International Journal Dental and Medical Sciences Research
Volume 7, Issue 5, Sept – Oct 2025 pp 232-238 www.ijdmsrjournal.com ISSN: 2582-6018

Electric Toothbrushes and Their Role in Preventive Dental Care

Kothwala Dr. Devesh kumar , Patel Hemant and Patel Piyush kamlesh bhai
Meril Medical Innovations Private Limited, Bilakhia House, Survey No.879, Muktanand Marg, Chala, Vapi, Dist-Valsad, Gujarat, 396191,India

Date of Submission: 25-09-2025 Date of Acceptance: 05-10-2025

ABSTRACT
The most popular oral hygiene instrument is still the manual toothbrush, but its efficacy is restricted by inconsistence method, poor plaque removal, and low compliance, all of which increase the risk of dental cavities and periodontal disease. This review sought evaluated the relative usefulness of electric toothbrushes in preventative dental care, with an emphasis cost efficiency, compliance, gingival health, and plaque reduction. The evidence was compiled from comprehensive reviews and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing electric and manual toothbrushes. The included experiments assessed integrated components including timers and pressure sensors, as well as acoustic and oscillating-rotating technology. Sonic models-have continuously had been linked to stronger decreases in gingival irritation and plaque buildup. Timer and pressure sensor integrated has been indicating to increase brushing duration, method consistency, and overall compliance, particularly for young children, the elderly, and people with poor dexterity. Beside these benefits, the accessible data has limitation, such as a lack of long-term clinical follow-up, insufficient cost-effectiveness judgments, and tolerating availability inequalities among societies. An effective enhancement to protective dental care could be an electric toothbrush. They could decrease the burden of oral illness universal if they are broadly adopted. Long-term clinical validation, economic viability, and fair access should be the main goals of futures studies, which should also make use of digital health tools to promote precision dental hygiene.
Keywords: An electric toothbrush, prevention of dental disease, gingivitis, plague, oral hygiene, and preventive density

I. INTRODUCTION

Dental caries and periodontal disorders are two examples of oral disease that are acknowledged as major worldwide health burden that lower quality of life and have a substantial financial impact [1]. According the World Health Organization (WHO), there are around 3.5 billion persons with oral problems globally, of whom 2.5 billion have untreated dental caries in their permanent teeth and roughly 1 billion have severe periodontal disease [2]. In addition to causing pain and discomfort, these problems burden individuals and health systems by causing dietary shortages, impaired speech, lost productivity, and higher healthcare costs [1].

There are regional differences in the prevalence of oral illnesses [3]. With dental cavities continuing to be the most prevalent chronic illness in children, it is estimated that over half of adults in Europe have some type of periodontitis [4]. In North America, dental caries affects about 90% of adults at some time in their lives, and periodontal is the main cause of tooth loss in people over 40 [5]. Dental caries is becoming more common in Asia; research indicates that in certain nations, almost 80% of school-age children suffer from it [6]. Africa's rural inhabitants are particularly impacted by the lack of access to preventative dental care, which raises the prevalence of untreated oral disease and its repercussions [3].

Effective plaque control has long been recognized as the foundation of preventative dental care [7]. Due to their accessibility and cost, manual toothbrushes continuous to be most popular oral hygiene device [8] . But inadequate plaque removal, irregular brushing technique, and low agreement sometimes restrict their effectiveness. High-risk population are excessively impacted by these restrictions, involving children, who regularly lack the skill and stability to brush their teeth; older adults, who may lose skill or experience cognitive decline; and people with physical disabilities, long-term illnesses, or orthodontic appliances, who need extra assistance to maintain good oral hygiene.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The efficiency of electric toothbrushes versus manual toothbrushes in sustain oral hygiene has been the subject of several researches over the past 20 years [9]. Research consistently indicates that electric toothbrushes, particularly those with sonic or oscillating rotation, are better in eliminating plaque and reducing gingivitis [10]. The Cochrane Oral Health Group meta-analysis found that electronic toothbrushes reduced plaque by 21% and gingivitis by 11% in just three months, making them superior to manual toothbrushes [11].Furthermore, it has been found that features such as pressure sensors, integrated timer, and smart connections assist patients in maintain proper brushing times and routines, particularly children and patients with dexterity impairments [12]. Despite these positive results, there is currently a dearth of long-term studies looking at how an electric toothbrush affects different age groups and oral health issues [13]. Moreover, user compliance and behavior modification in connection with the use of electric toothbrushes are not extensively studied [14].

Additionally, it has been discovered that features like integrated timers, pressure sensors and smart connections help patients-especially kids and patients with dexterity impairments maintain appropriate brushing times and routines. Despite these encouraging findings, long-term research examining the impact of electric toothbrush use across various age groups and dental diseases is still lacking [15]. Furthermore, there aren't many researches that deal with user compliance and behavior modification in relation to the adoption of electric toothbrushes [16].

Technological advantages are firmly established, but further research is needed to explore accessibility, cost, and the daily impact of these devices on oral hygiene habits [17]. This study contributes to the literature by assessing the clinical effectiveness and user satisfaction of electric toothbrushes in preventive oral hygiene, bridging the gap between controlled clinical outcomes and real-world daily use [18].

III. METHODOLOGY

Literature Search Strategy

Major scientific databases, such as PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library, were searched extensively for relevant literature from the time of their creation until July 2025 [19]. Medical subject Heading (MeSH) and fee-text phrases such "electric toothbrush", "powered toothbrush", " manual toothbrush", "plaque control", " gingivitis", and "oral hygiene" were used in the search. Boolean operators were utilized to the search (AND\OR). Major scientific databases, such as PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library, were searched extensively for relevant literature from the time of their creation until July 2025. Additional records were identified through manual screening of reference lists of relevant articles [20]. Studies with human subjects that were published in English were deemed admissible; however studies that only examined in vitro results, or non-reviewed sources were disqualified.

Selection Criteria

The current inclusion and exclusion criteria were used to choose the articles. [21]. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs), cohort studies, systemic reviews, meta-analyses, and pertinent patents that examined the differences between electric and manual toothbrushes in term of plaque removal, gingival health, compliance, and the user-related finding were among the studies that satisfied. Letters, case reports, editorials, and conference abstract without full text were not included. Titles and abstracts were independently screened, followed by full-text evaluation to ensure relevance [22].

Data Extraction and Analysis

Data extraction was performed using a standardized template [23]. Key information retrieved included study design, population characteristics, and type of toothbrush evaluated, duration of follow-up, outcome measures, and main findings [24]. To reduced bias, independent confirmed the accuracy of the extracted data [25]. Consistent result from systematic reviews conformed results from systematic reviews and meta-analyses were highlighted, and the finding were synthesized normatively with a focus on the relative efficacy of the electric versus manual toothbrushes [26].

Current State of the Art

Overview of Current Devices and Technologies

Due to large part to their accessibility, affordability, and easy to use, manual toothbrushes continue to be the most popular tool for maintaining daily oral hygiene [13]. But, it has been observed that their effectiveness is remarkably influenced by user method and compliance. In contrast, electric toothbrushes have been expanding to address these limitations [27]. The two that have been studied in clinical setting the most are the sonic and oscillating-rotating models [28]. Commercially available devices with a variety of design features, such as integrated timers, pressure sensors, Bluetooth connectively, and adaptive cleaning modes, have been produced by major manufacturers like Philips Sonicare, Panasonic, Colgate and Oral-B (Procter & Gamble). These characteristics have been included to encourage proper brushing time, lessen the use of excessive force, and increase the effectiveness of plaque removal in general [29].

Development in Technology

Significant advancement have been made since the 1950s,, when the first electric toothbrush was introduced. Since the first electric toothbrush was introduced in the 1950s, significant progress has been made [17]. It has been demonstrated that oscillating-rotating models reduce plaque more effectively than side-to –side brushing. Sonic technology has introduced high-frequency vibrations designed to enhance fluid dynamics and reach inter proximal areas. More recent innovations have included artificial intelligence (AI)-based brushing feedback, app-based tracking systems, and adaptive bristle technology. When compared to manual toothbrushes, these devices have been shown in comparative clinical studies to reduce indices and gingival bleeding scores more effectively [30]. Additionally, there is evidence that these devices improve user satisfaction and compliance [31].

The Clinical and Regulatory Environment

Depending on their design and intended use, electric toothbrushes are classified by the U.S. Food and drug Administration (FDA) as either class I or II medical devices [32]. These instrument falls under the Medical Devices Regulation (MDR) in the EU, this mandates CE marking and conformance development. Clinical evidence for safety and effectiveness has been produced by randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, which often demonstrate superior gingival health outcome and plaque control compared to manual brushes [11]. To ensure long-term safety, standardize performance metrics, and address population-specific arability safety, standardize performance metric, and address population-specific availability disparities, however, regulatory challenges remain.

Design Factors and Mechanism of Action

Design Principles

By using mechanical and dynamic cleaning action, electric toothbrushes have been designed to improve plaque removal [33]. Sonic toothbrushes use high frequency vibration to crate hydrodynamic forces that can break up plaque out of direct bristle contact, whereas oscillating-rotating models work by rotating the brush head [33]. In order to prevent gingival tissue damage, design considerations have included pressure sensors, replaceable brush heads, ergonomic handle shape, and adjustable vibration frequencies. In order to track user performance and promote behavioral adherence, clever features like app integration and Bluetooth-enabled feedback have been added.

Performance and Efficacy

Preclinical studies have demonstrated that powered movements achieve greater disruption of biofilm compared with manual brushing [34]. Clinical trials have consistently reported superior reductions in plaque indices and gingival inflammation scores with electric toothbrushes [10]. Performance measure have been included plaque Lessing percentages, gingival bleeding indices, brushing time span, and user agreements rates [11]. Safety outcomes, such as soft tissue trauma or enamel wear, have been monitored, with no remarkable adverse effects consistently reported.

Comparison with Existing Devices

In terms of gingival health and plaque removal, electronic toothbrushes have continuously surpassed manual toothbrushes [35]. While electric toothbrush are more systematic than manual brushing, oscillating–rotating models have been establish in some meta-analyses to perform marginally better than sonic pattern [10]. Other benefits of electric toothbrushes involved increased cleaning effectiveness, integrated timers and pressure sensors, and digital feedback system that improving brushing technique, duration, and compliance. Besides being widely accessible and reasonably priced, manual brushed remarkably rely on user ability and motivation, which results in varying degrees of efficacy in practical application.

Compliance and Accessibility

User compliance and behavioral results are important differentiators. According to studies, a person who use electric toothbrushes for longer periods of time and wish less force, which improves plaque control and lowers the risk of gingival trauma [36]. Children, Elderly, and those with poor dexterity benefits most from this effect [37]. Accessibility issues still exist, though, electric toothbrush adoption is increasing steadily in developed region, but it is limited in low-income and rural areas due to higher costs and infrastructure requirements like charging or battery replacement. Public health campaigns and reasonably priced entry-level models have been suggested as ways to promote a more equitable integration of powered toothbrushes into preventive care in order to address these disparities.

International Journal Dental and Medical Sciences Research
Volume 7, Issue 5, Sept – Oct 2025 pp 232-238 www.ijdmsrjournal.com ISSN: 2582-6018

Table No: 01 Comparative Analysis of Manual and Electric Toothbrush

Aspect	Manual Toothbrushes	Electric Toothbrushes
Plaque Removal	Effectiveness varies; highly dependent on brushing method and consistency	Consistently superior; oscillating–rotating models often outperform sonic and manual
Gingival Health	Limited improvement; technique-sensitive	Demonstrated reduction in gingivitis and better overall gum health
Advantages	Cheap, requires no power source, and is generally accessible worldwide	Improved cleaning effectiveness, guided functions, and suitability for kids, the elderly, and people with poor dexterity
Restriction	Variable effectiveness, mostly reliant on the user	Requires batteries abd charging, less accessible in environments with limited resources
Availability	Available everywhere	Adoption is higher in industrialized nation, low-income and rural communities have less uptake
Market Trends	Stable, with consistent worldwide use	Adoption steadily increasing; projected continued growth

IV. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATION

Beside their proven regulation, there are a number of obstacles to electric toothbrushes adoption use [38]. Long-term devices performance and dependability may be impacted by mechanical constraint like motor failures, bristle wear, and shorter battery life. Clinical barriers have also been identified, where benefits may be limited by inappropriate or underutilization, especially among population with low health literacy. Built-in timers, feedback features and pressure sensors help electric toothbrushes remove plaque and increases user compliance, but these benefits are offset by their higher initial cost when compared to the accessibility limitation of hand brushes in contexts with limited resources. There are honestly gaps in preventive oral care, as evidenced by the inconsistent in adoption that are still unanswered questions about cost-effectiveness, real-world adherence, long-term results and patient satisfaction, particularly with more recent smart models [39]. For electric toothbrushes to be more universally included into regular preventive dental care, these issues must be resolved [40].

V. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

It is anticipated that future development in electric toothbrush technology will improve preventive oral care while addressing present issues [17]. The goals of ergonomic plan and advanced biomaterials innovations are to expand use comfort, decrease environment impact, and expand durability [41]. It is expected that artificial intelligence driven personalization, sensor-based feedback, and integration with digital health platforms will improve compliance, optimize brushing method, and offer data-driven, patient-centered oral hygiene [42]. Availability is anticipated to improve by wireless charging and energy-efficient design, especially in areas with inadequate infrastructure. Future studied should focus on cost-effective models, ways to boost uptake in environments with limited resources, and public health campaigns that upgrade awareness and provide training in order to guarantee equitable assuming [43]. To assess long-term plaque control, cost-effectiveness, gingival health, and practical adherence especially in the elderly, children, and patients with dexterity limitation-longitudinal clinical trials are essential. When taken as a whole, this evolution should result in next-generation electric toothbrushes that are more efficient, environmentally friendly, and broadly available, remark improving the result prevention worldwide.

VI. DISCUSSION

Beside these benefits, problems like mechanical wear, battery limitations, expand cost, and restricted availability in low-resource settings still prevent widespread adoption [44]. In additionally, research gaps endure regarding long-term outcomes, real-world adherence, and cost-effectiveness, and patient satisfaction, especially with never smart models [45]. This review shows that electric toothbrushes, especially oscillating-rotating models, consistently provide superior plaque removal and improvements in gingival health when compared to manual toothbrushes [46]. The addition of timer, pressure sensors, and smart feedback features improves user compliance, standardizes brushing technique, and reduces user-dependant variability, especially in children, older adults, and individuals with dexterity limitation.

Electric toothbrushes' relative benefits imply that they are useful preventative instrument, but wider adoption necessitates measures to upgrade affordability and accessibility [47]. It is anticipated that future evolution in AI-driven personalization, environmentally friendly design, and long-term clinical trials will increase implement presentation even more and facilitate its fair integration into preventive oral care. All things review, the evidence demonstrate that although manual toothbrushes are still available and reasonably priced, electric toothbrushes offer better clinical results, expand compliance, and the potential to drastically lower the prevalence of oral diseases worldwide when adoption barriers are removed.

VII. CONCLUSION

When compared to manual toothbrushes, electric toothbrushes, especially oscillating—rotating models-offer good plaque removal and enhance gingival health [48]. By reducing depend on user technique [49]. Built-in timers, pressure sensors, and feedback system provide improved cleaning efficiency and behavior support, but there is still issue with the mechanical wear, battery life, cost, and accessibility in low-resource environment. For the advantages of electric toothbrushes to be fairly incorporate into preventive dental care, there will need to be ongoing innovation in materials, eco-friendly design, and AI-driven feedback in addition to tactics to increase affordability and adoption. All of these advancement put electric toothbrushes in a position to improve oral health worldwide and lessen the prevalence of dental disease [50].

REFERENCES

[1]. Peres MA, Macpherson LM, Weyant RJ, Daly B, Venturelli R, Mathur MR, Listl S, Celeste RK, Guarnizo-Herreño CC, Kearns C, Benzian H. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. The Lancet. 2019 Jul 20;394(10194):249-60.

[2]. Frencken JE, Sharma P, Stenhouse L, Green D, Laverty D, Dietrich T. Global epidemiology of dental caries and severe periodontitis–a comprehensive review. Journal of clinical periodontology. 2017 Mar;44:S94-105.

[3]. Petersen PE, Bourgeois D, Ogawa H, Estupinan-Day S, Ndiaye C. The global burden of oral diseases and risks to oral health. Bulletin of the world health organization. 2005;83:661-9.

[4]. Kassebaum NJ, Bernabé E, Dahiya M, Bhandari B, Murray CJ, Marcenes W. Global burden of severe periodontitis in 1990-2010: a systematic review and meta-regression. Journal of dental research. 2014 Nov;93(11):1045-53.

[5]. Pihlstrom BL, Michalowicz BS, Johnson NW. Periodontal diseases. The lancet. 2005 Nov 19;366(9499):1809-20.

[6]. Bagramian RA, Garcia-Godoy F, Volpe AR. The global increase in dental caries. A pending public health crisis. Am J dent. 2009 Feb 1;22(1):3-8.

[7]. Sälzer S, Slot DE, Van der Weijden FA, Dörfer CE. Efficacy of inter- dental mechanical plaque control in managing gingivitis–a meta- review. Journal of clinical periodontology. 2015 Apr;42:S92-105.

[8]. Deery C, Heanue M, Deacon S, Robinson PG, Walmsley AD, Worthington H, Shaw W, Glenny AM. The effectiveness of manual versus powered toothbrushes for dental health: a systematic review. Journal of Dentistry. 2004 Mar 1;32(3):197-211..

[9]. Clerehugh V, Williams P, Shaw WC, Worthington HV, Warren P. A practice-based randomised controlled trial of the efficacy of an electric and a manual toothbrush on gingival health in patients with fixed orthodontic appliances. Journal of dentistry. 1998 Nov 1;26(8):633-9.

[10]. Grender J, Adam R, Zou Y. The effects of oscillating-rotating electric toothbrushes on plaque and gingival health: a meta-analysis. Am J Dent. 2020 Feb 1;33(1):3-11.

[11]. Van der Weijden GA, Hioe KP. A systematic review of the effectiveness of self- performed mechanical plaque removal in adults with gingivitis using a manual toothbrush. Journal of clinical Periodontology. 2005 Oct;32:214-28.

[12]. Amit M, Chukoskie L, Skalsky AJ, Garudadri H, Ng TN. Flexible pressure sensors for objective assessment of motor disorders. Advanced Functional Materials. 2020 May;30(20):1905241.

[13]. Yaacob M, Worthington HV, Deacon SA, Deery C, Walmsley AD, Robinson PG, Glenny AM. Powered versus manual toothbrushing for oral health. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2014(6).

[14]. Erbe C, Klees V, Braunbeck F, Ferrari-Peron P, Ccahuana-Vasquez RA, Timm H, Grender J, Cunningham P, Adam R, Wehrbein H. Comparative assessment of plaque removal and motivation between a manual toothbrush and an interactive power toothbrush in adolescents with fixed orthodontic appliances: A single-center, examiner-blind randomized controlled trial. American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics. 2019 Apr 1;155(4):462-72.

[15]. Worthington HV, MacDonald L, Pericic TP, Sambunjak D, Johnson TM, Imai P, Clarkson JE. Home use of interdental cleaning devices, in addition to toothbrushing, for preventing and controlling periodontal diseases and dental caries. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2019(4).

[16]. Ramsay DS. Patient compliance with oral hygiene regimens: A behavioural self- regulation analysis with implications for technology. International dental journal. 2000 Dec;50(S6_Part1):304-11.

[17]. Löe H. Oral hygiene in the prevention of caries and periodontal disease. International dental journal. 2000 Jun;50(3):129-39.

[18]. Wilson NJ, Lin Z, Villarosa A, Lewis P, Philip P, Sumar B, George A. Countering the poor oral health of people with intellectual and developmental disability: a scoping literature review. BMC Public Health. 2019 Nov 15;19(1):1530.

[19]. Torab-Miandoab A, Samad-Soltani T, Jodati A, Rezaei-Hachesu P. Interoperability of heterogeneous health information systems: a systematic literature review. BMC medical informatics and decision making. 2023 Jan 24;23(1):18.

[20]. Wallace BC, Trikalinos TA, Lau J, Brodley C, Schmid CH. Semi-automated screening of biomedical citations for systematic reviews. BMC bioinformatics. 2010 Jan 26;11(1):55.

[21]. Humphreys K, Weisner C. Use of exclusion criteria in selecting research subjects and its effect on the generalizability of alcohol treatment outcome studies. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2000 Apr 1;157(4):588-94.

[22]. Scherer RW, Meerpohl JJ, Pfeifer N, Schmucker C, Schwarzer G, von Elm E. Full publication of results initially presented in abstracts. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2018(11).

[23]. Büchter RB, Weise A, Pieper D. Development, testing and use of data extraction forms in systematic reviews: a review of methodological guidance. BMC medical research methodology. 2020 Oct 19;20(1):259.

[24]. Kumar S, Tadakamadla J, Johnson NW. Effect of toothbrushing frequency on incidence and increment of dental caries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of dental research. 2016 Oct;95(11):1230-6.

[25]. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare. 2016 May 4:211-7.

[26]. Slot DE, Valkenburg C, Van der Weijden GA. Mechanical plaque removal of periodontal maintenance patients: A systematic review and network meta- analysis. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2020 Jul;47:107-24.

[27]. Ng C, Tsoi JK, Lo EC, Matinlinna JP. Safety and design aspects of powered toothbrush—A narrative review. Dentistry journal. 2020 Feb 5;8(1):15.

[28]. Preda C, Butera A, Pelle S, Pautasso E, Chiesa A, Esposito F, Oldoini G, Scribante A, Genovesi AM, Cosola S. The efficacy of powered oscillating heads vs. powered sonic action heads toothbrushes to maintain periodontal and peri-implant health: a narrative review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2021 Feb 4;18(4):1468.

[29]. Worthington HV, MacDonald L, Pericic TP, Sambunjak D, Johnson TM, Imai P, Clarkson JE. Home use of interdental cleaning devices, in addition to toothbrushing, for preventing and controlling periodontal diseases and dental caries. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2019(4).

[30]. Sicilia A, Arregui I, Gallego M, Cabezas B, Cuesta S. A systematic review of powered vs. manual toothbrushes in periodontal cause- related therapy. Journal of Clinical Periodontology. 2002 Dec;29:39-54.

[31]. Barbosa CD, Balp MM, Kulich K, Germain N, Rofail D. A literature review to explore the link between treatment satisfaction and adherence, compliance,

and persistence. Patient preference and adherence. 2012 Jan 13:39-48.

[32]. Tettey F, Parupelli SK, Desai S. A review of biomedical devices: classification, regulatory guidelines, human factors, software as a medical device, and cybersecurity. Biomedical Materials & Devices. 2024 Mar;2(1):316-41.

[33]. Digel I, Kern I, Geenen EM, Akimbekov N. Dental plaque removal by ultrasonic toothbrushes. Dentistry journal. 2020 Mar 23;8(1):28.

[34]. Schmidt JC, Zaugg C, Weiger R, Walter C. Brushing without brushing?—a review of the efficacy of powered toothbrushes in noncontact biofilm removal. Clinical oral investigations. 2013 Apr;17(3):687-709.

[35]. Trimpeneers LM, Wijgaerts IA, Grognard NA, Dermaut LR, Adriaens PA. Effect of electric toothbrushes versus manual toothbrushes on removal of plaque and periodontal status during orthodontic treatment. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics. 1997 May 1;111(5):492-7.

[36]. Stefanac SJ, Nesbit SP. Treatment Planning in Dentistry-E-Book: Treatment Planning in Dentistry-E-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2006 Aug 29.

[37]. Janssen I, LeBlanc AG. Systematic review of the health benefits of physical activity and fitness in school-aged children and youth. International journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity. 2010 May 11;7(1):40.

[38]. Wang S, Bolling K, Mao W, Reichstadt J, Jeste D, Kim HC, Nebeker C. Technology to support aging in place: Older adults' perspectives. InHealthcare 2019 Apr 10 (Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 60). MDPI.

[39]. National Research Council, Division of Behavioral, Social Sciences, Board on Human-Systems Integration, Committee on the Role of Human Factors in Home Health Care. Health care comes home: the human factors. National Academies Press; 2011 Jul 22.

[40]. Claydon NC. Current concepts in toothbrushing and interdental cleaning. Periodontology 2000. 2008 Oct 1;48(1).

[41]. Sapienza S, Tsurkalenko O, Giraitis M, Mejia AC, Zelimkhanov G, Schwaninger I, Klucken J. Assessing the clinical utility of inertial sensors for home monitoring in Parkinson's disease: a comprehensive review. npj Parkinson's Disease. 2024 Aug 20;10(1):161.

[42]. Erol-Kantarci M, Mouftah HT. Energy-efficient information and communication infrastructures in the smart grid: A survey on interactions and open issues. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials. 2014 Jul 22;17(1):179-97.

[43]. Elmusharaf K, Byrne E, O'Donovan D. Strategies to increase demand for maternal health services in resource-limited settings: challenges to be addressed. BMC public health. 2015 Sep 8;15(1):870.

[44]. Dehrouyeh F, Yang L, Ajaei FB, Shami A. On TinyML and cybersecurity: Electric vehicle charging infrastructure use case. IEEE Access. 2024 Aug 1.

[45]. Shaikh TA, Dar TR, Sofi S. A data-centric artificial intelligent and extended reality technology in smart healthcare systems. Social Network Analysis and Mining. 2022 Dec;12(1):122.

[46]. Adam R, Ram Goyal C, Qaqish J, Grender J. Evaluation of an oscillating- rotating toothbrush with micro- vibrations versus a sonic toothbrush for the reduction of plaque and gingivitis: results from a randomized controlled trial. International dental journal. 2020 Apr;70:S16-21.

[47]. Carter S, Green J, Thorogood N. The domestication of an everyday health technology: A case study of electric toothbrushes. Social theory & health. 2013 Jul 24;11(4):344.

[48]. Yeh CH, Lin CH, Ma TL, Peng TY, Vo TT, Lin WN, Chen YH, Lee IT. Comparison between powered and manual toothbrushes effectiveness for maintaining an optimal oral health status. Clinical, Cosmetic and Investigational Dentistry. 2024 Dec 31:381-96.

[49]. Noor AK. Recent advances and applications of reduction methods.

[50]. Palanisamy S. Innovations in oral hygiene tools: a mini review on recent developments. Frontiers in Dental Medicine. 2024 Aug 14;5:1442887.