

Assessment of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice based Survey towards Successful Restorations of Composite among Practitioners

Running Title: Survey on Successful restoration of composite among dentists

Kalyani Behera .A

Saveetha Dental college and Hospital, Saveetha institute of Medical and Technical science, Saveetha University
Chennai- 600077, Tamil Nadu, India. Email id: 151906003.sdc@saveetha.com

AdimulapuHima Sandeep*

Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Saveetha Dental college and Hospital
Saveetha institute of Medical and Technical science, Saveetha University, Chennai- 600077, Tamil Nadu, India.
Email id: himas.sdc@saveetha.com

Haripriya S

Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Saveetha Dental college and
Hospitals, Saveetha institute of Medical and Technical science, Saveetha University, Chennai- 600077,
Tamilnadu, India. Email id: haripriyas.sdc@saveetha.com

Article Info

Volume 83

Page Number: 2517 - 2535

Publication Issue:

July-August 2020

Abstract:

Composite resins are currently the most popular of all tooth coloured restorative materials, which completely replaced silicate cement and acrylic resin as esthetic restorative materials. Aesthetically pleasing restorations are much desirable in current day dentistry and efforts have been made to develop a restorative material to suit the patient's desired needs. The present study by means of a close ended questionnaire evaluates the knowledge, attitude and practice of the endodontists, general dentists, postgraduates and undergraduates towards successful restoration of composite. An online survey form, close ended questionnaires was distributed randomly among 150 respondents. Questions related to 5 knowledge, 5 attitude and 5 practice were presented. All the data was compiled and tabulated in Microsoft Excel and exported to IBM SPSS 20 software and data was represented through chi square tests performed for the comparison between Endodontists, General dental practitioners, Postgraduates and undergraduates. Results were obtained and depicted as graphs which showed the knowledge score as 53.16%, attitude score as 63.82% and practice score as 62.4%. Participants were of mean age groups of 31-40 years of age. More Continuing Dental Education Programmes(CDE), seminars and other educational programmes are required to strengthen the deficit in knowledge and improve treatment planning skills among postgraduate students of Endodontics. Within the limitations of the study, it shows that knowledge with regard to successful composite restoration is moderate, compared to attitude and practice among respondents. It is recommended there is a need for continued professional education and clinical training of the dentists towards all aspects

Article History

Article Received: 06 June 2020

Revised: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 14 July 2020

Publication: 25 July 2020

related to composite restorations in order to achieve desired results and esthetics within a stipulated time.

Keywords Acid etching, Bonding agent, Composites, Finishing, Isolation and Questionnaire.

INTRODUCTION

With the growing sense and awareness of beauty and Fashion, aesthetic restorations are an inseparable part of modern day conservative dentistry and ever since efforts have been made to develop a restorative material to suit the patient desires and needs. Composite resins are currently the most popular of all tooth coloured restorative materials, which have completely replaced silicate cement and acrylic resin as esthetic restorative material (Jose et al., 2020). It consists of a continuous polymeric (or) resin matrix in which a filler is dispersed. With the development of acid etch technique (Bunocore -1955) and dentin bonding agents, the marginal seal and bonding of composite to the tooth structure has drastically improved and thereby adding longevity to the restoration (Ravinthar and Jayalakshmi, 2018).

Based upon the filler particles size, composites are classified as megafill (0.5-2mm), macrofill (10-100 μ), midifill (1-10 μ), minifill (0.1- 1 μ), microfill (0.01- 0.1 μ) and nanofill (0.001- 0.1 μ). Composites with mixed ranges of particle sizes are called hybrids (Nandakumar and Nasim, 2018). Composites materials in the market which are used for restorations show promising results and despite excellent aesthetic results and good strength values (Teja et al., 2018). Due to polymerization shrinkage they are prone to marginal leakage, post operative sensitivity and secondary caries (Janani et al., 2020), (Manohar and Sharma, 2018)). The aim of this survey was to assess the knowledge, attitude and practice of a successful

composite restoration among endodontists, general dentists, postgraduates and undergraduates.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This survey was conducted in May 2020 among Endodontists, General dental practitioners, PG students in endodontics and undergraduates. This questionnaire based survey consisted of 15 questions with multiple choice and questionnaire was divided into demographic data, knowledge based, attitude based and practice based. The questionnaire was circulated via electronic media through mail.

Data was collected and statistical analysis was to be performed. The data was tabulated in Microsoft Excel followed by the exporting of the data to IBM SPSS software 20. The tabulated and converted data is analysed through SPSS. Chi square test was performed in order to check for the comparison of responses amongst the Endodontists, general dental practitioners, PG students in endodontics and undergraduates. The significance level was set at 0.05.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A total of 150 responses were received from the respondents in which 56% were females and 44% males. 20% of the participants were of the age group 19-25 years, 33% were in the age group of 25- 30 years, 38% were in the age group of 31-40 years and 8.6% were in the age group of 41-50 years. Majority of the participants were General dental practitioners 44% followed by PGs in endodontics 29% [Table 1].

Demographic variables	Categories	No.of respondents	Percentage %
Gender	Male	66	44
	Female	84	56
	Total	150	100
Age (years)	19-25 years	30	20
	25-30 years	49	33
	31-40 years	58	38
	41-50 years	13	8.6
Field of practice	Endodontist	33	9.3
	Post graduates	36	29
	General Dental practitioners	67	44.4
	Undergraduates	16	22

Table 1 showing Demographic Data of participants ,56% were females and 44% were males. 20 % of the participants were of the age group 19-25 yrs, 33% were in the age group of 25-30 yrs, 38% were in the age group of 31- 40 yrs and 8.6% were in the age group of 41-50 yrs. Majority of the participants were General dental practitioners 44% followed by PGs in endodontics 29% and 22 % were undergraduates followed by 9.3% were endodontists.

In the present study,on assessing the association between the respondent groups and their responses to the brand of composite used, general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding brand of composite than others,but it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$)[Figure 1].




Figure 1: Bar chart showing association between the respondent groups and their responses as to the brand of composite used. X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test, [Pearson chi square value= 7.332^a ; df-9; p= .603 ($p > 0.05$),statistically not

significant; implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding brand of composite than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied .




Figure 2 : Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to number of shades used for anterior teeth. X-axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 7.187^a ; df-9; p= .618 (p>0.05) statistically not significant, implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding number of shades used for anterior teeth than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

on assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to number of shades used for anterior teeth, general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding number of shades used for anterior teeth than others, but it was not statistically significant (p >0.05) [Figure 2]. On assessing the

association between the respondents groups and their responses as to methods of isolation, general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding number of shades used for anterior teeth than others, but it was not statistically significant (p >0.05) [Figure 3].




Figure 3: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to methods of isolation, X-axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test, [Pearson chi square value = 7.582^a ; df-6; p = .270 (p > 0.05), statistically not significant, implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding number of shades used for anterior teeth than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

on assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to preferred generation of bonding agent, general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding preferred generation of bonding agent, than others, but it was not statistically significant (p > 0.05) [Figure 4].




Figure 4 : Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to preferred generation of bonding agent, X-axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents, The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value = 2.712^a ; df-3; p = .438 (p > 0.05)]
Published by: The Mattingley Publishing Co., Inc.

statistically not significant, implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding preferred generation of bonding agent, than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

on assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to preferred bonding agent, general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding preferred bonding agent than others, but it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) [Figure 5].




Figure 5: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to preferred bonding agent, X-axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test and was found to be statistically not significant, [Pearson chi square value = 11.623^a ; df-9; $p = .235$ ($p > 0.05$), implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding preferred bonding agent than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

on assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses to time taken for etching (fifth generation), general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding time taken for etching (fifth generation) than others but it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) [Figure 6]. On assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to techniques to place composites, general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding

techniques to place composites than others, but it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) [Figure 7]. On assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to methods to check for curing light intensity, general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding techniques to place composites than others, but it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) [Figure 8].




Figure 6 : Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses to time taken for etching (fifth generation), X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 4.098^a ; df-9; p= .908 (p>0.05) and was found to be statistically not significant, implying that though general dental practitioners have better knowledge regarding time taken for etching (fifth generation) than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.




Figure 7: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to techniques to

place composites. X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 6.038^a ; df-9; p= .736 (p>0.05), statistically not significant, implying that general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding techniques to place composites than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.




Figure 8: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to methods to check for curing light intensity. X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents, The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 4.977^a ; df-6; p= .547 (p>0.05) statistically not significant, implying that general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding techniques to place composites than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

On assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses as to frequency to clean fiber optic tip. general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding than others, but it was not statistically significant (p > 0.05) [Figure 9].




Figure 9 : Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to frequency to clean fiber optic tip. X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test and was found to be statistically not significant, [Pearson chi square value= 4.098^a ; df-9; p= .808 (p>0.05), implying that general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.




Figure 10 : Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to long term success for placing composite restorations f.X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 8.395^a ; df-9; p= .495 (p>0.05), statistically not significant, implying that general dental practitioners have better awareness regarding than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.




Figure 11: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to time taken to cure the composite. X-axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 16.067^a ; df-9; p= .065 (p>0.05) statistically not significant, implying that general dental practitioners have better awareness than others, there was no major difference among the groups studied.

Depending on the attitude of participants regarding the long term success for placing composite restorations, general dental practitioners have better awareness than others, but it was not statistically significant (p>0.05) [Figure 10]. On assessing the association between the respondents groups and their responses regarding

matrix band used in posterior composite restorations, 24.67% of general dental practitioners, 15.33% were post graduates, 12.63% were undergraduates and 6.67% were endodontist suggested for palodont matrix band for posterior composite restorations, but it was not statistically significant (p>0.05) [Figure 11].




Figure 12: Bar chart showing association between the respondents groups and their responses as to matrix band used in posterior composite restorations..X- axis denotes the field of practice, Y-axis denotes the number of respondents. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 10.728^a ; df-9; p= .295 (p>0.05), statistically not significant,implying that all practitioners recommend palodent matrix band to use for posterior composite restorations,no major difference among the groups studied.




Figure 13: Bar chart showing association between the field of practice of the participants and responses post operative instructions. The association was analyzed using chi square test [Pearson chi square value= 12.612^a ; df-9; p= .181 (p>0.05) statistically not significant, implying that all practitioners recommend all of the above options to be given in post operative instructions, no major difference among the groups studied.

The success of a composite restoration depends on various clinical conditions like operating field, type of isolation and composite, type of bonding system, method of placing composite in the cavity (oblique layering technique/ incremental placement), time and type of finishing and polishing of composite restoration (Hussainy et al., 2018), (Rajendran et al., 2019). According to parpaiola AR et al., the main cause of restoration replacement was composite shade discolouration (63.8%) followed by marginal staining (50%) , unsatisfactory restoration anatomy (50 %) , marginal fracture (14.9%) , painful symptoms (8.5%) , fractured restoration body (4.3%) dental fracture (1.1%) and total displacement of the restoration (1.1%). Marginal staining and composite shade discolouration with the dental structure were related to the presence of caries.

According to a survey, the major cause for initial restoration is dental caries, while that for re-restorations was secondary caries (36.2%) followed by Endodontic root canal therapy (22.2%) discolouration of the restoration (14.4%) , restorative technique failures (13.4%), composite restorations fracture (11.3%) , pain and sensitivity (2.4%) (Ramanathan and Solete, 2015). The composite resin contracts by about 1.5% to 5% and the mode of polymerization Of composite resin is free radical polymerization. Significant polymerization shrinkage results in gap formation, secondary caries, marginal leakage , and post operative sensitivity (R et al., 2019; Ramamoorthi et al., 2015). The incremental filling technique of composite restoration has been recognised as the technique of choice to minimise polymerization shrinkage stresses. The incremental filling technique yielded significantly lower cuspal deflection than the bulk filling technique in a previous

study (Siddique et al., 2019). Previous studies show that 95% dentists in Srinagar and 85% of dentists in Delhi used Incremental layering technique. Traditionally mylar strips, tofflemire band and retainer , Ivory and S band retainer have been used for developing contact and contour in lesions involving proximal walls. But now we have better matrix system like palodent plus (DENTSPLY), sectional matrix plus retainer system (3M) , V3 ring (Triodent) , optra matrix (Ivoclar) specially designed to assist clinicians in creating precise automatically shaped contact points in cavities involving proximal walls (Noor et al., 2016; Siddique et al., 2019). In our survey we found mylar strip and tofflemire band and retainer to be the most popular and palodent were used by 60.8% dentists, when compared to a study which was done in Srinagar, it was 10% and 21% in Delhi (Kumar and Delphine Priscilla Antony, 2018).

According to a survey done in 2010, 63% did not use a rubber dam for any restorative procedures. In our survey , we found that only 5% of dentists use rubber dams as a method of isolation (Parpaiola et al., 2009; Teja and Ramesh, 2019, 2020). In the present survey, we found that (66.7%) of respondents use Rubber dam, cotton rolls & suction tips as their method of Isolation (Gurgan et al., 2020). The 42% of respondents used prime and bond NT (DENTSPLY) and the reasons cited for the popularity were its availability, ease of use and reliability. The previous study compared microleakage of fifth, sixth and seventh generation bonding agents and found the preparations treated with clear fill S3 (7th generation DBA) showed significantly less leakage than the other groups. In our survey we found that 7 th generation bonding system is most popular and xeno V is the most preferred brand of 7

th generation bonding system followed by the 5 th generation bonding system. 34% of the respondents (Al-Negrish, 2002). Strength of tooth - restoration interface is also a function of etching time when using 5 th generation bonding system (Manappallil, 2016). Few studies resin to enamel bond strengths with various etching times and concluded that 5 - second etch was sufficient to allow for adequate bond strength. other studies also found that Phosphoric acid gels (35%) and (10%) Maleic acid applied for 15 seconds and 60 seconds removed the smear layer and opened the dentinal tubule orifices. Thus it may be postulated that over etching is not required (*American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 1992).

Light output needs to be checked routinely in order to obtain desirable results. Hedge V conducted a clinical survey of the output intensity of 200 light curing units in dental offices across Maharashtra and found only 10% LED units and 2% QTH curing lights in good intensities (Steiner et al., 2019). (>400MW/Cm). A similar study found that the light intensities of the curing light units used in private practice were lower than expected. Martin et al., checked in a survey reported that nearly 50% of dentists had never checked the light output of their units and over one half of the light curing units were not functioning satisfactorily. The effects of light intensity and light curing time on the degree of polymerization of dental composites resins and found that light curing composite resins with higher energy density was beneficial to acquiring higher microhardness values and lower coefficients of thermal expansion (Gilbert et al., 2010). Coelho santos MJ et al studied the effect of light curing method on volumetric polymerization shrinkage of resin composites and found that is hybrid composites (z-100), continuous output with higher shrinkage than continuous output with conventional intensity light method and pulse- delayed output. Jose R David et al., studied the effects of curing time on curing efficiency and found significant increase in microhardness values

for all light curing composites, when exposure time was increased from 20 to 40 seconds. In our survey we found that 59.3% respondents cured for 20 seconds, while 25% of respondents in Srinagar and 24 in Delhi cured for 40 seconds (Kwon et al., 2012), (Vinay and Shivanna, 2010)

Finishing and polishing of composite resins enhances the esthetics as well as increase the longevity of the restoration. The survival rate of composite resin was found to be 91.7% at 5 years and 82.2% for 10 years. For amalgam the survival was 89.6% at 5 years and 79.2% at 10 years (Yamazaki et al., 2006). Lopes et.al., GC at sealing ability of composites restoration materials which is microfilled composite restorative material placing on dentin margins, it significantly had lower microleakage scores. In our study, we found that about 60% respondents finished and polished composites resin post operative, y immediately after the restoration and about 40% did it 3 -7 days post operatively. The most popular system used to finish and polish composite resins is shove supersnap(greater than 60%).

CONCLUSION:

Within the limitations of the study, it shows that knowledge with respect towards successful composite restoration is moderate, compared to attitude and practice among respondents. It is recommended there is a need for continued professional education and clinical training of the dentists towards composite restorations in order to achieve desired results and esthetics within a stipulated time.

CONFLICT OF RESULT

There is no conflict of interest

REFERENCES:

1. Al-Negrish ARS (2002) Composite resin restorations: a cross-sectional survey of placement and replacement in Jordan. *International dental journal* 52(6): 461–468.
2. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* (1992) Resin-to-enamel bond strengths with various etching times. DOI: 10.1016/s0889-5406(05)80249-5.
3. Gilbert GH, Litaker MS, Pihlstrom DJ, et al. (2010) Rubber Dam Use During Routine Operative Dentistry Procedures: Findings From The Dental PBRN. *Operative Dentistry*. DOI: 10.2341/09-287c.
4. Gurgan S, Kutuk ZB, Ozturk C, et al. (2020) Clinical Performance of a Glass Hybrid Restorative in Extended Size Class II Cavities. *Operative Dentistry*. DOI: 10.2341/18-282-c.
5. Hussainy SN, Nasim I, Thomas T, et al. (2018) Clinical performance of resin-modified glass ionomer cement, flowable composite, and polyacid-modified resin composite in noncarious cervical lesions: One-year follow-up. *Journal of conservative dentistry: JCD* 21(5): 510–515.
6. Janani K, Palanivelu A and Sandhya R (2020) Diagnostic accuracy of dental pulse oximeter with customized sensor holder, thermal test and electric pulp test for the evaluation of pulp vitality - An in vivo study. *Brazilian Dental Science*. DOI: 10.14295/bds.2020.v23i1.1805.
7. Jose J, P. A and Subbaiyan H (2020) Different Treatment Modalities followed by Dental Practitioners for Ellis Class 2 Fracture – A Questionnaire-based Survey. *The Open Dentistry Journal*. DOI: 10.2174/1874210602014010059.
8. Kumar D and Delphine Priscilla Antony S (2018) Calcified Canal and Negotiation-A Review. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*. DOI: 10.5958/0974-360x.2018.00683.2.
9. Kwon Y, Ferracane J and Lee I-B (2012) Effect of layering methods, composite type, and flowable liner on the polymerization shrinkage stress of light cured composites. *Dental Materials*. DOI: 10.1016/j.dental.2012.04.028.
10. Manappallil J (2016) Resin-based Composites and Bonding Agents. *Basic Dental Materials*. DOI: 10.5005/jp/books/12669_12.
11. Manohar MP and Sharma S (2018) A survey of the knowledge, attitude, and awareness about the principal choice of intracanal medicaments among the general dental practitioners and nonendodontic specialists. *Indian journal of dental research: official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research* 29(6): 716–720.
12. Nandakumar M and Nasim I (2018) Comparative evaluation of grape seed and cranberry extracts in preventing enamel erosion: An optical emission spectrometric analysis. *Journal of conservative dentistry: JCD* 21(5): 516–520.
13. Noor SSSE, S Syed Shihaab and Pradeep (2016) Chlorhexidine: Its properties and effects. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*. DOI: 10.5958/0974-360x.2016.00353.x.
14. Parpaiola AR, Guimarães PS, França FMG, et al. (2009) Small cross-sectional survey of composite restoration attributes associated with choices for replacement. *Brazilian oral research* 23(3): 346–351.
15. Rajendran R, Kunjusankaran RN, Sandhya R, et al. (2019) Comparative Evaluation of Remineralizing Potential of a Paste Containing Bioactive Glass and a Topical Cream Containing Casein Phosphopeptide-Amorphous Calcium Phosphate: An in Vitro Study. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada*. DOI: 10.4034/pboci.2019.191.61.

16. Ramamoorthi S, Nivedhitha MS and Divyanand MJ (2015) Comparative evaluation of postoperative pain after using endodontic needle and EndoActivator during root canal irrigation: A randomised controlled trial. *Australian Endodontic Journal*. DOI: 10.1111/aej.12076.
17. Ramanathan S and Solete P (2015) Cone-beam Computed Tomography Evaluation of Root Canal Preparation using Various Rotary Instruments: An in vitro Study. *The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10024-1773.
18. Ravinthar K and Jayalakshmi (2018) Recent Advancements in Laminates and Veneers in Dentistry. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*. DOI: 10.5958/0974-360x.2018.00148.8.
19. R R, Rajakeerthi R and Ms N (2019) Natural Product as the Storage medium for an avulsed tooth – A Systematic Review. *Cumhuriyet Dental Journal*. DOI: 10.7126/cumudj.525182.
20. Siddique R, Sureshbabu NM, Somasundaram J, et al. (2019) Qualitative and quantitative analysis of precipitate formation following interaction of chlorhexidine with sodium hypochlorite, neem, and tulsi. *Journal of conservative dentistry: JCD* 22(1): 40–47.
21. Steiner R, Edelhoff D, Stawarczyk B, et al. (2019) Effect of Dentin Bonding Agents, Various Resin Composites and Curing Modes on Bond Strength to Human Dentin. *Materials*. DOI: 10.3390/ma12203395.
22. Teja KV and Ramesh S (2019) Shape optimal and clean more. *Saudi Endodontic Journal* 9(3). Medknow Publications: 235.
23. Teja KV, Ramesh S and Priya V (2018) Regulation of matrix metalloproteinase-3 gene expression in inflammation: A molecular study. *Journal of conservative dentistry: JCD* 21(6): 592–596.
24. Vinay S and Shivanna V (2010) Comparative evaluation of microleakage of fifth, sixth, and seventh generation dentin bonding agents: An in vitro study. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry*. DOI: 10.4103/0972-0707.71645.
25. Yamazaki PCV, Bedran-Russo AKB, Pereira PNR, et al. (2006) Microleakage Evaluation of a New Low-shrinkage Composite Restorative Material. *Operative Dentistry*.