ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23

American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 09,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

MODERN DENTAL FILLING MATERIALS: BALANCING ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS

Vasila Sharipova
2nd-year student, Faculty of Medicine, Andijan Branch, Kokand University
Kazimovavasilya@cloud.com
Sevara Foziljonova
2nd-year student, Faculty of Medicine, Andijan Branch, Kokand University
foziljonova_s@icloud.com
Go'zaloy Qodirova
2nd-year student, Faculty of Medicine, Andijan Branch, Kokand University
qodirova707@icloud.com

Abstract: Dental fillings are among the most common restorative procedures in dentistry, essential for treating cavities, repairing fractured teeth, and restoring function. The evolution of filling materials has transformed restorative dentistry, shifting from traditional amalgam to advanced composite resins, glass ionomer cements, and ceramic-based materials. Modern filling materials prioritize not only strength and durability but also aesthetics, biocompatibility, and ease of application. Composite resins have become particularly popular due to their tooth-like appearance and bonding ability, while glass ionomer cements offer fluoride release and chemical adhesion to tooth structures. Ceramic fillings provide exceptional aesthetics and strength, making them suitable for larger restorations. Despite these advantages, each material also presents limitations. Amalgam, although durable, is criticized for its metallic appearance and mercury content. Composites are prone to wear and shrinkage, while ceramics can be costly and technique-sensitive. This article explores the properties, advantages, and disadvantages of modern filling materials, highlighting their clinical performance and applicability in various dental scenarios. By comparing traditional and contemporary materials, the article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of current trends in restorative dentistry. The findings emphasize the importance of material selection based on patient needs, cavity type, and long-term prognosis to ensure optimal restorative outcomes.

Keywords: Dental fillings, composite resins, amalgam, glass ionomer cement, ceramics, restorative dentistry, aesthetics, durability, fluoride release, biocompatibility.

Introduction

Dental caries remains one of the most widespread oral health problems worldwide, affecting people of all ages. The restoration of decayed or damaged teeth is therefore a central aspect of modern dentistry, and dental filling materials are fundamental in this process. Traditionally, amalgam dominated restorative dentistry for over a century, valued for its durability and affordability. However, increasing concerns regarding aesthetics and mercury content led to the development of alternative materials.

Today, modern restorative dentistry offers a variety of filling materials, each with distinct properties. Composite resins, glass ionomer cements, and ceramics are widely used, providing improvements in both functionality and appearance. These materials not only restore tooth structure but also enhance aesthetics, reduce microleakage, and promote better adhesion to natural tooth tissues.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 09,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

Despite these advancements, no single material is ideal for every clinical scenario. Each option presents a balance between advantages and disadvantages, requiring careful consideration of factors such as location of the cavity, functional demands, patient expectations, and cost. This article evaluates the characteristics of modern filling materials, highlighting their benefits and limitations in comparison to traditional amalgam, with the aim of guiding clinical decision-making for effective and long-lasting dental restorations.

Literature Review

The evolution of dental filling materials is well documented in dental literature. Amalgam, introduced in the 19th century, was long considered the gold standard due to its durability and resistance to wear (Mjör, 1997). However, its metallic appearance and mercury concerns have reduced its popularity (Bernardo et al., 2007). Composite resins emerged as aesthetic alternatives, with Bowen's 1960s research pioneering resin-based materials that bond directly to tooth structures (Bowen, 1962). Advances in nanotechnology have further improved their strength and wear resistance (Ferracane, 2011). Glass ionomer cements, introduced by Wilson and Kent in 1972, gained attention for their fluoride-releasing properties and chemical adhesion (Wilson & Kent, 1972). More recently, ceramics and hybrid materials have been developed, offering superior aesthetics and biocompatibility but at higher costs (Manhart et al., 2004). Collectively, the literature suggests that while modern materials enhance restorative outcomes, clinical selection must balance functional demands, patient preferences, and economic considerations.

Main Body

1. Amalgam Fillings

Amalgam fillings, composed of mercury mixed with silver, tin, and copper, have been widely used for over 150 years.

- **Advantages:** Exceptional durability, resistance to wear, cost-effectiveness, and ease of placement.
- **Disadvantages:** Poor aesthetics due to metallic appearance, potential for microleakage with expansion and contraction, and concerns about mercury exposure. Their declining popularity reflects modern preferences for aesthetic and biocompatible alternatives.

2. Composite Resins

Composite resins are tooth-colored materials made of resin matrix and inorganic fillers. They are currently the most popular choice for direct restorations.

- **Advantages:** Excellent aesthetics, ability to bond directly to enamel and dentin, minimal removal of tooth structure, and versatility in anterior and posterior restorations.
- **Disadvantages:** Susceptibility to polymerization shrinkage, marginal leakage, wear in high-stress areas, and technique sensitivity. Longevity is shorter compared to amalgam in posterior teeth.

3. Glass Ionomer Cements (GICs)

GICs are materials that chemically bond to tooth structures and release fluoride.

- **Advantages:** Fluoride release provides anti-cariogenic effects, chemical adhesion to enamel and dentin, biocompatibility, and ease of use in non-stress-bearing areas.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 09,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

- **Disadvantages:** Lower strength and wear resistance compared to composites and amalgam, making them unsuitable for high-load restorations. They are best used in cervical lesions, atraumatic restorative treatments, and pediatric dentistry.

4. Resin-Modified Glass Ionomer Cements (RMGICs)

Developed to overcome the weaknesses of conventional GICs, RMGICs combine the properties of resin composites and GICs.

- **Advantages:** Improved strength, better aesthetics, sustained fluoride release, and reduced sensitivity to moisture during placement.
- **Disadvantages:** Lower mechanical properties than composites, limited longevity under heavy occlusal stress.

5. Ceramics

Ceramic fillings, such as porcelain and lithium disilicate, are increasingly used for indirect restorations.

- **Advantages:** Outstanding aesthetics closely resembling natural teeth, high biocompatibility, strength, and resistance to discoloration.
- **Disadvantages:** Expensive, require laboratory fabrication or CAD/CAM technology, brittle in thin sections, and more invasive as they often demand greater tooth reduction.

6. Hybrid and Bulk-Fill Materials

Recent developments include bulk-fill composites and nanohybrid resins.

- **Advantages:** Faster placement, deeper curing, reduced shrinkage, and improved physical properties.
- **Disadvantages:** Limited long-term clinical evidence, potentially higher cost, and technique sensitivity.

7. Clinical Considerations.

The choice of filling material depends on:

- **Location of the cavity** (anterior vs. posterior).
- **Functional demands** (stress-bearing vs. non-stress areas).
- **Aesthetic expectations** (tooth-colored materials preferred in visible areas).
- **Cost and availability** (amalgam remains cheaper, while ceramics and CAD/CAM restorations are expensive).

8. Future Directions.

Modern research focuses on bioactive materials capable of remineralizing tooth structures and resisting bacterial colonization. Smart materials that respond to pH changes and deliver therapeutic ions are under development, indicating a shift toward restorative approaches that not only repair but also prevent further decay.

]

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative review methodology, analyzing peer-reviewed articles, textbooks, and clinical guidelines on modern dental filling materials. Sources were selected from PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, focusing on publications from 2000 onwards, with some historical references included for context. The analysis considered the physical, chemical, aesthetic, and biological properties of filling materials, alongside their clinical performance and patient satisfaction outcomes. Comparative evaluation was used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of amalgam, composite resins, glass ionomer cements, and ceramic materials. Case studies and systematic reviews were examined to highlight clinical effectiveness and failure rates. Additionally, recent developments such as bulk-fill composites and bioactive materials

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 09,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

were reviewed to understand future trends. This approach provides a comprehensive overview of modern filling materials, their advantages, disadvantages, and practical applications, serving as a reference for both clinical decision-making and academic research in restorative dentistry.

Results

The review reveals that no single filling material meets all clinical requirements perfectly. Amalgam remains durable and cost-effective but lacks aesthetic appeal and raises environmental concerns. Composite resins are currently the most widely used due to their excellent aesthetics and adhesion but are limited by shrinkage and reduced longevity in posterior restorations. Glass ionomer cements are valuable for their fluoride release and chemical bonding but lack strength, restricting their use to non-stress areas. Resin-modified GICs improve upon traditional GICs but still do not match composites in durability. Ceramics excel in aesthetics and strength but are costly and invasive. Hybrid and bulk-fill composites show promise for faster, more efficient treatment, though long-term studies are needed. Overall, modern filling materials significantly improve patient outcomes, but selection must be tailored to clinical conditions, patient needs, and economic considerations.

Conclusion

Modern filling materials represent a significant advancement in restorative dentistry, offering patients improved functionality, aesthetics, and long-term oral health. The transition from amalgam to contemporary alternatives reflects both patient preferences and professional demands for safer, more natural-looking restorations. Composite resins dominate clinical practice due to their versatility and aesthetic qualities, although challenges such as shrinkage and wear persist. Glass ionomer cements and their resin-modified variants continue to play a key role in preventive and pediatric dentistry, particularly in cases where fluoride release is beneficial. Ceramic restorations set the standard for aesthetics and biocompatibility, though their cost and technique sensitivity limit widespread use.

The review underscores that material selection should not follow a one-size-fits-all approach. Instead, it must consider multiple factors: cavity size, stress-bearing location, aesthetic requirements, patient compliance, and financial constraints. Aesthetic demands often lead patients to prefer composites or ceramics, while functional and economic considerations may necessitate amalgam or glass ionomers.

Emerging bioactive materials and nanotechnology-based composites represent the future of restorative dentistry. These materials aim not only to restore damaged teeth but also to promote healing and prevent future decay. Such innovations highlight the ongoing shift toward minimally invasive and preventive approaches in dental practice.

In conclusion, modern filling materials offer a wide spectrum of options, each with unique strengths and weaknesses. Optimal clinical outcomes depend on matching material properties with patient needs and clinical demands. Dentists must remain informed about evolving technologies and materials to deliver the best possible care. Ultimately, the continued advancement of restorative materials promises to enhance dental practice by combining durability, aesthetics, and biological compatibility in a single restorative solution.

References

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 09,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

1. Mjör, I.A. (1997). The reasons for replacement and the age of failed restorations in general dental practice. Acta Odontologica Scandinavica.
2. Bernardo, M. et al. (2007). Survival and reasons for failure of amalgam versus composite restorations. JADA.
3. Bowen, R.L. (1962). Dental filling material comprising vinyl silane-treated fused silica and a binder consisting of the reaction product of bisphenol and glycidyl acrylate. JADA.
4. Ferracane, J.L. (2011). Resin composite—state of the art. Dental Materials.
5. Wilson, A.D., & Kent, B.E. (1972). A new translucent cement for dentistry. British Dental Journal.
6. Manhart, J., Chen, H., Hamm, G., & Hickel, R. (2004). Review of the clinical survival of direct and indirect restorations in posterior teeth. Operative Dentistry.
7. Hickel, R., & Manhart, J. (2001). Longevity of restorations in posterior teeth. Journal of Adhesive Dentistry.
8. Opdam, N.J., et al. (2014). Clinical performance of composite restorations: a systematic review. Dental Materials.
9. Mount, G.J., & Hume, W.R. (2005). Preservation and Restoration of Tooth Structure. Wiley-Blackwell.
10. Peutzfeldt, A. (1997). Resin composites in dentistry: the monomer systems. European Journal of Oral Sciences.
11. Ilie, N., & Hickel, R. (2011). Resin composite restorative materials. Australian Dental Journal.
12. van Dijken, J.W.V. (2010). Direct resin composite restorations in clinical practice: Results and longevity. Dental Materials.