

Comparación entre dos técnicas de toma de injerto conectivo en cirugía de cobertura radicular.

Comparison between two techniques of harvesting connective tissue grafts in radicular coverage surgery.

Daniela Encalada¹, Guido Fuentes¹, M.de los Ángeles Ruíz¹, Carla Rojas²

RESUMEN

Objetivo: Comparar los resultados de la cirugía de cobertura radicular utilizando injerto de tejido conectivo subepitelial (SCGT) e injerto gingival desepitelizado (DGG) en recesiones gingivales clase I y II de Miller.

Materiales y métodos: Se realizó una revisión de la literatura de artículos publicados en los últimos 5 años en las bases de datos PubMed y Google Scholar, se utilizó la llave de búsqueda “de epithelialized gingival graft AND subepithelial connective tissue graft”.

Resultados: Se obtuvo un total de 250 artículos. De los que, mediante un filtro manual, se excluyeron 245 publicaciones por encontrarse duplicadas o no cumplir con los criterios previamente descritos, obteniéndose, finalmente, 5 artículos incluidos en esta revisión.

Conclusión: Ambos procedimientos ofrecen resultados satisfactorios frente a la cobertura de recesiones radiculares. Sin embargo, no existe suficiente evidencia para afirmar que una técnica es superior a la otra.

1. Pregrado, Facultad de Odontología Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile
2. Facultad de Odontología Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile.

VII Jornada Científica de Estudiantes de Odontología UV
(Valparaíso, Chile)
Locación: Online
Año: 2020
Presentación Oral
10 de octubre – 9:25 a 9:45 hr

Correspondencia:

Daniela Encalada Guerrero

Correo electrónico:
dencaladag@gmail.com

PALABRAS CLAVE:

Cobertura radicular; injerto de tejido conectivo; desepitelización

KEYWORDS:

Root coverage; connective tissue graft; de-epithelialization.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare root coverage surgery results using subepithelial connective tissue graft (SCGT) and de-epithelialized gingival graft (DGG) in Miller Class I and II gingival recessions.

Material and Methods: A review of the literature published in the last 5 years, with articles selected from PubMed and Google Scholar databases, using the search key "de epithelialized gingival graft AND subepithelial connective tissue graft."

Results: A total of 250 articles were obtained. 245 publications were excluded through a manual filter because they were duplicated or did not meet the established criteria, obtaining 5 articles included in this review.

Conclusion: Both harvesting techniques offer satisfactory results of coverage of root recessions. However, there is not enough evidence to state that one technique is superior to the other.

REFERENCIAS

- [1] Buti J, Baccini M, Nieri M, La Marca M, Pini-Prato GP. Bayesian network meta-analysis of root coverage procedures: ranking efficacy and identification of best treatment. *J. Clin. Periodontol.* 2013;40 (4):372-86.
- [2] Chambrone L, Tatakis DN. Periodontal Soft Tissue Root Coverage Procedures: A Systematic Review From the AAP Regeneration Workshop. *J. Periodontol.* 2015; 86 (2S):S8-S51.
- [3] Öncü E. The Use of Platelet-Rich Fibrin Versus Subepithelial Connective Tissue Graft in Treatment of Multiple Gingival Recessions: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent.* 2017; 37 (2):265-71.
- [4] Chambrone L, Chambrone D, Pustiglioni FE, Chambrone LA, Lima LA. Can subepithelial connective tissue grafts be considered the gold standard procedure in the treatment of Miller Class I and II recession-type defects? *J Dent.* 2008;36 (9): 659-71.
- [5] Pini-Prato G, Nieri M, Pagliaro U, Giorgi TS, La Marca M, Franceschi D, et al. Surgical treatment of single gingival recessions: clinical guidelines. *Eur J Oral Implantol.* 2014;7(1):9-43.
- [6] Zucchelli G, Mele M, Stefanini M, Mazzotti C, Marzadori M, Montebugnoli L, et al. Patient morbidity and root coverage outcome after subepithelial connective tissue and de-epithelialized grafts: a comparative randomized-controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2010; 37 (8): 728-38.
- [7] Bosco AF, Bosco JM. An alternative technique to the harvesting of a connective tissue graft from a thin palate: enhanced wound healing. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent.* 2007; 27 (2): 133-9.
- [8] Marques de Mattos P, Papalexiou V, Tramontina VA, Kim SH, Luczyszyn SM, Bettega PVC, et al. Evaluation of 2 techniques of epithelial removal in subepithelial connective tissue graft surgery: a comparative histological study. *J Periodontal Implant Sci.* 2020; 50 (1): 2-13.
- [9] Ozcelik O, Seydaoglu G, Haytac CM. Diode laser for harvesting de-epithelialized palatal graft in the treatment of gingival recession defects: a randomized clinical trial. *J. Clin. Periodontol.* 2016; 43 (1): 63-71.
- [10] Ho FC. A modified combined approach to harvest connective tissue grafts with high quality, less morbidity, and faster healing. *Int J Esthet Dent.* 2020; 15 (1): 56-67.
- [11] Gursoy H, Yarimoglu E, Kuru B, Ozkan Karaca E, Ince Kuka G. Evaluation of the Effects of Er: YAG Laser for the De-Epithelialization of the Palatal Graft in the Treatment of Multiple Gingival Recessions: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Photobiomodul Photomed Laser Surg.* 2019; 37 (11): 715-21.
- [12] Tavelli L, Ravidà A, Lin GH, Del Amo FS, Tattan M, Wang HL. Comparison between Subepithelial Connective Tissue Graft and De-epithelialized Gingival Graft: A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *J Int Acad Periodontol.* 2019; 21(2):82-96.
- [13] Chambrone L, Ortega MAS, Sukekava F, Rotundo R, Kalemaj Z, Buti J, et al. Root coverage procedures for treating single and multiple recession-type defects: An updated Cochrane systematic review. *J Periodontol.* 2019; 90 (12): 1399-422.