

Contemporary Esthetic Principles in Fixed Partial Denture: A Narrative Review

Dr. Vidhi Ahuja¹, Dr. Rajesh Kumar², Dr. Sunil Kumar MV³

¹Postgraduate Student, Department of Prosthodontics, Crown and Bridge, Jaipur Dental College, Maharaj Vinayak Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

²Head of Department, Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Crown and Bridge, Jaipur Dental College, Maharaj Vinayak Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

³Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Crown and Bridge, Jaipur Dental College, Maharaj Vinayak Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

Esthetic rehabilitation with fixed partial dentures (FPDs) requires integration of biological, functional and optical principles to reproduce a restoration that is harmonious with the remaining dentition and surrounding facial structures. Although replacement of missing teeth traditionally focused on restoration of function and preservation of the dental arch, contemporary prosthodontics places increasing emphasis on facially driven esthetic treatment planning, soft-tissue architecture, tooth morphology, restorative materials and patient expectations. Esthetic success is therefore determined not only by the artificial tooth itself but by its relationship with adjacent teeth, gingiva, lips and face.

This narrative review discusses the fundamental principles governing esthetic fixed partial denture therapy, including composition, unity, symmetry, balance, dominance, proportion, repeated ratios, tooth arrangement and optical illusion. Facial, dental and gingival factors relevant to esthetic diagnosis are described, with emphasis on facial and dental midlines, incisal edge position, tooth proportions, axial inclination, gingival zenith, gingival symmetry, contact areas and embrasures. The importance of comprehensive diagnosis and treatment planning, diagnostic preview, patient participation and digital visualization is also discussed. Conventional, cantilever and resin-bonded fixed dental prostheses are considered together with the selection of restorative materials and the influence of CAD/CAM technologies. Particular attention is given to pontic design and the pontic–ridge relationship because these factors directly influence esthetics, cleansability and periodontal health. Successful esthetic rehabilitation requires individualized integration of dentofacial characteristics, restorative materials, function, biology and patient expectations rather than rigid application of mathematical ideals.

Keywords: Esthetic dentistry; Fixed partial denture; Smile design; Dental esthetics; Pontic design; Gingival esthetics; Dental ceramics; CAD/CAM.

1. Introduction

Edentulous spaces may result from caries, periodontal disease, trauma or congenital absence of teeth. Replacement is important for restoration of function, maintenance of tooth position and occlusal relationships, phonetics and appearance. Failure to replace a missing tooth may be accompanied by drifting

or tilting of adjacent teeth, supraeruption of opposing teeth and loss of proximal contacts, potentially disturbing occlusion and the supporting tissues ^[1,2].

A fixed dental prosthesis is securely retained by natural teeth, tooth roots and/or dental implants and cannot be removed by the patient. In a conventional tooth-supported FPD, the major components are the abutments, retainers, connectors and pontic ^[1,2]. The primary objective is not merely replacement of the missing tooth but restoration of function and preservation of a harmonious dental arch while satisfying the patient's esthetic expectations ^[1,2].

Anterior FPD therapy presents a particular challenge because the restoration is evaluated within a dynamic dentofacial environment. Tooth position, form, color, surface texture, gingival architecture, negative spaces, lip position and facial reference lines collectively influence the final appearance. Consequently, esthetic fixed prosthodontics should be approached as dentofacial rehabilitation rather than isolated tooth replacement.

2. Evolution of Esthetic Fixed Prosthodontics

The history of fixed prosthodontics demonstrates a progressive transition from mechanically replacing missing teeth to reproducing natural anatomy and appearance. Early dental prostheses used natural or animal teeth, ivory, bone, gold wires and bands. Etruscan restorations included early gold fixed partial dentures, while subsequent developments introduced soldered frameworks, gold shell crowns and increasingly sophisticated artificial teeth ^[3].

The introduction and development of porcelain, dental alloys, resin materials and contemporary ceramics progressively expanded the esthetic possibilities of fixed prosthodontics. The modern emphasis is no longer limited to replacing a missing tooth; instead, treatment seeks to reproduce the relationship among teeth, soft tissues and facial structures. The historical development of restorative materials therefore parallels the increasing importance of esthetics in fixed prosthodontics.

3. Esthetics in Fixed Partial Denture Therapy

Esthetic dentistry may be defined as the art and science of dentistry applied to create or enhance beauty within functional and physiological limitations ^[5]. Dental esthetics is subjective and is influenced by the patient's expectations, cultural background, facial characteristics and perception. The source draft emphasizes that the clinician's objective is to create a pleasing composition in which teeth are arranged in appropriate proportion and relation to the gingiva, lips and face ^[4].

The appearance zone generally comprises the anterior and premolar region visible during smiling. Its dimensions are influenced by mouth size, smile width, tooth dimensions, lip morphology and the patient's self-perception ^[4]. The esthetic challenge is therefore to create harmony between the visible dental structures and the surrounding facial framework rather than to reproduce a predetermined ideal.

4. Principles of Esthetic Dentofacial Composition

The major principles described in the source include composition, unity, symmetry, cohesive and segregative forces, dominance, balance, lines, proportion and repeated ratios [4,5]. These concepts provide a framework for analyzing how individual dental elements contribute to the overall visual composition.

4.1 Composition and unity

Composition describes the relationship among visible elements through differences and similarities in color, line and texture. It may be considered at dental, dentofacial and facial levels. Unity produces a sense

of wholeness between the teeth and facial structures, whereas controlled variation prevents an artificial, repetitive appearance ^[4].

4.2 Symmetry and balance

Symmetry contributes to visual stability, but natural dentitions commonly exhibit subtle asymmetries. Contemporary esthetic planning therefore seeks visual balance rather than exact bilateral duplication. In the anterior region, the dental midline, central incisor form, gingival margins, incisal embrasures and incisal plane contribute to this balance ^[4].

4.3 Dominance and lines

Dominance refers to the visual prominence of selected elements within the composition. In the anterior dentition, central incisors commonly contribute strongly to visual dominance. Dental lines include the facial and dental midlines, incisal plane, occlusal plane and long axes of teeth. Their orientation influences the perceived harmony of the smile ^[4,5].

4.4 Proportion and golden proportion

Proportion provides a numerical method for describing relationships among dental structures. The golden proportion, approximately 0.618, has been incorporated into dental esthetics through the work of Lombardi and Levin. Levin described apparent anterior tooth-width relationships when the dentition is viewed from the front ^[5,6]. However, the source also reports considerable natural variation and evidence against rigidly correlating tooth form with facial form. Mathematical proportions should therefore be used as diagnostic guides rather than absolute requirements ^[4,6,7].

4.5 Tooth proportion

The width-to-length ratio of the maxillary central incisor is an important parameter in anterior esthetics. The source describes approximately 75–80% as a commonly used clinical range, while also reporting broader natural variation ^[4]. Tooth dimensions should be interpreted together with gingival levels, lip position, adjacent teeth and facial characteristics rather than in isolation.

5. Dentofacial Factors in Esthetic Diagnosis

The source organizes esthetic diagnosis around four broad concepts: frame and reference, proportion and idealism, symmetry, and perception and illusion. These concepts can be assessed through facial, dental, gingival and physical components ^[4].

5.1 Facial reference lines

The interpupillary line provides an important horizontal facial reference, while the facial midline provides a principal vertical reference. The orientation of the maxillary incisal plane and gingival contours should be assessed in relation to these references. The upper and lower lips also provide important information about tooth position and smile dynamics ^[4,8].

5.2 Lip support and incisal edge position

The position of the maxillary anterior teeth contributes to lip support and smile display. The relationship between the maxillary incisal edges and the lower lip during speech provides a useful functional reference. In particular, F and V sounds assist assessment of incisal edge position, whereas M sounds can be used to evaluate incisal display at rest. S and Z sounds provide information about anterior speaking space and vertical relationships ^[4,9].

5.3 Dental midline

The dental midline should be evaluated in relation to the facial midline. The source emphasizes that minor mediolateral discrepancies may be acceptable, whereas vertical orientation and the overall visual relation-

ship are more critical to the perception of harmony ^[4,10].

5.4 Tooth morphology and axial inclination

Anterior tooth forms have historically been classified as square, ovoid and tapered. Williams' concepts and Berry's biometric ratio attempted to relate tooth form to facial form, while Frush and Fisher introduced the dentogenic concept based on sex, age and personality ^[4,7]. However, the draft acknowledges that rigid correlations between facial form and tooth form have been challenged. Therefore, tooth morphology should be selected by integrating existing dentition, facial characteristics, patient preference and the overall composition.

Natural anterior teeth demonstrate variations in axial inclination. Moderate, harmonious deviations may contribute to naturalness, whereas excessive or conflicting inclinations may create visual tension. The long axes should therefore be evaluated collectively rather than as isolated angles ^[4].

5.5 Tooth arrangement, contact areas and embrasures

Tooth arrangement should provide appropriate lip support, phonetics and function. Contact areas generally progress cervically from the central incisors toward the canine region. The shape and position of proximal contacts influence the form of interdental embrasures and the appearance of the papillae ^[4].

The emergence profile, contact area, interproximal tooth form and root relationship all influence the appearance and accessibility of the embrasure. A balance is therefore required between esthetic closure and access for oral hygiene ^[4].

5.6 Surface texture and optical characteristics

Natural tooth appearance depends on three-dimensional surface morphology and light interaction. Grooves, ridges, facets, perikymata and other surface features influence the way light is reflected or scattered. Reproduction of appropriate surface texture is therefore important when fabricating an anterior FPD ^[4].

6. Gingival Esthetics

Dental and gingival esthetics are inseparable in anterior fixed prosthodontics. Gingival margin levels influence apparent crown dimensions and therefore directly affect perceived tooth proportion ^[11]. Important parameters include gingival margin position, gingival contour, gingival zenith, interdental papillae, tissue thickness and symmetry.

The gingival zenith represents the most apical point of the gingival scallop. Its mesiodistal and apicocoronal position contributes to the visual form of the anterior teeth. The zeniths of adjacent teeth should be assessed collectively rather than according to a rigid isolated measurement ^[4,12].

Gingival asymmetry may make otherwise appropriately proportioned restorations appear too long, too short or uneven. Periodontal procedures may therefore be required before definitive prosthetic treatment. Subtractive procedures such as crown lengthening can modify excessive gingival display or establish appropriate restorative dimensions, whereas additive procedures such as connective tissue grafting or coronally positioned flaps can improve deficient soft-tissue contours ^[13,14].

7. Diagnosis and Treatment Planning

A meticulous esthetic diagnosis followed by a defined treatment plan is the foundation of predictable treatment. The plan should consider treatment sequencing, cost, time, function, maintenance and expected esthetic outcomes ^[1,2].

Extraoral evaluation should include facial proportions, smile line, lip dynamics, facial midline and negative spaces. Intraoral examination should evaluate tooth morphology, shade, existing restorations, periodontal health, occlusion, tooth position and the dimensions of the edentulous space. Photographs provide valuable documentation of the smile frame, lip line, gingival asymmetry and midline relationships and facilitate laboratory communication ^[1,2].

A comprehensive soft-tissue assessment is particularly important for FPD planning. The position and morphology of the tongue and lips influence phonetics and tooth arrangement, while the quality and quantity of tissue over the edentulous ridge influence pontic placement and emergence profile ^[1,2].

7.1 Diagnostic preview

Diagnostic wax-up, mock-up and digital visualization allow the proposed tooth arrangement and morphology to be assessed before definitive treatment. Computer imaging can demonstrate changes in tooth arrangement, form, shape and color and can facilitate communication among the clinician, patient and laboratory ^[1,2].

The provisional restoration is also a valuable diagnostic tool. It allows assessment of incisal edge position, phonetics, tooth contour, occlusal relationships and pontic form before definitive fabrication. Pretreatment evaluation of pontics can further improve esthetic predictability and patient communication ^[19,21].

7.2 Treatment sequence

The source describes a sequence for comprehensive bioesthetic rehabilitation beginning with diagnosis and patient education, followed by periodontal therapy, stabilization of craniomandibular relationships, anterior rehabilitation, posterior rehabilitation and regular maintenance ^[1,2]. This emphasizes that esthetics should be incorporated into comprehensive prosthodontic treatment rather than treated as an isolated cosmetic objective.

8. Treatment Modalities

The choice of treatment modality depends on the number and location of missing teeth, abutment condition, periodontal status, occlusal requirements, available space, esthetic demands and patient preference ^[1,2].

8.1 Conventional fixed partial dentures

A conventional FPD generally uses retainers on abutment teeth with an intervening pontic. It remains a commonly used option when adjacent teeth require full-coverage restorations or are suitable abutments. The design must provide adequate mechanical support without compromising periodontal or esthetic requirements ^[1,2].

8.2 Cantilever fixed partial dentures

A cantilever FPD is supported from one side of the edentulous space. Because loading produces greater leverage on the abutment, careful case selection and occlusal control are essential. Its use should be determined by the biomechanical requirements of the individual case rather than by esthetic considerations alone ^[1,2].

8.3 Resin-bonded fixed dental prostheses

Resin-bonded prostheses offer a conservative alternative because retention is obtained through bonded retainers rather than complete-coverage preparation. They can be useful when preservation of sound tooth structure is a major consideration and when adequate enamel, occlusal relationships and space are available ^[15].

9. Restorative Materials for Esthetic FPDs

Material selection must balance esthetics, strength, remaining tooth structure, interocclusal space, occlusal loading and prognosis. The source identifies glass ceramics, high-strength ceramics, metal-ceramic systems and metallic alloys as major material categories [16].

9.1 Metal–ceramic systems

Metal–ceramic restorations have been widely used in fixed prosthodontics because they combine a strong substructure with a veneering ceramic. Their long clinical history has made them an important reference against which newer restorative systems have been evaluated ^[16,17]. Their principal esthetic limitations may include the opacity required to mask the metal framework and possible soft-tissue discoloration when margin design and tissue thickness are unfavorable.

9.2 All-ceramic systems

All-ceramic systems provide optical properties that can closely reproduce natural tooth appearance. The draft describes feldspathic, leucite-reinforced and lithium-disilicate glass ceramics, as well as alumina- and zirconia-based high-strength ceramics ^[16,18]. Material selection should be individualized according to the translucency of the adjacent tooth, the color of the substrate, the functional load and the required fracture resistance [16].

Highly translucent materials may be appropriate when the substrate is favorable and optical integration is the principal concern, whereas a more opaque or high-strength system may be required when the underlying tooth is discolored or when mechanical demands are greater. The material should therefore be selected only after both the optical and mechanical requirements have been analyzed ^[16].

9.3 Digital fabrication

CAD/CAM technologies have expanded the possibilities for designing and manufacturing fixed prostheses. Digital workflows allow virtual design, controlled morphology and reproducible fabrication and can be combined with contemporary ceramic materials such as zirconia and lithium disilicate [16]. The draft also discusses additive manufacturing and 3D printing as emerging technologies capable of producing customized prosthetic components ^[16].

10. Pontic Design and Esthetics

The pontic is the artificial tooth portion of an FPD that replaces the missing natural tooth. An appropriate pontic must satisfy esthetic, biological, functional, phonetic and maintenance requirements ^[19]. Pontic design is therefore not simply an exercise in reproducing tooth anatomy; it must account for the residual ridge, soft tissues, cleansability, occlusion and visibility of the edentulous space.

10.1 Residual ridge form

Seibert classified residual ridge defects according to the dimensions of tissue loss: Class I represents loss of ridge width with normal ridge height; Class II represents loss of ridge height with normal ridge width; and Class III represents loss in both dimensions. The severity and direction of ridge deficiency influence pontic design and may determine the need for soft-tissue or hard-tissue augmentation before definitive prosthetic treatment ^[19,20].

10.2 Ridge-lap pontic

The conventional ridge-lap or saddle pontic provides broad tissue contact and can reproduce the appearance of a natural tooth from the facial aspect. However, its concave tissue surface can compromise cleansability and encourage plaque accumulation. For this reason, contemporary practice generally favors designs that provide a convex, accessible tissue surface where clinical circumstances permit ^[19,21].

10.3 Modified ridge-lap pontic

The modified ridge-lap pontic combines facial esthetics with improved access for oral hygiene by limiting tissue contact to the facial aspect while maintaining a convex lingual contour. It is frequently considered when both appearance and cleansability are required, particularly in visible anterior and premolar regions [19].

10.4 Ovate pontic

The ovate pontic is designed to extend into a soft-tissue depression and reproduce the emergence profile of a natural tooth. It can provide a highly natural appearance because the artificial crown appears to emerge from the gingiva. Its successful use depends on appropriate ridge form, tissue management, pontic contour and meticulous oral hygiene [19,21].

10.5 Hygienic or sanitary pontic

A hygienic or sanitary pontic does not contact the residual ridge and is primarily selected when cleansability and tissue clearance are more important than maximum tissue-level esthetics. It is generally more appropriate in posterior areas where the gingival portion of the pontic is less visible [19].

10.6 Pontic–tissue relationship

The tissue surface of a pontic should be smooth, appropriately contoured and accessible for oral hygiene. The relationship between the pontic and residual ridge is critical to both periodontal health and the illusion of natural emergence. Provisional restorations can be modified progressively to shape the soft tissues and establish the desired emergence profile before definitive fabrication [19,21].

11. Color and Optical Integration

Color matching is a major determinant of esthetic success in fixed prosthodontics. The appearance of a restoration depends on hue, chroma, value, translucency, surface texture and illumination. Metamerism may occur when two materials appear to match under one light source but differ under another because their spectral properties are not identical [22,23].

Shade selection should therefore be performed under controlled lighting and should consider the adjacent natural teeth, substrate color and optical characteristics of the selected restorative material. Surface texture and polishing also influence light reflection and should be reproduced as part of the final characterization [22,23].

12. Discussion

Esthetic fixed prosthodontics has progressed from a predominantly mechanical approach to a dentofacial approach in which tooth morphology, soft tissues, facial references, optical properties and patient expectations are considered together. The principles of composition, symmetry, balance, dominance and proportion provide useful frameworks for diagnosis, but they should not be interpreted as rigid formulas. The source material itself documents substantial natural variation in tooth proportions and facial relationships [4].

The golden proportion is a useful historical concept but should be treated cautiously. Natural dentitions do not consistently conform to a single mathematical ratio, and strict application can produce restorations that appear overly standardized. Individual facial form, existing tooth morphology and patient preference should therefore be considered when establishing anterior proportions [4,6,7].

Gingival architecture is equally important. A restoration with appropriate tooth form and color may still appear unnatural if the gingival zeniths, papillae, marginal levels or emergence profile are inappropriate.

This reinforces the importance of interdisciplinary planning between prosthodontics and periodontics when soft-tissue deficiencies compromise the proposed restoration ^[13,14].

Pontic design represents another major determinant of outcome. The ideal design must reconcile appearance, cleansability, tissue health, phonetics and function. The choice should be dictated by the visibility of the site, ridge anatomy, oral hygiene, available restorative space and the desired emergence profile rather than by a single universally preferred design ^[19-21].

Material selection similarly requires individualized decision-making. Metal–ceramic systems remain clinically important because of their mechanical performance, while contemporary ceramic systems provide increasingly sophisticated optical properties. The most appropriate material is the one that provides the required combination of strength, optical integration, tissue compatibility and clinical longevity for the specific case ^[16-18].

Digital technologies have further expanded diagnostic and restorative possibilities. Virtual design, CAD/CAM fabrication and additive manufacturing can improve communication and reproducibility, but the digital workflow remains dependent on sound biological, functional and esthetic diagnosis. Technology should therefore be viewed as an extension of prosthodontic principles rather than a substitute for them.

13. Conclusion

Esthetic fixed partial denture therapy is an integration of prosthodontic principles, visual perception, restorative material science, periodontal considerations and individualized patient-centered planning. Successful rehabilitation requires harmony between tooth form, proportion, position, gingival architecture, facial references, phonetics, occlusion and optical characteristics. Mathematical concepts such as the golden proportion can assist diagnosis but should not override natural variation or patient-specific requirements.

Comprehensive diagnosis, diagnostic preview, appropriate treatment sequencing, careful material selection and deliberate pontic design are central to predictable outcomes. Particular attention should be given to the pontic–ridge relationship and to the health and contour of the surrounding soft tissues. Contemporary CAD/CAM and digital technologies can further enhance communication and fabrication when integrated with sound clinical judgment.

Ultimately, the esthetic success of an FPD is achieved when the restoration appears to belong to the patient's existing dentofacial composition while maintaining biological health, functional stability and long-term maintainability.

References

1. Rosenstiel SF, Land MF, Fujimoto J. Contemporary fixed prosthodontics. 2nd ed. St Louis: Mosby-Year Book; 1995.
2. Shillingburg HT Jr, Hobo S, Whitsett LD, Jacobi R, Brackett SE. Fundamentals of fixed prosthodontics. 3rd ed. Chicago: Quintessence; 1997.
3. Johnson WW. The history of prosthetic dentistry. J Prosthet Dent. 1959;9(5):841-846.
4. Purnapriya B, Sudheer A, Ramakrishna M, et al. Principles for establishment of esthetics in fixed prosthodontics: a review. Int J Dent Med Sci Res. 2021;3(6):423-434.
5. Lombardi RE. Visual perception and dental esthetics. J Prosthet Dent. 1973;29:352-382.

6. Simon J. Using golden proportion in aesthetic treatment: a case report. *Dent Today*. 2024;23(9):82-84.
7. Vasantha Kumar M, Ahila SC, Suganya Devi S. The science of anterior teeth selection for a completely edentulous patient: a literature review. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc*. 2011;11(1):7-13.
8. Margossian P, Laborde G, Koubi S, Magne P. Determination of facial references for esthetic restorative treatment. *Int J Periodont Restor Dent*. 2021;41(1).
9. Borracchini A. Phonetic analysis and maxillary anterior tooth position. *J Int Dent S Afr*. 2009;11(5).
10. Miller EL, Bodden WR Jr, Jameson HT. A study of the relationship of the dental midline to the facial midline. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1979;41(6):657-660.
11. Simon Z. Challenge in achieving gingival harmony. *CDA J*. 2010;38:583-590.
12. Takei H, Yamada H, Hau T. Maxillary anterior esthetics: preservation of the interdental papilla. *Dent Clin North Am*. 1989;33(2):263-273.
13. Abduo J, Lyons K. Interdisciplinary interface between fixed prosthodontics and periodontics. *Periodontol 2000*. 2017;74:40-62.
14. Allen EP. Use of mucogingival surgical procedures to enhance esthetics. *Dent Clin North Am*. 1988;32:307-330.
15. Forbes-Haley C. An investigation into aspects of resin retained bridge design on aesthetics and oral health related outcomes [doctoral dissertation]. Bristol: University of Bristol.
16. Santos MJ, Costa MD, Rubo JH, Pegoraro LF, Santos GC Jr. Current all-ceramic systems in dentistry: a review. *Compend Contin Educ Dent*. 2015;36(1).
17. Guess PC, Schultheis S, Bonfante EA, Coelho PG, Ferencz JL, Silva NR. All-ceramic systems: laboratory and clinical performance. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2011;55(2):333-352.
18. Roberts HW, Berzins DW, Moore BK, Charlton DG. Metal-ceramic alloys in dentistry: a review. *J Prosthodont*. 2009;18(2):188-194.
19. Cavazos E Jr. Tissue response to fixed partial denture pontics. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1968;20:143-153.
20. Parkinson CF, Schaberg TV. Pontic design of posterior fixed partial prostheses: is it a microbial misadventure? *J Prosthet Dent*. 1984;51:51-54.
21. Howard WW, Ueno H, Pruitt CO. Standards of pontic design. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1982;47:493-495.
22. Sproull RC. Color matching in dentistry. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1973;29:556-566.
23. Okubo SR, Kanawati A, Richards MW, Childress S. Evaluation of visual and instrument shade matching. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1998;80(6):642-648.
24. Nohl FS, Steele JG, Wassell RW. Crowns and other extra-coronal restorations: aesthetic control. *Br Dent J*. 2002;192(8):443-450.