

Xylotrupes gideon microchitosan-modified glass ionomer cement: in vitro assessment of mechanical properties

by Rosalina Tjandrawinata

Submission date: 23-Dec-2025 11:50AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2850797384

File name: fdmed-6-1717880_1.pdf (1.22M)

Word count: 7746

Character count: 44645



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY
Rahena Akhter,
The University of Sydney, Darlington, Australia

REVIEWED BY
Noha Taymour,
Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University,
Saudi Arabia
Preety Kumari Kashyap,
Homi Bhabha National Institute, India

*CORRESPONDENCE
Rosalina Tjandrawinata
✉ rosalina@trsai.kti.ac.id

RECEIVED 08 October 2025
REVISED 21 November 2025
ACCEPTED 03 December 2025
PUBLISHED 18 December 2025

CITATION
Tjandrawinata R, Kurniawan FL, Marpaung C,
Pratiwi D, Eddy E, Putri TS, Komariah K,
Gunardi I, Wijaya SK and Cahyanto A (2025)
Xylotrupes gideon microchitosan-modified
glass ionomer cement: *in vitro* assessment of
mechanical properties.
Front. Dent. Med. 6:1717880.
doi: 10.3389/fdmed.2025.1717880

COPYRIGHT
© 2025 Tjandrawinata, Kurniawan, Marpaung,
Pratiwi, Eddy, Putri, Komariah, Gunardi, Wijaya
and Cahyanto. This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of the Creative
Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The
use, distribution or reproduction in other
forums is permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are
credited and that the original publication in
this journal is cited, in accordance with
accepted academic practice. No use,
distribution or reproduction is permitted
which does not comply with these terms.

Xylotrupes gideon microchitosan-modified glass ionomer cement: *in vitro* assessment of mechanical properties

Rosalina Tjandrawinata^{1*}, Florencia Livia Kurniawan¹,
Carolina Marpaung², Deviyanti Pratiwi¹, Eddy Eddy¹,
Tansza Setiana Putri³, Komariah Komariah³, Indrayadi Gunardi⁴,
Sastra Kusuma Wijaya⁵ and Arief Cahyanto^{6,7}

¹Department of Dental Materials, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

²Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

³Department of Oral Biology, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia, ⁴Department

of Oral Medicine, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia, ⁵Department of Physics,

Faculty of Mathematics and Sciences, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, ⁶Department of Clinical

Sciences, College of Dentistry, Ajman University, Ajman, United Arab Emirates, ⁷Centre of Medical and

Bio-scaled Health Sciences Research, Ajman University, Ajman, United Arab Emirates

Background: Glass ionomer cements (GIC) are valued as inherent fluoride-releasing dental restorative materials, while chitosan binds to negatively charged enamel surfaces, promoting mineral deposition and strengthening teeth. This study aimed to evaluate the mechanical properties of GIC modified with microchitosan derived from *Xylotrupes gideon*, using an *in vitro* experimental design. This study uniquely employs micro-scaled chitosan derived from the exoskeleton of *Xylotrupes gideon*, an insect-based, locally sourced, and environmentally sustainable alternative to conventional marine chitosan, to reinforce a conventional GIC.

Materials and methods: Microchitosan was extracted from *Xylotrupes gideon* and incorporated into conventional GIC at 0.5%, 1% and 2% (w/w). Compressive strength, diametral tensile strength, and surface microhardness were measured using standard testing equipment after immersion in artificial saliva for 24 h and 7 days. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way ANOVA followed by the Games-Howell post hoc test, with significance set at $p < 0.05$.

Results: The 1% microchitosan-modified GIC exhibited the most significant improvements compared to the unmodified control. After 7 days, compressive strength increased by 35.4%, diametral tensile strength by 51.3%, and surface hardness by 46.6% ($p < 0.05$). These enhancements are attributed to microscale reinforcement and chemical bonding between microchitosan and the GIC matrix.

Conclusion: The addition of 1% microchitosan derived from *Xylotrupes gideon* significantly improved the mechanical performance of GIC. This bioactive reinforcement shows promising potential for clinical restorative applications, though further investigation into its long-term biocompatibility and fluoride release is warranted. These findings highlight a novel combination of insect-derived micro-scale chitosan and conventional GIC, yielding mechanical gains comparable to those reported for nanochitosan-modified formulations while relying on a more sustainable chitosan source.

KEYWORDS

mechanical properties, compressive strength, diametral tensile strength, glassionomer cement, hardness, microchitosan, *Xylotrupes gideon*

1 Introduction

Dental composite materials, including glass ionomer cements (GICs), are widely recognized in restorative dentistry for their versatility, biocompatibility, and ability to bond chemically to dental hard tissues. GICs, in particular, are valued for their inherent fluoride release, which aids in the prevention of tooth decay and supports long-term tooth preservation (1, 2). These advantages make GICs ideal for pediatric dentistry and minimally invasive restorations where fluoride release and adhesion are critical; however, their adhesive performance varies significantly across formulations.

A major drawback of traditional GICs is their weak mechanical properties, including low compressive and tensile strength, poor wear resistance, and susceptibility to fracture under occlusal stress. These limitations preclude their use in stress-bearing restorations, particularly in posterior regions that are subjected to high occlusal loads (3). The other limitations are primarily attributed to the intrinsic chemistry of the GIC matrix, particularly the brittle nature of the glass phase and the sensitivity of the acid-base setting reaction to moisture and dehydration (4). Recent technology developments, particularly involving micro-sized chitosan and titanium dioxide, have demonstrated improved filler dispersion and particle-matrix bonding in glass ionomer cements, resulting in enhanced mechanical properties, matrix cohesion, fracture resistance, and bioactivity (5, 6) with chitosan enhancing particle-matrix bonding and decreasing microvoid formation (7).

Such reinforcement strategies yield structurally robust cement matrices characterized by minimized porosity and enhanced resistance to fracture propagation. Studies have shown that the incorporation of chitosan significantly enhances compressive and flexural strength, consistent with previous findings on quaternized chitosan-coated nanoparticles and carboxymethyl chitosan derivatives (8, 9) thereby improving matrix homogeneity and resistance to fracture propagation.

A previous study showed that the addition of chitosan to GIC has a positive effect on microhardness and improves surface roughness, making it a promising additive for dental restorative materials (10). This material reinforces the structural framework and enhances mechanical reliability, which in turn leads to improved fracture resistance, increased microhardness, and enhanced overall

durability (11). The reinforcement effect demonstrated temporal dependence, with mechanical improvements more evident following extended maturation periods. Its ability to improve both the mechanical and biological properties of restorative materials makes it a compelling additive in dental biomaterials research. The molecular features of chitosan [poly-(β -1/4)-2-amino-2-deoxy-D-glucopyranose], a versatile biopolymer, are chemically inert, non-toxic, and possess robust, broad antimicrobial activities due to its polycationic nature (12). Characterized by amino and hydroxyl functional groups, chitosan enables ionic and hydrogen bonding that strengthens adhesion to dental substrates, improves mechanical strength through particle-matrix cohesion, and supports tissue compatibility via biocompatibility and regenerative potential (13) across a wide range of dental applications.

Chitosan exhibits remarkable physicochemical properties and good biocompatibility, forming bonds with human proteins, cells, and organs (14). Chitosan exhibits multifunctionality in dental applications by contributing to mechanical reinforcement, promoting tissue regeneration, and acting as a bioactive agent in restorative formulations such as glass ionomer cements and adhesives. Recently, alternative sources of chitosan have emerged, including the exoskeletons of the *Xylotrupes gideon* beetle, which offer a sustainable and locally available biomaterial. Previous research indicates that this chitosan, derived from insects, enhances GIC performance in acidic oral environments (with critical pH levels), showing promise for clinical applications (15). These advantages support further investigation of its mechanical reinforcement potential in dental composites. Research indicates that this novel form of chitosan demonstrates superior mechanical enhancement capabilities when integrated into GICs, including increased compressive strength and Vickers hardness (16). Additionally, the microstructure improves particle dispersion and matrix interaction, which are critical for achieving homogeneity and minimizing microvoid formation during the setting process (7, 17).

In addition to mechanical benefits, chitosan may confer secondary biofunctional advantages, which warrant future exploration but were not addressed in the present study (18). These properties may enhance the clinical performance of restorations by reducing bacterial colonization, improving marginal integrity, and supporting the healing of the pulp-dentin interface, in line with recent advancements in oral health technology (17). Notably, such modifications do not appear to compromise GIC's core

biofunctional properties, such as fluoride ion release and adhesion to dentin (1, 11).

Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the effect of incorporating *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan (on a submicron-micron scale) into conventional GIC on its mechanical properties, including compressive strength, diametral tensile strength, and surface hardness. By using an insect exoskeleton as a locally available and environmentally sustainable source of chitosan, this approach has potential for clinical feasibility, long-lasting nature, and biological functionality through the integration of eco-friendly materials in restorative dentistry (7).

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Synthesis and characterization of microchitosan from *xylotrupes gideon*

Microchitosan (MCH) was synthesized from the exoskeletons of *Xylotrupes gideon* beetles collected in Bogor, West Java, Indonesia. All body parts were detached and dried for 5 days, followed by extraction using established chitin-processing protocols: demineralization with 3N HCl, deproteinization with 3N NaOH, and deacetylation with 50% NaOH at 100°C to obtain chitosan.

The resulting chitosan was converted into microform via ionic gelation with sodium tripolyphosphate (TPP) in deionized water, stirred at 2,500 rpm for 4 h, intentionally omitting acetic acid to improve biocompatibility. A particle size analyzer (Horiba, Japan) revealed a spherical morphology with a size distribution of 200–4,000 nm, while SEM analysis also confirmed the morphology of the chitosan particles, as shown in Figure 1. The synthesized MCH was stored at 4°C in airtight containers until use (19).

The overall experimental workflow is illustrated in Figure 2, highlighting the synthesis of microchitosan from *Xylotrupes gideon* and its integration into glass ionomer cement for mechanical testing.

2.2 Preparation of modified glass ionomer cement

A commercially available Glass ionomer cement (Type IX Gold Label HS Posterior, GC, Tokyo, Japan) was used as the base material. The control group used unmodified GIC liquid, while the experimental groups consisted of 0.5%, 1%, and 2% (w/w) MCH added to the liquid component. Each modified liquid (0.5%, 1%, and 2% MCH) was vortex-mixed using the same standardized protocol immediately before mixing with the powder to improve homogeneity, acknowledging that achieving uniform dispersion becomes more challenging at higher MCH concentrations. Petroleum jelly was applied to the inner surfaces of the metal split mold. Then the mold was placed on a mylar strip, which was placed on a glass slab. The powder and liquid were dispensed on a paper pad and mixed manually according to the manufacturer's guidelines. After filling with the mixture, the mold was covered with another mylar strip, then covered with a second glass slab, and pressed for 30 s to extrude the excess material and obtain a uniformly smooth specimen surface. One hour after mixing, the specimens were removed from the mold, and any excess material was removed by dry grinding on both sides with 1,000-grit silicon carbide paper (1, 20, 21).

Compressive strength specimens were molded according to ISO 9917-1:2007: 3 mm diameter × 6 mm height, while the specimens for diametral tensile strength: 6 mm diameter × 4 mm thickness, and Vickers hardness: 6 mm diameter × 4 mm thickness. Specimen dimensions were confirmed using a digital caliper (Mitutoyo 500-196-30, Japan). After initial setting, all specimens were stored in 100% humidity at room temperature for 1 h. Compressive strength was calculated, in MPa, using the following equation: $C = (4p)/(\pi d^2)$ where p is the maximum force applied, in Newton; d is the average measured diameter of the specimen, in mm. The diametral tensile strength was also calculated in MPa, using the





FIGURE 1 Scanning electron microscope images showing particles of microchitosan from *Xylotrupes gideon*. Image (A) highlights large, smooth spherical particles at 10,000 times magnification. Image (B) depicts a mixture of smaller, rougher textured and smooth spherical particles at 2,000 times magnification.



equation $DTS = (2F)/(adt)$, where F is the applied load, D is the diameter of the disk, and t is the thickness of the disk (22).

2.3 Conditioning and storage

A total of 80 specimens were prepared for each mechanical test and divided into four groups ($n = 20$ each), with each group further subdivided into two subgroups ($n = 10$) based on immersion time (24 h and 7 days). The minimum specimen size

was estimated using the Lemeshow formula for comparing two independent means:

$$n = 2\tau^2(Z_{1-\alpha} + Z_{1-\beta})^2 / (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2$$

Where n is the minimum number of specimens per subgroup, μ_1 and μ_2 are the expected means from a previous study, τ is the common standard deviation, $Z_{1-\alpha}$ is the Z value for the selected significance level, and $Z_{1-\beta}$ is the Z value corresponding to the desired power.

A Fusayama-Meyer artificial saliva solution was prepared containing 0.4 g/L of NaCl, 0.4 g/L of KCl, 0.906 g/L of $\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.690 g/L of $\text{Na}_2\text{HPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.005 g/L of $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_5$, and a pH of 6.75. Each specimen was immersed in 10 mL of artificial saliva in a sealed container and incubated at 37°C.

2.4 Mechanical testing

Mechanical properties were evaluated using a universal testing machine (Shimadzu, Japan) equipped with a 5 kN load cell, following validated protocols (23). Compressive and diametral tensile strength tests were conducted at a crosshead speed of 1 mm/min. Surface hardness was measured using a Shimadzu HMV-G microhardness tester (Kyoto, Japan), employing a micro Vickers diamond indenter with a 100 g load applied for 10 s (24). All mechanical testing adhered to ISO 9917-1:2007 guidelines and methodological frameworks.

2.5 Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, were calculated. Data normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and homogeneity of variances was evaluated using Levene's test. When the assumption of homogeneity was violated, one-way ANOVA was followed by the Games-Howell *post hoc* test for pairwise comparisons. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to


examine relationships among mechanical parameters. The minimum required specimen size per subgroup was determined *a priori* using the Lemeshow equation for comparing two means, yielding a specimen size of 7. To ensure adequate power and consistency with ISO 9917-1:2007 recommendations and previous GIC mechanical studies, which typically use 5–10 specimens per subgroup, we ultimately used $n=10$ specimens per subgroup. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was applied throughout.


3 Results

The compressive, diametral tensile strength, and hardness test results for all test groups are presented in Figures 3–6, while Table 1 presents the significance values for comparisons between groups. The data from 240 specimens (20 per group and 10 at different time points) were found to be normally distributed, as confirmed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p = 0.200$). The addition of microchitosan (MCH) at all concentrations resulted in statistically significant increases in both compressive and diametral tensile strength compared to the control group ($p < 0.05$).

3.1 Compressive strength

The compressive strength results are presented in Figure 3. At 24 h, the control GIC group recorded a mean strength of 127.14 ± 15.82 MPa. Compared with the control, the 0.5% MCH group showed a slight reduction, whereas the 2% MCH group showed a numerically higher mean compressive





strength (130.01 ± 14.40 MPa); however, this difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.973$). The 1% MCH group was comparable to the control at this early time point.

After 7 days of immersion, the control group decreased to 114.63 ± 21.39 MPa. In contrast, all MCH groups showed higher values than the control. The highest compressive strength was observed in the 1% MCH group, which reached 155.16 ± 19.08 MPa ($p = 0.002$), representing a 35.4% increase over the 7-day control.

The corresponding compressive load-displacement curves (Figure 5, CS 24 h and CS 7 d) reveal predominantly linear elastic behavior, followed by abrupt failure in all groups, consistent with brittle, cement-like fracture. At 24 h, the slopes of the curves are broadly similar across groups, with only modest differences in peak load. After 7 days, the curves for all MCH groups shift towards higher peak loads compared with the control, with the 1% MCH group showing the highest peak load and largest displacement at failure, reflecting its superior strength and energy-absorbing capacity. The 0.5% MCH group exhibits the lowest peak load, while the 2% MCH and control curves lie between 0.5% and 1% MCH, mirroring the numerical ranking of compressive strength.

3.2 Diametral tensile strength

The diametral tensile strength results are presented in Figure 4. At 24 h, the control group showed a mean strength of


11.41 ± 3.16 MPa. Compared with the control, the 0.5% MCH group showed significantly lower strength, whereas the 1% and 2% MCH groups did not differ significantly from the control.

After 7 days, the control group decreased to 7.09 ± 2.70 MPa, while all MCH groups showed higher values. The 1% MCH group had the highest diametral tensile strength (10.73 ± 1.89 MPa, $p = 0.014$), corresponding to a 51% increase relative to the 7-day control.

The diametral tensile load-displacement curves (Figure 5, DTS 24 h and DTS 7 d) corroborate these trends. At 24 h, the control curve demonstrates the highest peak load, with the curves for the MCH groups clustered slightly below, reflecting the small or non-significant differences in DTS. By 7 days, the curves for all MCH-modified groups shift upward relative to the control, indicating higher peak loads at fracture. The 1% and 2% MCH groups in particular show steeper initial slopes and higher maxima than the control, whereas the 0.5% MCH curve occupies an intermediate position. This pattern is consistent with the 7-day DTS values, where 1% MCH provides the most pronounced reinforcement.

3.3 Vickers hardness

The Vickers microhardness test results at 24 h are given in Figure 6. The Control GIC had a microhardness mean value of 63.92 ± 15.17 VHN. The MCH-modified groups demonstrated



significantly increased hardness, with a peak at 1% MCH (135.30 ± 17.90 VHN; $p < 0.001$).

All groups experienced a decrease in hardness after 7 days, while the 1% MCH maintained the highest residual value (46.95 ± 7.32 VHN, $p < 0.001$).

3.4 Trends and correlation analysis

The inclusion of microchitosan resulted in a consistent increase in mechanical properties, particularly at 1%. While the 2% group showed strong initial values, its performance declined slightly over time, suggesting an upper threshold of reinforcement.

Pearson correlation analysis revealed strong positive correlations between microchitosan concentration and compressive strength ($r = 0.59$, $p = 0.002$), diametral tensile strength ($r = 0.57$, $p = 0.004$), and hardness ($r = 0.53$, $p = 0.011$). Seven-day specimens of compressive strength and diametral tensile strength showed a positive correlation ($r = 0.71$, $p = 0.001$). Additionally, compressive strength and hardness were positively correlated ($r = 0.64$, $p = 0.008$), indicating an interconnected strengthening effect.

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary of findings

This study demonstrated that incorporating *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan (MCH) into a conventional GIC significantly improved its mechanical properties. The 1% MCH concentration produced the best results across all measurements: compressive strength, diametral tensile strength, and surface hardness, particularly after 7 days of immersion in artificial saliva, indicating a time-dependent reinforcement effect (25). The 0.5% MCH group showed only modest improvements, whereas the 2% MCH group, despite some initial enhancement, was likely more prone to particle agglomeration, which compromised its long-term stability (6).

These findings align with previous research showing that chitosan can enhance the strength and durability of GICs and fit within the broader trend of nanomaterial-reinforced dental composites (16). The superior performance of 1% MCH is consistent with reports that nanochitosan outperforms other nanostructures (e.g., nano-silica, nano-zirconia) in GICs, largely




TABLE 1 Games-Howell significant value (p) for 24 hours (white) and 7 days (grey) compressive strength, diametral tensile strength and vickers microhardness.

Compressive strength	Control	MCH 0.5%	MCH 1%	MCH 2%	Time
Control		0.223	0.002*	0.032*	7 days
MCH 0.5%	0.707		0.020*	0.473	
MCH 1%	0.671	0.234		0.155	
MCH 2%	0.973	0.476	0.848		
Time	24 hours				
Diametral tensile strength	Control	MCH 0.5%	MCH 1%	MCH 2%	Time
Control		0.133	0.014*	0.025*	7 days
MCH 0.5%	0.012*		0.674	0.825	
MCH 1%	0.445	0.118		0.992	
MCH 2%	0.900	<0.001*	0.040*		
Time	24 hours				
Vickers microhardness	Control	MCH 0.5%	MCH 1%	MCH 2%	Time
Control		1.000	<0.001*	0.341	7 days
MCH 0.5%	<0.001*		0.038*	0.913	
MCH 1%	<0.001*	0.719		0.003*	
MCH 2%	<0.001*	0.882	0.999		
Time	24 hours				

*Significant difference between groups with $p < 0.05$.

because of its ability to form hydrogen bonds with the polyacrylic acid matrix, thereby improving cohesion and ion exchange (1). Our results confirm substantial gains in surface hardness and compressive strength compared with both unmodified GIC and GICs containing other nano-additives (26), supporting the concept that small-particle chitosan is a promising modifier for stress-bearing restorations, especially in Class I and V cavities where fluoride release and biocompatibility are important (27).

All groups exhibited a decrease in hardness after 7 days, consistent with previous work reporting a 40%–45% decline in microhardness of conventional GICs following thermocycling (28, 29). Notably, the 1% MCH group retained the highest residual hardness (46.95 VHN), consistent with the notion that reinforced GICs resist degradation better than unmodified formulations.

4.2 Mechanical reinforcement

The mechanical enhancements observed with MCH-modified GIC can be explained by microscale dispersion and interfacial interactions between MCH and the GIC matrix. MCH particles (200–4,000 nm) can occupy microwoids and irregularities, similarly to the homogenizing effect reported for nano-hydroxyapatite/chitosan composites (30) and microhybrid composites, resulting in a denser, more uniform structure that reduces crack initiation and propagation. In addition, the amino and hydroxyl groups of chitosan form hydrogen and ionic bonds with polyacrylic acid chains, increasing cross-link density and internal cohesion (4, 17). In this way, microchitosan addresses microstructural weaknesses inherent to the acid-base setting mechanism and may support greater restoration durability (4).

At early maturation (24 h), however, MCH particles and their positively charged amino groups may interact competitively with polyacrylic acid and multivalent cations ($\text{Ca}^{2+}/\text{Al}^{3+}$), temporarily disturbing optimal ionic cross-linking within the GIC matrix. This competition, together with the introduction of additional interfaces, may reduce initial network rigidity and create localized microwoids, which is consistent with the modest reductions or limited improvements in compressive and diametral tensile strength observed at 24 h for some concentrations. With extended maturation (7 days) in artificial saliva, ongoing ion exchange and secondary cross-linking between the GIC matrix and microchitosan (via ionic and hydrogen bonding) likely produce a more cohesive, denser matrix, which explains the substantial strength gains at 7 days, particularly for the 1% group.

Beyond reporting the overall particle size range of 200–4,000 nm, more detailed particle size descriptors, such as the mean particle size, full size distribution profile, and polydispersity index, were not determined in this study. This represents a limitation of the current work, as such parameters would enable a more precise interpretation of how particle size, dispersion quality, and potential agglomeration contribute to the mechanical response of the different MCH concentrations. Future investigations will therefore include comprehensive physicochemical characterization of *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan, including mean size,

polydispersity, and surface charge, to better correlate these properties with the observed mechanical reinforcement of the GIC matrix.

The 1% concentration aligns with findings from previous studies, which have shown that 1%–1.5% chitosan maximizes mechanical gains in GICs without agglomeration, underscoring the critical role of nanoparticle concentration in dental composites (27). The good performance of 1% MCH is consistent with the general role of colloidal stability in such systems. Although zeta potential was not measured here, previous studies have shown that a high surface charge in chitosan-modified GICs improves nanoparticle dispersion, mechanical strength, and fluoride release (25). In contrast, quaternized chitosan-coated nanoparticles have demonstrated superior interfacial bonding and more uniform filler distribution, supporting improved flexural strength and fracture resistance in reinforced GIC systems (8). Together with reports on other nano-enhanced restorative formulations (3), these findings suggest that colloidal stability is a key determinant of functional integration and mechanical performance.

Our findings on the increase in Vickers surface hardness with MCH addition are in agreement with earlier studies, which show that chitosan positively influences GIC microhardness (10). Previous work comparing chitosan with hydroxyapatite revealed that chitosan not only preserved microhardness but was particularly effective in reducing surface roughness (31), supporting our conclusion that incorporating micro-sized chitin derivatives from *Xylotrupes gideon* contributes to a more durable and homogeneous GIC matrix. Furthermore, the incorporation of carboxymethyl chitosan into the liquid phase of GIC has been shown to significantly enhance flexural strength, fracture toughness, and compressive strength at low concentrations, reinforcing the view that chitosan derivatives strengthen the GIC network via hydrogen bonding and improved interfacial cohesion (9).

The decline in mechanical performance observed at 2% MCH is consistent with the tendency of higher nanoparticle concentrations to promote agglomeration and disrupt uniform dispersion (17). Conversely, very low concentrations (e.g., below 0.5%) may be insufficient to achieve effective reinforcement. In the present work, the interpretation that 2% MCH leads to increased agglomeration is therefore inferred from the mechanical trends and the known behavior of over-loaded particle-reinforced systems, rather than from direct microstructural evidence. Enhanced powder–liquid interactions during setting, driven by the high surface energy of MCH, likely contributed to favorable gelation and final structure at 1%, in line with observations that optimized powder–liquid interactions support improved mechanical outcomes (32). MCH thus appears to improve hardness and mechanical durability while preserving essential GIC properties, including adhesion (33). At the same time, the absence of fractographic SEM analysis of fractured GIC–MCH specimens in this study is a further limitation that prevents direct visualization of crack paths, particle distribution, and agglomerate formation at different MCH concentrations. A dedicated follow-up investigation, including fracture-surface SEM for all MCH loadings is planned to elucidate these microstructural–mechanical correlations more clearly.

Previous work has shown that resin coatings can significantly enhance the viscoelastic behavior and environmental resistance of highly viscous GICs (34). While such strategies focus on external surface protection, our results suggest that internal reinforcement with chitosan may offer comparable benefits by increasing matrix cohesion and long-term mechanical stability without necessitating additional coating layers. In another study, shrimp shell-derived chitosan combined with hydrophilic fibers yielded a composite with compressive strength of 32.67 MPa and tensile strength of 17.18 MPa (35). Although their tensile strength values were higher, our 1% MCH-GIC formulation achieved a much higher compressive strength (155.16 MPa).

When compared with other reinforced GICs, the 1% MCH-GIC formulation (compressive strength 155.16 MPa) approaches the values reported for zirconia-reinforced GIC (160.91 MPa) and silver-alloy GIC (151.47 MPa) (21). These results exceed the ISO 9917-1:2016 minimum compressive strength threshold of 100 MPa for conventional restorative GICs (36). Although the compressive strength remains below that of enamel (262 MPa) and dentin (234 MPa), and below values for some high-viscosity GICs (301 MPa), it is still well above the estimated stress generated by maximum bite forces (≈ 21.2 MPa, assuming a 20 mm² contact area) (22, 37). Thus, the present MCH-GIC appears mechanically adequate for typical masticatory loading, and further optimization, such as combining MCH with high-viscosity GIC may provide additional safety margins.

In addition to bulk mechanical strengthening, chitosan has been reported to enhance the shear bond strength of GIC to dentin (38), which is critical for long-term clinical success. While bonding behavior was not evaluated in this study, it is plausible that the microchitosan used could confer similar benefits; this will be addressed in future work.

4.3 Biofunctional attributes and fluoride release

Biofunctional attributes, including antimicrobial potential, remineralization support, and tissue compatibility, are highly relevant to restorative materials. The present study did not evaluate antibacterial activity, fluoride release, or pulp/tissue responses, and no biological claims are made based on our data. However, previous studies have shown that chitosan's positively charged surface can disrupt bacterial membranes and inhibit biofilm formation (18, 39, 40), and that *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived nanochitosan can exhibit antibacterial effects and support sustained fluoride release in experimental restorative formulations (19, 41).

Notably, prior work indicates that incorporating nanochitosan into GIC does not compromise fluoride release and may even enhance it, particularly under acidic conditions (16, 25, 42). Chitosan's hydrogel-like network may modulate ion diffusion and support prolonged fluoride availability. Other reports have demonstrated that chitosan can promote the proliferation of fibroblasts and odontoblasts, enhance pulp healing, and reduce inflammation when applied near pulp tissue (43, 44). MCH's

mucoadhesive behavior may also improve marginal sealing *in vivo* (45). Together, these findings suggest that chitosan-modified GICs could offer multifunctional benefits, combining mechanical reinforcement with potential antibacterial and remineralizing effects; nevertheless, such biofunctional properties remain to be tested specifically for the present MCH-GIC formulation and should be addressed in future *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies.

4.4 Clinical implications and future directions

Within the limitations of this *in vitro* study, *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan appears to be a promising internal reinforcement for conventional GIC, particularly at a 1% loading. The observed improvements in strength and hardness, together with the material's fluoride-releasing nature, support potential use in stress-bearing posterior restorations, atraumatic restorative treatment (ART), and liners or bases in deep cavities, provided that adequate adhesion and long-term behavior are confirmed (1, 16, 27). However, the absence of flexural strength data represents an important limitation, as flexural performance is highly relevant to the clinical loading conditions of GIC restorations. To address this, future work will incorporate three-point or biaxial flexural strength testing as part of a broader mechanical characterization of *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan-modified GICs.

Further work is required before clinical adoption. Priority areas include: (i) *in vivo* assessment of pulp and tissue responses, (ii) long-term durability under occlusal load, thermocycling, and pH cycling, (iii) evaluation of cytotoxicity and potential allergic reactions, particularly in pediatric and medically compromised patients, (iv) detailed studies of fluoride-release kinetics under cariogenic challenges, and (v) optimization of handling and setting characteristics for clinical workflow.

Finally, the use of *Xylotrupes gideon*-derived microchitosan highlights an environmentally conscious approach to dental biomaterials. Insect-based chitosan offers a locally available, potentially less allergenic alternative to marine sources and integrates effectively into GIC matrices (1, 16, 18). Microchitosan thus represents a sustainable modifier that can enhance the mechanical performance of GIC while reducing reliance on traditional marine-derived additives. Such improvements in mechanical properties are critical for the biomechanical performance of GIC restorations in the oral cavity. Comprehensive biocompatibility testing, biofunctional evaluation, and clinical trials are necessary to confirm the safety and effectiveness of this approach and to support its broader clinical implementation.

5 Conclusion

Incorporating 1% microchitosan (MCH) from *Xylotrupes gideon* into glass ionomer cement (GIC) significantly enhanced

its mechanical properties after 7 days of maturation in artificial saliva. This modification resulted in a 35% increase in compressive strength, a 51% improvement in tensile strength, and 46% increase in surface hardness. Although the 2% MCH group initially showed strong values, its performance declined over time, suggesting an upper threshold of reinforcement. This reduced performance was likely due to particle agglomeration, which undermined long-term stability. A 0.5% formulation produced inconclusive results, the optimized 1% formulation supports minimally invasive dentistry by prolonging restoration longevity and preserving tooth structure.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Ethics statement

The animal study was approved by Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Health Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti (Approval No: 006/Dosen/KEPK/FGK/06/2021). The study was conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements.

Author contributions

RT: Conceptualization, Data curation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, FK: Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, CM: Validation, Writing – original draft, DP: Investigation, Writing – original draft, EE: Supervision, Writing – original draft, TP: Visualization, Writing – original draft, KK: Resources, Writing – original draft, IG: Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, SW: Writing – review & editing, AC: Writing – review & editing.

References

- Sidhu SK, Nicholson JW. A review of glass-ionomer cements for clinical dentistry. *J Funct Biomater*. (2016) 7(3):1–15. doi: 10.3390/jfb7030016
- Tjandrawinata R, Irie M, Yoshida Y, Suzuki K. Effect of adding spherical silica filler on physico-mechanical properties of resin modified glass-ionomer cement. *Dent Mater J*. (2004) 23(2):46–54. doi: 10.4012/dmj.23.146
- Komariah K, Trisiltha P, Wahyudi R, Erica N, Nugroho D, Artesani Y, et al. Chitosan *Xylotrapex gideon* encapsulated lemongrass leaf ethanol extract reduce H₂O₂-induced oxidative stress in human dermal fibroblast. *Indones J Biotechnol*. (2023) 28(4):191–9. doi: 10.22146/jbiotech.81544
- Shahid S, Duminis T. *Glass-Ionomer Cement: Chemistry and its Applications in Dentistry*. Advanced Dental Biomaterials. Elsevier, (2019):175–95. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-102476-6.00008-6
- Amin F, Rahman S, Khurshid Z, Muhammad Sohail Z, Seif F, Kumar N. Effect of nanostructures on the properties of glass ionomer dental restoratives/cements: a comprehensive narrative review. *Materials (Basel)*. (2021) 14(21):6260. doi: 10.3390/ma14216260
- Kurniawan FL, Tjandrawinata R, Marpuang C, Pratiwi D, Komariah K. The effect of horn beetle *banochitosan (Xylotrapex gideon)* addition on the hardness of glass-ionomer cement. *J Indones Dent Association*. (2022) 5(1):27–31. doi: 10.52793/jidav5i1.719
- Batu Eben Z, Ilie N. A critical review on the factors affecting the bond strength of direct restorative material alternatives to amalgam. *Materials (Basel)*. (2024) 17(19):4853. doi: 10.3390/ma17194853
- Elbhenawy EA, El-Ebary MA, Kenawy E-R, El-Olmy GA. Modification of glass-ionomer cement properties by quaternized chitosan-coated nanoparticles. *Odontology*. (2022) 111(2):328–41. doi: 10.1007/s10266-022-00738-0
- Bao X, Liu F, He J. Preparation and characterization of glass ionomer cements with added carboxymethyl chitosan. *J Macromol Sci Part B*. (2020) 59(6):345–56. doi: 10.1080/00222348.2020.1716486

Funding

The author(s) declared that financial support was not received for this work and/or its publication.

Acknowledgments

Special gratitude is addressed to Drg. Octarina, MSi, PhD, for technical support, Drg. Dewi Liliany, M.Kes and Abida Zhafira Inayasy, ST for general support.

Conflict of interest

The authors declared that this work was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declared that generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript. We used Grammarly to check grammatical errors.

Any alternative text (alt text) provided alongside figures in this article has been generated by Frontiers with the support of artificial intelligence and reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, including review by the authors wherever possible. If you identify any issues, please contact us.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

10. Soygun K, Soygun A, Dogan MC. The effects of chitosan addition to glass ionomer cement on microhardness and surface roughness. *J Appl Biomater Funct Mater*. (2021) 19:228080021989706. doi: 10.1177/228080021989706
11. Aramaz I, Akintara AR, Civera MC, Arias C, Elorza B, Heras Caballero A, et al. Chitosan: an overview of its properties and applications. *Polymers (Basel)*. (2021) 13(19):3256. doi: 10.3390/polym13193256
12. Agarwal M, Agarwal MK, Shrivastav N, Pandey S, Das R, Gaur P. Preparation of chitosan nanoparticles and their *in vitro* characterization. *Int J Life Sci Res*. (2018) 4(2):1713–20. doi: 10.21276/ijlsr.2018.4.2.17
13. Gao H, Wu N, Wang N, Li J, Sun J, Peng Q. Chitosan-based therapeutic systems and their potentials in treatment of oral diseases. *Int J Biol Macromol*. (2022) 222(Pt B):3178–94. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2022.10.090
14. Aboumarhab MAS, Pramanik S, Abdelgawad MA, Abualsoud BM, Kadi A, Ansan MJ, et al. Recent advances of chitosan formulations in biomedical applications. *Int J Mol Sci*. (2022) 23(18):10975. doi: 10.3390/ijms231810975
15. Pratiwi D, Genesis GR, Komariah K, Tjandrawinata R. The effect of nanochitosan from *Rhinoceros beetle (Xylotrupes gideon)* towards GIC surface roughness on critical pH of the saliva. *Colloids Dent J*. (2021) 3(1):73–9. doi: 10.30659/cdj.8.1.73–79
16. Nukunthine C, Miglani R, R I, Poorani S, Srinivasan MR, Robson A, et al. Evaluation of fluoride release in chitosan-modified glass ionomer cements. *Int Dent J*. (2022) 72(6):785–91. doi: 10.1016/j.identj.2022.05.005
17. Chu S, Wang J, Gao F. The application of chitosan nanostructures in nanotechnology. *Molecules*. (2021) 26(20):6315. doi: 10.3390/molecules26206315
18. Colonello GP, Suffredini JR, Andia DG, Lima AB, Saraceni CHC. Evaluating antimicrobial, cytotoxic and immunomodulatory effects of glass ionomer cement modified by chitosan and hydroxyapatite. *Dent Mater*. (2024) 40(8):1305–11. doi: 10.1016/j.dental.2024.05.021
19. Komariah K, Tatars RA, Bustami DA. Efficacy of rhinoceros beetle (*Xylotrupes gideon*) nano chitosan and calcium mouthwash in reducing quantity oral cavity bacteria among elementary school age children. *Int J Adv Biol Biomed Res*. (2017) 5(1):44–7. doi: 10.18869/IJABBR.2017.405
20. Baig MS, Henning GP. Conventional glass-ionomer materials: a review of the developments in glass powder, polyacid liquid and the strategies of reinforcement. *J Dent*. (2015) 43(8):897–912. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2015.04.004
21. Bhatia HP, Singh S, Sood S, Harma N. A comparative evaluation of sorption, solubility, and compressive strength of three different glass ionomer cements in artificial saliva: an *in vitro* study. *Int J Clin Pediatr Dent*. (2017) 10(1):49–54. doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-10905-1407
22. Shen C, Rawls HR, Esquivel-Upshaw JE. *Philips' Science of Dental Materials*. 10th ed Elsevier (2023).
23. Alrabiah A. Diametral tensile strength, flexural strength, and surface microhardness of bioactive bulk fill restorative. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. (2018) 19(1):7. doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-10024-2205
24. Özduman ZC, Oğlaklı R, Halkoğlu Bağış DM, Aydoğan Teneş B, Hıguzoğlu Balıkcı E. Comparison of a nanofiber-reinforced composite with different types of composite resins. *Polymers (Basel)*. (2023) 15(17):1–14. doi: 10.3390/polym15173628
25. Alumpuk H, Ertan Cui H, Madu, Agardun NB, Berkan A, Güney M. Prevention of secondary caries using fluoride-loaded chitosan nanoparticle-modified glass-ionomer cement. *Clin Oral Invest*. (2024) 28(9):504. doi: 10.1007/s00784-024-05891-0
26. Pratiwi D, Salim RF, Tjandrawinata R, Komariah K. Surface morphology evaluation of glass ionomer cement modified with nano chitosan of rhinoceros beetle. *J Keokok Gigi Univ Pascuduran*. (2021) 33(3):240–6. doi: 10.24198/jkgv333.32231
27. Senthil Kumar R, Ravikumar N, Kavitha S, Mahalakshi S, Jayaraj R, Sampath Kumar TS, et al. Nanochitosan modified glass ionomer cement with enhanced mechanical properties and fluoride release. *Int J Biol Macromol*. (2017) 104:1860–5. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2017.03.120
28. Ravi K, Paulraj J, Maiti S, Shanmugam R. Assessing the influence of thermocycling on compressive strength, flexural strength, and microhardness in green-mediated nanocomposite-enhanced glass ionomer cement compared to traditional glass ionomer cement. *Cureus*. (2024) 16(3):e56078. doi: 10.7759/cureus.56078
29. Azzazy AME, Ali MS, Shaban A. Effect of adding nanotitanium dioxide and chitosan on flexural strength, diametral tensile strength, and hardness of glass ionomer cement. *Al-Azhar J Dent Sci*. (2022) 25(3):253. doi: 10.21608/ajds.2021.90370.1222
30. Ren P, Wang F, Zhan T, Hu W, Zhou N, Zhang T, et al. A biomimetic nano-hydroxyapatite/chitosan/poly(methyl vinyl ether-alt-maleic anhydride) composite with excellent biocompatibility. *Mater Lett*. (2020) 261:327102. doi: 10.1016/j.mater.2019.127102
31. Farooqi MU, Al-Hassan B, Sayed M, Al-Azzawi H. Comparison between the effect of adding microhydroxyapatite and chitosan on surface roughness and Microhardness of resin modified and conventional glass ionomer cements. *J Clin Exp Dent*. (2021) 13(8):e737–44. doi: 10.4317/jced.55996
32. Jagdale S, Agarwal B, Dixit A, Gowate S. Chitosan as excellent bio-macromolecule with myriad of anti-activities in biomedical applications – A review. *Int J Biol Macromol*. (2024) 257:128697. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2023.128697
33. Song A, Gong H, Zhang J, Wang H, Zhu S. Adhesive properties and performance of glass ionomer cements in dental restorations: a comparative study of four materials. *Int J Adhes Adhes*. (2025) 140:103989. doi: 10.1016/j.ijadad.2025.103989
34. Yap AU, Ong JE, Yalini NA. Effect of resin coating on highly viscous glass ionomer cements: a dynamic analysis. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater*. (2021) 113:104120. doi: 10.1016/j.jmbm.2020.104120
35. Fadila DN, Ridwan AZ, Amir NA, Abdillah A, Kartini N R, Dhamaluddin N H H. Mechanical properties and formulation of hydrophilic fiber and shrimp shell combination as a novel eco-friendly dental restoration material. *Heliyon*. (2024) 10(14):e34140. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e34140
36. Navarro MF, de L, Pasotto RC, Borges AFS, Soares CJ, Raggio DP, Rios D, et al. Consensus on glass-ionomer cement thresholds for restorative indications. *J Dent*. (2021) 107:103609. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103609
37. Edmonds HM, Glowacka H. The ontogeny of maximum bite force in humans. *J Anat*. (2020) 237(3):329–42. doi: 10.1111/joa.13218
38. Khudhair AT, Khalaf MS. Effect of incorporating chitosan to resin modified glass ionomer cement on shear bond strength to dentin (*an in vitro* comparative study). *J Int Soc Prev Community Dent*. (2024) 14(3):235–32. doi: 10.4103/jupcd.195.23
39. Ke C-L, Deng F-S, Chuang C-Y, Lin C-H. Antimicrobial actions and applications of chitosan. *Polymers (Basel)*. (2021) 13(6):904. doi: 10.3390/polym13060904
40. Dobrzyński W, Piszko PJ, Kuryk J, Kuryk S, Michalak M, Kotela A, et al. Dental resin composites modified with chitosan: a systematic review. *Mar Drugs*. (2025) 23(5):199. doi: 10.3390/md23050199
41. Shalaby HA, Soliman NK, Al-Sandi KW. Antibacterial and preventive effects of newly developed modified nano-chitosan/glass-ionomer restoration on simulated initial enamel caries lesions: an *in vitro* study. *Dent Med Probl*. (2024) 61(3):353–62. doi: 10.17219/dmp/15885
42. Gull N, Khan SM, Zahid Butt MT, Khalid S, Shaqf M, Islam A, et al. *In vitro* study of chitosan-based multi-responsive hydrogels as drug release vehicles: a preclinical study. *RSC Adv*. (2019) 9(53):31078–91. doi: 10.1039/C9RA05025F
43. Fu Z, Zhuang Y, Cai J, Sheng R, Tomás H, Rodrigues J, et al. Development and challenges of cell- and material-based tooth regeneration. *Eng Regen*. (2022) 3(2):161–81. doi: 10.1016/j.engreg.2022.04.003
44. Pratt C, Gandolfi MG. Calcium silicate bioactive cements: biological perspectives and clinical applications. *Dent Mater*. (2015) 31(4):351–70. doi: 10.1016/j.dental.2015.01.004
45. Kannan KP, Gunasekaran V, Sreenivasan P, Sahasikumar P. Recent updates and feasibility of nanodrug in the prevention and eradication of dental biofilm and its associated pathogens—a review. *J Dent*. (2024) 143:101888. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2024.101888

Xylotrupes gideon microchitosan-modified glass ionomer cement: in vitro assessment of mechanical properties

ORIGINALITY REPORT

14%

SIMILARITY INDEX

10%

INTERNET SOURCES

12%

PUBLICATIONS

7%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- | | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Submitted to CSU, San Jose State University
Student Paper | 2% |
| 2 | www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
Internet Source | 1% |
| 3 | jurnal.unissula.ac.id
Internet Source | 1% |
| 4 | Submitted to California State University, Sacramento
Student Paper | 1% |
| 5 | Alba Xifra-Porxas, Michalis Kassinopoulos, Prokopis Prokopiou, Marie-Hélène Boudrias, Georgios D. Mitsis. "Global signal regression reduces connectivity patterns related to physiological signals and does not alter EEG-derived connectivity", Frontiers in Neuroimaging, 2025
Publication | 1% |
| 6 | Octarina Octarina, Florencia Livia Kurniawan, Niko Falatehan, Karen Sofiana et al. "Bovine Cancellous Hydroxyapatite Toothpaste Enhances Enamel Remineralization", International Dental Journal, 2026
Publication | 1% |
| 7 | Submitted to The University of Texas at Arlington
Student Paper | 1% |
| 8 | docksci.com
Internet Source | 1% |

9	Shreyas Vijayendra Kumar, Henrik Ström. "A combined experimental-numerical investigation of two-phase self-cleaning drop modulation by amphiphilic component addition", Frontiers in Chemical Engineering, 2025 Publication	<1 %
10	Letícia Gonçalves Oliveira Menezes, Beatriz Aiub Trajano Silveira, Larissa Moreira Spinola de Castro Raucci, Antônio Secco Martorano et al. "Functional glass ionomer cement modified with phosphate and zinc oxide nanoparticles: in vitro insights into physicommechanical behavior, cytotoxicity and antimicrobial activity", Journal of Dentistry, 2025 Publication	<1 %
11	archive.asmfc.org Internet Source	<1 %
12	ijjls.com Internet Source	<1 %
13	www.claisse.info Internet Source	<1 %
14	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet Source	<1 %
15	jebas.org Internet Source	<1 %
16	jommid.pasteur.ac.ir Internet Source	<1 %
17	Chatarasupalli Ajayteja, Satyanarayana Mantena, Rama Alla, Rao Guddala-Narasimha et al. "Evaluation of mechanical properties of glass ionomer cement incorporated with	<1 %

zirconia nanotubes: An in vitro study",
Advanced Technologies, 2025

Publication

-
- | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------|
| 18 | HATANAKA, Kenji, Masao IRIE, Rosalina TJANDRAWINATA, and Kazuomi SUZUKI. "Effect of Spherical Silica Filler Addition on Immediate Interfacial Gap-formation in Class V Cavity and Mechanical Properties of Resin-modified Glass-ionomer Cement", Dental Materials Journal, 2006.
<small>Publication</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 19 | Xiaoxu Liang, Dandan Zhou, Biao Yu, Hai-jing Zhong, Jingwei He. "Optimization of 3-butenic acid-modified polyalkenoic acid for enhanced glass ionomer cement performance", Journal of the Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials, 2025
<small>Publication</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 20 | archives.mfu.ac.th
<small>Internet Source</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 21 | www.researchsquare.com
<small>Internet Source</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 22 | Damodar Hegde, Baranya Shrikrishna Suprabha, Arathi Rao. "Organic antibacterial modifications of high-viscosity glass ionomer cement for atraumatic restorative treatment: A review", Japanese Dental Science Review, 2024
<small>Publication</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 23 | assets.cureus.com
<small>Internet Source</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 24 | www.preprints.org
<small>Internet Source</small> | <1 % |
| <hr/> | | |
| 25 | Mahdi Hasani, Weihao Yuan, Sevda Sevari, Luiza de Almeida Queiroz Ferreira et al. | <1 % |

"Dopamer: A bioactive polydopamine-containing glass-ionomer cement with mineralizing and antibacterial properties", Dental Materials, 2025

Publication

26

dbc.wroc.pl

Internet Source

<1 %

27

Sreejith Sasidharan Lathikumari, Manju Saraswathy. "Ionogel impregnated glass ionomer cement and the effect of nanoparticle additives", Materials Advances, 2024

Publication

<1 %

28

Volodymyr Korzhyk, Andrii Grynyuk, Yunqiang Zhao, Oleksandr Bushma, Oksana Konoreva, Oleksandr Voitenko, Guirong, Zhe Liu. "Influence of plasma arc characteristics on penetration depth and weld formation during welding of Al-Mg-Mn alloy with asymmetric variable polarity current", AIMS Materials Science, 2025

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes

On

Exclude matches

< 15 words

Exclude bibliography

On