

Author's Information

Dental Update invites submission of articles pertinent to general dental practice. Articles should be well-written, authoritative and fully illustrated. Manuscripts should be prepared following the Guidelines for Authors published in the April 2015 issue (*additional copies are available from the Editor on request*). Authors are advised to submit a synopsis before writing an article. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the editorial staff or the members of the Editorial Board. The journal is listed in *Index to Dental Literature*, *Current Opinion in Dentistry* & other databases.

Subscription Information

Full UK £162 | Digital Subscription £125
Retired GDP £89
Student UK Full £50 | Foundation Year £70
11 issues per year
Single copies £24 (NON UK £35)
Subscriptions cannot be refunded

For all changes of address and subscription enquiries please contact:

Dental Update Subscriptions
Mark Allen Group, Unit A 1-5, Dinton Business Park,
Catherine Ford Road, Dinton, Salisbury SP3 5HZ
Freephone: 0800 137201
Telephone: 01722 716997
Email: subscriptions@markallengroup.com

Managing Director: Stuart Thompson

Editor: Fiona Creagh

Production: Lisa Dunbar

Graphic Designer: Georgia Critoph-Evans

MA Dentistry Media

Part of **Mark Allen**

MARK ALLEN DENTISTRY MEDIA (LTD)
Unit 2, Riverview Business Park, Walnut Tree Close,
Guildford, Surrey GU1 4UX

Telephone: 01483 304944 | Fax: 01483 303191
Email: fiona.creagh@markallengroup.com
Website: www.dental-update.co.uk

Facebook: [@dentalupdateuk](https://www.facebook.com/dentalupdateuk)
Twitter: [@dentalupdateuk](https://twitter.com/dentalupdateuk)
Instagram: [@dentalupdatemag](https://www.instagram.com/dentalupdatemag)

Please read our privacy policy, by visiting
<http://privacypolicy.markallengroup.com>. This will
explain how we process, use & safeguard your data.



The Dental Faculty of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow offers its Fellows and Members *Dental Update* as an exclusive membership benefit.



DU ISSN 0305-5000



FJ Trevor Burke

(NOT) Seeing the light

I hope that readers enjoyed the excellent Dental Materials special issue, which included a comprehensive assessment of light curing by Steve Bonsor and Will Palin.¹ They recommended that 'members of the dental team using dental LCUs be aware of the potential damage to eyesight that these devices may present'. As a previous detached retina patient (which the surgeon suggested might be caused by me having looked at too many blue curing lights in the early days of research on the topic), I took their warnings on board. Another recent article on the subject² has also spelt out the risks on the potential hazards of using dental light curing units (LCUs), so it may be appropriate to add what that stated, given that a further article³ suggested that there may be considerable variations on dentists' safety awareness with regard to dental LCUs.

The comprehensive article by Richard Price's team² is worrying reading, given that it suggested a variety of hazards caused by bright blue lights, for example, soft tissue burns (therefore, do not shine the LCU directly on unprotected mucosa), but especially the 'blue light hazard' caused by high levels of blue light. This refers to the photochemical damage to the retina caused by short-wavelength electromagnetic radiation from 400 to 500 nm, with the most damaging being 420 to 455 nm, these being the wavelengths emitted by most dental LCUs. Additionally, blue light is all around us and is said to help regulate our circadian rhythms, with a report by the American Medical Association warning that blue light from LEDs in streetlamps can disrupt this.⁴ In the dental setting, bright white LED operating lights contain large amounts of blue light, and clinicians stare at brightly lit dental surfaces and metal instruments for hours each working day. Additionally, for clinicians using a microscope, ocular exposure to blue light may be enhanced unless appropriate filters are employed.⁵ The message, therefore, is very clear to all members of the chairside dental team: use appropriate eye protection, namely, orange goggles or glasses that are designed to protect against the wavelengths of light from dental LCUs.²

'Seeing the light' might also be taken to mean suddenly understanding something that one didn't previously understand. In this regard, there has been substantial discussion following publication of an article describing the treatment of moderate tooth wear by crowning anterior teeth.⁶ The contemporary view for treatment of tooth wear has been addressed in two previous Comments this year, with the 'evidence' being firmly in favour of the use of resin composite restorations placed at an increased occlusal vertical dimension. If I had not quoted sufficient articles on the topic, further (in my view) conclusive proof has been published in recent weeks by Dr Shamir Mehta and colleagues from King's College London and the University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands.⁷ They followed 34 patients with 'severe tooth wear' for 5.5 years (mean observation time being 39.7 months), with the patients receiving full-mouth rehabilitation using direct resin composite anterior and posterior restorations, the number of restorations totalling 1269 (in 676 anterior, 593 posterior teeth, with 700 in the maxillary arch and 569 in the mandibular arch). Restorations were placed at an increased occlusal vertical dimension based on an



Do more with digital

Are you already enjoying the benefits of digital dentistry with an intraoral scanner? Why not step into the world of digital printing with our free trial?

See the precision and quality that our 3D digital printing solutions provide by requesting your free sample today.

JUST EMAIL
info@dmg-dental.co.uk



estimation of the inter-occlusal space needed to permit the use of resin composite restorations in order to provide restoration of occlusal form. A 'lip generated smile design' was also used. Treatment was carried out over '3 to 5, 3-hour sessions' by five operators with experience in the technique. Failures were classified into Level 1 (severe deficiency), Level 2 (localized defects) and Level 3 (a restoration with small material chips). Restorations that required polishing were considered part of the required refurbishment, with the authors stating that patients were made aware of the need for these maintenance needs. At 5.5 years, 2.3% of restorations showed catastrophic (Level 1) failures, with molar restorations and anterior restorations requiring additional sessions for completion (which I took to mean probably more difficult or extensive restorations) being associated with significantly higher risk of failure. Level 2 (reparable) failures were 7.3%. The authors concluded (in my view correctly) that the failure rates justified the application of their approach for the medium-term management of patients with generalized severe tooth wear. For those who are sceptical of this treatment concept, I feel assured that this work demonstrates how adhesive techniques are of value in the treatment of severe tooth wear.

I recently attended a dental research meeting in Belgium, and it was refreshing to be at a 'live' meeting again. I had the opportunity to talk to dentists from around Europe, and while those may not be more than a convenience sample, it was clear that, in many countries, dental practice life had returned to something approaching the normal. In the UK, we are still awaiting definitive guidelines by our authorities on the level of PPE needed and the risk regarding a dental aerosol. Perhaps it is time that those who set the rules also 'saw the light' and provided the much-needed guidance that is long overdue?

Finally, I know that many readers have used Professor Samaranayake's COVID Commentary as their definitive up-to-date guide to matters related to COVID-19. We mentioned a few issues ago that this would appear in alternate issues, but our esteemed author has advised me that, as COVID becomes endemic in increasing numbers of countries, he will write a Commentary when there is something new to report.

References

1. Bonsor SJ, Palin WM. Let there be light: and there was light, but was it enough? A review of modern dental light curing. *Dent Update* 2021; **48**: 633–642.
2. Fluent MT, Ferracane JL, Mace JG *et al*. Shedding light on a potential hazard: dental light-curing units. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2019; **150**: 1051–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adaj.2019.08.012>.
3. Kopperud SE, Rukke HV, Kopperud HM, Bruzell EM. Light curing procedures – performance, knowledge level and safety awareness among dentists. *J Dent* 2017; **58**: 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2017.02.002>.
4. American Medical Association. AMA adopts guidance to reduce harm from high intensity street lights (press release). 2016. Available at: www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-adopts-guidance-reduce-harm-high-intensity-street-lights (accessed September 2021).
5. Michael R, Wegener A. Estimation of safe exposure time from an ophthalmic operating microscope with regard to ultraviolet radiation and blue-light hazards to the eye. *J Opt Soc Am A Opt Image Sci Vis* 2004; **21**: 1388–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1364/josaa.21.001388>.
6. Hassall D. Centric relation and increasing the occlusal vertical dimension: concepts and clinical techniques – part two. *Br Dent J* 2021; **230**: 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-2593-4>.
7. Mehta SB, Lima VP, Bronkhorst EM *et al*. Clinical performance of direct composite resin restorations in a full mouth rehabilitation for patients with severe tooth wear: 5.5-year results. *J Dent* 2021; **112**: 103743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103743>.