

Mouthrinse recommendation for prosthodontic patients*

Sheila Cavalca CORTELLI^(a)
 Fernando Oliveira COSTA^(b)
 Sigmar de Mello RODE^(c)
 Alex Nogueira HAAS^(d)
 Ana Karina Pinto de ANDRADE^(e)
 Claudio Mendes PANNUTI^(f)
 Elaine Cristina ESCOBAR^(g)
 Eliete Rodrigues de ALMEIDA^(g)
 José Roberto CORTELLI^(a)
 Vinicius PEDRAZZI^(h)

^(a)Periodontology Department, School of Dentistry, Universidade de Taubaté - UNITAU, Taubaté, SP, Brazil.

^(b)Periodontology Department, School of Dentistry, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais - UFMG, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil.

^(c)Dental Materials and Prosthesis Department, Instituto de Ciência e Tecnologia - ICT, Univ Estadual Paulista - UNESP, São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil.

^(d)Periodontology Department, School of Dentistry, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS, Rio Grande do Sul, RS, Brazil.

^(e)Periodontology Department, School of Dentistry, Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas - FMU, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

^(f)Periodontology Department, School of Dentistry, Universidade de São Paulo - USP, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

^(g)Epidemiology and Pediatric Dentistry Department, School of Dentistry, Universidade Cruzeiro do Sul - UNICSUL, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

^(h)Endodontics and Prosthesis Department, Faculdade de Odontologia de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo - USP, Ribeirão Preto, SP, Brazil.

*Paper presented at the "Equity, Social Inclusion and Oral Health Promotion: Major Challenges" International Symposium, held at the 18th Congress of the Brazilian Association for Oral Health Promotion (Associação Brasileira de Odontologia de Promoção de Saúde - ABOPREV), April 2013, Bauru, SP, Brazil.

Declaration of Interests: The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interest that represents a conflict of interest in connection with the manuscript.

Corresponding Author:
 Sheila Cavalca Cortelli
 E-mail: cavalcacortelli@uol.com.br

DOI: 10.1590/1807-3107BOR-2014.vol28.0020
 Epub Jun 27, 2014

Submitted: Nov 30, 2013
 Accepted for publication: Apr 16, 2014
 Last revision: May 21, 2014

Abstract: Different reasons can contribute to classifying dental prosthesis wearers as high-risk individuals in relation to dental biofilm accumulation. These include a past history of oral disease, age and additional retentive areas. Other common complaints include inflammation and halitosis. Moreover, prosthesis replacement and prosthetic pillar loss are generally associated with caries and periodontal disease recurrence. Therefore, the present study undertook to make a critical review of the literature, aiming at discussing the main aspects related to chemical agent prescriptions for dental prosthesis wearers. Most of the articles were selected based on relevance, methods and availability in regard to the specific subject under investigation, without considering publication year limitations. Different types of prostheses and their impact on teeth and other oral tissues were reported. It was demonstrated that there is greater biofilm buildup and increased inflammatory levels in the presence of different types of prostheses, suggesting that additional measures are required both on population-wide and individual levels in order to control these factors. Mechanical control consists of a combination of manual or electric toothbrush and toothpaste, as well as specific devices for interdental cleaning. Although many chemical agents exhibit antimicrobial benefits when used for prosthesis disinfection, only a few agents can be used safely without causing damage. Regarding the selection of antiseptics by the overall population, chlorhexidine is the most indicated in the short term and in sporadic cases. The most indicated adjuncts to overcome the deficiencies and limitations of daily mechanical biofilm control are products containing essential oils as active ingredients.

Keywords: Mouthwashes; Biofilms; Dental Prosthesis.

Introduction

Epidemiological studies demonstrate that rehabilitation by non-implant-supported prostheses is still a reality, even in developed countries,¹ although a tendency to reduce their use has been noticed, especially that of conventional removable dentures.² Specifically in regard to Brazil, this explains the high rates of partial tooth loss, even in young populations^{3,4} and edentulous subjects, a loss that becomes a reality in elder age groups.⁵ In addition, recent government measures have led to the dissemination of prostheses in our country.

Despite improvements⁶ in dental-related issues, including specific aspects such as chewing, phonation and aesthetics, and general aspects, such

as quality of life⁷ related to rehabilitation treatment, some authors have questioned the current opinion of dentists regarding treatment plans. In this sense, the offering of complete and desirable treatments based on scientific evidence is preferable to simple dental treatments that, in general, lead to successive prosthetic replacements.⁸ Furthermore, identification and management of risk factors, proper oral environment preparation for receiving prostheses and subsequent prosthetic follow-up are fundamental.

In an attempt to better understand this central issue, the authors of this literature review started from two basic premises derived from a comparison of implant-supported prostheses and natural teeth:

- a. prostheses tend to retain more biofilm, and
- b. prostheses tend to represent the greatest challenges to at-home mechanical control.

After a 3-month follow-up, Erdermir *et al.*⁹ reported higher plaque rates for teeth with fixed prosthesis, compared to their contralateral controls. However, specific aspects, such as prosthesis design, manufacture and materials, influence the amount of accumulated biofilm.^{10,11} For example, while Kissov *et al.*¹² observed higher biofilm accumulation on different types of deficient fixed prostheses, Kobubo *et al.*¹³ reported similar levels of plaque between ceramic crowns and teeth controls.

Individual biofilm behavior and its management become relevant when considering that prosthesis replacement and prosthetic pillar loss are generally associated with caries and periodontal disease. However, it should be noted that individual history and previous risk classification seem to have a direct impact on treatment prognosis. The plaque index is a profile indicator that cannot be underestimated, even when measured transversely. Interestingly, it was demonstrated that in the first 32 years of life, individuals remain in the same category of biofilm accumulation, i.e., either high, medium or low. As could be expected, individuals with higher biofilm accumulation rates were more susceptible to dental caries and periodontal disease.¹⁴ Moreover, the absence of a good periodontal prognosis was related to prosthetic support loss.¹⁵ Unlike high-risk populations, individuals with low periodontal disease sus-

ceptibility can remain stable for long periods of time after rehabilitation with fixed prostheses.¹⁶

The objective of this paper was to perform a critical literature review discussing the most comprehensive aspects related to chemical agent prescriptions for dental prosthesis wearers.

Types of prostheses and their effects on teeth and soft tissues

Single-tooth prosthesis

The use of single-tooth prostheses appears to be associated with exacerbated inflammatory levels, but not necessarily with periodontal tissue support destruction.¹⁷ However, studies such as that by Kokubo *et al.*¹³ observed similar plaque and gingival indexes between single-tooth prostheses—ceramic crowns—and natural teeth used as controls. It is worth pointing out that the use of more sensitive methods, like flowmetry, can reveal a more pronounced inflammatory process, as compared with clinical index analysis.¹⁸ After periodontitis, tooth decay is the second most frequent reason for tooth loss with prosthetic crowns.¹⁹ Furthermore, the use of crowns is also associated with the occurrence of caries in adjacent teeth.²⁰

Fixed partial denture (FPD)

Edermir *et al.*⁹ observed higher probing depth, plaque index and gingival index values in FPD-supporting teeth than in their contralateral controls. Unfortunately, the poor periodontal status revealed by these and other parameters, such as the absence of a prognosis classified as good, influences fixed prosthesis support loss over time.¹⁵ In addition, Goodacre *et al.*²¹ reported caries as one of the three most common complications of FPDs. According to Tan *et al.*,²² FPDs exhibited a 5.8% caries incidence in a five-year period.

Removable partial denture (RPD)

Longitudinal studies have suggested an association between RPD and the occurrence and/or greater severity of gingivitis, periodontitis and mobility of dental support. In the study by Zlatarić *et al.*,²³ conducted with 205 RPD users for periods ranging between 1 and 10 years, the support teeth of

dental prostheses exhibited a worse condition than the control teeth (no prosthetic support), as demonstrated by higher plaque and gingival indexes, and increased dental calculus, probing depth, gingival recession and tooth mobility. Do Amaral *et al.*²⁴ also observed higher periodontal tissue damage to direct and indirect RPD retainer teeth, as compared with controls. In subjects wearing RPDs, cariogenic activity may also be higher than in subjects wearing fixed prostheses.²⁵ Bergman and Ericson²⁶ found 6.2% recurrent caries in 422 initially restored surfaces, in addition to 7.1% new lesions in 436 initially healthy surfaces, after 3 years of RPD use.

Complete denture (CD)

Although tooth absence eliminates the possibilities of caries, gingivitis and periodontitis, two aspects related to soft tissues should be discussed prior to addressing chemical and mechanical biofilm control:

- a. inflammation, and
- b. microbial colonization.

The use of CDs causes changes in the epithelium and connective tissue leading to tissue adaptation to the new compression and chewing activity requirements.²⁷ Acrylic bases are the most common in making this type of prosthesis. These bases are associated with proinflammatory cytokine release, although the adoption of polishing techniques can decrease release levels.²⁸

Prosthetic surfaces favor colonization by different microbial species, including bacteria and fungi, especially *Candida*. This buildup may cause local infection or act as a reservoir for the spread of microorganisms to other sites.^{29,30,31}

Mechanical and chemical methods of biofilm control

After a brief explanation about the types of prostheses and their effects on oral structures, in the previous section, the authors will now discuss the main indications for chemical agents used as adjuncts to mechanical plaque control, for users of implant-supported prostheses:

- Oral hygiene of the prosthesis user [chemical ad-

juncts associated with the use of devices such as manual toothbrushes (conventional and electric), interdental brushes, dental floss, and water-pick].

- Cleaning the removable prosthesis (chemical adjuncts used in combination with special brushes, gauze, water-pick, disinfectants and antimicrobials).

Not all products have been tested or have proved sufficiently effective as antiplaque, anticaries and antigingivitis agents to justify clinical recommendation. With this mind, a cost-benefit analysis should always be performed. Furthermore, it is emphasized here that mechanical methods combined with the use of adjunct active ingredients offer benefits only if the proper dosage and form of use are observed. Instruction and motivation are essential to the success of both mechanical and chemical methods.

Expected benefits

Biofilm reduction

Based on the evidence discussed in the first section of this literature review, it is apparent that greater biofilm buildup occurs in the presence of different types of prostheses, suggesting that, in this situation, biofilm control requires additional measures to be adopted on both population-wide and individual levels. In this context, when biofilm reduction is the objective, some prosthesis- and host-related aspects must be considered. Certain materials used for the construction of prosthetic devices require complementary aids for proper biofilm control; resin, for example, retains more biofilm compared with porcelain.³² In addition, the polishing of materials, if performed inadequately, may negatively impact biofilm control.³³

In relation to the host, issues such as susceptibility and age are relevant. Older age is associated with a higher number of prosthesis users, and, unfortunately, also associated with greater mechanical control difficulties and higher frequency of biofilm-covered tooth surfaces. Among FPD users followed for 12 months, the younger subjects exhibited better oral hygiene levels than the older subjects.³⁴ Thus, age is the first good indicator for recommending additional chemical methods to boost the effectiveness

of at-home biofilm control.

Special attention should be given to implant-supported prostheses. It is clinically well known that the area of extension of this type of prosthesis, because of its specific design, often requires comparatively more connectors and bars—hence entailing more deficiencies—than conventional prostheses. Thus, in the absence of specific oral hygiene practices, there is a positive correlation between higher scores of dental plaque and gingival bleeding. Additionally, animal studies have shown that correct sealing between soft tissue, abutment and prosthesis has an important role in defending against infections. Therefore, in order to achieve stable, long-term peri-implant health, it is important to achieve proper sealing of the soft tissue around dental implants and restorations, to provide more favorable conditions for biofilm removal.

A recent study conducted by Olerud *et al.*³⁵ assessed the satisfaction of elderly patients with special care needs regarding general daily oral health hygiene, in relation to oral conditions and dental implants. Surprisingly, this study showed that few signs of oral disease were found, and that the tissues around implants were healthier than around natural teeth. There was no correlation between oral hygiene and plaque scores and gingival bleeding. Overall, most individuals were satisfied with their teeth, implants and oral hygiene.

However, there are only few studies addressing the association among inflammation, plaque scores and prosthetic implants in the literature, and mainly additional longitudinal studies are required.

Inflammation reduction and gingivitis

As with biofilm data, it can be generally established that dentures (depending on their type) can be associated with inflammation and gingivitis development. Thus, chemical agents with anti-inflammatory action may offer clinically detectable benefits.

Halitosis reduction

Halitosis is a common finding among prosthesis users and seems to be more pronounced in the presence of FPD versus RPD,³⁶ even in the absence of xerostomia complaints.³⁷ In the case of CDs, not

removing them at night is positively correlated with the presence of volatile sulfur compounds.³⁸ Again, the prosthesis wearer's age is a co-factor involved in halitosis, since increasing age is also related to the observation and self-reporting of this symptom.

In addition to active ingredients with specific halitosis action (like zinc citrate), antiplaque action itself combats the problem, since a thicker tongue coating also contributes significantly to the occurrence and severity of halitosis.

Salivary stimulation

Prolonged use of a maxillary CD may affect palate salivary secretion.³⁹ Although a systematic review published in 2008 did not gather sufficient evidence to guide clinical practice,⁴⁰ isolated studies have pointed out the negative influence of reduced salivary flow on the use and performance of a mucosa-borne prosthesis, and also its contribution to oral infection predisposition. A study conducted with 229 healthy individuals at least 60 years old showed that, regardless of educational level or gender, oral dryness led to the functional dissatisfaction of RPD and CD users.

Increased prosthetic longevity

Since periodontal diseases, followed by caries, are the main causes of prosthetic support loss, biofilm control promotes an increase in prosthesis longevity, and consequent reduction in prosthetic replacement. Additionally, specific bacterial counts, easily affected by active ingredients, have shown to be related to tooth loss in RPD users.⁴¹

Microbial modulation

Prosthetic surfaces retain a large number of microorganisms that must be controlled to prevent the occurrence of local lesions, such as denture stomatitis. They are also a source of possible systemic complications, such as pneumonia or bacteremia.^{29,30,31} Some individuals use CDs as a definitive therapy, whereas others, as a temporary therapy until such time as implants can be placed. There are also those who remain without any kind of prosthetic rehabilitation for long periods of time. Thus, both a CD and an edentulous oral cavity⁴² can be considered microbial reservoirs that should preferably be controlled.

Prosthetic devices

Prior to analyzing the main devices available, it should be noted that any oral hygiene program should be individualized, and may require change over time. Furthermore, prosthesis-cleaning chemical substances are disinfectants by definition, whereas oral-tissue cleaning chemicals are antiseptics by definition. The ideal characteristics of a disinfectant may differ from those of an antiseptic. The most obvious features involved are bioavailability and biotolerance. This implies, for example, that a good disinfectant as regards toxicity may be a bad antiseptic. However, in terms of an ideal daily routine for prosthesis users, a single product able to perform both functions should be recommended.

Hand-held toothbrushes and dental floss

Conventional toothbrushes should be kept apart from prosthetic brushes, and the bristle hardness recommended for brushes used both on tooth surfaces and prosthesis may be different than that recommended for brushes used only on prosthetic surfaces. Although no differences have been observed for the overall population, as regards seniors⁴³ the electric toothbrush can offer additional benefits in comparison with conventional toothbrushes.

In regard to fixed single-tooth prostheses and RPDs, interdental cleaning devices should be selected based on the spaces between the remaining teeth, and will vary from dental floss or tape to thick interdental brushes. The advantages of introducing specific interdental cleaning devices have been established for many years⁴⁴ and, regardless of the prosthesis used, their combination with conventional brushes produces greater reduction in biofilm, gingival inflammation and probing depth.⁴⁵ On the other hand, FPD requires specific flosses, regardless of the model of choice.⁴⁶ Although some initial training is required, these special flosses are associated with greater flossing frequency.⁴⁷ In terms of bristle concentration, of easy access to different oral areas and of level of intraoral biofilm removal, the single tuft usually boosts the oral hygiene procedure, and thus should always be recommended, with the exception of CD users, who are better served with wider brushes and greater bristle hardness.

The most widely used oral hygiene method among patients with RPD is the conventional manual toothbrush, just as it is in the general population; however, the population does not always use dentifrice.^{48,49} The lack of guidance on oral hygiene care was cited as a negative factor for the longevity of RPDs.¹¹ Moreover, Ortolan *et al.*³⁴ reported that oral hygiene education and motivation levels are improved after placing FPDs.

Chemical control for removable partial dentures or complete dentures

Active ingredients according to their advantages or reasons for non-recommendation

Regarding complete dentures (CDs), the use of effervescent tablets containing peroxides has proven to provide superior cleanliness over conventional brushing with water. Immersion in solutions containing 0.12% or 2.0% peroxide⁵⁰ or hypochlorite⁵¹ has also demonstrated superior biofilm removal for CDs. Although both hypochlorite and chlorhexidine cause color changes in RPD and CD resins,⁵² these changes are not always visible to the naked eye during the evaluation periods, according to the studies consulted. Additionally, hypochlorite alters acrylic resin surface roughness.⁵³

When combining different types of materials, such as resin/ceramic and alloys, RPDs require greater care in selecting the active ingredient. Despite the higher fungicidal action of sodium hypochlorite,⁵⁴ RPDs immersed in a 0.05% solution of this substance have been associated with corrosion and erosion of the metallic structure.^{55,56} Essential oils (EOs), namely menthol, thymol, eucalyptol and methyl salicylate, have demonstrated antimicrobial efficacy for CD disinfection,⁵⁷ and no changes in the resinous materials were observed.⁵⁸ Although cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) does not cause changes in dentures, its antimicrobial effect is lower, as compared with EOs.⁵⁹

Chemical oral biofilm control for prosthesis users

Active ingredients according to their

advantages or reasons for non-recommendation

Prosthesis users tend to be elderly, have greater difficulties in biofilm mechanical control and consequently more biofilm and disease indicators. Halitosis complaints are also frequent in this group. These are classical indications for biofilm chemical control. For this reason, the authors thought it necessary to discuss the main antiplaque and antigingivitis agents reported in the literature. Several reviews on the subject have pointed out the oral benefits of combining daily mechanical and chemical methods.^{60,61,62} Gunsolley⁶³ compiled data in 2010, and provided a ranking of the antiplaque and antigingivitis effects of three mouthwashes:

- chlorhexidine (CHX) ranked first,
- essential oils (EOs) ranked second, and
- cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) ranked third.

In the following year, Van Leeuwen⁶⁴ reported a greater antiplaque effect for CHX versus EOs, particularly in the short term, and similar anti-inflammatory effects for both. The superiority of EOs versus CPC was observed among the agents indicated for regular use.^{61,65,66}

Because no clear benefits have been observed for 0.05% CPC,⁶⁷ different CPC concentrations—0.07% and 0.075%—with greater bioavailability have been tested. Although the antiplaque and antigingivitis effects of these higher concentrations have proven better than those of the traditional concentration, they are still lower than those of CHX and EOs. Furthermore, these increased concentrations have also increased undesirable side effects, such as tooth staining. Undesirable effects, such as epithelial desquamation, tooth staining and interferences in the sense of taste, are also mainly responsible for the short-term use of CHX.^{68,69}

Another expected adjunct benefit of mouthwashes is halitosis reduction. CHX, EOs and 0.05% sodium fluoride show satisfactory results,^{70,71} whereas CPC shows less pronounced reductions.⁷²

Even though allergic reactions are not common, use of a mouthrinse should be contraindicated whenever there is a history, suspicion or risk of allergy to any mouthrinse formula component.

Because of the greater risk of caries that some prosthodontic patients may present, additional measures become necessary, apart from adding fluoride to toothpastes. In the initial mouth preparation phase, CHX gel has demonstrated suitable effects.⁶⁹ In the maintenance phase, in addition to fluoride solutions with anticaries and possible halitosis reduction effects,⁷³ combined formulations like CHX + fluoride or EOs + fluoride + zinc may also be prescribed.

Final considerations

The armamentarium for mechanical control should consist of a manual or electric toothbrush and toothpaste, combined with specific devices, according to each case, for interdental cleaning. Specific prosthesis designs, particularly implant-supported prostheses, may also require more specific oral hygiene care measures.

Although many chemical agents exhibit antimicrobial benefits when used for prosthesis disinfection, only a few agents can be used safely without causing damage. In selecting an antiseptic for the overall population, for the short term and in sporadic cases, CHX is indicated. The most indicated adjunctive active ingredients to overcome the deficiencies and limitations of daily mechanical control are essential oils (EOs). The second choice for daily use, because it is not as effective as EOs, is a CPC solution with concentrations ranging from 0.05% to 0.75%, which, however, have a greater potential for adverse reactions. Fluoride solutions may be prescribed for high caries risk patients.

After reviewing the current literature in search of a formulation with better adherence and cost-effectiveness, two chemical agents were found to have the best possibilities of performing both a disinfectant and an antiseptic function:

- CHX for short-term periods and
- EOs for long-term periods.

It is important to highlight that additional longitudinal studies on oral hygiene habits associated with prosthesis type should be conducted to determine the best adjuncts to complement traditional methods in choosing the oral hygiene regimen that will promote prosthesis longevity and oral health.

References

- Pun DK, Waliszewski MP, Waliszewski KJ, Berzins D. Survey of partial removable dental prosthesis (partial RDP) types in a distinct patient population. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2011 Jul;106(1):48-56.
- Edman K, Ohrn K, Holmlund A, Nordström B, Hedin M, Hellberg D. Comparison of oral status in an adult population 35-75 year of age in the county of Dalarna, Sweden in 1983 and 2008. *Swed Dent J.* 2012;36(2):61-70.
- Susin C, Haas AN, Oppermann RV, Albandar JM. Tooth loss in a young population from south Brazil. *J Public Health Dent.* 2006 Spring;66(2):110-5.
- Lorentz TCM, Cota LOM, Vargas AMD, Cortelli JR, Costa FO. Tooth loss in individuals under periodontal maintenance therapy: prospective study. *Braz Oral Res.* 2010 Apr-Jun;24(2):231-7.
- Gaio EJ, Haas AN, Carrard VC, Oppermann RV, Albandar J, Susin C. Oral health status in elders from South Brazil: a population-based study. *Gerodontology.* 2012 Sep;29(3):214-36.
- Yi SW, Carlsson GE, Ericsson I. Prospective 3-year study of cross-arch fixed partial dentures in patients with advanced periodontal disease. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2001 Nov;86(5):489-94.
- Ha JE, Heo YJ, Jin BH, Paik DI, Bae KH. The impact of the National Denture Service on oral health-related quality of life among poor elders. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2012 Aug;39(8):600-7.
- LeSage B. Are you treating planned cases or treating teeth to stay busy?. *Dent Today.* 2012 Sep;31(9):76, 78, 80 passim.
- Erdemir EO, Baran I, Nalcaci R, Apan T. IL-6 and IL-8 levels in GCF of the teeth supporting fixed partial denture. *Oral Dis.* 2010 Jan;16(1):83-8.
- Goncalves LM, Bezerra-Junior JR, Benatti BB, Santana IL. Improving the esthetic replacement of missing anterior teeth: interaction between periodontics and a rotational path removable partial denture. *Gen Dent.* 2011 May-Jun;59(3):190-4.
- Lynch CD. Successful removable partial dentures. *Dent Update.* 2012 Mar;39(2):118-20, 122-6.
- Kissov HK, Todorova BP, Popova EV. Correlation between overcontouring of fixed prosthetic constructions and accumulation of dental plaque. *Folia Med (Plovdiv).* 2001;43(1-2):80-3.
- Kokubo Y, Sakurai S, Tsumita M, Ogawa T, Fukushima S. Clinical evaluation of Procera AllCeram crowns in Japanese patients: results after 5 years. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2009 Nov;36(11):786-91.
- Broadbent JM, Thomson WM, Boyens JV, Poulton R. Dental plaque and oral health during the first 32 years of life. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2011 Apr;142(4):415-26.
- Cabanilla LL, Neely AL, Hernandez F. The relationship between periodontal diagnosis and prognosis and the survival of prosthodontic abutments: a retrospective study. *Quintessence Int.* 2009 Nov-Dec;40(10):821-31.
- Moser P, Hammerle CH, Lang NP, Schlegel-Bregenzler B, Persson R. Maintenance of periodontal attachment levels in prosthodontically treated patients with gingivitis or moderate chronic periodontitis 5-17 years post therapy. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2002 Jun;29(6):531-9.
- Giollo MD, Valle PM, Gomes SC, Rösing CK. A retrospective clinical, radiographic and microbiological study of periodontal conditions of teeth with and without crowns. *Braz Oral Res.* 2007 Oct-Dec;21(4):348-54.
- Develioglu H, Kesim B, Tuncel A. Evaluation of the marginal gingival health using laser Doppler flowmetry. *Braz Dent J.* 2006;17(3):219-22.
- Dikbas I, Tanalp J, Tomruk CO, Koksall T. Evaluation of reasons for extraction of crowned teeth: A prospective study at a university clinic. *Acta Odontol Scand.* 2013 May-Jul;71(3-4):848-56.
- Durr-E-Sadaf, Ahmad Z. Porcelain fused to metal (PFM) crowns and caries in adjacent teeth. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak.* 2011 Mar;21(3):134-7.
- Goodacre CJ, Bernal G, LRungcharassaeng K, Kan JY. Clinical complications in fixed prosthodontics. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2003 Jul;90(1):31-41.
- Tan K, Chan ES, Sim CP, Hean TK, Kiam CE, Wing YK, et al. A 5-year retrospective study of fixed partial dentures: success, survival, and incidence of biological and technical complications. *Singapore Dent J.* 2006 Dec;28(1):40-6.
- Zlatarić DK, Celebić A, Valentić-Peruzović M. The effect of removable partial dentures on periodontal health of abutment and non-abutment teeth. *J Periodontol.* 2002 Feb;73(2):137-44.
- do Amaral BA, Barreto AO, Gomes Seabra E, Roncalli AG, da Fonte Porto Carreiro A, de Almeida EO. A clinical follow-up study of the periodontal conditions of RPD abutment and non-abutment teeth. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2010 Jul;37(7):545-52.
- Tanaka J, Tanaka M. Influence of type of prosthesis on oral environment and the number of missing teeth in elderly persons. *Int J Dent.* 2010;2010: 584134. doi: 10.1155/2010/584134.
- Bergman B, Ericson G. Cross-sectional study of patients treated with removable partial dentures with special reference to the caries situation. *Scand J Dent Res.* 1986 Oct;94(5):436-42.
- Sharma AK, Mirza FD. Palatal mucosa under dentures: a qualitative histologic and histochemical analysis. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1986 Nov;56(5):574-82.
- Trubiani O, Toniato E, Di Iorio D, Diomedè F, Merciaro I, D' Arcangelo C, et al. Morphological analysis and interleukin release in human gingival fibroblasts seeded on different denture base acrylic resins. *Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol.* 2012 Jul-Sep;25(3):637-9.
- Coulthwaite L, Verran J. Potential pathogenic aspects of denture plaque. *Br J Biomed Sci.* 2007;64(4):180-9.

30. Gendreau L, Loewy ZG. Epidemiology and etiology of denture stomatitis. *J Prosthodont*. 2011 Jun;20(4):251-60.
31. Takeuchi Y, Nakajo K, Sato T, Koyama S, Sasaki K, Takahashi N. Quantification and identification of bacteria in acrylic resin dentures and dento-maxillary obturator-prostheses. *Am J Dent*. 2012 Jun;25(3):171-5.
32. Ababnaeh KT, Al-Omari M, Alawneh TN. The effect of dental restoration type and material on periodontal health. *Oral Health Prev Dent*. 2011;9(4):395-403.
33. Aykent F, Yondem I, Ozyesil AG, Gunal SK, Avunduk MC, Ozkan S. Effect of different finishing techniques for restorative materials on surface roughness and bacterial adhesion. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2010 Apr;103(4):221-7.
34. Ortolan SM, Viskić J, Stefanić S, Sitar KR, Vojvodić D, Mehulić K. Oral hygiene and gingival health in patients with fixed prosthodontic appliances--a 12-month follow-up. *Coll Antropol*. 2012 Mar;36(1):213-20.
35. Olerud E, Hagman-Gustafsson ML, Gabre P. Oral status, oral hygiene, and patient satisfaction in the elderly with dental implants dependent on substantial needs of care for daily living. *Spec Care Dentist*. 2012 Mar;32(2):49-54.
36. Mbodj EB, Faye B, Faye D, Seck MT, Sarr M, Ndiaye C, et al. Prevalence of halitosis in patients with dental prostheses in Senegal. *Med Trop (Mars)*. 2011 Jun;71(3):272-4.
37. Zigurs G, Vidzis A, Brinkmane A. Halitosis manifestation and prevention means for patients with fixed teeth dentures. *Stomatologija*. 2005;7(1):3-6.
38. Nalcaci R, Baran I. Oral malodor and removable complete dentures in the elderly. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2008 Jun;105(6):e5-9.
39. Niedermeier W, Huber M, Fischer D, Beier K, Müller N, Schuler R, et al. Significance of saliva for the denture-wearing population. *Gerodontology*. 2000 Dec;17(2):104-18.
40. Turner M, Jahangiri L, Ship JA. Hyposalivation, xerostomia and the complete denture: a systematic review. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2008 Feb;139(2):146-50.
41. Tanaka J, Tanaka M, Kawazoe T. Longitudinal research on the oral environment of elderly wearing fixed or removable prostheses. *J Prosthodont Res*. 2009 Apr;53(2):83-8.
42. Fernandes CB, Aquino DR, Franco GC, Cortelli SC, Costa FO, Cortelli JR. Do elderly edentulous patients with a history of periodontitis harbor periodontal pathogens?. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2010 Jun;21(6):618-23.
43. Verma S, Bhat KM. Acceptability of powered toothbrushes for elderly individuals. *J Public Health Dent*. 2004 Spring;64(2):115-7.
44. Waerhaug J. The interdental brush and its place in operative and crown and bridge dentistry. *J Oral Rehabil*. 1976 Apr;3(2):107-13.
45. Slot DE, Dörfer CE, Van der Weijden GA. The efficacy of interdental brushes on plaque and parameters of periodontal inflammation: a systematic review. *Int J Dent Hyg*. 2008 Nov;6(4):253-64.
46. Balshi TJ, Mingledorff EB. Maintenance procedures for patients after complete fixed prosthodontics. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1977 Apr;37(4):420-31.
47. Kleber CJ, Putt MS. Formation of flossing habit using a floss-holding device. *J Dent Hyg*. 1990 Mar;64(3):140-3.
48. Baran I, Nalçaci R. Self-reported denture hygiene habits and oral tissue conditions of complete denture wearers. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*. 2009 Sep-Oct;49(2):237-41.
49. Peracini A, Andrade IM, Paranhos HF, Silva CH, Souza RF. Behaviors and hygiene habits of complete denture wearers. *Braz Dent J*. 2010;21(3):247-52.
50. Andrade IM, Cruz PC, Silva-Lovato CH, Souza RF, Souza-Gugelmin MC, Paranhos HF. Effect of chlorhexidine on denture biofilm accumulation. *J Prosthodont*. 2012 Jan;21(1):2-6.
51. Dahlan AA, Haveman CW, Ramage G, Lopez-Ribot JL, Redding SW. Sodium hypochlorite, chlorhexidine gluconate, and commercial denture cleansers as disinfecting agents against *Candida albicans*: an in vitro comparison study. *Gen Dent*. 2011 Nov-Dec;59(6):e224-9.
52. Moffa EB, Giampaolo ET, Izumida FE, Pavarina AC, Machado AL, Vergani CE. Colour stability of relined dentures after chemical disinfection. A randomized clinical trial. *J Dent*. 2011 Dec;39 Suppl 3:e65-71.
53. Fernandes FH, Orsi IA, Villabona CA. Effects of the peracetic acid and sodium hypochlorite on the colour stability and surface roughness of the denture base acrylic resins polymerised by microwave and water bath methods. *Gerodontology*. 2013 Mar;30(1):18-25.
54. Silva PM, Acosta EJ, Pinto LR, Graeff M, Spolidorio DM, Almeida RS, Porto VC. Microscopical analysis of *Candida albicans* biofilms on heat-polymerised acrylic resin after chlorhexidine gluconate and sodium hypochlorite treatments. *Mycoses*. 2011 Nov;54(6):e712-7.
55. Felipucci DN, Davi LR, Paranhos HF, Bezzon OL, Silva RF, Pagnano VO. Effect of different cleansers on the surface of removable partial denture. *Braz Dent J*. 2011;22(5):392-7.
56. Felipucci DN, Davi LR, Paranhos HF, Bezzon OL, Silva RF, Barbosa Junior F, et al. Effect of different cleansers on the weight and ion release of removable partial denture: an in vitro study. *J Appl Oral Sci*. 2011 Oct;19(5):483-7.
57. Kato T, Iijima H, Ishihara K, Kaneko T, Hirai K, Naito Y, et al. Antibacterial effects of Listerine on oral bacteria. *Bull Tokyo Dent Coll*. 1990 Nov;31(4):301-7.
58. Pelino JEP, Passero A, Charles CH, Martins AA. Effects of mouthwashes on human enamel and restorative surfaces. *Caries Res*. 2012 Jun;46(Suppl):268-338.
59. André RF, Andrade IM, Silva-Lovato CH, Paranhos HF, Pimenta FC, Ito IY. Prevalence of mutans streptococci isolated from complete dentures and their susceptibility to mouthrinses. *Braz Dent J*. 2011;22(1):62-7.
60. Barnett ML. The rationale for the daily use of an antimicrobial mouthrinse. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2006 Nov;137 Suppl:16S-21S.

61. Gunsolley JC. A meta-analysis of six-month studies of antiplaque and antigingivitis agents. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2006 Dec;137(12):1649-57.
62. Teles RP, Teles FR. Antimicrobial agents used in the control of periodontal biofilms: effective adjuncts to mechanical plaque control?. *Braz Oral Res.* 2009;23 Suppl 1:39-48.
63. Gunsolley JC. Clinical efficacy of antimicrobial mouthrinses. *J Dent.* 2010 Jun;38 Suppl 1:S6-10.
64. Van Leeuwen MP, Slot DE, Van der Weijden GA. Essential oils compared to chlorhexidine with respect to plaque and parameters of gingival inflammation: a systematic review. *J Periodontol.* 2011;82(2):174-94.
65. Stoeken JE, Paraskevas S, van der Weijden GA. The long-term effect of a mouthrinse containing essential oils on dental plaque and gingivitis: a systematic review. *J Periodontol.* 2007 Jul;78(7):1218-28.
66. Cortelli SC, Cortelli JR, Wu MM, Simmons K, Charles CA. Comparative antiplaque and antigingivitis efficacy of a multipurpose essential oil-containing mouthrinse and a cetylpyridinium chloride-containing mouthrinse: a 6-month randomized clinical trial. *Quintessence Int.* 2012 Jul-Aug;43(7):e82-94.
67. Haps S, Slot DE, Berchier CE, Van der Weijden GA. The effect of cetylpyridinium chloride-containing mouth rinses as adjuncts to toothbrushing on plaque and parameters of gingival inflammation: a systematic review. *Int J Dent Hyg.* 2008 Nov;6(4):290-303.
68. Bagis B, Baltacioglu E, Ozcan M, Ustaomer S. Evaluation of chlorhexidine gluconate mouthrinse-induced staining using a digital colorimeter: an in vivo study. *Quintessence Int.* 2011 Mar;42(3):213-23.
69. Varoni E, Tarce M, Lodi G, Carrassi A. Chlorhexidine (CHX) in dentistry: state of the art. *Minerva Stomatol.* 2012 Sep;61(9):399-419.
70. Saad S, Greenman J, Shaw H. Comparative effects of various commercially available mouthrinse formulations on oral malodor. *Oral Dis.* 2011 Mar;17(2):180-6. doi: 10.1111/j.1601-0825.2010.01714.x.
71. Ademovski SE, Persson GR, Winkel E, Tangerman A, Lingström P, Renvert S. The short-term treatment effects on the microbiota at the dorsum of the tongue in intra-oral halitosis patients—a randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Investig.* 2013 Mar;17(2):463-73. doi: 10.1007/s00784-012-0728-y. Epub 2012 May 10.
72. Young A, Jonski G, Rölla G. Inhibition of orally produced volatile sulfur compounds by zinc, chlorhexidine or cetylpyridinium chloride—effect of concentration. *Eur J Oral Sci.* 2003 Oct;111(5):400-4.
73. Anusavice KJ. Dental caries: risk assessment and treatment solutions for an elderly population. *Compend Contin Educ Dent.* 2002 Oct;23(10 Suppl):12-20.