Abstract

Background and aims. A combination of guided tissue regeneration (GTR), bovine porous bone mineral (BPBM), and platelet rich plasma has been already applied for the regeneration of intrabony defects. The aim of this study was to determine the role of plasma rich in growth factor (PRGF) alone in the periodontal regeneration of intrabony defects in humans as compared with BPBM/GTR Technique.

Materials and methods. In this split-mouth clinical trial, nine advanced periodontal patients with 20 intrabony defects were randomly treated with a combination of either BPBM/GTR (control) or PRGF (test). Periodontal parameters including gingival recession, probing depth (PD), gingival index (GI), plaque index (PI), and relative clinical attachment level (CAL) were evaluated at baseline and 6 months post-operatively.

Results. No difference was observed at baseline between the two groups. At 6-month post-treatment, both techniques demonstrated significant reduction in CAL, PD and GI. The mean pocket depth reduction in control group was 4.1 ± 1.52 mm and 4.5 ± 1.5 mm on buccal and lingual sites, respectively (P < 0.0001); and 3.6 ± 0.9 mm in the test group. The changes in CAL in the deepest part of the defect were 3.06 ± 1.79 mm and 2.33 ± 0.78 mm for test and control groups, respectively. No statistically significant difference was detected between the two groups after 6 months.

Conclusion. According to the results, the use of PRGF alone, similar to BPBM/GTR improves clinical parameters and plays a significant role in PD reduction and CAL gain.
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Introduction

The important goal in periodontal therapy is the prevention of periodontal disease progress and the regeneration of lost supporting tissues, including cementum, periodontal ligament and the alveolar bone. Favorable results have been gained in the treatment of intrabony defects using a combination of graft materi-
als and collagen membranes. Recently, the use of polypeptide growth factors (PGFs) for periodontal regeneration has received attention from periodontal researchers and clinicians. PGFs are known as biologic mediators regulating cell proliferation, chemotaxis and differentiation. Among all known PGFs, platelet derived growth factors (PDGF) and bone morphogenic protein 3 (BMP-3), members of transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β) super family, have shown to exert a favorable effect on periodontal regeneration. PDGF and TGF-β are found abundantly in the alpha granules of platelets. The positive effect on bone healing, associated with platelet-rich plasma (PRP) which contains high concentrations of such granules, may be attributed to angiogenic, proliferative and differentiative effects exerted by these factors on osteoblasts. The use of PRP on wound healing sites enhances platelet concentration up to 338%. It has also yielded successful results in tissue and bone regenerative therapies in dentistry. In recent years, a combination of PRP with bone graft materials, such as bovine porous bone mineral (BPBM), and guided tissue regeneration (GTR) have revealed significant improvements in clinical parameters, however; PRP/BPBM/GTR treatment has not yielded superior results to BPBM/GTR without PRP. Due to the fact that most of the studies regarding the influence of PRP on the regeneration of intrabony defects has been performed in combination with bone grafts and GTR, the effect of PRP alone is not yet obvious. Plasma rich in growth factors (PRGF), like PRP, is rich in growth factors and has been presented as a material for use in tissue regenerative techniques. Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine the effect of PRGF alone in the regeneration of intrabony defects.

Materials and Methods

Study Population
Nine patients (5 females and 4 males; mean age, 44 ± 5.6 years old) with moderate to advanced periodontal disease were included in this split-mouth clinical trial. The purpose of the study was explained to the patients and they were required to sign informed consent forms. All patients were treated at the Department of Periodontology, Tehran Azad University, by one experienced surgeon during 2008-2009. The study protocol was approved by the ethical committee of the university.

Study Design
The study was designed as a randomized, comparative clinical trial. Patients included in this study were individuals with at least 2 bilateral, although not similar, intrabony defects with ≥ 3mm depth, visible on periapical radiographs, and a pocket depth of ≥ 6 mm. Patients with systemic disease, compromised immune system, pregnancy and or lactation, taking any drugs known to cause gingival enlargement, allergy or sensitivity to any of the medications to be used in the study were excluded. All patients received initial therapy including oral hygiene instruction, and scaling and root planning. Plaque control was followed up until O’Leary periodontal index (PI) of ≤ 25% was obtained. Occlusion adjustment was performed if trauma from occlusion was diagnosed. Trauma from occlusion was evaluated by examining the obvious presence of fremitus in centric occlusion or working or balancing excursions. Six to eight weeks following phase one therapy, a periodontal re-evaluation was performed to confirm the suitability of the sites for this periodontal surgical study and preoperative periapical radiographs were taken. Two surgical sites were randomly assigned to the test or control groups with toss of a coin.

Clinical Measurements
The following clinical parameters were assessed by the same calibrated examiner (NA) masked to treatment; at baseline and six months after the surgical procedure using the same type of periodontal probe (15-mm University of North Carolina (UNC-15) periodontal probe, Hu-Friedy, Chicago, IL). Plaque Index (PI), and Gingival Index (GI) were recorded. Probing Depth (PD), using the gingival margin as reference; Relative Clinical Attachment Level (CAL), using the acrylic stent, as reference, was measured with customized acrylic stent using grooves to ensure a reproducible placement of the periodontal probe. In order to ensure the correct and repetitive insertion of the stent, the distance between CEJ and stent edge was recorded.

An examiner other than the operator performed the clinical measurements without knowledge of the treatment groups. Intraexaminer calibration was achieved by examination of three patients twice, 48 hours apart, prior to the beginning of the study. Calibration was accepted if measurements at baseline and 48 hours were similar to the whole millimeter at a ≥ 90% level.

PRGF Preparation
In this study, the PRGF preparation was performed using a PRGF system (Biotechnology institution, Spain). One hour before surgery, 9 ml blood was...
drawn from the patient. The blood was collected in two 5-cc sterile glass tubes that contained 0.5 cc 3.8% sodium citrate as anticoagulant. The glass tubes containing blood were centrifuged by a digital machine at 460 G for 8 minutes. As a result, plasma was separated into different fractions: at the top, 1 cc plasma poor in growth factors, in the middle, 0.5 cc plasma average in growth factors, and in the bottom, 0.5 cc of plasma rich in growth factors (PRGF), exactly over red blood cells. Following the aspiration of the upper and middle fractions with a 500 µl pipette, the third PRGF fraction was separated in 5 times with a 100 µl pipette. PRGF was mixed with 10% calcium chloride (50 µl of 10% calcium chloride were added to sterile tube containing 1 cc PRGF). A thermal block machine was applied for fibrin preparation and acceleration in PRGF coagulation. After 15-20 minutes, PRGF displayed a plastic consistency, the same as a biologic membrane.

Surgical Procedure

After administration of local anesthesia (Lidocaine 2%, with epinephrine 1:80,000), sulcular incisions were performed extending to the inter-proximal line angle of the neighboring tooth; then full thickness flaps were raised. Vertical-releasing incisions were performed if necessary for a better access or to achieve better closure. All granulation tissues were removed from the defects and the roots were thoroughly scaled and planed by means of hand (Gracey, Hu-Friedy, Chicago, IL, USA) and ultrasonic (Cavitron, Dentsply, Tulsa, OK, USA) instruments.

Treatment in the test group was performed as follows: First, PRGF with plastic consistency was applied to the defects. Then, flap was repositioned and sutured in place by using 4-0 non-absorbable black-braided silk surgical suture (Ethicon, Johnson and Johnson Ltd., Somerville, NJ, USA) and ultrasonic (Cavitron, Dentsply, Tulsa, OK, USA) instruments.

In the control group, the same surgical procedure, undertaken for the test group, was performed without using PRGF. First, intrabony defects were filled with bovine porous bone mineral granules (Bio-Oss, Geistlich, Wolhusen, Switzerland; particle size, 0.25-1.0 mm); then a bioresorbable collagen membrane of Porcine origin (Biogide Perio, Geistlich, Wolhusen, Switzerland) was trimmed and adapted over the entire defect so as to cover 2-3 mm of the surrounding alveolar bone and to ensure stability of wound and of the graft material. Both surgical sites were covered with periodontal dressing (Coe-Pak, GC America Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Postoperative Care

All patients received antibiotics for a week (3 × 500 mg amoxicillin per day) and, if necessary, analgesics (Ibuprofen, 3 × 800mg per day). The post-operative care included 0.2% chlorhexidine rinses twice a day for 2 weeks. Periodontal dressing and sutures were removed one week postoperatively, and patients were instructed not to brush or floss the areas where surgery had been performed for 2 weeks. Patients were examined weekly up to 1 month after surgery and then at 3 and 6 months. At 6 months postoperatively, all clinical measurements were re-evaluated and periapical radiographs were also taken.

Statistical Analysis

All clinical parameters were tested for normal distribution by using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. To compare the test and control treatments, the intra-group differences between baseline and 6-months postoperatively were evaluated using the paired t-test. Between-group comparisons were performed using the non-parametric Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. Statistical analysis was performed using commercially available software (SPSS version 16, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Statistical significance was set at 0.05.

Results

All patients completed the study. Test and control sites healed uneventfully. No allergic reaction, abscess or infection, dehiscence, collagen membrane or graft particle exposure were detected in any of the surgical sites. At baseline, the mean pocket depth was similar in the two groups on buccal and lingual sites and no statistically significant difference was found. At six months post-treatment, the mean PD reduction was 4.1 ± 1.52 mm on the buccal and 4.5 ± 1.5 mm on the lingual site in the BPBM/GTR group, and 3.6 ± 0.96 mm on both buccal and lingual sites in the PRGF group (P < 0.0001). No statistically significant difference was found between the groups (Table 1).

At baseline, the mean gingival recession was similar between the two groups, with no statistically significant difference (Table 2). At Six months, the mean GR on buccal sites was increased 0.4 ± 1.35 mm in the BPBM/GTR group and 0.9 ± 1.2 mm in the PRGF group; the increase in GR was statistically significant for PRGF group (P < 0.05). The mean GR on lingual sites, at baseline and 6 months postoperatively, were similar for control and test groups.

The mean CAL was similar at baseline for both groups (Table 3). At six months postoperatively, CAL gains were 3.06 ± 1.79 mm and 2.33 ± 0.78 mm for
Table 1. Probing Pocket Depth of Buccal & Lingual (mean ± SD [mm]) at Baseline and 6 months (n=10 for each treatment group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>PDB Base line</th>
<th>PDB 6 months</th>
<th>PDB Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>PDL Base line</th>
<th>PDL 6 months</th>
<th>PDL Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPBM/GTR</td>
<td>7.30 ± 1.49</td>
<td>3.20 ± 0.79</td>
<td>4.10 ± 1.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001*</td>
<td>7.30 ± 1.34</td>
<td>2.80 ± 0.42</td>
<td>4.50 ± 1.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGF</td>
<td>7 ± 1.82</td>
<td>3.40 ± 1.50</td>
<td>3.60 ± 0.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001*</td>
<td>6.90 ± 0.99</td>
<td>3.30 ± 1.42</td>
<td>3.60 ± 0.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = not statistically significant.
*Statistically significant (P <0.05)

Table 2. Gingival Recession Buccal & Lingual, (mean ± SD [mm]) at Baseline and 6 months (n=10 for each treatment group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>GRB Base line</th>
<th>GRB 6 months</th>
<th>GRB Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>GRL Base line</th>
<th>GRL 6 months</th>
<th>GRL Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPBM/GTR</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.79</td>
<td>1.20 ± 1.03</td>
<td>0.40 ± 1.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1.40 ± 1.17</td>
<td>1.20 ± 1.03</td>
<td>0.20 ± 0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGF</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.87</td>
<td>1.80 ± 1.55</td>
<td>0.90 ± 1.20</td>
<td>&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>1.30 ± 1.16</td>
<td>1.60 ± 1.26</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = not statistically significant.
*Statistically significant (P <0.05)

BPBM/GTR and PRGF groups, respectively (P < 0.001). In both groups, CAL improved significantly compared to baseline, but no statistically significant difference was observed between the two groups. PI and GI changes are shown in Table 4.

The amount of PI in both groups at baseline and 6 months post operation were similar and showed no significant statistical changes. GI, at baseline and 6 months postoperatively, and its changes were similar between the groups, with a significant reduction in both groups.

Discussion

The results of this study show that the treatment of intrabony defects with both BPBM/GTR and PRGF leads to a significant pocket depth reduction and CAL gain compared to baseline. Pocket depth reduction, on the buccal and lingual sites, were 4.1 ± 1.52 mm and 4.5 ± 1.5 mm in BPBM /GTR group and 3.6 ± 0.97 mm in PRGF group. Gingival index reductions in both groups were also significant. The increase in gingival recession showed a significant change of 0.9 mm on the buccal site in the PRGF group.

Camargo et al, 9 using BPBM/GTR in the treatment of intrabony defects, showed mean pocket depth reduction and CAL gain of 4.03 ± 0.94 mm and 3.29 ± 1.12 mm on the buccal site, respectively. Another study comparing BPBM/GTR/PRP to open flap debridement in the treatment of intrabony defects found that the mean pocket depth reduction on the buccal site was 2.99 ± 1.42 mm in the control and 5.06 ± 1.15 mm in the case group and this difference was statistically significant for the BPBM/GTR/PRP cases.15 In the latter study, mean CAL gains were 4.52 ± 1.24 mm and 1.47 ± 1.95 mm in the case and control groups, respectively. 15 Higher pocket depth reduction and CAL gain in the latter study indicate that the growth factors may increase the benefits obtained from bone grafts and GTR. The present study showed pocket depth reductions of 4.1 ± 1.52 mm and 4.5 ± 1.5 mm on the buccal and lingual sites of BPBM/GTR group, respectively, compared to 3.6 ± 0.97 mm on the both sites of the PRGF group. These findings are in line with previous studies.9,15 The design of the present study, however, allows determining which treatment is responsible for the observed differences. That said, in the present study, the effect of the growth factors alone, as compared to BPBM/GTR, were investigated, and regarding the absence of significant differences in pocket depth reduction and CAL gain, it could be claimed that using PRGF is equally effective to BPBM/GTR combination.
In another study, GTR did not yield any clinical effects on PD reduction and CAL gain, compared to BPBM/PRP. In the present study, pocket depth reductions in both groups were also not significant; however, CAL gain showed statistical significance, although to a lower amount. However, the differences in sample size and BPBM application do not allow a comparison of these studies. In one study, PRP was not shown to be superior to combination of GTR and natural bone mineral, failing to achieve significant PD reduction and CAL gain. However, the use of BPBM/GTR/PRP, as compared to GTR alone lead to better results in the regeneration of intrabony defects.

Pocket depth reduction and CAL gain of the PRGF group in the present study were similar to those of GTR group in the study of Camargo et al (3.62 ± 0.81 mm and 2.62 ± 1.23 mm, respectively). Although in the present study the number of patients was not equal in the two groups, it could be concluded that the use of PRGF, could be at least as effective as the use of GTR in the regeneration of intrabony defects. Hanna et al demonstrated that a combination of bone graft and PRP, as compared to bone graft alone, may lead to more desirable results.

Okuda et al, comparing PRP/hydroxyapatite and salin/hydroxyapatite, showed improvements in both clinical and radiographic parameters using both combinations, with higher pocket depth reduction and CAL gain in PRP/hydroxyapatite group. Considering the use of PRGF alone in the present study, significant pocket depth reduction and CAL gain may be attributed to this substance.

Comparison of bioabsorbable barrier membrane (MEM) with autologous platelet concentrate (APC) has shown 3 ± 1.41 mm and 3.6 ± 1.67 mm pocket depth reductions and 2.2 ± 1.79 mm and 3 ± 1 mm those of CAL gains, in APC and MEM groups respectively. In the group with PRGF only in the present study, mean pocket depth reduction and CAL gain were 3.6 ± 0.97 mm and 2.33 ± 0.78 mm, respectively, indicating similar amounts of CAL gain and higher amounts of pocket depth reduction compared to the latter study. Considering the similar results obtained using growth factors alone in the present study, as compared to controls, a positive effect of these materials on pocket depth reduction and CAL gain can be inferred.

Considering the results of the present study and previous investigations, it can be concluded that the use of each material, effective in regeneration, alone cannot provide CAL gain of more than 2.5 mm, probably because regeneration is a multifactorial process and if space providing materials are needed to prevent the immigration of epithelial cells, there would be a simultaneous need for osteoconductive and osteoinductive materials. Pocket depth reduction is not only a favorable consequence of periodontal regenerative therapy, but it also is the most important parameter during the maintenance period, since it directly influences the cleansing of the involved site. The final amount of mean pocket depth in both groups of the present study was 3 mm, which is suitable for the maintenance period. Although CAL gain does not necessarily imply connective tissue attachment promotion and the presence of real regeneration, it still can indicate clinical improvement, as much as reentry or radiographic evaluations do.

The positive effects exerted by PRGF alone on PD reduction and CAL gain, showing no significant difference with those of GTR/BPBM group, can be attributed to biological characteristics of PRGF, one of which is its abundant growth factors, including TGF-β1, TGF-β2, TGF-β3, and PDGF. Large amounts of PDGF in osteoinductive proliferation, which usually happens at the first stages of healing. TGF-β family has an important role in differentiation of osteoblasts and cementoblasts. TGF-β also stimulates growth and differentiation in cells of periodontal ligament and alveolar bone, while at the same time, inhibits epithelial proliferation. Fibronectin stimulation causes the adherence of fibroblast to the root surface and angiogenesis. Due to its high amounts of fibrin, TGF-β also has a sticky property. The fibrin component works as an hemostatic agent and aids in stabilization of the graft material and the blood clot. Fibrin adherence to the root surface may impede the apical migration of the epithelial and connective tissue cells exerting an effect similar to that of a bone graft.
of GTR in defect regeneration. PRGF can modulate the regeneration process and significantly reduce pocket depth and improve CAL gain as well. However, considering the gingival recession on buccal sites in the PRGF group in the 6-month evaluation period of the present study, it seems PRGF, due to its inability to increase tissue tonicity, should be used with bone graft. Further histologic investigations need to be carried out to determine the exact effects of PRGF on tissue regeneration. The use of bone graft alone could enhance tissue consistency and prevent probe insertion even in the lack of any new attachment gain. Therefore, considering pocket depth reduction and gingival recession in PRGF group, such a reduction, should not be definitely attributed to attachment level improvement.

The limited number of cases evaluated does not allow for extrapolation of the obtained results. The device which produces PRGF is expensive and necessitates the involvement of especially-trained personnel. In addition to these limitations, processing of PRGF elongates the surgical time for about half an hour, which may be a limiting factor for its use in private clinics.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of the present study, it can be concluded that PRGF application would be beneficial for the treatment of intrabony defects as well as pocket depth reduction and clinical attachment gain.
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