



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

**Effects of Washing Time and Washing
Solution on the Biocompatibility and
Mechanical Properties of 3D printed
Dental Resin Materials**

Na-Kyung Hwangbo

Department of Dentistry

The Graduate School, Yonsei University

Effects of Washing Time and Washing Solution on the Biocompatibility and Mechanical Properties of 3D printed Dental Resin Materials

Directed by Professor Jong Hoon Choi, D.D.S., Ph.D.

The Doctoral Dissertation

submitted to the Department of Dentistry,

the Graduate School of Yonsei University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Dental Science

Na-Kyung Hwangbo

December 2021

**This certifies that the doctoral dissertation
of Na-Kyung Hwangbo is approved.**



Thesis Supervisor : Jong Hoon Choi



Thesis Committee Member : Jeong Seung Kwon



Thesis Committee Member : Jong-Eun Kim



Thesis Committee Member : Ki Woo Kim



Thesis Committee Member : Dong-Young Kang

The Graduate School

Yonsei University

December 2021

감사의 글

박사학위 과정을 마무리하며 그동안 돌이켜 보니, 제 곁의 소중한 분들의 관심과 신뢰, 가르침 덕분에 결실을 맺을 수 있었기에 진심을 담아 감사한 마음을 전하고자 합니다.

먼저 존경하는 최종훈 교수님, 4년 동안 다양하고 값진 경험과 배움의 기회를 주시고, 끝없는 지지와 격려로 지도해 주심에 마음 깊이 감사드립니다. 올곧은 성품의 교수님을 지도교수님으로 만나 올바른 방향으로 성장하고 인격적인 부분까지 향상시킬 수 있었습니다. 언제나 관심 어린 격려와 조언으로 매사에 정진할 수 있도록 도와주신 안형준 교수님, 끊임없는 관심과 응원으로 의지를 다질 수 있도록 힘을 주신 김성택 교수님께 깊은 감사 인사를 드립니다. 항상 흐트러짐 없는 자세로 교육자로서 본 모습을 보여주시는 권정승 교수님, 세심한 학위 논문 지도에 감사드립니다. 또한 학위 논문 집필에 처음과 끝까지 많은 도움을 주시고 지도해 주신 김중은 교수님 무한한 감사 인사를 드립니다. 생물학 교실 연구원들 곁에서 다양한 실험을 배울 수 있게 도와주신 김기우 교수님, 진심 어린 응원과 실험적으로 다양한 조언을 해주신 강동영 박사님, 세심한 학위논문 지도에 감사드립니다. 아울러 4년 동안 한 식구처럼 대해 주신 모든 구강내과 가족분들께도 감사드립니다.

이 자리에 있을 수 있도록 지금의 저를 만들어 주신 소중한 분들께도 감사 인사 드립니다. 저의 조교 생활을 행복한 기억으로 가득 채워주신 강부월, 황미영, 이춘선 교수님 감사합니다. 부족한 제가 교수님들의 무한한 사랑과 신뢰를 바탕으로 자신감을

언어 진학의 의지를 다질 수 있었습니다. 또 인격적으로 성장할 수 있도록 자애로운 사랑과 관심으로 항상 보듬어 주신 신명숙 교수님, 끊임없는 관심과 애정으로 올바른 방향으로 나아가야 할 길을 인도해 주시는 이선미 교수님 모두 존경하고 감사드립니다. 또한 뜻 깊은 연구자의 길에 대하여 아낌없는 조언과 지지를 보내주신 맹유진 교수님, 어려운 일이 있을 때 현명하게 해결할 수 있는 방향을 제시해 주시는 김선일 교수님 감사합니다. 교수님들의 가르침을 받아 더 나은 사람이 되도록 항상 노력하고 겸손하겠습니다.

또한 저의 대학원 생활을 빛내준 남나은, 김에리, 양동주 선생님들께도 감사합니다. 선생님들 곁에서 많이 배웠고, 덕분에 즐겁게 지낼 수 있었습니다. 이 외에도 곁에서 응원해 주셨던 많은 교수님, 선생님들께도 감사드립니다.

마지막으로 나를 믿고 지금까지 지켜봐 준 모든 가족들 사랑하고 감사합니다. 세상에서 가장 존경하고 사랑하는 어머니, 지지해 주심에 감사드리며 당신께 이 모든 기쁨을 돌리고 싶습니다. 저를 격려해 주신 모든 분들께 자랑스러운 사람이 되도록 빠르게 정진하고 노력하며, 그 은혜에 감사한 마음을 다시 베풀 수 있는 사람이 되겠습니다. 감사합니다.

2021 년 12 월
황보나경 올림

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MATERIALS AND METHODS	5
1. 3D specimen CAD design and printing	5
2. Washing of 3D-printed specimens and postcuring process	8
3. Biocompatibility test	11
4. Flexural strength and flexural modulus test	14
5. Scanning electron microscope analysis	16
6. Statistical analysis	16
III. RESULTS	17
IV. DISCUSSION	37

V. CONCLUSION	45
REFERENCES	46
ABSTRACT (in Korean)	56

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Additive manufacturing 3D printed specimens	6
Figure 2. Workflow of the overall experimental process, showing the washing conditions and types of experiment	9
Figure 3. Schematics of the test setup for ISO 10447	15
Figure 4. Results from three-way ANOVA for cell viability according to washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material ...	19
Figure 5. Results from one-way ANOVA for cell viability according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution	20
Figure 6. Results from three-way ANOVA for Cytotoxicity according to washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material ...	24
Figure 7. Results from one-way ANOVA for Cytotoxicity according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution	25
Figure 8. Confocal laser scanning microscopy images of human gingival fibroblasts cultures on 3D printed specimens	28
Figure 9. Results from three-way ANOVA for flexural strength according to washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material ...	30

Figure 10. Results from one-way ANOVA for flexural strength according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution31
Figure 11. Results from three-way ANOVA for flexural modulus according to washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material	...33
Figure 12. Results from one-way ANOVA for flexural modulus according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution34
Figure 13. Qualitative scanning electron microscopy images of the surface topography36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. 3D printed materials used in this study	7
Table 2. characteristics of the two washing solutions	10
Table 3. Cell viability after 24, 48, and 72 hours for each group according to the washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution ..	21
Table 4. Cytotoxicity after 24, 48, and 72 hours for each group according to the washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution ..	26

Abstract

Effects of Washing Time and Washing Solution on the Biocompatibility and Mechanical Properties of 3D printed Dental Resin Materials

Na-Kyung Hwangbo

Department of Dentistry,
The Graduate School, Yonsei University

(Directed by Professor Jong Hoon Choi, D.D.S., Ph.D.)

Three-dimensional (3D) printing technology is highly regarded in the field of dentistry. Three-dimensional printed resin restorations must undergo a washing process to remove residual resin on the surface after they have been manufactured. However, the effect of the use of different washing solutions and washing times on the biocompatibility of the resulting resin restorations is unclear. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to determine the effects of washing solution and time on the biocompatibility and mechanical properties of 3D printed dental photocurable resins.

Therefore, 3D printed denture teeth and crown & bridge resin were prepared, then washed with two washing solutions (Isopropyl alcohol and Tripropylene glycol monomethyl ether) using different time points (3, 5, 10, 15, 30, 60, 90 minutes). Subsequently, cell viability, cytotoxicity, and the status of human gingival fibroblasts using confocal laser scanning were evaluated. Also flexural strength, flexural modulus, and surface SEM imaging was analyzed.

As a result of the experiment, Increasing the washing time increased cell viability and decreased cytotoxicity ($p < 0.001$). Confocal laser scanning showed distinct differences in the morphology and number of fibroblasts. Increasing the washing time did not significantly affect the flexural strength and surface, but the flexural modulus of the 90-minute washing group was 1.01 ± 0.21 GPa (mean \pm standard deviation), which was lower than that of all other groups, and decreased as the washing time increased.

This study has confirmed that the washing time affected the biocompatibility and mechanical properties of dental 3D printed resins. The results reported herein will be helpful for determining an efficient workflow in clinical by providing a guide to appropriate washing solutions and washing times that can increase biocompatibility without affecting the mechanical strength of 3D printed dental resin materials.

Keywords: three-dimensional printing; washing solution; washing time; cell viability; cytotoxicity; confocal laser scanning; flexural strength; flexural modulus

Effects of Washing Time and Washing Solution on the Biocompatibility and Mechanical Properties of 3D printed Dental Resin Materials

Na-Kyung Hwangbo

**Department of Dentistry,
The Graduate School, Yonsei University**

(Directed by Professor Jong Hoon Choi, D.D.S., Ph.D.)

I . INTRODUCTION

Recently developed computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) technology is widely used in dentistry, and it has made a substantial contribution to the development of dental treatment techniques and restoration quality improvements due to its rapidness and reproducibility (Bayne and Heymann, 1996; Beuer, et al., 2008). Among the processing technologies, 3D printing involves stacking raw materials to produce an object, and is also called additive manufacturing. This approach has received attention because it can rapidly produce and prototype

various materials that can be 3D printed in a layer-by-layer manner (Abduo, et al., 2014). Additive manufacturing has many advantages, such as less material wastage, heat, and noise, and the absence of wear or need for replacement of related consumables since a burr is not used to remove material, unlike when using a cutting (subtractive) method (Atzeni and Salmi, 2012; Stansbury and Idacavage, 2016; Van Noort, 2012). In dentistry, additive manufacturing technology is used to manufacture dental models and for the implantation of surgical guides, crowns, denture bases, clear aligners, and mouth guards using 3D printed polymers, and also to manufacture metal restorations and dental implants through 3D printing (Bhargav, et al., 2018; Dawood, et al., 2015; Dodziuk, 2016). Recent advances in ceramic printing technology have led to the development of ceramic material-based prostheses also being considered possible (Methani, et al., 2020).

Among the various 3D printers that utilize additive manufacturing methods, stereolithography (SLA) and digital light projection (DLP) devices produce 3D structures by polymerizing liquid photopolymers with a ultraviolet (UV) laser or UV light emitting diode (LED) light source (Stansbury and Idacavage, 2016). SLA printers can accurately draw cross-section patterns on the bottom of the material vat using a numerically controlled microlaser spot, allowing the liquid light-curing resin to solidify in a layer-by-layer manner until the printing process is completed (Wang, et al., 2017). DLP printers use a laser for liquid polymerization, with a digital mirror device (DMD) controlling the curing laser. The DMD consists of several micromirrors that independently control the moving laser beam. DLP is considered a rapid process because it can curing an entire layer in one step using the DMD (Osman, et al., 2017; Wu and Hsu, 2015).

These SLA and DLP methods require a washing process after printing to remove the residual resin attached to the surface (Bayarsaikhan, et al., 2021). The manufacturing workflow for vat-polymerization 3D printers consists of three steps: 3D print manufacturing, washing, and postcuring

(Revilla-León, et al., 2019). First, the data processed into a Standard Tessellation Language (STL) file are used for manufacturing with a layer-by-layer build-up process by a vat-polymerization printer (Mostafavi, et al., 2020). Then, the support of the printed additive manufacturing polymer is removed and the uncured surface resin is cleaned with a dental appliance using solvents: isopropyl alcohol (IPA) or tripropylene glycol monomethyl ether (TPM) (Taormina, et al., 2018). Finally, a postcuring procedure must be performed to ensure complete polymerization of the printed object (Decker, 1998).

In the photopolymerization additive manufacturing method, an unpolymerized oxygen-inhibition layer is formed at the interface of the resin exposed to oxygen while the resin is being polymerized in air (Suh, 2004). Also, since the object is polymerized using a light source in the vat resin solution, the resin solution remains on the surface of the printed product. Residual dental resin monomers have been reported to exhibit cytotoxicity, causing a continuous inflammatory response and contractions when directly applied to Periodontium, and they inhibit restorative dentin formation (Accorinte, et al., 2005; Imazato, et al., 2009; Peumans, et al., 1998). It is also known to inhibit heat shock protein 72 expression (Noda, et al., 2002), and induce mitochondrial damage (Lefevre, et al., 2005) in human monocytes. In addition, uncombined free monomers promote the growth of the dental caries bacteria *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, *Streptococcus sobrinus*, *Streptococcus mutans*, and *Streptococcus salivarius* (Hansel, et al., 1998; Khalichi, et al., 2004). Local and systemic allergic reactions have been reported in 0.7~2% of patients and dentists (Goldberg, 2008). These findings indicate the importance of increasing the biocompatibility of the final product by removing the uncured resin from the surface using a sufficient washing process and reducing residual monomers.

However, excessive washing with alcohol-based washing solutions and resin-dissolving agents may diminish the mechanical properties of the resin. Aging by ethanol is known to significantly

decrease the fracture toughness of resins, and aging by a mixture of ethanol and water can also cause the solvent to penetrate the matrix, weakening the resin and impairing other mechanical properties (Drummond, 2008). Furthermore, the denture base polymer—especially those based on self-polymerized polymethyl methacrylate—cracks and dissolves on the surface easily when using solvent and disinfectant ethanol; the interphase region between the PMMA polymer bead and the polymer matrix is reportedly affected most by ethanol (Basavarajappa, et al., 2016). Moreover, immersing the composite resin in ethanol has been shown to lower microhardness and diametral tensile strength, and the immersion solution has been shown to change the physical properties of the resin composite (Aguiar, et al., 2005).

The washing process for 3D printed dental resin is considered a simple process and its importance has been overlooked. There is currently a dearth of studies that have extensively investigated the biocompatibility and mechanical properties of 3D printed dental resins according to washing times and washing solutions. Since 3D printed dental resin must exhibit mechanical properties that can cope with large mastication forces, research is needed to determine the optimal washing solution and washing time for improving biocompatibility without diminishing the mechanical strength. However, this is difficult to achieve consistently because the washing time suggested by each 3D printed resin manufacturer varies, as do the washing equipment and solutions that clinicians have, and clear recommendations are also insufficient.

The purpose of the present study was to determine the effects of washing solution (IPA and TPM) and time on the mechanical properties and biocompatibility of 3D printed crown & bridge and denture teeth photocurable resins. The null hypothesis was that the mechanical properties and biocompatibility of dental 3D printed photopolymerizable resin did not vary significantly with the type of washing solution and washing time.

II . Materials AND METHODS

1. 3D specimen CAD Design and Printing

The 3D printed specimen file used in this study was designed using CAD software (Meshmixer, Autodesk, San Rafael, CA, USA) before printing. The disks for use in biocompatibility tests and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) surface analyses were designed with a diameter of 9 mm and a thickness of 2 mm. For the mechanical property test, a bar with a length of 25 mm, a width of 2 mm, and a thickness of 2 mm was designed according to the ISO 10477 standard, and the designed specimen was saved as an STL file (Figure 1). The NextDent C&B (ND) resin specimen was printed using a dedicated DLP 3D printer (NextDent ND5100, Vertex-Dental, Soesterberg, the Netherlands), with a 405-nm UV LED used as the light source. An SLA 3D printer (Form 3, Formlabs, Somerville, MA, USA) was used to print the specimen with Formlabs Denture Teeth A2 (FL) resin, and a 405-nm UV LED light and 250 μ W laser power were used as the light source. All specimens were 3D printed at a thickness of 50 μ m (Table 1).




Figure 1. Additive manufacturing 3D printed specimens.

Table 1. 3D printed materials used in this study

Product	Code	Composition	Manufacturers
Formlabs Denture teeth	FL	Methacrylate monomer, Urethane dimethacrylate, Propylidynetrimethyl trimethacrylate, Diphenyl(2,4,6- trimethylbenzoyl) phosphine oxide	Formlabs, Sommerville, MA, USA
Nextdent C&B	ND	>90% Methacrylic oligomers, methacrylate monomer, <3% phosphine oxides, pigment	Nextdent, Soesterburg, the Netherlands

2. Washing the 3D printed specimens and the postcuring process

Before washing, the support structures and residual resin of each 3D printed specimen were removed, and then it was placed in a 3D printing washer (Twin Tornado, MEDIFIVE, Incheon, Korea) and washed with IPA or TPM solution for 3, 5, 10, 15, 30, 60, and 90 min to remove the residual resin monomer from the surface (Table 2). Washing time was subdivided from 3 and 5 minutes recommended by the manufacturer to 60 minutes according to previous studies, and the maximum time was set to 90 minutes in consideration of clinical application. A nonwashing group was used as a control group (CTR). After washing with 90% IPA, alcohol was evaporated in air, and after washing with TPM solution, the sample was rinsed with water or lightly brushed according to the manufacturer's recommendations. The specimen was then postcured for 30 min at 60°C in a UV-light polymerization chamber (FormCure, Formlabs, Somerville, MA, USA) using a 405-nm light source (13 multidirectional LEDs) (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Workflow of the overall experimental process, showing the washing conditions and types of experiment.

Table 2. Characteristics of the two washing solutions

Product	Code	purity	evaporation rate (n-butyl acetate = 1)	Flash point (°C)	Vapor pressure (mmHg)
Isopropyl alcohol	IPA	90%	0.0026	12°C	45.4
Tripropylene glycol monomethyl ether	TPM	< 95%	2.3	111°C	> 1

3. Biocompatibility test

3.1. In Vitro Cell Culture and Cell Line

Cell viability and cytotoxicity assays were performed to evaluate the biocompatibility of molecules released from 3D printed specimens according to the washing time. 3D printed specimens were manufactured according to the manufacturer's instructions for the resin suggested in ISO 7405 and Research by Ian Gibson, I.G., and were manufactured with a diameter of 9 mm and a thickness of 2 mm to fit the size of a 48 well. Primary human gingival fibroblasts (HGFs; PCS-201-018, ATCC, Manassas, VA, USA) were used with Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (WelGene, Daegu, Korea) containing 10% fetal bovine serum (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), 5% penicillin/streptomycin (100X, WelGene, Daegu, Korea), and 5% MEM nonessential amino acid solution (100X, WelGene, Daegu, Korea). The HGFs were incubated at 37°C in a 5% CO₂ and 95% air atmosphere and at 100% relative humidity. The cell culture medium was changed every 2 or 3 days, and when the cell confluency reached 85–90% the culture was treated with 0.25% trypsin-ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid solution (Trypsin-EDTA, 1X, WelGene, Daegu, Korea). The separated cells were centrifuged to remove the old medium and Trypsin-EDTA solution, and the cells were diluted to a density of 5×10^4 cells/ml in fresh medium. Five specimens were used in each group, and diluted cells were seeded on 48-well plates containing sterile circular 3D printed specimens. The plates were incubated for 24, 48, and 72 hours at 37°C and 5% CO₂ before analyzing cell viability and cytotoxicity.

3.2. Cell Viability and Cytotoxicity Assays

Cell viability was measured using the CELLOMAX™ viability assay kit that is based on the tetrazolium salt (2-(2-methoxy-4-nitrophenyl)-3-(4-nitrophenyl)-5-(2,4-disulfophenyl)-2H-tetrazolium and monosodium salt [WST-8]; Precaregene, Hanam, Kyungido, Korea). After 24, 48, and 72 hours of incubation, 50μL of CELLOMAX™ solution (CELLOMAX™ viability assay kit, Precaregene, Korea) was added to the 48-well plate with the specimen. Wells in which only cells without specimens were cultured were used as a positive-control group, and incubated at 37°C for 90 min according to the manufacturer's instructions. Next, 100μL of the medium from each well was transferred to 96-well plates and the absorbance was measured at 450 nm using a microplate reader (VERSA max, Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA, USA). The percentage of cell viability was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Cell viability (\%)} = \left(\frac{\text{OD}_{\text{test sample}} - \text{OD}_{\text{blank}}}{\text{OD}_{\text{control}} - \text{OD}_{\text{blank}}} \right) \times 100$$

The cytotoxicity of 3D printed resins to HGFs was evaluated using a lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) release assay kit (Quanti-LDH™ Cytotoxicity Assay Kit, BIOMAX, Seoul, Korea). From 48-well plates cultured for 24, 48, and 72 hours, 20μL of supernatant culture medium was transferred to new 96-well plates. In a high control group, cells were lysed according to the manufacturer's instructions, and in a low control group, only cells were cultured in wells without specimens. Then, 100 μL of the LDH substrate mixture was added and reacted at room temperature for 30 min, and the absorbance of the resultant solution was measured at 450 nm. The percentage of cytotoxicity was calculated as follows:

Cytotoxicity (%) =

$$\left[\frac{(\text{OD}_{\text{cells with 3D printed resin}} - \text{OD}_{\text{background control}}) - (\text{OD}_{\text{low control}} - \text{OD}_{\text{background control}})}{(\text{OD}_{\text{high control}} - \text{OD}_{\text{background control}}) - (\text{OD}_{\text{low control}} - \text{OD}_{\text{background control}})} \right] \times 100$$

3.3. Confocal laser scanning microscopy analysis

HGFs were incubated for 24 hours in a dish containing sterilized specimens, washed three times with PBS, and fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde in PBS for 15 min at room temperature. Then, the sample was washed three times for 5 min each, treated with 0.1% Triton™ X-100 in PBS for 15 min, and then washed three times with PBS again. For cytoskeletal quantification, phalloidin (Alexa Fluor 488® Phalloidin, Invitrogen, Thermo Scientific, USA) was used to fluorescently stain the cytoskeleton via its binding to F-actin according to the manufacturer's instructions. DAPI (4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole), which binds to AT regions of DNA and emits blue fluorescence, was then applied for nuclear counterstaining. Finally, the specimens were treated with antifade mounting media (VECTASHIELD, Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA, USA) and imaged using confocal laser scanning microscopy (CLSM; LSM 700, Carl Zeiss Microscopy, Jena, Germany).

4. Flexural strength and flexural modulus test

For the three-point flexural bend test, 15 bar specimens per group ($n = 15$) were stored at 37°C for 24 hours before performing the test according to the ISO 10477 standard. A universal tester (Model 3366, Instron Corporation, Norwood, MA, USA) equipped with a 10-kN load cell was used at a crosshead speed of 1 mm/min. The specimens were placed on two round supports parallel to each other separated by 20 mm. A uniaxial load was applied to the center of the specimen until it

broke, and the maximum force before fracture was recorded in newtons. The flexural strength (σ) in megapascals and the flexural modulus (E) in gigapascals were calculated as follows (Unkovskiy, et al., 2018):

$$\sigma = \frac{3FL}{2wh^2}$$

$$E = \frac{FL^3}{4wh^3d}$$

where F is the load at a selected point of the elastic region of the stress–strain plot in newtons, L is the span length between the supports in millimeters, w is the width of the specimen in millimeters, h is the height of the specimen in millimeters, and d is the deflection of the specimen in millimeters (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Schematic of the test setup for ISO 10447.

5. Scanning electron microscope analysis

After each washing time, the surface of the postcured specimen was analyzed using SEM (JEOL-7800F, JEOL, Tokyo, Japan) for qualitative SEM image analysis. The specimen was mounted after applying a carbon adhesive and coating with gold palladium. Representative images were obtained at 40 \times and 1,000 \times magnifications in each group.

6. Statistical analysis

The normality of all the data was confirmed by performing a Shapiro–Wilk test. Data from the cell viability ($n = 480$) and cytotoxicity ($n = 480$) assays were analyzed by a three-way ANOVA using standard statistical software (version 25.0, SPSS Statistics, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA), followed by the Bonferroni and Scheffe tests. Through this, the interaction between washing time, washing solution, and materials and the effect of variables on biocompatibility were confirmed. A one-way ANOVA was also used to confirm differences in the experimental results according to the washing time within each group ($\alpha < 0.05$). In order to confirm the effect of washing time, washing solution, and material on mechanical properties, data on flexural strength ($n = 480$) and flexural modulus ($n = 480$) were analyzed using a three-way ANOVA, followed by the Bonferroni test and Tukey multiple-comparison test. In addition, a one-way ANOVA was used to confirm the differences according to the washing time within various groups.

III. RESULTS

1. Biocompatibility test

1.1. Cell Viability Assay

HGFs were cultured on the surface of 3D printed specimens for 24, 48, and 72 hours, and the cell viability was found to vary with the washing time and 3D printed resin (Figure 4). Three-way ANOVA revealed that the cell viability varied significantly with the washing time ($F = 216.669$, $p < 0.001$) and material ($F = 79.899$, $p < 0.001$), but not with the washing solution ($F = 1.298$, $p = 0.255$) (Figure 4B). There were significant interactions between material and washing solution ($F = 164.1055$, $p < 0.001$), material and washing time ($F = 6.373$, $p < 0.001$), and washing solution and washing time ($F = 3.201$, $p = 0.003$). There was also a significant interaction effect between washing time, resin, and washing solution ($F = 12.311$, $p < 0.001$). Cell viability varied significantly with the washing time (Figure 4A). The cell viability was lowest in the control group $24.38 \pm 6.02\%$, and then increased significantly with the washing time. The cell viability was significantly higher in the ND group ($47.11 \pm 15.76\%$) than in the FL group ($41.60 \pm 19.58\%$) (Figure 4C).

Figure 5 shows the results of one-way ANOVA for verifying differences in cell viability according to the washing time for each material and washing solution. The analysis revealed that cell viability increased with the washing time in all groups. In the ND-IPA group, the cell viability was lowest in the control ($23.69 \pm 2.77\%$), and was significantly higher for washing times of 30 min

($61.86 \pm 9.36\%$), 60 min ($69.14 \pm 11.79\%$), and 90 min ($74.75 \pm 12.31\%$) (Figure 5A). In the ND-TPM group, cell viability was significantly lower for washing times of control ($29.47 \pm 2.16\%$) and 3 min ($30.38 \pm 2.16\%$), and significantly higher for washing times of 60 min ($53.77 \pm 7.55\%$) and 90 min ($63.81 \pm 12.01\%$) (Figure 5B). In the FL-IPA group, cell viability was significantly lower for washing times of control ($23.73 \pm 6.47\%$), 3 min ($24.12 \pm 6.61\%$), and 5 min ($25.44 \pm 7.12\%$), and significantly higher for a washing time of 90 min ($61.15 \pm 8.22\%$) (Figure 5C). In the FL-TPM washing group, cell viability was significantly lower for washing times of control ($20.64 \pm 7.43\%$) and 3 min ($22.77 \pm 7.09\%$), and significantly higher for washing times of 60 min ($66.10 \pm 8.36\%$) and 90 min ($80.79 \pm 15.43\%$) (Figure 5D). The data for cell viability after culturing for 24–72 hours are listed in Table 3.




Figure 4. Results from three-way ANOVA for cell viability according to (A) washing time, (B) washing solution, and (C) 3D printed resin material (24–72 hours). Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.




Figure 5. Results from one-way ANOVA for cell viability according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution (24–72 hours): (A) ND-IPA, (B) ND-TPM, (C) FL-IPA, and (D) FL-TPM groups. Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.

Table 3. Cell viability after 24, 48, and 72 hours in each group according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution^a

Group	Cultivation (hours)	Washing time (min)							
		CTR	3	5	10	15	30	60	90
ND-IPA	24	24.06	42.82	42.64	43.37	49.20	57.23	66.92	77.23
		±3.48	±3.48	±3.36	±5.78	±5.62	±5.58	±10.98	±16.40
	48	23.94	43.62	46.47	53.00	52.37	66.61	75.21	81.00
		±1.01	±1.28	±4.84	±6.97	±5.00	±13.69	±13.34	±5.40
	72	23.08	39.53	46.39	48.75	49.47	61.77	65.31	66.04
		±3.63	±1.73	±9.02	±7.22	±4.29	±5.78	±10.85	±9.02
ND-TPM	24	28.05	28.59	32.21	35.96	39.51	43.02	54.25	64.14
		±1.68	±1.45	±2.56	±0.67	±0.41	±4.48	±6.87	±13.35
	48	31.85	32.84	35.82	42.14	47.19	47.50	57.24	68.16
		±1.19	±1.20	±2.34	±6.84	±2.76	±5.31	±10.79	±15.43
	72	28.52	29.71	34.25	39.89	42.20	43.26	49.85	59.15
		±1.22	±0.88	±2.85	±3.35	±2.15	±3.24	±1.20	±6.13
FL-IPA	24	24.60	25.52	28.28	32.84	38.39	43.16	57.82	59.53
		±0.50	±1.75	±2.11	±4.25	±4.77	±5.05	±7.35	±4.40
	48	30.91	31.07	31.96	36.20	40.11	45.69	54.78	57.43
		±0.52	±0.27	±0.81	±3.32	±2.49	±3.74	±7.92	±5.39
	72	15.70	15.78	16.09	17.78	19.73	32.23	41.83	66.49
		±0.37	±0.29	±0.20	±1.36	±1.17	±7.82	±12.54	±11.49
FL-TPM	24	28.04	29.37	38.27	44.00	47.00	58.78	66.32	71.98
		±1.01	±2.35	±7.48	±13.40	±11.80	±7.90	±9.64	±13.73
	48	22.94	24.96	39.44	45.57	50.13	58.77	63.68	94.64
		±0.31	±0.89	±10.46	±5.34	±4.26	±8.08	±10.94	±16.43
	72	10.96	13.99	31.80	38.75	48.67	60.59	68.31	75.78
		±0.16	±3.61	±11.28	±6.60	±5.02	±6.44	±4.35	±2.65

^a Data are mean and standard-deviation values of the percentage cell viability.

1.2. Cytotoxicity assay

The cytotoxicity assays produced different results depending on the washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin (Figure 6). Three-way ANOVA revealed that cytotoxicity varied significantly with the washing time ($F = 222.559$, $p < 0.001$), washing solution ($F = 76.683$, $p < 0.001$), and material ($F = 249.099$, $p < 0.001$). There were significant interactions between material and washing solution ($F = 69.965$, $p < 0.001$), material and washing time ($F = 9.104$, $p < 0.001$), washing solution and washing time ($F = 10.123$, $p < 0.001$), and washing time, and material, and washing solution ($F = 13.240$, $p < 0.001$). The cytotoxicity varied significantly with the washing time (Figure 6A). The cytotoxicity was highest in the control group ($65.69 \pm 22.55\%$), and there was a trend of a significant decrease as the washing time increased. The cytotoxicity was significantly lower for washing times of 15 min ($9.52 \pm 7.83\%$), 30 min ($9.44 \pm 9.66\%$), 60 min ($5.86 \pm 5.76\%$), and 90 min ($5.04 \pm 4.38\%$). The cytotoxicity was $24.08 \pm 21.32\%$ in the IPA washing group and $20.06 \pm 25.42\%$ in the TPM washing group (Figure 6B). The cytotoxicity was significantly higher in the ND group ($26.71 \pm 26.07\%$) than in the FL group ($17.43 \pm 19.64\%$) (Figure 6C).

Figure 7 shows the results of one-way ANOVA for identifying differences in cytotoxicity according to the washing time for each material and washing solution. In the ND-IPA group, the cytotoxicity was significantly higher for washing times of control ($66.17 \pm 11.67\%$) and 3 min ($55.97 \pm 12.27\%$), and significantly lower for washing times of 10 min ($12.47 \pm 4.11\%$), 60 min ($8.84 \pm 2.71\%$), and 90 min ($9.35 \pm 4.36\%$) (Figure 7A). In the ND-TPM group, the cytotoxicity was significantly higher for a washing time of control ($96.58 \pm 15.12\%$), and significantly lower for washing times of 15 min ($10.02 \pm 5.01\%$), 60 min ($10.62 \pm 7.28\%$), and 90 min ($6.16 \pm 3.77\%$) (Figure 7B). In the FL-IPA group, cytotoxicity was significantly higher for washing times of control

($50.10 \pm 11.21\%$) and 3 min ($41.61 \pm 10.10\%$), and significantly lower for washing times of 30 min ($5.57 \pm 5.20\%$), 60 min ($2.90 \pm 3.28\%$), and 90 min ($3.02 \pm 2.93\%$) (Figure 7C). In the FL-TPM group, the cytotoxicity was significantly lower for all washing times except control ($49.93 \pm 10.21\%$) and 3 min ($32.59 \pm 5.86\%$) (Figure 7D). cytotoxicity decreased with increasing washing time in all groups. All data for cytotoxicity after culturing for 24–72 hours are listed in Table 4.




Figure 6. Results from three-way ANOVA for cytotoxicity according to (A) washing time, (B) washing solution, and (C) 3D printed resin material (24–72 hours). Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.




Figure 7. Results from one-way ANOVA for cytotoxicity according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution (24–72 hours): (A) ND-IPA, (B) ND-TPM, (C) FL-IPA, and (D) FL-TPM groups. Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.

Table 4. Cytotoxicity after 24, 48, and 72 hours in each group according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution^a

Group	Cultivation (hours)	Washing time (min)							
		CTR	3	5	10	15	30	60	90
ND-IPA	24	57.38	43.59	16.79	10.40	10.20	11.94	10.44	9.77
		±1.61	±4.07	±2.81	±1.18	±1.07	±1.86	±1.11	±1.49
	48	62.97	54.01	18.48	9.59	9.69	11.04	5.97	6.42
		±12.83	±6.29	±6.59	±1.34	±2.56	±3.48	±2.32	±3.38
	72	78.17	70.33	37.34	17.42	20.18	23.21	10.14	11.85
		±4.53	±4.09	±8.32	±3.11	±7.18	±5.31	±1.87	±5.86
ND-TPM	24	95.35	14.52	14.75	14.29	5.56	6.05	3.57	2.23
		±18.17	±6.19	±2.63	±5.22	±2.44	±5.21	±3.08	±1.39
	48	96.22	30.93	32.03	33.11	10.41	17.06	11.57	5.88
		±15.73	±8.03	±2.63	±14.06	±4.74	±12.72	±3.81	±1.71
	72	98.18	33.18	33.49	39.91	14.11	25.27	16.74	10.37
		±14.77	±5.57	±3.44	±9.66	±3.69	±7.46	±7.18	±1.86
FL-IPA	24	40.70	32.54	27.03	11.42	4.76	1.57	0.06	0.68
		±5.46	±1.49	±3.79	±1.51	±0.91	±0.74	±0.45	±0.39
	48	45.73	37.26	33.27	22.01	9.28	2.90	1.93	1.97
		±5.49	±1.30	±1.00	±1.63	±2.48	±1.35	±0.90	±0.97
	72	63.89	55.04	53.28	42.48	25.30	12.26	6.73	6.42
		±2.86	±1.15	±2.01	±2.38	±4.19	±2.78	±2.70	±2.53
FL-TPM	24	40.18	27.34	3.52	1.62	0.17	0.49	0.59	1.09
		±2.21	±1.90	±3.43	±1.38	±1.94	±0.84	±1.03	±0.62
	48	46.63	30.46	4.95	3.14	1.69	1.40	2.06	2.41
		±1.83	±0.62	±2.69	±2.56	±1.52	±0.22	±1.04	±0.69
	72	62.98	39.98	13.06	9.34	2.92	0.18	0.62	1.38
		±3.45	±2.79	±5.75	±7.65	±2.12	±0.50	±0.71	±1.12

^a Data are mean and standard-deviation values of the percentage cell viability.

1.3. CLSM analysis

The morphology of cells attached to the specimen surfaces was observed using CLSM (Figure 8). Differences in morphologies, sizes, and numbers of blue-stained multinucleate cells and green-stained cytoplasm and filopodia became evident with increasing washing time. For a washing time of control group there were adherent cells with very poor morphology in all groups, while the 3-min washing group showed a small round cells with a few filopodia at the cell edge. In the 5- and 10-min washing groups, cells had elongated or round shapes, and relatively few cells and nuclei remained. In the 15-min washing group, the cell cytoplasm mostly appeared elongated, with increased numbers of cells. In the 30-, 60-, and 90-min washing groups, elongated fibroblasts were observed, and large numbers of cells and cell-to-cell contacts were observed. As the washing time increased, the stretched cytoplasm of fibroblasts were conspicuous, while the numbers of cells increased as did contacts with neighboring cells.




Figure 8. Confocal laser scanning microscopy images of human gingival fibroblasts cultures
(5×10^4 cells/ml) on 3D printed specimens washed with various solutions and for
various times after 24 hours of incubation.

2. Flexural strength

Three-way ANOVA was performed to determine the effects of washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material on flexural strength. Washing time ($F = 2.109$, $p = 0.041$), washing solution ($F = 24.731$, $p < 0.001$), and material ($F = 14.684$, $p < 0.001$) were all found to significantly affect the flexural strength (Figure 9). The flexural strength was significantly higher in the CRT group (122.43 ± 16.05 MPa, mean \pm standard deviation) than in the 60-min washing group (115.43 ± 9.75 MPa) (Figure 9A), significantly lower in the TPM washing group (115.78 ± 10.41 MPa) than in the IPA washing group (121.13 ± 12.91 MPa) (Figure 9B), and significantly lower in the ND group (120.48 ± 11.86 MPa) than in the FL group (116.43 ± 11.86 MPa) (Figure 9C). There was also a significant interaction effect between the washing solution and material ($F = 7.520$, $p = 0.006$). In addition, one-way ANOVA performed to verify the difference in flexural strength according to the washing times for each 3D printed resin material and washing solution revealed no significant difference in all groups (Figure 10).




Figure 9. Results from three-way ANOVA for flexural strength according to (A) washing time, (B) washing solution, and (C) 3D printed resin material. Data are mean and standard-deviation values for 15 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.




Figure 10. Results from one-way ANOVA for flexural strength according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution: (A) ND-IPA, (B) ND-TPM, (C) FL-IPA, and (D) FL-TPM groups. Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 15 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.

3. Flexural modulus

Three-way ANOVA was performed to determine the effects of washing time, washing solution, and 3D printed resin material on the flexural modulus. Washing time ($F = 13.163$, $p < 0.001$) and material ($F = 257.151$, $p < 0.001$) were found to significantly affect the flexural modulus, whereas the washing solution ($F = 0.100$, $p = 0.752$) did not (Figure 11). There was a significant interaction between material and time ($F = 4.753$, $p < 0.001$) and between washing solution and time ($F = 2.705$, $p = 0.09$). The relationship between flexural modulus and washing time varied significantly between groups. The flexural modulus was significantly higher in the group without washing (1.30 ± 0.28 GPa) than in all washing groups except for the 3-min one, and it was significantly lower for washing times of 60 min (1.04 ± 0.25 GPa), 90 min (1.01 ± 0.21 GPa), and 15 min (1.09 ± 0.24 GPa) (Figure 11A). Overall, the flexural modulus tended to decrease as the washing time increased. The flexural modulus did not differ between the IPA washing group (1.12 ± 0.27 GPa) and the TPM washing group (1.13 ± 0.28 GPa) (Figure 11B), or between the ND (1.28 ± 0.24 GPa) and FL (0.98 ± 0.22 GPa) groups (Figure 11C). One-way ANOVA performed to identify differences in flexural modulus according to washing time for each 3D printed resin material and washing solution (Figure 12) revealed no significant difference in the ND group. In the FL-IPA group, the flexural modulus was highest in the control group (1.20 ± 0.21 GPa), and significantly lower for washing times of 5 min (0.95 ± 0.16 GPa), 60 min (0.79 ± 0.10 GPa), and 90 min (0.90 ± 0.13 GPa). In the FL-TPM group, the flexural modulus was significantly higher in the control group (1.33 ± 0.32 GPa), and did not differ between all of the other groups




Figure 11. Results from three-way ANOVA for flexural modulus according to (A) washing time, (B) washing solution, and (C) 3D printed resin material. Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.




Figure 12. Results from one-way ANOVA for flexural modulus according to washing time for each 3D printed resin and washing solution: (A) ND-IPA, (B) ND-TPM, (C) FL-IPA, and (D) FL-TPM groups. Data are mean and standard-deviation values of 5 3D printed specimens. Different lower-case letters indicate a significant difference.

4. SEM analysis

Four representative SEM images from the qualitative analysis (for washing times of 5, 30, and 90 min and control group) are shown in Figure 13. The four groups of matte specimens show that the surface characteristics varied with the material. The low-magnification analysis at 40× magnification revealed that the surface of the ND resin produced by 3D printing using the DLP method showed a characteristic grid pattern, while the surface of the FL resin produced by 3D printing using the SLA method showed a relatively smooth surface. However, there were no differences according to the washing time. The high-magnification analysis at 1000× magnification revealed differences in surface characteristics between groups, but no cracks or mechanical damage due to the washing process were observed.




Figure 13. Qualitative scanning electron microscopy images of the surface topography at 40× and 1000× in four representative groups for washing times of 5, 30, and 90 min and control group: ND-IPA (A–D), ND-TPM (E–H), FL-IPA (I–L), and FL-TPM (M–P) groups.

IV. DISCUSSION

Crowns and dentures printed with dental 3D printed resin are in direct contact with soft and hard tissues in the oral cavity for a long time and must withstand large mastication forces. Accordingly, high biocompatibility and mechanical properties need to be considered very carefully when selecting these materials. This study evaluated the effects of various combinations of washing solutions, washing times, and materials. Our analyses of these three main parameters revealed partial differences according to washing solutions and materials, and observed that washing times significantly affected the biological properties of the 3D printed samples. Therefore, the null hypothesis was partially accepted.

Figure 4A shows that cell viability was significantly affected by the washing time. The polymerization of the methacrylate-based monomer of the resin composite results in the formation of a polymer with a highly cross-linked structure, but since the conversion of the monomer is not complete, significant numbers of unreacted double bonds remain (Ferracane, et al., 1997). The materials used in our study were methacrylate-based resins, including urethane dimethacrylate, propylidynetrimethyl trimethacrylate, and phosphine oxide. These components are known to exert cytotoxic and genotoxic effects when present as uncured monomers (Bakopoulou, et al., 2009; Leggat and Kedjarune, 2003), and may lead to mutagenesis, DNA damage, or even cell death (Bakopoulou, et al., 2009; Samuelsen, et al., 2007; Schweikl, et al., 2006). Previous studies were referred to explain the effect of cell contact of 3D printed resin in direct contact with soft tissues in the oral cavity (Bayarsaikhan, et al., 2021; Kreß, et al., 2020; Kurzmann, et al., 2017). Therefore, direct approach of seeding the HGF on specimens was used. Kurzmann et al. applied an indirect approach, observing cytotoxicity by culturing cells in a normal well and placing a resin specimen

thereon, and found that the results were consistent with those of the direct approach of culturing cells directly on the specimen (Kurzmänn, et al., 2017). Also, as in the study of Kreß et al., considering the long-term oral contact, cytotoxicity was observed every 24 hours during a total culture period of 72 hours, which contrasts with the standard exposure time of only 24 hours (according to ISO 7405 (Standardization, 2018)).

In our study, it is particularly interesting that the cell viability in all groups increased significantly as the washing time increased up to 90 min. This can be explained by an increased washing time increasing the removal of uncured monomers from the surface, leading to increased cell viability. Xu et al. reported that 5 min of ultrasonic washing with IPA increased cell viability, while increasing the washing time beyond 5 min did not further improve the cell viability (Xu, et al., 2021). Contrary to our study, it appears that the use of ultrasonic cleaners can rapidly increase cell viability. González et al. also reported that cell proliferation was more pronounced in a sample sonicated for 5 min than in a sample immersed in ethanol or acetone for 2 hours, indicating that sonication was effective in reducing cytotoxicity (González, et al., 2020). Atay et al. classified a cell viability of greater than 90% as indicating that the substance is not cytotoxic, with values of 60–90% indicating mild cytotoxicity, 30–59% indicating moderate cytotoxicity, and less than 30% indicating severe cytotoxicity (Atay, et al., 2019). According to this classification, in the present study there were no significant differences between the washing solutions while there were significant differences between the materials, but both materials could be classified as having moderate cytotoxicity (cell viability of 30–59%). It can also be suggested that more than 60 min of washing is required to reach a cell viability in excess of 60%. However, the results of Atay et al. were obtained in cytotoxicity evaluations of different CAD/CAM materials using extracts from culture media, and not by direct contact (Rizo-Gorrita, et al., 2019). Cytotoxicity decreased as the washing time increased in all of

our groups, showing a similar trend to cell viability. In particular, there was a significant difference between the control group and the 90-min washing group, demonstrating that the washing process affects the biocompatibility of the material. Three-way ANOVA revealed that the cytotoxicity was significantly reduced after washing for more than 15 min. In particular, there was little difference between washing times of 60 and 90 min in all groups, for which a large decrease in cytotoxicity was observed. In particular, the cytotoxicity was very high in the control and 3-min washing groups, and so washing for at least 5 min seems to be necessary. Although there were differences between the washing solutions and materials, all groups showed less than 30% cytotoxicity, and so the washing process after manufacturing seems to be effective in reducing the number of unreacted monomers to below the cell tolerance threshold.

Fibroblasts are the most abundant cells present in connective tissue and directly guide and regulate cellular functions via receptor–ligand interactions (Häkkinen, et al., 2011). They also communicate with other cells by secreting or releasing growth factors and cytokines from the extracellular matrix, and develop cell-to-cell contacts with each other and with other types of cell to create complex cellular communication networks (Häkkinen, et al., 2011). Fibroblasts also regulate tissue development, organogenesis, homeostasis, and maintenance, and they play key roles in various physiological and pathological situations, including wound healing, inflammation, and cancer (Häkkinen, et al., 2014). Therefore, it is important to verify the fibroblast cytotoxicity of 3D printed resins. Our CLSM images revealed clear differences and trends in the size, morphology, and number of cells with washing time, similar to the results obtained in the cell viability and cytotoxicity tests. As the washing time increased, the number of normal cells increased, and elongated fibroblasts and cell-to-cell contact were observed. Prominently, large numbers of normal cells were found on the surface of the specimens in the 30-, 60-, and 90-min washing groups compared with the other groups.

Moreover, there were almost no normal adherent cells in the control and 3-min washing groups, and only a few very poorly formed filopodia were observed. Unwashed monomers remaining on the surface can result in irreversible disturbances of basic cellular functions such as cell proliferation, enzymatic activity, cell morphology, membrane integrity, cell metabolism, and survival (Bakopoulou, et al., 2009). It is therefore important to determine the optimal washing time for meeting the biological requirements of 3D printed resins. The results of this study suggest that the biocompatibility of products constructed from 3D printed resins improves as the washing time increases up to 90 min.

Three-way ANOVAs of all experimental groups included in this study revealed that the flexural strength was significantly higher in the control group, but that there was no significant tendency for the flexural strength to decrease as the washing time increased. Xu et al. similarly found no difference in flexural strength for washing times of 5 to 60 min (Xu, et al., 2021). However, those authors found that the flexural strength decreased after washing for more than 12 hours, suggesting that prolonged washing affects the flexural strength due to the solvent molecules penetrating from the surface into the resin matrix and the polymer network relaxing (Xu, et al., 2021). Our analysis of the flexural strength according to different washing solutions revealed that the flexural strength was significantly higher in the IPA washing group than in the TPM washing group. However, it is difficult to say that the difference was clinically significant, since it was less than 10 MPa. Mayer et al. recorded the highest degree of conversion after washing Temporary 3D printed fixed dental prosthesis materials with butyl glycol and IPA, and that the flexural strength was lowest after washing with acetone and butyl glycol (Mayer, et al., 2021). These observations suggest that flexural strength is affected by differences in washing solutions.

Unlike flexural strength, flexural modulus showed a tendency to decrease with increasing washing time (Figure 11). One-way ANOVA according washing time within groups revealed that as the washing time increased in the FL group, the flexural modulus tended to decrease. Awada et al. reported that a polymer-based material had a relatively low flexural modulus compared with its high flexural strength. This can be explained by the increase in the ability of elastic materials to withstand loads as they undergo elastic deformation before they break (Awada and Nathanson, 2015). After being stored in ethanol, the Wallace hardness increases significantly compared with that after storage in air, which is due to the resin-softening effect of ethanol (Asmussen and Peutzfeldt, 2001). Therefore, in this study, as the washing time increased, the molecular weight of the resin decreased and the flexural modulus decreased, whereas it is thought that the ability of the flexible material to bear loads increased as it undergoes elastic deformation. As a result, it appears that the flexural modulus decreased with increasing washing time, but the flexural strength might not have. As flexural strength increases, the modulus of resilience increases, and as flexural modulus increases, the modulus of resilience decreases. Therefore, the modulus of resilience directly depends on the interaction between flexural strength and modulus (Awada and Nathanson, 2015). As shown in our experimental results, a decrease in flexural modulus without a change in flexural strength means an increase in modulus of resilience. The modulus of resilience is the amount of strain energy per unit volume that a material can absorb without permanent deformation. An increase in this value means an increase in the elasticity of the material.

The flexural modulus did not differ between the washing solutions, and FL showed a low flexural modulus, which may be due to urethane dimethacrylate being one of its components. Urethane dimethacrylate is a monomer that reportedly exhibits lower viscosity and greater flexibility due to the presence of urethane bonds, and it is known that resin composites based on this monomer exhibit

greater toughness (Glenn, 1982). However, limitations associated with patents mean that manufacturers do not disclose the detailed monomer and polymer components of their products, which makes it difficult to analyze differences in results based on specific compounds. The ISO 4049 standard for resin composites specifies only the requirement of the minimum flexural strength value for the mechanical properties. But the elastic modulus of resin composites can have more clinical relevance since it provides resistance of material to deformation, which is correlated with the clinical performance (Jun, et al., 2013). Flexural modulus is a useful measure for determining whether a material that will break or rupture due to applied stress. A lower flexural modulus lowers the bending resistance and can cause problems such as repeated elastic deformation of a resilient restoration's margin might lead to microleakage (Awada and Nathanson, 2015). Furthermore a low flexural modulus could lead to restorative deformation under load, resulting in accelerated wear and hoop stress that may cause crown debonding (Ilie and Hickel, 2009; Lawson, et al., 2016) and therefore it is considered that washing for a long time should be avoided. However, a material with high strength and low flexural modulus is suitable for dental trauma management because a flexible splint assists in healing (Shirako, et al., 2017). Therefore, it seems that the washing time should be considered according to the purpose of use of the dental prosthetics.

The SEM images in Figure 13 show that washing with IPA for 90 min did not allow sufficient solvent to penetrate so as to cause irreversible deformation. In particular, TPM has a lower immersion sensitivity to cured resin than does IPA, and so washing for up to 90 min using both washing solutions did not seem to affect the surface properties. Xu et al. also reported that washing with IPA for up to 60 min did not cause any surface changes (Xu, et al., 2021). which is consistent the results of our study. However, cracks were found on the surface after washing for more than 12 hours, indicating that prolonged immersion could result in irreversible deformation. This has been

attributed to surface expansion, with solvent molecules being absorbed into the polymer network on the outermost surface to increase the volume, inducing various stresses and osmotic pressures (Xu, et al., 2021). According to the above experimental results, washing for more than 90 min can reduce the flexural modulus, and so this washing time should be considered the upper limit. In addition, the flexural strength and surface defects of 3D printed resin seem to be more affected by aging and the printing direction (KEßLER, et al., 2021; Shim, et al., 2020; Väyrynen, et al., 2016), surface treatment (Asli, et al., 2021; Thunyakitpisal, et al., 2011), printing method (Park, et al., 2020), and postcuring temperature and time (Bayarsaikhan, et al., 2021; Li, et al., 2021) than by any changes to the washing time within the upper limit of 90 min. Also, in order to more clearly confirm the effect of washing time on mechanical properties, it is considered that a follow-up study with a control group of other materials or conditions is needed.

IPA is the most common solvent used to wash unpolymerized resin from the surface of 3D printed restorations. IPA solvent evaporates due to its high vapor pressure and strong volatility. IPA is also flammable, and is classified as a toxic substance that can also have negative effects on users, and hence is a liquid that requires certain safety precautions (Mostafavi, et al., 2020; Slaughter, et al., 2014). In contrast, TPM is a nonflammable, nontoxic liquid with a low vapor pressure that does not require the safety standards associated with IPA, but it does require additional washing with a brush or detergent and is more expensive than IPA (Mostafavi, et al., 2020). According to the results obtained in the present study, both of these washing solutions can improve biocompatibility without significantly impairing the mechanical properties of the material. Mostafavi et al. investigated the effects of washing with TPM and IPA on the manufacturing accuracy of vat-polymerized dental materials, and found that both the trueness and precision were higher for TPM than for IPA (Mostafavi, et al., 2020). Therefore, our experimental results can be used as a basis for selecting a

washing solution that suits specific situations and requirements. In addition, manufacturers suggest washing 3D printed objects for longer than the recommended time if they are large or deep and narrow, but there are no exact guidelines for this. According to the results of the present study, washing for up to 90 min does not cause critical defects in mechanical properties, which can help when determining the optimal washing time according to the shape and size of specific objects. Furthermore, as a result of the biocompatibility test of this study, cytotoxicity was greatly reduced when washing for more than 15 minutes, and most of the cell morphology was maintained normally. Also, the modulus decreased as the washing time increased, but in most groups, 15 minutes of washing did not cause any critical defects. Therefore, it is possible to reduce unnecessary washing time beyond that by recommending a minimum washing time of 15 minutes in object processing.

One limitation of this study was the use of a single type of washer and washing method. Studies using different types of ultrasonic equipment or solutions with temperature control of the solvent are considered to be needed in the future. In addition, as it is an in vitro experiment that did not reproduce the effect of acid and base foods, saliva, etc., research based on the oral environment is also needed. Moreover, the accuracy of a 3D printed part finally produced by focusing only on mechanical and biological properties may vary depending on various parameters.

V. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the effects of washing time and washing solution on the mechanical properties, biocompatibility, and surface characteristics of 3D printed resins. Within the limitations of our study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) As the washing time increased, the cell viability increased and the cytotoxicity decreased, indicating an improved biocompatibility.
- (2) As the washing time increased, there were no reductions in the flexural strength or changes in surface defects, while the flexural modulus decreased.
- (3) Neither washing solution (IPA or TPM) caused significant defects in mechanical properties, and the biocompatibility increased with the washing time for both solutions.

The results reported herein will be helpful for determining an efficient workflow in clinical by providing a guide to appropriate washing solutions and washing times that can increase biocompatibility without affecting the mechanical strength of 3D printed dental resin materials.

REFERENCES

- Abduo J, Lyons K, Bennamoun M: Trends in computer-aided manufacturing in prosthodontics: a review of the available streams. *International journal of dentistry*: 783948, 2014.
- Accorinte MdLR, Loguercio AD, Reis A, Muench A, de Araújo VC: Adverse effects of human pulps after direct pulp capping with the different components from a total-etch, three-step adhesive system. *Dental Materials* 21(7): 599-607, 2005.
- Aguilar FH, Braccero AT, Ambrosano GM, Lovadino JR: Hardness and diametral tensile strength of a hybrid composite resin polymerized with different modes and immersed in ethanol or distilled water media. *Dental Materials* 21(12): 1098-1103, 2005.
- Asli HN, Rahimabadi S, Hemmati YB, Falahchai M: Effect of different surface treatments on surface roughness and flexural strength of repaired 3D-printed denture base: An in vitro study. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 126(4):595.e1-595.e8, 2021.
- Asmussen E, Peutzfeldt A: Influence of selected components on crosslink density in polymer structures. *European journal of oral sciences* 109(4): 282-285, 2001.
- Atay A, Gürdal I, Bozok Çetintas V, Üşümez A, Cal E: Effects of New Generation All-Ceramic and Provisional Materials on Fibroblast Cells. *Journal of Prosthodontics* 28(1): e383-e394, 2019.

Atzeni E, Salmi A: Economics of additive manufacturing for end-usable metal parts. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* 62(9-12): 1147-1155, 2012.

Awada A, Nathanson D: Mechanical properties of resin-ceramic CAD/CAM restorative materials. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry* 114(4): 587-593, 2015.

Bakopoulou A, Papadopoulos T, Garefis P: Molecular toxicology of substances released from resin-based dental restorative materials. *International journal of molecular sciences* 10(9): 3861-3899, 2009.

Basavarajappa S, Al-Kheraif AAA, ElSharawy M, Vallittu PK: Effect of solvent/disinfectant ethanol on the micro-surface structure and properties of multiphase denture base polymers. *Journal of the mechanical behavior of biomedical materials* 54: 1-7, 2016.

Bayarsaikhan E, Lim J-H, Shin S-H, Park K-H, Park Y-B, Lee J-H, et al.: Effects of Postcuring Temperature on the Mechanical Properties and Biocompatibility of Three-Dimensional Printed Dental Resin Material. *Polymers* 13(8): 1180, 2021.

Bayne S, Heymann H: CAD/CAM in dentistry: present and future applications. *Quintessence Int* 27(6): 431-433, 1996.

Beuer F, Schweiger J, Edelhoff D: Digital dentistry: an overview of recent developments for CAD/CAM generated restorations. *British dental journal* 204(9): 505-511, 2008.

Bhargav A, Sanjairaj V, Rosa V, Feng LW, Fuh YH J: Applications of additive manufacturing in dentistry: A review. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials* 106(5): 2058-2064, 2018.

Dawood A, Marti BM, Sauret-Jackson V, Darwood A: 3D printing in dentistry. *British dental journal* 219(11): 521-529, 2015.

Decker C: The use of UV irradiation in polymerization. *Polymer International* 45(2): 133-141, 1998.

Dodziuk H: Applications of 3D printing in healthcare. *Kardiochirurgia i torakochirurgia polska= Polish journal of cardio-thoracic surgery* 13(3): 283, 2016.

Drummond JL: Degradation, fatigue, and failure of resin dental composite materials. *Journal of dental research* 87(8): 710-719, 2008.

Ferracane J, Mitchem J, Condon J, Todd R: Wear and marginal breakdown of composites with various degrees of cure. *Journal of dental research* 76(8): 1508-1516, 1997.

Glenn J: Composition and properties of unfilled and composite resin restorative materials. *Biocompatibility of dental materials*: 98-125, 1982.

Goldberg M: In vitro and in vivo studies on the toxicity of dental resin components: a review. *Clinical oral investigations* 12(1): 1-8, 2008.

González G, Baruffaldi D, Martinengo C, Angelini A, Chiappone A, Roppolo I, et al.: Materials Testing for the Development of Biocompatible Devices through Vat-Polymerization 3D Printing. *Nanomaterials* 10(9): 1788, 2020.

Häkkinen L, Larjava H, Fournier BP: Distinct phenotype and therapeutic potential of gingival fibroblasts. *Cytotherapy* 16(9): 1171-1186, 2014.

Häkkinen L, Larjava H, Koivisto L: Granulation tissue formation and remodeling. *Endodontic Topics* 24(1): 94-129, 2011.

Hansel C, Leyhausen G, Mai U, Geurtsen W: Effects of various resin composite (co) monomers and extracts on two caries-associated micro-organisms in vitro. *Journal of dental research* 77(1): 60-67, 1998.

Ilie N, Hickel R: Investigations on mechanical behaviour of dental composites. *Clinical oral investigations* 13(4): 427-438, 2009.

Imazato S, Horikawa D, Nishida M, Ebisu S: Effects of monomers eluted from dental resin restoratives on osteoblast-like cells. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials: An Official Journal of The Society for Biomaterials, The Japanese Society for Biomaterials, and The Australian Society for Biomaterials and the Korean Society for Biomaterials* 88(2): 378-386, 2009.

Jun S-K, Kim D-A, Goo H-J, Lee H-H: Investigation of the correlation between the different mechanical properties of resin composites. *Dental materials journal* 32(1): 48-57, 2013.

KEßLER A, Hickel R, Ilie N: In vitro investigation of the influence of printing direction on the flexural strength, flexural modulus and fractographic analysis of 3D-printed temporary materials. *Dental Materials Journal* 40(3): 641-649, 2021.

Khalichi P, Cvitkovitch D, Santerre J: Effect of composite resin biodegradation products on oral streptococcal growth. *Biomaterials* 25(24): 5467-5472, 2004.

Kreß S, Schaller-Ammann R, Feiel J, Friedl J, Kasper C, Egger D: 3D Printing of Cell Culture Devices: Assessment and Prevention of the Cytotoxicity of Photopolymers for Stereolithography. *Materials* 13(13): 3011, 2020.

Kurzmann C, Janjić K, Shokoohi-Tabrizi H, Edelmayer M, Pensch M, Moritz A, et al.: Evaluation of resins for stereolithographic 3D-printed surgical guides: the response of L929 cells and human gingival fibroblasts. *BioMed research international*: 4057612, 2017.

Lawson NC, Bansal R, Burgess JO: Wear, strength, modulus and hardness of CAD/CAM restorative materials. *Dental Materials* 32(11): e275-e283, 2016.

Lefevre M, Amjaad W, Goldberg M, Stanislawski L: TEGDMA induces mitochondrial damage and oxidative stress in human gingival fibroblasts. *Biomaterials* 26(25): 5130-5137, 2005.

Leggat PA, Kedjarune U: Toxicity of methyl methacrylate in dentistry. *International dental journal* 53(3): 126-131, 2003.

Li P, Lambart A-L, Stawarczyk B, Reymus M, Spintzyk S: Postpolymerization of a 3D-printed denture base polymer: Impact of post-curing methods on surface characteristics, flexural strength, and cytotoxicity. *Journal of Dentistry*: 103856, 2021.

Mayer J, Reymus M, Wiedenmann F, Edelhoff D, Hickel R, Stawarczyk B: Temporary 3D printed fixed dental prosthesis materials: Impact of post printing cleaning methods on degree of conversion as well as surface and mechanical properties. *The International Journal of Prosthodontics*, 34(6):784-795, 2021.

Methani MM, Revilla-León M, Zandinejad A: The potential of additive manufacturing technologies and their processing parameters for the fabrication of all-ceramic crowns: A review. *Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry* 32(2): 182-192, 2020.

Mostafavi D, Methani MM, Piedra-Cascón W, Zandinejad A, Revilla-León M: Influence of the Rinsing Post-Processing Procedures on the Manufacturing Accuracy of Vat-Polymerized Dental Model Material. *Journal of Prosthodontics*, 30,610-616, 2020.

Noda M, Wataha J, Kaga M, Lockwood P, Volkmann K, Sano H: Components of dentinal adhesives modulate heat shock protein 72 expression in heat-stressed THP-1 human monocytes at sublethal concentrations. *Journal of Dental Research* 81(4): 265-269, 2002.

Osman RB, Alharbi N, Wismeijer D: Build angle: does it influence the accuracy of 3D-printed dental restorations using digital light-processing technology? *International Journal of Prosthodontics* 30(2), 2017.

Park S-M, Park J-M, Kim S-K, Heo S-J, Koak J-Y: Flexural Strength of 3D-Printing Resin Materials for Provisional Fixed Dental Prostheses. *Materials* 13(18): 3970, 2020.

Peumans M, Van Meerbeek B, Lambrechts P, Vanherle G, Quirynen M: The influence of direct composite additions for the correction of tooth form and/or position on periodontal health. A retrospective study. *Journal of periodontology* 69(4): 422-427, 1998.

Revilla-León M, Meyers MJ, Zandinejad A, Özcan M: A review on chemical composition, mechanical properties, and manufacturing work flow of additively manufactured current polymers for interim dental restorations. *Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry* 31(1): 51-57, 2019.

Rizo-Gorrita M, Herráez-Galindo C, Torres-Lagares D, Serrera-Figallo M-Á, Gutiérrez-Pérez J-L: Biocompatibility of polymer and ceramic CAD/CAM materials with human gingival fibroblasts (HGFs). *Polymers* 11(9): 1446, 2019.

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. *dental materials* 23(1): 34-39, 2007.

Schweikl H, Spagnuolo G, Schmalz G: Genetic and cellular toxicology of dental resin monomers. *Journal of dental research* 85(10): 870-877, 2006.

Shim JS, Kim J-E, Jeong SH, Choi YJ, Ryu JJ: Printing accuracy, mechanical properties, surface characteristics, and microbial adhesion of 3D-printed resins with various printing orientations. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry* 124(4): 468-475, 2020.

Shirako T, Churei H, Iwasaki N, Takahashi H, Ueno T: Evaluation of the flexural properties of a new temporary splint material for use in dental trauma splints. *Journal of dental sciences* 12(3): 308-310, 2017.

Slaughter R, Mason R, Beasley D, Vale J, Schep L: Isopropanol poisoning. *Clinical toxicology* 52(5): 470-478, 2014.

Standardization IOF: Dentistry-Evaluation of Biocompatibility of Medical Devices Used in Dentistry. ISO, 2018.

Stansbury JW, Idacavage MJ: 3D printing with polymers: Challenges among expanding options and opportunities. *Dental materials* 32(1): 54-64, 2016.

Suh BI: Oxygen-inhibited layer in adhesion dentistry. *Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry* 16(5): 316-323, 2004.

Taormina G, Sciancalepore C, Messori M, Bondioli F: 3D printing processes for photocurable polymeric materials: technologies, materials, and future trends. *Journal of applied biomaterials & functional materials* 16(3): 151-160, 2018.

Thunyakitpisal N, Thunyakitpisal P, Wiwatwarapan C: The effect of chemical surface treatments on the flexural strength of repaired acrylic denture base resin. *Journal of Prosthodontics: Implant, Esthetic and Reconstructive Dentistry* 20(3): 195-199, 2011.

Unkovskiy A, Bui PH-B, Schille C, Geis-Gerstorfer J, Huettig F, Spintzyk S: Objects build orientation, positioning, and curing influence dimensional accuracy and flexural properties of stereolithographically printed resin. *Dental Materials* 34(12): e324-e333, 2018.

Väyrynen VO, Tanner J, Vallittu PK: The anisotropy of the flexural properties of an occlusal device material processed by stereolithography. *The Journal of prosthetic dentistry* 116(5): 811-817, 2016.

Van Noort R: The future of dental devices is digital. *Dental materials* 28(1): 3-12, 2012.

Wang X, Jiang M, Zhou Z, Gou J, Hui D: 3D printing of polymer matrix composites: A review and prospective. *Composites Part B: Engineering* 110: 442-458, 2017.

Wu G-H, Hsu S-h: polymeric-based 3D printing for tissue engineering. *Journal of medical and biological engineering* 35(3): 285-292, 2015.

Xu Y, Xepapadeas AB, Koos B, Geis-Gerstorfer J, Li P, Spintzyk S: Effect of post-rinsing time on the mechanical strength and cytotoxicity of a 3D printed orthodontic splint material. *Dental Materials* 37(5): e314-e327, 2021.

ABSTRACT (in Korean)

치과용 3D 프린팅 레진 재료의 생체적합성 및 기계적 특성에 대한 세척 시간 및 세척 용액의 영향

<지도교수 최 중 훈>

연세대학교 대학원 치의학과

황보 나경

최근 치과에서는 3D 프린팅 기술을 주목하고 있다. 3D 프린팅 레진 수복물은 제작 후 표면의 잔류 레진을 제거하기 위한 세척 과정이 필수적이다. 그러나 다양한 세척제와 세척 시간이 생산된 레진 수복물의 생체 적합성에 어떻게 영향을 미치는지 밝혀진 바가 없다. 따라서 본 연구에서는 세척제 및 세척 시간이 광경화성 3D 프린팅 레진의 생체적합성과 기계적 특성에 미치는 영향을 평가하고자 하였다.

실험용 시편은 2 가지 방식(DLP 및 SLA)의 3D 프린터를 이용하여 치과용 3D 프린팅 레진(ND, FL)으로 출력하고, 2 가지 세척제(IPA 및 TPM)로 다양한 시간(0, 3, 5, 10, 15, 30, 60, 90 분)에서 세척하여 준비하였다. 시편에 HGFs 를 배양하여 세포 독성, 세포 생존율을 분석하고 표면에 부착된 세포의 형태 및 수를 공초점

레이저 스캐닝을 사용하여 생체적합성을 평가하였다. 또한 기계적 특성 테스트를 위해 시편에 대한 굴곡 강도 및 굴곡 탄성률, 표면의 SEM 촬영을 진행하였다.

실험 결과, 세척 시간이 증가하면 세포생존율은 증가하고 세포 독성은 감소하여 생체 적합성이 크게 향상되는 것으로 나타났다 ($p < 0.001$). 공초점 레이저 스캐닝 분석결과도 세척 시간이 증가함에 따라 정상세포 수가 뚜렷하게 증가하였다. 세척시간이 증가할수록 굴곡 강도, 표면의 결함은 관찰할 수 없었다. 그러나 90 분 세척 그룹의 굴곡 탄성률은 $1.01 \pm 0.21 \text{ GPa}$ (mean \pm 표준편차)로 다른 모든 그룹에 비해 유의미하게 낮았으며, 세척 시간이 증가함에 따라 감소하는 경향을 보였다.

본 연구를 통해 세척 시간이 치과용 3D 프린팅 레진의 생체적합성에 상당한 영향을 미치는 것으로 나타남을 확인하였다. 또한 임상에서 기계적강도에 영향을 미치지 않으면서도 생체적합성을 높일 수 있는 적절한 세척제 및 세척 시간을 선택하는데 활용할 수 있다.

핵심어: 3D 프린팅; 세척 용액; 세척 시간; 세포 생존력; 세포 독성; 공초점 레이저 스캐닝; 굴곡 강도; 굴곡 탄성률