**Press Release, June 2021**

# **Cost-effectiveness of Glass Hybrids as a long-term restorative alternative, now proven for cervical lesions**

# In the past, Glass Hybrids have shown similar clinical performance and superior cost-effectiveness compared to composites in Class II restorations in a 4 country multi-centre, randomized clinical trial. Now, in a controlled clinical trial conducted at Charitè University in Germany by Prof. Falk Schwendick, Glass Hybrids have yet again shown similar performance both clinically and in cost-effectiveness compared to composites in non-carious cervical lesions.

# With the phasing-down of dental amalgam, the global need for a long-term cost effective restorative alternative to amalgam has never been so high. It means that it is necessary to identify a suitable restorative alternative that is not only cost-effective and clinically proven but also has to be easy to use, bulk fill and is not sensitive to the technical procedure.

Prof. Dr. Falk Schwendicke’s latest study compares **survival, restoration quality and costs of glass hybrid (EQUIA Forte) and resin composite (Filtek Supreme XTE).**

**The study uses a cluster-randomized trial** of 88 patients with total of 175 restorations. Of those, 83 were glass hybrid restorations and 92 were resin composite restorations. There were no significant differences between both groups with regards to the sample characteristics. Restorations were placed without mechanical cavity preparation and evaluated at one, 18 and 36-months using FDI World Dental Federation criteria. Costs were estimated from a payer’s perspective in Germany, using time recordings and hourly costs, and follow-up costs based on statutory insurance fee-item-catalogues.

According to Dr Falk Schwendicke, ”Within this trial, survival was not significantly different between glass hybrid and resin composite […] as glass hybrid was significantly less costly, both initially and long-term, using resin composite was only cost-effective for payers willing to invest high additional expenses per minimal survival gains.” He added further that, “Glass hybrids are, by default, less technique-sensitive and can, in this way, be seen as more like amalgam. […] they are indeed a good alternative to composites, and I am very happy that there is a choice of materials that dentists can use when amalgam is no longer available.”

The conclusion of the study is that **while survival was not significantly different, glass hybrid is significantly less costly**

# The full study, titled “[Glass hybrid versus composite for non-carious cervical lesions: Survival, restoration quality and costs in randomized controlled trial after 3 years](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030057122100110X?via%3Dihub#!)” was published in the July 2021 issue of the *Journal of Dentistry*.
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