Content available at: https://www.ipinnovative.com/open-access-journals

Journal of Advances in Oral Health

Journal homepage: https://www.jaoh.in/

Short Communication

Specific gravity in prosthodontics: An overlooked determinant of material performance

Arpit Sikri[1]*

Dept. of Prosthodontics, Crown & Bridge and Oral Implantology Bhojia Dental College, Baddi, Himachal Pradesh, India.

Abstract

Specific gravity (SG) is a fundamental physical property that reflects the density of a material relative to water. Although widely recognized in material sciences, its significance in prosthodontics remains underappreciated. SG influences the weight, handling characteristics, patient comfort, biomechanical behavior, and long-term clinical success of prosthodontic materials. From denture base polymers and maxillofacial silicones to metallic frameworks and ceramic restorations, SG governs several critical outcomes—including retention, load distribution, and material selection for specialized prostheses. This guest editorial highlights the importance of SG across prosthodontic disciplines, discusses its clinical implications, and underscores the need for increased attention to this parameter in research and education.

Keywords: Alloys, biomechanics, Ceramics, Density, Denture base resin, Material science, Maxillofacial prosthetics, Prosthodontic materials, Specific gravity.

Received: 12-12-2025; **Accepted:** 26-12-2025; **Available Online**: 05-01-2026

1. Introduction

Specific gravity (SG) is defined as the ratio of the density of a substance to the density of water at a reference temperature. In prosthodontics, SG acts as an essential yet often overlooked determinant of how materials behave clinically. Whether a material is intended for intraoral use or extraoral prosthetic rehabilitation, its SG influences weight, patient acceptance, fabrication ease, and mechanical behavior. Despite its relevance, SG rarely receives explicit attention in academic discussions or clinical decision-making.

2. SG and Denture Base Resins

Polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA), the most commonly used denture base resin, has a specific gravity ranging from 1.15 to 1.19, making it lightweight and suitable for large prostheses such as complete dentures. A lower SG improves patient comfort and reduces the risk of excessive pressure on mucosal tissues. Studies have shown that alternative denture base materials, such as polyamides and flexible resins, exhibit slightly different SG values, affecting their weight and biomechanical behavior in function.[1] As new CAD/CAM resins emerge, their SG becomes relevant to retention and thickness optimization in digital workflows.[2]

3. SG in Metallic Prosthodontic Alloys

Metal alloys used in removable partial dentures (RPDs), implant abutments, and fixed prosthodontics exhibit comparatively high SG values. Cobalt–chromium (Co–Cr) alloys (SG ~8.3) and titanium (SG ~4.5) differ significantly, influencing both prosthesis weight and biomechanical load transfer. A heavier RPD framework may enhance stability in some cases but can compromise comfort in others. Titanium, with its lower SG and superior biocompatibility, has become increasingly preferred for implant components and milled prostheses. Comparative analyses indicate that lighter alloys reduce stress concentrations without compromising rigidity, supporting their expanding role in prosthodontics.[3,4]

*Corresponding author: Arpit Sikri
Email: arpitsikri@gmail.com

https:// 10.18231/j.jaoh.47057.1767615232

4. SG of Ceramics and Hybrid Restorative Materials

Ceramics used in crowns and implant-supported restorations demonstrate SG values ranging from 2.2 to 6.0. Zirconia, with a relatively high SG (~6.0), offers strength but increases the mass of large-span restorations—potentially affecting screw-retained prostheses and cantilevers. Lithium disilicate has a lower SG (~2.4), offering a balanced combination of strength and reduced weight. The SG of hybrid materials, including polymer-infiltrated ceramic networks (PICN), is even lower, contributing to improved shock absorption while reducing prosthetic weight.[5]

Understanding these differences is essential when selecting restorative materials for fragile ridges, elderly patients, and cases requiring extensive prosthetic rehabilitation.

5. SG in Maxillofacial Prosthetics

The concept of SG holds special relevance in maxillofacial prostheses such as facial, auricular, and orbital prostheses. Medical-grade silicones typically have SG values between 1.1 and 1.3. A lightweight prosthesis is crucial to prevent gravitational displacement, especially in large facial defects. Research indicates that modifying silicone formulations to adjust SG can reduce prosthesis weight without compromising mechanical properties.[6] Additionally, hollowing techniques used in orbital and nasal prostheses specifically aim to reduce overall SG and weight for enhanced retention and patient comfort.

6. SG and Implant Biomechanics

Implant-supported prostheses benefit greatly from materials with optimized SG, as prosthetic weight directly affects implant loading, peri-implant bone response, and prosthesis longevity. Heavy prostheses may increase bending moments on implants, especially in distal extension cases or long-span fixed implant prostheses. Evidence suggests that using lightweight materials such as titanium frameworks, PEKK/PEEK polymers, or milled resin nanocomposites lowers stress distribution on supporting implants.[7,8]

7. Digital Dentistry and the Future of SG Application

Digital design workflows offer increasing opportunities to integrate SG considerations into prosthesis fabrication. Computer-aided engineering (CAE) can estimate prosthesis mass during virtual planning, helping clinicians select materials that optimize weight, esthetics, and biomechanics. Additive manufacturing further allows infill manipulation to reduce SG without affecting functional surfaces. Emerging materials such as 3D-printed high-impact resins and lightweight metal lattices will likely redefine SG considerations in future prosthodontic practice.[9]

8. SG in Dental Education and Research

Despite its importance, SG receives limited attention in prosthodontic curricula. A stronger emphasis on material density and SG can enhance students' ability to make informed decisions regarding material selection. Furthermore, research comparing SG across conventional and digital materials can inform better clinical guidelines and adaptive workflows.[10]

9. Conclusion

Specific gravity, though often overshadowed by mechanical and esthetic properties, plays a vital role in prosthodontic material selection and clinical outcomes. SG influences prosthesis weight, comfort, biomechanics, retention, and long-term success across dentures, implant restorations, alloys, ceramics, and maxillofacial prostheses. As prosthodontics continues to evolve with digital manufacturing and innovative biomaterials, SG must be considered a key material attribute. Greater emphasis in research, education, and clinical practice will ensure more predictable, patient-centered prosthetic rehabilitation.

10. Source of Funding

None.

11. Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Phoenix R, Mansueto M, Ackerman N, Jones . Evaluation Of Mechanical And Thermal Properties Of Commonly Used Denture Base Resins. *J Prosthod,* 2004;13(1):17-27. https://doi;10.1111/j.1532-849x.2004.04002.x
2. Reem Abualsaud, Mohammed M. Gad, mam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University- College of Dentistry, *J Int Soc Preven Commun Dent.* 12(2):160. https://doi:10.4103/jispcd.JISPCD_310_21
3. Wataha JC. Alloys for prosthodontic restorations. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2002;87(4):351-63. https://doi:10.1067/mpr.2002.123817
4. Al Jabbari YS. Physico-mechanical properties and prosthodontic applications of Co-Cr dental alloys: a review of the literature. *No J.* 2014;6(2):138. https://doi:10.4047/jap.2014.6.2.138.
5. Denry I, Kelly JR. Emerging ceramic-based materials for dentistry. *J Dent Res.* 2014;93(12):1235-42. https://doi:10.1177/0022034514553627.
6. Lewis DH, Castleberry DJ. An assessment of recent advances in external maxillofacial materials. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1980;43(4):426-32. https://doi:10.1016/0022-3913(80)90215-2.
7. Mitra D, Gurav P, Rodrigues S, Khobragade B, Mahajan A. Evaluation of stress distribution in and around dental implants using three different implant–abutment interfaces with platform-switched and non-platform-switched abutments: A three-dimensional finite element analysis. *J Oral Implantol.* 2023;17(4):256-64. https://doi:10.34172/joddd.2023.40723.
8. Schwitalla A, Müller W. PEEK Dental Implants: A Review of the Literature. *J Oral Implantol*. 2013;39(6):743-9. https;//doi:10.1563/aaid-joi-d-11-00002.
9. Tigmeanu CV, Ardelean LC, Rusu LC, Negrutiu ML, Additive Manufactured Polymers in Dentistry, Current State-of-the-Art and Future Perspectives-A Review,

Polymers 2022;14(17):3658; https://doi.org/10.3390/polym14173658.

10. Simon P, Shinde H, Padhye M. Effects of prosthesis weight on stress distribution in implant dentistry. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc.* 2019;19(3):213-20.

Cite this article: Sikri A, Specific gravity in prosthodontics: An overlooked determinant of material performance. *J Advanc Oral Health*. 2025;2(2):84-86.