Table 1 Details of the 6 studies on IPS-Empress inlays and onlays reviewed

Reference	Type of study	Assessment criteria	No. of clinicians and examiners	No. of patients	Type of repair; no. of teeth		Position; no. of teeth		Cement	Follow-up (months)	No. (and %) failures	Causes of failure
					Inlay	Onlay	Premolar	Molar				
Frankenberger and others[12]	Controlled clinical trial	Modified USPHS	6, 2	34	72	24	39	57	Dual Variolink Low Variolink Ultra Tetric	48–72	7 (7)	Fracture (5) Pulpitis (2)
Van Dijken and others[13]	Controlled clinical trial	Modified USPHS	3, 2	29	79	0	53	26	Fuji Plus Panavia[21]	24	0 (0)	
Lehner and others[14]	Prospective clinical trial	Modified USPHS	18, 2	43	138	17	53	102	Panavia TC Porcelite Dicor LA VP891	60–84	2 onlays 5 inlays (4)	Complete fracture (5) Partial fracture (2)
Molin and Karlsson[15]	Randomized controlled clinical trial	CDA	1, 2	20	20	0	9	11	Dual	70	4 (20)	Fracture (4)
Fradeani and others[16]	Case series	Modified USPHS	3, 3	29	107	18	50	75	Dual Variolink	7–56	4 (3)	Fracture (3) Tooth fracture (1)
Tidehag and Gunne[17]	Controlled clinical trial	Modified CDA	2, NS	18	62	NS	40	22	Cem-Kit	26	1 (2)	Fracture (1)

USPHS = United States Public Health Service, CDA = California Dental Association, NS = not stated

Dual, Variolink Low, Variolink Ultra, Tetric, VP891, Cem-Kit (Ivoclar Vivadent, Schaan, Liechtenstein)
Fuji Plus (GC Dental, Tokyo, Japan)
Panavia21 and Panavia TC (Kuraray, Osaka, Japan)
Porcelite (Sybron Kerr, Orange, CA)
Dicor LA (Dentsply International, York, PA)