Journal of Orofacial Rehabilitation Vol. 6(2), Aug 2026, pp. 1-3. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21877050

EDITORIAL

Contemporary Indirect Veneer Materials: Beyond the Pursuit of Strength.

The evolution of indirect veneer materials reflects one of the most significant changes in contemporary esthetic dentistry. The traditional association of veneers with feldspathic porcelain has progressively expanded to include leucite-reinforced ceramics, lithium disilicate, zirconia-reinforced lithium silicate (ZLS), zirconia, polymer-infiltrated ceramic networks (PICN), and CAD/CAM resin-matrix materials. This expanding armamentarium offers unprecedented flexibility—but it also raises a fundamental question: does a stronger material necessarily make a better veneer?

The answer is clearly no.

The modern veneer must satisfy competing demands of optical integration, mechanical reliability, adhesive predictability and biological conservation. Material selection should therefore be dictated by the clinical indication rather than by the highest flexural strength advertised by a manufacturer.

Feldspathic ceramic remains the benchmark for optical biomimicry. Its high glass content permits exceptional translucency, fluorescence and individualized characterization, making it particularly valuable for highly esthetic, enamel-bonded and minimally invasive cases. Despite its lower strength compared with newer ceramics, long-term evidence demonstrates that feldspathic veneers can achieve excellent survival when appropriately designed and bonded.[1,2]

Leucite-reinforced glass ceramics represent an important transitional generation. They offer improved strength over conventional feldspathic porcelain while retaining excellent optical properties and the advantage of hydrofluoric-acid etching and silanization. Although their use has declined with the emergence of lithium disilicate, they remain clinically relevant in selected anterior indications.[2]

Lithium disilicate has arguably become the contemporary workhorse of indirect veneers. Its combination of strength, translucency, thin-section performance and predictable adhesive potential provides an attractive balance between esthetics and function. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis reported approximately 96.8% pooled 10-year survival for lithium-disilicate laminate veneers, comparable to feldspathic ceramics but with fewer reported complications. [2] This does not mean that lithium disilicate has replaced feldspathic ceramic; rather, it has expanded the range of cases that can be treated predictably.

ZLS attempts to combine the optical and adhesive advantages of glass ceramics with additional reinforcement from zirconia. Its CAD/CAM compatibility and favourable laboratory properties are attractive, but long-term clinical evidence for veneers remains limited. [3,4] It should therefore be viewed as a promising material rather than an established superior alternative.

The emergence of highly translucent and multilayered zirconia has perhaps generated the greatest enthusiasm. Contemporary 4Y and 5Y zirconias provide substantially improved optical properties compared with earlier generations and offer exceptional mechanical strength. Yet the clinical interpretation must remain cautious. Zirconia is not conventionally hydrofluoric-acid etchable, and predictable bonding requires appropriate surface conditioning and functional monomers such as MDP. More importantly, current evidence reports excellent short-term survival for zirconia veneers but lacks comparable long-term veneer-specific data.[2,5]

The same principle applies to PICN and CAD/CAM resin-matrix materials. These materials occupy an interesting intermediate position between ceramics and conventional composites, offering favorable machinability, reparability and altered stress behavior. Their potential is considerable, particularly within digital workflows, but their long-term evidence for laminate veneers remains less mature than that of established glass ceramics. [6,7]

The most important development, however, may not be the introduction of another material. It is the recognition that material strength cannot be considered independently of restoration thickness, preparation design and substrate.

A 0.3-mm veneer and a 0.8-mm veneer made from the same ceramic are mechanically different restorations. Likewise, a veneer bonded predominantly to enamel cannot be considered equivalent to one bonded extensively to dentin. Contemporary evidence continues to support enamel preservation as one of the fundamental principles governing predictable veneer outcomes. [1,5]

Digital dentistry has further changed this equation. Digital impressions, virtual smile design, CAD/CAM fabrication and three-dimensional planning allow clinicians to determine the intended restoration morphology and thickness before irreversible tooth preparation. The workflow is progressively shifting from "prepare first, then fabricate" to "design first, then prepare according to the design." This is perhaps the most important contribution of contemporary technology to minimally invasive esthetic dentistry.

The future, therefore, is unlikely to belong to a single "ideal" veneer material. Feldspathic ceramic will continue to dominate situations demanding maximum optical characterization; lithium disilicate will remain a versatile material for a broad range of indications; zirconia will find selective applications where strength and masking are priorities; and ZLS, PICN and CAD/CAM resin materials will continue to expand the restorative spectrum as clinical evidence accumulates.

The contemporary prosthodontist should consequently move away from material loyalty toward indication-based material selection.

The strongest veneer is not necessarily the most successful veneer. The most translucent veneer is not necessarily the most appropriate veneer. And the newest material is not necessarily the best material.

The ideal veneer is the one that achieves the required optical and mechanical result at the minimum biologically acceptable cost—in terms of tooth structure.

In contemporary esthetic prosthodontics, therefore, the material should serve the design, and the design should serve the tooth.

References

1. AlJazairy YH. Survival rates for porcelain laminate veneers: a systematic review. Eur J Dent. 2021;15(2):360-368.

2. Klein P, Spitznagel FA, Zembic A, et al. Survival and complication rates of feldspathic, leucite-reinforced, lithium disilicate and zirconia ceramic laminate veneers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2025;37(3):601-619.

3. Zarone F, Ruggiero G, Leone R, et al. Zirconia-reinforced lithium silicate mechanical and biological properties: a literature review. J Dent. 2021;109:103661.

4. Sorrentino R, Ruggiero G, Di Mauro MI, et al. Optical behaviors, surface treatment, adhesion, and clinical indications of zirconia-reinforced lithium silicate. J Dent. 2021;112:103722.

5. Beuer F, et al. Survival and complication rates of ceramic partial coverage restorations and ceramic laminate veneers: consensus statement. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2025;37(3):664-668.

6. Facenda JC, Borba M, Corazza PH. A literature review on the polymer-infiltrated ceramic-network material. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2018;30(4):281-286.

7. Gresnigt MMM, Cune MS, Jansen K, et al. Randomized clinical trial on indirect resin composite and ceramic laminate veneers: up to 10-year findings. J Dent. 2019;86:102-109.

Prof. (Dr.) Arka Swarnakar

Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Orofacial Rehabilitation
Indian Prosthodontic Society West Bengal State Branch

Professor
Dept. of Prosthodontics & Crown and Bridge
Kothiwal Dental College and Research Centre, Moradabad

ORCID id: 0009-0007-5144-9640