Effect of Sandblasting, Etching and Resin bonding on the Flexural Strength/Bonding of Novel Glass-Ceramics
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Abstract

Objectives: To process novel leucite glass-ceramics and test the effects of surface treatment and resin bonding on the biaxial flexural strength (BFS) and shear bond strength (SBS).

Methods: Alumino-silicate glasses were ball-milled, and heat treated to form leucite glass-ceramics (LG-C, OLG-C), then sintered into ingots. Ingots were heat extruded into a refractory mould to form disc specimens (1.3 x 14 mm diameter). IPS e.max® was used as a commercial comparison. Glass-ceramic test groups were sandblasted (Groups. 1, 4, 6) sandblasted, etched and adhesively bonded (Groups. 2, 5, 7) or lapped, etched and adhesively bonded (Groups. 3, 8). Specimens were adhesively bonded with Monobond S, followed by the application of Variolink II® cement and light curing. BFS testing was at 1mm/min and SBS testing at 0.5mm/min. Samples were characterised using XRD SEM and profilometry.

Results: XRD confirmed tetragonal leucite in LG-C/OLG-C and lithium disilicate/lithium orthophosphate in IPS e.max®. Mean BFS (MPa (SD)) were: Gp1 LG-C; 193.1 (13.9), Gp2 LG-C; 217.7 (23.0), Gp3 LG-C; 273.6 (26.7), Gp4 OLG-C; 255.9 (31); Gp5 OLG-C; 288.6 (37.4), Gp6 IPS e.max®; 258.6 (20.7), Gp7 IPS e.max®; 322.3 (23.4) and Gp8 IPS e.max®; 416.4 (52.6). The Median SBS (MPa) were Gp1 LG-C; 14.2, Gp2 LG-C (10 s etch); 10.6 and Gp3 IPS e.max®; 10.8. Mean surface roughness was 5-5.1 µm (IPS e.max®) and 2.6 µm (LG-C).

Significance: Novel leucite glass-ceramics with reduced flaw size and fine microstructures produced enhanced BFS and SBS by resin bonding. These properties may be useful for the fabrication of minimally invasive aesthetic and fracture resistant restorations.
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1. Introduction

Leucite (KAlSi$_2$O$_6$) glass-ceramics are desirable for the fabrication of dental restorations due to their excellent aesthetic properties, which simulate natural tooth appearance and their low cytotoxicity [1]. The high thermal expansion coefficient of tetragonal leucite (20.5 x 10^{-6} / °C) [2], makes it a useful component in veneering materials for high strength metal-ceramic restorations [3]. Leucite glass-ceramics can also be fabricated into a variety of all-ceramic restorations adhesively bonded to dentine–enamel tooth structure [4, 5], and encouraging a more conservative tooth preparation [6]. Restorations can be processed by heat extruding glass-ceramic ingots into a refractory mould prepared by the lost wax technique, then finished by extrinsically staining to simulate the natural characteristics of the tooth [7]. Heat extrusion increases densification and is associated with higher flexural strength due to crystallite dispersion and a more homogeneous crystal distribution [8, 9]. Typical properties are a reported $K_{IC}$ of 1.33 (0.08) MPa m$^{1/2}$ and flexural strengths in the range of 75.7–165 MPa [10, 11]. Mackert et al. [12] suggested that inherent flaws associated with the cubic to tetragonal transformation were reduced by synthesizing crystals in a critical size range (<4 µm). The synthesis and heat extrusion of a fine grained (<4µm) leucite glass-ceramic resulted in a high flexural strength of (mean (SD)) 245 (24.3) MPa and high reliability (weibull m =11.9) [13]. Heat extrusion and processing including sandblasting and finishing are however, associated with a range of critical flaws, which when under tensile stress cause premature failure by various failure modes, initiated at occlusal contacts or cementation surfaces [14]. Resin bonding of leucite glass-ceramic restorations is advantageous in this respect as they are significantly strengthened by this modification to their internal surfaces.
Internal ceramic surfaces can be sandblasted and etched to gain micromechanical retention, followed by silane bonding agents wetting and bonding to the ceramic surface. The organo-functional group in the silane next forms a bond with the resin cement [16, 17]. Effective resin-ceramic bonding of glass-ceramic restorations takes advantage of increased surface area for bonding to tooth structure to gain retention [15, 18] and reinforcement [5], and a clinically acceptable marginal fit [19, 20]. There is also the advantage of significant strengthening effects related to resin elastic modulus and thickness [21, 22]. Some pre-resin bonding surface treatments such as sandblasting, in addition to improving micro roughness, can change critical flaw populations and degrade strength [23]. Hydrofluoric (HF) acid etching has also been found to reduce the biaxial flexural strength of leucite glass-ceramics [24], and the type of silane employed can influence bond strengths [25]. When developing new glass-ceramic formulations the glass/crystal phase chemistry, leucite crystal size, number and distribution [15], and physical properties influence the resultant bonding surface area and structure after pre-cementation treatments. The subsequent micromechanical retention and wettability of these surfaces is important to achieve effective adhesive resin bonding [26]. The authors have synthesised a unique range of new leucite glass-ceramics with high leucite volume fraction and small crystallite size for the first time [27]. It is therefore key to assess these ceramics after scale-up and following processing and cementation procedures, to realise the optimisation of this important category of materials and its benefits for minimally invasive adhesive dentistry. Therefore, the aims of this study were to process novel leucite glass-ceramics (LG-C, OLG-C) using heat extrusion and to analyse the effects of sandblasting, etching and resin bonding on the biaxial flexural strength and the shear bond strength of the glass-ceramics.
2. **Materials and Methods**

2.1 **Preparation of Sandblasted Specimens**

An alumino-silicate glass with the following composition (mol %) was commercially synthesized (Lot nos: F-0356, 92100111, glasses supplied by Davis Schottlander Davis Ltd., UK and Cera Dynamics Ltd, Stoke-on-Trent, UK): SiO$_2$ (69.7 %), Al$_2$O$_3$ (10.6 %), K$_2$O (12.8 %), CaO (1.5 %), TiO$_2$ (1.3 %), Na$_2$O (1.9 %), Li$_2$O (1.6 %), B$_2$O$_3$ (0.7 %) by heating in a high temperature custom made furnace (Cera Dynamics Ltd, UK) at 10°C/min to 1550°C (5 h hold). The glass was air quenched and allowed to cool to room temperature. The glass frit was crushed, ball-milled for 1 h and screened to 125 µm (LG-C). To optimise the glass-ceramics another batch of glass was also produced using the same parameters but quenched in water and ball milled for 93 h, followed by spray drying (Niro Atomizer, Denmark) of the powder (OLG-C). The glass powders (LG-C and OLG-C) were placed into refractory trays (IPS press Vest speed, Ivoclar-Vivadent, Lot no: Powder TL3033 and Liquid TL3022) and heated in a furnace (Lenton 1600, Hope Valley, UK) at 10°C/ min to 592 °C (1h hold), then ramped at 10°C/min to 1040°C (30 min hold). The leucite glass-ceramic (LG-C) and optimised leucite glass-ceramic (OLG-C) were air quenched, ball-milled and screened through a 125 µm sieve (Endescott Ltd, London, UK). To fabricate glass-ceramic ingots 1.6 g of LG-C or OLG-C powder was dry compacted using a custom-made steel die and punch (diameter 13.0 mm, Specac Ltd., Slough, UK), by applying 0.5 bar pressure for 30 s using a hydraulic press (Quayle Dental, HBP 153, UK). Compacted powder ingots were ramped from 538°C at a rate of 38°C to 1060°C, under partial vacuum (55 hPa) and held for 2 min in a porcelain furnace (Multimat 2 Touch + Press, Dentsply, Weybridge, UK).
IPS e.max® (LT A3, Ivoclar-Vivadent, Lot no: T45580) was used as a commercial comparison. Perspex (ICI Plastics, UK) discs (1.3 mm depth x 14 mm diameter) were sprued onto muffle bases with a surrounding silicon cylinder. Disc specimens were invested using 200 g of investment material (IPS Press VEST speed powder, Lot no: TL3033), mixed with 32 ml liquid (Lot no: TL3022) and 22 ml distilled water and vacuum mixed (Renfert twister; E10022C6, Germany) at 350 rpm for 2.30 min. The investment was poured into the moulds under vibration and allowed to set for 45 min, then placed into a furnace (Renfert Magma, B1099520, Germany) preheated to 850°C and allowed to dwell for 60 min. The LG-C, OLG-C or IPS e.max® ingots (at room temperature) were placed into hot refractory moulds, then heat pressed using a press furnace (Programat EP 3000, Ivoclar-Vivadent, Schaan Liechtenstein) according to the protocols in Table 1. LG-C, OLG-C and IPS e.max® specimens were divested via a sandblasting unit (Renfert Basic Quattro, Germany) using 50 µm glass beads (07M509B, Bracon Ltd, UK) at 2 bar pressure. The sandblasting nozzle was held at 10 mm from specimen’s surface and at 45° to the specimens. Sprue areas were cut off using a diamond disc (006 Bracon Ltd., UK) and diamond bur (9907, Bracon Ltd., UK). Following divesting, LG-C and OLG-C discs were ultrasonically cleaned using distilled water in an ultrasonic bath (Sonorex RK 100H, Bandelin, Germany) for 10 min and air dried for 30 min. IPS e.max® G-C specimens following divesting had the reaction layers removed by immersion into invex liquid (lot no: H31070, Ivoclar-Vivadent AG, Germany) for 20 min. The residual acid solution was rinsed off the specimen under running water for 30 min, followed by sandblasting with 100 µm Al₂O₃ (lot no: 1644568, Renfert, Germany) using the same regimen as with the glass beads. Specimens were ultrasonically cleaned in distilled water (10 min) and air dried as previously.
2.2 Preparation of the Resin-bonded Specimens for the BFS Tests

The LG-C and OLG-C disc specimens (1.3 x 14 mm) prepared in 2.1 were split into 4 groups (n= 20 per group). Group 1 and 4 were tested as sandblasted. Group 2 and group 5 were sandblasted and resin bonded. Prior to resin bonding, the tensile surfaces were etched for 60 s (80 s for OLG-C) with 5 % Hydrofluoric (HF) acid (IPS ceramic etching gel, Lot no: T31384, Ivoclar-Vivadent) then rinsed under running water for 2 min. One measuring spoonful of IPS neutralising powder (lot no: T34017, Ivoclar-Vivadent) was spread over the etched surface for 5 min, rinsed under running water for 1 min then ultrasonically cleaned in distilled water for 3 min and air dried (30 min). Monobond S (lot no T29123, Ivoclar-Vivadent AG, Germany) was applied on the etched surfaces of the LG-C and OLG-C specimens and allowed to air dry for 60 s. Variolink II Base (lot no: T30272, Ivoclar-Vivadent) and Catalyst (lot no: T00901) were mixed for 10 s at a ratio of 1:1 and applied to the prepared surfaces. A mylar strip was placed over the resin followed by a glass cover slip and a 50 N weight for 1 min. The resin was light cured using an LED dental curing light (Bluephase16i, Ivoclar-Vivadent) at the SOF setting, placed at a distance of 1 mm over the centre of the specimen and cured for 15 s, then at three different points on the disc circumference for 10 s. Group 3 was sandblasted, lapped to P800 grit silicon carbide paper (Buehler, Coventry UK), then etched, neutralised and resin bonded as in Group 2.

IPS e.max® G-C disc specimens prepared in 2.1 were split into three groups (n= 20 per group). Group 6 was as sandblasted with 100 µm Al₂O₃ as described in 2.1. Group 7 was HF etched for 20s, neutralised and resin bonded as previously. Group
7 was lapped to P800 grit silicon carbide paper, and then HF etched for 20s, neutralised and resin bonded using the earlier protocol. The prepared LG-C, OLG-C and IPS e.max® specimens were stored at 37°C for 24 h in an incubator (Camlab, UK) prior to mechanical testing. Test groups are illustrated in Table 2.

### 2.3. Preparation of the Resin-bonded Specimens for the SBS Tests

LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C disc specimens as sandblasted in 2.1 were ultrasonically cleaned in distilled water and divided into three groups (n= 10 per group). Group 1 (LG-C) was etched using 5% HF acid (IPS ceramic etching gel, Ivoclar-Vivadent, Lot no: T31384) for 60 s and Group 2 (LG-C) etched for 10 s, while Group 3 (IPS e.max®) was etched for 20 s. The rinsing, neutralisation, cleaning and monobond S application procedures were identical to 2.2. During resin application, Tygon tubing (5 mm diameter x 2 mm depth, R3603, Norton Performance Plastic Corp, USA) was centrally positioned on the specimen surface and Variolink II® resin cement (prepared as previously) placed into the tubing at 1 mm increments. Each 1 mm increment was light cured centrally for 15 s and at three different points around the circumference for 10 s each, using an LED dental curing light (Bluephase16i, Ivoclar-Vivadent) on the SOF setting. Following light curing, the LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C specimens were stored in distilled water at 37°C for 7 days before SBS testing.
2.3 Biaxial Flexural Strength Testing

The biaxial flexural strength (BFS) of glass-ceramic groups shown in Table 2 were tested using the ball-on-ring test. Disc specimens were placed on a 10 mm diameter knife-edge support and centrally loaded via a 4 mm diameter spherical ball indenter at a crosshead speed of 1 mm/min until specimen failure. The BFS of the as sandblasted Groups 1, 4 and 6 were calculated using the Timoshenko and Woinowsky-Krieger equation [28]:

\[
\sigma_{\text{max}} = \frac{P}{h^2} \{(1+\nu)[0.485x\ln(\alpha/h)+0.52]+0.48\}
\]

where \(\sigma_{\text{max}}\) was the maximum tensile stress, \(P\) was the load at fracture, \(h\) was the thickness of the specimen, \(\alpha\) was the radius of knife-edge ring support, \(\nu\) was the Poisson’s ratio of 0.25 [29].

The maximum tensile stress (\(\sigma\)), of the resin-bonded groups (Table 2), were calculated using a multi-layer equation, described by Hsueh et al. [30]. Values for modulus of elasticity and Poisson’s ratio for the respective glass-ceramics and resin cement were entered into the equation. The modulus of elasticity values for the leucite glass-ceramics (LG-C/OLG-C) were taken to be 65 GPa [31] and 95 GPa [32] for IPS e.max® glass-ceramic. The Poisson’s ratio of the glass-ceramics was taken to be 0.25 [29] and for the resin cement was 0.33 [33]. The modulus of elasticity of the resin cement and taken to be 7.6 GPa [33].
2.4 Statistical Analysis

One-way ANOVA (Sigma Stat, version 2.03, SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA) and Tukey's multiple comparison tests (p< 0.05) was used to compare the BFS test groups. The biaxial flexure strength data were ranked in ascending order and the Weibull analysis using Weibullsmith software (Fulton Findings, USA) was performed. The double logarithm of 1/ (1-median rank) was plotted vertically against the logarithm of the actual data values and a straight line fitted through the points using the median rank regression methods. The equation of Weibull two parameter distribution function used was:

\[ P_f = 1 - \exp\left[ -\left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0}\right)^m \right] \]

Where \( P_f \) is the probability of failure and \( \sigma \) is the strength at a given \( P_f \) value. \( \sigma_0 \) is the characteristic strength and \( m \) is the Weibull modulus. Groups were compared according to the overlap of their double-sided confidence intervals at the 95% level.

2.5 Shear Bond Strength Test

10 specimens per test group, LG-C (10 and 60s etch) and IPS e.max® (20s etch), were loaded in a universal testing machine (Instron 5567, Instron Ltd., UK), using a knife edge chisel placed perpendicular to the resin-ceramic interfaces at a crosshead speed of 0.5mm/min until failure. The shear bond strength (SBS) was calculated using the equation:

\[ \text{SBS} = \frac{F}{\pi r^2} \]

Where \( F \) is the maximum force (N) and \( r \) is the radius of the composite cylinder. Data sets were compared using the Mann-Whitney rank sum test.
2.6 Secondary Electron Imaging (SEI)

Glass-ceramic specimens were polished to 1µm alumina micropolish (Lot no: 0335-0275, Buehler, Coventry, UK) and etched (LG-C/OLG-C; 0.1% HF, 60 s) and for IPS e.max® (2% HF mixed with 15% sulphuric acid, 10 s). Polished and fractured specimens were gold coated in an automatic sputter coater (Agar Scientific Ltd., UK) for 30 s at 40 mA and viewed using a field emission scanning electron microscope (FEI Inspect F, Eindhoven, The Netherlands) in the secondary electron imaging mode.

2.7 X-ray Diffraction Analysis

LG-C, OLG-C and IPS e.max® G-C powders were analysed using a Panalytical X’Pert Pro powder diffractometer (Panalytical B.V., Almelo, The Netherlands). CuKα radiation was used with the tube powered at 45 kV and 40 mA. Data was collected continuously with an X’Celerator solid state multistrip detector from 5° to 70° (2θ range) with a step size of 0.0334° and a step time of 200.03 s. Calibration was carried out using NIST standard reference material 660 a (lanthanum hexaboride). Crystal phases were identified using ICDD reference codes 00-038-1423 for tetragonal leucite, 40-0376 for Lithium disilicate and 01-087-0039 for β-lithium orthophosphate.

2.8 Profilometry Analysis

The surface roughness for the heat pressed and sandblasted LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C disc specimens were analysed before and after etching using the non-contact 3D White-light profilometer (Proscan-2000, Scantron, Taunton, UK). A dark background measurement was carried out for the sensor before conducting any
scans to ensure that a maximum sensitivity to the reflected light was achieved. An S13/1.2 chromatic sensor was used (Stil S.A., Aix-en-Provence, France) and samples were scanned at a frequency of 100 Hz using a step size of 5 µm and a surface area of (4 x 4 mm) that acquired profilometric surface image of 801 lines (x and y). All scanned data were analysed using the dedicated software (Proform ver. 1.41, Proscan-2000 ver. 2.1.8.8+ software, Scantron, UK) and a surface filter of 80 % was applied on all scanned images.
3. Results

3.1 Biaxial Flexural Strength Test Results

The biaxial flexural strength (BFS) results are presented in Table 3. There was a statistically significant difference (p< 0.05) between BFS groups 1 and 2, 4 and 5 and between 7 and 8. There was no significant difference (p> 0.05) between sandblasted OLG-C (group 4) and the IPS e.max® G-C (group 6) mean BFS values, however the LG-C (group 1) had a significantly lower mean BFS value. After resin bonding the IPS e.max® G-C (group 7 and 8) had a significantly higher (mean BFS value than the resin bonded OLG-C (group 5).

The results of the Weibull analysis are reported in Table 3. There was no significant difference in Weibull m values between groups 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. The group 1 m value was significantly higher than groups 4, 5 and 8. There were significant differences in characteristic strength between groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Group 4 was significantly different to all the other test groups apart from groups 3 and 6 characteristic strengths, according to the overlap of their 95% double sided confidence intervals.

3.2 Secondary Electron Imaging Results

SEI photomicrographs of LG-C, OLG-C and IPS e.max® G-C are presented in Figures 1a-h. The LG-C had a uniform dispersion of spherical leucite crystals with a mean (SD) crystal size of 0.89 (1.08) µm² and the OLG-C a mean (SD) crystal size of 0.62 (0.42) µm². There was no microcracking in the glass matrix observed for LG-C (Fig. 1a) and OLG-C (Fig. 1b). IPS e.max® G-C showed the characteristic rod-like crystals of lithium-disilicate (Fig. 1f). LG-C illustrated fine trans-granular fracture
surfaces (Fig. 1d), in contrast with the coarser inter-granular fracture surface of the IPS e.max® (Figs 1f). Crack pinning and possible crack bridging mechanisms were visible in the LG-C fracture surface (Fig. 1e). LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C indicated fracture surfaces where failure was initiated at the ceramic-cement interface or near this interface (1g-h).

For the SBS specimens 100% of the LG-C specimens (10 and 60 s, HF etched) failed cohesively into the ceramic (Figs. 2a-b) and only 20% of IPS e.max® G-C (20 s HF etched) showed similar cohesive failure. The remaining 80% showed largely interfacial mixed mode failure (Figs. 2c-d).

### 3.3 Shear Bond Strength Test Results

The shear bond strength (SBS) test results are shown in Table 4. The LG-C (group 1) had a significantly higher (p< 0.05) mean and median SBS than IPS e.max® G-C (group 3). There was no significant difference (p> 0.05) in SBS values between groups 2 and 3. There was no significant difference (p> 0.05) in the median SBS between LG-C Groups 1 and 2.

### 3.4 X-ray Diffraction Results

X-ray diffraction results for the powdered LG-C and OLG-C specimens identified tetragonal leucite as the major crystal phase (Fig 3a). Lithium disilicate was the major phase and β-lithium orthophosphate a minor phase in the IPS e.max® G-C (Fig 3b).
3.5. Profilometry Results

The surface roughness values for sandblasted LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C, before and after acid etching are given in Table 5. Profilometric image of the LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C after sandblasting and acid etching are shown in Figs 4a, b. The recorded roughness values (Ra) for the LG-C disc sample were lower than the IPS e.max® G-C. The Ra in both samples was consistent across the X and Y directions, which illustrates that the flaw sizes in the LG-C and IPS e.max® G-C were uniformly distributed. After acid etching the glass-ceramic samples, a decrease in the surface roughness (Ra) from 3.1 to 2.6 µm for LG-C and from 5.7 to 5 µm for IPS e.max® G-C was achieved.
4. Discussion

Tetragonal leucite was confirmed by X-ray diffraction to be the major crystalline phase in the experimental leucite glass-ceramics (OLG-C, LG-C) (Fig. 3a). Leucite crystal twinning, characteristic of the tetragonal leucite phase was also observed in the SEM photomicrographs (Fig 1a-b). Lamellar and merohedric twinning has been described by Palmer et al. [34] and is a consequence of complex stresses induced by the reversible cubic to tetragonal phase transformation of leucite crystals cooling from above 400°C to 25°C. This phenomenon is accompanied by a reversible 1.2% change in volume of the unit cell which induces tangential stresses around the crystals and its surrounding glassy matrix. Tetragonal leucite reinforced glass-ceramics are strengthened by these complex induced stresses [34, 35]. The LG-C and OLG-C featured a high area fraction (56.6% and 69%, respectively) of well bonded tetragonal leucite crystals, homogeneously dispersed within the microcrack-free glassy matrix (Figs. 1a-b). The relationship between leucite crystal growth and the remaining potassium deficient residual glass and its subsequent thermal expansion, was suggested as responsible for increased fracture strength [36]. The LG-C featured a higher BFS (mean (SD) =193.1 MPa (13.9)) than the strength range reported (75.7–165 MPa) for leucite glass-ceramics [10, 11]. Optimisation of the powder processing and spray drying of the glass powder took advantage of surface crystallisation effects discussed previously [11]. A reduction in the crystal size from 0.89 to 0.62 µm² was gained in the OLG-C Group which drove up the flexural strength by 32.5% to 255.9 (31.0) MPa. The absence of micro-cracks in the glass matrix (Fig. 1b) indicates a favourable CTE match between the crystal and matrix phases [37], and that crystal sizes were in the critical (<4µm) range for limiting microcracking [12]. Flaws in leucite reinforced glass-ceramics are thought to
propagate through both the crystals and the glassy matrix via a trans-granular mechanism [38]. A homogeneous dispersion of fine crystals within the matrix created a fine fracture surface (Fig. 1d). It appeared there was a more complex pattern of crack propagation and increased potentials for micro-crack bridging, pinning (Fig. 1e) and other crack deflection mechanisms [38, 39].

XRD of IPS e.max® G-C confirmed the major and minor crystal phases to be Li$_2$Si$_2$O$_5$ and Li$_3$PO$_4$ respectively (Fig 3b). The high-volume fraction (70 ± 5 vol.% [10]) of lithium disilicate fibres found in the IPS e.max® G-C (Fig 1c) are reported to resist crack propagation by means of their high aspect ratio fibres. The intergranular fracture process [38] can be seen in the rough fracture surface (Fig. 1f), resulting in high fracture toughness (3.3 ± 0.3 MPa.M$^{0.5}$) [40]. The Mean (SD) BFS of sandblasted IPS e.max® G-C in this study (258.6 (20.7) MPa) was less than the manufacturers values (300-400 MPa) [32], or higher reported values (440 (55.0) MPa) [31] for lapped and fired /annealed specimens. The Flexural strength was however, recovered in the group 8 IPS e.max® specimens (416.4 (52.6) MPa) when the flaw population was modified by lapping and adhesive bonding (Table 2). It was therefore thought that the reduced BFS of the group 6 specimens (sandblasted IPS e.max®) was associated with processing induced surface flaws cited in the literature [41, 42]. Profilometry of the surface following treatment with invex acid and sandblasting (100 µm Al$_2$O$_3$) regimens (as recommended by the manufacturers) produced a surface roughness ($R_a$) value of 5.7µm reduced to 5.0 µm after 20 sec hydrofluoric acid (HF) etching (Fig. 5b, Table 5). These flaws can act as stress concentrators causing cracks to propagate at a lower applied force [23, 43]. Sandblasting creates micromechanical retention for bonding but reduced flexural strengths in lithium disilicate glass-ceramic specimens (IPS e.max® CAD, Ivoclar-
vivadent), when abraded with 30 µm Al₂O₃ media (100-300 KPa pressure) [44]. In the current work, the increased erosion rate and subsequent surface roughness may be related to the square of the grit diameter [43], since 100 µm Al₂O₃ (150 KPa pressure) was used. Surface damage following sandblasting is however multifactorial and determined by the hardness, impact velocity, angle of impact and morphology of the blasting material [23, 43], as well as the physical properties of the glass-ceramic substrate. The use of Invex acid (0.6% HF and 1.7% sulfuric acid (Ivoclar-Vivadent) prior to sandblasting was to ensure the removal of any reaction layer with the investment. Vidotti et al. [45] indicated that after 20 min invex acid exposure there was no significant morphological surface changes, or differences in bond strengths for lithium disilicate glass-ceramics (IPS e.max® Press) compared to untreated controls. The sandblasting regimen in group 6 specimens may therefore be the major controlling factor influencing strength values. Alumina particle air abrasion (25-110 µm Al₂O₃) of feldspathic porcelains led to weakening of these materials, with a reduction in reliability for 110 µm Al₂O₃ abraded specimens, potentially associated with subsurface damage and flaw instability [23]. The extent of surface damage caused by the processing procedures on the IPS e.max® G-C was evident as it possessed almost twice the mean Rₐ value of the LG-C (Tables 5, Figs 5a-b). Since all sandblasting variables were kept constant the media size, morphology, chemical composition/hardness and the properties of the substrates effected the mean Rₐ values. The sandblasted (50 µm glass beads) LG-C exhibited a lower BFS compared to IPS e.max® G-C (100 µm Al₂O₃). The 50 µm glass blasting media created a different flaw size distribution in conjunction with the LG-C substrate (Fig 5a). The complexities of particle shape, size and erosion efficiency is discussed elsewhere [24], with sharp angular particles producing ploughing and cutting effects
at low angles [43]. Optimisation of the glass-ceramic microstructure (OLG-C, group 4) in conjunction with the 50 µm glass bead sandblasting process resulted in increased mean (SD) BFS (255.9 (31.0) MPa) and characteristic strength, with no statistical difference with the sandblasted IPS e.max® G-C (group 6, Table 3).

The mean Ra values of both the IPS e.max® G-C and LG-C reduced by 12.2% and 16.1% respectively following HF acid etching (20 and 60 secs, Table 5, Figs 4a-b). This 5% HF treatment and durations used reduced the surface flaw sizes on both materials, which may have reduced the severity of surface defects. HF etching (20 secs) of lapped IPS e.max® G-C resulted in no significant flexural strength reduction, but with resin infiltration the flexural strengths increased to mean (SD) 420 (31) MPa, [46], in agreement with the current lapped values of 416.4 (52.6) MPa (Table 3). The reduced glassy phase available for etching lithium disilicate materials [46], or preferential etching of the leucite crystalline phase may be factors, as feldspathic porcelains indicated increased ceramic roughness (mean Ra) and reduced BFS on HF addition [47]. HF Etching of ceramic materials with different glass-crystal chemistry and crystalline morphology will result in differing surface roughness, morphology, pore structure and wettability [48]. This was reflected in the SBS study with interfacial mixed mode failure (Figs. 2c-d) and lower bond strengths for the IPS e.max® G-C associated with the larger flaw size distribution or efficacy of etching (5% HF) the glassy phase at 20 secs. Etching (10 and 60 secs) of the leucite crystallites [17] in LG-C should produce a different surface area, morphology of etching and smaller flaw size which resulted in 100% cohesive failure in the ceramic (Figs 1a-b). Interestingly, fatigue and fracture testing of IPS e.max® Press laminate veneers adhesively bonded to human central incisors resulted in >50% adhesive
failures (between resin cement and glass-ceramic), suggesting adhesion improvements were possible [49].

All glass-ceramic (LG-C, OLG-C and IPS e.max® G-C) groups had a significant increase in BFS (12.7-24.6%, Table 3) and characteristic strength following acid etching and adhesively bonding via a silane bonding agent and resin cementation. This was not surprising since adhesive bonding has been found to strengthen dental ceramic materials [21, 22]. Previous strengthening theories suggest a combination of flaw recovery [50], and the generation of compressive stresses due to polymerisation shrinkage [5]. This strengthening effect may however be attributed to the interpenetration of the resin into the ceramic surface creating a hybrid layer and sensitive to the resin modulus [21]. Fleming et al. [51] suggested a significant ceramic reinforcement using a resin coating of 50 µm, with the flexural modulus and resin thickness related to the degree of strengthening. Resin thickness for IPS e.max® and LG-C (groups 2 and 7) was 45 (20) µm and 50 (30) µm respectively which was in this resin-ceramic strengthening range. Increased resin flexural modulus (12.6 (0.4) GPa led to a 47% increase in ceramic BFS [51]. The flexural modulus of Variolink II resin used in this study was 5.0 (1.36) GPa [52], so there is a potential for a strength enhancement by optimising this property, but with ensuring sufficient wetting of the ceramic interface. The IPS e.max® G-C benefitted most from resin bonding with a significant increase in BFS (24.6%, Table 3). This was related to the interaction of the resin layer with the surface defect population (5-5.1 µm, Fig. 5b), and with the magnitude of resin strengthening sensitive to ceramic surface texture [53]. When the ceramic surface sandblasting flaws were removed by lapping (800 grit silicon carbide paper), followed by etching and resin addition there was a remarkable 61% increase in BFS (416.4 (52.6) MPa) when compared with the
sandblasted group 6 (258.6 (20.7) MPa). Other factors can be removal of any porosity or surface crystallisation that may differ from the interior and the generation of residual stresses [54]. A moderate BFS increase was also encountered for the LG-C on adhesive bonding and following lapping, etching and resin addition there was a 41% increase in BFS. The LG-C had a much smaller flaw size (2.6 µm, Table 3), and a different profilometric profile and flaw size distribution (Fig. 5a) compared to the IPS e.max® G-C. Optimisation of the microstructure (OLG-C, group 5) necessitated an increased etching time (80 sec) and following cement addition a significant increase in BFS (mean (SD) 288.6 (37.4) MPa) over the LG-C groups 1 and 2 (p<0.05). Etching of the glass-ceramic phases and the differing surface areas for micromechanical retention and wettability will affect resin penetration and reaction of the silane and resin composite [48]. The resin-ceramic interaction at the interface can therefore be easily modified by these numerous factors and the interplay with the very different fracture mechanisms present in these materials [39, 55]. The texture of the differing failed specimens illustrated these different fracture processes (Fig 1d-f). Fractographic analysis of the failed BFS specimens revealed fracture origins in the IPS e.max® G-C originated from the resin-ceramic interface (Fig. 1h), whereas the LG-C exhibited interfacial and interior flaw failure (Fig 1g).

Dental glass-ceramics are processed using CAD-CAM technology, heat extrusion or sintering and this results in processing flaws of differing severity and distribution. At present, lithium disilicate glass-ceramics require an additional crystallisation heat treatment after machining or removal of a reaction layer following heat extrusion. The developed leucite glass-ceramics (LG-C OLG-C) do not require these lengthy processes and there is potential to control the surface stress state and modify defects through extended glaze firing cycles [56], or ion exchange to further improve
strengthening [57]. This study highlights current heat extrusion processing defects and their subsequent effects on BFS and SBS. Similar flexural strengths were achieved for heat pressed lithium disilicate and leucite glass-ceramic sandblasted materials. Although the IPS e.max® G-C resulted in the highest mean (SD) BFS of 322.3 (23.4) MPa, following adhesive bonding the optimised leucite glass-ceramics produced a high mean (SD) BFS of 288.6 (37.4) MPa and with the possibility of further strength enhancements by resin cement developments. Their fine crystal size, uniform microstructure and smaller etched flaw size (2.6 µm) appears to provide sufficient bond strength and high flexural strength at 1 mm depth. This allows minimal tooth preparation, retention to tooth structure and avoids destructive tooth reduction needed for retentive preparations [58]. Previous work also indicates reduced enamel wear [59] with these high strength leucite glass-ceramics. They possess some properties beneficial for adhesively bonded monolithic crowns or veneers to improve poor survival rates [60, 61]. The glass refractive index is also matched with the leucite crystal phase, to ensure translucency [27] and good aesthetics [27] to meet the patients expectations. This work has therefore opened the window to extend the clinical use of this important category of biocompatible glass-ceramic materials in minimally adhesive dentistry.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass-Ceramic Groups</th>
<th>Starting Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Pressing Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Heating Rate (°C)</th>
<th>Vacuum (%)</th>
<th>holding Time (mins)</th>
<th>Pressing Time (mins)</th>
<th>Pressing Speed (µm/min)</th>
<th>Pressure (Pa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG-C/ OLG-C</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*parameters automatically regulated by the heat pressing furnace during function.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFS Groups</th>
<th>Glass-Ceramic (G-C) Specimen</th>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>LG-C SGB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>LG-C resin-bonded SGB, etched 5% HF 60s, resin-bonded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>LG-C Lapped/ resin-bonded SGB, tensile surface lapped, etched 5% HF 60s, resin-bonded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>OLG-C SGB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>OLG-C resin-bonded SGB, etched 5% HF 80s, resin-bonded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C SGB, invex liquid 20 mins, sandblasted 100µm Al₂O₃.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C resin-bonded SGB, invex liquid 20 mins, sandblasted 100µm Al₂O₃, etched 5% HF 20s, resin–bonded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C Lapped/ resin-bonded SGB, invex liquid 20 mins, sandblasted 100µm Al₂O₃, tensile surface lapped, etched 5% HF 20s, resin–bonded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGC= Leucite Glass-Ceramic; OLG C= Optimised leucite Glass-ceramic, SGB= Sandblasted 50µm glass beads
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass-Ceramic Groups</th>
<th>Mean Biaxial Flexural Strength MPa (SD)</th>
<th>Weibull modulus ( m )</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals for ( m ) (95%)</th>
<th>Characteristic Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals for ( \sigma_0 ) (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C</td>
<td>193.1 (13.9) a</td>
<td>17.4 a</td>
<td>13.8-21.9</td>
<td>198.7 a</td>
<td>194.3-203.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C resin-bonded</td>
<td>217.7 (23.0) b</td>
<td>11.1 a,b,c</td>
<td>8.4-14.8</td>
<td>227.4 b</td>
<td>219.7-235.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C lapped/resin-bonded</td>
<td>273.6 (26.7) c,d</td>
<td>11.6 a,b,c</td>
<td>8.5-15.7</td>
<td>285.4 c</td>
<td>276.0-295.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLG-C</td>
<td>255.9 (31.0) c</td>
<td>9.5 b,c</td>
<td>7.1-12.7</td>
<td>269.0 c,e</td>
<td>258.3-280.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLG-C resin-bonded</td>
<td>288.6 (37.4) d</td>
<td>8.6 c</td>
<td>6.3-11.7</td>
<td>304.7 d</td>
<td>291.2-318.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C</td>
<td>258.6 (20.7) c</td>
<td>15.1 a,b,c</td>
<td>11.6-19.5</td>
<td>267.3 e</td>
<td>260.5-274.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C resin-bonded</td>
<td>322.3 (23.4) e</td>
<td>16.1 a,b</td>
<td>12.1-21.3</td>
<td>332.5 f</td>
<td>324.6-340.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C lapped/resin-bonded</td>
<td>416.4 (52.6) f</td>
<td>9.6 b,c</td>
<td>7.7-12.1</td>
<td>437.3 g</td>
<td>419.9-455.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference indicated by different superscript letters, \( m \) = Weibull modulus; \( \sigma_0 \) = Characteristic strength.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass-Ceramic Groups</th>
<th>Median SBS (MPa)</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals for Median (25%–75%)</th>
<th>Mean (SD) SBS (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C (60s etch)</td>
<td>14.2 &lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.3–15.2</td>
<td>14.5 (1.8)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C (10s etch)</td>
<td>10.6 &lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.4–15.5</td>
<td>11.1 (4.4)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C (20s etch)</td>
<td>10.8 &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.6–14.1</td>
<td>11.6 (2.6)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences indicated by different superscript letters in columns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass-Ceramic</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Before HF etching</th>
<th>After HF etching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISO $R_a$</td>
<td>Mean* X (µm)</td>
<td>Mean* Y (µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-C</td>
<td>ISO $R_a$</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS e.max® G-C</td>
<td>ISO $R_a$</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) represent the mean of 801 profiles.
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Figure 1: SEM photomicrographs of; (a) LG-C showing a dense distribution of tetragonal leucite crystals; (b) OLG-C with a homogeneous distribution of fine tetragonal leucite crystals; (c) IPS e.max® Press G-C with a high-volume fraction of needle like lithium disilicate crystals. (d) Fine fracture surface of the LG-C; (e) LG-C fracture surface with signs of crack pinning and bridging. (f) IPS e.max® Press G-C fracture surface. SEM photomicrographs of the sandblasted and resin bonded BFS fracture surfaces of; (g) LG-C and (h) IPS e.max® Press G-C showing the fracture origins.

Figure 2: SEM photomicrographs showing cohesive failure in the LG-C (10 s etch) SBS specimen; (a) ceramic side, (b) resin side and; (c) adhesive failure of the IPS e.max® G-C SBS specimen (ceramic side) and (d) resin side.

Figure 3a: X-ray diffraction plot of LG-C.

Figure 3b: X-ray diffraction plot of the IPS e.max® G-C.

Figure 4a: Profilometry image of LG-C after sandblasting and etching.

Figure 4b: Profilometry image of IPS e.max® G-C after sandblasting and etching.
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