COCHRANE-REVIEW

Ingen evidens for, at én eltandbørste er bedre end andre

Der er ingen grund til at anbefale patienterne at droppe den »gammeldags facon«.

Winnie Brodam

Et tidligere Cochrane-review har vist, at en elektrisk tandbørste børster bedre end en manuel tandbørste, når det gælder plakfjernelse og reduktion af gingivitis (1). Men reviewet viste ikke, om der var forskel på effekten af forskellige typer/mærker af elektriske tandbørster. Det har et nyt review ledt efter evidens for.

Nærværende Cochrane-review omfatter 15 studier og 1.015 deltagere, som fik målt plak- og gingivitisindeks efter elektrisk tandbørstning dagligt i mindst fire uger. Cochranes forfattere må imidlertid erkende, at udvalget af elektriske tandbørster er for stort og undersøgelserne for få til, at man kan drage endelige konklusioner angående, hvilke elektriske tandbørster der børster bedst.

Kommentar af lektor Alan Richards, Tandlægeskolen i Århus:

– Det tidligere Cochrane-review (1) konkluderede, at elektriske tandbørster, som kombinerer oscillering og rotation, børster bedre end manuelle tandbørster. Samtidig viste reviewet, at elektriske tandbørster, som fungerer på andre måder, ikke er signifikant bedre end manuel børstning.

Det nye Cochrane-review har analyseret effekten af forskellige typer af elektriske børster, men reviewets forfattere må erkende, at udvalget af elektriske tandbørster i undersøgelserne var for stort, og at undersøgelserne for få til, at man kan drage endelige konklusioner.

Sammenfattende må man konkludere, at der er insufficient evidens for at kunne anbefale en bestemt elektrisk børste, og at tandlæger sædvanligvis ikke behøver at anbefale deres patienter at gå væk fra tandbørstning på den »gammeldags facon«.

Forfatterne af det ny review begrænsede desværre deres valg af studier til kun at omhandle raske personer. Derfor har de ikke kunnet vise, om patienter med fysiske handicap, som forhindrer dem i at bruge en almindelig tandbørste, kunne være hjulpet af elektriske børster. Cochranes forfattere har heller ikke taget hensyn til faktorer som fx pris og holdbarhed, som kan have indflydelse på, hvilke tandbørster patienterne vælger.

Litteratur

Robinson P, Deacon SA, Deery C, Heanue M, Walmsley AD, Worthington HV, Glenny AM, Shaw BC. Manual versus powered toothbrushing for oral health. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2005, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD002281. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002281.pub2

Abstract

Background
Powered brushes were first introduced commercially in the 1960s. A recent systematic review suggested the superiority of certain modes of powered over manual toothbrushing for plaque and gingivitis reduction. That review did not allow for direct comparison between different modes of powered toothbrush.

Objectives
To compare different modes of powered toothbrushing against each other for plaque reduction and the health of the gingivae. Other factors to be assessed were calculus and stain removal, cost, dependability and adverse effects.

Search strategy
The following databases were searched: Cochrane Oral Health Group's Trials Register (to 26 July 2010); Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) *(The Cochrane Library* 2010, Issue 3); MEDLINE via OVID (1950 to 26 July 2010); EMBASE via OVID (1980 to 26 July 2010); CINAHL via EBSCO (1982 to 26 July 2010). There were no language restrictions.

Selection criteria
Trials were considered for inclusion with the following criteria: random allocation of participants; no compromised manual dexterity; unsupervised powered toothbrushing for at least 4 weeks. The primary outcomes were the plaque and gingivitis scores after powered toothbrush use during trial period.

Data collection and analysis
Data extraction was performed independently and in duplicate. The authors of trials were contacted to provide missing data where possible. The effect measure for each meta-analysis was the standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) using the random-effects model. Potential sources of heterogeneity were assessed.

Main results
The review included data from 15 trials with 1015 participants. Due to the dearth of trials assessing the same mode of action, no definitive conclusions can be stated regarding the superiority of one mode of powered toothbrush over any other. Only minor and transient side effects were reported. Cost, dependability were not reported.

Authors' conclusions
Further trials of good quality are required to establish if any mode of action has superiority over the other modes of action for powered toothbrushes.

Deacon SA, Glenny A-M, Deery C, Robinson PG, Heanue M, Walmsley AD, Shaw WC. Different powered toothbrushes for plaque control and gingival health. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2010, Issue 12. Art. No.: CD004971. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004971.pub2