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Abstract

The objective of this study was to present a systematized review of different methods used to evaluate the masticatory efficiency in conventional complete denture wearers. A survey was conducted in the databases PubMed, Scopus, and Cochrane, seeking scientific articles according to the previously selected terms: "Masticatory performance", "Masticatory efficiency" and "Chewing ability complete denture". Moreover, complementary studies have been carried out with library manual search/databases, which included studies related to different ways to assess masticatory efficiency, specifically as it related to conventional complete denture wearers. Forty three papers were selected to be used in the present review. Despite the wide variety of methodologies in the literature, the sieves method is currently considered the gold standard method to evaluation of conventional complete denture wearers masticatory efficiency, since it is the simplest, does not depend on specific devices (beyond the set of sieves), allows for a rational assessment, and it has been widely reproduced in various types of oral rehabilitation. More, the almond, as natural test food, and the optocal (made from the molding material Optosil), as artificial test food, are the most constantly employed test foods to evaluate masticatory efficiency.

Introduction

The loss of natural teeth not only results in aesthetic issues to individuals, but can also seriously risk masticatory function. Long-term edentation could eventually result in bone resorption, temporomandibular disorders or muscle hypotonicity which ultimately leads to direct damage to the masticatory process [1]. Furthermore, a reduction in the physiological secretion of gastric acid is characteristic of the aging human process which reinforces the importance of efficient mastication to start food digestion processes [2]. The process of chewing, which typically ranges from 10 to 40 masticatory cycles allows food to be effectively reduced in size and moistened by saliva, thus forming a bolus, which can be easily swallowed [1,3,4].

Although there are limitations, conventional complete dentures still represent the most common therapy for edentulous individuals [5]. However, problems such as discomfort and difficulty in chewing certain foods are generally reported by its wearers [4,5] as a result of a reduced masticatory efficiency, which ranges from 16% to 50%, when compared to dentate subjects [2,6]. Seeing that in normal individuals oral food preparation and bolus sizing are adapted to swallowing capacity [7,8], this poor masticatory efficiency of complete denture wearers oftentimes is compensated by chewing longer and swallowing coarser food particles [4,8].

In complete dentures wearers, both the subjective experience and the objective masticatory efficiency with their dentures are determined by several factors such as age, sex, duration of edentulism, oral conditions and previous dentures experiences [9,10]. Their chewing, admittedly limited, may predispose these individuals to a variety of problems, such as inability to chew tough or hard foods, oral pain or instability of their complete dentures [10].

Given the importance of evaluating chewing effectiveness, mainly related to complete denture rehabilitation, a wide variety of methods employed in the analysis of masticatory efficiency have been studied [7,11]. Despite the acceptance of some of these methods, there is still a search for more simplified and effective ways of obtaining such an index. Oftentimes, it is difficult to choose only one method that prevails among others. Thus, the aim of this paper is to present a review of the different methods used for the evaluation of masticatory efficiency in conventional complete denture wearers.

Materials and Methods

A survey was conducted in the databases PubMed, Scopus and Cochrane, seeking scientific articles according to the previously selected terms: "Masticatory performance", "Masticatory efficiency" and "Chewing ability complete denture". Moreover, complementary studies have been carried out with library manual search/databases. In this systematized review were included studies related to different ways to assess masticatory efficiency, specifically as it related to conventional complete denture wearers. The search focused in articles published up to November 2013. The last survey was conducted on 11-15-2013.

Results

Svpapers were selected to be used in the present review. The theme “Methods for evaluation of masticatory efficiency in conventional complete denture wearers” is presented in the sub-sections that follow.

Terminology

The current terminology used in research related to masticatory capacity/ability is rather confusing in the studies existing in literature, and not always there is a correct differentiation of
The most resistant foods, presenting a high degree of accuracy [19]. Moreover, it was observed that raw carrot was amongst chestnuts, sausages and sardines were among the easiest ones. Lettuce and celery were more difficult to be chewed, while foods used for measuring masticatory efficiency in denture by Kapur et al. [14,19] were distributed into different classes food (fish, sausage, soy, boiled egg, potato, turnips, bread and rice, ham, coconut, lettuce, celery, apple, almonds, sardines, beef, sausage, soy, boiled egg, potato, turnips, bread and rice, among others, distributed into different classes food (fish, nuts, fruits, grains, meat and vegetables) [14,19]. In the study by Kapur et al. was proposed an evaluation of various test food used for measuring masticatory efficiency in denture wearers, and they concluded that the fibrous ones (such as lettuce and celery) were more difficult to be chewed, while chestnuts, sausages and sardines were among the easiest ones [19]. Moreover, it was observed that raw carrot was amongst the most resistant foods, presenting a high degree of accuracy in reliability tests, and thus a good candidate for subsequent studies.

In addition to the natural test foods already mentioned, artificial materials have also been and are currently employed for masticatory efficiency analysis. Among these materials, we can highlight the optical [20-22,25,26], made from the molding material Optosil (condensation silicone), modified gelatin and chewing gum [24,27-30]. The use of Optosil as material for evaluation of masticatory efficiency is common nowadays and was supported by Edlund and Lamm, who tested it its properties by electromyographic analysis, deformation rate and storage and strength in contact with water [31]. According to these authors, the advantages of this material were the absence of degradation by water, grinding index easily established after chewing, and easy preparation.

Studies that aim the improvement of already established method of sieves are available in the literature. In an interesting attempt to decrease the concentration of oils in almonds and consequently their agglutination, a simplified methodology for placing almonds in a microwave was proposed by Al-Ali et al. [32]. According to these authors, by placing the whole almonds in the microwave, its oil content was reduced and could therefore reduce particle agglomeration. Thus, this procedure would eliminate the need for washing the particles chewed through the sieves, reducing the test time, which make this method useful for several applications. In a 2002 study, a comparison of single and multiple sieve methods for the determination of masticatory efficiency was conducted, whereas these methods have never been compared until this moment [33]. The multiple sieve method was recommended when more detailed information on masticatory efficiency is required, as it provides a more accurate result.

### Chewing gum

Poyiadjis and Likeman proposed an interesting way to measure masticatory efficiency, by using chewing gum (Wrigley's Freedent) [28]. The gum was dehydrated, and weighed after chewing. The after-chewing weight was compared to before-chewing one, and the weight reduction corresponded to the amount of sugar lost during chewing. Thus, the more sugar loss, the more efficient was the mastication. This methodology differed from the standard sieves method because the chewing gum could not be crushed by chewing and therefore the percentage of sugar loss during chewing was decisive for the value assigned to masticatory efficiency. According to the authors, the chewing gum proved to be excellent to test masticatory efficiency, allowing easy recovery after chewing. In a similar study, Anastassiadou,
Heath developed an objective test of mastication with chewing gums suitable for older people [34]. In this, the percentage of the original gum weight that was chewed out in a defined number of strokes was termed the masticatory effectiveness. Measuring the weight lost during chewing provided a simple test with chewing gum, especially important to be applicable to masticatory efficiency assessment of elderly people.

Hayakawa et al. also tested the use of chewing gum (color changing type) for the evaluation of masticatory efficiency [30]. The gum color changed as the masticatory process progressed and consisted of two layers. When the layers were mixed, the color changed from blue to red as a result of the reaction between the components (acid and dye). The new material was developed to fulfill two requirements:

1. The color would change according to the degree of chewing executed and
2. The material would not stick to the dentures. The gum was developed so that when chewed 5, 15, 30 and 45 times in dentate individuals, 25, 50, 75 and 100% of its total volume would become red, respectively. In their study, the authors concluded that gum color changing method could be used to quantitatively evaluate masticatory efficiency and was considered reliable enough to be used clinically.

According to Halazonetis et al. the chewing gum methodology, when used with chewing gum with different colors, provides a simple and safe evaluation of masticatory efficiency [35]. The authors tested the image analysis software View gum to be used with two color-tests, in a study that included 20 fully dentate volunteers. The software proved to be effectiveness because eliminated the drawbacks of the previously employed methods with chewing gum in two colors, showing up an important adjunct to masticatory efficiency evaluation using chewing gum in two colors. Schimmel et al. also investigated different assessment methods of two-colour chewing gum test for masticatory efficiency using a image analysis software [36]. The methodology to quantify the mixture degree of a two-colour chewing gum was considered realiable and precise, reaffirming the importance of the combination of the method with chewing gums and image analysis.

**Colorimetric method**

Currently, the method known as beads (Colorimetry), which is still being investigated and improved upon, appears to be suitable in the field of masticatory efficiency investigations. A study by Santos et al. in 2006, was the first to report this methodology [37]. The material used for the masticatory efficiency evaluation was composed of bead capsules, approximately 1 mm in diameter, coated by polyvinyl acetate, which contained approximately 250mg beads, obtained by gelation ionotropic of polymer dispersions. These beads were pigmented with violet fuchsin, and consisted of a combination of lactose, microcrystalline cellulose, starch, sucrose, hydrogenated oil, water and basic fuchsin. The bead capsules were then chewed by the participants so that the fuchsin spread proportionally to the energy used in the grinding. The capsule coating properly contained the dye and the beads inside. In the laboratory, the content of the crushed beads was dissolved in water and its color intensity was measured using a spectrophotometer, resulting in a value of fuchsin concentration which corresponded to the masticatory efficiency.

In a study by Felicio et al. in 2008, the reliability of beads to test masticatory efficiency and its correlation with the masseter and anterior temporal electromyographic activity were investigated [38]. The results showed a high reliability of masticatory efficiency test and a significant correlation with electromyographic activity. In 2010, Mazzeto et al. evaluated the correlation between the results of two masticatory efficiency tests, one with sieves and another with colorimetric capsules, applied in a group of subjects with natural and complete dentitions [39]. The statistical results obtained showed a correlation between the two methods, both of which could be clinically applied to test masticatory efficiency. In the same year, Farias Neto et al. studied the effect of occlusion on masticatory efficiency of conventional complete denture wearers using the colorimetric method, this being the first application of this new methodology in relation to this treatment modality [2].

**Subjective assessment**

We should also highlight the use of subjective methods, such as questionnaires, to assess the individual self-perception as to their ability to chew [23]. For Feine, Lund the principal measures of masticatory efficiency should be based on the patients’ perceptions. Slagter et al. evaluated the correlation between the masticatory efficiency using a questionnaire and objective tests, in complete denture wearers [23,25]. They concluded that the questionnaire method was rather weak compared to the objective tests and thus, dentists should not rely solely in subjective responses related to chewing problems, oral conditions and prosthetic quality in order to determine masticatory efficiency. Additionally, masticatory efficiency must be determined by scientifically proven objective tests, which may be supplemented by subjective tests, but never using the latter as a primary source of information. On the other hand, Bajoria et al. reported that while the objective quantification of the masticatory efficiency may result in a low value and not clinically significant, the subjective masticatory efficiency, which is an analysis by the patient about his mastication, may reflect a most relevant aspect. Thus, the combination of the two methods should be valuable for a thorough evaluation of masticatory efficiency [8,40].

**Image analysis**

Shi et al. proposed a masticatory efficiency study with soybean [41]. Soybean particles were chewed by 10 subjects with natural dentition and directly measured by a graphic scanner and a computer after different variations in the number of chewing cycles. A microscope was used to photograph the particles, that were amplified 14 times. A program developed by the authors calculated the diameter of the particles and descriptive statistical indices, including mean, median and standard deviation. After testing, it was noted that the method of direct measurement of the crushed soybean particle size provided important information and prevented errors that often occur with the sieves method. Additionally, Mowlana et al. developed a study aiming to validate the optical method by comparing it with the sieves method, using almonds as a natural test food [42]. The results for both methods showed similarity, allowing to conclude that the optical method was
easier and quicker to use, and also required less equipment skill than the sieves method.

Eberhard et al. (2012) conducted a study with the aim of presenting a valid and reproducible technique for evaluation of the masticatory efficiency through optical scanning in two dimensions (2-D), and enable comparison with the standard method of sieves [21]. Samples from crushed Optosil® chewed by healthy dentate were analyzed with the method of sieves and scanning. The scanning was performed using a conventional flatbed scanner (1200 dpi) and all scanned images were subjected to analysis of images in Image J editor. The scanning method was considered valid, simple and reproducible for the determination of the masticatory efficiency; however the authors explain that further studies are needed to test their ability in detecting small changes in masticatory efficiency.

B-carotene-containing gummy jelly
The development of an automated system for masticatory efficiency evaluation was proposed by Nokubi et al. [43]. The authors conducted the study in order to investigate the accuracy of a new system for direct masticatory efficiency measurement, by the use of a sticky gelatin containing beta-carotene. Using this method, the surface area of the crushed gelatin was calculated by measuring the glucose or beta-carotene concentration dissolved in water. A prototype device was developed, in which all operations presenting risk of errors were fully automated. The automatic system estimated the increase in crushed sticky gelatin surface area as a masticatory efficiency parameter of high precision after rinsing and dissolving each for 10 seconds. More, the grinding degree of the gelatin could be effectively represented as the masticatory efficiency by the increase in the test food surface area.

Discussion
A great variety of methodologies related to masticatory efficiency is currently found in the literature, however, important consideration should be given to the fact that very detailed protocols result in higher test complexity and reproducibility difficulties. One aspect of considerable importance for clinical studies is the sample standardization. Researches involving individuals with poor-fitting complete dentures may impair studies aimed to mastication analysis, as observed by Hayakawa et al. [30]. Special care was taken to add recent studies while this article was in process of submission for publication, in order to keep this review study updated.

Conclusion
It should be pointed out that simplicity and effectiveness are the two main requirements regarding the reproducibility of scientific as well as clinical methodology. Thus, despite the wide variety of new methodologies in the literature, the sieves method is currently considered the gold standard method to evaluation of conventional complete denture wearers masticatory efficiency, since it is the simplest, does not depend on specific devices (beyond the set of sieves), allows for a rational assessment, and it has been widely reproduced in various types of oral rehabilitation.

Finally, although there are various test foods utilized to evaluate masticatory efficiency [30,38,43], the almond, as natural test food [16,23,27,32,42] and the optocal (made from the molding material Optosil) as artificial test food, are the most constantly employed test foods to evaluate masticatory function in complete denture wearers, in natural dentition individuals, or even individuals rehabilitated with other prosthetic modalities [20-22,25,26,31].
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