Journal of Advanced Medical and Dental Sciences Research
@Society of Scientific Research and Studies ***NLM ID:*** *101716117*

Journal home page: www.jamdsr.com doi: 10.21276/jamdsr Indian Citation Index (ICI) Index Copernicus value = 100

(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599; (p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

Original Research

Proactive Strategies for Preventing Periodontitis: Effectively Addressing and Managing Gingivitis

[1]Jaskirat Kaur, [2]Amanpreet Singh Mann

[1]Operations Supervisor, VHA Home Healthcare, Toronto, Canada **Email:** jaskirat1994@gmail.com;
[2]Dental Assistant **Email:** amanmann8881@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:
Periodontitis is a widespread and irreversible inflammatory condition that poses a significant public health challenge. More than 11% of adults suffer from severe periodontitis, a leading cause of tooth loss that adversely affects speech, nutrition, quality of life, and self-esteem. Additionally, it has systemic inflammatory consequences. Although preventable, effective treatment requires patients to make behavioral changes, addressing lifestyle risk factors such as smoking, and, crucially, maintaining high standards of daily plaque removal throughout their lives. While mechanical plaque removal remains fundamental for managing periodontal disease successfully, it's noteworthy that in high-risk patients, the threshold for plaque accumulation to trigger periodontitis appears to be low. Therefore, these individuals may benefit from adjunctive agents for the primary prevention of periodontitis.
Keywords: accumulation,periodontitis,plaque.

Received: 17 November, 2023 Accepted: 22 December, 2023

Corresponding author: Jaskirat Kaur, Operations Supervisor, VHA Home Healthcare, Toronto, Canada

This article may be cited as: Kaur J, Mann AS. Proactive Strategies for Preventing Periodontitis: Effectively Addressing and Managing Gingivitis. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2024;12(1):55-58.

INTRODUCTION

The objectives of this working group were to conduct a thorough examination of the evidence pertaining to the primary prevention of periodontitis by targeting gingivitis through four distinct approaches: 1) assessing the effectiveness of self-administered mechanical plaque control regimes; 2) evaluating the effectiveness of self-administered inter-dental mechanical plaque control; 3) appraising the effectiveness of adjunctive chemical plaque control; and 4) scrutinizing anti-inflammatory approaches, whether used alone or as adjuncts. The methodology employed involved two meta-reviews for the assessment of mechanical plaque removal and two traditional systematic reviews focusing on chemical plaque control and anti-inflammatory agents. These reviews served as the foundation for reaching a consensus within the working group.[1,2]Periodontitis, a pervasive and prevalent disease, casts its influence over more than half of the world's adult population, a prevalence that intensifies with advancing age. According to the comprehensive 2010 global burden of diseases study, severe periodontitis has solidified its position as the sixth most widespread human ailment, presenting with a standardized prevalence rate of 11.2%. Beyond being a noteworthy statistic, it stands out as a major culprit behind tooth loss, contributing significantly to oral health challenges.The ramifications of severe periodontitis extend far beyond the dental realm, reaching into the intricate fabric of individuals' lives. Its adverse effects touch upon the very foundations of oral health, impacting the quality of life, impinging on clear and effective speech, influencing nutritional patterns, denting confidence levels, and casting a shadow on overall well-being. However, its impact does not stop at the oral cavity; rather, it extends its reach into the broader landscape of health.One notable facet of this pervasive condition is its independent association with various systemic chronic inflammatory diseases.[3] This interconnection underscores the intricate relationship between oral health and overall bodily well-being. As a result, severe periodontitis transcends its designation as a mere dental concern, emerging as a significant public health challenge with implications that stretch across various domains of health and life. The imperative to address and mitigate the impact of severe periodontitis on individuals' health and the

broader public health landscape is underscored by its multifaceted consequences. The onset of periodontitis is influenced by a combination of genetic predisposition and various lifestyle factors, such as smoking, type 2 diabetes, nutrition, and psychological stress. Nevertheless, the primary and most critical risk factor for the development of periodontitis is the accumulation of a plaque biofilm both at and below the gingival margin. Within this biofilm, dysbiosis occurs, triggering an inappropriate and destructive host inflammatory immune response. Consequently, effective plaque removal and control emerge as fundamental components in preventing periodontal diseases.[4]V Recognizing the paramount importance of addressing gingival inflammation as a primary endpoint, there is a compelling need to systematically evaluate the literature pertaining to mechanical and chemical methods for controlling the plaque biofilm. This report reflects the collective consensus of Working Group 2 from the 11th European Workshop in Periodontology on the primary prevention of periodontitis. Its foundation lies substantially, although not exclusively, in four systematic analyses that delved into the available and published evidence regarding mechanical and chemical approaches to control gingival inflammation. Importantly, the scope of this report excludes considerations for patients currently experiencing periodontitis, focusing instead on individuals with and without a history of the condition.

What is the Safety and Efficacy of Available Self-administered Tooth Brushing Regimes for Mechanical Plaque Removal on Plaque and Gingivitis in Adults?

Longitudinal studies spanning six months, encompassing a total of eight trials, have indicated that a singular session of professional oral hygiene instruction yields a modest yet statistically significant reduction in both plaque and gingivitis. These studies demonstrate a noteworthy 6% decrease in bleeding scores. It is important to note, however, that a comprehensive analysis in the form of systematic reviews comparing the efficacy of professional oral hygiene instruction to a "no oral hygiene instruction" (negative) control, specifically concerning alterations in plaque and gingival indices, is lacking.[5]While the existing research establishes the positive impact of a one-time professional oral hygiene instruction session, there is a notable gap in understanding the comparative effectiveness against a scenario where no oral hygiene instruction is provided. This underscores the need for further investigation and systematic reviews to offer a comprehensive evaluation of the specific benefits derived from professional oral hygiene instruction.Additionally, the available evidence suggests that the effects of professional oral hygiene instruction can be further enhanced through reinforcement. This implies that ongoing support and guidance may contribute to sustained improvements in oral hygiene practices and associated outcomes. Further research exploring the extended impact of reinforced oral hygiene instruction could provide valuable insights into optimizing oral health education strategies.

To what extent does manual tooth brushing contribute to reducing gum inflammation and plaque, and how do various design elements influence its effectiveness?

Engaging in a singular session of manual tooth brushing yields a substantial reduction in plaque scores, averaging approximately 42% (weighted mean; with an index-specific range of 30–53%) from pre-brushing scores. Although meta-analyses do not currently provide data on the impact of manual tooth brushing specifically on gingival inflammation, individual studies suggest that diligent manual brushing does contribute to a reduction in gingival inflammation.[6,7] However, there is a recognized need for a precise effect estimate derived from a systematic appraisal of the existing scientific evidence concerning manual toothbrushes and their role in managing gingivitis. When considering various bristle designs, reductions in plaque scores from baseline are reported within the range of 24–47% for flat-trim bristle designs, 33–54% for multi-level bristles, and 39–61% for criss-cross designs. Notably, meta-analyses have yet to provide insights into inter-design differences in effectiveness, preventing definitive statements regarding the superiority of one bristle design over another.In essence, while the reduction in plaque scores post-manual tooth brushing is evident across different bristle designs, a comprehensive understanding of their respective impacts on gingival inflammation is still pending. Further systematic analysis and meta-analyses are crucial for offering a nuanced and evidence-based assessment of manual toothbrush effectiveness in managing both plaque and gingivitis.

Does power brushing surpass manual brushing in terms of effectiveness, as indicated by brushing models and home use studies, in reducing gum inflammation and plaque levels?

Controlled studies consistently show that power toothbrushes generate statistically significant improvements in both short-term (28 days to 3 months) and long-term (≥3 months) reductions in plaque indices compared to manual toothbrushes. The data indicate an 11% reduction in plaque indices in the short term and a notable 21% reduction in the long term with the use of power toothbrushes.[8] Similarly, these benefits extend to reductions in gingival inflammation, with a 6% decrease observed in short-term studies and an 11% reduction in long-term studies.It is worth noting that, intriguingly, these positive outcomes are observed even when the time allocated for both power and manual toothbrushing is identical in most studies.[9] This underscores the

efficacy of power toothbrushes in achieving superior plaque and gingival health outcomes compared to manual brushes within comparable time frames.However, despite these demonstrated benefits, the implications of these outcomes for long-term dental health remain somewhat unclear. Additional research may be needed to explore the sustained impact of power toothbrush use over extended periods and its potential contributions to overall dental health. Nonetheless, the consistent findings in favor of power toothbrushes in controlled studies emphasize their effectiveness in promoting oral hygiene.

Does power brushing surpass manual brushing in terms of effectiveness, as indicated by brushing models and home use studies, in reducing gum inflammation and plaque levels?

Maintaining optimal gingival health requires thorough interproximal cleaning, particularly for secondary prevention. Various tools are available for this purpose, encompassing inter-dental brushes (IDBs), floss, wood sticks, and oral irrigators.Studies indicate that the adjunctive use of inter-dental brushes (IDBs) provides a more robust reduction in plaque levels compared to relying solely on manual tooth brushing. This moderate evidence underscores the efficacy of IDBs as valuable aids in promoting comprehensive oral hygiene. However, the landscape is nuanced for other interproximal cleaning devices, revealing inconsistent or weak evidence for their adjunctive effects. For instance, flossing may lack efficacy, and there is a dearth of conclusive evidence from well-designed clinical investigations for the effectiveness of oral irrigators and wood sticks.Notably, even when employing IDBs, there is limited evidence suggesting a reduction in gingival inflammation. The intricacies of this phenomenon remain unclear, with potential contributing factors including limitations in the ability of commonly used gingival indices to accurately assess interproximal inflammation. Additionally, variations in outcome measures (whether focused on plaque or gingival inflammation) and differences in study designs contribute to the heterogeneity observed in research findings.[10]In essence, while the adjunctive use of IDBs stands out as more effective in plaque removal compared to manual tooth brushing alone, the evidence for the efficacy of other interproximal cleaning devices in reducing plaque or gingival inflammation remains variable. Further research efforts, coupled with the standardization of study methodologies, are imperative to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the comparative effectiveness of diverse interproximal cleaning methods in promoting optimal gingival health. Implementing effective oral hygiene practices is crucial for reducing plaque and gingivitis, and professional oral hygiene instruction (OHI) stands as a cornerstone in this endeavor. It is not only advisable but essential to reinforce OHI through continuous education, as this approach can yield additional benefits in sustaining optimal oral health over the long term. Both manual and power tooth brushing are endorsed as primary methods for plaque and gingivitis reduction, with the cumulative advantages of regular tooth brushing far outweighing any potential risks associated with these practices .In situations where targeted improvements in plaque control are necessary, the adoption of rechargeable power brushes is recommended, acknowledging their potential to enhance overall oral hygiene. When gingival inflammation is present, it becomes imperative to provide patients with professional instruction on inter-dental cleaning techniques, with a preference for inter-dental brushes (IDBs). In instances where IDBs may not be suitable for certain patients, clinicians are encouraged to suggest alternative inter-dental cleaning devices or methods based on individual needs and circumstances.Caution is warranted when recommending IDBs at healthy sites without evident attachment loss, as there is a risk of trauma. In such cases, the use of floss may be considered, with the understanding that professional instruction is vital to ensure optimal effectiveness and minimize the potential for trauma during use.For the treatment of gingivitis and cases where improvements in plaque control are required, the adjunctive use of anti-plaque chemical agents may be considered. While mouth rinses may offer greater efficacy in this context, it is important to emphasize that they should complement, not replace, mechanical oral hygiene practices. However, the cautious stance prevails in recommending local or systemic NSAIDs (nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) for controlling gingival inflammation at this time due to a lack of sufficient scientific evidence. This highlights the commitment to evidence-based practices in oral health recommendations, underscoring the importance of regular professional guidance and ongoing education to ensure the optimal oral hygiene and gingival health of individuals.[11]Systematic evaluation of toothbrush filament texture and arrangement is essential to understand their respective impacts on reducing plaque and gingivitis, as well as to identify potential causes of adverse events. Investigator-initiated studies that directly compare commercially available power toothbrushes are necessary to establish their relative effectiveness. Long-term randomized controlled trials (RCTs) extending beyond 12 months are crucial to evaluate the risk of gingival recession associated with tooth brushing practices.For inter-dental cleaning devices, particularly inter-dental brushes (IDBs), and other tools, RCTs stratified based on the presence or absence of inter-dental attachment loss are encouraged. It is important to ensure the adequacy of inter-dental space and appropriate brush sizes for effective evaluation.[12] The use of specific indices designed to assess the inter-dental zone for plaque and gingival inflammation is recommended. Standardization of plaque and gingival indices in RCTs assessing interproximal plaque and bleeding is

crucial. Utilizing the Wolffe plaque index for open inter-dental spaces and the Eastman inter-dental bleeding index for both open and closed inter-dental spaces is recommended. Furthermore, examiners must undergo training and calibration to ensure consistency and reliability in the evaluation process.Beyond traditional clinical measures, patient outcome measures should be incorporated into research, including assessments of compliance, manual dexterity, preference, and oral health-related quality of life.To enhance research transparency and minimize publication bias, studies on oral hygiene products should follow established guidelines, and study protocols should be registered in regulated databases.Future systematic reviews should delve into identifying factors contributing to observed heterogeneity in meta-analyses, shedding light on the variability in research outcomes.Direct comparisons through RCTs are needed to evaluate different delivery formats of active ingredients in oral hygiene products.For the potential use of systemic and local NSAIDs (nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in reducing gingival inflammation, RCTs are essential to comprehensively assess risks and benefits before making recommendations for clinical use. This cautious approach underscores the importance of evidence-based practices in dental care and patient well-being.

CONCLUSION

The available data strongly support the notion that professionally administered plaque control plays a significant role in improving gingival inflammation and reducing plaque scores. There is also evidence suggesting that reinforcing oral hygiene practices provides additional benefits in maintaining oral health.When it comes to toothbrushes, rechargeable power toothbrushes have been shown to offer small but statistically significant additional reductions in both gingival inflammation and plaque levels. Flossing, on the other hand, cannot be universally recommended except for specific sites of gingival and periodontal health where inter-dental brushes (IDBs) may not pass through the interproximal area without causing trauma. In most cases, IDBs emerge as the preferred device for interproximal plaque removal. The use of local or systemic anti-inflammatory agents for managing gingivitis lacks a robust evidence base, suggesting a need for further research in this area. However, it's important to note that the almost universal recommendation for all individuals to brush their teeth twice a day for at least 2 minutes remains a cornerstone of oral hygiene practices, supported by a wealth of evidence. This simple yet effective routine is a fundamental aspect of maintaining optimal oral health for people of all ages.

REFERENCES

1. Caton, J. G. & Polson, A. M. (1985) The interdental bleeding index: a simplified procedure for moni- toring gingival health. *The Compendium of Continuing Education in Dentistry* 88, 90–92.
2. Eichler, H.-G. (2010) *Addressing the efficacy-effectiveness gap. European Medicines Agency, science, medicines, health*. London: EMA.
3. Gandini, S., Negri, E., Boffetta, P., La Vecchia,C.& Boyle, P. (2012) Mouthwash and oral cancer risk – quantitative meta-analysis of epi- demiologic studies. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine* 19, 173–180.
4. Kassebaum, N. J., Bernab´e, E., Dahiya, M., Bhan- dari, B., Murray, C. J. L. &Marcenes, W. (2014) Global burden of severe periodontitis in 1990–2010: a systematic review and meta- regression. *Journal of Dental Research* 93, 1045– 1053.
5. Kinane, D. F. &Attstro€m, R. (2005) Advances in the pathogenesis of periodontitis. Group B con- sensusreport of the fifth European Workshop in Periodontology. *Journal of Clinical Periodon- tology*32(Suppl. 6), 130–131.
6. Petersen, P. E. & Ogawa, H. (2012) The global burden of periodontal disease: towards integra- tion with chronic disease prevention and con- trol. *Periodontology 2000* 60, 15–39.
7. Polak, D., Martin, C., Sanz, I., Beyth, N. & Shapira, L. (2015) Are anti-inflammatory agents efficient in treating gingivitis as solo or adjunct therapy? A systematic review *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, (in press).
8. Quigley, G. A. & Hein, J. W. (1962) Comparative cleansing efficiency of manual and power brushing. *Journal of the American Dental Asso- ciation*65, 26–29.
9. S€alzer, S., Dorfer, C., van der Weijden, F. & Slot,D. E. (2015) Efficacy of interdental mechanical plaque control in managing gingivitis - a meta- review. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, (in press).
10. Serrano, J., Escribano, M., Roldan, S., Martin,C. & Herrera, D. (2015) Efficacy of adjunctive chemical plaque control in managing gingivitis. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Periodontol*2015; 42 (Suppl. 16): S106–S138.
11. Van der Weijden, F. & Slot, G. E. (2015) Efficacy of homecare regimes for mechanical plaque removal in managing gingivitis – a meta-review. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, (in press).
12. Wolffe, G. N. (1976) An evaluation of proximal surface cleansing agents. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* 3, 148–156.