INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LATEST TECHNOLOGY IN ENGINEERING, MANAGEMENT & APPLIED SCIENCE (IJLTEMAS)

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

"Facets of Beauty: Evidence-Based Guidelines for Porcelain Veneers in the Anterior Esthetic Zone"

Dr R Sumukh Bharadwaj

JSS Dental College Hospital

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.1410000149

Abstract: Porcelain veneers represent a minimally invasive yet highly aesthetic treatment option for anterior teeth. Advances in ceramic materials, adhesive protocols, and digital workflows have significantly improved longevity and predictability. This narrative review outlines the indications, contraindications, material choices, preparation designs, adhesive cementation protocols, and complication management related to veneer therapy. Particular emphasis is placed on evidence-based decision-making and clinical nuances that influence long-term success, including case selection, occlusal planning, and periodontal considerations. The review also highlights methodological limitations in the current literature—such as heterogeneous follow-up periods, variable preparation designs, and differing adhesive strategies—that may affect interpretation of survival data. Comparative insights from long-term clinical trials and systematic reviews are integrated to provide balanced, clinically relevant guidelines.

Keywords: porcelain veneers, ceramic laminates, minimally invasive dentistry, adhesive dentistry, esthetic dentistry

I. Introduction

The demand for esthetic dental treatment has grown substantially in recent decades, driven by increased patient expectations, social media exposure, and the normalization of cosmetic interventions. Porcelain veneers (ceramic laminate veneers) have become a cornerstone of smile enhancement due to their ability to mimic natural enamel, preserve tooth structure, and provide long-term color stability.[1],[2] Initially introduced in the 1930s as temporary facings for actors, veneer technology has evolved dramatically with the development of etchable ceramics, adhesive systems, and CAD/CAM technologies.[3]

Despite their popularity, the success of veneers depends on careful diagnosis, treatment planning, appropriate material selection, and strict adherence to adhesive protocols.[4] In addition, interpretation of the available evidence must account for variations in study design, follow-up duration, and outcome criteria, which may influence reported survival and complication rates. This manuscript provides an overview of contemporary evidence-based concepts for veneer therapy in dentistry, aimed at helping clinicians optimize functional and esthetic outcomes while critically appraising the strengths and limitations of the existing literature.

Indications and Contraindications

Indications

Porcelain veneers are indicated in a variety of clinical situations:

1. **Discolorations**
   - Intrinsic stains (e.g., tetracycline staining, fluorosis, trauma-related discoloration) resistant to bleaching.[5]
   - Discolored composite restorations or enamel defects such as hypoplasia or hypomineralization.
2. **Shape and Form Corrections**
   - Peg laterals, microdontia, tooth size discrepancies.[6]
   - Diastema closure and minor positional corrections (to an extent).
3. **Minor Malposition and Wear**
   - Slight rotations or crowding that can be corrected by enameloplasty and veneer placement rather than orthodontics in selected cases.[7]
   - Anterior tooth wear with sufficient enamel and stable occlusion.
4. **Esthetic Rehabilitation**
   - Smile design cases requiring modification of tooth proportions, midline alignment, or incisal edge position.[8]

Contraindications

Porcelain veneers are not ideal in the following scenarios:

Insufficient Enamel

Large dentin exposure, extensive existing restorations, or aggressive previous preparations reduce bonding predictability.[9]

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

Parafunction and Poor Occlusion

Uncontrolled bruxism, deep overbite with heavy anterior contacts, or unstable occlusion can predispose to chipping and debonding.[10]

Poor Oral Hygiene and Periodontal Health

Active periodontal disease, high caries risk, or poor plaque control are relative contraindications until stabilized.[11]

Severely Malpositioned Teeth

Cases better managed by orthodontics or orthognathic surgery rather than restorative camouflage.[7]

Appropriate case selection remains the single most important determinant of success.[4] Prospective studies consistently show higher survival rates when veneers are bonded predominantly to enamel and placed in patients with favorable occlusal and periodontal profiles.[29–31]

Clinical factor	Indications	Contraindications / Cautions	Clinical notes
Tooth discoloration	Intrinsic stains resistant to bleaching (e.g., tetracycline, fluorosis, trauma).	Severe dark discoloration requiring excessive reduction for masking.	Consider internal bleaching first in endodontically treated teeth when feasible.
Enamel quality and quantity	Adequate, intact enamel for bonding.	Extensive dentin exposure; large composite or full-coverage restorations.	Enamel-dominant bonding is associated with higher survival rates.
Tooth shape and form	Peg laterals, microdontia, diastema closure, minor tooth size discrepancies.	Severe tooth size–arch discrepancy requiring multidisciplinary treatment.	Veneers can harmonize proportions as part of comprehensive smile design.
Tooth position	Minor rotations, mild crowding, slight labio-lingual discrepancies correctable by enameloplasty.	Severe malposition, crossbites, skeletal discrepancies.	Consider orthodontics or orthognathic surgery instead of "camouflage" in complex cases.
Occlusion and function	Stable occlusion with favorable guidance and controlled functional contacts.	Uncontrolled bruxism, deep overbite with heavy anterior contacts.	Nightguard recommended in suspected parafunction; modify guidance where needed.
Periodontal status	Healthy periodontium, good plaque control, adequate keratinized tissue.	Active periodontal disease, poor hygiene, high caries risk.	Stabilize periodontal condition and caries risk before veneer therapy.
Patient expectations	Realistic esthetic expectations and willingness for maintenance.	Unrealistic expectations or desire for "instant orthodontics" in complex cases.	Careful communication, mock-ups, and informed consent are essential before treatment.

Table 1. Indications and contraindications for porcelain veneers in the anterior esthetic zone

Material Selection for Veneers

Several ceramic materials are used for veneers, each with distinct optical and mechanical properties. Material choice should consider esthetics, strength, required masking ability, and available enamel substrate.

Feldspathic Porcelain

Traditionally considered the gold standard for veneers due to:

- Excellent translucency and enamel-like optical properties.[12]
- Ability to be layered and characterized by the ceramist.

However, feldspathic ceramics are more brittle and require meticulous preparation design and occlusal planning.

Leucite-Reinforced Glass Ceramics

Leucite-reinforced ceramics (e.g., IPS Empress) exhibit:

- Improved flexural strength compared to feldspathic porcelain.
- Good translucency and etchability, allowing strong bonding.[13]

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

They are suitable for veneers needing slightly higher strength but still high esthetics.

Lithium Disilicate Glass Ceramics

Lithium disilicate (e.g., IPS e.max Press/CAD) has gained popularity because it offers:

- High flexural strength (approx. 360–400 MPa).[14]
- Good esthetics, with varying translucency levels (HT, MT, LT).

These ceramics are especially useful in cases with moderate discoloration or when slightly more robust restorations are desired.[14] Comparative clinical studies suggest similar survival for feldspathic and lithium disilicate veneers in enamel-bonded cases, but lithium disilicate may show fewer catastrophic fractures in higher-stress situations.[29–31]

CAD/CAM and Milled Veneers

Digital workflows allow chairside or lab-based CAD/CAM veneers from lithium disilicate or hybrid ceramics:

- Reduced turnaround times.
- Standardized, reproducible restorations.
- Potential for minimally invasive or even non-prep veneers in selected cases.[15]

Material choice should balance esthetics, strength, and required masking ability, guided by the specific clinical situation and supported by laboratory and clinical data.[4]

Material	Flexural strength (approx.)	Optical properties	Minimal thickness (approx.)	Indications	Limitations
Feldspathic porcelain	60–100 MPa	Excellent translucency, enamel-like; highly customizable	~0.3–0.5 mm	Highly esthetic anterior veneers with good enamel support	More brittle; technique-sensitive; requires careful occlusal planning.
Leucite-reinforced glass ceramic	120–180 MPa	Good translucency and esthetics	~0.5–0.7 mm	Anterior veneers requiring slightly higher strength	Limited indication in high-stress or heavy-load situations.
Lithium disilicate glass ceramic	360–400 MPa	Good esthetics; multiple translucency options (HT, MT, LT)	~0.3–0.6 mm (per shade/masking)	Anterior veneers, moderate discoloration, increased strength	May appear slightly more opaque in high-opacity ingots for masking.
CAD/CAM hybrid ceramics/composites	120–200 MPa (variable)	Esthetic; elastic modulus closer to dentin	~0.5–1.0 mm	Chairside veneers, minimally invasive restorations	Limited long-term data versus conventional glass ceramics.
Ultralight / no-prep veneer ceramics	150–400 MPa (material-dependent)	Highly translucent in thin sections	~0.2–0.3 mm	No-prep or minimal-prep veneers in ideal alignment/shade	Cannot mask severe discoloration; indication-sensitive; very case-dependent.

Table 2. Comparison of ceramic materials for porcelain veneers

Diagnostic Phase and Smile Design

Comprehensive Assessment

A structured diagnostic approach includes:

- Detailed history and chief complaint.
- Photographic documentation (extraoral and intraoral).

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

- Study models or digital scans.
- Radiographic evaluation to rule out pathology and assess existing restorations.[16]

Esthetic Analysis

Esthetic analysis involves evaluation of:

- Facial esthetics (midline, interpupillary line, facial symmetry).
- Dental esthetics (incisal display at rest, smile line, buccal corridor).
- Tooth proportions (width/height ratio, golden proportion as a guide, not a rule).[8],[17]

Digital smile design (DSD) tools can enhance communication with patients and the lab and allow simulation of treatment outcomes.[18]

Wax-Up and Mock-Up

A diagnostic wax-up translates the esthetic plan into three dimensions. From this, a silicone index is fabricated to create an intraoral mock-up using bis-acryl or flowable composite.[19]

The mock-up allows:

- Evaluation of esthetics, phonetics, and functional aspects.
- Minimally invasive preparation guided by the planned final form ("prep through the mock-up").[20]

Tooth Preparation Principles

Minimally Invasive Philosophy

Veneers should ideally remain within enamel to maximize bonding strength.[9],[21] The amount of reduction is dictated by:

- Initial tooth position.
- Desired final contour and shade (masking requirements).
- Material thickness recommendations.

Reduction Guidelines

Typical reduction values (may vary by case and material):

- **Facial reduction:** 0.3–0.5 mm in cervical third, 0.5–0.7 mm in middle third, and up to 0.7–1.0 mm in incisal third.[21]
- **Incisal edge:**
  - No-prep/non-prep in specific cases.
  - Incisal overlap design (1.0–2.0 mm) often preferred for enhanced mechanical performance and esthetics.[22]
- **Proximal reduction:** Enough to hide margins and create space while preserving contact when possible.

Depth-cutting burs and preparation guides from the mock-up help maintain uniform reduction and prevent over-preparation.[20]

Margin Design

Common margin designs:

- Light chamfer or butt joint at the cervical margin.
- Supragingival margins preferred for periodontal health and easier bonding/cleanup when esthetics allow.[23]
- Slightly subgingival placement may be required in cases of discoloration or short clinical crowns, but care must be taken to respect the biologic width.[11]

Impression Techniques and Provisionalization

Impression / Digital Scanning

Conventional impressions:

High-precision elastomeric materials (polyvinyl siloxane or polyether), with careful gingival retraction where necessary.[24]

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

Digital impressions:

Intraoral scanners provide accurate data, improved patient comfort, and seamless integration with CAD/CAM workflows.[15]

Parameter	Conventional impressions (PVS / polyether)	Digital impressions (intraoral scanners)
Accuracy	High, well-documented; depends on tray selection and technique	High; comparable or superior for short-span restorations
Soft tissue management	Often requires physical retraction cord and hemostatic agents	Still requires soft tissue control, but avoids tray distortion
Patient comfort	Lower (gag reflex, taste of materials, tray bulk)	Higher; no impression material, shorter data capture time
Workflow integration	Analog workflow; stone models, physical shipping to lab	Direct integration with CAD/CAM, digital wax-ups, and virtual planning
Turnaround time	Longer; reliant on lab logistics and transport	Potentially shorter; chairside or streamlined digital communication
Reproducibility	Remakes require a new physical impression	Data can be stored, duplicated, or resent without reimpression
Learning curve	Familiar to most clinicians	Requires training and investment in scanner hardware/software

Table 3. Conventional versus digital impressions for porcelain veneers

Provisional Veneers

Provisional restorations can be fabricated from the diagnostic mock-up using:

- Spot-etch technique and bis-acryl materials.
- Indirect provisionals in more extensive cases.

They allow evaluation of esthetics, phonetics, and soft tissue response, and can be adjusted prior to final fabrication.[19]

Adhesive Cementation Protocol

The ultimate success of veneers is determined largely by the bonding protocol.[4],[21]

1. Try-In

- Check fit, marginal adaptation, and contacts with glycerin-based try-in pastes shade-matched to the resin cement.[25]
- Evaluate esthetics in natural and operatory light.
- Obtain patient approval before final bonding.

2. Surface Treatment of Ceramic

For etchable glass ceramics (feldspathic, leucite-reinforced, lithium disilicate):

1. Etch internal surface with 5–10% hydrofluoric acid (HF) for manufacturer-recommended time (e.g., ~20 s for feldspathic, leucite-reinforced, and lithium disilicate; always check IFU).[13],[14]
2. Thoroughly rinse and dry.
3. Apply silane coupling agent and air dry.[26]
4. Apply a thin layer of adhesive (without curing) or as per manufacturer's recommendation.

3. Tooth Surface Treatment

Protocols depend on substrate:

- **Enamel-dominant substrate:**
  - 30–37% phosphoric acid etching for 15–30 s.
  - Rinse and dry to a frosty appearance.
  - Apply adhesive and gently air-thin; cure if required by system.[21]

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

- **Mixed enamel–dentin or dentin-exposed areas:**
  - Total-etch or selective-etch protocol with an etch-and-rinse or universal adhesive according to manufacturer instructions.[27]
  - Avoid over-drying dentin (maintain slight moistness).

4. Resin Cementation

- Use light-cure or dual-cure resin cement; light-cure is typically preferred for veneers due to better color stability and extended working time.[28]
- Place cement inside the veneer, seat gently, and apply uniform pressure.
- Remove gross excess with a brush or micro-brush before polymerization.
- Tack cure marginally (2–3 s) to facilitate removal of remaining excess with an explorer or scaler.[25]
- Apply glycerin gel along margins to prevent an oxygen-inhibited layer, then perform final light curing from multiple aspects.[25]

5. Finishing and Polishing

- Refine margins with fine diamond burs and polishing discs.
- Use silicone polishers and polishing pastes to achieve high gloss.[21]

Occlusal Considerations

Proper occlusal planning is critical for veneer longevity:

- Ensure even contact distribution in centric occlusion.
- Avoid heavy functional contacts on fragile incisal edges or ceramic margins.[22]
- Aim for shared guidance or canine guidance; undesirable protrusive interferences should be removed.[10]
- Consider a nighttime occlusal splint for patients with parafunctional habits, after informing them about the risk of fracture.[10]

Long-term prospective data suggest that parafunction and unfavorable guidance patterns significantly increase failure rates, even when materials and bonding protocols are optimal.[29–31]

Longevity and Clinical Performance

Long-term studies report high survival rates for porcelain veneers when placed under correct conditions:

- Survival rates of 91–95% at 10 years and approximately 83–94% at 15 years have been documented.[29–31]
- Main causes of failure include fracture, debonding, secondary caries, and marginal discoloration.[29]

Risk factors for failure:

- Predominant bonding to dentin rather than enamel.[9]
- Bruxism and heavy occlusal loads.[10]
- Inadequate preparation design and insufficient thickness of ceramic.[22]
- Poor moisture control and compromised bonding procedures.

Comparative analyses between feldspathic and lithium disilicate veneers indicate broadly similar overall survival, but differences in modes of failure (more cohesive ceramic fractures vs debonding) depending on preparation design and substrate.[29–31] Systematic reviews also emphasize heterogeneity in inclusion criteria, follow-up times, and outcome definitions as important methodological limitations when interpreting survival percentages.

Regular follow-up with professional maintenance (polishing, plaque control, and minor adjustments) is essential to prolong veneer life.[32]

Complications and Their Management

Fracture and Chipping

- Small chips can often be repaired intraorally with composite resin after surface roughening and silanization.[33]
- Larger fractures may require veneer replacement, ideally with reassessment of occlusal contacts and substrate quality.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

Debonding

- May result from contamination during bonding, inadequate enamel substrate, or occlusal trauma.[9]
- Management includes assessing underlying tooth structure, rebonding if feasible, or remaking with improved design and bonding protocol.

Marginal Discoloration

- Often related to microleakage or aging of resin cement.[28]
- Minor discoloration can sometimes be polished or masked; significant leakage may require replacement.

Biological Complications

- Gingival inflammation due to over-contoured restorations or subgingival excess cement.[11]
- Management includes improving hygiene, careful removal of excess cement, and contour adjustments.

Digital Veneers and Emerging Trends

CAD/CAM technology and digital smile design are reshaping veneer workflows:

- Fully digital workflows enable scanning, virtual design, and milling of veneers with fewer clinical steps.[15],[18]
- 3D printing diagnostic models and mock-ups enhances communication and predictability.
- Minimally invasive or no-prep veneers using high-strength, thin ceramics are increasingly popular in carefully selected cases, though they require precise indication and patient education regarding limitations.[34]

Emerging research focuses on ultra-translucent ceramics with higher strength, bioactive or self-adhesive interfaces, and AI-assisted esthetic planning and outcome prediction. However, many of these innovations are supported by short- to medium-term data and in vitro studies; robust long-term clinical trials are still limited, representing an important area for future research.

Limitations of the Current Evidence

The current body of literature on porcelain veneers, while extensive, presents several methodological limitations:

- Many clinical studies are **retrospective** and conducted in specialized centers, which may introduce selection bias and limit generalizability.
- **Follow-up periods** vary widely, and not all studies report standardized criteria for success, survival, and failure, complicating meaningful comparison of outcomes.[29–31]
- Differences in **preparation design**, substrate (enamel vs dentin), adhesive system, and cement type are often not controlled across cohorts.[9],[21],[27]
- Newer materials and digital workflows frequently have **short-term follow-up**, relying heavily on in vitro data or case series.[14],[15],[34]

Clinicians should interpret survival rates and complication frequencies in light of these limitations and apply evidence cautiously, integrating clinical experience and individual patient factors into decision-making.

II. Conclusion

Porcelain veneers, when used appropriately, offer a powerful combination of minimally invasive treatment and superior esthetics. Successful veneer therapy is anchored in meticulous diagnosis, careful case selection, enamel-focused preparation, evidence-based adhesive protocols, and thoughtful occlusal design. Long-term clinical data demonstrate high survival rates, particularly when veneers are bonded predominantly to enamel and placed in patients with favorable occlusal and periodontal conditions.[29–32]

At the same time, interpretation of veneer performance must account for methodological limitations in the literature, such as heterogeneous study designs, variable follow-up durations, and evolving materials and techniques. Emerging digital workflows and advanced ceramics further expand treatment possibilities but require continued critical appraisal and long-term evaluation.

Clinicians must remain updated on material science and adhesive strategies, adopt a minimally invasive and biologically respectful approach, and communicate realistically with patients about benefits, limitations, and maintenance requirements. When these principles are followed, porcelain veneers can provide predictable, durable, and highly satisfying outcomes in the anterior esthetic zone.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue X, October 2025

References (Vancouver Style)

1. Peumans M, Van Meerbeek B, Lambrechts P, Vanherle G. Porcelain veneers: a review of the literature. J Dent. 2000;28(3):163-77.
2. Radz GM. Minimum thickness anterior porcelain restorations. Dent Clin North Am. 2011;55(2):353-70.
3. Calamia JR. Etched porcelain veneers: the current state of the art. Quintessence Int. 1985;16(1):5-12.
4. Gresnigt MMM, Özcan M. Esthetic rehabilitation of anterior teeth with porcelain laminates and minimally invasive preparations. Eur J Esthet Dent. 2011;6(3):298-313.
5. Friedman MJ. Porcelain veneer restorations: a clinician's opinion about a disturbing trend. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2001;13(5):318-27.
6. Meijering AC, Creugers NHJ, Roeters FJM, Mulder J. Survival of three types of veneer restorations in a clinical trial: a 2.5-year interim evaluation. J Dent. 1998;26(7):563-8.
7. Magne P, Belser UC. Bonded porcelain restorations in the anterior dentition: a biomimetic approach. Chicago: Quintessence; 2002.
8. Coachman C, Calamita MA. Digital smile design: a tool for treatment planning and communication in esthetic dentistry. Quintessence Dent Technol. 2012;35:103-11.
9. Stappert CFJ, Ozden U, Gerds T, Strub JR. Longevity and failure load of ceramic veneers with different preparation designs after exposure to masticatory simulation. J Prosthet Dent. 2005;94(2):132-9.
10. Layton DM, Walton TR. The up to 21-year clinical outcome and survival of feldspathic porcelain veneers: a prospective study. J Dent. 2007;35(8):608-15.
11. Kois JC. Altering gingival levels: the restorative connection. Part I: Biologic variables. J Esthet Dent. 1994;6(1):3-9.
12. Dumfahrt H. Porcelain laminate veneers. A retrospective evaluation after 1 to 10 years of service: Part II—Clinical results. Int J Prosthodont. 1999;12(6):483-9.
13. Fradeani M. Esthetic rehabilitation in fixed prosthodontics: Volume 2. Chicago: Quintessence; 2008.
14. Guess PC, Schultheis S, Bonfante EA, Coelho PG, Ferencz JL, Silva NRFA. All-ceramic systems: laboratory and clinical performance. Dent Clin North Am. 2011;55(2):333-52.
15. Güth JF, Edelhoff D, Schweiger J, Keul C. A new method for the evaluation of the accuracy of full-arch digital impressions in vitro. Clin Oral Investig. 2016;20(7):1487-94.
16. Sarver DM, Ackerman MB. Orthodontics about face: the re-emergence of the esthetic paradigm. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2000;117(5):575-6.
17. Lombardi RE. The principles of visual perception and their clinical application to denture esthetics. J Prosthet Dent. 1973;29(4):358-82.
18. Coachman C, Paravina RD. Digitally enhanced esthetic dentistry—From treatment planning to quality control. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2016;28 Suppl 1:S3-4.
19. Gurel G. The science and art of porcelain laminate veneers. Chicago: Quintessence; 2003.
20. Gurel G, Sesma N, Calamita MA, Coachman C, Morimoto S. Influence of enamel preservation on failure rates of porcelain laminate veneers. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2013;33(1):31-9.
21. Van Meerbeek B, De Munck J, Yoshida Y, Inoue S, Vargas M, Vijay P, et al. Buonocore memorial lecture. Adhesion to enamel and dentin: current status and future challenges. Oper Dent. 2003;28(3):215-35.
22. Magne P, Hanna J, Magne M. The case for moderate "guided prep" veneers in the anterior dentition: biomimetic reconstructive dentistry. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2013;25(6):383-94.
23. Reynolds JM. Periodontal considerations in restorative dentistry. J Prosthet Dent. 1975;33(5):531-8.
24. Mandikos MN. Polyvinyl siloxane impression materials: an update on clinical use. Aust Dent J. 1998;43(6):428-34.
25. Dietschi D, Devigus A. Prefabricated composite veneers: historical perspectives, indications and clinical application. Eur J Esthet Dent. 2011;6(2):178-87.
26. Lung CYK, Matinlinna JP. Aspects of silane coupling agents and surface conditioning in dentistry: an overview. Dent Mater. 2012;28(5):467-77.
27. Perdigão J. New developments in dental adhesion. Dent Clin North Am. 2007;51(2):333-57.
28. Koizumi H, Saiki O, Nogawa H, Hiraba H, Okazaki T, Yoneyama T. Color stability of dual-cured resin cements after immersion in coffee. J Prosthodont Res. 2010;54(3):178-83.
29. Beier US, Kapferer I, Burtscher D, Dumfahrt H. Clinical performance of porcelain laminate veneers for up to 20 years. Int J Prosthodont. 2012;25(1):79-85.
30. Layton DM, Clarke M, Walton TR. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the survival of feldspathic porcelain veneers over 5 and 10 years. Int J Prosthodont. 2012;25(6):590-603.
31. Fradeani M, Redemagni M, Corrado M. Porcelain laminate veneers: 6- to 12-year clinical evaluation—a retrospective study. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 2005;25(1):9-17.
32. Radz GM. Veneer survival and maintenance. Dent Clin North Am. 2011;55(2):379-90.
33. Ozcan M, Niedermeier W. Clinical study on the reasons for and location of failures of metal-ceramic restorations and survival of repairs. Int J Prosthodont. 2002;15(3):299-302.
34. Chu SJ, Karabudak F, Maller S, Salama MA, Garber DA. Clinical considerations for minimally invasive esthetic treatment with porcelain veneers. Pract Proced Aesthet Dent. 2007;19(9):561-8.