Vol. 14, No. 6, November-December 2025

CONTEMPORARY ESTHETIC REHABILITATION IN FIXED PROSTHODONTICS AND IMPLANT DENTISTRY: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Arvinte Andreea-Raluca[1], Agop-Forna Doriana[2*], Maria-Alexandra Beanu[1]

1 DDS, Resident, Faculty of Dental Medicine, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Grigore T.Popa", Iasi
2"Gr. T. Popa" U.M.Ph. - Iași, Romania, Faculty of Dentistry, Department of Surgery

Corresponding authors: Agop-Forna Doriana , e-mail: drdorianaforna@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Contemporary esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry has undergone significant development due to advances in ceramic materials, adhesive techniques, implant therapy, and digital technologies. Modern patients increasingly demand restorations that combine optimal esthetics, functional stability, biological integration, and minimally invasive treatment approaches. As a result, esthetic rehabilitation has become a multidisciplinary process requiring careful integration of prosthetic, periodontal, surgical, and digital principles. **Objective:** The aim of this narrative review is to summarize current concepts and contemporary approaches in esthetic rehabilitation within fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry, with emphasis on restorative materials, minimally invasive therapies, implant esthetics, and digital workflows. **Methods:** A narrative review of the literature was conducted using recent scientific publications, systematic reviews, clinical studies, and consensus reports retrieved from major medical and dental databases. Priority was given to contemporary evidence regarding ceramic materials, veneers, implant-supported restorations, peri-implant soft tissue management, CAD/CAM technologies, and digital treatment planning. **Results:** Current evidence demonstrates that successful esthetic rehabilitation depends on the harmonious integration of facial, dental, periodontal, and functional parameters. Lithium disilicate ceramics, high-translucency zirconia, and adhesive restorative techniques have significantly improved esthetic and mechanical outcomes in fixed prosthodontics. In implant dentistry, implant positioning, emergence profile, and peri-implant soft tissue stability represent essential determinants of esthetic success. Furthermore, digital technologies such as intraoral scanning, Digital Smile Design (DSD), guided implant surgery, and CAD/CAM systems have improved treatment predictability, precision, and interdisciplinary communication. **Conclusions:** Contemporary esthetic rehabilitation requires a comprehensive and individualized approach that combines minimally invasive principles, advanced restorative materials, and digital technologies. Future developments in artificial intelligence, biomimetic materials, and regenerative therapies may further enhance esthetic predictability, long-term stability, and patient satisfaction in fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry.

Key words: *esthetic rehabilitation, fixed prosthodontics, implant dentistry, veneers, dental ceramics; digital dentistry; CAD/CAM; smile design.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary esthetic rehabilitation has become an essential component of modern prosthodontic and implant therapy, reflecting the increasing demand for restorations that combine functional efficiency, biological integration, and natural appearance [1], [2]. Advances in dental materials, adhesive techniques, implant dentistry, and digital technologies have significantly transformed the principles of esthetic treatment planning and restorative procedures over recent decades [3].

In contemporary clinical practice, patient expectations extend beyond the replacement of missing or damaged dental structures and increasingly emphasize

facial harmony, smile esthetics, and minimally invasive treatment approaches [4]. As a result, esthetic rehabilitation requires a comprehensive understanding of dentofacial proportions, gingival architecture, optical properties of restorative materials, and soft tissue management [5].

The development of ceramic materials such as lithium disilicate and zirconia, together with CAD/CAM technologies and digital smile design systems, has improved the predictability and longevity of esthetic restorations in both fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry [6], [7]. Furthermore, minimally invasive concepts, including adhesive restorations and veneers, have gained increasing popularity due to their ability to preserve healthy dental tissues while achieving highly esthetic outcomes [8].

In implant dentistry, esthetic success depends not only on osseointegration and prosthetic stability, but also on the preservation of peri-implant soft tissues, ideal implant positioning, and harmonious integration with adjacent natural dentition. Consequently, interdisciplinary treatment planning involving prosthodontists, periodontists, orthodontists, and oral surgeons has become fundamental for achieving optimal long-term results [9], [10].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

➢ Fundamental Principles of Esthetic Rehabilitation

Esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry is based on the integration of functional, biological, and esthetic principles aimed at restoring harmony between dental structures, soft tissues, and facial features. Contemporary treatment planning extends beyond the replacement of missing teeth and focuses on achieving natural and individualized esthetic outcomes adapted to each patient's facial characteristics and expectations [5], [11].

Facial and dentofacial analysis represent essential components of esthetic rehabilitation. Parameters such as facial symmetry, lip dynamics, smile line, incisal display, and gingival exposure significantly influence smile attractiveness and treatment planning. Smile analysis also includes evaluation of tooth proportions, axial inclinations, contact points, embrasures, and midline relationships [12], [13], [14].

The concept of "pink and white esthetics" emphasizes the importance of harmonious interaction between dental restorations and surrounding periodontal tissues. Gingival contour, papilla fill, soft tissue thickness, and gingival symmetry are considered critical determinants of esthetic success, particularly in the anterior maxillary region. Preservation of periodontal health and soft tissue architecture is therefore essential for achieving long-term esthetic stability [10], [15], [16].

Natural dental esthetics are also strongly influenced by optical properties such as translucency, fluorescence, opalescence, and surface texture. Contemporary restorative materials aim to reproduce these optical characteristics in order to mimic natural dentition as accurately as possible [17], [18].

- **Contemporary Restorative Materials in Esthetic Prosthodontics**

The evolution of ceramic and adhesive materials has significantly improved the esthetic and mechanical performance of contemporary prosthodontic restorations. Among currently available materials, feldspathic ceramics remain highly valued for their superior translucency and optical properties, making them particularly suitable for highly esthetic anterior restorations. However, their relatively low fracture resistance limits their indication in extensive rehabilitations and high-load areas [3], [19], [20].

Lithium disilicate ceramics have become increasingly popular due to their combination of esthetic qualities and favorable mechanical properties. These materials provide excellent translucency, color stability, and adhesive bonding potential while demonstrating improved flexural strength compared with conventional feldspathic ceramics. Lithium disilicate restorations are widely used for veneers, crowns, partial crowns, and implant-supported restorations in the esthetic zone [21], [22].

Zirconia-based restorations have also undergone substantial development in recent years. Earlier zirconia generations were associated with limited translucency and compromised esthetic appearance; however, modern high-translucency zirconia materials have significantly improved optical behavior while maintaining excellent fracture resistance. Consequently, zirconia is currently used in both anterior and posterior fixed prosthodontics, particularly in patients requiring enhanced mechanical durability [6], [23], [24].

CAD/CAM technologies have further revolutionized restorative dentistry by improving precision, reproducibility, and workflow efficiency. Digital fabrication techniques allow highly accurate restorations with improved marginal adaptation and reduced laboratory variability [7], [25]. Monolithic ceramic restorations produced through CAD/CAM systems have gained popularity due to their reduced risk of chipping and favorable long-term clinical performance [26].

Color stability and material aging remain important considerations in esthetic rehabilitation [18]. Surface roughness, staining susceptibility, and long-term optical alterations may influence the esthetic longevity of restorations [27]. Therefore, appropriate material selection should be individualized according to functional demands, esthetic requirements, and patient-specific risk factors [3].

- **Veneers and Minimally Invasive Esthetic Rehabilitation**

Minimally invasive dentistry has become a central concept in contemporary esthetic rehabilitation. Advances in adhesive dentistry and ceramic materials have enabled clinicians to preserve healthy dental tissues while achieving predictable esthetic outcomes. Porcelain laminate veneers represent one of the most conservative treatment modalities for correcting shape, color, alignment, and minor positional abnormalities of anterior teeth [8], [28], [29].

Indications for veneers include intrinsic discolorations, enamel defects, diastemas, minor malpositions, tooth wear, fractures, and esthetic reshaping. Contraindications may include severe parafunctional habits, insufficient enamel substrate, poor oral hygiene, or extensive structural destruction requiring full-coverage restorations [1], [29].

Tooth preparation principles for veneers emphasize enamel preservation and minimally invasive reduction. Enamel-supported restorations demonstrate superior adhesive performance and long-term clinical stability compared with dentin-bonded restorations. Ultraconservative or "no-prep" veneers have gained popularity in selected cases; however, careful case selection remains essential to avoid overcontoured restorations and compromised periodontal outcomes [30], [31], [32].

Adhesive protocols play a critical role in the success of ceramic veneers. Proper surface conditioning, resin cement selection, isolation techniques, and adhesive procedures directly influence marginal adaptation, retention, and esthetic integration. Contemporary adhesive systems have demonstrated high long-term survival rates when appropriate clinical protocols are followed [33], [34].

Clinical studies report favorable longevity for porcelain laminate veneers, with survival rates frequently exceeding 90% after 10 years. Common complications include ceramic fracture, debonding, marginal discoloration, and periodontal inflammation associated with inadequate contouring or oral hygiene [35], [36]. Nevertheless, veneers remain one of the most predictable treatment modalities for minimally invasive esthetic rehabilitation [29].

- **Esthetic Considerations in Implant Dentistry**

Esthetic implant rehabilitation requires precise integration between surgical, prosthetic, and periodontal principles. In addition to osseointegration and mechanical stability, successful implant therapy in the esthetic zone depends on the careful management of multiple biological and esthetic factors that influence long-term treatment outcomes. [9], [37].

Implant positioning is considered one of the most critical determinants of esthetic success. Incorrect three-dimensional implant placement may compromise emergence profile, papilla formation, soft tissue contour, and crown morphology. Prosthetically driven implant planning has therefore become the standard approach in contemporary implant dentistry [38], [39], [40].

Peri-implant soft tissue management is equally important for achieving natural esthetic outcomes. Gingival thickness, keratinized mucosa width, papillary architecture, and mucosal stability significantly influence the final appearance of implant-supported restorations. Connective tissue grafting and soft tissue augmentation procedures are frequently employed to optimize peri-implant esthetics in challenging cases [41], [42], [43].

The concept of emergence profile describes the transition between implant

restoration and peri-implant soft tissues and plays a major role in reproducing natural tooth morphology. Customized healing abutments and provisional restorations are commonly used to guide soft tissue maturation and improve peri-implant contouring [44], [45].

Immediate implant placement and immediate provisionalization protocols have gained increasing popularity in the esthetic zone. These approaches may reduce treatment time and preserve soft tissue architecture; however, careful patient selection and precise surgical execution are essential to minimize esthetic complications [46], [47].

Despite high success rates, biological and mechanical complications may negatively affect implant esthetics. Peri-implant mucosal recession, papilla loss, peri-implantitis, ceramic chipping, and prosthetic misalignment may compromise long-term esthetic outcomes and patient satisfaction [48], [49]. Therefore, long-term maintenance and supportive periodontal care remain fundamental components of implant rehabilitation [41].

- **Digital Dentistry and Contemporary Workflow**

Digital dentistry has profoundly transformed contemporary prosthodontic and implant rehabilitation. Intraoral scanners, CAD/CAM systems, digital smile design software, and guided implant surgery have improved treatment planning accuracy, communication, and workflow efficiency [50], [51].

Digital Smile Design (DSD) allows detailed analysis of facial proportions, smile dynamics, tooth morphology, and gingival relationships through digital simulation tools. This technology facilitates interdisciplinary communication and improves patient understanding and acceptance of proposed treatments [11], [52].

Intraoral scanning technologies have progressively replaced conventional impression techniques in many clinical situations [53]. Digital impressions improve patient comfort, reduce material distortions, and provide highly accurate data for prosthetic fabrication [54]. CAD/CAM systems further enable standardized manufacturing of restorations with enhanced precision and reproducibility [55].

Guided implant surgery has also become increasingly important in esthetic implant rehabilitation. Digital planning software allows virtual implant positioning based on prosthetic requirements, anatomical limitations, and esthetic considerations. Surgical guides improve placement accuracy and may reduce the risk of esthetic and functional complications [56], [57].

Artificial intelligence (AI) is emerging as a promising adjunctive tool in prosthodontics and implant dentistry. AI-based systems may assist in smile analysis, shade selection, treatment simulation, prosthetic design, and implant planning. Although still under development, these technologies may contribute to more personalized and predictable esthetic rehabilitation in the future [58], [59].

Despite numerous advantages, digital workflows also present limitations,

including high financial costs, learning curves, technical sensitivity, and dependence on software accuracy [53]. Consequently, successful implementation of digital dentistry requires adequate clinician training and careful integration with conventional prosthodontic principles [50].

3. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The future of esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry is strongly influenced by rapid technological advancements, biomimetic concepts, and the growing demand for personalized and minimally invasive treatment approaches. Contemporary research is increasingly focused on improving the predictability, longevity, and biological integration of esthetic restorations while simultaneously optimizing patient comfort and clinical efficiency [50], [52].

Artificial intelligence (AI) is expected to play a major role in the evolution of digital dentistry and esthetic rehabilitation. Machine learning algorithms and AI-based software may assist clinicians in smile analysis, facial assessment, shade selection, prosthetic design, and implant planning. These technologies have the potential to improve diagnostic precision, reduce human error, and facilitate highly individualized treatment planning based on facial proportions, occlusal relationships, and patient-specific esthetic parameters [58], [59].

The concept of the “virtual patient” is also becoming increasingly relevant in contemporary prosthodontics. Integration of facial scanning, intraoral scanning, cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), and digital jaw tracking systems may allow comprehensive three-dimensional simulation of both functional and esthetic rehabilitation before treatment initiation. Fully digital workflows may further improve interdisciplinary communication between prosthodontists, surgeons, orthodontists, and dental technicians while reducing treatment time and increasing restorative accuracy [7], [51].

Biomimetic dentistry and minimally invasive approaches are expected to remain central principles in future esthetic rehabilitation. Advances in adhesive systems and ceramic materials continue to support conservative restorative techniques aimed at preserving healthy dental tissues and reproducing the biomechanical behavior of natural teeth. At the same time, newer generations of high-translucency zirconia and reinforced glass ceramics are being developed to improve both optical properties and fracture resistance [23], [28], [33].

Regenerative and biologically oriented approaches may also significantly influence the future of implant dentistry. Tissue engineering, growth factors, platelet concentrates, and soft tissue regeneration strategies are currently being investigated to improve peri-implant tissue stability and long-term esthetic outcomes [43], [60]. In addition, research regarding implant surface modifications and bioactive materials may contribute to enhanced osseointegration and peri-implant soft tissue integration [61].

Patient-centered care is becoming increasingly important in contemporary

esthetic dentistry [52]. Future treatment protocols are expected to incorporate not only objective clinical criteria but also patient-reported outcomes, psychosocial factors, and individualized esthetic expectations. This trend reflects the growing recognition that esthetic success is closely related to patient satisfaction, self-confidence, and quality of life [62].

Despite these advances, several limitations and challenges remain [50]. High costs of digital technologies, technical sensitivity, limited long-term evidence for certain materials and workflows, and the need for specialized training may restrict widespread implementation in clinical practice [51]. Consequently, future research should focus on long-term clinical studies, standardization of digital protocols, and development of evidence-based guidelines for esthetic rehabilitation. The future of fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry will likely be characterized by the integration of artificial intelligence, fully digital workflows, biomimetic materials, and regenerative strategies into personalized treatment concepts. These developments may further improve esthetic predictability, biological outcomes, and patient satisfaction while supporting minimally invasive and interdisciplinary approaches in contemporary dental rehabilitation.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Contemporary esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics and implant dentistry requires the integration of biological, functional, and esthetic principles in order to achieve predictable and long-term clinical outcomes. Modern treatment focus on individualized smile design, soft tissue harmony, and minimally invasive restorative approaches.

Advances in ceramic materials, adhesive dentistry, and CAD/CAM technologies have significantly improved the esthetic and mechanical performance of contemporary restorations. Lithium disilicate ceramics, high-translucency zirconia, and digital workflows currently represent essential components of modern prosthodontic rehabilitation due to their favorable optical properties, precision, and durability.

Successful implant rehabilitation in the esthetic zone depends on accurate implant positioning, peri-implant soft tissue management, and interdisciplinary treatment planning.

Digital dentistry has transformed contemporary prosthodontic and implant workflows through intraoral scanning, digital smile design, guided implant surgery, and computer-assisted manufacturing. These technologies have improved treatment predictability, communication, and patient acceptance, although further standardization and long-term evidence are still required.

Future developments in artificial intelligence, biomimetic materials, regenerative therapies, and personalized treatment planning may further enhance esthetic outcomes and patient satisfaction. Nevertheless, successful esthetic rehabilitation continues to depend on comprehensive diagnosis, careful case selection, and the clinician’s ability to balance esthetic demands with functional and biological considerations.

Overall, contemporary esthetic rehabilitation represents a rapidly evolving field in which technological innovation and minimally invasive philosophy are increasingly combined to provide individualized, predictable, and patient-centered dental care.

REFERENCES

1. C. Coachman, N. Sesma, and M. B. Blatz, 'The complete digital workflow in interdisciplinary dentistry', *Int J Esthet Dent*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 34–49, 2021.
2. P. Magne, P. Lazari, M. Carvalho, T. Johnson, and A. Del Bel Cury, 'Ferrule-Effect Dominates Over Use of a Fiber Post When Restoring Endodontically Treated Incisors: An In Vitro Study', *Operative Dentistry*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 396–406, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.2341/16-243-L.
3. F. Zarone, M. Ferrari, F. G. Mangano, R. Leone, and R. Sorrentino, '"Digitally Oriented Materials": Focus on Lithium Disilicate Ceramics', *International Journal of Dentistry*, vol. 2016, pp. 1–10, 2016, doi: 10.1155/2016/9840594.
4. M. M. Pithon, C. C. Nascimento, G. C. G. Barbosa, and R. D. S. Coqueiro, 'Do dental esthetics have any influence on finding a job?', *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, vol. 146, no. 4, pp. 423–429, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2014.07.001.
5. J. Morley and J. Eubank, 'Macroesthetic elements of smile design', *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, vol. 132, no. 1, pp. 39–45, Jan. 2001, doi: 10.14219/jada.archive.2001.0023.
6. F. A. Spitznagel, J. Boldt, and P. C. Gierthmuehlen, 'CAD/CAM Ceramic Restorative Materials for Natural Teeth', *J Dent Res*, vol. 97, no. 10, pp. 1082–1091, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0022034518779759.
7. T. Joda, M. Ferrari, G. O. Gallucci, J. Wittneben, and U. Brägger, 'Digital technology in fixed implant prosthodontics', *Periodontology 2000*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 178–192, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1111/prd.12164.
8. G. Gürel, Ed., *The science and art of porcelain laminate veneers*. in Quintessence books. London Chicago Berlin Copenhagen Tokyo Paris Barcelona Milano São Paulo New Delhi Moscow Prague Warsaw Istanbul: Quintessence Publ, 2003.
9. D. Buser, W. Martin, and U. C. Belser, 'Optimizing esthetics for implant restorations in the anterior maxilla: anatomic and surgical considerations', *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, vol. 19 Suppl, pp. 43–61, 2004.
10. F. M. Spear and V. G. Kokich, 'A Multidisciplinary Approach to Esthetic Dentistry', *Dental Clinics of North America*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 487–505, Apr. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.cden.2006.12.007.
11. C. Coachman, M. Calamita, and N. Sesma, 'Dynamic Documentation of the Smile and the 2D/3D Digital Smile Design Process', *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 183–193, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.11607/prd.2911.
12. M. Fradeani, 'Esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics. 1: Esthetic analysis: a systematic approach to prosthetic treatment', Chicago Berlin: Quintessence Publ, 2004.
13. R. Sabri, 'The eight components of a balanced smile', *J Clin Orthod*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 155–167; quiz 154, Mar. 2005.
14. S. J. Chu, 'Range and mean distribution frequency of individual tooth width of the maxillary anterior dentition', *Pract Proced Aesthet Dent*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 209–215, May 2007.
15. U. C. Belser, L. Grütter, F. Vailati, M. M. Bornstein, H. Weber, and D. Buser, 'Outcome Evaluation of Early Placed Maxillary Anterior Single-Tooth Implants Using Objective Esthetic Criteria: A Cross-Sectional, Retrospective Study in 45 Patients With a 2- to 4-Year Follow-Up Using Pink and White Esthetic Scores', *Journal of Periodontology*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 140–151, Jan. 2009, doi: 10.1902/jop.2009.080435.

16. R. Fürhauser, D. Florescu, T. Benesch, R. Haas, G. Mailath, and G. Watzek, 'Evaluation of soft tissue around single-tooth implant crowns: the pink esthetic score', *Clinical Oral Implants Res*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 639–644, Dec. 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2005.01193.x.
17. P. Magne and U. Belser, *Bonded porcelain restorations in the anterior dentition: a biomimetic approach*. in Quintessence books. Chicago: Quintessence Publ, 2002.
18. R. D. Paravina and J. M. Powers, *Esthetic color training in dentistry*. St. Louis, Mo.: Elsevier Mosby, 2004.
19. E. McLaren, 'Cao PT. Ceramics in Dentistry – Part I: Classes of Materials', 2009.
20. I. Denry and J. A. Holloway, 'Ceramics for Dental Applications: A Review', *Materials*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 351–368, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.3390/ma3010351.
21. H. J. Conrad, W.-J. Seong, and I. J. Pesun, 'Current ceramic materials and systems with clinical recommendations: A systematic review', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 98, no. 5, pp. 389–404, Nov. 2007, doi: 10.1016/S0022-3913(07)60124-3.
22. S. Pieger, A. Salman, and A. S. Bidra, 'Clinical outcomes of lithium disilicate single crowns and partial fixed dental prostheses: A systematic review', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 112, no. 1, pp. 22–30, Jul. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.prosdent.2014.01.005.
23. R. Zhang *et al.*, 'A Comparative Analysis of Temporomandibular Disorders Using a Jaw Motion Analyzer and Surface Electromyography', *Int Dent J*, vol. 75, no. 3, pp. 1843–1853, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.identj.2025.03.023.
24. T. A. Sulaiman, 'Materials in digital dentistry—A review', *J Esthet Restor Dent*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 171–181, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1111/jerd.12566.
25. F. Mangano, A. Gandolfi, G. Luongo, and S. Logozzo, 'Intraoral scanners in dentistry: a review of the current literature', *BMC Oral Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 149, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s12903-017-0442-x.
26. P. C. Guess, R. A. Zavanelli, N. R. F. A. Silva, E. A. Bonfante, P. G. Coelho, and V. P. Thompson, 'Monolithic CAD/CAM lithium disilicate versus veneered Y-TZP crowns: comparison of failure modes and reliability after fatigue', *Int J Prosthodont*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 434–442, 2010.
27. B. Stawarczyk, M. Özcan, L. Hallmann, A. Ender, A. Mehl, and C. H. F. Hämmerlet, 'The effect of zirconia sintering temperature on flexural strength, grain size, and contrast ratio', *Clin Oral Invest*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 269–274, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s00784-012-0692-6.
28. C. A. Murdoch-Kinch and M. E. McLEAN, 'Minimally invasive dentistry', *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, vol. 134, no. 1, pp. 87–95, Jan. 2003, doi: 10.14219/jada.archive.2003.0021.
29. M. Peumans, B. Van Meerbeek, P. Lambrechts, and G. Vanherle, 'Porcelain veneers: a review of the literature', *Journal of Dentistry*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 163–177, Mar. 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0300-5712(99)00066-4.
30. J. Castelnuovo, A. H. L. Tjan, K. Phillips, J. I. Nicholls, and J. C. Kois, 'Fracture load and mode of failure of ceramic veneers with different preparations', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 171–180, Feb. 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0022-3913(00)80009-8.
31. M. Gresnigt, M. Ozcan, and W. Kalk, 'Esthetic rehabilitation of worn anterior teeth with thin porcelain laminate veneers', *Eur J Esthet Dent*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 298–313, 2011.
32. G. M. Radz, 'Minimum Thickness Anterior Porcelain Restorations', *Dental Clinics of North America*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 353–370, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.cden.2011.01.006.
33. M. B. Blatz, M. Vonderheide, and J. Conejo, 'The Effect of Resin Bonding on Long-Term Success of High-Strength Ceramics', *J Dent Res*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 132–139, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0022034517729134.
34. I. Sailer, N. A. Makarov, D. S. Thoma, M. Zwahlen, and B. E. Pjetursson, 'All-ceramic or metal-ceramic tooth-supported fixed dental prostheses (FDPs)? A systematic review of the survival and complication rates. Part I: Single crowns (SCs)', *Dental Materials*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 603–623, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.dental.2015.02.011.
35. U. S. Beier, I. Kapferer, D. Burtscher, and H. Dumfahrt, 'Clinical performance of porcelain laminate veneers for up to 20 years', *Int J Prosthodont*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 79–85, 2012.

36. D. M. Layton and T. R. Walton, 'The up to 21-year clinical outcome and survival of feldspathic porcelain veneers: accounting for clustering', *Int J Prosthodont*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 604–612, 2012.
37. U. C. Belser, B. Schmid, F. Higginbottom, and D. Buser, 'Outcome analysis of implant restorations located in the anterior maxilla: a review of the recent literature', *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, vol. 19 Suppl, pp. 30–42, 2004.
38. D. Buser, V. Chappuis, U. C. Belser, and S. Chen, 'Implant placement post extraction in esthetic single tooth sites: when immediate, when early, when late?', *Periodontology 2000*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 84–102, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1111/prd.12170.
39. D. P. Tarnow, S. C. Cho, and S. S. Wallace, 'The Effect of Inter-Implant Distance on the Height of Inter-Implant Bone Crest', *Journal of Periodontology*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 546–549, Apr. 2000, doi: 10.1902/jop.2000.71.4.546.
40. D. A. Garber and U. C. Belser, 'Restoration-driven implant placement with restoration-generated site development', *Compend Contin Educ Dent*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 796, 798–802, 804, Aug. 1995.
41. J. Cosyn, A. Eghbali, H. De Bruyn, K. Collys, R. Cleymaet, and T. De Rouck, 'Immediate single-tooth implants in the anterior maxilla: 3-year results of a case series on hard and soft tissue response and aesthetics: Immediate single-tooth implants', *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 746–753, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-051X.2011.01748.x.
42. J. Y. K. Kan, K. Rungcharassaeng, J. L. Lozada, and G. Zimmerman, 'Facial gingival tissue stability following immediate placement and provisionalization of maxillary anterior single implants: a 2- to 8-year follow-up', *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 179–187, 2011.
43. G. Zucchelli *et al.*, 'Autogenous soft tissue grafting for periodontal and peri-implant plastic surgical reconstruction', *Journal of Periodontology*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 9–16, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1002/JPER.19-0350.
44. E. Rompen, N. Raepsaet, O. Domken, B. Touati, and E. Van Dooren, 'Soft tissue stability at the facial aspect of gingivally converging abutments in the esthetic zone: A pilot clinical study', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 97, no. 6, pp. S119–S125, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1016/S0022-3913(07)60015-8.
45. N. Elian *et al.*, 'A Two-Stage Full-Arch Ridge Expansion Technique: Review of the Literature and Clinical Guidelines', *Implant Dentistry*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 16–23, Mar. 2008, doi: 10.1097/ID.0b013e318166d3a3.
46. J. Cosyn and T. De Rouck, 'Aesthetic outcome of single-tooth implant restorations following early implant placement and guided bone regeneration: crown and soft tissue dimensions compared with contralateral teeth', *Clinical Oral Implants Res*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 1063–1069, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2009.01746.x.
47. S. Chen and D. Buser, 'Esthetic Outcomes Following Immediate and Early Implant Placement in the Anterior Maxilla—A Systematic Review', *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, vol. 29, no. Supplement, pp. 186–215, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.11607/jomi.2014suppl.g3.3.
48. J. Wittneben, T. Joda, H. Weber, and U. Brägger, 'Screw retained vs. cement retained implant-supported fixed dental prosthesis', *Periodontology 2000*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 141–151, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1111/prd.12168.
49. F. Schwarz, J. Derks, A. Monje, and H. Wang, 'Peri-implantitis', *J Clinic Periodontology*, vol. 45, no. S20, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1111/jcpe.12954.
50. T. Joda and G. O. Gallucci, 'The virtual patient in dental medicine', *Clinical Oral Implants Res*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 725–726, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1111/clr.12379.
51. F. G. Mangano, G. Veronesi, U. Hauschild, E. Mijiritsky, and C. Mangano, 'Trueness and Precision of Four Intraoral Scanners in Oral Implantology: A Comparative in Vitro Study', *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 9, p. e0163107, 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0163107.
52. C. Coachman and R. D. Paravina, 'Digitally Enhanced Esthetic Dentistry – From Treatment Planning to Quality Control', *J Esthet Restor Dent*, vol. 28, no. S1, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.1111/jerd.12205.

53. A. Ender and A. Mehl, 'Accuracy of complete-arch dental impressions: A new method of measuring trueness and precision', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 109, no. 2, pp. 121–128, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1016/S0022-3913(13)60028-1.
54. A. Mangano, M. Beretta, G. Luongo, C. Mangano, and F. Mangano, 'Conventional Vs Digital Impressions: Acceptability, Treatment Comfort and Stress Among Young Orthodontic Patients', *Open Dent J*, vol. 12, pp. 118–124, 2018, doi: 10.2174/1874210601812010118.
55. J.-F. Güth, D. Edelhoff, J. Schweiger, and C. Keul, 'A new method for the evaluation of the accuracy of full-arch digital impressions in vitro', *Clin Oral Investig*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 1487–1494, Sep. 2016, doi: 10.1007/s00784-015-1626-x.
56. J. D'haese, T. Van De Velde, A. Komiyama, M. Hultin, and H. De Bruyn, 'Accuracy and Complications Using Computer-Designed Stereolithographic Surgical Guides for Oral Rehabilitation by Means of Dental Implants: A Review of the Literature', *Clin Implant Dent Rel Res*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 321–335, Jun. 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1708-8208.2010.00275.x.
57. G. Van De Wiele, W. Teughels, M. Vercruyssen, W. Coucke, A. Temmerman, and M. Quirynen, 'The accuracy of guided surgery via mucosa-supported stereolithographic surgical templates in the hands of surgeons with little experience', *Clinical Oral Implants Res*, vol. 26, no. 12, pp. 1489–1494, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1111/clr.12494.
58. M. Revilla-León *et al.*, 'Artificial intelligence applications in implant dentistry: A systematic review', *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, vol. 129, no. 2, pp. 293–300, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.prosdent.2021.05.008.
59. F. Schwendicke, W. Samek, and J. Krois, 'Artificial Intelligence in Dentistry: Chances and Challenges', *J Dent Res*, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 769–774, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0022034520915714.
60. L. Tavelli, S. Barootchi, G. Avila-Ortiz, I. A. Urban, W. V. Giannobile, and H. Wang, 'Peri-implant soft tissue phenotype modification and its impact on peri-implant health: A systematic review and network meta-analysis', *Journal of Periodontology*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 21–44, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1002/JPER.19-0716.
61. A. Wennerberg and T. Albrektsson, 'Current challenges in successful rehabilitation with oral implants: CHALLENGES IN ORAL IMPLANT TREATMENT', *Journal of Oral Rehabilitation*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 286–294, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2842.2010.02170.x.
62. B. E. Pjetursson, D. Thoma, R. Jung, M. Zwahlen, and A. Zembic, 'A systematic review of the survival and complication rates of implant-supported fixed dental prostheses (FDP s) after a mean observation period of at least 5 years', *Clinical Oral Implants Res*, vol. 23, no. s6, pp. 22–38, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2012.02546.x.