

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Aesthetic-And patient-related outcomes following root coverage procedures: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Francesco Cairo¹  | Shayan Barootchi²  | Lorenzo Tavelli²  | Luigi Barbato¹ |
Hom-Lay Wang²  | Giulio Rasperini^{2,3} | Filippo Graziani⁴  | Maurizio Tonetti^{5,6,7} 

¹Research Unit in Periodontology and Periodontal Medicine, Department of Experimental and Clinical Medicine, University of Florence, Florence, Italy

²Department of Periodontics & Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

³Department of Biomedical Surgical and Dental Sciences Foundation IRCCS Ca' Granda Policlinic, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

⁴Department of Surgical, Medical and Molecular Pathology and Critical Care Medicine, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

⁵European Research Group on Periodontology (ERGOPERIO), Genova, Italy

⁶Division of Periodontology, Faculty of Dentistry, Hong Kong University, Hong Kong, China

⁷Department of Oral and Maxillo-Facial Implantology, Shanghai Key Laboratory of Stomatology, National Clinical Research Centre for Stomatology, Shanghai Ninth People Hospital, School of Medicine, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

Correspondence

Francesco Cairo, Research Unit in Periodontology and Periodontal Medicine, Department of Experimental and Clinical Medicine, University of Florence, Via fra' Giovanni Angelico 51, 50121, Florence, Italy.

Email: cairofrancesco@virglio.it

Funding information

University of Michigan Periodontal Graduate Student Research Fund

Abstract

Background: Aim of this systematic review (SR) of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was to evaluate effect of different flap designs and graft materials for root coverage, in terms of aesthetics, patient satisfaction and self-reported morbidity (post-operative pain/discomfort).

Material and Methods: A comprehensive literature search was performed. A mixed-modelling approach to network meta-analysis was utilized to formulate direct and indirect comparisons among treatments for Root Coverage Esthetic Score (RES), with its individual components, and for subjective patient-reported satisfaction and post-operative pain/discomfort (visual analogue scale (VAS) of 100).

Results: Twenty-six RCTs with a total of 867 treated patients (1708 recessions) were included. Coronally Advanced Flap (CAF) + Connective Tissue Graft (CTG) (0.74 (95% CI [0.24, 1.26], $p = .005$)), Tunnel (TUN) + CTG (0.84 (95% CI [0.15, 1.53]), $p = .01$) and CAF + Graft substitutes (GS) (0.55 (95% CI [0.006, 1.094], $p = .04$)) were significantly associated with higher RES than CAF. No significant difference between CAF + CTG and TUN + CTG was detected (0.09 (95% CI [-0.54, 0.72], $p = .77$)). Addition of CTG resulted in less natural tissue texture (-0.21 (95% CI [-0.34, -0.08]), $p = .003$) and gingival colour (-0.06 (95% CI [-0.12, -0.03], $p = .03$)) than CAF. CTG techniques were associated with increased morbidity.

Conclusions: Connective tissue graft procedures showed highest overall aesthetic performance for root coverage, although graft integration might impair soft tissue colour and appearance. Additionally, CTG-based techniques were also correlated with a greater patient satisfaction and morbidity.

KEYWORDS

aesthetics, gingival recession, meta-analysis, connective tissue graft, coronally advanced flap

1 | INTRODUCTION

Predictability of root coverage procedures for treatment of single and multiple gingival recessions (GRs) has been extensively demonstrated (Cairo, Cortellini, et al., 2016; Cairo et al., 2012; Cairo, Nieri, & Pagliaro, 2014; Graziani et al., 2014). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses have assessed efficacy of different techniques mainly by comparing mean root coverage (mRC) and complete root coverage (CRC) (Cairo et al., 2014; Graziani et al., 2014; Tavelli, Ravida et al., 2019). The connective tissue graft (CTG) is widely considered as the gold standard treatment for single/multiple GRs (Cairo et al., 2014; Cortellini & Bissada, 2018a; Graziani et al., 2014), providing excellent stability of the gingival margin over time compared with flap alone or replacement biomaterials (Pini-Prato et al., 2012; Tavelli, Ravida et al., 2019). Nonetheless, outcomes of root coverage procedures are not solely dependent upon the final amount root coverage, but final soft tissue quality and related aesthetic outcomes with overall patient satisfaction may be considered the most important treatment goal (Cairo, 2017).

In this scenario, aesthetic- and patient-reported outcomes are routinely included in modern clinical studies (Azaripour et al., 2016; Barootchi et al., 2019; Cairo et al., 2020; Stefanini et al., 2016; Tavelli, Barootchi, Di Gianfilippo, et al., 2019; Tonetti et al., 2018). In particular, while patient morbidity and satisfaction are usually evaluated with a visual analogue scale (VAS), several methods have been proposed for evaluating aesthetic outcomes obtained (Aichelmann-Reidy, Yukna, Evans, Nasr, & Mayer, 2001; Cairo, Rotundo, Miller, & Pini Prato, 2009; Kerner et al., 2009; Salhi, Lecloux, Seidel, Rompen, & Lambert, 2014; Wang, Bunyaratavej, Labadie, Shyr, & MacNeil, 2001; Zucchelli, Marzadori, Mele, Stefanini, & Montebugnoli, 2012). Some of these methods relied on gingival margin position, level of the mucogingival junction, colour match, presence/absence of scar/keloid formation, consistency and contiguity of soft tissue compared to adjacent sites (Aichelmann-Reidy et al., 2001; Cairo et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2001), while others used a VAS or pink aesthetic score (Salhi et al., 2014; Zucchelli et al., 2012). Among them, root coverage esthetic score (RES) introduced by Cairo et al. in 2009 (Cairo et al., 2009) has been shown to be a reliable tool for assessing aesthetic outcomes of root coverage procedures, not only among experts (Cairo et al., 2010) but also among operators with different levels of periodontal experience (Isaia, Gyurko, Roomian, & Hawley, 2018). An early network meta-analysis (NMA) suggested that root coverage procedures improved aesthetic perceptions by both patient and dentist (Cairo, Pagliaro, et al., 2016). Limitations in the available evidence, however, limited the conclusions. In the last years, an increased number of RCTs and a growing interest in surgical techniques and biomaterials development have been noticed worldwide.

Therefore, the aims of the present systematic review were to evaluate which flap design and graft material are associated with the best aesthetic outcomes, highest patient satisfaction and the lowest patient morbidity.

Clinical relevance

Scientific rationale for the study: Although predictability of root coverage procedures has been extensively demonstrated for the treatment of single and multiple gingival recessions, outcomes in terms of aesthetic outcomes, satisfaction and patient morbidity are still unclear.

Principal findings: Coronally Advanced Flap (CAF) + Connective Tissue Graft (CTG) or Tunnel (TUN)+CTG showed superior final RES score than CAF alone, Enamel Matrix Derivatives and Xenogeneic Collagen Matrix. CAF achieved more natural soft tissue texture and gingival colour scores than CTG. Higher patient satisfaction was observed for CTG and CTG + EMD compared to flap alone, while CTG techniques were associated with increased morbidity.

Practical implications: Root coverage procedures are generally well-tolerated and improve aesthetic self-perception. Among techniques, CTG procedures showed highest aesthetic performance, although their use increased morbidity and less natural soft tissue texture and gingival colour.

2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 | Study registration and reporting format

The review protocol was registered and allocated the identification number CRD42020142623 in the PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews hosted by the National Institute for Health Research, University of York, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. The current systematic review and meta-analysis follows the 27-item Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, & Altman, 2009) and Cochrane Handbook (Higgins et al., 2011).

2.2 | Focused questions

The goal of conducting this review was to address the following questions:

1. Which root coverage procedure achieves the highest aesthetic outcome, based on the proposed classification of root coverage esthetic score (Cairo et al., 2009)?
2. Relative to other treatments, how do different root coverage approaches affect the individual components of RES?
3. Which root coverage procedure is associated with the highest scores for self-reported patient satisfaction, and the lowest patient morbidity (experienced and self-reported post-op pain/discomfort)?

2.3 | Patient, intervention, comparison, outcome and time (PICOT) question

P: Systemically healthy patients (at least 10 per trial) with clinical diagnosis of localized or generalized gingival recession(s) categorized as RT1 & 2 (Cairo, Nieri, Cincinelli, Mervelt, & Pagliaro, 2011; Cortellini & Bissada, 2018a).

I: Any type of root coverage procedure.

C: Comparison between CAF and TUN, either alone, with CTG or with graft substitutes or biologic agents.

O: Primary outcomes: Root Coverage Esthetic Score (RES) (Cairo et al., 2009), self-reported patient satisfaction and patient morbidity. Secondary outcome measures: individual components of RES, to investigate influence of different treatments for root coverage on each individual constituent of the esthetic score.

T: Only RCTs with a minimum 6-month follow-up duration were included.

2.4 | Eligibility criteria

In order to assert transitivity, the following set of inclusion and exclusion criteria were implemented a priori for selection of studies, to observe for significant heterogeneity relative to the design-driven differences, selection criteria and overall approach:

2.5 | Inclusion criteria

- Randomized clinical trials with a strict protocol
- Treatment of localized or multiple GRs (only RT1 & 2) with either the coronally advanced flap (CAF) or tunnel (TUN) technique, alone or having utilized a soft tissue graft, substitute or biomaterial
- Evaluating and reporting aesthetic outcomes according to RES (Cairo et al., 2009)
- Duration of follow-up and reporting of outcomes reaching at least 6 months

2.6 | Exclusion criteria

- Non-randomized studies; cohort and case-control studies, case series, retrospective studies, case reports and animal studies
- Utilization of other techniques for root coverage other than CAF or TUN (such as the laterally positioned flap, double papilla flap and free gingival graft as these tend to have slightly different indications for their treatment)
- Studies with a follow-up period of <6 months
- Studies including only smokers
- Lack of data regarding the exact number of treated sites in either test or control groups
- Utilizing different measurements or classifications other than RES (Cairo et al., 2009) for the aesthetic evaluation

- Utilization of laser treatment
- Utilization of combination therapies (e.g. CAF + CTG + enamel matrix derivative)

2.7 | Information sources and search strategy (see Appendix S1)

2.8 | Study selection (see Appendix S1)

2.9 | Data extraction and management (see supplemental Appendix S1)

2.10 | Synthesis of the mixed-models network meta-analysis (NMA)

For studies published more than once (i.e. duplicates), or those that utilized the same patient population, only one report with the most informative and complete data was included for the analyses. As per our focused questions, all outcomes were investigated within two sub-analyses: one where the different treatment arms were grouped according to flap design and graft materials (CAF, CAF + CTG, CAF + Graft substitutes (GS), Tunnel technique (TUN) + CTG, and TUN + GS) with CAF serving at the reference for the initial comparisons and a second sub-analysis where the same study arms were grouped according to the type of graft material (Acellular Dermal Matrix (ADM), CTG, EMD (Enamel matrix derivatives), CTG + EMD, Flap, platelet-rich fibrin (PRF), tissue engineering constructs (TEC), with XCM) and Flap serving as the initial reference point for the comparisons (Tavelli, Barootchi, Cairo, et al., 2019). This was done so for all the outcomes of RES (0–10), self-reported satisfaction, and patient morbidity (in terms of self-reported post-op pain/discomfort), which were assessed and analysed based on 0–100 on the VAS scale.

We used a mixed-modelling approach to NMA (Barootchi, Tavelli, Zucchelli, Giannobile, & Wang, 2020; Tu, 2015) to simultaneously compare all treatment arms regardless of their preexisting direct comparison. The transitivity assumption underlying the NMA was evaluated by checking the distribution of clinical and methodological variables that could potentially act as effect modifiers across treatment comparisons (such as the study design/approach, and baseline measures of the relevant variable) (Salanti, 2012). Our goal was to formulate indirect comparisons between treatments only if all included treatment arms could be interchangeably implemented and performed in all trials and for all the recruited and treated population.

The following mathematical formula presents our utilized model for both subgroup analyses, similar in construct to previous works (Barootchi et al., 2020; Tavelli, Barootchi, Cairo, et al., 2019):

$$y_{ijt} = \alpha_{q(ij)} + \beta_{q(ij)} * T_{ijt} + \theta_i^p * P_i + \theta_i^{sm} * (1 - P_i) + \eta_{ij} + \gamma_i * T_{ijt} + \lambda X_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

where i, j, t index studies, study arms and occasion, respectively; $q(i, j)$ is the treatment type administered in arm j of study i , T_{ijt} refers to the actual time of measurement/assessment of RES/patient




FIGURE 1 PRISMA flow chart displaying the performed search strategy leading to the inclusion of 26 randomized clinical trials. CAF, coronally advanced flap; RES, root coverage esthetic score; and TUN, tunnelling technique

satisfaction/morbidity. X_{ijt} contains baseline characteristics (REC, KT and GT baseline). The α and β fixed parameters capture the common intercept and common trend for all study arms with a given treatment type; θ , η and γ are random effects that capture study, study arm unique intercepts and a study unique time slope; and ϵ reflects all other sources of variation. P_i is 1 for a study of parallel design and 0 for any split-mouth trial that contributed to the analysis with both treatment arms (Aydinyurt, Tekin, & Ertugrul, 2019, Jhaveri et al., 2010, Milinkovic et al., 2015, Pietruska, Skurska, Podlewski, Milewski, & Pietruski, 2019, Stefanini et al., 2016). All other model components are random and capture study-specific effects.

Additionally, to evaluate the relative extent to which each treatment affects the individual parameters of RES, for both sub-analyses, the five constituents of RES (gingival margin, marginal tissue

contour, soft tissue texture, alignment of the mucogingival junction and gingival colour) served as an outcome of the NMA. As previously mentioned, these data were mostly obtained through the respective authors of the included trials and coded as a continuous variable representing the average score of each parameter.

The type of treatment approach (single/multiple site treatment) was controlled for in all models (through inclusion of a fixed-effects co-variate and observing its influence). Additionally, the arms were weighted according to the treated sample size. The analyses also accounted for correlations induced by multi-group studies, by using multivariate distributions. The variance of the random-effects distribution (heterogeneity variance) was considered to measure the extent of across-study and within-comparison variability on the treatment effects.

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the included studies, interventions and outcomes

| Publication | Country, Setting, Sponsored by companies | Treatment groups* | Patients (n), Sites (n) | Follow-up time (months) | Overall RES outcome (0–10) | Method of RES evaluation | Method of PROMs assessment | |
|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | Satisfaction | Morbidity (reported pain/discomfort) |
| (Ahmedbeyli, Ipci, Cakar, Kuru, & Yilmaz, 2014) | Turkey, University, No | CAF + ADMCAF | 24, 48 | 12 | 9.08 ± 1.75 7.58 ± 2.02 | Clinical | Three-point rating scale [‡] | NA |
| (Ahmedbeyli, Dirikan Ipci, Cakar, Yilmaz, & Chambrone, 2019) | Turkey, University, No | CAF + ADMCAF+ADM | 22, 55 | 12 | 9.45 ± 1.21 8.91 ± 1.97 | Clinical | Three-point rating scale [‡] | NA |
| (Aydinyurt et al., 2019) | Turkey, University, No | CAF + CTG+EMD CAF + CTG | 19, 38 | 12 | 8.93 ± 1.43 8.37 ± 1.85 | Clinical | NA | NA |
| (Azaripour et al., 2016) | Germany, University, No | TUN + CTG CAF + CTG | 40, 71 | 6 | 9.2 ± 1.1 9.2 ± 1.3 | Using photographs | Questionnaire [‡] | VAS |
| (Bansal et al., 2016) | India, University, NA | CAF | 10, 20 | 6 | 7.7 ± 1.41 | Using photographs | NA | NA |
| (Barootchi et al., 2019) | USA, University, No | CAF + CTG CAF + CTG CAF | 20, 55 | 6 | 8.9 ± 1.3 8.4 ± 1.5 8.25 ± 1.7 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Cairo et al., 2012) | Italy, University, No | CAF CAF + CTG | 29, 29 | 6 | 6.7 ± 1.5 7.6 ± 1.7 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Cairo et al., 2015) | Italy, University, No | CAF CAF + CTG | 24, 24 | 36 | 7.5 ± 1.8 8 ± 1.5 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Cairo, Cortellini, et al., 2016) | Italy, University, No | CAF CAF + CTG | 32, 74 | 6, 12 | 7.9 ± 1.4 7.9 ± 1.4 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Cairo et al., 2020) | Italy, University, No | CAF CAF + CTG | 30, 30 | 6 | 7.9 ± 4.6 8 ± 4.8 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Fernandes-Dias et al., 2015) | Brazil, University, No | CAF + CTG | 20, 20 | 6 | 7.85 ± 0.95 | Using photographs | NA | VAS |
| (Jhaveri et al., 2010) | India, University, No | CAF + ADM+F CAF + CTG | 10, 20 | 6 | 8.1 ± 2.33 7.9 ± 2.28 | Clinical | NA | NA |
| (Kuika, Ipci, Cakar, & Yilmaz, 2018) | Turkey, University, No | CAF CAF + PRF | 24, 52 | 12 | 7 ± 0.7 8 ± 1.32 | Using photographs | Three-point rating scale [‡] | NA |
| (Milinkovic et al., 2015) | Serbia, University, No | CAF + CTG CAF + XCM+F | 18, 36 | 12 | 8.61 ± 1.28 8.67 ± 1.41 | Clinical | NA | NA |
| (Ozcelik, Haytac, & Seydaoglu, 2011) | Turkey, University, No | CAF CAF | 41, 155 | 6 | 7.43 ± 1.56 8.65 ± 1.47 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

| Publication | Country, Setting, Sponsored by companies | Treatment groups* | Patients (n), Sites (n) | Follow-up time (months) | Overall RES outcome (0–10) | Method of RES evaluation | Method of PROMs assessment | |
|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | Satisfaction | Morbidity (reported pain/discomfort) |
| (Ozenci, Ipci, Cakar, & Yilmaz, 2015) | Turkey, University, No | TUN + ADM CAF + ADM | 20, 58 | 12 | 7.3 ± 1.25 8.9 ± 1.6 | Clinical | Three-point rating scale [‡] | NA |
| (Pelekos et al., 2019) | Italy, Private practice/ University, Yes | CAF + CTG CAF + XCM | 155, 393 | 6 | 7.9 ± 2.4 6.4 ± 3.7 | Using photographs | NA | VAS (retrieved from Tonetti et al., 2018) |
| (Pietruska et al., 2019) | Poland, University, Yes | TUN + CTG TUN + XCM | 29, 91 | 12 | 8.36 ± 1.78 7.11 ± 1.95 | Using photographs | NA | NA |
| (Roman, Soanca, Kasaj, & Stratul, 2013) | Romania, University, No | CAF + CTG CAF + CTG+EMD | 42, 57 | 12 | 9 ± 1.09 8.58 ± 1.54 | Clinical | VAS | NA |
| (Sangiorgio et al., 2017) | Brazil, University, No | CAF CAF + XCM CAF + EMD | 68, 68 | 6 | 7.71 ± 2.02 8.29 ± 2.54 7.82 ± 3 | Clinical | VAS (retrieved from Rocha Dos Santos et al., 2017) | VAS (retrieved from Rocha Dos Santos et al., 2017) |
| (Santamaria, Fernandes-Dias, et al., 2017) | Brazil, University, No | CTG | 20, 20 | 6, 12, 24 | 7.85 ± 0.95 8.83 ± 0.85 8.68 ± 0.97 | Using photographs | NA | NA |
| (Santamaria, Neves, et al., 2017) | Brazil, University, No | CAF + CTG TUN + CTG | 42, 42 | 6 | 8.4 ± 1.5 7.8 ± 1.9 | Clinical | NA | VAS |
| (Neves et al., 2019) | Brazil, University, No | CAF + CTG TUN + CTG | 39, 39 | 12 | 8.3 ± 1.5 7.5 ± 1.8 8.7 ± 1.2 8.4 ± 1.6 | Clinical | NA | NA |
| (Stefanini et al., 2016) | Italy, Spain, Germany | CAF CAF + XCM | 41, 82 | 12 | 7.34 ± 2.9 7.85 ± 2.42 | Using photographs | VAS (retrieved from Jepsen et al. 2013) | VAS (retrieved from Jepsen et al. 2018) |
| (Tavelli, Barootchi, Di Gianfilippo, et al., 2019) | USA, University, No | CAF + ADM TUN + ADM | 24, 84 | 6 | 8.01 ± 1.23 8.12 ± 1.9 | Clinical | VAS | VAS |
| (Zuhr et al., 2014) | Germany, Private practice, No | CAF + EMD TUN + CTG | 24, 47 | 6, 12 | 6.92 ± 2.32 9.06 ± 0.83 | Using photographs | VAS | VAS |

Abbreviations: ADM, acellular dermal matrix; CAF, coronally advanced flap; CTG, connective tissue graft; EMD, enamel matrix derivative; F, cultured fibroblasts; NA, Not available; PRF, platelet-rich fibrin; TUN, tunnel technique; XCM, xenogeneic cellular matrix.

*Note that only those study arms which were included in the network model and the analyses are presented in this table.

‡Not included in the analysis

To obtain direct and indirect pairwise comparisons between different treatment arms, different reference levels were specified in the model and the contrasts were recorded along with their standard errors, and p values. Confidence intervals were then produced, and a p value threshold of 0.05 was set for statistical significance.

The linearity assumption was tested for all models by including quadratic terms; however, no evidence of non-linearity was noticed. All analyses were performed by an author with experience in biostatistics (SB) using the lme4 (Bates et al., 2015), lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al., 2017), dplyr (Wickham, François, Henry, & Müller, 2019) and tidyr (Wickham, 2019), statistical packages in Rstudio (version 1.2.1335). The igraph (Csardi & Tamás, 2006) and ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016) packages were used to produce the network plots for visual representation of the formulated direct and indirect comparisons.

2.11 | Quality and risk of bias assessment (see Appendix S1)

3 | RESULTS

Twenty-six RCTs with a total of 867 treated patients and 1708 recessions were included.

3.1 | Search results and study selection (see Appendix S1)

Figure 1 presents the steps involved in the literature search process.

3.2 | Study characteristics and type of intervention (see Appendix S1)

Table 1 displays the characteristics of the included studies, their design, interventions and outcomes.

3.3 | Synthesis of results from the network meta-analysis

3.3.1 | Root coverage Esthetic Score

When investigating the first subset of analyses, grouped by flap design and their graft materials (treatments arms of CAF, CAF + CTG, CAF + GS, TUN + CTG, and TUN + GS), the model revealed that compared to CAF alone, the treatment groups of TUN + CTG (0.84 (95% CI [0.15, 1.53]), $p = .01$), CAF + CTG (0.74 (95% CI [0.24, 1.26]), $p = .005$) and CAF + GS (0.55 (95% CI [0.006, 1.094], $p = .04$)) were significantly associated with higher RES scores. With CAF + CTG as the reference, the treatment groups of CAF (-0.74 (95% CI [-1.23, -0.25], $p = .004$)) and TUN + GS (-0.9 (95% CI [-1.69, -0.11], $p = .02$))

showed significantly lower RES scores, while TUN + CTG (0.09 (95% CI [-0.54, 0.72], $p = .77$)) did not present a significant difference.

For second subset of analyses, with study arms grouped according to the type of graft material (ADM, CTG, CTG + EMD, EMD, Flap, PRF, TEC and XCM), the analysis showed a significantly higher estimate for CTG (0.71 (95% CI [0.27, 1.15]), $p = .003$), CTG + EMD (0.97 (95% CI [0.53, 1.41]), $p = .03$) and ADM (0.873 (95% CI [0.23, 1.51], $p = .003$)) compared to treatment with Flap alone, while other treatment arms failed to present a statistically significant difference with flap alone in the analyses. With CTG as the reference for the network comparisons, the treatment arms of XCM (-1.127 (95% CI [-1.66, -0.58], $p = .001$)), EMD (-1.18 (95% CI [-2.15, -0.21], $p = .01$)) and flap (-0.711 (95% CI [-1.15, -0.26], $p = .003$)) showed to be associated with significantly lower RES scores, whereas no significant difference was apparent for treatment arms of ADM (0.161 (95% CI [-0.43, 0.75], $p = .59$)), CTG + EMD (0.264 (95% CI [-0.68, 1.21]), $p = .57$), PRF (-0.448 (95% CI [-1.67, 0.77]), $p = .467$) and TEC (0.077 (95% CI [-1.02, 1.17], $p = .88$)). (see Figures 2-4).

Comparative efficacy of different approaches to the individual components of RES

1. The level of the gingival margin (GM)

In the first sub-analysis, the model demonstrated that with CAF as reference, both treatment groups TUN + CTG (1.14 (95% CI [0.21, 2.06]), $p = .02$) and CAF + CTG (0.68 (95% CI [0.09, 1.28]), $p = .03$), resulted in significantly higher scores for GM (while not showing significant intergroup differences), whereas the treatment arms of CAF + GS (0.45 (95% CI [-0.11, 1.01]), $p = .12$), and TUN + GS (-0.399 (95% CI [-1.17, 0.37]), $p = .31$) did not present a significant estimate in the model.

In the second sub-analysis for the graft materials, with flap serving as reference, the treatment groups PRF (1.24 (95% CI [1.16, 1.32]), $p = .001$), TEC (1.03 (95% CI [0.11, 1.94], $p = .03$)), CTG (0.95 (95% CI [0.51, 1.39], $p < .001$)), EMD (0.941 (95% CI [0.84, 1.04], $p = .003$)) and ADM (0.71 (95% CI [0.07, 1.34]), $p = .03$) all showed significantly higher scores, except for XCM (0.04 (95% CI [-0.56, 0.64]), $p = .8$). While with CTG as reference the treatment arms of Flap alone (-0.95 (95% CI [-1.39, -0.51], $p < .001$)) and XCM (-0.91 (95% CI [-1.49, -0.33], $p = .004$)) showed a statistically lower GM score.

2. Marginal tissue contour (MTC)

During the first sub-analysis, the only treatment arm that showed a statistically higher coefficient was CAF + GS (0.121 (95% CI [0.01, 0.22]), $p = .02$), while other treatment arms failed to show a statistically significant difference compared to CAF alone.

Whereas in the second sub-analysis, the treatment groups of PRF (-0.41 (95% CI [-0.48, -0.32]), $p < .001$) and ADM (0.33 (95% CI [0.21, 0.45]), $p = .007$) presented with statistically lower and higher scores compared to flap alone, respectively.

3. Soft tissue texture (STT)

The only statistically significant result in the model during the first sub-analysis was for CAF + CTG (-0.22 (95% CI [-0.34, -0.08]), $p = .002$), with a negative coefficient, while other treatment arms did not present any significant difference compared to CAF alone.

Similarly, in the second subgroup analysis, CTG (-0.20 (95% CI [-0.34, -0.05]), $p = .01$) again was the only treatment arm with a significant and negative coefficient, demonstrating that treatment with CTG resulted in significantly lower scores for STT compared to CAF, whereas the other treatment arms did not show a statistically significant difference.

4. Alignment of the mucogingival junction (MGJ)

The only statistically significant coefficient in the model was observed for TUN + GS (0.19 (95% CI [0.06, 0.31]), $p = .03$), and the other treatment groups did not show a significant difference compared to CAF.

For the second sub-analysis, there were no significant differences observed with any of the treatment arms compared to flap alone.

5. Gingival colour (GC)

For this parameter of RES, the only significant result in the model was for treatment with TUN + CTG (-0.12 (95% CI [-0.21, -0.03]),

$p < .01$), that showed a statistically lower coefficient compared with CAF, while the other the other treatment arms failed to present any statistical correlation.

For the second sub-analysis similarly, CTG (-0.06 (95% CI [-0.12, -0.03]), $p = .03$) was the only treatment group that showed a significant and negative coefficient compared with flap alone.

3.3.2 | Patient satisfaction

For the first set of sub-analyses in comparison with CAF alone, treatment with CAF + CTG (5.91 (95% CI [0.87, 10.95]), $p = .01$) presented significantly higher scores for patient satisfaction, while other treatment groups did not present statistically significant estimates in the model.

In the second subgroup of analysis, both treatment arms of CTG (8.12 (95% CI [2.9, 13.34]), $p = .004$) and CTG + EMD (4.31 (95% CI [0.27, 12.35]), $p = .02$) showed to be associated with significantly higher VAS scores when compared to flap alone.

3.3.3 | Patient morbidity

During the first subgroup analyses, both CAF + CTG (10.41 (95% CI [2.71, 18.11]), $p = .01$) and TUN + CTG (10.67 (95% CI [2.03, 19.31]), $p = .02$) were the only treatment groups that presented with statistically significant higher patient morbidity compared to CAF alone.




FIGURE 2 Network meta-analysis of eligible comparisons for (a) the analysis based on flap designs and their graft materials and (b) analysis by the graft material. Black solid lines connect treatments that are directly compared in at least 1 trial. Studies contributing with only one arm are not presented. Grey dotted lines display the indirect comparison of the treatments that have not been compared head-to-head previously and formed through the network model. Note that distances are for plot clarity. The node size is proportional to the number of treated sites. ADM, acellular dermal matrix; CAF, coronally advanced flap; CTG, connective tissue graft; EMD, enamel matrix derivatives; GS, graft substitutes; NMA, network meta-analysis; PRF, platelet-rich fibrin; TEC, tissue engineering constructs; TUN, tunnel technique; and XCM, xenogeneic collagen matrix




FIGURE 3 Pairwise comparisons from the network meta-analysis based on flap designs and their graft materials for the outcome of RES. Treatments are reported in alphabetical order. Results are the estimates (95% CIs) from the NMA model in the cell in common between the column-defining treatment (defined-treatment 1) and the row-defining treatment (defined-treatment 2). A superior treatment indicated on the diagonal will have positive values in its row and negative values in its column. Statistically significant results are in bold, with the estimates underlined. *($p < .05$), **($p < .01$). ⁱ denotes model estimate derived from a purely indirect comparison. CAF, coronally advanced flap; CI, confidence interval; CTG, connective tissue graft; GS, graft substitutes; NMA, network meta-analysis; and TUN, tunnel technique




FIGURE 4 Pairwise comparisons from the network meta-analysis according to graft materials for the outcome of RES. Treatments are reported in alphabetical order. Results are the estimates (95% CIs) from the NMA model in the cell in common between the column-defining treatment (defined-treatment 1) and the row-defining treatment (defined-treatment 2). A superior treatment indicated on the diagonal will have positive values in its row and negative values in its column. Statistically significant results are in bold, with the estimates underlined. *($p < .05$), **($p < .01$). ⁱ denotes model estimate derived from a purely indirect comparison. ADM, acellular dermal matrix; CI, confidence interval; CTG, connective tissue graft; EMD, enamel matrix derivatives; NMA, network meta-analysis; PRF, platelet-rich fibrin; TEC, tissue engineering constructs; and XCM, xenogeneic collagen matrix

And for the second sub-analyses, CTG-based materials (9.609 (95% CI [2.26, 16.94]), $p = .01$) showed significantly higher scores for patient morbidity compared with treatment with Flap alone.

3.4 | Risk of bias assessment (see Appendix S1)

The individual and overall assessment of risk of bias is presented in Appendix (Table S2 for the overall observed risk). Fifteen of 26 RCTs were rated at low risk of bias.

4 | DISCUSSION

The goals of the present NMA were to assess aesthetic- and patient-related outcomes following periodontal plastic surgery considering standardized evaluation assessments. An extensive review using 26 RCTs clustering data on 867 patients and 1708 treated recessions was performed. The outcomes confirmed that root coverage is associated with improved patient satisfaction and limited morbidity (Cairo, Pagliaro, et al., 2016).

The present results confirmed that CTG provided superior RES than CAF. In addition, the surgical technique, whether TUN or CAF,

did not seem to affect the final aesthetic outcomes when a CTG was used. Although it has been suggested that TUN can enhance the aesthetic outcomes (Santamaria, Neves, et al., 2017; Zuhr, Rebele, Schneider, Jung, & Hurzeler, 2014), our results suggested that most likely the graft material played a bigger role on the aesthetic outcomes than the flap design, as also reported comparing CAF and TUN in terms of RES score (Tavelli, Barootchi, Di Gianfilippo, et al., 2019; Tavelli et al., 2018b). This may be due to the fact that graft acts as biological filler under the surgical gingival margin, thus reducing post-operative shrinkage and promoting final root coverage outcomes (Cairo, 2017).

Apart from CTG-based techniques, other approaches showed a significantly higher RES than flap alone, including CTG + EMD and ADM. This is in line with the previous NMA (Cairo, Pagliaro, et al., 2016). Similarly, CTG demonstrated higher RES than XCM and EMD. When interpreting these results, it should be taken into account that the overall RES is largely sensitive to the amount of root coverage achieved (up to 6 points out of 10) (Cairo et al., 2009). Therefore, given the evidence supporting CTG as the gold standard treatment in terms of amount of root coverage (Cairo et al., 2014; Graziani et al., 2014; Tavelli, Ravida et al., 2019), it is not surprising that CTG achieved significantly higher overall RES and GM compared to XCM, EMD and flap alone. Similarly, other techniques, such as ADM, EMD, PRF and TEC, showed superior scores for GM compared with flap, which is due to higher root coverage outcomes that these treatments can achieve when CAF or TUN are combined with a scaffold material or a biologic agent (Cairo et al., 2014; Tavelli et al., 2020a, 2020b).

Interestingly, CTG showed lower scores than CAF for some RES parameters, as STT and GC. In line with this finding, a recent article found that CAF alone had better final RES when the gingival thickness at baseline was >0.82 mm, suggesting caution regarding the excessive use of CTG in patients with a thick gingival phenotype (Cairo et al., 2020; Cairo, Pagliaro, et al., 2016). Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that adding a CTG in a case with thick phenotype may result in an unnatural appearance of the gingiva compared to the untreated adjacent sites. The selective use of CTG has been also recently advocated by Stefanini et al., who suggested its use only in case with gingival thickness <1 mm or keratinized tissue width ≤ 1 mm (Stefanini, Zucchelli, Marzadori, & de Sanctis, 2018). It has to be mentioned despite taking baseline characteristics (multiple/single recession treatment, initial recession depth, etc.) into account in our analyses, not all studies reported gingival thickness, which may have affected our results.

A recent study evaluated the aesthetic outcomes from a multicenter randomized clinical trial comparing CAF + CTG versus CAF + XCM (Pelekos et al., 2019). Although CTG achieved an overall higher RES than XCM, the authors reported superior scores with XCM for STT and MTC (Pelekos et al., 2019). In line with this study, we observed that CAF + GS (either XCM or ADM) obtained better MTC than CAF alone. This may be due to the scaffold properties of XCM and ADM that improve the stability

of the blood clot promoting cellular migration and proliferation (Tavelli et al., 2020b). We also found that TUN + GS obtained a superior MGJ score than CAF; however, the reasons for this finding are open to speculations.

Patient satisfaction and morbidity are also important parameters when evaluating patient-related outcomes in root coverage procedures (McGuire, Scheyer, & Gwaltney, 2014; Mounssif et al., 2018; Rocha Dos Santos et al., 2017; Tonetti et al., 2018). In a commentary discussing the importance of incorporating PROMs into clinical trials, the use of specific questions for evaluating patients' anxiety, discomfort, preference and aesthetics was advocated (McGuire et al., 2014). Recent studies have investigated the impact of different treatments not only on patient morbidity but also in condition-specific health-related quality of life (Rocha Dos Santos et al., 2017; Tonetti et al., 2018). Our analysis showed that CAF + CTG obtained higher patient satisfaction scores than CAF and that CTG and CTG + EMD showed higher satisfaction scores than flap alone. This finding is most likely related to the superior recession reduction and complete root coverage that CTG and CTG + EMD can achieve over treatment with flap alone. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the final satisfaction is not able to capture the possible patient post-surgical discomfort (Cairo, Pagliaro, et al., 2016). Indeed, CAF + CTG and TUN + CTG were the only treatments that showed significantly higher morbidity than flap alone. Although it has been suggested that TUN is a less invasive technique than CAF (Gobbato et al., 2016; Santamaria, Neves, et al., 2017), it can be speculated that when the procedure also involves the harvesting of a CTG, the difference in morbidity may no longer be remarkable. This aspect should be further investigated by studies comparing TUN versus CAF without graft materials. When CAF and TUN were compared using the graft substitute (ADM), one study reported less post-operative discomfort for TUN + ADM compared to CAF + ADM (Papageorgakopoulos, Greenwell, Hill, Vidal, & Scheetz, 2008), while another study did not find any differences (Tavelli, Barootchi, Di Gianfilippo, et al., 2019). Our results confirm that CTG-based techniques increase patient morbidity compared to flap alone, while adding a GS does not. Among the advantages of using GS compared to CTG, a lower patient self-reported pain score, analgesic consumption and shorter time to recovery have been described (Tonetti et al., 2018). This aspect needs to be kept in mind since emerging evidence suggests that CTG should not be considered as the *panacea* for the treatment of gingival recessions, since similar root coverage outcomes can be obtained with flap alone in the presence of a thick gingival phenotype (Cairo et al., 2020). A cost-effective evaluation should be performed for each patient to decide the best treatment option considering the clinical, aesthetic- and patient-related outcomes (Pelekos et al., 2019). Patients' psychosocial factors, such as anxiety, depression, stress and well-being, should also be taken into account as they can affect the overall perception of the procedure, post-surgical morbidity and medication consumption (Klooster, Eber, Wang, & Inglehart, 2006).

Limitations of this manuscript may be due to the fact that analysis on single RES variables was performed only on 18 RCTs. Furthermore, a certain degree of heterogeneity in RES assessment (visual versus assessment on photographs) exists among studies, and, that our evaluation captures aesthetic outcomes at only short-time follow-up, while possible changes in the long-term should be assessed. Lastly, most of the included RCTs investigated CAF, CTG, ADM or XCM, while fewer publications have investigated the treatment arms of PRF, TEC and EMD.

5 | CONCLUSIONS

Based on the currently available evidence, and the limitations within this research, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- CTG with either CAF or TUN showed superior final RES than CAF, EMD and XCM
- CAF and TUN associated with CTG showed similar final RES
- CAF achieved higher soft tissue texture and gingival colour scores than CTG
- Adding ADM or XCM to CAF improved the marginal tissue contour compared to CAF
- Higher patient satisfaction was observed for CTG and CTG + EMD compared to flap alone
- CAF + CTG and TUN + CTG had higher morbidity than flap alone, while adding ADM or XCM did not increase patient discomfort.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Dr. Rebele (Private Practice Hurzeler/Zuhr, Munich, Germany), Dr. Ahmedbeyli (Department of Periodontology, Faculty of Dentistry, Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey), Dr. João Paulo Menck Sangiorgio (Department of Prosthesis and Periodontology, Division of Periodontics, Piracicaba Dental School, State University of Campinas, Campinas, Brazil), Dr. Mauro Pedrine Santamaria (Department of Periodontology, College of Dentistry—FOSJC, UNESP—São Paulo State University, São Paulo, Brazil), Dr. Gokser Cakar (Faculty of Dentistry, Department of Periodontology, Altinbas University, Istanbul, Turkey), DR. Otto Zuhr (Private Practice Hurzeler/Zuhr, Munich, Germany) and Dr. Sebnem Dirikan Ipci (Faculty of Dentistry, Department of Periodontology, Altinbas University, Istanbul, Turkey) for providing additional data regarding the individual components of the RES. The authors also thank Dr. Sila Cagri Isler (Department of Periodontology, Faculty of Dentistry, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey) for her valuable contribution in data collection. This paper was partially supported by the University of Michigan Periodontal Graduate Student Research Fund.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors do not have any financial interests, either directly or indirectly, in the products or information listed in the paper.

ORCID

- Francesco Cairo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3781-1715>
 Shayan Barootchi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5347-6577>
 Lorenzo Tavelli  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4864-3964>
 Hom-Lay Wang  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4238-1799>
 Filippo Graziani  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8780-7306>
 Maurizio Tonetti  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2743-0137>

REFERENCES

- Ahmedbeyli, C., Dirikan Ipci, S., Cakar, G., Yilmaz, S., & Chambrone, L. (2019). Coronally advanced flap and envelope type of flap plus acellular dermal matrix graft for the treatment of thin phenotype multiple recession defects. A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46, 1024–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13174>
- Ahmedbeyli, C., Ipci, S. D., Cakar, G., Kuru, B. E., & Yilmaz, S. (2014). Clinical evaluation of coronally advanced flap with or without acellular dermal matrix graft on complete defect coverage for the treatment of multiple gingival recessions with thin tissue biotype. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 41, 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12211>
- Aichelmann-Reidy, M. E., Yukna, R. A., Evans, G. H., Nasr, H. F., & Mayer, E. T. (2001). Clinical evaluation of acellular allograft dermis for the treatment of human gingival recession. *Journal of Periodontology*, 72, 998–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2001.72.8.998>
- Aydinyurt, H. S., Tekin, Y., & Ertugrul, A. S. (2019). The effect of enamel matrix derivatives on root coverage: A 12-month follow-up of a randomized clinical trial. *Brazilian Oral Research*, 33, e006. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-3107bor-2019.vol33.0006>
- Azaripour, A., Kissinger, M., Farina, V. S., Van Noorden, C. J., Gerhold-Ay, A., Willershausen, B., & Cortellini, P. (2016). Root coverage with connective tissue graft associated with coronally advanced flap or tunnel technique: A randomized, double-blind, mono-centre clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 43, 1142–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12627>
- Bansal, A., Kulloli, A., Kathariya, R., Shetty, S., Jain, H., & Raikar, S. (2016). Comparative evaluation of coronally advanced flap with and without bioactive glass putty in the management of gingival recession defects: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of the International Academy of Periodontology*, 18, 7–15.
- Barootchi, S., Tavelli, L., Di Gianfilippo, R., Byun, H. Y., Oh, T. J., Barbato, L., ... Wang, H. L. (2019). Long term assessment of root coverage stability using connective tissue graft with or without an epithelial collar for gingival recession treatment. A 12-year follow-up from a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46, 1124–1133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13187>
- Barootchi, S., Tavelli, L., Zucchelli, G., Giannobile, W. V., & Wang, H. L. (2020). Gingival phenotype modification therapies on natural teeth: A network meta-analysis. *Journal of Periodontology*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.19-0715>
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. M., Steven, C. W. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Cairo, F. (2017). Periodontal plastic surgery of gingival recessions at single and multiple teeth. *Periodontology 2000*, 75(1), 296–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12186>
- Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., Nieri, M., Pilloni, A., Barbato, L., Pagavino, G., & Tonetti, M. (2020). Coronally advanced flap and composite restoration of the enamel with or without connective tissue graft for the treatment of single maxillary gingival recession with non-carious cervical lesion. A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 47, 362–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13229>
- Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., Pilloni, A., Nieri, M., Cincinelli, S., Amunni, F., ... Tonetti, M. S. (2016). Clinical efficacy of coronally advanced flap with or without connective tissue graft for the treatment of multiple adjacent gingival recessions in the aesthetic area: A randomized

- controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 43, 849–856. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12590>
- Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., Tonetti, M., Nieri, M., Mervelt, J., Cincinelli, S., & Pini-Prato, G. (2012). Coronally advanced flap with and without connective tissue graft for the treatment of single maxillary gingival recession with loss of inter-dental attachment. A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 39, 760–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-051X.2012.01903.x>
- Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., Tonetti, M., Nieri, M., Mervelt, J., Pagavino, G., & Pini-Prato, G. P. (2015). Stability of root coverage outcomes at single maxillary gingival recession with loss of interdental attachment: 3-year extension results from a randomized, controlled, clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 42, 575–581. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12412>
- Cairo, F., Nieri, M., Cattabriga, M., Cortellini, P., De Paoli, S., De Sanctis, M., ... Pini-Prato, G. P. (2010). Root coverage esthetic score after treatment of gingival recession: An interrater agreement multicenter study. *Journal of Periodontology*, 81, 1752–1758. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2010.100278>
- Cairo, F., Nieri, M., Cincinelli, S., Mervelt, J., & Pagliaro, U. (2011). The interproximal clinical attachment level to classify gingival recessions and predict root coverage outcomes: An explorative and reliability study. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 38, 661–666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-051X.2011.01732.x>
- Cairo, F., Nieri, M., & Pagliaro, U. (2014). Efficacy of periodontal plastic surgery procedures in the treatment of localized facial gingival recessions. A systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 41(Suppl 15), S44–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12182>
- Cairo, F., Pagliaro, U., Buti, J., Baccini, M., Graziani, F., Tonelli, P., ... Tonetti, M. S. (2016). Root coverage procedures improve patient aesthetics. A systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 43, 965–975. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12603>
- Cairo, F., Rotundo, R., Miller, P. D., & Pini-Prato, G. P. (2009). Root coverage esthetic score: A system to evaluate the esthetic outcome of the treatment of gingival recession through evaluation of clinical cases. *Journal of Periodontology*, 80, 705–710. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2009.080565>
- Cortellini, P., & Bissada, N. F. (2018a). Mucogingival conditions in the natural dentition: Narrative review, case definitions, and diagnostic considerations. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 45(Suppl 20), S190–S198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12948>
- Csardi, G., & Tamás, N. (2006). The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal Complex Systems*, 1695.
- Fernandes-Dias, S. B., de Marco, A. C., Santamaria, M. Jr, Kerbauy, W. D., Jardini, M. A., & Santamaria, M. P. (2015). Connective tissue graft associated or not with low laser therapy to treat gingival recession: Randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 42, 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12328>
- Gobbato, L., Nart, J., Bressan, E., Mazzocco, F., Paniz, G., & Lops, D. (2016). Patient morbidity and root coverage outcomes after the application of a subepithelial connective tissue graft in combination with a coronally advanced flap or via a tunneling technique: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Clinical Oral Investigations*, 20, 2191–2202. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-016-1721-7>
- Graziani, F., Gennai, S., Roldan, S., Discepoli, N., Buti, J., Madianos, P., & Herrera, D. (2014). Efficacy of periodontal plastic procedures in the treatment of multiple gingival recessions. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 41(Suppl 15), S63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12172>
- Higgins, J. P., Altman, D. G., Gotzsche, P. C., Juni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., ... Sterne, J. A. C. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, 343, d5928. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d5928>
- Isaia, F., Gyurko, R., Roomian, T. C., & Hawley, C. E. (2018). The root coverage esthetic score: Intra-examiner reliability among dental students and dental faculty. *Journal of Periodontology*, 89, 833–839. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.17-0556>
- Jepsen, K., Jepsen, S., Zucchelli, G., Stefanini, M., de Sanctis, M., Baldini, N., ... & Sanz, M. (2013). Treatment of gingival recession defects with a coronally advanced flap and a xenogeneic collagen matrix: a multicenter randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol*, 40, 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12019>
- Jhaveri, H. M., Chavan, M. S., Tomar, G. B., Deshmukh, V. L., Wani, M. R., & Miller, P. D. Jr (2010). Acellular dermal matrix seeded with autologous gingival fibroblasts for the treatment of gingival recession: A proof-of-concept study. *Journal of Periodontology*, 81, 616–625. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2009.090530>
- Kerner, S., Katsahian, S., Sarfati, A., Korngold, S., Jankmakjian, S., Tavernier, B., ... Bouchard, P. (2009). A comparison of methods of aesthetic assessment in root coverage procedures. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 36, 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-051X.2008.01348.x>
- Klooster, P. W., Eber, R. M., Wang, H. L., & Inglehart, M. R. (2006). Surgical versus non-surgical periodontal treatment: Psychosocial factors and treatment outcomes. *Journal of Periodontology*, 77, 1253–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2006.050302>
- Kuka, S., Ipci, S. D., Cakar, G., & Yilmaz, S. (2018). Clinical evaluation of coronally advanced flap with or without platelet-rich fibrin for the treatment of multiple gingival recessions. *Clinical Oral Investigations*, 22, 1551–1558. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-017-2225-9>
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- McGuire, M. K., Scheyer, E. T., & Gwaltney, C. (2014). Commentary: Incorporating patient-reported outcomes in periodontal clinical trials. *Journal of Periodontology*, 85, 1313–1319. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2014.130693>
- Milinkovic, I., Aleksic, Z., Jankovic, S., Popovic, O., Bajic, M., Cacic, S., & Lekovic, V. (2015). Clinical application of autologous fibroblast cell culture in gingival recession treatment. *Journal of Periodontal Research*, 50, 363–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jre.12215>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 62, 1006–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005>
- Mounssif, I., Stefanini, M., Mazzotti, C., Marzadori, M., Sangiorgi, M., & Zucchelli, G. (2018). Esthetic evaluation and patient-centered outcomes in root-coverage procedures. *Periodontology 2000*, 77, 19–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12216>
- Neves, F., Augusto Silveira, C., Mathias-Santamaria, I. F., Miguel, M. M. V., Ferraz, L. F. F., Casarin, R. C. V., ... Santamaria, M. P. (2019). Randomized clinical trial evaluating single maxillary gingival recession treatment with connective tissue graft and tunnel or trapezoidal flap: 2-year follow-up. *Journal of Periodontology*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.19-0436>
- Ozcelik, O., Haytac, M. C., & Seydaoglu, G. (2011). Treatment of multiple gingival recessions using a coronally advanced flap procedure combined with button application. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 38, 572–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-051X.2011.01724.x>
- Ozenci, I., Ipci, S. D., Cakar, G., & Yilmaz, S. (2015). Tunnel technique versus coronally advanced flap with acellular dermal matrix graft in the treatment of multiple gingival recessions. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 42, 1135–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12477>
- Papageorgakopoulos, G., Greenwell, H., Hill, M., Vidal, R., & Scheetz, J. P. (2008). Root coverage using acellular dermal matrix and comparing a coronally positioned tunnel to a coronally positioned flap approach. *Journal of Periodontology*, 79, 1022–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2008.070546>
- Pelekos, G., Lu, J. Z., Ho, D. K. L., Graziani, F., Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., & Tonetti, M. S. (2019). Aesthetic assessment after root coverage of multiple adjacent recessions with coronally advanced flap with adjunctive collagen matrix or connective tissue graft: Randomized

- clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46, 564–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13103>
- Pietruska, M., Skurska, A., Podlewski, L., Milewski, R., & Pietruski, J. (2019). Clinical evaluation of Miller class I and II recessions treatment with the use of modified coronally advanced tunnel technique with either collagen matrix or subepithelial connective tissue graft: A randomized clinical study. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46, 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13031>
- Pini-Prato, G., Franceschi, D., Rotundo, R., Cairo, F., Cortellini, P., & Nieri, M. (2012). Long-term 8-year outcomes of coronally advanced flap for root coverage. *Journal of Periodontology*, 83(5), 590–594. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2011.110410>
- Rocha Dos Santos, M., Sangiorgio, J. P. M., Neves, F., Franca-Grohmann, I. L., Nociti, F. H. Jr, Silverio Ruiz, K. G., ... Sallum, E. A. (2017). Xenogenous collagen matrix and/or enamel matrix derivative for treatment of localized gingival recessions: A randomized clinical trial. Part II: Patient-reported Outcomes. *Journal of Periodontology*, 88, 1319–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2017.170127>
- Roman, A., Soanca, A., Kasaj, A., & Stratul, S. I. (2013). Subepithelial connective tissue graft with or without enamel matrix derivative for the treatment of Miller class I and II gingival recessions: A controlled randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Periodontal Research*, 48, 563–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jre.12039>
- Salanti, G. (2012). Indirect and mixed-treatment comparison, network, or multiple-treatments meta-analysis: Many names, many benefits, many concerns for the next generation evidence synthesis tool. *Res Synth Methods*, 3, 80–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1037>
- Salhi, L., Lecloux, G., Seidel, L., Rompen, E., & Lambert, F. (2014). Coronally advanced flap versus the pouch technique combined with a connective tissue graft to treat Miller's class I gingival recession: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 41, 387–395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12207>
- Sangiorgio, J. P. M., Neves, F., Rocha Dos Santos, M., Franca-Grohmann, I. L., Casarin, R. C. V., Casati, M. Z., ... Sallum, E. A. (2017). Xenogenous collagen matrix and/or enamel matrix derivative for treatment of localized gingival recessions: A randomized clinical trial. Part I: Clinical Outcomes. *Journal of Periodontology*, 88, 1309–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2017.170126>
- Santamaria, M. P., Fernandes-Dias, S. B., Araujo, C. F., da Silva, L., Neves, F., Mathias, I. F., ... Neves Jardim, M. A. (2017). 2-Year assessment of tissue biostimulation with low-level laser on the outcomes of connective tissue graft in the treatment of single gingival recession: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Periodontology*, 88, 320–328. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2016.160391>
- Santamaria, M. P., Neves, F., Silveira, C. A., Mathias, I. F., Fernandes-Dias, S. B., Jardim, M. A. N., & Tatakis, D. N. (2017). Connective tissue graft and tunnel or trapezoidal flap for the treatment of single maxillary gingival recessions: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 44, 540–547. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12714>
- Stefanini, M., Jepsen, K., de Sanctis, M., Baldini, N., Greven, B., Heinz, B., ... Zucchelli, G. (2016). Patient-reported outcomes and aesthetic evaluation of root coverage procedures: A 12-month follow-up of a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 43, 1132–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12626>
- Stefanini, M., Zucchelli, G., Marzadori, M., & de Sanctis, M. (2018). Coronally advanced flap with site-specific application of connective tissue graft for the treatment of multiple adjacent gingival recessions: a 3-year follow-up case series. *The International Journal of Periodontics & Restorative Dentistry*, 38, 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.11607/prd.3438>
- Tavelli, L., Barootchi, S., Cairo, F., Rasperini, G., Shedden, K., & Wang, H. L. (2019). The effect of time on root coverage outcomes: a network meta-analysis. *Journal of Dental Research*, 98, 1195–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034519867071>
- Tavelli, L., Barootchi, S., Di Gianfilippo, R., Modarressi, M., Cairo, F., Rasperini, G., & Wang, H. L. (2019). Acellular dermal matrix and coronally advanced flap or tunnel technique in the treatment of multiple adjacent gingival recessions. A 12-year follow-up from a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46, 937–948. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13163>
- Tavelli, L., Barootchi, S., Nguyen, T. V. N., Tattan, M., Ravida, A., & Wang, H. L. (2018). Efficacy of tunnel technique in the treatment of localized and multiple gingival recessions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Periodontology*, 89, 1075–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.18-0066>
- Tavelli, L., McGuire, M. K., Zucchelli, G., Rasperini, G., Feinberg, S. E., Wang, H. L., & Giannobile, W. V. (2020). Biologics-based regenerative technologies for periodontal soft tissue engineering. *Journal of Periodontology*, 91, 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.19-0352>
- Tavelli, L., McGuire, M. K., Zucchelli, G., Rasperini, G., Feinberg, S. E., Wang, H. L., & Giannobile, W. V. (2020). Extracellular matrix-based scaffolding technologies for periodontal and peri-implant soft tissue regeneration. *Journal of Periodontology*, 91, 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JPER.19-0351>
- Tavelli, L., Ravida, A., Lin, G. H., Del Amo, F. S., Tattan, M., & Wang, H. L. (2019). Comparison between subepithelial connective tissue graft and de-epithelialized gingival graft: A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of the International Academy of Periodontology*, 21, 82–96.
- Tonetti, M. S., Cortellini, P., Pellegrini, G., Nieri, M., Bonaccini, D., Allegri, M., ... Zuhr, O. (2018). Xenogenic collagen matrix or autologous connective tissue graft as adjunct to coronally advanced flaps for coverage of multiple adjacent gingival recession: Randomized trial assessing non-inferiority in root coverage and superiority in oral health-related quality of life. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 45, 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12834>
- Tu, Y. K. (2015). Linear mixed model approach to network meta-analysis for continuous outcomes in periodontal research. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 42, 204–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12362>
- Wang, H. L., Bunyaratavej, P., Labadie, M., Shyr, Y., & MacNeil, R. L. (2001). Comparison of 2 clinical techniques for treatment of gingival recession. *Journal of Periodontology*, 72, 1301–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2001.72.10.1301>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*.
- Wickham, H. H. L. (2019b). *tidyr. Tidy Messy Data*.
- Wickham, H. F., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2019a). *dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation*.
- Zucchelli, G., Marzadori, M., Mele, M., Stefanini, M., & Montebugnoli, L. (2012). Root coverage in molar teeth: A comparative controlled randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 39, 1082–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12002>
- Zuhr, O., Rebele, S. F., Schneider, D., Jung, R. E., & Hürzeler, M. B. (2014). Tunnel technique with connective tissue graft versus coronally advanced flap with enamel matrix derivative for root coverage: A RCT using 3D digital measuring methods. Part I. Clinical and patient-centred outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 41, 582–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12178>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

How to cite this article: Cairo F, Barootchi S, Tavelli L, et al. Aesthetic-And patient-related outcomes following root coverage procedures: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2020;47:1403–1415. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13346>