



LETTER TO THE EDITOR

## Periodontal dressing may influence the clinical outcome of non-surgical periodontal treatment: a split-mouth study.

Genovesi AM, Ricci M, Marchisio O, Covani U.

*Int J Dent Hygiene* 2012; **10**: 284–289

Dear Editor,

We read with great interest the article ‘Periodontal dressing may influence the clinical outcome of non-surgical periodontal treatment: a split-mouth study’ by Genovesi AM in the early view section of *Int J Dent Hygiene*. I greatly appreciate the publication of the article by Genovesi *et al.* on the topic. However, we wish to comment on a few points in this article.

The authors have mentioned in the manuscript ‘junctional long epithelium’ rather than long junctional epithelium that is the commonly accepted terminology. The statement ‘The functional integrity of a maturing periodontal wound has been examined by several authors. They pointed out the fact that after periodontal surgery, the tensile strength at the gingival root interface increases from 200 g at the third day to 340 g at the seventh day post-surgery, reaching 1700 g after 14 days (11)’. seems to indicate many authors, but only a single reference is given in the manuscript. A more detailed search on this literature may be mentioned here.

The authors have decided on a sample size of 30. How was the sample size determined as 30? What was the power for the study? During patient selection were only chronic periodontitis selected? What were the selection criteria? Which indices were used? The exclusion criteria used by the authors seem very weak. What about history of non-surgical periodontal therapy in past 6 months and pregnant females? Were the excluded from the study? Would these not affect the periodontal status of the individuals and their response to therapy?

Interestingly, the authors mentioned that the study was a double-blind study; however, we fail to understand how were the patients blinded as to which quadrant received periodontal dressing. Also, the authors have failed to mention accordance with the Helsinki Declaration and also whether ethical clearance was sought. No ethical clearance is mentioned in the manuscript. The authors have mentioned that ‘The operator was instructed to apply a force of 30 g’. How was the force of probing measured?

The authors have used the terminology ‘gingival’ instead of ‘gingiva’, which is confusing. The authors have used the terminology ‘PAL and CAL’ interchangeably in the manuscript again leading to confusion. Also, there are no tables in the manuscript depicting the mean PD and PAL in the subjects. The mean values are very important in deciphering the extent of clinical benefit and thus is indispensable in this study. The figures in the manuscript and their legends are not matching and seem to be wrongly represented.

We would appreciate if the authors could clarify these interesting points in their manuscript.

Nishanth S. Rao, Pavan Bajaj, Esha Agarwal, A.R. Pradeep  
*Department of Periodontology and Implantology,  
Government Dental College & Research Institute,  
Fort, Bangalore, India  
E-mail: dr.nishurao@gmail.com*

Copyright of International Journal of Dental Hygiene is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.