JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE SCIENCES
Volume 6 Issue 1 2026, Article ID: JOHS2026001173
http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103
e-ISSN: 1658-8967

Review

Evaluation of Tooth Structure Loss Following Conventional Crown Preparation Techniques

Manal Abdulrahman Bedawi[1*], Samaher Khaled Alfawzan[2], Amjad SalahAldeen Balto[3], Fahad Badri Alsulami[4], Jameel Abdulhamid Makki[5], Malak Ayed Alanazi[6], Maryam Kanaan Alanezi[7], Turki Hamoud Alanazi[8], Arwa Ibrahim Alatiequ[9], Abdulrahman Mohammed Alaskar[10]

[1] *Department of Prosthodontics, Specialized Dental Center, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[2] *Alswarqiah Health Center, Ministry of Health, Medina, Saudi Arabia*
[3] *College of Dentistry, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[4] *Department of Dentistry, King Abdulaziz University Dental Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[5] *Faculty of Dentistry, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[6] *College of Dentistry, Majmaah University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[7] *Aladan Health Center, Ministry of Health of Kuwait, Kuwait City, Kuwait*
[8] *Department of Dentistry, Private Sector, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[9] *Department of Dentistry, Ministry of Health, Medina, Saudi Arabia*
[10] *College of Dentistry, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*

Correspondence should be addressed **Manal Abdulrahman Bedawi**, Department of Prosthodontics, Specialized Dental Center, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: mbedaiwi@moh.gov.sa

Received: 01 December 2025, Accepted: 30 December 2025, Published: 01 January 2026.

Abstract

Tooth structure loss remains a central concern in conventional crown preparation, where significant enamel and dentin reduction is required to accommodate restorative materials. Although full-coverage crowns provide functional and esthetic rehabilitation, the process of preparing a tooth for such restorations can compromise its long-term integrity. The extent of structural loss depends on multiple variables including the type of crown, margin design, occlusal clearance, and the technique employed by the clinician. Over-preparation increases the risk of pulpal injury, dentinal hypersensitivity, and fracture, especially in posterior teeth subjected to high occlusal loads. The removal of peri-cervical dentin and the reduction of enamel undermine the biomechanical stability of the tooth, reducing its resistance to functional stresses. Conventional techniques often rely on subjective visual assessment, which can lead to unnecessary removal of sound tissue. Operator variability further compounds this issue, with studies showing frequent deviations from recommended guidelines. Modern approaches focus on limiting these effects through the use of depth-limiting burs, magnification tools, and digital planning systems. Partial coverage restorations, when appropriately bonded, offer a more conservative alternative while maintaining comparable clinical performance. Reduction guides and intraoral scanners also assist in maintaining precision and reducing the biological cost of treatment. Preserving tooth structure during preparation is closely linked to long-term prognosis and overall restorative success. Careful technique selection, attention to anatomic preservation, and the integration of available technology can reduce structural loss without compromising the durability or function of the final restoration. As clinical practices continue to evolve, the emphasis is gradually shifting from purely mechanical preparation strategies toward biologically respectful and minimally invasive solutions.

Keywords: *tooth reduction, crown preparation, structural loss, dentin preservation, restorative dentistry*

Introduction

Conventional crown preparation is a cornerstone of restorative dentistry, designed to provide optimal retention, resistance, and esthetics for full-coverage restorations. However, this procedure inherently involves the removal of significant amounts of tooth structure, which can compromise the integrity, strength, and vitality of the affected tooth. As clinicians aim to achieve precise reduction, margin placement, and adequate tapering, the amount of tooth substance sacrificed during crown preparation remains a subject of concern.

The extent of tooth structure loss varies depending on multiple factors, including the type of crown being prepared, the instruments used, the operator's technique, and the preoperative condition of the tooth. Full-coverage crowns often require extensive axial and occlusal reduction to accommodate material thickness, which can range from 1.2 to 2 mm, depending on whether the crown is made from metal-ceramic, all-ceramic, or full-metal materials (1). Such a reduction may result in the loss of more than 60% of coronal dentin in some cases, thereby weakening the tooth and predisposing it to fracture or loss of vitality (2). Additionally, aggressive preparations that extend subgingivally may increase the risk of periodontal inflammation and loss of attachment.

Biologic width violation, thermal damage from high-speed rotary instruments, and exposure of the pulp or proximity to it are also potential complications associated with conventional preparations. The use of rotary burs for tooth preparation can generate significant frictional heat, which, if not controlled by proper cooling, may cause pulpal injury. Even when careful technique is applied, the risk of microcracks and dentinal damage due to mechanical stresses during preparation cannot be overlooked (3). Furthermore, studies have shown that once a tooth is prepared for a crown, its ability to withstand occlusal forces is significantly reduced compared to an intact tooth. This reduced resistance can compromise the longevity of the restoration, particularly in posterior teeth subjected to heavy masticatory loads. Another challenge lies in operator variability. Clinical studies reveal that practitioners often remove more tooth structure than required, particularly when using visual judgment alone rather than depth-limiting instruments or guides. Excessive axial tapering and over-reduction of occlusal surfaces not only lead to weakened tooth structure but may also necessitate endodontic intervention or use of post-and-core systems to rebuild lost tissue (4). Such interventions can further complicate the restorative prognosis and increase the overall biological and financial cost for the patient.

Review

Tooth structure loss during conventional crown preparation poses significant implications for the long-term prognosis of restored teeth. The volume of tooth reduction required for full-coverage restorations often exceeds that of more conservative techniques, leading to increased susceptibility to structural compromise and pulpal damage. While the need for adequate clearance to accommodate material thickness is clinically justified, excessive reduction, particularly in the absence of proper depth control, may weaken the tooth beyond safe thresholds. This structural loss is particularly problematic in teeth with pre-existing restorations or carious lesions, where remaining dentin is already compromised.

Operator technique plays a pivotal role in determining the extent of tissue removal. Studies have demonstrated that practitioners frequently over-prepare teeth due to a lack of standardized visual guides, leading to unnecessarily aggressive reduction patterns (1, 5). Additionally, improper angulation and excessive convergence can further erode critical tooth substance, adversely affecting the retention form and necessitating adjunctive procedures like post placements. Such procedures, while restorative in intent, may further reduce the tooth’s biomechanical integrity.

Emerging evidence supports the integration of digital planning tools and minimally invasive approaches to mitigate unnecessary reduction during crown preparation. These techniques have shown promise in preserving tooth vitality and

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103

enhancing the longevity of restorations without compromising fit or function (6).

Tooth Reduction in Conventional Techniques

Tooth preparation for conventional crowns requires a careful balance between creating sufficient space for restorative materials and maintaining as much of the natural structure as possible. The geometric principles involved in crown preparation, including retention, resistance, and clearance, are based on specific reduction guidelines. However, in practice, the amount of tooth removed often exceeds what is theoretically necessary. Occlusal clearance for all-ceramic or porcelain-fused-to-metal crowns can range from 1.5 to 2 millimeters, and axial walls typically require 1 to 1.5 millimeters of reduction depending on the crown material (7). While these values are clinically justified for optimal restoration strength, they can lead to considerable loss of enamel and dentin.

Advancements in dental materials have not substantially reduced this need. High-strength ceramics such as zirconia or lithium disilicate still require bulk to resist fracture under functional loads. Clinical studies show that many practitioners tend to remove more tooth structure than required due to concerns over insufficient space and potential fracture of the final crown. In many cases, the absence of calibrated depth guides or visual aids leads to reduction levels that go well beyond recommended limits (8). When clinicians prepare freehand using rotary instruments, they may rely solely on subjective visual judgment, which often lacks precision.

The consequences of this over-preparation are more pronounced in teeth that are vital or structurally compromised. Once dentin is significantly exposed, the protective barrier provided by enamel is lost, leaving the pulp vulnerable to thermal and mechanical irritation. The reduction of dentin volume is associated with a measurable decrease in fracture resistance, especially in posterior teeth subjected to high occlusal forces (8). Even minor overcuts in specific areas such as functional cusps or marginal ridges can act as stress concentrators, increasing the likelihood of fractures during function or trauma.

Visual evaluation during preparation lacks accuracy. When tooth reduction is assessed objectively, it is common to find that even experienced dentists often exceed ideal parameters. A study involving typodont models found that both students and trained practitioners consistently over-reduced teeth when depth-control tools were not used (9). Without clear feedback during the preparation process, the clinician may unintentionally create undercuts or reduce more tooth than necessary, compromising the final outcome. The convergence angle of axial walls can also vary widely from intended values, affecting both the retention of the crown and the amount of residual tooth tissue.

Simple tools such as silicone putty matrices or reduction guides made from diagnostic wax-ups have been shown to improve preparation accuracy. These aids allow dentists to verify clearance during each step of the procedure and help prevent excessive removal. Although effective, their use is still not standard in many practices due to time constraints or perceived complexity (10). The result is a continued reliance on visual and tactile skills, which can vary significantly between operators and influence the quality of preparations.

Impact on Tooth Integrity and Prognosis

Tooth integrity after conventional crown preparation is influenced by the volume and location of structural loss. The removal of enamel exposes underlying dentin, a more porous and less mineralized tissue that offers reduced protection against mechanical, chemical, and microbial challenges. This transition increases susceptibility to hypersensitivity and makes the tooth more dependent on the restoration for functional durability. Full crown preparation often leads to significant loss of peri-cervical dentin, which is critical for distributing stress during mastication and for long-term survival of the tooth-restoration complex (11).

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103

As dentin exposure increases, so does the risk of pulpal inflammation and necrosis. Even in the absence of direct pulp exposure, the cumulative effects of heat, pressure, and dehydration during high-speed preparation can compromise pulpal health. Teeth prepared for full crowns demonstrate higher rates of pulpal complications compared to those receiving more conservative restorations. In a clinical review, the incidence of pulpal death following full coverage restorations was reported to be as high as 15 percent, even in teeth with no prior history of trauma or caries (12). The preparation process itself can initiate a degenerative cycle, particularly when followed by cementation of restorations with insufficient insulation or sealing capability. Structural integrity is also affected by the geometry of preparation. Rounded internal angles, appropriate taper, and smooth surface finishes help reduce internal stress points. However, clinical studies have shown that variations in technique often result in sharp angles or inconsistent wall tapering, both of which compromise the tooth's resistance to fracture under functional load. When too much dentin is removed, the residual structure may no longer distribute forces evenly, increasing the risk of catastrophic failure. Molars, in particular, are vulnerable due to their complex occlusal anatomy and exposure to high masticatory forces.

The prognosis of the prepared tooth also becomes increasingly reliant on the type of restorative material and the bonding interface. Full coverage restorations can reinforce weakened teeth when bonded appropriately, but this benefit is diminished if preparation has already removed key areas of strength. In cases where excessive reduction leads to thin remaining dentin walls, even well-bonded crowns may fail under repeated loading. A finite element analysis study demonstrated that teeth with minimal remaining dentin thickness exhibited significantly higher stress concentrations around cervical margins, particularly when subjected to off-axis forces (13).

Endodontically treated teeth face even greater risks following crown preparation. The absence of pulp removes the internal support offered by hydrated dentin and reduces proprioceptive feedback, increasing the likelihood of overload. A retrospective study evaluating long-term outcomes of crowned teeth found that those with prior root canal therapy were more likely to fracture if the remaining tooth structure was insufficiently preserved during preparation (13). Preservation of the ferrule is widely recognized as essential for improving fracture resistance. However, achieving this ferrule often requires aggressive reduction or crown lengthening procedures, which in themselves may compromise the periodontal status of the tooth.

The decision to place a full crown must therefore be carefully weighed against the potential biological cost. While crown restorations offer durability and coverage, their success heavily depends on preserving enough natural teeth to support the restoration. Excessive removal, especially of cervical dentin or proximal contacts, may create long-term complications including recurrent decay, periodontal breakdown, and failure of retention due to weakened structural anchorage (14).

Minimizing Structural Loss During Preparation

Efforts to reduce structural loss during conventional crown preparation have increasingly focused on refining both technique and technology. The primary objective is to retain as many natural teeth as possible while still achieving the mechanical and aesthetic demands of a successful full-coverage restoration. Clinicians are shifting attention toward controlled, conservative protocols that limit unnecessary removal of enamel and dentin, especially in areas where strength and biologic function are critical.

One of the most effective strategies involves the use of depth-limiting burs and reduction guides. These tools provide immediate visual and tactile feedback, helping the operator to confine reduction within defined parameters. Studies have shown that the application of such aids significantly reduces over-preparation, particularly on occlusal surfaces where visual estimation alone often leads to excessive material removal (15). Preoperative planning using diagnostic wax-ups or digital mock-ups allows for a more calculated approach to space management,

 http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103

guiding preparation only where it is required based on material selection and occlusal clearance needs.

Minimally invasive preparation designs such as partial coverage restorations or on-lays also serve as alternatives to full crowns in many clinical scenarios. These approaches preserve large portions of the buccal and lingual surfaces and reduce axial wall height removal. When bonded with modern adhesive systems, partial restorations have demonstrated comparable longevity to full crowns while maintaining significantly more natural tooth structure (16). Preserving enamel not only retains mechanical integrity but also improves bond strength, which is a critical determinant of long-term success in adhesively retained restorations.

The influence of magnification in conservative tooth preparation has also been well-documented. High-powered loupes or dental operating microscopes enhance the operator's ability to identify subtle anatomical features and monitor reduction depths with greater precision. This allows for more careful margin placement and the preservation of cervical dentin and proximal contacts. Incorporating magnification into routine practice improves tactile control and reduces iatrogenic damage to adjacent teeth or soft tissues, which can occur when working within limited visual fields (17). Although these tools require training and adaptation, their integration has been associated with improved outcomes in both preparation quality and restoration longevity.

Digital design and computer-aided manufacturing further support minimal intervention strategies. Intraoral scanners and CAD software can be used to simulate preparations virtually before any cutting occurs, providing a precise blueprint for minimal reduction based on occlusion, material thickness, and esthetic requirements. This pre-planned guidance reduces the variability introduced by hand preparation and allows for customized tooth-preserving designs that still meet functional demands. In a controlled clinical trial, preparations guided by digital protocols resulted in a measurable decrease in tooth reduction volume without compromising restoration fit or marginal integrity (17, 18). The precision of these technologies supports a treatment philosophy centered on conservation and customization, where the preparation is tailored to the tooth rather than forcing the tooth to fit the restoration.

Conclusion

Conventional crown preparation, while effective, often results in considerable tooth structure loss that may compromise long-term tooth integrity. Careful planning, precise techniques, and conservative approaches can significantly reduce unnecessary reduction. Advances in technology offer clinicians tools to enhance accuracy and preserve vital tissue. Emphasizing tooth conservation improves both prognosis and restorative success.

Disclosure

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Funding

No funding.

Ethical consideration

Non applicable.

Data availability

All data is available within the manuscript.

Author contribution

All authors contributed to conceptualizing, data drafting, collection and final writing of the manuscript.

References

1. Goodacre CJ, Campagni WV, Aquilino SA. Tooth preparations for complete crowns: an art form based on scientific principles. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2001;85(4):363-76.

2. Edelhoff D, Sorensen JA. Tooth structure removal associated with various preparation designs for anterior teeth. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2002;87(5):503-9.

3. Reeh ES, Messer HH, Douglas WH. Reduction in tooth stiffness as a result of endodontic and

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103

restorative procedures. Journal of endodontics. 1989;15(11):512-6.

4. Blair F, Wassell R, Steele J. Crowns and other extra-coronal restorations: preparations for full veneer crowns. British dental journal. 2002;192(10):561-71.

5. Christensen GJ. Frequently encountered errors in tooth preparations for crowns. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 2007;138(10):1373-5.

6. Bindl A, Mormann WH. Clinical evaluation of adhesively placed Cerec endo-crowns after 2 years-preliminary results. Journal of Adhesive Dentistry. 1999;1:255-66.

7. Coffman C, Visser C, Soukup J, Peak M. Crowns and prosthodontics. Wiggs's Veterinary Dentistry: Principles and Practice. 2019:387-410.

8. Tiu J, Al-Amleh B, Waddell JN, Duncan WJ. Clinical tooth preparations and associated measuring methods: a systematic review. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2015;113(3):175-84.

9. Ballo A. Traditional and digital assessment of a protective matrix to minimize iatrogenic damage of adjacent teeth during crown preparation by dental students: University of British Columbia; 2019.

10. Lee J-H. Guided tooth preparation for a pediatric zirconia crown. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 2018;149(3):202-8. e2.

11. Haridoss S, Rajendran M, Swaminathan K, Sharma A, Elumalai V. Impact of pericervical dentin on fracture resistance of endodontically treated posterior permanent teeth: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice. 2024;25(4):372-85.

12. Bender IB. The dental pulp: biologic considerations in dental procedures: Lippincott; 1975.

13. Aquilino SA, Caplan DJ. Relationship between crown placement and the survival of endodontically treated teeth. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 2002;87(3):256-63.

14. Sorensen JA, Engelman MJ. Ferrule design and fracture resistance of endodontically treated teeth. The Journal of prosthetic dentistry. 1990;63(5):529-36.

15. Eames WB, O’Neal SJ, Monteiro J, Miller C, Roan JD, Cohen KS. Techniques to improve the seating of castings. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1978;96(3):432-7.

16. Stappert CF, Att W, Gerds T, Strub JR. Fracture resistance of different partial-coverage ceramic molar restorations: An in vitro investigation. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 2006;137(4):514-22.

17. Low JF, Dom TNM, Baharin SA. Magnification in endodontics: A review of its application and acceptance among dental practitioners. European journal of dentistry. 2018;12(04):610-6.

18. Miyazaki T, Hotta Y, Kunii J, Kuriyama S, Tamaki Y. A review of dental CAD/CAM: current status and future perspectives from 20 years of experience. Dental materials journal. 2009;28(1):44-56.

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60103