



Short explanation about this document:

This is the literature list for

- **Glass Hybrids**

**Clinical studies** are our Unique Selling Proposition, and the literature list focuses on this type of evidence. However, still some relevant *in-vitro* studies are in this list in order to provide support to mechanical/physical properties.

Please adapt this document according the needs, laws and regulations of your area.

Please upload it in your local website according the product category:

- GH list for EQUIA Forte and EQUIA Forte HT

Thank you.



## Glass Hybrids

Cost-effective, long-term restorative alternative



# Glass Hybrids

## Scientific Sheet

Feb. 2024

# EQUIA Forte

# EQUIA Forte HT





## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>Comparative evaluation of postoperative sensitivity in bulk fill restoratives:<br/>A randomized controlled trial</b> |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Hirani RT <i>et al.</i> J Int Soc Prev Community Dent. 2018. 8(6):534-539.<br>doi: 10.4103/jispcd.JISPCD_218_18         |
| Patients treated with EQUIA Forte and Activa Bioactive presented lower POS when compared to groups restored with Cention N. Follow-up period: 24 h, 1 week and 1 month. |   |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 144 patients  |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Glass hybrid restorations as an alternative for restoring hypomineralized molars in the ART model</b> |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Grossi J <i>et al.</i> , BMC Oral Health. 2018. 18(1):65.<br>doi: 10.1186/s12903-018-0528-0              |
| A success rate of 98.3% was observed after 6 and 12 months. The only failure occurred in a restoration involving three or more surfaces presenting the breakdown of all cusps. |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 44 patients<br>Number of restorations: 60 restorations   |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>Multi-center clinical evaluation of bulk-fill glass hybrid restorations:<br/>One-year report</b>  |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Turkun S <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 97(Spec Iss B): 1972.<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/18iags-2953131/multi-center-clinical-evaluation-of-bulk-fill-glass-hybrid-restorations-oneyear-report">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/18iags-2953131/multi-center-clinical-evaluation-of-bulk-fill-glass-hybrid-restorations-oneyear-report</a> |
| In this split-mouth study design, EQUIA Forte and the composite Tetric EvoCeram were equally successful in moderate to large size Class II restorations |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients<br>Number of restorations: 360 restorations  |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>Does the depth of the cavity and the activity of the lesion in primary molars influence in the success of the restoration?</b>  |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Baumotte L <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 98 (Spec Iss A): 0605. <a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/19iags-3186371/does-the-depth-of-the-cavity-and-the-activity-of-the-lesion-in-primary-molars-influence-in-the-success-of-the-restoration">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/19iags-3186371/does-the-depth-of-the-cavity-and-the-activity-of-the-lesion-in-primary-molars-influence-in-the-success-of-the-restoration</a> |
| EQUIA Forte showed a success rate of 94% after a mean evaluation time of 13.3 months. Cavity depth and caries lesion activity did not influence the restoration's survival. |  |
| Number of Restorations: 45 restorations   |  |





## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | High-viscosity glass ionomer used with selective cavity preparation in MIH   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Sezer B <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 98 (Spec Iss B): 0568.<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/ced-iadr2019-3222886/high-viscosity-glass-ionomer-used-with-selective-cavity-preparation-in-mih">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/ced-iadr2019-3222886/high-viscosity-glass-ionomer-used-with-selective-cavity-preparation-in-mih</a> |
| After 2 years, EQUIA Forte presented a high survival rate in MIH affected first permanent molars. The probability of being satisfied at 12 months and 24 months were respectively 88,2%,78.6%. |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 58 patients<br>Number of restorations: 134 restorations  |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | Clinical performance of a glass hybrid restorative in extended size class II cavities   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Gurgan S <i>et al.</i> Oper Dent. 2019. 45(3):243-254.<br>Oct 29. doi: 10.2341/18-282-C |
| EQUIA Forte performed as good as the micro-hybrid composite (G-ænial Posterior), with a success rate of 100% at the 24-month recall. |   |
| Number of Patients evaluated:37 patients<br>Number of restorations: 108 restorations   |   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | Clinical performance of a glass-hybrid system compared with a resin composite in the posterior region: Results of a 2-year multicenter study |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Miletić I <i>et al.</i> J Adhes Dent. 2020. 22(3):235-247.<br>doi: 10.3290/j.jad.a44547  |
| In this split-mouth study design, EQUIA Forte performed as good as the nanohybrid resin composite (Tetric EvoCeram) in moderate to large two-surface class II restorations. |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients<br>Number of restorations: 360 restorations  |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | Twenty-four-month clinical performance of a glass hybrid restorative in non-carious cervical lesions of patients with bruxism: a split-mouth, randomized clinical trial |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Vural U <i>et al.</i> Clin Oral Investig. 2020. 24(3):1229-1238.<br>doi: 10.1007/s00784-019-02986-x   |
| EQUIA Forte showed good performance for the restoration of NCCLs when compared to Ceram.X One Universal. Cumulative survival rates was 84.1% |   |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 25 patients<br>Number of restorations: 148 restorations  |   |





## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>A Clinical Evaluation of Conservative approach and GIC Performance in MIH Affected Molars: Three-year Results</b>  |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Tugcu N <i>et al.</i> IAPD20 Virtual. Abstract book p.1076.<br>chrome-<br><a href="https://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://iapdworld.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/IAPD20-Virtual-Abstract-Book-_compressed.pdf">extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://iapdworld.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/IAPD20-Virtual-Abstract-Book-_compressed.pdf</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte combined with minimal invasive cavity preparation was found to be a successful approach during a 3-year follow-up.</b> |   |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 31 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 65 restorations</b>                                    |   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>ART restorations in MIH severely affected molars: 4 years follow-up</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Marques M <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 99 (Spec Iss A): 2384.<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/20iags-3328771/art-restorations-in-mih-severely-affected-molars-4-years-follow-up">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/20iags-3328771/art-restorations-in-mih-severely-affected-molars-4-years-follow-up</a> |
| <b>The survival rate was 61.9% after a 48 months. EQUIA Forte is a trustable option for treating severely MIH affected teeth.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 44 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 60 restorations</b>                                |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>48-Month clinical performance of a glass hybrid in extended size class II cavities</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Gurgan S <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 99 (Spec Iss A): 1389.<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/20iags-3327309/48-month-clinical-performance-of-a-glass-hybrid-in-extended-size-class-ii-cavities">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/20iags-3327309/48-month-clinical-performance-of-a-glass-hybrid-in-extended-size-class-ii-cavities</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte and the micro-hybrid composite (G-ænial Posterior) presented acceptable surface and marginal adaptation characteristics, rendering the glass hybrid a trustable permanent material for large Class II cavities.</b> |   |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 32 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 90 restorations</b>   |   |



## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Glass Hybrid Versus Nanocomposite for Restoration of Sclerotic Non-cariou Cervical Lesions: 18-Month Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial</b> |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Schwendicke F <i>et al.</i> J Adhes Dent. doi: 10.3290/j.jad.b2287831  |
| <b>EQUIA Forte may be a suitable alternative to Filtek Supreme XTE for restoring sNCCLs, without any significant difference in survival between the materials. GH restorations required less chairtime than did placing RC restorations.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 88 patients<br/>Number of restorations: 175 restorations</b>  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Glass hybrid versus composite for non-cariou cervical lesions: Survival, restoration quality and costs in randomized controlled trial after 3 years</b>     |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Schwendicke F <i>et al.</i> J Dent. 2021. 110:103689.<br><a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103689">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103689</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte was significantly less costly both, initially and long-term, than Filtek Supreme XTE for restoring non-cariou cervical lesions. Survival was not significantly different.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 88 patients<br/>Number of restorations: 175 restorations</b>  |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>Cost-effectiveness of glass hybrid versus composite in a multi-country randomized trial</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Schwendicke F <i>et al.</i> J Dent. 2021. 107:103614.<br><a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103614">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103614</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte was less costly than Tetric EvoCeram both initially and over 3 years. Efficacy differences were extremely limited.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients<br/>Number of restorations: 360 restorations</b>  |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Long-term cost-effectiveness of glass hybrid versus composite in permanent molars</b>  |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Schwendicke F <i>et al.</i> J Dent. 2021. 112:103751<br><a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103751">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103751</a> |
| <b>This study used data provided by a multi-country randomized trial comparing EQUIA Forte to Tetric EvoCeram (Miletic <i>et al.</i>, 2020) . Microsimulations models translated the data into a long-term horizon, concluding that glass-hybrid is likely a cost-effective option for restoring permanent molars.</b> |   |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients<br/>Number of restorations: 360 restorations</b>   |   |





## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>4-Years Clinical Performance of Glass-Hybrid and Composite in Multi-Center Trial</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Miletic I, <i>et al.</i> 2022. J Dent Res Vol 101 (Spec Iss C): P350<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/per-iadr2022-3787618/4-years-clinical-performance-of-glass-hybrid-and-composite-in-multi-center-trial">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/per-iadr2022-3787618/4-years-clinical-performance-of-glass-hybrid-and-composite-in-multi-center-trial</a> |
| <b>In this split-mouth study design, EQUIA Forte performed as good as the nanohybrid resin composite (Tetric EvoCeram) in moderate to large two-surface class II restorations.</b> |   |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 360 restorations</b>   |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Sixty-Month Follow-up of a Glass Hybrid in NCCLs</b>  |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Gurgan S, <i>et al.</i> 2022. J Dent Res Vol 101 (Spec Iss C): P319<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/per-iadr2022-3760534/sixty-month-follow-up-of-a-glass-hybrid-in-nccls">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/per-iadr2022-3760534/sixty-month-follow-up-of-a-glass-hybrid-in-nccls</a> |
| <b>After 5 years, EQUIA Forte showed similar clinical performance and survival as the resin composite Ceram.X One Universal in NCCLs in patients with bruxism.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated:15 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 97 restorations</b>  |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>Changes in oral health-related quality of life after treatment of molar incisor hypomineralisation using Glass Hybrid Restorations</b>                               |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>  | Tugcu N, <i>et al.</i> 2022. J Pak Med Assoc Vol. 72 No. 10 (2022): OCTOBER<br>DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.3848">https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.3848</a> |
| <b>Treating MIH-affected molars with EQUIA Forte after selective caries removal improved the Oral Health-related Quality of Life (OHRQOL) in children aged 11-14 years.</b> |   |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated:40 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 86 restorations</b>   |   |





## References – Clinical studies

### EQUIA® Forte

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Five-Year Performance of Glass-Hybrid and Nano-Hybrid Restoratives: Multi-Centre Clinical Trial</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Miletić I <i>et al.</i> J Dent Res Vol 102 (Spec Iss C ): 0363<br><a href="https://ced-iadr2023.com/abstract-book-2/">https://ced-iadr2023.com/abstract-book-2/</a> page 183 |
| <b>In this split-mouth study design, the success and survival rates of EQUIA Forte were satisfactory and comparable to those of resin composite, Tetric EvoCeram, in moderate to large two-surface restorations of permanent molars.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 360 restorations</b>   |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>Clinical performance of a glass-hybrid system in comparison with a resin composite in two-surface class II restorations: a 5-year randomised multi-centre study</b> |
| <b>REFERENCE</b>   | Miletić I <i>et al.</i> Clin Oral Investig. 2024 Jan 20;28(1):104<br><a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38243032/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38243032/</a> |
| <b>In this split-mouth study design, EQUIA Forte and Tetric EvoCeram have demonstrated comparable satisfactory performance, suggesting that both products can be used as long-term restorative materials in the posterior region for moderate to large two-surface restorations.</b> |  |
| <b>Number of Patients evaluated: 180 patients</b><br><b>Number of restorations: 360 restorations</b>   |  |



## References – clinical studies

### EQUIA FORTE™ HT

|  |   |
|--|---|
| TITLE  | <b>Clinical Performance of Restorations in Teeth Affected by MIH</b>  |
| REFERENCE  | Kaya R, Kargul B. 2021. J Dent Res Vol 100 (Spec Iss A): 0584.<br><a href="https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/21iaqs-3572669/clinical-performance-of-restorations-in-teeth-affected-by-mih">https://iadr.abstractarchives.com/abstract/21iaqs-3572669/clinical-performance-of-restorations-in-teeth-affected-by-mih</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte HT (GH) and everX Flow were the restorative options to treat first permanent molars affected by MIH. Retention rate at 12-month was 100% for GH restoration, while marginal integrity was 89.2%. This suggests that EQUIA Forte HT is a good restorative option for MIH affected teeth.</b> |   |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 28 patients<br>Number of restorations: 67 restorations   |   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| TITLE   | <b>Two years clinical performance of composite and hybrid ionomer for molars affected by MIH</b>   |
| REFERENCE   | Kaya R, Kodaman N, Kargul B. Eur Arch Paediatr Dent . 2023 Jan 16 : 1–96<br>doi: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40368-022-00771-1">10.1007/s40368-022-00771-1</a> |
| <b>EQUIA Forte HT (GH) and everX Flow were the restorative options to treat first permanent molars affected by MIH. At 24-month, retention rate was 96,8% and 93,5% for GH and resin composite respectively, suggesting that GH is a reliable restorative alternative for MIH affected teeth.</b> |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 31 patients<br>Number of restorations: 64 restorations  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| TITLE  | <b>Could bulk fill glass hybrid restorative materials replace composite resins in treating permanent teeth? A randomized controlled clinical trial</b>   |
| REFERENCE  | Uyumaz FÜ, Abaklı İnci M, Özer H. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2023 Dec 18.<br><a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38108583/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38108583/</a><br>doi: 10.1111/jerd.13181. Online ahead of print. |
| <b>In this split-mouth study design, EQUIA Forte HT (GH) and Charisma Smart Universal were the restorative options to treat Class I restorations in permanent molars. After 1 year, GH and resin composite demonstrated equivalent and successful performance.</b> |  |
| Number of Patients evaluated: 44 patients<br>Number of restorations: 144 restorations  |  |

