



Journal Homepage: - [www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)  
**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF  
 ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)**

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/5626  
 DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/5626>



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### EFFECTS OF FRUIT DRINKS ON SURFACE ROUGHNESS OF ESTHETIC RESTORATIVE MATERIALS.

Faika Y. Abdelmegid<sup>1</sup>, Mohamed A. El-sharawy<sup>2</sup>, Mohammad M. Al-Jameel<sup>3</sup>, Talal T. Al-rasheed<sup>3</sup> and Fouad S. Salama<sup>4</sup>.

1. Associate Professor; Department of Oral Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, College of Dentistry, King Saud University, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
2. Bio-medical Engineer Researcher, Dental Biomaterials Research Chair, College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
3. Dental Interns, College of Dentistry, King Saud University, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
4. Professor; Department of Pediatric Dentistry and Orthodontics, College of Dentistry, King Saud University, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 14 August 2017  
 Final Accepted: 16 September 2017  
 Published: October 2017

##### Key words:-

Surface roughness; Optical surface profiler, Biodegradation, Surface area; Resin composite

#### Abstract

**Aim:** This study evaluated the effect of two fruit drinks on surface roughness of two esthetic restorative materials. One resin-composite, one resin-modified-glass-ionomer and two fruit drinks (orange and cocktail) were used in this study.

**Methods:** Specimens (n=20) of each material were fabricated against Mylar strip and surface roughness was recorded using noncontact surface profilometer. Each specimen was placed in the tested fruit drinks for 24 hours and then surface roughness was recorded.

**Results:** Surface roughness (mean±SD) of resin-composite before/after immersion in orange and cocktail were 0.04±0.02, 0.12±0.05, 0.06±0.03, and 0.11±0.06. For resin-modified-glass-ionomer were 0.72±0.14, 0.60±0.19, 0.56±0.11, and 0.52±0.15. For resin-composite there was significant difference between surface roughness before/after immersion in orange and cocktail ( $P<0.05$ ). For resin-modified-glass-ionomer, there was significant difference between surface roughness before/after immersion in orange ( $P<0.05$ ).

**Conclusion:** The surface roughness of the resin-composite and resin-modified-glass-ionomer examined showed a significant change in the surface roughness after immersion for 24 hours in the tested fruit drinks.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2017. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction:-

Fruit drinks are largely consumed in most populations.<sup>1</sup> In Japan, a study determined the content of sucrose, glucose, total sugar, and pH in a range of popular contemporary Japanese soft drinks and compare their changes in different periods reported that all drinks showed pH values below 7, with a very wide variety of sugar content.<sup>2</sup> Also, in Saudi Arabia, it was found that canned fruit drinks were provided by 87% of the primary schools in Riyadh City.<sup>3</sup> The excessive consumption of fruit drinks, poses hazard to young children especially in their primary dentition due to the reduced amount of tooth structure.<sup>1</sup> The production of acid by bacteria after consumption of fruit drinks would lead

**Corresponding Author:- Faika Y. Abdelmegid.**

Address:- Associate Professor; Department of Oral Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, College of Dentistry, King Saud University, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

to enamel demineralization.<sup>1</sup> Similar to demineralization of enamel; acidic drinks may cause surface degradation of restorative materials.<sup>4</sup> Also, resin-based restorative materials exposed to acids in the plaque, enzymes, and some food may undergo softening and their ingredients leak out when resin composite are exposed to particular substances in the food and drinks.<sup>5</sup> Materials used for restorations of primary teeth may be subjected to continuously or intermittently to different substances found in different types of drinks, which may cause their deterioration.<sup>5,6</sup> Low pH drinks can affect solubility, surface roughness, and microhardness of compomer and glass ionomers while resin composite is relatively less affected.<sup>6</sup>

Different types of resin composites are commonly used because of their higher esthetic properties and ease of use.<sup>7</sup> Resin-modified glass-ionomer cements are formed by the addition of polymerizable hydrophilic resins to conventional glass-ionomer cement which make them less sensitive to desiccation with minimal surface crazing, brittleness, solubility and with high strength.<sup>8</sup> Surface roughness of different restorative materials governs the quality, color and performance of materials in the oral cavity.<sup>9</sup> Roughness could also worsen buildup of plaque and diminish longevity and esthetics of the restorations.<sup>9</sup> Experimental data demonstrated that high surface roughness of restorative materials is correlated to presence of more biofilm on its surface.<sup>10</sup> The surface roughness influences the biofilm formation and maturation on restorative materials and a more complex biofilm can be formed on a rougher substrate rapidly.<sup>11,12</sup>

As far as the authors are aware, little information is known regarding the surface roughness of newer restorative materials after soaking in low pH fruit drinks. Particularly those available to children through school canteens and their effect on surface roughness of restorative materials, which used to restore carious teeth in children. Also, little is known about the influence of those fruit drinks on the long-term degradation of the restorations. Therefore, the purpose of this *in vitro* study was to assess the effect of two fruit drinks on surface roughness of two esthetic restorative materials (submicron hybrid resin composite and resin-modified glass-ionomer). The tested null hypothesis is that there are no differences between surface roughness of different restorative materials after immersion in low pH fruit drinks.

## **Materials and methods:-**

### **Materials and Fruit Drinks:-**

This study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Human Studies, College of Dentistry Research Center, King Saud University. The two fruit drinks chosen to be tested were orange and cocktail drinks and the two restorative materials used in the present study and their manufacturers are presented in Table 1.

### **Preparation of Specimens:-**

A total of 20 disc specimens were prepared for surface roughness evaluations from each material (Shade A2) using standard Teflon mold of 5-mm diameter and 2-mm thickness. The power sample size was 0.81 and level of significant  $\sigma=0.05$  with estimated standard deviation  $=0.9$ , the sample size should be at least 9 in each group. Therefore, the sample size was determined as  $n=10$  per group. The materials were used according to the instructions of the manufacturers and compressed within the mold, covered by a Mylar strip (Dental Mylar Strips, Dent America Inc., City of Industry, CA, USA), and a microscopic glass slide (Shandon™ Polysine Slides, Thermo Scientific, Kalamazoo, MI, USA) was placed on the top to press flat the material even with the surface of the mold. Each specimen was then light cured for 20 seconds using an LED curing light (Elipar S10, 3M ESPE, Seefeld, Germany). The bottom of the cylindrical specimen was also light cured for 20 seconds and marked to identify the bottom surface, so only the top surface was measured for surface roughness. No further finishing or polishing was done except that the top surface of each specimen was identical finished to a uniform surface using #600 grit silicone carbide papers (standard finished surface) with tap water. Polishing with Soflex system (3M ESPE, St. Paul, USA) was accomplished according to the manufacturer's instructions using a slow-speed handpiece immediately after finishing, resembling the clinical situation. The specimens were then stored in distilled water (pH 6.8) at room temperature for 24 hours. The specimens from each material were then randomly divided into 2 groups with 10 each. Baseline measurements of surface roughness were recorded storage in distilled water in a closed container for after 24 hours. Groups 1 and 3 were immersed in the orange drink and Groups 2 and 4 were immersed in the cocktail drink. Each specimen was immersed for 24 hours in a closed individual container containing 2.5 mL of the respective immersion fruit drinks. The can of each fruit drink was stirred well before opening as recommended by the manufacture. After the immersion period, all specimens were washed with deionized water and new roughness readings were completed under the same conditions.

**Optical profiler analysis:-**

The surface roughness {Sa=Arithmetic mean height} of restorative materials was analyzed with a 3D optical noncontact surface profiler (Contour Gt-K1 optical profiler, Bruker Nano, Inc., Tucson, AZ, USA) based on noncontact scanning interferometry to evaluate roughness of each surface. The objective standard camera has a magnification 5X. The profile meter scanned area (3 measurements in different directions) was approximately 1.3x1.0 mm<sup>2</sup> and were situated at the center of each surface. Multi-Core Processor with Vision64™ Software for Accelerated 3D Surface Measurement and Analyses were used for image transfer (Bruker Nano Surface Division, Inc., Tucson, AZ, USA).

**Statistical analysis:-**

Two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and paired t-test were used to compare and evaluate interactions between the two materials and the two fruit drinks. All statistical analyses were set with a significance level of  $p < 0.05$ . The statistical analysis was performed with SPSS Version 16.0 (SPSS Inc. Released 2007. SPSS for Windows, Chicago, SPSS Inc., Ill).

**Results:-**

Generally, the low pH fruit drinks used in this study affected surface roughness of the tested materials. Orange and cocktail drinks adversely affected the resin composite while favorably affected resin-modified glass ionomer. Surface roughness was increased for resin composite and decreased for resin-modified glass ionomer following immersion in orange and cocktail drinks for 24 hours. Hence, the null hypothesis of this study was rejected as the results showed that low pH fruit drinks caused changes on surface roughness of tested restorative materials. Two-way ANOVA showed no interaction between resin composite and resin-modified glass ionomer. Mean ( $\pm$ SD) of surface roughness "Sa" for each material in micrometer ( $\mu$ m) before and after immersion in each fruit drink is presented in Table 2. Figures 1 and 2 show mean surface roughness of each material after immersion in each fruit drink. Paired t-test showed that for resin composite there was significant difference between Sa before and after immersion in orange and cocktail ( $P < 0.05$ ) {Table 3}. For resin-modified glass ionomer, there was significant difference between Sa before and after immersion in orange ( $P < 0.05$ ) but there was no significant difference between Sa before and after immersion in cocktail drink ( $P > 0.05$ ) {Table 3}. In general, resin composite showed the smoothest surface before and after immersion in fruit drinks compared to resin-modified glass ionomer.

Comparison of the surface roughness between materials when immersed in each fruit drink showed significant difference after immersion in orange drink while no significant difference was noted after immersion in cocktail drink (Table 3). Comparison of difference in surface roughness according to the fruit drink used showed no significant difference of roughness of resin composite and significant difference of roughness of resin-modified glass ionomer (Table 4).

**Table 1:-** The esthetic restorative materials and fruit drinks used in the present study

Materials	Manufacturers	Lot Number
Spectrum® TPH®3	DENTSPLY, Surrey, KT15 2PG, UK	1203001231
3M™ ESPE™ Photac™	3M Center, St. Paul, MN , USA	479684
Orange Drink - pH 2.99	Al Rabie Saudi Foods Co. Ltd., Riyadh, KSA	6281026165100
Cocktail Drink - pH 3.47	Al Rabie Saudi Foods Co. Ltd., Riyadh, KSA	6281026083602

**Table 2:-** Descriptive statistics of surface roughness (Sa) of restorative materials before and after immersion in each fruit drink

Restorative Material	Fruit Drinks		Mean	Std.	N
Resin Composite	Orange	Before	0.04	0.02	30
Resin Composite	Orange	After	0.12	0.05	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Cocktail	Before	0.06	0.03	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Cocktail	After	0.11	0.06	30
Resin Composite	Orange	Before	0.72	0.14	30
Resin Composite	Orange	After	0.60	0.19	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Cocktail	Before	0.56	0.11	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Cocktail	After	0.52	0.15	30

**Table 3:-** Comparison of difference in surface roughness (Sa) between restorative materials when immersed in each fruit drink


Fruit Drink	Material	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Sig.
Orange	Resin Composite	-0.07	0.06	30	$P=0.0001^*$
Orange	Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	0.13	0.17	30	$P=0.0001^*$
Cocktail	Resin Composite	-0.05	0.05	30	0.007*
Cocktail	Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	0.04	0.16	30	$P>0.05^{**}$


\*Significant

\*\*Not Significant

**Table 4:-** Comparison of difference in surface roughness (Sa) according to the fruit drink used for each material

	Fruit Drink	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Resin Composite	Orange	-0.07	0.06	30
Resin Composite	Cocktail	-0.05	0.05	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Orange	0.13	0.17	30
Resin-modified Glass-ionomer	Cocktail	0.04	0.16	30

**Figure 1:-** Mean surface roughness of each material after immersion in each fruit drink.



**Figure 2:-** Mean surface roughness of each material according to the fruit drink used.

### Discussion:-

In United States and Saudi Arabia; vending machines in schools provide ready access to highly-refined carbohydrates such drinks as juices and sports drinks.<sup>3,13</sup> Foods and beverages, especially fruit drinks that contain a variety of acids and fermentable carbohydrates were capable to drop the pH of the dental plaque structure.<sup>1,14</sup> It was reported that children who go to schools that had vending machines have increase in caries scores.<sup>15</sup> In the present study orange and cocktail drinks which are commonly available to children through school canteens in primary schools were selected as they were considered to be popular brands and have low pH value. The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry (AAPD) inspires administrators of schools and parents to have healthy selections in vending machines.<sup>13</sup>

The goal is to produce restorations with smooth surfaces without irregularities, which result in improved esthetics and minimal plaque accumulation.<sup>6,16</sup> In the present study, generally low pH fruit drinks unfavorably affected surface roughness of resin composite and surface roughness was increased following immersion in orange and cocktail drinks for 24 hours. This is similar to another study where low pH beverages adversely affected the properties of conventional glass ionomer, resin-modified glass ionomer, compomer, and resin composite.<sup>6</sup> The present study showed that orange and cocktail drinks favorably affected resin-modified glass ionomer and surface roughness was decreased for resin-modified glass ionomer following immersion in orange and cocktail drinks for 24 hours. However, the baseline of surface roughness of resin-modified glass ionomer was higher than that of resin composite. There is no agreement about reference data on the limit roughness below which the bacteria would not adhere.<sup>17</sup> The most commonly mentioned limit of surface roughness (Ra) is below 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  for adherence of dental biofilm.<sup>10,18,19</sup> May be it is most accurate to say, that it depends on the bacteria species. It is important to emphasize that rough surfaces favor bacterial adhesion and biofilm formation on the teeth and restorations, which can further cause secondary caries, gingival and periodontal diseases.<sup>18,19</sup> In the present study, the mean surface roughness of resin composite before and after immersion in orange and cocktail were 0.04, 0.12, 0.06 and 0.11 and for resin-modified glass ionomer were 0.72, 0.60, 0.56, and 0.52 respectively. Although comparisons between surface roughness data of different studies have to be taken with thoughtfulness due to differences in methods and settings of surface analysis as well as tested materials. It is not possible to compare roughness values obtained with contact profilometer along one line of the specimen with those values obtained with the non-contact optical interferometers

as surface area. Also it should be noted that in the present study, generally resin composite showed less surface roughness than resin-modified glass ionomer. Another study reported that resin composite was the smoothest surface with lowest solubility after immersion in low pH beverages.<sup>6</sup> The lower surface roughness values of resin composite can be explained by material filler composition. This material is a submicron hybrid resin composite, filled with nanometer size particles, from which some are dispersed and others create nanoclusters, as secondary formed fillers.<sup>20</sup> The size of these nanoclusters can range from about 0.6 to 10  $\mu\text{m}$ .<sup>20</sup> Also in the present study, there was significant difference between Sa before and after immersion in orange and cocktail as well as for resin-modified glass-ionomer there was significant difference between Sa before and after immersion in orange. A study showed that a greater degree of erosion occurred for the traditional glass ionomer than resin-modified glass ionomer by both the simulated gastric acid and the simulated lemon juice.<sup>14</sup> Also, erosion of resin-modified glass ionomer was more superficial than for the traditional glass ionomer where bulk loss of material resulted.<sup>14</sup>

Mylar strips and celluloid crowns are usually applied as matrices for shaping restorative materials which more likely require no further surface finishing.<sup>10</sup> It was recommended using polyester strips against resin composite to produce the best smooth surface<sup>20</sup> which justified its application in the present study. This is supported by another study which reported significantly higher surface roughness for polished resin composite compared to the one polymerized against Mylar strips.<sup>21</sup> It has been reported that the consequence of using different polishing methods on surface roughness and most have indicated that none of these methods could reproduce the surface smoothness initially created by a Mylar strip.<sup>22,23</sup> However, another study observed this phenomenon only for one resin composite material, whereas other resin composites showed no significant differences in surface roughness between the surfaces polished with silicone carbide paper and those polymerized against Mylar strips.<sup>16,23</sup> In the present study; the specimens were cured against a Mylar strip and no further finishing or polishing was done except that the top surface of each specimen was finished to a uniform surface using #600 grit silicone carbide papers and polished with Soflex system. This protocol was followed for all materials.

In the present study, each specimen was placed in a separate closed container containing 2.5 mL of the tested fruit drinks for 24 hours. This time period was selected to mimic *in vivo* situation of having long term effect of fruit drinks. The study set out to examine the worst case scenarios, such as might occur in a child who likes to frequently drink fruit drinks. It was reported that storing restorative materials in mouthwashes for 12 hours is equivalent to the use of mouthwash for 2 minutes per day for 12 months.<sup>24</sup> This may be similar to restorative materials, which may either be exposed continuously or intermittently to materials found in different drinks, which may lead to deterioration and biodegradation.<sup>5,6</sup>

As measurement of surface roughness determined by measurement method, the research protocol for roughness is vital.<sup>25</sup> The assessment of roughness using scanning electron microscope (SEM) is subjective and descriptive as well as unreliable for quantitative analysis.<sup>26</sup> A contact profilometer with a stylus that moves in line is used for the quantitative investigation of roughness and may induce misconception due to holes on the surface.<sup>27</sup> Other instruments are available to measure roughness at a much higher resolution and over a larger area such as non-contact optical interferometers and atomic force microscopes (AFM). In this study, the optical interferometry noncontact profilometer was used to measure surface roughness. Compared with a stylus profilometer, the optical interferometry noncontact profilometer is faster, nondestructive, and allow repeatability. In addition, it provides a larger field and does not need sample preparation in comparison with AFM. There are few reports of using optical interferometry noncontact profilometer to determine the surface roughness of restorative materials.

Resin-modified glass ionomers have lower resistance to softening by certain drinks than microfilled composites.<sup>6</sup> Resin-modified glass ionomers that use acid monomers instead of polyalkenoic acid have higher resistance to softening than other resin-modified glass ionomers.<sup>28</sup> A recent *in vitro* study reported that food-simulating drinks affect surface roughness of restorative materials and biodegradation depend on the material, solution and exposure time.<sup>29</sup>

The results of this investigation should consider the limitations of the study, including its *in vitro* setting and immersion of the tested materials in fruit drinks for 24 hours to simulate cumulative long term effect of fruit drinks *in vivo*. This may be different if we immersed the tested materials in fruit drinks for less number of hours such as 8 or 12 hours and repeated the immersion for 24 hours. In addition, the clinical condition in the mouth is not easy to mimic in the laboratory.<sup>30</sup> However, in this *in vitro* study standardization of experimental conditions was advantage and the results demonstrated a clear correlation between surface roughness of one resin composite and one resin-



modified glass ionomer and immersion in fruit drinks. Another limitation is that the specimens were immersed in the fruit drinks without stirring which may allow some component of the fruit drinks to settle down and decrease their effect. The manufacture of the fruit drinks used recommend to shake well the can before opening which was performed before it is use but not during immersion period.

### Conclusions:-

Under the experimental conditions and within the limitations of this *in vitro* study, the following conclusions can be drawn: The surface roughness of the tested resin composite and resin-modified glass ionomer showed significant change in the surface roughness after immersion for 24 hours in the two types of fruit drinks. In general, resin composite showed the smoothest surface before and after immersion in fruit drinks compared to resin-modified glass ionomer. Surface roughness varied depending on the fruit drink and the restorative material used.

### Acknowledgement:-

The authors wish to thank College of Dentistry Research Center and Deanship of Scientific Research at King Saud University, Saudi Arabia for funding this research. Also, the authors wish to express sincere thanks to Mr. Nassr Al Maflehi for his valuable help in the statistical analysis.

### Competing interest:-

This study had no competing interest.

### References:-

1. Banan LK, Hegde AM. Plaque and salivary pH changes after consumption of fresh fruit juices. J Clin Pediatr Dent 2005; 30: 9-13.
2. Inukai J, Nakagaki H, Itoh M, Tsunekawa M, Watanabe K. Recent trends in sugar content and pH in contemporary soft drinks. J Dent Child (Chic) 2011; 78: 138-42.
3. AL-Hussyeen A. Types of snacks and drinks available in female primary schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia in relation to the dental health of children. J Pakistan Dent Assoc 2004; 13: 13-7.
4. Rahim TN, Mohamad D, Md Akil H, Ab Rahman I. Water sorption characteristics of restorative dental composites immersed in acidic drinks. Dent Mater 2012; 28: e63-70.
5. Yap AUJ, Tan SHL, Wee SSC, Lee CW, Lim EL, Zeng KY. Chemical degradation of composite restoratives. J Oral Rehabil 2001; 28: 1015-21.
6. Hamouda IM. Effects of various beverages on hardness, roughness, and solubility of esthetic restorative materials. J Esthet Restor Dent 2011; 23: 315-22.
7. Ferracane JL. Resin composite – state of the art. Dent Mater 2011; 27: 29-38.
8. Xie D, Brantley WA, Culbertson BM, Wang G. Mechanical properties and microstructures of glass-ionomer cements. Dent Mater 2000; 16: 129-38.
9. Kawai K, Urano M. Adherence of plaque components to different restorative materials. Oper Dent 2001; 26: 396-400.
10. Bollen CM, Lambrechts P, Quirynen M. Comparison of surface roughness of oral hard materials to the threshold surface roughness for bacterial plaque retention: a review of the literature. Dent Mater 1997; 13: 258-69.
11. Eick S, Glockmann E, Brandl B, Pfister W. Adherence of Streptococcus mutans to various restorative materials in a continuous flow system. J Oral Rehabil 2004; 31: 278-85.
12. Rimondini L, Farè S, Brambilla E, Felloni A, Consonni C, Brossa F, et al. The effect of surface roughness on early in vivo plaque colonization on titanium. J Periodontol 1997; 68: 556-62.
13. AAPD Reference Manual - American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Policy on Vending Machines in Schools, Council on Clinical Affairs, Oral Health Policies. Pediatr Dent 2013-2014; 34(7 Suppl): 59-60.
14. Wan Bakar W, McIntyre J. Susceptibility of selected tooth-coloured dental materials to damage by common erosive acids. Aust Dent J 2008; 53: 226-34.
15. Maliderou M, Reeves S, Nobel C. The effect of social demographic factors, snack consumption, and vending machine use on oral health of children living in London. Br Dent J 2006; 201: 441-44; discussion 437; quiz 466.
16. Ionescu A, Wutscher E, Brambilla E, Schneider-Feyrer S, Giessibl FJ, Hahnel S. Influence of surface properties of resin-based composites on in vitro Streptococcus mutans biofilm development. Eur J Oral Sci 2012; 120: 458-65.

17. Mei L, Busscher HJ, van der Mei HC, Ren Y. Influence of surface roughness on streptococcal adhesion forces to composite resins. *Dent Mater* 2011; 27: 770-78.
18. Antonson SA, Yazici AR, Kilinc E, Antonson DE, Hardigan PC. Comparison of different finishing/polishing systems on surface roughness and gloss of resin composites. *J Dent* 2011; 39(Suppl 1): e9-17.
19. Bashetty H, Joshi S. The effect of one-step and multi-step polishing systems on surface texture of two different resin composites. *J Conserv Dent* 2010; 13: 34-8.
20. Mitra SB, Wu D, Holmes BN. An application of nanotechnology in advanced dental materials. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2003; 134: 1382-90.
21. Carlen A, Nikdel K, Wennerberg A, Holmberg K, Olsson J. Surface characteristics and in vitro biofilm formation on glass ionomer and composite resin. *Biomaterials* 2001; 22: 481-87.
22. Özgünlaltay G, Yazici AR, Görücü J. Effect of finishing and polishing procedures on the surface roughness of new tooth-coloured restoratives. *J Oral Rehabil* 2003; 30: 218-24.
23. de Oliveira AL, Domingos PA, Palma-Dibb RG, Garcia PP. Chemical and morphological features of nanofilled composite resin: influence of finishing and polishing procedures and fluoride solutions. *Microsc Res Tech* 2011; 75: 212-19.
24. Gürkan S, Önen A, Köprülü H. In vitro effects of alcohol containing and alcohol-free mouth rinses on microhardness of some restorative materials. *J Oral Rehabil* 1997; 24: 244-46.
25. Karan S, Toroglu MS. Porcelain refinishing with two different polishing systems after orthodontic debonding. *Angle Orthod* 2008; 78: 947-53.
26. Winchester L. Direct orthodontic bonding to porcelain: an in vitro study. *Br J Orthod* 1991; 18: 299-308.
27. Tholt de Vasconcellos B, Miranda-Júnior WG, Prioli R, Thompson J, Oda M. Surface roughness in ceramics with different finishing techniques using atomic force microscope and profilometer. *Oper Dent* 2006; 31: 442-49.
28. Mante MO, Saleh N, Tanna NK, Mante FK. Softening patterns of light cured glass ionomer cements. *Dent Mater* 1999; 15: 303-09.
29. Correr GM, Bruschi Alonso RC, Baratto-Filho F, Correr-Sobrinho L, Sinhoreti MA, Puppini-Rontani RM. In vitro long-term degradation of aesthetic restorative materials in food-simulating media. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2012; 70: 101-08.
30. Eliades T, Bourauel C. Intraoral aging of orthodontic materials: the picture we miss and its clinical relevance. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2005; 127: 403-12.