



Journal List > Int J Mol Sci > v.10(9); Sep 2009

Int J Mol Sci. 2009 September; 10(9): 3861–3899.
Published online 2009 September 4. doi: 10.3390/ijms10093861.

PMCID: PMC2769064

[Copyright](#) © 2009 by the authors; licensee Molecular Diversity Preservation International, Basel, Switzerland.

Molecular Toxicology of Substances Released from Resin-Based Dental Restorative Materials

Athina Bakopoulou,¹ Triantafillos Papadopoulos,^{2*} and Pavlos Garefis¹

¹Department of Fixed & Implant Prosthodontics, School of Dentistry, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 541 24, Greece; E-Mails: athinabakopoulou@hotmail.com (B.A.); Email: garefis@dent.auth.gr (G.P.)

²Department of Biomaterials, School of Dentistry, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, 115 27, Greece

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; E-Mail: trpapad@dent.uoa.gr (P.T.); Tel. +302-107-461-100; Fax: +302-107-461-306.

Received July 7, 2009; Revised August 24, 2009; Accepted September 2, 2009.

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).

Abstract

Resin-based dental restorative materials are extensively used today in dentistry. However, significant concerns still remain regarding their biocompatibility. For this reason, significant scientific effort has been focused on the determination of the molecular toxicology of substances released by these biomaterials, using several tools for risk assessment, including exposure assessment, hazard identification and dose-response analysis. These studies have shown that substances released by these materials can cause significant cytotoxic and genotoxic effects, leading to irreversible disturbance of basic cellular functions. The aim of this article is to review current knowledge related to dental composites' molecular toxicology and to give implications for possible improvements concerning their biocompatibility.

Keywords: dental composite resins, molecular toxicology, biocompatibility, biodegradation, cytotoxicity, genotoxicity

1. Introduction

The development and widespread use of new generations of resin-based dental restorative materials has allowed for the application of more conservative, esthetic and long lasting restorative techniques. These adhesive techniques are extensively used in a wide variety of applications in dentistry, including restorative procedures, prosthodontics, orthodontics and preventive dentistry, making resin-based composites

one of the most important groups of materials in dental practice. The main bulk of scientific and manufacturing effort during the past years has been focused on the improvement of the filler fraction of these materials, providing a great variety of new formulations in the micro- or nano-scale, in an attempt to improve their mechanical and esthetic properties. On the other hand, little improvement has been offered with respect to the resinous matrix of these materials, which is based in the majority of commercially available products on methacrylate monomers. Most of these products consist of a mixture of various methacrylate monomers, such as BisGMA (2,2-bis[4-(2-hydroxy-3-methacryloxypropoxy)phenyl]propane) and UDMA (urethane dimethacrylate) in combination with comonomers of lower viscosity, such as TEGDMA (triethyleneglycol dimethacrylate), EGDMA (ethyleneglycol dimethacrylate) or DEGDMA (diethyleneglycol dimethacrylate) [1–3]. These methacrylate monomers, polymerized through radical chain polymerisation, are responsible for major clinical disadvantages, such as polymerization shrinkage of the composites, leading to microleakage phenomena in the tooth-material interface [4,5], as well as adverse effects caused by substances released from the resinous matrix due to incomplete polymerization or resin degradation [6–9]. Several attempts have been made in order to overcome these problems through the development of new monomer systems, including the so called “expanding monomers”, based on spiro-orthocarbonate molecules [10], epoxides systems (oxiranes, siloranes) set via cationic polymerization [11,12], or multifunctional hyper-branched methacrylic monomers (dendrimers), as alternatives to the conventional methacrylic formulations [13–15]. However, the insufficient mechanical properties of these systems, together with several problems concerning their filler incorporation and polymerization have not yet allowed for their extensive clinical application.

The release of methacrylic monomers together with compounds of the polymerization system from dental composites has been considered as a source of a wide variety of adverse biological reactions, including local and systemic toxicity, pulp reactions, allergic and estrogenic effects. These effects have been extensively reviewed in the literature [16–21]. On the other hand, a significant amount of scientific effort has been focused during the past few years by several research groups in the world on the determination of the molecular mechanisms underlying the dental composites' toxicological effects (cytotoxicity and genotoxicity). These studies have used a variety of sophisticated molecular biological techniques in order to assess the potential risks that these chemicals could pose to the living tissues, including exposure assessment, hazard identification, dose-response analysis, analysis of signaling pathways implicated in tissue response and repair and genotoxicity analysis, as a tool for potential mutagenic and clastogenic effects. This rapidly growing field of molecular toxicology of substances released by dental restorative materials also reflects the expanding public awareness of potential health risks caused by these materials during their long term clinical services and the urgent need for improvement on their

biological properties. Therefore, the aim of this article is to review the rapidly growing body of knowledge related to dental composite materials' molecular toxicology and to give implications for possible future improvements with respect to their biocompatibility.

2. Nature, Amount and Bioavailability of Substances Released by Resin-Based Dental Restorative Materials

Dental composite resin materials contain polymer networks that have been shown to be susceptible to hygroscopic and hydrolytic effects to varying extents, dependent upon their chemistry and structure. These effects may not only affect their physical and mechanical properties leading to a shortened service life but they may also be responsible for short-term release of unreacted components, as well as long-term elution of degradation products in the oral cavity [8,16,22,23].

The elution of unreacted components from dental composites is influenced by several factors, including the chemistry of the composite (mainly the solubility and the molecular weight of the monomers used), the degree of conversion, the degree of crosslinking of the polymer network, the surface treatment of the filler particles and the nature of the solvent [7,23–26]. The free radical polymerization of dimethacrylate monomers produces a highly crosslinked polymer network, but also leaves unreacted monomers or oligomers. For most resin-based composites the degree of conversion has been reported to vary from 55 to 75 % when they are directly cured by halogen or LED curing units [26–32] and can reach up to 80% when the composite resins are further post-cured indirectly under different laboratory conditions, including high intensity light, heat, pressure or a combination of the above [33–35]. On the other hand, the degree of conversion can be as low as 25–35% if oxygen is in contact with the resin surface during the setting reaction (oxygen inhibition layer), allowing for more unreacted components to be released from the polymer network [24,36]. The latter may constitute a significant biological risk.

The nature and amount of released components has been evaluated by several elution studies, using a variety of techniques, including Ultraviolet (UV) and Infrared (IR) Radiation, High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) and Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy (GC/MS) [6,8,36–52]. These studies have shown that resin-based dental materials are able to release more than 30 different compounds into aqueous or organic solvents. These substances include major (co)-monomers, additives, compounds of the polymerization system (co initiators, stabilizers, or inhibitors), as well as ions from the filler particles. Most of the above mentioned studies support that almost any component present in a composite or adhesive resin is capable of being leached from the set material [42,49]. Generally, extraction is more complete in alcohol or organic solvents as compared to water. Moreover, solution of 75% ethyl alcohol in water, which is recommended by US FDA

as a food/oral simulating liquid, has been shown to be among the best solvents for dental composite networks, although this solution extracts far more organic compounds, as compared to the artificial saliva that is composed of a complex salt mixture [6,53,54]. However, there are a few components that are also leached into an aqueous media. In particular, considerable amounts of TEGDMA and HEMA may be released by polymerized composite resins into water. Bis-GMA, UDMA, TEGDMA, EGDMA DEGDMA, 1,6-hexanediol di-methacrylate, methyl methacrylate, camphoroquinone, 4-*N,N*-dimethylaminobenzoic acid, ethyl ester, and various other substances have been also identified in minor concentrations in aqueous extracts [16,42,44,45,50,54]. In filled polymers, ions from the filler particles may also be released. These include strontium, silicon, boron, sodium and barium, depending on the filler type [55,56].

It is important to note that not all unreacted methacrylate groups in resin-based materials are capable of being leached into aqueous environment, because they are part of dimethacrylate molecules covalently bound to one end of the main polymer chain. It has been reported that approximately 10% or less of the nonreacted methacrylate groups exist as residual monomer and are available to be leached into various media [6,57]. Studies have shown that elution of as little as 0.05% to as high as 2.0 % of the weight of the specimen into aqueous media, with elution into alcohol and other organic solvents being generally higher (2–6%) [6,8,41,46,57]. In most cases, the elution process is completed within the first few days or weeks after initial polymerization depending on the solvent [23,53,58]. Among the resinous monomers released, hydrophilic monomers, such as TEGDMA, were identified in higher amounts into aqueous extraction media (0.04–2.3%wt) as compared to BisGMA (0.03–0.07%) [19,24,42,59,60]. Moreover, the hydrophilic monomers HEMA and TEGDMA were the only ones to be able to diffuse through the dentin into the pulp space at significantly high concentrations in the millimolar range. The diffusion increases when the remaining dentin thickness is decreased, especially below 1mm or after acid etched treatment [61]. HEMA leaching from dental adhesives might reach concentrations as high as 1.5–8 mmol/L in the pulp [62], whereas TEGDMA concentrations could be in the range of 4 mmol/L [20,63]. These concentrations may be high enough to cause detrimental effects to the pulpal homeostasis and repair [8,17,20].

The amount of leachable components from composite resin networks has been found to be affected by the curing protocol and the density of crosslinking of the polymer network produced. However, a complex relationship exists between these two parameters and the extent that the elution process takes place. It is generally accepted that highly crosslinked polymers are more resistant to degradative processes, based on the more limited space and pathways available for solvent molecules to diffuse within the structure [23,64]. On the contrary, some other studies support that the higher the crosslinking density of a resin, the higher its heterogeneity

and the larger the volume of micropores. This increase of the heterogeneity of the resin network enhances the elution process of the resin monomers [25,65]. These studies support that other factors, including the degree of conversion of the polymer and the quantity of pendant molecules existing within the network, may also affect the extent of water sorption and monomer elution.

Most studies also support that the elution from light-curing polymer-based materials is mainly influenced by the amount of energy delivered to the material during irradiation. The higher the energy density applied, the lower the elution into various solvents [46,66,67]. This can be explained by the increase in the degree of conversion with increasing energy density. However, for a given energy density, different combinations of curing time, power density and modes of cure (continuous, pulse-delay, or stepped) may significantly affect the elution process. Munksgaard *et al.* [46] observed that specimens cured with plasma arc for 3 s eluted a higher amount of monomers compared to specimens cured for 40 s with a conventional quartz–tungsten–halogen curing unit. Hofmann *et al.* [68] observed that different curing protocols influenced the solubility and water sorption of resin composites. Moon *et al.* [66] recorded different degrees of elution and softening in ethanol when a resin composite was cured with various curing units and curing protocols. Yap *et al.* [24] proved that with the same emitted energy level, the level of crosslinking of resin composites irradiated with continuous mode halogen curing is higher than LED-cured analogs. This is accompanied by more leached monomer and more pronounced toxic effects. Bennetti *et al.* [67] also found that the curing mode (continuous, step cured or pulse-delay mode) can significantly affect the crosslinking and degree of conversion of the material and therefore the process of elution. Therefore, it can be concluded from the above mentioned studies that the elution of elements and the degree of cytotoxicity of composite resins depends on the mode of polymerization process, including type of curing unit, total energy density, power density, irradiation time and mode of curing (continuous or different modes of soft start curing) [24,26,69].

3. Degradation of Resin-Based Dental Restorative Materials

As already mentioned, elution of substances from resin composites is usually completed within a few hours or days after initial polymerization. However, leachable substances may also be generated by erosion and degradation over time. The latter is of major biological significance, as it theoretically lasts as long as the service life of the material [6,16,22,54]. Resin degradation may be caused by photo, thermal, mechanical, or chemical influences. For example, it has been found that biologically derived enzymes, such as cholesterol esterase (CE) and pseudocholinesterase (PCE) can degrade the monomer components of composite resins, which may then result in the liberation of methacrylic substances [7,70]. Reviews of polymer degradation mechanisms have been already published [7,22]. Methacrylates degradation can

produce different types of products through different mechanisms, such as formaldehyde via oxidation and methacrylic acid and other molecules, such as bis-HPPP, which is the dialcohol left after splitting methacrylic acid from bis-GMA by hydrolysis or esterification [23,41,71–74]. Other biodegradation products also include triethylene glycol methacrylate (TEGMA), 2,3-epoxymethacrylic acid (2,3-EMA) and ethoxylated bisphenol A (E-BPA) [75,76]. The biodegradation process mainly depends on the molecular chemistry. TEGDMA has been shown to be more susceptible to enzymatic hydrolysis than Bis-GMA or Bis-EMA [71,77]. Moreover, chemically modified BisGMA (ethoxylated BisGMA) degrades to a lesser degree in the presence of cholesterol esterase as compared to BisGMA. In addition, urethane modified bis-GMA/TEGDMA networks have been shown to be more stable in the presence of cholesterol esterase than unmodified bis-GMA/TEGDMA networks [74]. It is also important to note that not all esterases have demonstrated the same specificity for monomer components. Kinetic studies have shown that PCE preferentially hydrolyzes TEGDMA over BisGMA, while CE's activity with respect to BisGMA is 14 times greater than that of PCE [73]. Therefore, it can be concluded that resinous matrix degradation, caused through different mechanisms is mainly dependent on the molecular chemistry of the monomers released, as well as the enzymatic activity of each individual.

Little is known however with respect to pharmacokinetics and toxicokinetics of degradation products of resin components. The existing studies support that HEMA and TEGDMA monomers when administered by different routes (oral, subcutaneously or intravenously) are almost completely eliminated 24 hours after administration. The main routes of excretion in animal studies are via the lungs and to a lesser extent via the faeces or the urine [78]. This implies that the concentration of these monomers in different tissues is below those known to cause acute toxic effects. However, several studies support that sub-cytotoxic concentrations of these monomers are able to alter cell function [79]. Further investigation is necessary to clarify the *in vivo* degradation and toxicokinetics of substances released by dental composite resins.

Another very important molecule from a biological point of view is Bisphenol A (BPA), due to its well documented estrogenic activity [80–82]. BPA is used in the production of several types of resins used in a variety of products including food and drink containers, CDs etc. The majority of published studies were not able to identify BPA as a degradation product of BisGMA-based composites, despite the fact that several of these studies used extreme elution conditions with respect to pH, organic solvents (*e.g.*, acetonitrile) and presence of different hydrolytic enzymes (esterases) [83–87]. On the other hand, BPA was found to be eluted as a degradation product of BisDMA, which is commonly found as a component of pit and fissure sealants [88–91]. The latter has been considered the main cause of their reported estrogenic effects [88,90]. In contrast, however to the abovementioned studies, Pulgar *et al.* [92]

reported considerable release of BPA (up to 1.8 µg/mg of resin) and other related aromatic compounds with estrogenic effects (Bis-DMA, 1.15 pg/mg), bisphenol A diglycidylether (6.1 pg/mg), Bis-GMA (2.0 pg/mg) and ethoxylate and propoxylate of bisphenol A from Bis-GMA-based composites. These concentrations have found to be able to cause significant biologic effects in *in vivo* experimental models [80,93–98].

BPA has been also detected in the saliva and urine samples of healthy donors immediately after composite placement. Arenholt-Bindslev *et al.* [89] reported that minute amounts of BPA were detected in saliva samples collected immediately after, but not 1 h and 24 h after placement of dental sealants. Fung *et al.* [99] also analyzed the blood samples and saliva of a patient population and concluded that even if small amount of BPA was present in the saliva immediately after placement of the sealant, it could not be detected in their blood samples. Sasaki *et al.* [100] detected BPA using an ELISA system, in the range of several tens to 100 ng/mL in the saliva of healthy donors after filling teeth with two pit and fissure sealants. BPA was found however to be removed with sufficient gargling after treatment. Joscow *et al.* [101] found that BPA concentrations in saliva samples of healthy donors collected immediately after a BisDMA containing sealant placement were more than 50-fold higher than their baseline BPA concentrations, also in the range of several tens of ng/mL, whereas urinary concentrations one hour after placement were five times higher than their baseline levels. It can be concluded that even if BPA concentration is reduced after resin materials placement these results cause significant concerns with respect to the long term exposure to estrogenic substances released by composites, especially when it is added to the environmental exposure to several xenoestrogens.

4. Molecular Toxicology of Substances Released by Composite Resins

4.1. Cytotoxicity and Genotoxicity of Released Substances

The cytotoxicity and genotoxicity of substances released by dental composite resins has been extensively studied during the last two decades. Most studies have focused on the effects of resin compounds on basic cellular functions, such as cell proliferation, inhibition of enzyme activities, disruption of cell morphology, membrane integrity, cell metabolism (DNA-, RNA- and protein synthesis) and cell viability. These effects have been already reviewed by Geurtsen [16] and Schweikl *et al.* [20]. Most studies have shown that dental composite resins are able to release compounds with severe (Bis-GMA, UDMA, TEGDMA, DMBZ, και DMDTA) or medium (HEMA, BEMA, CQ, DMPT and DMAPE) cytotoxicity, whereas their biodegradation products, such as methacrylic acid, have been shown in general to be less cytotoxic [44,54,62,102,103]. The latter can also explain the fact that the cytotoxic effects of these compounds are reduced by the action of a metabolically active microsomal liver fraction (S9 mix) [104,105]. Among the substances released, the major

(co)monomers have been identified as the main cause of cytotoxicity and their TC50 have been evaluated in a variety of cell culture systems, including permanent cell lines (3T3 and L929 fibroblasts, V79 chinese hamster lung fibroblasts, HaCaT keratinocytes, THP-1 monocytes etc), as well as primary cell lines of human origin (pulp, periodontal, gingival or skin fibroblasts), presenting significant variability in their sensitivity. Despite these differences, in most studies the cytotoxicity ranking of the basic monomers has been found to be the following: BisGMA > UDMA > TEGDMA >>> HEMA [54,102,104,106,110–113]. Moreover, a relationship between the structural and biological activities of the monomers has been reported [114].

4.2. Molecular Mechanisms

Taking a step forward, a considerably growing number of studies has been focused on the investigation of the key molecular mechanisms and signaling pathways involved in resin components-induced cytotoxicity and genotoxicity. These mechanisms have been already reviewed by Schweikl *et al.* three years ago [20]. However, considerable scientific knowledge during the last few years has been added with respect to the molecular toxicology of these substances. The studies relevant to the molecular mechanisms underlying the resin components' induced cytotoxicity and genotoxicity are presented in [Tables 1](#) and [2](#) respectively, mainly focusing on the studies of the last decade, that have been conducted in target tissues of the oral cavity.

Table 1.

Mechanisms of cytotoxic effects of substances released by resin-based dental restorative materials.

Table 2.

Mechanisms of genotoxic effects of substances released by resin-based dental restorative materials.

4.2.1. TEGDMA (*Triethyleneglycol Dimethacrylate*)

TEGDMA has been the most extensively studied resinous monomer with respect to biocompatibility, since it is easily released from polymerized composites into aqueous media and accounts for most of the unreacted double bonds [23,42]. Moreover, TEGDMA is a commonly used diluent of many resin-based dental composites and also a common component of dentin adhesives in contents varying from 25 to 50% [2,6]. Due to its lipophilic nature, TEGDMA can easily penetrate the cytosol and membrane lipid compartments of mammalian cells [115].

TEGDMA has been reported to induce time- and concentration- dependent cytotoxicity in various cell lines, as shown in [Table 1](#). In most studies, TEGDMA concentration ranged from 0.5–5 mM. Moreover, its lethal concentrations have been reported to vary in different cell lines and among the same types of cells obtained from different donors [[116,117](#)]. It is also to note that some of the metabolic products of TEGDMA, such as the epoxy compound 2,3-epoxymethacrylic acid (2,3-EMA) have been found to cause comparable cytotoxic effects, contributing to TEGDMA cytotoxicity. On the other hand, other metabolites, such as triethylene glycol (TEG) and methacrylic acid (MAA) have shown minimal cytotoxicity [[118](#)]. At lower concentrations the predominant type of cell death induced by TEGDMA was apoptosis (programmed cell death), whereas necrosis was more pronounced at higher concentrations [[109,119–121](#)]. TEGDMA-induced apoptosis was enhanced by its inhibitory effect on phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase in primary human pulp cells [[116](#)] and by differential activation of MAP-kinase signaling pathways [[121,122](#)]. There is evidence that the balance between the sustained activation of the MAP kinases ERK1/2 and the stress kinases p38 and JNK is most likely a central factor in the regulation of cell death and survival in TEGDMA-treated cell cultures [[122](#)].

TEGDMA-induced apoptosis was also found in a number of studies to be associated with oxidative stress via Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) generation [[121,123,124](#)]. This was further supported by the fact that its cytotoxicity was reduced in the presence of antioxidants, such as *N*-acetylcysteine (NAC), ascorbate, vitamins A and E (Trolox), uric acid etc [[123,125–127](#)]. ROS generation was accompanied in various cell lines by depletion of intracellular glutathione (GSH), a major natural reducing agent implicated in cellular detoxification and maintenance of redox balance. [[128–131](#)]. Lefeuvre *et al.* [[128](#)] also found significant reduction of glutathione transferase P1 activity by TEGDMA in human gingival fibroblasts. They supported that TEGDMA is a non-competitive antagonist of GSTP1 and that GSTP1 polymorphism could be involved in inter-individual susceptibility to TEGDMA cytotoxicity. The same authors supported that GSH depletion was accompanied by lipid peroxidation and mitochondrial damage, indicated by a collapse of the mitochondrial membrane potential [[132](#)]. These effects were significantly reduced by a soluble derivative of tocoferol (vitamin E) and by CCCP (carbonylcyanide *m*-chlorophenylhydrazone), an uncoupler of oxidative phosphorylation on lipid peroxidation and LDH leakage.

Several studies have supported that the cell death pattern could be important regarding the evaluation of the potential of dental materials to cause adverse effects [[110,120,133](#)], as apoptotic cells are removed by phagocytosis and with little inflammatory response. The latter is in sharp contrast to the inflammation and injury to surrounding tissues induced by the necrotic process [[134,135](#)].

TEGDMA has been also reported to induce significant genotoxic damage at subtoxic

concentrations. It has been found to increase the number of micronuclei [104,109] and promote degradation of DNA derived from salivary gland tissue and lymphocytes, as shown in comet assays [136,137]. The induction of micronuclei was however clearly abolished by a microsomal fraction (S9) from rat liver, which indicates that the metabolites of TEGDMA are not able to cause genotoxic damage. Antioxidants were also able to reduce TEGDMA induction of micronuclei [123]. TEGDMA was also reported to induce extensive deletions of nucleotide sequences in the hypoxanthine-guanidine phosphoribosyltransferase (*hprt*) gene in V79 Chinese hamster lung fibroblasts, which is indicative of the clastogenic potential of this chemical [138]. Most recently, it has been reported that TEGDMA is able to cause oxidative DNA damage, indicated by the generation of 8-oxoG, followed by activation of ATM, which by itself might activate pathways leading to apoptosis [122]. Moreover, Schweikl *et al.* [124] have shown using microarrays technology that TEGDMA-induced cell damage is followed by a coordinated induction of genes coding for significant biological processes, including oxidative stress, cellular growth, proliferation and morphology, cell death, DNA replication and repair. The most upregulated genes were GEM, KLHL24, DDIT4, TGIF, DUSP5 and ATF3, which are related to the regulation of the cell structure, stress response and cell proliferation, whereas the most down-regulated transcript was TXNIP which regulates the cellular redox balance. As a consequence of DNA damage, different patterns of cell cycle delays-mainly in G2 phase- have been reported for different cell lines exposed to TEGDMA, in order to allow DNA repair processes [139,140]. These delays have been shown to be mediated through both p53-dependent and p53-independent pathways, in different cell lines [140].

Of major clinical significance are the long term effects of TEGDMA at subtoxic concentrations. It has been reported that TEGDMA cannot induce TNF- α release from THP-1 monocytes by itself, but it suppresses LPS-induced TNF- α secretion, suggesting some modification of the normal inflammatory response of pulpal tissues [141]. Moreover, other inflammatory mediators, such as IL-6 and IL-8 are released from 3-D cultures of TR146 cells exposed to TEGDMA [142]. Most recently, it has been shown that TEGDMA modulates LPS-induced production of not only TNF- α , but also of many other cytokines. It has been found to suppress IL-6 and IL-10 production by about 90% and CD14 expression at high concentrations. Moreover, CD40 and CD80 were down-regulated, whereas CD86 and MHC class I were inhibited to a lesser extent. On the contrary, CD54 was increased about twofold by increasing TEGDMA concentrations [143]. TEGDMA has been also found to induce cytokine MCP-1 secretion from U937 cells and to increase the hydrolase activity in human gingival fibroblasts [144]. Other inflammation markers, including Prostaglandin E2 were found to be increased in murine macrophages [142]. Overall, these data suggest that TEGDMA has a strong influence on the interaction of immune cells, including presentation of antigens, co-stimulation of T-cells, and cell-cell interactions [145].

Long term exposure to subtoxic concentrations of TEGDMA is not only able to affect immune responses but also other physiological processes, such as wound healing, cell differentiation and cellular metabolism. It has been found that TEGDMA is able to affect the physiological differentiation processes of dental pulp fibroblasts into odontoblasts and their normal mineralization procedure at very low concentrations [79]. TEGDMA has been found to modulate stress response by suppressing the expression of heat shock proteins, such as HSP72 [62]. Moreover, in a very interesting study by Engelmann *et al.* [146] TEGDMA was detected by NMR spectroscopy in all cellular fractions (cytosol, lipid fractions, as well as the culture media) and was able to affect the metabolic state of the cells by increasing the ratio of nucleoside diphosphates to nucleoside triphosphates.

Therefore, it can be concluded from the above presented studies that TEGDMA is a very active methacrylate molecule, that is able to cause not only pronounced cytotoxic and genotoxic effects mainly through oxidative stress pathways in different cell types but also to influence significant cellular functions implicated in immune response, wound healing and cellular metabolism even at very low (subtoxic) concentrations.

4.2.2. HEMA (2-Hydroxy-ethyl-methacrylate)

HEMA has been also widely studied for biocompatibility, as it is one of the most common components of dentin-adhesives, ranging from 30 to 55% and has a pivotal role during the dentin impregnation process of adhesive systems. This is due to its high water affinity, which allows HEMA to flow into the collagen network of the dentin organic matrix, thus favoring infiltration and preventing collagen collapse [147]. Because HEMA has a low molecular weight and high hydrophilicity, it can also diffuse throughout the residual dentin and affect the underlying odontoblast vitality, altering cell division and physiological activity [61, 148]. According to Spagnuolo *et al.* [126] the release of HEMA from polymerized dental adhesives ranges from 1.5 mmol/L to 8 mmol/L.

In terms of cytotoxicity, HEMA has been found to be far less toxic, as compared to the bifunctional monomers [102, 104, 106–111, 116]. However, the TC50 concentration varied significantly with different cell lines and among the same types of cells obtained from different donors, ranging from 3.6 mmol/L to 10 mmol/L in various studies [63, 112, 117, 126]. According to most of these studies the cytotoxicity of HEMA was time- and concentration-dependent.

HEMA induced cytotoxicity was also associated with oxidative stress, indicated by ROS production and depletion of intracellular glutathione [111, 130, 131, 149]. These effects were found to be reduced in the presence of antioxidants [109, 125, 126]. Chang *et al.* [149] however reported that ROS production induced by HEMA is probably not followed by GSH depletion in human gingival epithelial cells, because GSH depletion was marked only at high concentrations, while an excessive ROS

production was noted also at lower concentrations. Likewise, a significant change of the GSH-GSSG ratio was not assessed in THP-1 human monocytic cells after treatment with HEMA sub-lethal concentrations [[130](#)].

The resulting imbalanced redox state caused by HEMA is further associated with cell cycle delays and apoptosis involving activation of caspases-8,-9 and -3 [[139](#),[149](#),[150](#)]. HEMA induced apoptosis was found to be associated with the activation of nuclear factor kappa B (NF- κ B), which plays a protective role to counteract HEMA cytotoxicity [[150](#)] and differential MAP kinase activation, including phosphorylation of JNK and p38 [[121](#)]. HEMA induced apoptosis has been also proposed as an important mechanism for the generation and persistence of hypersensitivity reactions of patients to this monomer. Paranjpe *et al.* [[151](#)] have shown that HEMA induced a dose-dependent apoptosis in Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells (PBMCs) of both healthy and HEMA-sensitized patients. However, induction of cell death by HEMA was lower in PBMCs obtained from patients in comparison to healthy individuals. On the contrary, other studies with primary human gingival fibroblasts cultures have supported that HEMA induced cell death is mainly in the form of necrosis rather than apoptosis [[126](#),[152](#)].

In terms of genotoxicity, HEMA has been also reported to be a clastogenic chemical by increasing the number of micronuclei, effects that were however diminished after metabolic inactivation [[104](#),[109](#)]. It has been also found to increase DNA migration in Comet assays [[136](#),[137](#)]. These effects were followed by cell cycle delays, but were found to be reduced in the presence of antioxidants [[127](#)].

Several studies have also evaluated the effects of HEMA at very low concentrations in long-term cytotoxicity systems that are more relevant to clinical conditions. HEMA has been found to alter the normal inflammatory response of pulpal tissues, by significantly reducing TNF- α secretion from LPS-stimulated human THP-1 monocytes and peripheral blood monocytes [[108](#),[141](#),[145](#),[153](#)]. These findings are further supported by the fact that HEMA was found to induce up-regulation of COX-2 [[145](#)] and VEGF expression [[154](#)], as well as suppression of Hsp72 expression in immune cells [[62](#)], suggesting its implication in inflammation related processes caused by composite materials. Other long term effects of HEMA include the interruption of normal collagen I synthesis [[117](#),[148](#)] and the significant perturbation of normal differentiation processes of pulp fibroblasts into odontoblasts [[79](#)], which has a critical significance in pulpal homeostasis and repair.

In conclusion, HEMA was also found to be a very active biologic molecule, although its cytotoxicity is much lower compared to the bifunctional monomers TEGDMA and BisGMA. However, its pivotal role during composites adhesion into dentin and its high mobility due to its hydrophilicity and low molecular weight make it a critical molecule from the viewpoint of biocompatibility. The mechanisms of its cytotoxic and genotoxic

effects seem not to differ from those of TEGDMA and mainly involve oxidative stress via ROS production. Of significant importance are also the long term effects of HEMA at subtoxic concentrations, which are able to disturb physiological pulp homeostasis and repair.

4.2.3. Basic Monomers BisGMA (2,2-Bis[4-(2-hydroxy-3-methacryloxypropoxy)phenyl]propane) and UDMA (Urethane dimethacrylate)

The basic bifunctional resinous monomers BisGMA (2,2-bis[4-(2-hydroxy-3-methacryloxypropoxy)phenyl]propane) and UDMA (urethane dimethacrylate) have been also studied for cytotoxicity and genotoxicity in a considerable number of studies. In general, the aromatic monomer BisGMA has been found to be slightly more cytotoxic than the aliphatic monomer UDMA [102, 104, 106–110, 112, 116, 152]. Despite the fact that BisGMA is not readily soluble in water and available only in small amounts in a hydrophilic environment it has been used as a representative acrylate compound for studying the toxic mechanisms of resin monomers on biological tissues [155, 156]. On the other hand, UDMA, that has been often used today to replace BisGMA in many commercially available dental composites due to its high flexibility and toughness, represents a family of molecules with different molecular weight and structure that have been relatively less studied compared to other methacrylate molecules [157].

BisGMA (>0.001 mM) and UDMA (0,05 mM) have been found to cause time- and concentration-dependent cytotoxicity to various cell lines, including human gingival and pulp fibroblasts and human THP-1 and peripheral blood monocytes [108, 131, 153, 156, 158, 159]. Bis-GMA have been also found to induce a rapid and intense decline of the glutathione pool of HGFs combined with induction of apoptosis at much lower concentrations (>0.1 mM) as compared to TEGDMA (>5 mM) [156]. BisGMA could also stimulate ERK phosphorylation, PGE2 production, COX-2 mRNA and protein expression, as well as ROS production. Catalase and U0126 (a MEK inhibitor) were able to effectively prevent the above mentioned effects [155]. These findings suggest that BisGMA released from composite resins may potentially affect the vitality of dental pulp and/or induce pulpal inflammation. This is further supported by the fact that BisGMA is able to disturb normal differentiation procedures of pulp fibroblasts [79, 160]. Other long term effects of BisGMA include its ability to affect the migration and tenascin expression of keratinocytes and human gingival fibroblasts, possibly disturbing the healing of injured oral tissues [161]. Moreover, BisGMA and its biodegradation product methacrylic acid (MMA) have been found to significantly decrease ICAM-1 expression in TNF- α -stimulated cells, which suggests that these methacrylates may decrease the recruitment of leukocytes towards the inflammation sites [158].

Concerning genotoxicity, BisGMA and UDMA has been also found to increase the number of micronuclei and these effects to be reduced by S9 mix, in the same way as

with TEGDMA and HEMA [104]. DNA migration has been also reported in Comet assays for these monomers [136,137]. On the other hand, the hydroxylized metabolites of Bis-GMA, such as Bisphenol A bis (2,3-dihydroxypropyl) were found to be non-mutagenic and less cytotoxic than their parent monomer [159].

In conclusion, the basic resinous monomers BisGMA and UDMA, which account for about 70-75% of the total resinous matrix of dental composites may significantly contribute to these materials cytotoxicity and genotoxicity. Despite their hydrophobic character which limits their release into aqueous environments they are able to exert their cytotoxic action at much lower concentrations as compared to HEMA and TEGDMA. Involved mechanisms seem also to include oxidative stress, as well as disturbance of normal biological processes, such as differentiation, immune response and wound healing at very low concentrations.

4.3. Compounds of Dental Composites' Polymerization System

Extractable components of resin-based dental restorative materials also include *substances of their polymerization system*, such as photosensitizers and initiators [16]. Camphoroquinone (CQ) is the most commonly used photosensitizer and has been found to be eluted by various resin composites. Very few studies up to now have addressed the potential biological adverse effects of CQ. It has been shown that CQ in the presence or absence of reducing agents was cytotoxic to a human submandibular duct cell line, as well as to human gingival and pulp fibroblasts [162,163]. In addition, many of the most known polymerization initiators, such as CQ, benzoyl peroxide (BPO) dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate (DMAEMA) and dimethyl-*para*-toluidine (DMPT) have been found to be cytotoxic to human gingival fibroblasts by inducing cell cycle arrest and cell death mainly in the form of necrosis [164]. When compared to other photosensitizers, such as benzil (BZ), benzophenone (BP), 9-fluorenone (9-F), CQ was found to be less cytotoxic and to produce less ROS. Moreover, ROS induced by the aliphatic ketone CQ were efficiently scavenged by hydroquinone and vitamin E, whereas those by the aromatic ketone 9-F were diminished by mannitol and catalase, suggesting that OH radicals were involved in ROS derived from 9-F [162]. In addition, CQ in combination with visible light (VL) irradiation was found to increase the radical production, whereas 9F with VL irradiation increased ROS production and effecting changes in the phase-transition properties of DPPC liposomes, which were used as a model for cell membranes. The addition of DMA (a tertiary amine) to the photosensitizer enhanced the free-radical production without increasing the ROS level or the cytotoxicity. The authors concluded that CQ/DMA is a valuable combination for the polymerization of dental resins because of its less photo-oxygenation and cytotoxicity together with its great ability to cause polymerization of methacrylates. On the other hand, another scientific group has shown that CQ/DMT with or without VL irradiation was able to cause significant prolongation of the cell cycle. In addition, VL irradiated CQ/DMT was found to exhibit

significantly genotoxic and cytotoxic effects, compared with CQ/DMT alone. These effects were however reduced by pre-treatment with antioxidants [165]. These results are in agreement with Pagoria *et al.* [166] who reported that VL irradiated CQ/DMT caused DNA strand breakages in isolated supercoiled plasmid DNA, and Winter *et al.* [167], who demonstrated that VL irradiated CQ/DMT caused DNA damage in a cell-free environment. Moreover, recently, Pagoria and Geurtsen [168] have published that VL irradiated CQ/DMT caused oxidative damage in 3T3-Swiss albino murine fibroblasts and murine cementoblasts. They also confirmed the protective effect of high concentrations of NAC (10 mM) and ascorbic acid (10mM) in these cell lines. Taken together, these results suggest that the CQ/DMT system can act as a genotoxic agent.

Other substances of the polymerization system of dental composites have been also studied to a lesser extent for biocompatibility. Cimpan *et al.* [169] have found that 4-*N,N*-dimethylaminobenzoic acid ethyl ester (DMABEE), one of the compounds commonly being eluted, was able to cause time- and concentration- dependent induction of cell death in human monoblastoid cells in the form of apoptosis and necrosis. Other studies reported that DMABEE is also able to interact with monolayers of saturated phosphatidylcholines (PC, *i.e.*, markers of the outer membrane leaflet) and phosphatidylserines (PS., *i.e.*, markers of the inner membrane leaflet) [170].

In conclusion, several compounds eluted from dental composites' polymerization system are able to significantly contribute to their cytotoxicity and genotoxicity by enhancing the oxidative stress and DNA damage. These effects are significantly increased by visible light irradiation of these systems.

4.4. Effects of Composite Resins' Compounds on Oral Bacteria Growth

Most studies support that pulp inflammation caused by derivatives of resin composites is mainly due to incomplete dentin adhesion, which leads to bacterial microleakage [171–173]. However, there are also some studies supporting that dental monomers, such as TEGDMA and EGDMA are able to promote the growth and proliferation of caries relevant bacteria, such as *S. Sobrinus* and *L. Acidophilus* [174,175] and by this way to contribute to pulpal inflammation and secondary caries formation. Kawai *et al.* supported that these monomers are not only able to increase bacterial growth but also to increase glycosyltransferase activity which is responsible for glycans formation that play a key role in bacterial adhesion and plaque formation. Moreover, Khalichi *et al.* [176] supported that several by-products of TEGDMA, such as TEG, are also able to increase glycosyltransferase B expression in *S. mutans*. On the contrary, Takahasi *et al.* [177] claimed that ethyleneglycol monomers do not increase in fact microbial proliferation but the observed biomass increase is mainly due to polymerization of

resin monomers to form vesicular structures attached to cells.

There has also been an effort to produce resin monomers with antibacterial properties, such as MDPB (methacryloyldodecylpyridinium bromide) or composites fillers based on apatite and contain silver and zinc (Apacider™ of Novaron) [178–180]. Although these substances are able to reduce the proliferation of cariogenic bacteria including *Str. Mutans*, they are usually immobilized by polymerization and therefore diffusion through the dentin is no longer possible [179].

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Studies on the molecular toxicology of substances released by resin-based dental restorative materials clearly support that the majority of these molecules are able to cause cytotoxic and genotoxic effects at concentrations relevant to those released into the oral cavity. These effects include irreversible disturbance of basic cellular functions, such as cell proliferation, enzyme activities, cell morphology, membrane integrity, cell metabolism and cell viability. Signaling pathways involved in immune response, tissue homeostasis and repair are also affected. Moreover, several studies have reported the clastogenic and genotoxic properties of some of these substances, implying their potential mutagenic effects and stressing the importance of assessing their safety from the viewpoint of genotoxicity.

The clinical relevance of identifying the potential of these substances to disturb functions at the cellular and molecular level has been already emphasized by experienced investigators in the field [20, 181]. However, the direct extrapolation of molecular toxicological data obtained from *in vitro* studies into the clinical situation is not always straight forward. At the local level, a large number of *in vivo* studies with animal or human teeth (usage tests) support that pulp reaction is not expected in medium or low depth cavities, when a sufficient thickness of dentin layer remains and bacterial penetration beneath the filling is avoided [182–185]. On the other hand, other studies support that there are pronounced histological reactions when the remaining dentin is too thin and acid etched [186, 187]. The same detrimental effects, including pulp inflammation, insufficient reparative dentin formation and even pulp necrosis are also reported when resin adhesives are used for direct pulp capping instead of calcium hydroxide [188–191]. Further research on this aspect is necessary.

The clinical significance of *in vitro* mutagenicity and genotoxicity data is also quite difficult to be assessed, since no information is up to now available concerning the threshold concentrations that are able to trigger these reactions during the long term clinical service of these materials. Moreover, the toxicokinetics of the metabolic products of dental composites and the possibility for systemic mutagenic effects should be further investigated in animal models.

Although the frequency of adverse effects caused by resin based dental restorative materials, mainly allergic reactions in patients and dental personnel [192–195], has increased over the past years, the total number of patients presenting with adverse reactions still remains a low proportion of the total population. However, despite the fact that general risk seems to be quite low, the individual health risk during the long term clinical service of these materials, attributed to interindividual variations in immune responses and reparative processes, cannot be underestimated, especially in severe allergic cases [19].

It is surprising however that despite the rapidly growing bulk of scientific evidence concerning the toxicological effects of these substances, little effort has been observed from the part of the companies to develop new materials not only with improved mechanical but also biological properties. The majority of commercially available products are based on methacrylate monomers, whereas some promising new technologies, including Siloranes and Ormocers [196,197], using different chemistry and polymerization mechanisms are yet to be investigated from the viewpoint of biocompatibility. Taking into account that dental composite resins have an integral role in every day dental clinical practice, it is extremely important to encourage not only the development of less cytotoxic materials but also, as a future goal, the development of “biomimetic” materials or “biofillings”, which will be effective in stimulating natural tissue repair and maintaining the vitality of the compromised oral tissues.

Abbreviations:

ALP	Alkaline Phosphatase
Bis-GMA	2,2-bis[4-(2-hydroxy-3-methacryloxypropoxy)phenyl]propane)
BP	Benzoyl Peroxide
BPA	Bisphenol A
BrdU	5-bromo-2'-deoxyuridine
CCCP	carbonylcyanide <i>m</i> -chlorophenylhydrazone
CMF-DA	Chloromethylfluorescein diacetate
CQ	camphorquinone
DCFH-DA	2',7'-dichlorofluorescein diacetate
DMA	2-dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate
DMABEE	4- <i>N,N</i> -Dimethylaminobenzoic acid ethylester

DMT	<i>N,N</i> -dimethyl- <i>p</i> -toluidine
EMSA	Electromobility shift assay
FACs	Flow cytometry
GSH	Glutathione
HEMA	2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate
HMBP	2-hydroxy-4-methoxybenzophenone
LPS	lipo-polysaccharide
MBBr	monobromobimane
mBCl	monochlorobimane
MTT	3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazoliumbromide
NAC	<i>N</i> -acetylcysteine
PI	propidium-iodide
PI3-Kinase	phosphatidylinositol 3 kinase
ROS	Reactive Oxygen Species
S9 mix	metabolically active microsomal fraction from mouse or rat liver
SDS-PAGE electrophoresis	Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
TBARS	Thiobarbituric acid reactive substances
TEGDMA	triethyleneglycoldimethacrylate
TUNEL assay	terminal deoxyribonucleotidyl transferase (TdT) uridine triphosphate
UTP	(UTP) nick-end labeling
UDMA	urethanedimethacrylate
WB	Western blotting
WST-8	[2-(2-methoxy-4-nitrophenyl)-3-(4-nitrophenyl)-5-(2,4-disulfophenyl)-2 <i>H</i> -tetrazolium, monosodium salt]

References

1. Ferracane JL. Current trends in dental composites. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 1995;6:302–318. [[PubMed](#)]
2. Peutzfeldt A. Resin components in dentistry: The monomer systems. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 1997;105:97–116. [[PubMed](#)]
3. Rueggeberg FA. From vulcanite to vinyl, a history of resins in restorative dentistry. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 2002;87:364–379. [[PubMed](#)]
4. Silicas N, Eliades G, Watts DC. Light intensity effects on resin composite degree of conversion and shrinkage strain. *Dent. Mater.* 2000;16:292–296. [[PubMed](#)]
5. Braga RR, Ballester RY, Ferracane JL. Factors involved in the development of polymerization shrinkage stress in resin-composites: A systematic review. *Dent. Mater.* 2005;21:962–970. [[PubMed](#)]
6. Ferracane JL. Elution of leachable components from composites. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1994;21:441–452. [[PubMed](#)]
7. Santerre JP, Shajii L, Leung BW. Relation of dental composite formulations to their degradation and the release of hydrolyzed polymeric-resin-derived products. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 2001;12:136–151. [[PubMed](#)]
8. Hume WR, Gerzina TM. Bioavailability of components or resin-based materials which are applied to teeth. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 1996;7:172–179. [[PubMed](#)]
9. Eliades G, Eliades T, Vavuranakis M. General aspects of biomaterial surface alterations following exposure to biologic fluids. In: Eliades G, Eliades T, Brantley WA, Watts DC, editors. *Dental Materials in Vivo, Aging and Related Phenomena*. Quintessence, Publishing Co Inc; Chicago, USA: 2003. pp. 3–20.
10. Moon EJ, Lee JY, Kim CK, Cho BH. Dental restorative composites containing 2,2-bis-[4-(2-hydroxy-3-methacryloyloxy propoxy) phenyl] propane derivatives and spiro orthocarbonates. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2005;73B:338–346. [[PubMed](#)]
11. Braga RR, Ferracane JL. Alternatives in polymerization contraction stress management. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 2004;15:176–184. [[PubMed](#)]
12. Weinmann W, Lucterhandt T, Guggenberger R, Stippschild A, Then S. Comparative testing of volumetric shrinkage and sealing of silorane and methacrylate filling materials. *J. Dent. Res.* 2002;81A:417.
13. Ge J, Trujillo M, Stansbury J. Synthesis and photopolymerization of low shrinkage methacrylate monomers containing bulky substituent groups. *Dent. Mater.* 2005;21:1163–1169. [[PubMed](#)]
14. Viljanen EK, Lassila LVJ, Skrifvars M, Vallittu P. Degree of conversion and flexural properties of a dendrimer/methyl methacrylate copolymer: Design of experiments and statistical screening. *Dent. Mater.* 2005;21:172–177. [[PubMed](#)]
15. Matinlinna JP, Lassila LVJ, Kangasniemi I, Yli-Urpo A, Vallittu PK. Shear bond strength of bis-GMA and methacrylated dendrimer resins on silanised titanium substrate. *Dent. Mater.* 2005;21:287–296. [[PubMed](#)]
16. Geurtsen W. Biocompatibility of resin-modified filling materials. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 2000;11:333–355. [[PubMed](#)]

17. Bouillaguet S. Biological risks of resin-based materials to the dentin pulp complex. *Crit. Rev. Oral Biol. Med.* 2004;15:47–60. [[PubMed](#)]
18. Schedle A, Oretngren U, Eidler N, Gebauer M, Hensten A. Do adverse effects of dental materials exist? What are the consequences and how they can be diagnosed and treated? *Clin. Oral Impl. Res.* 2007;18:232–256.
19. Schmalz G, Arenholt-Bindslev D. *Biocompatibility of Dental Materials*. Springer-Verlag; Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany: 2009. pp. 99–137.
20. Schweikl H, Spagnuolo G, Schmalz G. Genetic and cellular toxicology of dental resin monomers. *J. Dent. Res.* 2006;85:870–877. [[PubMed](#)]
21. Anagnostou M, Chatzianni E, Doucoudakis S, Potamianou A, Tesseromatis C. Biocompatibility of resin composites subcutaneously implanted in rats with experimentally induced arthritis. *Dent. Mater.* 2009;25:863–867. [[PubMed](#)]
22. Gopferich A. Mechanisms of polymer degradation and erosion. *Biomaterials.* 1996;17:103–114. [[PubMed](#)]
23. Ferracane JL. Hygroscopic and hydrolytic effects in dental polymer networks. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:211–222. [[PubMed](#)]
24. Yap AU, Han VT, Soh MS, Siow KS. Elution of leachable components from composites after LED and halogen light irradiation. *Oper. Dent.* 2004;29:448–453. [[PubMed](#)]
25. Sideridou ID, Achilias DS. Elution study of unreacted bis-GMA, TEGDMA, UDMA, and bis-EMA from light-cured dental resins and resin composites using HPLC. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2005;74B:617–626. [[PubMed](#)]
26. Tseng WY, Huang CH, Chen R, Lee MS, Chen J, Rueggeberg FA, Chen MH. Monomer conversion and cytotoxicity of dental composites irradiated with different modes of photoactivated curing. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2007;83B:85–90. [[PubMed](#)]
27. Sakaguchi R, Hong XB. Reduced light energy density decreases post-gel contraction while maintaining degree of conversion in composites. *J. Dent.* 1998;26:695–700. [[PubMed](#)]
28. Pianelli C, Devaux J, Bebelman S, Leloup G. The micro-Raman spectroscopy, a useful tool to determine the degree of conversion of light-activated composite resins. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 1999;48:675–681. [[PubMed](#)]
29. Imazato S, McCabe JF, Tarumi H, Ehara A, Ebisu S. Degree of conversion of composites measured by DTA and FTIR. *Dent. Mater.* 2001;17:178–183. [[PubMed](#)]
30. Tarle Z, Meniga A, Knezevix A, Sutalo J, Risti XM, Pichler G. Composite conversion and temperature rise using a conventional, plasma arc, and an experimental blue LED curing. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2002;29:662–667. [[PubMed](#)]
31. Yoon TH, Lee YK, Lim BS, Kim CW. Degree of polymerization of resin composites by different light sources. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2002;29:1165–1173. [[PubMed](#)]
32. Soh MS, Yap AU, Yu T, Shen ZX. Analysis of the degree of conversion of LED and halogen lights using micro-Raman spectroscopy. *Oper. Dent.* 2004;29:571–577. [[PubMed](#)]

33. Ferracane JL, Condon JR. Post cure heat treatments for composites: Properties and fractography. *Dent. Mater.* 1992;8:290–295. [[PubMed](#)]
34. Knobloch LA, Kerby RE, Seghi R, van Putten M. Two body wear resistance and degree of conversion of laboratory processed composite materials. *Int. J. Prosthodont.* 1999;12:432–438.
35. Peutzfeldt A, Asmussen E. The effect of postcuring on quantity of remaining double bonds mechanical properties and *in vitro* wear of two resin composites. *J. Dent.* 2000;28:447–452. [[PubMed](#)]
36. Franz A, König F, Lucas T, Watts DC, Schedle A. Cytotoxic effects of dental bonding substances as a function of degree of conversion. *Dent. Mater.* 2009;25:232–239. [[PubMed](#)]
37. Braden M, Pearson GJ. Analysis of aqueous extract from filled resins. *J. Dent.* 1981;9:141–143. [[PubMed](#)]
38. Ferracane JL, Condon JR. Rate of elution of leachable components from composite. *Dent. Mater.* 1990;6:282–287. [[PubMed](#)]
39. Muller H, Olsson S, Soderholm KJ. The effect of comonomer composition, silane heating, and filler type on aqueous TEGDMA leachability in model resin composites. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 1997;105:362–368. [[PubMed](#)]
40. Lee SY, Huang HM, Lin CY, Shih YH. Leached components from dental composites in oral simulating fluids and the resultant composite strengths. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1998;25:575–588. [[PubMed](#)]
41. Pelka M. Elution parameters and HPLC-detection of single components from resin composite. *Clin. Oral Invest.* 1999;3:194–200.
42. Spahl W, Budzikiewicz H, Geurtsen W. Determination of leachable components from four commercial dental composites by gas and liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry. *J. Dent.* 1998;26:137–145. [[PubMed](#)]
43. Hamid A, Okamoto A, Iwaku M, Hume WR. Component release from light-activated glass ionomer and compomer cements. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1998;25:94–99. [[PubMed](#)]
44. Geurtsen W, Spahl W, Muller K, Leyhausen G. Aqueous extracts from dentin adhesives contain cytotoxic chemicals. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. (Appl. Biomater.)*. 1999;48:772–777.
45. Lygre H, Hol PJ, Solheim E, Moe G. Organic leachables from polymer-based dental filling materials. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 1999;107:378–383. [[PubMed](#)]
46. Munksgaard EC, Peutzfeldt A, Asmussen E. Elution of TEGDMA and BisGMA from a resin and a resin composite cured with halogen or plasma light. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 2000;108:341–345. [[PubMed](#)]
47. Ortengren U, Langer S, Goransson A, Lundgren T. Influence of pH and time on organic substance release from a model dental composite: A fluorescence spectrophotometry and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry analysis. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 2004;112:530–537. [[PubMed](#)]
48. Mazzaoui SA, Burrow MF, Tyas MJ, Rooney FR, Capon RJ. Long-term quantification of the release of monomers from dental resin composites and a resin modified glass ionomer cement. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 2002;63:299–305. [[PubMed](#)]
49. Michelsen VV, Lygre H, Skalevik R, Tveit AB, Solheim E. Identification of organic eluates from four polymer based dental filling materials. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 2003;111:263–271. [[PubMed](#)]

50. Michelsen VB, Moe G, Strøm MB, Jensen E, Lygre H. Quantitative analysis of TEGDMA and HEMA eluted into saliva from two dental composites by use of GC/MS and tailor-made internal standards. *Dent. Mater.* 2008;24:724–731. [[PubMed](#)]
51. Wu W, McKinney JE. Influences of chemical on wear of dental composites. *J. Dent. Res.* 1982;61:1180–1183. [[PubMed](#)]
52. Polydorou O, Hammad M, König A, Hellwig E, Kümmerer K. Release of monomers from different core build-up materials. *Dent. Mater.* 2009;25:1090–1095. [[PubMed](#)]
53. Zhang Y, Xu J. Effect of immersion in various media on the sorption, solubility, elution of unreacted monomers, and flexural properties of two model dental composite compositions. *J. Mater. Sci.: Mater. Med.* 2008;19:2477–2483. [[PubMed](#)]
54. Geurtsen W. Substances released from dental resin composites and glass-ionomer cements. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 1998;106:687–695. [[PubMed](#)]
55. Oysed H, Ruyter IE. Water sorption and filler characteristics of composites for use in posterior teeth. *J. Dent. Res.* 1986;65:1315–1318. [[PubMed](#)]
56. Zhou M, Drummond JL, Hanley L. Barium and strontium leaching from aged glass particle/resin matrix dental composites. *Dent. Mater.* 2005;21:145–155. [[PubMed](#)]
57. Tanaka K, Taira M, Shintani H, Wakasa K, Yamaki M. Residual monomers (TEGDMA and Bis-GMA) of a set visible light-cured dental composite resin when immersed in water. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1991;18:353–362. [[PubMed](#)]
58. Polydorou O, Trittler R, Hellwig E, Kümmerer K. Elution of monomers from two conventional dental composite materials. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:1535–1541. [[PubMed](#)]
59. Inoue K, Hayashi I. Residual monomer (Bis-GMA) of composite resins. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1982;9:493–497. [[PubMed](#)]
60. Tabatabaee MH, Mahdavi H, Zandi S, Kharrazi MJ. HPLC analysis of eluted monomers from two composite resins cured with LED and halogen curing lights. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2009;88B:191–196. [[PubMed](#)]
61. Gerzina TM, Hume WR. Diffusion of monomers from bonding resin-resin composite combinations through dentine *in vitro*. *J. Dent.* 1996;24:125–128. [[PubMed](#)]
62. Noda M, Wataha JC, Kaga M, Lockwood PE, Volkmann KR, Sano H. Components of dentinal adhesives modulate heat shock protein 72 expression in heat-stressed THP-1 human monocytes at sublethal concentrations. *J. Dent. Res.* 2002;81:265–269. [[PubMed](#)]
63. Bouillaguet S, Wataha JC, Hanks CT, Ciucchi B, Holz J. *In vitro* cytotoxicity and dentin permeability of HEMA. *J. Endod.* 1996;22:244–248. [[PubMed](#)]
64. Arima T, Murata H, Hamada T. The effects of cross-linking agents on the water sorption and solubility characteristics of denture base resin. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 1996;23:476–480. [[PubMed](#)]
65. Pace RJ, Datyner A. Model of sorption of simple molecules in polymers. *J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Phys. Ed.* 1980;18:1103–1124.

66. Moon HJ, Lee YK, Lim BS, Kim CW. Effects of various light curing methods on the leachability of uncured substances and hardness of a composite resin. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2004;31:258–264. [[PubMed](#)]
67. Benetti AR, Asmussen E, Munksgaard EC, Dewaele M, Peutzfeldt A, Leloup G, Devaux J. Softening and elution of monomers in ethanol *Dent Mater* 2009. in press.
68. Hofmann N, Renner J, Hugo B, Klaiber B. Elution of leachable components from resin composites after plasma arc vs. standard or soft-start halogen light irradiation. *J. Dent.* 2002;30:223–232. [[PubMed](#)]
69. Sigusch BW, Völpel A, Braun I, Uhl A, Jandt KD. Influence of different light curing units on the cytotoxicity of various dental composites. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:1342–1348. [[PubMed](#)]
70. Jaffer F, Finer Y, Santerre JP. Interactions between resin monomers and commercial composite resins with human saliva derived esterases. *Biomaterials.* 2002;23:1707–1719. [[PubMed](#)]
71. Shajji L, Santerre JP. Effect of filler content on the profile of released biodegradation products in micro-filled bis-GMA/TEGDMA dental composite resins. *Biomaterials.* 1999;20:1897–1908. [[PubMed](#)]
72. Yourtee DM, Smith RE, Russo KA, Burmaster S, Cannon JM, Eick JD, Kostoryz EL. The stability of methacrylate biomaterials when enzyme challenged: Kinetic and systematic evaluations. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 2001;57:522–531. [[PubMed](#)]
73. Finer Y, Santerre JP. Biodegradation of a dental composite by esterases: Dependence on enzyme concentration and specificity. *J. Biomater. Sci. Polym. Ed.* 2003;14:837–849. [[PubMed](#)]
74. Finer Y, Santerre JP. Salivary esterase activity and its association with the biodegradation of dental composites. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:22–26. [[PubMed](#)]
75. Lin BA, Jaffer F, Duff MD, Tang YW, Santerre JP. Identifying enzyme activities within human saliva which are relevant to dental resin composite biodegradation. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:4259–4264. [[PubMed](#)]
76. Seiss M, Nitz S, Kleinsasser N, Buters JT, Behrendt H, Hickel R, Reichl FX. Identification of 2,3-epoxymethacrylic acid as an intermediate in the metabolism of dental materials in human liver microsomes. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:9–16. [[PubMed](#)]
77. Finer Y, Santerre JP. The influence of resin chemistry on a dental composite's biodegradation. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 2004;69A:233–246.
78. Durner J, Kreppel H, Zaspel J, Schweikl H, Hickel R, Reichl FX. The toxicokinetics and distribution of 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate in mice. *Biomaterials.* 2009;30:2066–2071. [[PubMed](#)]
79. About I, Camps J, Mitsiadis TA, Bottero MJ, Butler W, Franquin JC. Influence of resinous monomers on the differentiation *in vitro* of human pulp cells into odontoblasts. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2002;63:418–423.
80. Steinmetz R, Brown NG, Allen DL, Bigsby RM, Ben-Jonathan N. The environmental estrogen bisphenol-A stimulates prolactin release *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *Endocrinology.* 1997;138:1780–1786. [[PubMed](#)]
81. Kang JH, Kondo F, Katayama Y. Human exposure to bisphenol A. *Toxicology.* 2006;21, 226:79–89. [[PubMed](#)]
82. Welshons WV, Nagel SC, vom Saal FS. Large effects from small exposures. III. Endocrine mechanisms mediating effects of bisphenol A at levels of human exposure. *Endocrinology.* 2006;147:S56–S69. [[PubMed](#)]

83. Nathanson D, Lertpitayakun P, Lamkin MS, Edalatpour M, Chou L. *In vitro* elution of leachable components from dental sealants. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 1997;128:1517–1523. [[PubMed](#)]
84. Hamid A, Hume WR. A study of component release from resin pit and fissure sealants *in vitro*. *Dent. Mater.* 1997;13:98–102. [[PubMed](#)]
85. Lewis JB, Rueggeberg FA, Lapp CA, Ergle JW. Identification and characterization of estrogen-like components in commercial resin-based dental restorative materials. *Clin. Oral Invest.* 1999;3:107–113.
86. Schmalz G, Preiss A, Arenholt-Bindslev D. Bisphenol-A content of resin monomers and related degradation products. *Clin. Oral Investig.* 1999;3:114–119.
87. Wada H, Tarumi H, Imazato S, Narimatsu M, Ebisu S. *In vitro* estrogenicity of resin composites. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:222–226. [[PubMed](#)]
88. Olea N, Pulgar R, Perez P, Slea-Serrano F, Rivas A, Novillo-Fertress A, Pedraza V, Soto AM. Estrogenicity of resin-based composites and sealants used in dentistry. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 1996;104:298–305. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
89. Arenholt-Bindslev D, Breinholt V, Preiss A, Schmalz G. Time-related bisphenol—A content and estrogenic activity in saliva samples collected in relation to placement of fissure sealants. *Clin. Oral Investig.* 1999;3:120–125.
90. Tarumi H, Imazato S, Narimatsu M, Matsuo M, Ebisu S. Estrogenicity of fissure sealants and adhesive resins determined by reporter gene assay. *J. Dent. Res.* 2000;79:1838–1843. [[PubMed](#)]
91. Atkinson JC, Diamond F, Eichmiller F, Selwitz R, Jones G. Stability of bisphenol-A dimethacrylate in whole saliva. *Dent. Mater.* 2002;18:128–135. [[PubMed](#)]
92. Pulgar R, Olea-Serrano FM, Novillo-Fertell A, Rivas A, Pazos P, Pedraza V, Navajas JM, Olea N. Determination of bisphenol-A, and related aromatic compounds released from Bis-GMA based composites and sealants by high performance liquid chromatography. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2000;108:21–27. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
93. vom Saal FS, Hughes C. An extensive new literature concerning low-dose effects of bisphenol A shows the need for a new risk assessment. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2005;113:926–933. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
94. Markey CM, Luque EH, de Toro M, Sonnenschein C, Soto AM. In utero exposure to bisphenol A alters the development and tissue organization of the mouse mammary gland. *Biol. Reprod.* 2001;65:1215–1223. [[PubMed](#)]
95. Schonfelder G, Flick B, Mayr E, Talsness C, Paul M, Chahoud I. In utero exposure to low doses of bisphenol A lead to long-term deleterious effects in the vagina. *Neoplasia.* 2002;4:98–102. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
96. Howdeshell KL, Hotchkiss AK, Thayer KA, Vandenberg JG, vom Saal FS. Exposure to bisphenol A advances puberty. *Nature.* 1999;401:763–764. [[PubMed](#)]
97. Takeuchi T, Tsutsumi O, Ikezuki Y, Takai Y, Taketani Y. Positive relationship between androgen and the endocrine disruptor, bisphenol A, in normal women and women with ovarian dysfunction. *Endocr. J.* 2004;51:165–169. [[PubMed](#)]

98. Hanaoka T, Kawamura N, Hara K, Tsugane S. Urinary bisphenol A and plasma hormone concentrations in male workers exposed to bisphenol A diglycidyl ether and mixed organic solvents. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 2002;59:625–628. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
99. Fung EYK, Ewoldsen NO, St. German HA, Marx DB, Miaw CL, Siew CH, Chou HN, Gruninger SE, Meyer DM. Pharmacokinetics of bisphenol A released from a dental sealant. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 2000;131:51–58. [[PubMed](#)]
100. Sasaki N, Okuda K, Kato T. Salivary bisphenol-A levels detected by ELISA after restorations with composite resin. *J. Mater. Sci.* 2005;16:297–300.
101. Joskow R, Barr DB, Barr JR, Calafat AM, Needham LL, Rubin C. Exposure to bisphenol A from bis-glycidyl dimethacrylate-based dental sealants. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 2006;137:353–362. [[PubMed](#)]
102. Hanks CT, Strawn SE, Wataha JC, Craig RG. Cytotoxic effects of resin components on cultured mammalian fibroblasts. *J. Dent. Res.* 1991;70:1450–1455. [[PubMed](#)]
103. Thonemann B, Schmalz G, Hiller KA, Schweikl H. Responses of L929 mouse fibroblasts and immortalized bovine dental papilla immortalized cell lines to dental resin components. *Dent. Mater.* 2002;18:318–323. [[PubMed](#)]
104. Schweikl H, Schmalz G, Spruss T. The induction of micronuclei *in vitro* by unpolymerized resin monomers. *J. Dent. Res.* 2001;80:1615–1620. [[PubMed](#)]
105. Hikage S, Nakayama K, Saito T, Takahashi Y, Kamataki T, Suzuki S, Hongo T, Sato A. Cytotoxicity of bisphenol A glycidyl methacrylate on cytochrome P450-producing cells. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2003;30:544–549. [[PubMed](#)]
106. Ratanasathien S, Wataha JC, Hanks CT, Dennison JB. Cytotoxic interactive effects of dentin bonding components on mouse fibroblasts. *J. Dent. Res.* 1995;74:1602–1606. [[PubMed](#)]
107. Kehe K, Reichl FX, Durner J, Walther U, Hickel R, Forth W. Cytotoxicity of dental composite components and mercury compounds in pulmonary cells. *Biomaterials.* 2001;22:317–322. [[PubMed](#)]
108. Heil TL, Volkmann KR, Wataha JC, Lockwood PE. Human peripheral blood monocytes versus THP-1 monocytes for *in vitro* biocompatibility testing of dental material components. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2002;29:401–407. [[PubMed](#)]
109. Lee DH, Lim BS, Lee YK, Ahn SJ, Yang HC. Involvement of oxidative stress in mutagenicity and apoptosis caused by dental resin monomers in cell cultures. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:1086–1092. [[PubMed](#)]
110. Becher R, Kopperud HM, Al RH, Samuelsen JT, Morisbak E, Dahlman HJ, Lilleaas EM, Dahl JE. Pattern of cell death after *in vitro* exposure to GDMA, TEGDMA, HEMA and two compomer extracts. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:630–640. [[PubMed](#)]
111. Reichl FX, Seiss M, Marquardt W, Kleinsasser N, Schweikl H, Kehe K, Hickel R. Toxicity potentiation by H₂O₂ with components of dental restorative materials on human oral cells. *Arch. Toxicol.* 2008;82:21–28. [[PubMed](#)]
112. Moharamzadeh K, van Noort R, Brook IM, Scutt AM. Cytotoxicity of resin monomers on human gingival fibroblasts and HaCaT keratinocytes. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:40–44. [[PubMed](#)]
113. Issa Y, Watts DC, Brunton PA, Waters CM, Duxbury AJ. Resin composite monomers alter MTT and LDH activity of human gingival fibroblasts *in vitro*. *Dent. Mater.* 2004;20:12–20. [[PubMed](#)]

114. Yoshii E. Cytotoxic effects of acrylates and methacrylates: Relationships of monomer structures and cytotoxicity. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 1997;37:517–524. [[PubMed](#)]
115. Geurtsen W, Leyhausen G. Chemical–biological interactions of the resin monomer triethyleneglycol-dimethacrylate (TEGDMA). *J. Dent. Res.* 2001;80:2046–2050. [[PubMed](#)]
116. Geurtsen W, Lehmann F, Spahl W, Leyhausen G. Cytotoxicity of 35 dental resin composite monomers/additives in permanent 3T3 and three human primary fibroblast cultures. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 1998;41:474–480. [[PubMed](#)]
117. Falconi M, Teti G, Zago M, Pelotti S, Breschi L, Mazzotti G. Effects of HEMA on type I collagen protein in human gingival fibroblasts. *Cell. Biol. Toxicol.* 2007;23:313–322. [[PubMed](#)]
118. Emmler J, Seiss M, Kreppel H, Reichl FX, Hickel R, Kehe K. Cytotoxicity of the dental composite component TEGDMA and selected metabolic by-products in human pulmonary cells. *Dent. Mater.* 2008;24:1670–1675. [[PubMed](#)]
119. Janke V, von Neuhoff N, Schlegelberger B, Leyhausen G, Geurtsen W. TEGDMA causes apoptosis in primary human gingival fibroblasts. *J. Dent. Res.* 2003;82:814–818. [[PubMed](#)]
120. Spagnuolo G, Galler K, Schmalz G, Cosentino C, Rengo S, Schweikl H. Inhibition of phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase amplifies TEGDMA-induced apoptosis in primary human pulp cells. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:703–707. [[PubMed](#)]
121. Samuelsen JT, Dahl JE, Karlsson S, Morisbak E, Becher R. Apoptosis induced by the monomers HEMA and TEGDMA involves formation of ROS and differential activation of the MAP-kinases p38, JNK and ERK. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:34–39. [[PubMed](#)]
122. Eckhardt A, Gerstmayr N, Hiller K-A, Bolay C, Waha C, Spagnuolo G, Camargo C, Schmalz G, Schweikl H. TEGDMA-induced oxidative DNA damage and activation of ATM and MAP kinases. *Biomaterials.* 2009;30:2006–2014. [[PubMed](#)]
123. Stanislowski L, Lefevre M, Bourd K, Soheili-Majd E, Goldberg M, Perianin A. TEGDMA-induced toxicity in human fibroblasts is associated with early and drastic glutathione depletion with subsequent production of oxygen reactive species. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 2003;66A:476–482.
124. Schweikl H, Hiller K-A, Eckhardt A, Bolay C, Spagnuolo G, Stempf T, Schmalz G. Differential gene expression involved in oxidative stress response caused by triethylene glycol dimethacrylate. *Biomaterials.* 2008;29:1377–1387. [[PubMed](#)]
125. Walther UI, Siagian II, Walther SC, Reichl FX, Hickel R. Antioxidative vitamins decrease cytotoxicity of HEMA and TEGDMA in cultured cell lines. *Arch. Oral Biol.* 2004;49:125–131. [[PubMed](#)]
126. Spagnuolo G, D'Anto V, Cosentino C, Schmalz G, Schweikl H, Rengo S. Effect of N-acetyl-L-cysteine on ROS production and cell death caused by HEMA in human primary gingival fibroblasts. *Biomaterials.* 2006;27:1803–1809. [[PubMed](#)]
127. Schweikl H, Hartmann A, Hiller K-A, Spagnuolo G, Bolay C, Brockhoff G, Schmalz G. Inhibition of TEGDMA and HEMA-induced genotoxicity and cell cycle arrest by N-acetylcysteine. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:688–695. [[PubMed](#)]
128. Lefevre M, Bourd K, Lorient MA, Goldberg M, Beaune P, Périanin A, Stanislowski L. TEGDMA modulates glutathione transferase P1 activity in gingival fibroblasts. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:914–919.

[[PubMed](#)]

129. Engelmann J, Volk J, Leyhausen G, Geurtsen W. ROS formation and glutathione levels in human oral fibroblasts exposed to TEGDMA and camphorquinone. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2005;75B:272–276. [[PubMed](#)]
130. Noda M, Wataha JC, Lewis JB, Kaga M, Lockwood PE, Messer RLW, Sano H. Dental adhesive compounds alter glutathione levels but not glutathione redox balance in human THP-1 monocytic cells. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2005;73B:308–314. [[PubMed](#)]
131. Volk J, Engelmann J, Leyhausen G, Geurtsen W. Effects of three resin monomers on the cellular glutathione concentration of cultured human gingival fibroblasts. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:499–505. [[PubMed](#)]
132. Lefeuvre M, Amjaad W, Goldberg M, Stanislawski L. TEGDMA induces mitochondrial damage and oxidative stress in human gingival fibroblasts. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:5130–5137. [[PubMed](#)]
133. Bakopoulou AA, Tsiftoglou AS, Galaktidou G, Markala D, Trivai IN, Garefis PD. Patterns of cell death and cell cycle profiles of cultured WEHI 13 var fibroblasts exposed to eluates of composite resins used for direct and indirect restorations. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 2007;115:397–407. [[PubMed](#)]
134. Okada H, Mak TW. Pathways of apoptotic and non-apoptotic death in tumour cells. *Cancer.* 2004;4:592–603. [[PubMed](#)]
135. Steller H. Mechanisms and genes of cellular suicide. *Science.* 1995;267:1445–1450. [[PubMed](#)]
136. Kleinsasser NH, Schmid K, Sassen AW, Harreus UA, Staudenmaier R, Folwaczny M, Glas J, Reichl FX. Cytotoxic and genotoxic effects of resin monomers in human salivary gland tissue and lymphocytes as assessed by the single cell microgel electrophoresis (comet) assay. *Biomaterials.* 2006;27:1762–1770. [[PubMed](#)]
137. Kleinsasser NH, Wallner BC, Harreus UA, Kleinjung T, Folwaczny M, HICKEL R, Kehe K, Reichl FX. Genotoxicity and cytotoxicity of dental materials in human lymphocytes as assessed by the single cell microgel electrophoresis (comet) assay. *J. Dent.* 2004;32:229–234. [[PubMed](#)]
138. Schweikl H, Schmalz G. Triethylene glycol dimethacrylate induces large deletions in the hprt gene of V79 cells. *Mutat. Res.* 1999;438:71–78. [[PubMed](#)]
139. Li N, Miao X, Takakuwa M, Sato K, Sato A. Effect of dental material HEMA monomer on human dental pulp cells. *Artif. Cells Blood Substit. Immobil. Biotechnol.* 1999;27:85–90. [[PubMed](#)]
140. Schweikl H, Altmannberger I, Hanser N, Hiller KA, Bolay C, Brockhoff G, Spagnuolo G, Galler K, Schmalz G. The effect of triethylene glycol dimethacrylate on the cell cycle of mammalian cells. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:4111–4118. [[PubMed](#)]
141. Noda M, Wataha JC, Lockwood PE, Volkmann KR, Kaga M, Sano H. Sublethal, 2-week exposures of dental material components alter TNF-alpha secretion of THP-1 monocytes. *Dent. Mater.* 2003;19:101–105. [[PubMed](#)]
142. Schmalz G, Schweikl H, Hiller KA. Release of prostaglandin E2, IL-6 and IL-8 from human oral epithelial culture models after exposure to compounds of dental materials. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 2000;108:442–448. [[PubMed](#)]
143. Eckhardt A, Harorli T, Limtanyakul J, Hiller KA, Bosl C, Bolay C, Reichl FX, Schmalz G, Schweikl H. Inhibition of cytokine and surface antigen expression in LPS-stimulated murine macrophages by triethylene

glycol dimethacrylate. *Biomaterials*. 2009;30:1665–1674. [[PubMed](#)]

144. Gregson KS, O'Neill JT, Platt JA, Windsor LJ. *In vitro* induction of hydrolytic activity in human gingival and pulp fibroblasts by triethylene glycol dimethacrylate and monocyte chemotactic protein-1. *Dent. Mater.* 2008;24:1461–1467. [[PubMed](#)]

145. Lee DH, Kim NR, Lim BS, Lee YK, Ahn SJ, Yang HC. Effects of TEGDMA and HEMA on the expression of COX-2 and iNOS in cultured murine macrophage cells. *Dent. Mater.* 2009;25:240–246. [[PubMed](#)]

146. Engelmann J, Leyhausen G, Leibfritz D, Geurtsen W. Metabolic effects of dental resin components *in vitro* detected by NMR spectroscopy. *J. Dent. Res.* 2001;80:869–875. [[PubMed](#)]

147. de Munck J, van Landuyt K, Peumans M, Poitevin A, Lambrechts P, Braem M, van Meerbeek B. A critical review of the durability of adhesion to tooth tissue: Methods and results. *J. Dent. Res.* 2005;84:118–132. [[PubMed](#)]

148. Teti G, Mazzotti G, Zago M, Ortolani M, Breschi L, Pelotti S, Ruggeri A, Falconi M. HEMA down-regulates procollagen alpha1 type I in human gingival fibroblasts. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. A*. 2009;90:256–262. [[PubMed](#)]

149. Chang HH, Guo MK, Kasten FH, Chang MC, Huang GF, Wang YL, Wang RS, Jeng JH. Stimulation of glutathione depletion, ROS production and cell cycle arrest of dental pulp cells and gingival epithelial cells by HEMA. *Biomaterials*. 2005;26:745–753. [[PubMed](#)]

150. Spagnuolo G, Mauro C, Leonardi A, Santillo M, Paterno R, Schweikl H, Avvedimento EV, Rengo S. NF-B protection against apoptosis induced by HEMA. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:837–842. [[PubMed](#)]

151. Paranjpe A, Bordador LCF, Wang MY, Hume WR, Jewett A. Resin monomer 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate (HEMA) is a potent inducer of apoptotic cell death in human and mouse cells. *J. Dent. Res.* 2005;84:172–177. [[PubMed](#)]

152. Reichl FX, Esters M, Simon S, Seiss M, Kehe K, Kleinsasser N, Folwaczny M, Glas J, Hickel R. Cell death effects of resin-based dental material compounds and mercurials in human gingival fibroblasts. *Arch. Toxicol.* 2006;80:370–377. [[PubMed](#)]

153. Rakich DR, Wataha JC, Lefebvre CA, Weller RN. Effect of dentin bonding agents on the secretion of inflammatory mediators from macrophages. *J. Endod.* 1999;25:114–117. [[PubMed](#)]

154. Mantellini MG, Botero T, Yaman P, Dennison JB, Hanks CT, Nör JE. Adhesive resin and the hydrophilic monomer HEMA induce VEGF expression on dental pulp cells and macrophages. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:434–440. [[PubMed](#)]

155. Chang MC, Lin LD, Chan CP, Chang HH, Chen LI, Lin HJ, Yeh HW, Tseng WY, Lin PS, Lin CC, Jeng JH. The effect of BisGMA on cyclooxygenase-2 expression, PGE2 production and cytotoxicity via reactive oxygen species- and MEK/ERK-dependent and -independent pathways *Biomaterials* 2009. in press.

156. Engelmann J, Janke V, Volk J, Leyhausen G, Neuhoff NV, Schlegelberger B, Geurtsen W. Effects of BisGMA on glutathione metabolism and apoptosis in human gingival fibroblasts *in vitro*. *Biomaterials*. 2004;25:4573–4580. [[PubMed](#)]

157. Polydorou O, König A, Hellwig E, Kümmerer K. Uthethane dimethacrylate: A molecule that may cause confusion in dental research *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater* 2009. in press.

158. Kostoryz EL, Tong PY, Strautman AF, Glaros AG, Eick JD, Yourtee DM. Effects of dental resins on TNF- α -induced ICAM-1 expression in endothelial cells. *J. Dent. Res.* 2001;80:1789–1792. [[PubMed](#)]
159. Kostoryz EL, Eick JD, Glaros AG, Judy BM, Welshons WV, Burmaster S, Yourtee DM. Biocompatibility of hydroxylated metabolites of BISGMA and BFDGE. *J. Dent. Res.* 2003;82:367–371. [[PubMed](#)]
160. Imazato S, Horikawa D, Nishida M, Ebisu S. Effects of monomers eluted from dental resin restoratives on osteoblast-like cells. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2009;88B:378–386. [[PubMed](#)]
161. Theilig C, Tegtmeier Y, Leyhausen G, Geurtsen W. Effects of BisGMA and TEGDMA on proliferation, migration, and tenascin expression of human fibroblasts and keratinocytes. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. (Appl. Biomater.)*. 2000;53:632–639.
162. Atsumi T, Iwakura I, Fujisawa S, Ueha T. The production of reactive oxygen species by irradiated camphorquinone-related photosensitizers and their effect on cytotoxicity. *Arch. Oral Biol.* 2001;46:391–401. [[PubMed](#)]
163. Atsumi T, Ishihara M, Kadoma Y, Tonosaki K, Fujisawa S. Comparative radical production and cytotoxicity induced by camphorquinone and 9-fluorenone against human pulp fibroblasts. *J. Oral Rehabil.* 2004;31:1155–1164. [[PubMed](#)]
164. Masuki K, Nomura Y, Bhawal UK, Sawajiri M, Hirata I, Nahara Y, Okazaki M. Apoptotic and necrotic influence of dental resin polymerization initiators in human gingival fibroblast cultures. *Dent. Mater. J.* 2007;26:861–869. [[PubMed](#)]
165. Li YC, Huang FM, Lee SS, Lin RH, Chang YC. Protective effects of antioxidants on micronuclei induced by camphorquinone/N,N-dimethyl-p-toluidine employing *in vitro* mammalian test system. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part B: Appl. Biomater.* 2007;82B:23–28. [[PubMed](#)]
166. Pagoria D, Lee A, Geurtsen W. The effect of camphorquinone (CQ) and CQ-related photosensitizers on the generation of reactive oxygen species and the production of oxidative DNA damage. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:4091–4099. [[PubMed](#)]
167. Winter K, Pagoria D, Geurtsen W. The effect of antioxidants on oxidative DNA damage induced by visible-light-irradiated camphorquinone/N,N-dimethyl-p-toluidine. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:5321–5329. [[PubMed](#)]
168. Pagoria D, Geurtsen W. The effect of N-acetyl-L-cysteine and ascorbic acid on visible-light-irradiated camphorquinone/N,N-dimethyl-p-toluidine-induced oxidative stress in two immortalized cell lines. *Biomaterials.* 2005;26:6136–6142. [[PubMed](#)]
169. Cimpan MR, Matre R, Skaug N, Lie SA, Lygre H. The coinitiator DMABEE induces death by apoptosis and necrosis in human monoblastoid cells. *Clin. Oral Invest.* 2005;9:168–172.
170. Lygre H, Vorland M, Holmsen H. Interaction of a dental filling material eluate and membrane lipids. *Clin. Oral Investig.* 2001;5:167–171.
171. Bergenholz G. Evidence for bacterial causation of adverse pulpal responses in resin-based dental restorations. *Crit. Rev. Oral. Biol. Med.* 2000;11:467–480. [[PubMed](#)]
172. Cox CF, Sübay RK, Suzuki S, Suzuki SH, Ostro E. Biocompatibility of various dental materials: Pulp healing with a surface seal. *Int. J. Periodontics. Restorative. Dent.* 1996;16:240–251. [[PubMed](#)]
173. van Meerbeek B, de Munck J, Yoshida Y, Inoue S, Vargas M, Vijay P, van Landuyt K, Lambrechts P,

- Vanherle G. Buonocore memorial lecture. Adhesion to enamel and dentin: Current status and future challenges. *Oper. Dent.* 2003;28:215–235. [[PubMed](#)]
174. Hansel C, Leyhausen G, Mai UE, Geurtsen W. Effects of various resin composite (co)monomers and extracts on two caries-associated micro-organisms *in vitro*. *J. Dent. Res.* 1998;77:60–67. [[PubMed](#)]
175. Kawai K, Tsuchitani Y. Effects of resin composite components on glucosyltransferase of cariogenic bacterium. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 2000;51:123–127. [[PubMed](#)]
176. Khalichi P, Singh J, Cvitkovitch DG, Santerre P. The influence of triethylene glycol derived from dental composite resins on the regulation of *Streptococcus mutans* gene expression. *Biomaterials.* 2009;30:452–459. [[PubMed](#)]
177. Takahashi Y, Imazato S, Russell RRB, Noiri Y, Ebisu S. Influence of resin monomers on growth of oral streptococci. *J. Dent. Res.* 2004;83:302–306. [[PubMed](#)]
178. Tanagawa M, Yoshida K, Matsumoto S, Yamada T, Atsuta M. Inhibitory effect of antibacterial resin composite against *Streptococcus mutans*. *Caries. Res.* 1999;33:366–371. [[PubMed](#)]
179. Imazato S, Tarumi H, Ebi N, Ebisu S. Cytotoxic effects of composite restorations employing self-etching primers or experimental antibacterial primers. *J. Dent.* 2000;28:61–67. [[PubMed](#)]
180. Imazato S. Antibacterial properties of resin composites and dentin bonding systems. *Dent. Mater.* 2003;19:449–457. [[PubMed](#)]
181. Geurtsen W. Toxicology of dental materials and 'clinical experience' [editorial]. *J. Dent. Res.* 2003;82:500. [[PubMed](#)]
182. Goracci G, Mori G, Bazzucchi M. Marginal seal and biocompatibility of a fourth-generation bonding agent. *Dent. Mater.* 1995;11:343–347. [[PubMed](#)]
183. Gilpatrick RO, Johnson W, Moore D, Turner J. Pulpal response to dentin etched with 10% phosphoric acid. *Am. J. Dent.* 1996;9:125–129. [[PubMed](#)]
184. de Souza Costa CA, Hebling J, Randall RC. Human pulp response to resin cements used to bond inlay restorations. *Dent. Mater.* 2006;22:954–962. [[PubMed](#)]
185. Inokoshi S, Fujitani M, Otsuki M, Sonoda H, Kitasako Y, Shimada Y, Tagami J. Monkey pulpal responses to conventional and adhesive luting cements. *Oper. Dent.* 1998;23:21–29. [[PubMed](#)]
186. Fuks AB, Cleaton-Jones P. Pulp response to a composite resin inserted in deep cavities with and without surface seal. *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 1990;63:129–134. [[PubMed](#)]
187. Fujitani M, Inokoshi S, Hosoda H. Effect of acid etching on the dental pulp in adhesive composite restorations. *Int. Dent. J.* 1992;42:3–11. [[PubMed](#)]
188. Pereira JC, Segala AD, Costa CA. Human pulpal response to direct pulp capping with an adhesive system. *Am. J. Dent.* 2000;13:139–147. [[PubMed](#)]
189. Medina VO, Shinkai K, Shirono M, Tanaka N, Katoh Y. Histopathologic study on pulp response to single-bottle and self-etching adhesive systems. *Oper. Dent.* 2002;27:330–342. [[PubMed](#)]
190. de Sousa Costa CA, Lopes Nascimento AB, Teixeira HM, Fontana UF. Response of human pulps capped with a self-etching adhesive system. *Dent. Mater.* 2001;17:230–240. [[PubMed](#)]

191. Horsted-Bindslev P, Vilkinis V, Sidlauskas A. Direct capping of human pulps with a dentin bonding system or with calcium hydroxide cement. *Oral Surg. Oral Med. Oral Pathol. Oral Radiol. Endod.* 2003;96:591–600. [[PubMed](#)]
192. Moore MM, Burke FJ, Felix DH. Allergy to a common component of resin-bonding systems: A case report. *Dent. Update.* 2000;27:432–434. [[PubMed](#)]
193. Kanerva L. Cross-reactions of multifunctional methacrylates and acrylates. *Acta Odontol. Scand.* 2001;59:320–329. [[PubMed](#)]
194. Carmichael AJ, Gibson JJ, Walls AW. Allergic contact dermatitis to bisphenol-A-glycidylmethacrylate (BIS-GMA) dental resin associated with sensitivity to epoxy resin. *Br. Dent. J.* 1997;183:297–298. [[PubMed](#)]
195. Hutchinson I. Hypersensitivity to an orthodontic bonding agent. A case report. *Br. Dent. J.* 1994;21:331–333.
196. Ilie N, Hickel R. Macro-, micro- and nano-mechanical investigations on silorane and methacrylate-based composites. *Dent. Mater.* 2009;25:810–819. [[PubMed](#)]
197. Polydorou O, König A, Hellwig E, Kümmerer K. Long-term release of monomers from modern dental-composite materials. *Eur. J. Oral. Sci.* 2009;117:68–75. [[PubMed](#)]
198. Bouillaguet S, Wataha JC, Virgillito M, Gonzalez L, Rakich DR, Meyer JM. Effect of sub-lethal concentrations of HEMA (2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate) on THP-1 human monocyte-macrophages *in vitro*. *Dent. Mater.* 2000;16:213–217. [[PubMed](#)]
199. Spagnuolo G, D'Antò V, Valletta R, Strisciuglio C, Schmalz G, Schweikl H, Rengo S. Effect of 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate on human pulp cell survival pathways ERK and AKT. *J. Endod.* 2008;34:684–688. [[PubMed](#)]
200. Volk J, Leyhausen G, Dogan S, Geurtsen W. Additive effects of TEGDMA and hydrogenperoxide on the cellular glutathione content of human gingival fibroblasts. *Dent. Mater.* 2007;23:921–926. [[PubMed](#)]

Articles from *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* are provided here courtesy of
Molecular Diversity Preservation International (MDPI)