reinforced composite products may be significantly superior to those of existing resin- based composites and metal materials. The majority of the data explained in this review are laboratory- oratory investigations, whereas relatively couple of clinical research studies have actually been carried out. The few clinical trials that have actually been published suggest, a minimum of in the short term, reasonable success for glass fiber-based restorations including endodontic posts, repaired partial denture, and posterior restorations. For these reasons, glass fiber reinforced composites have emerged as a significant class of structural material and are either utilized or being considered as alternative to traditional materials in dental applications.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Magne, D. Cascione, Influence of post-etching cleaning and connecting porcelain on the microtensile bond strength of composite resin to feldspathic porcelain, J. Prosthet. Dent. 96 (2006) 354–361.

[2] F.J. McCabe, W.G.A. Walls, Applied Dental Materials, 8th ed. Blackwell Science, Oxford, 1998.

[3] F. Lutz, I. Krejci, Resin composites in the post-amalgam age, Compend. Contin. Educ. Dent. 20 (1999) 1138–1148.

[4] M.J. Tyas, K.J. Anusavice, J.E. Frencken, G.J. Mount, Minimal intervention dentistry— a review, FDI Commission Project 1–97, Int. Dent. J. 50 (2000) 1–12.

[5] Y. Yashida, K. Shirai, Y. Nakayama, M. Itoh, M. Okazaki, H. Shintani, S. Inoue, P. Lambrechts, G. Vanherle, V.B. Meerbeek, Improved filler-matrix coupling in resin composites, J. Dent. Res. 81 (2002) 270–273.

[6] Food, Drug Administration (FDA), Dental Composites-Premarket Notification, US Department of Health and Human Services, 1998.

[7] R.L. Bowen, Dental filling material comprising vinyl silane treated fused silica and a binder consisting of the reaction product of bis-phenol and glycidylaerylate, US patent 3,066,112, 1962.

[8] R.L. Bowen, Silica-resin direct filling material and method of preparation, US patents 3,194,783 and 3,194,784, 1965.

[9] R.G. Craig, J.M. Power, Restorative Dental Materials, 11th ed. Mosby, 2002.

[10] C.M. Sturdevant, The Art and Science of Operative Dentistry, 3rd ed. Mosby, 1995.

[11] H.H. Xu, J.B. Quinn, D.T. Smith, Effects of different whiskers on the reinforcement of dental resin composites, Dent. Mater. 19 (2003) 359–367.

[12] A. Tezvergil, L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallittu, The effect of fiber orientation on the thermal expansion coefficient of fiber reinforced composites, Dent. Mater. 19 (2003) 471–477.

[13] M. Zhang, J.P. Matinlinna, E-glass fiber reinforced composites in dental applications, Silicon 4 (2012) 73–78.

[14] H.-Y. Zhu, D.-H. Li, D.-X. Zhang, B.-C. Wu, Y.-Y. Chen, Influence of voids on interlaminar shear strength of carbon/epoxy fabric laminates, Trans. Nonferrous. Met. Soc. China 19 (2009) s470–s475.

[15] T. Moriwaki, Mechanical property enhancement of glass fibre reinforced polyamide composite made by direct injection, Composites 27 (1996) 379–384.

[16] C.E. da Silva Pinto, A. Carbajal, F. Wypych, L.P. Ramos, S.G. Kestur, Studies of the effect of molding pressure and incorporation of sugarcane bagasse fibers on the structure and properties of poly (hydroxy butyrate), Compos. A: Appl. Sci. Manuf. 40 (2009) 573–582.

[17] J.W. Leenslag, A.J. Pennings, High-strength poly(L-lactide) fibres by a dry-spinning/ hot-drawing process, Polymer 28 (1987) 92–94.

[18] S.N. Nazhat, M. Kellomaki, P. Tormala, K.E. Tanner, W. Bonfield, Dynamic mechanical characterization of biodegradable composites of hydroxyapatite and polylactide, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B Appl. Biomater. 58 (2001) 335–343.

[19] G. Viguie, G. Malquarti, B. Vincent, D. Bourgeois, Epoxy/carbon composite resins in dentistry: mechanical properties related to fiber reinforcements, J. Prosthet. Dent. 72 (1994) 245–249.

[20] L.A. Dos Santos, L.C. De Oliveira, R. Da Silva, R.G. Carrodeguas, A.O. Boschi, Fiber reinforced calcium phosphate cement, Artif. Organs 24 (2000) 212–216.

[21] S.H. Foo, T.J. Lindquist, S.A. Aquilino, R.L. Schneider, D.L. Williamson, D.B. Boyer, Effect of polyaramid fiber reinforcement on the strength of 3 denture base polymethyl methacrylate resins, J. Prosthodont. 10 (2001) 148– 153.

[22] P.K. Vallittu, Oxygen inhibition of auto-polymerization of polymethylmethacrylate glass fibre composite, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 8 (1997) 489–492.

[23] A. Signore, S. Benedicentia, V. Kaitsasb, M. Baronec, F. Angierod, G. Raverae, Long-term survival of endodontically treated, maxillary anterior teeth restored with either tapered or parallel-sided glass-fiber posts and full-ceramic crown coverage, J. Dent. 37 (2009) 115–121.

[24] L. Schlichtingab, C.M.A. de Andradaa, L. Vieiraa, G. Barrac, P. Magneb, Composite resin reinforced with pre-tensioned glass fibers. Influence of prestressing on flexural properties, Dent. Mater. 26 (2010) 118–125.

[25] K. Narva, P.K. Vallitu, H. Helens, Clinical survey of acrylic resin removable denture repair with glass-fiber-reinforced, Int. J. Prosthodont. 14 (2001) 219–224.

[26] X.G. Yong, Effect of interface structure on mechanical properties of advanced composite materials, Int. J. Mol. Sci. 10 (2009) 5115–5134.

[27] A.G. Ashwini, Reinforcing esthetic with fiber post, Int. J. Dent. Clin. 3 (2011) 89–90.

[28] H.D. Stipho, Effect of glass fiber reinforcement on some mechanical properties of autopolymerizing polymethyl methacrylate, J. Prosthet. Dent. 79 (1998) 580–584.

[29] G. Meric, J.E. Dahl, I.E. Puyter, Physicochemical evaluation of silica-glass fiber reinforced polymers for prosthodontic applications, Eur. J. Oral Sci. 113 (2005) 258–264.

[30] H.K. Chang, J. Chai, Strength and mode of failure of unidirectional and bidirectional glass fiber-reinforced composite material, Int. J. Prosthodont. 16 (2003) 161–166.

[31] M. Kotaki, T. Kuriyama, H. Hamada, Z. Maekawa, I. Narisawa, Annealing effect in glass woven fabric composites, Part II. Bending properties, Compos. Interfaces 7 (2001) 385–397

[32] Y. Tanimoto, T. Nishiwaki, N. Nemoto, Numerical failure analysis of glass-fiber- reinforced composites, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. A 68 (2004) 107–113.

[33] V.M.Miettinen,P.K.Vallittu,H.Fross,Releaseoffluoridefromglassfiber-reinforced composites with multiphase polymer matrix, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 12 (2000) 503–505.

[34] G.S. Solnit, The effect of methyl methacrylate reinforcement with silane-treated and untreated glass fibers, J. Prosthet. Dent. 66 (1991) 310–314.

[35] P. Soo-Jin, J. Joong-Seong, L. Jae-Rock, Influence of silane coupling agents on the surface energetics of glass fibers and mechanical interfacial properties of glass fiber-reinforced composites, J. Adhes. Sci. Technol. 14 (2000) 1677–1689.

[36] A. Tezvergil, L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallitu, The shear bond strength of bidirectional and random-oriented fibre-reinforced composite to tooth structure, J. Dent. 33 (2005) 509–516.

[37] S. Uctasli, A. Tezvergil, L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallittu, The degree of conversion of fiber- reinforced composites polymerized using different light-curing sources, Dent. Mater. 21 (2005) 469–475.

[38] H. Li, J. Meng, C. Richards, Alkaline earth aluminosilicate glass: route to high modulus fiber reinforced composites, Proceeding of International Glass Fiber Symposia, vol. 1, 2013.

[39] P.K. Vallittu, Some aspects of the tensile strength of unidirectional glass fibre- polymethyacrylate composite used in dentures, J. Oral Rehabil. 25 (1998) 100–105.

[40] W.R. Larson, D.L. Dixon, S.A. Aquilino, M.S. Clancy, The effect of carbon graphite fiber reinforcentent on the strength of provisional crown and fixed partial denture resins, J. Prosthet. Dent. 66 (1991) 816–820.

[41] D. Lukkassen, A. Meidell, Advanced Materials and Structures and their Fabrication Processes, Narvik University College, 2008.

[42] Y.I. Kolesov, M.Y. Kudryavtsev, N.Y. Mikhailenko, Types and compositions of glass for production of continuous glass fiber (review), Glass Ceram. 58 (2001) 5–6.

[43] L.V. Lassila, J. Tanner, A.M. Le Bell, K. Narva, P.K. Vallitu, Flexural properties of fiber reinforced root canal posts, Dent. Mater. 20 (2004) 29–36.

[44] S. Garoushi, M. Kaleem, A. Shinya, P.K. Vallittu, J.D. Satterthwaite, D.C. Watts, L.V.J. Lassila, Creep of experimental short fiber-reinforced composite resin, Dent. Mater. J. 31 (2012) 737–741.

[45] M. Behr, M. Rosentritt, R. Lang, G. Handel, Flexural properties of fiber-reinforced composite using a vacuum/pressure or a manual adaptation manufacturing process, J. Dent. 28 (2000) 509–514.

[46] S. Garoushi, P.K. Vallittu, V.J. Lassila, Use of short fiber-reinforced composite with semi-interpenetrating polymer network matrix in fixed partial dentures, J. Dent. 35 (2007) 403–408.

[47] P.G. Malchev, C.T. David, S.J. Picken, A.D. Gotsis, Mechanical properties of short fiber reinforced thermoplastic blends, 462005. 3895–3905.

[48] J. DeBoer, S.G. Vermilyea, R.E. Brady, The effect of carbon fiber orientation on the fatigue resistance and bending properties of two denture resins, J. Prosthet. Dent. 51 (1984) 119–121.

[49] S. Vishu, Handbook of Plastic Testing Technology, 2nd ed. John Wiley, New York, 1998. 546 (e).

[50] S.R. Dyer, L.V. Lassila, M. Jokinen, P.K. Vallittu, Effect of fiber position and orientation on fracture load of fiber- reinforced composite, Dent. Mater. 20 (2004) 947–955.

[51] J.D. Callaghan, A. Vaziri, H. Nayeb-Hashemi, Effect of fiber volume fraction and length on the wear characteristics of glass fiber-reinforced dental composites, Dent. Mater. 22 (2006) 84–93.

[52] J. Manhart, K.H. Kunzelmann, H.Y. Chen, R. Hickel, Mechanical properties of new composite restorative materials, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B Appl. Biomater. 53 (2000) 353–361.

[53] H.H.K. Xu, F.C. Eichmiller, A.A. Giuseppetti, Reinforcement of a self-setting calcium phosphate cement with different fibers, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. 52 (2000) 107–114.

[54] A. Tezvergil, L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallittu, The effect of fiber orientation on the polymerization shrinkage strain of fiber-reinforced composites, Dent. Mater. 22 (2006) 610–616.

[55] L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallitu, The effect of fiber position and polymerization condition on the flexural properties of fibre-reinforced composite, J. Contemp. Dent. Pract. 5 (2004) 14–26.

[56] T.M. Lastum ki, L. . . Lassila, P. . allittu, The semi-interpenetrating polymer network matrix of fiber-reinforced composite and its effect on the surface adhesive properties, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 14 (2003) 803– 809.

[57] A.A. Abdulmajeed, T.O. Narhi, P.K. Vallittu, L.V. Lassila, The effect of high fiber fraction on some mechanical properties of unidirectional glass fiber-reinforced composite, Dent. Mater. 27 (2011) 313–321.

[58] V.M. Miettinen, P.K. Vallittu, Water sorption and solubility of glass fiber-reinforced denture polymethyl-methacrylate resin, J. Prosthet. Dent. 7 (1997) 531–534.

[59] L. . . Lassila, T. Nohrstr m, P. . allittu, The influence of short-term water storage on the flexural properties of unidirectional glass fiber reinforced composites, Biomaterials 23 (2002) 2221–2229.

[60] C.G. Pantago, L.A. Carman, S. Warner, Glass fiber surface effect in silane coupling, in: K.L. Mittal (Ed.), Silanes and Other Coupling Agents, VSP, Utrecht, 1992, pp. 229–240.

[61] P.K. Vallittu, Prosthodontic treatment with a glass fiber-reinforced resin-bonded fixed partial denture: a clinical report, J. Prosthet. Dent. 82 (1999) 132–135.

[62] I.E. Ruyter, Unpolymerized surface layers on sealants, Acta Odontol. Scand. 39 (1981) 27–32.

[63] T.M. Lastum ki, T.T. allio, P. . allittu, The bond strength of light-curing composite resin to finally polymerized and aged glass fiber reinforced composite substrate, Biomaterials 23 (2002) 4533–4539.

[64] L.H. Sperling, Overview of IPNs. Interpenetrating polymer networks, in: D. Klempner, L.H. Sperling, L.A. Utracki (Eds.), Advances in Chemistry Series, vol. 239, American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, 1994, pp. 4–6.

[65] M. kiparta, . li-Urpo, P.K. Vallittu, Flexural properties of glass fiber reinforced composite with multiphase biopolymer matrix, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 15 (2004) 7–11.

[66] P.K. Vallittu, I.E. Ruyter, R. Nat, The swelling phenomenon of acrylic resin polymer teeth at the interface with denture base polymers, J. Prosthet. Dent. 78 (2) (1997) 194–199.

[67] M. Rosentritt, M. Behr, C. Kolbeck, G. Handel, In vitro repair of three unit FRC-FPDs, J. Adhes. Dent. 14 (2001) 344–349.

[68] T.T. Kallio, T.M. Lastumaki, P.K. Vallittu, Bonding of restorative and veneering composite resin to some polymeric composites, Dent. Mater. 17 (2001) 80–86.

[69] M. Cheikh, P. Coorevits, A. Loredo, Modelling the stress continuity at the interface of bonded joints, Int. J. Adhes. Adhes. 21 (2001) 249–258.

[70] A.N. Gent, G.R. Hamed, Fundamentals of adhesion, in: I. Skeist (Ed.), Handbook of Adhesion, Chapman & Hall, New York, 1990, pp. 36–72.

[71] H.R. Daghyani, L. Ye, Y.W. Mai, Evaluation of mode-II fracture energy of adhesive joints with different bond thickness, J. Adhes. Dent. 56 (1996) 171–186.

[72] A.T. DiBenedetto, S.M. Connelly, W.C. Lee, M. Accorsi, The properties of organosilane/polyester interfaces at an E-glass fiber surface, J. Adhes. Dent. 52 (1995) 41–64.

[73] J. Jancar, L. Lapcik, I. Stasko, Electron paramagnetic resonance study of free-radical kinetics in ultraviolet light cured dimethacrylate copolymers, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 9 (1998) 257–262.

[74] P. Polacek, J. Jancar, Effect of filler content on the adhesion strength between UD fiber reinforced and particulate filled composites, Compos. Sci. Technol. 68 (2008) 251–259.

[75] V.M. Miettinen, K.K. Narva, P.K. Vallittu, Water sorption, solubility and effect of post-curing of glass fibre reinforced polymers, Biomaterials 20 (1999) 1187–1194.

[76] Y. Takahashi, J. Chai, S.C. Tan, Effect of water storage on the impact strength of three glass fiber-reinforced composites, Dent. Mater. 22 (2006) 291–297.

[77] K. Narva, Clinical and laboratory findings reinforcing denture base acrylic, The Third International Symposium on Fibre-Reinforced Plastics in Dentistry, 2002, pp. 113–124.

[78] . . onseca, M. . de Paula, .N. avar o, . . . asuya, L.N. de lmeida, . .M. Mendes, .L. Carlo, Reinforcement of dental methacrylate with glass fiber after heated silane application, Biomed Res. Int. 2014 (2014) 364398.

[79] S. Garoushi, L.V.J. Lassila, A. Tezvergil, P.K. Vallittu, Load bearing capacity of fibre-reinforced and particulate filler composite resin combination, J. Dent. 34 (2006) 179–184.

[80] S.R. Dyera, L.V.J. Lassila, M. Jokinen, P.K. Vallittu, Effect of fiber position and orientation on fracture load of fiber-reinforced composite, Dent. Mater. 20 (2004) 947–955.

[81] G.W. Ehrenstein, A. Schmiemann, A. Bledzki, R. Spaude, Corrosion phenomena in glass-fiber reinforced thermosetting resins, in: N.P. Cheremisinoff (Ed.), Handbook of Ceramics and Composites, vol. 1, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1990, pp. 231–268.

[82] C.G. Pantano, L.A. Carman, S. Warner, Glass fiber surface effects in silane coupling, in: K.L. Mittal (Ed.), Silanes and Other Coupling Agents, VSP, Utrecht, 1992, pp. 229–240.

[83] F. Papacchini, F.L. de Castro, C. Goracci, T.N. Sardella, F.R. Tay, A. Polimeni, M. Ferrari, R.M. Carvalho, An investigation of the contribution of silane to the compos- ite repair strength over time using a double-sided microtensile test, Int. Dent. South Africa 8 (2006) 26–36.

[84] B. Abdel-Magid, S. Ziaee, K. Gass, M. Schneider, The combined effects of load, moisture and temperature on the properties of E-glass/epoxy composites, Compos. Struct. 71 (2005) 320–326.

[85] P. Peltonen, P. rvel , Methodology for determining the degree of impregnation from continuous glass fibre prepreg, Polym. Test. 11 (1992) 215–244.

[86] P.K. Vallittu, Effect of 180-week water storage on the flexural properties of E glass and silica fiber acrylic resin composite, Int. J. Prosthodont. 13 (2000) 334–339.

[87] I.E. Ruyter, K. Ekstrand, N. Bjork, Development of carbon/graphite fiber reinforced poly (methyl methacrylate) suitable for implant-fixed dental bridges, Dent. Mater. 2 (1986) 6–9.

[88] A.S. Hargreaves, Equilibrium water uptake and denture base resin behavior, J. Dent. 6 (1979) 342–349.

[89] S. Garoushi, P.K. Vallittu, L.V.J. Lassila, Short glass fiber reinforced restorative composite resin with semi-inter penetrating polymer network matrix, Dent. Mater. 23 (2007) 1356–1362.

[90] . . abr cio, C. . os enato, L.P.P. ab ola, .N. . . elcio, . . de Carvalho, . Mutlu, Evaluation of bond strength between glass fiber and resin composite using different protocols for dental splinting, Eur. J. Gen. Dent. 2 (2013) 281–285.

[91] K.H.R. Ott, Evidence based therapy for the missing tooth/teeth, The Third Interna-tional Symposium on Fibre- Reinforced Plastics in Dentistry, 2002, pp. 15–23.

[92] O. Dutt, R.M. Paroli, M.P. Malivangnum, R.G. Turenne, Glass transition in polymeric roofing membrane-determination by dynamic mechanical analysis, Third International Symposium on Roofing Technology, Montreal, Quebec, 1991.

[93] S. Debnath, R. Ranade, S.L. Wunder, J. McCool, K. Boberick, G. Baran, Interface effects on mechanical properties of particle-reinforced composite, Dent. Mater.20 (2004) 677–686.

[94] S.M. Tussa, M.J. Peltola, T. Tirri, L.V.J. Lassila, P.K. Vallittu, Frontal bone defect repair with experimental glass- fiber-reinforced composite with bioactive glass granule coating, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B Appl. Biomater. 82b (2007) 149–155.

[95] H. Krenchel, Fibre Reinforcement — Theoretical and Practical Investigations of the Elasticity and Strength of Fibre-Reinforced Materials(PhD Thesis) Akademisk Forlag, Copenhagen, 1964.

[96] J. Murphy, Reinforced Plastics Handbook, 2nd ed. Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford, 1998.

[97] M. Chieruzzi, S. Pagano, M. Pennacchi, G. Lombardo, P.D. Errico, J.M. Kenny, Compressive and flexural behaviour of fibre reinforced endodontic posts, J. Dent. 40 (2012) 968–978.

[98] W.C. Outhwaite, S.W. Twiggs, C.W. Fairhurst, G.E. King, Slots vs pins: a comparison of retention under simulated chewing stresses, J. Dent. Res. 61 (1982) 400–402. E.

[99] Mizrahi, D.C. Smith, Direct attachment of orthodontic brackets to dental enamel a preliminary clinical report, Oral Health 61 (1971) 11–14.

[100] G.V. Newman, Epoxy adhesives for orthodontic attachments: progress report, Am. J. Orthod. 51 (1965) 901–912.

[101] F. Heravi, S.M. Moazzami, S. Tahmasbi, Fracture characteristics of fiber reinforced composite bars used to form rigid orthodontic anchorage units, J. Dent. 4 (2007) 53–58.

[102] P. Alander, L. Lassila, P. Vallittu, The span length and cross-sectional design affect values of strength, Dent. Mater. 21 (2005) 347–353.

[103] A.Y. Soininmaki, N. Moritz, L.V.J. Lassila, M. Peltola, H.T. Aro, P.K. Vallittu, Characterization of porous glass fiber-reinforced composite (FRC) implant structures: porosity and mechanical properties, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med. 24 (2013) 2683–2693.

[104] A.S. Khan, M.J. Phillips, K.E. Tanner, F.S.L. Wong, Comparison of the visco-elastic behavior of a pre-impregnated reinforced glass fiber composite with resin-based composite, Dent. Mater. 24 (2008) 1534–1538.

[105] A. Le Bell, L.V.J. Lassila, I. Kangasniemi, P.K. Vallittu, Bonding of fibre-reinforced composite post to root canal dentin, J. Dent. 33 (2005) 533–539.

[106] A. Kadam, M. Pujar, C. Pati, Evaluation of push-out bond strength of two fiber- reinforced composite posts systems using two luting cements in vitro, J. Conserv. Dent. 16 (2013) 444–448.

[107] S. Binus, A. Koch, A. Petschelt, C. Berthold, Restoration of endodontically treated teeth with major hard tissue loss — bond strength of conventionally and adhesive- ly luted fiber-reinforced composite posts, Dent. Traumatol. 29 (2013) 339–354.

[108] F. Monticelli, R. Osorio, M. Toledano, M. Ferrari, D.H. Pashley, F.R. Tay, Sealing properties of one-step root-filling fibre post-obturators vs. two-step delayed fibre post-placement, J. Dent. 38 (2010) 547–552.

[109] D. Assif, A. Bitenski, R. Pilo, E. Oren, Effect of post design on resistance to fracture of endodontically treated teeth with complete crowns, J. Prosthet. Dent. 69 (1993) 36–40.

[110] T. Waltimo, J. Tanner, P. Vallittu, M. Haapasalo, Adherence of Candida albicans to the surface of polymethylmethacrylate—E glass fiber composite used in dentures, Int. J. Prosthodont. 12 (1999) 83–86.

[111] A.M. Ballo, Fiber-reinforced Composites: Oral Implant Material Experimental Studies of Glass Fiber and Bioactive Glass In-vitro and In-vivo(PhD Thesis) University of Turku, Finland, 2008.

[112] J.L. Ferracane, J.R. Condon, Post-cure heat treatments for composites: properties and fractography, Dent. Mater. 8 (1992) 290–295.

[113] S. Ramakrishna, J. Mayer, E. Wintermantel, L.W. Leong, Biomedical applications of polymer-composite materials: a review, Compos. Sci. Technol. 61 (2001) 1189–1224. C.K.

[114] Schreiber, Polymethyl methacrylate reinforced with carbon fibres, Br. Dent. J. 130 (1971) 29–30.

[115] T.R. Manley, A.J. Bowman, M. Cook, Denture bases reinforced with carbon fibers, Br. Dent. J. 146 (1979) 25.

[116] W.R. Krause, S.H. Park, R.A. Straup, Mechanical properties of Bis-GMA resin short glass fiber composites, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. 23 (1989) 1195–1211.

[117] A.J. Goldberg, C.J. Burstone, The use of continuous fiber reinforcement in dentistry, Dent. Mater. 8 (1992) 197– 202.

[118] M. Stiesch-Scholz, K. Schulz, L. Borchers, In vitro fracture resistance of four-unit fiber-reinforced composite fixed partial dentures, Dent. Mater. 22 (2006) 374–381. D.

[119] Isaac, Engineering aspects of the structure and properties of polymer-fibre composites, Proceedings of the First Symposium on Fiber Reinforced Plastic in Dentistry, 1998, pp. 1–21.

[120] J.W.V. van-Dijken, K.R. Wing, I.E. Ruyter, An evaluation of the radiopacity of composite restorative materials used in Class I and Class II cavities, Acta Odontol. Scand. 47 (1989) 401–407.

[121] I.H. Tacir, J.D. Kama, M. Zortuk, S. Eskimez, Flexural properties of glass fibre reinforced acrylic resin polymers, Aust. Dent. J. 51 (2006) 52–56.

[122] J.V. Altieri, C.J. Burstone, A.J. Goldberg, Longitudinal clinical evaluation of fiber-reinforced composite fixed partial dentures: a pilot study, J. Prosthet. Dent. 71 (1994) 16–22.

[123] M.A. Freilich, A.C. Karmaker, C.J. Burstone, A.J. Goldberg, Development and clinical applications of a light-polymerized fiber-reinforced composite, J. Prosthet. Dent. 80 (1998) 311–318.

[124] K. Ekstrand, I.E. Ruyter, H. Wellendorf, Carbon/graphite reinforced poly (methyl meth- acrylate): properties under dry and wet conditions, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. 21 (1987) 1065–1080.

[125] P.K. Vallittu, Comparison of the in vitro fatigue resistance of an acrylic resin removable partial denture reinforced with continuous glass fibers or metal wires, J. Prosthodont. 5 (1996) 115–121.

[126] A.C. Karmaker, A.T. DiBenedetto, A.J. Goldberg, Continuous fiber reinforced composite materials as alternatives for metal alloys used for dental appliances, J. Biomater. Appl. 11 (1997) 318–328.

[127] K.K. Narva, L.V. Lassila, P.K. Vallittu, Fatigue resistance and stiffness of glass fiber reinforced urethane dimethacrylate composite, J. Prosthet. Dent. 91 (2004) 158–163.

[128] C.C. van Heumen, C.M. Kreulen, N.H. Creugers, Clinical studies of fiber-reinforced resin-bonded fixed partial dentures: a systematic review, Eur. J. Oral Sci. 117 (2009) 1–6.

[129] J.L. Drummond, M.S. Bapna, Static and cyclic loading of fiber-reinforced dental resin, Dent. Mater. 19 (2003) 226–231.

[130] C.C. van Heumen, J. Tanner, J.W. van Dijken, R. Pikaar, L.V.J. Lassila, N.H. Creugers, P.K. Vallittu, C.M. Kreulen, Five-year survival of 3-unit fiber- reinforced composite fixed partial dentures in the posterior area, Dent. Mater. 26 (2010) 954–960.

[131] G. Rappelli, M. Corso, E. Coccia, E. Camaioni, R. Di Felice, M. Procaccini, In vitro retentive strength of metal superstructures cemented to solid abutments, Minerva Stomatol. 57 (2008) 95–101.

[132] M. Chieruzzi, M. Rallini, S. Pagano, S. Eramo, P.D. Errico, L. Torre, J.M. Kenny, Mechan- ical effect of static loading on endodontically treated teeth restored with fiber- reinforced posts, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B Appl. Biomater. 102 (2014) 384–394.

[133] D.W. Fallis, R.P. Kusy, Novel esthetic bonded retainers: a blend of art and science, Clin. Orthod. Res. 2 (1999) 200–208.

[134] E. . ilynoja, L. Lassila, . aroushi, P. . allittu, The effect of fibers length on the frac- ture toughness of short fiber reinforced composites, Dent. Mater. 29 (2013) e56.

[135] S. Garoushi, P.K. Vallittu, L.V.J. Lassila, Direct restoration of severely damaged inci- sors using short fiber-reinforced composite resin, J. Dent. 35 (2007) 731–736.

[136] S. Garoushi, P.K. Vallittu, D.C. Watts, L.V.J. Lassila, Polymerization shrinkage of experimental short glass fiber reinforced composite with semi-inter penetrating polymer network matrix, Dent. Mater. 24 (2008) 211–215.

[137] S. Garoushi, P.K. Vallittu, L.V.J. Lassila, Fracture toughness, compressive strength and load-bearing capacity of short glass fiberreinforced composite resin, Chin. J. Dent. Res. 14 (2011) 15–19.

[138] S. Garoushi, J. Tanner, P.K. Vallittu, L. Lassila, Preliminary clinical evaluation of short fiber-reinforced composite resin in posterior teeth: 12-months report, Open Dent. J. 6 (2012) 41–45.

[139] . aroushia, E. ilynojac, P. . allittu, L. Lassilaa, Physical properties and depth of cure of a new short fiber reinforced composite, Dent. Mater. 29 (2013) 835–841. C.J.

[140] Burstone, A.J. Kuhlberg, Fiber-reinforced composites in orthodontics, J. Clin. Orthod. 34 (2000) 271–279.

[141] J.C. Meiers, R.B. Kazemi, M. Donadio, The influence of fiber reinforcement of composites on shear bond strengths to enamel, J. Prosthet. Dent. 89 (2003) 388–393. J.W.

[142] Freudenthaler, G.K. Tischler, C.J. Burstone, Bond strength of fiber-reinforced composite bars for orthodontic attachment, Am. J. Orthod. Dentofac. Orthop. 120 (2001) 648–653.

[143] B.U. Zachrisson, The acid-etch technique in orthodontics: Clinical studies, in: L.M. Silverstone, I.L. Dogon (Eds.), Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Acid Etch Technique, North Central Publishing Co., St. Paul, Minnesota, 1975, pp. 265–267.

[144] E. Bolla, M. Cozzani, T. Doldo, M. Fontana, Failure evaluation after a 6-year reten- tion period: a comparison between glass fiber-reinforced (GFR) and multistranded bonded retainers, Int. Orthod. 10 (2012) 16–28.

[145] S. Rosenberg, A new method for stabilization of periodontally involved teeth, J. Periodon. 51 (1980) 469–473.

[146] . rtun, .T. padafora, P. . Shapiro, A 3-year follow-up study of various types of orthodontic canine-to-canine retainers, Euro. J. Orthod. 19 (1997) 501–509.

[147] M. Geserick, J. Ball, A. Wichelhaus, Bonding fiber-reinforced lingual retainers with color-reactivating flowable composite, J. Clin. Orthod. 38 (2004) 560–562.

[148] B.U. Zachrisson, Clinical experience with direct-bonded orthodontic retainers, Am. J. Orthod. 71 (1977) 440–448.

[149] B. Kargul, E. Caglar, U. Kabalay, Glass fiber-reinforced composite resin as fixed space maintainer in children: 12-month clinical follow-up, J. Dent. Child. 72 (2005) 109–112.

[150] C. Nidhi, R.L. Jain, M. Neeraj, K. Harsimrat, B. Samriti, C. Anuj, Evaluation of the clinical efficacy of glass fiber reinforced composite resin as a space maintainer and its comparison with the conventional band and loop space maintainer: an in vivo study, Minerva Stomatol. 61 (2012) 21–30.

[151] J.C. Meiers, J.P. Duncan, M.A. Freilich, A.J. Goldberg, Preimpregnated, fiber- reinforced prosthesis. Part II. Direct applications: splints and fixed partial dentures, Quint. Int. 29 (1998) 761–768.

[152] O. Kumbuloglu, A. Saracoglu, M. Ozcan, Pilot study of unidirectional E-glass fibre- reinforced composite resin splints: up to 4.5-year clinical follow-up, J. Dent. 39 (2011) 871–877.

[153] M.G. Hoeppner, R.B. onseca, E. . Pfau, . . usto, . vero, L.L. remm, ehabilitation of periodontally compromised teeth with fiber-reinforced composite resin: a case report, Quint. Int. 42 (2011) 113–120.