

1

Cutting with Rotating Instruments and Cutting Efficiency of Burs

María Arregui¹, Lluís Giner-Tarrida¹, Teresa Flores²,
Angélica Iglesias², and Andreu Puigdollers²

¹ Department of Odontology, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Sant Cugat del Valles, Barcelona, Spain

² Department of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Sant Cugat del Valles, Barcelona, Spain

1.1 Introduction

The retention phase is a crucial part of orthodontic treatment. Its importance keeps increasing since patients look for a long-lasting 'perfect' result for aesthetic reasons, even though some degree of relapse is always expected. For this reason, life-long retention is more commonly advised every day by clinicians (Padmos et al. 2018).

Many studies have analysed the retention phase in terms of stability, retention material, adhesion, clinician and patient preference and hygiene (Al-Moghrabi et al. 2018; Eroglu et al. 2019; Gugger et al. 2016; Sifakakis et al. 2017), but none of the literature has focused on the consequences of retention on the enamel. Unlike bracket debonding, the detachment of lingual retainers is usually accidental and may be caused by excessive force, adhesive material wear or retainer rupture. The enamel could be altered due to the applied load that caused the rupture in the adhesive interphase or the removal of remaining adhesive or retainer materials (Ryf et al. 2012).

Debonding and Fixed Retention in Orthodontics: An Evidence-Based Clinical Guide, First Edition. Edited by Theodore Eliades and Christos Katsaros.

© 2024 John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Published 2024 by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Cleaning and polishing procedures for remnants of adhesive materials are as variable as retention protocols. No consensus has been reached on the ideal protocol for adhesive removal (Janiszewska-Olszowska et al. 2014). The various techniques include using hand instruments, rotatory instruments (high- and low-speed), sandblasting, ultrasound and bur and disc materials including tungsten carbide burs, diamond burs, composite burs, rubber burs and Sof-Lex discs (Eliades 2019; Janiszewska-Olszowska et al. 2015; Shah et al. 2019). This is a critical moment, as the aim is to remove the material with no or minimal damage to the enamel structure and without overheating the pulp due to friction caused by the instruments. To do so, it is extremely important to carefully select the burs and rotary instruments to be used. For this reason, it is important to have a good understanding of the cutting efficiency of the burs, which type of bur is most suitable, the bur's longevity and the maximum number of uses due to loss of effectiveness. It is also important to take into account the characteristics of the rotating instruments: rotational speed, torque or power, water spray coolant, etc., to avoid damaging the tooth.

In this chapter, we will discuss aspects of the retention phase concerning enamel preservation and the consequences of temporarily adhesive procedures, such as appliances bonding, on the enamel surface. We will analyse the repercussions of adhesive procedures for retention materials, especially considering that life-long retention may require one or more rebonding procedures (Jin et al. 2018). We will also deal with the correct selection of burs for the removal of cement from brackets and fixed retainers; the subsequent final finishing with polishing tools to help recover the enamel aesthetics; and the most advisable protocol for removing fixed retainers, whether for final removal or for a rebonding procedure.

1.2 Enamel Surface and Damage Associated with Debonding Techniques: Burs and Polishing

Thanks to advanced microscopy technology and mineral property analysis techniques, the composition of enamel and its properties before and after adhesive treatments have been widely studied. The vast majority of studies are based on the vestibular surface because there is significant

concern about enamel preservation due to aesthetic concerns. However, more aggressive bonding techniques are often used on the lingual surface because this surface does not have aesthetical importance. Such studies are usually done on labial surfaces; it is not common to do them on lingual surfaces.

An *in vitro* study using a scanning electron microscope (SEM) found an important difference between the two enamel surfaces. The lingual surface appears to be smoother, with smaller micropores and a less pronounced wavelike appearance after conditioning, which resulted in less mechanical interlocking in the enamel-bonding interphase and, thus, lower shear bond strength (SBS) values and greater tooth damage compared to the buccal side (Brosh et al. 2005). This interesting data is rarely discussed when adhesion protocols for retainers or lingual brackets are presented.

Sufficient bonding strength, easy debonding and limited damage to the enamel surface are critical factors in orthodontics (Shinya et al. 2008). A lower enamel Adhesive Remnant Index (ARI) after cleaning of residual adhesive corresponds to less damage to the enamel surface (David et al. 2002; Fjeld and Ogaard 2006). Removal systems are important not only for enamel preservation after appliance removal but also in lingual retention: the polishing phase is crucial for patient comfort because studies show that patients' tongues can detect changes in surface roughness (SR) of less than $1\ \mu\text{m}$ (Jones et al. 2004). Furthermore, the smoother surface helps reduce the amount of bacterial plaque deposited.

Before selecting instruments, some basic concepts related to burs must be considered: cutting, grinding, and finishing and polishing actions. *Cutting* is a unidirectional action related to instruments with blades, such as tungsten carbide burs. Depending on the number of blades, the bur will have more of a cutting or polishing function. Also, if we use a low-speed handpiece, by allowing a change of rotation, we can obtain a greater polishing effect rather than cutting. It has been seen that tungsten carbide burs can leave a regular pattern on the enamel structure (Figure 1.1). The *grinding* action is responsible for removing small particles from the surface by the effect of abrasive wear, and their action is unidirectional. Diamond burs are an example (Figure 1.2). Different types of diamond burs are available depending on the size of the component particles. During the *finishing and polishing* phase, the use of tungsten carbide burs with more blades or diamond burs with fine grit is




Figure 1.1 (a) Natural tooth; (b) tooth ground with a carbide bur.




Figure 1.2 (a) Natural tooth; (b) tooth ground with a diamond bur.

indicated to give the final texture to the surface. Polishing gives a gloss to the enamel, which regains its usual brightness after the cement is removed and becomes smooth and homogeneous. This final part of the polishing process is usually carried out with abrasive instruments such as rubber cups, discs, strips and fine-grained polishing pastes (Anusavice 2013).

To remove cement properly, it is important to take into account the *cutting efficiency* of the burs, which is defined as the maximum capacity to remove dental tissue with the minimum effort during a specific period of time (Choi et al. 2010). It is measured and evaluated by calculating the amount of substrate removed (by weight or length of the cut) in a given time. Many studies have observed a reduction in cutting efficiency after repeated use of burs (Bae et al. 2014).

This reduction of cutting efficiency is associated with factors such as (i) wear of the burs due to use and friction, (ii) debris clogging the bur surface, and (iii) the procedures for cleaning, disinfecting and sterilizing the burs. Some studies have determined that cutting efficiency decreases between the first and the sixth sterilization cycles (Bae et al. 2014; Emir et al. 2018; Regev et al. 2010). Firoozmand et al. (2008) determined that the lifetime of a bur is five uses, since after that it is difficult to guarantee a proper and efficient cut. These results were confirmed by Emir et al. (2018).

1.2.1 Design and Type of Burs

1.2.1.1 Diamond Burs

The selection of diamond burs should focus on constant cutting efficiency throughout their life span because studies have shown that these burs tend to lose their efficiency due to use (Bae et al. 2014; Emir et al. 2018; Prithviraj et al. 2017). One of the factors related to the reduction in cutting efficiency is the pull-out of diamond chips (Bae et al. 2014; Pilcher et al. 2000; Prithviraj et al. 2017) (Figure 1.3).

Manufacturers use various methods to adhere abrasive particles to the bur shaft, such as electrodepositing a nickel coating on diamond chips (Ben-Hanan et al. 2008; Siegel and Anthony Von Fraunhofer 1998), electrodepositing a chrome-nickel coating (Regev et al. 2010; Siegel and Anthony Von Fraunhofer 1998), sintering, microabrasion (Prithviraj et al. 2017; Siegel and Anthony Von Fraunhofer 1998; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1996) and chemical vapour deposition (Jackson et al. 2004). The quality of diamond burs is based on the concentration of abrasive particles and the capacity of the adhesive system to retain the diamond particles during continuous use.




Figure 1.3 (a) Diamond bur before use; (b) diamond bur after use.

The diamond particles used in burs vary between manufacturers, and the primary characteristics are (i) whether the diamonds are natural or synthetic, (ii) their size and shape, and (iii) the individual features of burs. Natural diamonds have more irregular shapes than synthetic ones, which facilitates their deposition in a nickel or chrome-nickel coating matrix. The size of the diamond chips determines the thickness and category of the burs: ultrafine, fine, medium or coarse (Siegel and Anthony Von Fraunhofer 1998). In cutting efficiency studies, medium grit (120–140 μm) or coarse grit (150–160 μm) burs are generally used. Fine and ultra-fine grit burs are not usually evaluated in the literature, as their use is more indicated for finishing and polishing.

The cutting and grinding actions of diamond burs are caused by friction. Every movement of the bur in both directions removes tissue with the abrasive action of the sharp edges of the diamond chips (Figure 1.4).

1.2.1.2 Tungsten Carbide Burs

Tungsten carbide burs are composed of 8 to 40 blades (Figure 1.5); the most frequently used have 8, 12, 20 or 40 blades and are indicated for contouring and smoothing various dental materials and structures (Jefferies 2007). These burs generally are characterised by their hardness and cutting edge, but they wear out with each use and are also fragile and susceptible to fracture (Di Cristofaro et al. 2013).




Figure 1.4 Grinding action by diamond burs. (a) During the first step in the grinding process, the bur starts to remove tissue. (b) Every movement of the bur in both directions removes tissue by abrasive action.




Figure 1.5 (a) Carbide bur before use; (b) carbide bur after use.




Figure 1.6 (a) Cutting action in a clockwise direction; (b) polishing action in a counterclockwise direction.

Tungsten carbide burs have a bidirectional cut so that when the burs are rotated in a clockwise direction, they have a cutting action. In a counterclockwise direction, they have a polishing action such that a regular pattern is observed on the tooth structure, corresponding to the ordered arrangement of the blades on the bur (Figure 1.6).

Burs with fewer blades are normally used for cutting and grinding, while those with more blades are used to finish polishing and provide texture, as they have a less aggressive effect on the enamel surface.

Carbide burs are considered the gold standard in the literature for removing orthodontic cement during the debonding procedure because they are faster and more effective than other tools that can be used in this stage. But there is always a risk of removing part of the enamel and altering the external surface, in which case the enamel will not recover its original external roughness (Bosco et al. 2020).

1.2.2 Cutting Efficiency

Cutting efficiency can be defined as the amount of substrate removed in a specific period. A long cutting time means lower cutting efficiency (Bae et al. 2014).

This efficiency depends on several factors, such as (i) the type of burs used (diamond or carbide); (ii) the cutting instrument, which may be a turbine or an electric motor handpiece; (iii) the water flow (to remove debris that is clogging the burs and control the intra-pulp temperature); (iv) the force applied by the operator; and (v) the substrate.

1.2.2.1 Diamond and Carbide Burs

Studies usually compare carbide burs with each other and with diamond burs. Diamond burs are also compared with each other, comparing different particle sizes, usually medium (120–140 μm) or coarse (150–160 μm) grit, with different designs (channelled or conventional) and shapes (chamfered or thin taper).

In general, carbide burs have good cutting efficiency; it is greater in burs with deep angles and sharp edges (Di Cristofaro et al. 2013). Another factor that improves cutting efficiency is a negative cutting angle: it makes the bur more effective because it reduces debris that clogs the bur and interferes with cutting and speed. Some studies observe that carbide burs are faster and more effective than diamond burs (Ercoli et al. 2009); this may be due to their hardness and cutting edge compared to the hardness of the metal that acts as a binder for diamond chips. However, other publications consider diamond burs to have a higher cutting efficiency than carbide burs (Emir et al. 2018).

All diamond burs exhibit similar behaviour: the greatest loss of efficiency occurs between the first and second cuts, after which it decreases progressively (Bae et al. 2014; Pilcher et al. 2000). This is due to wear of the burs during use.

The cutting performance of this type of burs primarily depends on the diamonds. Natural diamonds have irregular shapes with sharper edges, so the most effective burs have a higher proportion of natural diamonds (Prithviraj et al. 2017; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1996, 1999). Other factors are the size and diameter of the diamond chips. Larger grit means the bur has greater cutting efficiency. However, studies show that burs with medium and coarse grit often do not differ in their cutting efficiency. This may be because manufacturers assign a category to their

burs, such as medium grit; then, when studies analyse the burs with a SEM and measure the diamond chips, the diamonds are observed to be larger and correspond more closely to the coarse size described by the ISO standard (Bae et al. 2014; Prithviraj et al. 2017). In general, these differences between manufacturer classifications and the analysis during studies may be due to the filters used in the manufacturing process to standardise the grit allowing a range of sizes to pass through, so that sometimes particles with greater diameters are introduced.

Cutting efficiency is compromised when diamond chips are pulled out of the binder with which they are attached to the bur shaft rather than by the wear of the diamond cutting edge (Bae et al. 2014; Ben-Hanan et al. 2008; Emir et al. 2018; Prithviraj et al. 2017). The extent to which diamonds can be pulled out is associated with the properties of the metal used as a binder (Bae et al. 2014) or the system used to bond the diamonds to the bur. The chips are less likely to be detached when the binder is more powerful and has higher adhesion properties, and therefore the bur has greater cutting efficiency. It has also been seen that burs that use nickel electroplating have lower cutting efficiency than burs that use a proprietary brazing system (PBS) (Prithviraj et al. 2017). SEM studies of burs processed by means of electrodeposition with nickel have observed that spaces are left by detached diamond chips; in addition, some diamond chips are embedded too far into the metal matrix, leaving fewer cutting edges exposed and providing less area for cutting (Prithviraj et al. 2017). Another factor that can affect cutting efficiency is a secondary effect of spaces left by diamonds when they are clogged with debris. This effect reduces the effective work of the burs, which is why it is important to cool them properly during grinding or polishing so the water removes this debris (Ben-Hanan et al. 2008).

The design and shape of diamond burs also influence their cutting efficiency. Some studies have compared chamfered and thin-taper burs and observed that burs with a larger diameter (chamfered) have a larger cutting area, greater peripheral speed, and higher cutting efficiency than thinner burs (Bae et al. 2014). However, it has been observed that chamfered burs produce a larger temperature increase due to greater friction. Other studies have compared conventional and channelled burs and observed that conventional burs have a higher cutting efficiency than channelled burs (Funkenbusch et al. 2016). It has been seen that grooved burs allow a better distribution of water along the bur between the grooves, providing constant cleaning and reducing clogging debris in the

bur, and also achieve faster heat dissipation (Galindo et al. 2004), but no statistically significant differences were observed compared to conventional burs (Ercoli et al. 2009).

The effect of cleaning, disinfecting and sterilisation on the cutting efficiency of burs has also been studied, and some studies concluded that these procedures do not directly affect cutting efficiency (Bae et al. 2014). However, other authors have observed that cleaning and sterilising burs that are used repeatedly improved their cutting behaviour because debris is eliminated during the cleaning procedure (Rotella et al. 2014).

Some studies have evaluated whether bur wear affects the SR the bur causes on the tooth structure or materials as well as cutting efficiency. It seems that the more worn the bur is, the lower the cutting efficiency and SR. The loss of roughness may be heterogeneous, but it can affect the bonding process (Emir et al. 2018). When studying different materials, it is observed that the cutting efficiency of burs used to cut zirconium or lithium disilicate or metals is reduced more rapidly since those materials have harder surfaces than the tooth structure (Emir et al. 2018; Galindo et al. 2004; Nakamura et al. 2015; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1996).

In summary, the cutting efficiency of carbide burs is reduced due to wear and tear on the blades (Di Cristofaro et al. 2013). On the other hand, in diamond burs, the factors that influence wear and cutting efficiency are (i) diamond chips being pulled out, (ii) wear of the cutting edges of the diamond chips, (iii) debris clogging the cutting areas, and (iv) wear of the material that acts as a binding agent for the diamond chips on the shank (Ben-Hanan et al. 2008).

1.2.2.2 Rotating Instruments: Turbines and Electric Motor Handpieces

For more than 50 years, turbines have been used in dentistry to grind or polish dental structures and materials because of their performance: (i) they are ergonomic and lightweight, (ii) they are reasonably priced, and (iii) they can quickly remove tooth structure. On the other hand, turbines have these disadvantages: (i) vibration and noise, (ii) the release of aerosols, and (iii) low torque, which causes them to slow down when too much force is detected and decreases cutting capacity – a turbine can even get stuck and stop (Choi et al. 2010; Eikenberg 2001; Ercoli et al. 2009; Kenyon et al. 2005; Rotella et al. 2014) (Figure 1.7).

Figure 1.7 Different types of turbines.



Figure 1.8 Electric motor handpieces.



Electric motor handpieces were developed 20 or 30 years ago. They are characterised by their variable power and higher torque than turbines and therefore maintain their rotation speed with less risk of getting stuck when more force is applied than usual. Other positive aspects of these instruments are that (i) they are quieter and have less vibration; (ii) they release fewer aerosols, reducing the risk of cross-contamination; and (iii) they provide more precise and concentric cuts than turbines. On the other hand, electric motor handpieces weigh more, making them less ergonomic than turbines (Choi et al. 2010; Eikenberg 2001; Ercoli et al. 2009; Kenyon et al. 2005; Rotella et al. 2014) (Figure 1.8).

Studies have been carried out to compare cutting efficiency depending on the cutting instrument used: turbine or electric motor handpiece. All the studies came to the same conclusion – that the electric motor handpiece had a higher cutting efficiency than the turbine – although no statistically significant differences were observed (Choi et al. 2010; Eikenberg 2001; Ercoli et al. 2009; Rotella et al. 2014). All the authors believe the reason is the difference in torque: the high torque of the electric motor handpiece means its rotational speed is not reduced when

more force is applied (Choi et al. 2010; Eikenberg 2001; Ercoli et al. 2009; Rotella et al. 2014). Choi et al. (2010) even add that the difference could be related to the increased weight of the electric motor handpiece, which may cause the dentist to apply slightly more force (without being aware of it), making the instrument more efficient.

Not only is the electric motor handpiece more efficient than the turbine, but a smoother surface is obtained. In contrast, rough marks can be seen from the effect of a turbine, which may be related to loss of speed and possible stall caused by low torque (Geminiani et al. 2014).

1.2.2.3 Other Factors Related to Cutting Efficiency

As previously mentioned, various factors reduce cutting efficiency, including water flow, which depends on the instruments, and applied force, which depends on both the instrument and the dentist.

Water flow is a very important factor since it removes debris that may remain attached to the bur and avoids iatrogenic injury caused by heat generated during preparation of the tooth (most of the energy that is not used is transformed into heat). The amount of heat transmitted to the tooth usually depends on the type of bur, applied force, cutting time and rate, cooling technique, speed, and torque of the instrument (Galindo et al. 2004).

Most studies that have measured the effect of water flow on the temperature inside the pulp chamber have observed that grinding does not affect the pulp chamber because the water-flow coolant helps to decrease the temperature and prevent the pulp from reaching a critical temperatures. The water flow indicated in these studies to prevent an increase in pulp temperature is between 25 and 50 ml/min, regardless of whether the bur is made of diamond or carbide. More water is always better to cool the tooth preparation (Ercoli et al. 2009; Galindo et al. 2004; Siegel and von Fraunhofer 2000; Siegel and Patel 2016; Von Fraunhofer and Siegel 2000).

The importance of water flow is based on the number and distribution of water outlets on the instruments (Ercoli et al. 2009; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 2002). Earlier turbines (and some of today's turbines) had only one water port at the base of the head, so the bur was not fully cooled. Today, electric motor handpieces and modern turbines have three or four water ports (Figure 1.9), increasing the water flow of the entire bur. This allows control over the temperature, increases the




Figure 1.9 (a) Turbine with one water port; (b) turbine with three water ports; (c) turbine with four water ports; and (d) electric motor handpiece with three water ports.

removal of debris, and therefore increases cutting efficiency. Studies have compared the efficiency of dry and wet cutting and concluded that wet cutting increases the cutting rate and removes three times more tissue than dry cutting (Ercoli et al. 2009).

The last important factor related to cutting efficiency is the force applied when preparing the tooth. Different authors have conducted studies with dentists to determine the force they apply. Elias et al. (2003) determined that the force varied between 0.66 and 2.23 N, and Siegel et al. (Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1997, 1999) concluded that the most effective force for medium-grit burs is 0.92 N. Most literature considers that dentists exert a force between 50 and 150 g when preparing a tooth (Eikenberg 2001; Galindo et al. 2004; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1997, 1999). Elias et al. (2003) concluded that the magnitude of the force depends more on the power of the rotating instrument than on the speed of the instrument or outside force applied by the operator. On the other hand, Funkenbusch et al. (2016) consider that greater force applied by the operator generally increases cutting efficiency, so we can observe that there is no consensus about whether force depends more on the instrument or the operator. In summary, all studies consider that as the burs wear out and cutting efficiency is reduced, the force applied by the operator increases, leading to a risk of raising the temperature if there is not proper water flow (Emir et al. 2018; Pilcher et al. 2000; Rotella et al. 2014; Siegel and Von Fraunhofer 1996).

1.2.3 Effect of the Debonding Technique on the Enamel

In adhesion protocols, many properties must be taken into account: the chemical nature of the substrates to be joined, the state of the surfaces (cleaning, oxidation, passivation, etc.), their roughness (in relation to previous preparations such as carving, milling, roughing, casting, micro-etching, etc.), the relationship between the energy surface of the substrate to be bonded and that of the adhesive, wettability between the adhesive and the surface or substrate, adhesive viscosity, liquid transformation, strength of the adhesive, dimensional changes of the adhesive during this transformation, strength and toughness (cohesion) of the cured adhesive and film thickness of the adhesive agent.

When fixed lingual retention is selected, many of these variables must be considered. For example, a smoother lingual surface may require a more aggressive pretreatment or a longer acid-etching exposure to ensure mechanical porosity and greater resistance to debonding.

Another important aspect of fixed retention is the increasing preference of clinicians for life-long retention, which will also affect the bonding procedure. Since adhesion in orthodontics is almost always temporary, when looking for definitive bonding, some aspects of the protocol must be revised.

Regarding the retainer itself, there is no consensus among practitioners about adequate stiffness or properties of the material. These are influenced by the clinician's experience, training and beliefs. However, most agree about the use of a fluid composite resin with an acid-etching-priming procedure for adhesion.

The consequences of a permanent adhesive technique become evident when rupture, debonding or fracture of the interphase of the retainer occurs. In this case, we encounter damage from the mechanical removal of adhesive remnants and additional chemical damage from the rebonding procedure.

Disruption of the demineralization/remineralization balance in teeth can lead to irreversible structural damage, as adult enamel cannot self-regenerate (Yamaguchi et al. 2006). Removal of lingual retainer, orthodontic brackets and residual cement causes inevitable enamel loss that is irreversible by biological mechanisms (Pus et al. 1980). This loss can be minimised by carefully selecting less aggressive removal processes. However, any enamel repair must be induced by external methods

(Eisenburger et al. 2001), which should be instituted as soon as possible after orthodontic appliance removal.

Reported amounts of enamel loss after bracket debonding and cleaning are highly variable, ranging from 5–10 μm (Zachrisson and Arthun 1979) to 29.5–41.2 μm (Pus et al. 1980). This high variability may be attributed to differences in the methods used for remnants, bracket bonding (self-etching versus conventional etching cement and direct versus indirect bonding) (Flores et al. 2015; Iglesias et al. 2020; Mielczarek and Michalik 2014) or analysis (weight comparison, surfometry [Hosein et al. 2004], profilometry [Pus et al. 1980], SEM [Fjeld and Ogaard 2006]). A significant loss of enamel volume is observed in premolars subjected to simulated orthodontic treatment compared to untreated enamel. Enamel loss can be reversed, but not completely recovered, by remineralization with toothpaste. This finding may be attributable to the rapid decrease in fluoride release over time (Hahnel et al. 2014).

Recently, research done at the Orthodontics Department of Universitat Internacional de Catalunya compared different removal techniques (specifically after retention debonding) and found higher levels of rugosity (Sa, Sq, Sz) of the enamel in samples to which a high-speed white stone was applied (Figure 1.10). Tungsten burs were also tested at high and low




Figure 1.10 Enamel appearance after debonding and polishing with white stone using a high-speed handpiece.

speeds (Figures 1.11 and 1.12), with 15-blade burs, and the results showed less damage of the enamel when using a tungsten bur at low speed. This protocol of low-speed tungsten bur and posterior polishing with rubber cups was applied in accordance with other studies that analysed similar parameters after bracket debonding (Ireland et al. 2005).




Figure 1.11 Enamel appearance after debonding and polishing with a tungsten carbide bur using a high-speed handpiece.




Figure 1.12 Enamel appearance after debonding and polishing with a tungsten carbide bur using a low-speed handpiece.

1.3 Preservation and Remineralization

Researchers have examined the potential use of toothpaste containing surface (S) prereacted glass-ionomer (PRG) filler (Flores et al. 2017; Ikemura et al. 2008) based on calcium phosphate (Cochrane et al. 2010) or a novel fluoride-containing bioactive glass (Coceska et al. 2016) for inhibiting demineralization and recovering enamel loss (Fujimoto et al. 2010). In aqueous environments, PRG forms a stable glass-ionomer phase via a reaction between polyacrylic acid and fluoride-containing glass (Ikemura et al. 2008). The buffering action of S-PRG reduces the acidity of the oral environment (Fujimoto et al. 2010; Iijima et al. 2014; Ikemura et al. 2008). Furthermore, S-PRG filler releases strontium and fluorine ions, which improve the acid resistance of teeth by reacting with hydroxyapatite (Featherstone et al. 1983). More novel investigations have focused on the study of biometric hydroxyapatite toothpaste as a preventive measure in remineralization cases (Bossù et al. 2019; Memarpour et al. 2019).

Nanometric techniques permit three-dimensional data to be obtained with minimum sample preparation (Hashimoto et al. 2013). Reports of nanometric studies of healthy and affected enamel have described the enamel topography and SR.

SR affects the aesthetic properties, bacterial adhesion and plaque formation of enamel by altering the pathogenic environment (Elkassas and Arafa 2014; Kaga et al. 2014). Researchers have analysed the enamel SR using atomic force microscopy (AFM) and SEM as nanometric techniques. In contrast to SEM, AFM does not dehydrate the surface enamel during sample preparation (Bitter 1998; Keszthelyi and Jenei 1999). Similar to AFM, confocal microscopy (CFM) and profilometry are non-invasive nanometric techniques that enable the quantification of SR parameters with high measurement sensitivity and without altering the enamel surface quality (Poggio et al. 2012).

In a recent study (Iijima et al. 2014), toothpaste containing 5 or 30% S-PRG offered greater enamel remineralization than NaF-containing toothpaste, as indicated by the improved surface hardness and elastic modulus values. Remineralization was primarily determined by the toothpaste's strontium- and fluorine-releasing capacities rather than the fraction of S-PRG filler. Using SR and microhardness analyses, Elkassas and Arafa (2014) demonstrated the superior remineralizing efficacy of fluoride varnish compared to fluoride toothpaste, which they attributed to the greater fluoride content of the varnish. However,

toothpaste may yield better long-term results because fluoride varnish is only intended for use over one year.

Kaga et al. (2014) reported that the buffering effect of S-PRG filler inhibits enamel demineralization. An aqueous solution containing S-PRG filler exhibited a rapid increase in pH at one day, a gradual increase over six days, and the lowest Ca ion concentration among remineralization solutions. Although human saliva can harden the enamel surface, calcifying solutions may have greater remineralizing potential due to their higher concentrations of calcium and phosphate (Reynolds 1997; Reynolds et al. 2003). Calcium phosphate precipitates on the enamel surface as an amorphous precursor that undergoes rapid transformation to apatite crystals (Shen et al. 2001). Lippert et al. (2004) observed no enamel hardening due to saliva.

A previous study reported higher SR values after remineralization with 70wt% S-PRG compared to untreated enamel. The improvement could have been due to an increasing number of filler particles on the enamel surface (Hahnel et al. 2014). Fluoride toothpaste can reportedly restore the surface of lesions (Gjorgievska et al. 2013; Mielczarek and Michalik 2014), indicating its potential utility in cases with an elevated risk of caries, such as orthodontic patients (Gjorgievska et al. 2013).

1.4 Clinical Considerations

Due to the stability of the enamel composition and its poor ability to restore itself once its structure has been damaged, it is vital to create protocols that produce the least possible iatrogenesis. Among them, the use of different, less-aggressive burs for removing residual cement accompanied by a remineralization protocol that can help reconstitute damaged enamel should be incorporated into any debonding protocol. It is important to minimise the structural damage previously discussed in all temporary bonding procedures and in fixed retentions.

Given that it is impossible to avoid changing the surface structure of the enamel even if the most appropriate and least invasive protocols are followed, the systematic use of post-treatment remineralizing agents should be practically mandatory after treatment to remove residual cement. These parameters should remain a vital focus of study, as we have yet to find a non-harmful method.

References

- Al-Moghrabi, D., Johal, A., O'Rourke, N. et al. (2018). Effects of fixed vs removable orthodontic retainers on stability and periodontal health: 4-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 154 (2): 167–174.e1.
- Anusavice, S.R. (2013). Materials and processes for cutting, finishing, and polishing. In: *Phillip's Science of Dental Materials* (ed. S.R. Anusavice), 231–253. Elsevier Ltd.
- Bae, J.H., Yi, J., Kim, S. et al. (2014). Changes in the cutting efficiency of different types of dental diamond rotary instrument with repeated cuts and disinfection. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 111 (1): 64–70.
- Ben-Hanan, U., Judes, H., and Regev, M. (2008). Comparative study of three different types of dental diamond burs. *Tribol. Mater. Surf. Interfaces* 2 (2): 77–83.
- Bitter, N. (1998). A scanning electron microscope study of the long-term effect of bleaching agents on the enamel surface in vivo. *Gen. Dent.* 46 (1): 84–88.
- Bosco, E., Iancu Potrubacz, M., Arrizza, L. et al. (2020). Enamel preservation during composite removal after orthodontic debonding comparing hydroabrasion with rotary instruments. *Dent. Mater. J.* 39 (3): 367–374.
- Bossù, M., Saccucci, M., Salucci, A. et al. (2019). Enamel remineralization and repair results of biomimetic hydroxyapatite toothpaste on deciduous teeth: an effective option to fluoride toothpaste. *J. Nanobiotechnol.* 17 (1): 1–13.
- Brosh, T., Strouthou, S., and Sarne, O. (2005). Effects of buccal versus lingual surfaces, enamel conditioning procedures and storage duration on brackets debonding characteristics. *J. Dent.* 33: 99–105.
- Choi, C., Driscoll, C.F., and Romberg, E. (2010). Comparison of cutting efficiencies between electric and air-turbine dental handpieces. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 103 (2): 101–107.
- Coceska, E., Gjorgievska, E., Coleman, N.J. et al. (2016). Enamel alteration following tooth bleaching and remineralization. *J. Microsc.* 262 (3): 232–244.
- Cochrane, N.J., Cai, F., Huq, N.L. et al. (2010). Critical review in oral biology & medicine: new approaches to enhanced remineralization of tooth enamel. *J. Dent. Res.* 89 (11): 1187–1197.

- David, V.A., Staley, R.N., Bigelow, H.F., and Jacobsen, J.R. (2002). Remnant amount and cleanup for 3 adhesives after debracketing. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 121 (2): 291–296.
- Di Cristofaro, R.G.R., Giner, L., and Mayoral, J.R. (2013). Comparative study of the cutting efficiency and working life of carbide burs. *J. Prosthodont.* 22 (5): 391–396.
- Eikenberg, S.L. (2001). Comparison of the cutting efficiencies of electric motor and air turbine dental handpieces. *Gen. Dent.* 49 (2): 199–204.
- Eisenburger, M., Addy, M., Hughes, J.A., and Shellis, R.P. (2001). Effect of time on the remineralization of enamel by synthetic saliva after citric acid erosion. *Caries Res.* 35 (3): 211–215.
- Eliades, T. (2019). Orthodontic applications of biomaterials. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* 53: 230.
- Elias, K., Amis, A.A., and Setchell, D.J. (2003). The magnitude of cutting forces at high speed. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 89 (3): 286–291.
- Elkassas, D. and Arafa, A. (2014). Remineralizing efficacy of different calcium-phosphate and fluoride based delivery vehicles on artificial caries like enamel lesions. *J. Dent.* 42 (4): 466–474.
- Emir, F., Ayyildiz, S., and Sahin, C. (2018). What is the changing frequency of diamond burs? *J. Adv. Prosthodont.* 10 (2): 93–100.
- Ercoli, C., Rotella, M., Funkenbusch, P.D. et al. (2009). In vitro comparison of the cutting efficiency and temperature production of 10 different rotary cutting instruments. Part I: turbine. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 101 (4): 248–261.
- Ercoli, C., Rotella, M., Funkenbusch, P.D. et al. (2009). In vitro comparison of the cutting efficiency and temperature production of ten different rotary cutting instruments. Part II: electric handpiece and comparison with turbine. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 101 (5): 319–331.
- Eroglu, A.K., Baka, Z.M., and Arslan, U. (2019). Comparative evaluation of salivary microbial levels and periodontal status of patients wearing fixed and removable orthodontic retainers. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 156 (2): 186–192.
- Featherstone, J.D.B., Shields, C.P., Khademazad, B., and Oldershaw, M.D. (1983). Acid reactivity of carbonated apatites with strontium and fluoride substitutions. *J. Dent. Res.* 62 (10): 1049–1053.
- Firoozmand, L., Faria, R., Araujo, M.A. et al. (2008). Temperature rise in cavities prepared by high and low torque handpieces and Er:YAG laser. *Br. Dent. J.* 205 (1): E1.

- Fjeld, M. and Ogaard, B. (2006). Scanning electron microscopic evaluation of enamel surfaces exposed to 3 orthodontic bonding systems. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 130: 575–581.
- Flores, T., Mayoral, J., Giner, L., and Puigdollers, A. (2015). Comparison of enamel-bracket bond strength using direct- and indirect-bonding techniques with a self-etching ion releasing S-PRG filler. *Dent. Mater. J.* 34 (1): 41–47.
- Flores, T., Mayoral, J.R., Artés, M. et al. (2017). Increase in enamel volume of premolars by remineralization with s-prg filler containing toothpaste following debonding of lingual buttons: an in-vitro nanometric study. *Int. J. Sci. Res.* 7: 539–541.
- Fujimoto, Y., Iwasa, M., Murayama, R. et al. (2010). Detection of ions released from S-PRG fillers and their modulation effect. *Dent. Mater. J.* 29 (4): 392–397.
- Funkenbusch, P.D., Rotella, M., Chochlidakis, K., and Ercoli, C. (2016). Multivariate evaluation of the cutting performance of rotary instruments with electric and air-turbine handpieces. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 116 (4): 558–563.
- Galindo, D.F., Ercoli, C., Funkenbusch, P.D. et al. (2004). Tooth preparation: a study on the effect of different variables and a comparison between conventional and channeled diamond burs. *J. Prosthodont.* 13 (1): 3–16.
- Geminiani, A., Abdel-Azim, T., Ercoli, C. et al. (2014). Influence of oscillating and rotary cutting instruments with electric and turbine handpieces on tooth preparation surfaces. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 112 (1): 51–58.
- Gjorgievska, E.S., Nicholson, J.W., Slipper, I.J., and Stevanovic, M.M. (2013). Remineralization of demineralized enamel by toothpastes: a scanning electron microscopy, energy dispersive X-ray analysis, and three-dimensional stereo-micrographic study. *Microsc. Microanal.* 19 (3): 587–595.
- Gugger, J., Pandis, N., Zinelis, S. et al. (2016). Retrieval analysis of lingual fixed retainer adhesives. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 150 (4): 575–584.
- Hahnel, S., Wastl, D.S., Schneider-Feyrer, S. et al. (2014). Streptococcus mutans biofilm formation and release of fluoride from experimental resin-based composites depending on surface treatment and S-PRG filler particle fraction. *J. Adhes. Dent.* 16 (4): 313–321.
- Hashimoto, Y., Hashimoto, Y., Nishiura, A., and Matsumoto, N. (2013). Atomic force microscopy observation of enamel surfaces treated with self-etching primer. *Dent. Mater. J.* 32 (1): 181–188.

- Hosein, I., Sherriff, M., and Ireland, A.J. (2004). Enamel loss during bonding, debonding, and cleanup with use of a self-etching primer. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 126: 717–724.
- Iglesias, A., Flores, T., Moyano, J. et al. (2020). In vitro study of shear bond strength in direct and indirect bonding with three types of adhesive systems. *Materials (Basel)* 13 (11).
- Iijima, M., Ito, S., Nakagaki, S. et al. (2014). Effects of immersion in solution of an experimental toothpaste containing S-PRG filler on like-remineralizing ability of etched enamel. *Dent. Mater. J.* 33 (3): 430–436.
- Ikemura, K., Tay, F.R., Endo, T., and Pashley, D.H. (2008). A review of chemical-approach and ultramorphological studies on the development of fluoride-releasing dental adhesives comprising new Pre-Reacted Glass ionomer (PRG) fillers. *Dent. Mater. J.* 27 (3): 315–339.
- Ireland, A.J., Hosein, I., and Sherriff, M. (2005). Enamel loss at bond-up, debond and clean-up following the use of a conventional light-cured composite and a resin-modified glass polyalkenoate cement. *Eur. J. Orthod.* 27: 413–419.
- Jackson, M.J., Sein, H., and Ahmed, W. (2004). Diamond coated dental bur machining of natural and synthetic dental materials. *J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med.* 15 (12): 1323–1331.
- Janiszewska-Olszowska, J., Szatkiewicz, T., Tomkowski, R. et al. (2014). Effect of orthodontic debonding and adhesive removal on the enamel – current knowledge and future perspectives – a systematic review. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 20: 1991–2001.
- Janiszewska-Olszowska, J., Tandecka, K., Szatkiewicz, T. et al. (2015). Three-dimensional analysis of enamel surface alteration resulting from orthodontic clean-up -comparison of three different tools. *BMC Oral Health* 15 (1): 1–7.
- Jefferies, S.R. (2007). Abrasive finishing and polishing in restorative dentistry: a state-of-the-art review. *Dent. Clin. N. Am.* 51: 379–397.
- Jin, C., Bennani, F., Gray, A. et al. (2018). Survival analysis of orthodontic retainers. *Eur. J. Orthod.* 40 (5): 531–536.
- Jones, C.S., Billington, R.W., and Pearson, G.J. (2004). The in vivo perception of roughness of restorations. *Br. Dent. J.* 196 (1): 42–45.
- Kaga, M., Kakuda, S., Hashimoto, M. et al. (2014). Inhibition of enamel demineralization by buffering effect of S-PRG filler-containing dental sealant. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 122: 78–83.

- Kenyon, B.J., Van Zyl, I., and Louie, K.G. (2005). Comparison of cavity preparation quality using an electric motor handpiece and an air turbine dental handpiece. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 136 (8): 1101–1105.
- Keszthelyi, G. and Jenei, A. (1999). An atomic force microscopy study on the effect of bleaching agents on enamel surface. *J. Dent.* 27: 509–515.
- Lippert, F., Parker, D.M., and Jandt, K.D. (2004). In vitro demineralization/remineralization cycles at human tooth enamel surfaces investigated by AFM and nanoindentation. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 280: 442–448.
- Memarpour, M., Shafiei, F., Rafiee, A. et al. (2019). Effect of hydroxyapatite nanoparticles on enamel remineralization and estimation of fissure sealant bond strength to remineralized tooth surfaces: an in vitro study. *BMC Oral Health* 19 (1): 1–13.
- Mielczarek, A. and Michalik, J. (2014). The effect of nano-hydroxyapatite toothpaste on enamel surface remineralization. An in vitro study. *Am. J. Dent.* 27: 287–290.
- Nakamura, K., Katsuda, Y., Ankyu, S. et al. (2015). Cutting efficiency of diamond burs operated with electric high-speed dental handpiece on zirconia. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 123 (5): 375–380.
- Padmos, J.A.D., Fudalej, P.S., and Renkema, A.M. (2018). Epidemiologic study of orthodontic retention procedures. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 153 (4): 496–504.
- Pilcher, E.S., Tietge, J.D., and Draughn, R.A. (2000). Comparison of cutting rates among single-patient-use and multiple-patient-use diamond burs. *J. Prosthodont.* 9: 66–70.
- Poggio, C., Dagna, A., Chiesa, M. et al. (2012). Surface roughness of flowable resin composites eroded by acidic and alcoholic drinks. *J. Conserv. Dent.* 15 (2): 137–140.
- Prithviraj, D.R., Saraswat, S., Sounderraj, K. et al. (2017). Cutting efficiency and longevity of differently manufactured dental diamond rotary points – an in vitro study. *J. Appl. Dent. Med. Sci.* 3 (1): 8–14.
- Pus, M.D. and Way, D.C. (1980). Enamel loss due to orthodontic bonding with filled and unfilled resins using various clean-up techniques. *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 77 (3): 269–283.
- Regev, M., Judes, H., and Ben-Hanan, U. (2010). Wear mechanisms of diamond coated dental burs. *Tribol. Mater. Surf. Interfaces* 4 (1): 38–42.
- Reynolds, E.C. (1997). Remineralization of enamel subsurface lesions by casein phosphopeptide-stabilized calcium phosphate solutions. *J. Dent. Res.* 76 (9): 1587–1595.

- Reynolds, E.C., Cai, F., Shen, P. et al. (2003). Retention in plaque and remineralization of enamel lesions by various forms of calcium in a mouthrinse or sugar-free chewing gum. *J. Dent. Res.* 82 (3): 206–212.
- Rotella, M., Ercoli, C., Funkenbusch, P.D. et al. (2014). Performance of single-use and multiuse diamond rotary cutting instruments with turbine and electric handpieces. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 111 (1): 56–63.
- Ryf, S., Flury, S., Palaniappan, S. et al. (2012). Enamel loss and adhesive remnants following bracket removal and various clean-up procedures in vitro. *Eur. J. Orthod.* 34 (1): 25–32.
- Shah, P., Sharma, P., Goje, S.K. et al. (2019). Comparative evaluation of enamel surface roughness after debonding using four finishing and polishing systems for residual resin removal – an in vitro study. *Prog. Orthod.* 20 (1): 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40510-019-0269-x>.
- Shen, R., Cai, F., Nowicki, A. et al. (2001). Remineralization of enamel subsurface lesions by sugar-free chewing gum containing casein calcium phosphate. *J. Dent. Res.* 80 (12): 2066–2071.
- Shinya, M., Shinya, A., Lassila, L.V.J. et al. (2008). Treated enamel surface patterns associated with five orthodontic adhesive systems — surface morphology and shear bond strength. *Dent. Mater. J.* 27 (1): 1–6.
- Siegel, S.C. and Anthony Von Fraunhofer, J. (1998). Dental cutting: the historical development of diamond burs. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 129 (6): 740–745.
- Siegel, S.C. and Patel, T. (2016). Comparison of cutting efficiency with different diamond burs and water flow rates in cutting lithium disilicate glass ceramic. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 147 (10): 792–796.
- Siegel, S.C. and Von Fraunhofer, J.A. (1996). Assessing the cutting efficiency of dental diamond burs. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 127 (6): 763–772.
- Siegel, S.C. and Von Fraunhofer, J.A. (1997). Effect of handpiece load on the cutting efficiency of dental burs. *Mach. Sci. Technol.* 1 (1): 1–13.
- Siegel, S.C. and Von Fraunhofer, A. (1999). Dental cutting with diamond burs: heavy-handed or light-touch? *J. Prosthodont.* 8 (1): 3–9.
- Siegel, S.C. and von Fraunhofer, J.A. (2000). Cutting efficiency of three diamond bur grit sizes. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 131 (12): 1706–1710.
- Siegel, S.C. and Von Fraunhofer, J.A. (2002). The effect of handpiece spray patterns on cutting efficiency. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 133 (2): 184–188.
- Sifakakis, I., Zinelis, S., Patcas, R., and Eliades, T. (2017). Mechanical properties of contemporary orthodontic adhesives used for lingual fixed retention. *Biomed. Tech.* 62 (3): 289–294.

- Von Fraunhofer, J.A. and Siegel, S.C. (2000). Enhanced dental cutting through chemomechanical effects. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 131 (10): 1465–1469.
- Yamaguchi, K., Miyazaki, M., Takamizawa, T. et al. (2006). Effect of CPP – ACP paste on mechanical properties of bovine enamel as determined by an ultrasonic device. *J. Dent.* 34: 230–236.
- Zachrisson, B.U. and Arthun, J. (1979). Enamel surface appearance after various debonding techniques. *Am. J. Orthod.* 75 (2): 121–127.