

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

**THE EFFECT OF ABUTMENT AND
CROWN DESIGN ON FRACTURE
STRENGTH AND FRACTURE MODE
OF IMPLANT-SUPPORTED
PROSTHESIS (ISP)**

**AMMAR YASEER BIN ABDUL HAKIM @
ABDUL KHAKIN**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of The
Requirements for The Degree of
Doctor in Prosthodontics**

Faculty of Dentistry

August 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise and gratitude be to Allah, the Almighty, for His infinite blessings, guidance, and mercy. It is by His grace that I have been granted the strength, patience, and perseverance to embark on and successfully complete this PhD journey. May peace and blessings be upon Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), his family, and his followers, whose teachings continue to serve as a source of inspiration in all aspects of life.

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Nur Hafizah Kamar Affendi, for her steadfast guidance, enduring patience, and unwavering support throughout this journey. Her mentorship has been crucial in helping me navigate the challenges of this research. My sincere appreciation also goes to my co-supervisor, Professor Dr. Rohana Ahmad, for her expert insights, invaluable feedback, and consistent encouragement, which were essential to the successful completion of this work despite her demanding schedule.

I am immensely grateful to Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) for providing the support, facilities, and technical resources that have been fundamental to conducting this research. To my supportive lecturers, thank you for your wisdom, guidance, and dedication to nurturing students like me. Your encouragement and belief in my potential have been a significant source of motivation.

Special thanks to my incredible batchmates and friends, whose constant encouragement, understanding, and camaraderie have been a beacon of strength during this journey. I am particularly thankful to Dr. Mohd Firdaus Mazlan, Dr. Mohammad Amal Wahab, and Dr. Mohamad Shamim for their countless acts of guidance and support throughout my research. I would also like to express my heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Fazliza Mohd Fathoni, Dr. Bibi Aisiah, and Dr. Muhammad Nur Izham for their friendship and unwavering support as we journeyed together toward becoming Prosthodontists.

Above all, my deepest gratitude goes to my beloved parents, siblings, and family members. Your unconditional love, prayers, and unwavering support have been the cornerstone of my strength and determination throughout this endeavor.

This achievement is not mine alone; it is a testament to the shared sacrifices, support, and unshakeable faith of all those who have stood by me. To everyone who has contributed to this journey, directly or indirectly, I am forever grateful. Alhamdulillah.

ABSTRACT

Aim: This in-vitro study aimed to evaluate the fracture strength and fractographic characteristics of CAD/CAM cement-retained (CR) and screw-retrievable cement-retained (SRCR) implant-supported molar crowns bonded to different titanium-based abutments. **Material and methods:** Sixty implant crowns, comprising monolithic zirconia and bilayer crowns, were assigned into control and test groups. The control group included monolithic cemented crowns bonded to Variobase (MCV, n=10) and NiTium abutments (MCN, n=10). The test groups consisted of monolithic screw-retained crowns bonded to Variobase (MSV, n=10) and NiTium abutments (MSN, n=10), as well as bilayer screw-retained crowns with reinforced access hole bonded to Variobase (BSV, n=10) and NiTium abutments (BSN, n=10). All crowns were cemented onto prefabricated titanium-based abutments. Samples underwent thermal cycling to simulate oral conditions, followed by a single-load fracture test. Fracture modes were examined using Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM). Fracture strength values were statistically analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test, with significance set at $P < .05$. **Results:** There was no significant difference in fracture strength between NiTium and Variobase abutments for both cement-retained ($p = 0.096$) and screw-retrievable cement-retained crowns ($p = 0.650$). Similarly, no significant difference was observed between abutments for bilayer crowns (BSV vs. BSN, $p = 0.520$). However, crown design significantly influenced fracture strength (Kruskal-Wallis's test, $p < 0.001$). Bilayer crowns demonstrated significantly lower fracture strength compared to monolithic crowns (both CR and SRCR groups, $p < 0.001$), while no significant difference was noted between monolithic CR and SRCR crowns ($p = 1.000$). Fractographic analysis revealed catastrophic failure for MSV and MSN, while other groups showed complex failure patterns. **Conclusion:** No significant difference in fracture strength was found between NiTium and Variobase abutments, indicating both effectively support implant crowns under the tested conditions. Bilayer crowns exhibited lower fracture strength primarily due to lithium disilicate chipping and delamination. Retention type (CR vs. SRCR) did not significantly affect monolithic crown fracture strength. The SEM analysis highlight significant differences in fracture behavior among the three groups. While monolithic SRCR crowns demonstrated superior mechanical strength, they predominantly failed through catastrophic cohesive bulk fractures. In contrast, bilayer crowns exhibited more repairable adhesive failures, typically occurring at the veneer-core interface. The findings highlight the superior mechanical strength of monolithic crowns for posterior load-bearing applications, whereas bilayer crowns may be better suited to anterior regions, where aesthetic considerations are of primary concern.

Keywords: Dental implant; Implant abutment; Cement retained; Screw-retained; Zirconia crown

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CONFIRMATION BY PANEL OF EXAMINERS	ii
AUTHOR'S DECLARATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	iv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Research Problem	4
1.3 Research Question	5
1.4 Significance of The Study	5
1.5 Limitations	6
1.6 Research Objectives	6
1.6.1 General Objective	6
1.6.2 Specific Objectives	7
1.7 Hypothesis	7
1.7.1 Null Hypothesis (H0)	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction to Implant Dentistry and Success Criteria	8
2.1.1 Historical Background and Evolution of Dental Implants	8
2.1.2 Success Criteria for Dental Implants	11
2.1.2.1 <i>Biological Success</i>	12
2.1.2.2 <i>Mechanical Success</i>	14
2.1.2.3 <i>Aesthetic Success</i>	16
2.2 Implant Abutment Design and Types	18

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

Dental implants have revolutionized restorative dentistry, providing predictable success rates attributed to factors such as osseointegration, prosthesis stability, peri-mucosal health, and bone preservation. However, complications often arise post-loading, emphasizing the importance of effective prosthetic design and retention methods to ensure long-term outcomes (Pjetursson et al., 2018; Misch, 2020). Among these, the retention interface between the crown, abutment, and implant fixture plays a critical role in determining the mechanical and clinical success of implant-supported restorations (Affendi et al., 2024).

Implant-supported restorations are traditionally categorized as cement-retained or screw-retained, each with distinct benefits and limitations. Cement-retained restorations are lauded for their aesthetics, simplified fabrication, and passive fit. However, residual cement from placement often contributes to biological complications such as peri-implantitis, while their lack of retrievability poses challenges during maintenance or repair (Levine et al., 2014; Linkevicius et al., 2013). Conversely, screw-retained systems eliminate the risks of cement-related complications and allow easier retrievability, but their visible screw access channels may compromise esthetics, and the disruption of the crown's structural integrity due to the channel often reduces fracture strength (Rajan & Gunaseelan, 2004; Kotsakis et al., 2016).

To address these shortcomings, screw-retrievable cement-retained (SRCR) restorations have been developed as a hybrid solution, combining the advantages of both systems. This design minimizes the risks of residual cement by allowing extra-oral cementation while retaining the retrievability of screw-retained systems. Moreover, the cement layer in SRCR restorations serves as a stress absorber, potentially enhancing fracture strength under functional loads. However, the screw access channels themselves introduce structural challenges, with factors such as channel diameter, placement, and