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

Evaluation of Antibiotics Efficacy in Maxillofacial Region Space Infections: An Original Research

[1]Vijay Paul Dsilva, [2]V Gopalakrishnan, [3]A Rashmi Pillai, [4]Sahil Mogla, [5]Harveen Kaur, [6]Ravinder Pal Singh Rana

[1]MDS, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgeon, Ahalia Hospital Mussafah, Abu Dhabi;
[2]Associate Professor, Army Dental Centre, Research and Referral, Delhi, India;
[3]MDS, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeon, Rashmis Dentofacial Multispeciality Centre, Kavanad, Kollam, Kerala, India;
[4]Consultant Prosthodontist and Implantologist, Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab, India;
[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Oral Medicine & Radiology, Dr Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India;
[6]Command Military Dental Centre, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT:
Objective: This original research aimed to evaluate the efficacy of antibiotics in the management of maxillofacial region space infections and to determine their impact on clinical outcomes and patient recovery. **Methods:** A prospective, randomized controlled trial was conducted at a tertiary maxillofacial surgery center. A total of 150 adult patients diagnosed with maxillofacial region space infections were enrolled in the study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups: Group A received a broad-spectrum antibiotic regimen, while Group B received a combination of targeted antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results. All patients were followed up for a period of 30 days, during which clinical parameters and laboratory investigations were recorded. **Results:** The study observed a significant reduction in infection severity and inflammation in both treatment groups. However, Group B, which received targeted antibiotics, demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in clinical outcomes compared to Group A ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, the duration of hospitalization was significantly shorter in Group B, indicating a more rapid recovery ($p < 0.001$). **Conclusion:** This original research demonstrates the efficacy of antibiotics in managing maxillofacial region space infections. The use of targeted antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results appears to be more effective in improving clinical outcomes and expediting patient recovery. These findings emphasize the importance of personalized antibiotic therapy in the management of maxillofacial infections, potentially reducing the risk of antibiotic resistance and optimizing patient care.
Keywords: Antibiotics, Efficacy, Maxillofacial region, Space infections, Clinical outcomes, Patient recovery, Targeted therapy, Antibiotic resistance, Randomized controlled trial.

Received: 11 May, 2023 Accepted: 17 June, 2023

Corresponding author: Vijay Paul Dsilva, MDS, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgeon, Ahalia Hospital Mussafah, Abu Dhabi

This article may be cited as: Dsilva VP, Gopalakrishnan V, Pillai AR, Mogla S, Kaur H, Rana RPS. Evaluation of Antibiotics Efficacy in Maxillofacial Region Space Infections: An Original Research. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2023;11(7):74-77.

INTRODUCTION

Maxillofacial region space infections, encompassing various deep neck infections, are potentially life-threatening conditions with a high risk of morbidity if not promptly and effectively managed[1]. These infections can arise from odontogenic, peritonsillar, or other head and neck sources, leading to the rapid spread of infection through fascial planes and anatomical spaces[2]. Early recognition and appropriate intervention are crucial to prevent the progression of these infections, which can extend into critical areas such as the mediastinum and intracranial space[3].

The cornerstone of treating maxillofacial region space infections includes a combination of surgical drainage and systemic antibiotics. While surgical intervention remains essential for the removal of the infectious source and to promote drainage, antibiotics play a

pivotal role in controlling systemic infection and reducing the risk of complications[4].

The efficacy of antibiotics in managing various types of infections is well-established. However, specific guidelines for antibiotic selection in maxillofacial region space infections are still a subject of debate. The choice of antibiotics should ideally be based on the identified pathogen and its sensitivity to antimicrobial agents. Nevertheless, the empirical use of broad-spectrum antibiotics is commonly employed in clinical practice due to the urgent nature of these infections and the need for immediate therapeutic intervention[2,5].

The emergence of antibiotic resistance further complicates the treatment of these infections, necessitating a more judicious and targeted approach to antibiotic therapy. Relying on empirical treatment alone may lead to unnecessary antibiotic exposure, potentially contributing to the development of resistant bacterial strains[3,6]. Therefore, an understanding of the specific pathogens responsible for maxillofacial region space infections and their susceptibility patterns is crucial for optimizing antibiotic therapy and improving patient outcomes.

To address this gap in knowledge, the present original research aims to comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of antibiotics in the management of maxillofacial region space infections. This study will compare the clinical outcomes and patient recovery rates between a group receiving broad-spectrum antibiotics and another group receiving targeted antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results.

By elucidating the effectiveness of targeted antibiotic therapy, this research seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations for the optimal management of maxillofacial region space infections, with the ultimate goal of improving patient outcomes and reducing the risk of antibiotic resistance.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design: This research utilized a prospective, randomized controlled trial design to evaluate the efficacy of antibiotics in managing maxillofacial region space infections.

Participants: A total of 150 adult patients diagnosed with maxillofacial region space infections were enrolled in the study. Patients were recruited from a tertiary maxillofacial surgery center. Inclusion criteria comprised individuals with confirmed maxillofacial region space infections based on clinical and radiographic findings. Patients who had received antibiotic treatment within the past 72 hours, exhibited severe systemic illness, or had known allergies to study antibiotics were excluded from the study.

Randomization and Blinding: The enrolled patients were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups using a computer-generated randomization sequence. Group A received a broad-spectrum antibiotic regimen, while Group B received a combination of targeted antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results. The allocation concealment ensured that neither the participants nor the investigators were aware of the treatment group assignment to minimize bias.

Intervention: Patients in Group A were administered a broad-spectrum antibiotic regimen, which included empiric antibiotics commonly prescribed for maxillofacial region space infections, such as amoxicillin-clavulanate or clindamycin. Patients in Group B received targeted antibiotic therapy based on culture and sensitivity results obtained from aspirated or drained specimens.

Data Collection: Baseline demographic information, medical history, and clinical parameters of all participants were recorded at the time of enrollment. Severity of infection, including the extent of facial swelling, trismus, and systemic signs, was assessed using standardized scales.

Outcome Measures: The primary outcome measures included the reduction in infection severity and inflammation, as well as the clinical resolution of maxillofacial region space infections. Secondary outcome measures included the duration of hospitalization and the occurrence of complications.

Follow-up: All patients were followed up for a period of 30 days after initiation of antibiotic treatment. During the follow-up period, clinical parameters, laboratory investigations, and adverse events were documented at scheduled intervals.

Statistical Analysis: Data analysis was conducted using appropriate statistical methods. The t-test and chi-square test were employed to compare continuous and categorical variables between the two treatment groups, respectively. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations: The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Ethics Committee of the participating center. Informed consent was obtained from all study participants before enrollment, ensuring their voluntary participation and privacy rights.

RESULTS

Table 1: Descriptive Details of Study Participants

	Group A (Broad-Spectrum)	Group B (Targeted)
Total Participants	75	75
Age (mean ±SD)	42.5 ±8.7	40.9 ±9.2
Gender (Male/Female)	40/35	38/37
Etiology - Odontogenic	52 (69.3%)	56 (74.7%)
- Peritonsillar	12 (16.0%)	10 (13.3%)

- Others	11 (14.7%)	9 (12.0%)
Initial Severity*	7.6 ±1.2	7.8 ±1.1
Complications**	10 (13.3%)	6 (8.0%)

*Severity assessed on a scale from 0 (mild) to 10 (severe).
**Number and percentage of patients with complications.

Table 1 presents descriptive details of the study participants, including their distribution among the two treatment groups. The mean age of participants in Group A was 42.5 years (SD ±8.7), and in Group B was 40.9 years (SD ±9.2). Both groups had a balanced gender distribution. The most common etiology of maxillofacial region space infections was odontogenic, accounting for 69.3% in Group A and 74.7% in Group B. Peritonsillar and other sources contributed to a smaller proportion of cases in both groups. The initial severity of infections was comparable between the groups, with mean scores of 7.6 ±1.2 in Group A and 7.8 ±1.1 in Group B. Complications were observed in 13.3% of patients in Group A and 8.0% in Group B.

Table 2: Inferential Statistics and Comparison of Outcome Measures

Outcome Measure	Group A (Broad-Spectrum)	Group B (Targeted)
Infection Severity (mean ±SD)	4.2 ±1.3*	3.1 ±1.0*
Duration of hospitalisation (days, mean ±SD)	6.8 ±1.7 †	4.5 ±1.2 †
Clinical Resolution (number and %)	65 (86.7%) ††	72 (96.0%) ††

*Significantly lower infection severity in Group B compared to Group A ($p < 0.001$).
†Significantly shorter duration of hospitalization in Group B compared to Group A ($p < 0.001$).
††Higher percentage of clinical resolution in Group B compared to Group A ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2 presents the inferential statistics and comparison of outcome measures between the two treatment groups. Group B, receiving targeted antibiotics, showed significantly lower infection severity with a mean score of 3.1 ±1.0, compared to Group A with a mean score of 4.2 ±1.3 ($p < 0.001$). The duration of hospitalization was significantly shorter in Group B (4.5 ±1.2 days) than in Group A (6.8 ±1.7 days) ($p < 0.001$), indicating a more rapid recovery in the targeted antibiotic group. Moreover, the percentage of patients with clinical resolution was higher in Group B (96.0%) than in Group A (86.7%) ($p < 0.05$).

The results of this study highlight the efficacy of targeted antibiotic therapy in managing maxillofacial region space infections. Group B, which received antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results, demonstrated significantly lower infection severity, a shorter duration of hospitalization, and a higher rate of clinical resolution compared to Group A, which received broad-spectrum antibiotics. These findings emphasize the importance of personalized antibiotic therapy in optimizing patient outcomes and supporting evidence-based recommendations for the management of maxillofacial region space infections.

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of antibiotics in managing maxillofacial region space infections, comparing the outcomes between a group receiving broad-spectrum antibiotics (Group A) and another group receiving targeted antibiotics based on culture and sensitivity results (Group B). The results of this research contribute valuable insights to the existing literature on the treatment of these potentially life-threatening infections.

The findings of this study align with previous research supporting the role of antibiotics in the management of maxillofacial region space infections. Benevides et al[1]. conducted a study examining the microbiological profile and clinical outcomes of odontogenic space infections and observed favorable results with antibiotic therapy. Similarly, Gupta et al[3]. conducted an 8-year analysis of cervicofacial necrotizing fasciitis cases and emphasized the importance of early intervention with antibiotics and surgical drainage to prevent complications. The current study reinforces the significance of antibiotic therapy as an integral component in the management of maxillofacial region space infections.

Table 1 provides a detailed demographic overview of the study participants. The age distribution and gender ratio were comparable between the two treatment groups, minimizing potential confounding factors. Moreover, the predominant etiology of maxillofacial region space infections in both groups was odontogenic, consistent with other studies reporting dental infections as a common source (Chang et al[2]., 2018).

In Table 2, the inferential statistics and comparison of outcome measures demonstrate notable advantages of targeted antibiotic therapy over broad-spectrum antibiotics. Group B exhibited significantly lower infection severity, indicating a more effective control of the infectious process. This finding is in line with the results presented by Chang et al[2]., who also reported a reduction in infection severity with antibiotic treatment. The shorter duration of hospitalization observed in Group B further reinforces the clinical benefits of targeted antibiotic therapy, facilitating quicker patient recovery.

The higher percentage of clinical resolution in Group B underscores the significance of tailored antibiotic interventions based on culture and sensitivity results. This result concurs with a study by Benevides et al[1]. and Liao, H. T et al[7]., which emphasized the relevance of microbiological evaluation in guiding appropriate antibiotic selection. Targeted antibiotic therapy minimizes the risk of unnecessary exposure to broad-spectrum agents, reducing the likelihood of antibiotic resistance development (Gupta et al[3]., Vila, P. M. et al[8].,)

Overall, the results of this study support the rationale for personalized antibiotic therapy in the management of maxillofacial region space infections. By identifying the specific pathogens and their susceptibility patterns, clinicians can make informed decisions regarding antibiotic selection, leading to improved patient outcomes and reduced complications.

However, this study has some limitations that warrant consideration. First, the sample size could be expanded to enhance statistical power and generalize the findings to a broader population. Additionally, the duration of follow-up was limited to 30 days, and longer-term outcomes could provide a more comprehensive assessment of treatment efficacy and potential complications.

In conclusion, this original research provides compelling evidence for the efficacy of targeted antibiotic therapy in the management of maxillofacial region space infections. The study supports previous literature on the importance of antibiotic treatment in controlling infection severity and promoting clinical resolution. By employing a tailored approach based on culture and sensitivity results, clinicians can optimize patient care and contribute to the global efforts to combat antibiotic resistance.

REFERENCES

1. Benevides MLS, Rôças IN, Santos, KRN, et al. (2019). Maxillofacial space infections of odontogenic origin: microbiological profile and its association with clinical outcomes. Journal of Endodontics, 45(11), 1329-1335.
2. Chang AY, Skladman R, Patel N, et al. (2018). The Use of Antibiotics in Odontogenic Space Infections. The Journal of emergency medicine, 54(4), 448-454.
3. Gupta A, Gujjar KR, Shah N, et al. (2020). Cervicofacial necrotizing fasciitis: An 8-year analysis of 67 patients with clinical features and outcomes. Oral Diseases, 26(7), 1419-1426.
4. Park, Y. K., Park, M. H., Chang, S. H., Kim, S. G., & Kim, J. W. (2017). Comparison of Penicillin, Clindamycin, and Metronidazole for the Treatment of Pericoronitis: A Randomized Double-Blind Clinical Trial. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, 75(6), 1222-1229. DOI: 10.1016/j.joms.2016.12.014
5. Shao, Y., Xu, F., Yang, X., et al. (2020). Microbiological profile and antibiotic susceptibility of severe odontogenic infections in a Chinese population. Journal of Oral Microbiology, 12(1), 1701788. DOI: 10.1080/20002297.2019.1701788
6. Yang, X., Shao, Y., Shi, Y., et al. (2021). Comparative study on the microbiological characteristics and resistance patterns in patients with odontogenic infections and non-odontogenic infections. BMC Oral Health, 21(1), 54. DOI: 10.1186/s12903-021-01464-1
7. Liao, H. T., Chen, W. H., Chen, Y. T., & Chen, C. T. (2021). Analysis of microbiological characteristics and antibiotic susceptibility patterns in patients with cervicofacial space infections of odontogenic origin. Journal of Dental Sciences, 16(4), 1077-1082. DOI: 10.1016/j.jds.2020.07.015
8. Vila, P. M., Leal, A. C., Vila, L. M., et al. (2018). A prospective study of 30, 533 odontogenic maxillofacial infections: bacteria isolated and antibiotic susceptibility. Brazilian Oral Research, 32, e17. DOI: 10.1590/1807-3107BOR-2018.vol32.0017