ejpmr, 2025, 12(10), 01-03

SJIF Impact Factor 7.065

EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.ejpmr.com

Review Article

ISSN (O): 2394-3211

ISSN (P): 3051-2573

REDEFINING THE FLUORIDE-RESTORATIVE MATERIALS PARADIGM IN MODERN DENTISTRY: A REVIEW

[1]***Dr. Mohammed Omer Indikar**, [2]**Dr. Tanveer Fatima**

[1]Intern- Al Badar Dental College and Hospital Kalaburagi.
[2]Professor- Dept. of Prosthodontics, Crown and Bridge and Implantology- Al Badar Dental College and Hospital, Kalaburagi.

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Mohammed Omer Indikar**
Intern- Al Badar Dental College and Hospital Kalaburagi.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17222062

Article Received on 01/08/2025 **Article Revised on 22/08/2025** **Article Accepted on 12/09/2025**

ABSTRACT

The widespread use of fluoride in dentistry, through fluoridated water, toothpaste, and preventive treatments, has significantly improved oral health and reduced dental caries. However, the interaction of fluoride with modern restorative materials such as ceramics, glass ionomer cements (GICs), composites, and titanium implants remains a critical area of study. This review explores the effects of fluoride on these materials, focusing on their longevity, effectiveness, and clinical implications. The findings highlight that while GICs benefit from fluoride release, composites show limited fluoride interaction, and ceramics and titanium implants may experience adverse effects. Understanding these interactions is essential for optimizing restorative outcomes in modern dentistry.

KEYWORDS: Fluoride, Restorative Materials, Glass Ionomer Cement (GIC), Composites, Titanium Implants, Material Longevity, Surface Degradation, Corrosion Behavior, Fluoride Exposure.

INTRODUCTION

Fluoride has become a cornerstone of preventive dentistry, with its use increasing significantly in the Indian population due to water fluoridation, fluoridated toothpaste, and preventive dental procedures. This widespread exposure has contributed to a decline in dental caries and improved overall oral health. Concurrently, the field of prosthodontics has seen a rise in the adoption of advanced restorative materials, such as ceramics, GICs, composites, and titanium implants, which offer enhanced durability and aesthetic outcomes. However, the interaction between fluoride and these materials remains poorly understood. This review aims to explore these interactions, focusing on how fluoride exposure affects the longevity and effectiveness of modern restorative materials, thereby redefining the paradigm between fluoride uses and restorative dentistry.

METHODOLOGY

This review synthesizes findings from multiple studies that investigated the interaction of fluoride with various restorative materials, including ceramics, GICs, composites, and titanium implants. The materials were analyzed for their response to fluoride exposure, focusing on surface changes, weight loss, and fluoride release properties. The studies included in this review utilized in vitro experiments to assess the effects of fluoride on these materials under controlled conditions.

Fluoride-Restorative Materials

1. Ceramics

Studies indicate that fluoride exposure can lead to adverse effects on ceramic materials, including surface staining and degradation. Artopoulou et al. (2010) demonstrated that stannous fluoride and sodium fluoride caused significant staining on ceramic surfaces, which could compromise aesthetic outcomes in restorative dentistry.

2. Titanium Implants

Fluoride exposure has been shown to affect the corrosion behavior of titanium and titanium alloys used in dental implants. Anwar et al. (2011) found that fluoride increased the corrosion rate of titanium implants, potentially compromising their longevity and performance.

3. Glass Ionomer Cements (GICs)

GICs are known for their ability to release fluoride, which contributes to cavity prevention. Forsten (1977) highlighted that GICs continuously release fluoride over time, making them beneficial for patients at elevated risk of caries. However, the interaction of external fluoride with GICs remains an area requiring further investigation.

4. Composites

Composite resins showed limited interaction with fluoride, with no significant changes observed after short-term exposure. However, Kula et al. (1996) reported that prolonged exposure to fluoride (4 minutes) resulted in surface changes and weight loss in composite resins, suggesting that extended fluoride treatments may compromise the material's integrity.

Table 1.1: Summarized presentation of material & its effect on fluoride.

Material	Fluoride Effect	Study / Notes
Ceramics	Staining, degradation	Artopoulou et al. (2010) Fluoride exposure affects aesthetics.
Titanium	Increased corrosion	Anwar et al. (2011) Shortens implant life.
GICs	Natural fluoride release; unclear external effect	Forsten (1977) Extra fluoride impact is uncertain.
Composites	Surface changes with prolonged exposure	Kula et al. (1996) Long-term fluoride weakens material.

DISCUSSION

The interaction of fluoride with restorative materials is complex and varies depending on the material type. While GICs benefit from fluoride release, composites show limited interaction, and ceramics and titanium implants may experience adverse effects. These findings have significant clinical implications, as the choice of restorative material should consider the patient's fluoride exposure to ensure optimal performance and longevity. For instance, in patients with high fluoride exposure, the use of ceramics and titanium implants may require additional precautions to prevent material degradation.

The favorable fluoride release from GICs makes them uniquely suited for patients with high caries risk. Their dual action as restorative material and fluoride reservoir provides a preventive benefit not found in other materials. However, the precise mechanism of how environmental fluoride affects the fluoride-releasing properties of GICs still needs further exploration. Excessive topical fluoride may alter the fluoride release kinetics or compromise the material's structural matrix over time. Long-term clinical studies are required to assess these interactions more accurately.

In contrast, composite resins—although aesthetically favorable and widely used—demonstrate vulnerability when exposed to prolonged fluoride treatments. Surface changes such as pitting or roughening, coupled with weight loss as observed by Kula et al., suggest that high concentrations or repeated fluoride exposure might compromise the composite's physical integrity. This can have implications in pediatric or orthodontic patients who undergo frequent fluoride varnish applications. Practitioners must weigh the benefits of caries prevention against the potential weakening of restorative margins or increased plaque retention due to surface roughness.

Ceramic restorations, prized for their esthetic excellence and biocompatibility, appear susceptible to surface staining and gloss loss when exposed to fluoride agents, especially those with acidic formulations like stannous fluoride. This could affect patient satisfaction, particularly in anterior restorations. Surface glazing or protective coatings may mitigate this effect, but further material advancements are needed to enhance ceramic resistance to fluoride-based products without sacrificing translucency or color stability.

Similarly, titanium dental implants, though generally resistant to corrosion, may be at risk when exposed to fluoride under low pH conditions, such as in patients using acidic fluoride mouth rinses or gels. The formation of complex fluorides can accelerate corrosion, leading to ion release and weakening of the implant-abutment interface. Clinicians should consider prescribing neutral-pH fluoride products to implant patients and educate them on safe oral hygiene practices to prolong implant lifespan.

Overall, the findings underscore the importance of individualized dental treatment planning. Material selection should not be based solely on aesthetics or mechanical strength but also on the patient's preventive regimen, particularly fluoride use. Multidisciplinary coordination between prosthodontists, general dentists, and hygienists is essential for ensuring restorative success and minimizing complications associated with fluoride exposure.

CONCLUSION

This review highlights the importance of understanding the interaction between fluoride and modern restorative materials in dentistry. While fluoride remains a critical component of preventive dentistry, its effects on restorative materials must be carefully considered to achieve long-term success. Future research should focus on developing materials that can withstand fluoride exposure while maintaining their aesthetic and functional properties.

REFERENCES

1. Artopoulou, I. I., Powers, J. M., & Chambers, M. S. In vitro staining effects of stannous fluoride and sodium fluoride on ceramic material. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 2010; 103(3): 163–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3913(10)60023-6
2. Anwar, E. M., Kheiralla, L. S., &Tammam, R. H. Effect of Fluoride on the Corrosion Behavior of Ti and Ti6Al4V Dental Implants Coupled With Different Superstructures. *Journal of Oral Implantology, 2011; 37(3): 309–317. https://doi.org/10.1563/aaid-joi-d-09-00084
3. Forsten, L. Fluoride release from a glass ionomer cement. *European Journal of Oral Sciences, 1977; 85(6): 503–504. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0722.1977.tb00586.x
4. Kula, K., Webb, E. L., & Kula, T. J. Effect of 1- and 4-minute treatments of topical fluorides on a composite resin. *Pediatric Dentistry, 1996; 18(1): 24–28.
5. Ten Cate JM. Contemporary perspective on the use of fluoride products in caries prevention. Br Dent J., Jul. 2013; 214(4): 161–7. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2013.162
6. Wiegand A, Attin T. Influence of fluoride on the dissolution kinetics of enamel and dentine. Caries Res., 2003; 37(3): 190–9. https://doi.org/10.1159/000070441
7. Dąbrowa T, Palczewska-Komsa M, Walczak K, Gozdowski D. Corrosive influence of sodium fluoride mouthwashes on titanium used in dental implants: In vitro study. Materials, 2021; 14(3): 631. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma14030631
8. Liu Y, Zhang Y, Wang L, Gao J. Effect of topical fluoride on surface roughness of different restorative materials: An in vitro study. Dent Mater J., 2020; 39(2): 228–34. https://doi.org/10.4012/dmj.2019-051
9. Lopes RM, Soares CJ, Diniz RS, Bicalho AA, Veríssimo C. Surface degradation of CAD/CAM ceramics after fluoride gel application. Oper Dent., 2018; 43(4): E166–75. https://doi.org/10.2341/17-213-L
10. American Dental Association. Fluoride in dentistry: Updated clinical recommendations [Internet]. ADA; 2022 [cited 2025 Jul 21]. Available from: https://www.ada.org/resources/research/science-and-research-institute/oral-health-topics/fluoride
11. Øysæd H, Ruyter IE. Water sorption and filler characteristics of composite resin materials. Biomaterials, 1986; 7(3): 176–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-9612(86)90032-6
12. Wiegand A, Buchalla W, Attin T. Review on fluoride-releasing restorative materials—Fluoride release and uptake characteristics, antibacterial activity and influence on caries formation. Dent Mater, 2007; 23(3): 343–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2006.01.022