International Journal of Drug Research and Dental Science
Volume 6 Issue 4 (Page: 22-32), 2024 ISSN: 2582-0826

Knowledge Awareness and Practice regarding Complications of Oral and Perioral Piercings among Undergraduate Dental Students

Dr. K. Sneha Sri[1*], Dr. K. V. N. R. Pratap[2], Dr. T. Madhavi Padma[3], Dr. V. Srujan Kumar[4], Dr. Surbhit Singh[5]

[1]Student, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental, College, Khammam, India.
[2]Professor and HOD, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental, College, Khammam, India.
[3]Professor, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental, College, Khammam, India.
[4,5]Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental, College, Khammam, India.

Research Article

[*]**Corresponding Author**: K. Sneha Sri**,** Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental, College, Khammam, India.
E-mail: snehasrikondabattini@gmail.com
Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.C

ABSTRACT

Body piercing was an artistic custom associated with religious or conventional solemnities in age. Presently, it has grown in fashionability among teenagers and youthful people as a form of tone expression. Youthful grown-ups are now constantly seen with body and oral piercings, which can beget several complications. Cases with intraoral piercing frequently present with poor dental and periodontal health, as well as colorful complications and side goods. The public is frequently inadequately informed about the pitfalls they are exposed to after intraoral piercing and the strategies for minimizing them, and indeed healthcare professionals often have limited knowledge of the pitfalls and complications that may arise after this procedure. To the stylish of our knowledge, no published data assessing the knowledge of oral and personal piercing among the population living in Khammam are presently available. Considering this, we conducted this study to assess the position of mindfulness and knowledge of oral piercing and its complications among the population living in Khammam megacity and estimate the correlation of nation, age, and socioeconomic status (educational position, area of hearthstone, and income) with the position of individual knowledge.

Keywords: Oral, Perioral Piercings, Piercing's Complications.

Introduction

Piercing is a worldwide form of body art and has become increasingly popular in Western society. Piercing refers to the infiltration of the jewelry into the body areas similar to the eyebrows, cognizance, lingo, nose, lips, nexus, and genitals. Oral and perioral piercing has been rehearsed for a long time for colorful religious, artistic, sexual, or identical reasons and has been believed and rehearsed autonomously all over the world. It's important to know that oral and perioral piercings not only affect oral health but also beget other long-term systemic damage if not treated with care. Numerous original and systemic complications have been observed as a consequence of oral and perioral piercing which include.

Immediate Complication

Edema of the lingo leads to airway inhibition, and pain of the lingo affects speech, mastication, and deglutition. Anaphylactic reactions can be caused by some of the accoutrements e.g., nickel. Hyperactive expectoration, puncturing the napkins without proper measures can beget severe hemorrhage.

Delayed Complication

Ulcerations and Shrine accumulation can produce halitosis and possible infections. Endocarditis is the most common and potentially due to Neisseria mucosa and Haemophilus aphrophilus. Trauma to lingual gingiva, erythema, and edema of the gingiva due to rubbing the ball in the lingual gingiva.

Materials and Methods

The present study is a questionnaire grounded check on the mindfulness of complications related to oral and perioral piercing which was conducted online using Google Forms. In total 200 undergraduate scholars of a tertiary care teaching hospital shared in this check. An aggregate of 10 questions was asked of the actors. The actors replied to the check by clicking the applicable options. The questionnaire was the tone-conceptualized and its authenticity was made by agitating it with the faculty of the Department of Public Health Dentistry. The check was approved by the Institutional Ethical Commission. After the data collection, it was collected and presented in the form of statistical analysis.

Addition Criteria: Undergraduate dental scholars belonging to the age group of 19- 22 times Region-Khammam.

Rejection Criteria: Pg scholars and faculty

Results

Table: 1

Gender				1	2	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	10	0	10
			% of Total	24.4%	0.0%	24.4%
		4	Count	0	11	11
			% of Total	0.0%	26.8%	26.8%
		5	Count	11	9	20
			% of Total	26.8%	22.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	21	20	41
			% of Total	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	51	11	62
			% of Total	24.4%	5.3%	29.7%
		2	Count	19	20	39
			% of Total	9.1%	9.6%	18.7%
		3	Count	48	0	48
			% of Total	23.0%	0.0%	23.0%
		4	Count	31	11	42
			% of Total	14.8%	5.3%	20.1%
		5	Count	9	9	18
			% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	8.6%
	Total		Count	158	51	209
			% of Total	75.6%	24.4%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	61	11	72

			% of Total	24.4%	4.4%	28.8%
		2	Count	19	20	39
			% of Total	7.6%	8.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	48	0	48
			% of Total	19.2%	0.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	31	22	53
			% of Total	12.4%	8.8%	21.2%
		5	Count	20	18	38
			% of Total	8.0%	7.2%	15.2%
	Total		Count	179	71	250
			% of Total	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 2

Gender				1	2	3	4	Total		
1	Year of study	1	Count			0	10		0	10
			% of Total			0.0%	24.4%		0.0%	24.4%
		4	Count			0	11		0	11
			% of Total			0.0%	26.8%		0.0%	26.8%
		5	Count			11	0		9	20
			% of Total			26.8%	0.0%		22.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count			11	21		9	41
			% of Total			26.8%	51.2%		22.0%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count			0	11	32	19	62
			% of Total			0.0%	5.3%	15.3%	9.1%	29.7%
		2	Count			9	20	10	0	39
			% of Total			4.3%	9.6%	4.8%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count			10	29	0	9	48
			% of Total			4.8%	13.9%	0.0%	4.3%	23.0%
		4	Count			22	9	11	0	42
			% of Total			10.5%	4.3%	5.3%	0.0%	20.1%
		5	Count			9	9	0	0	18
			% of Total			4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count			50	78	53	28	209
			% of Total			23.9%	37.3%	25.4%	13.4%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count			0	21	32	19	72
			% of Total			0.0%	8.4%	12.8%	7.6%	28.8%
		2	Count			9	20	10	0	39
			% of Total			3.6%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count			10	29	0	9	48
			% of Total			4.0%	11.6%	0.0%	3.6%	19.2%
		4	Count			22	20	11	0	53
			% of Total			8.8%	8.0%	4.4%	0.0%	21.2%
		5	Count			20	9	0	9	38
			% of Total			8.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	15.2%
	Total		Count			61	99	53	37	250
			% of Total			24.4%	39.6%	21.2%	14.8%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 3

Gender				1	2	3	4	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0		10	0	10
			% of Total	0.0%		24.4%	0.0%	24.4%
		4	Count	0		0	11	11
			% of Total	0.0%		0.0%	26.8%	26.8%
		5	Count	11		9	0	20
			% of Total	26.8%		22.0%	0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	11		19	11	41
			% of Total	26.8%		46.3%	26.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	11	21	19	11	62
			% of Total	5.3%	10.0%	9.1%	5.3%	29.7%
		2	Count	18	10	11	0	39
			% of Total	8.6%	4.8%	5.3%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	18	9	11	10	48
			% of Total	8.6%	4.3%	5.3%	4.8%	23.0%
		4	Count	11	20	11	0	42
			% of Total	5.3%	9.6%	5.3%	0.0%	20.1%
		5	Count	18	0	0	0	18
			% of Total	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	76	60	52	21	209
			% of Total	36.4%	28.7%	24.9%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	11	21	29	11	72
			% of Total	4.4%	8.4%	11.6%	4.4%	28.8%
		2	Count	18	10	11	0	39
			% of Total	7.2%	4.0%	4.4%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	18	9	11	10	48
			% of Total	7.2%	3.6%	4.4%	4.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	11	20	11	11	53
			% of Total	4.4%	8.0%	4.4%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	29	0	9	0	38
			% of Total	11.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	87	60	71	32	250
			% of Total	34.8%	24.0%	28.4%	12.8%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 4

Gender				1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0		0		10	10
			% of Total	0.0%		0.0%		24.4%	24.4%
		4	Count	0		11		0	11
			% of Total	0.0%		26.8%		0.0%	26.8%

		5	Count	11		9		0	20
			% of Total	26.8%		22.0%		0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	11		20		10	41
			% of Total	26.8%		48.8%		24.4%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	21	0	41	0	62
			% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	19.6%	0.0%	29.7%
		2	Count	0	0	0	21	18	39
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	8.6%	18.7%
		3	Count	0	0	0	18	30	48
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	14.4%	23.0%
		4	Count	0	11	20	11	0	42
			% of Total	0.0%	5.3%	9.6%	5.3%	0.0%	20.1%
		5	Count	9	0	0	0	9	18
			% of Total	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	8.6%
	Total		Count	9	32	20	91	57	209
			% of Total	4.3%	15.3%	9.6%	43.5%	27.3%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	21	0	41	10	72
			% of Total	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%	16.4%	4.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	0	0	0	21	18	39
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	7.2%	15.6%
		3	Count	0	0	0	18	30	48
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	12.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	0	11	31	11	0	53
			% of Total	0.0%	4.4%	12.4%	4.4%	0.0%	21.2%
		5	Count	20	0	9	0	9	38
			% of Total	8.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	15.2%
	Total		Count	20	32	40	91	67	250
			% of Total	8.0%	12.8%	16.0%	36.4%	26.8%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 5

Gender				1	2	3	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	10	10
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	24.4%	24.4%
		4	Count	0	11	0	11
			% of Total	0.0%	26.8%	0.0%	26.8%
		5	Count	11	9	0	20
			% of Total	26.8%	22.0%	0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	11	20	10	41
			% of Total	26.8%	48.8%	24.4%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	62	0	62
			% of Total	0.0%	29.7%	0.0%	29.7%
		2	Count	11	28	0	39

			% of Total	5.3%	13.4%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	9	9	30	48
			% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	14.4%	23.0%
		4	Count	11	20	11	42
			% of Total	5.3%	9.6%	5.3%	20.1%
		5	Count	9	0	9	18
			% of Total	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	8.6%
	Total		Count	40	119	50	209
			% of Total	19.1%	56.9%	23.9%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	62	10	72
			% of Total	0.0%	24.8%	4.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	11	28	0	39
			% of Total	4.4%	11.2%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	9	9	30	48
			% of Total	3.6%	3.6%	12.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	11	31	11	53
			% of Total	4.4%	12.4%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	20	9	9	38
			% of Total	8.0%	3.6%	3.6%	15.2%
	Total		Count	51	139	60	250
			% of Total	20.4%	55.6%	24.0%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 6

Gender				1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0		10		0	0	10
			% of Total	0.0%		24.4%		0.0%	0.0%	24.4%
		4	Count	0		0		0	11	11
			% of Total	0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	26.8%	26.8%
		5	Count	11		0		9	0	20
			% of Total	26.8%		0.0%		22.0%	0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	11		10		9	11	41
			% of Total	26.8%		24.4%		22.0%	26.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	11	0	0	11	10	30	62
			% of Total	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	4.8%	14.4%	29.7%
		2	Count	19	0	11	9	0	0	39
			% of Total	9.1%	0.0%	5.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	0	9	9	0	20	10	48
			% of Total	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	9.6%	4.8%	23.0%
		4	Count	0	20	0	22	0	0	42
			% of Total	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.1%
		5	Count	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
			% of Total	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	48	29	20	42	30	40	209
			% of Total	23.0%	13.9%	9.6%	20.1%	14.4%	19.1%	100.0%

Total	Year of study	1	Count	11	0	10	11	10	30	72
			% of Total	4.4%	0.0%	4.0%	4.4%	4.0%	12.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	19	0	11	9	0	0	39
			% of Total	7.6%	0.0%	4.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	0	9	9	0	20	10	48
			% of Total	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	8.0%	4.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	0	20	0	22	0	11	53
			% of Total	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	29	0	0	0	9	0	38
			% of Total	11.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	59	29	30	42	39	51	250
			% of Total	23.6%	11.6%	12.0%	16.8%	15.6%	20.4%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 7

Gender				1	2	3	4	Total
1	Year of study	1		0	10	0	0	10
			% of Total	0.0%	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	24.4%
		4	Count	0	0	0	11	11
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.8%	26.8%
		5	Count	11	0	9	0	20
			% of Total	26.8%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	11	10	9	11	41
			% of Total	26.8%	24.4%	22.0%	26.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	41	11	10	0	62
			% of Total	19.6%	5.3%	4.8%	0.0%	29.7%
		2	Count	10	20	9	0	39
			% of Total	4.8%	9.6%	4.3%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	9	9	20	10	48
			% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	9.6%	4.8%	23.0%
		4	Count	0	33	9	0	42
			% of Total	0.0%	15.8%	4.3%	0.0%	20.1%
		5	Count	0	18	0	0	18
			% of Total	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	60	91	48	10	209
			% of Total	28.7%	43.5%	23.0%	4.8%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	41	21	10	0	72
			% of Total	16.4%	8.4%	4.0%	0.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	10	20	9	0	39
			% of Total	4.0%	8.0%	3.6%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	9	9	20	10	48
			% of Total	3.6%	3.6%	8.0%	4.0%	19.2%
		4	Count	0	33	9	11	53
			% of Total	0.0%	13.2%	3.6%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	11	18	9	0	38
			% of Total	4.4%	7.2%	3.6%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	71	101	57	21	250
			% of Total	28.4%	40.4%	22.8%	8.4%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 8

Gender				1	2	3	4	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	10	0		10
			% of Total	0.0%	24.4%	0.0%		24.4%
		4	Count	0	0	11		11
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	26.8%		26.8%
		5	Count	11	0	9		20
			% of Total	26.8%	0.0%	22.0%		48.8%
	Total		Count	11	10	20		41
			% of Total	26.8%	24.4%	48.8%		100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	20	10	22	10	62
			% of Total	9.6%	4.8%	10.5%	4.8%	29.7%
		2	Count	9	21	9	0	39
			% of Total	4.3%	10.0%	4.3%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	11	9	9	19	48
			% of Total	5.3%	4.3%	4.3%	9.1%	23.0%
		4	Count	20	11	0	11	42
			% of Total	9.6%	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	20.1%
		5	Count	9	9	0	0	18
			% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	69	60	40	40	209
			% of Total	33.0%	28.7%	19.1%	19.1%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	20	20	22	10	72
			% of Total	8.0%	8.0%	8.8%	4.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	9	21	9	0	39
			% of Total	3.6%	8.4%	3.6%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	11	9	9	19	48
			% of Total	4.4%	3.6%	3.6%	7.6%	19.2%
		4	Count	20	11	11	11	53
			% of Total	8.0%	4.4%	4.4%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	20	9	9	0	38
			% of Total	8.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	80	70	60	40	250
			% of Total	32.0%	28.0%	24.0%	16.0%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 9

Gender				1	2	3	Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	10	0		10
			% of Total	24.4%	0.0%		24.4%
		4	Count	0	11		11
			% of Total	0.0%	26.8%		26.8%
		5	Count	11	9		20
			% of Total	26.8%	22.0%		48.8%
	Total		Count	21	20		41

			% of Total	51.2%	48.8%		100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	11	51	0	62
			% of Total	5.3%	24.4%	0.0%	29.7%
		2	Count	0	39	0	39
			% of Total	0.0%	18.7%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	9	30	9	48
			% of Total	4.3%	14.4%	4.3%	23.0%
		4	Count	11	20	11	42
			% of Total	5.3%	9.6%	5.3%	20.1%
		5	Count	0	18	0	18
			% of Total	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	31	158	20	209
			% of Total	14.8%	75.6%	9.6%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	21	51	0	72
			% of Total	8.4%	20.4%	0.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	0	39	0	39
			% of Total	0.0%	15.6%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	9	30	9	48
			% of Total	3.6%	12.0%	3.6%	19.2%
		4	Count	11	31	11	53
			% of Total	4.4%	12.4%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	11	27	0	38
			% of Total	4.4%	10.8%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	52	178	20	250
			% of Total	20.8%	71.2%	8.0%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Table: 10

Gender				**1**	**2**	**3**	**Total**
1	Year of study	1	Count	0		10	10
			% of Total	0.0%		24.4%	24.4%
		4	Count	11		0	11
			% of Total	26.8%		0.0%	26.8%
		5	Count	20		0	20
			% of Total	48.8%		0.0%	48.8%
	Total		Count	31		10	41
			% of Total	75.6%		24.4%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	11	51	0	62
			% of Total	5.3%	24.4%	0.0%	29.7%
		2	Count	0	39	0	39
			% of Total	0.0%	18.7%	0.0%	18.7%
		3	Count	27	0	21	48

			% of Total	12.9%	0.0%	10.0%	23.0%
		4	Count	11	20	11	42
			% of Total	5.3%	9.6%	5.3%	20.1%
		5	Count	9	9	0	18
			% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	8.6%
	Total		Count	58	119	32	209
			% of Total	27.8%	56.9%	15.3%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	11	51	10	72
			% of Total	4.4%	20.4%	4.0%	28.8%
		2	Count	0	39	0	39
			% of Total	0.0%	15.6%	0.0%	15.6%
		3	Count	27	0	21	48
			% of Total	10.8%	0.0%	8.4%	19.2%
		4	Count	22	20	11	53
			% of Total	8.8%	8.0%	4.4%	21.2%
		5	Count	29	9	0	38
			% of Total	11.6%	3.6%	0.0%	15.2%
	Total		Count	89	119	42	250
			% of Total	35.6%	47.6%	16.8%	100.0%

P-value = 0.000*

Discussion

Oral and perioral piercing is just an ill wind that blows nothing any good. These piercings are performed in tattoo workrooms. Numerous of the piercers aren't indeed certified interpreters and therefore piercing procedures are done without giving applicable anesthesia. Some of them use the same needles on a different person constantly without sterilization. Hence, colorful piercing failure cases have been reported worldwide. Actually, the American Dental Association has put across an opposing statement against oral piercings. According to Hennequin-Hoenderdos et al., the rising fashionability of body piercings in youthful grown-ups is determined by colorful factors, including the appetite to fulfill social demands, establish a particular statement, or enhance sexual appeal. 33 Whereas in our study, 71.3 scholars considered oral piercing as a fashion statement. As a part of history taking questions related to piercings should be included. In our study, only 35.6 scholars pronounced gingival recession as a complication of oral piercing which obviously states how gingival recession isn't considered as a serious complication.

Conclusion

Dentists are the consummate professionals in detecting similar complications and hence they should be well apprehensive and so require comprehensive knowledge regarding sequelae of oral and perioral piercings. Dental scholars on the other hand are forthcoming dentists who will treat the forthcoming generation and therefore play an important part in educating their peer groups and other cases. Although numerous dental scholars have knowledge regarding dangerous complications of oral and perioral piercing, numerous runners are unturned with respect to its inflexibility and how it affects the life of an existent after.

References

1. Pramod RC, Suresh KV, Kadashetti1 V, Shivakumar KM, Ingaleshwar PS, and Shetty SJ. Oral piercing in a parlous fashion. J Educ Ethics Dent. 2012; 2(2) 50–60. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0974-7761.121257
2. Escudero-Castaño N, Perea-García M, Campo-Trapero J, Sánchez C, Bascones-Martínez A. Oral and Perioral Piercing Complications. Open Dent J, 2008; 2: doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1874210600802010133
3. Plastargias, I., & Sakellari, D. (2014). The Consequences of Tongue Piercing on Oral and Periodontal Tissues. ISRN Dentistry, 2014, 876510. doi: https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/876510
4. Levin, L., Zadik, Y., & Becker, T. (2005). Oral and dental complications of intra-oral piercing. Dental Traumatology, 21(6), 341-343. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-9657.2005.00395.x
5. Shinohara EH, Horikawa FK, Ruiz MM, Shinohara MT. Tongue piercing case report of an original complication. J Contemp Dent Pract. 2007; 8(1) 83–9. https://www.thejcdp.com/doi/pdf/10.5005/jcdp-8-1-83
6. Hennequin- Hoenderdos NL, niche DE, Weijden GAVD. The frequency of oral and peri-oral piercings in youthful grown-ups: a methodical review. Int J Dent Hyg. 2012; 10(3) 223–8.

How to cite this Article: K. Sneha Sri, K. V. N. R. Pratap, T. Madhavi Padma, V. SivaKalyan, V. Srujan Kumar; *Knowledge Awareness and Practice regarding Complications of Oral and Perioral Piercings among Undergraduate Dental Students;* Int. J. Drug Res. Dental Sci., 2024; 6(4): 22-32,
doi: https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.C
Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** Nil.
Received: 20-11-2024 **Revised:** 8-1-2025 **Accepted:** 14-1-2025