Clinical Studies Supporting Periodontal Endoscopy

Subgingival Identification study. SEM evaluation 1
- 42 teeth, 210 sites
- 4 hygienists
  95% accuracy in identifying topographical landmarks and features

Extraction Study: SEM evaluation 2
- 42 teeth, 210 sites
- Teeth cleaned with aid of dental endoscope (Perioscopy)
- Teeth extracted and SEM evaluated
  1.2% of Endoscope aided SRP had residual calculus – mostly at CEJ
  Similar study designs in literature showed 10 – 50% residual calculus remaining following traditional SRP w/out endoscope

Endoscopic SRP (Perioscopy) 3
- 46 patients, 73 quadrants
  – Sites treatment planned for surgery
  – Used endoscope and non surgical therapy first
  – 1 year follow-up at 3 month intervals
- Treated by 1 hygienist
  At 1 year, 71 – 73 quadrants required no flap surgery
  Mean attachment gain of 2.06mm

Retrospective look at Perioscopy treatment outcomes after three years (626 sites) 4
In pockets 4 – 6mm
  PD reduction of 1.94mm with endoscope as compared with traditional SRP reported in literature of 1.0mm
  Attachment gain of 1.92mm as compared with traditional SRP reported in literature of 0.38mm
In pockets over 6mm
  PD reduction of 4.4mm with endoscope as compared with traditional SRP reported in literature of 2.18mm
  Attachment gain 4.1mm as compared with traditional SRP reported in literature 0.97mm