IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 25, Issue 7 Ser. 1 (July. 2026), PP 53-58
www.iosrjournals.org

Dental Zirconia In Modern Prosthodontics: Composition, Microstructural Evolution, Clinical Applications, And Emerging Technologies

Dr. Sana Sanober
Junior Resident, Department Of Prosthodontics And Crown & Bridge, Career Post Graduate Institute Of Dental Science & Hospital, Lucknow

Dr. Mariyam Ali
Professor, Department Of Prosthodontics And Crown & Bridge, Career Post Graduate Institute Of Dental Science & Hospital, Lucknow

Dr. Pratibha Katiyar
Professor, Department Of Prosthodontics And Crown & Bridge, Career Post Graduate Institute Of Dental Science & Hospital, Lucknow

Dr. Ankita Pandey
Junior Resident, Department Of Prosthodontics And Crown & Bridge, Career Post Graduate Institute Of Dental Science & Hospital, Lucknow

Abstract
Zirconia has undergone a remarkable transformation over the past two decades, evolving from a structurally strong yet optically limited framework material into a versatile, aesthetically refined ceramic that now serves as the foundation for a wide spectrum of fixed prosthodontic restorations. This review synthesises findings from peer-reviewed literature and current clinical practice to provide a comprehensive account of zirconia's compositional diversity, microstructural underpinnings, mechanical and optical trade-offs, processing advancements, and clinical indications. Special emphasis is placed on the generational evolution from yttria-stabilized tetragonal zirconia polycrystals (Y-TZP) through to composition-gradient multilayered systems, and on emerging processing technologies including high-speed sintering and additive manufacturing. A summary of clinical selection criteria and practical recommendations for prosthodontists and dental technicians is also provided.
Keywords: *dental zirconia, Y-TZP, PSZ, translucency, sintering, monolithic restoration, prosthodontics, CAD/CAM*

Date of Submission: 01-07-2026 | Date of Acceptance: 10-07-2026

I. Introduction

The incorporation of zirconia into contemporary restorative dentistry represents one of the most consequential materials science advances in oral healthcare over the past quarter century. Since the introduction of three mole percent yttria-stabilized tetragonal zirconia polycrystals (3Y-TZP) as a dental biomaterial, the field has progressed at a pace that has repeatedly outpaced clinical guidelines, demanding that practitioners continuously update their understanding of the material they prescribe.

In 2008, landmark reviews by Denry and Kelly established the foundational scientific framework for dental zirconia and collectively attracted over 2,300 citations within fifteen years, reflecting the breadth of subsequent research activity.(1,2) By 2023, the landscape had shifted dramatically: a literature search using the terms 'dental' and 'zirconia' returned over 5,100 publications, catalogued across more than 31 distinct research categories. Among these, translucent zirconia commanded the single largest body of literature, with 638 dedicated studies, underscoring the clinical and commercial pressure to reconcile zirconia's formidable mechanical properties with the aesthetic demands of contemporary patients.(3)

This review presents an integrated account of zirconia's evolution — from its crystal chemistry and toughening mechanisms to its generational compositional developments, processing technologies, and evidence-based clinical applications — with the aim of equipping both researchers and practising clinicians with a current and actionable knowledge base.

II. Crystal Chemistry And Toughening Mechanism Of Zirconia

Zirconium dioxide (ZrO_2) exists naturally in three polymorphic forms that are thermodynamically stable across distinct temperature ranges. At room temperature, zirconia adopts a monoclinic structure that transforms to tetragonal between 1,170°C and 2,370°C, and finally to cubic above 2,370°C. Because neither the monoclinic phase's toughness nor the cubic phase's optical isotropy alone meet the demands of load-bearing dental applications, stabilising the tetragonal phase at room temperature through cation doping has been the defining strategy of modern dental zirconia design.

When divalent or trivalent metal cations — most prevalently yttrium (Y^{3+}) — are substituted for Zr^{4+} in the lattice, the size disparity introduces oxygen vacancies that reduce crystal symmetry constraints, allowing the tetragonal phase to persist in a metastable state at ambient temperatures. Under localised tensile or shear stress at a crack tip, metastable tetragonal grains undergo a stress-induced martensitic transformation to the monoclinic form. Since the monoclinic unit cell occupies approximately 4.5% greater volume, the transformation generates compressive stresses that effectively impede crack propagation — a mechanism referred to as transformation toughening, first described by Garvie et al. in their seminal 1975 paper 'Ceramic Steel.' [4]

The stress-induced tetragonal-to-monoclinic transformation is analogous to a built-in crack arrest mechanism, making zirconia one of the few ceramics that actively responds to mechanical damage rather than failing catastrophically.

This self-protecting character qualifies Y-TZP as a 'smart material' under the accepted definition of materials whose properties change in a controlled, stimulus-responsive manner. However, the same metastability renders Y-TZP susceptible to low-temperature degradation (LTD) when exposed to moisture, particularly at temperatures between 100°C and 400°C, where spontaneous surface transformation can occur without mechanical provocation. This limitation has informed alumina-doping strategies and phase-ratio engineering across successive generations of the material.[5]

III. Generational Evolution Of Dental Zirconia

The history of dental zirconia can be organized into four compositional-microstructural generations, each representing a deliberate response to the limitations of its predecessor.

First Generation: High-Alumina 3Y-TZP

The earliest commercially viable dental zirconia was dominated by 3 mol% yttria-stabilised tetragonal zirconia polycrystals containing approximately 0.25 wt% alumina. Alumina serves a dual function: it improves powder sinterability and suppresses LTD by forming a protective grain-boundary phase. The resulting microstructure consists of equiaxed tetragonal grains maintained within a size range of 0.2–1 μm — a constraint essential to preserving tetragonal phase stability. Density exceeding 96% of theoretical values is routinely achieved through conventional cold isostatic pressing (CIP) followed by sintering at temperatures of 1,350–1,600°C.

The mechanical properties of first-generation Y-TZP are outstanding: flexural strength routinely reaches 1,000–1,400 MPa, and fracture toughness values of approximately 5 MPa·m½ place it among the toughest dental ceramics ever produced.[2] Its clinical limitation was, paradoxically, its microstructure: the alumina inclusions and anisotropic birefringence of tetragonal crystals scatter light heavily, yielding a total transmittance of only 12–15% and an appearance too opaque for monolithic anterior use. This necessitated veneering with feldspathic porcelain or glass-ceramics, which introduced a new failure mode — ceramic chipping — and required greater tooth reduction to accommodate the bilayer architecture.[1]

Second Generation: Low-Alumina 3Y-TZP

Recognition that alumina particles were the dominant source of grain-boundary light scattering prompted the development of powders with alumina content reduced from 0.25 wt% to below 0.05 wt%. Tosoh's Zpex powder, retaining 3 mol% yttria, exemplified this approach and yielded an improvement of up to 28% in light transmittance for 1 mm specimens relative to first-generation materials. Mechanical strength remained comparable at approximately 1,000–1,200 MPa.[6] Commercial products from this generation include Lava Plus (3M), Cercon ht (Dentsply Sirona), Vita YZ HT, Prettau Zirconia, and IPS e.max ZirCAD MO/LT.

Despite the measurable gain in translucency, clinical uptake for highly aesthetic monolithic applications was limited. The perceived improvement was insufficient to displace the well-established bilayer paradigm, and further microstructural intervention was required.

Third Generation: Partially Stabilised Zirconia (4Y- and 5Y-PSZ)

The decisive translucency breakthrough came through phase-diagram engineering: increasing yttria content beyond 3 mol% progressively stabilises the optically isotropic cubic phase, which does not exhibit the birefringent scattering of tetragonal crystals. The trade-off is mechanical: cubic grains cannot participate in transformation toughening, and their fraction increases at the expense of toughness and strength.[7]

4Y-PSZ, produced from Tosoh's Zpex4 powder, introduces approximately 25–30% cubic phase while retaining a predominantly tetragonal matrix. Flexural strength decreases to 900–1,000 MPa but translucency improves by roughly 10% compared to low-alumina 3Y-TZP. The 5Y-PSZ materials (Zpex Smile powder) contain 50–80% cubic phase, yielding a near-30% gain in translucency but a substantial strength reduction to 600–800 MPa. The Weibull modulus decreases with rising yttria content — from approximately 9.2 for 3Y-TZP to 4.9 for 5Y-PSZ — underscoring the increased mechanical variability of higher-translucency formulations.(8)

Beyond 5 mol% yttria (e.g., Katana Zirconia UT, Shofu Disk ZR Lucent Ultra), up to 60% gains in transmittance relative to second-generation materials are achievable.(9) The Shofu product, released in 2021, achieves 5Y-PSZ-equivalent strength (~750 MPa) at above-5-mol% yttria through cyclic cold isostatic pressing and a 'Plus Y' surface-enrichment technology in which semi-sintered blocks are immersed in an yttrium-containing solution to increase surface yttria concentration differentially.

Table 1. Comparative summary of dental zirconia generations

Generation	Yttria Content	Key Feature	Flexural Strength (MPa)	Clinical Use
1st (High-Al 3Y-TZP)	3 mol%	High alumina, high strength	1,000–1,400	Bridges, posterior crowns
2nd (Low-Al 3Y-TZP)	3 mol%	Reduced alumina, modest translucency	1,000–1,200	Monolithic posterior, veneered anterior
3rd-A (4Y-PSZ)	4 mol%	Mixed tetragonal-cubic, balanced	900–1,000	Universal crowns and bridges
3rd-B (5Y-PSZ)	5 mol%	High cubic fraction, high translucency	600–800	Anterior crowns, veneers
3rd-C (>5 mol%)	>5 mol%	Ultra-high translucency	500–750	Aesthetic single units
4th (Gradient)	3Y→5Y gradient	Graded strength and translucency	Variable by zone	Universal, full arch

Fourth Generation: Composition-Gradient Multilayered Zirconia

The most recent generational advance addresses the fundamental strength-translucency compromise by distributing different zirconia compositions across the thickness of a single CAD/CAM blank, allowing clinicians to orient restorations such that the high-strength 3Y-TZP zone resists tensile bending forces while the high-translucency 5Y-PSZ zone occupies incisal or occlusal areas.(7)

Common configurations include three-layer systems pairing a 3Y-TZP base, a 4Y-PSZ intermediate layer, and a 5Y-PSZ enamel layer (e.g., Prettau 3 Dispersive, Lucent Supra, Cercon xt ML, Katana YML). Ivoclar's IPS e.max ZirCAD Prime exemplifies true gradient technology, with yttria content transitioning continuously from a 3Y-TZP base to a 5Y-PSZ apex across two-thirds of the block height, eliminating abrupt compositional interfaces.

The multilayer manufacturing approach can reduce overall restoration strength by up to 30% compared to single-layer counterparts due to interfacial defects introduced during incremental powder pressing.(10) Zone thicknesses vary substantially across manufacturers — from 1.3 mm to 6 mm for the translucent enamel layer — making strict adherence to manufacturer orientation guidance during CAD design non-negotiable.

IV. Processing Technologies

Powder Technology and Compaction

All commercial dental zirconia begins as chemically synthesised powder produced through co-precipitation to ensure homogeneous yttria distribution. Cold isostatic pressing (CIP) at 200–250 MPa remains the industry standard for compacting powder into CAD/CAM blanks. Inadequately dispersed agglomerates or incomplete packing generate internal voids that survive sintering and act as critical flaw origins in the final restoration.(3)

Manufacturers address agglomeration through chlorination, hydrolysis, calcination, spray drying, and organic binders. Colloidal processing techniques — pH modification, optimised dispersant use, ball milling, and ultrasonication — further improve green body density. Despite these measures, quality variations across commercially obtained blanks are documented because each manufacturer independently performs compaction from a common powder source.(3)

Conventional and Speed Sintering

Conventional sintering follows heating and cooling rates of 5–10°C per minute with dwell times of two to five hours at peak temperatures between 1,350°C and 1,600°C, resulting in total cycle times of 8–12 hours. Speed-sintering protocols, exemplified by Dentsply Sirona's SpeedFire furnace, reduce the total cycle to approximately 25 minutes by increasing peak temperature by roughly 70°C while limiting the hold time to two minutes.

Speed sintering can yield flexural strength values equivalent to or higher than conventional cycles, partly because shorter dwell times limit grain growth.(3) However, isolated pores left by abbreviated sintering increase light scattering and compromise translucency without affecting strength. Microwave sintering similarly reduces sintering time by approximately six-fold but incurs a comparable translucency penalty due to elevated residual porosity.

Post-Sintering Hot Isostatic Pressing (HIP)

Hot isostatic pressing applies inert gas pressure (100–300 MPa argon or nitrogen) at temperatures 100–200°C below peak sintering to close sub-surface pores. While HIP has demonstrated benefits in zirconia-toughened alumina composites, its efficacy for dental zirconia is limited: a small additional densification of ~0.1% is achievable, but critically-sized subsurface flaws of 10–60 μm arising from incompletely fractured CIP agglomerates cannot be healed regardless of temperature or pressure applied.(11)

Additive Manufacturing

Three-dimensional printing of zirconia has attracted significant research interest as a means of reducing material waste and enabling complex geometries. Vat photopolymerisation methods — stereolithography (SLA) and digital light processing (DLP) — dominate the published literature, comprising 68 studies. These approaches cure consecutive layers of a zirconia–photopolymer slurry, followed by debinding at 200–500°C and high-temperature sintering.(12)

Additively manufactured zirconia consistently exhibits lower flexural strength than milled counterparts due to layer-interface fractures, surface irregularities from build-platform separation, and pore aggregation. Interlayer light scattering further impairs translucency. Additive manufacturing of dental zirconia remains a technology in development requiring additional research before it can be considered clinically equivalent to subtractive techniques.(12)

V. Polychromic Zirconia And Coloring Considerations

The next commercial development after translucency was the introduction of colour gradients through incremental addition of pigment-doped layers, producing polychromic materials that more closely simulate the cervical-to-incisal shade transition of natural dentition without requiring external staining beyond glaze application.

Coloring agents — typically oxides of cerium, iron, erbium, and bismuth — are incorporated either by mixing with starting powder or by infiltrating pre-sintered blanks with rare-earth chloride solutions. At higher concentrations, studies document increased grain size, elevated porosity (up to ten times the control level when chloride solutions are used), and reduced fracture load. Immersion time in coloring solutions must be kept to manufacturers' recommended durations.(13)

Polychromic zirconia streamlines the laboratory workflow by embedding the shade gradient into the blank itself, but the layered manufacturing approach imposes a measurable strength penalty compared to monochromatic blocks of equivalent composition.

VI. Clinical Applications And Material Selection

The proliferation of zirconia types has created a material-selection landscape of considerable complexity. A rational, evidence-guided framework for matching material generation to clinical indication is essential.(14,15)

3Y-TZP and Low-Alumina 3Y-TZP

These materials retain the highest mechanical reliability and are the preferred choice wherever structural demands predominate: posterior multi-unit fixed partial dentures, implant frameworks, cantilever bridges, full-arch rehabilitations, and restorations for patients with parafunctional habits such as bruxism. Their residual opacity constrains use to posterior regions or as frameworks requiring veneering in visible zones.

4Y-PSZ

The intermediate mechanical and optical profile of 4Y-PSZ positions it as a genuinely universal material for both single crowns and short-span bridges in anterior and posterior regions. It offers sufficient translucency for acceptable anterior aesthetics in a monolithic form while retaining strength values adequate for connector areas.

5Y-PSZ and Above-5-Mol% Materials

These materials are indicated for single unit anterior crowns, veneers, and occlusal veneers in patients without significant parafunctional loading. Their optical properties approach those of lithium disilicate glass-ceramics. Multi-unit use should be restricted to cases where connector cross-sections can be maximised to compensate for reduced strength.

Gradient and Multilayered Blanks

Fourth-generation gradient materials offer location-dependent optimisation of strength and translucency within a single restoration. They are particularly advantageous for long-span anterior bridges where incisal translucency and connector integrity must be simultaneously achieved. Correct orientation within the CAD blank is non-negotiable and must be verified against manufacturer documentation.[10]

Table 2. Clinical indication guide by zirconia generation

Zirconia Type	Anterior Single Crown	Posterior Crown	Short-Span FPD	Full-Arch / Implant
High-Al 3Y-TZP	Not indicated (opaque)	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Low-Al 3Y-TZP	Framework only (veneer required)	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
4Y-PSZ	Good (monolithic)	Excellent	Good	With caution
5Y-PSZ	Excellent	Good	Limited	Not recommended
>5 mol% PSZ	Excellent	Acceptable	Not recommended	Not recommended
Gradient 3–5Y	Excellent (if oriented correctly)	Excellent	Excellent	Supported by evidence

VII. Surface Finishing And Wear Considerations

Polished zirconia surfaces demonstrate favourable wear characteristics toward opposing enamel. Conversely, glazed zirconia substantially increases wear of opposing enamel when the glaze degrades under clinical service.[14] Intraoral examination of monolithic zirconia restorations after ten months of function shows characteristic glaze microcracking and delamination, exposing underlying zirconia grains — strongly supporting polishing over glazing as the finishing method of choice for occlusal surfaces.

Post-processing adjustments with rotary instruments induce surface compressive stresses through the stress-induced tetragonal-to-monoclinic transformation, which can strengthen the surface layer. However, excessive grinding without subsequent polishing leaves a roughened surface that increases opposing wear and creates stress-riser defects. All chairside adjustments should be followed by thorough polishing with zirconia-compatible diamond instruments.

VIII. Future Directions

Refinements to speed-sintering protocols that minimise residual porosity without sacrificing translucency represent an immediate priority as chair-side CAD/CAM workflows expand. Additive manufacturing requires substantial materials and process development before parity with subtractive techniques is achievable, but the potential for zero-waste fabrication justifies continued investment.[12]

Nanostructured zirconia ceramics with grain sizes below 100 nm offer theoretical transmittance approaching that of glass-ceramics at clinically relevant thicknesses. Realising this in dense, fully sintered bodies remains technically challenging due to agglomeration-driven grain coarsening during densification. Novel colloidal processing and field-assisted sintering techniques may provide a viable pathway.[7]

The long-term clinical performance of gradient and multilayered formulations — including fatigue behaviour under cyclic loading and durability of compositional interfaces — requires prospective clinical data. Evidence-based updates to selection frameworks will depend on outcomes of multi-centre randomised controlled trials currently in progress.

IX. Conclusions

Dental zirconia has matured from a single-composition, structurally reliable but aesthetically limited material into a compositionally diverse family of ceramics spanning the full range of restorative demands. The key clinical takeaways from the current evidence base are summarised below:

- The pathway to improved translucency involves reducing alumina content and increasing yttria content, with each step yielding more cubic phase and proportionally lower mechanical strength.
- Fourth-generation gradient blanks enable within-restoration optimisation of strength and aesthetics, but correct orientation within the CAD block is essential to clinical success.
- Speed sintering is validated for strength, but translucency compromises must be factored into material selection when using this modality.
- Polishing is preferable to glazing for occlusal surfaces to minimise wear of opposing dentition.
- Additive manufacturing remains an emerging technology; subtractive milling continues to offer superior mechanical and optical reliability.
- The diversity of available materials demands continuous education on zirconia materials science, as improper selection can result in premature failure or compromised aesthetics.

As the evidence base matures and processing technologies continue to evolve, dental zirconia is poised to extend its clinical reach further — potentially into domains currently reserved for glass-ceramics and metal-based frameworks alike.

References

[1]. Denry I, Kelly JR. State Of The Art Of Zirconia For Dental Applications. Dent Mater. 2008;24(3):299–307.

[2]. Kelly JR, Denry I. Stabilized Zirconia As A Structural Ceramic: An Overview. Dent Mater. 2008;24(3):289–298.

[3]. Cesar PF, Miranda RBP, Santos KF, Scherrer SS, Zhang Y. Recent Advances In Dental Zirconia: 15 Years Of Material And Processing Evolution. Dent Mater. 2024;40(5):824–836.

[4]. Garvie RC, Hannink RH, Pascoe RT. Ceramic Steel. Nature. 1975;258:703–704.

[5]. Chevalier J, Gremillard L, Virkar AV, Clarke DR. The Tetragonal-Monoclinic Transformation In Zirconia: Lessons Learned And Future Trends. J Am Ceram Soc. 2009;92(9):1901–1920.

[6]. Zhang Y. Making Yttria-Stabilized Tetragonal Zirconia Translucent. Dent Mater. 2014;30(10):1195–1203.

[7]. Zhang Y, Lawn BR. Novel Zirconia Materials In Dentistry. J Dent Res. 2018;97(2):140–147.

[8]. Lim CH, Vardhaman S, Reddy N, Zhang Y. Composition, Processing, And Properties Of Biphasic Zirconia Bioceramics: Relationship To Competing Strength And Optical Properties. Ceram Int. 2022;48(12):17095–17103.

[9]. Ban S. Development And Characterization Of Ultra-High Translucent Zirconia Using New Manufacturing Technology. Dent Mater J. 2023;42(1):1–10.

[10]. Kaizer MR, Kolakarnprasert N, Rodrigues C, Chai H, Zhang Y. Probing The Interfacial Strength Of Novel Multi-Layer Zirconias. Dent Mater. 2020;36(1):60–67.

[11]. Scherrer SS, Cattani-Lorente M, Yoon S, Karvonen L, Pokrant S, Rothbrust F, Et Al. Post-Hot Isostatic Pressing: A Healing Treatment For Process Related Defects And Laboratory Grinding Damage Of Dental Zirconia? Dent Mater. 2013;29(8):E180–E190.

[12]. Branco AC, Colaco R, Figueiredo-Pina CG, Serro AP. Recent Advances On 3D-Printed Zirconia-Based Dental Materials: A Review. Materials. 2023;16(5):1860.

[13]. Ban S. Classification And Properties Of Dental Zirconia As Implant Fixtures And Superstructures. Materials. 2021;14(17):4879.

[14]. Vijan K. Emerging Trends And Clinical Recommendations For Zirconia Ceramic Crowns: A Concise Review. Br Dent J. 2024;237:28–32.

[15]. Bonfante EA, Calamita M, Bergamo ETP. Indirect Restorative Systems — A Narrative Review. J Esthet Restor Dent. 2023;35:84–104.