Physics Forceps vs Conventional Forceps in Extraction of Maxillary 1st Molar
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ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on the atraumatic removal of teeth. The Physics Forceps are the latest innovation in dental extraction technology and they provide an efficient means for atraumatic dental extractions. We compared the Physics Forceps with the conventional forceps for the removal of maxillary 1st molars in 30 patients under the following parameters: time taken, postoperative pain on 3rd-5th-7th day, incidence of crown/root/buccal plate fracture during extraction. There was a significant difference pertaining to the time taken (p = 0.006) and pain on the 3rd postoperative day (p = 0.031). There were no other significant differences between the groups in any other variable studied. On comparing all of the aforementioned parameters, we have found that the utility of the instrument is better in comparison to the conventional forceps.
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INTRODUCTION

Tooth extraction is probably the oldest aspect of dentistry known to man and is the most primary procedure an oral surgeon has to perform. The history of dental extractions dates back to the days of Aristotle (384–322 BC) who described the mechanics of extraction forceps, including the advantages of “two levers acting contrary...having a single fulcrum.” The traditional means of extracting teeth often involving creation of the mucoperiosteal flap, elevation and luxation with forceps often results in fracture or deformation of the dentoalveolar complex. This trauma could lead to ridge defects, making the placement of implants and other prosthesis very difficult and even impossible in some cases.1 There have been several new exciting technological advances with an increased interest and need for atraumatic tooth extractions.2 These advances have revolutionized the field of dentistry and oral and maxillofacial surgery. Among them is the development of Physics Forceps® by Golden|Misch in an attempt to change the face of dental extraction. The Physics Forceps implements a first-class lever, creep, and the type of force that provides a mechanical advantage that makes it more efficient.3

There is not enough literature describing its use and efficacy, hence we conducted a study to compare the efficacy of Physics Forceps vs conventional forceps for the extraction of the right and left maxillary 1st molars (Fig. 1).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Thirty healthy patients between the age group of 15 to 60 years reporting to our department, satisfying the inclusion criteria, were taken up for the study after getting approval of the Ethical Committee of the institution and

Fig. 1: Physics Forceps® (GMX 100L #12-15, GMX 200-Lower Universal #18-31, GMX 100A -#6-11, GMX 100R #2-5®)
all the subjects gave informed consent to the study. All the subjects were healthy without any systemic illness. Following the standard surgical protocol, under local anesthesia (2% lignocaine with 1:80,000 adrenaline), all the extractions were performed by a single surgeon.

The patients were alternatively divided into two groups. Extractions in the test group were performed using Physics Forceps (GMX 100 series – UR #2-5 and UL #12-15®) and the control group were performed using conventional upper molar forceps (API Germany No. 17, 18). Postextraction instructions were given and patients were recalled for follow-up on 3rd, 5th, and 7th postoperative day. All the patients were prescribed Amoxicillin 500 mg as antibiotic and were asked to take Aceclofenac sodium 500 mg as analgesic if and when required.

Following parameters were assessed:

- Time taken for extraction (from the point of application of the beaks on the tooth to the delivery of tooth out of the socket).
- Pain evaluated using 100 mm visual analogue scale (VAS) at 3rd, 5th, and 7th postoperative day.
- Intraoperative evaluation—evaluation for root fracture, bone plate facture, and adherence of buccal plate to the root.
- The success of extraction was based on the following criteria:
  - Complete success: Extraction without crown and root fracture
  - Limited success with osteotomy: Fracture-free extraction but associated with buccal or intradental fracture.
  - Failure: Failure to extract.
- The overall utility of the instrument as:
  - Score 1 – good
  - Score 2 – average
  - Score 3 – poor
- Complications (if any): Such as dry socket, hemorrhage, infection, oro-antral communication, damage to surrounding tissue.

**Statistical Analysis**

Statistical analysis was done using software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. The mean scores of various variables were obtained and chi-square test and Mann–Whitney U test were performed. Grouping of the time taken and VAS score was done for, e.g., less than 5 minutes and more than 5 minutes for time taken and VAS score < 50 and ≥ 50 mm. For intraoperative evaluation, data were dichotomized based on fracture of buccal plate, root, and adherence of the buccal plate. Score 1 = no fracture of buccal plate, root, and adherence of the buccal plate. Score 2 = fracture of buccal plate, root, and adherence of the buccal plate.

**RESULTS**

The mean age in group A was 36.53 years (±12) and group B was 38.53 years (±10.7). Mean time taken for group A was 4.2 (±4.9) minutes, while for group B, was 8.5 (±2.8) minutes. After grouping, chi-square test was applied and statistically significant difference was observed when time was taken into consideration (p-value < 0.05). Mean score for pain in VAS for group A was 20.9 ± 22.5 and for group B it was 46.4 ± 19.26 on 3rd postoperative day; 14.66 ± 16.8 (group A) and 35.6 ± 18.8 (group B) on 5th postoperative day and 5.6 ± 8.17 (group A) and 14.3 ± 11.3 (group B) on 7th postoperative day. On applying chi-square test, statistically significant difference (p-value < 0.05) was noted on the 3rd day, while there was no difference seen on the 5th and 7th postoperative day (p-value > 0.05). Seven patients had fracture of either the root or buccal plate or adherence of buccal plate to tooth in group B, while four patients had the same problem in group A. There was no statistically significant difference observed (p-value > 0.05). Utility of Physics Forceps was found to be good in 80% cases, while that of conventional forceps was 40% (Figs 2 and 3).

**DISCUSSION**

Atraumatic tooth extraction is a technique that specialists use to carefully remove a tooth and that dramatically reduces or eliminates the trauma to the tissues preserving the remaining bone around the tooth. The advantages of the atraumatic tooth removal are as follows:

- Preserves the tissue and bone around the teeth
- Improves the potential of the body to regenerate bone and “fill-in” the socket

![Fig. 2: Left maxillary first molar gripped by GMX100 UL](image-url)
The Physics Forceps was developed by Golden and Misch in 2004. Implementation of a first-class lever, creep, and the type of force provides the mechanical advantages necessary to make this dental extraction device more efficient. One handle of the device is connected to a “bumper,” which acts as a fulcrum during the extraction. The beak of the extractor is positioned on the lingual or palatal root of the tooth and into the gingival sulcus. The bumper is placed on the facial aspect of the dental alveolus typically at the mucogingival junction. No squeezing pressure is applied to the handles or to the tooth. Instead, the handles (once in position) are rotated as squeezing pressure is applied to the handles or to the alveolus typically at the mucogingival junction. No force is required to be placed on the beak, which is only on the lingual aspect of the tooth root. Therefore, the tooth does not split, crush, or fracture.9

According to Dym and Weiss,12 there is no need to raise a mucoperiosteal flap or use an elevator before attempting extraction with the Physics Forceps. This is a major advantage, particularly in cases that require atraumatic extraction.

The extractions using the Physics Forceps are more predictable in time commitment, faster procedures, and most assuredly, less traumatic physically and psychologically to the patient.13

We chose this study on maxillary 1st molars because they are considered to be the most difficult to extract due to their variable crown bulk and multiple roots with variable anatomy. There was a significant difference pertaining to the time taken and pain on the 3rd postoperative day for extraction between the conventional and Physics Forceps (p < 0.05). These differences could be attributed to the unique design of the Physics Forceps, which reduces the time frame as it allows building up internal force or creep within 60 to 90 seconds, allowing the bone to slowly expand and the periodontal ligament to release at the point at which the tooth will disengage from its socket. The working mechanism of Physics Forceps allows the tooth to be removed atraumatically unlike conventional forceps, thus reducing trauma at the surgical site and pain in the early postoperative period. There was no statistically significant difference found between pain on 5th and 7th postoperative days and intraoperative complications, such as buccal plate fracture, root fracture, or buccal bone adherence to the root. On comparing all of the above parameters, we have found out that the utility of the instrument is better in comparison to the conventional forceps. These findings are similar to those reported by various authors in the past.1,3,13,14

Harihanar et al15 compared outcome variables (operative complications, inflammatory complications, and operating time) in patients undergoing orthodontic extraction of upper premolars with the Physics Forceps or the universal extraction forceps. A split-mouth clinical trial was conducted to compare the outcomes of the two groups (n = 54 premolars). The Physics Forceps group had lower mean (SD) VAS for pain (0.59 (0.57)) on the first postoperative day than the other group (1.04 (0.85)) (p = 0.03). There were no other significant differences between the groups in any other variable studied.
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