



A Comparative Review of Cast Metal vs Composite Inlays: Which One Should I Prefer?

Renu Rajput*, Ayushi Rawat, Rohit Babu and Anil Dhingra

Department of Conservative Dentistry, Seema Dental College and Endodontics Hospital, Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India

*Corresponding Author: Renu Rajput, Department of Conservative Dentistry, Seema Dental College and Endodontics Hospital, Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India.

DOI: 10.31080/ASDS.2024.08.1758

Received: October 12, 2023

Published: December 12, 2023

© All rights are reserved by **Renu Rajput, et al.**

Abstract

Dental inlays are essential restorative options for preserving damaged teeth. Among the various materials available, cast metal and composite inlays stand out for their unique properties. This article delves into the characteristics, clinical applications, advantages, and disadvantages of cast metal and composite inlays. Through a comparative analysis, we aim to provide a comprehensive comparison between cast metal and composite inlay and why we should choose one over the other [2].

Keywords: Cast Metal; Composite Inlays; Teeth

Introduction

Dental inlays, essential in restorative dentistry, come in diverse materials catering to specific clinical needs. Cast metal inlays, traditionally crafted from alloys, and composite inlays, composed of resin-based materials, are prominent choices. Dental inlays have emerged as indispensable solutions for the preservation and repair of damaged teeth. As technology and materials have advanced, the choice between cast metal and composite inlays has become a pivotal decision for dental practitioners. These indirect restorations satisfy the increasing patient expectations for a natural or enhanced appearance. The directly placed resin restoration is clearly the most conservative posterior restoration in contemporary dentistry. Although this technique requires only that diseased tooth structures be removed and replaced, direct resin is subject to shrinkage when it is light cured. This can result in stretch forces on the bond or the tooth with the potential for postoperative sensitivity and/or microleakage if these forces are not relieved by elastomeric flow in the resin. Although this development is less problematic in smaller class II cavities and can be controlled or limited somewhat by technique, it is of greater concern in larger carious lesions. Inlay restorations attempt to minimize this inherent property of light-cured resins, because only the thin layer of luting resin is subject to polymerization shrinkage at restoration placement. This article critically examines the two different types of inlay and their mechanical strength, aesthetics, and clinical applicability [1-10].

Cast metal inlays

Mechanical properties

Cast metal inlays are lauded for their exceptional mechanical strength, making them ideal for posterior restorations subjected

to significant occlusal forces. Alloys like gold exhibit high tensile strength and durability, ensuring the longevity of the restoration.

Clinical applications

Cast metal inlays find extensive use in posterior teeth, especially in patients with bruxism or heavy bite forces. Their ability to withstand wear and tear makes them suitable for molars and premolars, where functional longevity is paramount.

Aesthetics and biocompatibility

While not as aesthetically pleasing as tooth-colored alternatives, cast metal inlays are often placed in less visible areas, mitigating aesthetic concerns. Moreover, these materials are biocompatible, minimizing the risk of adverse reactions.

Advantages and challenges

The precision of fit, longevity, and minimal wear make cast metal inlays a preferred choice in specific clinical scenarios. However, challenges include their visible appearance in some cases and the need for more aggressive tooth reduction during preparation.

Composite inlays

Mechanical properties

Modern composite materials have made significant strides in terms of strength and durability. Composite inlays exhibit impressive mechanical properties, with sufficient strength to withstand moderate occlusal forces, especially in anterior and some posterior applications.

Clinical applications

Composite inlays are highly versatile and can be used in both anterior and posterior teeth. Their ability to bond directly to the

tooth structure allows for minimally invasive preparations, preserving more natural tooth substance.

Aesthetics and biocompatibility

Composite inlays are renowned for their excellent aesthetics. With a vast array of shades and translucencies, they can be precisely matched to the patient's natural dentition. Additionally, composites are generally well-tolerated by the surrounding tissues.

Advantages and challenges

The main advantages of composite inlays include their aesthetic adaptability, conservative preparation, and direct bonding capabilities. However, challenges such as potential wear and staining over time need to be considered in long-term evaluations.

Comparative analysis

Strength and durability

Cast metal inlays excel in strength, especially in high-stress areas, making them ideal for posterior restorations. However, modern composites offer satisfactory strength, enabling their use in a broader range of applications.

Aesthetics

Composite inlays have a clear advantage in aesthetics, providing natural and seamless integration with the surrounding dentition. Cast metal inlays, though durable, may lack the esthetic appeal demanded by many patients, especially in visible areas.

Clinical flexibility

Composite inlays are versatile and can be used in various clinical situations, from anterior to posterior teeth. Their ability to preserve more natural tooth structure and adapt to minimal invasive techniques makes them a popular choice. Cast metal inlays, while strong, are limited to posterior applications and require more substantial tooth reduction.

Conclusion

Choosing between cast metal and composite inlays necessitates a careful consideration of clinical requirements and patient preferences. Cast metal inlays, with their exceptional strength, are ideal for posterior teeth subjected to significant chewing forces. On the other hand, composite inlays, with their impressive aesthetics and clinical versatility, are suitable for both anterior and posterior restorations, especially in cases where preserving natural tooth structure is crucial. Dentists must assess individual patient needs and preferences, coupled with the specific clinical demands, to make informed decisions. As materials continue to evolve, the choice between cast metal and composite inlays will become even more nuanced, empowering dental professionals to provide the best possible care for their patients.

Bibliography

1. Smith DE and Zarb GA. "Criteria for success of osseointegrated endosseous implants". *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 62.5 (1989): 567-572.
2. Christensen GJ. "Why select posterior tooth-colored restorations?" *The Journal of the American Dental Association* 128.10 (1997): 1473-1475.
3. Van Noort R. "Introduction to dental materials". Elsevier Health Sciences (2017).
4. Hilton TJ, et al. "Comparison of CaOH with MTA for direct pulp capping: a PBRN randomized clinical trial". *Journal of Dental Research* 92.7 (2013): 16S-22S.
5. Heintze SD and Rousson V. "Clinical effectiveness of direct anterior restorations—a meta-analysis". *Dental Materials* 31.5 (2015): 481-495.
6. Manhart J, et al. "Buonocore Memorial Lecture. Review of the clinical survival of direct and indirect restorations in posterior teeth of the permanent dentition". *Operative Dentistry* 29.5 (2004): 481-508.
7. Reeh ES and Douglas WH. "Criteria for direct and indirect dental restorative materials". *Current Opinion in Dentistry* 2.1 (1992): 91-97.
8. Krejci I, et al. "Use of Cerec inlays in adhesive restorations". *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed* 101.8 (1991): 950-957.
9. Burke FJ. "Amalgam to tooth-coloured materials—implications for clinical practice and dental education". *Dental Materials* 23.4 (2007): 487-496.
10. Opdam NJ, et al. "Five-year clinical performance of posterior resin composite restorations placed by dental students". *Journal of Dentistry* 32.5 (2004): 379-383.