TANTIA UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCIENCES

Official Publication of Tantia University, Sriganganagar

Review

Clinical Considerations and Contraindications in the Use of Ultrasonic Scalers in Dental Practice

[1]Dr Gagandeep Kaur Sidhu, [2]Dr Amandeep Kaur, [3]Dr Atiksha Sharma,

[1]Professor, Department of Oral Pathology and Microbiology, [2]Assitant Professor, , Department of Conservative and Endodontics
Dr. S.S. Tantia Dental College Hospital and Research Centre, Sriganganagar

Corresponding Author
Dr Gagandeep Kaur Sidhu
Professor, Department of Oral Pathology and Microbiology, Dr. S.S. Tantia Dental College Hospital and Research Centre, Sriganganagar
Email- dr.gagansidhu14@gmail.com

Received Date: 28 April, 2026 Acceptance Date: 12 May, 2026 Published Date: 15 May, 2026

ABSTRACT
A new age of patient-centered, precision-driven oral healthcare has been brought about by the use of digital technologies into dentistry. Intraoral scanning, T-Scan occlusal analysis, photometric dentistry, AI-assisted diagnostics, 3D printing, and guided implant surgery are among the important digital modalities that are examined in this review. Their clinical relevance, workflow benefits, and effects on treatment outcomes are all assessed. According to the research, digital dentistry greatly improves patient communication, increases diagnostic accuracy, and lowers operator error. The delivery of modern, evidence-based dental care depends on the methodical integration of these technologies into ordinary clinical practice, which is both unavoidable and crucial as they become more widely available.

Keywords: Ultrasonic scalers, contraindications, dental practice, magnetostrictive scalers, piezoelectric scalers, aerosol generation, infection control, pacemakers, dental implants, patient safety

How to Cite : Sidhu GK, Kaur A and Sharma A. Clinical Considerations and Contraindications in the Use of Ultrasonic Scalers in Dental Practice .TU J. Med Dent. Scie. 2026:1(1)19-23

INTRODUCTION

Ultrasonic scalers constitute essential instruments in contemporary dental practice, owing to their efficacy in the removal of dental plaque, calculus, and extrinsic stains from tooth surfaces. Compared to conventional manual scaling methods, ultrasonic instrumentation offers several advantages, including diminished operator fatigue, increased clinical productivity, and improved patient comfort.[1] However, despite their prevalent use, there are contraindications associated with ultrasonic scalers and understanding the contraindications is therefore critical for ensuring patient safety and delivering optimal dental care.[2]

Types of Ultrasonic Scalers and Their Mechanism of Action

Ultrasonic scalers function primarily through high-frequency vibrational motion coupled with simultaneous water irrigation. They are broadly classified into two types: magnetostrictive and piezoelectric scalers. Magnetostrictive scalers, commonly known as Cavitron units, generate tip vibrations via an alternating magnetic field, typically at frequencies ranging from 18,000 to 45,000 cycles per second, which facilitates the disruption and removal of dental deposits. However, this mechanism produces an electromagnetic field that may interfere with certain implanted medical devices. [3-4] In contrast, piezoelectric scalers employ electrical energy to induce deformation of internal crystals, resulting in linear vibrations at the scaler tip. This design produces comparatively lower electromagnetic interference, rendering it safer for use in patients with specific medical implants. Despite these differences, both scaler types generate aerosols and

mechanical vibrations that may present potential risks under particular clinical conditions.[5-6]

Absolute Contraindications

Cardiac Pacemakers and Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators

A major contraindication for the use of ultrasonic scalers is their application in patients with cardiac pacemakers or implantable cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs), especially in earlier-generation devices. [7] Magnetostrictive ultrasonic scalers produce electromagnetic fields capable of interfering with the normal operation of these cardiac implants. Such interference can result in inappropriate pacing, suppression of pacemaker output, or unintended activation of defibrillator shocks. [8-9] While contemporary pacemakers often incorporate enhanced electromagnetic shielding, the potential for interference has not been completely eliminated. Consequently, consultation with the patient's cardiologist is advised prior to the use of any ultrasonic device. In situations where the risk remains uncertain, manual scaling is recommended as a safer alternative.[10-11]

Communicable and Respiratory Diseases

Ultrasonic scalers generate substantial amounts of aerosol, which can disperse microorganisms into the surrounding clinical environment. This presents a considerable infection control concern, particularly in patients with communicable airborne diseases such as tuberculosis, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and influenza. The aerosolized particles may remain suspended in the air for prolonged durations, thereby elevating the risk of cross-contamination among dental personnel and other patients. [12] Current clinical guidelines recommend postponing elective dental procedures that involve aerosol production in such cases. If intervention is clinically necessary, strict infection control protocols must be observed, including the use of high-volume evacuation systems and appropriate personal protective equipment. Nevertheless, the use of ultrasonic scalers is generally contraindicated in patients with active infectious conditions. [13]

Immunocompromised Patients

Individuals with compromised immune function, including those with HIV/AIDS, severe neutropenia, or poorly controlled diabetes, exhibit heightened susceptibility to infection. The transient bacteremia associated with ultrasonic scaling procedures may pose significant health risks in this population.[14-15] Furthermore, the generation of aerosols during scaling can further increase the potential for opportunistic infections.Although ultrasonic scaling is not an absolute contraindication for all immunocompromised patients, those with severe immunosuppression warrant thorough clinical assessment. In such cases, manual scaling combined with appropriate antibiotic prophylaxis is often considered a safer alternative. Clinical decision-making should be guided by professional judgment and consultation with the patient's attending physician.[12,16]

Patients at High Risk for Aspiration

Ultrasonic scalers employ a water spray to dissipate heat from the vibrating tip and to irrigate and remove debris from the oral cavity. In patients with conditions such as severe dysphagia, neurological disorders, or muscular dystrophy, the risk of aspiration is markedly elevated. [17-18] These individuals often have impaired control of oral secretions, which may result in the inhalation of water, dental debris, or microorganisms into the lower respiratory tract.[12]Aspiration can lead to serious complications, including aspiration pneumonia.[19] Accordingly, ultrasonic scaling is contraindicated in patients at high risk of aspiration, and alternative approaches for plaque and calculus removal should be employed in such cases. [20]

Relative Contraindications

Titanium Implants

Periodontal maintenance of dental implants, particularly those fabricated from titanium, requires careful consideration of instrumentation. The use of conventional metal ultrasonic tips may cause surface abrasion or damage to the implant, thereby compromising its structural integrity and potentially increasing the risk of peri-implantitis. Consequently, this represents a relative rather than an absolute contraindication to ultrasonic scaling.[21-22] To mitigate this risk, specialized plastic or coated ultrasonic tips have been developed for implant maintenance, which minimize surface alteration while allowing effective debridement. When such instruments are employed, ultrasonic scaling can be conducted safely in implant-supported restorations.[22]

The selection of appropriate instrumentation and technique is critical to preserving the integrity of peri-implant tissues. Depending on the orientation of the deposit—horizontal, oblique, or vertical—short, light-pressure working strokes are advised to reduce trauma to the delicate peri-implant sulcus. In cases where prosthetic components limit access to the implant surface, ultrasonic or sonic scalers equipped with protective plastic sleeves may be utilized for safe calculus removal.[23] Calculus on the nonporous titanium surface of implants is typically

softer and predominantly supragingival compared to that on natural teeth. However, when harder deposits are encountered, pretreatment with agents such as SofScale (Dentsply Professional, York, PA, USA) may facilitate their removal and reduce the likelihood of surface scratching during instrumentation.[24]

A range of specialized instruments has been designed specifically for implant maintenance to prevent surface damage. Examples include Implacare (Hu-Friedy, IL, USA), made from Plasteel, a high-grade resin; implant scalers by 3i-Implant Innovations, Inc. (West Palm Beach, FL, USA), constructed from advanced plastic materials; the Steri-Oss scaler system (Yorba Linda, CA, USA), composed of graphite-reinforced nylon; and Implant Cleaning Kits (Brevet Inc., Irvine, CA, USA). These devices are intended to provide effective biofilm and calculus removal while maintaining the integrity of the implant surface.[25]

Demineralized Enamel and Sensitive Teeth

Patients presenting with demineralized enamel or dentinal hypersensitivity may experience heightened discomfort during ultrasonic scaling. The mechanical vibrations and concurrent water spray can aggravate sensitivity, potentially resulting in pain and diminished patient cooperation. In such instances, clinicians may consider employing manual scaling techniques or reducing the power output of the ultrasonic device to alleviate discomfort.[26] The application of desensitizing agents and comprehensive patient education can further aid in the management of sensitivity. [27] Nonetheless, care must be taken to avoid exacerbating damage to already compromised dental structures.

Pediatric Patients

Pediatric patients present distinct challenges in dental treatment owing to anatomical and physiological differences. In primary and young permanent teeth, the pulp chambers are proportionally larger, rendering them more vulnerable to thermal and vibrational injury. [28] Improper use of ultrasonic scalers may therefore lead to pulpal irritation or discomfort. [29] Although ultrasonic scaling is not an absolute contraindication in children, its application should be approached with caution. The use of reduced power settings, limited application duration, and continuous clinical monitoring are recommended to ensure patient safety. [28,30]

Advancements and Modern Considerations

Recent technological developments have contributed to the design of ultrasonic scalers and cardiac devices with enhanced resistance to electromagnetic interference.[31-33] Many current-generation pacemakers are equipped with shielding components that mitigate the effects of external electromagnetic fields.[34] In addition, piezoelectric ultrasonic scalers are associated with a lower degree of electromagnetic interference relative to magnetostrictive scalers.Nevertheless, clinical prudence continues to be a fundamental consideration. It is incumbent upon dental practitioners to obtain a detailed medical history and, where appropriate, seek consultation with the patient's physician before employing ultrasonic scaling. Ultimately, the decision to utilize this modality should be grounded in an individualized assessment of potential risks and benefits. [35]

Infection Control and Aerosol Management

Ultrasonic scalers are recognized for generating aerosols that may present occupational and patient safety concerns during dental procedures. This issue was formally acknowledged by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention approximately twenty years ago. [36] To reduce aerosol exposure, the use of high-volume evacuation systems at the treatment site, combined with appropriate personal protective equipment, is recommended during ultrasonic scaling.[37] In individuals with known or suspected infectious conditions, alternative treatment modalities should be evaluated. Limiting aerosol production not only safeguards dental healthcare personnel but also contributes to overall patient safety.[12]

Clinical Decision-Making and Patient Safety

The application of ultrasonic scalers necessitates sound clinical judgment. Dentists should conduct a comprehensive evaluation of each patient's medical history, present health status, and relevant risk factors prior to determining the most appropriate treatment approach. While the advantages of ultrasonic scaling often justify its use, alternative methods may be preferable in certain clinical scenarios.

Effective patient communication constitutes an integral aspect of safe clinical practice. Providing patients with clear information regarding potential risks and securing informed consent promotes transparency and fosters trust in the clinician-patient relationship. Furthermore, maintaining current knowledge of evolving clinical guidelines and technological developments is essential for evidence-based decision-making.

CONCLUSION

Ultrasonic scalers represent an effective modality in contemporary dental practice, providing notable benefits in procedural efficiency and patient

comfort. Despite these advantages, their use is subject to certain limitations. Absolute contraindications, including patients with specific cardiac devices, communicable diseases, severe immunocompromise, and an elevated risk of aspiration, warrant avoidance of ultrasonic instrumentation. Relative contraindications, such as the presence of titanium implants, dentinal hypersensitivity, and pediatric cases, require appropriate modifications in technique and equipment selection. Technological progress has contributed to an improved safety profile for ultrasonic scalers; however, individualized patient assessment remains essential. By following established clinical guidelines, consulting with relevant medical professionals when indicated, and implementing rigorous infection control protocols, dental practitioners can facilitate the safe and effective application of ultrasonic scaling.

REFERENCES

1. Kumari N, Johnson L, Yadav H, Das A, Umrao B, Gera R. Effect of Hand and Ultrasonic Scaling-Root Planing Methods on Tooth Surface Topography: An In-Vitro Atomic Force Microscopy Study. Cureus. 2023 Oct 12;15(10):e46925.
2. Paramashivaiah R, Prabhuji ML. Mechanized scaling with ultrasonics: Perils and proactive measures. J Indian Soc Periodontol. 2013 Jul;17(4):423-8.
3. Daly S, Newcombe RG, Claydon NC, Seong J, Davies M, West NX. A randomised controlled trial to determine patient experience of a magnetostrictive stack scaler as compared to a piezoelectric scaler, in supportive periodontal therapy. Journal of dentistry. 2020 Feb 1;93:103279.
4. You X, Wu X, Chen S. Effects of a new magnetostrictive ultrasonic scaler and a traditional piezoelectric ultrasonic scaler on root surfaces and patient complaints. Sci Rep. 2024 Mar 19;14(1):6601.
5. Yousefimanesh H, Robati M, Kadkhodazadeh M, Molla R. A comparison of magnetostrictive and piezoelectric ultrasonic scaling devices: an in vitro study. J Periodontal Implant Sci. 2012;42(6):243–247.
6. Singh S, Uppoor A, Nayak D. A comparative evaluation of the efficacy of manual, magnetostrictive and piezoelectric ultrasonic instruments—an in vitro profilometric and SEM study. J Appl Oral Sci. 2012;20(1):21–26.
7. Elayi CS, Lusher S, Meeks Nyquist JL, Darrat Y, Morales GX, Miller CS. Interference between dental electrical devices and pacemakers or defibrillators: results from a prospective clinical study. J Am Dent Assoc. 2015 Feb;146(2):121-8.
8. Miller CS, Leonelli FM, Latham E. Selective interference with pacemaker activity by electrical dental devices. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 1998 Jan;85(1):33-6.
9. Lahor-Soler E, Miranda-Rius J, Brunet-Llobet L, Sabaté de la Cruz X. Capacity of dental equipment to interfere with cardiac implantable electrical devices. Eur J Oral Sci. 2015 Jun;123(3):194-201.
10. Kamal R, Dahiya P, Saini HR. Dental treatment in patients with cardiac pacemakers: Is it a risky affair?. Journal of Dental Research and Reviews. 2016 Jun;3(2):76-8.
11. Gonçalves Lomardo P, Nunes MC, Arriaga P, Antunes LA, Machado A, Quinelato V, Aguiar TR, Casado PL. Concern about the risk of aerosol contamination from ultrasonic scaler: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Oral Health. 2024 Apr 5;24(1):417.
12. Harrel SK, Molinari J. Aerosols and splatter in dentistry: a brief review of the literature and infection control implications. J Am Dent Assoc. 2004 Apr;135(4):429-37.
13. Singh A, Shiva Manjunath RG, Singla D, Bhattacharya HS, Sarkar A, Chandra N. Aerosol, a health hazard during ultrasonic scaling: A clinico-microbiological study. Indian J Dent Res. 2016 Mar-Apr;27(2):160-2.
14. Squire JD, Gardner PJ, Moutsopoulos NM, Leiding JW. Antibiotic prophylaxis for dental treatment in patients with immunodeficiency. The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology: In Practice. 2019 Mar 1;7(3):819-23.
15. Suwandi T, Nursolihati V, Sundjojo M, Widyarman AS. The Efficacy of High-Volume Evacuators and Extraoral Vacuum Aspirators in Reducing Aerosol and Droplet in Ultrasonic Scaling Procedures during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Eur J Dent. 2022 Oct;16(4):803-808.
16. Huh J, Lee N, Kim KY, Jung S, Cha J, Kim KD, Park W. Foreign body aspiration and ingestion in dental clinic: a seven-year retrospective study. J Dent Anesth Pain Med. 2022 Jun;22(3):187-195.
17. Mann R, Srinivasan B, Baker A. Managing aspiration. British Dental Journal. 2012 May 26;212(10):464-5.
18. Sanivarapu RR, Vaqar S, Gibson J, Overmeyer KA. Aspiration pneumonia

(nursing). InStatPearls [Internet] 2024 Mar 20. StatPearls Publishing.
19. Yen Nee W, Raja Awang RA, Hassan A. Effects on the Titanium Implant Surface by Different Hygiene Instrumentations: A Narrative Review. Cureus. 2022 Oct 30;14(10):e30884.
20. Susan Wingrove. **Long-term prevention of peri-implant complications: assessment, maintenance and home-care protocols.** Available at: **https://www.straumann.com/en/discover/youtooth/article/preventive/2021/susan-wingrove-long-term-prevention-peri-implant-complications-assessment-maintenance-home-care-protocols.html**
21. Gulati M, Govila V, Anand V, Anand B. Implant Maintenance: A Clinical Update. Int Sch Res Notices. 2014 Jul 9;2014:908534.
22. Sison G. Implant maintenance and the dental hygienist. Access. 2003;(1):1–13.
23. Goldstein RE, Nimmons KJ. The expanding esthetic practice: implant maintenance—part 2. Contemporary Esthetics & Restorative Practice. 2005:2–25.
24. Mortilla LDT. Hygiene and soft tissue management: the hygienist's perspective. In: Babbush C. A., editor. Dental Implants: The Art and Science. Philadelphia, Pa, USA: W.B. Saunders; 2001. pp. 423–444.
25. Suda T, Kobayashi H, Akiyama T, Takano T, Gokyu M, Sudo T, Khemwong T, Izumi Y. Desensitizing Agent Reduces Dentin Hypersensitivity During Ultrasonic Scaling: A Pilot Study. J Clin Diagn Res. 2015 Sep;9(9):ZC46-9.
26. Müller S, Huber H, Goebel G, Wimmer G, Kapferer-Seebacher I. Pain perception during debridement of hypersensitive teeth elicited by two ultrasonic scalers. Clin Oral Investig. 2017 Jun;21(5):1559-1564.
27. Igna A, Mircioagă D, Boariu M, Stratul ȘI. A Diagnostic Insight of Dental Pulp Testing Methods in Pediatric Dentistry. Medicina (Kaunas). 2022 May 16;58(5):665.
28. Nicoll BK, Peters RJ. Heat generation during ultrasonic instrumentation of dentin as affected by different irrigation methods. J Periodontol. 1998 Aug;69(8):884-8.
29. Cianetti S, Abraha I, Pagano S, Lupatelli E, Lombardo G. Sonic and ultrasonic oscillating devices for the management of pain and dental fear in children or adolescents that require caries removal: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2018 Apr 28;8(4):e020840.
30. Tiikkaja M, Aro AL, Alanko T, Lindholm H, Sistonen H, Hartikainen JE, Toivonen L, Juutilainen J, Hietanen M. Testing of common electromagnetic environments for risk of interference with cardiac pacemaker function. Saf Health Work. 2013 Sep;4(3):156-9.
31. Conde-Mir I, Miranda-Rius J, Trucco E, Lahor-Soler E, Brunet-Llobet L, Domingo R, Tolosana JM, Mont L. In-vivo compatibility between pacemakers and dental equipment. European Journal of Oral Sciences. 2018 Aug;126(4):307-15.
32. Misiri J, Kusumoto F, Goldschlager N. Electromagnetic interference and implanted cardiac devices: the medical environment (part II). Clin Cardiol. 2012 Jun;35(6):321-8.
33. Erdogan O. Electromagnetic interference on pacemakers. Indian Pacing Electrophysiol J. 2002 Jul 1;2(3):74-8.
34. Cardiac Implantable Devices and Electronic Dental Instruments. Available at: https://www.ada.org/resources/ada-library/oral-health-topics/cardiac-implanted-devices-and-electronic-dental-instruments Last accessed as on May 3, 2026.
35. Kohn WG, Collins AS, Cleveland JL, Harte JA, Eklund KJ, Malvitz DM; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guidelines for infection control in dental health-care settings--2003. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2003 Dec 19;52(RR-17):1-61.
36. Choi JJ, Chen J, Choi YJ, Moffat SM, Duncan WJ, Waddell JN, Jermy M. Dental high-speed handpiece and ultrasonic scaler aerosol generation levels and the effect of suction and air supply. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology. 2023 Jun;44(6):926-33.