

# Use of dental care and smoking-free tobacco

Rakesh Sagar, Akshay Yadav

Sagar R, Yadav A. Use of dental care and smoking-free tobacco. Dent Case Rep. 2023; 7(1):10-11.

### ABSTRACT

The usage of smokeless tobacco negatively impacts dental health. The aim of the current study is to evaluate the use of dental services between smokers and non-smokers, in order to ascertain the level of dental care utilisation among smokers. The cross-sectional study's data came from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). The BRFSS questionnaire was used to identify use of smokeless tobacco and recent dental visits. Included were participants. Both

logistic regression and chi square analysis were performed. Even after correcting for gender, age, education, income, health insurance, smoking, geography, and race/ethnicity, there was a significant correlation between using smokeless tobacco and not having a dental appointment within the preceding year. People who use smokeless tobacco are less likely to have a dental visit within the previous year.

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

### INTRODUCTION

Tobacco that is retained in the mouth rather than burned or inhaled is referred to as smokeless tobacco. Others suck (dip) the tobacco while others chew it. Based on how the tobacco is chopped and wrapped, smokeless tobacco comes in a variety of shapes. Chewing tobacco can be purchased as leaves, bricks, plugs, or rope twists. In dissolvable lozenges, pouches, strips, and other similar packaging, dry snuff and moist snuff are two forms of snuff that can be purchased. Snuff is also available as a powder or very finely processed cuts of tobacco [1]. Adults who use smokeless tobacco number about 10 million. Men are more likely to be affected than women are, and Wyoming and West Virginia have the greatest prevalence rates [2].

The negative effects of smokeless tobacco use on health include exposure to highly addictive nicotine, carcinogenic tobacco-specific nitrosamines, and heavy metals such as arsenic, polonium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, lead, nickel, and mercury (Muthukrishnan and Warnakulasuriya Jul). Use of smokeless tobacco raises the risk of pancreatic, esophageal, and oral cancer as well as preterm birth, stillbirth, and problems with fetal brain growth [3]. professional dentists and smokeless tobacco Smokeless tobacco products are linked to significant oral tissue damage, which can lead to periodontal disease, tooth loss, leukoplakia, erythroplakia, erythroleukoplakia, sub mucous fibrosis, oral squamous cell carcinoma, verrucous carcinoma, and other potentially cancerous conditions in the mouth [4]. Researchers found that the use of

smokeless tobacco was more prevalent in the lowest population segments after conducting a comprehensive global evaluation [5, 6]. The authors proposed that early assistance with quitting and prevention of start could reduce the number of quality-adjusted life years.

Dental professionals can play a vital role in smokeless tobacco conversations during oral examinations because many effects of smokeless tobacco usage have dental/oral/craniofacial repercussions. Visits to the dentist are essential for identifying tissue changes brought on by smoking tobacco, as well as for talking about not starting usage or offering support for efforts to stop using smokeless tobacco. [7]. There has been less research on smokeless tobacco than combustible tobacco, according to researchers, despite the widespread usage of this product and its documented negative health effects. For instance, in a systematic evaluation of tobacco and peri-implantitis related to tobacco, the researchers were unable to locate any papers 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 crucial to understand how dental use differs between people who use smokeless tobacco and people who do not, as dental practitioners may reduce smokeless tobacco use through quitting programs. The aim of the current study is to examine the utilization of dental services between smokers and non-smokers and to ascertain how frequently smokers use smokeless tobacco [9]. The null hypothesis

---

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

Correspondence: Rakesh Sagar, Department of Pharmacy, Anand College, Agra, UP, India, E-mail: [sagar\\_rakesh@gmail.com](mailto:sagar_rakesh@gmail.com)

Received: 6 Jan, 2023, Manuscript No. puldcr-23-6325, Editor assigned: 7 Jan, 2023, Pre QC No. puldcr-23-6325 (PQ), Reviewed: 21 Jan, 2023, QC No. puldcr-23-6325 (Q), Revised: 23 Jan, 2023, Manuscript No. puldcr-23-6325(R), Published: 27 Jan, 2023, DOI: 10.37532. pulacr-23.7.1.10-11.



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)

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.

### Bifacial relationships

The usage of smokeless tobacco and not having visited the dentist in the previous year are examined using logistic regression. For participants who used smokeless tobacco, the odds ratio for not seeing the dentist was unadjusted [11]. When the model was modified to account for gender, race/ethnicity, age, education, income, health insurance, smoking, and geography, it still held significance.

### DISCUSSION

Compared to adult residents who didn't use smokeless tobacco, they had a lower likelihood of seeing the dentist within the past year. In contrast to persons who did not use smokeless tobacco, smokers were more likely to have skipped a dentist appointment in the previous year.

There were differences between non-pregnant women who used tobacco and those who did not, as well as between people who smoke and those who do not, in terms of dental visits, even though there are no studies of smokeless tobacco use and dental visits that are specifically comparable to this one in the literature. The education of dental healthcare professionals in pharmacotherapeutic and behavioral smoke cessation therapies has received a lot of attention. If the people who need them the most don't show up for regular care, these efforts will be hindered. Additionally, if smokers do not visit the dentist regularly, invasive malignancies of the tongue and other oral tissues, which are frequently linked to smokeless tobacco use, cannot be detected in time. Public service ads should be made more frequently 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):212-8.
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):1044-1049.
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):906-913.
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):605-613.
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):820-828.
8. Hurzeler MB, Zuhr O, Schupbach P, et al. The socket-shield technique: a proof-of-principle report. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2010;37(9):855-862.
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):176-180.
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):1450-1458.