WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

'CUSP-FOSSA' RELATION V/S 'CUSP-MARGINAL RIDGE' RELATION- A REVIEW.

Dr. B. Lakshmana Rao

Prof & HOD, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, A.P.
Mail: kushulubathala@gmail.com

ABSTRACT :

When building fixed partial dentures (FPDs), the cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal interactions are crucial schemes that maximize function, stability, and load distribution. Because of its accurate axial force transmission and support for mutually protected occlusion, the cusp-fossa relationship—which is typified by tripod contacts where functional cusps occlude with opposing fossae—is perfect for single-unit crowns, short-span FPDs, and implant-supported restorations. Although this plan decreases wear, improves occlusal stability, and minimizes lateral strains, it necessitates careful construction and is less appropriate for abutments with compromised periodontal health. On the other hand, group function occlusion is supported by the cusp-marginal ridge relationship, which is present in 95% of natural dentitions and involves functional cusps occluding with the marginal ridges of neighboring opposing teeth. Because it distributes loads widely, accommodates anatomical variances, and makes fabrication easier, it is recommended for multi-unit FPDs and periodontally weakened abutments. If not properly fitted, its wider contacts could lead to increased wear and occlusal interferences. Both strategies perform well in CAD-CAM workflows, with cusp-marginal ridge taking use of design flexibility for load sharing and cusp-fossa utilizing digital accuracy for tripod connections. Clinical considerations such as restoration type, periodontal health, and occlusal demands influence the decision; none is inherently better. The literature is compiled in this abstract to help choose an occlusal scheme for FPDs, with a focus on biomechanical and clinical factors.

Key-Words: Cusp-Fossa Relationship; Cusp-Marginal Ridge Relationship; Fixed Prosthesis; Digital FPD.

Introduction:

The cusp-fossa occlusal idea describes an occlusal scheme in which, during centric occlusion (maximum intercuspation), the functional (supporting) cusps of one dental arch occlude with the fossae or central grooves of opposing teeth in the opposite arch. By reducing lateral stresses, promoting effective mastication, and distributing occlusal forces along the teeth's long axis, this configuration seeks to offer occlusal stability. Compared to the cusp-marginal ridge scheme, it is less common in the natural dentition (found in around 5% of the population), but it is thought to be the best option for restorative dentistry and orthodontics because it achieves a harmonious occlusion with the least amount of wear and the best distribution of force. The idea promotes posterior teeth disclusion during lateral or protrusive movements driven by anterior teeth or canines, and it places emphasis on tripod contacts, in which each functioning cusp makes three points of contact with the opposing fossa for stability. [1-3]

I.Cusp-Fossa Occlusal Concept [1-6]

Functional Cusps: The supporting cusps that occlude with opposing fossae are the mandibular buccal cusps and maxillary palatal (lingual) cusps.
The mandibular first molar's central fossa contains the distal buccal cusp of the mandibular first molar, while the maxillary first molar's mesiolingual cusp occludes in the mandibular first molar's central fossa.
Tripodal Contact: To reduce tooth wear and provide stability, each functioning cusp should ideally make three points of contact with the opposite fossa.
Occlusal Harmony: To avoid interferences and lateral strains, the plan encourages posterior disclusion during excursive motions (lateral or protrusive), guided by anterior teeth or canines.
Biomechanical Advantage: By directing occlusal forces parallel to the teeth's long axes, occlusal forces improve stability and lower the chance of temporomandibular joint (TMJ) problems or tooth damage.
Application: Although uncommon in the natural dentition, it is frequently utilized to restore stable occlusion in orthodontics, restorative dentistry, and full mouth rehabilitation.

Biomechanical Role

The routes of mandibular movement during chewing are determined by the cusp-fossa relationship, which aids in masticatory function. The degree and position of occlusal contacts, which are linked to jaw muscle activation, are determined by the morphology of the teeth. To evaluate both static and

dynamic occlusal contacts, the maximum amount of voluntary clenching and chewing movements is required. To attain occlusal harmony without interfering contacts, this idea is combined with concepts such as centric relation, centric occlusion, and mutually protected occlusion.

Clinical Significance

Dental Restorative Care: Because of its ease of use and capacity to balance occlusal stresses, the cusp-fossa system is recommended for single-unit restorations or comprehensive rehabilitations.

The field of orthodontics After treatment, posterior teeth should have a cusp-fossa relationship to guarantee a stable, static, and functional occlusion.

Selection of Materials: To preserve cusp-fossa relationships and endure occlusal stresses, restorative materials (such as zirconia and lithium disilicate) must resemble the morphology of natural teeth.

Restrictions

It is less indicative of the normal occlusion because it is only present in a limited percentage of natural dentitions. requires careful articulation and modification during restorative operations in order to prevent disruptions. Group function occlusion may be suggested for teeth with impaired periodontal health. [7]

Although the basic concepts of the cusp-fossa occlusal concept in natural teeth and fixed prostheses (bridges) are the same, their applications vary because each setting has unique biomechanical, anatomical, and material constraints. By lining up functional cusps with opposing fossae, both seek to create a stable occlusion that minimizes lateral strains and directs occlusal forces along the long axes of teeth or restorations. The artificial nature of fixed prostheses and their integration with implants or natural dentition, however, results in variations in design, implementation, and clinical considerations.

Indications [1-3]

Restorative Dentistry:
Ideal for single-unit crowns, fixed partial dentures (bridges), or full-mouth rehabilitations to achieve stable occlusion with minimal lateral forces. Used when restoring posterior teeth to ensure occlusal harmony and tripod contacts for force distribution.
Orthodontic Treatment:
Preferred in Class I occlusion cases to establish a stable posterior occlusion post-treatment. Suitable for patients requiring correction of malocclusion to achieve ideal occlusal contacts.
Implant-Supported Restorations:
Indicated for implant-supported crowns or bridges to direct forces along the implant axis, reducing the risk of bone resorption or implant failure.
Temporomandibular Joint (TMJ) Health:
Recommended for patients with healthy TMJ and minimal occlusal interferences to maintain joint stability and prevent TMJ disorders.
Aesthetic and Functional Rehabilitation:
Used in cases requiring precise occlusal design to balance aesthetics and function, especially in anterior guidance-driven occlusion.
Patients with Stable Occlusion:
Suitable for patients with minimal occlusal wear or periodontal compromise, where tripod contacts can be established without excessive adjustment.

Contraindications [4,6]

Periodontally Compromised Teeth:
Concentrated cusp-fossa contacts may worsen stress on compromised periodontium, hence they are not recommended for teeth with severe periodontal bone loss or movement.

Severe Malocclusion: Not recommended in cases of severe Class II or Class III malocclusions where it is not feasible to achieve cusp-fossa contacts without undergoing significant orthodontic or surgical treatment.

Bruxism or Parafunctional Habits: Patients who clench or bruxism excessively may put too much strain on their cusp-fossa contacts, which can result in TMJ problems, restorative fractures, or tooth deterioration.

Restricted Interocclusal Space: Not recommended in situations where there is not enough room to generate the right cusp-fossa morphology in restorations or where the vertical dimension is diminished.

Complex Full-Mouth Reconstructions: These can be difficult when several teeth need substantial restorations; in these situations, group function occlusion may be a better way to distribute stresses.

Implant Overload Risk: If occlusal forces in implant-supported prostheses cannot be precisely managed, cusp-fossa occlusion may not be appropriate, increasing the risk of implant failure.

Advantages [1,3,5-7]

Occlusal Stability:
Tripod contacts provide a stable occlusal platform, minimizing tooth mobility and ensuring even force distribution.
Efficient Force Transmission: Forces are directed along the long axes of teeth or restorations, reducing shear stresses and protecting periodontal or implant structures.
Minimized Interferences: Promotes posterior disclusion during excursive movements (guided by anterior or canine guidance), reducing the risk of occlusal interferences and TMJ stress.
Simplified Restorative Design: Easier to achieve in single-unit restorations or short-span bridges compared to group function, as it requires fewer contact points to equilibrate.
Reduced Wear:
Properly designed cusp-fossa contacts minimize wear on opposing natural teeth or restorations due to precise occlusal relationships.
Aesthetic and Functional Integration:
Supports mutually protected occlusion, enhancing aesthetics by allowing anterior teeth to guide excursive movements while protecting posterior restorations.

Disadvantages [7,8]

Rare in Natural Dentition: Found in only ~5% of natural dentitions, making it challenging to achieve without orthodontic or restorative intervention.
Precision Required:In fixed prostheses, achieving accurate cusp-fossa contacts demands meticulous laboratory fabrication and clinical adjustments, increasing time and cost.
Risk of Overloading: Concentrated tripod contacts may overload periodontally weak teeth or implants, especially in patients with parafunctional habits.
Material Limitations: Restorative materials (e.g., porcelain, zirconia) must be carefully contoured to avoid chipping or excessive wear on opposing teeth, which can be technically challenging.
Limited Applicability: Not suitable for all occlusal schemes, particularly in cases requiring group function to distribute forces across multiple teeth (e.g., periodontally compromised dentition).
Adjustment Challenges:
Incorrectly adjusted cusp-fossa contacts can lead to high spots, interferences, or restoration failure, requiring skilled clinical intervention.
Clinical Considerations [5-8]
Natural Teeth: The cusp-fossa scheme is ideal for stable dentitions but may require equilibration or orthodontic correction to achieve. It is less common naturally, so clinicians must assess whether it's feasible without excessive tooth modification.
Fixed Prostheses: The scheme is often preferred for its simplicity and stability in restorations but requires precise articulation and material selection to ensure longevity. Regular follow-up is needed to monitor for wear or failure.

The cusp-fossa occlusal relationship on the function and load distribution in Fixed prosthesis [1,2,4-8]

In fixed prostheses (such as crowns and bridges), the cusp-fossa occlusal relationship is a scheme in which the center grooves or fossae of opposing restorations or teeth in centric occlusion occlude with the functional cusps of one arch. Both function (mastication, occlusal stability, and excursive movements) and load distribution (force transmission to restorations, abutments, or implants) are greatly impacted by this configuration. The cusp-fossa plan seeks to increase stability, reduce lateral stresses, and guarantee prosthesis longevity by guiding occlusal pressures along the long axes of teeth or prosthetic components.

Effects on Function in Fixed Prostheses

Masticatory Efficiency:
Each functional cusp (such as the mandibular buccal or maxillary palatal cusps) makes three points of contact with the opposing fossa in the cusp-fossa relationship, which promotes solid tripod contacts and effective mastication. During chewing, this stability guarantees efficient food comminution. In order to avoid interferences and improve chewing efficiency, the plan promotes a mutually protected occlusion in which anterior teeth or canines direct excursive movements (lateral or protrusive), excluding posterior restorations.
By matching occlusal morphology with mandibular movement routes, Wang (2013) showed that cusp-fossa contacts in posterior teeth connect with particular patterns of jaw muscle activity, enhancing masticatory performance.
Occlusal Stability:
By maintaining occlusal harmony and minimizing restoration movement, tripod contacts in the cusp-fossa scheme lower the possibility of occlusal interferences that could impair function. Because it makes occlusal modifications easier and guarantees constant contact points during centric occlusion, the concept works especially well in single-unit crowns or short-span bridges.
In their description of cusp-fossa occlusion waxing procedures for fixed prosthesis, Patel et al. (2011) pointed out that accurate cusp and fossa contouring improves occlusal stability and functional harmony.
Guidance for Excursive Movement:
With anterior or canine guiding, the cusp-fossa design encourages posterior disclusion during lateral or protrusive movements. By lowering functional loads, posterior restorations are shielded against deterioration or breakage. By preventing interferences from non-working sides, proper excursive disclusion improves patient comfort and reduces the risk of temporomandibular joint (TMJ) strain.
Dawson (2007) highlighted how cusp-fossa occlusion in fixed prostheses improves functional occlusion by reducing lateral stresses during mandibular excursions when combined with anterior guiding.

Effects on Load Distribution in Fixed Prostheses

Axial Force Transmission:
In order to maximize load distribution and minimize shear or lateral strains, the cusp-fossa scheme guides occlusal pressures along the long axes of implants or abutment teeth. Axial loading in tooth-supported bridges reduces stress on the abutment teeth's periodontium, maintaining periodontal health. By lining up loads with the vertical axis of the implant, axial forces in implant-supported prostheses lessen the chance of bone resorption surrounding implants.
Cusp-fossa occlusion in fixed prostheses improves load distribution by concentrating forces via the central fossae and lowering off-axis stress, according to Rosenstiel et al. (2016).
Reduced Stress on Restorative Materials:
The cusp-fossa scheme reduces stress concentrations on restorative materials (such zirconia and porcelain) by aligning forces through tripod connections, which lowers the chance of chipping or fracture. Bridge connectors, which are susceptible to tensile or shear stresses, are additionally shielded by appropriate load distribution.
According to Shillingburg et al. (2012), cusp-fossa contacts in fixed prostheses maintain the structural integrity of restorations and abutments by uniformly distributing occlusal loads.
Protection of Supporting Structures:
The cusp-fossa design in tooth-supported bridges lessens lateral stresses on abutment teeth, which is crucial in cases when the abutments have periodontal damage. Axial loading in implant-supported bridges promotes osseointegration and long-term stability by reducing micromovement at the implant-bone contact.
Wiskott and Belser (1995) promoted cusp-fossa occlusion and other simpler occlusal designs in restorative dentistry, pointing out that they can optimize force distribution and protect supporting components.

Impact of Parafunctional Habits:
The concentrated tripod contacts of cusp-fossa occlusion in bruxism or clenching patients may raise localized stresses on implants or restorations, requiring careful material selection and occlusal modification (e.g., high-strength zirconia).

When reviewing occlusal schemes in full-mouth rehabilitation, Kumar et al. (2020) issued a warning that cusp-fossa occlusion in fixed prostheses necessitates precise equilibration and sturdy materials in order to endure parafunctional stresses.

Clinical Considerations
Selection of Materials: Restorative materials must be able to endure occlusal stresses and replicate the natural cusp-fossa morphology. Because of their robustness and accuracy, zirconia or metal-ceramic restorations are frequently used.

Articulation and Adjustment: To guarantee tripod contacts and prevent high spots, which could impair function or overburden restorations, precise articulation (using semi-adjustable articulators) and clinical occlusal adjustments are essential.

Design Specific to Implants: Cusp-fossa occlusion in implant-supported prostheses must take into consideration the absence of periodontal ligament, necessitating lighter contacts and shorter cusp angles to avoid excessive loading.

Patient-related factors: Patient characteristics including as TMJ status, periodontal health, and occlusal behaviors affect the scheme's effectiveness. To keep an eye out for wear, fractures, or implant issues, routine follow-up is required.

By coordinating occlusal forces with muscle activity and mandibular movement, Wang (2013) examined the biomechanical function of cusp-fossa contacts and discovered that they maximize masticatory performance.

In fixed prostheses, the cusp-fossa occlusal relationship optimizes load distribution by directing pressures axially to safeguard implants, abutments, and restorations while also facilitating steady, effective mastication and excursive disclusion. Precise design, material selection, and therapeutic changes are essential to its effectiveness, especially when dealing with complex cases or individuals who have parafunctional habits. Research emphasizes its biomechanical benefits, although caution must be used to prevent overloading or material failure.

II. Cusp-Marginal Ridge occlusal relationship

When the functional (supporting) cusps of one dental arch occlude with the marginal ridges of opposing teeth instead of their fossae, this is known as the cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connection. This occlusal scheme is frequent in both natural teeth and fixed prostheses. Compared to the cusp-fossa scheme, this configuration is more common in natural dentition and is important for load distribution, masticatory function, and occlusal stability. The cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connection in natural teeth and fixed prosthesis is described here, with an emphasis on its traits, uses, and biomechanical factors:

Cusp-Marginal Ridge Occlusal Relationship in Natural Teeth

The mandibular buccal cusps and maxillary palatal cusps, which are functional cusps, occlude with the marginal ridges of opposing teeth in centric occlusion (maximum intercuspation) in the cusp-marginal ridge system. The distal marginal ridge of the mandibular first molar and the mesial marginal ridge of the mandibular second molar are in touch with the mesiolingual cusp of the maxillary first molar. Because of the inherent interactions between the jaw and teeth, this scheme is the most prevalent in natural dentition, occurring in about 95% of populations.

In contrast to the tripod contacts of the cusp-fossa scheme, contacts usually take place in a one-to-two connection, with one cusp occlating with two marginal ridges of neighboring opposing teeth, resulting in a larger contact area. Instead than depending only on canine guidance, it is frequently linked to group function occlusion, in which several posterior teeth share occlusal loads during lateral movements.

Functional Role:
Mastication: The broader contact area facilitates efficient chewing by distributing occlusal forces across multiple teeth, enhancing masticatory stability.
Occlusal Stability: The cusp-marginal ridge contacts provide a stable occlusal platform, though less precise than cusp-fossa tripod contacts, accommodating natural variations in tooth morphology.
Excursive Movements: In natural dentition, this scheme often supports group function during lateral excursions, where multiple posterior teeth maintain contact, distributing forces and reducing stress on individual teeth.
Biomechanical Considerations:
Forces are distributed across marginal ridges, which are less ideal for axial loading compared to fossae but better suited for patients with broader occlusal contacts or slight malocclusions. The scheme is forgiving of minor occlusal discrepancies, making it adaptable to natural variations but potentially leading to uneven wear if not properly balanced.
Nelson (2015) notes that the cusp-marginal ridge relationship is the predominant occlusal scheme in natural dentition due to its adaptability to anatomical variations and functional demands.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge Occlusal Relationship in Fixed Prostheses

The cusp-marginal ridge concept in fixed prostheses (such as crowns and bridges) is intended to replicate the normal occlusal connection, in which the restoration's functional cusps make contact with the marginal ridges of opposing natural teeth or restorations. The buccal cusps of a mandibular molar crown are curved to occlude the marginal ridges of the opposing maxillary molar and premolar. [1, 3, 6, 8]

In fixed prosthodontics, the method is frequently employed to replicate the natural occlusion or when cusp-fossa contacts are not feasible because of restorative limitations or preexisting occlusal patterns. To guarantee correct contact sites and prevent interferences, it must be precisely fabricated in a lab, frequently with the use of articulators to mimic mandibular movements.

Functional Role:

Masticatory Efficiency: The cusp-marginal ridge scheme supports effective chewing by providing multiple contact points, which are particularly useful in multi-unit bridges where load distribution across several teeth is desired.

Occlusal Stability: The broader contact area enhances stability in restorations, especially in cases with periodontally compromised abutments or complex occlusal schemes.

Excursive Movements: This scheme often incorporates group function occlusion in fixed prostheses, allowing multiple posterior contacts during lateral movements, which is beneficial for distributing forces in extensive restorations.

Biomechanical Considerations:

Load Distribution: Forces are distributed across marginal ridges, which may lead to less precise axial loading compared to cusp-fossa occlusion but is advantageous for spreading loads over multiple teeth or restorations, reducing stress on individual abutments.
Material Considerations: Restorative materials (e.g., porcelain, zirconia) must be contoured to replicate marginal ridge anatomy accurately, ensuring durability and compatibility with opposing teeth to prevent excessive wear or fracture.
Implant-Supported Prostheses: To lessen the chance of overloading a single implant, the cusp-marginal ridge design may be chosen for implant-supported bridges in order to spread stresses among several implants or abutments.
According to Shillingburg et al. (2012), the cusp-marginal ridge scheme is a useful option in fixed prosthodontics for spreading occlusal loads and mimicking natural occlusion, especially in multi-unit restorations.
In both natural teeth and fixed prostheses, the cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connection is a common and useful system that is distinguished by larger contact surfaces that improve load distribution and allow for natural variations. It facilitates effective mastication and group function in natural teeth, and it is perfect for multi-unit restorations or situations requiring load sharing in permanent prostheses. It is a popular option due to its versatility, but careful design is necessary to guarantee practical harmony and avoid issues like wear or interferences.
When the functional (supporting) cusps of one dental arch occlude with the marginal ridges of opposing teeth in centric occlusion, this is known as the cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connection. About 95% of individuals have natural dentition, and this method is commonly used in fixed prosthesis to replicate natural occlusion or meet particular clinical requirements.

Indications, Contraindication, Advantages and Disadvantages [1,3-8]

Indications

Natural Dentition with Typical Occlusion: Suitable for patients whose cusp-marginal ridge occlusion occurs naturally because it is the most prevalent occlusal pattern in the human dentition. ideal for preserving the current occlusion without the need for significant orthodontic or reshaping work.
Fixed prosthodontics: Suggested for full-mouth rehabilitations or multi-unit fixed partial dentures (bridges) where it is necessary to distribute load across several teeth or to replicate the natural occlusion.
Because the larger contact area more equally distributes stresses, it is utilized in restorations involving abutment teeth that have periodontal disease.
Group Function Occlusion: Applied when several posterior teeth share occlusal loads to improve stability and lessen stress on individual teeth or restorations during lateral excursions.
Complex Restorative Cases: Ideal for patients with complicated occlusal schemes or many missing teeth, when anatomical or restorative limitations may make cusp-fossa contacts impracticable.
Implant-supported prostheses: These reduce the possibility of overload on a single implant by distributing occlusal forces among several implants or abutments in implant-supported bridges.
Patients with Mild Class I or Class II/III Malocclusions: Suitable for patients whose occlusal irregularities can be accommodated by the cusp-marginal ridge system without requiring significant treatment.

Contraindications

Need for Precise Axial Loading:
Because cusp-marginal ridge contacts may transfer forces less directly down the long axis than cusp-fossa occlusion, they are contraindicated in situations where exact axial force transmission is crucial (such as single-unit implant restorations).
Severe Bruxism or Parafunctional Habits: Patients with severe clenching or bruxism should not use this method because the larger contact areas could cause more stress or wear on restorations, particularly if the materials are not sufficiently sturdy.
Limited Interocclusal Space: Not recommended in situations when it is difficult to create appropriate marginal ridge morphology in restorations due to decreased vertical dimension.
Severe Malocclusion: Not appropriate for severe Class II or Class III malocclusions, where considerable orthodontic or surgical intervention is necessary to achieve functional cusp-marginal ridge contacts.
Restorations of a Single Unit For single-unit crowns, when cusp-fossa occlusion may offer more stability and accuracy in occlusal contacts, this is less desirable.
High Aesthetic Demands: May not be appropriate for anterior restorations where anterior guiding and aesthetic harmony require a mutually protected occlusion (with cusp-fossa posterior contacts).

Advantages

Natural Prevalence:
reflects approximately 95% of the most prevalent occlusal pattern found in normal teeth, making it simpler to duplicate in restorative procedures without requiring significant alteration.
By distributing occlusal forces among several teeth or restorations through marginal ridge contacts, broad load distribution lessens the strain on individual abutments or implants, particularly in circumstances when the periodontium is weakened.
Adaptability: It is useful for patients with complex restorative needs or less-than-ideal occlusion since it is forgiving of small occlusal discrepancies or anatomical variances.

Support for Group Function: Assists in group function occlusion during lateral excursions, which is advantageous for individuals with high occlusal loads or for distributing stresses in multi-unit restorations.

Ease of Fabrication: Compared to the exact tripod contacts needed for cusp-fossa occlusion, marginal ridge contacts in fixed prostheses are simpler to design and modify, saving time in the lab and in the clinic.

In both natural and repaired dentition, functional stability improves occlusal harmony and chewing efficiency by facilitating steady mastication through the use of many contact sites.

Drawbacks

Less Accurate Force Transmission: In contrast to cusp-fossa occlusion, forces are dispersed across marginal ridges rather than centrally through fossae, which may result in less ideal axial loading.

Risk of Wear or Fracture: If restorative materials (such porcelain) are not precisely matched for wear compatibility, wider contact areas may result in increased wear on neighboring natural teeth or restorations.

Possibility of Interferences: Poorly made marginal ridge contacts may cause occlusal interferences, particularly when moving in an excursive manner, which may cause pain or result in restoration failure.

The intricacy of extensive restorations

To prevent unequal loading in full-mouth rehabilitations, careful occlusal adjustment is necessary to provide constant cusp-marginal ridge interactions throughout several restorations.

Material Challenges: Weaker materials, such some ceramics, may chip easily under high stresses, and restorative materials need to be properly shaped to mimic the structure of marginal ridges.

Limited Implant Suitability:

If not properly controlled, the wider connections in implant-supported prostheses may increase off-axis loading and jeopardize implant stability.

A Look at Clinical Considerations

Natural Teeth: Due to its frequency, the cusp-marginal ridge scheme is frequently maintained in natural teeth, needing little equilibration absent interferences. Patients with mild malocclusions or group function occlusions benefit greatly from it.

For multi-unit bridges or restorations including teeth with reduced periodontal health, the fixed prosthesis scheme is feasible; however, accurate articulation and occlusal modifications are essential to guarantee functional harmony and avoid difficulties.

Material Selection: Wear compatibility with opposing teeth must be taken into account, although materials such as zirconia or metal-ceramic are favored for their strength and capacity to replicate marginal ridge morphology.

Patient Factors: Patients with stable periodontal health or group function demands can benefit from the program; however, patients with parafunctional habits need to be watched for wear or interferences.

'Cusp-Marginal Ridge occlusal relationship' affects the function and load distribution in FPD [1,5-8]

In fixed partial dentures (FPDs), also referred to as bridges, the cusp-marginal ridge occlusal relationship is a popular occlusal scheme in which the marginal ridges of opposing teeth or restorations in centric occlusion occlude with the functional (supporting) cusps of one arch. About 95% of natural dentitions use this pattern, which is frequently imitated in FPDs to improve masticatory performance, simulate natural occlusion, and disperse occlusal loads among several teeth or abutments.

Effects on Function in Fixed Partial Dentures

Masticatory Efficiency:

By offering several sites of contact between functional cusps (such as mandibular buccal or maxillary palatal cusps) and the marginal ridges of opposing teeth or restorations, the cusp-marginal ridge design promotes efficient mastication. Stable chewing is supported by this larger contact area, especially in multi-unit FPDs that span multiple teeth.

It frequently combines with group function occlusion, which distributes functional loads among several posterior teeth or restorations to improve chewing efficiency by maintaining contact during lateral excursions.

Study Insight: By simulating natural occlusal patterns, the wider contact regions improve masticatory stability. Patel et al. (2011) detailed waxing approaches for establishing cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in FPDs.

Occlusal Stability: A stable occlusal platform that may accommodate slight misalignments in FPDs and natural teeth is provided by the one-to-two contact pattern, in which one cusp occludes with two marginal ridges of neighboring opposing teeth.

In multi-unit FPDs, where preserving uniform occlusal contacts between pontics and abutments is essential for functional harmony, this system works very well.

Study Insight: Shillingburg et al. (2012) highlighted that by dispersing contacts across marginal ridges, the cusp-marginal ridge scheme in FPDs lowers the possibility of occlusal interferences and guarantees occlusal stability.

Guidance for Excursive Movement:

When several posterior restorations share occlusal stresses during lateral excursions, the cusp-marginal ridge scheme frequently promotes group function and lessens the strain on individual abutments or pontics.

The cusp-fossa system, in contrast, usually uses canine or anterior guiding for posterior disclusion. Patients with high occlusal loads or impaired anterior guiding benefit from group function in FPDs.

Research Perspective: By spreading stresses over several points of contact, cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in FPDs promotes group function and improves functional stability during excursive motions (Dawson, 2007).

Effects on Load Distribution in Fixed Partial Dentures

Broad Load Distribution:

In contrast to the tripod contacts of the cusp-fossa system, the cusp-marginal ridge design disperses occlusal stresses over a greater surface area (the marginal ridges of two neighboring teeth). This is especially helpful with FPDs because implants or abutment teeth may be subject to high stresses or have poor periodontal health.

This wider distribution lessens the strain on individual abutments in tooth-supported FPDs, maintaining periodontal health.

By distributing stresses over several implants or abutments, implant-supported FPDs reduce the possibility of overload on a single implant.

The cusp-marginal ridge method in FPDs optimizes load distribution by involving several contact sites, lowering stress concentrations on abutments or pontics, according to Rosenstiel et al. (2016).

Decreased Stress on Abutments and Connectors: The design reduces shear or lateral loads on abutment teeth and connector areas, which are crucial for the structural integrity of FPDs, by dispersing forces across marginal ridges.

In long-span bridges, where abutments may experience greater loads and connectors are susceptible to tensile forces, this is especially crucial.

Study Finding: Shillingburg et al. (2012) observed that by distributing occlusal loads, the cusp-marginal ridge scheme in FPDs prolongs the life of restorations by lowering stress on connections and abutments.

Adaptability to Periodontal Conditions: FPDs with periodontally impaired abutments benefit from the larger contact area since it lessens localized stress and allows for little bone loss or mobility.

Study Insight: In their study of occlusal schemes in full-mouth rehabilitation, Kumar et al. (2020) pointed out that cusp-marginal ridge occlusion is the ideal FPD for teeth with periodontal weakness because of its efficient force distribution.

Things to Think About for FPDs Supported by Implants:

The cusp-marginal ridge design in implant-supported FPDs helps disperse forces among several implants, lowering the possibility of overload-induced implant failure or bone resorption.

However, because implants lack a periodontal ligament, careful occlusal adjustment is necessary to prevent severe off-axis loading, which can happen with wider marginal ridge contacts.

Study Insight: To distribute stresses and safeguard the implant-bone interface, Wiskott and Belser (1995) recommended cusp-marginal ridges and other reduced occlusal designs in implant-supported restorations.

The effects of parafunctional habits include the need for strong materials (like zirconia) and frequent monitoring to prevent chipping or fracture. In individuals with bruxism or clenching, the wider contacts may increase wear on opposing teeth or restorations.

Study Insight: In order to properly regulate parafunctional stresses, Kumar et al. (2020) warned that cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in FPDs necessitates careful material selection and occlusal equilibration.

A Look at Clinical Considerations

Material Selection: In order to imitate marginal ridge morphology and endure occlusal stresses, FPDs with cusp-marginal ridge occlusion need materials like as metal-ceramic or zirconia. To avoid injury, it is essential that the wear be compatible with the opposing teeth.

Expression and Modification: Especially with multi-unit FPDs, precise articulation (using semi-adjustable articulators) and clinical occlusal adjustments are necessary to guarantee appropriate marginal ridge contacts and prevent interferences.

Patient-related factors: Patients with complex restorative needs, periodontally damaged abutments, or group function occlusion benefit greatly from the scheme; however, patients with parafunctional habits need to have their wear or interferences monitored.

Design Specific to Implants: In implant-supported FPDs, the cusp-marginal ridge technique is designed to transfer stresses uniformly, and cusp angles should be smaller and contacts lighter to reduce off-axis loading.

FPDs are appropriate for multi-unit restorations because of the cusp-marginal ridge occlusal relationship, which improves function by facilitating steady mastication and promoting group function during excursive movements. By distributing stresses over marginal ridges, it maximizes load distribution and lessens stress on implants, abutments, and connectors—especially in complicated or periodontally impaired patients. Its effectiveness, particularly in individuals with parafunctional habits, hinges on careful design, material selection, and occlusal adjustments to avoid wear or interferences.

Differences between Cusp-Fossa V/S Cusp-Marginal Ridge occlusal relationship [1,3-8]

Both natural teeth and fixed prostheses use two different occlusal systems, the cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge. Each has special properties that impact function, load distribution, and clinical application. In the cusp-marginal ridge system, functional cusps obstruct the marginal ridges of opposing teeth, whereas in the cusp-fossa scheme, they obstruct opposing fossae.

Key Differences

Aspect	Cusp-Fossa	Cusp-Marginal Ridge
Prevalence	Rare (~5%) in natural dentition	Common (~95%) in natural dentition
Contact Pattern	Tripod (3-point) contacts in fossae	One-to-two contacts on marginal ridges
Load Distribution	Precise, axial through fossae	Broader, diffuse across marginal ridges
Occlusal Stability	High due to tripod contacts	Moderate, forgiving of misalignments
Excursive Guidance	Mutually protected (anterior/canine guidance)	Group function (multiple posterior contacts)
FPD Application	Single-unit crowns, implants	Multi-unit bridges, periodontally compromised

Aspect	Cusp-Fossa	Cusp-Marginal Ridge
Design Complexity	High precision required	Easier to design and adjust
Periodontal Suitability	Less suitable for compromised teeth	Preferred for compromised teeth
Wear/Fracture Risk	Lower wear, higher fracture risk if misadjusted	Higher wear, lower fracture risk

The cusp-fossa occlusal relationship, which offers great stability but necessitates careful design, is perfect for precise, axially directed force transfer and is recommended in single-unit restorations or implants. More prevalent in normal dentition, the cusp-marginal ridge design can be modified for multi-unit FPDs and situations of periodontal compromise. It distributes loads widely but has less accurate axial loading. Clinical considerations including as restoration type, occlusal demands, and periodontal health influence the choice between these schemes.

According to literature, 'Cusp-Fossa' or 'Cusp-Marginal Ridge' occlusal relationship is ideal for FPD [5,6,8]

Clinical considerations like the kind of restoration, periodontal health, occlusal demands, and patient-specific circumstances influence the decision between the cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal relationships for fixed partial dentures (FPDs). According to the literature, each scheme has unique benefits, and none is "ideal" for all FPDs. Each approach offers distinct advantages for function, load distribution, and restoration longevity, and the best one depends on the particular clinical situation.

Cusp-Fossa Occlusal Relationship in FPDs

Rationale for Use:

For FPDs that need precise occlusal stability and axial force transmission, the cusp-fossa scheme—in which functional cusps (such as mandibular buccal cusps or maxillary palatal cusps) occlude with opposing fossae in centric occlusion—is frequently thought to be the best option. By providing tripod connections (three-point contacts per cusp), it reduces shear stresses and lengthens the lifespan of restorations by guiding occlusal forces along the long axes of abutment teeth or implants.

For single-unit crowns, short-span bridges, or implant-supported FPDs, where exact force distribution is essential to avoiding overload or failure, this system is especially well-suited. In order to lessen lateral stresses on restorations, it promotes mutually protected occlusion, in which anterior or canine guidance discludes posterior teeth during excursive motions.

Advantages for FPDs:

Optimal Load Distribution: By reducing stress on abutments and connectors, axial force transmission safeguards implant or periodontal structures.

Reduced Wear: When utilizing durable materials like zirconia, precise contacts lessen wear on neighboring teeth or restorations.

Occlusal Stability: For individuals with a healthy TMJ and little occlusal interferences, tripod contacts offer a sturdy occlusal platform.

Because it reduces off-axis loading and promotes osseointegration and implant stability, implant compatibility is preferred for FPDs supported by implants.

Limitations: To achieve perfect tripod connections, careful laboratory manufacturing and clinical adjustments are needed, which adds time and expense.

Concentrated contacts may overwhelm weak teeth, making them less appropriate for abutments with impaired periodontal health.

difficult in intricate restorations when a wider load distribution could be required due to several missing teeth or malocclusions.

Wiskott and Belser (1995) emphasize how the cusp-fossa scheme helps to reduce stress on the implant-bone interface and simplify occlusal design for restorations supported by implants.

According to Patel et al. (2011), waxing procedures for cusp-fossa occlusion in FPDs are precise in establishing solid occlusal contacts and promoting occlusion that is mutually safeguarded.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge Occlusal Relationship in FPDs [1,5,7]

Rationale for Use:

The most prevalent occlusal pattern in natural dentition (~95%) is the cusp-marginal ridge scheme, in which functional cusps occlude with the marginal ridges of two neighboring opposing teeth. This pattern is frequently mimicked in FPDs to resemble natural occlusion. Because it disperses occlusal pressures across a larger region, it is perfect for full-mouth rehabilitations, multi-unit bridges, and situations with periodontally damaged abutments.

This plan is appropriate for individuals with high occlusal forces or little anterior guidance because it facilitates group function occlusion, in which several posterior teeth or restorations share burdens during lateral excursions.

Advantages for FPDs:

Wide Load Distribution: This lessens the strain on individual abutments by distributing stresses over marginal ridges; it is especially advantageous for teeth with poor periodontal tissue.

Adaptability: It can accommodate small occlusal differences, which makes it useful for patients with mild malocclusions or complex restorations.

Ease of Fabrication: Compared to the exact tripod contacts of cusp-fossa occlusion, broader contact regions make laboratory design and clinical changes easier.

Group Function Support: Reduces connector stress by permitting multiple posterior connections during excursive movements, improving stability in multi-unit FPDs.

Limitations: Less accurate axial loading than cusp-fossa, which could result in off-axis stresses that put stress on implants or abutments.

Particularly in patients with parafunctional habits, wider contacts may result in more wear on neighboring teeth or restorations.

If marginal ridge contacts are not carefully balanced, there is a risk of occlusal interferences, which could compromise restorative longevity or performance.

According to Shillingburg et al. (2012), cusp-marginal ridge occlusion is advised for multi-unit FPDs because it can replicate natural occlusion and disperse loads among abutments, particularly in cases when the periodontal tissue is weakened.

The cusp-marginal ridge scheme's appropriateness for intricate full-mouth rehabilitations is highlighted by Kumar et al. (2020), who also stress the scheme's load-sharing advantages and anatomical variable adaptability.

The use of cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in FPDs for group function is supported by Dawson (2007), especially for patients who need a wider force distribution during excursive motions.

Comparative Analysis: Which is Ideal for FPDs?

Cusp-Fossa: [7]

The best cases include single-unit crowns, short-span bridges, FPDs supported by implants, or individuals with stable TMJs and good periodontal support. When accurate axial loading and posterior disclusion are important, as in implant restorations to preserve the implant-bone interface, it is the recommended method.

Why Perfect: Its tripod connections minimize restoration wear and stress by ensuring ideal force transmission and occlusal stability. In anterior-guided instances, it improves both the functional and cosmetic results by aligning with mutually protected occlusion.

Evidence: Patel et al. (2011) confirm its technical accuracy in occlusal design, whereas Rosenstiel et al. (2016) and Wiskott and Belser (1995) highlight its precision for implants and single-unit restorations.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge: [1]

Ideal situations include individuals with group function occlusion, full-mouth rehabilitations, periodontally impaired abutments, and multi-unit bridges. When weight distribution across several teeth or restorations is required, as in complex instances or long-span bridges, it is the preferred method.

Why Perfect: Its wider contact surfaces disperse stresses, lessening the strain on weaker connectors or abutments, and its versatility makes complex restorations easier to design.

Evidence: Dawson (2007) supports its usage for group function applications, and Shillingburg et al. (2012) and Kumar et al. (2020) support its use in multi-unit FPDs and periodontally impaired instances.

There is no one occlusal plan that works best for all FPDs. The decision is based on:

Restoration Type: Cusp-marginal ridge is better for multi-unit bridges, while cusp-fossa is favored for single-unit or implant-supported FPDs.

Periodontal Status: Cusp-fossa is appropriate for healthy periodontium, while cusp-marginal ridge is preferred for impaired abutments.

Occlusal Plan: Cusp-marginal ridge promotes group function, while cusp-fossa aligns with mutually protected occlusion.

Patient Factors: The decision is influenced by parafunctional behaviors, malocclusion, or aesthetic requirements.

Study Insight: Kumar et al. (2020) find that both strategies work well, with cusp-marginal ridge being used for load distribution in complex situations and cusp-fossa being used for precision.

One occlusal plan is not uniformly recommended as the best for FPDs in the literature. Cusp-fossa's precise axial loading and stability make it perfect for single-unit crowns, short-span bridges, or implant-supported FPDs, especially in patients with mutually protected occlusion and healthy periodontium. Because of its greater load distribution and versatility, cusp-marginal ridge is perfect for multi-unit bridges, situations of periodontal compromise, or group function occlusion. The best plan is decided by clinical judgment backed by occlusal analysis and patient-specific considerations.

Cusp-Fossa or Cusp-Marginal Ridge occlusal relationships applicable for CAD-CAM /Digital work flow [9-12]

For CAD-CAM (Computer-Aided Design and Computer-Aided Manufacturing) and digital processes in fixed prosthodontics, such as crowns, implant-supported restorations, and fixed partial dentures (FPDs), cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connections are both relevant. The digital approach, which includes milling or 3D printing, virtual articulators, and intraoral scanning, enables accurate restoration design and manufacture to meet clinical needs for either occlusal scheme.

Applicability of Cusp-Fossa and Cusp-Marginal Ridge in CAD-CAM/Digital Workflows

1. Cusp-Fossa Occlusal Relationship in CAD-CAM

Definition: In the cusp-fossa scheme, opposing fossae and functional cusps (such as the mandibular buccal or maxillary palatal cusps) occlude in centric occlusion to generate tripod contacts that provide precise axial force transmission and occlusal stability.

Relevance to CAD-CAM:

Design Accuracy: To produce tripod connections, fossae and cusps can be precisely sculpted using CAD software (such as ExoCAD or 3Shape), which guarantees an accurate reproduction of the cusp-fossa relationship. By simulating mandibular movements, virtual articulators allow for dynamic occlusal modifications for occlusion that is mutually safeguarded.

Material Adequacy: High-strength materials that can endure concentrated occlusal stresses, like as zirconia or lithium disilicate, are frequently utilized in CAD-CAM and enable the exact morphology needed for cusp-fossa interactions.

Clinical Indications: CAD-CAM's accuracy guarantees axial loading and posterior disclusion during excursive movements, making it perfect for single-unit crowns, short-span FPDs, or implant-supported restorations.

Workflow Integration: To design restorations with fossa-centric contacts, CAD software imports precise occlusal relationships obtained by intraoral scanners.

In order to guarantee that tripod contacts line up with opposing fossae, virtual articulators (such as Artex and Denar) replicate centric and excursive movements.

Clinical adjustments are made to milled or 3D-printed restorations to ensure occlusal harmony.

Benefits: By enabling great precision in fossa design, CAD-CAM lessens the need for significant chairside revisions.

Tripod contacts are consistently replicated over several restorations because to digital procedures.

By reducing interferences, virtual occlusal analysis improves functional stability.

Obstacles: [9,10]

requires sophisticated CAD abilities to provide accurate tripod contacts and fossa morphology.

To prevent occlusal alignment mistakes, precise scanning and bite registration are essential.

To keep opposing teeth from wearing down, high-strength materials might need to be carefully polished.

Kwon et al. (2018) showed how cusp-fossa occlusion in single-unit crowns can be precisely replicated by CAD-CAM processes employing virtual articulators, increasing occlusal stability and decreasing correction time.

Ender and associates (2016): It was discovered that intraoral scanners support the design of cusp-fossa contacts in CAD-CAM restorations by offering adequate precision for capturing occlusal connections.

2. CAD-CAM's Cusp-Marginal Ridge Occlusal Relationship

In the cusp-marginal ridge design, two adjacent opposing teeth's marginal ridges occlude with functional cusps to support group function occlusion and create wider contact areas.

Relevance to CAD-CAM:

Flexibility in Design: Marginal ridge connections, which are easier to accomplish in multi-unit FPDs or intricate restorations but less accurate than tripod contacts, can be designed with the use of CAD software. Group function during lateral excursions can be simulated with virtual articulators.

Material Adequacy: Zirconia, lithium disilicate, and metal-ceramic alloys are examples of CAD-CAM materials that can be shaped to mimic the morphology of marginal ridges while maintaining strength and wear compatibility.

Clinical Indications: Preferred when a wider load distribution is required, such as in full-mouth rehabilitations, multi-unit FPDs, or periodontally damaged abutments. ~95% prevalence, suitable for simulating natural occlusion.

Integration of Workflow:

In order to construct restorations with marginal ridge contacts aligned with opposing cusps, CAD software uses intraoral scanners to record occlusal connections.

In order to provide many posterior contacts during excursive movements, virtual articulators replicate group function.

Clinical adjustments are made to milled restorations in order to equalize marginal ridge contacts and avoid interferences.

Benefits: Because marginal ridges require less accuracy than fossae, wider contact areas make CAD design simpler.

Anatomical variances are accommodated by digital procedures, which makes the scheme perfect for difficult instances.

In multi-unit FPDs, load distribution is supported by the easy simulation of group function design in virtual articulators.

Difficulties: [11,12]

Wider contacts necessitate cautious material selection (e.g., polished zirconia) since they may increase wear on opposing teeth.

Clinical changes may be necessary due to interferences caused by inaccurate bite registration.

In implant-supported FPDs, less accurate axial loading could be problematic, necessitating lighter contacts.

According to Ahlholm et al. (2018), CAD-CAM processes use digital design to distribute loads and simulate natural occlusion in multi-unit FPDs, successfully simulating cusp-marginal ridge occlusion.

Joda and associates (2017): highlighted how computerized workflows can accurately design occlusal schemes, such as cusp-marginal ridge, for complex restorations, resulting in better fit and shorter manufacturing times.

CAD-CAM Workflow Comparison

Complexity of Design:

Cusp-Fossa: Needs accurate scanning and sophisticated software skills to establish tripod connections by precise CAD sculpting of cusps and fossae.

Because of its wider marginal ridge contacts, which may accommodate small scanning or alignment mistakes, the cusp-marginal ridge is easier to build.

Occlusal Accuracy:

Cusp-Fossa: Provides increased axial loading precision, making it perfect for implant or single-unit restorations. Accurate fossa alignment is ensured via CAD-CAM.

With CAD-CAM making group function design easier, Cusp-Marginal Ridge offers a wider load distribution but less accurate axial loading, making it appropriate for multi-unit FPDs.

Clinical Significance:

Cusp-Fossa: Suggested for implants, short-span FPDs, or single-unit crowns where the accuracy of CAD-CAM promotes mutually protected occlusion.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge: Perfect for scenarios with periodontal compromise or multi-unit FPDs, where load-sharing designs are made simpler by digital workflows.

Material Considerations: CAD-CAM materials such as zirconia or lithium disilicate are advantageous for both schemes; however, cusp-marginal ridge necessitates wear-compatible surfaces, while cusp-fossa demands more contouring precision.

Efficiency of Workflow:

Cusp-Fossa: Benefits from virtual articulators for occlusal analysis, but may take longer to develop and adapt due to precision requirements.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge: Digital workflows simplify multi-unit restorations, and wider connections make design and adjustment faster.

General Considerations in CAD-CAM Workflows

Intraoral Scanning: To ensure correct alignment for either scheme, high-accuracy scanners (such as CEREC or TRIOS) are necessary for collecting occlusal connections.

Virtual Articulators: To model centric and excursive movements, software such as exocad or 3Shape include virtual articulators. This is essential for modeling cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusion.

The choice of material for CAD-CAM must strike a compromise between wear compatibility (such as polished surfaces to stop opposing tooth wear) and strength (such as zirconia for durability).

Clinical modifications: To improve occlusal contacts, especially for cusp-fossa tripod interactions, little chairside modifications are frequently required despite digital perfection.

Patient Factors: Digital workflows allow for personalized designs, and the selection of schemes is based on restoration goals, occlusal behaviors (such as bruxism), and periodontal health.

Consensus in Literature

In CAD-CAM processes, cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal connections are both possible, with the selection being based on clinical requirements:

Cusp-Fossa: Preferred for restorations that require accuracy (such as implants and single-unit crowns), taking advantage of CAD-CAM's capacity to produce precise tripod connections.

Cusp-Marginal Ridge: Suitable for intricate or multi-unit FPDs, this design uses digital technology to distribute loads and mimic natural occlusion.

Both approaches benefit from digital workflows, which increase design quality, shorten fabrication times, and allow for virtual occlusal examination. However, the precision of the scanner, operator skill, and clinical adjustments are necessary for success. [9–12]

According to Kwon et al. (2018), CAD-CAM processes improve occlusal precision in single-unit restorations by precisely simulating cusp-fossa occlusion.

According to Ahlholm et al. (2018), digital workflows improve load distribution and fit by supporting cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in multi-unit FPDs.

Ender et al. (2016): Intraoral scanners are suitable for both schemes and offer adequate precision for occlusal design in CAD-CAM.

Joda et al. (2017): For intricate restorations, digital processes simplify the design of occlusal schemes, including cusp-marginal ridge.

Cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal relationships play different functions in FPD design and are relevant to CAD-CAM and digital workflows. Utilizing the accuracy of CAD-CAM for tripod connections and axial loading, the cusp-fossa scheme is perfect for single-unit crowns, short-span bridges, or implant-supported restorations. The cusp-marginal ridge method uses digital design for larger load distribution and group function, making it appropriate for multi-unit FPDs or instances with poor periodontal health. Clinical judgment establishes the best option based on patient demands, but digital operations improve both schemes with precise milling, virtual articulation, and accurate scanning. [**5-12**]

Conclusion

For fixed partial dentures (FPDs), the cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusal relationships are both workable plans with unique benefits suited to particular clinical situations. For single-unit crowns, short-span FPDs, and implant-supported restorations, the cusp-fossa scheme is ideal due to its tripod contacts and precise axial force transmission. It offers superior occlusal stability and minimal lateral stresses, especially in patients with mutually protected occlusion and healthy periodontal support. Its limited applicability for teeth with impaired periodontal health and its precise requirements, however, limit its widespread use. By using larger contact areas to disperse stresses and facilitate group function occlusion, the cusp-marginal ridge scheme, which is common in natural dentition, performs exceptionally well in multi-unit FPDs in situations involving periodontally compromised abutments. Although it may increase wear and need careful adjustment to eliminate interferences, its versatility and ease of production make it useful for intricate restorations. With digital tools improving design correctness and functional results, both schemes are successfully included into CAD-CAM workflows. With careful clinical decision-making, the choice between cusp-fossa and cusp-marginal ridge occlusion in FPDs ultimately depends on the kind of restoration, periodontal health, occlusal dynamics, and patient-specific factors. This ensures optimal function, longevity, and patient comfort.

REFERENCES

1.Shillingburg HT, Sather DA, Wilson EL, Cain JR, Mitchell DL, Blanco LJ, et al. Fundamentals of fixed prosthodontics. 4th ed. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing; 2012. p. 45-60, 85-102.

2.Wang M. A possible biomechanical role of occlusal cusp-fossa contact relationships. J Oral Rehabil. 2013;40(1):69-79. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2842.2012.02336.x.

3.Nelson SJ. Wheeler's dental anatomy, physiology, and occlusion. 10th ed. St. Louis: Elsevier Saunders; 2015. p. 273-80.

4.Dawson PE. Functional occlusion: from TMJ to smile design. St. Louis: Mosby Elsevier; 2007. p. 120-35, 250-60.

5.Patel JR, Patel PR, Sethuraman R. Waxing techniques to develop proper occlusal morphology in different occlusal schemes. J Indian Prosthodont Soc. 2011;11(3):143-50. doi:10.1007/s13191-011-0087-6.

6.Kumar D, Hazra R, Srivastava A, Khattak A, Kalia D. Occlusal forms and philosophies in full mouth rehabilitation: a literature review. IP Ann Prosthodont Restor Dent. 2020;6(3):89-94.

7.Rosenstiel SF, Land MF, Fujimoto J. Contemporary fixed prosthodontics. 5th ed. St. Louis: Elsevier; 2016. p. 117-35.

8.Wiskott HW, Belser UC. A rationale for a simplified occlusal design in restorative dentistry: an overview. Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent. 1995;15(2):170-83.

9. Kwon T, Kim D, Kim Y, Kim H. Accuracy of occlusal contacts for CAD/CAM restorations using different acquisition methods. J Prosthodont Res. 2018;62(3):365-70. doi:10.1016/j.jpor.2018.01.003.

10.Ender A, Attin T, Mehl A. In vivo precision of conventional and digital methods of obtaining complete-arch dental impressions. J Prosthet Dent. 2016;115(3):313-20. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2015.09.011.

11.Ahlholm P, Sipilä K, Vallittu P, Kotiranta U. Digital versus conventional impressions in fixed prosthodontics: a review. J Prosthodont. 2018;27(1):35-41. doi:10.1111/jopr.12527.

12.Joda T, Brägger U, Zitzmann NU. CAD/CAM implant crowns in a digital workflow: five-year follow-up of a prospective clinical trial. Clin Implant Dent Relat Res. 2017;19(4):687-93. doi:10.1111/cid.12481.