

Table IV. Clinical outcomes from automated flossers studies*

Automatic flosser tested	Compared to	Subject number	Length	Clinical outcomes	Comments	Reference
Interclean™	Manual floss	60	30 days	Significant reductions for both groups in PI, MGI, MPBI	Prophylaxis at baseline; subjects could not have history of flossing more than once per week	Gordon et al. ³²
Interclean™	Manual floss	48	6 weeks	Interclean equivalent to manual floss for reducing interproximal plaque and gingivitis	Prophylaxis at baseline; subjects could not have history of flossing more than once per week	Cronin and Dembling ³³
Interclean™	Manual floss	170	6 mos	No statistical difference between products for GI and GBI	Prophylaxis at baseline; subjects could not have a history of flossing more than once per week	Isaacs et al. ³⁴
Interclean™	Several types of manual cleaning devices	35	11 days	Interproximal cleaning devices selected to fit the size of the interdental space were superior to the power device.	A dentist utilized the devices on the subjects rather than typical self-use.	Schmage et al. ³⁵
Floss Plus	Manual floss	66	6 weeks	No differences between devices in reduction of interproximal inflammation or plaque	Dental student subjects preferred manual floss but the SPT subjects preferred the automated device.	Pucher et al. ³⁶
Waterpik™ flosser	Manual floss	60	30 days	No differences between devices for PI and GI	Prophylaxis at baseline	Anderson et al. ³⁷
Waterpik™ flosser	Manual floss	70	30 days	Power device equivalent to manual floss in reducing PI, MGI, EBI	Subjects had moderate gingivitis.	Shibly et al. ³⁸

*Table represents published, in-vivo studies that evaluate clinical outcomes