JOURNAL OF CLINICAL MEDICINE

Research Article

Volume 1 | issue 4

Randomized Controlled, Clinical Blinded Study to Evaluate the Main Cause of Periodontal Disease, the Predominant Presence of Bacteria in Percentage and the Total Bacterial Load Before and After Non-Surgical Therapy

Giuseppe Grech

Master of Periodntology Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.

***Corresponding Author:** Giuseppe Grech, Master of Periodntology Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.

Submitted: 01 July 2026 **Accepted:** 15 July 2026 **Published:** 08 August 2026

Citation: Grech, G. (2026). Randomized Controlled, Clinical Blinded Study to Evaluate the Main Cause of Periodontal Disease, the Predominant Presence of Bacteria in Percentage and the Total Bacterial Load Before and After Non-Surgical Therapy. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 1(4), 01-14.

Abstract

Evaluate the root cause of periodontal disease, the predominance of bacteria and the total bacterial load before and after.

Materials and Methods

Microbiological Tests

It consists in taking the crevicular fluid colonized by bacteria and containing epithelial cells of the person being examined, using a sterile paper cone with a diameter of 60/80 in the periodontal or peri-implant pocket for at least 30 seconds (so that it is soaked in liquid crevicular possibly without blood); it is placed inside the test tube; the procedure is repeated to obtain from a minimum of two to a maximum of four paper cones. The test was performed on 420 patients aged 30-60 years, 236 women, 184 men, 4-11mm pockets moderate-severe chronic periodontitis, for a total of 498 samples, in 78 patients a second sampling was carried out after treatment.

Results

The study highlighted that the main cause of periodontal disease are parafunctions (Bruxism, clenching, bad habits, atypical swallowing, mouth breathing), dental misalignment, pre-contacts and incongruous prosthetic products. Therefore, as "direct and triggering" local etiological factors and no longer "indirect and predisposing" as has always been claimed. In the background by bacteria.

Keywords: Periodontal Disease, Inflammation, Plaque, Tartar, Bacteria, Microbiological Analysis, Parafunctions.

Introduction

The Periodontal Disease

The term periodontal disease (periodontitis) indicates a set of inflammatory pathologies, of an infectious nature, which are characterized at a clinical level by the pathological involvement of all the tissue components of the periodontal organ (gingiva, periodontal ligament, alveolar bone and root cementum). “Direct and triggering” local etiological factors: Bacterial (bacterial plaque, tartar, “alba” (“dawn”) materia, food residues. “Indirect and aggravating local” factors: Functional (occlusal trauma, parafunctions, bad habits, oral respiration, atypical swallowing, hypofunction) [1-4].

"Indirect and predisposing" factors: Mechanical (wrong oral hygiene, presence of food). Anatomical (dental malposition, dental shape, shape of periodontal tissues). "Indirect, predisposing and aggravating": Iatrogenic (overflowing fillings, incorrect prosthetic margins, oversized prosthetic crowns and orthodontic devices). The initiation and progression of periodontal disease are commonly attributed to pathogenic bacteria of the oral mi-

crobiota, mainly part of the red/orange complexes:

- Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans
- Porphyromonas gingivalis
- Tannerella forsythia
- Treponema denticola
- Fusobacterium nucleatum
- Campylobacter rectus

Other factors including bad habits, anatomical and latrogenic, genetic and hereditary factors.The aim of this study is to evaluate the main cause of periodontal disease, the predominant presence of bacteria in percentage and the total bacterial load before and after non-surgical therapy [5-8].

Materials and Methods

Microbiological Tests

It consists in taking the crevicular fluid colonized by bacteria and containing epithelial cells of the person being examined, using a sterile paper cone with a diameter of 60/80 in the periodontal or peri-implant pocket for at least 30 seconds (so that it is soaked in liquid crevicular possibly without blood); it is placed inside the test tube; the procedure is repeated to obtain from a minimum of two to a maximum of four paper cones. The test was performed on 420 patients, aged 30-60 years, 236 women, 184 men, 4-11mm pockets moderate-severe chronic periodontitis, for a total of 498 samples, in 78 patients a second sampling was carried out after treatment [9-11].

The patients had received no antibiotics or periodontal treatment during the past 6 months, no systemic disease. It follows the methodology, but differs primarily in the choice of patients, with specific characteristics (age, smokers 10/20 cigarettes a day, moderate-severe periodontitis, 4/11mm periodontal pockets) more responsive to ordinary people. Plaque index (IP), bleeding index (BoP), pocket depth (PPD), mobility (M), recession (GAC) were evaluated. All patients were provided with information about the study, having signed the informed consent[12-16].

Clinical Procedures

Microbiological testing was used for the study. The mesial area of the upper right first molar (1.6) and the mesial area of the lower left first molar (3.6) were selected. A group of 78 patients underwent a second sampling after treatment. (Scaling and root planing) [17-19].

Microbiological Analysis Results

The following sample was analysed: 498 withdrawals for a total of 420 patients.

In 78 patients a second sampling was carried out after the treatment, for a consideration of 15,7% of the total samples and 18,6% of the patients. The bacterium Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans is present in 2.2% of the samplings (11 cases out of 420) with values ranging from 0,0006% to 1,7875% of the total bacterial load, with an average value of 0,4995% before treatment [20].



Chart 1: Normal distribution of the presence of Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans

The bacterium Porphyromonas gingivalis is present in 25,5% of the samplings (127 cases out of 420) with values ranging from 0,0003% to 48,5433%, with an average value of 2,7917 on the total bacterial load. In the case of patients in which the measurement was made before treatment, the average percentage value is 2,8689, the average value after treatment drops to 0,4178%



Chart 2

The Tannerella forsythia bacterium is present in 31,3% of the samplings (156 cases out of 420) with values ranging from 0,0004% to 15,1197% with an average percentage value of 1.1961 on the total bacterial load. In the case of patients in which the measurement was made before treatment, the average percentage value is 1,2331, the average value after treatment is 0,5912%.



Chart 3

The Treponema denticola bacterium is present in 32,7% of the samplings (163 cases out of 420) with values ranging from 0,0010% to 52,4201%, with an average percentage value of 1,5862 on the total bacterial load. In the case of patients in which the measurement was made before treatment, the average percentage value is 1,6668, the average value after treatment is 0,846%.



Chart 4

The Fusobacterium nucleatum bacterium is present in 72,5% of the samplings (361 cases out of 420) with values ranging from 0,0035% to 86,3505%, with an average value of 6,4628% of the total bacterial load. In the case of patients in which the measurement was made before treatment, the average percentage value is 7,0148, the average value after treatment is 2,5865.



Chart 5

The Campylobacter rectus bacterium is present in 37,5% of the samplings (187 out of 420 cases) with values ranging from 0,0006% to 29,5476%, with an average value of 1,5387% of the total bacterial load. In the case of patients in which the measurement was made before treatment, the average percentage value is 1,4527, the average value after treatment rises to 2,4589.



Chart 6



Figure 1: Presence of Bacteria and Parafunctions Throughout the Sample



Figure 2: Presence of Bacteria and Parafunctions Before Treatment



Figure 3: Presence of Bacteria and Parafunctions After Treatment



Figure 4: Presence of Bacteria in Patients without Parafunctions



Figure 5: Total Bacterial Load Before Treatment



Figure 6: Total Bacterial Load After Treatment



Figure 7: Normal Bacterial Load Distribution in Parafunctions Before Treatment



Figure 8: Normal Bacterial Load Distribution in Parafunctions After Treatment

(prima = 1 o dopo = 2)	Codice Paziente	azione (no = 0 o si = 1)	M o F	Parafunzioni	Aggregatibacter_actinomycetemcomitans	Porphyromonas_gingivalis	Tannerella_forsythi	Treponema_denticol	Fusobacterium_nucleatum	Campylobacter_rectus	Carica_totale	tinomycetemcomitans_quantita_relativa	Porphyromonas_gingivalis_quantita_relativa	Tannerella_forsythia_quantita_relati
2	Paziente 1	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	1928	2662	3277397	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 2	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	1554	1412	0	95789	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 3	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	1554	1412	0	95789	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 4	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	187	0	72376	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 5	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	2076	35883	1611	519970	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 6	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	2475	0	174417	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 7	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	0	0	564	32061	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 8	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	613	580	274734	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 9	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	103	0	118676	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 10	1		precontatto	0	0	0	0	0	0	2435	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 11	1	F	serrare	0	0	71	0	28331	0	143417	0,0000	0,0000	0,0495
0	Paziente 12	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	56	0	0	120143	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 13	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	0	0	128673	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 14	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	4688	0	415385	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 15	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	0	716	493	6531	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 16	1	M	precontatto	0	151	0	0	1529	1009	101658	0,0000	0,1485	0,0000
0	Paziente 17	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	1952	279	133606	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 18	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	0	5698	159	203460	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 19	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	58	0	45088	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 20	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	1949	0	441213	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 21	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	92	0	0	1362868	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 22	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	1114	0	90735	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 23	1		precontatto	0	0	0	0	572	965	135111	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 24	1	F	precontatto	0	85	237	0	281	568	40704	0,0000	0,2088	0,5823
0	Paziente 25	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	0	0	38099	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 26	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	8985	4526	3332463	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 27	1	M	precontatto	0	0	0	0	0	0	80914	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 28	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	154	0	320538	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 29	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	0	0	0	31681	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 30	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	0	0	62790	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 31	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	0	0	99420	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 32	1	M	serrare	0	0	0	0	2115	10660	14225762	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 33	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	1136	426	29388	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 34	1	F	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	0	0	4101536	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 35	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	0	0	4101536	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 36	1	M	serrare	0	0	0	0	1383	92	87633	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 37	1	F	serrare	0	0	0	0	4346	2505	64383	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 38	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	0	1910	144	694984	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
1	Paziente 39	1	F	precontatto	0	0	0	212	101371	15915	191938	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 40	1	M	precontatto	0	0	0	0	0	0	77556	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000
0	Paziente 41	1	M	bruxismo	0	0	0	0	0	0	142997	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000

Figure 9: Presence of Bacteria in Parafunctions



Figure 10: Patient 42 years old 417 x 276 mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 11: 417 x 276 mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 12: Orthopanoramic 417 x 276 mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 13: Full Endorale 214 x 144 mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 14: Periodontal Chart Examples of periodontal planning to evaluate the bleeding index (BoP) and the plaque index (PI) 320 x 104 mm (150 x 150 DPI)

LAB srl
Sede Amministrativa: Via Urbana, 1, 40123 Bologna
Sede Operativa: Via Cavallotti 65, 44021 Codigoro (FE)

CODICE PAZIENTE
DATA di NASCITA
SESSO
SEDE PRELIEVO
PROFONDITA' DI TASCA
DATA del PRELIEVO



RICHIEDENTE Dr. GRECH
E-mail

Risultati analisi microbiologica

CEPPO BATTERICO	QUANTITA' ASSOLUTA	QUANTITA' RELATIVA (sulla carica assoluta)
Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans	0	0,00%
Porphyromonas gingivalis	0	0,00%
Tannerella forsythia	0	0,00%
Treponema denticola	0	0,00%
Fusobacterium nucleatum	0	0,00%
Campylobacter rectus	0	0,00%
Carica totale	90370	100,00%



* *batterio detectato*
** *quantità batterica elevata (10^2 <copie<10^4)*
*** *quantità batterica molto elevata (copie>10^4)*





Note:

Si consiglia di ripetere il test alla fine della terapia per verificare la riduzione della carica batterica totale a valori inferiori a 10.000.

Data referto 12/03/2021

Prof. Francesco Carinci Dr. Damiano Mucchi

Discussion

The graphs have highlighted that after the treatment (Scaling and root planing) there is a drastic reduction (elimination of some bacteria) of the bacteria and of the total bacterial load. Before treatment the presence of Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans, Tannerella forsythia, the percentage is very low and in many cases their absence, on the other hand we have a very high percentage of the bacterium Fusobacterium nucleatum also present in the intestine and causes colorectal cancer (studies have demonstrated a correlation between the bacterium present in the oral cavity and colorectal cancer).

In graph 7, the Parafunctions are 70% (bruxism, clenching, atypical swallowing, precontacts, bad habits, dental misalignment, oral respirator and incongruous prosthetic products), with high acterial load in some cases without main bacteria in other cases the almost constant presence of the bacterium Fusobacterium nucleatum,

Out of 420 patients 263 are with parafunctions 157 periodontal disease is attributed to bacteria.
Of these 263 patients (Chart 15) N 60 are without bacteria
N 86 are without 5 bacteria
N 112 are without the first 4 bacteria
N 2 only have Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans
N 13 have only Porphyromonas gingivalis
N 173 have Fusobacterium nucleatum

Results

The study highlighted that the main cause of periodontal disease are parafunctions (bruxism, clenching, bad habits, atypical swallowing, mouth breathing), dental misalignment, pre-contacts and incongruous prosthetic products. Therefore as "direct and triggering" local etiological factors and no longer "indirect and predisposing" as has always been claimed. In the background by bacteria. Before treatment the presence of Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans Porphyromonas gingivalis, Tannerella forsythia, the percentage is very low and in many cases their absence, on the other hand we have a very high percentage of the bacterium Fusobacterium nucleatum, also present in the intestine and causing colorectal cancer (studies have shown a correlation of the bacterium present in the oral cavity and colorectal cancer). After the treatment (Scaling and root planing) there is a drastic reduction (elimination of some bacteria) of the bacteria and of the total bacterial load.

Out of 420 patients 263 are with parafunctions 157 periodontal disease is attributed to bacteria.
Of these 263 patients (Chart 15) N 60 are without bacteria
N 86 are without 5 bacteria
N 112 are without the first 4 bacteria
N 2 only have Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans
N 13 have only Porphyromonas gingivalis
N 173 have Fusobacterium nucleatum
Out of 78 patients where a second sampling was carried out after treatment, 40% (31 patients) of the patients had Fusobacterium nucleatum always present.

Thanks
I thank Dr. Nicole Savioli, Dr. Laura Giuliani, the ASO manager Manuela Fuganti and all the staff of the "Dr Giuseppe Grech" team for the collaboration. I thank Dr. Caterina Giovinazzo for the technical-scientific support.

Fusobacterium Nucleatum and Oral Cancer: A Critical Review
Emily McIlvanna 1, Gerard J. Linden 2, Stephanie G Craig 1 3, Fionnuala T Lundy 4, Jacqueline A James .Pup Med. 5

The periodontal pathogens Porphyromonas gingivalis and Fusobacterium nucleatum promote tumor progression in an oral specific chemical carcinogenesis model.
Binder Gallimidi A, Fischman S, Revach B, Bulvik R, Maliutina A, Rubinstein AM, Nussbaum G, Elkin M. Pub Med.

Involvement of Fusobacterium Species in Oral Cancer Progression: A Literature Review Including other Cancer Types.
Fujiwara N, Kitamura N, Yoshida K, Yamamoto T, Ozaki K, Kudo Y. Pub Med

Colorectal Cancer Patients have Identical Strains of Fusobacterium Nucleatum in Colorectal Cancer and Oral Cavity.
Yasuhiko Komiya 1 2, Yumi Shimomura 3, Takuma Higurashi 1, Yutaka Sugi 3, Jun Arimoto 1, Shotaro Umezawa 1, Shiori Uchiyama 1, Mitsuharu Matsumoto 3, Atsushi Nakajima 1 .Pub Med

Colon Cancer - Associated Fusobacterium Nucleatum can Originate from the Oral Cavity and Reach Colon Cancers via the Circulatory System.
Abed J, Maalouf N, Manson AL, Earl AM, Parhi L, Emgård JEM, Klutstein M, Tayeb S, Almogy G, Atlan KA, Chaushu S, Israeli E, Mandelboim O, Garrett WS, Bachrach G. Pub Med

Fusobacterium Nucleatum Associated with Colon Cancer can Originate from the Oral Cavity and Reach Colon Tumors via the Circulatory System.
Jawad Abed 1 2, Naseem Maalouf 1, Abigail L Manson 3, Ashlee M Earl 3, Lishay Parhi 1, Johanna EM Emgård 1, Michael Klutstein 1, Shay Tayeb 4, Gedeone Almogy 5, Karine A Atlan 6, Stella Chaushu 2, Era israeliano 7, Ofer Mandelboim 8, Wendy S. Garrett 10, Gilad Bachrach .Pub Med

Determination of the Role of Fusobacterium Nucleatum in the Pathogenesis Inside and Outside the Mouth.
Urim Tefiku 1, Mirjana Popovska 2, Amella Cana 3, Lindita Zendeli-Bedxeti 3, Bilbil Recica 4, Ana Spasovska-Gjorgovska 5, Spiro Spasovski Pub Med

References

1. American Academy of Periodontology. (1989). Supportive treatment. In Proceedings of the World Workshop in Clinical Periodontics (p. IX-24). American Academy of Periodontology.
2. American Academy of Periodontology. (1998). Position paper: Supportive periodontal therapy (SPT). Journal of Periodontology, 69(4), 502-506.

3. American Academy of Periodontology. (2003). Position paper: Periodontal maintenance. Journal of Periodontology, 74, 1395-1401.
4. Löe, H., Theilade, E., Jensen, S. B. (1965). Experimental gingivitis in man. Journal of Periodontology, 36, 177-187.
5. Löe, H., Anerud, A., Boysen, H., Morrison, E. (1986). Natural history of periodontal disease in man: Rapid, moderate, and no loss of attachment in Sri Lankan laborers 14 to 46 years of age. Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 13, 431-445.
6. Aass, A. M., Preus, H. R., Zambon, J. J., Gjermo, P. (1994). Microbiologic tests in epidemiologic studies: Are they reproducible? Scandinavian Journal of Dental Research, 102(6), 355-360.
7. Abrahamson, M., Wikström, M., Potempa, J., Renvert, S., Hall, A. (1997). Modification of cystatin C activity by bacterial proteinases and neutrophil elastase in periodontitis. Molecular Pathology, 50(6), 291-297.
8. Abu-Amer, Y., Ross, F. P., Edwards, J., Teitelbaum, S. L. (1997). Lipopolysaccharide-stimulated osteoclastogenesis is mediated by tumor necrosis factor via its P55 receptor. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 100(6), 1557-1565.
9. Addy, M., Langeroudi, M., Hassan, H. (1985). The development and clinical use of acrylic strips containing antimicrobial agents in the management of chronic periodontitis. International Dental Journal, 35(2), 124-132.
10. Adriaens, P. A. (1989). Bacterial invasion in periodontitis: Is it important in periodontal treatment? Revue Belge de Médecine Dentaire, 44(2), 9-30.
11. Amsterdam, M., Rossman, S. R. (1960). Technique of hemisection of multirooted teeth. Alpha Omegan, 54(4).
12. Amsterdam, M. (1974). Periodontal prosthesis: Twenty-five years in retrospect. Alpha Omegan.
13. Amsterdam, M. (1980). Periodontal prosthesis. In H. M. Goldman & D. W. Cohen (Eds.), Periodontal therapy (6th ed.). Mosby.
14. Beaudreau, D. E. (1965). The role of the posterior fixed bridge in occlusion. Dental Clinics of North America, 13.
15. Beaudreau, D. E. (1980). Periodontal considerations in restorative dentistry. In H. M. Goldman & D. W. Cohen (Eds.), Periodontal therapy (6th ed., p. 1116). Mosby.
16. Bower, R. C. (1979). Furcation morphology relative to periodontal treatment. Journal of Periodontology, 50, 366.
17. Box, H. K. (1935). Experimental traumatogenic occlusion in sheep. Oral Health, 25(9).
18. Carnevale, G., Di Febo, G. (1981). Greater New York Academy of Prosthodontics. Personal communication.
19. Carnevale, G., Freni, S. S. (1982). First International Congress of the Italian Society of Periodontology, Milan. Personal communication.
20. Carnevale, G., Freni, S. S., Di Febo, G. (1983). Soft and hard tissue wound healing following tooth preparation to the alveolar crest. The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry, 6-37.