

# ASSESSMENT OF THE ANTIMICROBIAL EFFICACY AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF GLASS IONOMER CEMENT (GIC) INCORPORATING SILVER NANOPARTICLES IN VARYING CONCENTRATIONS FOR PEDIATRIC DENTAL APPLICATIONS

<sup>1</sup>Dr Soumya Rajan, <sup>2</sup>B Muralikrishnan, <sup>3</sup>Anjali S, <sup>4</sup>Amla Prasad S, <sup>5</sup>Dharmmya RK, <sup>6</sup>Gayathry L S

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Dept of pediatric and preventive dentistry, Sri Sankara Dental College

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Pediatric and preventive dentistry, Annoor dental college

<sup>3</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Pediatric and preventive dentistry, Sri Sankara Dental College

<sup>4</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Pediatric and preventive dentistry, Sri Sankara Dental College

<sup>5</sup>Post graduate student, department of pediatric and preventive dentistry, Sri Sankara Dental College

<sup>6</sup>Post graduate student, department of pediatric and preventive dentistry, Sri Sankara Dental College

## ABSTRACT

**Background and Objectives-** Although Glass Ionomer Cement (GIC) is a commonly utilized restorative material, it loses its antimicrobial effectiveness with time. To evaluate the antimicrobial property, Flexural Strength (FS) and Surface Micro Hardness (SMH) of GIC added with silver vanadate (AgVO<sub>3</sub>) nanoparticles.

**Methods-** This study was performed in the Department of Pedodontics at Sri Sankara Dental College. The study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee. Considering the methodology of the study conducted by Jowkar Z et al., (2019). Using SPSS (Version 24.0) software for power analysis indicated the required total of 50 samples. The number of samples to evaluate antimicrobial property was 26, and 12 samples each to test FS (Flexural Strength): and SMH (Surface Micro-Hardness).

**Results-** The modified groups exhibited higher antimicrobial activity compared to the unmodified group. Group 4 exhibited the highest antimicrobial activity (27.65±1.10 mm) followed by Group 3 (24.32±0.69 mm) and Group 2 (20.30±1.21 mm). Group 1 (unmodified GIC) exhibited the least antimicrobial property with a mean zone of inhibition of 15.60±1.20 mm. One-way ANOVA showed a significant difference (p=0.01) between the groups. GIC added with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Group 4) exhibited higher FS with a mean of 47.62±10.10 MPa than the unmodified GIC (Group 1)

**Conclusion-** Type II GIC with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticle addition demonstrated increased FS and SMH in addition to greater antibacterial properties.

**KEYWORDS:** Glass Ionomer Cement (GIC), Flexural strength, Surface microhardness, silver nanoparticles, anti-microbial properties.

## INTRODUCTION

The field of restorative care for children and adolescents is always changing. Silicate cement was the tooth-colored restorative material of choice in the 1950s and early 1960s. Its advantageous qualities are ascribed to the fluoride found in silicate cement powder. But with time, GIC took the place of these cements because of their high acidity, high solubility in oral fluids, poor mechanical qualities, gradual discoloration, and inadequate adhesive bond between the restoration and the tooth [1]. Because it has anticariogenic properties, leaches away fluoride ions, and forms a chemical link with hard tissues, GIC is a commonly used tooth-colored restorative material in pediatric dentistry [1,2]. Nevertheless, a few characteristics of GIC restrict its broad application as a therapeutic substance. It is demonstrated to have poor physical and mechanical qualities, such as low hardness and fracture strength, decreased wear resistance, and opaqueness. GICs have undergone numerous changes since their introduction in an effort to enhance their mechanical, physical, and chemical properties [3,4].

Among the hardest metals, vanadium exhibits good corrosion resistance. In the medical field, implantable devices such as cardioverter defibrillators, neurotransmitters, artificial external defibrillators (AEDs), and drug infusion devices are made using vanadium added to silver since it has been shown to be biocompatible and antibacterial. Biomedical applications can arise from the modification of vanadium oxide nanostructures using silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) [5]. AgVO<sub>3</sub> was added to acrylic dentures to increase their antibacterial activity without changing their mechanical characteristics [6]. Without significantly altering its physico-chemical characteristics, it was shown that adding it to endodontic sealers enhanced its antibacterial activity [7].

This study was designed to add AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles to Type II GIC in order to enhance its antibacterial property because of its positive benefits. The literature search turned up no evidence of prior attempts of this kind, nor of its impact on the cement's mechanical characteristics. Therefore, the purpose of this work was to assess the mechanical and antibacterial qualities of GIC that had been supplemented with AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles for pediatric dental applications.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was performed in the Department of Pedodontics at Sri Sankara Dental College. The study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee. Considering the methodology of the study conducted by Jowkar Z et al., (2019) [8]. Using SPSS (Version 24.0) software for power analysis indicated the required total of 50 samples. The number of samples to evaluate antimicrobial property was 26, and 12 samples each to test FS (Flexural Strength): and SMH (Surface Micro-Hardness).

## METHODOLOGY

Previous research incorporating AgVO<sub>3</sub> into resins demonstrated that FS reduced as AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticle concentration increased but SMH remained same. Additionally, the maximum concentration of AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles in the current investigation was restricted to 2% due to the fact that an increase in AgVO<sub>3</sub> percentage causes agglomeration of nanoparticles [6]. To generate 0.5%, 1%, and 2% w/w concentration AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles, respectively, 1.8 g of GIC (GC Type II cement, Tokyo, Japan) powder was mixed with 4 mg, 8 mg, and 16 mg of AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Nano Elements sub-branch of Sigma Aldrich, Germany) [6,9].

The altered GIC was worked with in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and put into rectangular glass molds measuring 25 x 2 x 2 mm and spherical glass molds with a diameter of 10 mm and a thickness of 2 mm. On either side, the modified GIC was covered with a thin glass slide. After four minutes of initial setting, the specimens were taken out of the mold. After that, the samples were kept for a full day at 37°C in distilled water. The altered GIC was worked with in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and put into rectangular glass molds measuring 25 x 2 x 2 mm and spherical glass molds with a diameter of 10 mm and a thickness of 2 mm. The antimicrobial property was evaluated using disk diffusion in a direct contact method. Unmodified GIC (Type II GIC) served as a control group and considered as

**Group 1:** Twenty- six spherical disks of GIC (10 mm diameter and 2 mm thickness),

**Group 2:** Six samples of each concentration of AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles were prepared and grouped as Group 2 (GIC with 0.5% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub>),

**Group 3:** GIC with 1.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> and

**Group 4:** GIC with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub>.

To eliminate moisture, the specimens were heated to 60°C in a hot air oven for one hour. The mutans strain from the grass culture was kept in PBS before being poured onto solidified agar petriplates using the pour plate technique. Digital Vernier callipers with an accuracy of 0.001 were used to measure these zones. Only the addition of 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> was utilized to assess the FS and SMH because this concentration demonstrated the maximum antibacterial efficiency [7,8].

For flexural strength- A computerized universal testing machine (Instron 8801, United Kingdom) was used to measure the FS utilizing a 3-point bending test at a crosshead speed of 1 mm/minute. 14 rectangular specimens, each measuring 25 by 2 by 2 mm, were prepared: 7 samples of GIC containing 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Group 4) and 7 samples of GIC that had not been altered (Group 1). After mounting the test specimen and applying load until it cracked, the FS was calculated in Megapascal (MPa) units [8].

For Surface Micro- Hardness- Vickers' micro-hardness tester (Daksh Quality Systems Pvt., Ltd., India) was used to evaluate SMH. A diamond indenter was used, and the load was set to 25 gm for 15 seconds of dwell time. To assess SMH, fourteen spherical specimens with dimensions of 10 mm in diameter and 2 mm in thickness were created, seven from unmodified GIC (Group 1) and seven from 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Group 4). For every specimen, a total of five indentations were made at various locations; the mean hardness values of these five indentations were calculated as VHN [9].

## Statistical Analysis

The obtained data were subjected to statistical analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 24.0. Quantitative variables were compared using ANOVA as the data sets were normally distributed between the groups. An unpaired t-test was used to compare the data between the two groups for FS and SMH. A p-value of ≤0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## RESULTS

**Table 1- Mean values comparison among groups based on Inhibition zones (mm)**

| Groups | Mean±SD    | p-value |
|--------|------------|---------|
| 1      | 15.60±1.20 | 0.01*   |
| 2      | 20.30±1.21 |         |
| 3      | 24.32±0.69 |         |
| 4      | 27.65±1.10 |         |

As per table 1 the mean values of inhibition zones (mm) between the groups are given in. The modified groups exhibited higher antimicrobial activity compared to the unmodified group. Group 4 exhibited the highest antimicrobial activity (27.65±1.10 mm) followed by Group 3 (24.32±0.69 mm) and Group 2 (20.30±1.21 mm).

Group 1 (unmodified GIC) exhibited the least antimicrobial property with a mean zone of inhibition of  $15.60 \pm 1.20$  mm. One-way ANOVA showed a significant difference ( $p=0.01$ ) between the groups.

**Table 2- Pair-wise comparison of zones of inhibition (mm) between the groups.**

| Groups comparison |       | Mean $\pm$ SD                                     | p-value      |
|-------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1                 | 2,3,4 | 4.5 $\pm$ 0.54, 8.40 $\pm$ 0.54, 11.61 $\pm$ 0.54 | <b>0.01*</b> |
| 2                 | 3,4   | 4.50 $\pm$ 0.54, 3.86 $\pm$ 0.54                  | <b>0.01*</b> |
| 3                 | 4     | 7.10 $\pm$ 0.54                                   | <b>0.01*</b> |

As per table 2 pair wise comparison among groups shows significant difference in the formation of inhibition zones in all groups.

**Table 3- Comparison of Mean Flexural Strength among groups**

| Groups | Mean $\pm$ SD     | p-value      |
|--------|-------------------|--------------|
| 1      | 26.88 $\pm$ 8.62  | <b>0.01*</b> |
| 4      | 47.62 $\pm$ 10.10 |              |

As per table 3 GIC added with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Group 4) exhibited higher FS with a mean of 47.62 $\pm$ 10.10 MPa than the unmodified GIC (Group 1). A statistically significant difference ( $p=0.01$ ) in mean FS was observed between the two groups.

**Table 4- Comparison of Surface Micro hardness among groups**

| Groups | Mean $\pm$ SD    | p-value      |
|--------|------------------|--------------|
| 1      | 49.46 $\pm$ 0.76 | <b>0.01*</b> |
| 4      | 61.28 $\pm$ 2.54 |              |

As per table 4 GIC added with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles (Group 4) exhibited higher SMH with a mean of 61.26 $\pm$ 2.54 VHN than the unmodified GIC (Group 1), and showed a statistically significant difference ( $p=0.01$ ) in SMH between the two groups.

## DISCUSSION

In the current work, it was found that, in comparison to standard GIC, GIC combined with AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles displayed improved mechanical and antibacterial capabilities. However, because of their subpar physical characteristics, secondary caries have been documented to occur. Additionally, the fluoride release characteristic is not long-lasting and is not strong enough to inhibit bacteria [1]. The antibacterial activities of GICs were found to be enhanced by the addition of theobromine [10], polymers (2-methacryloxytroponones, Epigallocatechin-3-gallate (EGCG), sodium fusidate, triclosan, furanone, poly quaternary ammonium salts) [3,11], metals (Zinc, strontium, bioglass) [12].

It has been demonstrated that adding TiO<sub>2</sub>, ZnO, and hydroxyapatite nanoparticles to the GIC enhances both its mechanical and anticariogenic qualities. Stainless steel nanopowder added to GIC demonstrated enhanced mechanical characteristics [13]. Agglomeration of silver nanoparticles was a prevalent issue, despite the fact that adding AgNPs to GIC increased its antibacterial capabilities. Silver vanadate (AgVO<sub>3</sub>) nanoparticles were created as a solution to this problem. AgVO<sub>3</sub> serves as an AgNP carrier and lessens AgNP loss due to leaching [6].

This study made it clear that the quantity of AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles introduced directly correlated with antibacterial activity. The antibacterial activity of GIC with 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles was highest, followed by 1.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> and 0.5%. It is appropriate to note that both fluoride release and silver must have contributed to antimicrobial activity since the modified GIC samples with AgVO<sub>3</sub> shown the higher antibacterial property [14]. Fluoride ion release suppresses microbial growth, metabolism, and plaque formation [15]. Other theories include the replication of bacterial DNA by active silver ions, the structural damage caused by oxygen free radicals generated by silver, and other chemicals containing phosphorus [16].

The mechanical characteristics of the cement may be affected by the size, density, and enclosed voids of the GIC powder particles. Higher mechanical characteristics are produced by filler particles of smaller sizes because they occupy more of the vacant areas between glass ionomer particles [17]. However, the addition of a larger concentration of nanoparticles resulted in a decrease in the cement's mechanical qualities. A high powder/liquid ratio that results in a dry mix, insufficient wetting of the matrix and filler bond, and overcrowding of filler particles could all be to blame [18]. In the current study, samples with higher concentrations of AgVO<sub>3</sub> showed higher FS and SMH in addition to higher levels of antibacterial activity.

The SMH measures a material's resistance to piercing or indentation. AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles were added to resins at different doses (0.5, 1, 2.5, 5, and 10) but there was no change in SMH of the resins. Nevertheless, FS dropped when more than 1% AgVO<sub>3</sub> was added. Although it may not be optimal for promoting antibacterial activity, the lower concentration of AgVO<sub>3</sub> in acrylic resins may be perfect for obtaining the mechanical qualities. It has been demonstrated that adding more AgVO<sub>3</sub> at higher concentrations improves antibacterial action while keeping SMH values constant [18].

## CONCLUSION

When AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles were introduced to Type II GIC, it showed better mechanical and antibacterial qualities than the original. FS and SMH were higher in samples containing 2.0% w/w AgVO<sub>3</sub> than in samples containing the other amounts under investigation. In the field of pediatric restorative dentistry, GIC with prolonged antibacterial activity and enhanced mechanical and physical qualities is preferred. The characteristics of GIC were enhanced by the inclusion of AgVO<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles. However, such a change should be validated in vitro for biocompatibility as well as other mechanical and physical qualities before to being used clinically.

**Source of Funding-** None

**Conflict of Interest-** None declared

## REFERENCES

1. El-Negoly SA, El-Fallal AA, El-Sherbiny IM. A new modification for improving [3]shear bond strength and other mechanical properties of conventional glass-ionomer restorative materials. *J Adhes Dent*. 2014;1(1):41-47.
2. Hu J, Du X, Huang C, Fu D, Ouyang X, Wang Y. Antibacterial and physical properties of EGCG-containing glass ionomer cements. *J Dent*. 2019;41(10):927-34.
3. Agrawal S, Bhatt M, Rai SK, Bhatt A, Dangwal P, Agrawal PK. Silver nanoparticles and its potential applications: A review. *J Pharmacogn Phytochem*. 2018;7(2):930-37.
4. Kreve S, Oliveira VC, Bachmann L, Alves OL, Reis ACD. Influence of AgVO<sub>3</sub> incorporation on antimicrobial properties, hardness, roughness and adhesion of a soft denture liner. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):11889.
5. Teixeira ABV, Vidal CL, de Castro DT, de Oliveira-Santos C, Schiavon MA, Dos Reis AC. Incorporating antimicrobial nanomaterial and its effect on the antimicrobial activity, flow and radiopacity of endodontic sealers. *Eur Endod J*. 2017;2(1):01-06.
6. Castro de DT, Valente ML, da Silva CH, Watanabe E, Siqueira RL, Schiavon MA, et al. Evaluation of antibiofilm and mechanical properties of new nanocomposites based on acrylic resins and silver vanadate nanoparticles. *Arch Oral Biol*. 2016;67:46-53.
7. Garcia-Contreras R, Scougall-Vilchis RJ, Contreras-Bulnes R, Sakagami H, Morales-Luckie RA et al. Mechanical, antibacterial and bond strength properties of nano-titanium-enriched glass ionomer cement. *J Appl Oral Sci*. 2015;23(3):321-28.
8. Jowkar Z, Jowkar M, Shafiei F. Mechanical and dentin bond strength properties of the nanosilver enriched glass ionomer cement. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2019;113(3):e275-81.
9. Hafshejani TM, Zamanian A, Venugopal JR, Rezvani Z, Sefat F, Saeb MR, et al. Antibacterial glass-ionomer cement restorative materials: A critical review on the current status of extended release formulations. *J Control Release*. 2018;262(1):317-28.
10. Paulraj J, Nagar P. Antimicrobial efficacy of Triphala and propolis-modified glass ionomer cement: An in-vitro study. *Int J Clin Pediatr Dent*. 2020;13(5):457-62
11. El-Tatari A, de Soet JJ, de Gee AJ, Abou Shelib M, van Amerongen WE. Influence of *Salvadora persica* (miswak) extract on physical and antimicrobial properties of glass ionomer cement. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent*. 2011;12(1):22-25.
12. Prabhakar AR, Yavagal Chandrashekar M, Karuna YM, Mythri P. Effect of turmeric incorporation on fluoride release, antibacterial activity and physical properties of glass ionomer cement. An in-vitro comparative study. *IJAM*. 2014;5(1):91-101.
13. Mishra A, Pandey RK, Manickam N. Antibacterial effect and physical properties of chitosan and chlorhexidine-cetrimide-modified glass ionomer cements. *J Indian Soc Pedod Prev Dent*. 2017;35(1):28-33.
14. Mohamed Hamouda I. Current perspectives of nanoparticles in medical and dental biomaterials. *J Biomed Res*. 2012;26(3):143-51.
15. Bruna T, Maldonado-Bravo F, Jara P, Caro N. Silver nanoparticles and their antibacterial applications. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2021;22(13):7202.
16. Marquis RE. Antimicrobial actions of fluoride for oral bacteria. *Can J Microbiol*. 1995;41(11):955-64.
17. Wang L, Hu C, Shao L. The antimicrobial activity of nanoparticles: Present situation and prospects for the future. *Int J Nanomedicine*. 2017;12:1227-49.
18. Yin IX, Zhang J, Zhao IS, Mei ML, Li Q, Chu CH. The antibacterial mechanism of silver nanoparticles and its application in dentistry. *Int J Nanomedicine*. 2020;15:2555-62.