Evaluating splatter and settled aerosol during orthodontic debonding: implications for the COVID-19 pandemic

Hayley Llandro[1,2], James R Allison[1,2], Charlotte C Currie[1,2], David C Edwards[1,2], Charlotte Bowes[1,2], Justin Durham[1,2], Nicholas Jakubovics[2], Nadia Rostami[2], Richard Holliday[1,2]

Affiliations

1. Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom
2. School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Richard Holliday; School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU; 07876 580022

Three 'In brief' points:

- Orthodontic debonding, including removal of composite using a slow speed handpiece with dental suction, appears to pose little risk of widespread distribution of settled contamination.
- Splatter and settled aerosol was produced during the debonding procedure, however this was mainly localised to the patient, operator and assistant.
- Further work is required to examine aerosol which remains suspended in the air.

Abstract

Introduction: Dental procedures produce splatter and aerosol which have potential to spread pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2. Mixed evidence exists on the aerosol generating potential of orthodontic procedures. The aim of this study was to evaluate splatter and/or settled aerosol contamination during orthodontic debonding.

Material and Methods: Fluorescein dye was introduced into the oral cavity of a mannequin. Orthodontic debonding was undertaken with surrounding samples collected. Composite bonding cement was removed using a speed-increasing handpiece with dental suction. A positive control condition included a water-cooled, high-speed air-turbine crown preparation. Samples were analysed using digital image analysis and spectrofluorometric analysis.

Results: Contamination across the 8-metre experimental rig was 3% of the positive control on spectrofluorometric analysis and 0% on image analysis. Contamination of the operator, assistant, and mannequin, was 8%, 25%, and 28% of the positive control, respectively.

Discussion: Splatter and settled aerosol from orthodontic debonding is distributed mainly within the immediate locality of the mannequin. Widespread contamination was not observed.

Conclusions: Orthodontic debonding is unlikely to produce widespread contamination via splatter and settled aerosol, but localised contamination is likely. This highlights the importance of personal protective equipment for the operator, assistant, and patient. Further work is required to examine suspended aerosol.

Keywords: COVID-19; Dental Infection Control; Aerosols, Dental Equipment; Orthodontics

Introduction

The delivery of orthodontics has changed rapidly over the last several months as a result of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Routine dental services all over the world were required to close. Those which remained open were advised to restrict treatment to urgent or emergency care only, initially through urgent dental care centres,[1] with the overarching message being to avoid aerosol generating procedures (AGPs) wherever possible.[2-6] Guidance on what constitutes an AGP in dentistry is not clear, and existing documents acknowledge a limited evidence base.[7] This guidance specifically mentions high-speed dental instruments (high-speed air-turbine handpiece and ultrasonic scaler) however, orthodontic procedures are not specifically mentioned. Following the gradual reintroduction of dental services,[8-11] significant onus is now placed on the need for appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) wherever AGPs are carried out.[12-14]

In England, the Office of the Chief Dental Officer published its Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for the resumption of dental services on the 4th of June 2020[13] which classified “orthodontic treatment” as a non-AGP. Guidance from a number of organisations contradicts this however, by classifying the use of a slow-speed handpiece during removal of bonded orthodontic appliances (debonding) as an AGP.[15, 16] The British Orthodontic Society (BOS) has advised that if a clinician chooses to use a slow speed handpiece, they should work in a dry field and use high volume evacuation.[17] The study cited by the BOS to support this recommendation showed a reduction in respirable particles of up to 44%[18] when dental suction was used.[18] Other authors have also demonstrated particulate aerosols produced by orthodontic debonding[19, 20], however these studies aimed to examine dental material

particulates and not droplets contaminated with saliva; additionally, these studies only focussed on the immediate vicinity of the procedure (0.1 - 0.3 m) and operator. Several methodologies have been used to evaluate dental aerosol and splatter. These include the use of tracer dyes,[21-27] measurement of bacterial contamination,[28-35] and the use of optical particle counting instruments.[36, 37] Various definitions exist for the terms “aerosol” and “splatter”. One classification described in the literature defines aerosol droplets as having a diameter of less than 10 µm,[38] with splatter comprising droplets larger than this. Of droplets that become suspended in the air, a proportion will settle out over a varying time period (i.e. settled aerosol), and a proportion (most likely particles < 5 µm) will remain suspended (i.e. suspended aerosol). Our group has recently developed and described a reliable and valid methodology of evaluating splatter and settled aerosol created following dental procedures using a tracer dye with digital image and spectrofluorometric analysis.[39] As part of these investigations, we have demonstrated that the use of a 3-in-1 spray (with air *and* water) produces significant contamination and should be regarded as an AGP, with a 30 second wash causing visual contamination up to one metre. The aim of the present study was to evaluate splatter and settled aerosol contamination following orthodontic debonding, including removal of composite using a slow speed handpiece with assistant-held dental suction.

Materials and Methods

The methods used in this study have previously been described in detail elsewhere.[39] In summary, an eight-metre diameter rig was used to support grade 1 qualitative cotton-cellulose filter papers (Whatman; Cytiva, MA, USA) spaced at 0.5 m intervals on eight, four metre rods arranged at 45-degree intervals around a dental

training mannequin (Model 4820, A-dec; OR, USA). Filter papers were also placed on the forearms, chest, upper leg, and head of the operator and assistant, as well as on their masks and full-face visors. Standard hospital ventilation provided 6.5 air exchanges per hour. 2.65 mM fluorescein solution was used as a tracer and in a modification to our previous work, fluorescein was introduced into the mouth of the mannequin rather than through the water supply to model normal salivary flow. Dental models were soaked in fluorescein for 2 minutes before each experiment, and four, 10 mm diameter cotton rolls were secured to the left and right, upper and lower buccal sulci of the mannequin to replicate a natural reservoir of saliva (Figure 1). Immediately prior to starting the experiment, 5 mL of fluorescein solution was added to the labial surfaces of the teeth, and the cotton rolls. 1 mm internal diameter tubing was secured 5 mm apical to the gingival margins of the upper and lower incisors in the midline, and fluorescein was introduced through the tubing at a rate of 1.5 mL/min for the duration of the experiment to mimic the higher end of the normal stimulated salivary flow range in a healthy adult.[40] Fluorescein was not added to the handpiece irrigation reservoir, and irrigation was not used for the procedure. Figure 1 demonstrates this setup.

Prior to the experiment, GAC Ovation® (Dentsply Sirona; PA, USA) orthodontic brackets were bonded from first molar to first molar in both arches on three sets of dental models (Frasaco GmbH; Tettnang, Germany) using Unitek Transbond™ XT Light Cure Adhesive (3M UK PLC; Berkshire, UK). A macro-mechanical lock was created by preparing a 3 mm x 3 mm undercut cross in the labial surface of each tooth using an acrylic bur. This was piloted before the experiment to ensure that after removal of brackets a thin layer of composite remained on the teeth as in vivo. A

0.14 mm nickel-titanium wire was ligated in each arch. During the experiment, the brackets and archwire were removed using orthodontic debonding pliers and the teeth were polished with a fluted tungsten carbide bur in a 1:5 ratio speed-increasing dental handpiece driven by a dental air motor at full speed (with no water coolant). Large bore dental suction was operated by an assistant, closely following the operator's handpiece, with a flow rate of 105 L/min of air measured using a commercial dental suction flow meter (RAMVAC FlowCheck, DentalEZ; PA, USA), or 6.3 L/min of water. The procedure lasted for 10 minutes and filter papers were left for 10 minutes after the end of the procedure before collection to allow settling of any splatter/ settled aerosol; this 10-minute settling time has been reported previously.[41-43] The experiment was repeated on three separate occasions. A positive control condition – high-speed air-turbine crown preparation of the upper right central incisor with water coolant – was carried out under the same conditions as the orthodontic debonding procedure including assistant-held dental suction. This procedure was used as a positive control as it has been previously shown to produce widespread splatter and settled aerosol contamination[39] and therefore represents a "worst case" AGP for comparison.

Contamination of the filter papers was assessed as previously described[39] using fluorescence photography with a 500-600 nm wavelength halogen lamp (QHL75 model 503; Dentsply, NC, USA) and DSLR camera (EOS 1000D, Canon; Tokyo; Japan), and subsequent image analysis using ImageJ (v1.48 NIH; MD, USA) to give a surface area measurement (mm^2) of fluorescein contamination; this method is likely to detect large droplets and splatter. Filter papers were also assessed using spectrofluorometric analysis as previously described[39] by eluting fluorescein from

filter papers in distilled water; a Synergy HT Microplate Reader (BioTek; VT, USA) was then used to give a quantitative fluorescence measurement in relative fluorescence units (RFU). Total RFU values for each experiment were also calculated by combining values from all samples across all replicates. This method is likely to measure the settled fraction of aerosol as well as large droplets and splatter. Examiners for both analysis methods were blinded to the experimental conditions and were calibrated for image analysis. Data were collected using Excel (2016, Microsoft; WA, USA) and analysed using SPSS (Version 24, IBM Corp.; NY, USA) using basic descriptive statistics. Heatmaps were generated using Python 3[44].

Results

For the positive control procedure (high-speed air-turbine crown preparation), settled aerosol and/or splatter deposition was largely concentrated in the central one metre but with some smaller deposits observed across the experimental rig (excluding mannequin, operator, and assistant). Of the 195 samples on the experimental rig (65 samples per run with three independent repeats), image analysis identified 18 contaminated samples, with spectrofluorometric analysis identifying 12 contaminated samples. There was significant operator contamination (total of 54,521 RFU across all replicates) and much less assistant contamination (total of 2,417 RFU). Combining all the samples and replicates, total contamination for the positive control was 116,482 RFU. Supplemental Table 1 provides a detailed breakdown. The pattern of contamination was similar to previously reported[39] and is shown in Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure 1.

For the orthodontic debonding procedure, settled aerosol and/or spatter deposition was minimal across the eight-metre diameter experimental rig. Out of 195 samples on the experimental rig, image analysis identified two contaminated samples (centre and 90° at 0.5 m). Each of these samples contained a single relevant particle, with a small surface area (0.019 mm^2 and 0.022 mm^2 respectively). None of these samples gave a positive reading on spectrofluorometric analysis. On spectrofluorometric analysis only one sample provided a positive result for contamination (315°, 3.5 m). See Table 1 for further details. Operator and assistant contamination was observed, with the right leg of the operator being the most contaminated location (3.43 mm^2; 3,777 RFU) followed by the right leg of the assistant (contamination on spectrofluorometric analysis 393 RFU). The operator's mask was contaminated on spectrofluorometric analysis only (343 RFU) as was the assistant's visor (208 RFU). The mannequin had contamination on the upper left torso only (4.37 mm^2; 4,671 RFU). Combining all the samples and replicates, total contamination for the orthodontic debonding procedure was 11,307 RFU.

Figures 3 and 4 present summarised data by sample location for the two procedures based on analysis technique. The orthodontic debonding procedure produced considerably less contamination across all samples. Across the experimental rig, the orthodontic debonding procedure produced 3% of the contamination of the positive control when comparing the spectrofluorometric analysis data (0% when comparing the image analysis data). Similarly, the operator had 8% of the contamination from the positive control (2% on image analysis), assistant 25% (0% on image analysis), mannequin 28% (8% on image analysis).

Discussion

The vast majority of samples showed no contamination across our eight-metre experimental area for the orthodontic debonding procedure. In contrast, our positive control (anterior crown preparation) showed much higher levels of local contamination and some distant contamination. This supports the guidance from the English CDO[13] that an orthodontic debonding procedure using a slow-speed handpiece, in a dry field with high volume suction does not produce widespread contamination from settled aerosol and splatter. Most contamination was confined to the patient, operator, and assistant; this is consistent with microbiological studies which have investigated contamination from orthodontic debonding in the immediate vicinity of the patient, operator, and assistant.[45]

The contamination of the operator and assistant's legs highlight the need for suitable PPE such as disposable apron, which may not have been included in PPE recommendations prior to the pandemic. The contamination on the mask, whilst probably of very low clinical significance, suggests the need to wear both a visor and a mask for adequate protection against splatter, especially if masks are used on a sessional basis. It is crucial that operating teams visually inspect each other's masks between patients if this is the case, to ensure no visible soiling or moistening of the mask has occurred.

Our analysis identified a single positive reading (*n*= 1 of 303) at 3.5 m from the orthodontic debonding procedure, which warrants further consideration. This could be a false positive (i.e. accidental contamination), however extensive developmental

work and contamination testing was completed to reduce the chance of this,[39] and as a result we set the lower threshold of detection by spectrofluorometry at 164 RFU. The reading at 3.5 m was 1,259 RFU, eight times larger than our lower threshold (164 RFU), which suggests that this reading is unlikely to be spurious. One possible explanation for this could be related to the removal of the archwire and brackets from the mouth; a flexible wire was used which may have propelled fluorescein due to spring-back when the wire and brackets were removed from the mouth. Another possible explanation is a small volume of “saliva” (i.e. fluorescein) coming into contact with the bur. This is consistent with our previous work which demonstrated that this region (opposite the operator) is high risk for contamination across a range of dental procedures.[39] These findings are perhaps of minor relevance for a small, closed-surgery environment but they may have wider implications for an open-plan clinic setting. Further studies should evaluate the risk of contamination in open clinical environments.

It is interesting to note that two samples (of 303) were positive for contamination on image analysis but not on spectrofluorometric analysis. One possible explanation for this is that dry debris may have settled onto these samples, but did not absorb into the filter paper, explaining the presence on photographic analysis but not on spectrofluorometric analysis (suggesting that debris may have fallen off the sample during transfer to the laboratory following photography). This is further supported by the location of these samples being very close to the source (≤ 0.5 m) in an area where dental material particulates are known to be produced from debonding.[19, 20] Knowledge about the infectivity of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is still developing but from our current knowledge of the susceptibility

of coronaviruses to desiccation,[46] the risk is likely to be lower from dry debris than from droplets.

The contamination readings obtained in the present study by using fluorescein in the mouth of the mannequin were significantly lower for the positive control condition (anterior crown preparation with suction) than we have previously reported using fluorescein in the irrigation reservoirs of dental instruments.[39] This is perhaps unsurprising but demonstrates that only a small proportion of the settled aerosol and splatter produced by dental procedures is likely to be made up of saliva (and/or blood). This dilution effect should be the subject of further study but indicates that this model is likely to be more biologically and clinically relevant.

The suction used in the present investigation would be typically described as “high flow dental suction” or “high volume evacuation”, however on the basis of the flow rate we measured, this would be more correctly classified as “medium volume suction” according to existing standards.[47] Based on our testing (data not presented) this is within the normal range for this type of suction found in dental settings, and is consistent with previously reported studies.[34]

Our methodology has some limitations. The splatter and settled aerosol detection technique used in this study was a passive technique, in that it relied on contaminated splatter or aerosol naturally settling onto filter papers. Active sampling techniques (such as air samplers or particle counting instruments) are available and would complement this work by also allowing sampling of the proportion of the aerosol that remains suspended. However, these methods also have limitations,

such as the spot nature of their sampling, which would make sampling of the 101 locations used in this investigation impractical. Also, some methods (such as optical particle meters) are non-specific, and once particle levels have returned to background levels, it is challenging to know how much of the background sample is made up of contaminated air. Because the present study relied on settling, it is likely that this methodology does not measure the fraction of aerosol which remains suspended in the air (suspended aerosol; likely droplets <5 µm). Larger droplets (up to 30 µm) may also become aerosolised and may travel some distance before settling onto surfaces;[48] this fraction of the aerosol (settled aerosol) in addition to larger droplets and splatter will be detected by the present methodology. Both suspended and settled aerosol represent an inhalation risk, and studies addressing both components should be interpreted in combination. It is important to note, however, that emerging evidence suggests that fomite transmission may be a more significant route for SARS-CoV-2 than airborne transmission.[49, 50] Another potential limitation of the present study is the setup of the “salivary ducts” as these were positioned in a non-anatomical position. We chose this position (Figure 1) to counteract the fact that the mannequin does not move and has no (un)conscious muscle tone or movement of the lips, tongue, and vestibules to distribute saliva around the mouth. The ducts were therefore positioned anteriorly to attempt to simulate more natural (albeit passive in our model) saliva flow around the mouth. The flow rate of instilled fluorescein (1.5 mL/min) used was also in the stimulated saliva flow range, which would likely occur when dental treatment was being performed. Our salivary flow model therefore represents a worst-case scenario for saliva contamination. Finally, as we have explored in our previous work[39] there are still many unknowns about SARS-CoV-2 such as the infective dose. As we still do

not know how viral particles are carried in aerosols produced by dental instruments and the infectivity of these, more biologically relevant models of dental bioaerosols are required.

Conclusion

Within the limitations of this study, orthodontic debonding (with a speed-increasing handpiece, dental suction, and in settings with at least 6.5 air changes per hour) appears to produce low levels of localised settled aerosol and splatter contamination compared to a known AGP. This has implications for operator and assistant PPE (including a disposable apron, mask, and visor) and highlights the importance of patient aprons. Further work is required to examine suspended aerosol, the carriage of viral particles within dental bioaerosols, and the infectivity of these.

Declaration of Interests

The Author(s) declare(s) that there are no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by research grants from the British Endodontic Society and the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, and by the School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University. Richard Holliday is funded by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Clinical Lectureship. Charlotte Currie is funded by an NIHR Doctoral Research Fellowship. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social

Care. Nadia Rostami was funded during this period by the Dunhill Medical Trust (RPGF1810/101) who kindly extended her funding to support this urgent COVID-19 related research. We would like to thank Kimberley Pickering, Ekaterina Kozhevnikova, Jamie Coulter, and Chris Nile for their wider support on this project.

Contributions

H. Llandro and J. R. Allison are joint first authors. H. Llandro, J. R. Allison, C. C. Currie, D. Edwards, J. Durham, N. Jakubovics, and R. Holliday, contributed to the conception and design of the study. H. Llandro, J. R. Allison, C. C. Currie, D. Edwards, C. Bowes, N. Rostami, and R. Holliday contributed to the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data. All authors were involved in drafting and critically revising the manuscript and have given final approval for publication. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

References

1. Carter E, Currie CC, Asuni A, Goldsmith R, Toon G, Horridge C, et al. The first six weeks - setting up a UK urgent dental care centre during the COVID-19 pandemic. British Dental Journal. 2020;228(11):842-8.

2. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidance for Dental Settings: Centres for Disease Control and Prevention; 2020 [Accessed: 25/06/2020]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html

3. Bridgman C. Letter to all primary care dental teams in Wales, 23rd March 2020 [Accessed: 23/06/2020]. Available from: https://www.fgdp.org.uk/sites/fgdp.org.uk/files/editors/2020.03.23%20CDO%20Wales%20COVID-19%20advice%20letter.pdf

4. Donaldson M. COVID-19: Outline strategic plan for General Dental Services and updated guidance for General Dental Practice, 23rd March 2020 [Accessed: 23/06/2020].

Available from: http://www.hscbusiness.hscni.net/pdf/HSCB_COVID-19_GDS-Strategic-Plan.pdf

5. Ferris T. Letter to NHS Dental Services (ref: POL/33888), 23rd March 2020 [Accessed: 23/06/2020]. Available from: https://www.fgdp.org.uk/sites/fgdp.org.uk/files/editors/2020.03.23%20CDO%20Scotland%20COVID-19%20advice%20letter.pdf

6. Hurley S, Neligan M. Letter to general dental practices and community dental services (ref: 001559), 25th March 2020 [Accessed: 06/06/2020]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/issue-3-preparedness-letter-for-primary-dental-care-25-march-2020.pdf

7. Health Protection Scotland. Transmission Based Precautions Literature Review: Aerosol Generating Procedures. Glasgow: Health Protection Scotland; 2020.

8. Bridgman C, Tolley W. Letter to All Primary Care Dental Teams and Health Boards, 10th June 2020 [Accessed: 14/07/2020]. Available from: https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2020-06/all-wales-standard-operating-procedure-sop-for-dental-practices-letter-from-chief-dental-officer.pdf

9. Donaldson M. Timing of phases 2 and 3 of GDS re-establishment plan, 18th June 2020 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020].

10. Ferris T. REMOBILISATION OF NHS DENTAL SERVICES: AEROSOL GENERATING PROCEDURES (AGPs), 7th August 2020 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020]. Available from: https://www.sehd.scot.nhs.uk/pca/PCA2020(D)11.pdf

11. Hurley S, Neligan M. Issue 5, Preparedness letter for primary dental care - 13 July 2020 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020]. Available from: https://www.gdc-uk.org/docs/default-source/covid-19/c0603-dental-preparedness-letter_july-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=1e36ec63_2

12. College of General Dentistry, Faculty of General Dental Practice. Implications of COVID-19 for the safe management of general dental practice: A practical guide. London: College of Genreal Dentistry, Faculty of General Dental Practice
2020.

13. Office of the Chief Dental Officer England. Standard Operating Procedure Transition to Recovery. London: Office of The Chief Dental Officer England; 2020.

14. England PH. COVID-19 personal protective equipment (PPE) 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-infection-prevention-and-control/covid-19-personal-protective-equipment-ppe#section-8point1

15. British Orthodontic Society. Resolving the Aerosol Issue 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020]. Available from:

https://www.bos.org.uk/Portals/0/Public/docs/Advice%20Sheets/COVID19%20FACTSHEETS/Recovery%20Phase%20Advice/AGP/AGP%20letter%2030%20may%202020.pdf

16. American Association of Orthodontists. Interim Orthodontic PPE Summary Based on Current CDC and OSHA Guidelines 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020]. Available from: https://assets-prod-www1.aaoinfo.org/assets-prod-www1/2020/05/PPE-FLOWCHART.pdf

17. British Orthodontic Society. Slow Speed Handpiece Use In Orthodontic Procedures The BOS Position 2020 [Accessed: 17/08/2020]. Available from: https://www.bos.org.uk/Portals/0/Public/docs/Advice%20Sheets/COVID19%20FACTSHEETS/Recovery%20Phase%20Advice/BOS%20position%20AGP%209th%20June%202020%20Final.pdf

18. Johnston NJ, Price R, Day CJ, Sandy JR, Ireland AJ. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of particulate production during simulated clinical orthodontic debonds. Dental Materials. 2009;25(9):1155-62.

19. Day CJ, Price R, Sandy JR, Ireland AJ. Inhalation of aerosols produced during the removal of fixed orthodontic appliances: A comparison of 4 enamel cleanup methods. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2008;133(1):11-7.

20. Ireland AJ, Moreno T, Price R. Airborne particles produced during enamel cleanup after removal of orthodontic appliances. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 2003;124(6):683-6.

21. Bentley CD, Burkhart NW, Crawford JJ. Evaluating Spatter And Aerosol Contamination During Dental Procedures. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1994;125(5):579-84.

22. Chanpong B, Tang M, Rosenczweig A, Lok P, Tang R. Aerosol-Generating Procedures and Simulated Cough in Dental Anesthesia. Anesthesia Progress. 2020:DOI: 10.2344/anpr-67-03-04.

23. Dahlke WO, Cottam MR, Herring MC, Leavitt JM, Ditmyer MM, Walker RS. Evaluation of the spatter-reduction effectiveness of two dry-field isolation techniques. Journal of The American Dental Association. 2012;143(11):1199-204.

24. Harrel SK, Barnes JB, Rivera-Hidalgo F. Aerosol and splatter contamination from the operative site during ultrasonic scaling. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1998;129(9):1241-9.

25. Veena HR, Mahantesha S, Joseph PA, Patil SR, Patil SH. Dissemination of aerosol and splatter during ultrasonic scaling: a pilot study. Journal of Infection and Public Health. 2015;8(3):260-5.

26. Chiramana S, Bindu O SH, Kadiyala K, Prakash M, Prasad T, Chaitanya S. Evaluation of Minimum Required Safe Distance between Two Consecutive Dental Chairs for Optimal Asepsis. Journal of Orofacial Research. 2013;3:12-5.

27. Harrel SK, Barnes JB, Rivera-Hidalgo F. Reduction of Aerosols Produced by Ultrasonic Sealers. Journal of Periodontology. 1996;67(1):28-32.

28. Al-Amad SH, Awad MA, Edher FM, Shahramian K, Omran TA. The effect of rubber dam on atmospheric bacterial aerosols during restorative dentistry. Journal of Infection and Public Health. 2017;10(2):195-200.

29. Bennett AM, Fulford MR, Walker JT, Bradshaw DJ, Martin MV, Marsh PD. Microbial aerosols in general dental practice. British Dental Journal. 2000;189(12):664-7.

30. Dutil S, Meriaux A, de Latremoille MC, Lazure L, Barbeau J, Duchaine C. Measurement of airborne bacteria and endotoxin generated during dental cleaning. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene. 2009;6(2):121-30.

31. Holloman JL, Mauriello SM, Pimenta L, Arnold RR. Comparison of suction device with saliva ejector for aerosol and spatter reduction during ultrasonic scaling. Journal of The American Dental Association. 2015;146(1):27-33.

32. Miller RL, Micik RE, Abel C, Ryge G. Studies on Dental Aerobiology: II. Microbial Splatter Discharged from the Oral Cavity of Dental Patients. Journal of Dental Research. 1971;50(3):621-5.

33. Rautemaa R, Nordberg A, Wuolijoki-Saaristo K, Meurman JH. Bacterial aerosols in dental practice - a potential hospital infection problem? Journal of Hospital Infection. 2006;64(1):76-81.

34. Timmerman MF, Menso L, Steinfort J, van Winkelhoff AJ, van der Weijden GA. Atmospheric contamination during ultrasonic scaling. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2004;31(6):458-62.

35. Zemouri C, Volgenant CMC, Buijs MJ, Crielaard W, Rosema NAM, Brandt BW, et al. Dental aerosols: microbial composition and spatial distribution. Journal of Oral Microbiology. 2020;12(1):DOI: 10.1080/20002297.2020.1762040.

36. Liu MH, Chen CT, Chuang LC, Lin WM, Wan GH. Removal efficiency of central vacuum system and protective masks to suspended particles from dental treatment. PLoS One. 2019;14(11):e0225644.

37. Rupf S, Berger H, Buchter A, Harth V, Ong MF, Hannig M. Exposure of patient and dental staff to fine and ultrafine particles from scanning spray. Clin Oral Investig. 2015;19(4):823-30.

38. Kumar PS, Subramanian K. Demystifying the mist: Sources of microbial bioload in dental aerosols. Journal of Periodontology. 2020;DOI: 10.1002/JPER.20-0395.

39. Allison JR, Currie CC, Edwards DC, Bowes C, Coulter J, Pickering K, et al. Evaluating aerosol and splatter following dental procedures: addressing new challenges for oral healthcare and rehabilitation. Jornal of Oral Rehabilitation. 2020:DOI: 10.1111/joor.13098.

40. Ship JA, Fox PC, Baum BJ. How much saliva is enough? 'Normal' function defined. J Am Dent Assoc. 1991;122(3):63-9.

41. Holliday R, Allison J, Currie C, Edwards D, Bowes C, Pickering K, et al. Evaluating dental aerosol and splatter in an open plan clinic environment: implications for the COVID-19 pandemic. OSF Preprints. 2020:DOI: 10.31219/osf.io/md49f.

42. National Services Scotland. SBAR Ventilation, water and environmental cleaning in dental surgeries relating to COVID-19. Edinburgh: National Services Scotland; 2020.

43. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme. Mitigation of Aerosol Generating Procedures in Dentistry A Rapid Review 2020 [Accessed: 13/10/2020]. Available from: https://www.sdcep.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/SDCEP-Mitigation-of-AGPS-in-Dentistry-Rapid-Review.pdf

44. Van Rossum G, Drake FL. Python 3 Reference Manual. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace; 2009.

45. Toroğlu MS, Haytaç MC, Köksal F. Evaluation of Aerosol Contamination During Debonding Procedures. The Angle Orthodontist. 2001;71(4):299-306.

46. Geller C, Varbanov M, Duval RE. Human coronaviruses: insights into environmental resistance and its influence on the development of new antiseptic strategies. Viruses. 2012;4(11):3044-68.

47. NHS Estates. HTM 2022 - Supplement 1: Dental compressed air and vacuum systems. London: The Stationary Office; 2003.

48. Siegel JD, Rhinehart E, Jackson M, Chiarello L, Health Care Infection Control Practices Advisory C. 2007 Guideline for Isolation Precautions: Preventing Transmission of Infectious Agents in Health Care Settings. American journal of infection control. 2007;35(10 Suppl 2):S65-S164.

49. Kim UJ, Lee SY, Lee JY, Lee A, Kim SE, Choi O-J, et al. Air and Environmental Contamination Caused by COVID-19 Patients: a Multi-Center Study. J Korean Med Sci. 2020;35(37).

50. Moore G, Rickard H, Stevenson D, Aranega Bou P, Pitman J, Crook A, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 within the healthcare environment: a multicentre study conducted during

the first wave of the COVID-19 outbreak in England. medRxiv. 2020:DOI:10.1101/2020.09.24.20191411.

Table/Figure Captions

Table 1. Settled dental aerosol and splatter as measured by contaminated surface area using image analysis or by spectrofluorometric analysis. For each experimental condition, the data from an average of three repetitions for all samples at each location are included together. RFU: relative fluorescence units.

Figure 1. Experimental set up. A, eight-metre diameter experimental rig with operator and assistant performing orthodontic debonding procedure. B, Close up of bracket removal. Note the cotton wool rolls placed in the buccal sulci and the tubing delivering fluorescein solution. C, Close up of composite resin cement removal with slow-speed handpiece.

Figure 2. Heatmaps contaminated surface area (mm^2) from photographic image analysis. A, Orthodontic debonding procedure. B, positive control (anterior crown preparation). For each coordinate, the maximum value recorded from three repetitions of each clinical procedure was used. Logarithmic transformation was performed on the data (Log_{10}). Note the scale is reduced to remove areas showing zero readings.

Figure 3. Bar chart comparing contaminated surface area (mm^2) from photographic image analysis data by clinical procedure and sample type/location. Surface area data from each area were combined for all repetitions (i.e. all samples on the operator, assistant, mannequin, and those at 0.5m, 1m, 1.5m etc. from the centre). Note, 0.4 m and 0.65 m readings were located on the mannequin.

Figure 4. Bar chart comparing the spectrofluorometric analysis data by clinical procedure and sample type/location. RFU: relative fluorescence units. Spectrofluorometric analysis data from each area were combined for all repetitions (i.e. all samples on the operator, assistant, mannequin, and those at 0.5m, 1m, 1.5m etc. from the centre). Note, 0.4 m and 0.65 m readings were located on the mannequin.

Min
Mean (SD)
Max
Sum
[*n*]

	Rig contamination. Distance from centre (m)									
	0	**0.5**	**1**	**1.5**	**2**	**2.5**	**3**	**3.5**	**4**	**Total**
Surface area (mm^2)	0.00 **0.00** (0.01) 0.02 0.02 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.02 0.02 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 0.00 (0.00) 0.02 0.04 [195]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0.00 **52** (257) 1259 1259 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 6 (90) 1259 1259 [195]

	Operator contamination									
	Left body	**Right Body**	**Left arm**	**Right arm**	**Left leg**	**Right leg**	**Head**	**Visor#**	**Mask$**	**Total**
Surface area (mm^2)	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **1.14** (1.98) 3.43 3.43 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [18]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [9]	0.00 0.07 (0.50) 3.43 3.43 [48]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **1259** (2181) 3777 3777 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [18]	0 **38** (114) 343 343 [9]	0 86 (546) 3777 4120 [48]

	Assistant contamination									
	Left body	**Right Body**	**Left arm**	**Right arm**	**Left leg**	**Right leg**	**Head**	**Visor#**	**Mask$**	**Total**
Surface area (mm^2)	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [18]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [9]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [48]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 131 (226) 392 392 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **12** (49) 208 208 [18]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [9]	0 12.5 (63) 392 600 [48]

	Mannequin contamination				
	Upper left	**Upper right**	**Lower left**	**Lower right**	**Total**
Surface area (mm^2)	0.00 **1.68** (2.35) 4.37 5.05 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 0.42 (1.26) 4.37 5.05 [12]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 1776 (2529) 4671 5328 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 444 (1344) 4671 5328 [12]

Table 1. Dental aerosol and splatter as measured by contaminated surface area using image analysis or by spectrofluorometric analysis. For each experimental condition, the data from an average of three repetitions for all samples at each location are included together.

All visor samples combined

$ All mask samples combined


A.
B.
C.


A.
B.
y (m)
x (m)
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−1.5
Total surface area, mm^2 on log$_{10}$ scale
2.4
1.8
1.2
0.6
0.0
−0.6
−1.2
−1.8
−2.4


Total surface area contaminated, mm² (photographic image analysis)
600
400
200
0
Operator
Assistant
Mannequin
0 m
0.4 m
0.5 m
0.65 m
1 m
1.5 m
2 m
2.5 m
3 m
3.5 m
4 m
Sum (rig only)
Sum (all)
Sample positions
Orthodontic debonding procedure
Anterior crown preparation (positive control)


Fluorescence, RFU (spectrofluorometric analysis)
120000
80000
40000
0
Operator
Assistant
Mannequin
0 m
0.4 m
0.5 m
0.65 m
1 m
1.5 m
2 m
2.5 m
3 m
3.5 m
4 m
Sum (rig only)
Sum (all)
Sample positions
Orthodontic debonding procedure
Anterior crown preparation (positive control)

Supplementary Material

Evaluating aerosol and splatter during orthodontic debonding: implications for the COVID-19 pandemic

Hayley Llandro[1,2], James R Allison[1,2], Charlotte C Currie[1,2], David C Edwards[1,2], Charlotte Bowes[1,2], Justin Durham[1,2], Nicholas Jakubovics[2], Nadia Rostami[2], Richard Holliday[1,2]

Affiliations

1. Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom
2. School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Richard Holliday; School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU; richard.holliday@newcaslte.ac.uk

Min
Mean (SD)
Max
Sum
[*n*]

Rig contamination. Distance from centre (m)

	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	Total
Surface area (mm^2)	11.16 **91.5** (127.8) 238.88 274.61 [3]	0.00 **1.88** (5.78) 26.24 45.31 [24]	0.00 **0.01** (0.05) 0.25 0.36 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [24]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.01 0.01 [24]	0.00 1.64 (17.3) 238.88 320.29 [195]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 2328 (2917) 5601 6984 [3]	0 **1019** (3335) 13207 24451 [24]	0 **251** (1230) 6028 6028 [24]	0 **31** (153) 749 749 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **9** (45) 220 220 [24]	0.00 **59** (290) 1421 1421 [24]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [24]	0 **31** (151) 738 738 [24]	0 208 (1334) 13207 40591 [195]

Operator contamination

	Left body	Right Body	Left arm	Right arm	Left leg	Right leg	Head	Visor#	Mask$	Total
Surface area (mm^2)	37.41 **23.62** (16.9) 37.41 70.86 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.02 0.02 [3]	0.09 **12.76** (11.2) 21.5 38.3 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.01** (0.02) 0.04 0.04 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.01) 0.01 0.01 [3]	0.00 **4.26** (7.00) 27.49 76.71 [18]	0.00 **0.00** (0.01) 0.02 0.04 [9	0.00 3.87 (8.54) 37.41 185.94 [48]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **8473** (8598) 17189 25420 [3]	0 **1271** (2202) 3814 3814 [3]	0 **776** (1345) 2329 2329 [3]	0 **359** (622) 1077 1077 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **1205** (1931) 5847 21691 [18]	0 **21** (63) 190 190 [9]	0 1136 (2961) 17189 54521 [48]

Assistant contamination

	Left body	Right Body	Left arm	Right arm	Left leg	Right leg	Head	Visor#	Mask$	Total
Surface area (mm^2)	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.10** (0.17) 0.29 0.29 [3]	0.00 **2.17** (2.55) 4.97 6.51 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.42** (0.07) 0.13 0.13 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [3]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [18]	0.00 **0.00** (0.00) 0.00 0.00 [9]	0.00 0.14 (0.75) 4.98 6.93 [48]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **645** (921) 1700 1936 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 **27** (113) 481 481 [18]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [9]	0 50 (255) 1700 2417 [48]

Mannequin contamination

	Upper left	Upper right	Lower left	Lower right	Total
Surface area (mm^2)	12.34 **13.59** (1.24) 14.82 40.78 [3]	1.58 **4.46** (2.97) 7.51 13.37 [3]	0.03 **2.79** (4.58) 8.03 8.36 [3]	0.00 **0.01** (0.01) 0.02 0.03 [3]	0.00 5.21 (5.82) 14.82 62.55 [12]
Fluorescence (RFU)	0 **4303** (5911) 11044 12910 [3]	666 **1931** (1326) 3312 5795 [3]	0 **124** (175) 248 248 [2]	0 **0** (0) 0 0 [3]	0 1723 (3280) 11044 18953 [11]

Supplementary Table 1. Positive control (high-speed air turbine crown preparation with assistant held dental suction). Dental aerosol and splatter as measured by contaminated surface area using image analysis or by spectrofluorometric analysis. The data from an average of three repetitions for all samples at each location are included together.

All visor samples combined

$ All mask samples combined



Supplementary Figure 1. Heatmaps presenting spectrofluorometric analysis data. A, Orthodontic debonding procedure. B, positive control (anterior crown preparation). For each coordinate, the maximum value recorded from three repetitions of each clinical procedure was used. Logarithmic transformation was performed on the data (Log10). Note the scale includes the full dimensions of the experimental rig. RFU: relative fluorescence units.