Journal of Dental Science and Medicine

Noorah, Dent Implants Dentures 2023, 6:2

Review Article Open Access

Utilizing Cavitation from a Dental Ultrasonic Scaler Vibrating in Carbonated Water, Improved Biofilm Removal

Alkubaisi Noorah*

Department of Botany and Microbiology, College of Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh 11495, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

It is of great interest to use cavitation to improve biofilm cleaning. There is currently no system that effectively removes biofilm from dental implants and medical implants. A vibrating tip on a dental ultrasonic scaler can create cavities that can be used to clean biomaterials like dental implants. For clinical applications, however, the cleaning process must be significantly accelerated. By operating the scaler in carbonated water of varying CO2 concentrations, the purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was a potential for an increase in cavitation. The cavitation around a ultrasonic scaler tip was recorded with rapid imaging. Picture examination was utilized to ascertain the area of cavitation. Bacterial biofilm was developed on surfaces and its evacuation was imaged with a high velocity camera involving the ultrasonic scaler in still and carbonated water. Cavitation increments fundamentally with expanding carbonation. When they were in carbonated water as opposed to uncarbonated water, cavitation also began earlier around the tips. When used in carbonated water, the scaler removed significantly more biofilm. According to our findings, cavitation around ultrasonic scalers could be significantly increased and accelerated with the use of carbonated water in a clinical setting, resulting in improved biofilm removal from dental implants and other biomaterials.

Keywords: Microbubble; Ultrasonic scaler; Dental implants; Biofilm evacuation

Introduction

Cavitation is the formation of a cloud of bubbles in a liquid or in a tissue and its subsequent dynamics, typically triggered by ultrasound or high-speed flows [1]. Vapor, gas, or a mixture can be used to fill cavity bubbles, which can be vacuumed. When crashed into swaying by ultrasound, such air pockets are equipped for yielding microstreaming, shock waves, rapid planes and high warming, which are hindering in various applications. Numerous industries also make use of the energy that is released during bubble implosion for cleaning. Cavitation may be an efficient cleaning method for removing biofilms from surfaces. Cavitation bubbles are able to get into small crevices, making it easier for them to remove bacterial biofilm from biomaterials with surfaces that are microscopically roughened, like dental implants. In dentistry, the use of titanium metallic implants is well-established and growing. In order to bond to the bone, these implants have specialized surface treatments. Dental plaque biofilm development on embed surfaces can prompt gum infection, which can cause loss of supporting bone and resulting insert disappointment [2]. As a result, in order to prevent and treat peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis, it is essential to effectively remove biofilm surface and hinder re-osseointegration. There is currently no method that safely and effectively removes biofilm from implants.

In dentistry, ultrasonic scalers are used to gently scrape the surface of teeth with a vibrating metal tip to remove mineralized plaque. The metal tip can produce cavitation bubbles in the cooling water that flows over it because it vibrates at ultrasonic frequencies. Increasing the cavitation that occurs around ultrasonic scalers may speed up biofilm removal. Dental implant surfaces can be cleared of biofilm using ultrasonic scaler cavitation, as demonstrated by our most recent in vitro studies [3]. This suggests that dental implant surfaces could be cleaned without the metal tip touching the teeth or implants, resulting in less damage. However, significant cleaning only occurred after the scaler's tip was held one millimeter away from the biofilm for sixty seconds. This is inconvenient for clinical use, where quick cleaning is required (a few seconds).

Increasing the gas contained within the fluid to facilitate the inception of cavitation is one method for increasing the number of cavitation bubbles. This has been finished in past examinations by utilizing microbubbles in water created by adding air or oxygen microbubbles and this has improved ultrasonic cleaning. This has not, however, been looked into for biofilm removal applications. We investigated whether carbonated water could increase cavitation around ultrasonic scalers in this study. When a liquid evaporates, cavitation creates vapour cavities. At a location in the liquid where the liquidized vapour becomes supersaturated and the pressure is relatively low, these cavities form. Cavitation can be upgraded via carbonated water since significantly more liquidized CO2 is vanished than liquidized fume subject to a similar strain decrement [4]. The cleaning impact because of the strain waves produced by a swaying ultrasonic scaler is relative to the slope of the tension wave, which is in the request for O(pA/λ), where Dad and λ are the sufficiency and frequency of tension waves. At the point when cavitation occurs, the angle of tension and shear pressure is in the request for O(pA/R), where R is the air pocket sweep. Since microbubble radii are many times a lot more modest than the acoustic frequency, cavitation upgrades the cleaning essentially. Additionally, carbonated water is inexpensive, safe for use by patients, and simple to produce, facilitating its rapid implementation in clinical settings. We utilized high velocity imaging and picture examination to research how carbonation changes the cavitation happening around a dental ultrasonic scaler tip, and how it influences biofilm evacuation.

***Corresponding author:** Alkubaisi Noorah, Department of Botany and Microbiology, College of Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh 11495, Saudi Arabia, E-mail: noo.rahsi@alku.asi.com

Received: 02-Mar-2023, Manuscript No. did-23-101767; **Editor assigned:** 04-Mar-2023, PreQC No. did-23-101767 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Mar-2023, QC No. did-23-101767; **Revised:** 23-Mar-2023, Manuscript No. did-23-101767 (R); **Published:** 30-Mar-2023, DOI: 10.4172/did.1000179

Citation: Noorah A (2023) Utilizing Cavitation from a Dental Ultrasonic Scaler Vibrating in Carbonated Water, Improved Biofilm Removal. Dent Implants Dentures 6: 179.

Methods

Production of carbonated water: An automatic carbonator (SodaStream Power, SodaStream International Ltd., Israel) was used to carbonate 14 °C reverse osmosis (RO) water. This instrument allows for three levels of carbonation—low, medium, and high—to be achieved [5]. For each set, 840 ml of RO water was carbonated. To reduce CO2 emissions, experiments were carried out as soon as the water was carbonated. By filling balloons with the CO2 gas dispensed by the carbonator's gas jet nozzle without water, the CO2 at each carbonation setting was approximated. A precision balance was used to subtract the mass of the balloon before filling it from its mass after filling it. For each carbonation setting, this was done three times to calculate the mean and standard deviation, which were then converted to g/L.

Rapid imaging of cavitation: A P5 Newtron XS scaler (29 kHz working recurrence) was utilized related to Tip 10P working at the most extreme power setting [6]. The ultrasonic scaler tip was submerged in a glass water tank (180 ml) and its position was fixed by connecting it to a XYZ interpretation stage and a high-accuracy pivot mount. Throughout each experiment, the scaler tip's axial rotation was also maintained. An LED cold light source operating in bright field mode was used to illuminate the scaler. In order to guarantee reproducibility, the scaler was positioned in the same spot within the image frame for each repeat.

Using a high-speed camera with a shutter speed of 262 ns and 250 and 100,000 frames per second (fps), images of the tip's cavitation were taken. The camera was connected to a significant distance magnifying instrument long range focal point with a 2x connector. A magnification of x1.2 was used for the imaging, which was done at 250 fps and had a resolution of 8.4 m/pixel. A magnification of x0.58 was used for the imaging, which was done at 100,000 fps and had a resolution of 17.2 m/pixel. The interim taken for cavitation to begin once the scaler had begun vibrating was determined from 5 rapid recordings taken at 100,000 fps for each setting.

Factual investigation and information diagramming were finished utilizing SigmaPlot 14, with measurable importance characterized as $p < 0.05$. On the ranks test, an ANOVA was used to determine whether there was statistical significance. The Tukey test was then performed to analyze every one of the settings pairwise.

Images taken at 250 fps over five repeats with 300 frames per repeat were used to calculate the mean area of cavitation around the tips at various carbonation levels [7]. The cavitation area was calculated using image analysis. The Minimum automatic threshold was used to set thresholds on the images. The fill openings order was executed to guarantee the whole air pocket region was portioned. The number of pixels that correspond to the area of the scaler containing the cavitation bubbles was then determined by calculating the histogram of each image. The area of the cavitation bubbles was then created by subtracting the scaler's area, which had been calculated in the same way from an image of the scaler before it started vibrating.

Biofilm development: Seven-day biofilms were created using Streptococcus sanguinis, a Gram-positive bacteria. The biofilms were developed on optically straightforward polymer coverslips with a surface unpleasantness of 0.02 μm [8]. This substrate was picked in view of its adaptability contrasted with glass coverslips, permitting the examples to be situated upward inside an imaging tank for fast imaging, and in light of their straightforwardness, to consider ideal difference between the foundation and the biofilm so the picture examination to precisely be directed more.

The stock microorganisms were retrieved from porous storage beads that were kept at 80 °C. They were first grown for three days on Tryptone Soya Agar media at 37 °C and 5% CO2. To inoculate 10 ml of Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) medium supplemented with 1 percent sucrose, 2–3 single colonies were used. The primary culture was serially diluted in BHI medium to 103 cfu/ml at 37 °C and 88 rpm overnight until it reached approximately 109 cfu/ml.

According to Pratten et al.'s method, artificial saliva was added to the biofilm culture surface to encourage the formation of biofilms. Counterfeit spit (1 ml) was pipetted into each well of a 24-well plate into which a sterile Thermanox coverslip had been put and was taken out after 15 min, to condition the examples [9]. To create a tab so that the samples could be removed from the well with the least amount of disruption to the biofilm, sterile forceps were used to bend one corner of the coverslips upward.

Each well of the 24-well plates received 1 ml of fresh BHI medium and 1 ml of the diluted S. sanguinis culture. The 24-well plates were then brooded at 37 °C, 88 rpm for 24 h to permit biofilm arrangement. The stock was supplanted with 2 ml new BHI medium each 24 h. The Thermanox coverslips were taken out from the 24 well plates following a sum of 7 days of brooding and afterward fixed in 0.1 M sodium cacodylate cushion and 2.5% glutaraldehyde. After that, they were washed gently in Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) and stained for five minutes with Crystal Violet stain. Preventing dehydration, samples were kept in PBS until high-speed imaging.

The disruption of the biofilm was captured with a fast camera. With a shutter speed of 1/10,000, the camera was operated at 500 fps. In a custom-made glass water tank with dimensions of 2.7 cm x 2.7 cm x 2.7 cm, the biofilm-covered coverslip was fixed vertically. The tank was loaded up with 15 ml switch assimilation (RO) water or with RO water carbonated at the high setting. By attaching the ultrasonic scaler tip to an XYZ translation stage and a high-precision rotation mount, its position in the glass water tank was fixed at 0.5 mm from the biofilm. Throughout each experiment, the scaler tip's axial rotation was also maintained. An LED cold light source operating in bright field mode was used to illuminate the sample. The scaler was operated at the medium power setting for two seconds ($n = 5$) to image the removal of biofilm.

Image analysis was used to determine the total area of biofilm that was removed using the ultrasonic scaler in carbonated or still water [10]. Fiji used the internodes automatic threshold to threshold high-speed still images at $t = 0$ and $t = 2$ s. The analyze particles plugin was used to remove objects smaller than 20 pixels in order to reduce noise. The histogram was determined to acquire the quantity of pixels relating to the cleaned region. The region cleaned was determined by deducting the region at $t = 0$ from the area at $t = 2$ s. This was rehashed multiple times utilizing 5 distinct biofilm tests for every carbonation setting tried.

Results and Discussion

There are four main outcomes. The ultrasonic scaler tip was surrounded by more cavitation bubbles, more bubble cloud lift, and more biofilm was removed when the water was carbonated.

High-speed cavitation imaging

In carbonated water, the cavitation around the vibrating tip began earlier than in non-carbonated water. When the tips were immersed in carbonated water, cavitation began immediately after the tips started

vibrating (after 0.3–0.5 ms, or between 6 and 15 scaler oscillations), whereas in still water, the tip vibrated for approximately 100 oscillations before cavitation bubbles were seen in the water in high-speed videos taken at 100 k fps (after approximately 4 ms).

Rapid pictures showed cavitation around a ultrasonic scaler tip in still water, or in low, medium, and high carbonation separately. Both the area of cavitation calculated using image analysis and the high-speed images demonstrate that, in comparison to non-carbonated water, carbonated water experiences significantly more cavitation and that the among the various test groups, there was a statistically significant difference in the area of cavitation (p 0.001). This is in concurrence with past examinations which have expressed that expanded gas content works with the nucleation of cavitation bubbles. Water has a high solubility for carbon dioxide. Expanded gas content decreases the surface pressure of the fluid, and the higher the dissolvability of the gas, the more it can lessen the surface strain, hence working with bubble nucleation [11]. Consequently an expanded number of cavitation air pockets would prompt more fast biofilm evacuation.

Biofilm evacuation

Rapid imaging showed that essentially more biofilm region was eliminated when the scaler tip was in carbonated water contrasted with still water after 2 s. This ought to be on the grounds that there was more cavitation occurring in carbonated water and this likewise caused more individual air pockets on the outer layer of the biofilm which could clean the surface speedier. The orientation of the tip is similar to how the body of the probe is held parallel to the biofilm-covered surface in a clinical setting so that the tip can vibrate parallel to the surface to avoid damage. The biofilm evacuation increment found in the high velocity recordings was fundamentally in regions close to the tip, which associates with the region around the tip where the expansion in cavitation was seen in rapid imaging. There was a genuinely huge distinction in how much biofilm eliminated involving cavitation in still water contrasted with when drenched in carbonated water ($p < 0.05$).

Shear forces applied to the surface during the collapse of the cavitation bubble are thought to be the cause of surface cleaning by cavitation [12]. This can occur when an oscillating bubble is surrounded by acoustic streaming or when the bubble collapses into a microjet. Although inertial collapsing bubbles were observed on the coverslip and biofilm in high-speed imaging, which may be producing microjets upon collapse, the frame rate in this study was insufficient to image microjet formations. When the tip was used in carbonated water as opposed to still water, there were more inertial collapsing bubbles on the coverslip surface. This suggests that the increased level of carbonation was able to remove more biofilm.

Past examinations have not researched carbonated water and cavitation for expanded biofilm expulsion, yet ongoing investigations have shown that expanded broke down oxygen in cavitating water causes expanded surface cleaning. Yamashita and team suggest that oxygen-supersaturated water's cavitation bubbles may lessen erosion. This may occur because the bubble's gas cushioned implosion causes it to exert less force on the surface it collapses on. Although further research is needed to determine how the type of gas affects the cleaning ability of cavitation bubbles, this may also be occurring in carbonated water and may assist in causing less damage to soft tissue such as the gum surrounding dental implants.

Although the biofilm removal in carbonated water and still water differed significantly, the current study's results were based on a sample size of five for each condition, and the large standard deviation indicates that there were significant differences. As a result, additional research into the effectiveness of cleaning on a variety of surfaces and with a larger sample size is possible [13-20]. This study's protocols can be used in other studies of this kind.

Conclusions

By immersing the scaler tip in carbonated water, we have demonstrated that cavitation increases around dental ultrasonic scalers, resulting in increased biofilm removal via cavitation. The ultrasonic scaler tip was surrounded by more cavitation bubbles, more bubble cloud lift, and more biofilm was removed when the water was carbonated. The amount of carbonation increases these trends significantly. This can be used in a wide range of fields where cavitation is used for surface cleaning, including the removal of bacterial biofilms in cavitation cleaning applications.

The current finding uncovered that biofilm arrangement happens among the microorganisms of the dental caries. Albeit different microbial verdure found in the dental caries and these networks showed dynamic opposition against different tried anti-toxins. For the formation of biofilm, the ideal sucrose level, temperature, and pH were useful. Thus, adjustments of these three significant factors fundamentally influence biofilm arrangement. Also, the chose bacterial strain endured unfavorable climatic circumstances because of the presence of biofilm and extracellular polysaccharides. The ability of bacteria to form biofilms also varied antibiotic sensitivity.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Niemczewski B (2007) Observations of water cavitation intensity under practical ultrasonic cleaning conditions. Ultrason Sonochem 14: 13-18.
2. Liu L, Yang Y, Liu P, Tan W (2014) The influence of air content in water on ultrasonic cavitation field. Ultrason Sonochem 210: 566-71.
3. Sluis LVD, Versluis M, Wu M, Wesselink P (2007) Passive ultrasonic irrigation of the root canal: a review of the literature. Int Endod J 40: 415-426.
4. Carmen JC, Roeder BL, Nelson JL, Ogilvie RLR, Robison RA, et al. (2005) Treatment of biofilm infections on implants with low-frequency ultrasound and antibiotics. Am J Infect Control 33: 78-82.
5. Dhir S (2013) Biofilm and dental implant: the microbial link. J Indian Soc Periodontol 17: 5-11.
6. Qian Z, Stoodley P, Pitt WG (1996) Effect of low-intensity ultrasound upon biofilm structure from confocal scanning laser microscopy observation. Biomaterials 17: 1975-1980.
7. Schwarz F, Jepsen S, Obreja K, Vinueza EMG, Ramanauskaite A, et al. (2022) Surgical therapy of peri-implantitis. Periodontol 2000 88: 145-181.
8. Guéhennec LL, Soueidan A, Layrolle P, Amouriq Y (2007) Surface treatments of titanium dental implants for rapid osseointegration. Dent Mater 23: 844-854.
9. Colombo JS, Satoshi S, Okazaki J, Sloan AJ, Waddington RJ, et al. (2022) In vivo monitoring of the bone healing process around different titanium alloy implant surfaces placed into fresh extraction sockets. J Dent 40: 338-46.
10. Figuero E, Graziani F, Sanz I, Herrera D, Sanz M, et al. (2014) Management of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis. Periodontol 2000 66: 255-73.
11. Mann M, Parmar D, Walmsley AD, Lea SC (2012) Effect of plastic-covered ultrasonic scalers on titanium implant surfaces. Clin Oral Implant Res 23: 76-82.
12. Augthun M, Tinschert J, Huber A (1998) In vitro studies on the effect of cleaning methods on different implant surfaces. J Periodontol 69: 857-864.

13. Anastassiadis P, Hall C, Marino V, Bartold P (2015) Surface scratch assessment of titanium implant abutments and cementum following instrumentation with metal curettes. Clin Oral Invest 19: 545-551.

14. Ronay V, Merlini A, Attin T, Schmidlin PR, Sahrmann P, et al. (2017) In vitro cleaning potential of three implant debridement methods. Simulation of the non-surgical approach. Clin Oral Implants Res 28: 151-155.

15. Vyas N, Pecheva E, Dehghani H, Sammons RL, Wang QX, et al. (2016) High speed imaging of cavitation around dental ultrasonic scaler tips. PLoS One 11: e0149804.

16. Vyas N, Sammons RL, Addison O, Dehghani H, Walmsley AD, et al. (2016) A quantitative method to measure biofilm removal efficiency from complex biomaterial surfaces using SEM and image analysis. Sci Rep 6: 32694.

17. Hauptmann M, Frederickx F, Struyf H, Mertens P, Heyns M, et al. (2013) Enhancement of cavitation activity and particle removal with pulsed high frequency ultrasound and supersaturation. Ultrason. Sonochem 20: 69-76.

18. Hauptmann M, Struyf H, Mertens P, Heyns M, Gendt SD, et al. (2013) Towards an understanding and control of cavitation activity in 1 MHz ultrasound fields. Ultrason Sonochem 20: 77-88.

19. Yamashita T, Ando K (2019) Low-intensity ultrasound induced cavitation and streaming in oxygen-supersaturated water: role of cavitation bubbles as physical cleaning agents. Ultrason Sonochem 52: 268-279.

20. Kang BK, Kim MS, Park JG (2014) Effect of dissolved gases in water on acoustic cavitation and bubble growth rate in 0.83 MHz megasonic of interest to wafer cleaning. Ultrason Sonochem 21: 1496-503.