Calculus are calcified deposits on the teeth formed by the continuous presence of dental plaque. The surface of calculus is very rough, which makes oral hygiene more difficult and allows new biofilm to accumulate [1]. Generally, calculus accumulation is the result of inadequate oral care [2].

Calculus creates a strong bond with the tooth surface that can only be removed by a professional dental cleaning. Saliva is the main source of the calcium needed for calculus formation and because the saliva glands are located in the lower jaw, below the tongue, tartar is mainly formed on the back side of the lower front teeth.

How can one prevent the formation of tartar? Primarily through regular, proper tooth brushing using not only brushes but also dental floss and dentifrices which contain chemicals to prevent calculus formation. Dentifrice formulations with anticalcification ingredients inhibit its formation between dental visits, as a result, improved oral hygiene.

Dental calculus could be supragingival or subgingival according to its location relative to the gingival margin. Differences in hardness be-
between the two types of dental calculus are probably due to differences in the degree of calcification. The content of minerals in the supra- and subgingival calculus have been fully determined and the average is between 37 and 58% [3]. The composition and properties of tartar are very well understood on the basis of research and analytical chemistry [4–6].

A study using light and transmission electron microscopy has demonstrated that supragingival calculus forms a number of different crystalline forms. New crystals are composed of calcium phosphate, which builds up, hardens and forms into tartar. It is very interesting that the observation of the authors has demonstrated the presence of non-mineralized canals linking the extensive gaps (lacunae), places which were littered with bacteria, mainly cocci and rods [7].

On the other hand, the subgingival stone structure was compacted, dense, of uniform mineralization and was observed without channels and lacunae. In trying to explain why the formation of these channels occurs, the authors suggested the contribution of filamentous bacteria in the supragingival plaque, which may have inhibitory properties of mineralization. It was also found that the differences in calcification between different bacterial colonies lead to the mineralization of the superficial layers of plaque, preventing the delivery of minerals into the deeper layers [8, 9]. Moreover, testing tartar samples taken from patients with gingivitis and observed under fluorescence and a confocal laser scanning microscope, when combined with microbiological examination, showed that viable aerobic and anaerobic bacteria were present within supragingival calculus, specifically within the internal channels and lacunae [10].

These findings are of great clinical importance because calculus could be a reservoir of pathogenic periodontal bacteria [11, 12]. Incomplete removal of supragingival calculus may expose these reservoirs of possible pathogenic bacteria and be a factor in the recurrence of periodontal diseases after treatment.

The first chemical compound added to a toothpaste that controlled tartar formation was pyrophosphate [13]. In vitro studies have shown that pyrophosphate inhibits the growth and mineralization of dental plaque via a chelate effect of the minerals. Showing a very strong affinity to the surface of hydroxyapatite, strongly bound to the tooth surface and tartar, and coating the new embryos inhibited the growth of mineral crystals [14–16]. In turn, based on clinical studies, White et al. confirmed a significant reduction in dental plaque compared to the control paste (restricting the mineral formation by approx. 40–50%) [17].

Another form of pyrophosphate is sodium hexametaphosphate (SHMP). It is a polymer with an average of twenty-one repeating subunits, giving it a stronger attraction to calcium hydroxyapatite in enamel and dentin relative to pyrophosphates, which have two phosphate units. Therefore, the SHMP ability to inhibit both calculus and stain formation at the enamel surface is better. The results of in vitro studies show the HSMP in solution had a strong affinity for HAP surfaces as well as good inhibitory activity of HAP crystal growth. Hexametaphosphate dentifrice showed decreased mineralization. The reduction was 69% after topical applications of HSPM [18].

Results of clinical studies carried out by Liu et al. [19] on a group of 551 participants, (duration of the study – 8 months), demonstrated significantly higher tartar inhibition upon use of the experimental SHMP paste compared to the control one.

A new toothpaste formula containing stannous fluoride with SHMP in a very low water formulation has made it possible to obtain the maximal biochemical availability of stannous fluoride, which is stabilized and afforded advanced protection against the formation of tartar and stains on tooth surfaces. It was also possible to obtain a pleasant taste, which is not without significance for the users.

Shiff et al. [20] made a clinical assessment of a toothpaste (0.454% stabilized stannous fluoride/13% SHMP) and compared it to a market-ed, tartar control, 0.30% triclosan/0.243% NaF/2% copolymer dentifrice. The study subjects were 81 participants with the ability to form at least 1.5 mm of calculus on the anterior mandibular teeth (lingual surface) in an 8-week pre-test phase following dental prophylaxis. The Volpe-Manhold Index [21] was used to measure calculus on the lingual surfaces of the lower 6 anterior teeth. The Lombone index [22] was used to measure the stain on the facial surfaces of 12 anterior teeth. Subjects were randomized to either SnF₂/SHMP dentifrice or the control one, and used the toothpaste twice a day for 6 months. The examination for calculus and stain was done again after 3 and 6 months. The results showed a 54% reduction in calculus accumulation at month 3 and a 56% reduction at month 6. No appreciable extrinsic stain accumulation was noticed. Almost the same results were obtained by Winston et al. [23], who observed a 50% reduction of calculus formation after 3 months of using the above dentifrice formula by 142 participants and 55% reduction after 6 months.

Subsequent clinical studies when a similar research protocol was used have shown a 70% reduction of calculus formation both at month 3
and 6 [24], and 30.3% reduction at week 6 and 26.5% at month 3 [25].

Pyrophosphates are also the most common agents responsible for whitening control, which is a chemical mechanism [26, 27]. The ability of this agent increases with the length of the molecule. During absorption to mineral sites, they desorb portions of the adsorbed proteins, i.e. pellicle proteins containing stain chromogens. Longer molecules with a longer molecular weight have more binding sites, giving them a greater chance of adsorption and retention on the tooth surface. SHMP’s multiple binding sites results in its ability to remove extrinsic surface discoloration and inhibit new chromogens from being adsorbed into proteins in the pellicle. SHMP was shown to be a highly chemically-active agent for stain prevention [26] and reduction of pellicle conditioning film thicknesses [27].

Numerous clinical trials have been carried out, comparing the scope of stain removal by the dentifrice with a stabilized SnF2-SHMP to a positive control whitening dentifrice [28–30]. The results have shown (always two independent clinical trials) that the Lobene stain scores were significantly reduced by 61.8% and 96.6% for the SnF2/SHMP group and the control group, respectively, in study 1; and 61.9% and 94.4% for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Study subjects (n)</th>
<th>Duration of the study</th>
<th>Index used</th>
<th>Results of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. [19] 2002</td>
<td>551 Only SHMP</td>
<td>8 months (2 + 6)</td>
<td>Volpe-Manhold</td>
<td>After 6 months, the study group exhibited calculus inhibition (p &lt; 0.01) compared to the control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiff et al. [20] 2005</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Volpe-Manhold (mm)</td>
<td>After 3 months, 54% of calculus reduction, after 6 months – 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston et al. [23] 2007</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Volpe-Manhold (mm)</td>
<td>After 3 months – 50% calculus reduction, after 6 – 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He et al. [24] 2008</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Volpe Manhold</td>
<td>After 3 and 6 months, 70% calculus reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milleman et al. [25] 2011</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Volpe Manhold</td>
<td>After 6 weeks – 30.3% of calculus reduction, after 3 months – 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He et al. [28] 2007</td>
<td>52 – study 1 58 – study 2</td>
<td>3 weeks 6 weeks</td>
<td>Lobene Stain</td>
<td>A significant level of activity removing external discoloration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terezhalmy et al. [29] 2007</td>
<td>29 – study 1 30 – study 2</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Lobene Stain</td>
<td>A significant reduction of discoloration compared to the initial values Study 1 – 61.8% and 96.6% control Study 2 – 61.9% and 94.4% control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terezhalmy et al. 2011</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3 weeks 6 weeks</td>
<td>Lobene Stain (LSI)</td>
<td>improving discolored sites Week 3 – 95% comp. to 90% + control Week 6 – 99% comp. to 100% + control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amini et al. [31] 2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 weeks: two step SnF2 paste and H2O2 gel</td>
<td>Lobene Stain Gingival Bleeding Index (GBI)</td>
<td>100% subjects – improvements of stain 97% subjects – improvements in gingivitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amini et al. [32] 2015</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1 week two step SnF2 paste and H2O2 gel</td>
<td>LSI GBI</td>
<td>Significant (p= 0.0001) improvement of gingivae and stain status compared to the control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SnF₂/SHMP group and the control group, respectively, in study 2 (two weeks study) [29]. Other experiments demonstrated a comparable extrinsic stain removal efficacy of the stannous fluoride dentifrice with SHMP relative to the positive control one [28, 30].

Recent data from studies presented at the IADR 2015 congress show attempts to determine the relationship between the therapeutic and aesthetic two-stage action of SnF₂ dentifrice and then a gel. After three weeks of using the above formulations, improvement in both the state of the gums and the aesthetic appearance of teeth was achieved, which indicates the correlated effect of the two components [31]. There were no side effects, and short, 1-week, randomized study, which involved 61 patients, showed a significant reduction in surface discoloration and gingivitis only after application of a toothpaste and the gel with hydrogen peroxide. The control dentifrice containing sodium monofluorophosphate showed no such action [32].

Conclusions: Toothpaste containing stabilized stannous fluoride – sodium hexametaphosphate effectively and safely reduces the tartar formation. Tartar inhibition, and thus the reservoir of the live bacteria, contributes to the reduction of periodontal inflammation. The toothpaste removes the external stains and its effectiveness is comparable to whitening toothpastes. It also has bleaching properties which are important because of the aesthetic aspect.
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