



Dental Students Suffered A Serious Ocular Injury During Manual Scaling Procedure: Are We Protecting Ourselves

Dr. Neelam Das

M.D.S., Assistant Professor, Department of Periodontology, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre, Kanpur (Uttar Pradesh)- 208024

***Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Neelam Das

M.D.S., Assistant Professor, Department of Periodontology, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre, Kanpur (Uttar Pradesh)- 208024

Type of Publication: Original Research Paper

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

The risk of ocular injury in dentistry is mainly attributed to the use of power driven high speed handpieces and ultrasonics. These ocular injuries may vary from mild irritation to grave implications such as blindness. Various studies have reported about such injuries and their consequences. The guidelines are laid by health associations regarding protective eyewear use during dental procedures. The present article emphasizes about the need to protect the eye with protective eye wear, failing which a dental student suffered a serious ocular injury while performing manual scaling procedure.

Keywords: Guidelines, ocular injury, scaling

Introduction

No occupation is without risk and dentistry is no exception. In today's ultramodern era, safety and protection are everybody's concern and are of paramount importance. The saying "Prevention is better than cure" is universally true. Until the 1980s, dentists performed dental procedures with little knowledge about personal protection. The ever increasing knowledge about personal protection and cross-infection control has changed this perception. While the use of protective gloves and mouth masks by all the dentists appear to be the norm at present, this may not be true for eye protection^[1].

Routinely performed dental procedures include the removal of caries, tooth removal, oral prophylaxis, and restoration of teeth, which are accomplished by the use of power driven instruments rotating at a speed of 80,000-5,00,000 rpm. During the performance of these procedures, there exists a possibility of particles projecting out and causing injury, which may be physical, chemical, or

microbiological. These projectiles include pieces of the enamel, calculus, amalgam, pumice, etc. Dental turbine-created aerosols can act as a serious threat of infection as they contain an array of infectious microorganisms, viruses, and fungi, which can transmit infections to the respiratory tract and to the unprotected eye^[2]. Ocular injuries include mild irritation of the eye to serious consequences leading to loss of vision. To avoid such untoward consequences, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), American National Standard Institute (ANSI), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and British Dental Association (BDA) have made mandatory guidelines and have put forth the recommendation of personal protective equipment.

In 1986, the US Govt. recommended the use of eyewear with shields for dentists and updated that protective eyewear for patients can shield their eyes from splatter and debris during dental procedures^[3]. In 1991, OSHA mandated the usage of protection eyewear to reduce the risk from blood borne

pathogens during procedures in which splatter or the use of aerosols might occur ^[3]. In February 2003, BDA published an advice sheet, "Infection Control in Dentistry," which stated that: "Operators and close support clinical staff must protect their eyes against foreign bodies, splatter and aerosols that may arise during operative dentistry: During scaling, (manual and ultrasonic), While using rotary instruments, cutting and use of wires and cleaning instruments. Ideally protective glasses should have side protection. Patient eyes must always be protected against possible injury; tinted glasses may also protect against glare from the operating light"^[1].

The American Dental Association (ADA) in 2003 has published the "Guidelines for Infection Control in Dental Health-Care Settings 2003," which states: "Protective eyewear with solid side shields or a face should be worn by dental health care personnel during procedures". The use of protective clothing including eyewear is also advised by the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations, 2002 and Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) requirements at Workplace Regulations, 1992. The routine use of goggles or spectacles with side pieces and plastic lenses conforming to British Standard BS2092 are recommended ^[1].

The failure to update and implement these recommendations can lead to an increase in the incidence of such injuries. This review describes a situation how in majority of dental colleges Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) undergraduate students are suffering an serious eye injury resulting in corneal ulceration and episcleritis, caused by dislodgement of calculus of a while performing manual scaling procedure on a patient.

Situation

During manual scaling procedure on a patients, eyes are injured as a result of dislodgement of the calculus. Immediately after rinsing the eyes with clean water a number of times. Despite repeated rinsing, as the irritation continued to persist and eye will be turned red with difficulty in opening and advised to consult an ophthalmologist immediately. Upon consultation, the ophthalmologist will performed a slit lamp examination and diagnose it will be an episcleritis with corneal ulceration and advised to get corneal scrapping done. After corneal

scrapping will advise antibiotics and anti-inflammatory (cefixime 200 mg, Aceclofenac), along with eyedrops (Vigamox, tobramycin, and natamycin 5% every hour) homatropine 2%, (twice daily) and an eye ointment to be applied for every 1 h. Sunglasses will give to protect the eyes during daytime and whenever moved out.

It will advise to continue the same medication for the next few days. After 10 days, the redness and irritation had reduced but only to return. This time, the ulceration appeared to be more prominent. Steroids will added to the existing medication. Complete recovery occurred after 1 month. It will be advise to taper the dose of medication and stop. It will take 3 months for the complete recovery.

Literature Reported About Such Injuries And Their Consequences

Accidents can occur anywhere and at any time. The dental office can be a source of ocular injury due to mechanical, chemical, microbiological, and electromagnetic insults ^[4]. Both the dental personnel and the patient are at risk, which is mainly attributed to the use of power-driven handpieces and ultrasonics. Manual scaling involves the removal of plaque and calculus from supra- and subgingival areas of teeth by the use of certain instruments. Effective instrumentation

is based on the concepts of grasp, finger rest, adaptation, angulation, and use of strokes. It is during the application of scaling stroke that the calculus got dislodged and injured the eye of the clinical student. In most cases, the particle locates itself in the conjunctival sac or cornea causing acute pain, irritation, and reddening of the eyeball. However, deeper penetration may lead to perforation of the cornea and injury to the lens ^[2]. Since, the eye is a vital structure, simple contact with an infected substance (e.g., aerosol) has the potential to cause infection without the need to be breached ^[1].

Herpetic keratitis is said to be one of the worst infections that can be contracted by clinical dental staff ^[4]. Various studies have reported the adverse effects of eye injuries owing to lack of utilization of eye protection. In a study conducted by Ramos MF, eye injuries accounted for 6% of all national injuries with 60% of those injured professing to not having worn any eye protection ^[5]. The adverse effects

include corneal abrasion, hemorrhage, conjunctivitis, keratitis (bacterial or viral), hepatitis, and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) ^[6].

In another study conducted by Al Wazzan AK, the prevalence of ocular injury and infection among the dental personnel, the dentist and the technician, had a prevalence of 42.3% of foreign bodies in their eye during the period of 1 month. The author concluded that protection of the eye should be emphasized and it should be protected at the undergraduate level. The awareness of the eye protection should be highlighted at all clinical and research symposia ^[4]. Another survey by Stokes AN showed that eye protection for the dental personnel and patients did not meet the currently recommended standards ^[7]. Sims *et al.* reported that 43% of the orthodontists reported instances of ocular injury during debonding and trimming acrylic ^[8]. Farrier *et al.* reported that 87% of general dental practitioners (GDPs) wore eye protection that was not adequate. Out of them, 48% had experienced ocular trauma or infection and 75% of these resulted from not wearing eye protection ^[1]. Palenik CJ has stressed on the awareness of eye protection to assure a safe working environment ^[9]. A survey by Lonnroth EC and Shahnavaz H on adverse health reactions on the skin, eye, and respiratory tract among dental personnel showed a significantly higher prevalence of conjunctivitis and atopic dermatitis ^[10]. In another study, Folk JC and Lobes LA reported bacterial endophthalmitis and traumatic hyphema that resulted from injuries during dental procedures ^[11].

According to a study by Ajayi YO, Ajayi EO, significant difference in the prevalence of ocular injury among the dental personnel were reported with the technologists having the highest prevalence of 40% and dental students with lowest prevalence of 15.4% ^[12]. ADA and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has outlined that dental staff should wear either a face shield or shatter resistant glasses with side shields while performing the procedures that could result in projectiles, chemicals, and aerosols entering the eye. The presence of an eye wash station within 7.62 meters of all the employees has also been emphasized so that immediate care can be given. Hence, protection of the eyes becomes an integral part of any procedure.

As the dental team holds value in function and protection of teeth, the same value should be applied to the eyes. Protection of the eyes should be emphasized at the undergraduate level and its awareness should be highlighted at all clinical and research symposia. "Healthy vision for health teeth" should be the motto. All dental personnel must be educated about eye safety in the dental office. This should be instructed to the students enrolled in dental profession once they are exposed to the use of rotary or ultrasonic instruments.

To the author's best knowledge, this is the first kind of review emphasizes an eye injury with dislodged calculus, affecting a clinical students in various dental college while performing manual scaling procedure.

Conclusion

Accidents do occur but their frequency can be minimized by the implementation of certain set standard guidelines. Visual health is a vital component of general health. Specific guidelines have been recommended by OSHA, ADA, and BDA. The failure to implement these guidelines can lead to serious outcomes. These injuries can be prevented with the use of common sense, proper education, adequate eye protective eyewear, and correct handling of dental instruments and materials in various dental colleges of India.

Author Contributions: The author was contributed to update all relevant information to formulate the design, drafted the manuscript review. The author gave final approval and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

References

1. Farrier SL, Farrier JN, Gilmour ASM. Eye safety in operative dentistry-A study in general dental practice. *Br Dent J* 2006;200:218-23.
2. Jolanta Szymanska. Work –related vision hazard in the dental office. *Ann Agric Environ Med* 2000; 7:1-4.
3. Edward E. Hill. Eye safety practices in U.S Dental school restorative clinics, 2006. *J Dent Edu* 2006;70:1294-7.
4. Al Wazzan KA, Almas K, AL Qahtani MQ, Al Shethri and Khan N. Prevalence of ocular injuries, conjunctivitis and use of eye protection

- among dental personnel in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Int Dent J* 2001;51:89-94.
5. Ramos MF. Prevention of work related injuries: a look at eye protection use and suggested prevention strategies. *J Ophthalmic Nurs Technol* 1999;18:117-9.
 6. Albdour MQ, Othman EF. Eye safety in dentistry-A study. *Pak Oral Dent J* 2010;30:8-13.
 7. Stokes AN, Burton JF, Beale RR. Eye protection in dental practice. *NZ Dent J* 1990;86:14-5.
 8. Sims AP, Roberts-Harry TJ, Roberts-Harry DP. The incidence and prevention of ocular injuries in orthodontic practice. *Br J Orthod* 1993;20:339-43.
 9. Palenik CJ. Eye protection in dental laboratories. *J Dent Technol* 1997;14:22-6.
 10. Lonnroth EC, Shahnava H. Adverse health reactions in skin, eyes and respiratory tract among dental personnel in Sweden. *Swed Dent J* 1998;2233-45.
 11. Folk JC, Lobes LA. Bacterial endophthalmitis and traumatic hyphema resulting from ocular injuries during dental procedures. *Can J Ophthalmol* and traumatic hyphema resulting from ocular injuries during dental procedures.
 12. Ajayi YO, Ajayi EO. Prevalence of ocular injury and the use of protective eye wear among the dental personnel in a teaching hospital. *Nig Q J Hosp Med* 2008;18:83-6.