



# BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL



*British Medical Journal Volume-1, No 2*  
10.5281/zenodo.5201524

## **British Medical Journal**

### **Volume 1, No 2., 2021**

**Internet address:** <http://ejournals.id/index.php/bmj>

**E-mail:** [info@ejournals.id](mailto:info@ejournals.id)

Published by British Medical Journal

Issued Bimonthly

3 knoll drive. London. N14 5LU United Kingdom

+44 7542 987055

Chief Editor

**Dr. Fiona Egea**

*Requirements for the authors.*

*The manuscript authors must provide reliable results of the work done, as well as an objective judgment on the significance of the study. The data underlying the work should be presented accurately, without errors. The work should contain enough details and bibliographic references for possible reproduction. False or knowingly erroneous statements are perceived as unethical behavior and unacceptable.*

*Authors should make sure that the original work is submitted and, if other authors' works or claims are used, provide appropriate bibliographic references or citations. Plagiarism can exist in many forms - from representing someone else's work as copyright to copying or paraphrasing significant parts of another's work without attribution, as well as claiming one's rights to the results of another's research. Plagiarism in all forms constitutes unethical acts and is unacceptable. Responsibility for plagiarism is entirely on the shoulders of the authors. Significant errors in published works. If the author detects significant errors or inaccuracies in the publication, the author must inform the editor of the journal or the publisher about this and interact with them in order to remove the publication as soon as possible or correct errors. If the editor or publisher has received information from a third party that the publication contains significant errors, the author must withdraw the work or correct the errors as soon as possible.*

**OPEN ACCESS**

Copyright © 2021 by British Medical Journal

**British Medical Journal** Volume-1, No 2

## **Comparison of microbiological parameters in the early and late stages of prosthetics on dental implants**

**Akhmedov M. R., Rizaeva S.M., Ziyadullaeva N.S.**

**Tashkent State Dental Institute Republic of Uzbekistan**

**Abstract:** On patients with installed dental implants and having an implant-abutment connection system using a fixing screw, the microbiological status of the oral cavity was studied in the dynamics of observation with and without transition of the platform to the abutment. All patients were divided into 2 groups: 1 group consisted of 9 patients with an implant-abutment system without platform switching; Group 2 consisted of 10 patients with a platform-to-abutment transition element.

The material for the microbiological study was a biomaterial from the soft tissue mucosa around the abutment. The study of the dynamics of the microbial flora in patients with the transition of the platform on the abutment relative to the indicators before prosthetics, showed mainly a decrease in the quantitative indicators of representatives of both its stabilizing and aggressive components.

**Keywords:** microflora of the oral cavity, implants, abutment, treatment, prosthetics.

**Introduction:** The microflora of the oral cavity is formed in the process of evolution between the human body and microorganisms and represents a peculiar, complex and stable microbiocenosis, which is a favorable environment for the growth and maintenance of the vital activity of microorganisms. Microorganisms that are more or less frequently selected from the body of a healthy person form its normal microflora. According to the variety of species and the number of microorganisms, the predominant position in the oral cavity is occupied by bacteria [1, 3,4, 10].

One of the main functions of the normal oral microflora is to maintain a relatively stable state of specific and non-specific, humoral and cellular mechanisms of immunity. The protective role of normal microbial flora in relation to pathogenic and opportunistic bacteria is manifested owing to the synthesis of bactericidal substances (diplococcin, acidophilus, lactocidin, lactoline, hydrogen peroxide, etc.), organic acids (lactic, acetic, ketoglutaric and succinic). Normal microflora takes part in the synthesis of vitamins B, PP, K, C, improves the synthesis and absorption of vitamins D and E, folic and nicotinic acids that enter the body with food. At the same time, many microorganisms of the oral cavity produce organic acids in the course of their vital activity, which contributes to the development of decay, and under certain conditions, some microorganisms are able to cause deeper pathological processes in the oral cavity [2,5,6,11].

Considering the above, it is quite relevant to study the microbiocenosis of the oral cavity in time of various prosthetic manipulations, because the percentage of failures in this area of prosthetic treatment is still quite high (7,8,9). And oftentime they are associated with mechanical causes (microtrauma in the joint of the implant and abutment), and the influence of pathogenic microflora, usually acting in association. We can't avoid the presence of an interspace between the implant and the abutment in using an implant consisting of two parts. Bacteria and their metabolic products can and will colonize this area, and can initiate the development of an inflammatory reaction in the soft tissues surrounding the implant.

**The purpose of the research** was to study the microbial landscape of the oral cavity in individuals without and with the transition of platforms to abutment.

**Material and methods of the research.** There were studied patients after dental implantation who had got treatment in the department of Prosthetic Dentistry/ The installed dental implants are the IMPRO company' implants of an implant-abutment connecting system with a fixing screw. All patients were diagnosed with "Partial secondary adentia". All patients were divided into 2 groups: group 1<sup>st</sup> consisted of 9 patients with an implant-abutment system without switching platforms; group 2<sup>nd</sup> consisted of 10 patients with a platform-to-abutment transition element. We observed the patients in the dynamics: a) before the prosthetics, b) in the 3<sup>rd</sup> monthes after prosthetics, c) in the 6<sup>th</sup> monthes after prosthetics.

The material for the microbiological study was a biomaterial on a soft tissue mucosa around the abutment. The material was placed in vials with Stewart's medium and within no more than 3 hours was transferred to the microbiological laboratory.

**Results and discussion.** There was revealed an almost complete list of typical microorganisms of an oral cavity in the biomaterial from the soft tissue mucosa around the abutment. A comparative analysis of the occurrence of microorganisms showed that the type of microorganisms did not depend on the implant system, the shape and the size of its connection, the installation time.

Almost half of the permanent resident microorganisms are facultative and obligate anaerobic streptococci, which are represented by *S. mutans*, *S. sanguis*, *S. mitis*, *S. salivarius* and peptostreptococci, and the other half are represented by *Veylonella* and diphteroids.

Other representatives of the oral microflora (staphylococci, lactobacilli, bacteroids, *Neisseria*, fungi, protozoa) are detected more rarely than streptococci, *vaiilonella* and diphteroids. These ones were formed as a result of the mutual adaptation of the macro- and microorganism, because there are antagonistic or synergistic relationships between microorganisms.

The data presented in the table shows a quantitative evaluation of each representative of the resident microflora of the oral cavity. The analysis of the bacteria association in the area of periimplantation cuff after the implant installation

without prosthetics, we could note a rather stable content of the microflora, which did not depend on the timing and size of the implant installation. Microorganisms such as *S. mutans*, *S. salivarius*, *S. mitis*, *Veylonella*, *peptostreptococci*, *fusobacteria* were detected in different concentrations in oral cavity of all the examined patients (100%). The occurrence of *staphylococci*, *mycobacteria*, *anaerobic diptheroids* was up to 30-40% of cases.

We initially evaluated the microbial content of the oral cavity in patients before prosthetics, It was found that *S. mutans* amounted to  $(1.9 \pm 0.12) \times 10^4$ ; *S. salivarius*  $(4.2 \pm 0.21) \times 10^5$ , *S. sangvist*  $(4.2 \pm 0.21) \times 10^5$ , and *S. aureus*  $(5.1 \pm 0.20) \times 10^6$ , *Fusobacterium* spp.  $(2.3 \pm 0.20) \times 10^4$  CFU/g, *Neisseria* spp.,  $(4.4 \pm 0.21) \times 10^6$  (CFU/g); *Corynebacterium* spp.  $(2.6 \pm 0.20) \times 10^5$  CFU/g; *C. pseudodiphthericum*  $(2.4 \pm 0.20) \times 10^6$  CFU/g; *Enterobacterium* spp.  $(4.5 \pm 0.12) \times 10^6$  CFU/g .

The comparative analysis of microorganisms quantitative change in the 1<sup>st</sup> group of patients without switching platforms in the dynamics: before the prosthetics, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> months after prosthetics and in the 6<sup>th</sup> months after prosthetics.

**Table 1**

**Qualitative and quantitative content of the oral basic microflora in patients after dental implantation without transition to platforms**

<i>Types of microorganisms</i>	<i>Terms of research</i>		
	<i>Before prosthetics</i>	<i>After 3 months</i>	<i>After 6 months</i>
	<i>(KOE/г)</i>		
<i>Streptococcus mutans</i>	$(1,9 \pm 0,12) \times 10^4$	$(3,2 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(3,6 \pm 0,19) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Streptococcus epidermidis</i>	$(2.1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^5$	$(4,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(4,5 \pm 0,21) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Streptococcus sanguis</i>	$(4,2 \pm 0,21) \times 10^5$	$(4,1 \pm 0,21) \times 10^5$	$(5,2 \pm 0,19) \times 10^5$
<i>Streptococcus salivarius</i>	$(5,3 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$	$(5,2 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$	$(4,7 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$
<i>Neisseria</i> spp.	$(4,4 \pm 0,21) \times 10^6$	$(2,6 \pm 0,21) \times 10^{5*}$	$(2,3 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Fusobacterium</i> spp.	$(2.3 \pm 0,20) \times 10^4$	$(4,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(4,5 \pm 0,21) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	$(5,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$	$(4,8 \pm 0,21) \times 10^6$	$(4,2 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$
<i>Corynebacterium</i> spp.	$(2.6 \pm 0,20) \times 10^5$	$(4,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(4,5 \pm 0,21) \times 10^{5*}$

C.pseudodiphthericum	(2.4±0,20) x10 <sup>6</sup>	(6,4±0,20) x10 <sup>5</sup>	(4,8±0,21) x10 <sup>5</sup>
L.buccalis	(1.8±0,20) x10 <sup>4</sup>	(5,6±0,20) x10 <sup>4*</sup>	(4,9±0,16) x10 <sup>4*</sup>
V.parvula	(8,6±0,19) x10 <sup>6</sup>	(3,0±0,20)x1 0 <sup>6</sup>	(3,2±0,22)x1 0 <sup>6</sup>
B.gingivalis	(5,8±0,11) x10 <sup>6</sup>	(6,6±0,18)x1 0 <sup>4*</sup>	(5,8±0,21)x1 0 <sup>4*</sup>
Enterobacterium spp.	(4,5±0,12) x10 <sup>6</sup>	(4,2±0,21)x1 0 <sup>5*</sup>	(4,5±0,20)x1 0 <sup>5*</sup>
Peptostreptococcus anaerobius	(6,2±0,21) x10 <sup>6</sup>	(4,1±0,20)x1 0 <sup>5*</sup>	(4,7±0,21)x1 0 <sup>5*</sup>

**Note:** \* - P< 0.05 the difference is significant concerning to the indicators before prosthetics

It can be noted a rather stable content of the microflora in the dynamics after 3 months, i.e. the representatives of the oral microflora are detected with almost the same frequency and the same quantitative content. Thus, the amount of Streptococcus sanguis almost does not change, before prosthetics this indicator was (4.2±0.21)x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml. At the 3rd month the amount of this mat remained almost the same and was 4.1±0.21 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml. At the 6th month, the quantitative indicator of this mat increased slightly and was (5.2±0.19) x10<sup>5</sup> CFU / ml. Another important representative of the oral microbiocenosis is Streptococcus salivarius. Its amount before prosthetics was 5.3±0.20 x10<sup>6</sup> CFU/ml. After 3 and 6 months after prosthetics light changes were observed from 5.2±0.20 x10<sup>6</sup> CFU/ml to monitoring 4.7±0.20 x10<sup>6</sup> CFU/ml, respectively. The representative of anaerobic streptococci-Peptostreptococcus anaerobius, was detected in an amount of up to 6.2±0.21 x10<sup>6</sup> CFU / ml before prosthetics, slightly decreased by the 3rd month of monitoring – 4.1±0.20 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml, but by the 6th month there was a slight increase to 4.7±0.20 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml. In this group of patients there was a positive trend in the amount of Corynebacterium spp. during all follow-up periods relative to the parameters before prosthetics (2.6±0.20 x 10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml.) and was characterized by an increase in the number of bacteria by 3 months to 4.1±0.20 x 10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml and by 6 months to 4.5±0.20 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml.

We also identified representatives of aggressive microflora, among which we should note the Enterobacterium spp., the number of which decreased slightly in the dynamics of observation. Thus, before prosthetics, it was 4.5±0.12 x10<sup>6</sup> CFU/ml, by the 3rd month it was 4.2±0.21 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml, and by the 6th month it practically did not change 4.5±0.20 x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml. The detection of such untypical bacteria may

indicate the presence of dysbiosis in the area of the implant-gingiva contact. It is also necessary to note the presence of Staphylococcus aureus in the contents of the crops and almost no dynamics during the observation. Thus its amount was  $5.1 \pm 0.20 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml at the beginning of the study and up to  $4.2 \pm 0.20 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml by the end of the observation.

The dynamics considering of the microbial flora in patients with the transition of the platform on the abutment relative to the indicators before prosthetics, a decrease in the quantitative indicators of representatives of both the stabilizing and aggressive components was revealed.

Thus, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> month of monitoring there was a slight increase in the number of *S. mutans* ( $2.8 \pm 0.14 \times 10^4$  CFU/ml) and *S. epidermidis* ( $2.7 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml) relative to the data before prosthetics ( $1.9 \pm 0.12 \times 10^4$  CFU/ml and  $2.1 \pm 0.20 \times 10^4$  CFU/ml, respectively). By the 6<sup>th</sup> month there is a decrease of *S. mutans* to ( $2.5 \pm 0.15 \times 10^4$  CFU / ml) and *S. epidermidis* to ( $2.4 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU / ml) relative to the previous term, but they remain slightly above the level of these indicators before prosthetics.

**Table 2**

**Qualitative and quantitative composition of the main microflora of the oral cavity in persons with the transition of the platform on the abutment**

<i>Types of microorganisms</i>	<i>Terms of research</i>		
	<i>Before prosthetics</i>	<i>After 3 months</i>	<i>Before prosthetics</i>
	(KOE/г)		
<i>S. mutans</i>	$(1,9 \pm 0,12) \times 10^4$	$(2,8 \pm 0,14) \times 10^4$	$(2,5 \pm 0,15) \times 10^4$
<i>S. epidermidis</i>	$(2,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^5$	$(2,7 \pm 0,21) \times 10^5$	$(2,4 \pm 0,16) \times 10^5$
<i>S. sanguis</i>	$(4,2 \pm 0,21) \times 10^5$	$(3,2 \pm 0,16) \times 10^5$	$(2,6 \pm 0,12) \times 10^5$
<i>S. salivarius</i>	$(5,3 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$	$(4,4 \pm 0,23) \times 10^{5*}$	$(3,8 \pm 0,16) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Neisseria spp.</i>	$(4,4 \pm 0,21) \times 10^6$	$(2,1 \pm 0,18) \times 10^{5*}$	$(1,64 \pm 0,23) \times 10^{5*}$
<i>Fusobacterium spp.</i>	$(2,3 \pm 0,20) \times 10^4$	$(3,6 \pm 0,17) \times 10^4$	$(2,8 \pm 0,21) \times 10^4$
<i>S. aureus</i>	$(5,1 \pm 0,20) \times 10^6$	$(3,8 \pm 0,21) \times 10^{5*}$	$(3,2 \pm 0,20) \times 10^{5*}$

Corynebacterium spp.	$(2.6 \pm 0.20) \times 10^5$	$(5.4 \pm 0.23) \times 10^5$	$(5.8 \pm 0.21) \times 10^5$
C.pseudodiphthericum	$(2.4 \pm 0.20) \times 10^6$	$(5.6 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(4.4 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{5*}$
L.buccalis	$(1.8 \pm 0.20) \times 10^4$	$(4.6 \pm 0.20) \times 10^4$	$(3.8 \pm 0.16) \times 10^4$
V.parvula	$(8.6 \pm 0.19) \times 10^6$	$(4.0 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(2.8 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{5*}$
B.gingivalis	$(5.8 \pm 0.11) \times 10^6$	$(4.2 \pm 0.14) \times 10^{4*}$	$(3.8 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{4*}$
Enterobacterium spp.	$(4.5 \pm 0.12) \times 10^6$	$(3.2 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{5*}$	$(2.5 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{5*}$
P.anaerobius	$(6.2 \pm 0.21) \times 10^6$	$(3.1 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{5*}$	$(2.7 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{5*}$

**Note:** \* -  $P < 0.05$  the difference is significant concerning to the indicators before prosthetics

Streptococcus sanguis decreases from  $4.2 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml indicators before prosthetics to  $3.2 \pm 0.16 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml by the 3rd month, and to  $2.6 \pm 0.12 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml by the end of the research. At the same time, the dynamics of Streptococcus salivarius behavior is as follows:  $5.3 \pm 0.20 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml – before prosthetics,  $4.4 \pm 0.23 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml – at 3<sup>th</sup> months, and  $3.84 \pm 0.16 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml – at 6<sup>th</sup> months from the start of the research.

The quantitative index of anaerobic streptococci Peptostreptococcus anaerobius in patients of this group before prosthetics was  $6.2 \pm 0.21 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml, significantly decreased by 3<sup>th</sup> months of observation to  $3.1 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml and by 6<sup>th</sup> months of observation decreased to  $2.7 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml. The number of corynebacteria before prosthetics was at the level of  $2.6 \pm 0.20 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml, in the dynamics of observation by 3<sup>th</sup> months the level reached  $5.4 \pm 0.23$  CFU/ml and by 6<sup>th</sup> months it was further increased to  $5.8 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml.

Corinobacteria actively reduce molecular oxygen in the course of their life and synthesize vitamin K, which contributes to the development of obligate anaerobes. According to this, it can be noted that an increase in the number of detected corynebacteria in subsequent follow-up periods positively characterizes the dynamics of the oral microflora in these patients.

For aggressive microflora, the following dynamics were noted. The quantitative index of enterococci also characterized the positively dynamics of the microbial landscape of the oral cavity in this group of patients at all observing periods, i.e., if



before prosthetics their number was  $4.5 \pm 0.12 \times 10^6$  CFU/ml, then by 3<sup>th</sup> months there was a decrease in their number to  $3.2 \pm 0.21 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml, and by 6<sup>th</sup> months they were  $2.5 \pm 0.20 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml.

Thus, the results of the research allow us to conclude that in cases when the platform is switched to an abutment a positive microbiocenosis is formed in patients at the 6<sup>th</sup> month after prosthetic on implants, but the value of all the representatives of microorganisms have been studied remains at high levels. At the same time, the microbial landscape is characterized by the prevalence of stabilizing types of bacteria (*Streptococcus saivarius*, *Streptococcus sanguis*, *Corynebacterium* spp.). However, the frequency of such untypical microorganisms for the oral cavity, such as enterobacteria, enterococci, indicates the development of dysbiosis in the area of implant-gingival contact.

**References:**

1. Zakharov A. A., Ilina N. A. Analysis of the oral microflora of examined people with various diseases // *Successes of modern natural science*. - 2007. - No. 12-3. - pp. 141-143
2. Krendelev M. S. Normal microflora of the human oral cavity // *Modern problems of science and education*. - 2015. - No. 5. - p. 24-27
3. Mostovaya O. S. The use of dental implants with a modified biocomposition antimicrobial coating (experimental and clinical studies) // *Autoref. diss. ... Candidate of Medical Sciences, Saratov, 2012*. - .23 P.
4. Sakharuk N. A. Microbial flora of the oral cavity in normal and pathological conditions. morphology of fungi of the genus candida. // *Vestnik VSMU, 2008*. - Volume 7, No. 2. - p. 1-10
5. Wolf A. G. Microbial flora of the oral cavity: ways of settlement, distribution, distribution by biotopes of the oral cavity in normal and pathological conditions // *Stomatol. review*. 2004. - No. 1. - p. 7-10.
6. Kargaltseva N. M. The oral cavity is an important biotope of the human body // *Institute of Dentistry*. - 2001. - No. 1. - p. 18-21.
7. Yakovlev A. T., Badrak E. Yu., Mikhailchenko D. V., Grishina M. A., Demyanova O. B. Research of microflora in the field of connection of a dental implant with an abutment. 2015. No. 1. pp. 46-49.
8. Lepilin A.V., Venig S. B., Lyasnikova A.V., Zakharevich A.M., Smirnov D. A. Studies of morphology and chemical properties of biocompositional silver-containing coating of dental implants // *Russian Dental Journal*, 2011-No. 2. - pp. 6-9.
9. Mikhailchenko D. V., Badrak E. Yu., Mikhailchenko A.V., Yarygina E. N. Internal interface of a dental implant as a focus of chronic infection // *Meditnskiy vestnik Severnogo Kavkaza.*, 2015. - t10, No. 3. - pp. 307-309
10. Zorina O. A., Kulakov A.A., Grudyanova I. Microbiocenosis of the oral cavity in normal and inflammatory periodontal diseases // *Dentistry-2011*. - No. 1. - pp. 73-78.
11. Simonova E. V., Ponomareva O. A. The role of normal microflora in maintaining human health // *Siberian Medical Journal*. – No. 8. - 2008. p. 20-25.