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Abstract
Aim: The objective of this randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial was to study the effect of implant surface decontamination with chlorhexidine (CHX)/cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) on microbiological and clinical parameters.

Material & Methods: Thirty patients (79 implants) with peri-implantitis were treated with resective surgical treatment consisting of apically re-positioned flap, bone re-contouring and surface debridement and decontamination. Patients were randomly allocated to decontamination with 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC (test-group) or a placebo-solution (without CHX/CPC, placebo-group). Microbiological parameters were recorded during surgery; clinical and radiographical parameters were recorded before (pre-) treatment (baseline), and at 3, 6 and 12 months after treatment.

Results: Nine implants in two patients in the placebo-group were lost due to severe persisting peri-implantitis. Both decontamination procedures resulted in significant reductions of bacterial load on the implant surface, but the test-group showed a significantly greater reduction than the placebo-group (log 4.21 ± 1.89 versus log 2.77 ± 2.12, p = 0.006). Multilevel analysis showed no differences between both groups in the effect of the intervention on bleeding, suppuration, probing pocket depth and radiographical bone loss over time.

Conclusion: Implant surface decontamination with 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC in resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis leads to a greater immediate suppression of anaerobic bacteria on the implant surface than a placebo-solution, but does not lead to superior clinical results. The long-term microbiological effect remains unknown.
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The principal objectives for treatment of peri-implantitis are resolution of inflammation and preservation of supporting bone. If non-surgical therapy does not resolve the inflammatory lesion, access flap surgery is recommended (Lindhe & Meyle 2008). Surgical access to the peri-implantitis lesion allows for proper removal of granulation tissue and exposes the implant surface for debridement and decontamination. The clinical effects of access surgery combined with surface debridement
and decontamination have been investigated in only a few studies (Leonhardt et al. 2003, Máximo et al. 2009, Heitz-Mayfield et al. 2012). Three other studies have evaluated resective surgical procedures, for example, apically re-positioned flap, bone re-contouring and/or implantoplasty, combined with debridement and decontamination of the implant surface (Romeo et al. 2005, Deppe et al. 2007, Serino & Turri 2011). Most of these studies included adjunctive systemic antibiotic therapy in their treatment protocol. Different protocols, materials and chemical compounds for decontamination of the implant surface have been used, including 10% hydrogen peroxide (Leonhardt et al. 2003), teflon curettes and abrasive sodium carbonate air-powder (Máximo et al. 2009), titanium coated curettes and surgical gauzes soaked in saline (Heitz-Mayfield et al. 2012), metronidazole gel and a tetracycline hydrochloride solution (Romeo et al. 2005), air-powder abrasive alone or in combination with CO2 laser irradiation (Deppe et al. 2007) and an ultrasonic instrument and rotating rubber cup under chlorhexidine (CHX) irrigation (Serino & Turri 2011).

Due to the wide variation in materials and procedures that have been described for the treatment of peri-implantitis, it is difficult to discriminate between effective and ineffective (components of) interventions. Therefore, it has been suggested that it may be necessary to start assessing simple interventions using a double-blind study design before gradually testing more complex treatments (Esposito et al. 2012). Future studies should compare two treatment protocols that differentiate only on one component of the intervention.

So far, only two randomized controlled trials, comparing different protocols for debridement and decontamination of the implant surface and combined surgical treatment of peri-implantitis, were published (Romeo et al. 2005, Schwarz et al. 2011). Modification of surface topography (implantoplasty) when combined with resective surgery seems to positively influence implant survival and clinical parameters such as peri-implant pocket depth, suppuration and sulcus bleeding (Romeo et al. 2005). In the second randomized controlled trial, implantoplasty was used as an adjunct to regenerative surgical procedures (Schwarz et al. 2011, 2012). The method of surface debridement and decontamination (Er:YAG laser versus plastic curets + cotton pellets + sterile saline) did not significantly impact the clinical outcomes, neither after 6 months nor after 2 years. Unfortunately, in both studies, the microbiological effects of the surface modification/decontamination procedures were not assessed.

As peri-implantitis is an infectious disease (Lindhe & Meyle 2008, Zitzmann & Berglundh 2008), it seems logical to focus on anti-infective measures. The screw-shaped design of implants and the various implant surface modifications may limit the effect of mechanical debridement of implant surfaces and may advocate the use of additional therapies, such as antibiotics or anti-septics. An in vivo study showed that the anti-septics chlorhexidine, sodium hypochlorite, hydrogen peroxide, essential oils and citric acid may have some beneficial effect in reducing the bacterial load on titanium surfaces and may improve peri-implantitis therapy (Gosau et al. 2010). CHX has broad antibacterial activity and, for periodontal diseases, has well-documented clinical efficacy and plaque-reducing capabilities [for reviews see: (Addy 1986, Jones 1997)].

The objective of this study was to study the microbiological, clinical and radiographical effect of implant surface decontamination by a CHX/cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) solution in comparison to a placebo-solution in resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. It was hypothesized that no differences would exist in reduction of counts of anaerobic bacteria on the implant surface between the two decontamination procedures.

Material and Methods

Participants

Participants were consecutively recruited from patients referred for treatment of peri-implantitis to the University Medical Center Groningen, the Netherlands. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before entering the trial. Inclusion- and exclusion criteria are depicted in Fig. 1. Peri-implantitis was defined as bleeding and/or suppuration on probing combined with a peri-implant probing pocket depth (PPD) ≥ 5 mm and bone loss ≥ 2 mm.

The study took place between October 2009 and September 2011. The study has been conducted in full accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki (version 2008) and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University Medical Center Groningen, the Netherlands (METc2009.172). US National Institutes of Health clinical trial registration was done at www.ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01521260). The CONSORT guidelines for reporting a clinical trial were followed (Moher et al. 2010, Schulz et al. 2010, Cairo et al. 2012).

Trial design

This study is a randomized, double-blind and placebo-controlled trial evaluating the microbiological, clinical and radiographical outcomes of resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis combined with decontamination of the implant surface using 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC or a placebo-solution. Follow-up time was 12 months. Patients were randomly assigned to either the test- or placebo-group using a one-to-one allocation ratio.

Randomization

Fifteen notes with the words “solution A” and 15 notes with “solution B” were put into 30 identical, sequentially numbered, non-transparent envelopes according to a computer generated randomization list with a permuted block design (fixed block sizes of four). No stratification was performed. All envelopes were irreversibly sealed, only to be opened by the surgical assistant during the surgical procedure. According to the information on the note, the surgical assistant prepared a syringe with either solution A or solution B and was unaware of the composition of the solution. This information was stored and kept by an independent person not involved in the study. The placebo-solution was matched to the CHX-solution for taste, smell, colour and viscosity, ensuring blinding of the assistant, the surgeon, the patient and the investigator to treatment allocation.
Before the surgical procedure, all patients received extensive oral hygiene instructions and mechanical debridement of implants, suprastructures and remaining dentition. Patients were all surgically treated by one experienced oral- and maxillofacial surgeon (GR). Suprastructures were removed if reasonably possible (in all but eight patients). Incisions were made using a surgical blade (no. 15) under local anaesthesia. Flaps were designed to allow optimal access to the peri-implant bone defect for granulation tissue removal and debridement and decontamination of the implant surface. Vertical releasing incisions extending into the alveolar mucosa were placed at the mesial and distal aspects of the horizontal incision.

Full thickness mucoperiosteal flaps were raised buccally and linguually. Granulation tissue was removed using curettes (Gracey; Hu-Friedy®, Chicago, IL, USA). Bone re-contouring, aimed at eliminating angular bony defects, was performed using a rotating round bur under saline irrigation. The implant surface was mechanically cleaned using surgical gauzes soaked in saline. After mechanical debridement, patients were randomly allocated to either the placebo- or the test-group. After treatment allocation, the implant surface was rinsed for 1 min with 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC without alcohol (Perioaid; Dentaid SL) two times daily during 30 s. Sutures were removed after 2 weeks. During follow-up examinations, patients were re-instructed in oral hygiene measures and implants and teeth were cleaned as necessary. Follow-up visits were scheduled after 3 ($T_3$), 6 ($T_6$) and 12 ($T_{12}$) months.

Outcomes

Primary outcome

The primary outcome variable was the difference in anaerobic bacterial load of the implant surface before and after mechanical and chemical debridement and decontamination. After flap deflection and granulation tissue removal, a sample was obtained from the implant surface by rubbing a sterilized brush (Microbrush™ International, Grafton, WI, USA) across the implant surface ($T_{pos}$). A second sample was obtained after mechanical debridement and rinsing of the implant surface with the test- or placebo-solution and saline ($T_{pos}$). The top part of the brush was cut-off and collected in a vial containing reduced transport fluid (Syed & Loesche 1972). Separate samples were obtained from every implant presenting peri-implantitis. All microbiological samples were processed within 24 h as described by Van Winkelhoff et al. (1985) and Van Steenberg et al. (1986). Total anaerobic bacterial load and presence and numbers of the putative periodontal pathogens Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans, Porphyromonas gingivalis, Prevotella intermedia, Tannerella forsythia, Fusobacterium nucleatum, Parvimonas micra and Campylobacter rectus were determined by laboratory technicians who were blind to treatment allocation.

Secondary outcomes

Secondary outcome parameters were presence of plaque (% sites plaque), bleeding on probing (% sites BoP), suppuration on probing (% sites BoS).
SoP), mean PPD and mean radiographical marginal bone loss. Measurements were performed before (pre-) treatment (baseline, $T_0$) and at 3, 6 and 12 months after surgery ($T_3$, $T_6$ and $T_{12}$) by one and the same experienced examiner (YDW) who was blind to treatment allocation. Presence of plaque was assessed (present/absent) at four sites per implant (mesial, buccal, distal and lingual) by running a probe across the marginal surface of the implant/suprastructure. Peri-implant pocket probing was performed at four sites per implant using a pressure sensitive probe (probe force of 0.25 N; KerrHawe Click Probe® Biogeo, Switzerland). PPD was scored to the nearest millimetre. Up to 30 s after pocket probing, the presence or absence of bleeding and supputation were assessed. Reproducibility of probing pocket depth measurements was assessed by evaluating 20 implants in eight subjects on two separate occasions, 1 week apart and calculating the linear weighted kappa ($\kappa$) value.

Intra-oral radiographs were obtained using an aiming device and the long cone paralleling technique. Care was taken to position the film parallel to the long axis of the implant. Due to anatomical restrictions, in nine fully edentulous patients (16 implants) no intra-oral radiographs could be obtained without pain or major distortion of the image. In these patients, orthopantomograms were taken. All radiographs were digital. Measurements were performed using Adobe Photoshop (version 10.0.1; Adobe Systems Incorporated, San Jose, CA, USA). The radiographs were calibrated using the known dimensions of the implant as reference values. A horizontal line was drawn through the shoulder of the implant and the distance from this line to the first bone-to-implant contact was measured at the mesial and distal site. Bone loss was assessed with regard to the position at which the bone is normally positioned, taking into account the different implant types and brands. Reproducibility of radiographical examinations was assessed by evaluating radiographical images of 20 implants (10 intra-oral radiographs and 10 orthopantomograms) twice with a 1-week interval. Intra-class correlation coefficients were calculated for both categories of radiographs.

**Statistical methods**

**Sample size calculation**

From the literature, no data were available for estimating the effect size. However, the microbiological effect of rinsing the dental implant surface with a CHX-solution *versus* rinsing with a placebo-solution was expected to be large.

To detect a difference of 1 standard deviation (assumed to be unknown and equal) between both groups under the null hypothesis that both group means were 0.0, with a significance level ($\alpha$) of 0.05 and a power ($\beta$) of 80% using a two-sided two-sample t-test, required group sample sizes of 15 (G*Power Version 3.1.0; University of Kiel, Kiel, Germany). As no compensation for patient withdrawal or losses to follow-up was required (data regarding primary outcome variable was collected during surgical treatment), a sample size of 30 patients was chosen (15 per group).

**Statistical analysis**

Total anaerobic bacterial load at baseline ($T_{pre}$) was distributed normally after logarithmic transformation. To compare outcomes between placebo- and test-group, linear regression analysis was performed. Baseline values and implant surface roughness were included in the regression model. For comparison of within-group differences in detection frequency of single bacterial species between $T_{pre}$ and $T_{post}$, the McNemar test was used. Between-group differences at $T_{post}$ were analysed using the Fisher’s exact test.

As the primary outcome variable is a measure of the local effect of decontamination, the implant (and not the patient) was taken as the statistical unit, despite the fact that multiple implants were present per patient. To correct for the within patient dependency, multilevel modelling was used to determine the effect of the intervention over time (test-group *versus* placebo-group) on the secondary outcome variables. A multilevel hierarchical three-level structure was chosen with three levels of analysis being timing of follow-up measurements (level 1), implant (level 2) and patient (level 3). Baseline values of BoP, SoP, PPD and marginal bone loss (continuous variables), smoking, dental status and history of periodontitis (dichotomous variables) and implant surface roughness (categorical variable) were a priori identified as potential confounders. For each outcome variable two analyses were performed (Twisk 2006). With the crude analysis the effect of the intervention over time was determined, while controlling for baseline value and time. Since follow-up was conducted at irregularly spaced time intervals and not completely similar for each patient, time was included in the crude model (Ridders et al. 2007). In the adjusted analysis, the potential confounders smoking, dental status, history of periodontitis and implant surface roughness were additionally included in the model.

Descriptive data and data regarding the primary outcome variable were analysed using PASW® Statistics 18 (version 18.0.3; SPSS inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Multilevel models were analysed using MLwiN version 2.12 (Centre for Multilevel Modeling, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK).

**Results**

The flow of the participants throughout the different phases of the study is depicted in Fig. 2. Eligible patients were recruited from October 2009 to September 2010 and were followed 3, 6 and 12 months after the surgical procedure. The baseline demographic patient and implant characteristics are reported in Table 1. Thirty patients with a total of 79 implants with peri-implantitis were included.

**Primary outcome**

The log-transformed mean anaerobic bacterial load of the culture positive implants for the placebo- and test-group before and after debridement and decontamination of the implant surface are depicted in Table 2. Sixty of the 79 sampled implant surfaces appeared culture positive after exposure and removal of granulation tissue ($T_{pre}$). In both groups, the decontamination procedure resulted...
in a significant reduction of the bacterial load on the implant surface, although the test-group showed a significantly greater reduction than the placebo-group (4.21 \pm 1.89 versus 2.77 \pm 2.12, p = 0.006).

The number of implants culture positive for the selected periodontal pathogens before and after decontamination are depicted in Table 3. *A. actinomyces* was not detected on any of the implant surfaces. Both decontamination procedures resulted in reduction below detection level of *P. gingivalis* and *P. intermedia* and in significant reductions in detection frequencies of *T. forsythia*, *F. nucleatum*, *P. micra* and *C. rectus*. No differences were observed between both groups.

Secondary outcomes

One implant (machined surface; Nobel Biocare AG, Zürich, Switzerland) in one patient (with no other implants affected by peri-implantitis) was lost due to implant fracture between surgery and T3. No signs of fracture were present during the surgical procedure. Nine implants in two patients from the placebo-group had to be removed between T6 and T12 due to severe persisting peri-implantitis. One patient lost all seven treated implants (Nobel Biocare, Ti-Unite surface) and discontinued the study. The other patient lost 2 of 3 treated implants (Straumann AG, Basel, Switzerland, TPS surface), but continued the study with the remaining implant. No implants were lost in

**Fig. 2.** Flow-diagram.
Table 1. Baseline demographic characteristics of included subjects/implants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age [years; mean (SD)]</td>
<td>61.5 (10.0)</td>
<td>59.4 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender; M (male), F (female)</td>
<td>M 5, F 10</td>
<td>M 5, F 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking; n subjects (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never (or quit smoking before implant placement)</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
<td>8 (53.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former (quit smoking after implant placement)</td>
<td>1 (6.7)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of periodontitis; n subjects (%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental status; n subjects (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully edentulous</td>
<td>9 (60.0)</td>
<td>10* (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially edentulous</td>
<td>6 (40.0)</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of implants (range)</td>
<td>63 (2–10)</td>
<td>58 (1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of implants presenting</td>
<td>48 (1–7)</td>
<td>31 (1–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peri-implantitis (range)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in function [years; mean (SD)]</td>
<td>8.6 (5.5)</td>
<td>9.2 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implant surface; n implants (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel Biocare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machined surface</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
<td>4 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porous anodized surface, TiUnite</td>
<td>21 (43.8)</td>
<td>6 (19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straumann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titanium plasma-sprayed, TPS</td>
<td>5 (10.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandblasted large grit acid-etched, SLA</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>14 (45.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandblasted large grit acid-etched, SLActive</td>
<td>10 (20.8)</td>
<td>1 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titanium plasma-sprayed</td>
<td>7 (14.6)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astra Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoride-modified titanium dioxide</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentsply Friadent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit-blasted acid-etched, Friadent plus</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of restoration; n implants involved (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single crown</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed partial denture</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed full denture</td>
<td>7 (14.5)</td>
<td>6 (19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdent</td>
<td>33 (68.8)</td>
<td>22 (71.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw- or cement-retained restoration; n implants involved (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw-retain</td>
<td>44 (91.7)</td>
<td>28 (90.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement-retain</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>3 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implants placed in maxilla or mandible; n implants (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxilla</td>
<td>24 (50.0)</td>
<td>20 (64.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>24 (50.0)</td>
<td>11 (35.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 were partially edentulous at the time of implant placement.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial evaluating the microbiological, clinical and radiographical effect of an implant surface decontamination procedure combined with resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. The results of this study indicate that decontaminating the implant surface with 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC leads to a greater reduction of the anaerobic bacterial load on the implant surface than using a placebo-solution. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference can be rejected. However, this greater reduction in bacterial load did not lead to superior clinical or radiographical results over a period of 12 months. These findings are consistent with Schwarz et al. (2011, 2012) who did not find an impact of the method of surface debridement and decontamination on the clinical outcomes following combined surgical therapy of advanced peri-implantitis lesions. It was suggested that the long-term stability of the clinical outcomes may be influence by factors other than the method of surface debridement and decontamination.

Chlorhexidine is considered the gold standard for oral antiseptics (Addy 1986, Jones 1997). It has been widely used and extensively tested and has a broad spectrum of antibacterial activity including gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria (Jones 1997). From the literature, no comparable studies are available evaluating the immediate microbiological effect of an antiseptic agent on a genuine peri-implantitis-associated biofilm. However, an in vivo study showed that chlorhexidine, among other antiseptics such as sodium hypochlorite, hydrogen peroxide,
essential oils and citric acid, may have some beneficial effect in reducing the bacterial load on titanium surfaces and may improve peri-implantitis therapy (Gosau et al. 2010). The antibacterial mode of action is based on the ability of the cationic CHX-molecule to rapidly get attracted by the negatively charged bacterial cell surface (Rat 1986). The commercial available CHX-solution used in this study also contained CPC as active ingredient. CPC is a cationic agent and has a broad antimicrobial spectrum with bactericidal effect on gram-positive pathogens and yeast in particular (Pitten & Kramer 2001). CPC has a strong immediate bactericidal effect, but lower residual effect compared with CHX (Pitten & Kramer 1999). It has been shown that the non-alcoholic formulation of 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC is an equally effective anti-plaque and anti-inflammatory agent as the 0.2% CHX mouthrinse with alcohol (Quirynen et al. 2001). In addition, Herrera et al. (2003) showed that the re-formulation and addition of 0.05% CPC to 0.12% CHX products may not only compensate for the absence of alcohol but may rather increase the in vitro and in vivo antimicrobial activity. Both CHX + alcohol and CHX + CPC showed high antimicrobial activity to 20 bacterial species, including periodontal pathogens.

In this study, microbiological samples were collected using sterilized microbrushes. These were small enough to reach the areas between implant threads, but robust enough to allow rubbing of the implant surface. As the local and immediate microbiological effect of the decontamination procedure was evaluated, data were analysed on implant level. Microbiological parameters were not assessed over time. The clinical and radiographical data were analysed using a multi-level model. By using multilevel modelling, a correction is made for the difference in number of
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implants per patient and the dependency of the observations within each patient and over time. As multilevel modelling is very flexible in handling missing data points, all longitudinal data could be used despite some incomplete patient records (e.g. implants that were removed during the follow-up period) (Twisk & de Vente 2002). Due to practical and anatomical limitations, radiographs could not be standardized. In addition, in many fully edentulous subjects intra-oral radiographs could not be obtained and had to be replaced by orthopantomographs. However, despite these limitations, intra-examiner reproducibility was very good both for intra-oral radiographs (intra-class correlation coefficients were 0.99 and 0.96 respectively).

No significant differences were seen between the test- and placebo-group over 12 months of observation in BoP, SoP, PPD and marginal bone loss. Although both groups showed improved clinical parameters as a result of treatment, complete resolution of inflammation (i.e. health) was almost never achieved. Sixty-six of the 69 implants present at T12 showed at least one site with BoP and 15 implants additionally showed suppuration (representing either peri-implant mucositis or peri-implantitis).

If the criteria for treatment failure were to be defined according to the inclusion criteria used in this study (residual pockets ≥5 mm associated with bleeding and/or suppuration) treatment was only successful for 11 implants additional to those included in this study (residual pockets ≥6 mm). These results are somewhat less than the 2-year follow-up results described by Serrino & Turri (2011), who used more or less a comparable surgical approach (apically re-positioned flap, bone re-contouring and mechanical decontamination and CHX irrigation). Two years after treatment, 77% of the subjects and 75% of the implants showed no pockets ≥6 mm associated with bleeding/suppuration. A possible explanation for the difference between both studies is the fact that in the latter study, all patients received adjunctive systemic therapy. A possible explanation for the difference between both studies is the fact that in the latter study, all patients received adjunctive systemic therapy.
Table 5. Average differences in BoP, SoP, PPD and radiographical marginal bone loss between placebo- and test-group over three follow-up measurements (3, 6 and 12 months) from baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>Crude model*</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Adjusted model†</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Sites BoP</td>
<td>0.34 (–14.93 to 15.61)</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>–7.58 (–24.20 to 9.05)</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Sites SoP</td>
<td>0.08 (–5.36 to 5.52)</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>–3.77 (–10.25 to 2.72)</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean PPD</td>
<td>–0.26 (–1.13 to 0.62)</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>–0.50 (–1.40 to 0.41)</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean marginal bone loss</td>
<td>0.01 (–0.35 to 0.38)</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.11 (–0.27 to 0.48)</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The reference category for intervention effect is the placebo-group. The regression coefficients (β) indicate the average differences in secondary outcomes between placebo- and test-group over the three follow-up measurements (3, 6 and 12 months) from baseline. BoP, bleeding on probing; SoP, suppuration on probing; PPD, probing pocket depth; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval.

*Adjusted for baseline value and time, smoking, dental status, history of periodontitis and implant surface roughness.

†Adjusted for baseline value, time, smoking, dental status, history of periodontitis and implant surface roughness.

antibiotic therapy (clindamycine). However, one could think of many other factors that may influence treatment results (e.g. patient factors such as smoking, plaque levels, periodontitis and dental status, implant factors, treatment factors) making a direct comparison between this study and other studies difficult. Therefore, more randomized controlled trials are needed, each focusing on one aspect of the treatment protocol at a time.

This study shows that implant surface decontamination with 0.12% CHX + 0.05% CPC in resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis leads to greater suppression of anaerobic bacteria on the implant surface than a placebo-solution. However, this does not translate to better clinical or radiographical outcomes of the intervention.
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Clinical Relevance

Scientific rationale for study: The method of surface debridement and decontamination might influence the outcome of surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. However, limited evidence exists as to which method should be used.

Principal findings: Implant surface decontamination with chlorhexidine/cetylpyridinium chloride during resective surgical treatment of peri-implantitis leads to greater bacterial reduction, but similar clinical results compared with decontamination with a placebo-solution.

Practical implications: Chlorhexidine/cetylpyridinium chloride might be useful for decontamination of the implant surface during surgical treatment of peri-implantitis, but it fails to improve clinical results significantly.