CLINICAL STUDIES - DR. BARMAN'S SUPERBRUSH

1. Moran Yitzhak, Saim Sarat, Meri Rakocz, Yaniv Yaish, Malka Askenazi, Tel Aviv University. Published in Spec Care Dentisy 33(1):20-27, 2013. «The effect of toothbrush design on the ability of nurses to brush the teeth of institutionalized cerebral palsy patients». Conclusion: Brushing by nurses of cerebral palsy patients was more effective and instruction better retained with a triple-headed compared to single-headed toothbrush.


3. Liran Levin University of Haifa, Yael Marom Univ of Haifa, Malka Ashkenaz Univ of Tel Aviv. Published in Quintessence Int. Volume 43, No 6, 2012. “Brushing skills and plaque reduction using single- and triple-headed toothbrushes”. Evaluations of the effect of toothbrush design on brushing skills and plaque removal among young healthy adults. Conclusion: The triple headed toothbrush was found to promote easier toothbrushing and plaque removal both before and after receiving toothbrushing instructions.

4. Miolin I, Kulik EM, Weber C, Meyer J, University of Basel. “Clinical effectiveness of two different toothbrushes in the elderly”. 34 elderly people aged 65 and over participated in study. Conclusion: The overall plaque removal was similar for the Superbrush, The Elmex InterX and the patients’ own toothbrushes. However, at the oral surfaces of the teeth, Superbrush was significantly more effective than the other toothbrushes. No or only small differences were found for other surfaces (posterior and front teeth and facial surfaces).

5. Zvi Rafe, A.Vardimon, Malka Ashkenazi, University of Tel-Aviv. “Comparative study of 3 types of toothbrushes in patients with fixed orthodontic appliances” American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics Volume 130, no. 1/2006. Conclusion: Superbrush was significantly more effective than the other toothbrushes in plaque removal and in improving the gingival health of patients with orthodontic fixed appliances.

6. I Kasche, J Klaus-Roland and A Zeller, Universitätmedizin Berlin Charité, Berlin. “The effectiveness of different toothbrushes for people with special needs. Journal of Disability and Oral Health (2005) 6/2-00-00. Conclusion: Superbrush performed better for those adults who required help, some or total, to brush their teeth. Superbrush can thus be recommended for brushing in these groups on the basis of the results.

7. Dogan Mc, Alacam A, Asici N, Odabas M, Seydaoglu G. at University of Cukurova, Adana, Turkey. “Clinical evaluation of the plaque-removing ability of three different toothbrushes in a mentally disabled group” 15 children aged 6-12 and 15 children aged 13-18 with mild mental disabilities participated. The Braun 3D was more effective in removing plaque (means of QHI: 1.54) compared to the other brushes 1,77 (Superbrush) and 2.15 (CrossAction). The study indicated that the electric toothbrush is the most effective for removing dental plaque in mentally disabled children, whereas the Superbrush is a good alternative.
8. Azrak B, B. Barfaraz, G. Krieter, Willershausen B at Gutenberg University of Mainz, Germany: “Effectiveness of a three-headed toothbrush in pre-school children”. Journal of Oral Health and Preventive Dentistry, 2/2004. 29 children aged 4-5 years were participating in the comparable study. Results: The study shows that the ability of removing plaque is far better with Superbrush compared to a conventional toothbrush for children. It also concludes that Superbrush simplifies oral hygiene for children.

9. Kargül B, Ergeneli S, Aydin Y, Caglar E, Kabalay U “Clinical evaluation of plaque removal with a new triple head toothbrush in children.” Poster presentation at EAPD Congress in Dublin 2002. Marmara University, Istanbul. 25 children from 6-13 years of age brushed with Superbrush for 90 sec. Conclusion: The study indicates that Superbrush may be an effective alternative to commonly used toothbrushes for children. However, the easiness of manipulating this newly designed toothbrush renders it a useful tool for children. It will help to establish reliable habits for oral self-care at an early age.

10. Fukai T, Matumoto, Goshima H et al.: “A study on the Effects of Toothbrushes on gingivitis in Elementary School Children”. Meikai Univ. Dental J 29 (2). 231-237. 2000. Meikai University, Tokyo/Japan. The study was conducted to see the effects on Gingivitis when using Superbrush compared to a conventional brush. The results of this study suggested that Superbrush was more effective than a conventional brush in improving Gingivitis in elementary school children.

11. Zimmer S, Diedner B, Roulet J F: “Clinical study on the plaque removing ability of a new triple-headed toothbrush.” Journal of Clinical Periodontology (Munksgaard) 1999, 26, 281-285. Humbolt University Berlin Germany. A clinical research was performed to study Superbrush’s ability to remove plaque. 3 groups of children, adults and dental students brushed in turns with Superbrush, Elmex (conventional brush) and Braun’s electric toothbrush. The results showed that Superbrush removed significantly more plaque than the other two toothbrushes.

12. Bloch-Zupan A, Maniere M C “Une nouvelle brosse à trois têtes; étude comparative chez l’enfant” Information Dentaire” no. 36, 04.10.96. Strasbourg University, France. The study showed that Superbrush removed more plaque than a conventional brush when used in 1 minutes among children form 4 to 15 years. Bleeding points were reduced and the children were happier with Superbrush than the conventional brush.

13. Müller-Bruchschwaiger, K: „Die richtige Zahnbürste für Ober-Osterreich? Report 1993 PGA (Verein für profylaktische Gesundheits Arbeiten) in Linz, Austria. The study showed that the children who had used Superbrush had a 20% lower plaque-score than the group using the control brush. The study also showed that Superbrush had significantly longer contact with the surfaces of the teeth. Further the study showed better improvement in gingivitis and that the children preferred Superbrush to the 5conventional brush. An analysis of the utilitarian value of the control brush and Superbrush was also conducted. The main goal was to find out which brush had an easy-to-learn and efficient technique to prevent caries and gingivitis, was able to reach all surfaces of the teeth in a relatively short time, and spread the agents in the toothpaste evenly. In spite of having a higher price, Superbrush excelled in this analysis. The study was published in “Rapport 1993” to the National Health Authorities and Health Insurance Office.
SURVEYS BASED ON INTERVIEWS:

1. Munday P “Summary Evaluation of an Oral Health Pack for parents and carers of children with physical, medical and learning disabilities. Evaluation report 1993. Dep. of Community Dental Health Kings Health Care, Kings College, University of London. 1500 families with handicapped children received “Oral Health Pack” with various oral hygiene products. Some weeks later a survey was conducted to register the families experiences with the remedies in the pack. The survey showed that nearly all parents and children preferred Superbrush to a normal brush.

2. Steenkiste M V “Wie beurteilen Eltern von Kindergarten eine dreiköpfige Zahnbürste beim nachputzen? Profylaxe Impuls, 6-12, 2001. Public Dental Health (Gesundheitsamt Rems-Murr-Kreis, Germany) 970 randomly picked families with children in 30 kindergartens, were given Supebrush for their children. Results from the survey showed that a majority of the arents found Superbrush more adequate for brushing their children’s teeth than a conventional brush.