

Neue Sicht auf Glasionomermaterialien

Prof. Dr. Andrej M. Kielbassa/Krems

Dental Tribune German/Austrian/Swiss Edition 1+2/2015

Literatur

1. Kielbassa AM, Muller J, Gernhardt CR: Closing the gap between oral hygiene and minimally invasive dentistry: a review on the resin infiltration technique of incipient (proximal) enamel lesions. *Quintessence Int* 2009; 40: 663-681
2. DuBois DJ, Reichl RB, Hondrum SO: The comparative radiopacity of Fuji IX-GP, an intermediate restorative material. *Mil Med* 2000; 165(4): 278-282
3. Lohbauer U, Petschelt A: Influence of a Nanofilled Coating on Physical Properties of Glassionomercements. *J Dent Res (Spec Iss A)* 2012; 91: 1048
4. Diem VTK et al: The effect of a nano-filled resin coating on the 3-year clinical performance of a conventional high-viscosity glass-ionomer cement. *Clinical Oral Investigations*, 2013; DOI 10.1007/s00784-013-1026-z
5. Gurgan S, Kutuk ZB, Ergin E, Oztas SS, Cakir FY: Four-year Randomized Clinical Trial to Evaluate the Clinical Performance of a Glass Ionomer Restorative System. *Operative Dentistry In-Press*, 2014; DOI 10.2341/13-239-C
6. Klinke T, Daboul A, Biffar R: EQUIA-RCT in the field: Longevity after 24 months. *CED IADR Florenz*, 2013, Abstract 3. Abruf am 17.10.2014 unter: <https://iadr.confex.com/iadr/ced13/webprogram/Paper179792.html>
7. Gurgan S, Kutuk ZB, Firat E, Cakir FY, Oztas SS: 60-Month Clinical Performance Of A Glass Ionomer Restorative System, *IADR General Session*, Cape Town, June 25th 2014, Abstract of Oral Session. Abruf am 10.09.2014 unter: <https://iadr.confex.com/iadr/14iags/webprogram/Paper190266.html>
8. Mickenautsch S, Yengopal V, Banerjee A: Atraumatic restorative treatment versus amalgam restoration longevity: a systematic review. *Clin Oral Investig* 2010 Jun;14(3): 233-40
9. Mickenautsch S, Yengopal V: Failure rate of high-viscosity GIC based ART compared to that of conventional amalgam restorations-evidence from a systematic review update. *S Afr Dent J* 2012; 67: 329-31. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23951787>
10. Mickenautsch S, Yengopal V: Direct contra naïve-indirect comparison of clinical failure rates between high-viscosity GIC and conventional amalgam restorations. An empirical study, 2013; *PLOS One* 2013; 8: e78397, <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0078397>
11. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP): Mercury. Time to Act. 2013. Abruf am 10.09.2014 unter: http://www.unep.org/PDF/PressReleases/Mercury_TimeToAct_hires.pdf
12. FDI World Dental Federation: Dental restorative materials and the Minamata Convention on Mercury – Guidelines for successful implementation. Abruf am 21.10.2014 unter: http://www.fdiworldental.org/media/54670/minamata-convention_fdi-guidelines-for-successful-implementation.pdf
13. Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR). Preliminary opinion on The safety of dental amalgam and alternative dental restoration

materials for patients and users. 26 August 2014. Abruf am 10.09.2014 unter:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihr_o_046.pdf