

# Instead of burning, use dental care and a tobacco-free mouth

Maria Graham

Graham M. Instead of burning, use dental care and a tobacco-free mouth. *Dent Case Rep.* 2023; 7(2):25-26.

### ABSTRACT

The use of smokeless tobacco has a deleterious impact on dental health. The current study's goal is to compare the usage of dental services by smokers and nonsmokers in order to determine the level of dental care utilization among smokers. The data for the cross-sectional investigation were obtained from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). The BRFSS questionnaire was used to determine smoking cessation and recent dental visits. Participants were

included. Both We used logistic regression and the chi-square test square analysis. Even after accounting for gender, age, education, income, health insurance, smoking, region, and race/ethnicity, there was a substantial link between using smokeless tobacco and not having a dental appointment in the previous year. Smokeless tobacco users are less likely to have had a dental appointment in the previous year.

**Key Words:** *Alveolar bone; Lamellar bone; Periodontal ligament; Buccal crest; Maxillary region*

### INTRODUCTION

A smokeless tobacco is tobacco that is kept in the mouth rather than burned or breathed. Some people suck (dip) their tobacco, while others chew it. Smokeless tobacco comes in a variety of shapes depending on how it is chopped and wrapped. Chewing tobacco is available in the form of leaves, bricks, plugs, or rope twists. Dry snuff and moist snuff are two types of snuff that can be purchased in dissolvable lozenges, pouches (snus), strips, and other similar packaging. Snuff can also be purchased as a powder or as very finely processed tobacco cuts [1]. There are about adults who use smokeless tobacco. Men are more likely than women to be afflicted, and Wyoming and West Virginia have the highest prevalence rates [2]. Exposure to highly addictive nicotine, carcinogenic tobacco-specific nitrosamines, and heavy metals such as arsenic, polonium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, lead, nickel, and mercury are all harmful impacts of smokeless tobacco usage (Muthukrishnan and Warnakulasuriya Jul). Tobacco use increases the risk of pancreatic, esophageal, and oral cancer, as well as premature birth, stillbirth, and foetal brain growth abnormalities [3]. Smokeless tobacco and competent dentists Tobacco products that do not contain nicotine have been associated to severe oral tissue damage, which can result in periodontal disease, tooth loss, leukoplakia, erythroplakia, erythroleukoplakia, sub mucous fibrosis, oral squamous cell carcinoma, verrucous carcinoma, and other potentially malignant

conditions in the mouth [4]. After completing a comprehensive global study, researchers discovered that the use of smokeless tobacco was more widespread in the poorest demographic segments [5, 6]. The authors claimed that providing early aid in quitting and preventing new smoking could lower the number of quality-adjusted life years.

Because many of the impacts of smokeless tobacco use have dental/oral/craniofacial ramifications, dental professionals can play an important role in smokeless tobacco conversations during oral examinations. Visits to the dentist are critical for diagnosing tissue changes caused by smoking tobacco, as well as discussing the benefits of not starting or supporting efforts to cease using smokeless tobacco. [7]. According to academics, despite the widespread use of this substance and its recognized detrimental health effects, there has been less research on smokeless tobacco than on combustible tobacco. For example, in a systematic review of tobacco and peri-implantitis, the researchers were unable to find any studies on smokeless tobacco products in the indexed literature. Smokeless tobacco was not among the primary findings of any of the assessed papers in another systematic analysis of variables linked with the use of dental services [8].

It is critical to understand how persons who use smokeless tobacco vary from those who do not, because dental practitioners may minimize smokeless tobacco usage through cessation programmers. The current study's goal is to compare the usage of dental services by

---

Department of Pharmacy, Anand College, Agra, UP, India

Correspondence: Maria Graham, Department of Pharmacy, Anand College, Agra, UP, India, Email: graham\_m@gmail.com

Received: 6 March, 2023, Manuscript No. puldcr-23-6501, Editor assigned: 7 March, 2023, Pre QC No. puldcr-23-6501 (PQ), Reviewed: 21 March, 2023, QC No. puldcr-23-6501 (Q), Revised: 23 March, 2023, Manuscript No. puldcr-23-6501 (R), Published: 29 March, 2023, DOI: 10.37532. puldcr-23.7.2.25-26.

---



This open-access article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (CC BY-NC) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits reuse, distribution and reproduction of the article, provided that the original work is properly cited and the reuse is restricted to noncommercial purposes. For commercial reuse, contact [reprints@pulsus.com](mailto:reprints@pulsus.com)

smokers and nonsmokers, as well as to determine how frequently smokers use smokeless tobacco [9]. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the likelihood of using a dental visit between those who use smokeless tobacco and people who do not. The usage of smokeless tobacco and dental visits within the previous year were the two main factors of interest that were evaluated in this study. The BRFSS computed variable for adults who recently visited a dentist, dental hygienist, or other dental facility was used to extract the dental visit variable. The BRFSS question, "Do you currently use chewing tobacco, snuff, or snus every day, some days, or not at all," dichotomized the usage of smokeless tobacco into a yes/no variable. Presented are a sample description and the Chi Square correlations between dental visits in the past year. Participants in the study included women, non-Hispanic whites, people in their years of age, and people with a high school diploma as their greatest level of education. Nearly two thirds of people did not smoke, and the majority had health insurance [10]. Throughout the year, there were those who went to the dentist.

Logistic regression is used to assess the use of smokeless tobacco and not having visited the dentist in the previous year. The odds ratio for not seeing the dentist was unadjusted for persons who used smokeless tobacco [11]. The model retained relevance after being updated to account for gender, race/ethnicity, age, education, income, health insurance, smoking, and geography.

### DISCUSSION

Adult residents who did not use smokeless tobacco had a reduced likelihood of seeing the dentist in the previous year. In comparison to non-smokeless tobacco users, smokers were more likely to have missed a dentist appointment in the previous year.

There were differences in dental visits between non-pregnant women who used tobacco and those who did not, as well as between people who smoke and those who do not, despite the fact that there are no studies of smokeless tobacco use and dental visits in the literature that are specifically comparable to this one. There has been a lot of interest in the education of dental healthcare practitioners in pharmacotherapeutic and behavioral smoke cessation therapies. These efforts will be hampered if the people who need them the most do not show up for regular care. Furthermore, aggressive cancers of the tongue and other oral tissues, which are usually associated with smokeless tobacco use, cannot be recognized in time if smokers do not visit the dentist on a regular basis. More public service announcements should be made to promote dental checkups, especially for smokers.

### REFERENCES

1. Araujo MG, Lindhe J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction. An experimental study in the dog. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2005;32(2):21-8.
2. Pinho MN, Novaes Jr AB, Taba Jr M, et al. Titanium membranes in prevention of alveolar collapse after tooth extraction. *Implant Dent.* 2006;15(1):53-61.
3. Lekovic V, Camargo PM, Klokkevold PR et al. Preservation of alveolar bone in extraction sockets using bioabsorbable membranes. *J Periodontol.* 1998;69(9):1044-9.
4. Fickl S, Zuhr O, Wachtel H et al. Dimensional changes of the alveolar ridge contour after different socket preservation techniques. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2008;35(10):906-13.
5. Fiorellini JP, Howell TH, Cochran D, et al. Randomized study evaluating recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 for extraction socket augmentation. *J Periodontol.* 2005;76(4):605-13.
6. Froum S, Cho SC, Rosenberg E, et al. Histological comparison of healing extraction sockets implanted with bioactive glass or demineralized freeze-dried bone allograft: A pilot study. *J Periodontol.* 2002;73(1):94-102.
7. Botticelli D, Berglundh T, Lindhe J. Hard-tissue alterations following immediate implant placement in extraction sites. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2004;31(10):820-8.
8. Hurzeler MB, Zuhr O, Schupbach P, et al. The socket-shield technique: a proof-of-principle report. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2010;37(9):855-62.
9. Siormpas KD, Mitsias ME, Kontsiotou-Siormpa E, et al. Immediate implant placement in the esthetic zone utilizing the "root-membrane" technique: clinical results up to 5 years postloading. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants.* 2014;29(6):1397-1405.
10. Abadzhiev M, Nenkov P, Velcheva P. Conventional immediate implant placement and immediate placement with socket-shield technique-which is better. *Int J Clin Med Res.* 2014;1(5):176-80.
11. Baumer D, Zuhr O, Rebele S, et al. Socket Shield Technique for immediate implant placement - clinical, radiographic and volumetric data after 5 years. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 2017;28(11):1450-8.