Original Article

Feasibility of Using Latex Examination Gloves as Dental Dam: A Tensile Strength Study

Budi Aslinie Md Sabri[1], Nur Hidayah Mohd Radzi[2], Fatimatuz Zahira Abdul Hadi[2], Ikmal Hisham Ismail[3]

[1]Centre Of Studies for Community Dentistry Studies, Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Malaysia.

[2]Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Malaysia.

[3]Centre for Restorative Dentistry Studies, Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Malaysia.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.24191/cos.v2i0.17521

Abstract

Objective: To evaluate feasibility of hand gloves as a rubber dam isolation alternative**,** in respect of physical properties. ***Materials and Methods:*** A randomized controlled trial study design was used. Three types of gloves were tested with two types of a rubber dam used as the control group. Cut-out pattern of dumb-bell shapes were made from 35 samples for each type of groups and tensile strength were tested using Universal Testing Machine and the Trapezium X software. All tests for physical requirements were performed in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials D412, Standard Test Methods for Vulcanized Rubber and Thermoplastic Rubbers and Thermoplastic Elastomers-Tension. Findings were analyzed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) and differences were compared using a Tukey-Kramer interval calculated at the 0.05 significance level. ***Results:*** Heavy gauge rubber dam has the highest Mean (calculated at the 0.05 significance level) except for maximum stress calculate**d** at entire area. Medium-gauge rubber dam has significantly higher tensile strength (44.5075 N/mm^2) when compared to heavy-gauge rubber dam (35.7787 N/mm^2) although it was 0.09mm thinner. Discovery 2020 Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves with tensile strength value of 28.5922 N/mm^2 (±3.27366) is more than the minimum requirement specified by American Federal Specification ZZ-R90B Rubber Dam (Dental, 1985) (4000 pounds per square inch or 27.6 N/mm^2). For all variable tested, all groups are significantly different from each other. The mean square between the groups was quite large. ***Conclusion****:* This study shows that there are significant differences between the physical strength of latex gloves when compared to rubber dam. However, the comparison between thickness and tensile strength among various rubber dam, did not correspond proportionately. Only one type of rubber gloves met the minimum requirement but that is just one aspect. In view of these mixed results, more research is needed before we can conclude that it is feasable that we use hand gloves to replace rubber dam.

Key words*: Dental dam, latex examination gloves, physical properties, tensile strength.*

Introduction

As the mirror and probe are two instruments representing the global federation of the dental profession, so does the hand gloves and rubber (dental) dam which insulates the staff and

*Corresponding to: Ikmal Hisham Ismail, Centre for Restorative Dentistry Studies, Faculty of Dentistry, University Technology MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Malaysia.

patients from many infectious diseases and hazardous situations.

Sanford Christie Barnum first advocated the use of rubber dam almost 150 years ago [1]. Even in that era of dentistry, the benefit of isolating a tooth to obtain a dry working field, free of salivary contamination, was appreciated [1]. This material is produced as a thin sheet of natural latex that is usually available in at least three different weights (thin, medium, and heavy) [2]. The use of the rubber dam during root canal treatment confers three main advantages: control of cross-infection, physical protection and improving treatment efficiency [3]. The benefits of rubber dam placement are now well known and accepted as a standard of care by professional organizations such as European Society of Endodontology 1992, 2006 [5], American Association of Endodontists 2004, and American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry 2008-2009 [3]. In spite of this, a review study done by I. A. Ahmad, 2009 stated that studies have cited a variety of reasons for lack of regular use of rubber dam amongst the dental profession. The most commonly reported reasons include lack of patient acceptance, time required for application, insufficient training, difficulty in use, the cost of equipment and materials and low treatment fees [3]. Several respondents also suggested that patients did not like rubber dam being used [10].

While more than one factor is associated with lack of regular use of rubber dam, a technique that has a clear infection control benefit and medico-legal and safety implications should not be excluded from use for reasons of cost [3]. Thus, one of the aims of this study is to explore the potential use of latex examination gloves as a replacement material in effort to overcome the cost issue associated with rubber dam use.

Why hand gloves?

This study is focused on the usage of latex examination gloves because it is cheap and readily available in dental clinics. Examination gloves are also made from the same resource as a dental rubber dam, which is rubber, and share similar properties like elasticity, stretch ability and impermeability [2] which makes it a suitable alternative for the more expensive rubber dam (dental). Despite these similarities, the quality, quantity and type of ingredients used in the manufacturing of rubber dams and latex gloves may differ and the way each of these materials are handled before and after compounding also will result in different tensile and tear properties [2]. Hence a study needs to be done to evaluate whether the latex examination gloves has the physical properties needed for a rubber dam [2]. The purpose of this study was to compare the tensile and tear properties of two different weights of rubber dam and three different types and manufacturer brand of gloves. The manner in which the tensile and tear properties can be determined is described in the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D412- Standard Test Properties for Rubber Properties in Tension. [2].

Material and Methods

This is a randomized controlled trial study testing for tensile strength of three (3) types of gloves and two (2) types of rubber dam as a control group. The rubber dams and gloves used for this study were obtained from the Faculty Dentistry of University Technology MARA clinic.

Sample	Type/brand
1	Cross Protection Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves
2	Rainbow Dental Dam Powder Free (Medium Gauge)
3	Rainbow Dental Dam Powder Free (Heavy Gauge)
4	Cross Protection Powdered Latex Examination Gloves
5	Discovery 2020 Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves

The types and brands of the gloves and rubber dam used in this study include:

Thirty five test pieces were prepared for each sample type. Each test piece is prepared as a dumb-bell shape (Figure. 1) using a slicing machine with a continuous band blade. Each test piece is made out of a size M gloves obtained from the palm area.



Figure 1: Dumb-bell test piece.

Width (D) and gauge length(C) were measured using a metal ruler and recorded. For each type of sample, thickness was measured using electronic veneer caliper and recorded.

All tests for physical requirements were performed in accordance with ASTM D412, Standard Test Methods for Vulcanized Rubber and Thermoplastic Rubbers and Thermoplastic Elastomers-Tension [11]. For this research, the Universal Testing Machine with Trapezium X software was used. Relevant sample data such as thickness (mm), width (mm) and gauge length (mm) was inserted into the software.

The sample was set in between two jigs with a gauge length 45mm and the calibration of the machine was done using Vernier caliper. A uniform pressure was exerted across the width and surface area of the test piece. Test speed was set at 500 mm/min for all samples.

When tensile loads are applied to rubber materials, they elongate and their thickness decreases to a breaking point. Values of force stroke, stress stroke, stroke strain, maximum displacement stress and stroke, maximum displacement, maximum stress calculate at entire area, maximum force calculate at entire area, maximum displacement strain, maximum displacement time, maximum stroke calculate at entire area, maximum stroke strain calculate at entire area, maximum displacement calculated at entire area, maximum strain calculate at entire area, maximum time calculated at entire area and force 1 Newton were calculated using the Trapezium X software. In this research, the stress over strain relationship was used as a measure of tensile strength. Means and standard deviation were calculated, and data for maximum displacement (%), maximum forces (N), maximum stress (N/mm^2 or MPa) and maximum

strain (%), maximum stroke (mm) were recorded.

All the data were inserted in SPSS version 21. Analyses to compare between gloves and rubber dam for variables tested were done using 1-way ANOVA. Differences between groups were analyzed using a *Tukey-Kramer Post-Hoc* test, calculated at the 0.05 significance level. Differences between the two means that were larger than the calculated Tukey HSD interval were considered statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Result

Results from a total of 175 samples consisting of 3 different types of latex gloves and 2 different weights (medium and heavy) of rubber dam

Brand	N	Maximum displacement strain (%)	Maximum forces calculated at entire area (N)	Maximum stress calculated at entire area (N/mm^2 or MPa)	Maximum strain calculated at entire area (%)	Maximum stroke calculated at entire area (mm)
	Mean (SD)					
Cross Protection Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves	35	701.62 (9 .62P)	9.43 (8 362)	21.43 (.432P)	678.81 (8.81Pr)	305.46 (5.46Pr)
Rainbow Dental Dam Powder Free (Medium Gauge)	35	959.07 (2 .07w)	30.26 (1 267)	44.50 (.507w)	919.73 (9.73w)	413.88 (3.88w)
Rainbow Dental Dam Powder Free (Heavy Gauge)	35	1023.53 (523.53)	37.20 (9 205)	35.77 (7 775)	990.03 (0.033)	445.51 (5.513)
Cross Protection Powdered Latex Examination Gloves	35	789.80 (9.80Pr)	10.11 (.110P)	25.29 (.290P)	769.43 (9.43Pr)	346.24 (6.24Pr)
Discovery 2020 Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves	35	762.36 (3 .36e)	10.29 (.296e)	28.59 (.596e)	731.82 (1.82er)	329.32 (9.32er)
Total	175	31.12 (3.122er)	19.46 (2.4.02)	368.08 (48.08)	817.96 (87.96er)	847.27(97.27e)

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest

		df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Maximum displacement strain (%)	Between	4	658801.526	198.953	.000
	Within	170	3311.351		
Maximum forces calculated at entire area (N)	Between	4	6156.673	1295.953	.000
	Within	170	4.751		
Maximum stress calculated at entire area (N/mm^2 or MPa)	Between	4	2930.646	271.917	.000
	Within	170	10.778		
Maximum strain calculated at entire area (%)	Between	4	604631.731	212.355	.000
	Within	170	2847.272		
Maximum stroke calculated at entire area (mm)	Between	4	122437.845	212.355	.000
	Within	170	576.571		

Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

were recorded. The mean values and standard deviation of variables of interest for the different sample groups are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 displays the descriptive analysis of maximum displacement strain, maximum forces calculated at entire area, maximum stress calculated at entire area, maximum strain calculated at entire area and maximum stroke calculated at entire area for the 5 different groups of sample. Results shows that heavy gauge rubber dam has the highest mean value for almost all variable tested except for maximum stress calculated at entire area.

A one way between subject ANOVA was conducted to compare the maximum displacement strain, maximum forces calculated at entire area, maximum stress calculated at entire area, maximum strain calculated at entire area and maximum stroke calculated at entire area in three different types and manufacturer of gloves and two different types of rubber dam which are Cross Protection Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves, Rainbow Dental Dams Powder Free (Heavy Gauge), Rainbow Dental Dams Powder Free (Medium Gauge), Cross Protection Powdered Latex Examination Gloves, Discovery 2020 Powder Free Latex Examination Gloves (Table 2).

There was a statistically significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level in maximum displacement strain, maximum forces calculated at entire area, maximum stress calculated at entire area, maximum strain calculated at entire area and maximum stroke for the five groups

The effect size using ETA squared was 0.82, 0.97, 0.86, 0.83, 0.83 respectively. The mean square between the group was quite large indicating that the difference in mean scores between the groups was also quite large.

Post Hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean maximum displacement strain percentage, maximum forces calculated at entire area, maximum stress calculated at entire area, maximum strain calculated at entire area and maximum stroke calculated at entire area for Group 1 (M=701.6269, SD=75.61201) was significantly different from Group 2, Group 3, Group 4, and Group 5. All groups are significantly different from each other.

Discussion

The manufacturer of a rubber dam (Sanctuary Health ISO 9001 and ISO 13485) stated that the minimum tensile strength of a rubber dam is 24.0 MPa meanwhile in Standard Malaysian Gloves (SMG) did state the minimum tensile strength of gloves is 18.0 MPa to meet the ASTM D3578, Standard Specification for Rubber Examination Gloves [13]. These differences were statistically significant; however, these differences are not considered to have any clinical relevance because rubber dam will not be stretched to its limits during clinical usage. There may be a question as to the usefulness of this tensile strength test with modern-day dental dam [2].

In descriptive analysis, all variable tested shows that heavy gauge rubber dam has the highest mean (± SD) value for almost all variable tested except for maximum stress calculate at entire area. In maximum stress calculate at the entire area (N/mm²), medium-gauge rubber dam has highest mean (±SD) which was 44.5075 (±3.63074) compared to heavy-gauge rubber dam which was 35.7787 (±3.49714). When comparing heavy-gauge rubber dam and medium-gauge rubber dam, there was a significantly higher tensile strength for medium-gauge rubber dam, yet the material was 0.09 mm thinner than heavy-gauge rubber dam. The maximum stress calculate at entire area (tensile strength, MPa) test did show significant differences in comparisons of weight (thickness) for rubber dam, however, these results were inconsistent and incongruous. The heavy-gauge rubber dam had a thickness that was 0.09 mm thicker than the medium-gauge rubber dam material, yet it had approximately higher tensile strength.

The value (>27.6 MPa) called for in the federal specification ZZ-R-690B Rubber Dam [14] shows that Rainbow Dental Dam powder-free of two different weights (medium-gauge and heavy-gauge), complied with the specification for rubber dam as the maximum stress calculate at entire area (tensile strength, MPa) for medium-gauge rubber dam and heavy-gauge rubber dam are 44.5075 (±3.63074) and 35.7787 (±3.49714). The value stated by federal specification ZZ-R-690B Rubber Dam may give rise to the possibility for Discovery 2020 Powder Free Latex Examination to be rubber dam as tensile strength value for this Discovery hand gloves is within value stated (>27.6 MPa) which is 28.5922 (±3.27366). This shows that further test on different types of brand for gloves in comparison to rubber dam can be done.

Moreover, the universal testing machine used in this study was equipped with grippers that were not suitable in rubber tensile tests. The

thin rubber dam and glove material may prematurely tear away or at least break free from the grippers making favorable measurements impossible. The gripper grip-surfaces were the grooved metal type, so to prevent the samples from tearing, a layer of adhesive cellophane tape were stuck to them. There were no observable occurrences of tearing of samples at the gripper interface.

Limitations of this study include the short period of time allocated, which was less than one year. Furthermore only rubber dam and gloves tested were of latex. Other materials from Nitrile and Vinyl may be included in future tests.

Conclusion

This study shows that there are significant differences between the physical strength of latex gloves when compared to rubber dam. Even though the findings show that the feasibility of using latex hand gloves as rubber dam is not promising based on their tensile strength alone, the findings are limited to the brands tested. Hence, it may be worthwhile to repeat this study using a more specific rubber tensile test machine or using different material of gloves before a definitive report on the feasibility of using hand gloves as rubber dam can be made.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the staff of Science Laboratory of Faculty of Dentistry UiTM especially En Hizwan Nizam B. Abd Rahman and also Faculty Applied Science Laboratory, En Mohd Sofi B. Khalib for their valuable support and contribution in completing our research project.

References

1. Bhavin Bhuva, Bun San Chong, Shanon Patel (2008) Rubber Dam in Clinical Practice. **ENDO (Lond Engl) ; 2(2):**131-141.
2. Timothy A. Svec, John M. Powers, G. David Ladd, and Trenholm N. Meyer (1996) Tensile and Tear Properties of Dental Dam. **Journal of Endodontics. Vol. 2,** No. 5.
3. I. A. Ahmad (2009) Rubber dam usage for endodontic treatment: a review. **International Endodontic Journal, 42,** 963–972.
4. Patrick Wahl, Trevor Andrews. Isolation: a look at the differences and benefits of rubber dam and Isolite. **Endodontic Practice, Vol. 3 No. 2,** pp.52-55.
5. European Society of Endodontology (2006) Quality guidelines for endodontic treatment: consensus report of the European Society of Endodontology. **International Endodontic Journal 39**, 921–930.
6. Francesca Soldani, Jennifer Foley (2006) An assessment of rubber dam usage amongst specialists in paediatric dentistry practising within the UK. **Blackwell Publishing Ltd**, pp.50 -56.
7. Petersson K, Olsson H, So¨derstrom C, Fouilloux I, Jegat N, Le´vy G (2002) Undergraduate education in endodontology at two European dental schools: a comparison between the Faculty of Odontology, Malmo¨ University, Malmo¨, Sweden and Faculty of Odontology, Paris 5 University (Rene´ Descartes), France. **European Journal of Dental Education 6,** 176–81.

8. Mark S Hagge, Wayne P Pierson, Robert B Mayhew, Robert D Cowan, E Steven Duke (1984) Use of Rubber Dam among General Dentists in the United States Air Force Dental Service. **Operative Dentistry *9*,** 122-129.

9. Whitworth JM, Seccombe GV, Shoker K, Steele JG (2000) Use of rubber dam and irrigant selection in UK general dental practice. **Int Endod J; 33:**435-441.

10. Saunders WP, Chestnutt IG, Saunders EM (1999) Factors influencing the diagnosis and management of teeth with pulpal and periradicular disease by general dental practitioners. **Part 2. British Dental Journal 187,** 548–54.

11.ASTM D412-06a (2013), Standard Test Methods for Vulcanized Rubber and Thermoplastic Elastomers—Tension, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, 2013, www.astm.org

12. T .Murakami, Tensile Test of Rubber Dumb-bell Specimens, 2010. Standard No. ISO37: 2005 (JIS K6251: 2010)

13. ASTM D3578-05(2010), Standard Specification for Rubber Examination Gloves, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, 2010, www.astm.org

14.U.S. Federal Government, Federal specification, ZZ-R-690B (1985), rubber dam (dental).

15. Hill EE, Rubel BS (2008) Do dental educators need to improve their approach to teaching rubber dam use? **Journal of Dental Education 72,** 1177–81