

# SCD **Case Study**

January 2018

Patient treated by Dr Simon Killough  
BSc(Hons) BDS MFDS FDS(Rest Dent) PhD Specialist In Restorative Dentistry

## Introduction

The patient presented initially with an UR1 missing, the tooth being extracted due to a failed post crown. A temporary acrylic denture was provided to allow for socket healing. When healing was complete an Ankylos implant was placed in the UR 1. A PFM bridge was already in place UR 3-2. There was an aesthetic discrepancy between the crown and bridgework on the UR 3-2-1 and the natural teeth UL 1-2-3. The patient requested an improvement in the appearance of the upper anterior teeth.



Preoperative presentation of the patient

## Technical detail

This was a complex upper anterior restorative case involving a combination of crowns, conventional bridgework, veneers and an implant retained crown:

1. IPS e.max® crowns on the UR 4, UL 4-5 with the IPS e.max® veneers on the UL 1-2-3.
2. A conventional cantilever bridge, fabricated in Porcelain Fused to Zirconia (PFZ), with the retainer on the UR 3 and a pontic on the UR 2.
3. UR1 anodised titanium ANKYLOS® abutment with an IPS e.max® implant crown (modified screw retained).



Preoperative diagnostic wax up



Restoration side view



Restoration anterior view

### Techniques and materials used

In order to maximise the aesthetics, Dr Killough decided that it would be best to provide all ceramic restorations. During the initial stages of implant restoration, Dr Killough provided a provisional restoration on the UR1 to ensure good soft tissue healing and to modify the soft tissue. The provisional crown was in place for a period of 3 months. The anodised titanium ANKYLOS® abutment permitted the use of an IPS e.max® crown. An anodised titanium abutment has a gold/yellow hue which permits the provision of the relatively translucent IPS e.max® material. If the abutment was not anodised then the grey coloured abutment could show through the translucent IPS e.max® material.

The UR 3-2 cantilever bridge would not have been strong enough if fabricated in IPS e.max® but the use of a zirconia substructure provided sufficient strength for a cantilever design

The IPS e.max® veneers allowed for a conservative approach to the restoration of the UL 1-2-3.

### Dentist/patient feedback

The patient was delighted with the outcome with Dr Killough commenting “It’s a great result”.

Southern Cross Dental would like to thank Dr Simon Killough BSc(Hons) BDS MFDS FDS(Rest Dent) PhD Specialist In Restorative Dentistry at Fortwilliam Clinic in Belfast, UK for his contribution to this article.



Preoperative and post-operative comparison