

**CLINICAL BEHAVIOR OF SELF-ADHESIVE COMPOSITE RESIN  
RESTORATIONS: LITERATURE REVIEW.**

**ABSTRACT**

Self-adhesive flowable composite resins are relatively new formulations on the market. These materials do not require the prior application of the adhesive system and, at the same time, can promote a durable seal at the tooth-restoration interface. However, there is little clinical information about these materials. Thus, the purpose of this review was to gather information regarding the clinical behavior of these self-adhesive materials by performing bibliographical research over the last ten years in the PubMed database. Clinical follow-up studies of restorations performed with these materials were eligible for selection. The search terms used were “self-adhesive composite” or “self-adhesive flowable composite” where 13 complete articles were evaluated and 11 were selected. Only clinical follow-up studies of enamel and/or dentin restorations performed with self-adhesive resins were eligible for selection. This systematic review concluded that the self-adhesive flowable resin showed results comparable to those of the conventional flowable resin. However, studies have shown that for restorations in Class I and V cavities, self-adhesive flowable composite resin performed better than restorations in Class II cavities.

**KEYWORDS**

Self-adhesive flowable composite resin, conventional flowable composite resin, clinical behavior, literature review.

**INTRODUCTION**

Composite resins have become the materials of choice for esthetic restorations in anterior and posterior teeth[1]. Today, there are a variety of types on the market, each with different characteristics and physical properties according to their composition.

However, restorative materials that are simpler to use and that save time are more convenient for dental offices. Thus, advances in research have as their main objective the simplification of the technique while trying to improve retention of restorations, minimize microleakage, and reduce post-operative sensitivity[2].

One of the recent advances in dentistry was the introduction of self-adhesive flowable composite resins, which are the combination of two functional groups: the single-step adhesive system and the flowable composite resin[2,3]. By incorporating the functional monomer glycerophosphate dimethacrylate (GPDM) into the chemical composition of composite resins, the steps of direct restorative procedures were simplified[4,5]. Based on the manufacturer's claims, this monomer exhibits acidic properties that condition enamel and dentin[6]. Chemically, it binds to the calcium of the tooth structure and has two methacrylate functional groups, which can copolymerize with other methacrylate monomers[6]. Therefore, the use of these composite resins results in a reduction in the clinical time required for their application, as well as a decrease in errors and technique sensitivity. In contrast, it has been reported that GPDM only “conditions” rather than “binds” to hydroxyapatite[7]. Still, based on previous studies, these composite resins show a modulus of elasticity, hardness[8], and degree of conversion[9] superior to other conventional flowable composite resins. Furthermore, these composites exhibited more hygroscopic expansion[10] and water absorption [11] compared to other flowable composites 150 days after water immersion.

Flowable composite resins, compared to conventional hybrid resins, have inferior mechanical properties due to their lower filler content[12]. However, for large cavity restorations, where it receives an occlusal load, the use of flowable resins is recommended only for cavity lining[1]. On the other hand, in conservative cavity restorations, where most of the occlusal forces are supported by the residual tooth structure, the use of flowable resins has been recommended[13]. Traditional flowable composites require the prior application of a dentin adhesive system, but the self-adhesive flowable composite eliminates this need, simplifying the restorative procedure[14].

However, there is little information about the clinical behavior of these restorative materials. Thus, this study aimed to gather information about the clinical performance of these self-adhesive restorative materials to assist professionals in choosing the most appropriate materials for different clinical situations.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

(i) Eligibility criteria: Articles published in English dating from 2010 to December 2021 were eligible for this review. Selected articles included the search terms in the title or abstract. Full-text articles and literature reviews were chosen. Only clinical follow-up studies of restorations performed with self-adhesive resins were eligible for selection.

(ii) Data Sources: A complete literature search was performed on the PubMed database. The search terms used were "self-adhesive composite" or "self-adhesive flowable composite."

(iii) Search Strategy: A total of 13 complete articles were screened and evaluated.

(iv) Data extraction: Only relevant articles that met the review's objectives (clinical follow-up studies of restorations performed with self-adhesive resins applied to enamel and/or dentin) were considered. Thus, of the 13 complete articles, 11 were selected.

## RESULTS

A total of 13 potentially relevant records were identified in the database and examined by titles and abstracts, of which two were excluded for not meeting the eligibility criteria. A total of 11 studies met the selection criteria and were included in this review (Table 1).

## DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Four different commercial brands of self-adhesive flowable composite resins were evaluated in this review (Table 2). Of the included studies, six evaluated Vertise Flow resin (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA, USA)[1,2,14–17], three evaluated Fusio Dentin Liquid (Pentron Clinical Orange, CA, USA)[18–20], one evaluated Self-adhesive Bulk Fill Restorative (3M Oral Care, St Paul, MN, USA)[21], and one evaluated Filtek Supreme Ultra Flowable (3M ESPE, USA)[22].

Table 2 – Self-adhesive flowable composite resins evaluated.

---

<b>Materi</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>General composition</b>	<b>Instructions for use</b>
---------------	--------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

---

---

als/

**Manufacturer**

s

---

Vertise (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)	Flow, Self- adhesive flowable composite resin	GPDM methacrylate monomers, polymerized barium nanometer silica, and nanometer ytterbium fluoride.	and pre- fillers, glass, colloidal nanometer	Dispense Vertise Flow into the cavity with the dispenser tip provided. Use the supplied brush to apply Vertise Flow to the cavity wall with moderate pressure for 15–20 s to obtain a thin layer (<0.5 mm). Light cure for 20 s. After lining the cavity wall, build the restoration with more Vertise Flow in 2mm increments or less. Light cure each increment for 20 s.
Fusio Dentin Clinical, USA)	Liquid (Pentron Orange, USA)	Self- adhesive flowable composite resin	4-MET (65% by weight).	and fillers Dispense an initial coat onto a dry surface; Brush the surface for 15-20 s with moderate pressure and light cure for 20 s; Apply additional material from the syringe in less than 2 mm increments and light cure each increment for 20 s.
Self-adhesive Bulk Restorative Oral Care, Paul, MN, USA)	Self- Fill adhesive (3M St composite resin	Cross-linking dimethacrylate TEGDMA, fluoro-alumino- silicate, and zirconia- silica.	and strontium- silica.	Mix in a capsule mixing device for 15 s and deposit in the unconditioned well. Light cure for 20 s.
Filtek Ultra (3M ESPE, USA)	Supreme Flowable Self- adhesive flowable composite resin	Treated ceramic, dimethacrylate, bisGMA, treated TEGDMA, fluoride, polycaprolactone polymer and diphenyl iodonium hexafluorophosphate and fillers (65% by weight).	silanized substituted silane- silica, ytterbium reacted	Dispense Filtek Supreme Ultra Flowable into the cavity with the applicator tip. Insert and cure restorative in less than 2 mm increments and light cure each increment for 20 s.

---

- GPDM: glycerol phosphate dimethacrylate; 4-MET: 4-methacryloxyethyl trimethyl acid; TEGDMA: triethylene glycol dimethacrylate.

---

In addition, different conventional fluid composite resins were used as a comparison parameters. Two studies evaluated Filtek™Z350-XT Flowable, 3M ESPE, USA (conventional fluid resin, total-etch)[15,17] and Tetric® N-Flow (IvoclarVivadent, Delhi, India) (conventional flowable resin, total-etch) [18,19]. Flowable resins, with one evaluation each were Premise Flowable, Kerr, Orange, CA, USA (conventional flowable resin, total-etch) [16], Filtek Z250 (3M ESPE, St. Paul, MN, ABD) (conventional fluid resin, total-etch)[1], Filtek One Bulk Fill (3M Oral Care, St. Paul, MN, USA)[21] (bulk fill resin), Filtek Supreme Ultra (3M ESPE, USA) (conventional resin)[22],Luxa Flow (DMG, Hamburg, Germany) (conventional resin)[14]. All conventional flowable composite resins were applied to their respective adhesive systems. The comparison also evaluated the resin-based sealant Heliobond-F (IvoclarVivadent, Delhi, India)[20].

Another material evaluated in the comparison was resin-based sealant Heliobond-F (IvoclarVivadent, Delhi, India)[20].

## **DISCUSSION**

This systematic review aimed to gather information on the clinical performance of restorations made with self-adhesive composite resins.

The review showed that the main self-adhesive flowable resins evaluated were Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA, USA)[1,2,14–17] and Dyad™-flow (Kerr, CA, USA)[18–20], which is the trade name given to Latin America, abroad it is marketed as Fusio Dentin Liquid (Pentron Clinical, Orange, CA, USA)[23].

Studies have shown that conventional and self-adhesive fluid composite resins have comparable clinical performances[2,15–18,20,21]. This was evidenced both in Class I restorations[2,14,15,17,19,20,22], as well as Class II[16,18] and Class V[21].

Studies with follow-up between 12 and 24 months in permanent teeth showed that in Class I restorations the clinical efficacy of self-adhesive flowable composite resin exhibited characteristics similar to conventional flowable composite resin[15,19,20,22]. There was no significant difference in color matching, marginal fit[17,19,22], postoperative sensitivity, and marginal discoloration[2,14,17,19,22]. However, in restorations in areas that receive high occlusal loading, the use of flowable composite resins is recommended only as a cavity base [22]. When used as an intermediate layer between the adhesive system and the hybrid

composite, the flowable composite is ideal for absorbing the stress generated by overlaying the more rigid resin[14].

The adhesion of self-adhesive fluid composite resin compared to etching and rinsing adhesive systems was positive [16,18]. The advantage in clinical procedures is that it is a simpler and less technically sensitive material, and the high wettability of these self-adhesive fluid resins allows for better penetration into uneven surfaces of cavities. In addition, due to its ability to form thin layers, it eliminates the incorporation of air bubbles[16]. However, the disadvantage is the presence of a higher percentage of the organic matrix, which contributes to increased water solubility, compromising long-term restorations[14]. The lower amount of inorganic filler impairs shear strength and is therefore generally not recommended as a restorative material in cavities with a high occlusal function[14,17,20]. And they are dimensionally unstable because they contain hydrophilic monomers [2,15].

In Class II cavities, self-adhesive flowable composite exhibited mechanical and biological properties similar to conventional flowable composite, without the occurrence of exacerbated fractures and acceptable postoperative sensitivity[16,18]. However, restorations with self-adhesive flowable composite resin showed deviations in terms of translucency and surface gloss, which were significantly lower than restorations with conventional flowable composite resin. This can be attributed to the composition of the material itself, as it has small porosities and voids, which increases the marginal discoloration of the restorations over time [18]. In addition, another negative aspect of Class II self-adhesive fluid resin restorations is microleakage[16], which decreases the marginal adaptation [18]of the proximal boxes [16]. Over time, restorations with this material showed steps and minor irregularities, which were not observed in conventional fluid composite resin[18].

In Class V cavities, the adhesion efficiency is better evaluated because these cervical lesions do not have any macro mechanical retention. An 18-month study showed that self-adhesive flowable composite restorations demonstrated good color stability with superior performance concerning marginal discoloration and integrity when compared to conventional flowable resin. The self-adhesive flowable composite provided a better finish after polishing than the conventional flowable composite[21].

According to the literature review of in vivo studies, self-adhesive flowable resin showed comparable results to conventional flowable resin[2,15–18,21]. However, studies

have shown that for restorations in Class I and V cavities, self-adhesive flowable composite resin performed better than restorations in Class II cavities.

## CONCLUSION

According to the review carried out, it can be concluded that:

- The self-adhesive flowable resin showed comparable results with the conventional flowable resin.

- The self-adhesive flowable resin obtained better results in class I and V cavity restorations than in class II cavities.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Serin BA, Yazicioglu I, Deveci C, Dogan MC. Clinical evaluation of a self-adhering flowable composite as occlusal restorative material in primary molars: one-year result., *Eur. Oral Res.* 2019;53:119–124. <https://doi.org/10.26650/eor.20190025> PM - 31579892.
- [2] Vichi A, Margvelashvili M, Goracci C, Papacchini F, Ferrari M. Bonding and sealing ability of a new self-adhering flowable composite resin in class I restorations. *Clin. Oral Investig.* 2013;17:1497–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-012-0846-6> PM - 23086332.
- [3] Garcia RN, Silva CS, Silva GG, Mocellin G, Ozelame J, Fracasso L, Ozelame MB, do Nascimento RF, Gomes ACR. Bonding performance of a self-adhering flowable composite to indirect restorative materials. *Rev. Sul-Brasileira Odontol.* 2014;11:6–12. [file:///D:/JULIO/Citavi\\_Projetos/Pibic\\_Cassia\\_2021\\_Resina\\_Autoadesiva/Citavi Attachments/153029831002.pdf](file:///D:/JULIO/Citavi_Projetos/Pibic_Cassia_2021_Resina_Autoadesiva/Citavi Attachments/153029831002.pdf).
- [4] Poss SD. Utilization of a new self-adhering flowable composite resin. *Dent. Today.* 2010;29:104–105.
- [5] Jordehi AY, Shahabi MS, Akbari A. Comparison of self-adhering flowable composite microleakage with several types of bonding agent in class V cavity restoration. *Dent. Res. J. (Isfahan).* 2019;16: 257–263.

file:///D:/JULIO/Citavi\_Projetos/Pibic\_Cassia\_2021\_Resina\_Autoadesiva/Citavi Attachments/Jordehi, Shahabi et al. 2019 - Comparison of self-adhering flowable composite.pdf.

- [6] Yuan H, Li M, Guo B, Gao Y, Liu H, Li J, Evaluation of Microtensile Bond Strength and Microleakage of a Self-adhering Flowable Composite. *J. Adhes. Dent.* 2015;17:535–543. <https://doi.org/10.3290/j.jad.a35253> PM - 26734678 M4 - Citavi.
- [7] Yoshida Y, Nagakane K, Fukuda R, Nakayama Y, Okazaki M, Shintani H, Inoue S, Tagawa Y, Suzuki K, Munck J, van Meerbeek B. Comparative study on adhesive performance of functional monomers. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:454–458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/154405910408300604> PM - 15153451.
- [8] Salerno M, Derchi G, Thorat S, Ceseracciu L, Ruffilli R, Barone AC. Surface morphology and mechanical properties of new-generation flowable resin composites for dental restoration. *Dent. Mater.* 2011;27:1221–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2011.08.596> PM - 22000067.
- [9] Czasch P, Ilie N. In vitro comparison of mechanical properties and degree of cure of a self-adhesive and four novel flowable composites. *J. Adhes. Dent.* 2013;15:229–236. <https://doi.org/10.3290/j.jad.a29530> PM - 23560255.
- [10] Wei Y, Silikas N, Zhang Z, Watts DC. Hygroscopic dimensional changes of self-adhering and new resin-matrix composites during water sorption/desorption cycles. *Dent. Mater.* 2011;27:259–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2010.10.015> PM - 21111476.
- [11] Wei Y, Silikas N, Zhang Z, Watts DC. Diffusion and concurrent solubility of self-adhering and new resin-matrix composites during water sorption/desorption cycles. *Dent. Mater.* 2011;27:197–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2010.10.014> PM - 21084109.
- [12] Peterson J, Rizk M, Hoch M, Wiegand A. Bonding performance of self-adhesive flowable composites to enamel, dentin and a nano-hybrid composite. *Odontology.* 2018;106:171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10266-017-0324-3> PM - 29243187.
- [13] Baroudi K, Rodrigues JC. Flowable Resin Composites: A Systematic Review and Clinical Considerations. *J. Clin. Diagn. Res.* 2015;9:ZE18-24.

<https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2015/12294.6129> PM - 26266238.

- [14] Oz FD, Ergin E, Cakir FY, Gurgan S. Clinical Evaluation of a Self-Adhering Flowable Resin Composite in Minimally Invasive Class I Cavities: 5-year Results of a Double Blind Randomized, Controlled Clinical Trial. *Acta Stomatol. Croat.* 2020;54:10–21. <https://doi.org/10.15644/asc54/1/2> PM - 32523153.
- [15] Shaalan OO, Abou-Auf E, El Zoghby AF. Clinical evaluation of self-adhering flowable composite versus conventional flowable composite in conservative Class I cavities: Randomized controlled trial. *J. Conserv. Dent.* 2018;21:485–490. [https://doi.org/10.4103/JCD.JCD\\_210\\_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/JCD.JCD_210_18) PM - 30294107.
- [16] Sabbagh J, Dagher S, El Osta N, Souhaid P. Randomized Clinical Trial of a Self-Adhering Flowable Composite for Class I Restorations: 2-Year Results. *Int. J. Dent.* 2017;5041529. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/5041529> PM - 28348594.
- [17] Shaalan OO, Abou-Auf E. A 24-Month Evaluation of Self-Adhering Flowable Composite Compared to Conventional Flowable Composite in Conservative Simple Occlusal Restorations: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Contemp. Clin. Dent.* 2021;12:368–375. [https://doi.org/10.4103/ccd.ccd\\_600\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/ccd.ccd_600_20) PM - 35068835.
- [18] AlHumaid J, Al Harbi FA, ElEmbaby AE. Performance of Self-adhering Flowable Composite in Class V Restorations: 18 Months Clinical Study. *J. Contemp. Dent. Pract.* 2018;19:785–791.
- [19] Gayatri C, Rambabu T, Sajjan G, Battina P, Priyadarshini MS, Sowjanya BL. Evaluation of Marginal Adaptation of a Self-Adhering Flowable Composite Resin Liner: A Scanning Electron Microscopic Study. *Contemp. Clin. Dent.* 2018;9:S240–S245. [https://doi.org/10.4103/ccd.ccd\\_156\\_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/ccd.ccd_156_18) PM - 30294151.
- [20] Wadhwa S, Nayak UA, Kappadi D, Prajapati D, Sharma R, Pawar A. Comparative Clinical Evaluation of Resin-based Pit and Fissure Sealant and Self-adhering Flowable Composite: An In Vivo Study. *Int. J. Clin. Pediatr. Dent.* 2018;11:430–434. <https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10005-1552> PM - 30787558.
- [21] Cieplik F, Scholz KJ, Anthony JC, Tabenski I, Ettenberger S, Hiller KA, Buchalla W, Federlin M. One-year results of a novel self-adhesive bulk-fill restorative and a conventional bulk-fill composite in class II cavities—a randomized clinical split-mouth

study. Clin. Oral Investig. 2022;26:449–461. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-021-04019-y> PM - 34129074.

[22] Lawson NC, Radhakrishnan R, Givan DA, Ramp LC, Burgess JO. Two-year Randomized, Controlled Clinical Trial of a Flowable and Conventional Composite in Class I Restorations. Oper. Dent. 2015;40:594–602. <https://doi.org/10.2341/15-038-C> PM - 26237643 M4 - Citavi.

[23] Miletic V. Dental Composite Materials for Direct Restorations. Springer International Publishing, Switzerland. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60961-4> M4 - Citavi.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1 – Data from the studies included in the review.

Study	Year	Country	Number of teeth (per group)	Type of tooth	Material	Type of material
<b>AlHumaid (AlHumaid <i>et al.</i>, 2016)</b>	2018	Saudi Arabia	20	Permanent anterior tooth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fusio Liquid Dentin (Pentron Clinical Technologies)</li> <li>Tetric N-Flow (Ivoclar Vivadent, Delhi, India)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Cieplik (Cieplik <i>et al.</i>, 2017)</b>	2021	Germany	30	Premolar and permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive bulk-fill restorative (3M Oral Care, St Paul, MN, USA)</li> <li>Filtek™ One Bulk Fill (3M Oral Care, St Paul, MN, USA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Gayatri (Gayatri <i>et al.</i>, 2018)</b>	2018	India	22	Premolar permanent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dyad Flow (Kerr Products, Delhi, India)</li> <li>Tetric N-Flow (Ivoclar Vivadent, Delhi, India)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Lawson (Lawson <i>et al.</i>, 2015)</b>	2015	United States	60	Premolar and permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Filtek Supreme Ultra Flowable (3M ESPE, USA)</li> <li>Filtek Supreme Ultra (3M ESPE, USA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Oz (Oz <i>et al.</i>, 2016)</b>	2020	Turkey	32	Permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li> <li>Luxa Flow (DMG, Hamburg, Germany)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Sabbagh (Sabbagh <i>et al.</i>, 2017)</b>	2017	Lebanon	34	Permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li> <li>Premise flowable (Kerr Corporation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Serin (Serin <i>et al.</i>, 2019)</b>	2019	Turkey	31	Deciduous molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li> <li>Filtek Z250 (3M ESPE, St Paul, MN, ABD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Shaan (Shaan <i>et al.</i>, 2018)</b>	2018	Egypt	18	Premolar and permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li> <li>Filtek™Z350-XT (3M ESPE, USA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>
<b>Shaan (Shaan <i>et al.</i>, 2021)</b>	2021	Egypt	18	Premolar and permanent molar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li> <li>Filtek™Z350-XT (3MESPE, USA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-adhesive flowable resin</li> <li>Conventional flowable resin</li> </ul>

<b>Vichi (Vichi <i>et al.</i>, 2013)</b>	2013	Italy	40	Pré-molar e molar permanente	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vertise Flow (Kerr Corporation, Orange, CA)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Self-adhevised flowable resin</li></ul>
<b>Wadhwa (Wadhwa <i>et al.</i>, 2018)</b>	2018	India	80	Molar permanente	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dyad Flow (Kerr Products, Delhi, India)</li><li>• Heliobond-F (Ivoclar Vivadent, Delhi, India)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Self-adhevised flowable resin</li><li>• Conventional flowable resin</li></ul>

---

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW