

The Next Generation of Easier, Faster, More
Comfortable Floss/ing Generates Fun *

Yes, “it’s a loss not to floss *for fun now!*” SM **

By Leonard Lorch

* Copyright 2006, Leonard Lorch. All Rights Reserved.

SM Service Mark of Author/Inventor Leonard Lorch

* * Copyright 2006, Leonard Lorch. All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

On the one hand this article covers why well known manufacturing, engineering, dental science, educational and legal teams may focus fully on thinking of the **next generation of floss/ing as easier, faster, much more comfortable and fun** *versus* all other floss/ing that 88 percent of Americans *perceive as*, if not know from experience is, no fun whatsoever and takes too long since those 88 percent of Americans do not floss daily. On the other hand this article clarifies why well known marketing teams plus corporate officers and business unit managers may focus fully on thinking of how to get such a difference across to the 88 percent of Americans who are the avoiders of daily flossing who, in fact, are a “huge market of non-consumption”. Before the existence of today’s next generation of floss/ing, and existing within the 88 percent of Americans who do not floss daily are 39 percent of Americans who floss less than daily because those 39 percent of Americans have not yet had enough of their *unmet* needs met. Hence, wouldn’t it be better if today’s *new choice* of, for example, the fun generated by the next generation of floss/ing better meets those unmet needs and further helps *break the cycle* of those unmet needs? If so teams, this author’s motto since early on remained categorically true that “it’s a loss not to floss”. However, the perception of fun *and*, for example, the fun generated by the next generation of floss/ing have the likelihood of *guiding* the transformation of the ‘unmentionable’ job of floss/ing into the outstanding choice of fun rather than merely an unpopular priority that most Americans do not relish doing daily. Most Americans do not floss daily but, thanks to the dental profession, Americans know they should floss daily. Could the possibilities of better solving this societal problem with the proposed solution of the obviously “easier, faster, much more comfortable and fun” *job(s)* of the next generation of “flossing” and/or “floss-training” be any more encouraging if not genuinely within reach now? This author is asking for *spiritual* permission to *reflect the light from* the old perception and old reality of the “old rules of floss/ing” *onto* the next generation’s new rules of floss/ing and/or floss-training. Those new rules of floss/ing have “easier, faster, much more comfortable and fun” attributes that are an integral part of a new “differential fitness” incorporating the underlying *job(s)* of floss/ing and/or, *floss-training* too. The higher hanging “fruit” of these improved attributes of the next generation of floss/ing and/or floss-training probably can help better meet the *unmet* needs of American consumers. This likelihood is in view of better serving the “huge market of non-consumption” of the 49 percent of Americans who do not floss yet and, currently, the 39 percent of Americans who floss-less-than daily *versus* the mere 12-13 percent of Americans who currently floss daily. Since categorically “it’s a loss not to floss *for fun now!*” which is the service mark of the author/inventor’s patent pending next generation of floss/ing, the likelihood of securing a patent in due course is approaching for the team(s) to make decisions and take actions on a clarified new choice: the *guided* “differential fitness” of the next generation of floss/ing and/or floss-training. This sustaining shredproof technology is literally *and* figuratively **guided or “targeted”** with ideally *fast dissolving* oral care strips (targets) that are fused as an edible film “riveted” target that engages two parallel “segments of floss” that in turn are defined by the hole that the target engages. Those parallel segments of floss or “floss segments” were justified by “*job-based segmentation logic*”. One ultimate purpose if not guiding light of

this article is to lead, and to support a better consumer's alternative. Hence, this article clarifies scientific reasons why it is critical not to overshoot or undershoot the upward path of innovation from any floss if not ideally a shredproof ePTFE floss/ing substrate. Another purpose of this article is to present and clarify the "circumstance-based" *guide* for, and of, the "differential fitness" of the next generation of floss/ing which may unexpectedly create unending new possibilities.

Main Article

Most of us know flossing is not a game but an essential part of oral hygiene. However, except for the well known "Mental Floss" cartoon by J. K. Kliban, and except for dental floss bikinis, it has not been possible for most of us to imagine a practical way of actually having fun related to or during flossing. That was until a new *targeted* dental floss invention was created that's easier, faster, much more comfortable and of course fun - - the sort of fun that is a psychological advantage too.

Some of us aim at targets like goals or having more fun in our lives. Some of us aim a cursor as we point and click a computer mouse to target our tasks or our wishes. Some of us aim at targets in sports or video games. However, imagine targeting dental floss like the way we once aimed at large enough objects in a carnival booth. Most of us aimed at those objects or other kinds of targets when we were children.

That's when knocking down a target was fun for some of us because we could get a simple sense of accomplishment or satisfaction when we saw and

participated in the action of the game that took place in front of our eyes. Some of us could also count the targets we hit or we could enjoy the social scene with some of our friends or family.

In the carnival booth clearly any object was a fun target. Remember it was even more fun if we made enough targets disappear so that our score won us a stuffed furry animal? That prize was positive reinforcement of the fun.

Say the word floss however and, for some people, it can conjure up disgust, fear or embarrassment. However, that's a world away from the truthful Kaiser Permanente advertisement that, for example, touts using dental floss so that we can be healthy and thrive.

Back to the truth about dental floss given away by dentists or floss retailed to consumers. If those flosses do not have a target that can easily be knocked out of or dissolved off a mount in a hole in the floss, then each of those unguided regular dental flosses surprisingly enable little or no fun, play or psychological advantage - - except when someone pulls regular dental floss along to play with a cat!

Let's return to the patent pending invention of an easier, faster and much more comfortable dental floss with fun targets. The first aim of the new targeted floss invention is dissolving off or knocking out an edible target merely as the user glides the targeted floss between teeth. The user does that by grabbing the floss

substrate and by merely having a pair of teeth knock out and/or dissolve off the invention's floss target as the user glides the underlying floss substrate between that pair of teeth.

However, the neat trick (for adults and teenagers) is that underneath each fast dissolving target is a rather short segment of non-dissolving shredproof dental floss that's less than an inch long. That floss segment automatically glides between our contacting teeth as our intended target, the fun so to speak, is downed and knocked out by and dissolves off because of our typically saliva-coated teeth.

Each floss target is preferably flat and can look like the silhouette of any animal if not a well known cartoon character. Alternately, each preferably flat target can look like the silhouette of a circle, a rectangle or any other geometric shape if not the well known elliptical like shape that exists around the perimeter of Procter & Gamble's GLIDE floss trademark - - if not the well known oval or frankfurter shape that exists around the perimeter the ORAL-B trademark of, until recently, Gillette.

However, the targeted dental floss invention has one or more holes preferred centered along the length of a planar substrate. At least one hole is covered with a preferably flat but edible and preferably fast-dissolving "rivet". The edible rivet by definition has two "heads" or "faces" (edible films of ideally fast dissolving oral care strips) that are merely fused together in and extend out from

the hole and thereby cover the “riveted” hole in the planar substrate. The point is that each head or face of the rivet represents the shape of a *target*.

To see illustrations of the fast dissolving edible targets “riveted” on the flossing substrate see Figures 1 through 10 in the *companion* internet publication of this author/inventor Leonard Lorch’s U.S. Patent *application* that is officially patent pending. Figures 1 through 10 are herein incorporated by reference from that officially patent pending published application. To view Figures 1 through 10 in that published application on the internet go to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office’s hereby linked website www.uspto.gov.

Ultimately since it’s a loss not to floss, let’s return to the new premise that *targeted* floss/ing first involves *fun or play when a target is knocked out or dissolved off* and then later on in this article we can get into the additional fun of the prize of *real-time-positive-reinforcement* from the rather tasty target’s dissolved components of flavor, sweetness and coolness for example. The well known psychologist Jean Piaget divided play into three types: sensorimotor play, symbolic play and games or *playing with rules*.

In view of the 88% of Americans who currently do not *daily* follow the old rules of the old flossing ‘game’, to those Americans flossing daily with 18 inches to 24 inches of dental floss is unpopular. However, the dental profession teaches and about 12% of Americans follow flossing daily. Since 88% of Americans do not floss daily, what kind of new and improved flossing rules would make more of

us happier to switch and/or somehow either floss more often if not daily or more of us to somehow change from not flossing at all to some form of flossing?

Enter bringing back something *like the fun* of aiming at and playing with any object that is a target in a carnival booth. Targeting the flossing game, and genuinely making the first half of the invention's new rules a game whose first rule is to *"have fun by having adjacent teeth knock out and/or dissolve off a target while gliding the targeted floss between those teeth,"* removes the constraints imposed in real life from the legendary way to floss by the old rules! It is believed most of us have a special ability to learn especially when it is fun to easily knock out an edible target from a hole in the floss invention as the invention goes between teeth to begin flossing. When any task is structured with fun virtually anyone can benefit. If dentists and hygienists have been discouraged about the large numbers of patients not flossing daily, can dentists and hygienists be faulted for not making the old flossing rules easier and fun? Could any of the rest of us have foreseen the next generation of targeted and fun dental floss that is shredproof and that is intended for easier, faster (1) and much more comfortable flossing?

Because this author was also originally responsible for discovering the first generation of shredproof dental flosses (2) that are referred to here as one of the usual flossing substrates of 18 inches to 24 inches of hand held "professional" floss, the next shredproof generation of targeted floss is intended for those of us who floss less than daily, not at all yet or daily but improperly. This next

generation of targeted floss and associated next generation of targeted flossing were invented to serve most of us because daily flossing compliance is sorely needed by 88% of us.

To date, daily flossing compliance is missing *actes gratuites*. The first half of targeted flossing involves *actes gratuites* in which necessity (that is, merely gliding the floss between teeth) is obeyed. That's because at the same time the floss-between-necessity consists of the *fun-knock-out-the-target-new-rule* in order to initially get the floss between teeth for example. The new approach is fun for those who choose to participate. However, the old rules of flossing involve no such fun whatsoever.

According to the American Dental Association's Council on Scientific Affairs, the legendary way to floss has been shown to be effective in removing interdental plaque. Dentists and hygienists clearly do not need a fun and easier way to do what they already do professionally every day, namely floss daily by the old rules of flossing. However, if we have to floss at all it makes sense that most of the rest of us prefer an easier, faster, much more comfortable floss that's fun too.

Another option is that we may not know that we may need a training floss to help us learn to floss. How many of us remember bicycle training wheels that made learning to ride a bicycle fun?

Turning to any field of training, *Nashner* (3) extensively teaches intensive means of monitoring of training, and *Nashner* (3) specifies, “performance assessment means, training task prescription and expected compliance, training compliance monitoring means, actual compliance, compliance analysis means and task difficulty adjustment”. Clearly the latter, task difficulty adjustment, could be applied to redirecting a lay person’s motor task of flossing toward or away from using 18 to 24 inches of shredproof “professional” floss. And if away from the first generation of shredproof “professional” floss, toward what viable alternative and alternative method?

One such alternative is the multi-purpose floss and multi-purpose method of flossing proposed herein for most of us to floss not only easier and faster but more frequently if more of us can also learn, that is, train to floss easier, faster and much more comfortably based on the list of four instructions below - - these are the new and improved rules of flossing with targets:

*Easier, Faster, More Comfortable And Fun New Flossing Rules * * **

Step 1. Daily tear off or pull out at least about 3.5 or 4 inches, and then to the left and right of one visible target merely grab the white (ePTFE) dental flossing tape between the fingers of two hands such that between two hands is about 1 to 2 inches of that much more comfortable *0.50 inch width* of shredproof, non-slip and non-binding dental flossing tape; such flossing tape carries at least one fresh

mini-“target” of an edible rivet of ideally well known fast dissolving oral care strips that deliver for example cool mint or citrus flavor from such strips that altogether, as an edible rivet, can be knocked out and/or dissolved off from *merely* a hole in the remaining wide and for example *inedible* flossing tape during targeted flossing and/or floss-training;

Step 2. Gently slide the targeted floss between teeth to knockout and/or dissolve off one fresh targeted rivet for real-time positive reinforcement by actually sliding, or training to slide, *merely* “one” of that deliverable breath freshening rivet’s two underlying segments of white ePTFE floss between teeth;

Step 3. Curve either underlying segment of floss (the less than one inch long narrow segment of the floss located between the hole and either longest edge of the flossing tape) around and against each tooth as you merely scrape up and down always properly moving the narrow segment of floss gently above and below the gum line; and

Step 4. Every few teeth or at least every day, move along to a fresh target of another breath freshening rivet by grabbing another length of 1 to 2 inches always to the left and right of a fresh edible rivet and slide the floss between teeth to knockout and/or dissolve off that next target of a breath freshening rivet as you thereby slide another underlying segment of floss between teeth, and then repeat the third step. -- Clean back sides of back teeth too.

* * * *Copyright 2006, Leonard Lorch. All Rights Reserved.*

Exceptions to such fun targeted flossing involve, for example, using “professional” 18-24 inch floss for cleaning temporary crown restorations, or using a guiding “floss threader” for bridgework or braces. Another exception is using a flossing wand for physically and/or mentally disabled or aged persons who are unable, or anyone else who is unwilling to freely manipulate “professional” 18-24 inch floss. Another anticipated exception involving any kind of floss is if any of us have sharp and overhanging amalgam restorations that can cut any floss. However, it is believed the fun of targeted flossing is devised to support the human factors of most of us including the dental ergonomics of potentially able lay persons, training or learning to more frequently and properly perform perceivably easier, faster and much more comfortable flossing.

Roberts, Rosenblum and Curcio (5) indicate, “Dental ergonomics can help provide the answer – the adaptation of the man, the dentist, to his work, dentistry. Dental ergonomics is progress for people – all people – professionals, auxiliaries and patients.” - - and human factors engineering includes adding fun for patients and non-patients too.

In 1973 *Radentz, Barnes and Carter et. al.* (6) indicate that most of us do not know how to properly floss. Furthermore, in 2004 *Dave* (7) indicates, “Only about 12%

of the U.S. population flosses regularly." -- that is, daily. That means 88% of the population does not floss daily, or does not floss at all yet. Turning to flossing daily and less than daily, in 2004 , *Wiersama* (8) reports, "According to the American Dental Association, about 49% of the U.S. population skips this recommended step in their dental hygiene program."

As a result, can there be any doubt dentists have led the way based on the well known "professional" flossing technique (9) with 18-24 inches of floss to date? More fundamentally however, to date no such "professional" method of flossing meets enough unmet needs of most of us. Most of us floss less than daily, not at all or with painful "tourniquets" that take time to be wrapped and unwrapped around middle fingers. For most of us the norm is some form of non-compliance by up to 88% of us. Because of that substantial non-compliance, dentists and hygienists recommend flossing wands and flossing picks as aids. However, dentists continue to highly recommend, in effect, the juggernaut of "professional" 18-24 inch floss and "professional" handheld flossing not just because it is safe and effective but also because no viable flossing alternative could be imagined or invented before the current targeted floss invention.

In 2003 *Christensen* and *Raynor* (1) indicate, "Choosing the right improvements is **critical.**"

It is believed "targeted floss" and/or "training floss" works because most lay persons feel that, despite the well known benefits of daily and proper flossing

inuring, in reality, to currently about 12% of the U.S. population who flosses daily and properly, “professional” floss is sort of a “bum-wrap” --- despite the digital dexterity that dentists and hygienists employ. That “bum-wrap” (the well known middle finger wraparound of “professional” floss) was literally and figuratively implied by the four to three patients’ preference for a tested dental flossing wand over hand held “professional” flossing that in 1980 *Barton and Diamond* (10) indicate. Well known dental floss manufacturers’ aids of flossing wands indicate that manufacturers since then have not ignored the perception of many of us about the so-called ‘bum wrap’ of “professional” 18-24 inch floss. And are those dental floss manufacturers likely to ignore this targeted floss invention if manual and automated flossing wands have not solved the societal problem of daily flossing non-compliance? If 88% of the U. S. population does not floss daily and properly, does that justify an alternative floss if the alternative is improved enough so that it can supersede the “bum-wrap” of professional floss if the alternative further helps break the cycle from *unmet* needs of consumers impeded by the “bum wrap” for example? Haven’t tools like manual and powered flossing wands gradually scratched the surface of breaking the cycle with more ease of use? However, should the alternative of targeted floss and/or training floss be another alternative if not the alternative? If so, is that alternative fun and perceivably easier, faster and much more comfortable than the perception most of us have about the bum-wrap of “professional” floss?

If we go beyond the 12% of us who floss daily, 39% of us still prefer not to floss daily but we take some action to floss less-than-daily. However, another 49% of us do not floss at all. On the one hand, 88% of us do not comply with daily flossing. On the other hand, at least 39% of us floss less than daily because those of us who floss less-than-daily have not yet had enough of their needs met daily by the not-so-funny rules of the current 'game' of "professional" 18-24 inch flossing.

Clearly there is more here than meets the eye. Our tongue's sensitive taste buds and our sensitive nose are not between our teeth where many flavored, "professional" flosses are supposed to go. This is one reason why flavored, "professional" floss, for the average person, also has never made total sense to this author. What does that have to do with a "training floss" or "targeted floss"? – a lot. It actually is one reason why the next generation of dental floss, the invention herein referred to as *targeted* floss or training floss, was also referred to by people during focus-group-tests as "knockout" floss.

Why? Because the "knockout" floss invention presents easy targets whereby each knocked out colorful target (of fast dissolving and ideally fused and flavored for example cool mint or citrus edible film oral care strips bonded together to make rivet or target) delivers such flavorings or essential oils for real-time, positive reinforcement and breath freshening pleasure. That helps supersede, with the help of the pleasantness of the cleansing action of flossing itself, the average person's perception of the stench of the less-than-daily flossed

bacterial plaque's junk and gunk itself – especially when most of us floss improperly, less than daily or not at all.

Add to the above “knockout” fast-dissolving scenario the fact that each riveted flat target of such fast dissolving mini-breath-freshening strips are a visible and edible “target” that enables a visibly “guided” approach that *Singer* and *Pease* (11) more generically document since their article's title indicates, “(the) Effect of *guided* vs. discovery learning strategies on initial motor task learning, transfer and retention” (italics added for emphasis by this author). No floss except the inedible “guide” of floss threaders and apparently only one flossing wand employing an inedible “guide” of a safety strand (12, 13) has ever before presented an “edible guide” that is a riveted and rewarding target for real-time, positive reinforcement for fun during flossing and/or floss training.

Each time such “edible guide” or edible target is knocked out and/or dissolved off it indicates, to the user, where the targeted floss is sliding between teeth and that targeted flossing has begun and/or is continuing using a fresh fast dissolving target plus the trick of an underlying inch long segment of non-dissolving floss that is shredproof. Related to *Singer* and *Pease* (11), *Nashner* (3) discloses and proposes intensive professional monitoring of training programs. *Nashner* (3) indicates two generally accepted principles on training.

As one principle, *Nashner* (3) indicates, “It is generally accepted in the scientific literature pertaining to motor learning and skill acquisition that the number and

the intensity of practice repetitions of an exercise and the motivation of an individual performing the exercise substantially influence the speed at which a new skill is acquired and the eventual level of proficiency attained. Thus, individuals who exert higher levels of effort performing a training exercise as well as those who spend more time performing the exercise are likely to reach higher levels of proficiency more quickly compared to individuals expending less effort and time. This finding is easily extendable to many forms of training.”

Nashner (3) further indicates, “Another generally accepted principle in the scientific literature pertaining to motor learning and skill acquisition is that effective skill acquisition requires matching the exercise difficulty with the individual’s performance capabilities relative to the exercise. If the exercise is too difficult relative to a trainee’s performance capabilities, the trainee’s performance is poor, little if any reinforcing feedback is received, and relatively less is acquired in the way of a new skill. At the other extreme, if the training task is simple relative to the performance capabilities of the trainee, the accuracy of the trainee’s performance will be very high, but the trainee will lack sufficient challenge to acquire additional skill. Research studies indicate that skill acquisition is most effective when the exercise challenge enables the trainee to correctly perform approximately “one-half” of his attempts. The above principles of skill acquisition are understood in such diverse fields as sports training, musical performance, dance, high performance aircraft piloting, to

name a few. The clinical literature suggests that these same principles of skill acquisition pertain to patients attempting to re-learn or improve skills.”

And finally *Nashner* (3) further indicates, “A well accepted principle of education is that a trainee striving to achieve a clearly defined, objective goal while receiving periodic objective feedback relative to his progress is the best motivated. Anecdotally, this principle is demonstrated by the intensity at which children and adults perform computer-based video games. Motivation is further enhanced when the trainee knows in advance that the supervising trainer will also be receiving periodic feedback regarding progress relative to the prescribed goal.”

Returning to the trainee’s fun task of targeted flossing, after any attempt to simply slide and knockout any fast dissolving target and, preferably thereby, slide any underlying segment of shredproof floss of the current invention between contacting teeth, it is believed, for 39% of Americans who floss less than daily to 88% who floss less than daily or not at all yet, there remains the challenging task to daily and properly perform the remaining two steps of the targeted flossing procedure specified in the four steps indicated earlier on. However when this “knockout” floss or targeted floss ultimately becomes commercially available, it is believed dentists should have the opportunity to better assess, train, prescribe, monitor, analyze and adjust or redirect patient “homework” and a patient’s “dental-office-‘work’ ” if such work is ergonomically and psychologically first *redirected* to at least the first two steps of

the four steps of targeted flossing so that 39% to 88% of most of us can have a potentially far more favorable chance of daily and correctly performing approximately one-half of *any* of our attempts (3) but preferably more than one-half of our attempts of at least the much easier first two steps *en-route* to daily and correctly performing approximately one-half our attempts (3) to perform steps 3 and 4 described earlier.

That's because, to those 39% to 88% of us, the challenging if not currently daunting task of daily and proper flossing is not something that most of us, through a conscientiously applied program of regular professional care, have performed or have been able or willing to properly perform (6) approximately 50% of the time (3). Nor have most of us had access to technology to date that has supported improving our flossing regimen since the four steps of targeted flossing, plus this next generation of shredproof targeted floss itself that is an integral part thereof, have not ever before existed let alone imagined.

At this juncture it is believed imperative to reiterate that *Nashner* (3) indicates that in order for any new motor task acquisition to be most effective, we the user *must* be able to correctly perform the motor task approximately 50% of the time. To date, have those people who manufacture and market dental flosses plus dentists unknowingly or unintentionally overshoot or undershot that magic number of about 50% that is applicable in *any* field of training?

Yes, for “professional” flossing, dentists and hygienists virtually 100% of the time themselves reliably and professionally perform flossing with 18-24 inches of floss on a daily basis. However, that can lead to what are believed to be three outstanding rhetorical questions: If on average the number of attempts over time most of the rest of us are expected to daily and correctly perform targeted flossing are at least the easier and faster first two steps of the above four steps approximately 50% of the time (3), does that revised and improved total structure of targeted flossing begin to bode well for either the 39% of Americans who currently floss less than daily and/or the additional 49% who currently do not floss at all yet? Is such a fun, easier, faster and much more comfortable training floss targeted or at least guided (11) analogous to the “guides” (10, 11) of bicycle training wheels? Moreover, can there be any doubt most of us prefer an easier, faster and fun way if we need to somehow be better “guided” by something, someone or both to merely floss if not floss daily and properly?

It is believed achieving the various preventive dentistry goals in the last question probably involves at least some of the structure of the guidelines that *Leonard* and *Swap* (14) indicate. In their article entitled “**Deep Smarts**” Leonard and Swap refer to “guided practice, guided observation, guided problem-solving and guided experimentation” that follows any Plato-like question applicable to any field of endeavor. *Leonard* and *Swap* (14) further indicate this guided structure of deep smarts represents the advanced part of the process of “**active learning**”.

In summary, if virtually anyone is to genuinely be enabled to improve their flossing, what alternatives and *sustaining* technology generate fun from the likelihood of better *guiding* and targeting floss/ing?

Since targeted flossing involves targeting one or more knockouts, targeted floss generates fun and a psychological advantage. In an article entitled “The Power of Play” *Estroff Marano* (15) targets a choice that can be applied to the old and new rules of flossing. *Estroff Marano* does so by mentally flossing the unending new possibilities since the first half of targeted flossing or training to floss with targeted floss by targeting “(play) reveals what we choose to do, not what we have to do” (15) *per se*.

Therefore, author/inventor Leonard Lorch’s re-framed motto and *service mark* exclaims some of the *guided* “differential fitness” of the next generation of floss/ing: “it’s a loss not to floss *for fun now!*”

Figures

Figures 1 through 10 are incorporated herein by reference from the *companion* internet publication of author/inventor Leonard Lorch’s officially patent pending U.S. patent *application* entitled “Dental Floss” that can be readily searched and viewed on the internet on the U.S. Patent Office’s hereby linked website www.uspto.gov.

References

1. Christensen CM, Raynor ME. The Innovator's Solution(:) Creating And Sustaining Successful Growth. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2003: 81 - 95.

2. Lorch LG. Floss Employing Microporous Tapes Sandwiching Paste Dentifrice. In: Lorch LG (inventor). United States Patent 4776358, Washinton, DC: US PTO, 1988: columns 2 - 4.

3. Nashner LM. Monitoring Of Training Programs. In: Nashner LM (inventor). United States Patent 6632158, Washington, DC: US PTO, 2003: columns 2 - 13.

4. Baillie RL, Chastain JH, Dolan JW et. al. Dental Floss Having Low Density AND Method Of Making Same. In: Baillie et. al. (inventors). United States Patent 6539951, Washington, DC: US PTO, 2003: columns 1 - 13.

5. Roberts DL, Rosenblum DT and Curcio FB. The Dynamics of Dental Practice Administration. Flushing, N.Y., Medical Examination Publishing Co., 1977:11.

6. Radentz WH, Barnes GP, Carter HG et. al. An evaluation of two techniques of teaching proper dental flossing procedures. J. Periodont., 1973; 44: 177 - 182.

7. Dave VB. Monofilament Tape. In: DaveVB (inventor). United States Patent 6742528, Washington, DC: US PTO, 2004: column 1.

8. Wiersema L. Listerine might trump flossing in war against tooth decay. MorningNewsOnline.com 2004;
[http://www.morningnewsonline.com/servlet/satellite?pagename=FMN%2FmGArticle%2FFMN_BasicArticle&c=MGArticle&cid=1031776057536&path=.](http://www.morningnewsonline.com/servlet/satellite?pagename=FMN%2FmGArticle%2FFMN_BasicArticle&c=MGArticle&cid=1031776057536&path=)
9. Bunn ST. How to Floss. In: Bunn ST, DrBunn.com (DDS). Alexandria, USA: DrBunn, 2004: drbunn.com/flossing.htm.
10. Barton R, Diamond B. Evaluation of mechanized flossing device compared to hand held flossing. J. Dental Research 1980; 50(A): 537.
11. Singer RN, Pease D. Effect of guided vs. discovery learning strategies on initial motor task learning, transfer and retention. Research Quarterly 1978; 49(2): 206 - 217.
12. Lorch LG. Safeguarded Flossing Device. Quintessence Int 1981; 12(4): 415 – 417.
13. Lorch LG. Dental Flossing Device. In: Lorch LG (inventor). United States Patent 4162687, Washington, DC: US PTO, 1979: columns 3 - 6.
14. Leonard D, Swap W. Deep Smarts. Harvard Business Review 2004; 82(9): 88 - 97.

15. Estroff Marano H, The Power of Play. Psychology Today 1999; 32(4): 36-40, 68-69.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge a mentor early on, the now deceased Willard J. Tarbet, DDS, PhD, who was the Oral Care R& D Director of Richardson-Vicks six years before it was acquired in 1985 by Procter & Gamble.

The author also wishes to acknowledge his registered patent attorney, Donn K. Harms, of the American Patent & Trademark Law Center of Del Mar, California for filing on my behalf the patent application on the targeted floss invention. This patent application was filed by this American author, the “sole inventor” Leonard Lorch, who has no affiliation with any third party.

Procter & Gamble in the last quarter of 2003 purchased the “Glide” brand of shredproof ePTFE flosses from W. L. Gore & Associates. The author acknowledges W. L. Gore & Associates because up to that time Gore had further developed to the best of their abilities the shredproof ePTFE flossing substrate that the herein named author is originally and independently responsible for specifying in his U. S. Patent 4776358 . That patent contains the earliest filed specification of shredproof ePTFE dental flossing substrate among any patent in the world as first filed by this author on September 23, 1986. That specification of that patent indicated “(Gore’s GORETEX brand of) ePTFE weaving fiber” that

for a “dental floss” “demonstrates little or no fraying” for the first generation of shredproof flossing substrates under the old rules of flossing plus, now, the next generation of shredproof ePTFE floss too. This next generation is a *sustaining* innovation that applies the new rules of easier, faster and much more comfortable flossing with a fun target.

This author is grateful for the book *The Innovator's Solution(:) Creating And Sustaining Successful Growth* because that book, by Clayton M. Christensen and Michael E. Raynor, not only precipitated the herein named author's insight into the outstanding strategy of an “easier and faster” solution. Their book seems to invite people how to stop and rethink anything, for example, a “**huge market of non-consumption**” or a “**much more reliable predictor of success**” based on “**fit**” or “**circumstance-based segmentation**” that they do indeed go over in their book. Independently, the author/inventor Leonard Lorch acknowledges the intersection of such a fit with what the above book does not target per se, namely, the fit of a new invention's or new meme's “**differential fitness**”. The emerging science of memes alone may be cause for thinking if not critical thinking. It is further acknowledged that the author/inventor's article on the next generation of floss/ing *applies* practical scientific knowledge that guides and clarifies some of the *fit of the “differential fitness”* of the next generation of floss/ing. That seems to suggest a sea change for one of the *most avoided* and personally challenging *daily* jobs ever known to consumers, namely flossing. Thanks to the guidance in Christensen and Raynor's above book, they highlight their “**(Easy) Cram.com utility**”. Christensen and Raynor indicate that in the

“first year” that utility “would make it easier and cheaper for students to cram more effectively for their exams”. Serendipity has it that in a flash of insight for this author/inventor their (Easy)Cram.com example both precipitated and “**fit**” the author/inventor Leonard Lorch’s innovative insight into an “(Easy)Cram**Floss**” that, remarkably the *second time around* for shredproof ePTFE flosses that this author/inventor was originally responsible for, as *Christensen* and *Raynor* originally without italics indicated in “*the next year*, (Easy)Cram.com would need (to make the job of cramming) even easier and faster”. Believe it or not, it is a true story that the *fit* of those guidelines evolved into the author/inventor’s strategy of “*the next generation of easier, faster, much more comfortable and fun floss/ing*”. The last part of that inventor’s strategy emerged *immediately* after the marketing team at Procter & Gamble on December 22, 2003 “requested more information” from Leonard Lorch on his “EasyCram**Floss**” ---- and P&G’s request over the telephone was in the context of an immediately preceding baseline of P&G’s negative replies, in writing, to two other technologies that were presented in the few months immediately preceding P&G’s rather positive request. In the next telephone conversation later in January 2004 one of their corporate officers clarified P&G’s marketing team’s request for more information, but P&G’s officer in effect said that he “did *not* merely want what’s in (or applied from) a book” – a reference to and outstanding compliment for *Christensen* and *Raynor’s* seminal book acknowledged based on these circumstances.

After further reflecting on the steps of “active learning” indicated in the cited **Harvard Business Review** article by *Leonard* and *Swap*, the inventor Leonard Lorch acknowledges that if we substitute the word “play” for “experimentation” in *Leonard* and *Swap*’s illustration of for example the last step of “active learning” then another way of looking at “guided experimentation” could be “guided play” or “guided fun”.

It is further acknowledged that organizations including and not limited to Pfizer, Wm. Wrigley Jr. Company and well known others have fast dissolving oral care strips or edible films and edible film materials that are an integral part of the author/inventor’s functionally and *materially* associated target of *targeted* floss/ing because categorically, “it’s a loss not to floss *for fun now!*” {service mark of the author/inventor and innovator Leonard Lorch’s “solution” with a special tribute to *Christensen* and *Raynor*’s book **The Innovator’s Solution(:) Creating And Sustaining Successful Growth**}.

The author is also grateful to Ralan Wong, DDS, MS, Associate Professor, Department of Endodontics, University of Pacific, School of Dentistry. Dr. Wong read one of the final drafts of this article and encouraged the author to help *guide* visual learning, for example, with the author/inventor’s *preexisting* Figures 1 through 10 that are now incorporated herein by reference from the *companion* internet publication of author/inventor Leonard Lorch’s officially patent pending U.S. patent *application* entitled “Dental Floss” that can be readily

searched and viewed on the internet on the U.S. Patent Office's hereby linked website www.uspto.gov.

The author/inventor acknowledges a new and incipient meme's differential fitness of the likely next generation of floss/ing and/or floss training. Whatever the ultimate outcome is for the next generation of floss/ing, the author is grateful to readers practicing (professional) hand held flossing on a daily and proper basis notwithstanding the societal problem of daily non-compliance by most lay persons of such hand held ("professional") flossing. Since that non-compliance is hereby incipiently challenged, this situation may unexpectedly create unending new possibilities.