JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE SCIENCES

Volume 6 Issue 1 2026, Article ID: JOHS2026001209

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121

e-ISSN: 1658-8967

Review

Epidemiology, Evaluation, Treatment, and Complications of Alveolar Osteitis

Ebtihal Abdulfattah Sindy[1*], Shahad Khalil Alghamdi[2], Aljazi Mobarak Muwainea[3], Ghaida Mohammed Alotaibi[4], Jehad Saleh Alghamdi[5], Mohammed Abdulrahman Alghamdi[6], Nasser Mohammed Suhluli[6], Norah Ali Altarif[7]

[1] *Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, East Jeddah Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[2] *Oral and maxillofacial, Dammam Medical Complex, Abha, Saudi Arabia*
[3] *Department Of Dentistry, Kharsa Clinic, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[4] *Department of Dentistry, Sijam Dental Clinic, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[5] *Department of General Dentist, Private Sector, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[6] *College of Dentistry, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*
[7] *College of Dentistry, Qassim University, Qassim, Saudi Arabia*

Correspondence should be addressed **Ebtihal Abdulfattah Sindy**, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, East Jeddah Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: dr.esindy@hotmail.com

Received: 10 December 2025, Accepted: 20 January 2026, Published: 27 January 2026.

Abstract

Alveolar osteitis, commonly referred to as dry socket, is a painful and often unexpected complication following tooth extraction, particularly third molars in the mandible. It is primarily characterized by the disintegration or loss of the blood clot within the extraction socket, leading to exposed bone, delayed healing, and significant discomfort. The condition typically arises within a few days post-extraction and has a reported incidence that varies widely depending on patient demographics, surgical technique, and postoperative care. Multiple factors influence the development of alveolar osteitis. Local trauma during extraction, bacterial contamination, smoking, hormonal influences, and systemic health all contribute to clot instability. Among these, tobacco use and oral contraceptives are consistently associated with increased risk. Clinically, diagnosis remains subjective and is based on signs such as socket exposure, intense localized pain, and halitosis. Radiographs are used primarily to rule out other complications, as alveolar osteitis lacks distinct radiographic features. Management focuses on symptomatic relief rather than reversing the condition. Treatment options include socket irrigation, medicated dressings, analgesics, and more recently, biologically active agents such as platelet-rich fibrin and low-level laser therapy. Although these newer methods show potential in improving healing, their accessibility and standardization remain limited. Preventive strategies, including preoperative antiseptic rinses and minimally traumatic surgical techniques, have been effective in reducing incidence. Postoperative instructions that emphasize avoiding behaviors that dislodge the clot are also critical. Despite its transient nature, alveolar osteitis can lead to prolonged discomfort and additional clinical interventions. Continued investigation into diagnostic biomarkers and regenerative therapies is essential to improve both prevention and treatment. Clinical awareness, patient education, and refined surgical protocols play a vital role in minimizing risk and optimizing recovery in affected individuals.

Keywords: *alveolar osteitis, dry socket, tooth extraction complications, postoperative pain, clot disintegration*

Introduction

Alveolar osteitis (AO), commonly referred to as "dry socket," is one of the most frequently encountered complications following tooth extractions, particularly in the posterior mandible. It is characterized by the premature loss or breakdown of the blood clot formed in the alveolar socket, leading to exposure of the underlying bone and resulting in intense localized pain that typically begins two to four days post-extraction. This condition significantly impacts postoperative recovery and patient comfort. The incidence of AO varies widely, reported in 0.5 to 30 percent of cases, depending on several factors including surgical difficulty, site of extraction, and patient-related risks such as smoking and oral hygiene status (1).

Understanding the pathophysiology of AO has evolved over time, though it remains incompletely understood. The most widely accepted theory proposes that fibrinolysis, either of systemic or local origin, is responsible for the dissolution of the blood clot in the socket. This fibrinolytic activity is often associated with trauma from the surgical procedure, bacterial contamination, or systemic conditions that interfere with healing. Bacterial pathogens, particularly anaerobic organisms like Treponema denticola and Fusobacterium nucleatum, have been implicated in increasing fibrinolytic activity through the release of tissue activators and enzymes (2).

Diagnosis of alveolar osteitis is primarily clinical, based on patient history and characteristic signs such as absence of the blood clot, exposed bone, and halitosis. Radiographs are generally unremarkable unless retained root fragments or other complications are suspected. Effective treatment relies on palliative care and supportive therapy, including irrigation of the socket, placement of medicated dressings, and pain management. Various intra-alveolar dressings such as eugenol-based pastes, chlorhexidine gels, and Alvogyl are commonly used to provide analgesia and promote healing (3). However, the use of some of these materials remains controversial due to concerns over delayed healing or potential toxicity. Preventive strategies, including the use of antiseptic rinses and atraumatic surgical techniques, have shown promise in reducing the incidence of AO.

Despite being considered a self-limiting condition, alveolar osteitis can lead to secondary complications if not properly managed. Prolonged pain, infection, and delayed healing are among the most common sequelae, often resulting in patient dissatisfaction and increased need for follow-up care. Additionally, systemic implications such as the spread of local infection in immunocompromised individuals may occur in rare cases. Studies have explored various risk factors such as age, sex, use of oral contraceptives, and systemic diseases like diabetes mellitus in relation to the development of AO (4).

Review

Alveolar osteitis remains a significant postoperative concern due to its multifactorial etiology and variable incidence. Current research emphasizes the role of both local and systemic factors in its pathogenesis. Surgical trauma, bacterial contamination, and host immune response all contribute to clot disintegration and delayed healing. Recent studies have highlighted the importance of minimizing intraoperative trauma and promoting aseptic techniques to reduce the likelihood of alveolar osteitis development. In particular, the use of chlorhexidine rinses has demonstrated effectiveness in lowering dry socket occurrence, especially in mandibular third molar surgeries (5).

Treatment of alveolar osteitis primarily involves symptomatic relief rather than curative intervention. Analgesics, socket irrigation, and medicated dressings are commonly used to manage pain and inflammation. Research has shown that dressings containing eugenol provide temporary pain control but may interfere with socket healing if overused. Newer alternatives, such as platelet-rich fibrin and antiseptic gels, are under investigation for their potential to enhance tissue regeneration and reduce postoperative discomfort (6).

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121

Clinical Variability and Risk Determinants in Alveolar Osteitis

The manifestation of AO is not uniform across patient populations, and variability in its clinical presentation has been attributed to a complex interaction of procedural, anatomical, and systemic influences. In clinical settings, the socket environment following tooth extraction can shift dramatically due to small changes in local physiology or behavior, often altering the course of healing. The posterior mandible, particularly the site of third molar extractions, presents with higher incidence rates. This trend is frequently attributed to reduced vascularity, dense cortical bone, and increased mechanical trauma during removal of impacted molars. Studies suggest that trauma during extraction contributes significantly to clot instability by increasing local fibrinolytic activity, which is known to dissolve the early clot and expose the socket to oral contaminants (7).

Patient lifestyle factors also play a strong role in modifying risk. Tobacco use, for example, introduces vasoconstrictive agents that impair blood supply to the healing socket and disrupt the clot formation process. Nicotine reduces oxygen delivery to the tissue and alters immune response, which can lead to higher susceptibility to inflammation and infection. It has been documented that smokers are several times more likely to develop dry socket than nonsmokers, regardless of surgical difficulty (8). Similarly, oral contraceptive use has been associated with elevated risk, particularly during peak estrogen phases, which influence fibrinolysis. Elevated serum estrogen levels enhance the activity of plasminogen activators, further contributing to early clot degradation.

Local microbial load is a less visible, but equally important, determinant. The presence of anaerobic bacteria such as Treponema, Fusobacterium, and Prevotella within the extraction site has been identified as a catalyst for fibrin degradation. These microorganisms produce proteolytic enzymes capable of disrupting soft tissue repair and delaying socket granulation. This bacterial profile is commonly observed in patients with poor oral hygiene or periodontal disease, adding further variability to AO risk profiles (9). Notably, in patients with existing chronic periodontal conditions, socket healing is often impaired due to the inflamed tissue's reduced regenerative capacity. The complexity of host-pathogen interactions makes it difficult to predict AO occurrence with absolute certainty, even when predisposing conditions are evident.

Surgical technique and operator experience also influence AO development. Excessive manipulation of the surrounding bone or soft tissue, use of rotary instruments with high torque, and prolonged exposure of the socket during difficult extractions have been linked to increased fibrinolytic response. Cooling with irrigation, minimizing pressure during luxation, and use of gentle elevation techniques have been shown to significantly reduce socket trauma. In fact, clinicians who adopted atraumatic approaches saw measurable reductions in postoperative complications (10).

Challenges and Advances in Diagnostic and Therapeutic Approaches

Clinical diagnosis of AO relies almost entirely on symptoms and visual inspection. The absence of a clot, exposed alveolar bone, radiating pain starting a few days after extraction, and foul odor are commonly used to identify the condition. However, these criteria are subjective, often overlapping with normal post-extraction discomfort or other inflammatory conditions. The lack of a standardized diagnostic tool complicates comparisons across studies and limits the development of unified treatment protocols. Pain intensity varies between individuals, and some patients with evident bone exposure report minimal discomfort. This inconsistency reduces the reliability of pain as a diagnostic marker. Recent attempts to quantify healing through socket scoring systems have not yet achieved wide clinical acceptance, partly due to limited validation and impracticality in routine care settings (11).

Therapeutic approaches, while numerous, often prioritize symptom relief over addressing the underlying biological disruptions. The use of

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121

medicated dressings such as Alvogyl, zinc oxide-eugenol, and obtundents has persisted in clinical practice for decades, even though their effects on healing dynamics remain debated. For instance, eugenol-based materials can provide strong analgesia but may delay epithelial coverage by interfering with cell proliferation. Some clinicians opt for saline irrigation and minimal socket manipulation, relying on natural resolution, while others incorporate topical antimicrobials or corticosteroids to modulate inflammation. These variations in practice reflect the absence of a definitive therapeutic standard. Low-level laser therapy (LLLT), platelet-rich fibrin (PRF), and chlorhexidine application have shown promise in clinical trials, but inconsistent methodology limits reproducibility across diverse populations (12).

Biological interventions represent a growing field of interest in AO management. PRF, derived from autologous blood centrifugation, contains growth factors that may promote faster healing. Its application in post-extraction sockets has been associated with reduced incidence of AO and improved tissue regeneration. The mechanism is attributed to fibrin matrix stabilization and a localized anti-inflammatory effect. However, logistical challenges such as equipment cost, blood handling protocols, and variability in preparation techniques have prevented widespread adoption. Similarly, LLLT has been evaluated for its biostimulatory effects on fibroblasts and capillary formation. In clinical trials, patients receiving laser therapy reported lower pain scores and faster granulation tissue formation, although long-term outcomes and cost-effectiveness remain under evaluation (13).

Digital technologies and biomarkers are beginning to influence the diagnostic landscape. Advanced imaging techniques such as cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) have helped differentiate AO from other complications like residual root fragments or early osteomyelitis. Nonetheless, the resolution of CBCT may not capture early clot disintegration or subtle tissue breakdown. On the molecular front, researchers are investigating salivary and serum markers of fibrinolysis and inflammation as potential diagnostic aids. Elevated levels of plasminogen activator or pro-inflammatory cytokines could theoretically serve as early indicators of AO risk. However, no biomarker has yet demonstrated sufficient sensitivity and specificity for clinical use. Implementation would also require substantial infrastructure, limiting its feasibility in general dental practice. Until these methods are refined, the diagnostic process remains largely clinical, shaped by practitioner experience and subjective symptom reporting (14).

Post-Treatment Complications and Strategies for Prevention

AO often presents complications that extend beyond the immediate healing period. Persistent pain and delayed soft tissue closure are among the most frequently reported issues following initial management. Although the acute symptoms typically resolve within 7 to 10 days, some patients continue to experience socket sensitivity, tenderness upon mastication, and residual inflammation. These post-treatment effects can be linked to prolonged clot absence, bacterial infiltration, and incomplete granulation tissue formation. In cases where medicated dressings are overused or retained longer than necessary, epithelial healing may be impaired. Residual paste materials, particularly those containing obtundents or zinc compounds, have been observed to induce local irritation or foreign body reaction in susceptible individuals (15).

Secondary infections may occur if the exposed alveolar bone becomes colonized by pathogenic flora. While rare, these infections can lead to localized abscesses or, in immunocompromised patients, systemic involvement. Complications are more likely when follow-up care is inconsistent or when patients prematurely discontinue analgesic or antimicrobial therapy. Socket debridement, though effective for symptom relief, can introduce trauma that prolongs healing if not performed with care. Moreover, mechanical disruption of early granulation tissue can delay epithelial closure, particularly in posterior mandible sites where vascular supply is naturally limited. Repeated socket instrumentation should be approached

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121

cautiously, with emphasis on irrigation and non-aggressive cleaning (16).

Prevention strategies target both the procedural environment and patient behavior. Preoperative antiseptic protocols, including chlorhexidine rinses, have demonstrated consistent effectiveness in reducing AO occurrence. A single rinse before surgery or a short course following extraction has been shown to lower microbial load in the socket without introducing toxicity. Application of 0.12% chlorhexidine solution has been particularly effective in third molar extractions, where the likelihood of dry socket is elevated. Clinicians have also reported fewer complications when surgical time is minimized and flap reflection is reduced, both of which help preserve the local clot structure. Suture placement to stabilize the clot and minimize exposure to food particles or mechanical disruption remains an underutilized but valuable method in certain cases (17).

Patient-specific risk management plays a pivotal role in prevention. Educating patients on post-operative care, such as avoiding smoking, spitting, or straw use, can significantly decrease clot dislodgment. Smoking cessation, even temporarily during the first 48 to 72 hours, correlates with reduced AO rates, particularly in habitual smokers. Hormonal influences related to oral contraceptive use can also alter clot stability. In such cases, delaying elective extractions to lower-estrogen phases of the menstrual cycle has been recommended by some oral surgeons. While not universally adopted, this approach reflects a growing interest in individualized timing to mitigate complications. Analgesic regimens may include non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), but care is required when prescribing agents that could interfere with platelet function or exacerbate bleeding risk. Clear, written post-operative instructions and follow-up reinforcement have been associated with higher compliance and improved outcomes (18).

Conclusion

Alveolar osteitis continues to challenge clinicians due to its unpredictable onset and multifactorial nature. Despite its self-limiting course, it significantly impacts patient recovery and satisfaction. Advances in preventive care and biologically driven therapies offer promising directions for management. Consistent clinical protocols and patient education remain essential for reducing incidence and improving outcomes.

Disclosure

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Funding

No funding.

Ethical consideration

Non applicable.

Data availability

All data is available within the manuscript.

Author contribution

All authors contributed to conceptualizing, data drafting, collection and final writing of the manuscript.

References

1. Blum I. Contemporary views on dry socket (alveolar osteitis): a clinical appraisal of standardization, aetiopathogenesis and management: a critical review. International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2002;31(3):309-17.

2. Wikström M, Dahlén G, Linde A. Fibrinogenolytic and fibrinolytic activity in oral microorganisms. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 1983;17(5):759-67.

3. Torres-Lagares D, Serrera-Figallo MA, Romero-Ruíz MM, Infante-Cossío P, García-Calderón M, Gutiérrez-Pérez JL. Update on dry socket: a review of the literature. Medicina Oral, Patologia Oral y Cirugia Bucal. 2005;10(1):81-5; 77.

4. Sweet J, Butler D. The relationship of smoking to localized osteitis. Journal of oral surgery (American Dental Association: 1965). 1979;37(10):732-5.

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121

5. Larsen PE. Alveolar osteitis after surgical removal of impacted mandibular third molars: Identification of the patient at risk. Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology. 1992;73(4):393-7.

6. Minervini G, Franco R, Martelli M, Hafedh S, Marrapodi MM, Di Blasio M, et al. Low-level laser treatment's ability to reduce dry socket pain. Acta Odontologica Scandinavica. 2024;83:42261.

7. Bortoluzzi MC, Manfro R, De Déa BE, Dutra TC. Incidence of dry socket, alveolar infection, and postoperative pain following the extraction of erupted teeth. The journal of contemporary dental practice. 2014;11(1):33-40.

8. Meechan J, Macgregor I, Rogers S, Hobson R, Bate J, Dennison M. The effect of smoking on immediate post-extraction socket filling with blood and on the incidence of painful socket. British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. 1988;26(5):402-9.

9. Nayak P. Microbial Analysis in Dry Socket. Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development. 2019;10(11).

10. Amler MH. The time sequence of tissue regeneration in human extraction wounds. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology. 1969;27(3):309-18.

11. Noroozi A-R, Philbert RF. Modern concepts in understanding and management of the "dry socket" syndrome: comprehensive review of the literature. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology. 2009;107(1):30-5.

12. Kaya GŞ, Yapıcı G, Savaş Z, Güngörmüş M. Comparison of alvogyl, SaliCept patch, and low-level laser therapy in the management of alveolar osteitis. Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 2011;69(6):1571-7.

13. Miron RJ, Fujioka-Kobayashi M, Bishara M, Zhang Y, Hernandez M, Choukroun J. Platelet-rich fibrin and soft tissue wound healing: a systematic review. Tissue Engineering Part B: Reviews. 2017;23(1):83-99.

14. Khanna S. Immunological and biochemical markers in oral carcinogenesis: The public health perspective. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2008;5(5):418-22.

15. Jesudasan JS, Ramadorai AK, Wahab PA. Effect of eugenol in the management of alveolar osteitis: A systematic review. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Medicine, and Pathology. 2014;26(2):101-7.

16. Kolokythas A, Olech E, Miloro M. Alveolar osteitis: a comprehensive review of concepts and controversies. International journal of dentistry. 2010;2010(1):249073.

17. Dodson T. Prevention and treatment of dry socket. Evidence-based dentistry. 2013;14(1):13-4.

18. Bonine FL, Larsen PE. Effect of chlorhexidine rinse on the incidence of dry socket in impacted mandibular third molar extraction sites. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology. 1995;79(2):154-8.

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2026.60121