A Study of the Precision Achieved by A Set of 3D Printers Used in Dentistry

Rovelo P*

University of leeds, International Digital Dental Academy, England, United Kingdom

Abstract

The present study involved some of the recently released 3D printers that have not yet been studied for their accuracy. In doing so, it becomes necessary to examine whether they are accurate in comparison to previously used 3D printers. To assess dimensional accuracy, the accepted measurement procedure is to make comparisons between a physical part and its digital model. The accuracy and resolution of 3D model samples depend on various factors, including the technology used, operating methods and parameters. The quality of a 3D printed part depends on the quality of the virtual model from which it was created. The level at which a model's geometry is controlled affects the dimensional accuracy of a part. A total of 12 3D printers created test blocks. The same settings were used for printing all test blocks, including a standard print time setting and a Z layer thickness of 100 microns.

Keywords: Dentistry; 3D printer; Fabrication process

Introduction

A Dentsply Sirona Ineos X5 lab scanner was used to digitally measure the generated blocks, measuring the XYZ dimensions of each block created on each printer and the departure from the Master STL using Cloud Compare. Each measurement is performed from the axis at the middle of that dimension. The cheapest 3D printers in the group, the Anycubic printers and the Elegoo Mars, are statistically comparable to the more expensive Asiga Max UV or even the mid-priced Formlabs printers in the X and Z dimensions when grouped into homogenous subsets. However, in terms of constantly accurate Y dimension, the Envisiontec One and D4K Pro, Ackuretta Sol, and Asiga Max UV were generally superior [1]. No particular printer technology is more precise than the others, despite the fact that these printers print using several technologies.

Fabrication Process

Three different phases comprise the SLA technique's whole fabrication process. In the preliminary stage, the build orientation is determined using CAD or slicing software, which creates the support structure and "slice" or "layer" of the model and supports. In the second stage, the actual structure is executed, and in the third phase, the manufactured structure is post-cured, the support structures are taken down, and the finished product is polished and completed. The surface quality, mechanical characteristics, and dimensional correctness of the finished produced product have all been observed to be significantly impacted by the build parameters in various phases, which are frequently connected [1].

A study by Alharbi et al. [2,3] investigates the impact of build angle and support configuration (thick versus thin support) on the dimensional correctness of 3D printed full-coverage dental restorations. The findings of this study imply that the construction angle and support structure arrangement have a substantial impact on the dimensional correctness of 3D printed restorations. According to the study's findings, the model print should have the highest dimensional accuracy and self-supported geometry at a construction angle of 45° to 90°. This permits the minimum necessary support surface area and shortens the finishing and polishing process. The additional angulation, however, may result in an increase in the overall model height, which will lengthen print times.

Degree of accuracy compared in different 3D printing techniques

Dental prostheses synthetic using 3-D printing technology has been proven to have an appropriate diploma of accuracy and precision as compared to prostheses made the usage of traditional plaster cast fashions. In a examine with the aid of Dietrich et al. [4] the accuracy (trueness and precision) of two exclusive rapid prototyping techniques have been as compared to the physical reproduction of 3-d virtual orthodontist resin casts the use of SLA and PolyJet structures [2]. The outcomes of this observe imply better trueness in PolyJet replicas than inside the SLA models, however the precision measurements favoured the SLA strategies. However, the observe determined that each replicas have a maximum deviation of 127 μm in the dimensional mistakes, which was far underneath the recommended variety of 300–500 μm for clinically applicable accuracy in orthodontic. moreover, the results display that polyvinyl siloxane substances provide extra accurate interocclusal recordings for a successful articulation of virtual models in comparison to different materials along with Regisil rigid, Futar scan, Byte right, and Aluwax [3].

Several other researchers have additionally studied how both DLP and PolyJet are 3-d printing technology that provides tremendous accuracy and floor finish in dentistry. for the reason that DLP and PolyJet printers are 3-D printing techniques usually utilized in dentistry, Brown et al. performed a examine to evaluate the accuracy of the usage of a virtual model constructed from digital intraoral impression scanners. Numerous factors had been used to compare dimensional alternate which include mesiodistal (crown width) and incisal/occlusal-gingival (crown height) and intercanine and intermolar widths. The importance of this contrast aimed to evaluate the accuracy of the whole digital

Citation: Rovelo P (2022) A Study of the Precision Achieved by A Set of 3D Printers Used in Dentistry. Dent Implants Dentures 5: 154.

Page 2 of 3

workflow. As stated inside the previous research, the findings suggest that both the DLP and PolyJet printers had clinically suitable accuracy within the 3D printing fashions produced, and consequently, they may be considered as options to plaster-solid storage in orthodontic practice [4].

A current have a look at evaluates the accuracy of 3-D revealed retainers in comparison with the traditional vacuum-shaped retainers and commercially available vacuum-shaped retainers. The consequences from this have a look at show that traditional vacuum-shaped retainers have the least deviation from the authentic reference models (0.10-0.20 mm), observed through commercially shaped retainers (0.10-0.30 mm), whereas the best deviation (0.10-0.40 mm) was found in 3-D published retainers. But, all three workflows produce retainers that are within zero. 5mm accuracy and are consequently deemed clinically desirable for the assessment of digital articulation [5].

Test Blocking

The test blocks were sourced from existing 3D printer units that are regularly used in dental practice by the International Digital Dental Academy committee and board. Some test blocks were also sourced from manufacturers who complied with the data collection methods below. Other than the data collection method, no specific information was given regarding the actual virtual block size to rule out user bias. Where blocks could only be sourced individually, other sources were found to give a more rounded and less biased production [6].

Design of the Study

All take a look at blocks had been revealed using the same settings with one hundred micron Z layer thickness and the print time set to traditional in which applicable. Submit print processing and remedies have been carried out according with the manufacturers commands, and the workflows blanketed an alcohol wash and curing accurately informed for that resin.

All print check blocks have been revealed using the identical positioning, in other phrases they had been centralised at the print build platform. No supports were used to print every model and all prints have been published the usage of the producers software program with all software program being the contemporary available model as of April 2021 [7].

For the purposes of this have a look at, the layout of model as an openly available cuboid three-D Printing calibration model changed into chosen to permit the look at of the distortion upon printing in every of the XYZ axes because the cube is a specific shape, variances in generation could have an effect upon these revealed fashions in phrases of a particular border being accurately printed within the XY depending on LED length, laser spot size and so forth. The accuracy of the Z axis moves will effect the Z measurements and as a result accuracy in that size.

Discussion

One of the printers in this study, the Ackuretta Sol, is a totally dental particular 3D printer and has a large vary of resin profiles that are calibrated and in constructed into the reducing software. Some producers have additionally differentiated themselves from price range printers by using growing resins which are licensed solely for their brand. This is the case with the D4K Pro by using envisioned which the consequences confirmed had the very best universal imply accuracy. The D4K Pro, alongside with different envisioned branded printers, has biomedical resins licenced completely for their platform, for instance

the Flex era resin used for digital dentures and restorations. This learn about on the modern-day 3D printers suggests that they can produce effects that are correct to inside 30 microns in every of the XYZ dimensions [8]. For the blunders of the printers in the existing study, the universal mixed error ought to be inside a clinically desirable stage of below a hundred microns. These printers surpassed expectations and they are all rewarding to use in medical practice [9-20].

Conclusion

This find out about indicates that the present day vary of 3D printers can produce clinically appropriate ranges of accuracy. The current learn about additionally suggests that there is no statistical distinction in the outcomes of price range printers and greater high-priced printers. These find out about confirms that all 12 of the 3D printers can produce a reliable, reproducible model. However, the printing of dental arches and restorations is greater difficult in phrases of complicated and high-quality small print and this deserves in addition investigation. Following this study, in addition lookup is wanted on these printers in quite number settings, and the proof of their accuracy and electricity of substances should be established in a medical setting.

Acknowledgement

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Al-Imam H, Gram M, Benetti AR, Gotfredsen K (2018) Accuracy of stereolithography additive casts used in a digital workflow. J Prosthet Dent 119: 580-585.

2. Alharbi N, Osman RB, Wismeijer D (2016) Effects of build direction on the mechanical properties of 3D-printed complete coverage interim dental restorations. J Prosthet Dent 115: 760-767.

3. Han T, Kundu S, Nag A, Xu Y (2019) 3D printed sensors for biomedical applications: a review. Sensors 19: 1706.

4. Dietrich CA, Ender A, Baumgartner S, Mehl A (2017) A validation study of reconstructed rapid prototyping models produced by two technologies. Angle Orthod 87: 782-787.

5. Oberoi G, Nitsch S, Edelmayer M, Janjić K, Müller AS, et al. (2018) 3D printing-encompassing the facets of dentistry. Front Bioeng Biotechnol 6: 172.

6. Revilla-Leon M, Gonzalez-Martín O, Perez Lopez J, Sanchez-Rubio JL, Ozcan M (2018) Position accuracy of implant analogs on 3D printed polymer versus conventional dental stone casts measured using a coordinate measuring machine. J Prosthodont 27: 560-567.

7. Richert R, Goujat A, Venet L, Viennot S, Robinson P, et al. (2017) Intraoral scanner technologies: a review to make a successful impression. J Healthc Eng 8427595.

8. Alharbi N, Osman RB, Wismeijer D (2016) Factors influencing the dimensional accuracy of 3D-printed full-coverage dental restorations using stereolithography technology. Int J Prosthodont 29: 503-510.

9. Sason GK, Mistry G, Tabassum R, Shetty (2018) A comparative evaluation of intraoral and extraoral digital impressions: An in vivo study. J Indian Prosthodont Soc 18: 108-116.

10. P atzelt SB, Vonau S, Stampf S, Att W (2013) Assessing the feasibility and accuracy of digitizing edentulous jaws. J Am Dent Assoc 144: 914-920.

11. Kasparova M, Grafova L, Dvorak P, Dostalova T, Prochazka A, et al. (2013) Possibility of reconstruction of dental plaster cast from 3D digital study models. Biomed Eng Online 12: 49.

12. Keating AP, Knox J, Bibb R, Zhurov AI (2008) A comparison of plaster, digital and reconstructed study model accuracy. J Orthod 35: 191-201.

13. Shahidi YE, Qallandar OB, Evenden J, Segbaya FA, Ahmed KE (2020) Accuracy of 3-dimensionally printed full-arch dental models: a systematic review. J Clin Med 9: 3357.

14. Mullen SR, Martin CA, Ngan P, Gladwin M (2007) Accuracy of space analysis with emodels and plaster models. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 132: 346-352.

15. Rodriguez JM, Austin RS, Bartlett DW (2012) A method to evaluate profilometric tooth wear measurements. Dent Mater 28: 245-251.

16. Pintado MR, Anderson GC, DeLong R, Douglas WH (1997) Variation in tooth wear in young adults over a two-year period. J Prosthet Dent 77: 313-320.

17. Besl PJ, McKay ND (1992) Method for registration of 3-D shapes. IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell 14: 239-256.

18. Wulfman C, Koenig V, Mainjot AK (2018) Wear measurement of dental tissues and materials in clinical studies: A systematic review. Dent Mater 34: 825-850.

19. Dinneen LC, Blakesley BC (1973) A generator for the sampling distribution of the Mann-Whitney u statistic. J Roy Stat Soc Ser C 22: 269-273.

20. Menditto A, Patriarca M, Magnusson B (2007) Understanding the meaning of accuracy, trueness and precision. Accredit Qual Assur12: 45-47.