

Waterpik® Water Flosser Removes 99.9% of Plaque Biofilm After 3-Second Treatment

Biofilm Removal with a Dental Water Jet

Gorur A, Lyle DM, Schaudinn C, Costerton JW. *Compend Contin Ed Dent* 2009; 30 (Suppl 1):1-6. Study conducted at the University of Southern California School of Dentistry, USC Center for Biofilms, Los Angeles, California.

Objective

To evaluate the effect of the Waterpik® Water Flosser on plaque biofilm removal using scanning electron microscopy (SEM).

Methodology




Eight periodontally involved teeth were extracted. Ten slices were cut from four teeth and were inoculated with saliva and left for four days to further grow plaque biofilm. Four slices were treated with the Classic Jet Tip, four slices were treated with the Orthodontic Tip, and two slices were used as controls. The remaining 4 teeth were treated with the Orthodontic Tip to evaluate the removal of calcified plaque biofilm. All teeth were treated using medium pressure for three seconds and evaluated by SEM.

Results

The Classic Jet Tip removed 99.9% and the Orthodontic Tip removed 99.8% of the plaque biofilm from the treated areas after a 3-second exposure as viewed by SEM. The Orthodontic Tip significantly removed the calcified biofilm from the surface of the four teeth as viewed by the naked eye and SEM.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser significantly removes plaque biofilm.



Waterpik® Water Flosser: Significantly More Effective than String Floss for Removing Plaque

Evaluation of the Plaque Removal Efficacy of a Water Flosser Compared to String Floss in Adults After a Single Use

Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. *J Clin Dent* 2013; 24(2):37-42. Study conducted at BioSci Research Canada, Ltd., 3

Objective

To compare the plaque removal efficacy of the Waterpik® Water Flosser to string floss combined with a manual toothbrush.

Methodology


Seventy subjects participated in this randomized, single use, single blind, parallel clinical study. Subjects abstained from any oral hygiene for 23 - 25 hours prior to their appointment. Subjects were screened and assigned to one of two groups: Waterpik® Water Flosser plus a manual toothbrush, or waxed string floss plus a manual toothbrush. Instructions were provided for each product used. Each participant brushed for 2-minutes using the Bass method. Group 1 used the Water Flosser with 500 ml of warm water and Group 2 used waxed string floss cleaning all areas between the teeth. Subjects were observed to make sure they covered all areas and followed instructions. Scores were recorded for whole mouth, marginal, approximal, facial, and lingual regions for each subject using the Rustogi Modification Navy Plaque Index.

Results

The Waterpik® Water Flosser was 29% more effective than string floss for overall plaque removal, 29% for approximal surfaces, and 33% for marginal surfaces.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is significantly more effective than string floss in removing plaque for all tooth surfaces.



Waterpik® Water Flosser: Twice as Effective as String Floss for Reducing Gingival Bleeding

The Effect of Different Interdental Cleaning Devices on Gingival Bleeding

Rosema NAM, et al. *J Int Acad Periodontol* 2011; 13(1):2-10.
Study conducted at the University of Amsterdam, Academic Center for Dentistry, Amsterdam.

Objective

To evaluate the efficacy of a manual toothbrush plus a Water Flosser versus a manual toothbrush plus traditional floss, to reduce gingival bleeding and plaque biofilm.

Methodology



One hundred four subjects participated in this 30-day, randomized, single blind study. Group A used a Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Classic Jet Tip plus a manual toothbrush, Group B used a Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Plaque Seeker® Tip plus a manual toothbrush and Group C used waxed string floss plus manual toothbrush. Subjects brushed twice daily and used either the Water Flosser or floss once daily in the evening. Gingival bleeding and plaque biofilm were evaluated at day 14 and day 30.

Results

After 14 days, used in conjunction with manual toothbrushing, the Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Classic Jet Tip was twice as effective as traditional floss at reducing gingival bleeding. At 30 days, the relative improvement in gingival bleeding for the Water Flosser groups was even more dramatic. There were no significant differences between the Water Flosser Classic Jet Tip and the Plaque Seeker® Tip.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is a more effective alternative to traditional dental floss for reducing gingival bleeding and improving oral health.



Classic Jet Tip Data

Waterpik® Water Flosser: 80% More Effective than Sonicare® Air Floss for Reducing Gingivitis

Comparison of Two Power Interdental Cleaning Devices on the Reduction of Gingivitis

Sharma NC, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23(1): 22-26.
Study conducted at BioSci Research Canada, Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

Objective

To compare the Waterpik® Water Flosser to the Sonicare® Air Floss (Model HX8181) for the reduction of gingivitis and plaque biofilm over a 4 week period.

Methodology



Eighty-two subjects participated in this 4 week, randomized, single blind, clinical study. Subjects were assigned to one of two groups: Waterpik® Water Flosser plus a manual toothbrush; or Sonicare® Air Floss plus a manual toothbrush. Subjects were instructed on the proper use of the interdental cleaning devices based on manufacturer's directions. Instructions on the Bass method of toothbrushing were also provided. Gingivitis scores were recorded for whole mouth, facial, and lingual using the Modified Gingival Index. Plaque scores were recorded for whole mouth, facial, lingual, marginal, and approximal regions using the Rustogi Modification of the Navy Plaque Index.

Results

The Waterpik® Water Flosser was significantly more effective than Sonicare® Air Floss at reducing plaque and gingivitis for all areas measured after 4 weeks of use. The Water Flosser was 80% more effective than Air Floss for overall gingivitis reduction, and was 70% more effective for plaque reduction. Notably, the Water Flosser was twice as effective for plaque removal from lingual surfaces and more than 3 times as effective at the gingival margin vs. Air Floss.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is significantly more effective than Sonicare® Air Floss (Model HX8181) for reducing gingivitis and plaque.



Waterpik® Water Flosser: Over 50% More Effective than String Floss for Reducing Gingivitis

Comparison of Irrigation to Floss as an Adjunct to Toothbrushing: Effect on Bleeding, Gingivitis and Supragingival Plaque

Barnes CM, Russell CM, Reinhardt RA et al. *J Clin Dent*, 2005; 16(3): 71-77. Study conducted at the University of Nebraska Medical Center, College of Dentistry, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Objective

To evaluate the ability of a Waterpik® Water Flosser paired with either a power or manual toothbrush, and a manual toothbrush and floss, to reduce gingivitis, bleeding and supragingival plaque biofilm.

Methodology





One hundred five subjects participated in this four-week study. One group used a Waterpik® Water Flosser with a manual toothbrush and a second used the Waterpik® Water Flosser with a power toothbrush. The control group used a manual toothbrush and floss. Subjects brushed twice daily and used either the Water Flosser or dental floss once daily. Plaque biofilm, bleeding, and gingivitis were evaluated at two and four weeks.

Results

At 4 weeks, the addition of a Water Flosser resulted in significantly better oral health, regardless of toothbrush type used over manual brushing and flossing. Adding the Waterpik® Water Flosser was up to 93% better in reducing bleeding and up to 52% better at reducing gingivitis than traditional dental floss.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is an effective alternative to traditional dental floss for reducing gingivitis.



The Waterpik® Water Flosser: Significantly More Effective than Interdental Brushes for Improving Gingival Health!

Comparison of Water Flosser and Interdental Brush on Reduction of Gingival Bleeding and Plaque: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Study.

Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. *J Clin Dent* 2016; 27: 61-65.

Objective

To determine the efficacy of a Waterpik® Water Flosser vs. interdental brushes for plaque and gingivitis reduction.

Methodology



Twenty-eight subjects completed this 2-week study. Subjects were assigned to one of two groups: the Waterpik® Water Flosser (WF) plus a manual toothbrush or interdental brushes (IDBs) plus a manual toothbrush. Gingival health was evaluated by measuring bleeding on probing (BOP) at six sites per tooth. Plaque removal was measured using the Rustogi Modification of the Navy Plaque Index (RMNPI).

Results

The Waterpik® Water Flosser was significantly more effective than the interdental brushes for reducing gingival bleeding. Notably, the Water Flosser was 56% more effective for reducing whole mouth bleeding, and 53% more effective for reducing whole mouth approximal bleeding.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is significantly more effective than interdental brushes for improving gingival health.



The Waterpik® Water Flosser: Significantly More Effective than Interdental Brushes for Removing Plaque.

Comparison of Water Flosser and Interdental Brush on Plaque Removal: A Single-Use Pilot Study.

Lyle DM, Goyal CR, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. J Clin Dent 2016; 27: 23-26.

Objective

To determine the efficacy of a Waterpik® Water Flosser vs. interdental brushes for plaque removal.

Methodology



Twenty-eight (28) subjects completed this one-time use study. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of two groups: Waterpik® Water Flosser (WF) plus manual tooth brushing or interdental brushes (IDB) plus manual tooth brushing. Plaque scores were obtained using the Rustogi Modification of the Navy Plaque Index (RMNPI). Subjects were instructed on the use of their interdental product. Post-cleaning scores were obtained after a supervised brushing and use of the interdental device. Scores were recorded for whole mouth, marginal, approximal, facial, and lingual regions for each subject.

Results

The WF group was significantly more effective than the IDB group for removing plaque from all areas measured. Specifically, the WF was 18% more effective for whole mouth and marginal areas, 20% for approximal areas, 11% for facial areas, and 29% for lingual areas.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser and manual toothbrush removes significantly more plaque from tooth surfaces than interdental brushes and a manual toothbrush after a single use.



Waterpik® Water Flosser: 3X as Effective as String Floss for Orthodontic Patients

The Effect of a Dental Water Jet with Orthodontic Tip on Plaque and Bleeding in Adolescent Orthodontic Patients with Fixed Orthodontic Appliances

Sharma NC, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG et al. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2008; 133(4): 565-571. Study conducted at BioSci Research Canada, Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

Objective

To compare the use of a manual toothbrush and the Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Orthodontic Tip to manual toothbrushing and flossing with a floss threader on bleeding and plaque biofilm reductions in adolescents with fixed orthodontic appliances. A control group consisted of brushing only.

Methodology




One hundred five adolescents with fixed orthodontics participated in this single-center, randomized study. Bleeding and plaque biofilm scores were collected at baseline and days 14 and 28.

Results

The Waterpik® Water Flosser was over 3 times more effective than flossing and over 5 times more effective than brushing alone for the reduction of plaque biofilm. For bleeding, the Water Flosser was 26% better than flossing and 53% better than brushing alone.

Conclusion

Adding a Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Orthodontic Tip to manual toothbrushing is significantly more effective at improving oral health in adolescent orthodontic patients than adding manual floss or brushing only.



Four-week data
Orthodontic Tip data

Waterpik® Water Flosser: 2X as Effective as String Floss For Implant Patients

Comparison of the Effect of Two Interdental Cleaning Devices Around Implants on the Reduction of Bleeding: A 30-day Randomized Clinical Trial

Magnuson B, Harsono M, Stark PC, et al. *Compend Contin Ed Dent* 2013; 34(Special Issue 8):2-7. Study conducted at Tufts University, School of Dental Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts.

Objective

To compare the efficacy of a Waterpik® Water Flosser to string floss for implant patients.

Methods



Subjects were randomized into two groups; Group 1 used a manual toothbrush and a Waterpik® Water Flosser with the Plaque Seeker® Tip (WF) and Group 2 used a manual toothbrush and string floss (SF). There were 22 implants in each group and the primary outcome was the reduction in the incidence of bleeding on probing. Subjects brushed twice a day and used either the WF or SF once a day.

Results

There were no differences between the groups at baseline. At 30 days, 18 of the 22 (81.8%) implants in the WF group showed a significant reduction in BOP compared to 6 of the 18 (33.3%) from the floss group. The WF group experienced 145% better reduction in gingival bleeding around implants vs. the string floss group (p=0.0018).

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Water Flosser is significantly more effective than string floss for improving gingival health around implants and is safe to use.



Waterpik® Complete Care: 70% More Effective than Sonicare® FlexCare for Reducing Gingival Bleeding

The Addition of a Water Flosser to Power Toothbrushing: Effect on Bleeding, Gingivitis, and Plaque

Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23:57-63. Study conducted at BioSci Research Canada, Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

Objective

To compare the efficacy of Waterpik® Complete Care (Water Flosser and Sonic Toothbrush) vs. Sonicare® FlexCare on gingival bleeding, gingivitis and plaque removal.

Methodology




One hundred and forty subjects were enrolled in this 4 week, randomized, single blind, clinical study. Subjects were assigned to one of four groups: Group 1 used a Waterpik® Complete Care — combination Water Flosser and Sonic Toothbrush, Group 2 used a Waterpik® Sonic Toothbrush only, Group 3 used a Sonicare® FlexCare only, and Group 4 used an ADA standard manual toothbrush. Bleeding on Probing (BOP), Modified Gingival Index (MGI) and Rustogi Modified Navy Plaque Index (RMNPI) were measured at 14 days and 28 days.

Results

At 4 weeks, Waterpik® Complete Care was significantly more effective than Sonicare® FlexCare on all measures; 70% better for gingival bleeding, 48% better for gingivitis, and 52% better for plaque removal. At 4 weeks, Waterpik® Complete Care was also significantly more effective than a manual toothbrush on all measures; 159% better for gingival bleeding; 135% better for gingivitis, and 134% better for plaque removal.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Complete Care regimen is up to 70% more effective than Sonicare® FlexCare and up to 159% more effective than a manual toothbrush for improving gingival health.



Waterpik® Sensonic® Professional Plus Toothbrush: 29% More Effective than Sonicare® FlexCare for Improving Oral Health

Comparison of Two Sonic Toothbrushes for the Reduction of Plaque, Bleeding and Gingivitis

Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23:57-63. Study conducted at BioSci Research Canada, Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

Objective

To compare the use of a Waterpik® Sensonic® Professional Plus to Sonicare® FlexCare for the reduction of plaque and inflammation over a 4 week period.

Methodology




One hundred and five subjects were randomized into one of three brushing groups: Waterpik® Sensonic® Professional Plus toothbrush, Sonicare® FlexCare toothbrush or an ADA standard manual toothbrush. During this randomized, single blind, clinical study, subjects were evaluated at baseline, 2 weeks and 4 weeks for plaque, bleeding and gingivitis. Subjects were instructed on the proper use of their assigned power device based on manufacturer's instructions. Manual toothbrush users continued with their normal brushing technique. All subjects used the assigned ADA fluoridated toothpaste and brushed twice a day. Modified Gingival Index (MGI) and Bleeding on Probing (BOP) scores were recorded for whole mouth, facial and lingual. Plaque scores were recorded for whole mouth, facial, lingual, marginal and approximal using the Rustogi Modified Navy Plaque Index (RMNPI).

Results

At 4 weeks the Waterpik® Sensonic® Professional Plus was 29% more effective than Sonicare® FlexCare for plaque removal. And also significantly more effective for reducing gingival bleeding and gingivitis. The Sensonic® Professional Plus was also more effective than the manual toothbrush for all areas and regions measured.

Conclusion

The Waterpik® Sensonic® Professional Plus is significantly more effective than Sonicare® FlexCare for removing plaque and improving oral health.



Research Bibliography

- Al-Mubarak S, Ciancio S, Aljada A et al. Comparative evaluation of adjunctive oral irrigation in diabetes. *J Clin Periodontol* 2002; 29:295-300.
- Aziz-Gandour IA, Newman HN. The effects of a simplified oral hygiene regime plus supragingival irrigation with chlorhexidine or metronidazole on chronic inflammatory periodontal disease. *J Clin Periodontol* 1986; 13:228-236.
- Bakdash MB, Doherty FM, Flemmig TF, Newman MG. Daily compliance of chlorhexidine irrigation. Presented at IADR, Dublin, June 30, 1989.
- Barnes CM, Russell CM, Reinhardt RA, Payne JB, Lyle DM. Comparison of irrigation to floss as an adjunct to tooth brushing: Effect on bleeding, gingivitis and supragingival plaque. *J Clin Dent* 2005; 16(3):71-77.
- Berger SA, Weitzman S, Edberg SC, Casey JJ. Bacteremia after the use of an oral irrigation device. *Annals of Int Med* 1974; 80:510-511.
- Bhaskar SN, Cutright DE, Gross A, Frisch J, Beasley JD, Perez B. Water jet devices in dental practice. *J Periodontol* 1971; 42:658-664.
- Bhaskar SN, Cutright DE, Frisch J. Effect of high pressure water jet on oral mucosa of varied density. *J Periodontol* 1969; 40:593-598.
- Boyd RL, Hollander BN, Eakle WS. Comparison of a subgingivally placed cannula oral irrigator tip with a supragingivally placed standard irrigator tip. *J Clin Periodontol* 1992; 19:340-344.
- Boyd RL, Leggott P, Quinn R, Buchanan S, Eakle W, Chambers D. Effect of self-administered daily irrigation with 0.02% SnF₂ on periodontal disease activity. *J Clin Periodontol* 1985; 12:420-431.
- Brady JM, Gray WA, Bhaskar SN. Electronic microscopic study of the effect of water jet lavage on dental plaque. *J Dent Res* 1973; 52:1310-1313.
- Braun RE, Ciancio SG. Subgingival delivery by an oral irrigating device. *J Periodontol* 1992; 63:469-472.
- Brownstein CN, Briggs SD, Schweitzer KL, Briner WW, Kornman KS. Irrigation with chlorhexidine to resolve naturally occurring gingivitis. *J Clin Periodontol* 1990; 17:588-593.
- Burch JG, Lanese R, Ngan P. A two-month study of the effects of oral irrigation and automatic toothbrush use in an adult orthodontic population with fixed appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop* 1994; 106:121-126.
- Cantor MT, Stahl SS. Interdental col tissue responses to the use of a water pressure cleansing device. *J Periodontol* 1969; 5:292-295.
- Chaves ES, Kornman KS, Manwell MA, Jones AA, Newbold DA, Wood RC. Mechanism of irrigation effects on gingivitis. *J Periodontol* 1994; 65:1016-1021.
- Ciancio SG, Mather ML, Zambon JJ, Reynolds HS. Effect of a chemotherapeutic agent delivered by an oral irrigation device on plaque, gingivitis, and subgingival microflora. *J Periodontol* 1989; 60:310-315.
- Cobb CM, Rodgers RL, Killoy WJ. Ultrastructural examination of human periodontal pockets following the use of an oral irrigation device *in vivo*. *J Periodontol* 1988; 59:155-163.
- Cutler CW, Stanford TW, Abraham C, Cederberg RA, Boardman TJ, Ross C. Clinical benefits of oral irrigation for periodontitis are related to reduction of pro-inflammatory cytokine levels and plaque. *J Clin Periodontol* 2000; 27:134-143.
- Derdivanis JP, Bushmaker S, Dagenais F. Effects of a mouthwash in an irrigating device on accumulation and maturation of dental plaque. *J Periodontol* 1978; 49:81-84.
- Drisko CL, White CL, Killoy WJ, Mayberry WD. Comparison of dark-field microscopy and a flagella stain for monitoring the effect of a Water Pik on bacterial motility. *J Periodontol* 1987; 58:381-386.
- Eakle WS, Ford C, Boyd RL. Depth of penetration in to periodontal pockets with oral irrigation. *J Clin Periodontol* 1986; 13:39-44.
- Felix JE, Rosen S, App GR. Detection of bacteremia after the use of an oral irrigating device in subjects with periodontitis. *J Periodontol* 1971; 42:785-787.
- Felo A, Shibly O, Ciancio SG, Lauciello FR, HO A. Effects of subgingival chlorhexidine irrigation on peri-implant maintenance. *Am J Dent* 1997; 10:107-110.
- Fine JB, Harper DS, Gordon JM, Hovliaras CA, Charles CH. Short-term microbiological and clinical effects of subgingival irrigation with an antimicrobial mouth rinse. *J Periodontol* 1994; 65:30-36.
- Flemmig TF, Newman MG, Doherty FM, Grossman E, Meckel AH, Bakdash MB. Supragingival irrigation with 0.06% chlorhexidine in naturally occurring gingivitis. I. 6 month clinical observations. *J Periodontol* 1990; 61:112-117.
- Flemmig TF, Epp B, Funkenhauser Z et al. Adjunctive supragingival irrigation with acetylsalicylic acid in periodontal supportive therapy. *J Clin Periodontol* 1995; 22:427-433.
- Genovesi AM, Lorenzi C, Lyle DM, et al. Periodontal maintenance following scaling and root planing. A randomized single-center study comparing minocycline treatment and daily oral irrigation with water. *Minerva Stomatologica* 2013; 62(Suppl. 1 to No. 12):1-9.
- Gorur A, Lyle DM, Schaudinn C, Costerton JW. Biofilm removal with a dental water jet. *Compend Contin Ed Dent* 2009; 30 (Suppl 1):1-6.
- Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. The addition of a water flosser to power tooth brushing: effect on bleeding, gingivitis, and plaque. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23(2):57-63.
- Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Evaluation of the plaque removal efficacy of a water flosser compared to string floss in adults after a single use. *J Clin Dent* 2013; 24(2):37-42.
- Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Efficacy of two interdental cleaning devices on clinical signs of inflammation: a four-week randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Dent* 2015; 26:55-60.
- Goyal CR, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Comparison of water flosser and interdental brush on reduction of gingival bleeding and plaque: a randomized controlled pilot study. *J Clin Dent* 2016; 27:61-65.
- Hoover DR, Robinson HBG. The comparative effectiveness of a pulsating oral irrigator as an adjunct in maintaining oral health. *J Periodontol* 1971; 42:37-39.
- Hugoson A. Effect of the Water Pik device on plaque accumulation and development of gingivitis. *J Clin Periodontol* 1978; 5:95-104.
- Hurst JE, Madonia JV. The effect of an oral irrigating device on the oral hygiene of orthodontic patients. *JADA* 1970; 81:678-683.
- Jolkovsky DL, Waki MY, Newman MG et al. Clinical and microbiological effects of subgingival and gingival marginal irrigation with chlorhexidine gluconate. *J Periodontol* 1990; 61:663-669.
- Kancir SL, Krajewski JJ. The relation of water pressure cleansing to the reticulo-endothelial system. *J Periodontol* 1972; 43(11):696-698.
- Kozam G. The effect of hydro massage on capillary strength. *NYSJD* 1973; 39:551-559.
- Krajewski J, Giblin J, Gargiulo AW. Evaluation of a water pressure cleaning device as an adjunct to periodontal treatment. *Periodontics* 1964; 2:76-78.
- Lainson PA, Bergquist JJ, Fraleigh CM. A longitudinal study of pulsating water pressure cleansing devices. *J Periodontol* 1972; 43:444-446.
- Lang NP, Raber K. Use of oral irrigators as vehicle for the application of antimicrobial agents in chemical plaque control. *J Clin Periodontol* 1981; 8(3):177-188.
- Larner JR, Greenstein G. Effect of calculus and irrigator tip design on depth of subgingival irrigation. *Int J Periodontics Res Dent* 1993; 13:289-297.
- Lobene RR. The effect of a pulsed water pressure cleansing device on oral health. *J Periodontol* 1969; 40:667-670.
- Lugassy AA, Lautenschlager EP, Katrina D. Characterization of water spray devices. *J Dent Res* 1971; 50(2):466-473.
- Lyle DM, Goyal CR, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Comparison of water flosser and interdental brush on plaque removal: a single-use pilot study. *J Clin Dent* 2016; 27:23-26.
- Magnuson B, Harsono M, Stark PC, Lyle D, Kugel G, Perry R. Comparison of the effect of two interdental cleaning devices around implants on the reduction of bleeding: A 30-day randomized clinical trial. *Compend of Contin Ed in Dent* 2013; 34(Special Issue 8):2-7.
- Manhold JH, Vogel RI, Manhold EA. Carbon penetration of gingival tissue by oral irrigating devices. *J Prev Dent* 1978; 5:3-6.
- McDevitt MJ, Eames WB. Attrition of dental restorations by a pulsating water device. *Virginia Dent J* 1971; 48(1):6-10.
- Newman MG, Cattabriga M, Etienne D et al. Effectiveness of adjunctive irrigation in early periodontitis: Multi-center evaluation. *J Periodontol* 1994; 65:224-229.
- Newman MG, Flemmig RF, Nachnani S et al. Irrigation with 0.06% chlorhexidine in naturally occurring gingivitis. II. 6-month microbiological observations. *J Periodontol* 1990; 61:427-433.
- O'Leary TJ, Shafer WG, Swenson HM, Nesler DC, Van Dorn PR. Possible penetration of crevicular tissue from oral hygiene procedures. I. *J Periodontol* 1970; 41:158-162.
- Oshrain RL, Fiorello LA, Harper DS, Lamster IB. Oral irrigation devices: A clinical evaluation. *J Dent Hyg* 1987; 61:551-555.
- Peterson WA, Shiller WR. Unsupervised use of a water spray device by naval personnel. *J Periodontol* 1968; 39(6):335-337.
- Phelps-Sandall BA, Oxford SJ. Effectiveness of oral hygiene techniques on plaque and gingivitis in patients placed in intermaxillary fixation. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1983; 56:487-490.
- Pistorius A, Willershausen B, Steinmeier EM, Kreisler M. Efficacy of subgingival irrigation using herbal extracts on gingival inflammation. *J Periodontol* 2003; 74(5):616-622.
- Romans AR, App GR. Bacteremia, a result from oral irrigation in subjects with gingivitis. *J Periodontol* 1971; 42:757-760.
- Rosema NAM, Hennequin-Hoenderdos NL, Berchier CE, Slot DE, Lyle DM, Van der Weijden GA. The effect of different interdental cleaning devices on gingival bleeding. *J Int Acad Periodontol* 2011; 13(1):2-10.
- Sander PC, Linden GJ, Newman HN. The effects of a simplified mechanical oral hygiene regime plus supragingival irrigation with chlorhexidine or metronidazole on subgingival plaque. *J Clin Periodontol* 1986; 13:237-242.
- Selting WJ, Bhaskar SN, Mueller RP. Water jet direction and periodontal pocket debritement. *J Periodontol* 1972; 43:569-572.
- Sharma NC, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Comparison of two power interdental cleaning devices on plaque removal. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23(1): 17-21.
- Sharma NC, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Schuller R. Comparison of two power interdental cleaning devices on the reduction of gingivitis. *J Clin Dent* 2012; 23(1): 22-26.
- Sharma NC, Lyle DM, Qaqish JG, Galustians J, Schuller R. Effect of a dental water jet with orthodontic tip on plaque and bleeding in adolescent patients with fixed orthodontic appliances. *Am J Ortho Dentofacial Orthop* 2008; 133(4):565-571.
- Tamimi HA, Thomassen PR, Moser EH. Bacteremia study using a water irrigation device. *J Periodontol* 1969; 40:4-6.
- Tawakoli PN, Sauer B, Becker K, Buchalla W, Attin T. Interproximal biofilm removal by intervallic use of a sonic toothbrush compared to an oral irrigation system. *BMC Oral Health* 2015; 15:91.
- Tempel TR, Marcil JFA, Siebert JS. Comparison of water irrigation and oral rinsing on clearance of soluble and particulate materials from the oral cavity. *J Periodontol* 1975; 46:391-396.
- Waki MY, Jolkovsky DL, Otomo-Corgel J et al. Effects of subgingival irrigation on bacteremia following scaling and root planing. *J Periodontol* 1990; 61:405-411.
- Walsh TF, Glenwright HD, Hull PS. Clinical effects of pulsed oral irrigation with 0.2% chlorhexidine digluconate in patients with adult periodontitis. *J Clin Periodontol* 1992; 19:245-248.
- Wolff LF, Bakdash MB, Pihlstrom BL, Bandt CL, Aeppli DM. The effect of professional and home subgingival irrigation with antimicrobial agents on gingivitis and early periodontitis. *J Dent Hyg* 1989; 63: 222-225, 241.

Additional Reading

- Lyle DM. Changing our long-held beliefs about floss. *Int J Evid Based Pract Dent Hyg* 2016;2(4):214-219.
- Jolkovsky DL, Lyle DM. Safety of a Water Flosser. A literature review. *Compend Cont Ed Dent* 2015; 36(2):2-5.
- Lyle DM. Current evidence on primary prevention of periodontitis: self-care management of gingivitis. *Int J Evid Based Pract Dent Hyg* 2015;1(2):86-91.