Keywords: Artificial intelligence; machine learning; prosthodontics; deep learning; convolutional neural networks; generative adversarial networks.

Dildora Nabiyeva[1]
Doctor of Medical Sciences (DSc), Professor. Department of Faculty and Hospital Therapy No. 1, Rheumatology and Occupational Pathology
Tashkent State Medical University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: dil_nab@mail.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7879-1522

Musashaykhov Umidjon Khusanovich[2]
DSc, Head of the Department of Propaedeutics of Internal Diseases at the Andijan State Medical Institute. Andijan, Uzbekistan
E-mail: musashayxov1989@mail.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1619-9101

Orifjon Abdumalikovich Aripov[3]
DSc, professor.Head of the Department at the Center for the Development of Professional Qualifications of Medical Workers, Uzbekistan
E-mail: orifjon-aripov75@mail.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6472-4604

Nodir Kuziev[4]
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in philosophy. Associate Professor, Department of History and Source Studies of Islam, Philosophy,
Bukhara State University
E-mail: n.a.kuziyev@buxdu.uz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5587-9759

Shirinova Madina Bonu Gulomjon kizi[5]
Assistant at the department of Therapeutic dentistry Samarkand State Medical University. Samarkand, Uzbekistan
E-mail: Mjiyanova00@mail.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9725-4215

Allayeva Aziza Nasridinovna
Bukhara State Medical Institute, Assistant at the Department of Anatomy and Clinical Anatomy (OSTA). Bukhara, Uzbekistan
E-mail: aziza.allayeva@bsmi.uz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2661-5078

Received-23-05-2026
Revised-25-06-2026
Accepted-29-06-2026
Doi: 10.1922/ejprd.v34i4s.1521

European Journal of Prosthodontics and Restorative Dentistry (2026) 34 (04s), 512-521

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Modern Prosthodontics: A Comprehensive Review of Automated Design, Margin Line Extraction, and Radiographic Implant Identification

Abstract
This review examines the expanding role of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) in contemporary prosthodontics, with particular emphasis on automated prosthodontic design, margin line detection, and radiographic implant identification. A systematic search of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect identified 68 peer-reviewed studies published between 2018 and 2025. The findings indicate that deep learning models, including convolutional neural networks (CNNs), U-Net architectures, generative adversarial networks (GANs), YOLO, and DETR, significantly improve clinical efficiency and diagnostic precision. GAN-based systems reduced crown design time by up to 75% while maintaining acceptable marginal adaptation. AI-assisted margin line extraction achieved high accuracy with IoU values above 91%, whereas implant identification models demonstrated mAP scores exceeding 96%. Despite promising outcomes, challenges remain regarding dataset standardization, clinical validation, interoperability, regulatory compliance, and data privacy. Overall, AI-driven technologies demonstrate substantial potential to optimize prosthodontic workflows, enhance treatment planning, and improve patient-centered clinical outcomes.

1. Introduction

The contemporary landscape of prosthodontic practice has undergone profound transformation through the integration of digital technologies and computational intelligence. Prosthodontics, a specialized discipline concerned with the restoration and replacement of missing or damaged oral structures, increasingly relies on computer-assisted methodologies to enhance diagnostic precision, treatment planning optimization, and prosthetic fabrication accuracy. The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms represents the latest evolutionary milestone in this digital revolution, offering unprecedented capabilities for automated analysis, pattern recognition, and predictive modeling within clinical workflows.

Artificial intelligence, broadly defined as computational systems capable of performing tasks typically requiring human cognition, encompasses various methodological approaches including supervised learning, unsupervised learning, reinforcement learning, and deep learning architectures. Within the prosthodontic domain, AI applications have proliferated across multiple facets of clinical practice, from diagnostic image analysis and treatment outcome prediction to prosthetic design automation and quality control assessment. These technological innovations address longstanding challenges in prosthodontic care, including operator-dependent variability, time-intensive manual processes, and subjective decision-making paradigms.

The application of deep learning methodologies, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs), has demonstrated exceptional efficacy in processing complex three-dimensional dental imaging data. CNNs possess inherent capabilities for hierarchical feature extraction from visual information, enabling automated recognition of anatomical structures, pathological conditions, and prosthetic components with accuracy levels approaching or exceeding human expert performance. Recent systematic reviews have documented AI's transformative impact across dental specialties, with prosthodontics emerging as a particularly fertile domain for algorithmic innovation due to its heavy reliance on digital imaging, geometric modeling, and precision manufacturing.

Three specific applications of AI technology have garnered substantial research attention within prosthodontic literature: automated prosthodontic design systems, margin line extraction and finish line detection algorithms, and radiographic implant identification frameworks. Each application domain presents unique technical challenges and clinical requirements, yet collectively they exemplify the potential for AI to fundamentally restructure prosthodontic workflows. Automated design systems, leveraging generative adversarial networks (GANs) and related architectures, promise to streamline the labor-intensive process of dental restoration design while maintaining anatomical accuracy and functional appropriateness. Margin line detection algorithms address a critical bottleneck in digital crown fabrication workflows, where precise identification of tooth preparation boundaries determines prosthetic fit quality. Radiographic implant identification systems offer solutions to the complex challenge of determining implant system specifications from diagnostic images—information essential for proper prosthetic component selection and treatment planning.

Despite the rapid proliferation of AI research in prosthodontics, significant knowledge gaps persist regarding clinical validation, algorithmic transparency, standardization protocols, and long-term performance characteristics. Furthermore, ethical considerations surrounding data privacy, algorithmic bias, informed consent, and the evolving role of human expertise in AI-augmented workflows demand careful examination. The present review addresses these gaps by synthesizing current evidence on AI applications in prosthodontic design, margin detection, and implant identification, critically evaluating methodological approaches, clinical performance metrics, and implementation challenges, while identifying priority areas for future investigation.

1.1 Study Objectives

The primary objective of this comprehensive review is to synthesize and critically evaluate the current state of AI and ML technologies in three key prosthodontic applications. Specifically, this review aims to: (1) elucidate the technical architectures and algorithmic approaches employed in automated prosthodontic design, margin line detection, and implant identification systems; (2) systematically assess the clinical performance, accuracy metrics, and validation methodologies reported across relevant studies; (3) identify persistent methodological limitations, data quality concerns, and translational barriers hindering clinical adoption; (4) examine ethical, regulatory, and practical considerations associated with AI integration into prosthodontic workflows; and (5) delineate evidence-based recommendations for future research directions and clinical implementation strategies. This analysis provides a rigorous foundation for understanding AI's transformative potential and inherent limitations within contemporary prosthodontic practice.

2. Methods

2.1 Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple electronic databases including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and IEEE Xplore, covering publications from January 2018 through May 2025. The search strategy employed Boolean operators combining Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and free-text keywords organized into three conceptual domains: (1) AI/ML terminology ('artificial intelligence,' 'machine learning,' 'deep learning,' 'neural networks,' 'convolutional neural network,' 'generative adversarial network,' 'transformer'); (2) prosthodontic applications ('prosthodontics,' 'dental crown,' 'prosthetic design,' 'margin line,' 'finish line,' 'dental implant,' 'CAD/CAM'); and (3) methodological terms ('automated design,' 'detection,' 'identification,' 'segmentation'). Reference lists of identified systematic reviews and high-impact primary studies were manually screened to capture additional relevant articles.

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (1) described original research employing AI or ML methodologies for prosthodontic applications; (2) focused on automated design systems, margin/finish line detection, or implant identification; (3) reported quantitative performance metrics; (4) were published in English in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings; and (5) utilized digital imaging or three-dimensional scan data. Exclusion criteria encompassed: (1) non-prosthodontic dental applications; (2) theoretical or purely algorithmic papers without clinical application context; (3) reviews, editorials, or opinion pieces; (4) studies lacking sufficient methodological detail for quality assessment; and (5) duplicate publications of the same dataset. No restrictions were placed on study design, sample size, or geographic origin, recognizing the developmental nature of this research field.

2.3 Data Extraction and Synthesis

Data extraction captured study characteristics (author, publication year, country), methodological details (AI architecture, training dataset size, validation approach), clinical application domain, performance metrics (accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, IoU, mAP, Hausdorff distance, marginal fit), and reported limitations. Given the heterogeneity of AI methodologies, imaging modalities, evaluation protocols, and outcome measures across studies, a narrative synthesis approach was adopted rather than quantitative meta-analysis. Results are organized thematically by application domain (automated design, margin detection, implant identification) with critical appraisal of methodological quality, clinical applicability, and comparative performance across algorithmic approaches.

3. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Fundamentals in Prosthodontics

3.1 Deep Learning Architectures

Contemporary AI applications in prosthodontics predominantly employ deep learning architectures—multilayered neural networks capable of automatically learning hierarchical feature representations from raw data without explicit human-engineered features. Convolutional neural networks constitute the foundational architecture for visual data processing in prosthodontic applications. CNNs utilize specialized convolutional layers that apply learnable filters across spatial dimensions of input images, enabling extraction of progressively abstract features from low-level edges and textures to high-level anatomical structures. The U-Net architecture, originally developed for biomedical image segmentation, has become ubiquitous in prosthodontic margin detection tasks due to its symmetric encoder-decoder structure with skip connections that preserve spatial information during feature abstraction.

Generative adversarial networks represent a distinct paradigm wherein two neural networks—a generator and a discriminator—engage in adversarial training to produce realistic synthetic outputs. In prosthodontic design applications, the generator learns to create anatomically plausible crown morphologies while the discriminator learns to distinguish generated crowns from human-designed examples. This adversarial dynamic drives the generator toward producing increasingly realistic and clinically appropriate designs. Recent architectural innovations include conditional GANs (cGANs), which incorporate additional conditioning information such as antagonist tooth geometry or prepared abutment shape to guide generation, and two-stage GANs that separately optimize global morphology and fine occlusal detail.

Transformer architectures, initially developed for natural language processing, have recently been adapted for visual recognition tasks in dentistry. The YOLO (You Only Look Once) family of object detection algorithms provides real-time detection capabilities by framing object detection as a regression problem, predicting bounding boxes and class probabilities directly from full images in a single forward pass. The DEtection TRansformer (DETR) architecture employs transformer encoder-decoder structures with self-attention mechanisms to detect objects by directly predicting sets of objects without requiring hand-crafted components like non-maximum suppression. These architectures have proven particularly effective for radiographic implant identification tasks where multiple implants of varying types must be simultaneously detected and classified within panoramic or periapical radiographs.

3.2 Training Methodologies and Data Requirements

Supervised learning approaches dominate prosthodontic AI applications, requiring large annotated datasets where input data (e.g., intraoral scans, radiographs) are paired with ground-truth labels (e.g., expert-defined margin lines, implant system classifications). Dataset sizes in reviewed studies ranged from 150 to 4,677 cases, with larger datasets generally correlating with improved model performance and generalizability. Data augmentation techniques—including geometric transformations (rotation, scaling, cropping), intensity modifications (brightness adjustment, contrast enhancement), and noise injection—are routinely employed to artificially expand training datasets and improve model robustness to input variations.

Transfer learning strategies, wherein models pre-trained on large-scale general image datasets (e.g., ImageNet) are fine-tuned on domain-specific prosthodontic data, have proven effective in mitigating limited dataset availability. Self-supervised learning approaches, exemplified by masked autoencoder pre-training, enable models to learn robust feature representations from unlabeled data before supervised fine-tuning, potentially addressing the annotation bottleneck inherent in clinical dataset curation. Cross-validation protocols, typically employing k-fold validation with k ranging from 3 to 10, serve to assess model generalizability and mitigate overfitting risks. However, many studies lack independent external validation on data from different institutions or imaging devices, limiting conclusions regarding real-world performance.

4. Automated Prosthodontic Design Systems

4.1 Generative Adversarial Network Architectures for Crown Design

Generative adversarial networks have emerged as the predominant approach for automated dental crown design, offering substantial time efficiency advantages over conventional CAD workflows. The foundational GAN-based crown design framework incorporates three-dimensional intraoral scan data of the prepared tooth and antagonist dentition as input, generating complete crown morphologies that satisfy spatial constraints, occlusal requirements, and aesthetic considerations. The DCPR-GAN (Dental Crown Prosthesis Restoration GAN) architecture represents a milestone implementation, employing a two-stage generation process that first establishes global crown morphology and subsequently refines occlusal surface detail. This staged approach addresses the dual optimization challenge of achieving both anatomically correct overall shape and functionally appropriate occlusal topography.

Comparative studies evaluating GAN-based automated design (AI group) versus conventional CAD software (non-AI group) have documented significant time efficiency improvements. Working time reductions of 60-75% have been consistently reported across multiple studies, with AI-designed crowns requiring 5-8 minutes compared to 15-30 minutes for conventional manual design. Critically, these time savings were achieved while maintaining clinically acceptable marginal fit and internal adaptation. Quantitative assessments using digital superimposition techniques revealed marginal discrepancies of 50-120 μm for AI-designed crowns—values well within the clinically acceptable threshold of 120 μm established in prosthodontic literature. Occlusal morphology analysis demonstrated root mean square deviation (RMSD) values of 0.08-0.15 mm between AI-generated and expert-designed crowns, indicating high morphological fidelity.

The 3D CycleGAN architecture has been specifically adapted for implant-supported crown design, demonstrating average Intersection over Union (IoU) scores of 75% and mean Hausdorff distances of 1.06 mm when compared to manually designed prostheses. Conditional GAN variants that incorporate anatomical constraints, opposing arch information, and patient-specific aesthetic parameters have shown enhanced performance over unconditional models. Recent implementations integrate biomechanical optimization objectives into the GAN loss function, enabling generation of crown designs that balance aesthetic requirements with mechanical stress distribution optimization. These multi-objective optimization frameworks represent a significant advance over purely geometric or aesthetic-focused design algorithms.

4.2 Convolutional Neural Networks for Partial Denture and Prosthesis Design

Beyond single-crown applications, CNN architectures have been successfully applied to more complex prosthetic design tasks including removable partial denture framework design and complete arch rehabilitation planning. Deep convolutional networks trained on expert-designed partial denture frameworks can automatically generate framework configurations that satisfy biomechanical principles, retention requirements, and patient-specific anatomical considerations. These systems incorporate Kennedy classification assessment algorithms to determine edentulous arch patterns, followed by automated framework component selection and positioning. Accuracy metrics for automated partial denture design systems report 85-92% concordance with expert clinician designs for major connector selection, rest seat placement, and retentive clasp configuration.

Automated tooth morphology reconstruction algorithms employ generative neural networks to predict missing tooth anatomy from antagonist and adjacent tooth information. These systems demonstrate particular utility in implant prosthodontics and orthodontic treatment planning where tooth position optimization requires anatomically plausible predictions of final restoration morphology. Performance evaluation using volumetric overlap metrics, cusp tip position accuracy, and occlusal contact area analysis indicates that AI-generated tooth morphologies achieve high fidelity to natural tooth anatomy, though systematic variations in cuspal inclination and intercuspal distance have been observed compared to population norms. Table 1 summarizes key performance metrics across automated design applications.

Table 1. Performance metrics for AI-driven automated prosthodontic design systems across various application domains and architectural approaches.

Application Domain	AI Architecture	Primary Metric	Performance Range
Crown design automation	GAN, DCPR-GAN, 3D CycleGAN	Marginal fit (µm)	50-120 µm
Crown design automation	GAN	Design time reduction	60-75%
Crown design automation	3D CycleGAN	IoU / Hausdorff	75% / 1.06 mm
Partial denture design	Deep CNN	Design concordance	85-92%

5. Margin Line Extraction and Finish Line Detection

5.1 U-Net and CNN-Based Segmentation Approaches

Automated margin line detection on prepared tooth surfaces represents a critical enabling technology for fully digital crown fabrication workflows. The margin line—the interface between prepared tooth structure and unprepared gingival region—must be precisely identified to ensure proper prosthetic adaptation and marginal seal. Manual margin line definition in CAD software is labor-intensive, operator-dependent, and subject to inter-operator variability. Deep learning-based automated margin detection systems address these limitations by applying semantic segmentation algorithms to three-dimensional intraoral scan data.

The U-Net architecture and its variants dominate margin detection applications due to their specialized design for biomedical segmentation tasks. The symmetric encoder-decoder structure with skip connections enables U-Net to capture both local detail and global context—essential for distinguishing subtle preparation boundaries. The S-Octree CNN approach employs spatial partitioning of preparation point clouds using octree data structures, enabling efficient processing of high-resolution three-dimensional scan data. This method achieved accurate margin line extraction on complex preparation geometries, though computational requirements remain substantial for real-time clinical application.

Quantitative evaluation of automated margin detection systems employs multiple geometric accuracy metrics. Hausdorff distance, measuring maximum deviation between detected and ground-truth margin lines, serves as a conservative worst-case performance indicator. Studies report Hausdorff distances ranging from 0.15 to 0.35 mm for state-of-the-art systems—substantially smaller than clinically significant discrepancies. Chamfer distance, computing average point-to-point distance between margin curves, typically ranges from 0.05 to 0.15 mm. Intersection over Union (IoU) metrics, quantifying overlap between predicted and true margin regions, demonstrate scores exceeding 91% for well-defined preparations.

Performance variations across tooth types have been consistently documented, with anterior teeth demonstrating superior detection accuracy compared to posterior teeth. This performance differential reflects the more complex three-dimensional geometry of posterior preparations, increased susceptibility to scanning artifacts in posterior regions, and reduced visual accessibility during scan acquisition. Preparation quality significantly influences detection accuracy—chamfer and deep chamfer preparations yield superior automated detection compared to knife-edge or feather-edge preparations lacking clear demarcation. Subgingival margin locations present particular challenges, with detection accuracy degrading when margin termination extends more than 0.5 mm subgingivally.

5.2 Hybrid Detection Approaches and Clinical Validation

Recognition of deep learning's occasional failure modes has motivated development of hybrid detection systems combining neural network predictions with parametric curve-fitting algorithms. These hybrid approaches leverage CNN outputs as initial margin estimates that are subsequently refined using geometric optimization procedures. The curve-on-mesh algorithmic component applies spline-fitting or B-spline optimization to neural network-detected margin points, producing smooth, continuous margin curves suitable for direct CAD/CAM processing. Hybrid methods demonstrate improved robustness to preparation irregularities, scan artifacts, and anatomical variations compared to pure neural network approaches.

Clinical validation studies comparing automated detection to expert manual definition reveal compelling efficiency advantages without sacrificing accuracy. Automated detection requires 15-30 seconds per preparation compared to 2-5 minutes for manual definition. Refined-automated segmentation workflows, wherein clinicians review and minimally adjust AI-generated margins, reduce total segmentation time by 60-70% compared to fully manual workflows while maintaining equivalent or superior accuracy. Importantly, automated systems demonstrate lower intra-operator variability across repeat measurements—a critical advantage for treatment standardization and quality assurance protocols. Table 2 presents comparative performance data for margin detection methodologies.

Table 2. Comparative performance metrics for margin line detection methodologies showing intersection over union scores and maximum deviation measurements.

Detection Method	Architecture	IoU Score	Hausdorff Distance
Pure CNN detection	3D U-Net	0.91	0.15-0.35 mm
Hybrid CNN + parametric	U-Net + curve-on-mesh	0.93	0.12-0.28 mm
S-Octree CNN	Spatial partition CNN	0.89	0.18-0.42 mm
Manual expert definition	N/A (ground truth)	1.00	Reference

6. Radiographic Implant Identification and Classification

6.1 Object Detection Architectures for Implant Recognition

Accurate identification of dental implant systems from radiographic images addresses a significant clinical challenge in prosthodontic practice. When patients present for prosthetic treatment with existing implants of unknown origin, clinicians must determine implant system specifications to select compatible prosthetic components. Traditional identification relies on manual comparison with manufacturer catalogs—a time-consuming process prone to diagnostic errors, particularly given the proliferation of implant systems and subtle inter-system design variations. AI-based implant identification systems automate this process through object detection and classification algorithms applied to panoramic and periapical radiographs.

The YOLO family of algorithms has emerged as the predominant approach for real-time implant detection in radiographs. YOLOv10, the most recent iteration, employs a single-stage detection architecture that simultaneously predicts bounding boxes and class probabilities without requiring computationally expensive region proposal networks. Applied to dental implant identification, YOLOv10 models have achieved mean average precision (mAP) scores of 98.3% across seven major implant systems including Adin, Dentium, Dionavi, Make It Simple, Nobel Biocare, Noris, and Osstem. These performance levels represent substantial improvements over earlier YOLO versions and exceed typical human expert accuracy, particularly for less common implant systems.

The DEtection TRansformer (DETR) architecture represents an alternative paradigm, employing transformer encoder-decoder structures with self-attention mechanisms for implant detection and classification. DETR-based systems achieved overall precision of 0.83 and recall of 0.89 across five implant types in panoramic and periapical radiographs. The transformer architecture's ability to capture long-range dependencies and global context proves advantageous when multiple implants of varying types appear within single radiographic images. Self-supervised learning approaches, particularly masked deep embedding pre-training extending the masked autoencoder paradigm, have significantly enhanced detection performance, achieving improvements of up to 2.9 average precision points over supervised baseline models.

Dataset characteristics critically influence model performance and generalizability. High-performing systems typically train on datasets containing 1,000-5,000 radiographic images with 3,000-8,000 annotated implant instances. Data augmentation strategies including rotation, brightness adjustment, contrast enhancement, and Gaussian blur are systematically applied to enhance model robustness to radiographic acquisition variability. Multi-center datasets incorporating images from diverse radiographic equipment and clinical settings demonstrate superior generalization compared to single-center data, though remain uncommon in published literature. Table 3 summarizes performance metrics across major implant identification studies.

Table 3. Performance characteristics of deep learning architectures for radiographic dental implant identification showing mean average precision and accuracy metrics.

AI Architecture	Dataset Size	Implant Systems	mAP	Accuracy
YOLOv10	4,677 images / 8,189 implants	7 systems (Adin, Dentium, Dionavi, MIS, Nobel, Noris, Osstem)	98.3%	>95%
DETR (Transformer)	1,138 base / 1,744 augmented	5 systems	—	Precision: 0.83 Recall: 0.89

Masked Deep Embedding + ViT	Variable	Multiple	96.1%	+2.9 AP vs baseline
Faster R-CNN	Multi-center dataset	Multiple systems	0.71	92.2%

6.2 Challenges in Low-Quality and Distorted Radiographs

A critical limitation of current implant identification systems concerns performance degradation on low-quality or distorted radiographic images—precisely the challenging cases where automated assistance would provide greatest clinical value. Systematic evaluation of AI models on intentionally degraded radiographs revealed substantial accuracy reductions when images contained motion blur, exposure artifacts, or anatomical distortions. The presence of foreign bodies (orthodontic appliances, existing prostheses, surgical hardware) introduces particular challenges, with classification accuracy declining by 15-30% in heavily occluded cases.

Image enhancement preprocessing strategies including histogram equalization, contrast-limited adaptive histogram equalization (CLAHE), and deep learning-based super-resolution have demonstrated modest improvements in detection robustness. However, fundamental limitations persist when critical implant features are genuinely obscured by anatomical overlap or radiographic artifacts. Multi-view detection strategies, integrating information from multiple radiographic projections when available, offer promising approaches to mitigate single-view ambiguities. Uncertainty quantification mechanisms that flag low-confidence predictions for human review represent practical implementations enabling clinical deployment despite imperfect performance.

7. Discussion

7.1 Clinical Translation and Implementation Challenges

Despite impressive technical performance metrics documented across AI applications in prosthodontics, substantial barriers impede clinical translation and widespread adoption. The overwhelming majority of published studies report retrospective analyses on single-center datasets with limited demographic diversity and restricted anatomical variation. Such methodological constraints severely limit generalizability conclusions—a model achieving 98% accuracy on training institution data may demonstrate markedly inferior performance when deployed in different clinical environments with distinct patient populations, imaging equipment, and preparation protocols. The paucity of prospective clinical trials directly comparing AI-augmented versus conventional workflows in real treatment scenarios represents a critical evidence gap.

Interoperability challenges further complicate clinical implementation. Contemporary prosthodontic workflows involve multiple software systems for image acquisition, treatment planning, prosthetic design, and manufacturing control. Successful AI integration requires seamless data exchange across these heterogeneous platforms—a technical requirement rarely addressed in current research implementations. Proprietary data formats, incompatible coordinate systems, and divergent quality standards create substantial integration friction. The absence of standardized evaluation protocols across studies additionally hinders comparative assessment of competing AI approaches and prevents evidence-based selection of optimal algorithms for specific clinical contexts.

Regulatory considerations present additional implementation barriers. Medical device approval pathways for AI-based clinical decision support systems remain evolving, with regulatory agencies grappling with unique challenges posed by continuously learning algorithms, opaque decision-making processes, and potential for algorithmic bias. Current regulatory frameworks, designed for static medical devices with fixed performance characteristics, inadequately address AI systems that may improve or degrade over time through continued learning or data drift. The computational infrastructure requirements for deploying deep learning models—including specialized hardware (GPUs), substantial memory resources, and real-time inference capabilities—impose non-trivial financial and technical burdens on clinical practices, particularly smaller independent operations.

7.2 Data Quality, Privacy, and Algorithmic Transparency

The fundamental dependence of deep learning systems on large, high-quality training datasets introduces significant practical and ethical challenges. Dental imaging data, while increasingly digitized, remains fragmented across institutional repositories with limited mechanisms for multi-center data sharing. Patient privacy protections under regulations such as HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) and GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) impose stringent constraints on data transfer and usage. Anonymization procedures, while essential for privacy protection, may inadvertently remove clinically relevant contextual information. Furthermore, the historical underrepresentation of certain demographic groups in research datasets raises concerns about algorithmic fairness and equitable performance across diverse patient populations.

Data quality inconsistencies pose additional challenges. Variation in imaging protocols, scanner specifications, operator technique, and annotation standards introduce noise that can degrade model performance or perpetuate systematic biases. The subjective nature of certain ground-truth labels—particularly for tasks like margin line definition where expert opinions may legitimately differ—introduces fundamental uncertainty into supervised learning paradigms. Adversarial vulnerabilities, wherein deliberately crafted input perturbations cause dramatic prediction failures, remain incompletely characterized for prosthodontic AI applications, raising concerns about robustness in clinical deployment.

Algorithmic transparency and interpretability constitute critical considerations for clinical acceptance. Deep neural networks function as complex nonlinear transformations with millions of parameters, producing predictions through processes that remain opaque even to their developers. This 'black box' nature conflicts with medical practice norms emphasizing explainable decision-making and clinical accountability. While explainable AI (XAI) techniques including attention visualization, saliency mapping, and layer-wise relevance propagation offer partial insights into model reasoning, fundamental tensions persist between model complexity (which drives performance) and interpretability (which enables clinical trust and error diagnosis). The appropriate balance between automation and human oversight—determining which decisions warrant algorithmic delegation versus mandatory human review—remains an open question requiring careful consideration of error consequences, clinical context, and practitioner preferences.

7.3 Comparative Performance and Methodological Heterogeneity

Direct performance comparisons across studies remain complicated by substantial methodological heterogeneity. Different investigations employ varying evaluation metrics, dataset characteristics, validation protocols, and baseline comparators, precluding straightforward algorithmic rankings. For instance, margin detection studies variously report Hausdorff distance, Chamfer distance, IoU scores, or qualitative clinical acceptability—metrics that capture distinct aspects of performance and may yield contradictory conclusions regarding relative algorithm superiority. The absence of standardized benchmark datasets analogous to ImageNet in computer vision or COCO in object detection represents a significant impediment to systematic progress measurement and reproducible research.

Ground-truth establishment methods significantly influence reported performance. Studies employing single expert annotations may overestimate true accuracy by failing to capture inter-expert variability. Conversely, consensus-based ground truth derived from multiple expert opinions better represents realistic clinical uncertainty but requires substantially greater annotation effort. The temporal stability of AI performance—whether models maintain accuracy over extended deployment periods or experience degradation due to data drift, equipment changes, or evolving clinical practices—remains poorly characterized given the predominance of cross-sectional study designs over longitudinal evaluations.

Publication bias likely inflates perceived AI capabilities. Positive results demonstrating high accuracy garner publication preferentially over null findings or performance limitations. This selection pressure creates systematic overestimation of technology maturity and may conceal important failure modes or boundary conditions. Pre-registration of AI development studies, analogous to clinical trial registration, could mitigate publication bias while promoting methodological rigor. Negative results documenting algorithm failures or unexpected behaviors possess substantial scientific value for delineating technology limitations and guiding refinement priorities.

7.4 Future Research Directions and Recommendations

Several priority research directions emerge from this comprehensive review. First, multicenter prospective clinical trials comparing AI-augmented versus conventional prosthodontic workflows are urgently needed to establish evidence-based efficacy and cost-effectiveness. Such trials should employ clinically meaningful endpoints including treatment time, prosthetic fit quality, revision rates, and patient-reported outcomes rather than solely technical performance metrics. Longer-term follow-up assessing prosthetic longevity, biological complications, and patient satisfaction under AI-assisted versus traditional fabrication would provide critical data for evidence-based adoption decisions.

Development and validation of standardized benchmark datasets representing diverse patient populations, anatomical variations, and imaging conditions would enable rigorous comparative evaluation of competing algorithms. Such benchmarks should incorporate challenging cases—subgingival margins, severely malpositioned teeth, poor-quality radiographs, uncommon implant systems—that reveal algorithmic limitations and guide targeted improvements. Collaborative initiatives analogous to the Medical Segmentation Decathlon or Grand Challenges in Biomedical Image Analysis could accelerate prosthodontic AI development through structured competition and open data sharing.

Explainable AI research specifically tailored to prosthodontic applications warrants investment. Techniques that provide clinicians with interpretable rationales for algorithmic decisions—highlighting which anatomical features influenced margin detection, visualizing prosthetic design decision logic, or quantifying prediction confidence—would facilitate appropriate trust calibration and error detection. Human-AI collaboration frameworks that optimize task delegation, leverage complementary strengths of human expertise and algorithmic processing, and maintain clinician agency represent promising research directions. Adaptive interfaces that adjust automation levels based on case complexity, clinician experience, and contextual factors could maximize efficiency gains while preserving quality safeguards.

Algorithmic fairness and bias mitigation constitute essential research priorities. Systematic evaluation of AI performance stratified by demographic variables (age, sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic status) would reveal potential disparities. Development of fairness-aware training procedures and bias correction techniques could ensure equitable performance across patient populations. Ethical frameworks addressing informed consent for AI-assisted treatment, data ownership, liability allocation for algorithmic errors, and appropriate balance between innovation and patient protection require multidisciplinary collaboration among clinicians, computer scientists, ethicists, and policymakers.

Finally, curriculum development integrating AI literacy into prosthodontic education represents a critical implementation consideration. Future practitioners require competencies in interpreting AI outputs, recognizing algorithmic limitations, identifying appropriate use cases, and maintaining clinical judgment in AI-augmented environments. Educational programs should balance enthusiasm for technological innovation with critical appraisal skills, enabling informed adoption decisions and responsible clinical deployment. Continuing education initiatives for current practitioners would facilitate knowledge translation and support evidence-based integration of AI technologies into existing clinical workflows.

8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies have demonstrated substantial potential to transform prosthodontic practice through automated design systems, margin line detection algorithms, and implant identification frameworks. Deep learning architectures including convolutional neural networks, generative adversarial networks, U-Net variants, and transformer-based models consistently achieve performance levels approaching or exceeding human expert benchmarks on standardized evaluation datasets. Automated crown design systems reduce design time by 60-75% while maintaining clinically acceptable marginal fit. Margin detection algorithms achieve sub-millimeter accuracy with IoU scores exceeding 91%. Implant identification systems demonstrate mAP scores of 96-98% across multiple implant manufacturers.

However, significant translational barriers including limited dataset diversity, insufficient clinical validation, interoperability challenges, regulatory uncertainty, data privacy concerns, and algorithmic transparency limitations constrain immediate widespread clinical adoption. The technology demonstrates clear promise for enhancing diagnostic accuracy, optimizing treatment planning, reducing clinical time, and improving treatment outcomes, yet requires continued development, rigorous validation, and thoughtful implementation to realize its transformative potential. Future research must prioritize multicenter prospective trials, standardized evaluation protocols, explainable AI development, fairness assessment, and educational integration to facilitate evidence-based, ethically sound, and clinically effective deployment of AI technologies in prosthodontic practice.

The integration of AI into prosthodontics represents neither wholesale replacement of human expertise nor uncritical technology adoption, but rather thoughtful augmentation of clinical capabilities through human-AI collaboration. Success will require balancing innovation enthusiasm with scientific rigor, technological capability with clinical needs, efficiency gains with quality assurance, and automation potential with appropriate human oversight. As prosthodontic practice continues its digital evolution, AI technologies offer powerful tools for advancing patient care—provided their deployment remains grounded in robust evidence, guided by ethical principles, and centered on optimal patient outcomes.

References

1. Bernauer, S. A., Zitzmann, N. U., & Joda, T. (2021). The use and performance of artificial intelligence in prosthodontics: A systematic review. Sensors, 21(19), 6628. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21196628
2. Choi, J., Ahn, J., & Park, J. M. (2024). Deep learning-based automated detection of the dental crown finish line: An accuracy study. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 132(6), 1286.e1-1286.e9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2023.11.029
3. ElShamally, H. (2025). AI and digital dentistry in prosthodontics: A systematic review. International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry, 8(1), 107-119. https://doi.org/10.9734/ijrrd/2025/v8i1214
4. Jang, J. H., Yun, K. D., Lee, S., Lee, J. H., & Lim, H. P. (2023). Deep learning-based automated segmentation of dental implants on cone-beam computed tomography images: A validation study. Journal of Dentistry, 135, 104589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104589
5. Kim, J. E., Nam, N. E., Shim, J. S., Jung, Y. H., Kim, J. H., & Kim, W. C. (2020). Identification of dental implants through deep learning-based object detection. BMC Oral Health, 20(1), 262. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-020-01256-1
6. Lee, D. W., Kim, S. Y., Jeong, S. N., & Lee, J. H. (2020). Artificial intelligence in fractured dental implant detection and classification: Evaluation using dataset from two dental hospitals. Diagnostics, 11(2), 233. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics11020233
7. Lee, J. H., Jeong, S. N., & Kim, Y. T. (2024). Identification of dental implant systems from low-quality and distorted dental radiographs using AI trained on a large multi-center dataset. Scientific Reports, 14(1), 13076. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-63422-z
8. Liu, C. M., Lin, W. C., & Lee, S. Y. (2024). Evaluation of the efficiency, trueness, and

clinical application of novel artificial intelligence design for dental crown prostheses. Dental Materials, 40(1), 19-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2023.11.007

9. Mai, H. N., Han, J. S., Kim, H. S., Park, Y. S., Park, J. M., & Lee, D. H. (2023). Reliability of automatic finish line detection for tooth preparation in dental computer-aided software. Journal of Prosthodontic Research, 67(1), 138-143. https://doi.org/10.2186/jpr.JPR_D_22_00075
10. Nasser, A., Hamza, M., & AlQahtani, M. (2024). Advanced deep learning techniques for recognition of dental implants. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 8, 1508234. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1508234
11. Rahmani, M., Baghban, A. A., & Alenazy, M. (2024). The potential of artificial intelligence in prosthodontics: A comprehensive review. Saudi Dental Journal, 36(6), 842-851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sdentj.2024.04.009
12. Revilla-León, M., Gómez-Polo, M., Vyas, S., Barmak, A. B., Özcan, M., Att, W., & Krishnamurthy, V. R. (2022). Artificial intelligence applications in restorative dentistry: A systematic review. Journal of Prosthodontics, 31(S1), 83-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopr.13441
13. Saghiri, M. A., Garcia-Godoy, F., Gutmann, J. L., Lotfi, M., & Asgar, K. (2015). The reliability of artificial neural network in locating minor apical foramen: A cadaver study. Journal of Endodontics, 41(8), 1130-1135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2015.03.004
14. Schwendicke, F., Samek, W., & Krois, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence in dentistry: Chances and challenges. Journal of Dental Research, 99(7), 769-774. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034520915714
15. Tian, S., Wang, M., Dai, N., Ma, H., Li, L., Fiorenza, L., Sun, Y., & Li, Y. (2021). DCPR-GAN: Dental crown prosthesis restoration using two-stage generative adversarial networks. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, 26(1), 151-160. https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2021.3119394
16. Tian, S., Wang, M., Ma, H., Huang, P., Dai, N., Sun, Y., & Meng, J. (2022). Efficient tooth gingival margin line reconstruction via adversarial learning. Biomedical Signal Processing and Control, 78, 103954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2022.103954
17. Wu, Y., Zhao, L., Chen, H., Wang, X., He, Y., Li, Q., & Wang, Q. (2024). Convolutional neural network for automated tooth segmentation on intraoral scans. BMC Oral Health, 24(1), 811. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-024-04582-2
18. Ye, H., Rahimi, H. M., Grlj, B., Tichy, A., & Schwendicke, F. (2023). Mapping the artificial intelligence role in the design of digital prosthetics: A scoping review. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, 131(1), 13-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2025.12.003
19. Zhang, B., Dai, N., Tian, S., Yuan, F., & Yu, Q. (2019). The extraction method of tooth preparation margin line based on S-Octree CNN. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Biomedical Engineering, 35(11), e3241. https://doi.org/10.1002/cnm.3241
20. Zhang, Y., Li, J., Zhao, Y., Xie, Q., Wang, Y., & Chen, Y. (2024). Deep learning-based object detection of dental implant systems in panoramic and periapical radiographs. The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2024.12.005