Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health
https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub
https://doi.org/10.64483/202522369

Oral Health in Systemic Disease: Integrated Clinical Considerations and Interprofessional Care Pathways for Dental, Medical, and Allied Health Professionals

Ahmed Jaber Mohammed Al-Hejji [1] , Zahraa Hussain Saleh Al Nasser , Wadiah Yousef Alhamdan , Zainab Ali Hassan Aloufi , Zainab Mustafa Mohsan Al Hassan , Saad Abdulrahman Alsaadi [2] , Abdulaziz Ali Ibrahim Bussanah [3] , Zainab Nuri Ali Alghirash [4] , Mohammed Matar Al-Anzi [5]

(1) Al Omran General Hospital,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(2) First Health Cluster, Riyadh,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(3) Maternity and Children's Hospital, Al Hassa,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(4) Al Ahsa Medical Health Cluster, Dental Department,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(5) King Khalid Hospital, Al Kharj, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract
Background: Oral health is deeply interconnected with systemic health, yet dental care is often perceived as isolated from medical practice. Invasive dental procedures can trigger systemic responses, especially in patients with chronic conditions, making integrated care essential.
Aim: This paper aims to outline clinical considerations and interprofessional strategies for delivering safe dental care to patients with systemic diseases, emphasizing risk assessment, procedural modifications, and collaborative care pathways.
Methods: A comprehensive review of current literature and clinical guidelines was conducted, focusing on oral–systemic interactions, risk stratification frameworks, and evidence-based recommendations for managing medically complex patients during invasive dental procedures.
Results: Findings reveal that systemic conditions such as hypertension, cardiovascular disease, immunosuppression, coagulopathy, and cancer significantly influence dental treatment planning. Risk assessment tools like ASA classification, Charlson Comorbidity Index, and dental-specific models provide structured decision support. Key modifications include stress-reduction protocols, epinephrine limitation in hypertensive patients, antibiotic prophylaxis for high-risk cardiac conditions, and tailored strategies for immunocompromised individuals. Integration of interoperable health records, interprofessional education, and standardized protocols emerged as critical solutions to overcome structural and behavioral barriers.
Conclusion: Safe dental care for medically complex patients requires a shift from isolated practice to integrated, patient-centered models. Interprofessional collaboration, comprehensive risk assessment, and proactive oral health optimization before systemic therapies are essential to reduce complications and improve outcomes.
Keywords: Oral-systemic health, dental risk assessment, interprofessional care, systemic disease, invasive dental procedures, patient safety.

Introduction

Dental interventions are frequently perceived as routine outpatient procedures; however, many commonly performed treatments entail irreversible surgical manipulation of hard and soft oral tissues, emphasizing that general dental practice is inherently invasive. Extractions, periodontal surgery, implant placement, endodontic access, and even seemingly minor soft-tissue procedures disrupt mucosal barriers and vascularized tissues, creating biologic conditions that can precipitate systemic responses. Although the overall physiologic insult associated with most dental procedures is often less extensive than that of many major medical operations, dental care is not biologically isolated from the rest of the body. The oral cavity is richly innervated and vascularized, harbors a complex microbiome, and interfaces with the systemic circulation through inflamed periodontal tissues and procedural bacteremia. Consequently, dental treatment can have systemic consequences that extend beyond localized pain and wound healing, including transient hemodynamic changes, inflammatory activation, medication interactions, and—in select high-risk patients—infectious or thromboembolic complications.[1] Contemporary demographic and epidemiologic trends have amplified the clinical importance of understanding oral health in the context of systemic disease. As populations age, individuals retain their natural

*Corresponding author e-mail: Ahjalhejji@moh.gov.sa (Ahmed Jaber Mohammed Al-Hejji).
Receive Date: 28 November 2025, Revise Date: 23 December 2025, Accept Date: 24 December 2025

dentition longer, and medical advances allow patients with chronic illness to live with complex comorbidity profiles, a larger proportion of dental patients now present with significant systemic conditions. This shift is not limited to the elderly; improvements in survival for congenital heart disease, diabetes, autoimmune disease, malignancy, transplant medicine, and hematologic disorders have created diverse patient groups who require ongoing dental care while receiving long-term pharmacotherapy or immunomodulating treatments. Parallel increases in the prevalence and incidence of systemic disease inevitably mean that dental practitioners—along with interdisciplinary partners in medicine, pharmacy, and nursing—must routinely navigate scenarios in which oral procedures intersect with cardiovascular instability, bleeding risk, glycemic dysregulation, renal or hepatic impairment, infectious vulnerability, or complex medication regimens [1].

These realities elevate the importance of comprehensive risk assessment prior to dental treatment. The goal of pre-procedural evaluation is not to deny or delay necessary dental care but to ensure that care is delivered safely, with appropriate modifications and interprofessional coordination when indicated. While there are relatively few absolute medical contraindications to receiving dental treatment, the absence of an outright contraindication should not be conflated with negligible risk. Certain patient factors can increase the likelihood of adverse outcomes, including peri-procedural morbidity and, rarely, mortality.[2] Relevant variables include the severity and stability of systemic disease, the invasiveness and anticipated bleeding burden of the dental procedure, the patient's immune competence, and the potential for drug–drug interactions involving anticoagulants, antiplatelet agents, antihypertensives, hypoglycemic therapies, corticosteroids, bisphosphonates, and other commonly prescribed medications. Additionally, psychosocial determinants—such as frailty, functional capacity, and ability to adhere to post-operative care—may influence healing and complication rates. Accordingly, modern dental care increasingly requires a structured, medically informed approach that integrates patient history, targeted examination, and, when necessary, communication with treating physicians and pharmacists. This model supports individualized decision-making that balances procedural urgency against systemic risk, optimizes medication management, and anticipates complications. By embedding dental practice within a broader clinical risk framework, oral health professionals can deliver safer care to patients with systemic disease while preserving access to essential dental treatment and improving overall health outcomes.[1][2]

Function

Delivering safe, effective dental care to patients with systemic disease is best understood as a structured clinical function rather than a single decision point. It is a stepwise process that integrates patient-centered assessment with procedure-specific planning to reduce preventable harm while preserving timely access to needed oral treatment. The process begins with a comprehensive evaluation of the individual patient, recognizing that systemic disease is not a uniform risk category and that clinical stability, physiologic reserve, and treatment context vary widely even among patients who share the same diagnosis. Age provides an initial anchor for risk appraisal because it correlates with frailty, comorbidity burden, and polypharmacy, but chronological age alone is insufficient. A robust assessment therefore requires careful review of the patient's medical history, including the nature and severity of systemic conditions, recent exacerbations, prior surgeries or hospitalizations, baseline cardiopulmonary function, bleeding history, infection susceptibility, and any implanted devices or prior complications relevant to dental procedures. Equally important is appraisal of the patient's physical, cognitive, emotional, and functional status, because these domains shape both intra-procedural safety and post-procedural recovery. Physical status includes hemodynamic stability, respiratory capacity, and pain tolerance, all of which influence procedural positioning, sedation risk, and physiologic response to stress. Cognitive status affects the patient's ability to provide informed consent, follow instructions, report symptoms accurately, and adhere to post-operative restrictions. Emotional status matters because anxiety can provoke sympathetic activation, alter blood pressure and heart rate, and increase perceived pain, potentially complicating treatment. Functional status—often captured through mobility, self-care capacity, and social support—predicts whether the patient can maintain oral hygiene, manage medications, attend follow-up visits, and respond appropriately if complications arise [2][3][4].

This patient-level assessment must then be interpreted in conjunction with treatment-level variables, because procedural risk is not determined solely by the underlying disease but also by the intensity and physiologic demands of the dental intervention. Critical procedure-related factors include the invasiveness of the planned treatment, anticipated bleeding burden, duration of the procedure, and the extent to which the procedure disrupts mucosal barriers and introduces bacteremia. The drugs administered before, during, and after care—local anesthetics with or without vasoconstrictors, sedatives, analgesics, antibiotics, and hemostatic adjuncts—must be evaluated for interactions with the patient's existing medications and for their potential to exacerbate systemic conditions. Level of consciousness is particularly important in sedation or anesthesia contexts, where airway protection, aspiration risk, and cardiovascular stability become central safety concerns and may warrant modified protocols or additional monitoring. Operationally, the function of this diagnostic framework depends on acquiring high-quality information across historical, clinical, physiologic, biologic, and imaging domains. Medical records, medication lists, laboratory values when indicated, and relevant imaging results provide objective grounding for risk stratification and help identify conditions that may not be apparent from history alone. However, information quality alone is insufficient without effective communication among healthcare providers. Coordinated dialogue between dentists, physicians, pharmacists, and nursing teams enables alignment on anticoagulation management, glycemic control, infection prophylaxis decisions, and peri-procedural monitoring plans. In this way, the function of dental care in medically complex patients becomes an interprofessional process that translates comprehensive assessment into individualized treatment planning, consistent quality care, and safer clinical outcomes [2][3][4].

Issues of Concern

A persistent challenge in contemporary healthcare is the artificial separation between oral health services and the broader medical system. This divide is structural, cultural, and operational, and it continues despite repeated high-level efforts to emphasize the inseparability of oral health and overall health. Landmark initiatives—such as the United States Surgeon General's report in 2000 [3] and the World Health Organization's report in 2021 [4]—have explicitly highlighted the public health significance of oral disease and the need for integration across care domains. Yet, in many settings, oral healthcare remains organized, financed, documented, and taught as though it were peripheral to medicine rather than a component of it.[5] The consequence is not merely an administrative inconvenience; it is a patient-safety issue that can directly influence risk assessment, treatment sequencing, medication management, and the recognition of systemic complications. This separation is reinforced early in professional training through siloed curricula, where dental and medical students often have limited structured exposure to one another's clinical frameworks. The downstream effect is predictable: dental clinicians may receive insufficient support and access to systemic health data needed for nuanced risk stratification, while medical clinicians may underestimate the physiologic demands and systemic implications of dental procedures. The divide is further intensified by frequent separation of electronic health records between dental and medical services, limited interoperability, and policy or workflow barriers to sharing information. When dental notes, medication reconciliations, laboratory values, imaging results, and problem lists exist in parallel systems, the clinical picture becomes fragmented. In such environments, the reliability of decision-making depends heavily on patient recall and on informal communication pathways, both of which are vulnerable to error. These structural constraints can delay necessary clarifications about anticoagulant use, immunosuppression status, glycemic control, renal function, or recent cardiovascular events—factors that may meaningfully alter procedural planning, anesthetic choice, and post-operative monitoring.

The fragmentation also shapes patient expectations and understanding. Patients may not appreciate why a dentist must obtain detailed medical history, review medication lists, and inquire about active medical problems, particularly when the healthcare system itself treats dentistry as separate. When patients perceive dental care as disconnected from systemic health, they may inadvertently omit critical information, assume that medical details are irrelevant, or resist coordination with physicians. This misunderstanding can be amplified in patients with complex disease who are fatigued by repetitive history-taking across multiple clinics. Conversely, medical clinicians who are less familiar with dental procedures may not recognize when dental pathology or planned interventions could precipitate bacteremia, bleeding complications, medication interactions, aspiration risk during sedation, or delayed healing in immunocompromised states. Together, these factors create fertile ground for miscommunication, incomplete risk appraisal, and suboptimal clinical decisions, particularly for patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy. A second major concern is the underutilization of oral health optimization as a proactive component of systemic care. Oral disease is not an isolated set of symptoms but a chronic inflammatory and infectious burden that can influence nutrition, glycemic stability, cardiovascular risk profiles, and overall quality of life. Ensuring optimal oral health is therefore not an optional add-on but a foundational component of general health maintenance.[6][7] This relationship becomes especially consequential when patients undergo interventions that increase susceptibility to infection, impair wound healing, or raise the stakes of peri-procedural complications. For this reason, recommendations for comprehensive oral evaluation and management prior to certain treatments—such as chemotherapy, radiation therapy, renal replacement therapy, and major surgery—are widely supported.[8][9][10][11] These settings share a common logic: systemic therapies and major procedures can magnify the consequences of existing oral infection, mucosal trauma, or periodontal disease, increasing the risk of postoperative infection, delayed recovery, and avoidable morbidity.

Notably, the importance of pre-procedural oral evaluation has been recognized within health policy frameworks. Renal replacement therapy and major surgery are services covered under Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services since 1979, accompanied by rationale emphasizing that an oral examination can identify existing medical problems that increase infection risk and thereby threaten surgical success while exposing patients to additional perioperative hazards. Despite this longstanding rationale, the practical application of routine oral evaluation before complex medical interventions remains inconsistent across facilities. Implementation often depends on local culture, availability of dental services, referral pathways, and the perceived urgency of the medical treatment. When oral assessment is omitted, dental infections may remain untreated until systemic therapy begins, at which point options may be limited, complication risk may be higher, and treatment delays may become unavoidable. Taken together, the ongoing separation of oral and medical systems, combined with inconsistent application of oral health optimization before high-risk therapies, represents a meaningful barrier to integrated, patient-centered care. Addressing these issues requires not only better policy statements but also interoperable records, shared clinical protocols, interprofessional education, and normalized communication pathways that treat oral health as an essential component of systemic disease management rather than a parallel, disconnected service.[3][4][5][6][7][8][9][10][11]

Clinical Significance

Systemic disease is no longer an occasional consideration in dentistry; it is a routine feature of contemporary dental practice that reshapes clinical decision-making, procedural planning, and patient safety. The prevalence of systemic disease among dental patients has been reported to range from approximately 12% to 35%, with meaningful variation depending on population characteristics, age distribution, and the structure of the care setting. Rates tend to be higher in public health systems and among older adults, reflecting greater comorbidity burden and more frequent medical complexity in these groups. In a large university dental clinic, for example, 12% of patients were identified as having a medically compromised condition, with allergies, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, heart disease, and thyroid disease among the most common diagnoses. A separate investigation reported systemic disease prevalence of 35% among public dental patients and 28% in private practice, with particularly high rates of rheumatic and endocrine-metabolic disorders in patients younger than 65 years.[12] These epidemiologic findings underscore that medically complex patients are not confined to hospital-based dentistry or geriatric clinics; they are present across general practice environments, and their distribution is influenced by insurance status, access to primary care, and social determinants that shape disease burden. The clinical significance of these figures lies in what they imply operationally: dentists and oral health teams must be prepared to integrate medical evaluation into routine workflow, not only for rare high-risk procedures but for day-to-day treatment decisions. Yet assessing medical status is inherently complex. Many systemic diseases fluctuate in stability, severity, and treatment intensity, and their risks are often mediated through medication effects and physiologic reserve rather than through diagnostic labels alone. A patient with hypertension controlled on a single agent and no end-organ damage poses a different procedural risk profile than a patient with resistant hypertension and heart failure, even though both share the same umbrella diagnosis. Similarly, diabetes risk is shaped by glycemic control, presence of microvascular disease, and immune function, not merely the presence of the condition. The need to translate heterogeneous medical information into actionable dental decisions has led to the adoption of structured assessment systems that collate and stratify risk. These systems do not replace clinical judgment; rather, they provide a scaffold that helps standardize communication, anticipate complications, and guide decisions about setting, monitoring, and procedural modification.

The American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status classification remains one of the most widely recognized stratification tools. It has long been used to estimate the likelihood of adverse outcomes—particularly mortality—associated with anesthesia and surgical procedures, and it is often applied in dentistry when sedation or general anesthesia is considered.[Meyer Saklad; GRADING OF PATIENTS FOR SURGICAL PROCEDURES. Anesthesiology. 1941; 2:281-284. doi: https://doi.org/10.1097/00000542-194105000-00004] However, its original purpose was to categorize peri-anesthetic risk rather than to predict the full spectrum of complications that can arise during routine dental procedures. As a result, while ASA status can be helpful for deciding whether office-based sedation is appropriate or whether additional monitoring is warranted, it has limitations when used as a universal risk framework for dental treatment planning, especially for procedures performed under local anesthesia where bleeding, infection, and wound healing concerns may be more clinically salient than anesthetic risk. The Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) was developed to predict 1-year mortality in patients with breast cancer who also had comorbid conditions, using weighted scoring to capture the cumulative effect of multiple diseases on outcomes.[13] Its conceptual strength is that it recognizes that comorbidity burden is additive and that multiple moderate conditions can confer risk comparable to a single severe condition. The CCI has also been applied to evaluate in-hospital mortality in broader clinical contexts.[14] In dental practice, such an index can be useful for contextualizing overall health burden and for anticipating the likelihood of complications that may warrant closer follow-up or coordination with medical teams. However, like the ASA classification, the CCI was not designed specifically for dental decision-making and may not fully capture procedure-specific risk modifiers such as anticoagulant management, airway vulnerability, or aspiration risk during sedation.

In response to the need for dental-specific decision support, models such as the Medical Complexity Score have been described as more tailored frameworks for assessing risk in patients requiring dental treatment.[Michael Glick et al. Burket's Oral Medicine, 13th edition. Wiley-Blackwell; 2021] Although conceptually similar to the ASA physical status approach, the Medical Complexity Score attempts to map medical conditions to anticipated dental complications and to recommend the appropriate setting for management, thereby linking medical assessment more directly to dental operational decisions. This linkage is clinically important because “risk” in dentistry is not an abstract concept; it often translates into practical questions such as whether care can be provided safely in an outpatient clinic, whether enhanced monitoring is needed, whether consultation with a physician or pharmacist is required, and whether peri-procedural modifications are necessary to reduce bleeding, infection, or cardiopulmonary stress. A complementary and increasingly relevant perspective is offered by the World Health Organization’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF), which provides a holistic method for evaluating patients across domains of function, activity, and participation.[World Health Organization. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)] In dental settings, the ICF framework is clinically significant because it extends assessment beyond disease labels and into the practical realities that determine outcomes: the ability to perform self-care, maintain oral hygiene, attend follow-up appointments, understand instructions, and cope with procedural stress. Functional capacity and environmental supports can be decisive determinants of healing and long-term success, particularly for patients with cognitive impairment, neurologic disability, or limited social resources. Regardless of which system is used, structured assessment represents only one component of comprehensive dental management. Outcomes also depend on the skills and judgment of the clinician and team, the adequacy of informed consent and patient education, and the ability to provide post-procedural support. Risk tools can guide planning, but they cannot substitute for a clinician’s ability to recognize instability, communicate effectively, and adapt treatment plans to patient-specific realities. This is especially true in dentistry, where procedural invasiveness is often irreversible and where small changes in technique, timing, and medication selection can substantially affect complication rates [9][10][11].

In clinically meaningful terms, the factors that shape outcomes in medically complex dental patients extend well beyond the mere presence of systemic disease. Key domains include demographics and social determinants of health, which influence disease prevalence, access to care, health literacy, and the ability to comply with follow-up. The preexisting burden of disease, along with risk factors and behaviors such as smoking, substance use, and nutrition, affects healing capacity and infection susceptibility. Cognitive capacity and communication ability determine whether symptoms will be reported accurately and whether safety instructions will be followed. Emotional responses within the dental environment—particularly anxiety and fear—can provoke physiologic stress responses that complicate blood pressure control, pain management, and procedural tolerance. Functional capacity and comorbidities influence positioning tolerance, aspiration risk, and the feasibility of maintaining oral hygiene after surgery. When dental treatment is planned for patients with systemic disease, additional complexity factors must be integrated into the risk appraisal. The invasiveness of the procedure and its bleeding burden may interact with antiplatelet or anticoagulant therapy. Drugs administered during care—including local anesthetics, vasoconstrictors, sedatives, analgesics, and antibiotics—must be evaluated for interactions and contraindications within the patient’s medical regimen. The level of consciousness, particularly when sedation or general anesthesia is used, introduces new risks related to airway protection, aspiration, and cardiopulmonary stability. Risk of asphyxiation, infection, or procedural contamination becomes more consequential in immunocompromised patients or those with valvular disease under specific conditions. The impact on associated structures, the reversibility of the planned intervention, and the duration and cumulative stress of the procedure also matter, because longer and more invasive procedures increase physiologic demand and may require staging or alternative strategies. Taken together, these considerations demonstrate why systemic disease is clinically significant in dentistry: it transforms dental care from a purely technical exercise into a medically integrated process in which risk stratification, interprofessional communication, and individualized planning are essential. Importantly, systemic disease is only part of the equation, but it is often the part that amplifies the consequences of otherwise routine dental interventions. For that reason, the focus on dental management recommendations for patients with systemic diseases is justified not by rarity, but by frequency, complexity, and the high potential for preventable harm when medical risk is underestimated or poorly integrated into dental decision-making.[12][13][14]

Systemic Disease Requiring Modifications for Invasive Procedures

Dental practice encompasses a spectrum of interventions that range from conservative, minimally invasive therapies to procedures that are clearly surgical and physiologically demanding. Most routine dental therapies—including restorations, nonsurgical periodontal care, administration of local anesthetics containing epinephrine, and single-tooth extractions—are generally categorized as minimally invasive in comparison with complex surgical interventions. Even within this "low invasiveness" category, however, complications can still arise, and they frequently relate to perioperative and postoperative risks such as bleeding, infection, medication-related adverse effects, and the patient's physiologic and psychosocial capacity to tolerate the procedure and adhere to post-treatment instructions. When the planned intervention becomes more invasive—such as removal of impacted third molars, extraction of multiple teeth, extensive flap procedures, or osseous surgery—the margin for error narrows and systemic risk becomes more clinically consequential. In these circumstances, an expanded pre-procedural risk assessment may be warranted, and applying cardiovascular risk stratification frameworks such as the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) perioperative cardiovascular management guidelines for noncardiac surgery can provide a structured lens for evaluating patients who may have limited cardiopulmonary reserve or high likelihood of adverse events under procedural stress.[15] Importantly, the intent is not to transform dental care into hospital-based surgery for all medically complex individuals, but rather to recognize that invasiveness, duration, physiologic stress, and medication exposure increase the probability that comorbid disease will influence outcomes.

Hypertension

Hypertension is among the most frequently encountered systemic conditions in dental settings and is clinically significant because both the dental environment and procedural stimuli can provoke acute elevations in blood pressure. Anxiety is common before and during dental visits, and sympathetic activation can increase heart rate and blood pressure even in patients whose baseline hypertension is controlled. Accordingly, blood pressure assessment at dental visits is widely regarded as a standard of care, not only as a screening tool but also as an operational safety measure to identify severe elevations that may indicate uncontrolled disease or an evolving cardiovascular event. Clinical guidance exists regarding management of elevated readings, and stress-reduction protocols—such as effective communication, allowing rest before re-measurement, minimizing procedural pain, and scheduling shorter visits—are generally recommended. However, it is important to interpret guidance with nuance. Recommendations that propose deferring dental treatment in the presence of blood pressure readings above 180/110 mm Hg when cardiovascular symptoms are present are shaped by concern for potential catastrophic events, yet the evidence base supporting strict thresholds remains limited.[15] This uncertainty underscores the need for individualized assessment that considers symptoms, trend, comorbidity, and the urgency of dental care rather than a single measurement in isolation.

Medication interactions introduce a further layer of complexity, particularly when local anesthetics containing epinephrine are administered. Epinephrine is used to enhance anesthetic efficacy and reduce bleeding through vasoconstriction, but it can also precipitate clinically significant hemodynamic responses in susceptible patients. A classic concern involves patients taking nonselective beta-blockers, in whom epinephrine administration may produce an exaggerated pressor response. Mechanistically, nonselective beta blockade attenuates beta-mediated vasodilation and cardiac effects, leaving alpha-adrenergic vasoconstriction relatively unopposed, which can result in marked hypertension and reflex bradycardia.[16] For this reason, a common recommendation is to limit epinephrine to approximately 0.04 mg (often cited as the equivalent of two cartridges of local anesthetic containing 1:100,000 epinephrine) in patients taking nonselective beta-blockers to reduce the risk of a potentially life-threatening hypertensive crisis. At the same time, the interaction profile is not uniform across antihypertensive classes. Observational evidence has noted decreases in blood pressure in association with other antihypertensive regimens—such as calcium channel blockers, angiotensin II receptor antagonists, and alpha-blockers—during dental anesthetic administration.[17] This reinforces the principle that medication reconciliation should be precise and that hemodynamic risk should be anticipated based on drug class, patient stability, and the planned anesthetic approach rather than generalized assumptions about "hypertension" alone.

Endocarditis

The oral cavity hosts a dense and diverse microbiome, and invasive dental procedures may result in transient bacteremia, particularly when gingival tissues are manipulated or bleeding occurs. In most individuals, such bacteremias are cleared without consequence. However, for patients with specific cardiac conditions, the potential for bacteremia to seed damaged endocardial surfaces or prosthetic material can translate into clinically devastating outcomes. Infective endocarditis is associated with substantial morbidity and mortality, and its consequences—heart failure, embolic stroke, systemic infection, and need for valve surgery—justify rigorous prevention strategies in defined high-risk groups. For this reason, the American Heart Association (AHA) recommends antibiotic prophylaxis before selected dental procedures for patients with a history of infective endocarditis or other high-risk cardiac conditions.[18] The emphasis on "high risk" is deliberate: prophylaxis is targeted to patient categories in whom the consequence of endocarditis is most severe and in whom the balance of benefit versus antibiotic-associated harm is most favorable. Evidence supporting prophylaxis has been historically challenging to generate because endocarditis is relatively uncommon and confounded by multiple exposures. Nonetheless, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis of case-control, crossover, and cohort studies suggests that antibiotic prophylaxis is associated with a lower risk of developing infective endocarditis after dental procedures.[19][20] Despite such findings, the AHA currently does not recommend prophylaxis for patients considered low or medium risk for endocarditis following invasive dental procedures, reflecting ongoing concern about antimicrobial stewardship, adverse drug reactions, and the population-level harms of overprescribing. In practice, this requires dentists to correctly identify high-risk cardiac conditions, clarify ambiguity through communication with cardiology or primary care when needed, and document rationale for prophylaxis decisions, particularly in complex cases where the patient's condition does not neatly fit standard categories.

Neutropenia and Broader Immunosuppression

Neutropenia represents a clinically important risk modifier for invasive dental procedures because neutrophils are essential for controlling bacterial infection and for limiting local spread. Neutropenia may be primary, such as autoimmune or cyclic neutropenia, or secondary to medications, malignancies, bone marrow suppression, infections, or chemotherapy. While risk of postoperative infection is a consideration in many forms of surgery, the oral cavity's high vascularity, microbial density, and proximity to vital spaces—the airway, mediastinum via fascial planes, the central nervous system, and major cervical vessels—means that odontogenic infections can progress rapidly and become life-threatening if they spread through head and neck tissue planes. The prevalence of immunosuppression in the community has increased due to demographic aging and expanded use of immunomodulatory therapies, with estimates suggesting immunosuppression occurs in 6.6% of U.S. adults.[21] This epidemiologic reality increases the likelihood that dentists will routinely encounter patients with impaired host defense. Although evidence-based thresholds are limited, expert-opinion guidance commonly suggests that patients with an absolute neutrophil count below 500/µL—and in some situations below 1000/µL—may warrant antibiotic prophylaxis for invasive dental treatments. This decision is inherently individualized because infection risk depends not only on the numerical neutrophil count but also on the etiology of neutropenia, the anticipated duration, concurrent mucositis or oral infection, and the invasiveness of the planned procedure. In some patients, deferring elective invasive care until neutrophil recovery may be the safest approach, whereas urgent dental infection may require treatment with careful coordination, enhanced antimicrobial coverage, and close follow-up.

Beyond neutrophils, lymphocyte-mediated immunity is also relevant, particularly in lymphopenic states and in advanced HIV infection. Patients with CD4+ T-lymphocyte counts in the range of 300 to 500 cells/mm³, and especially those below 200 cells/mm³, are at increased risk of opportunistic infections arising from organisms in the oral microbiome and from reactivation of latent viral infections. Candida species, including C albicans and C glabrata, represent the most common oral opportunistic pathogens, though bacterial and viral infections can also occur. Despite this vulnerability, routine prophylaxis for oral, oropharyngeal, and esophageal fungal infections is not recommended in HIV guidelines; instead, treatment is advised when infection is present, in part to limit the emergence of drug-resistant organisms.[Clinicalinfo.HIV.gov. Guidelines for the Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in Adults and Adolescents With HIV] For dental teams, the practical implication is that screening for candidiasis and other oral infections should be integrated into care, early treatment should be initiated when indicated, and coordination with HIV specialists may be necessary for patients with advanced immunosuppression. A broader constellation of disorders also increases infection risk, including autoimmune disease, diabetes, and end-stage renal disease, each of which may impair host defenses and wound healing through distinct mechanisms. In the presence of active odontogenic infection—such as a dental abscess—the possibility of hematogenous seeding to distant prostheses becomes a clinical consideration. The question of prophylactic antibiotics in patients with prosthetic joints has been contentious; current joint guidance from the American Dental Association and the American Academy of Orthopedic Clinicians recommends against routine antibiotic prophylaxis for dental procedures solely on the basis of a prosthetic joint.[22] For other implants and prosthetic devices—ocular lenses, breast implants, dental implants, orthopedic plates or screws, pacemakers, implantable cardioverter-defibrillators—routine prophylaxis is also generally not recommended, with an often-cited exception during the first six months after implant placement, when prophylaxis may be considered reasonable. In certain high-risk circumstances—such as dental procedures performed in the setting of active infection, patients with synthetic arterial or cardiac grafts or stents, individuals with central intravenous catheters, or those with left ventricular assist devices (LVADs)—some clinicians elect to use antibiotic prophylaxis, though this practice is largely empirical rather than supported by randomized trials.[23] LVADs are sometimes managed analogously to prosthetic heart valves in institutional protocols, highlighting the importance of explicit consultation between cardiology and oral healthcare teams.[24] Adding further complexity, some patients with second-generation LVADs may develop acquired von Willebrand disease due to shear forces that degrade von Willebrand factor, thereby introducing both bleeding and infection concerns that must be balanced carefully.

Coagulopathy and Bleeding Risk

Coagulopathy is a frequent driver of dental treatment modification because bleeding is a predictable consequence of many invasive dental procedures. Most perioperative bleeding in dentistry can be controlled effectively with local measures—direct pressure, suturing and primary closure, topical hemostatic agents, and local antifibrinolytics—yet systemic hemostatic impairment can overwhelm local control, leading to prolonged bleeding, hematoma formation, airway compromise in rare cases, or need for emergent medical intervention. Coagulopathies may be primary, such as von Willebrand disease or immune thrombocytopenia, or secondary to liver disease, malignancy, renal failure, and medication effects. Liver disease is particularly important because it can disrupt multiple components of hemostasis, including synthesis of clotting factors, platelet function, and fibrinolysis, while thrombocytopenia can result from hypersplenism, marrow suppression, chemotherapy, or autoimmune mechanisms. As a result, dentists often need a more refined understanding of both the cause and severity of bleeding risk, especially when multiple teeth are extracted or when osseous surgery is planned. Common diagnostic tests used to assess perioperative bleeding risk include platelet count, liver function tests (ALT, AST, albumin, bilirubin), and the international normalized ratio (INR). However, test interpretation must be contextual. A patient taking warfarin with an INR of approximately 2.5 may undergo a simple extraction safely when local measures are properly applied, whereas a non-anticoagulated patient with a similar INR suggests intrinsic coagulopathy and may be at high risk for significant hemorrhage. This distinction illustrates why identifying the underlying mechanism of abnormal coagulation is essential for meaningful risk assessment. Practical thresholds often cited for "safe extraction" include platelet counts above 50,000/µL, an INR between approximately 0.8 and 1.2 for a non-anticoagulated patient (and potentially up to 3.5 in a patient taking coumadin), AST less than 37 U/L, ALT less than 41 U/L, and total bilirubin less than 2 mg/dL. These values should not be treated as universal cutoffs, but they provide a framework for triaging risk, determining when medical consultation is necessary, and deciding whether prophylactic interventions—such as platelet transfusion, adjustment of anticoagulation, or performance of the procedure in a higher-acuity setting—should be considered [21][22][23].

Cancers, Antineoplastic Therapy, and Long-Term Oral Sequelae

Cancer and its therapies introduce some of the most consequential oral-systemic intersections in dentistry. For patients undergoing treatment for solid tumors or hematologic malignancies, dental evaluation is often recommended before initiating chemotherapy, radiation therapy, or hematopoietic transplantation, because the oral cavity can harbor chronic infection foci that may become dangerous in the context of immunosuppression. Teeth with poor prognosis, advanced periodontal disease, or high risk of pulpal or periodontal infection are typically addressed—through endodontic therapy, periodontal therapy, or extraction—before anticancer treatment begins. This pre-treatment planning aims to minimize the likelihood that urgent dental infection will arise during periods of neutropenia or mucositis, when treatment options are more limited and complications can be severe. Chemotherapy can increase susceptibility to infection and can cause xerostomia, thereby elevating long-term caries risk. It can also induce oral mucositis, a highly prevalent adverse effect that can markedly impair nutrition, oral intake, and quality of life and may increase inpatient days.[25] Radiation therapy, particularly when delivered to the head and neck, adds additional risks. Modern radiation modalities include intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) and intensity-modulated proton therapy (IMPT). Although quality-of-life outcomes may be better with IMPT than IMRT in some contexts, research continues to compare late toxicities such as xerostomia and other sequelae.[26][27] A critical dental concern is osteoradionecrosis (ORN) of the jaw, which can develop after high-dose radiation—particularly above 60 Gray—when invasive dental procedures are performed. ORN risk is higher in the mandible than the maxilla and appears greater when extractions are performed within seven days before initiation of radiation therapy.[28] Advances in three-dimensional dose shaping have likely reduced ORN incidence, and comparative data suggest IMPT may further lower ORN risk through reduction of unintended mandibular irradiation.[29] Additional retrospective data indicate that avoiding epinephrine-containing local anesthesia and using conservative surgical technique may reduce ORN risk in susceptible patients undergoing extractions.[30] These findings collectively support a preventive strategy: prioritize dental stabilization before radiation when possible, minimize traumatic interventions afterward, and coordinate closely with oncology and radiation teams to understand dose distribution and timing.

Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation, often referred to as bone marrow transplantation (BMT), represents another setting where dental modifications are essential. Induction regimens increase risk of new infection, reactivation of latent viruses such as herpesviruses, and development of severe mucositis, making thorough oral evaluation important before and after treatment.[31] In allogeneic transplantation, graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) adds significant chronic oral morbidity. Acute oral GVHD can present with nonspecific mucositis, ulcerations, or erythema of keratinized or nonkeratinized mucosa or lips, typically emerging 2 to 4 weeks post-transplant but potentially up to 6 months.[32] Chronic oral GVHD often develops between 6 months and 2 years post-transplant and classically manifests with lichenoid changes, atrophy, erythema, white reticular striae, ulcerations, pseudomembranes, and mucoceles. Salivary gland involvement can produce xerostomia and hyposalivation, increasing caries risk and mucosal fragility. Perioral and skin sclerosis may cause trismus, limiting oral access and complicating prevention and restorative care. Because GVHD is systemic and may involve skin, gastrointestinal tract, eyes, liver, and lungs, oral manifestations are often managed in coordination with systemic therapy, while topical interventions—steroids, lubricants, and emollients—can relieve symptoms locally. Post-transplant secondary malignancy surveillance within the oral cavity is also important, with surveillance commonly recommended every 6 to 12 months.

After cancer therapy, patients may receive immune-modulating medications and bone-targeted therapies that alter dental risk in durable ways. Bisphosphonates, often used in breast or prostate cancer to reduce risk of skeletal metastases, and other antiresorptive or antiangiogenic agents have been associated with medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaw (MRONJ). MRONJ is defined by MASCC as: current or prior exposure to a bone-modifying agent or angiogenic inhibitor; exposed bone or bone probeable through a maxillofacial fistula persisting for more than eight weeks; and no history of jaw radiation therapy or jaw metastasis. Risk correlates with potency and duration of exposure, with intravenous delivery conferring higher risk than oral therapy and with zoledronate generally associated with higher risk than less potent agents. Local trauma such as extractions or bone biopsy increases risk, and risk is amplified by age, periodontal disease, tobacco use, corticosteroid exposure, and local infection. Additional implicated drugs include denosumab and agents such as bevacizumab, sunitinib, everolimus, temsirolimus, and sorafenib.[33] For invasive dental planning, these realities require careful medication history, coordination with oncology, prioritization of conservative treatment when possible, and use of minimally traumatic surgical techniques when extraction is unavoidable.

Medications, Drug Interactions, and Oral Adverse Effects

Medication-related complications are a frequent source of dental risk because both dentists and medical teams prescribe drugs that can interact or produce oral adverse effects. Dentists must evaluate known medication allergies and consider genetic risk factors for severe cutaneous reactions when relevant, such as in patients taking carbamazepine who may carry HLA-B*1502 and possibly HLA*3101 alleles. Carbamazepine also demonstrates clinically meaningful pharmacokinetic interactions with several antiretroviral agents—reducing effectiveness of drugs such as indinavir, atazanavir, dolutegravir, and tenofovir—while ritonavir can increase carbamazepine concentration through CYP3A4 inhibition, increasing toxicity risk. These interactions illustrate why dental prescribing, even for pain management or neuropathic conditions, should be coordinated with the patient's broader medical regimen when complex therapies are involved. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are widely used in dentistry, but medium- and long-term administration requires assessment of renal function and gastrointestinal ulcer risk. Long-term NSAID exposure can contribute to lichenoid mucositis and may reduce the effectiveness of antihypertensive medications, which is clinically relevant for patients with borderline blood pressure control. Hepatic function should be considered before recommending acetaminophen, NSAIDs, azithromycin, erythromycin, or carbamazepine, particularly in patients with chronic liver disease or active hepatic injury. Clarithromycin warrants special caution because it can interact adversely with calcium channel blockers, pose increased risk in patients with poor kidney function, and may be problematic in individuals with cardiac arrhythmia.[34] These considerations exemplify the importance of pharmacist collaboration and medication reconciliation in medically complex dental patients, especially when antibiotics are prescribed empirically.

Skeletal muscle relaxants and sedative medications may be used to manage temporomandibular disorders or procedural anxiety, but they raise safety concerns related to postural stability, gait impairment, and fall risk, particularly in older adults. Such prescriptions should be accompanied by assessment of baseline functional status, counseling about driving and fall prevention, and careful consideration of additive sedative burdens from existing medications. Beyond acute prescribing, many chronic medical therapies have oral sequelae that influence dental outcomes. Calcium channel blockers have been associated with gingival overgrowth, which can complicate plaque control and increase periodontal inflammation.[35] Xerostomia is a common adverse effect across many antihypertensive classes and numerous other medications, increasing risk of caries, mucosal trauma, and oral candidiasis. Certain antihypertensives—angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, beta-blockers, and direct vasodilators—have been linked to oral lichenoid lesions or lichenoid mucositis, which may present as chronic discomfort, erosions, or ulcerations and may complicate mucosal healing after invasive procedures.[36]

Integrating Modifications into Practical Dental Planning

Across these systemic domains, a unifying clinical theme emerges: modifications for invasive dental procedures should be guided by the interplay between disease severity, treatment-related immunologic or hemostatic consequences, and the procedural burden of the planned dental intervention. In many cases, the safest approach is not simply to “avoid” invasive dentistry, but to optimize timing, select the least traumatic effective intervention, coordinate with medical specialists, and implement risk-mitigation strategies such as stress reduction, limited epinephrine exposure when indicated, targeted antibiotic prophylaxis for clearly defined high-risk cardiac conditions, careful evaluation of neutropenia and immunosuppression, and appropriate hemostatic planning in coagulopathy. When cancer therapies, transplantation, LVAD support, or antiresorptive medications are present, the oral healthcare team’s role expands further into long-term surveillance and preventive care to reduce future need for traumatic interventions. Ultimately, systemic disease becomes clinically actionable in dentistry when it informs how invasive procedures are planned, staged, and supported—transforming routine surgical decisions into individualized, interprofessionally coordinated care pathways that prioritize safety without compromising necessary oral health treatment [32][33][34][35][36].

Other Issues

Despite growing recognition that oral health and systemic health are inseparably linked, substantial “structural” and “behavioral” barriers continue to impede effective integration of dental and medical care. A primary structural obstacle is the ongoing separation of electronic health records for dentistry and medicine, which fragments the patient narrative into parallel documentation systems that do not communicate efficiently. When dental teams cannot readily view medical diagnoses, medication lists, laboratory results, implanted devices, allergies, and recent hospitalizations—and when medical teams cannot easily access dental findings such as active infection, periodontal status, and planned invasive procedures—the result is avoidable uncertainty and unnecessary duplication. This fragmentation disproportionately affects patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy, for whom risk assessment depends on timely access to current information. In addition to information technology limitations, workflow barriers and privacy concerns may discourage proactive communication between teams, leaving the burden of clinical “translation” to patients, who may not have the health literacy needed to accurately relay complex medical histories. Behavioral and educational gaps further compound these challenges. Patients may not intuitively understand why a dentist needs detailed information about cardiovascular disease, anticoagulant use, immunosuppression, renal function, or diabetes control. Because the mouth is often perceived as separate from the body in common health narratives, patients may unintentionally omit information they consider irrelevant, such as recent medication changes, steroid use, or hospital admissions. Strengthening patient understanding of the bidirectional relationship between oral disease and systemic outcomes is therefore not merely educational—it is a safety intervention. When patients appreciate that systemic conditions can influence bleeding, infection risk, wound healing, sedation safety, and medication interactions, they are more likely to disclose critical information and to participate in coordinated care decisions [33][34][35][36].

At the professional level, increased interprofessional education during training can reduce cultural barriers between disciplines and establish shared language for risk stratification and consultation. Structured medical-dental rotations, interdisciplinary case conferences, and joint simulation exercises can help trainees understand how dental procedures create physiologic stress, bacteremia risk, and medication needs, while also helping dental teams better interpret the systemic implications of immunosuppression, cardiovascular instability, or hepatic dysfunction. Importantly, guidelines that are created through interdisciplinary consensus can also reduce confusion by aligning recommendations across specialties, clarifying responsibility for peri-procedural planning, and standardizing terminology and thresholds that drive action. Examples where such guidance supports dentists managing medical complexity include infective endocarditis prophylaxis recommendations (American Heart Association, 2021)[37]; dental management guidance linked to blood pressure status (Little and Falace, 10th Edition, Table 3.5); prosthetic joint replacement recommendations (ADA Council for Scientific Affairs)[22]; the diabetes–periodontal disease consensus work by the International Diabetes Federation and European Federation of Periodontology[38]; standardized diagnostic criteria for temporomandibular disorders (DC/TMD)[39]; the AAOMS position paper on MRONJ[40]; dental sleep medicine guidance for obstructive sleep apnea[41]; and other evolving frameworks that link systemic risk to dental decision-making.

Current Challenges and Potential Solutions

Current challenges in caring for medically complex dental patients are best conceptualized as failures of alignment: misalignment of records, misalignment of education, misalignment of clinical pathways, and misalignment of incentives. The separation of electronic health records is perhaps the most operationally visible issue, because it directly limits the dental team's ability to perform high-quality medication reconciliation and risk assessment. A unified patient health record—or, at minimum, interoperable systems that permit bidirectional sharing of problem lists, medications, allergies, laboratory data, and procedural notes—would represent a foundational step toward safer, more efficient care. Interoperability is particularly important for time-sensitive scenarios, such as patients receiving anticoagulants, chemotherapy, dialysis, biologic immune modulators, or advanced cardiovascular devices. When real-time data cannot be shared, dental teams may be forced to delay care, request redundant testing, or proceed with incomplete information, each of which can degrade outcomes. Another challenge is the patient's limited understanding of why information sharing is necessary. A practical solution is to embed brief, standardized educational messaging into intake forms and chairside discussions explaining that systemic diseases and medications can change bleeding risk, infection risk, healing, anesthetic safety, and even the choice of procedure. This messaging should be framed as protective rather than bureaucratic, emphasizing that accurate medical information allows safer, more comfortable dental care. Beyond messaging, clinics can implement structured intake workflows that prompt disclosure of high-impact variables, such as anticoagulation status, immunosuppression, recent hospitalization, pregnancy, implanted devices, and known drug allergies. When combined with clear documentation and standardized escalation pathways—such as triggers for physician consultation—these workflows reduce reliance on memory and individual clinician variability [37][38].

Interprofessional education is a third leverage point. Expanding shared learning opportunities between medical and dental trainees can normalize consultation and collaboration, reducing "silo" thinking that impedes coordinated care. Rotations that place dental trainees in medical settings and medical trainees in dental or oral medicine clinics enhance mutual understanding of procedural risk and systemic physiology. In parallel, interdisciplinary professional guideline development should continue to expand, because aligned guidance reduces contradictory recommendations that confuse clinicians and patients alike. When guidelines explicitly define which patients need prophylaxis, which procedures carry higher risk, and what monitoring or setting is appropriate, decision-making becomes more consistent and defensible. Finally, service design can reduce barriers. Co-location of dental and medical services in community health centers can facilitate warm handoffs, shared documentation, and rapid consultation. Increasing access to dental consultations in inpatient and outpatient hospital settings can also prevent delays in medically necessary treatments, such as chemotherapy, transplantation, or major surgery, by addressing oral infection foci proactively. These solutions are not merely logistical enhancements; they are safety interventions that reduce preventable complications, improve patient experience, and support equitable access to integrated care [38][39][40].

Enhancing Healthcare Team Outcomes

Improving outcomes for dental patients—particularly those with systemic disease—requires an interprofessional approach that treats assessment and communication as core clinical interventions. Successful management begins with thorough evaluation, accurate diagnosis, and implementation of preventive and personalized treatment strategies that reflect individual risk, physical status, medical conditions, and current medications. As more patients live longer with chronic diseases and complex pharmacotherapy, modern dentistry increasingly demands working knowledge of medicine, pharmacology, and current clinical standards, not as optional "extra" knowledge, but as essential competence for safe practice. This shift is especially relevant for invasive procedures, sedation planning, antibiotic stewardship, and management of bleeding risk in patients taking antithrombotic agents. Effective collaboration between medical and dental providers is central to safe care. The dentist may identify oral infection that could complicate systemic therapy; the physician may provide stability assessment and peri-procedural recommendations; and pharmacists can clarify drug–drug interactions, advise on antibiotic selection, and support medication reconciliation. Nurses and allied health professionals play a complementary role by reinforcing education, monitoring adherence, and facilitating follow-up. Communication should be timely, structured, and clinically focused—ideally supported by shared documentation systems or standardized consultation templates—to ensure that all parties understand the procedural plan, anticipated risks, and contingency strategies. Team outcomes can be strengthened by creating predictable pathways for common scenarios, such as anticoagulated patients requiring extraction, immunosuppressed patients with oral infection, or diabetic patients needing periodontal therapy. Such pathways reduce variability, improve efficiency, and minimize errors. Co-location of services within community health centers can further enhance collaboration by enabling direct referral and shared infrastructure. Similarly, expanding access to dental consultation services in hospital inpatient and outpatient environments supports medically complex patients who may otherwise face fragmented care. When dental services are integrated into hospital workflows, oral health can be optimized before major surgery, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, or transplantation, reducing infection risk and preventing avoidable delays. Ultimately, enhancing healthcare team outcomes depends on a shared commitment to integrated care. When medical and dental teams adopt a common understanding of the oral–systemic interface, share critical information reliably, and align recommendations through interdisciplinary guidelines, patient outcomes improve through fewer complications, clearer counseling, more appropriate procedure selection, and safer pharmacologic management.[22][37][38][39][40][41]

Conclusion:

Systemic disease is no longer a peripheral consideration in dentistry; it is a central determinant of treatment safety and success. As populations age and chronic conditions become more prevalent, dental professionals must adopt a medically informed approach that integrates risk stratification, procedural modification, and interprofessional collaboration. The evidence underscores that oral health optimization before major medical interventions—such as chemotherapy, radiation, or surgery—can prevent severe complications, yet implementation remains inconsistent due to structural and educational gaps. Fragmented health records, siloed training, and limited patient awareness perpetuate these challenges, increasing the risk of miscommunication and adverse outcomes. Moving forward, solutions must prioritize interoperability of electronic health systems, standardized intake workflows, and shared clinical guidelines that align dental and medical recommendations. Interprofessional education and co-location of services can further bridge the divide, fostering a culture of collaboration. Ultimately, dentistry must be reframed as an integral component of systemic health management rather than an isolated specialty. By embedding oral care within broader healthcare pathways, clinicians can deliver safer, more efficient, and patient-centered treatment—reducing preventable harm and enhancing overall health outcomes.

References:

1. Vacaru RP, Didilescu AC, Sfeatcu R, Tănase M, Munteanu A, Miricescu D, Kaman WE, Brand HS. The Effect of Dental Treatments in Caries Management on Stress and Salivary Protein Levels. Journal of clinical medicine. 2022 Jul 27:11(15):. doi: 10.3390/jcm11154350.
2. Reuter NG, Westgate PM, Ingram M, Miller CS. Death related to dental treatment: a systematic review. Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology and oral radiology. 2017 Feb:123(2):194-204.e10. doi: 10.1016/j.oooo.2016.10.015.
3. Satcher DS. Surgeon General's report on oral health. Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974). 2000 Sep-Oct:115(5):489-90
4. Lamster IB. The 2021 WHO Resolution on Oral Health. International dental journal. 2021 Aug:71(4):279-280. doi: 10.1016/j.identj.2021.06.003.
5. Satcher D, Nottingham JH. Revisiting Oral Health in America: A Report of the Surgeon General. American journal of public health. 2017 May:107(S1):S32-S33. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2017.303687.
6. Foroughi M, Torabinejad M, Angelov N, Ojcius DM, Parang K, Ravnan M, Lam J. Bridging oral and systemic health: exploring pathogenesis, biomarkers, and diagnostic innovations in periodontal disease. Infection. 2025 May 26:():. doi: 10.1007/s15010-025-02568-y.
7. Genco RJ, Sanz M. Clinical and public health implications of periodontal and systemic diseases: An overview. Periodontology 2000. 2020 Jun:83(1):7-13. doi: 10.1111/prd.12344.
8. Pfister DG, Spencer S, Adelstein D, Adkins D, Anzai Y, Brizel DM, Bruce JY, Busse PM, Caudell JJ, Cmelak AJ, Colevas AD, Eisele DW, Fenton M, Foote RL, Galloway T, Gillison ML, Haddad RI, Hicks WL, Hitchcock YJ, Jimeno A, Leizman D, Maghami E, Mell LK, Mittal BB, Pinto HA, Ridge JA, Rocco JW, Rodriguez CP, Shah JP, Weber RS, Weinstein G, Witek M, Worden F, Yom SS, Zhen W, Burns JL, Darlow SD. Head and Neck Cancers, Version 2.2020, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network : JNCCN. 2020 Jul:18(7):873-898. doi: 10.6004/jnccn.2020.0031.
9. Mirfendereski P, France K. Patient Receiving Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Reports for Dental Clearance. Dental clinics of North America. 2023 Jul:67(3):447-451. doi: 10.1016/j.cden.2023.02.016.
10. Cotti E, Cairo F, Bassareo PP, Fonzar F, Venturi M, Landi L, Parolari A, Franco V,

Fabiani C, Barili F, Di Lenarda A, Gulizia M, Borzi M, Campus G, Musumeci F, Mercuro G. Perioperative dental screening and treatment in patients undergoing cardiothoracic surgery and interventional cardiovascular procedures. A consensus report based on RAND/UCLA methodology. International endodontic journal. 2020 Feb:53(2):186-199. doi: 10.1111/iej.13166.

11. Potter C, Ritson Z, Walton G, Coats L, Irvine T, Ohlsen-Turner K. The heart of it: dental care and cardiothoracic surgery. British dental journal. 2024 Jul:237(1):33-39. doi: 10.1038/s41415-024-7558-6.
12. Fernández-Feijoo J, Garea-Gorís R, Fernández-Varela M, Tomás-Carmona I, Diniz-Freitas M, Limeres-Posse J. Prevalence of systemic diseases among patients requesting dental consultation in the public and private systems. Medicina oral, patologia oral y cirugia bucal. 2012 Jan 1:17(1):e89-93
13. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. Journal of chronic diseases. 1987:40(5):373-83
14. D'Hoore W, Sicotte C, Tilquin C. Risk adjustment in outcome assessment: the Charlson comorbidity index. Methods of information in medicine. 1993 Nov:32(5):382-7
15. Nath S, Jiang T, Barrow J, Simon L. Treatment deferral for elevated blood pressure at a dental school clinic. Journal of dental education. 2024 Jan:88(1):51-55. doi: 10.1002/jdd.13369.
16. Zhang C, Banting DW, Gelb AW, Hamilton JT. Effect of beta-adrenoreceptor blockade with nadolol on the duration of local anesthesia. Journal of the American Dental Association (1939). 1999 Dec:130(12):1773-80
17. Ouchi K, Jinnouchi A. Calcium channel blockers, angiotensin II receptor antagonists and alpha-blockers accentuate blood pressure reducing caused by dental local anesthesia. Clinical oral investigations. 2021 Aug:25(8):4879-4886. doi: 10.1007/s00784-021-03795-x.
18. Thornhill MH, Dayer M, Lockhart PB, McGurk M, Shanson D, Prendergast B, Chambers JB. A change in the NICE guidelines on antibiotic prophylaxis. British dental journal. 2016 Aug 12:221(3):112-4. doi: 10.1038/sj.bdj.2016.554.
19. Sperotto F, France K, Gobbo M, Bindakhil M, Pimolbutr K, Holmes H, Monteiro L, Graham L, Hong CHL, Sollecito TP, Lodi G, Lockhart PB, Thornhill M, Diz Dios P, Turati F, Edefonti V. Antibiotic Prophylaxis and Infective Endocarditis Incidence Following Invasive Dental Procedures: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. JAMA cardiology. 2024 Jul 1:9(7):599-610. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2024.0873.
20. Thornhill MH, Crum A, Campbell R, Stone T, Lee EC, Bradburn M, Fibisan V, Dayer M, Prendergast BD, Lockhart P, Baddour L, Nicoll J. Temporal association between invasive procedures and infective endocarditis. Heart (British Cardiac Society). 2023 Jan 11:109(3):223-231. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2022-321519.
21. Martinson ML, Lapham J. Prevalence of Immunosuppression Among US Adults. JAMA. 2024 Mar 12:331(10):880-882. doi: 10.1001/jama.2023.28019.
22. Sollecito TP, Abt E, Lockhart PB, Truelove E, Paumier TM, Tracy SL, Tampi M, Beltrán-Aguilar ED, Frantsve-Hawley J. The use of prophylactic antibiotics prior to dental procedures in patients with prosthetic joints: Evidence-based clinical practice guideline for dental practitioners--a report of the American Dental Association Council on Scientific Affairs. Journal of the American Dental Association (1939). 2015 Jan:146(1):11-16.e8. doi: 10.1016/j.adaj.2014.11.012.
23. Hong CH, Allred R, Napenas JJ, Brennan MT, Baddour LM, Lockhart PB. Antibiotic prophylaxis for dental procedures to prevent indwelling venous catheter-related infections. The American journal of medicine. 2010 Dec:123(12):1128-33. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2010.08.009.
24. Kim YH, Pavone J, Wasmuht-Perroud VAB, Frare RW, Baker PR. The left ventricular assist device: a literature review and guidelines for dental care. General dentistry. 2024 Jan-Feb:72(1):34-42
25. Yuwanati M, Gondivkar S, Sarode SC, Gadbail A, Desai A, Mhaske S, Pathak SK, N Khatib M. Oral health-related quality of life in oral cancer patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. Future oncology (London, England). 2021 Mar:17(8):979-990. doi: 10.2217/fon-2020-0881.
26. Sharma S, Zhou O, Thompson R, Gabriel P, Chalian A, Rassekh C, Weinstein GS, O'Malley BW Jr, Aggarwal C, Bauml J, Cohen RB, Lukens JN, Swisher-McClure S, Ghiam AF, Ahn PH, Lin A. Quality of Life of Postoperative Photon versus Proton Radiation Therapy for Oropharynx Cancer. International journal of particle therapy. 2018 Fall:5(2):11-17. doi: 10.14338/IJPT-18-00032.1.

27. Gunn GB, Blanchard P, Garden AS, Zhu XR, Fuller CD, Mohamed AS, Morrison WH, Phan J, Beadle BM, Skinner HD, Sturgis EM, Kies MS, Hutcheson KA, Rosenthal DI, Mohan R, Gillin MT, Frank SJ. Clinical Outcomes and Patterns of Disease Recurrence After Intensity Modulated Proton Therapy for Oropharyngeal Squamous Carcinoma. International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics. 2016 May 1:95(1):360-367. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2016.02.021.
28. Lee J, Hueniken K, Cuddy K, Pu J, El Maghrabi A, Hope A, Hosni A, Glogauer M, Watson E. Dental Extractions Before Radiation Therapy and the Risk of Osteoradionecrosis in Patients With Head and Neck Cancer. JAMA otolaryngology--head & neck surgery. 2023 Dec 1:149(12):1130-1139. doi: 10.1001/jamaoto.2023.3429.
29. Zhang W, Zhang X, Yang P, Blanchard P, Garden AS, Gunn B, Fuller CD, Chambers M, Hutcheson KA, Ye R, Lai SY, Radwan MAS, Zhu XR, Frank SJ. Intensity-modulated proton therapy and osteoradionecrosis in oropharyngeal cancer. Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology. 2017 Jun:123(3):401-405. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2017.05.006.
30. Maxymiw WG, Wood RE, Liu FF. Postradiation dental extractions without hyperbaric oxygen. Oral surgery, oral medicine, and oral pathology. 1991 Sep:72(3):270-4
31. Elad S, Cheng KKF, Lalla RV, Yarom N, Hong C, Logan RM, Bowen J, Gibson R, Saunders DP, Zadik Y, Ariyawardana A, Correa ME, Ranna V, Bossi P, Mucositis Guidelines Leadership Group of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer and International Society of Oral Oncology (MASCC/ISOO). MASCC/ISOO clinical practice guidelines for the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy. Cancer. 2020 Oct 1:126(19):4423-4431. doi: 10.1002/cncr.33100.
32. Ion D, Stevenson K, Woo SB, Ho VT, Soiffer R, Antin JH, Treister NS. Characterization of oral involvement in acute graft-versus-host disease. Biology of blood and marrow transplantation : journal of the American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. 2014 Nov:20(11):1717-21. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.06.031.
33. Ahdi HS, Wichelmann TA, Pandravada S, Ehrenpreis ED. Medication-induced osteonecrosis of the jaw: a review of cases from the Food and Drug Administration Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS). BMC pharmacology & toxicology. 2023 Mar 6:24(1):15. doi: 10.1186/s40360-023-00657-y.
34. Gandhi S, Fleet JL, Bailey DG, McArthur E, Wald R, Rehman F, Garg AX. Calcium-channel blocker-clarithromycin drug interactions and acute kidney injury. JAMA. 2013 Dec 18:310(23):2544-53. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.282426.
35. Livada R, Shiloah J. Calcium channel blocker-induced gingival enlargement. Journal of human hypertension. 2014 Jan:28(1):10-4. doi: 10.1038/jhh.2013.47.
36. Kaomongkolgit R. Oral lichenoid drug reaction associated with antihypertensive and hypoglycemic drugs. Journal of drugs in dermatology : JDD. 2010 Jan:9(1):73-5
37. Baddour LM, Wilson WR, Bayer AS, Fowler VG Jr, Tleyjeh IM, Rybak MJ, Barsic B, Lockhart PB, Gewitz MH, Levison ME, Bolger AF, Steckelberg JM, Baltimore RS, Fink AM, O'Gara P, Taubert KA, American Heart Association Committee on Rheumatic Fever, Endocarditis, and Kawasaki Disease of the Council on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia, and Stroke Council. Infective Endocarditis in Adults: Diagnosis, Antimicrobial Therapy, and Management of Complications: A Scientific Statement for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2015 Oct 13:132(15):1435-86. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000296.
38. Sanz M, Ceriello A, Buysschaert M, Chapple I, Demmer RT, Graziani F, Herrera D, Jepsen S, Lione L, Madianos P, Mathur M, Montanya E, Shapira L, Tonetti M, Vegh D. Scientific evidence on the links between periodontal diseases and diabetes: Consensus report and guidelines of the joint workshop on periodontal diseases and diabetes by the International Diabetes Federation and the European Federation of Periodontology. Journal of clinical periodontology. 2018 Feb:45(2):138-149. doi: 10.1111/jcpe.12808.
39. Schiffman E,Ohrbach R,Truelove E,Look J,Anderson G,Goulet JP,List T,Svensson P,Gonzalez Y,Lobbezoo F,Michelotti A,Brooks SL,Ceusters W,Drangsholt M,Ettlin D,Gaul C,Goldberg

LJ,Haythornthwaite JA,Hollender L,Jensen R,John MT,De Laat A,de Leeuw R,Maixner W,van der Meulen M,Murray GM,Nixdorf DR,Palla S,Petersson A,Pionchon P,Smith B,Visscher CM,Zakrzewska J,Dworkin SF, Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders (DC/TMD) for Clinical and Research Applications: recommendations of the International RDC/TMD Consortium Network* and Orofacial Pain Special Interest Group. Journal of oral & facial pain and headache. 2014 Winter

40. Ruggiero SL, Dodson TB, Aghaloo T, Carlson ER, Ward BB, Kademani D. American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons' Position Paper on Medication-Related Osteonecrosis of the Jaws-2022 Update. Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery : official journal of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons. 2022 May:80(5):920-943. doi: 10.1016/j.joms.2022.02.008.

41. Ramar K, Dort LC, Katz SG, Lettieri CJ, Harrod CG, Thomas SM, Chervin RD. Clinical Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea and Snoring with Oral Appliance Therapy: An Update for 2015. Journal of clinical sleep medicine : JCSM : official publication of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine. 2015 Jul 15:11(7):773-827. doi: 10.5664/jcsm.4858..