

# EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF 5.25% SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE AND 5% CHLORHEXIDINE DISINFECTANT SOLUTION ON VISCOELASTICITY, SURFACE HARDNESS AND COLOUR STABILITY IN ACRYLIC AND SILICONE BASED SOFT DENTURE LINERS-AN INVITRO STUDY.

Dr Ilavarasan Anbazhagan, Dr Ravichandran R, Dr Harsha Kumar K, Dr Vivek V Nair, Dr Shony Mohan, Dr Amal Shajahan.

---

## **Abstract**

### **Background And Rationale**

Soft denture liners in prosthetic dentistry are crucial for patient comfort and oral health preservation, but concerns about disinfectants' properties, viscoelasticity, surface hardness, and colour stability have been raised. Disinfection treatments, such as 5.25% sodium hypochlorite and 5% chlorhexidine, are commonly used to disinfect soft liners, but the impact on their physical properties is limited.

### **Aim:**

The study evaluates the impact of 5.25% sodium hypochlorite and 5% chlorhexidine disinfectant solution on viscoelasticity, surface hardness, and colour stability of acrylic and silicone-based soft denture liners.

### **Methodology:**

Viscoelastic, surface hardness and colour stability characteristics of silicone- and acrylic-based soft denture liners were examined in this work using tests and dynamic mechanical analysis. After being immersed in sodium hypochlorite for 15 minutes, the silicone-based group's liners had the maximum viscoelasticity, while the acrylic-based group's liners had the lowest viscoelasticity, according to the results. Disinfectant type also had an impact on surface hardness; sodium hypochlorite produced a harder surface than chlorhexidine. Silicone-based liners performed better in terms of color stability after being submerged in sodium hypochlorite. The evaluated groups' viscoelasticity, surface hardness, and color stability were found to differ significantly, with some comparisons showing statistical significance indicated by *p*-values.

### **Statistical Analysis:**

Chi-square tests are used for qualitative analysis and independent *t*-tests were utilized for quantitative comparisons.

### **Conclusion:**

The study found that 5% chlorhexidine disinfection improved viscoelasticity and surface hardness of acrylic and silicone-based soft denture liners, while 5.25% sodium hypochlorite significantly affected viscoelasticity and surface hardness without significant color stability.

---

Date of Submission: 05-09-2024

Date of Acceptance: 15-09-2024

---

## **I. Introduction**

Soft denture liners are popular in prosthetic dentistry for patients with thin mucosa or severe alveolar resorption, providing cushioning, energy absorption, and durability. Dental prosthesis and appliances are urged to be disinfected before patient delivery and after intraoral use due to their susceptibility to microbial adhesion. Disinfection procedures are crucial to prevent cross-contamination risks in dental laboratory and clinical procedures, often involving chemical solutions like sodium hypochlorite and chlorhexidine. Sodium hypochlorite and chlorhexidine are known for their antimicrobial properties, but there is limited literature on their impact on the physical properties of soft liners. Soft denture liners' hardness, a key indicator of viscoelasticity, can cause discomfort, soreness, and tissue irritation due to increased occlusion forces on the underlying mucosa. Colour stability is crucial for dental materials, indicating aging or damage. Soft liners, especially acrylic ones, show color changes due to water absorption or solubilization. This study explores the impact of disinfection methods and denture cleansers on the physical properties of soft denture liners, despite

---

the lack of research in this area. The study investigates the impact of cleansers on soft denture liners' hardness and color stability, aiming to optimize these materials for prosthetic dentistry. Surface topography influences attachment, rough surfaces promote colonization, and surface roughness contributes to plaque and biofilm formation. UV aging is suggested for accelerated aging. A comprehensive approach involving various factors that influence the aging of soft liners is inevitable. The aim of this invitro study was to evaluate the parameters like viscoelasticity, surface hardness, and colour stability of soft denture-relining materials that have an effect after disinfection with 5.25 % sodium hypochlorite and 5% chlorhexidine.

## II. Methodology:

Soft denture liners and tissue conditioners' efficacy is determined by their viscoelastic properties, which are assessed through penetration, static, and dynamic tests. This study evaluates viscoelastic, surface hardness, and color stability properties of ufigel-C acrylic-based auto-polymerized and mollosil silicone-based soft denture liners using dynamic mechanical analysis.



FIGURE 1- ACRYLIC BASED SOFT DENTURE LINER




FIGURE 2- SILICONE BASED SOFT DENTURE LINER



FIGURE 3- SAMPLES



FIGURE 4- SAMPLES IMMERSSED IN 5.25% SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE



FIGURE 7- SAMPLES IMMERSED IN 5% CHLORHEXIDINE

**Viscoelasticity Evaluation:**

The viscoelastic properties of soft denture liners and tissue conditioners are assessed through penetration, static, and dynamic tests, with dynamic mechanical analysis being most clinically useful. The test material's dynamic viscoelastic properties are assessed using an automatic viscoelastometer (RHEOVIBRON)

The rheological parameters namely the complex dynamic tensile modulus, storage modulus, loss modulus and loss tangent or respectively defined as

$$E^* = E' + i E''$$

$$E' = |E^*| \cos \delta$$

$$E'' = |E^*| \sin \delta$$

$$\tan \delta = E''/E'$$

Where  $i$  is  $\sqrt{-1}$  and  $\delta$  is the phase angle between the stress and strain.

Ten cylindrical specimens were created from each material to study viscoelastic properties. Silicone rubber patterns were embedded in gypsum, then removed and filled with acrylic resin-based denture liner dough. The cold-cured type soft denture liner specimens will be produced in a 20 mm in diameter and 20 mm in height cylindrical split Teflon mold, placed on a Mylar strip-covered glass plate. The mold was then filled with the mixed silicone-based product, covered with the Mylar strip and pressed flush with a glass plate. This procedure is done using viscoelastometer RHEOVIBRON measured in Pascal-second (pa.s)





FIGURE 8-ANTON PAAR RHEOMETER



FIGURE 9- SCREEN DISPLAY FOR THE READINGS




FIGURE 10- DIAGRAMATIC REPRESENTATION OF MECHANISM




FIGURE 11- CIRCUIT AND GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF RHEOMETER




FIGURE 12- VISCOELASTICITY OF SILICONE AND ACRYLIC SOFT DENTURE LINERS

**Surface Hardness Evaluation:**

The materials were processed according to manufacturer's instructions, ensuring uniform size and surface roughness through polymerization against the same glass surface. Petroleum Jelly was applied to a mold for easy removal, and the mold's back was placed on a glass slab covered with cellophane for separation. Soft denture liners were molded, covered with cellophane, and pressed against a glass slab to shape specimens.

All specimens were divided into three major groups based on cleansing treatments.

- Group A (sodium hypochlorite)
- Group B (chlorhexidine)

---

Comprising of 10 specimens each.

Each group was divided further into 6 subgroups:

Subgroups I, II, III, IV, V and VI (consisting of 10 specimens each) are to be tested at a time intervals of 1 week, 1 month, 3 months and 6 months respectively.

Each subgroup was again divided into two minor subgroups:

Minor Subgroup a - consisted of samples made of acrylic-based soft denture liner

Minor Subgroup b - consisted of samples made of silicone-based soft denture liner.

All specimens were cleaned daily. Specimens in Group A were immersed in 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution for ten minutes daily. The study investigates the in vitro effects of plasticizer leaching on soft denture liners, designed for use with dentures in the oral cavity, focusing on the viscous, elastic, and copolymer materials, such as plasticized acrylics and silicone rubber. The study suggests that the study's findings on denture lining materials may only partially predict clinical performance due to the nutrient-rich environment of the oral cavity. Further investigation into factors like absorption, solubility, roughness, bond strength, color stability, and viscoelastic properties is needed. This procedure is done using shore A durometer, measured in Newton per square millimeter (N/mm<sup>2</sup>).



FIGURE 13- SHORE A DURAMETER



FIGURE 14- SAMPLE IS PLACED IN THE PLATFORM TO TEST THE SURFACE HARDNESS




FIGURE 15- DIAGRAMATIC REPRESENTATION OF SURFACE HARDNESS MEASUREMENTS USING SHORE A DURAMETER.

**Color Stability Evaluation:**

This study processes soft lining materials from acrylic and silicon-based chemical types, as well as denture-based acrylic resin for both materials and specimens. A gypsum mold was created using a glass plate, partially filled with Parisian plaster, and kept clean on the upper surface. A rectangular wax was placed on a glass plate, covered with plaster mixture. The flask was filled, closed, and pressed for 30 minutes. The wax



---

piece was removed, cleaned, and fixed to a glass plate. The wax was then painted with a separating medium. The study involved filling a flask with plaster, pressing it for 30 minutes, cleaning the mold, drying glass surfaces, painting gypsum surfaces, and packing soft materials in molds. Data was collected on ten specimens from different materials, analyzed for power differences, and immersed in (5.25%) sodium hypochlorite. Disinfecting solution was evenly distributed in separate glass bowls, with equal volumes in each bowl and daily changes. The same batch of disinfectant solution was used throughout the experimental period of study. Color measurements for each specimen were taken with a colorimeter (NR-3000, Nippon Denshoku, Tokyo, Japan) before immersion in the disinfectant solution, and after 24 h and 7 days of immersion. Samples were stored in distilled water for 24 hours before color measurements. Device is calibrated with white plate, used as background to eliminate background color variations. The specimens were washed and air-spray dried before color measurements, which were performed using a colorimeter and measured in parts per million (ppm).



FIGURE 16- THERMO SCIENTIFIC COLORIMETER ( ONE PLUS EVOLUTION)



FIGURE 17- TOP LOADING TRAY MECHANISM



FIGURE 18- SAMPLE IS LOADED AND THE TRAY IS INSERTED FOR COLOUR STABILITY



FIGURE 19- COLOUR STABILITY READING OF THE SAMPLE FROM WHITE COLOUR.

---

### III. Results

The study evaluated the effects of disinfection on the viscoelasticity, surface hardness, and color stability of acrylic and silicone-based soft denture liners, with 60 samples per group. The study found that

1. The mean viscoelasticity and standard deviation values of Aarc and molloplast in subgroup A1B1 specimens were  $9.5 \pm 0.9$  and  $9.3 \pm 1.1$ , respectively [table I, graph I].
2. The mean surface hardness and standard deviation values of Aarc and molloplast in subgroup A2B2 were found to be  $8.0 \pm 0.9$  and  $7.7 \pm 1.3$ , respectively [table II graph II].
3. The specimen in subgroup A3B3 underwent 15-minute chlorhexidine immersion, resulting in mean color stability values of  $5.6 \pm 1$  and  $8.1 \pm 1$ , respectively, with a p value of  $<0.01$  [Table III, graph III].
4. The mean viscoelasticity and standard deviation values of Aarc and molloplast in subgroup A4B4 specimens were  $5.7 \pm 0.9$  and  $7.5 \pm 0.9$ , respectively, after 15 minutes of immersion in sodium hypochlorite [table IV, graph IV].
5. Subgroup A5B5 specimens, immersed in 5.25% sodium hypochlorite for 15 minutes, showed mean surface hardness and standard deviation values of  $5.4 \pm 0.9$  and  $7.2 \pm 0.7$  respectively with p value  $<0.01$  [ table V; graph V].
6. The specimen in subgroup A6B6 was exposed to 5.25% sodium hypochlorite for 15 minutes, resulting in mean color stability and standard deviation values of  $10 \pm 1.1$  and  $11.2 \pm 1.6$  respectively with pvalue  $0.054$  ( $P > 0.05$ ) [Table VI, graph VI]

As per the study ,highest mean surface hardness was found to be with subgroup A5B5 and lowest mean surface hardness was found to be with subgroup A2B2. Subgroup A6B6 exhibited the highest mean color stability, while subgroup A3B3 had the lowest mean color stability. Independent t test was used to compare quantitative parameters between categories. It was found that the results were statistically significant with subgroups A3B3, A4B4, A5B5 as p value was  $<0.05$ . For Subgroup A1B1, A2B2, A6B6 the results were statistically nonsignificant as p-value was  $>0.05$ .

#### Statistical Analysis

For all statistical interpretations,  $p < 0.05$  was considered the threshold for statistical significance. The study employed an independent t test to compare quantitative parameters, while a Chi-square test was employed to identify associations between categorical variables in viscoelasticity, surface hardness and colour stability. Statistical analyses was performed by using a statistical software package SPSS, version 20.0.

---

**Table I**

**Evaluation of viscoelasticity of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**

Subgroup A1B1	Mean	SD	N	t	p
AARC	9.5	0.9	10	0.51	0.615
MOLLOPLAST	9.3	1.1	10		

**Subgroup A1B1**

**Non-statistically significant-NS**

**Table II**

**Evaluation of surface hardness of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**

SubgroupA2B2	Mean	SD	N	t	p
AARC	8.0	0.9	10	0.51	0.615
MOLLOPLAST	7.7	1.3	10		

**Subgroup A2B2 Non-statistically significant-NS**



---

**Table III**

**Evaluation of colour stability of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**

SubgroupA3B3	Mean	SD	N	t	p
AARC	5.6	1.0	10	5.42	p<0.01
AARC	8.1	1.0	10		

**SubgroupA3B3**

**Statistically significant(SS)**

**Table IV**

**Evaluation of viscoelasticity of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution.**

SubgroupA4B4	Mean	SD	N	t	p
AARC	5.7	0.9	10	4.53	p<0.01
MOLLOPLAST	7.5	0.9	10		

**Subgroup A4B4 Statistically significant(SS)**

---

**Table V**

**Evaluation of surface hardness of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution**

<b>SubgroupA5B5</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>AARC</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5.12</b>	<b>p&lt;0.01</b>
<b>MOLLOPLAST</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>10</b>		

**Subgroup A5B5**

**Statistically significant(SS)**

**Table VI**

**Evaluation of colour stability of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite.**


<b>SubgroupA6B6</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>AARC</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>0.054</b>
<b>MOLLOPLAST</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>10</b>		

**Subgrup A6B6 Non-statistically Significant**

**Graph I**


---

**Evaluation of viscoelasticity of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**



**Graph II**

**Evaluation of surface hardness of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**




**Graph III**

**Evaluation of colour stability of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after**

---

**chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution.**


**Subgroup A3B3**



**Graph IV**

**Evaluation of viscoelasticity of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution.**

**Subgroup A4B4**



**Graph V**


**Evaluation of surface hardness of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner**



---


after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution.

**Subgroup A5B5**



**Evaluation of colour stability of acrylic soft denture liner and silicone soft denture liner after chemical disinfection with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite.**

**Subgroup A6B6**



**IV. Discussion**

Disinfection of acrylic and silicone-based soft denture liners is a significant issue in prosthodontic practice due to issues like loss of viscoelasticity, surface hardness, color stability, tear strength, water sorption, and inappropriate polymerization. The study examined two commonly used soft lining materials: (AARC)

---

acrylic-based soft denture liners and (MOLLOPLAST) silicone-based soft denture liners. Samples were disinfected with chlorhexidine and sodium hypochlorite for 15 minutes at 37°C. Standard hygiene for removable prosthetic restorations recommends soft lining materials for improved comfort, as elastomeric materials are susceptible to elasticity loss and require costly replacements. Jones et al. identified eight chemicals as plasticizers for soft lining materials, used in varying amounts from 26% to 51% by mass. Kaul et al. found that ionized solutions accelerate the release of plasticizers, with sodium and potassium ions being particularly effective in soft lining materials. The research indicates that acrylic elastomers are highly sensitive to disinfecting solutions, a finding that has been confirmed by other authors' observations. Villacryl Soft's VEC value nearly doubled after 28 days, while Vertex Soft's average Viscoelastic value increased by 0.2 MPa in sodium hypochlorite solution, due to artificial saliva's elasticity change. Ethylene glycol dimethacrylate is used in storage solutions to improve cross-linking in silicone and acrylic materials, but its release can indicate incomplete or unstable cross-links, requiring regular hygiene. Limit mechanical brushing on dentures to prevent lining material damage, use disinfectants instead, but be cautious about releasing phthalic acid esters, which could act as xenoestrogens. Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry studies have determined compounds released from soft lining materials, revealing that between 0.02% and 0.38% of the material can be leached into aqueous media. Artificial saliva significantly lost weight in high temperature polymerized materials, while sodium hypochlorite affected room temperature materials. Disinfectants affected elastomeric, surface hardness, and color stability. Soft liners contained Ethyl glycol methacrylate in chlorhexidine and sodium hypochlorite solutions, while silicone materials were more stable. The study found EGDMA in all silicone solutions, except for Mollosil samples in artificial saliva, and found methyl methacrylate and n-didocyl methyl in storage solutions of Molloplast B, irrespective of polymerization type. Cylindrical specimens were prepared from a custom-made metal mold with dimensions of 14 mm × 2 mm (According to ASTM: D-2240-64T), and a glass slab was placed over another slab coated with petroleum jelly for easy removal. Soft denture liners were molded, covered with petroleum jelly, and shaped. They were set, removed, trimmed, and cured in a water bath before being carefully removed and trimmed for data collection. The study collected data on ten specimens from each material, and conducted a power analysis (using G\*Power Version 3.1.5) to determine the required number of specimens for each test group. Specimens were immersed in sodium hypochlorite (5.25%) (National Cleaning Products Company, Haryana) and 5% chlorhexidine (Relief lab private limited, Hyderabad). The participants were immersed in a glass beaker filled with disinfecting solution, using equal volumes and the same batch throughout the experimental study period.

### **Viscoelasticity**

Test methods like oscillating rheometers, cone plate type rheometers, dynamic mechanical analyzers, and creep meters assess viscoelastic properties, interpreting them as Voigt four-element model characteristics, determining elastic deformation of serial spring. The displacement of  $h_2$  and  $h_3$  after load application, known as delayed elastic displacement, represents the elastic deformation of the parallel connected spring and dashpot elements. The viscous flow of soft liners, whether acrylic resin-based or silicone-based, was found to have a water sorption and solubility of 0.9-1.2 and 0.7-3.4%, respectively. The viscoelastic properties of soft denture liners can be significantly affected by the elution of plasticizer components during storage in water, according to previous research. Viscoelastic properties were measured using a creep meter (Anton Paar, modular compact rheometer, Tokyo, Japan). The specimen was loaded with a 3-mm probe at 1 mm/s until a final load of 1.96 N was reached, then the probe's displacement was continuously recorded until 120 s. The viscoelastic parameters, including instantaneous, delayed, viscous flow, and residual displacement, were calculated using the Voigt four-element model and a software program (Creep Analysis Ver. 1.3, Yamaden). Denture disinfectants affect elastic lining materials' properties, releasing compounds and reducing elasticity. However, materials stored in artificial saliva, dry, or exclusively in artificial saliva showed minimal change. AARC and MOLLOPLAST soft liners showed less elasticity loss compared to silicone materials, with substances released within European limits. Chemical disinfection with 5.25% Sodium hypochlorite solution significantly reduced viscoelasticity, while 5% chlorhexidine solution did not.

### **Surface Hardness**

Resilient materials' hardness, which should remain consistent over time, can be affected by factors like temperature, with acrylics showing more negative effects than silicone. The study measured surface hardness using a Shore A Durometer calibrated to 822 gf (8.06 N), revealing changes in soft lining substances like plasticizers and monomers. The Shapiro-Wilk analysis revealed a normal distribution of hardness values in the investigated groups, while ANOVA revealed no significant differences between the examined groups. The study found that soft liner samples' surface hardness increased significantly when cleansed with 5% chlorhexidine and 5.25% sodium hypochlorite, despite variations in cleaning tablets, sample sizes, and storage durations, while resilient liner's hardness remained unaffected. This study aligns with a 2013 study by Pahuja et al., which found

---

an increase in the shore A value of acrylic resilient liner in sodium hypochlorite and chlorhexidine groups. Mohammed et al.'s 2016 study found that self-cured acrylic and silicone resilient liners' hardness increased when submerged in cleansing tablets. Chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution did not significantly reduce the surface hardness of acrylic and silicone-based soft liner MOLLOPLAST(subgroup A2B2) while 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution significantly reduced the surface hardness of acrylic and silicone soft liner MOLLOPLAST(subgroup A5B5).

### **Colour Stability**

Color measurements were taken using a colorimeter (Thermo scientific evolution , one plus, Tokyo, Japan) after immersion in disinfectant solution. The device was calibrated with a white calibration plate, and the white calibration standard plate was used as the background during data collection. This study processed soft lining materials from plasticized acrylic resin and silicone-based materials, along with a denture base acrylic resin. A glass plate was applied to the bottom of a glass slab flask filled with soft liner materials. Soft liner materials were pressed, dried, and painted, then processed in a water bath. A Bonferroni test showed insignificant changes in acrylic-based liner values after immersion. The acrylic-based liner showed a higher increase in values after immersion compared to silicone-based liner, and color changes in soft denture liners increased with longer immersion times. Disinfectants were used in glass bowls, calibrated, and specimens washed and air-dried before color measurements. A lens was applied to the glazed surface. Chemical disinfection with 5% chlorhexidine solution significantly reduced the color stability of acrylic and silicone-based soft liners AARC and MOLLOPLAST(subgroup A3B3), while 5.25% sodium hypochlorite solution did not significantly affect color stability of AARC and MOLLOPLAST(subgroup A1B1).

My sincere thanks and respect for Dr. kiruthika babu MDS (gold medal), senior resident in OMFS, Government dental college, Kottayam and Dr Manisha sunale rani MDS in endodontics for immense support and insight in this research.

### **V. Conclusion**

Within the limitations of the present study, it was concluded that disinfecting with 5% chlorhexidine did not significantly affect the viscoelasticity and surface hardness of acrylic and silicone-based soft denture liners. However, it significantly affected the color stability. When disinfected with 5.25% sodium hypochlorite, the viscoelasticity and surface hardness were significantly affected, but no significant color stability was observed. Therefore, 5% chlorhexidine disinfection is recommended for viscoelasticity and surface hardness, while 5.25% sodium hypochlorite is safer for color stability.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES**

1. Matos AO, Costa JO, Beline T, Ogawa ES, Assunção WG, Mesquita MF, Consani RX, Barão VA.

- 
- Effect of disinfection on the bond strength between denture teeth and microwave cured acrylic resin denture base. *Journal of Prosthodontics*. 2018 Feb;27(2):169-76.
2. Cunningham JL, Benington IC. An investigation of the variables which may affect the bond between plastic teeth and denture base resin. *Journal of dentistry*. 1999 Feb 1;27(2):129-35
  3. Moffitt AR, Woody RD, Parel SM, Miller BH. Failure modes with point loading of three commercially available denture teeth. *Journal of Prosthodontics*. 2008 Aug;17(6):432-8.
  4. Lira AF, Consani RL, Mesquita MF, Nóbilo MA, Henriques GE. Effect of toothbrushing, chemical disinfection and thermocycling procedures on the surface microroughness of denture base acrylic resins. *Gerodontology*. 2012 Jun;29(2):e891-7.
  5. Asad T, Watkinson AC, Huggett R. The effects of various disinfectant solutions on the surface hardness of an acrylic resin denture base material. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*. 1993 Jan 1;6(1)
  6. Izumida FE, Ribeiro RC, Giampaolo ET, Machado AL, Pavarina AC, Vergani CE. Effect of microwave disinfection on the surface roughness of three denture base resins after tooth brushing. *Gerodontology*. 2011 Dec;28(4):277-82.
  7. Cucci AL, Vergani CE, Giampaolo ET, Afonso MC. Water sorption, solubility, and bond strength of two autopolymerizing acrylic resins and one heat-polymerizing acrylic resin. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 1998 Oct 1;80(4):434-8.
  8. Sartori EA, Schmidt CB, Mota EG, Hirakata LM, Shinkai RS. Cumulative effect of disinfection procedures on microhardness and tridimensional stability of a poly (methyl methacrylate) denture base resin. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials: An Official Journal of The Society for Biomaterials, The Japanese Society for Biomaterials, and The Australian Society for Biomaterials and the Korean Society for Biomaterials*. 2008 Aug;86(2):360-4.
  9. Machado AL, Breeding LC, Vergani CE, da Cruz Perez LE. Hardness and surface roughness of reline and denture base acrylic resins after repeated disinfection procedures. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2009 Aug 1;102(2):115-22.
  10. Amarnath GS, Indra Kumar HS, Muddugangadhar BC. Bond strength and tensile strength of surface treated resin teeth with microwave cured and heat cured acrylic resin denture base: An *in vitro* study. *Int J Clin Dent Sci* 2011;2:27-32. †
  11. Yadav NS, Somkuwar S, Mishra SK, Hazari P, Chitumalla R, Pandey SK. Evaluation of bond strength of acrylic teeth to denture base using different polymerization techniques: A comparative study. *Journal of international oral health: JIOH*. 2015;7(Suppl 1):54.
  12. Saavedra G, Valandro LF, Leite FP, Amaral R, Özcan M, Bottino MA, Kimpara ET. Bond strength of



- 
- acrylic teeth to denture base resin after various surface conditioning methods before and after thermocycling. *International Journal of Prosthodontics*. 2007 Mar 1;20(2).
13. Mahadevan V, Krishnan M, Krishnan CS, Azhagarasan NS, Sampathkumar J, Ramasubramanian H. Influence of surface modifications of acrylic resin teeth on shear bond strength with denture base resin- an invitro study. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*. 2015 Sep;9(9):ZC16.
  14. Kim SJ, Kwon HJ, Kim JE, Park JE, Yoo JH, Park YS, Park YD, Hwang KS. Safety and efficacy of fittydent mega denture clean agents: in vitro. *International Journal of Clinical Preventive Dentistry*. 2014;10(3):147-56.
  15. Hayran Y, Sarikaya I, Aydin A, Tekin YH. Determination of the effective anticandidal concentration of denture cleanser tablets on some denture base resins. *Journal of Applied Oral Science*. 2018 Jan 18;26.
  16. Machado Cucci AL, Vergani CE, Giampaolo ET, da Silveira Ferreira Afonso MC. Water sorption, solubility, and bond strength of two autopolymerizing acrylic resins and one heat-polymerizing acrylic resin. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 1998;80(4):434-8.
  17. Hashem M, Alsaleem SO, Assery MK, Abdeslam EB, Vellappally S, Anil S. A comparative study of the mechanical properties of the light-cure and conventional denture base resins. *Oral Health Dent Manag*. 2014 Jun 1;13(2):311-5.
  18. Mosharraf R, Abed-Haghighi M. A comparison of acrylic and multilithic teeth bond strengths to acrylic denture base material. *The journal of contemporary dental practice*. 2009 Sep 1;10:17-22.
  19. Walczak K, Thiele J, Geisler D, Boening K, Wieckiewicz M. Effect of Chemical Disinfection on Chitosan Coated PMMA and PETG Surfaces—An In Vitro Study. *Polymers*. 2018 May;10(5):536.
  20. Consani RL, Mesquita MF, Zampieri MH, Mendes WB, Consani S. Effect of the simulated disinfection by microwave energy on the impact strength of the tooth/acrylic resin adhesion. *The open dentistry journal*. 2008;2:13.
  21. Korkmaz T, Dogan A, Murat Dogan O, Demir H. The bond strength of a highly cross-linked denture tooth to denture base polymers: a comparative study. *Journal of Adhesive Dentistry*. 2011 Feb 1;13(1):85.
  22. Loyaga-Rendon PG, Takahashi H, Hayakawa I, Iwasaki N. Compositional characteristics and hardness of acrylic and composite resin artificial teeth. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2007 Aug 1;98(2):141-9.
  23. Yuzugullu B, Acar O, Cetinsahin C, Celik C. Effect of different denture cleansers on surface roughness and microhardness of artificial denture teeth. *The journal of advanced prosthodontics*. 2016 Oct 1;8(5):333-8.

- 
24. Sartori EA, Schmidt CB, Mota EG, Hirakata LM, Shinkai RS. Cumulative effect of disinfection procedures on microhardness and tridimensional stability of a poly (methyl methacrylate) denture base resin. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials: An Official Journal of The Society for Biomaterials, The Japanese Society for Biomaterials, and The Australian Society for Biomaterials and the Korean Society for Biomaterials.* 2008 Aug;86(2):360-4.
  25. Cardash HS, Liberman R, Helft M. The effect of retention grooves in acrylic resin teeth on tooth denture-base bond. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry.* 1986 Apr 1;55(4):526-8.
  26. Phukela SS, Chintalapudi SK, Sachdeva H, Dhall RS, Sharma N, Prabhu A. Comparative evaluation of different mechanical modifications of denture teeth on bond strength between high-impact acrylic resin and denture teeth: An in vitro study. *Journal of International Society of Preventive & Community Dentistry.* 2016 Mar;6(2):161.
  27. Gandhi N, Daniel S, Benjamin S, Kurian N, Varghese VS. Evaluation of surface microhardness following chemical and microwave disinfection of commercially available acrylic resin denture teeth. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR.* 2017 May;11(5):ZC87.
  28. Consani RL, Soave T, Mesquita MF, Sinhoreti MA, Mendes WB, Guiraldo RD. Effect of repeated microwave disinfections on bonding of different commercial teeth to resin denture base. *Gerodontology.* 2012 Jun;29(2):e553-9.
  29. Sadar L, Dhume S, Maniar N, Patil JP, Rane P, Gandhewar M. Comparative evaluation of shear compressive bond strength between cross-linked acrylic resin denture base and cross-linked acrylic resin teeth with different modifications of their ridge lap surfaces. *The journal of contemporary dental practice.* 2013 Sep 1;14(5):898-903.
  30. Chittaranjan B, Taruna M, Sudheer N, Patil NS. Evaluation of shear bond strength of three different types of artificial teeth to heat cure denture base resin: an in vitro study. *Indian Journal of Dental Research.* 2013 May 1;24(3):321.
  31. Ma T, Johnson GH, Gordon GE. Effects of chemical disinfectants on the surface characteristics and color of denture resins. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry.* 1997 Feb 1;77(2):197-204.
  32. Stoia AE, Tudor A. New Aspects of the Acrylic Teeth Denture Base Resin Bond Strength. *Materiale Plastice.* 2016 Mar 1;53(1):58-60.
  33. Klironomos T, Katsimpali A, Polyzois G. The effect of microwave disinfection on denture base polymers, liners and teeth: A Basic overview. *Acta stomatologica Croatica.* 2015 Sep 22;49(3):242-53.
  34. Machado AL, Giampaolo ET, Vergani CE, Souza JF, Jorge JH. Changes in roughness of denture base and reline materials by chemical disinfection or microwave irradiation: surface roughness of denture base and reline materials. *Journal of applied oral science.* 2011;19:521-8.

- 
35. Ragher M, Vinayakumar G, Patil S, Chatterjee A, Mallikarjuna DM, Dandekeri S, Swetha V, Pradeep MR. Variations in flexural strength of heat-polymerized acrylic resin after the usage of denture cleansers. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2016 Apr 1;17(4):322-6.
  36. Jain G, Palekar U, Awinashe V, Mishra SK, Kawadkar A, Rahangdale T. The effect of different chemical surface treatments of denture teeth on shear bond strength: a comparative study. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*. 2014 Jun;8(6):ZC15.
  37. Sesma N, Rocha AL, Laganá DC, Costa B, Morimoto S. Effectiveness of denture cleanser associated with microwave disinfection and brushing of complete dentures: in vivo study. *Brazilian dental journal*. 2013 Jul;24:357-61.
  38. Talikoti A, Kashinath KR, Shambhu HS. Hardness of Two Different Heat Polymerized Acrylic Resins after Immersion in Disinfectants and the Effect on it after Long Term Water Immersion: An In-Vitro Comparative Study. *Indian Journal of Stomatology*. 2012 Jun 1;3(2).
  39. Heath JR, Davenport JC, Jones PA. The abrasion of acrylic resin by cleaning pastes. *Journal of oral rehabilitation*. 1983 Mar;10(2):159-75.
  40. Neppelenbroek KH, Pavarina AC, Vergani CE, Giampaolo ET. Hardness of heat-polymerized acrylic resins after disinfection and long-term water immersion. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2005 Feb 1;93(2):171-6.
  41. Meng GK, Chung KH, Fletcher-Stark ML, Zhang H. Effect of surface treatments and cyclic loading on the bond strength of acrylic resin denture teeth with autopolymerized repair acrylic resin. *J Prosthet Dent* 2010;103:245-52.
  42. Cunningham JL, Benington IC. Bond strength variation of synthetic resin teeth in dentures. *Int J Prosthodont* 1995;8:69-72
  43. Fletcher Stark ML, Chung KH, Rubenstein JE, Raigrodski AJ, Mancl LA. Shear bond strength of denture teeth to heat and light polymerized denture base resin. *Journal of Prosthodontics: Implant, Esthetic and Reconstructive Dentistry*. 2011 Jan;20(1):52-9.
  44. Andrade de Freitas SL, Brandt WC, Miranda ME, Vitti RP. Effect of thermocycling, teeth, and polymerization methods on bond strength teeth-denture base. *International journal of dentistry*. 2018 Jun 4;2018
  45. Vargani C, Machado LA. Effects of Surface treatments on the bond strength between composite resin and acrylic resin denture teeth *Int. J. Prostho* 2000; Vol 13:383-386.
  46. Vallittu PK, Docent DT, Ruyter IE, Nat R. The swelling phenomenon of acrylic resin polymer teeth at the interface with denture base polymers. *J Prosthet Dent* 1997; 78: 194–199.

- 
47. Vallittu PK, Lassila VP, Lappalainen R. Wetting the repair surface with methyl methacrylate affects the transverse strength of repaired heat-polymerized resin. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1994;72: 639–643.
  48. Zuckerman GR. A reliable method for securing anterior denture teeth in denture bases. *J Prosthet Dent* 2003; 89: 603-607.
  49. Vallittu PK. Bonding of resin teeth to the polymethyl methacrylate denture base material. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1995; 53: 99–104.
  50. Takahashi Y, Chai J, Takahashi T et al. Bond strength of denture teeth to denture base resins. *Int J Prosthodont* 2000; 13: 59–65.
  51. Debora Barros Barbosa et al., Bond strength of denture teeth to acrylic resin: effect of thermocycling and polymerisation methods. *Gerodontology* 2008; 25: 237–244.
  52. Cardash HS Applebaum B Baharav H, Liberman R. Effect of retention grooves on tooth-denture base bond. *J Prosthet Dent* 1990; 64:492-496
  53. Hansen PA, Killoy W. Effect of brushing with sonic and counterrotational toothbrushes on the bond strength of orthodontic brackets. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics*. 1999 Jan 1;115(1):55-
  54. Mahadevan V, Krishnan M, Krishnan CS, Azhagarasan NS, Sampathkumar J, Ramasubramanian H. Influence of surface modifications of acrylic resin teeth on shear bond strength with denture base resin-an invitro study. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*. 2015 Sep;9(9):ZC16.
  55. Shen C, Javid NS, Colaizzi FA. The effect of glutaraldehyde base disinfectants on denture base resins. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*. 1989 May 1;61(5):583-9.
  56. Clancy JM, Boyer DB. Comparative bond strengths of light-cured, heat-cured, and autopolymerizing denture resins to denture teeth. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 1989 Apr 1;61(4):457-62.
  57. Schneider RL, Curtis ER, Clancy JM. Tensile bond strength of acrylic resin denture teeth to a microwave-or heat-processed denture base. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 2002 Aug 1;88(2):145-50.
  58. A Hatim N, Hasan RH. Bond Strength Of Different Artificial Tooth Manufacturing To Microwave Cured Acrylic Denture Base. *Al-Rafidain Dental Journal*. 2010 Jan 1;10(1):8-16.
  59. Zidan S, Silikas N, Haider J, Alhotan A, Jahantigh J, Yates J. Assessing Tensile Bond Strength Between Denture Teeth and Nano-Zirconia Impregnated PMMA Denture Base. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*. 2020;15:9611.

- 
60. Choi JJ, Uy CE, Plaksina P, Ramani RS, Ganjigatti R, Waddell JN. Bond strength of denture teeth to heat cured, CAD/CAM and 3D printed denture acrylics. *Journal of Prosthodontics*. 2020 Jun;29(5):415-21.
  61. Baia JC, Oliveira RP, Ribeiro ME, Lima RR, Loretto SC, Silva e Souza Junior MH. Influence of prolonged dental bleaching on the adhesive bond strength to enamel surfaces. *International Journal of Dentistry*. 2020 May 14;2020.
  62. Kawara M, Carter JM, Ogle RK, Johnson HH. Bonding of plastic teeth to denture base resins. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry*. 1991 Oct 1;66(4):566-71.
  63. Baghani MT, Yahyazadehfar N, Zamanian A, Abbasi K, Shanei F, Shidfar S, Zohri Z. Factors affecting bonding strength of artificial teeth: a literature review. *J Res Med Dent Sci*. 2018 Feb 1;6(1):184-91.
  64. Mohamed R, Noufal PK, Shenoy D, Reddy PS, Varma AC, Jain AR. A Comparative Study on the Tensile Bond Strength of Conventional Denture Base Resin to Cross Linked Acrylic Tooth using two Different Curing Cycles—an invitro Study. *Biomedical and Pharmacology Journal*. 2017 Mar 25;10(1):447-54.