International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Applications
Volume 7, Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2022, pp: 1985-1990 www.ijprajournal.com ISSN: 2456-4494

A Review On: Local Drug Delivery in Periodontics

Menuka Chaudhary,Mrs. Yashika Uniyal
B.Pharma, Guru Nanak Collage Of Pharmaceutical Science Dehradun, Uttrakhand [Collage Code:164], 248007 (Kukreja Institue Of Pharmaceutical Science)

Submitted: 17-12-2022 Accepted: 28-12-2022

ABSTRACT:
An inflammatory disease Periodontitis is the supportive tissues surrounding the teeth which is seen worldwide in all groups of people. Various methods of treatments were used in the management of periodontal disease. There are many efficient ways to treat these disorders, such as mechanical debridement of plaque and topical and systemic administration of antibiotic medicines. There are various options of antimicrobials which can be locally delivered such as metronidazole, chlorhexidine, doxycycline and tetracycline.

KEY WORD: Tetracycline, Doxycycline, Chlorhexidine

I. INTRODUCTION:

A number of pathological diseases that damage the tissues that support the teeth can cause periodontal disease. such as necrotizing periodontitis, chronic periodontitis, and periodontitis linked to systemic diseases. Periodontal disease is well established to be brought on by a localised bacterial infection with pathogenic microflora in the periodontal pocket. Bacterial infection and microbial plaque cause the inflammation to start. In the periodontal pocket, the bacteria create a highly structured and complicated biofilm. Later, the biofilm extends below the gingiva, making it challenging to remove during routine oral hygiene procedures. Gram negative anaerobic bacteria make up the majority of the periodontitis-relatedmicro-floral. Traditional treatments include mechanical debridement, which removes the subgingival flora and creates a clean, smooth, and biocompatible root surface, are often ineffective due to the complicated architecture of some diseases.

History

Ever sincethe introduction of systemic antibiotics, various drugs have been used in the treatment of periodontitis. The disadvantages of systemic antibiotics like bacterial resistance, superimposed infections, uncertain patient compliance, nausea, vomiting and gastrointestinal 6 disturbances led to the introduction of local drug delivery as the treatment option. It was in the year 1979, Dr.Max Goodson et al first proposed the concept of controlled 7 delivery in the treatment of periodontitis. Since then, a number of studies have been carried out over the yearswith different antimicrobial agents and in different clinical situations.

Classification Various classification systems were evolved:

I)Based on the application [Rams and Slots] 1996 1. Personally applied (in patient home self-care)**)**

A. Non-sustained subgingival drug deliveryoral irrigation home oral irrigation jet tips Traditional jet tips Oral irrigation (water pick) Soft cone rubber tips (pick pocket)

B. Sustained subgingival drug delivery

2. Professionally applied (in dental office)

A.Non-sustained subgingival drug delivery Professional pocket irrigation

B. Sustained subgingival drug delivery Controlled release devices Hollow fibres Dialysis tubing Strips 8 Films

II)Based on the duration of medicament release 9 (Greenstein and Tonetti 2000)

A. Sustained release devices – Designed to provide drug delivery for less than 24 hours

B. Controlled release devices – Designed to provide drug release that at least exceeds 1 day or for at least 3 days following application.

III) DEPENDING ON DEGRADABBILITY:

1. Nondegradable gadgets.

2. Degradable gadgets various sedate conveyance frameworks for treating periodontitis are fibres, injectable frameworks, gels, strips.

3. Vesicular framework, microparticles and nanoparticles. Currently accessible locally conveyed antimicrobials in periodontal treatment.

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Applications
Volume 7, Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2022, pp: 1985-1990 www.ijprajournal.com ISSN: 2456-4494

Tetracycline:Containing filaments are the primary accessible neighbourhood drug. It had ethylene/vinyl acetic acid derivation copolymer fibre with diameter of 0.5 mm, containing tetracycline12.7mg per 9 1 inches. The actsite tetracycline filaments have been approved both by the Joined together States Nourishment and DrugAdministration (FDA) and by the European Union's regulatory offices. These are non-resorbable, secure, inactive copolymer stacked with 25% w/w tetracycline HCI.It maintains steady concentrations more than 1000 µg/mL for a period of 10 days. Follow up appeared lessening within the 2 subgingival micro-organisms.Bioresorbable tetracycline fibre has been created with base of collagen film, which is commercially accessible as Periodontal Furthermore AB. It offers the advantage of no moment arrangement for expulsion because it 10 corrupts inside 7 days.Tetracycline serratio-peptidase containing gels were assessed in a consider by Maheshwari et al 2005. This combination containing thermos-reversible gelwas clinically viable in conjunction with scaling and root 11 planning. Different considers were conducted with tetracycline as monotherapy additionally as an adjunctive to scaling and rootplanning. In a 6-month multi-centre assessment ofadjunctive appeared that fibre treatment altogether upgraded the effectiveness of scaling and root planning in the management of restricted repetitive periodontitis locales, in patients getting normal steady period on tal therapy.

DOXYCYCLINE: This medication is used to treat adult gum disease (periodontitis). Doxycycline belongs to a class of drugs known as tetracycline antibiotics. When applied to the infected tooth pockets, this medication works by preventing the growth of bacteria. This medication is a gel that your dental professional places into the infected tooth pocket. It becomes wax-like when it comes in contact with saliva. Doxycycline is then slowly released from the hardened gel over the next 7 days.Biodegradable gel containing 8.5% doxycycline on the anaerobic vegetation and on anti-microbial susceptibility designs related with subgingival plaque and spit detailed that the treatment essentially reduced the anaerobic populace in plaque but did not result in alter in either number of safe microbes or 13 the securing of anti-microbial resistance.

Chlorhexidine:Perio-chipis a small chip composed of biodegradable hydrolysed gelatine matrix, cross-linked with glutaraldehyde and also containing glycerine and water, into which 2.5 mg of chlorhexidine gluconate has been 1 incorporated per chip. It is FDA approved small, orange brown, chip measuring 4.0x 0.5x 0.35mm in a bio-degradable matrix of hydrolysed gelatine.Studies showed reduction in the numbers of the putative periodontopathic organisms(Porphyromonsgingivalis,prevotellainter media, Bacteroides Forsythus, and 2Campylobacter rectus) after placement of the chip. Study by Soskolne, W.A. in 1999 showed that there was an initial peak concentration of chlorhexidine in gingival crevicular fluid at 2- hour after the chip was introduced. Slightly lower concentrations being maintained over next 96 hrs. Total 16 degradation occurred between 7-10 d.

Ideal Requirement of Locally Delivered Drug:

1. The medicate conveyance framework ought to provide the sedate to the base of the take.
2. It ought to be successful against periodontal pathogens as it were and not on commensal microflora.
3. Medicate must appear in-vitro action against the organisms.
4.The target measurements ought to be adequate sufficient to slaughter the focused on life forms moreover ought to not have any antagonistic effects.
5. Sub-stainity.
6. Delayed rack life.
7. It ought to be both biodegradable and biocompatible.
8. Ease of situation.
9. Prepared to utilize chairside.
10. Ought to be economical.

CONTRAINDICATION:

Local medicate conveyance ought to not be utilized within the taking after conditions,

1. Periodontal patients with known touchiness response to any components of the LDD systems to be used.
2. As a substitution to scaling and root arranging amid starting periodontal treatment and maintenance.
3. In pregnant or lactating patients.
4. Patients vulnerable to infective endocarditis to dodge the hazard of bacteria in blood.
5. As a substitution for surgical periodontal treatment in cases shown for periodontal surgery.
6. As a substitution for systemic anti-microbial treatment, where their systemic organization is indicated.

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Applications
Volume 7, Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2022, pp: 1985-1990 www.ijprajournal.com ISSN: 2456-4494

Advantages:

1. Accomplishes a 100 overlay higher concentration of antimicrobial operators in sub-gingival destinations.
2. The concentration of the sedate in periodontal take isn't influenced by the vacillation in plasma levels.
3. The strategy is reasonable for specialists which cannot be given systemically, such as chlorhexidine.
4. Little measurements can be managed.
5. Superinfection and sedate resistance are rare.
6. Diminishment in recurrence of medicate administration.

Disadvantages:

1. Trouble in setting into the more profound parts of the pockets of the furcation lesions.
2. Does not have any impact on adjoining or close by structures such as tonsils, buccal mucosa act so may cause chances of reinfection.
3. Time devouring.
4. In nearness of generalized pockets, other periodontal treatments ought to be used.

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE VERSUS CLINICAL SIGNIFICANCE:

Results of considers have to be deciphered with respect to their factual and clinical centrality because these terms are not fundamentally interchangeable. The term factual importance indicates that the differences between a test and a control bunch did not occur by chance. It does not show that the difference was huge or vital. In this respect, a statistically significant result may not be clinically meaningful. Therefore, caution must be worked out when evaluating the clinical pertinence of little cruel contrasts between test and control bunches that are factually significance. On the other hand, little cruel differences achieved relative to particular parameters (e.g., probing depth decrease) may not reflect other clinically important benefits (e.g., number of destinations with ‡2 mm probing profundity decrease).

Establishing limits to mean ‘‘clinical significance’’ is tricky, since there's no precise way to characterize clinical significance with regard to how small in change is significant at a specific location in a particular quiet. In this manner, clinicians need to assess information concerning the viability of a local drug conveyance framework with respect to the assortment of factors: anticipated result related with a neighbourhood drug delivery gadget and its connection to the measure of the injuryto be treated; wanted clinical result; and the patient’s medical and dental history. Appropriately, it is suggested that clinical noteworthiness signifies a alter that may modify how a clinician will treat the understanding, and this value judgment shifts depending on the situation.10 Furthermore, clinicians may translate clinical relevance in an unexpected way since they may put emphasis on distinctive results (e.g., measure of impact, fetched, and time required for treatment)

II. CONCLUSION:

Based on the accessible prove, the nearby medicate conveyance into the periodontal stash can make strides the periodontal health. Be that as it may these drugs come up short to totally supplant the conventional scaling and root arranging. In this way the advantage of these drugs as a mono treatment is flawed. When compared to systemic antimicrobials, the nearby sedate delivery will decrease the creating sedate safe bacterial strain which is of current around the world concern. Moreover, the controlled discharge properties can be connected as a therapeutic component within thecompelling administration of localised holding on injuries. Neighbourhood medicate organization should be based on quiet clinical discoveries, logical evidence and legitimate diagnosis. Thus, it can be concluded that neighbourhood sedate conveyance in spite of the fact that not a substitute for the routine treatment, can be of added advantage in case utilized as an aide with the customary scaling and root arranging.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Newman, Takei, Klokkevold, Carranza. Carranza's clinical periodontology 2010:pp 798-803, Chemotherapeutic agents,10 edition.2010;Elsevier, Reed Elsevier India Private Limited.
[2]. Dodwad V, Vaish S, Mahajan A, Chhokra M, Local drug delivery in periodontics: a strategic intervention. International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.2004;4(4):30-4.
[3]. Pragati S, Ashok S., KuldeepS., Recent advances in periodontal drug delivery systems. International Journal of Drug Delivery Jan 2009:1: 1- 9.
[4]. Gordon JM, Walker CB., Current status of systemicantibiotic usage in destructive periodontal disease. J. Periodontal 1993; 64: 760-771.
[5]. Divya P.V, K. Nandakumar: "Local Drug Delivery---Periocol"In

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Applications
Volume 7, Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2022, pp: 1985-1990 www.ijprajournal.com ISSN: 2456-4494

Periodontics;trendsbiometer. Artif.Organs.2010; 19(2): 74-80.

[6]. Chadha VS, Arora K, Manjunath B C, SarikaKalra: local drug delivery in periodontics: current concepts and trends; International Journal of Advanced Research on Oral Sciences 2012; 1(1): 1 -9.

[7]. Goodson JM, Hafajee A, Socransky SS. Periodontal therapy by local delivery of tetracycline. J Clinical Periodontal 1979; 6: 83-92.

[8]. Rams TE, Slots J. Local delivery of antimicrobial agents in the periodontal pocket. Periodontology 2000. 1996 Feb: 10: 139-159.

[9]. Greenstein G, Tonetti M. The role of controlled drug delivery for periodontitis. The Research, Science and Therapy Committee of the American Academy of Periodontology. J Periodontal 2000 Jan; 71(1):125-140.

[10]. Ashtaputre V, Limaye M. Local drug delivery in periodontics: A tactical entreaty. Journal of Research in Pharmaceutical Science2014; 2 (1): 06-11.

[11]. Maheshwari M, Miglani G, Mali A, Paradkar A, Yamamura S, Kadam S. Development of TetracyclineSerratio-peptidase: Containing Periodontal Gel: Formulation and Preliminary Clinical Study; AAPS Pharm Sci Tech 2006; 7 (3):162-171.

[12]. 12.Newman MG, Kornman KS, Doherty FM. A 6-month multi-centre evaluation of adjunctive tetracycline fibre therapy used in conjunction with scaling and root planning in maintenance patients-clinical results. J Periodontal July 1994; 65: 685-691.

[13]. Walker C, Godowski K, Borden L, Lennon J, Nango S, Stone C, & Garrett S, The effects of sustained release doxycycline on the anaerobic flora and antibiotic –resistant patterns in subgingival plaque and saliva. JPeriodontal 2000:71:768-774.

[14]. Renvert S, Lessem J, Dahlen G, Renvert H,Lindahl C. Mechanical and Repeated AntimicrobialTherapy Using a Local Drug DeliverySystemin theTreatment of Peri-Implantitis:A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Periodontal 2008;79: 836-844.

[15]. Shifrovitch Y, Binderman I, Bahar H, Berdicevsky I, Zilberman M. Metronidazole-Loaded Bioabsorbable Films as Local Antibacterial Treatmentof Infected Periodontal Pockets. J Periodontal 2009:80:330- 7.

[16]. Varma A, Sanghi S, Grover D, Aggarwal S, Gupta R, Pandit N. Effect of insertion of xanthan-based chlorhexidine gel in the maintenance phase following the treatment of chronic periodontitis. J Indian Soc Periodontal. 2012 Jul-Sep; 16(3): 381–5.

[17]. Chava VK, Vedula BD. Thermo-reversible green tea catechin gel for local application in chronic periodontitis: a 4-week clinical trial. J Periodontal 2013:84:1290-6.

[18]. Pradeep AR, Rao NS, Naik SB, Kumari M. Efficacy of varying concentrations of sub-gingivally delivered metformin in the treatment of chronic periodontitis: the randomized controlled clinical trials. J of Periodontal. Feb 2013:84:133-135.

[19]. Pradeep AR, Kumari M, Rao NS, Martande SS, Naik SB. Clinical Efficacy of sub-gingivallydelivered 1.2% Atorvastatin in chronicperiodontitis: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. Journal of Periodontology. July 2013; 84(7): 871-9.

[20]. Williams RC, Paquette DW, Offenbacher S. Treatment of periodontitis by local administration of minocycline microspheres: a controlled trial. Journal of Periodontology. November 2001;72(1):11-4.

[21]. Ramesh A, Thomas B, Sathish M. Comparative evaluation of subgingival application of chlorhexidine varnish and chlorhexidine gel as an adjunct to full mouth scaling and root planning in the treatment of moderate to deep periodontal pockets – Aclinical study.JIDA2010:8(3):35-40.

[22]. Agarwal E, Pradeep AR, Bajaj P, Naik SB. Efficacy of local drug delivery of 0.5% Clarithromycin gel as an adjunct to non-surgical periodontal therapy in the treatment of current smokers with chronic periodontitis: A randomized controlled clinical trial., J.Periodontal September 2012:83:1155-1163.

[23]. Pradeep AR, Sharma A, Rao NS, Bajaj P, Naik SB, Kumari M. Local drug delivery of alendronate gel for the treatment of patients withchronic periodontitis with diabetes mellitus: a double-masked controlledclinicaltrial; J. Periodontal.oct 2012; 83(10):1322-8.

[24]. Pradeep AR, Kumari M, Rao NS, Naik SB .1% Alendronate gel as local drugdelivery in the treatment of class infuriation defects: a randomizedcontrolled clinical trial J.periodontal march 2012; vol 84(3):307-315.

[25]. Baiju CS, Manchanda S.Chair side therapeutic aids in periodontics. Heal talk. Nov-Dec 2010;3(2)

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Applications
Volume 7, Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2022, pp: 1985-1990 www.ijprajournal.com ISSN: 2456-4494

[26]. Amitha ramesh, Agumbe priyanka prakash, Biju thomas - Local drug delivery in periodontal diseases - Nitte university journal of health science (march 2016).
[27]. Ankur singh rajpoot, Anuj singh parihar - Local drug delivery in periodontics - International journal of research in health and allied science (july - august 2017).
[28]. Dharshan Mundinamane, Sucheta A, Karthik venkataraghavan, Akanksha Garg- Newer trends:41-2 n local drug delivery for periodontal problems- a preview- Aug (2011)
[29]. Slots J, Rams TE. Local delivery of antimicrobial agents in the periodontal pocket- (2000).
[30]. Goodson JM, Hogan PE, Dunham S.L. Clinical responses following periodontal treatment by local drug delivery.
[31]. Rose LF, Mealey BC, Genco Rj, Cohen DW. Periodontitis. Elseviermosby: 2004.
[32]. Magnusson I, Lindhe J, et al recolonisation of a subgingival microbiota following scaling in deep pockets.
[33]. American academy of periodontology on local drug delivery of sustained or controlled release antimicrobials as adjunctive therapy in treatment of periodontitis. j periodontal 2006.
[34]. Lacroix JM, Walker CB. Detection and incidence of the tetracycline resistant determinant in the microflora associated with adult periodontitis, J Periodontal 1995.
[35]. Clinical periodontology - Carranza 9/10th edition REFERENCES
[36]. Haffajee AD, Socransky SS. Microbial etiologicalagents of destructive periodontal diseases. Periodontol2000 1994;5:78-111.
[37]. Evans AS. Epidemiological concepts. In: Evans AS,Brachmen PS, eds. Bacterial Infections of Humans:Epidemiology and Control. New York: Plenum; 1991;3-58.
[38]. Offenbacher S. Periodontal diseases: Pathogenesis.Ann Periodontal 1996:1:821-878.
[39]. Page RC, Offenbacher S, Schroeder HE, Seymour GJ,Kornman KS. Advances in the pathogenesis of periodontitis: Summary of developments, clinical implications and future direction. Periodontal 2000 1997:14:216-248.
[40]. Cobb CM. Non-surgical pocket therapy: Mechanical, Ann Periodontal 1996;1:443-490.
[41]. American Academy of Periodontology. Sonic and ultrasonic scalers in periodontics (position paper). J Periodontal 2000:71:1792-1801.
[42]. Tonetti MS. The topical use of antibiotics in periodontal pockets. In: Lang NP, Karring R, Lindhe J,eds. Proceedings of the 2nd European Workshop onPeriodontology, Chemical in Periodontics. CarolStream, IL: Quintessence; 1996:78-109.
[43]. Greenstein G, Polson A. The role of local drug deliveryin the management of periodontal diseases: A comprehensive review. J Periodontal 1998;69:507-520.
[44]. Greenstein G, Lamster I. Efficacy of periodontal therapy: Statistical versus clinical significance (guesteditorial). J Periodontal 2000:71:657-662.
[45]. Lindgren BR, Wielinski CL, Finkelstein SM, WarwickWJ. Contrasting clinical and statistical significancewithin the research setting. Pediatr Pulmonol 1993:16:336-340.
[46]. Greenstein G, Nunn M. A method to enhance determining the clinical relevance of periodontal researchdata: Number needed to treat (NNT). J Periodontol2004:75:620-624.
[47]. Chatellier G, Zapletal E, Lemaire D, Menard J, Degoulet P. The number needed to treat a clinicallyuseful nomogram in its proper context. BMJ 1996:312:426-429.
[48]. Goodson JM, Hogan P, Dunham S. Clinical responsesfollowing periodontal treatment by local drug delivery, J Periodontal 1985;56(11 Suppl.):81-87.
[49]. Heijl L, Dahlen G, Sundin Y, Wenander A, GoodsonJM. A 4-quadrant comparative study of periodontaltreatment using tetracycline containing drug deliveryfibres and scaling. J Clin Periodontal 1991:18:111-116.
[50]. Goodson JM, Cugini MA, Kent RL, et al. Multicentre evaluation of tetracycline fibre therapy: II. Clinicalresponse. J Periodontal Res 1991:26:371-379.
[51]. Newman MG, Kornman KS, Doherty FM. A 6-monthmulti-center evaluation of adjunctive tetracycline fibre therapy used in conjunction with scaling and rootplanning in maintenance patients: Clinical results. JPeriodontal 1994:65:685-691.
[52]. Aimetti M, Romano F, Torta I, Cirillo D, Caposio P,Romagnoli R. Debridement and local application often tetracycline-loaded fibres in the management of persistent periodontitis: Results after 12 months. J ClinPeriodontal 2004:31:166-172.
[53]. Drisko CL, Cobb CM, Killoy WJ, et al. Evaluation ofperiodontal treatments using

controlled-release tetracycline fibres. Clinical response. J Periodontal 1995:66:692-699.

[54]. Wong MY, Lu CL, Lui CM, Hou LT. Clinical response oflocalized recurrent periodontitis treated with scaling,root planning, and tetracycline fibres. J Formos MedAssoc 1998:97:490-497.

[55]. Kinane DF, Radvar M. A 6-month comparison of 3periodontal local antimicrobial therapies in persistentperiodontal pockets. J Periodontal 1999:70:1-7.

[56]. Tonetti M, Cortellini P, Carnevale G, Cattabriga M, deSanctis M, Pini Prato GP. A controlled multicentre study of adjunctive use of tetracycline periodontalfibres in mandibular Class II furcations with persistentbleeding. J Clin Periodontal 1998:25:728-736.

[57]. Garrett S, Johnson L, Drisko CH, et al. Two multicentre studies evaluating locally delivered doxycyclinehyclate, placebo control, oral hygiene, and scaling androot planning in the treatment of periodontitis. J Periodontal 1999:70:490-503.

[58]. Eickholz P, Kim TS, Bu¨rklin T, et al. Nonsurgicalperiodontal therapy with adjunctive topical doxycycline. A double-blind randomized controlled multicentre study. I. Study design and clinical results. J ClinPeriodontal 2002:29:108-117.

[59]. Wennstrom JL, Newman HN, MacNeil SR, et al.Utilisation of locally delivered doxycycline in non-surgical treatment of chronic periodontitis. A comparative multi-centre trial of 2 treatment approaches.J Clin Periodontal 2001:28:753-761.

[60]. Machion L, Andia DC, Benatti BB, et al. Locallydelivered doxycycline as an adjunctive therapy toscaling and root planning in the treatment of smokers:A clinical study. J Periodontal 2004:75:464-469.

[61]. de Lima AFM, Cury CC, Paliotto DB, Duro AM, daSilva RC, Wolff LF. Therapy with adjunctive doxycycline local delivery in patients with type 1 diabetesmellitus and periodontitis. J Clin Periodontal 2004:31:648-653.

[62]. Tomasi C, Wennstrom JPL. Locally delivered doxycycline improves healing following non-surgical periodontal therapy in smokers. J Clin Periodontal 2004:31:589-595.

[63]. Jeffcoat M, Bray KS, Ciancio SG, et al. Adjunctive useof a sub-gingival controlled-release chlorhexidine chipreduces probing depth and improved attachment levelcompared with scaling and root planning alone. J Periodontal 1998:69:989-997.

[64]. Soskolne WA, Heasman PA, Stabholz A, et al. Sustained local delivery of chlorhexidine in the treatmentof periodontitis: A multi-centre study. J Periodontal 1997:68:32-38.

[65]. Heasman PA, Heasman L, Stacey F, McCracken GI. local delivery of chlorhexidine gluconate (Perio-Chip)in periodontal maintenance patients. J Clin Periodontal 2001:28:90-95.

[66]. Azmak N, Atilla G, Luoto H, Sorsa T. The effect ofsub-gingival controlled-release delivery of chlorhexidine chip on clinical parameters and matrix metalloproteinase-8 levels in gingival crevicular fluid.J Periodontal 2002:73:608-615.

[67]. Grisi DC, Salvador SL, Figueiredo LC, Souza SLS,Novaes AB Jr., Grisi MFM. Effect of a controlledrelease chlorhexidine chip on clinical and microbiological parameters of periodontal syndrome. J Clinical Periodontal 2002:29:875-881.

[68]. Williams RC, Paquette DW, Offenbacher S, et al. Treatment of periodontitis by local administration of minocycline microspheres: A controlled clinical trial.J Periodontal 2001:72:1535-1544.