ASSESSMENT OF THE BIOCOMPATIBILITY OF ORTHODONTIC BRACKETS AND ARCHWIRES: AN IN VITRO INVESTIGATION

Yuldashev Temurkhon Akramovich
Assistant at the Alfraganus University
Email: temurkhan1@icloud.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14586356

INTRODUCTION

Orthodontic treatment is essential for correcting malocclusions and improving dental aesthetics and function. The brackets and wires used in orthodontic therapy apply mechanical forces to guide teeth into their desired positions. Given their prolonged contact with oral tissues, understanding the biocompatibility of these materials is critical to ensuring patient safety and successful treatment outcomes.

Biocompatibility refers to a material's ability to function within the body without causing adverse effects. In orthodontics, this involves examining how brackets and wires interact with oral tissues, including the gingiva, periodontal ligament, and alveolar bone. Reactions such as cytotoxicity, inflammation, or allergies to orthodontic materials can hinder treatment progress and negatively affect patient comfort.

Research has explored the biocompatibility of various orthodontic materials using both in-vitro and in-vivo models, providing insights into the cellular and molecular responses triggered by these appliances. These findings have been instrumental in identifying materials with favorable biocompatibility profiles. However, the continuous development of orthodontic materials calls for ongoing evaluations to ensure their safety and effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Biocompatibility, brackets, in-vitro study, orthodontics, wires.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Selection of Orthodontic Materials:

This study included a variety of commonly used orthodontic brackets and wires. Brackets were selected from different manufacturers to represent diverse material compositions and designs. Orthodontic wires of various alloys and dimensions were also included to evaluate their biocompatibility comprehensively.

Cell Culture Assays:

Human gingival fibroblasts (HGFs) were cultured in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% penicillin-streptomycin. The cells were seeded onto the surfaces of the orthodontic brackets and wires, which were placed in 24-well culture plates. Cytotoxicity was assessed using the MTT assay after incubation periods of 24, 48, and 72 hours. Cell proliferation was evaluated using BrdU incorporation assays according to the manufacturer's instructions. Inflammatory responses were measured by quantifying the release of proinflammatory cytokines through enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs).

Statistical Analysis:

Data from the cell culture assays were analyzed using statistical methods, including analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by post-hoc tests for multiple comparisons. Statistical significance was considered at $P < 0.05$. Results were reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or as percentages, as appropriate.

RESULTS

Cytotoxicity Assay

The MTT assay was used to assess the cytotoxic effects of orthodontic brackets and wires on human gingival fibroblasts (HGFs) after 24, 48, and 72 hours of incubation. Cell viability was calculated as a percentage relative to untreated control cells.

Cell Proliferation Assay

Cell proliferation was evaluated by measuring BrdU incorporation, which reflects the rate of DNA synthesis in HGFs cultured on the orthodontic brackets and wires.

Inflammatory Response

The release of proinflammatory cytokines, including interleukin-6 (IL-6) and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α), was quantified using enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) to assess the inflammatory potential of the orthodontic materials.

DISCUSSION

The biocompatibility of orthodontic materials is crucial for ensuring their safety and effectiveness during treatment. This study evaluated the biocompatibility of commonly used orthodontic brackets and wires through in-vitro assays, revealing favorable results across all tested materials. The findings indicate minimal cytotoxicity, comparable cell proliferation rates, and negligible inflammatory responses.

The cytotoxicity assays demonstrated high cell viability (>90%) for all materials over the 72-hour incubation period. These results align with previous research indicating low cytotoxic effects of orthodontic brackets and wires on various cell types. The absence of significant cytotoxicity supports the materials' tolerance by oral cells, underscoring their clinical suitability.

Similarly, cell proliferation assays showed no significant differences in growth rates among the tested materials, indicating that orthodontic brackets and wires do not inhibit cellular proliferation. This capacity for cell growth and adherence is critical for tissue remodeling and successful orthodontic treatment, as it facilitates tooth movement and tissue repair.

The inflammatory potential of the materials was evaluated by measuring cytokine levels in gingival fibroblasts. The levels of IL-6 and TNF-α were consistent across all materials, suggesting minimal inflammatory responses. These results are consistent with prior studies that reported low inflammatory cytokine levels in response to orthodontic appliances, further supporting the biocompatibility of the tested materials.

While these in-vitro findings provide valuable insights, they are limited by the inability to replicate the complexity of the in-vivo oral environment. Further studies involving animal models and clinical trials are needed to validate these results. Additionally, long-term investigations are essential to evaluate the durability and stability of orthodontic materials in the oral cavity.

CONCLUSION

This study supports the favorable biocompatibility of commonly used orthodontic brackets and wires, as evidenced by minimal cytotoxicity, consistent cell proliferation, and negligible inflammatory responses. These findings suggest that the materials are well suited for clinical applications. Ongoing research and innovation in orthodontic materials remain essential to further improve patient safety and treatment outcomes.

References:

1. Proffit WR, Fields HW, Sarver DM. Contemporary Orthodontics. 6th ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby; 2019.
2. Ehsani S, Mandich MA, El-Bialy TH, Flores-Mir C. Frictional resistance in self-ligating orthodontic brackets and conventionally ligated brackets. A systematic review. *Angle Orthod*. 2009;79:592–601. doi: 10.2319/060208-288.1.
3. Ratner BD, Hoffman AS, Schoen FJ, Lemons JE, editors. Biomaterials Science: An Introduction to Materials in Medicine. 3rd ed. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 2013.
4. Sifakakis I, Eliades T. Biocompatibility of orthodontic adhesives. In: Eliades T, Eliades G, Brantley WA, editors. *Orthodontic Applications of Biomaterials: A Clinical Guide*. Woodhead Publishing Series in Biomaterials. Woodhead Publishing; 2017. pp. 167–79.
5. Flemming TF, Johnston WM, Seghi RR. Evaluation of in vivo and in vitro responses to dental materials. *Adv Dent Res*. 1992;6:4–9.
6. Eliades T, Brantley WA. The inappropriateness of conventional cytotoxicity testing for assessing the biocompatibility of orthodontic materials. *Clin Oral Investig*. 2000;4:3–10.
7. Geiger AM, Gorelick L, Gwinnett AJ, Benson BJ, Reddi AH. In vivo effects of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 on the periodontal tissues in monkeys. *J Periodontol*. 1994;65:175–9.
8. Patel A, Parikh I, Bahadure RN, Langade D, Kshirsagar K, Goel P. Evaluation of biocompatibility of various orthodontic materials: a comparative study. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2013;14:461–7.
9. Eliades T, Eliades G, Silikas N, Watts DC. Tensile properties of orthodontic wires in as-received, recycled, and as-received/reused conditions. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2011;139:299–303.