COCHRANE-REVIEW

Ingen evidens for effekt af proteserensning

Plak på proteser kan influere på den orale sundhed. Hvis proteser ikke renses ordentligt, kan det føre til stomatitis, gingivitis og caries – men man har ikke fundet evidens for, hvilken rengøringsmetode der er mest effektiv.

Winnie Brodam

Metoderne til at rense proteser er mange: børstning med pasta, kemisk rensning med tabletter og væsker eller måske brug af mikrobølgeovn. Cochranes review har søgt at finde den ideelle blandt rensningsmetoderne, men selv med seks inkluderede studier har de ikke kunnet konkludere noget endeligt. Materialer og metoder er for mangfoldige. Reviewet nøjes med forsigtigt at antyde, at kemi og protesebørstning med pasta tilsyneladende er mere effektivt end placebo.

Der mangler forskning på området – især forskning, som sammenligner mekaniske og kemiske metoder, fastslår Cochranes forfattere.

Kommentar af professor, dr.odont., Flemming Isidor, Tandlægeskolen i Århus:

– På personer, der anvender delprotese(r) ses ofte mere caries end på andre med et tilsvarende resttandsæt, men som ikke anvender delprotese. Dette forhold kan hænge sammen med problemer med proteserenholdet. Derfor er det væsentligt, hvordan delproteser mest hensigtsmæssigt gøres rene. Forfatterne til dette review fandt i forhold til inklusionskriterierne ingen artikler, som havde set på renhold af delproteser og eventuelle bivirkninger, som fx hvordan kemien påvirker metalstel. Så her ved vi desværre endnu mindre end ved helproteser.

Abstract

Background

Removing denture plaque may be essential for maintaining the oral health of edentulous people. Brushing and soaking in chemical products are two of the most commonly used methods of cleaning dentures.

Objectives

To evaluate the effectiveness and safety of different methods for cleansing removable dentures.

Search strategy

We searched the following databases: the Cochrane Oral Health Group Trials Register (to May 2009); CENTRAL (The Cochrane Library 2009, Issue 2); MEDLINE (1965 to May 2009); EMBASE (1980 to May 2009); LILACS (1980 to May 2009); and CINAHL (1997 to May 2009). There were no language restrictions.

Selection criteria

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) comparing any mechanical method (e.g. brushing or ultrasound) or chemical (e.g. enzymes, sodium hypochlorite, oral rinses or peroxide solutions) in adults over the age of 18 wearing removable partial dentures or complete dentures.

The primary outcomes considered were the health of denture bearing areas (soft tissues, periodontal tissues and teeth) and participants' satisfaction and preference. Secondary outcomes included denture plaque coverage area, indicators of halitosis and microbial counts on abutment teeth, soft tissues or denture base or saliva.

Data collection and analysis

Two independent review authors screened and extracted information from, and independently assessed the risk of bias in the included trials.

Main results

Although six RCTs were included in this review, the wide range of different interventions and outcome variables did not permit pooling of data in a meta-analysis. Isolated reports indicated that chemicals and brushing appear to be more effective than placebo in the reduction of plaque coverage and microbial counts of anaerobes and aerobes on complete denture bases.

Authors' conclusions

There is a lack of evidence about the comparative effectiveness of the different denture cleaning methods considered in this review. Few well designed RCTs were found. Future research should focus on comparisons between mechanical and chemical methods; the assessment of the association of methods, primary variables and costs should also receive future attention.

de Souza RF, de Freitas Oliveira Paranhos H, Lovato da Silva CH, Abu-Naba'a L, Fedorowicz Z, Gurgan CA. Interventions for cleaning dentures in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2009, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD007395. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007395.pub2.