



HAL
open science

Comparative effects of various commercially available mouth-rinse formulations on oral malodour.

Saliha Saad

► **To cite this version:**

Saliha Saad. Comparative effects of various commercially available mouth-rinse formulations on oral malodour.. *Oral Diseases*, 2010, 17 (2), pp.180. 10.1111/j.1601-0825.2010.01714.x . hal-00599897

HAL Id: hal-00599897

<https://hal.science/hal-00599897>

Submitted on 11 Jun 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ORAL DISEASES

Comparative effects of various commercially available mouth-rinse formulations on oral malodour.

Journal:	<i>Oral Diseases</i>
Manuscript ID:	ODI-08-09-OM-1371.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Apr-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Saad, Saliha; University of the West of England, Centre of Research in Biomedicine
Keywords:	Immunology and Microbiology, Mouth-rinses oral malodour



1
2
3 Comparative effects of various commercially available mouth-rinse formulations on
4 oral malodour.
5

6
7 **Authors: Saad S¹, Greenman J¹, Shaw H²**
8

- 9
10 1. Microbiology Unit, University of West of England, Coldharbour Lane,
11 Bristol, BS16 1QY, UK
12 2. Healthcare Brands International Ltd, 2nd Floor, The Clock Tower, Talbot
13 Street, Nottingham, NG1 5GG, UK
14

15
16 Contact author: Prof John Greenman
17

18
19 E-mail: John.Greenman@uwe.ac.uk
20

21 *Key words:*
22

23 Oral malodour, mouth rinse, volatile sulphur compounds, hydrogen sulphide,
24 zinc, chlorhexidine, organoleptic, Halimeter, OralChroma, anaerobic bacteria
25
26

27 **Abstract**

28
29 **Objectives:** To compare a new mouthwash (SB12[®]) containing 0.025%
30 chlorhexidine and 0.3% zinc for oral malodour reduction against four
31 commercially available mouthwashes and negative control. **A secondary aim**
32 **was to compare the two methods for measuring volatile sulphur**
33 **compounds (VSC) by halimetry and OralChroma.**
34
35

36
37 **Methods:** Organoleptic scale, halimeter and the OralChroma were used to
38 assess oral malodour and VSC. The effects of five test formulations and water
39 (negative control) were assessed after 30-, 60-, 90- and 180-minutes, with
40 one week between the treatments to avoid any cross-over effect.
41

42
43 **Results:** Reduction in H₂S by halimetry and malodour levels by organoleptic
44 assessment ranged from, **slight** (LacerFresh[®]) (P > 0.05), moderate
45 (BreathRx[®], SmartMouth[®]) (P < 0.01) to **marked** effect (SB12[®], Listerine[®]) (P
46 < 0.001) at all time points compared to water. The largest differences were
47 observed at 30-minutes and decreased with time. SB12[®] showed separation
48 from Listerine[®] at 180-minutes, using ANOVA plus Bonferroni's Multiple
49 Comparison post-test (P < 0.05). Relationships between organoleptic,
50 halimeter and OralChroma were between R² = 0.795 to 0.926.
51
52

53
54 **Conclusion:** SB12 shows a consistent and reproducible inhibitory effect on
55 oral malodour parameters which in turn **correlate well with each other.**
56
57

58 **Introduction**

59
60

1
2
3 A significant source of oral malodour is from organisms on the surface of the
4 tongue with microbes inhabiting the tongue biofilm being responsible for
5 approximately 80% of cases of oral malodour (Yeagaki and Sanada, 1992;
6 Rosenberg and Leib, 1995; Van den Broek *et al.*, 2008). The particular
7 papillary surface of the tongue with its large number of crypts and fissures
8 allows it to harbour a high number of bacteria in a relatively anaerobic
9 environment (Tonzetich, 1977). The extremely diverse microflora particularly
10 Gram-negative anaerobes possess enzymes that allow biotransformations of
11 sulphur-substrates (cysteine, methionine and glutathione) into volatile sulphur
12 compounds (VSC) (Kleinberg and Westbay, 1990; Scully *et al.*, 1997). The
13 main VSC in oral malodour is believed to be hydrogen sulphide (H₂S),
14 although methyl mercaptan (CH₃SH) (Tonzetich, 1971; Yaegaki and Sanada,
15 1992) and dimethyl sulphide (CH₃)₂S may also play a role (Quiryneen, 2003;
16 Suarez *et al.*, 2000). In addition to producing bad breath, VSC produced by
17 periodontopathogens in the gingival crevice have been implicated in the
18 aetiology of periodontal disease resulting in tooth loss if left untreated
19 (Shapiro *et al.*, 1977; Radcliff and Johnson, 1999). Other volatile organic
20 compounds (VOC) contribute to an unknown extent to oral malodour and they
21 are thought to include indole, amines and acids (Kostlec *et al.*, 1980;
22 Goldberg *et al.*, 1994; Radcliff and Johnson, 1999).
23
24
25
26
27

28 Numerous mouthwashes are available for use as part of a daily oral hygiene
29 routine. The formulations contain actives that may inhibit microbial growth,
30 enzymatic reactions or may react directly with VSC to reduce their levels in
31 the breath. In addition, these formulations may include flavour-compounds,
32 which can mask the effects of odiferous compounds.
33
34

35 Certain metal ions, in particular zinc (Zn), are well known to reduce or inhibit
36 the formation of VSC (Tonzetich, 1971; Yaegaki and Suetaka, 1989; Young *et al.*,
37 2002) as do certain antibacterial agents such as chlorhexidine (CHX) and
38 cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) with a subsequent reduction in oral malodour
39 (Denton, 1991; Loe and Schiott, 1970; Lang *et al.*, 1973; Grossman *et al.*,
40 1996; Young *et al.*, 2002; Winkel *et al.*, 2003; **Roldan *et al.*, 2003**). The
41 combination of low concentrations of Zn and CHX seems to be particularly
42 effective (Young *et al.*, 2002; Winkel *et al.*, 2003). More evidence is emerging
43 for the efficacy of this combination including double-blind comparisons with
44 several widely used formulations against halitosis. The studies have in the
45 main used gas chromatography (GC) to measure VSC (Tonzetich *et al.*, 1991;
46 Yaegaki and Sanada, 1992; Rosenberg, 1996).
47
48
49

50 Two common approaches to assessing oral malodour include halimetry and
51 organoleptic measurements by a trained odour judge (Rosenberg *et al.*, 1991;
52 De Boever *et al.*, 1994). More recently another instrument has been
53 commonly employed; a portable GC system (OralChroma®). Organoleptic
54 assessments by a trained judge have been shown to correlate with halimetry
55 (Rosenberg *et al.*, 1991; De Boever *et al.*, 1994) but the relationship between
56 these measurements and Oral Chroma have not been widely studied.
57
58
59

60 The aim of this study was to compare a combination of low concentrations of
Zn and CHX (SB12®) with several commercially available mouthwash

1
2
3 preparations and a negative control using both organoleptic measures and a
4 halimeter. A secondary aim was to compare these results with those obtained
5 using an OralChroma®.
6

7
8 The hypothesis to be tested in this study was that the combination of Zn and
9 CHX in low concentrations is at least as effective as a selection of other
10 currently used antibacterial agents/mouth rinses against malodour and VSC
11 concentrations. By testing the active formulations against a negative control
12 (water), information could be gained as to the efficacy of test compounds in
13 terms of their immediate (within 30 minutes) and intermediate (3 hour) effects.
14
15

16 **Materials and methods**

17 *Human subjects*

18
19 Fourteen volunteers from the University of the West of England were selected
20 from a database of volunteers previously screened for inclusion in malodour
21 trials. The panel included 8 female and 6 male with a mean age at onset of 39
22 years (range 23 – 64). They were all healthy adults with no sign of oral
23 disease.
24
25

26 *Study design*

27
28 The study was double-blind and neither judge, technician or panellists knew
29 which product was administered for all test days. Test days were one week
30 apart. Each subject was randomly assigned a label 1 to 14. The mouthwashes
31 were assigned letters A to F. All products were dispensed into **15 ml** volumes
32 by an independent technical member of staff. The volunteers rinsed for 2
33 minutes for each mouthwash. Each subject received all test products in
34 random order thereby acting as their own control.
35
36

37
38 Eligibility criteria included informed consent and availability at the specified
39 study intervals and sampling times plus a baseline organoleptic malodour
40 score of >2 on each study morning. Exclusion criteria included; medical
41 history of infectious diseases (e.g. hepatitis, HIV, tuberculosis); **obvious**
42 **gingival inflammation, active or severe caries, gingivitis or advanced**
43 **periodontitis and oral thrush**; antibiotic medication within 1 month prior to
44 the start of the trial or during the trial period; consumption of medicated
45 sweets containing antimicrobial agents; changes in oral hygiene practices
46 during the trial; consumption of foods associated with oral malodour (such as
47 garlic, spices or alcohol) on the day prior to, and on the sampling day; wearing
48 of strongly perfumed cosmetics on the sampling day and substantial false
49 dentition. On the evening prior to the test day volunteers were instructed to
50 continue their normal oral hygiene habit but on the morning of their
51 assessments they were asked to avoid oral hygiene (brushing their teeth) and
52 food intake.
53
54
55

56
57 All participants were provided with their individual protocol, a diary and
58 appointment dates/times for attending the laboratory. An adverse reaction
59 form was available on request from the principal investigator. With the
60 exception of the treatment mornings, subjects were not asked to alter their
normal oral hygiene regime throughout the 6-week study.

Oral test rinses

Five oral rinses, all of which are commercially available, were compared along with water as the negative control; SB12[®], Listerine[®], BreathRX[®], Smarth Mouth[®] and Lacer Fresh[®]. Table 1 lists the mouthrinses, the manufacturers and a summary of their ingredients (and amounts) as far as this information is available.

Ethics and study conduct

The protocol and informed consent form were approved by the local Ethics Committee. The study was conducted in a manner consistent with the ethics encompassed within the 'Declaration of Helsinki'.

Organoleptic assessment

One trained odour judge scored breath odour levels using the 0 to 5 organoleptic scale as outlined by Rosenberg *et al.*, (1991) and modified in term of odour descriptives by Greenman *et al.* (2004), 0 = no odour, 1 = barely noticeable, 2 = slight odour, 3 = moderate odour, 4 = strong odour, 5 = very strong odour (saturation).

Instrumental analysis:

Measurements with Halimeter and OralChroma were taken according to the manufacturer's instructions. Two halimeter readings were taken and the calculated average was recorded as ppb. OralChroma readings were taken using a 1ml gas sample from a "2-minute" closed mouth via plastic syringe. **H₂S was obtained by measurements of area-under-curve (AUC) of the separated chromatographic peaks from the output trace. However, due to the 10 minute time period required for running samples, only one sample per person per time point was taken.**

Trial procedures

On the test day, volunteers reported to the breath odour judge who carried out a baseline breath assessment. Two assessments were taken within 5 minutes and an average value calculated for each time point. Following organoleptic assessment, the laboratory technician undertook baseline halimeter and OralChroma readings. The volunteers were then given **15 ml** of one of six test mouthrinses, in a randomised and double-blind manner and instructed to rinse the mouth for two-minutes. The breath assessments and instrumental readings were repeated at 30, 60, 90 and 180 minutes following test or control "treatment". The volunteers were not allowed to eat or drink between sampling.

Statistical analysis

Organoleptic scores, VSC concentrations (by halimetry) and H₂S (by OralChroma) were taken at baseline, 30, 60, 90 and 3 hours per person, per treatment. GraphPad Prism (GraphPad Software, San Diego, Ca, USA) was used to log transform, plot (as change in readings from time zero) and statistically analyse the data using ANOVA plus Bonferroni's multiple comparison post test. Correlation tests were performed using

Excel Microsoft and goodness of fit expressed as the coefficient of determination (r^2).

Results

Table 2 shows the range and overall average readings for the pre-treatment (baseline) conditions for the three measured parameters. Since this involved readings from 14 individual trialists on 6 different occasions (5 treatments and control) the total data points are $n = 84$. The mean and range are suitable for a designed study to show reductions in malodour parameters. Efficacy in terms of reduction in VSC compared to control substance F (water) as measured by the Halimeter (figure 1 and table 3) varied amongst the mouthrinse formulations, ranging from **no significant** effect with product D (LacerFresh[®]), moderate effect for products B (BreathRX[®]) and C (SmartMouth[®]) $p \leq 0.01$, to good **marked** with products E (SB12[®]) and A (Listerine[®]) $p \leq 0.001$.

Comparing the Halimeter[™] readings between products, SB12[®] ($p \leq 0.01$) and Listerine[®] ($p \leq 0.05$) both showed statistical separation from LacerFresh at all time points **using ANOVA plus Bonferroni's Multiple Comparison post test**. The separation for SB12 was larger and was maintained throughout the 3 hour observation period.

Efficacy as measured by reduction in breath odour using the organoleptic scale showed water to have a very slight breath reduction at 30 minutes, but then odour levels increase to above the initial, time zero, pre-treatment level. All products separated statistically from water at all time points (range $p \leq 0.05 - 0.001$). As can be seen in figure 2, product D (LacerFresh[®]) had the least benefit, products A (Listerine[®]), B (BreathRX[®]) and C (SmartMouth[®]) show more marked reductions whilst product E (SB12[®]) reduced breath odour levels to a measurably greater extent than all other products, and maintained the reduction up to 180 minutes.

SB12[®], (figure 2, table 3), showed statistical separation from LacerFresh[®] at all time points ($p < 0.001$), from SmartMouth[®] at 90 minutes ($p \leq 0.05$) and at 180 minutes ($p < 0.001$), and from Listerine[®] and BreathRX[®] by 180 minutes ($p < 0.01$). Listerine[®] showed statistical separation from LacerFresh[®] at all time points ($p \leq 0.05$). Smart Mouth[®] and BreathRX[®] separated from LacerFresh[®] from 60 minutes ($p < 0.001$).

The organoleptic data support the Halimeter[™] results with all products maintaining their positions of efficacy $F < D < C < B < A < E$. Figure 3 shows the results obtained for H_2S using the OralChroma[™]. **These data followed a similar profile of reduction and recovery over time as halimetry or organoleptic scores.** Relationships between organoleptic scores, Halimeter[™], and OralChroma were between $R^2 = 0.795$ to 0.926 as seen in figures 4-6.

Discussion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Five oral rinses, SB12[®] (containing a low concentration of Zn and CHX), Listerine[®], BreathRX[®], SmartMouth[®] and Lacer Fresh[®], all of which are commercially available, were compared along with water as the negative control. The odour-inhibiting capacity of the mouthwash formulations was determined using the organoleptic scale, the Halimeter and the OralChroma. Malodour levels of 14 orally healthy volunteers were assessed at baseline and at the same time periods during the day. The organoleptic assessment of individuals prior to and after treatment was performed by one trained odour judge in a completely double-blind manner. It is well accepted that humans have the capacity to determine the strength (i.e. concentration) of odour molecules. Models relating the organoleptic score to the occupancy of odour binding sites (degree of receptor saturation) have been proposed (Greenman *et al.*, 2004; 2005). Judges can be trained to score the strength of odour (0 to 5) and it is clear that to have a useful meaning, a zero score must relate to no detectable odour and a 5 must be as strong as it gets. When subjected to pure odour compounds of known concentrations, judges are able to discriminate and respond in a dose dependant manner even when the order of concentrations is randomised. Moreover, the judges can repeat their measurements at a later date and be shown to give similar (reproducible) responses. Another useful method to validate the organoleptic judge is to see how their scores compare with other objective measurements of the same or similar samples, using an instrumental gas sensor (e.g. Halimeter) or GC.

In this study, it was important to see whether any correlations between sensory and instrumental measurements existed so that one type of measure could be used to validate the other. Although some reports have shown a relationship between organoleptic score and either halimeter or GC (Rosenberg *et al.*, 1991; Doran *et al.*, 2007; Winkel and Tangerman 2005; Van del Velde *et al.*, 2009), no relationships between all three methods have been reported. In the current work, it was noticed that whether an inhibitory effect from an active mouthwash was calculated as a change in malodour value from time zero or as an absolute measurement at each time point, the correlations between the three methods of breath measurement were high. This finding implies that all methods are equally capable of assessing oral malodour and that any method on its own might also be sufficient.

The inhibitory effects on H₂S and oral malodour can be described as follows: slight effect (Lacer Fresh[®]), a moderate effect (BreathRX[®], SmartMouth[®]) and a marked effect (Listerine[®], SB12[®]). However, in comparison with a clinically proven mouthwash such as Listerine (Pitts *et al.*, 1983), SB12 was shown to be numerically and at some time points, statistically, superior.

Chlorhexidine, a cationic bis-biguanide with low mammalian toxicity and broad spectrum activity against Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria (Denton, 1991) has been used for *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies (Kinniment *et al.*, 1996; Jones, 1997). The cationic properties of CHX explain how its electrostatic attraction by the anionic bacterial surfaces may lead to membrane disruption, increased permeability and cell death and as a result, to a reduction in bacterial load (Jones, 1997; Kuyyakanond, 1992, Quiryneen and Zhao, 2002)

1
2
3 and malodour. CHX is also known for its high substantivity to buccal surfaces
4 and has been shown to reduce gingival inflammation and dental plaque
5 (Cummins and Creeth, 1992; Addy and Moran, 1997; Bollen and Quirynen,
6 1996). The strong antimicrobial action and increased substantivity in the
7 mouth of CHX justify its use for malodour reduction (Bossy *et al.*, 1994; De
8 Bover *et al.*, 1996). More recently, CHX has been used in association with
9 other anti-malodour agents such as CPC and Zn and the efficacy of this
10 combination was shown to be more effective than CHX alone (Quirynen *et al.*,
11 2002; Roldan *et al.*, 2000) suggesting a more synergistic effect by CHX when
12 present with other active compounds.
13
14

15
16 The efficacy of CHX against microbes has been shown to be both dose and
17 time-dependant (Quirynen **and Zhao**, 2002) and different product
18 formulations may use CHX at different concentrations which might explain the
19 variability of side effects such as discolouration of the oral mucosa and teeth
20 as well as an alteration of taste (Bossy *et al.*, 1994; Flötra *et al.*, 1971;
21 Quirynen **and Zhao**, 2002).
22
23

24 From the 1970's onwards, zinc has been extensively studied either on its own
25 or in association with other compounds used to control oral malodour,
26 (Tonzetich, 1977; Schmidt and Tarbet, 1978; Wåler, **1978**; Young *et al.*,
27 2001). In addition to its antimicrobial properties, zinc is relatively non-toxic,
28 non-cumulative and gives no visible coloration (Quirynen *et al.*, 2002). It is
29 believed that zinc binds to the membrane of microorganisms, interfering with,
30 and reducing cell growth rate (Sugman, 1983; Radke *et al.*, 1994). It has also
31 been suggested that zinc reacts with VSC by forming an insoluble complex
32 (ZnS) which is non-volatile and thus non-odiferous (Boulware *et al.*, 1985).
33
34
35

36 In previous clinical trials using mouthwashes containing zinc, volunteers have
37 reported an unpleasant metallic taste (**Young *et al.*, 2003**). It has also been
38 shown that low concentrations of zinc alone do not produce an unpleasant
39 taste but are not very effective against oral malodour. Likewise, CHX at high
40 concentrations produces taste effects as well as staining. Young *et al.* showed
41 that low concentrations of CHX still maintained an effect over time. It could be
42 that a low concentration of CHX may reduce the staining of the teeth without
43 losing all of its anti malodour properties. **A synergistic effect between low
44 zinc and low CHX, previously observed by others (Thrane *et al.*, 2007;
45 Young *et al.*, 2003) may reduce oral malodour and decrease the above
46 mentioned side-effects. It is likely that zinc and CHX have different high-
47 affinity binding sites within the cell, and that occupation of one type of
48 site makes the cell more sensitive to the inhibitory or cidal effects of the
49 other type of ligand.**
50
51
52
53

54 In conclusion, a combination of CHX and Zn in low concentration, such as
55 SB12, was shown to reduce significantly (for up to 3 hours) H₂S **in the oral**
56 **cavity** which is considered to be the main contributor to oral malodour.
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- Andy M and Moran J (1997). Clinical indications for the use of chemical adjuncts to plaque control: chlorhexidine formulations. *Periodontol 2000* **15**: 52-54.
- Bollen CML and Quirynen M (1996). Microbiological response to mechanical treatment in combination with adjunctive therapy: a review of the literature. *J Periodontol* **67**: 1143-1158.
- Boulware RT, Southard GL, Yankell SL (1985). Sanguinaria extract, a new agent for the control of volatile sulphur compounds in the oral cavity. *J Soc Cosmet* **36**: 297-302.
- Bosy A, Kulkarni GV, Rosenberg M, McCulloch CA (1994). Relationship of oral malodor to periodontitis :evidence of independence in discrete subpopulations. *J Periodontol*; **65**(1): 37-46.
- Cummins D and Creeth JE (1992). Delivery of antiplaque agents from dentifrice, gels and mouthwashes. *Int Dent J* **71**: 1439-1449.
- De Boever EH, De Uzeda M, Loesche WJ (1994). Relationship between volatile sulfur compounds, BANA-hydrolyzing bacteria and gingival health in patients with and without complaints of oral malodor. *J Clin Dent* **4** (4): 114-9.
- De Boever EH (1996). The tongue microbiota and tongue surface characteristics contribute to oral malodor. **In: *Bad Breath: a multidisciplinary approach*, pp 111-121, Leuven, Leuven University Press.**
- Denton GW (1991). *Chlorhexidine Disinfection, Sterilization and Preservation*. **4th edn ed S S Block, p 274-289, Philadelphia, PA: Lea and Febiger.**
- Doran A, Greenman J, Verran J (2007). A clinical study on the antimicrobial and breath-freshening effect of zinc-containing lozenge formulations. *Microbial ecology in health and disease* **19** (3): 164-170.
- Flötra L, Gjeramo P, Rölla G, Waerhaug J (1971). Side effects of Chlorhexidine mouth washes. *Scand J Dent Res* **79**: 119-125.
- Goldberg S, Kozlovski A, Gordon D, Gelernter I, Sintov A, Rosenberg M (1994). Cadaverine as a putative component of oral malodour. *J Dent Res* **73**: 1168-1172.
- Greenman J, Duffield J, Spencer P, Rosenberg M, Corry D, Saad S, *et al* (2004). Study on the organoleptic intensity scale for measuring oral malodor. *J Dent Res* **83** (1): 81-5.
- Greenman J, Duffield J, Spencer P, Rosenberg M, Corry D, Saad S, *et al* (2005). Assessing the relationship between the concentrations of compounds and odor scores from judges. *JADA* **136**: 749-757.

1
2
3 Grossman E, Cronin M, Dembling W, *et al* (1996). A comparative clinical study of
4 extrinsic tooth stain removal with two electric toothbrushes (Braun D7 and D9) and a
5 manual brush. *Am J Den* **9**: S25-S29.

6
7
8 Jones CG (1997). Chlorhexidine is it still the gold standard. *Periodontol 2000* **15**: 55-
9 62.

10
11 Kimminent SL, Wimpenny JW, Adams D and Marsh PD (1996). The effect of
12 chlorhexidine on defined, mixed culture oral biofilms grown in a nivel system. *J Appl*
13 *Bacteriol* **81**: 120-5.

14
15
16 Kleinberg I and Westbay G (1990). Oral malodour. *Crit Rev Oral Biol Med* **1**: 247-
17 259.

18
19
20 Kostlec JG, Preti G, Zelson PR, Stoller NH, Tonzetich J (1980). Salivary volatiles as
21 indicators of periodontitis *J.Periodont Res* **15**: 185-192.

22
23
24 Kuyyakanond T and Quesnel LB (1992). The mechanism of action of chlorhexidine.
25 *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **79**: 211-215.

26
27
28 Lang NP, Cumming BR, Loe H (1973). Toothbrush frequency as it is related to
29 plaque development and gingival health. *J Periodontol* **44**: 398-405.

30
31
32 Loe H and and Schiott CR (1970). The effect of mouthrinses and topical applications
33 of chlorhexidine on the development of dental plaque and gingivitis in man. *J*
34 *Periodont Res* **5**: 79-83.

35
36
37 Pitts G, Brogdon C, Hu L, Masurat T, Pianotti R, Shumann P (1983). Mechanism of
38 action of an antiseptic, anti-odor mouth-wash. *J Dent Res* **62**: 738-742.

39
40
41 Quirynen M (2003). Management of oral malodour. *J Clin Periodontol* **30** (Suppl 5):
42 1718.

43
44
45 Quirynen M, Zhao H and van Steenberghe (2002). Review of the strategies for oral
46 malodour *Clin Oral Invest* **6**: 1-10 DOI 10.1007/s0084-002-0152-9.

47
48
49 Radcliff PA, Johnson PW (1999). The relationship between oral malodour, gingivitis
50 and periodontitis, a review. *J Periodontol* **70**: 485-489.

51
52
53 Radke LL, Hahn BL, Wagner DK, Sohnle PG (1994). Effect of abcess fluid
54 supernatant on kinetics of *Candida albicans* growth. *Clin Immun and Immuno Pathol*
55 **73**: 344-349.

56
57
58 Roldan S, Herrera D, Sanz M (2000). Clinical and microbiological efficacy of an
59 antimicrobial mouthrinse on oral halitosis. *J Clin Periodontol* 27-24.

60
Roldan S, Winkel EG, Herrera D, Sanz M, van Winkelhoff AJ (2003). The effect of a
new mouthrinse containing chlorhexidine, cetylpyridinium chloride and zinc lactate

1
2
3 on the microflora of oral halitosis patients: a dual-centre, double-blind placebo-
4 controlled study. *J Clin Periodontol* **30**: 427-434.
5

6
7 Rosenberg M and Leib E (1995). **Experiences on an Israeli malodour clinic. In:**
8 ***Bad Breath: research perspectives*, pp 137-148, Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University,**
9 **Ramot Publishing.**
10

11 Rosenberg M (1996). Clinical assessment of bad breath: Current concepts. *J Am Dent*
12 *Assoc* **127**: 475-482.
13

14 Rosenberg M, Kulkarni GV, Bosy A *et al* (1991). Reproducibility and sensitivity of
15 oral malodour measurements with a portable sulphide monitor. *J Dent Res* **70**: 1436-
16 1440.
17

18 Schmidt NF and Tarbet WJ (1978). The effect of oral rinses on organoleptic mouth
19 odor ratings and levels of volatile sulphur compounds. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral*
20 *Pathol* **45**: 876-883.
21

22 Scully C, El-Maaytah M, Porter SR, Greenman J (1997). Breath odor:
23 aetiopathogenesis, assessment and management. *Eur J Oral Sci* **105**: 287-293.
24

25 Shapiro JA, Dworkin M (1997). ***Bacteria as Multicellular Organisms*. New York,**
26 **Oxford University Press.**
27

28 Suarez FL, Furne JK, Springfield J, Levitt MD (2000). Morning breath odor:
29 influence of treatments on sulfur gases. *J Dent Res* **79** (10): 1773-77.
30

31 Sugarman B (1983). Zinc and infection. *Rev Infec Dis*: 138-147.
32

33 **Thrane PS, Young A, Jonski G, Rolla G (2007). A New Mouthrinse Combining**
34 **Zinc and Chlorhexidine in Low Concentrations Provides Superior Efficacy**
35 **Against Halitosis Compared to Existing Formulations: A Double-Blind Clinical**
36 **Study. *J Clin Dent* **18**: 82-86.**
37

38 Tonzetich J (1977). Production and origin of oral malodour: a review of mechanisms
39 and methods of analysis. *J. Periodontol* **48**: 13-20.
40

41 Tonzetich J (1971). Direct gas chromatographic analysis of sulphur compounds in
42 mouth air in man. *Arch Oral Biol* **14**: 815-825.
43

44 Tonzetich J, Coil JM & Ng W (1991). Gas chromatographic method for trapping and
45 detection of volatile organic compounds from human mouth air. *Journal of Clinical*
46 *Dentistry* **2** (3): 79-82.
47

48 **Van den Broek AM, Feenstra L and de Baat C (2008). A review of the current**
49 **literature on management of halitosis. *Oral Diseases* **14** (1): 30-39.**
50

51 Van den Velde S, Van Steenberghe D, Van Hee P, Quirynen M (2009). Detection of
52 Odorous Compounds in Breath. *J Dent Res* **88** (3): 285-289.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wåler SM (1978). The effect of some metal ions on volatile sulphur-containing
4 compounds originating from the oral cavity. *Acta Odont Scand* **55**: 261-264.
5
6

7 Winkel EG, Roldan S, van Winkelhoff AJ, Herrera D, Sanz M (2003). Clinical effects
8 of a new mouthrinse containing chlorhexidine, cetylpyridinium chloride and zinc-
9 lactate on oral halitosis A dual-center, double blind placebo-controlled study. *J Clin*
10 *Periodontol* **30**: 300-306.
11

12 Winkel EG and Tangerman A (2005). Clinical association of volatile sulfur
13 compounds, Halimeter values, organoleptic score and tongue coating in oral
14 malodour. *Oral Diseases* **11** (1): 99-99.
15
16

17 Yaegaki K and Sanada K (1992). Volatile sulfur compounds in mouth air from
18 clinically healthy subjects and patients with periodontal disease. *J Periodont Res* **27**:
19 233-238.
20
21

22 Yaegaki K, Suetaka T (1989). The effect of zinc chloride mouthwash on the
23 production of oral malodour, the degradations of salivary cellular elements and
24 proteins. *J Dent Health* **39**: 377-386.
25
26

27 Young AR, Jonski G and Rölla G (2002). The oral anti-volatile sulphur compound
28 effects of zinc salts and their stability constants. *Eur J Oral Sci* **110**: 31-34.
29
30

31 Young A, Jonski G, Rölla G, Waler SM (2001). Effects of metal salts on the oral
32 production of volatile sulphur-containing compounds (VSC). *J Clin Periodontol* **28**:
33 776-781.
34

35 **Young AR, Jonski G and Rölla G (2003). Combined effects of zinc ions and**
36 **cationic antibacterial agents on intraoral volatile sulphur compounds (VSC). *Int***
37 ***Dent J* **53**: 237-242**
38
39

40 41 42 **Acknowledgements**

43
44
45 This study was supported by Healthcare Brands International Ltd, 2nd Floor,
46 The Clock Tower, Talbot Street, Nottingham, NG1 5GG, UK.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Mouthrinse, ingredients and code

Code	Mouthrinse	Ingredients
A	Listerine antibacterial Mouthwash- Total Care® Pfizer Consumer Healthcare	Aqua, Alcohol, Sorbitol, Aroma, Poloxamer 407, Benzoic Acid, Eucalyptol, Methyl salicylate, Thymol, Menthol, Sodium Fluoride, Zinc Chloride, Sucralose, Sodium saccharin, Sodium benzoate, Benzyl alcohol, Cl 16035, Cl 42090. Contains Sodium fluoride (0.022% w/v 100ppm F).
B	BreathRX® Discus Dent Inc USA	Aqua, Sorbitol, Propylene glycol, PEG-40, hydrogenated Castor oil, Polaxamer 407, Xylitol, Aroma (Mint, thymol and Eucalyptus oil), Zinc gluconate, Cocamidopropyl Betaine, Cetylpyridinium Chloride, Sodium Saccharin, Citric Acid, Cl 42090.
C	SmartMouth Wash® Triumph Pharmaceutical Inc US	Solution 1: Purified water, Sodium Benzoate, Benzoic Acid, and Sodium Chlorite. Solution 2: Purified water, glycerine, Polaxamer 407, Propylene Glycol, Benzoic acid, Flavour, Polaxamer 124, Sodium Benzoate, Sodium Chloride, Sodium Saccharin, Zinc Chloride, D&C Yellow No 10, and FD&C Blue No 1.
D	LacerFresh Mouthwash® Lacer, S.A Sardenya Barcelona	Triclosan 0.15%, Zinc Chloride 0.05%, Sodium Fluoride 0.05% (225ppm), Xylitol 1%
E	SB12® Antula Healthcare Stockholm	Zinc acetate (0.3%), chlorhexidine diacetate (0.025%), sodium fluoride (0.05%), mint/menthol flavour (in alcohol)
F	Control	Water

Table 2: Average, minimum and maximum values of baseline readings (pre-treatment measurements) for organoleptic scores, VSC and H₂S (from OralChroma) recorded for 14 trialists

Measurements	Average (± SD; n=84)	Minimum (± SD)	Maximum (± SD)
Organoleptic score	3.55 (0.23)	2.50 (0.00)	4.33 (0.25)
Halimeter readings	156 (49.21)	36.16 (3.65)	379.50 (86.00)
H ₂ S OralChroma	416.40 (213)	50.75 (27.80)	544 (61.09)

Table 3: Summary of ANOVA plus Bonferroni statistical data

Products	Time	P values Halimeter	P values Organoleptic
A and B	All Time Points	-	-
A and C	All Time Points	-	-
A and D	30 60 90 180	P < 0.05 P < 0.01 P < 0.01 P < 0.05	P < 0.05 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
A and E	30 60 90 180	- - - -	- - - P < 0.01
A and F	30 60 90 180	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
B and C	All Time Points	-	-
B and D	30 60 90 180	- - - -	- P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
B and E	30 60 90 180	- - - -	- - - P < 0.01
B and F	30 60 90 180	P < 0.01 P < 0.01 P < 0.01 P < 0.01	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
C and D	30 60 90 180	- - - -	- P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
C and E	30 60 90 180	- - - -	- - P < 0.05 P < 0.01
C and F	30 60 90 180	P < 0.01 P < 0.01 P < 0.01 P < 0.01	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
D and E	30 60 90 180	P < 0.01 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001
D and F	30 60 90 180	- - - -	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.05 -
E and F	30 60 90 180	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001	P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001 P < 0.001

(-) Not Significant

A=Listerine; B=BreathRX; C=SmartMouth; D=Lacerfresh; E=SB12; F=Water

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

List of figures

Figure 1: Log₁₀ halimeter changes for 5 products plus control (*SB12,

◆ Listerine, ▣ BreathRX, ▲ SmartMouth, ■ LacerFresh, ● Control)

Figure 2: Organoleptic changes for 5 products plus control (*SB12,

◆ Listerine, ▣ BreathRX, ▲ SmartMouth, ■ LacerFresh, ● Control)

Figure 3: Log₁₀ Hydrogen sulphide changes for 5 products plus control (*SB12,

◆ Listerine, ▣ BreathRX, ▲ SmartMouth, ■ LacerFresh, ● Control)

Figure 4: Correlation between organoleptic score and Log₁₀ H₂S readings from Halimeter

Figure 5: Correlation between organoleptic score and Log₁₀ H₂S readings from Oral Chroma™

Figure 6: Correlation between Log₁₀ VSC readings from Halimeter™ and Log Oral Chroma™

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Log10 halimeter changes for 5 products plus control
170x101mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Manuscript Copy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: Organoleptic changes for 5 products plus control
169x101mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3: Log₁₀ Hydrogen sulphide changes for 5 products plus control
185x102mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Manuscript Copy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4: Correlation between organoleptic score and Log10 halimeter readings
177x103mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Manuscript Copy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5: Correlation between organoleptic score and Log10 H₂S readings from Oral Chroma™
177x102mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Manuscript Copy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 6: Correlation between Log10 Halimeter readings and Log10 H2S from Oral Chroma™

170x111mm (96 x 96 DPI)