

1 **Characterization and mitigation of aerosols** 2 **and splatters from ultrasonic scalers**

3
4 Qisheng Ou^{1,*}, Rafael Grazzini Placucci^{1,*}, Judy Danielson², Gary Anderson^{2,†}, Paul Olin³, Paul
5 Jardine⁴, John Madden³, Qinghui Yuan⁵, Timothy H. Grafe⁵, Siyao Shao¹, Jiarong Hong¹, and
6 David Y.H. Pui^{1,6}
7

8 ¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

9 ²Department of Developmental and Surgical Sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,
10 MN 55455, USA

11 ³Department of Restorative Sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

12 ⁴Department of Diagnostic and Biological Sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
13 55455, USA

14 ⁵Donaldson Company, Inc. Minneapolis, MN 55431

15 ⁶School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen,
16 Guangdong, 518172, China

17
18 * equal contribution

19 † corresponding author
20

21 **Abstract:**

22 **Background:** Dental procedures often produce aerosols and splatter which have the potential to
23 transmit pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2. The existing literature is limited.

24 **Methods:** Aerosols and splatter were generated from an ultrasonic scaling procedure on a dental
25 mannequin and characterized by two optical imaging methods – digital inline holography (DIH)
26 and laser sheet imaging (LSI). Capture efficiencies of various aerosol mitigation devices were
27 evaluated and compared.

28 **Results:** The ultrasonic scaling procedure generates a wide size range of aerosols up to a few
29 hundred micrometers and occasional large splatter which emit at low velocity (mostly below 3
30 m/s). Use of a saliva ejector (SE) and high-volume evacuator (HVE) resulted in 63% and 88% of
31 overall reduction respectively while an extraoral local extractor (ELE) resulted in a reduction of
32 96% at the nominal design flow setting.

33 **Conclusions:** The study results showed that the use of ELE or HVE significantly reduced aerosol
34 and splatter emission. The use of HVE generally requires an additional person to assist a hygienist,
35 while an ELE can be operated “hands-free” when a dental hygienist is performing ultrasonic
36 scaling and other operations.

37 **Practical Implications:** An extraoral local extractor aids in the reduction of aerosols and splatters
38 during ultrasonic scaling procedures, potentially reducing transmission of oral or respiratory
39 pathogens, like SARS-CoV-2. Position and airflow of the device are important to effective aerosol
40 mitigation.

41

42 **Key Words:** Aerosol-generating procedures, splatter, high-volume evacuation, extraoral local
43 extractor, dental aerosols, ultrasonic scaling

44

45 Introduction

46 There is a general consensus that aerosols are one of the major paths of transmission for SARS-
47 CoV-2 in the current pandemic¹. This has led to concerns for health care workers involved in
48 procedures which generate aerosols²⁻⁵. Dental providers are thought to be at particular risk due
49 to the generation of aerosols and splatters⁶⁻¹⁰ during dental procedures such as ultrasonic
50 cleaning and high-speed, water-cooled tooth preparation. The dental profession has responded
51 with increased use of personal protection equipment (PPE) and recommendations to avoid
52 aerosol generating procedures such as ultrasonic scaling. Current industry guidelines for
53 addressing airborne risks focus on increased ventilation (or air changes per hour (ACH)), portable
54 room filtration systems (not at the source), the avoidance of discretionary aerosol-generating
55 procedures (AGPs), and adding time between patients and procedures to allow for increased
56 ventilation^{6,7,11}. These measures have understandably placed increased burden on the oral health
57 care system and are based on limited data regarding the generation and mitigation of dental
58 aerosols. Recommendations about mitigation of airborne contaminants in other occupational
59 settings suggest that capture of contaminants near the source is far superior to general ventilation
60 and/or use of PPE¹².

61 There is a serious deficiency in the literature regarding the risks posed by aerosols and splatter
62 from aerosol-generating procedures (AGPs) in dental settings and the efficacy of various aerosol
63 mitigation techniques. A number of studies have collected aerosols and splatters directly onto a
64 collecting surface for subsequent analysis, which include fluorescent¹³⁻¹⁷ or non-fluorescent¹⁸⁻²⁰
65 based chromatic indicators and microbiological methods using culture media²¹⁻²⁴. These studies
66 are limited by their inefficient collection of small size aerosols (<~50 μm) which do not provide a
67 comprehensive characterization over the entire size spectrum. This is especially important as
68 smaller aerosols may carry SARS-CoV-2 virus (0.06 -0.14 μm^{25}). Some investigations have used
69 aerosol sampling techniques^{21,26-31}, but suffer from limited sampling of large aerosols and
70 splatters or incorrect use of the sampling devices.

71 Dental procedures generate both aerosols and splatter. Without a commonly recognized size
72 threshold, splatters are generally considered to be large droplets and/or debris that is heavy
73 enough to settle rapidly without spreading a long distance. Aerosols, on the other hand, are small
74 droplets that can become smaller through evaporation and result in smaller residual aerosols (10
75 microns in size or smaller) that may stay suspended in air indefinitely since they are sufficiently
76 small to overcome gravitational settling, especially in a thermally stratified indoor environment³²⁻
77 ³⁴. Although most of these residual aerosols are the result of the supplied cooling water, they can
78 include patient saliva, dental plaque, calculus, and blood, which can be infectious to dental
79 practitioners or other dental patients if a patient carries SARS-CoV-2 or other infectious agents.
80 Since a droplet's ability to spread and subsequently be inhaled strongly depends on its original
81 size and evaporation process, a comprehensive size characterization of the original droplets and
82 the residual aerosols is essential in risk assessment of AGPs. Such a comprehensive assessment
83 has not been reported yet to our best knowledge.

84 One example of a common dental hygiene procedure which is being avoided during the pandemic
85 due to aerosol generation is ultrasonic scaling for dental prophylaxis⁴. This ultrasonic scaling
86 technology increases the efficiency of dental hygienists and is much less physically demanding
87 than manual scaling. Dental hygienists are at risk for repetitive stress injuries and the ban on
88 ultrasonic scaling procedures makes this more likely. The reduced efficiency of manual scaling
89 also increases the time the patient is seating in the dental chair and for some patients may
90 increase the number of appointments needed. High-volume evacuation (HVE) is reported to
91 reduce aerosol contamination considerably^{23,35,36}, but it is generally not used by dental hygienists
92 without an additional assistant to hold, position and manipulate the end of the HVE. Extraoral
93 local extractors (ELE) have been discussed and marketed since the beginning of this pandemic,
94 but the evidence supporting their effectiveness is rare^{37,38} and details about the proper design,
95 configuration and use of ELEs has not been studied and reported.

96 We conducted this experiment to provide detailed physical characterizations of aerosols and
97 splatters from ultrasonic scaling processes using novel *in-situ* optical methods. The methods were
98 further used to evaluate the effectiveness of a variety of dental aerosol mitigation devices.

99 **Methods**

100 Digital Inline Holography (DIH) and Laser Sheet Imaging (LSI) were used to characterize the size
101 and velocity of aerosols and splatters from an ultrasonic scaling procedure. DIH can be leveraged
102 to image particles larger than 6 μm but is limited to a small sample volume. On the other hand,
103 LSI is not capable of distinguishing particle sizes, but can be used to count particles in a wide
104 field of view. The combination of DIH and LSI measurements was therefore employed for more
105 holistic insight into the generation and mitigation of aerosols during the dental procedure. This
106 also provided an effective methodology for the evaluation of various aerosol mitigation strategies
107 and devices.

108 **Digital Inline Holography (DIH)**

109 Near-field *in situ* holographic measurements were conducted using a DIH setup consisting of a
110 laser, a digital camera, as well as beam expanding, collimating and condensing optics. A dental
111 mannequin with thermoplastic teeth was placed on a horizontal surface facing upwards to mimic
112 a patient during the dental procedure. The center of the DIH sample volume ($15.6 \times 13.0 \times 250 \text{ mm}^3$)
113 was located approximately 8 mm above the mannequin's mouth opening (Figure 1).

114 The hybrid hologram processing method proposed by Shao et al.³⁹, consisting of image
115 enhancement, digital reconstruction, particle segmentation and post-processing was used to
116 obtain the size distribution of particles passing through the DIH sample volume during simulated
117 dental procedures.

118 **Simulated Ultrasonic Scaling**

119 A dental hygienist simulated supragingival scaling of the facial surfaces of the upper incisors and
120 the lingual surfaces of the lower incisors using an ultrasonic scaler (Dentsply Sirona Cavitron ®

121 Plus with 30K FSI-1000 inserts) operating at the medium power setting while the holographic
122 sensor (35 fps, 13 μ s exposure) acquired 10-second videos for a total of three trials. Clinically
123 ultrasonic scaling in these dental regions generates the most splatters and aerosols.

124 **Tested Mitigation Devices and Strategies**

125 Various mitigation devices were subsequently tested including a saliva ejector (SE, operated by
126 the hygienist), a high-volume evacuation (HVE, operated by a second person) and an extraoral
127 local extractor (ELE, BOFA DentalPro Aerosol UVC) at two different flow rates, 100 m³/h and 220
128 m³/h. Different aerosol mitigation devices, and combinations thereof, were employed during the
129 simulated procedure. For the mitigation measurements the saliva ejector and HVE were used
130 adjacent to the operating field as is typical of clinical practice. The ELE nozzle was tested at two
131 distances from the mouth of the mannequin, 14 cm and 18 cm. The 14 cm distance was felt to be
132 the most effective nozzle placement based on the recommendations of dental hygienists who
133 collaborated with the manufacturer of the tested ELE through informal clinical testing. The 18 cm
134 distance was investigated to further assess the impact of ELE nozzle position on aerosol
135 mitigation.

136 **Laser Sheet Imaging (LSI)**

137 Far-field *in situ* laser sheet imaging was conducted using the setup illustrated in Figure 2, which
138 comprised of a high-resolution camera coupled with an image intensifier and an imaging lens, as
139 well as a light sheet generating system. The dental mannequin was placed in a horizontal surface
140 facing upwards in a fashion similar to the previous setup. The light sheet generating system was
141 placed 80 cm to the side of the center of the camera's field of view (FOV) and used to generate
142 a light sheet that crossed the mannequin's head just above its mouth opening and below its nose.
143 The camera module, located 60 cm away from the mannequin, was oriented perpendicularly to
144 the light sheet and focused to achieve a FOV of 40×40 cm². Additional measures were taken to
145 ensure the signal to noise ratio was maximized, such as spray-painting the mannequin head and
146 implementing a light trap to diminish background reflection.

147 Recorded images were converted grayscale and enhanced using background subtraction. The
148 plume of aerosol generated during the procedure was segmented by employing an entropy filter,
149 and the total pixel intensity of the plume area was measured and compared to the mitigation-free
150 test trial to obtain the device's capture efficiency.

151 The ultrasonic scaling simulation and the mitigation techniques were tested with LSI in the same
152 manner previously described with DIH. This provided a complementary broader field of view for
153 the generated droplets and aerosols, as well as their mitigation.

154 **Results**

155 **Digital Inline Holography (DIH)**

156 *Droplet size distribution*

157 The observed droplet generation of the ultrasonic scaler was very dynamic consisting of a
158 relatively continuous generation of a plume of small droplets (aerosols) with occasional large
159 splatters shooting out at high speed. Like many other liquid-films broken up by mechanical forces,
160 a wide range of droplet sizes was observed with DIH with more than 99% falling between 12 to
161 200 μm (Figure 3). Splatters larger than 200 μm were much less prevalent and were highly
162 dependent on the positioning and movement of the ultrasonic scaler tip on teeth. The number
163 mode (size with the highest number concentration) of the size distributions were 55 μm when
164 working on the facial surfaces of teeth #8 & 9 and 34 μm for the lingual surfaces of teeth #24 &
165 25). Total droplet concentration was 114 particles per cubic centimeter (CC) for teeth #8 and 9
166 and 42 particles/CC for teeth #24 & 25. The lower concentration for teeth #24 and 25 was due to
167 the more confined space trapping droplets inside the mouth of the mannequin. The concentration
168 difference between the two sites was more pronounced for larger size droplets.

169 *Droplet velocity*

170 More than 65% of the droplets had a velocity below 1 m/s and less than 2% of the droplets had a
171 velocity greater than 3 m/s (See Figure 4). The low average droplet velocity observed here

172 suggests a suction-based point-of-source mitigation strategy is possible and may be more
173 effective than a whole-room-ventilation-based mitigation. A 3-D mapping of the velocity profile
174 (not shown) suggested there was no dominant direction of droplet travel.

175 *Capture efficiency of mitigation devices*

176 The capture efficiency of various mitigation devices is presented in Figure 5. The size dependent
177 capture efficiency was determined by comparing the measured droplet size distribution with the
178 mitigation device(s) applied with that measured when no mitigation was applied. There was a
179 clear trend of decreased capture efficiency with increased droplet size. For the particular field of
180 view of the DIH in this experiment, all mitigation devices but one (saliva ejector) demonstrated
181 greater than 95% of capture for droplets up to 90 μm . The capture efficiency dropped to $\sim 80\%$
182 and $\sim 50\%$ at 120 and 150 μm , respectively. The previously described irregular generation of
183 large splatters made a statistically meaningful quantification of capture efficiency impossible at
184 droplet size larger than 180 μm . As previously discussed, droplets and aerosols smaller than 150
185 μm are the focus of any mitigation strategies given their high potential for longer-distance travel
186 and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and other airborne infectious agents.

187 **Laser Sheet Imaging (LSI)**

188 LSI provided a larger field assessment of the tested mitigation strategies with more
189 comprehensive visualization of their effect on aerosol and splatter spread. A sample video clip of
190 LSI is provided in supplementary information, in which a local extractor was off first and turned on
191 for ~ 10 seconds and then turned off again to demonstrate its effectiveness. When no mitigation
192 device was deployed, the plume (mainly clusters of small droplets at low speed) shows a swirling
193 movement representing the vortexing flow generated by an ultrasonic scaler tip moving at high
194 frequency. Larger splatters were generated occasionally (larger and brighter dots in the video)
195 shooting out at higher speed. When the local extractor was turned on, the signal of both the plume
196 and the distinct splatters were significantly suppressed, with a clear sign of the plume being drawn
197 towards the opening of the extractor. Occasional splatters were still observed, consistent with the

198 size-dependent capture observed by DIH that droplets with large momentum (larger size and/or
199 higher speed) have relatively higher chance to escape from the capture of a mitigation device.
200 Without distinguishing individual particles and their sizes, an overall capture efficiency was
201 obtained from LSI data for each mitigation device (or their combinations) as shown in Figure 6.
202 Among saliva ejector, HVE, and ELE at 14 cm working distance, saliva ejector had the lowest
203 capture efficiency at 63%, followed up the local extractor at low flow setting (74%). HVE showed
204 a higher capture efficiency at 88%. The ELE operating at high speed setting provided the best
205 capture with an efficiency of 96%. A combination of local extractor at high flow setting with either
206 saliva ejector (94%) or HVE (95%) did not provide additional improvement in capture efficiency,
207 which implies the best mitigation strategy may be to use a local extractor (with proper flow setting,
208 nozzle design, and placement relative to the patient and their oral cavity).
209 The reported efficiencies for LSI were consistently lower than those by DIH at size from 30 to 120
210 μm , which can be explained by two reasons: (1) the existence of large splatters (with lower capture
211 efficiency) in LSI video reduces the overall efficiency since a single large splatter contributes more
212 intensity signal than a small droplet; and (2) the differences in size and position of the field of view
213 between DIH and LSI result in characterizations of different portions of aerosol and splatter
214 populations from the same source.
215 When the local extractor was moved 4 cm further away (from 14 to 18 cm) from the generation
216 site, its capture efficiency dropped substantially from 74% to 38% at low flow setting, and from
217 96% to 56% at high flow setting.

218 **Discussion**

219 Dental aerosols and splatters are an important potential transmission mode for many pathogens,
220 including SARS-CoV-2, and it is vital to understand their generation profile and transportation
221 behaviors in air to support the risk assessment and aerosol mitigation in the current COVID-19

222 pandemic. The combination of the DIH and broader field of LSI provided important complementary
223 characterization of aerosols generated by an ultrasonic scaling with and without mitigation.

224 **Ultrasonic Scaler Aerosol Characterization**

225 Among various engineering parameters, the size and velocity of original droplets are the most
226 important ones that influence how they spread, evaporate, and their ability of being inhaled to
227 cause potential aerosol transmission. To our best knowledge, this study characterizes these two
228 important droplet properties for the first-time using novel *in-situ* optical methods. We demonstrate
229 the wide spread of droplet sizes and the presence of both small and large droplets in the
230 population. Small aerosols ($< \sim 50 \mu\text{m}$) are not sampled effectively by any impingement-based
231 collection surface especially when their velocity is low due to the lack of momentum in air. Our
232 findings suggest these small aerosols likely have been overlooked in previous studies employing
233 surface collection methods for droplet sampling.

234 The droplet size and velocity reported here are properties measured close to their generation site
235 outside of the oral cavity. When they travel further in the air, the droplets evaporate to significantly
236 smaller size and the velocity relaxes close to the movement of the surrounding air. In view of the
237 respiratory disease transmission, particles smaller than $10 \mu\text{m}$ (the size after droplets have
238 reduced in size due to evaporation) pose more risk than larger ones since they are more likely to
239 remain suspended in air⁴⁰, to bypass a face shield, to penetrate through face masks /
240 respirators⁴¹⁻⁴³, and be inhaled and deposited in the respiratory tract. The residual particle size
241 depends on the size and composition of the original droplets. For dental generated droplets,
242 especially ultrasonic scaling, this is dominated by dissolved solid impurities in the cooling water
243 which is typically tap water filtered with a bacterial filter. Assuming a total dissolved solid (TDS)
244 level of 350 ppm for a typical tap water^{44,45}, a droplet with a $142\text{-}\mu\text{m}$ original size dries into a 10
245 μm solid residual, suggesting droplets smaller than $\sim 150 \mu\text{m}$ should receive more attention in
246 dental aerosol mitigation. Larger droplets, however, can deposit onto ground, dental chairs and
247 other equipment, bodies of patients or dental operators, surfaces of face shield, face mask, or

248 respirators, causing potential surface contamination. These findings therefore support the
249 continued use of enhanced PPE in addition to regular surface cleaning and disinfection. The
250 optical methods used in this study focus on initial droplets greater than 12 μm since any droplets
251 smaller can be effectively mitigated as suggested by the size-dependent capture efficiency shown
252 in Figure 5.

253 **Aerosol Mitigation**

254 The ultrasonic scaler did produce omnidirectional droplets as expected, due to the high-frequency
255 oscillation of the ultrasonic tip. However, aerosol mitigation was demonstrated and the ELE was
256 very effective as compared to the more traditional clinical mitigation strategies without the need
257 for additional personnel. It was clear that proper positioning of the nozzle and airflow of the ELE
258 are of great importance but could be accomplished without impeding the work position of the
259 dental hygienist.

260 The low average droplet velocity observed in this study suggests suction-based point-of-source
261 mitigation strategies such as those tested may be more effective than whole-room-ventilation-
262 based mitigation as has been recommended in other settings^{12,46}. The ELE works in a similar
263 principle as a saliva ejector or an HVE, but at a higher flowrate and a longer working distance.
264 Unlike an HVE, it can be designed to remain in a fixed position, so an extra assistant is not needed
265 to operate it.

266 It should be noted that room ventilation provided by heating, ventilation and air conditioning
267 systems (HVAC) alone would require significantly higher flow for aerosol mitigation due to lack of
268 focus on contamination sources. And it is possible that air ventilation provided by an HVAC system
269 could contribute to aerosol spread rather than mitigation, as an aerosol could travel throughout
270 an entire room before eventually being vented by the room HVAC system (where it may be
271 recirculated if not properly filtered.) With ELE, however, the majority of contaminants are captured
272 by the ELE at the source and subsequently filtered.

273 **Dental Aerosol and Infection Risk**

274 Not every aerosol or splatter from ultrasonic scalers carries pathogens, so the emission profiles
275 measured in this study represent a worst-case scenario, which need to be combined with a
276 biological property evaluation for a more comprehensive risk assessment in the future. Since our
277 knowledge on the infective dose of SARS-CoV-2 required to cause COVID-19 is still limited, it is
278 difficult to draw definitive conclusions as to the risks posed by dental aerosols and splatters and
279 if the reported efficacy of the mitigation devices is sufficient. It is therefore recommended that
280 multiple mitigation strategies be employed to minimize the risk of dental aerosol transmission.
281 The authors also recommend that dental practitioners continue to use enhanced PPE in addition
282 to other aerosol mitigation techniques.

283 **Conclusions**

284 Results of this study provide a scientific basis for risk assessment of aerosols and splatters from
285 ultrasonic scaling. The engineering approaches of size and velocity profile characterization offer
286 insight from a different angle – small aerosols which may be overlooked by a good number of
287 previous studies can pose higher risk in terms of infection disease transmission through aerosol
288 route, especially with the current COVID-19 pandemic. Implementing a hands-free extraoral local
289 extractor can assist dental hygienists in implementing an effective, ergonomically sound method
290 to reduce dental aerosols and splatters. Further research is needed on the biological property of
291 these emissions for a comprehensive risk assessment. The methods in this work can be applied
292 in the future to characterization of other AGPs in dental and medical settings to develop safe and
293 efficient clinical practices in the face of highly contagious air-borne diseases. Future investigations
294 will include assessment of water-cooled high-speed handpieces, as well as the interplay of point
295 of source mitigation and clinical HVAC systems.

296


297 References

- 298 1. Karia R, Gupta I, Khandait H, Yadav A, Yadav A. COVID-19 and its Modes of Transmission. *SN*
299 *Compr Clin Med*. 2020;2(10):1798-1801. doi:10.1007/s42399-020-00498-4
- 300 2. Harding H, Broom A, Broom J. Aerosol-generating procedures and infective risk to healthcare
301 workers from SARS-CoV-2: the limits of the evidence. *J Hosp Infect*. 2020;105(4):717-725.
302 doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.05.037
- 303 3. Guo W, Chan BH, Chng CK, Shi AH. Two Cases of Inadvertent Dental Aerosol Exposure to COVID-
304 19 Patients. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2020;49(7):514-516. doi:10.47102/annals-
305 acadmedsg.2020186
- 306 4. Ge Z, Yang L, Xia J, Fu X, Zhang Y. Possible aerosol transmission of COVID-19 and special
307 precautions in dentistry. *J Zhejiang Univ Sci B*. 2020;21(5):361-368. doi:10.1631/jzus.B2010010
- 308 5. Mick P, Murphy R. Aerosol-generating otolaryngology procedures and the need for enhanced PPE
309 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A literature review. *J Otolaryngol - Head Neck Surg*.
310 2020;49(1):1-10. doi:10.1186/s40463-020-00424-7
- 311 6. World Health Organization. *Considerations for the Provision of Essential Oral Health Services in*
312 *the Context of COVID-19: Interim Guidance, 3 August 2020*. World Health Organization; 2020.
- 313 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Infection Prevention and Control Guidance
314 for Dental Settings During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. Published 2020.
315 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html#section-1>
- 316 8. S KN, Eachempati P, Paisi M, Nasser M, Sivaramakrishnan G, Jh V. dental procedures for
317 preventing infectious diseases (Review). Published online 2020.
318 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013686.pub2.www.cochranelibrary.com
- 319 9. Peng X, Xu X, Li Y, Cheng L, Zhou X, Ren B. Transmission routes of 2019-nCoV and controls in
320 dental practice. *Int J Oral Sci*. 2020;12(1):9. doi:10.1038/s41368-020-0075-9
- 321 10. Amato A, Caggiano M, Amato M, Moccia G, Capunzo M, De Caro F. Infection control in dental
322 practice during the covid-19 pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(13):1-12.
323 doi:10.3390/ijerph17134769
- 324 11. Office of Chief Dental Officer England. Standard operating procedure. Transition to recovery.
325 2020;(June):2-57. [https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/06/C0575-dental-transition-to-recovery-SOP-4June.pdf)
326 [content/uploads/sites/52/2020/06/C0575-dental-transition-to-recovery-SOP-4June.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/06/C0575-dental-transition-to-recovery-SOP-4June.pdf)
- 327 12. The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. *Industrial Ventilation: A Manual*
328 *of Recommended Practice for Design*. 28th ed.; 2013.
- 329 13. Allison JR, Currie CC, Edwards DC, et al. Evaluating aerosol and splatter following dental
330 procedures: Addressing new challenges for oral health care and rehabilitation. *J Oral Rehabil*.
331 2020;(August 2020):61-72. doi:10.1111/joor.13098
- 332 14. Dahlke WO, Cottam MR, Herring MC, Leavitt JM, Ditmyer MM, Walker RS. Evaluation of the
333 spatter-reduction effectiveness of two dry-field isolation techniques. *J Am Dent Assoc*.
334 2012;143(11):1199-1204. doi:10.14219/jada.archive.2012.0064

- 335 15. Kaufmann M, Solderer A, Gubler A, Wegehaupt FJ, Attin T, Schmidlin PR. Quantitative
336 measurements of aerosols from air-polishing and ultrasonic devices: (How) can we protect
337 ourselves? *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12 December):1-10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0244020
- 338 16. Holliday R, Allison JR, Currie CC, et al. Evaluating contaminated dental aerosol and splatter in an
339 open plan clinic environment: Implications for the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Dent*. 2021;105:103565.
340 doi:10.1016/j.jdent.2020.103565
- 341 17. Harrel SK, Barnes JB, Rivera-Hidalgo F. Aerosol and Splatter Contamination from the Operative
342 Site during Ultrasonic Scaling. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 1998;129(9):1241-1249.
343 doi:10.14219/jada.archive.1998.0421
- 344 18. Shahdad S, Patel T, Hindocha A, et al. The efficacy of an extraoral scavenging device on reduction
345 of splatter contamination during dental aerosol generating procedures: an exploratory study. *Br*
346 *Dent J*. Published online 2020:1-10. doi:10.1038/s41415-020-2112-7
- 347 19. Harrel SK. Clinical use of an aerosol-reduction device with an ultrasonic scaler. *Compend Contin*
348 *Educ Dent*. 1996;17(12):1185-1193; quiz 1194.
- 349 20. Chiramana S, O S, Kadiyala K, Prakash M, Prasad T, Chaitanya S. Evaluation of Minimum Required
350 Safe Distance between Two Consecutive Dental Chairs for Optimal Asepsis. *J Orofac Res*.
351 2013;3:12-15. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10026-1056
- 352 21. Zemouri C, Volgenant CMC, Buijs MJ, et al. Dental aerosols: microbial composition and spatial
353 distribution. *J Oral Microbiol*. 2020;12(1). doi:10.1080/20002297.2020.1762040
- 354 22. Holloman JL, Mauriello SM, Pimenta L, Arnold RR. Comparison of suction device with saliva
355 ejector for aerosol and spatter reduction during ultrasonic scaling. *J Am Dent Assoc*.
356 2015;146(1):27-33. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2014.10.001
- 357 23. Bentley CD, Burkhart NW, Crawford JJ. Evaluating spatter and aerosol contamination during
358 dental procedures. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 1994;125(5):579-584. doi:10.14219/jada.archive.1994.0093
- 359 24. Timmerman MF, Menso L, Steinfort J, Van Winkelhoff AJ, Van Der Weijden GA. Atmospheric
360 contamination during ultrasonic scaling. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2004;31(6):458-462.
361 doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2004.00511.x
- 362 25. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,
363 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-733. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001017
- 364 26. Dutil S, Mériaux A, De Latrémoille MC, Lazure L, Barbeau J, Duchaine C. Measurement of airborne
365 bacteria and endotoxin generated during dental cleaning. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2008;6(2):121-
366 130. doi:10.1080/15459620802633957
- 367 27. Miller RL. Characteristics of Blood-Containing Aerosols Generated by Common Powered Dental
368 Instruments. *Am Ind Hyg Assoc J*. 1995;56(7):670-676. doi:10.1080/15428119591016683
- 369 28. Bennett AM, Fulford MR, Walker JT, Bradshaw DJ, Martin M V, Marsh PD. Microbial aerosols in
370 general dental practice. *Br Dent J*. 2000;189(12):664-667. doi:10.1038/sj.bdj.4800859
- 371 29. Jacks ME. A laboratory comparison of evacuation devices on aerosol reduction. *J Dent Hyg*.
372 2002;76(3):202-206.
- 373 30. Matys J, Grzech-Leśniak K. Dental aerosol as a hazard risk for dental workers. *Materials (Basel)*.

- 374 2020;13(22):1-13. doi:10.3390/ma13225109
- 375 31. Nulty A, Lefkaditis C, Zachrisson P, Van Tonder Q, Yar R. A clinical study measuring dental
376 aerosols with and without a high-volume extraction device. *Br Dent J*. Published online 2020:1-8.
377 doi:10.1038/s41415-020-2274-3
- 378 32. Liu F, Qian H, Zheng X, Song J, Cao G, Liu Z. Evaporation and dispersion of exhaled droplets in
379 stratified environment. *IOP Conf Ser Mater Sci Eng*. 2019;609(4). doi:10.1088/1757-
380 899X/609/4/042059
- 381 33. Liu F, Zhang C, Qian H, Zheng X, Nielsen P V. Direct or indirect exposure of exhaled contaminants
382 in stratified environments using an integral model of an expiratory jet. *Indoor Air*.
383 2019;29(4):591-603. doi:10.1111/ina.12563
- 384 34. Zhou Q, Qian H, Ren H, Li Y, Nielsen P V. The lock-up phenomenon of exhaled flow in a stable
385 thermally-stratified indoor environment. *Build Environ*. 2017;116:246-256.
386 doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.02.010
- 387 35. Sawhney A, Venugopal S, Girish Babu RJ, et al. Aerosols how dangerous they are in clinical
388 practice. *J Clin Diagnostic Res*. 2015;9(4):52-57. doi:10.7860/JCDR/2015/12038.5835
- 389 36. Harrel SK, Barnes JB, Rivera-Hidalgo F. Reduction of Aerosols Produced by Ultrasonic Sealers. *J*
390 *Periodontol*. 1996;67(1):28-32. doi:10.1902/jop.1996.67.1.28
- 391 37. Teanpaisan R, Taeporamaysamai M, Rattanachone P, Poldoung N, Srisintorn S. The usefulness of
392 the modified extra-oral vacuum aspirator (EOVA) from household vacuum cleaner in reducing
393 bacteria in dental aerosols. *Int Dent J*. 2001;51(6):413-416. doi:10.1002/j.1875-
394 595X.2001.tb00853.x
- 395 38. Junevicius J, Surna A, Surna R. Effectiveness evaluation of different suction systems.
396 *Stomatologija*. 2005;7(2):52-57.
- 397 39. Shao S, Li C, Hong J. A hybrid image processing method for measuring 3D bubble distribution
398 using digital inline holography. *Chem Eng Sci*. 2019;207:929-941. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2019.07.009
- 399 40. Hinds WC. Aerosol technology: properties, behaviour, and measurement of airborne particles.
400 Published online 1982. Accessed January 24, 2021. [https://www.wiley.com/en-](https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Aerosol+Technology%3A+Properties%2C+Behavior%2C+and+Measurement+of+Airborne+Particles%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471194101)
401 [us/Aerosol+Technology%3A+Properties%2C+Behavior%2C+and+Measurement+of+Airborne+Part](https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Aerosol+Technology%3A+Properties%2C+Behavior%2C+and+Measurement+of+Airborne+Particles%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471194101)
402 [icles%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471194101](https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Aerosol+Technology%3A+Properties%2C+Behavior%2C+and+Measurement+of+Airborne+Particles%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471194101)
- 403 41. Pei C, Ou Q, Kim SC, Chen S-C, Pui DYH. Alternative Face Masks Made of Common Materials for
404 General Public: Fractional Filtration Efficiency and Breathability Perspective. *Aerosol Air Qual Res*.
405 2020;20(Viii):2581-2591. doi:10.4209/aaqr.2020.07.0423
- 406 42. Ou Q, Pei C, Chan Kim S, Abell E, Pui DYH. Evaluation of decontamination methods for
407 commercial and alternative respirator and mask materials – view from filtration aspect. *J Aerosol*
408 *Sci*. 2020;150:105609. doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105609
- 409 43. Konda A, Prakash A, Moss GA, Schmoldt M, Grant GD, Guha S. Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of
410 Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory Cloth Masks. *ACS Nano*. 2020;14(5):6339-6347.
411 doi:10.1021/acsnano.0c03252
- 412 44. Park M, Snyder SA. Attenuation of contaminants of emerging concerns by nanofiltration


- 413 membrane: rejection mechanism and application in water reuse. In: *Contaminants of Emerging*
414 *Concern in Water and Wastewater*. Elsevier; 2020:177-206. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-813561-
415 7.00006-7
- 416 45. Quench - a Culligan company. What's in Your Water: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) in Drinking
417 Water. Published 2019. <https://quenchwater.com/blog/tds-in-drinking-water/>
- 418 46. Li A, Kosonen R, Hagström K. Industrial ventilation design method. In: *Industrial Ventilation*
419 *Design Guidebook*. ; 2020:19-37. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-816780-9.00003-4
- 420



421

422 Figure 1. Schematic of DIH setup used for near-field aerosol size and velocity measurements.
423 The DIH system is mounted onto a cage system secured to a table (not shown) and incorporates
424 beam expanding, collimating and condensing optics (also not shown). A detailed description of
425 the system can be found in Supplementary Information.


426



427

428 Figure 2. Schematic of LSI setup used for far-field plume and splatter measurements. The
429 camera module incorporates a camera sensor, image intensifier and imaging lens, and the laser
430 sheet generator is composed of a high-power laser and a set of optical lenses. A detailed
431 description of the system can be found in Supplementary Information.

432




433

434 Figure 3. Size distribution of droplets as measured by DIH. (Error bars represent standard
435 deviations of three measurements.)

436


437



438

439 Figure 4. The velocity distribution of droplets as measured by DIH


440



441

442 Figure 5. Size dependent capture efficiency of various mitigation device(s) by DIH when cleaning
443 facial surface of teeth #8 & 9. (SE: saliva ejector; HVE: high-volume evacuation; ELE-L: extraoral
444 local extractor at low flow setting; ELE-H: local extractor at high flow setting; '+' denotes a
445 combination of two devices. Error bars represent standard deviations of three measurements.)

446



447

448 Figure 6. Capture efficiency of various mitigation device(s) by LSI when cleaning facial surface of
449 teeth #8 & 9. (SE: saliva ejector; HVE: high-volume evacuation; ELE-L-#: local extractor at low
450 flow setting at a distance of # cm; ELE-H-#: local extractor at high flow setting at a distance of #
451 cm; '+' denotes a combination of two devices. Error bars represent standard deviations of three
452 measurements.)

453