

1
2
3
4 **A regimen of systematic periodontal care after removal of impacted mandibular**
5
6
7 **third molars manages periodontal pockets associated with the mandibular**
8
9
10 **second molars**
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 W. Keung Leung, Esmonde F. Corbet, Kwok Wing Kan, Edward C.M. Lo, and Jerry

18
19
20 K.S. Liu

21
22
23 Faculty of Dentistry, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
24
25
26
27

28
29 Key words: extraction; impacted tooth; periodontal pocket; periodontitis; third
30
31
32 molar
33
34
35
36
37

38 Running title: debridement during 3rd molar removal
39
40
41
42
43

44 Address

45
46
47 W. Keung Leung

48
49
50 Faculty of Dentistry

51
52
53 The University of Hong Kong

54
55
56 Room 3B39

57
58
59 34 Hospital Road
60

Hong Kong SAR

China

Tel: +852 2859 0417

Fax: +852 2858 7874

e-mail: ewkleung@hkucc.hku.hk

Date of submission: November 22, 2004

Date of revision: January 26, 2005

1
2
3
4 *Leung WK , Corbet EF, Kan KW, Lo ECM, and Liu JKS. A regimen of systematic*
5
6
7 *periodontal care after removal of impacted mandibular third molars manages*
8
9
10 *periodontal pockets associated with the mandibular second molars J Clin Periodontol*
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 **Abstract**
18

19
20 **Aim:** This randomized, single-blinded control trial investigated the local effects of
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Aim: This randomized, single-blinded control trial investigated the local effects of periodontal care on mandibular second molar delivered during and after impacted third molar surgical extraction.

Method: 30 subjects (50% male, 32.1 ± 7.8 years) out of 35 enrolled, with a mesio-angular impacted mandibular third molar, having probing pocket depth (PPD) ≥ 5 mm at adjacent second molar distal, and crestal radio-lucency between the two teeth completed the study. Oral hygiene instruction, scaling and caries stabilization were performed before surgery. Controls (n = 16) had their third molar extracted followed by standard socket debridement. Test group subjects (n = 14) received the same treatment, except before wound closure the operator was informed of the group allocation and ultrasonic root debridement on the second molar was performed, followed by a 3-visit plaque control programme.

Results: 6-months post-extraction, statistically significantly ($P < 0.007$) better plaque control and shallower probing depths were observed at test second molars'

1
2
3
4 distal (%Plaque = 21; PPD = 3.2 ± 1.2 mm) than at control second molars (%Plaque =
5
6
7
8 88; PPD = 5.2 ± 0.7 mm).
9

10 **Conclusions:** The periodontal interventions investigated prevented residual pockets
11
12
13 on periodontally involved second molars 6-months after ipsilateral impacted
14
15
16
17 mandibular third molar removal.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Clinical Relevance:** Periodontal pockets persisting on mandibular second molars
36
37
38 after surgical removal of the ipsilateral impacted third molar are not uncommon. This
39
40
41 randomized controlled trial showed that a regimen of systematic periodontal care
42
43 including debridement, local antimicrobial use and plaque control for mandibular
44
45
46
47 second molars with distal crestal bone loss after third molar removal could manage
48
49
50
51 distal periodontal pockets. Dentists and oral surgeons should assess the periodontal
52
53
54 conditions of adjacent mandibular second molars (pockets, radiographic bone loss)
55
56
57 before third molar extraction and should scale/root plane affected second molars
58
59
60 during the surgery and arrange follow-up oral hygiene care.

1
2
3
4 Third molars, the last teeth to erupt into the human dental arch, are ranked the most
5
6 frequently impacted teeth of modern humans (Andreasen et al. 1997). Impacted
7
8 third molars have been shown to have a higher prevalence in Chinese populations than
9
10 has been reported for Caucasian populations (Chu et al. 2003, Quek et al. 2003).
11
12
13 Impacted third molars may contribute to various problems such as: pericoronitis
14
15 and/or oro-facial infection; caries, periodontitis and/or root resorption of the adjacent
16
17 tooth; cystic or neoplastic changes; orthodontic problems; prosthetic problems; or
18
19 even temporomandibular joint symptoms (National Institutes of Health 1980,
20
21 Knutsson et al. 1996, Nemcovsky et al. 1996, Worrall et al. 1998). Problems like
22
23 pericoronitis and consequent dento-alveolar infections can be managed by extraction
24
25 of the culprit third molar (Worrall et al. 1998). However, sometimes surgical
26
27 removal of the impacted tooth alone cannot rectify the pathology caused by its
28
29 impaction (Kugelberg et al. 1985). Studies in Caucasians have shown that following
30
31 surgical removal of impacted mandibular third molars residual periodontal and
32
33 intrabony defects may persist at the distal aspect of mandibular second molars (Ash et
34
35 al. 1962, Gröndahl & Lekholm 1973, Chin Quee et al. 1985, Marmary et al. 1985,
36
37 Kugelberg et al. 1985, Kugelberg 1990). A study of Chinese in Taiwan showed
38
39 periodontal breakdown detected on the distal surfaces of mandibular second molars
40
41 following surgical removal of the adjacent mandibular third molars in adult
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 periodontitis patients, although attributed to the surgery rather than the impaction and
5
6
7 the periodontitis (Peng et al. 2001). Furthermore, it was shown in an earlier study that
8
9
10 up to 67% of Hong Kong Chinese who had undergone surgical removal of
11
12
13 mesio-angularly impacted mandibular third molars exhibited probing pocket depth
14
15
16 (PPD) \geq 5 mm on the distal aspect of second molars, 6-36 months post extraction
17
18
19
20 (Kan et al. 2002).
21

22
23 The present study was a randomized controlled clinical trial which aimed at
24
25
26 studying the effects of intensive periodontal care on mandibular second molars that
27
28
29 exhibited signs of possible periodontal involvement at the time of surgical removal of
30
31
32 mandibular third molars with follow-up attention to oral hygiene of the site. The
33
34
35 null hypothesis was that the 6-month clinically assessed periodontal status of the
36
37
38 second mandibular molars of the test group subjects would be the same as those of the
39
40
41 control subjects who had not received particular periodontal attention during or after
42
43
44 similar third molar surgical removal.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Material and methods**

51 **Sample size determination**

52
53
54 The clinical trial targeted at subjects who had mesio-angularly impacted mandibular
55
56
57 third molars and pre-extraction crestal radio-lucency at the distal aspect of the
58
59
60

adjacent second molar (Kan et al. 2002). Sample size for the study was computed using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) (Z\alpha/2 + Z\beta)^2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}$$

where σ_1 is the standard deviation of PPD at distal aspect of the mandibular second molars in the control group after impacted mandibular third molar extraction

σ_2 is the standard deviation of PPD at distal aspect of the mandibular second molars in the test group after impacted mandibular third molar extraction

$Z\alpha/2 = 1.96$ if significant level is set a $\alpha = 0.05$

$Z\beta = 0.8416$ if the power of the test is set at 80%

μ_1 is the mean PPD at the distal aspect of the mandibular second molars in the control group after impacted mandibular third molar extraction

μ_2 is the mean PPD at the distal aspect of the mandibular second molars in the test group after impacted mandibular third molar extraction

According to our previous study, those subjects having crestal radio-lucency and mesio-angularly impacted mandibular third molars, a mean PPD of 7.1 ± 2.1 mm (mean \pm SD), range 4-11 mm (Kan et al. 2002) was found at the associated second

1
2
3
4 molars 6-36 months post third molar extraction. Based on the null hypothesis, the
5
6
7
8 treatment outcomes are assumed to be equal in every respect in both the test and
9
10
11 control groups (i.e. $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 2.1$ mm). Sample size required in the test and control
12
13
14 groups of this study thus depends on the difference in mean PPD at distal aspect of the
15
16
17 mandibular second molars between the test and control groups after the trial
18
19
20 intervention. According to previous reports regarding non-surgical or surgical
21
22
23 periodontal therapy, for pockets greater than 7 mm, a 2-3 mm mean PPD reduction
24
25
26 was usually reported (e.g. Ramfjord et al. 1987, Kaldahl et al. 1988). This
27
28
29 periodontal intervention study was planned to achieve 2 mm or more difference in
30
31
32 mean PPD at distal aspect of the mandibular second molars between the test and
33
34
35 control groups after impacted mandibular third molar extraction. According to the
36
37
38 above mathematical formula, 17 subjects in each group were required.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Patient selection and screening**

46
47
48 New patients attending the Reception Clinic of the Prince Philip Dental Hospital, The
49
50
51 University of Hong Kong, and satisfying the inclusion criteria were recruited by one
52
53
54 research group member (K.W.K.) to participate in the study. The target sample size
55
56
57 was at least 34 subjects. For inclusion, patients had to be free of systemic disease, not
58
59
60 undergoing orthodontic treatment, not having PPD > 5 mm (except at the mandibular

1
2
3
4 second molars so involved), and displaying the following oral features:

- 5
6
7
8 • Mandibular third molar - mesio-angular impaction, defined as a convergence
9
10 angle, towards the coronal aspect, between the long axes of the third and second
11
12 molars of $\geq 30^\circ$ (Kan et al. 2002); no signs of cystic/neoplastic change.
13
14
15
16 • Adjacent second molar - present and responsive to electric pulp test; positive
17
18 bleeding on probing (BOP) and PPD ≥ 5 mm at distal aspect; mobility \leq degree 1
19
20 (Parfitt 1960); no furcation involvement.
21
22
23
24 • Radiographic feature on the panoramic oral radiograph: crestal radio-lucency
25
26 (other than follicular space) between the second and third molars (Kan et al. 2002)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The target sample size was secured four months after the commencement of
36
37 recruitment. All studied mandibular third molars were treatment planned for surgical
38
39 extraction by dental surgeons in charge of the Reception Clinic who were unrelated to
40
41 the study.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Patient management and surgery**

51
52 The clinical study was carried out in the Periodontology Clinic, Faculty of Dentistry,
53
54 the University of Hong Kong. Oral hygiene instruction, scaling and caries
55
56 stabilization, if necessary, were completed before the surgical removal of the impacted
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 mandibular third molars. For each subject, only one impacted third molar, and its
5
6
7 adjacent second molar, was included in this study. For subjects with two eligible
8
9
10 mandibular third molars based on the criteria, a coin was tossed to select randomly
11
12
13 either the left or the right side to be included. The third molar that was not selected
14
15
16 for the study was surgically extracted at least 3 months before commencement of the
17
18
19 study. All deep caries lesions were treated, except those on the distal surface of the
20
21
22 study mandibular second molars, which were stabilized immediately after the surgical
23
24
25 procedures. One member of the research team (W.K.L.) checked the eligibility of all
26
27
28 subjects and that all necessary pre-operative preparations were carried out.
29
30
31 Receptionists of the Periodontology Clinic were then instructed to arrange the surgical
32
33
34 extraction appointment for all subjects within an 8-week period. At the appointment
35
36
37 for surgery, the attending dental surgery assistant, in the absence of the surgeon,
38
39
40 randomly allocated the subject into either the test (head) or the control (tail) group by
41
42
43 tossing a coin before the patient. The grouping result was entered into a standard
44
45
46 patient record form by the dental surgery assistant, which was then sealed inside an
47
48
49 envelope and immediately passed to W.K.L., who maintained the concealment of the
50
51
52 subjects' allocation until completion of the data collection. The surgeon was unaware
53
54
55 of the subject group allocation until the third molar extraction was completed. Then
56
57
58 the dental surgery assistant would inform him the patient's allocation. The subjects
59
60

1
2
3
4 and the surgeon were therefore aware of the patient allocation but both parties were
5
6
7 reminded not to disclose such information to any person.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 • Control Group:

15
16 The impacted mandibular third molar was extracted according to a conventional
17
18 surgical protocol (Howe 1985), i.e. standard three-sided buccal flap; buccal bone
19
20 gutter creation; tooth sectioning, if necessary; third molar elevation; surgical
21
22 wound debridement and closure with sutures. The sutures were removed one
23
24 week after the surgery. Patients were reminded to resume their regular oral
25
26 hygiene care except at the surgical wound region one day after the surgery. No
27
28 antibiotics were prescribed.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 • Test Group:

39
40 Impacted mandibular third molar was extracted as described above. However,
41
42 before suturing, the operator (K.W.K.) was informed of the patient's allocation to
43
44 the test group. According to the study protocol, the distal root surface of the
45
46 periodontally involved mandibular second molar adjacent to the extracted third
47
48 molar was subjected to ultrasonic root surface debridement (regular ultrasonic tip
49
50 in a standard handpiece fitted onto a Piezon Master 400, Electro-Medical
51
52 Systems, Switzerland). Post-extraction, the test group subjects were instructed
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to perform mouthrinsing with 10 ml 0.2% w/v chlorhexidine gluconate (Adams
5
6
7
8 Healthcare Ltd., Leeds, UK) twice daily, starting one day after the surgery, for 2
9
10 weeks. No antibiotics were prescribed. Sutures were removed one week after
11
12 the surgery and at that appointment the subjects were instructed to use 1%
13
14 chlorhexidine gel (Corsodyl Gel, Smithkline Beecham, UK) on a single-tufted
15
16
17 brush to clean the distal surface of the study mandibular second molar twice daily,
18
19
20 until the first recall at six weeks post-operation. The test group subjects were
21
22
23 recalled every 6 weeks (total 3 times) for focused oral hygiene instructions
24
25
26 targeting the distal aspect of the study mandibular second molar. They also
27
28
29 received debridement at that site, if clinical examination revealed plaque deposits.
30
31
32 At the first recall, the test subject also received tooth polishing to remove the
33
34
35 chlorhexidine staining, if any, on their teeth.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Caries, if any, on the distal surface of the study mandibular second molar was
45
46 removed during the surgery, and after tooth extraction, an amalgam or glass ionomer
47
48 restoration was inserted as appropriate. All clinical treatments were performed by a
49
50
51 single investigator (K.W.K.) who was not involved in the clinical data collection.
52
53
54 Any residual periodontal problems at the second molars detectable at the conclusion
55
56
57 of the study at six months, namely those in the control subjects and for second molars
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 adjacent to eligible third molars which had been extracted ahead of the study in
5
6
7 patients with bi-lateral clinically similar situations, were followed-up and appropriate
8
9
10 periodontal treatment was arranged and delivered without delay.
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Recall examination**

17
18
19 All patients were examined 6 months after the surgery by one independent examiner
20
21 (J.K.S.L.) who was blinded to the group assignment of the patients. The examiner
22
23 was well trained and had previously been involved for the same role in a related study
24
25
26 (Kan et al. 2002). A simple questionnaire was administered before the 6-month
27
28
29 examination to record any spontaneous, thermal or food related pain or discomfort
30
31
32 (secondary outcome) within the two-month period before the 6-month recall. A
33
34
35 manual constant pressure periodontal probe, the True Pressure Sensitive (TPS) probe
36
37
38 (Vivacare Schaan, Liechtenstein), made of a flexible plastic material, was used for
39
40
41 assessing the periodontal parameters. The following local periodontal parameters of
42
43
44 the test and control mandibular second molars were recorded at mesio-buccal,
45
46
47 mid-buccal, disto-buccal, mid-distal, disto-lingual, mid-lingual and mesio-lingual
48
49
50 surfaces: probing pocket depth (PPD, primary outcome); recession (Rec, primary
51
52
53 outcome); clinical attachment level (CAL, primary outcome); bleeding on probing
54
55
56 (BOP, secondary outcome); suppuration on probing (SOP, secondary outcome); and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 tooth mobility (secondary outcome). Local plaque control (primary outcome) of the
5
6
7 study tooth was recorded at mesio-buccal, buccal, distal and lingual surfaces in a
8
9
10 dichotomous fashion: i) plaque detectable by visual inspection and/or by collection
11
12
13 on the probe; and ii) no plaque detected visually or on the probe tip. One out of six
14
15
16 patients was randomly selected for a re-examination 30 minutes after the clinical
17
18
19 examination. Reproducibility of clinical assessments was assessed by calculating
20
21
22 the percentage agreement, or percentage agreement \pm 1 mm for PPD, Rec and CAL,
23
24
25
26 between the two sets of data.
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Ethics**

33
34
35 The research protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee, Faculty of Dentistry,
36
37
38 The University of Hong Kong. Written informed consent was obtained from all
39
40
41 participants before the commencement of the study.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data analysis**

49
50
51 Data analysis was carried out using the statistics software: SPSS (SPSS V.11.0,
52
53
54 Chicago, IL, USA). Standard descriptive statistics were used to summarize the
55
56
57 variables studied. Variations in demographic data, and smoking habit, between
58
59
60 control and test groups were assessed by unpaired t-tests with *P* value set at 0.05.

1
2
3
4 Differences in Plaque%, BOP%, SOP% between the control and test groups, at the
5
6
7 mandibular second molar, were assessed by Fisher Exact tests. For PPD, Rec and
8
9
10 CAL, the differences between the control and test groups were assessed by 2-sample
11
12
13 t-tests. To account for the possible error due to the use of multiple bi-variate
14
15
16 statistical tests on the same data set, the level of statistical significance was adjusted to
17
18
19
20 0.007.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Results**

27
28
29 35 subjects were enrolled and 30 of them completed the study (Fig. 1). Two and
30
31
32 three subjects in control and test group respectively were lost to follow up. One
33
34
35 subject from test group emigrated to a foreign country. Two each from both groups
36
37
38 could no longer attend the scheduled recalls due to contemporaneous conflict with
39
40
41 their job time-tables (Fig. 1). All participants completing the study were Chinese, aged
42
43
44 18-52 years. Half of them were men and 30% were smokers. Their demographic
45
46
47 background and clinical parameters on recruitment are shown in Table 1. There
48
49
50 were 16 subjects in the control group and 14 subjects in the test group. One control
51
52
53 and two test subjects had two impacted third molars and hence one of the teeth was
54
55
56 randomly selected to be extracted before the commencement of the study. Except
57
58
59 that test group subjects were older than the controls ($P = 0.014$), other demographic
60

1
2
3
4 background, smoking habits and clinical parameters were similar among the two
5
6
7 groups. All studied mandibular second molars had PPD \geq 5 mm with positive BOP
8
9
10 pre-operation at the disto-buccal and/or disto-lingual site(s). Because the impacted
11
12
13 mandibular third molar crown may have hindered the accurate measurement of the
14
15
16 PPD and CAL prior to extraction, the pre-extraction data **were** not compared to the
17
18
19 data collected at the 6-month post-extraction recall.
20
21

22
23 The periodontal conditions of the study mandibular second molars at the 6-month
24
25 recall are shown in Table 2. Mean PPD at the mid-distal aspect of the test second
26
27
28 molars was significantly less than that of the control second molars. Multiple linear
29
30
31 regression analysis was performed with mean PPD at mid-distal of the studied second
32
33
34 molar at six months as the dependent variable and all other variables recorded as
35
36
37 independent variables, including group assignment, smoking and distal caries lesion
38
39
40 of the second molar. The only variable which was retained in the final regression
41
42
43 model was subject group assignment, indicating that the other features did not have
44
45
46 any statistically significant influence on the mid-distal PPD of second molars after six
47
48
49 months. Four (29%) of the test second molars and five (31%) of the control second
50
51
52 molars exhibited Grade 1 mobility and none exhibited mobility greater than Grade 1.
53
54
55 The percentage agreement of the duplicate examinations on mobility and BOP% of
56
57
58 the study teeth was 80%, and 66%, respectively. The percentage agreement \pm 1mm
59
60

1
2
3
4 for PPD, Rec and CAL measurements of the second molars were 100%.
5
6

7 Overall, a statistically significantly ($P = 0.045$, Fisher exact test) higher
8 percentage of control group subjects ($n = 8$, 50%) than test group subjects ($n = 2$,
9 14%), reported having pain or discomfort of any kind within the two months
10 preceding the 6-month recall.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 19 20 21 22 23 **Discussion**

24
25 The present study investigated the effect of intensive periodontal care on
26 periodontally involved mandibular second molars, the periodontal involvement being
27 indicated by the distal crestal radio-lucency on the panoramic oral radiograph, during
28 and after surgical extraction of ipsilateral mesio-angularly impacted third molars. A
29 previous cross-sectional study in the same population had shown that periodontal
30 pockets persisting on mandibular second molars after surgical extraction of the
31 adjacent third molars was not uncommon (Kan *et al.* 2002). Early studies of mostly
32 non-periodontally involved second molars concluded that the periodontal status of the
33 second molar was unaffected by the scaling and 'root planing' of the second molar at
34 the time of third molar removal (Ash *et al.* 1962, Osborne *et al.* 1982). Nonetheless,
35 publications on the periodontal implications of third molars have advocated that
36 scaling/root planing of the second molar should be part of the management (Corn &
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Marks 1969, Groves & Moore 1970). One short-term (2 months) study showed that
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Marks 1969, Groves & Moore 1970). One short-term (2 months) study showed that mechanical periodontal treatment of mandibular second molars, not all of which were periodontally involved, at the time of forceps extraction of adjacent third molars, resulted in better periodontal conditions on the scaled/root planed second molars compared to control second molars (Ferreira et al. 1997). The present study focused on studying the effects of periodontal interventions on periodontally involved mandibular second molars after third molar surgical extraction. These second molars run a high risk of having persistent residual periodontal defects at mid-distal site, as shown in the current study's control group at six months post-extraction and from a survey conducted earlier by the current research group (Kan et al. 2002). The subjects recruited for this study were not significantly affected by periodontitis, except for the mandibular second molar of concern. The reason for this decision on the study design was so that it can be recognized that localized periodontal defects can be associated with mesio-angularly impacted mandibular third molars in mouths otherwise generally free of periodontitis.

The present clinical trial planned to recruit at least 17 subjects from each group. Due to drop-out, only 16 and 14 subjects were available from the control and test groups respectively for recall at 6 months. Nevertheless, the test second molars' mid-distal PPD measurements observed among the two groups at six months were

1
2
3
4 found to be significantly different, indicating more favourable periodontal healing
5
6 responses in the test group. The periodontal therapy at and after impacted third molar
7
8 surgical removal in the test group resulted in statistically significantly shallower PPDs
9
10 at the mid-distal of second molars in the test group than in the control group. Test
11
12 group second molars also exhibited greater Rec and had better CAL than controls,
13
14 both favouring test second molars and both contributing to the statistical significance
15
16 of the PPD difference at the mid-distal. Perhaps a larger sample size would have
17
18 allowed these differences in Rec and CAL to reach statistical significance.
19
20 Nevertheless, the periodontal care provided in the test group was successful in
21
22 improving the oral hygiene around the second molar of interest and hence
23
24 significantly prevented the establishment of residual periodontal pockets at the distal
25
26 aspect of the second molar tooth.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Prior to the present study there had not been published a randomized controlled
42
43 study on the impact of periodontal interventions on second molars having
44
45 pre-extraction characteristics shown to be associated with persistence of periodontal
46
47 pockets after third molar removal, and indicative of periodontal involvement of the
48
49 second molar, e.g. crestal radio-lucency at the distal aspect of the second molar
50
51 (Kugelberg et al. 1991, Kan et al. 2002). While extraction of the third molar adjacent
52
53 to the periodontally involved second molar, the periodontal involvement being
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 indicated by the distal crestal radio-lucency, would be expected by itself to favorably
5
6
7 impact on the periodontal condition of the second molar (Grassi et al. 1987), the
8
9
10 present study has clearly demonstrated the additional benefits to periodontally
11
12
13 involved second molars through the completion of root surface debridement at the
14
15
16 time of surgical extraction of mesio-angularly impacted third molars, followed by
17
18
19 specific attention to the oral hygiene of the site. Such a simple approach to the
20
21
22 management of defects at the distal aspect of mandibular second molars may obviate
23
24
25 the need for complex regenerative therapies, shown to have some effectiveness in this
26
27
28 situation (Pecora et al. 1993, Oxford et al. 1997, Karapataki et al. 2000).
29
30
31

32 While an intra-individual study design would have excluded the influence of
33
34 patient specific characteristics, a previous study (Kan et al. 2002) suggested that the
35
36 recruitment into a study of patients with bi-lateral similarly impacted third molars
37
38 associated with bi-lateral second molars displaying a distal crestal radio-lucency,
39
40
41 without significant periodontitis on other teeth, would be a long drawn-out process
42
43
44 given the population at hand, despite the high prevalence of impacted teeth (Chu et al.
45
46
47 2003). This study adopted a parallel group study design and allocated subjects
48
49
50 randomly into the test and control groups. The only statistically significant difference
51
52
53 in demographic background between the two groups is that the test group subjects
54
55
56 were older. This characteristic of the test subjects fortuitously accords with a patient
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 characteristic shown to be associated with residual distal periodontal defects after
5
6
7 third molar extraction (Kugelberg 1991), which the procedures applied to test subjects
8
9
10 specifically sought to address. The operator did not know of the subject allocation to
11
12
13 the test group until the third molar had been successfully removed, so the surgical
14
15
16 protocol, apart from the root surface debridement at its conclusion, was unaffected by
17
18
19 the assignment. Various studies have investigated the effect of flap design and
20
21
22 manipulation in the management of aspects of periodontal complications of
23
24
25 mandibular third molar extraction (Groves & Moore 1970, Woolf et al. 1978,
26
27
28 Stephens et al. 1983, Schofield et al. 1988, Motamedi 1999 & 2000, Rosa et al. 2002,
29
30
31 Suarez-Cunqueiro et al. 2003). Most of these studies were on second molars without
32
33
34 obvious periodontal involvement at the outset, so perhaps unsurprisingly no approach
35
36
37 has been shown to be superior, and hence a standard buccal flap was raised in this
38
39
40 study. Bone guttering around the impacted third molar was performed, taking care
41
42
43 not to remove bone from around the second molar. A recent study, which did not
44
45
46 employ any periodontal interventions, has shown that disto-lingual bone removal from
47
48
49 impacted mandibular third molars being surgically extracted resulted in better
50
51
52 periodontal healing on mandibular second molars following third molar extraction
53
54
55 compared to disto-buccal bone removal and tooth division, a similar approach to that
56
57
58 employed in the present study (Chang et al. 2004). Antibiotics were not prescribed,
59
60

1
2
3
4 as only mechanical interference, versus non-interference, with plaque bacteria was
5
6
7 being tested; but post-operative prophylactic antibiotics in third molar surgery have
8
9
10 been shown not to prevent the inflammatory complications following surgery for
11
12
13 which such antibiotics are usually prophylactically prescribed (Poeschl et al. 2004).
14
15

16
17 A study investigating the effect of twice daily 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate
18
19 mouthrinse on periodontal healing at sites next to simple extraction sockets
20
21 demonstrated that the chemical therapy provided benefit one-month post extraction
22
23 (Brägger et al. 1994, Lang et al. 1994). The one-month mouthrinse therapy, in
24
25
26 addition to the regular concurrent non-surgical periodontal therapy, appeared to assist
27
28
29 healing in the alveolar bone at six month post-extraction. Except suppression of BOP
30
31
32 in test sites, no significant benefit on periodontal healing was observed 6 months post
33
34
35 operation with or without 0.12% chlorhexidine mouthrinse. The current test subjects
36
37
38 practiced 2 weeks of 0.2% chlorhexidine gluconate twice daily mouthrinses followed
39
40
41 by 4 weeks 1% chlorhexidine gel usage daily at the test second molar. In strict sense,
42
43
44 the current study could not be compared to that of Brägger and co-workers (Brägger
45
46
47 et al. 1994, Lang et al. 1994) for their study categorically excluded surgical
48
49
50 extractions, especially of mandibular third molars. Nevertheless, from both studies,
51
52
53 BOP of the test sites was similarly suppressed, indicating that the influence of the
54
55
56 1-1.5 month application of topical chlorhexidine could be noted until 6 months
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 post-extraction, supporting our current rationale of using the agent in augmenting the
5
6
7 effects of the periodontal debridement and mechanical plaque control.
8
9

10 The crown of the mesio-angularly impacted third molar often interferes with
11
12 registering pre-extraction pocket depth. Hence no comparisons were made between
13
14 pre-extraction and post-extraction measurements. The outcome measure was the
15
16 periodontal status of the second molar six months after extraction and these
17
18 measurements were taken by a recorder unaware of the patient assignment. Six
19
20 months was the ethical limit of this study, as treatment of residual periodontal defects
21
22 on control second molars and second molars adjacent to third molars extracted ahead
23
24 of the study, due to bi-lateral similarly impacted third molars and affected second
25
26 molars, required immediate periodontal intervention.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Only a small proportion of Norwegian adults (0.3%) who had surgical removal
39
40 of impacted third molars 4-6 years beforehand, reported chronic pain associated with
41
42 periodontal problem at the related second molar (Berge 2002), indicating that residual
43
44 periodontal problems at mandibular second molars after removal of associated
45
46 impacted third molars can remain relatively silent. Despite pain or discomfort being
47
48 felt by 8 control and 2 test subjects within two months preceding the 6-month recall in
49
50 the present study, the pain/discomfort appeared not severe enough to trigger the
51
52 subjects to contact the research group for early review, or to seek dental care from
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 others. Ash et al. (1962) reported 26% of American subjects experienced pain and
5
6
7 discomfort on ipsilateral mandibular second molars one year after the third molar
8
9
10 removal. A similar 36% incidence of discomfort was reported in a group of Hong
11
12
13 Kong adults who had undergone third molar extraction within the previous 6-36
14
15
16 months (Kan et al. 2002), which compares with an incidence of discomfort of 50%
17
18
19
20 within 4-6 months post-extraction in the control subjects of the present study.
21

22
23 In conclusion, within the limitations of the current study, careful root
24
25
26 surface debridement, at the time of surgical extraction of mesio-angularly impacted
27
28
29 third molars, of the adjacent second molar which exhibited distal crestal radio-lucency
30
31
32 suggestive of periodontal involvement, and a focused follow-up plaque control
33
34
35 programme was found to reduce significantly the probing depth at the distal aspect of
36
37
38 the second molar.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Andreasen, J.O., Peterisen, J.K. & Laskin, D.M. (1997) *Textbook and colour atlas of tooth impactions*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Ash, M.M. Costich, E.R. & Hayward, J.R. (1962) A study of periodontal hazards of third molars. *Journal of Periodontology* **33**, 209-219.
- Berge, T.I. (2002) Incidence of chronic neuropathic pain subsequent to surgical removal of impacted third molars. *Acta Odontologica Scandinavica* **60**, 108-112.
- Brägger, U., Schild, U. & Lang, N. P. (1994) Effect of chlorhexidine (0.12%) rinses on periodontal tissue healing after tooth extraction. (II). Radiographic parameters. *J Clin Periodontol* **21**, 422-430.
- Chang, H.-H., Lee, J.-J., Kok, S.-H. & Yang, P.-J. (2004) Periodontal healing after mandibular third molar surgery - A comparison of distolingual alveolectomy and tooth division techniques. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* **33**, 32-37.
- Chin Quee, T.A., Gosselin, D., Millar, E.P. & Stamm, J.W. (1985) Surgical removal of the fully impacted mandibular third molar. The influence of flap design and alveolar bone height on the periodontal status of the second molar. *Journal of Periodontology* **56**, 625-630.

- 1
2
3
4 Chu, F.C., Li, T.K., Lui, V.K., Newsome, P.R., Chow, R.L., & Cheung, L.K. (2003)
5
6
7 Prevalence of impacted teeth and associated pathologies--a radiographic study
8
9
10 of the Hong Kong Chinese population. *Hong Kong Medical Journal* **9**, 158-163.
11
12
13
14 Corn, H & Marks, M.H. Strategic extractions in periodontal therapy. *Dental Clinics*
15
16
17 *of North America* **13**, 817-843
18
19
20 Ferreira, C.E., Grossi, S.G., Novaes Junior, A.B., Dunford, R.G., & Feres-Filho, E.J.
21
22
23 (1997) Effect of mechanical treatment on healing after third molar extraction.
24
25
26 *International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry* **17**, 250-259.
27
28
29 Grassi, M., Tellenbach, R. & Lang, N.P. (1987) Periodontal conditions of teeth
30
31
32 adjacent to extraction sites. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **14**, 334-339.
33
34
35 Gröndahl, H.G. & Lekholm, U. (1973) Influence of mandibular third molars on related
36
37
38 supporting tissues. *International Journal of Oral Surgery* **2**, 137-142.
39
40
41 Groves, B.J. & Moore, J.R. (1970) The periodontal implications of flap design in
42
43
44 lower third molar extractions. *Dental Practice Dental Record* **20**, 297-304.
45
46
47 Howe, G.L. (1985) *Minor Oral Surgery*, 3rd edn. London: Wright.
48
49
50
51 Kan, K.W., Liu, J.K.S., Lo, E.C.M., Corbet, E.F., & Leung, W.K. (2002) Residual
52
53
54 periodontal defects distal to the mandibular second molar 6-36 months after
55
56
57 impacted third molar extraction. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **29**,
58
59
60 1004-1011.

1
2
3
4 Kaldahl, W.B., Kalkwarf, K.L., Patil, K.D., Dyer, J.K., Bates, R.E. Jr. (1988)

5
6
7 Evaluation of four modalities of periodontal therapy. Mean probing depth,
8
9
10 probing attachment level and recession changes. *Journal of Periodontology* **59**;
11
12
13 783-793.
14

15
16 Karapataki, S., Hugoson, A. & Kugelberg, C.F. (2000) Healing following GTR

17
18
19 treatment of bone defects distal to mandibular 2nd molars after surgical removal
20
21
22 of impacted 3rd molars. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **27**, 325-332.
23
24

25
26 Knutsson, K., Brehmer, B., Lysell, L. & Rohlin M. (1996) Pathoses associated with

27
28
29 mandibular third molars subjected to removal. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine*
30
31
32 *Oral Pathology Oral Radiology Endodontics* **82**, 10-17.
33
34

35
36 Kugelberg, C.F., Ahlstrom, U., Ericson, S. & Hugoson A. (1985) Periodontal healing

37
38
39 after impacted lower third molar surgery. A retrospective study. *International*
40
41
42 *Journal of Oral Surgery* **14**, 29-40.
43

44
45 Kugelberg, C.F. (1990) Periodontal healing two and four years after impacted lower

46
47
48 third molar surgery. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*
49
50
51 **19**, 341-345.
52

53
54 Kugelberg, C.F., Ahlstrom, U., Ericson, S., Hugoson, A. & Thilander, H. (1991) The

55
56
57 influence of anatomical, pathophysiological and other factors on periodontal
58
59
60 healing after impacted lower third molar surgery. A multiple regression analysis.

1
2
3
4 *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **18**, 37-43.

5
6
7 Lang, N. P., Schild, U. & Brägger, U. (1994) Effect of chlorhexidine (0.12%) rinses
8 on periodontal tissue healing after tooth extraction. (I). Clinical parameters. *J*
9
10 on periodontal tissue healing after tooth extraction. (I). Clinical parameters. *J*
11
12
13 *Clin Periodontol* **21**, 415-421.

14
15
16 Marmary, Y., Brayer, L., Tzukert, A., & Feller, L. (1986) Alveolar bone repair
17 following extraction of impacted mandibular third molars. *Oral Surgery Oral*
18
19 *Medicine & Oral Pathology* **61**, 324-326.

20
21
22 Motamedi, M.H. (1999) Preventing periodontal pocket formation after removal of an
23 impacted mandibular third molar. *Journal of the American Dental Association*
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 **130**, 1482-1484.

34
35 Motamedi, M.H. (2000) A technique to manage gingival complications of third molar
36 surgery. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology*
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 *Endodontics* **90**, 140-143.

44
45 National Institutes of Health (1980) NIH consensus development conference for
46 removal of third molars. *Journal of Oral Surgery* **38**, 235-236.

47
48
49
50 Nemcovsky, C.E., Libfeld, H., & Zubery Y. (1996) Effect of non-erupted 3rd molars
51 on distal roots and supporting structures of approximal teeth. A radiographic
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 survey of 202 cases. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **23**, 810-815.

Oxford, G.E., Quintero, G., Stuller, C.B. & Gher, M.E. (1997) Treatment of 3rd

1
2
3
4 molar-induced periodontal defects with guided tissue regeneration. *Journal of*
5
6
7
8 *Clinical Periodontology* **24**, 464-469.

9
10 Osborne, W.H., Snyder, A.J. & Tempel, T.R. (1982) Attachment levels and crevicular
11
12 depths at the distal of mandibular second molars following removal of adjacent
13
14
15
16
17 third molars. *Journal of Periodontology* **53**, 93-95.

18
19
20 Parfitt, G.J. (1960) Measurement of the physiological mobility of individual teeth in
21
22 an axial direction. *Journal of Dental Research* **39**, 608-618.

23
24
25
26 Pecora, G., Celletti, R., Davarpanah, M., Covani, U. & Etienne, D. (1993) The effects
27
28
29 of guided tissue regeneration on healing after impacted mandibular 3rd-molar
30
31
32 surgery: 1 year results. *International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative*
33
34
35 *Dentistry* **13**, 397-407.

36
37
38 Peng, K.Y., Tseng, Y.C., Shen, E.C., Chiu, S.C., Fu, E. & Huang, Y.W. (2001)
39
40
41 Mandibular second molar periodontal status after third molar extraction.
42
43
44
45 *Journal of Periodontology* **72**, 1647-1651.

46
47
48 Poeschl, P.W., Eckel, D. & Poeschl, E. (2004) Postoperative prophylactic antibiotic
49
50
51 treatment in third molar surgery – a necessity? *Journal of Oral and*
52
53
54 *Maxillofacial Surgery* **62**, 3-9.

55
56
57 Quek, S.L., Tay, C.K., Tay, K.H., Toh, S.L. & Lim, K.C. (2003) Pattern of third molar
58
59
60 impaction in a Singapore Chinese population: a retrospective radiographic

1
2
3
4 survey. *International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery* **32**, 548-552.

7
8 Ramfjord, S.P., Caffesse, R.G., Morrison, E.C., Hill, R.W., Kerry, G.J., Appleberry,
9
10 E.A., Nissle, R.R., Stults, D.L. (1987) 4 modalities of periodontal treatment
11
12 compared over 5 years. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **14**; 445-452.

16
17 Rosa, A.L., Carneiro, M.G., Lavrador, M.A. & Novaes, A.B. Jr. (2002) Influence of
18
19 flap design on periodontal healing of second molars after extraction of impacted
20
21 mandibular third molars. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral*
22
23 *Radiology Endodontics* **93**, 404-407.

27
28 Schofield, I.D., Kogon, S.L. & Donner, A. (1988) Long-term comparison of two
29
30 surgical flap designs for third molar surgery on the health of the periodontal
31
32 tissue of the second molar tooth. *Journal of the Canadian Dental Association* **54**,
33
34 689-691.

37
38 Stephens, R.J., App, G.R. & Foreman, D.W. (1983) Periodontal evaluation of two
39
40 mucoperiosteal flaps used in removing impacted mandibular third molars.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 *Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery* **41**, 719-724.

50
51 Suarez-Cunqueiro, M.M., Gutwald, R., Reichman, J., Otero-Cepeda, X.L. &
52
53 Schmelzeisen, R. (2003) Marginal flap versus paramarginal flap in impacted
54
55 third molar surgery: a prospective study. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral*
56
57
58
59
60 *Pathology Oral Radiology Endodontics* **95**, 403-408.

1
2
3
4 Woolf, R.H., Malmquist, J.P. & Wright, W.H. (1978) Third molar extractions:
5
6
7 periodontal implications of two flap designs. *General Dentistry* **26**, 52-56.
8
9

10 Worrall SF, Riden K, Haskell R, Corrigan AM. (1998) UK National Third Molar
11
12 project: the initial report. *The British Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery*
13
14
15
16
17 **36**, 14-18.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Legend
8
9

10 *Fig. 1.* CONSORT diagram showing the flow of participants through each stage of the
11
12
13
14 randomized trial.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. Subjects' demographic background, smoking habit and clinical parameters at recruitment.

	Control Group (n =16)	Test Group (n =14)
Age ^a (year, mean \pm SD)	28.9 \pm 7.3	35.7 \pm 6.8
% male	63	36
% smoker	38	22
<u>Clinical data</u>		
No. of teeth ^b	28.8 \pm 1.5	28.1 \pm 1.7
% BOP	50.2 \pm 24.0	35.6 \pm 23.2
% Pocket 4-5mm ^c	1.5 \pm 2.3	1.2 \pm 2.3
<u>Study mandibular second molars</u>		
% left side	38	57
% with distal caries lesion	56	21
Mean PPD (mm)		
DB	6.5 \pm 1.5	6.1 \pm 1.4
DL	5.6 \pm 1.8	5.6 \pm 2.2

^aStatistically significant difference between the Test and Control Groups, $P = 0.014$, unpaired t-test

^bexcept impacted mandibular third molar(s)

^cexcept impacted mandibular third molar and associated second molar

Table 2. Periodontal conditions of the mandibular second molars at the 6-month recall.

Surface	PPD ^a (mm)		Rec ^a (mm)		CAL ^a (mm)		% of subjects with					
	Control	Test	Control	Test	Control	Test	BOP		SOP		Plaque	
							Control	Test	Control	Test	Control	Test
Mid-buccal	2.1 ± 1.1	1.7 ± 0.6	1.2 ± 0.4	1.7 ± 0.9	3.3 ± 1.4	3.4 ± 1.2	44	14	0	0	50	29
Mid-lingual	1.9 ± 0.7	1.6 ± 0.5	1.1 ± 1.0	1.8 ± 1.0	3.0 ± 1.1	3.4 ± 1.2	44	14	0	0	94	29 ^c
Mid-distal	5.2 ± 0.7	3.2 ± 1.2 ^b	1.5 ± 1.0	2.7 ± 1.3	6.7 ± 1.0	5.9 ± 1.5	81	43	19	0	88	21 ^c
Mesiobuccal	2.8 ± 1.1	1.9 ± 0.7	0.3 ± 0.5	0.6 ± 0.5	3.1 ± 1.0	2.4 ± 1.0	38	29	0	0	56	21
Distobuccal	2.7 ± 1.0	2.1 ± 1.1	1.5 ± 0.5	2.1 ± 1.0	4.2 ± 1.1	4.3 ± 1.1	63	21	0	0	ND ^d	ND
Mesiolingual	2.8 ± 0.7	2.3 ± 0.6	0.5 ± 0.7	1.1 ± 0.8	3.3 ± 1.0	3.4 ± 0.8	69	50	0	0	ND	ND
Distolingual	3.6 ± 2.1	2.0 ± 1.2	1.4 ± 1.0	2.4 ± 1.0	5.0 ± 1.9	4.4 ± 1.4	56	29	6	0	ND	ND

^a mean ± SD

^b Statistically significant different between the control and test groups, $P < 0.007$, 2-sample t-test.

^c Statistically significant different between the control and test groups, $P < 0.006$, Fisher exact test.

^d ND = not determined




Fig. 1. CONSORT diagram showing the flow of participants through each stage of the randomized trial.

129x170mm (300 x 300 DPI)

CONSORT Checklist

Paper section and topic	Item	Description	Reported on page#
Title and abstract	1	▪ Randomized single-blinded controlled trial	3
Introduction			
Background	2	▪ scientific background and explanation of rationale	5-6
Methods			
Participants	3	▪ Eligibility criteria for participants ▪ Settings and location where the data were collected	8-9 9, 13
Interventions	4	▪ precise details of the interventions intended for each group and how and when they were actually administered	10-14
Objectives	5	▪ specific objectives and hypothesis	6
Outcomes	6	▪ define primary and secondary outcome measures ▪ methods used to enhance the quality of measurements	13 13-14
Sample size	7	▪ How sample size was determined	6-8
Randomization	8	▪ method used to generate the random allocation sequence	10
-sequence generation	9	▪ method used to implement the random allocation sequence	10-11
-allocation concealment	10	▪ who generated the allocation sequence ▪ who enrolled participants ▪ who assigned participants to their groups	10 8 10
-implementation	11	▪ participants were not blinded ▪ administer of the interventions blinded until last moment ▪ assessor of outcome blinded	10 11 13
Blinding (masking)	12	▪ statistical methods used to compare groups for primary outcome(s)	14-15
Statistical methods			
Results			
Participant flow	13	▪ Figure 1	Figure 1
Recruitment	14	▪ dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	8-13
Baseline data	15	▪ baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of each group	Table 1
Numbers analyzed	16	▪ number of participants (denominator) in each group included in each analysis	Figure 1
Outcomes and estimation	17	▪ A summary of results for each group	Table 2, 15-17
Ancillary analysis	18	▪ Address multiplicity by reporting any other analyses performed	N.A.
Adverse events	19	▪ All important adverse events or side effects in each intervention group	Nil
Discussion			
Interpretation	20	▪ Interpretation of the results	17-19, 22
Generalizability	21	▪ Generalizability of the trial findings	20, 23-24
Overall evidence	22	▪ General interpretation of the results in the context of current evidence	20-21

N.A. = Not applicable