Zeynep B Kutuk

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7449950/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



7EVNED R KIITIIK

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Four-year Randomized Clinical Trial to Evaluate the Clinical Performance of a Glass Ionomer Restorative System. Operative Dentistry, 2015, 40, 134-143.	1.2	73
2	Thirty-Six-Month Clinical Comparison of Bulk Fill and Nanofill Composite Restorations. Operative Dentistry, 2017, 42, 478-485.	1.2	64
3	Clinical performance of a glass ionomer restorative system: a 6-year evaluation. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2017, 21, 2335-2343.	3.0	46
4	A randomized controlled 10 years follow up of a glass ionomer restorative material in class I and class II cavities. Journal of Dentistry, 2020, 94, 103175.	4.1	39
5	Effects of in-office bleaching agent combined with different desensitizing agents on enamel. Journal of Applied Oral Science, 2019, 27, e20180233.	1.8	29
6	Six-year clinical evaluation of bulk-fill and nanofill resin composite restorations. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2022, 26, 417-426.	3.0	24
7	An 18-month clinical evaluation of three different universal adhesives used with a universal flowable composite resin in the restoration of non-carious cervical lesions. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2019, 23, 1443-1452.	3.0	21
8	Mechanical performance of a newly developed glass hybrid restorative in the restoration of large MO Class 2 cavities. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice, 2019, 22, 833.	0.6	20
9	Mechanical properties and water sorption of two experimental glass ionomer cements with hydroxyapatite or calcium fluorapatite formulation. Dental Materials Journal, 2019, 38, 471-479.	1.8	12
10	Influence of modeling agents on the surface properties of an esthetic nano-hybrid composite. Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 2020, 45, e13.	1.5	10
11	Compressive Strength of New Glass Ionomer Cement Technology based Restorative Materials after Thermocycling and Cyclic Loading. Acta Stomatologica Croatica, 2019, 53, 318-325.	1.0	9
12	Comparison of two different methods of detecting residual caries. Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 2017, 42, 48.	1.5	8
13	Does a new formula have an input in the clinical success of posterior composite restorations? A chat study. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2021, 25, 1715-1727.	3.0	8
14	Comparison of two different composite resins used for tooth reshaping and diastema closure in a 4-year follow-up. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice, 2018, 21, 1098.	0.6	8
15	Comparative evaluation of different adhesive strategies of a universal adhesive in class II bulk-fill restorations: A 48-month randomized controlled trial. Journal of Dentistry, 2022, 117, 103921.	4.1	6
16	Influence of extremely high irradiances on the micromechanical properties of a nano hybrid resin based composite. American Journal of Dentistry, 2017, 30, 9-15.	0.1	6
17	Effect of various bleaching treatments on shear bond strength of different universal adhesives and application modes. Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 2018, 43, e20.	1.5	5
18	Bond strength of three different universal adhesives after different thermal cycling protocols. Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology, 2018, 32, 2741-2752.	2.6	3

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Influence of preprocedural antiseptic mouthrinses against COVID-19 on enamel/dentin bond strength of a universal adhesive. Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology, 2021, 35, 2288-2300.	2.6	3
20	Güncel bir cam iyonomer restoratif sistemin 36-aylık klinik performansının değerlendirilmesi. Cumhuriyet Dental Journal, 2014, 17, 244.	0.3	3