Laser Therapy for Peri-Implant Diseases

Lin, López del Amo, Wang

Laser Therapy for Treatment of Peri-Implant Diseases: An American Academy of Periodontology Best Evidence Review

Guo-Hao Lin*[†] Fernando Suárez López del Amo,* and Hom-Lay Wang*

* Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, MI.

† Department of Surgical Sciences, Marquette University School of Dentistry, Milwaukee,

WI.

Background: Peri-implant diseases are prevalent, with numerous therapies studied in an attempt to combat this condition. The present review aims to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of laser therapy with non-surgical or surgical therapy in managing peri-implant diseases.

Methods: An electronic search of three databases and a hand search of peer-reviewed journals for relevant articles published (in English) from January 1980 to June 2016 were performed. Human clinical trials of ≥ 10 patients with peri-implant diseases, treated with surgical or non-surgical approaches and laser therapy, and a follow-up period of ≥ 6 months, were included. Random-effects meta-analyses were performed to analyze weighted mean difference (WMD) and confidence interval for the recorded variables according to PRISMA guidelines. Risk of bias assessment was also performed for randomized controlled trials included.

Results: From 22 articles selected, 11 were included in the meta-analyses. The outcomes of using lasers as a monotherapy could not be evaluated since no controlled studies were identified. Therefore, all reported results were the outcomes of applying lasers as an adjunct to surgical/non-surgical treatment. For the non-surgical approach, WMD of probing depth (PD), clinical attachment level (CAL), bleeding on probing (BOP), plaque index (PI), marginal bone level (MBL) and recession (REC) was 0.15 mm (P = 0.50), -0.10 mm (P = 0.32), 21.08% (P = 0.02), -0.07 (P = 0.002), -0.22 mm (P = 0.04) and -0.11 mm (P = 0.34), respectively. For the surgical approach with a long-term follow up, WMD of PD, CAL, BOP, and PI was 0.45 mm (P = 0.11), 0.22 mm (P = 0.56), 7.26% (P = 0.76) and -0.09 (P = 0.84), respectively.

Conclusions: Current evidence shows laser therapy in combination with surgical/non-surgical therapy provided minimal benefit in PD reduction, CAL gain, amount of REC improvement, and PI reduction in the treatment of peri-implant diseases. Lasers when used as an adjunct to non-surgical therapy might

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been the only the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the <u>Version of Record</u>. Please cite this article as <u>doi:</u> 10.1902/jop.2017.160483

result in more BOP reduction in the short term. However, current evidence allowed for analysis of only Er:YAG, CO₂, and diode lasers. Studies on others failed to have controlled evidence supporting their evaluation. *J Periodontol* 2018;89:000-000.

KEY WORDS

Decontamination; dental implants; peri-implantitis; lasers; meta-analyses; systematic review.

Laser, an aeronym for *l*ight *a*mplification by *s*timulated *e*mission of *r*adiation, was introduced in periodontics in the 1990s1-3 as a tool in diagnostics, surgeries, and physiologic studies.4 It is a device that emits light coherently into a small, intense, and nearly non-divergent beam with sufficient energy to cut through hard and soft tissues. The effect of a laser depends on the energy emitted and absorption by the target tissue. Basically, this energy represents a monochromatic light that is collimated into a focused beam interacting with the targeted tissue by being scattered, transmitted, absorbed, or reflected (see supplementary Figure 1 in online *Journal of Periodontology*)[ID]SUPFIG1[/ID]. The power of the energy could result in effects such as warming, coagulation, or vaporization of the tissues, based on different energy levels.⁴ Therefore, lasers have myriad applications in periodontics and implant dentistry, which includes non-surgical and surgical periodontal therapy, **5**,6 gingivectomy and crown-lengthening procedures, **7**,8 as well as decontamination of implants with peri-implantitis.9

Given the increased use of dental implants in oral reconstructions, it is no surprise that recent epidemiologic research demonstrated mean prevalence rates of 43% and 22% for periimplant mucositis and peri-implantitis, respectively.10 Likewise, there is an increase in the number of studies conducted seeking an effective and predictable therapy for peri-implant diseases. It was shown that peri-implant mucositis could be effectively treated by mechanical non-surgical therapy,11 and peri-implantitis generally requires surgical interventions.12,13 Consequently, a variety of surgical approaches, such as access flap debridement, resective and regenerative procedures, implantoplasty, and lasers for implant surface decontamination, have been proposed.14

With only limited evidence in specific scenarios, the employment of lasers around implants has been proven effective in different clinical therapies, such as non-surgical treatment15 and the combination of lasers and surgical treatment; 16,17 however, conflicting results have been reported when lasers were used as a method for implant surface detoxification. 16-18 A recent review concluded that laser therapy provided identical outcomes as other surface detoxification methods with regard to probing depth (PD) reduction, clinical attachment level (CAL) gain, and radiographic bone fill.19 The tremendous heterogeneity in treatment outcomes after the application of lasers for peri-implant diseases could be attributed to three main factors: 1) the multifactorial etiology of peri-implant infections, including host- and implant- related factors, could play a major role in treatment outcomes; 20-23 2) the wide range of lasers investigated had different properties and settings (i.e., wavelength, power, waveform, pulse duration, energy/pulse, density of the energy, duration of the exposure, angulation of the energy toward the targeted tissue, peak power of the pulse, and the properties of tissue), 4 all of which could strongly influence the treatment outcomes; and 3) the frequency of use might have an impact on treatment outcomes

as several studies demonstrated positive results with repeated application of lasers to periimplant defects. 15

Despite the increasing number of investigations conducted using lasers for implant surface detoxification, significant heterogeneity and controversy still exist. Hence, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analyses is to evaluate the potential of lasers in the detoxification and treatment of peri-implant diseases.



Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome (PICO) Question24

The focused question of this systematic review was: "Do lasers used alone or as adjuncts provide better treatment and patient outcomes in the management of peri-implant mucositis or peri-implantitis"? The population selected comprised individuals with peri-implant mucositis or peri-implantitis. The intervention investigated was the use of lasers alone or as adjuncts in surgical/non-surgical therapies. The selected outcomes to be compared between individuals treated with laser and those treated without were changes in: 1) PD, 2) CAL, 3) percentage of bleeding on probing (BOP), 4) plaque index (PI), 5) recession (REC), and 6) marginal bone level (MBL).

Selection Criteria

Prospective and retrospective human case series (CS), controlled clinical trials (CCTs), or randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs) published (in English) from January 1980 to June 2016 were screened. Inclusion criteria were: 1) had ≥ 10 patients diagnosed with periimplant mucositis or peri-implantitis and treated with lasers surgically or non-surgically; 2) had a follow-up period of ≥ 6 months; and 3) reported outcomes of one of the clinical parameters (PD, CAL, BOP, PI, REC, or MBL) after the therapy. Exclusion criteria were studies published as: 1) editorials; 2) letters or comments and non-English citations; 3) animal/in vitro studies; 4) review articles; and 5) case reports/series with <10 patients.

Screening Process

Two independent examiners (G-HL and FSLA) conducted the literature search using three databases (Ovid MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Dentistry and Oral Sciences Source). The search terms used, where mh represented the MeSH terms and tiab represented title and/or abstract, in MEDLINE/PubMed were: ("peri-implantitis"[mh] OR "peri-implant mucositis"[tiab] OR "peri-implant"[tiab] OR "peri-implantis"[tiab] OR "peri-implantis"[tiab] OR peri-implantitis"[tiab] OR peri-implant[tiab] OR peri-implants[tiab] OR peri-implantitis[tiab]) AND ("laser therapy"[mh] OR "lasers, solid-state"[mh] OR laser[tiab] OR lasers[tiab]) AND English[la] NOT (letter[pt] OR comment[pt] OR editorial[pt]) The search terms used in EMBASE were: 'periimplantitis'/exp OR 'peri--implant':ab,ti OR 'peri--implant':ab,ti OR 'peri--implant':ab,ti OR 'peri--implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-implant':ab,ti OR 'peri-or ([animals]/lim NOT [humans]/lim) NOT ('letter'/exp OR 'editorial'/exp OR note:it OR erratum:it), and the search terms used in Dentistry and Oral Sciences Source

were: (DE "PERI--implantitis" OR TI "peri--implant*" OR AB "peri--implant*") AND (DE "Lasers" OR TI "Laser*" OR AB "Laser*")

A hand search was also performed for all offline journals (January 1980 to June 2016). Furthermore, a search in the references of included papers as well as the related systematic reviews was conducted for publications not electronically identified. The two reviewers (G-HL and FSLA) examined the pre-identified articles in full text, and their eligibility for this review was confirmed after discussion. The level of agreement between reviewers regarding study inclusion was calculated with κ statistics.

Statistical Analyses

Two reviewers (G-HL and FSLA) independently extracted data from papers that met inclusion criteria. Any disagreements were reconciled after discussion with a third reviewer (H-LW). Demographics, such as study design, sample size, numbers of implants, follow-up period, treatment outcome measurements, and study conclusion, were extracted and recorded for each selected study. Authors of the selected studies were contacted if additional information regarding the study was needed for the review and meta-analyses.

The primary outcome was PD reduction, and the secondary outcome was changes in recorded peri-implant parameters. The pooled weighted mean difference (WMD) and the 95% confidence interval (CI) of each variable were estimated using a computer program.[‡] Random effects meta-analyses of the selected studies were applied to minimize bias caused by methodologic differences among studies. Forest plots were generated to represent WMD and 95% CI in primary and secondary outcomes for all included studies using number of dental implants as the unit of analysis. Heterogeneity was assessed with χ^2 test and I^2 test, which ranged between 0% and 100% with the lower values representing less heterogeneity. If a study presented more than one test/control arm, the outcomes of each test/control group were combined. The reporting of these meta-analyses adhered to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analyses) statement.25

Risk of Bias Assessment

Criteria used to assess the quality of the selected RCTs were modified from the RCTs checklist of the Cochrane Center26 and the CONSORT statement,27 which provided guidelines for the following parameters: 1) sequence generation; 2) allocation concealment method; 3) masking of examiner; 4) adequate handling of incomplete outcome data; and 5) absence of selective outcome reporting. The degree of bias was categorized as low risk (if all criteria were met), moderate risk (when only one criterion was missing), or high risk (if two or more criteria were missing). Two reviewers (G-HL and FSLA) assessed all included articles independently (see supplementary Table 1 in online *Journal of Periodontology*).[ID]SUPPTBL1[/ID]

Level of Evidence Assessment

The level of currently available evidence for lasers in treatment of peri-implant diseases was examined. The authors categorized the evidence level based on the following criteria: 1) "no evidence" (represents no RCTs or CCTs were identified to warrant the treatment benefit); 2) "limited evidence" (represents ≤ 3 RCTs or CCTs were identified); and 3) "some evidence"

(represents >3 RCTs or CCTs were identified) (see supplementary Table 2 in online *Journal of Periodontology*)[ID]SUPPTBL2[/ID].

RESULTS

The screening process is shown in [ID]FIG1[/ID]Figure 1. Electronic and hand searches yielded 237 articles, of which 27 were selected for full-text evaluation after screening of titles and abstracts. Five articles 28-32 were then further excluded due to the following: 1) being an in vitro study, 31 2) use of a light-emitting diode source instead of laser; 30, 32 and 3) no clinical data reported. 28, 29 Twenty-two total articles 9, 15-18, 33-49 were included in this systematic review. The main features and conclusions of the included studies are summarized in [ID]TBL1[/ID]Table 1 (non-surgical) and [ID]TBL2[/ID]Table 2 (surgical). Eleven papers (nine RCTs9, 16, 18, 34, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 and two CCTs48, 49) that met the inclusion criteria were included for meta-analyses. It is worth noting that currently no controlled studies are identified offering evidence of lasers used as a monotherapy in the treatment of peri-implantitis. The x value for inter-reviewer agreement for potentially relevant articles was 0.93 (titles and abstracts) and 0.97 (full-text articles), indicating an "almost perfect" agreement between the two reviewers.50

Features of the Included Studies

Among the 22 human clinical trials, lasers were used as an adjunct to non-surgical interventions in 13 studies (Table 1) 15,34-37,40-43,45,47-49 In the other nine studies,9,16-18,33,38,39,44,46 lasers were used with a surgical approach (Table 2). Although the current review aims to investigate the effect of adjunctive laser treatment on clinical outcomes of peri-implant diseases, most of the included articles focused on peri-implantitis, and only three studies 47-49 used lasers as an adjunct in the treatment of peri-implant mucositis. Seven studies 9,16-18,33,38,44 introduced guided bone regeneration (GBR) procedures as part of surgical treatment with either non-resorbable 16,33 or absorbable 9,17,18,38,44 membranes. Most of the treated implants in the selected studies were rough-surfaced implants, 9,15-18,33-35,38-49 whereas smooth-surfaced implants were more commonly found in the non-surgical laser-treated approach. 36,37 Among the selected studies that examined a surgical treatment modality, the diode laser was used in three studies, 33,39,46 the carbon dioxide (CO₂) laser in two studies 16,17, and the erbium: yttrium-aluminum-garnet (Er:YAG) laser in four studies.9,18,38,44 For studies that used a non-surgical treatment approach, the diode laser was used in eight studies, 15, 40-43, 45, 48, 49 and the Er: YAG laser was introduced in five studies.34-37,47 The selected articles generally included mechanical hand curettage with plastic, titanium, or carbon fiber curets. However, air abrasives, 16, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43 chlorhexidine rinse, 9,34 or locally delivered antibiotics 41,43 were applied in some studies. The follow-up period ranged from 618,39,44,46 to 6016 months in studies that used the surgical approach and 6 to 12 months in those with the non-surgical approach. 15, 34-37, 40-43,45,47-49

Meta-analyses conducted in the current study only include CCTs and RCTs with data comparing the clinical parameters between groups with and without adjunctive laser treatment. For non-surgical treatment, all included studies had a follow-up period of 6 to 12 months; therefore, only short-term clinical outcomes could be analyzed. For surgical groups, two studies9,16 reported data after a 48-month follow-up period; therefore, short-term and

long-term outcomes were analyzed separately. Two articles by Schwarz et al.9,38 were follow-up studies of an early study.18 Similarly, Renvert et al.37 and Persson et al.36 retrieved data from the same population. Therefore, repeated data were not included in metaanalyses. Most studies9,15-18,34-49 reported a PD and BOP reduction with CAL gain when defects were treated surgically or non-surgically. Higher mean PD reduction was generally achieved in the group augmented with bone grafts and membranes. Slight MBL loss was reported in some non-surgical treatment groups using lasers.37,45,49 When compared with mechanical debridement and antiseptics in combination with a surgical approach, the addition of laser treatment group, the addition of lasers showed significant reduction of BOP compared with the non-laser treatment group. However, a slight but significant MBL loss was also detected in the laser treatment group.

Short-Term (<12 months) Outcomes of Non-Surgical Treatment in Combination With Lasers

Of the included studies, six articles 34,37,41,43,45,49 were selected and pooled in the metaanalyses. These six studies presented a follow-up period of 6 to 12 months, of which four studies 41,43,45,49 used the diode laser and another two studies 34,37 used the Er:YAG laser.

A total of six articles 34,37,41,43,45,49 were pooled to evaluate PD reduction. The results presented WMD of 0.24 mm (95% CI = -0.38 to 0.85 mm, P = 0.45, four studies were included 41,43,45,49), -0.07 mm (95% CI = -0.32 to 0.18 mm, P = 0.57, two studies were included 34,37), and 0.15 mm (95% CI = -0.28 to 0.57 mm, P = 0.50) for diode laser, Er:YAG laser, and overall comparison, respectively. No statistical significance was found [ID]FIG2[/ID](Fig. 2A) for any of the comparison between groups. The comparisons presented a low heterogeneity for Er:YAG laser (P = 0.59) and high heterogeneity for diode laser (P < 0.001) and overall comparisons (P < 0.001).

In terms of CAL gain, three articles 34,41,43 were analyzed. The results presented WMD of -0.12 mm (95% CI = -0.33 to 0.09 mm, P = 0.25, two studies were included 41,43), 0.10 mm (95% CI = -0.54 to 0.74 mm, P = 0.76, only one study was included 34), and -0.10 mm (95% CI = -0.30 to 0.10 mm, P = 0.32) for diode laser, Er:YAG laser, and overall comparison, respectively. No statistical significance was found (Fig. 2B) for any comparisons between groups. The comparisons presented low heterogeneity for diode laser (P = 0.35) and overall comparisons (P = 0.52).

Pertaining to BOP reduction, two articles were analyzed.34,48 The results presented WMD of 12.70% (95% CI = 10.71% to 14.69%, P < 0.001, one study48), 30.56% (95% CI = 21.68% to 39.44%, P < 0.001, one study34), and 21.08% (95% CI = 3.61% to 38.55%, P = 0.02) for diode laser, Er:YAG laser, and overall comparison, respectively. Statistical significance was found, favoring laser treatment group (Fig. 2C). However, the comparison presented a high heterogeneity for overall comparison (P = 0.001).

Regarding PL reduction, three 34,41,43 articles were analyzed. The results presented WMD of -0.07 (95% CI = -0.12 to -0.03, P = 0.002, two studies included 41,43), 0.00 (95% CI = -0.25 to 0.25, P > 0.99, one study 34), and -0.07 (95% CI = -0.12 to -0.03, P = 0.002) for diode laser, Lt YAG laser, and overall comparisons, respectively. Statistical significance was found for diode laser and overall comparisons, favoring non-laser treatment group (Fig.

2D). The comparisons presented a low heterogeneity for diode laser (P = 0.41) and overall comparison (P = 0.60).

The outcome of MBL was reported in three articles. 37,45,48 The results presented WMD of -0.23 mm (95% CI = -0.50 to 0.04 mm, P = 0.10, two studies were included 45,48), -0.20 mm (95% CI = -0.53 to 0.13 mm, P = 0.24, one study 37), and -0.22 mm (95% CI = -0.43 to -0.01, P = 0.04) for diode laser, Er:YAG laser, and overall comparisons, respectively. Statistical significance was found for diode laser and overall comparisons, favoring control group (Fig. 2E). The comparisons presented a high heterogeneity for diode laser (P = 0.003) and overall comparison (P = 0.01).

In terms of REC, three articles were analyzed. 34,41,43 The results presented WMD of -0.17 mm (95% CI = -0.44 to 0.11 mm, P = 0.24, two studies were included41,43), 0.00 mm (95% CI = -0.37 to 0.37 mm, P > 0.99, one study34), and -0.11 mm (95% CI = -0.33 to 0.11 mm, P = 0.34) for diode laser, Er:YAG laser, and overall comparison, respectively. No statistical significance was found (Fig. 2F) for any of the comparison between groups. The comparisons presented a low heterogeneity for diode laser (<math>P = 0.62) and overall comparisons (P = 0.69).

Short-Term (≤12 months) Outcomes of Surgical Treatment in Combination With Lasers

Of the included studies, two articles 18,39 were selected and pooled in meta-analyses. Both articles reported treatment outcomes after a 6-month follow-up.

For PD reduction, an overall WMD of 0.08 mm (95% CI = -1.28 to 1.44 mm) between laser treatment group and conventional treatment group with no statistical significance (*P* = 0.91) was found [ID]FIG3[/ID](Fig. 3A). The comparisons presented a high heterogeneity among selected studies (*P* value for χ^2 test = 0.006 and *I*² test = 87%).

In terms of CAL gain, an overall WMD of -0.03 mm (95% CI = -1.13 to 1.07 mm), with no statistical significance (P = 0.96) was found (Fig. 3B). The comparisons presented a high heterogeneity among selected studies (P value for χ^2 test= 0.02 and I^2 test= 83%).

An overall WMD of 9.88% (95% CI = -26.46% to 46.21%), with no statistical significance (*P* = 0.59) with regard to BOP reduction was found (Fig. 3C). The comparisons presented a moderate-to-high heterogeneity among selected studies (*P* value for χ^2 test = 0.05 and I^2 test = 73%).

Since there was only one comparative study 18 reporting differences in PI and REC between test and control groups, the meta-analyses could not be performed. Based on this article, mean difference was -0.10 (95% CI = -0.47 to 0.27) for PI and 0.0 mm (95% CI = -0.17 to 0.17 mm) for REC, with no detectable statistical significance (P = 0.60 for PI; P > 0.99 for REC) between groups. In addition, no short-term studies reported outcomes of MBL change; therefore, short-term MBL change between groups could not be evaluated.

Long-Term (≥48 months) Outcomes of Surgical Treatment in Combination With Lasers

Among the included studies, two articles 9,16 were selected and pooled in the meta-analyses to evaluate the long-term treatment outcomes. One study 9 was a 4-year follow-up of a previous study. 18 Another study, by Deppe et al., 16 reported treatment outcomes after a 60-month follow-up.

An overall WMD of 0.45 mm (95% CI = -0.10 to 1.00 mm) between laser treatment group and conventional treatment group, with no statistical significance (P = 0.11) was found for PD reduction [ID]FIG4[/ID](Fig. 4A). The comparisons presented a low heterogeneity among selected studies (P value for χ^2 test = 0.64 and I^2 test = 0%).

In terms of CAL gain, an overall WMD of 0.22 mm (95% CI = -0.52 to 0.95 mm), with no statistical significance (P = 0.56) was found (Fig. 4B). The comparisons presented a low heterogeneity among selected studies (P value for χ^2 test = 0.52 and I^2 test = 0%).

Pertaining to BOP reduction, an overall WMD of 7.26% (95% CI = -38.77% to 53.29%), with no statistical significance (P = 0.76) was found (Fig. 4C). The comparisons presented a high heterogeneity among selected studies (P value for χ^2 test = 0.03 and I^2 test = 80%).

An overall WMD of -0.09 (95% CI = -0.95 to 0.77), with no statistical significance (P = 0.84) was found for PI reduction (Fig. 4D). The comparisons presented a moderate heterogeneity among selected studies (P value for χ^2 test = 0.06 and I^2 test = 71%).

Only one comparative study reported MBL16 differences between test and control groups, likewise for differences in REC.9 As a result, the meta-analysis could not be performed Based on these studies, mean difference of MBL and REC was 0.64 mm (95% CI = -0.24 to 1.52 mm) and 0.20 mm (95% CI = -0.35 to 0.75 mm), respectively, with no statistical significance (P = 0.15 for MBL and P = 0.47 for REC) detected between groups.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The results of the risk of bias assessment for included RCTs are summarized in supplementary Table 1 in the online *Journal of Periodontology*. Four studies 34,36,37,41 had low risk of bias, three studies 18,39,46 had moderate risk of bias, and three studies 9,43,45 had high risk of bias.

Level of Evidence Assessment

The results of level of evidence assessment are reported in supplementary Table 2 in the online *Journal of Periodontology*. No evidence is currently available to support the use of lasers in treatment of peri-implant mucositis. As for non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis, some evidence presented controversial clinical benefits of adjunct laser treatment in the short term, but no evidence was found to support the long-term benefits. As for surgical treatment of peri-implantitis, limited evidence presented controversial short-term clinical benefits and no long-term benefits.

DISCUSSION

While previous studies 51,52 suggested that peri-implant mucositis might be successfully treated if detected early and when combined with non-surgical treatment, a complete resolution of peri-implant inflammation was not commonly obtained. 53 Therefore, the current review aims to identify the potential benefit of adjunctive laser therapy in the

treatment of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis. However, among the selected 22 human clinical trials, only three studies 47-49 included patients with peri-implant mucositis; other studies only selected patients with peri-implantitis. In a study by Schwarz et al., 47 carbon eurets and chlorhexidine rinse for surface detoxification were used to treat peri-implant mucositis, while Er:YAG laser was used to treat peri-implantitis. Although both groups achieved short-term significant clinical improvements, a complete disease resolution was not achieved in the majority of the study patients. Another two studies 48,49 compared the effect of mechanical debridement with or without adjunctive diode laser treatment on clinical outcomes of peri-implant diseases and reported significant reduction of PD and BOP if the laser was used. However, since the disease status (peri-implant mucositis or peri-implantitis) of the participants was not clearly demarcated in the analysis of the treatment outcomes, the evidence supporting the use of lasers to treat peri-implant mucositis was limited. Currently the efficacy of non-surgical treatment of peri-implant mucositis with or without using lasers could not be warranted, and more RCTs should be conducted in the future to investigate this topic.

Pertaining to treatment of peri-implantitis, the current review and meta-analyses failed to detect significant PD reduction and CAL gain when lasers were used together with nonsurgical and surgical therapies. This result was consistent with previously published systematic reviews. 19,54 However, the current review identified two recent articles 39,46 that introduced the diode laser in the surgical management of peri-implantitis. While both studies demonstrated promising outcomes in PD reduction and CAL gain when the laser was used versus mechanical debridement only, the WMD presented less than 1 mm for both parameters. Therefore, the adjunctive use of diode laser in surgical treatment of peri-implantitis appeared to be effective; however, its efficacy still required further investigations.

When considering the benefit of GBR procedures in treating peri-implant defects, most of the defects that had GBR achieved better outcomes in terms of PD reduction, CAL gain, and MBL gain.9,16-18,33,38,44 However, an addition of lasers to GBR procedures did not present further improvement to the peri-implant parameters.9,16,18,38 Therefore, GBR procedures should be considered as a standard treatment modality irrespective of the use of lasers when dealing with intrabony peri-implant defects.44

Peri-implant tissue recession after surgical therapy with and without adjunctive laser treatment was only reported from a series of publications by Schwarz et al.9,18,38 In their studies, the same population was followed up to 48 months, and slight recession, ranging from 0.1 to 0.3 mm, was observed. For the intervention, no significant change in soft tissue level (ranging from 0.03 to 0.3 mm) was observed in studies 34,41,43 that evaluated non-surgical therapy with and without laser. Therefore, the current evidence revealed that adjunctive laser treatment combined with surgical/non-surgical therapies did not interfere with peri-implant soft tissue levels.

Conflicting data on BOP reduction was reported in selected studies. 9,18,34,38,39,46,48 Some studies reported significant BOP reduction when lasers were introduced. 34,39,48 On the contrary, other studies 9,18,38,46 did not find significant BOP reduction as compared with conventional treatment. It appeared that the adjunctive use of lasers with non-surgical therapy might decrease BOP after a short follow-up period of 6 to 12 months. This could be explained by the coagulation or vaporization of the tissues after laser treatment, and reflects the truth that a long-term control of tissue inflammation might be related to maintenance

protocol instead of active treatment. However, when adjunctive lasers were used in surgical treatment, there was no significant BOP reduction detected.9,16 Interestingly, previous studies have reported a higher percentage of BOP around dental implants despite lower plaque scores and fewer signs of inflammation.21,55 Also, higher sensitivity of probing around dental implants compared with probing around teeth has been reported;56 therefore, clinicians should be aware that the presence of BOP might not accurately represent the inflammatory status of the peri-implant tissues. Also, absence of BOP might have limited diagnostic value.57 As such, clinicians should evaluate this parameter cautiously and not apply the presence of BOP as a criterion of treatment outcomes.

The results of this meta-analysis showed no additional benefit in PI reduction when lasers were used as an adjunct to conventional intervention. Interestingly most data reported a minimal difference in PI (a change of <1) between baseline and the final follow-up appointment in groups with and without laser treatment. Therefore, it could be assumed that the outcome of PI reduction might not be significantly related to treatment modalities. Other factors, such as maintenance protocol 58 or the use of locally delivered antibiotics, 41,43 might have a larger impact on PI reduction.

Most studies that evaluated surgical interventions used GBR in the treatment of both test and control groups.9,16-18,33,38,44 Therefore, MBL could not be accurately evaluated since this difference might not be related to the adjunctive use of laser therapy. When performing non-surgical treatment, a statistically significant MBL loss was detected (-0.22 mm with 95% CI = -0.43 to -0.01, P = 0.04) in the laser-treated group compared with the control group. This might be a result of uncontrolled temperature increase in the laser-treated area, thus further jeopardizing the healing outcomes.45,59 However, when interpreting this result, clinicians should be aware that only three studies^{37,45,48} were pooled in the meta-analyses and this difference was minimal in terms of clinical significance. Nonetheless, after repeated application of a diode laser, Mettraux et al.15 reported sound improvement in clinical parameters for implants affected by peri-implantitis. Results from this study opened a new area of future research to investigate the need for repeated laser applications to decontaminate an implant surface.

Comparisons of bacterial profile between treatment with and without adjunctive laser therapy were recorded in six studies. 28,29,36 39,43,45 Among these six studies, three studies28,29,39 introduced surgical approaches, while the remaining three studies had nonsurgical treatment 36,43,45 Bach et al.,28 in an early study, reported that the elimination of certain pathogenic bacteria with diode laser could be maintained at the 60-month follow-up in 10 of 15 patients. Moreover, significant reduction of black-pigmented, Gram-negative anaerobic bacteria was noted throughout the study period. Similarly, Dörtbudak et al.29 used a diode laser in combination with surgical treatment to evaluate reduction of bacteria counts in patients with peri-implantitis. The results of their study showed that the combined treatment significantly reduced the bacterial counts of *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemconitans, Porphyromonas gingivalis,* and *Prevotella intermedia.* However, this study lacked a control group, and complete elimination of bacteria was never achieved. Recently, Born beccari et al.39 concluded that a diode laser, when used as an adjunct to surgical treatment, was able to reduce the bacterial biofilm by 95.2% colony-forming units (CFUs) per milliliter compared to 80.85% CFU reduction in conventional treatment group. As for non-surgical intervention, all three studies 37,43,45 that introduced laser therapy as an adjunct reported no additional benefit on the peri-implant microbiota compared with conventional mechanical debridement after a 6- to 12-month follow-up period. Interestingly, it has been reported that results of microbiologic testing are often inconsistent due to different laboratory processing;60,61 thus this information should always be interpreted cautiously. To date, there are very few clinical trials that have assessed the efficacy of various laser treatments on microbiologic outcomes; therefore, a firm conclusion cannot be drawn.

There were a number of limitations in the current systematic review and meta-analyses: 1) only 11 papers with comparable data were included in the meta-analyses; 2) a few analyses presented with high heterogeneity (this heterogeneity was related to the presence of confounding factors within and among the selected studies, for example, different study designs, follow-up periods, various lasers settings, etc.); 3) owing to the limited available data, patient-centered outcome measures, cost-effectiveness of lasers, and microbiologic data were not analyzed in the current review; 4) the systematic review only included studies written in English, which could result in a selection bias; 5) because peri-implant diseases are multifactorial and affected by numerous local and systemic factors, further investigations should evaluate the influence of both implant- and host-related factors as they both play a major role in treatment outcomes; and 6) the various definitions of peri-implant diseases as well as different measurement methods of clinical parameters might also influence the presented results. Moreover, the main parameter used for evaluation of disease status (PD) is subject to multiple variables that might affect its accuracy.

CONCLUSIONS

Current evidence allowed for analysis of only Er:YAG, CO₂, and diode lasers. Studies on others failed to have controlled evidence to support their evaluation. Since the types of lasers analyzed have different modes of action, the limited number of included studies and patients/implants evaluated makes it difficult to warrant their therapeutic values. Data on adjunctive laser treatment for peri-implant mucositis are scarce. Therefore, future clinical trials are needed to evaluate the potential benefit of this approach. Based on the results of meta-analyses, when treating peri-implantitis surgically, no differences in PD reduction, CAL gain, amount of REC, and PI reduction were found between groups with and without adjunctive laser treatment. However, controversial results have been reported in the literature. Also based on the results of meta-analyses, when treating peri-implantitis non-surgically, adjunctive laser treatment might result in more BOP reduction in the short term. However, no long-term data were available to warrant this benefit. Limited evidence showed that nonsurgical treatment with adjunctive laser therapy might result in slightly more MBL loss compared with conventional treatment and also showed a potential reduction in dark pigmented, gram-negative anaerobic bacteria when applying adjunctive diode laser therapy to surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. However, this benefit was not detected in non-surgical treatment with adjunctive laser therapy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Dr. Jia-Hui Fu (Department of Periodontics, National University of Singapore, Singapore) for her assistance in proofreading of this manuscript. The authors report no conflicts of interest related to this review.

Figure 1. Flowchart illustrating the publication selection process.



Figure 2.

Meta-analyses for the comparison of clinical parameters in non-surgical approach between groups with adjunctive laser therapy (test) and without laser therapy (control) among selected studies. A) Comparison of PD reduction; B) comparison of CAL gain; C) comparison of BOP reduction; D) comparison of PI; E) comparison of MBL loss; F) comparison of REC increase. IV = independent variable.

Aut

24	Right or Relations	Maar 30	Tetal I	Curde Mean III	M Telef	Weight .	Mean Othersney Con M. Ranslem, MPL CI	o har	Nean Bifference (2001) H. Kanalam, MPL CI
	Dode	0.00	- 24	1.0		11.85	0.010.40.014	204.1	-
	Basedinet.a. 2114"	0.11 8.44	30	1.00 0.0	1 10	17.876	-6.40 (-6.70, -6.70)	2014	-
	Areast at al. 2085" Lanatic at al. 2085"	246 1.07	101	LN 1.1	28	16.2%	1.12(1.33, 3.22)	2045 2046	L
	Rutental (97% Cit) Helerogeneity: Tay* =	6.37.09*+5	100.07	38-00	88 00010.171	- 20%	926 [838, 936]		•
	Test for scenal effect	2 = 1.75 P-++	140						
	Britag			12.10		-1.85	0.0010.000.0000		-
	Revenuel et al. 2011	08 88	ē	18 0	1 10	11.8%	6.10 (6.37, 6.17	2011	1
	Heterogeneity: Tax* =	6.80, OV-+0	n.e-	1 /P = 0 N	17-16	20.7%	491 (479, 514)		Ť
	Taul for scanul affect	2 - 1.12 P - 1	147)						
	Total (MIT: D) Helenander Text of	134 DF + 8	228	18-00	MT 0000 P	100.0%	010[028,037]	,	•
	Test for overall affect.	2-1.80 (P-1	(96)						Favon control Favon fast
		1.000		Cont.					New Yorkson (1997)
28	Work or Bubgroup	Non 18	103	Noon 5	100	Noge	H, Random, 85% El	ner.	PC Rondon, 975 CI
	ficture at al. 2018"	8.18 0.48		1.9.04	4 10	48.05	-0.010-0.01, 0.201	21+5	+
	Reventing al. 2014" Builded (MINLD)	8.08 C/M	湖	8.34 0.4	1 20	45.7%. 88.2%	025(054,638)	2044	
	Helengeneity: Tau ²	0.00 CMP=0	61.#*	10-18	tr-es				1
	E-Tra	2-149-							
	Bulture's of al. 2008	8.7 048	16	88 1.0	1	5.85.	0.00(008.8.74)	1008	±
	Helengeneily Rol a	-			14	1.0%	1.0 (4.8, 2.9)		Ŧ
	Test for sweritt effect	2+031 pro	0.16)						
	Total (975-08)	one care a		-	54		410(430,410)	,	!
	Test for sveral affect	2=0.98 (P=	0.80						4 -2 -0 -2 -4 Paroni uarini Paroni karr
		Loose		tue!	ni .		Max Officiana	_	Mon Bifeston
2C	Dog-	Mage 15	1 Tarmet	Weat	0.144	Peright	N. Senten, WN. C.	1992	N, Fandem, Hits O
	ArAnana at 2016" Subbatal (RIN-CO	209 48	34	212 :	3 33	00.7% 10.7%	12.70 (10.71, 14.80) 12.70 (10.71, 14.80)	2014	7
	Heterogeneity: Rol ap Text for overall effect	(RCADH) 2 = 10.50 (P =	8.000e+	6					
	Brillion .								
	Tolesare et al. 2008" Tolesare (MIT) CD	1213 18.1	14	21.07 14	N 14	40.75	30-00 (21-08, 38-44) 30-00 (21-08, 38-44)	2008	1
	Helenoperative Kel ap	diam'n.				-	search car, and		•
	Ted for overall effect.	2-175/8-1	198000)						-
	Heterogeneity: Taul* =	148.72, 017 -		r-18-8	1007) P	- 90%	Series (strain, series)		
	Ted for sylenil effect.	2-237/#-1	132)						Falati-comit Falati later
20	Their or Tabarcon	Lanar Mass 30	Tier	Card Max 1	ni D Tubu	more	Baar Olfferense M. Random, 101-12	Tear	Maan Difference PC Renders, 875 Cl
20	Biolo w Bolegoup	Lanar Mean 10	1.00	Carl	ы 0 тын 1 10	Wager	Ran Officeros N. Randon, 105, D	Teas	Maar Difference PC-Renders, 875 Cl
20	Bola or Bolapoue Boole Schar et al. (2015 Research at a 2014 Autoreal (2014 Ca	Later Most 90 6.10 0.1 6.0 0.1	100 20	Card Mass 3 0.16 8.1 0.21 8.3	0 Tuber	20.75 0.05	Baan Olferance M. Randon, 505, D 4481 (4, 10, 8, 20) 4481 (4, 10, 8, 20) 4471 (4, 1, 448)	7 1667 2015	Maar Offerense PC-Renders, BFS CI
20	Binto er Todagoogo Biode Schar et al. (2015 Beseutt et al. 2014 Beseutt et al. 2014 Beseutt et al. 2014 Beseutt et al. 2014 Beseutt et al. 2014	Later Muse 10 6.11 0.1 6.02 0.1	10 20 40	Carli Mass 3 0.10 11 0.21 13 1.07 13.4		8175 6175 8145	Ban Offerens N. Randon, 805 D 405 (4.13, 5.00) 407 (4.14, 448) 447 (4.14, 448)	7607 2013 2014	Maar Difference IV. Renter, BFS CI
20	Binto er Toteproze Boote Scher et al. (2010) Researt et al. 2010 Battering parts Cit Hettrogenolty, Tau' Teat for sonnal affect	Lanar Maan 10 6.0 27 1.00, 04/-1 2-2.40/P	10 20 40 87.01 8.000	Card Max 3 0.16 8.1 0.21 8.0 1.0 ² - 0.4		8175 6665	Baar-Offerenze M. Random, 105: D 4:00 (4: 10, 100) 4:00 (4: 10, 100) 4:07 (4: 10, 4:00)	7600 2013 2014	Maan Differense PC-Renters, BFS-C1
20	Thefe at Tychgroup Brote Scher et al. (2115) ¹⁷ Research at al. (2115) ¹⁷ Research at al. (2115) ¹⁷ Tel for source affect Briting Datasets et al. (2001) ¹⁸	Lange Mage 10 6 (1) 87 6 (2) 87 1 10((1)) (2 - 3.46)(P - 1) (2 - 3.46)(P - 1) (2 - 3.46)(P - 1)	17 Here 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Card Mass 3 0.16 8.1 0.21 8.1 1.0 ² - 0.4 0 8.1		2015 0015 0015	Baar-Olferense M. Bandon, 105, D 409 (473, 830) 409 (473, 830) 409 (474, 440) 500 (420, 820)	71607 30113 3014	Maan Difference PC Render, BTS C1
20	Binh at Bohapion Boha Schar et al. 2012 Research at al. 2010 References in al. 2010 References in al. 2010 References at al. Britishare et al. 2010 References at al. 2010 References at al. 2010	Lanar Musa 10 6.13 8.1 6.2 8.1 1.10, 0.4 = 1 (2 = 3.16, 9 = 1 1.10, 0.4 = 1	17 20 40 187, d1 18001	Conti Phone 3 0.16 8.1 0.21 8.4 1.07 = 0.4 0 8.1		275 0.75 0.75 0.75 0.75 0.75	Baar-Olferense M. Bandon, 105, D 4,05 (4, 13, 130) 4,05 (4, 14, 13, 130) 4,07 (4, 14, 14, 140) 4,07 (4, 14, 4, 440) 0,00 (0, 21, 0, 20)	7685 3013 3014	Maan Difference PK-Reinber, NPL C
20	Binh at Bohanoo Boha Schar et al. (2017 Research at al. 2017) References and a Strike References and a Strike References and all References at al. 2020 References at al. 2020 Referenc	Lanar Mean B2 6.13 37 6.20 37 1.30; 097 = 0 12 = 3.45; P = 0 8.22 minutes 12 = 5.35; P =	10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Carel Mana 3 0.21 8.2 1.07 1.0 8 8.2	10 Tube 10	275 605 845	Bar-Offerenze N. Barollon, 105, 12 409 (4, 13, 830) 409 (4, 14, 430) 409 (4, 14, 444) 600 (4, 24, 444) 630 (4, 24, 424)	7684 3014 3005	Muse Difference PC-Senior, UPI-CI
20	Ellefe at Technology Boots Scher et al. (2017) ¹⁰ Research at a 2014 ¹⁰ Restance (2014) ¹⁰ Restance (20	Lange Mean B2 6-13 8.7 6-10 8.7 1.80, 0.97 = 1 1.2 = 3.80, 9 = 1 6 8.20 millionitie 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 = 1 1.2 = 3.20, 9 =	17064 170 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 2	Carel <u>Base</u> 1 0.19 8.1 0.21 8.2 1.0 ² = 0.4 0 8.2 1.0 ² = 0.4		20.75 00.05 00.05 00.05 00.05 00.05	Ban Olferens N. Bandon, MD, D 449 (4, 11, 139) 449 (4, 11, 139) 449 (4, 11, 139) 449 (4, 11, 149) 049 (4, 11, 149) 447 (4, 11, 149)	7687 3014 2005	Muse Difference
20	Bindy or Technology Boots Some of al. (2007) Rearrent and 2017 Rearrent and 2017 Rearrent and 2017 Test for second affect Rearrent and 2017 Rearrent and 201	Lange Nov 12 133 33 130 00*1 2 346/* 1 12 picetia 2 320/* 130 00*1 2 320/* 130 00*1 130 00*1 1	17 1444 19 20 44 187, d* 18021 180 18021 180 180 180 180 180 180 180 180 180 18	Canti Phan 1 0.19 8.1 0.21 8.1 1.0 ² - 1.4 0 8.2 2.0 ² - 1.8	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Ban (100 mm) 10, Bandon, 100, D 400 (4 10, 100) 400 (4 10, 100)	7687 3013 2014	Muse Difference IX-Steading, NPLCI
20	Shelt an Sylapolo. Book Solar of al. (2012) ¹ Solar of al. (2012) ¹ Heating endly. Fach Heating endly. Fach Test for avoid all for Heating endly. Fach Heating effects of Heating endly. Fach Solar (2015) Cli Heating endly for Cli	Lane Mass 20 6.13 37 6.2 3.4 2.2 3.45/P - 1.2 2.3 45/P - 1.2 1.30/P - 1.2 1.30/P - 1.2 1.30/P - 1.2 1.30/P - 1.2 1.30/P -	17 Tieled 200 440 187,051 8,8021 188 18021 188 180 180 180 180 180 180 180 180 18	Cont Man 3 0.78 8.7 0.21 8.4 1.0 ² = 0.4 0 8.2 2.0 ² = 0.4 		A TE COLOR	Ban (100 mm) 10, Bandon, 100, D 400 (4 10, 100) 400 (4 10, 100)	Tear 2015 2006	Nan Dileman Tr. Mellin, NT.CI Angle Status Particular Francisco Transcolor Francisco
20	State or Sydgerour Book Solar of al. (2015) ¹ Banandi ata, 2016 Banandi ata, 2016 Banang (PK CM) Teat be avoud attes Banang (PK CM) Banang (Lane Mass 82 6.13 3.2 6.20 3.3 10.00 10 - 1 2.2 3.340/F - 1.00 (20 - 1) 1.2 1.20 (20 - 1) 1.2 (20 - 1) 1.2 1.20 (20 - 1) 1.2 (20	17 Head 20 20 20 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Cont 1 0.11 1 0.21 1 1.07 - 1.4 0 1 2.07 - 1.4 0 1 2.07 - 1.4 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1		20075 20075 20075 20075 20075	Base Officerous M. Baselon, 1995, D. -Carely (4: 73, 1991) -Arei (4: 74, 1991) Base Officeron Immodeling Marcine, 1991, O.	7944 3015 2004 2005	Main Differences Tr. Stelling, ITT. CT
20	Electric ar Torbaccion Scotte Scotte et al. 2019 Torona et al.	Lase Mon E 2.13 33 5.2 33 5.2 33 1.0, 00*1 2.136/F* 1.10, 00*1 2.2.300/F* 1.10, 00*1 1.2.300/F* 1.2.300	170404 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200	Conti Man 1 0.31 81 1.07 0.4 0 82 0 82 0 82 0 82 0 82 0 82 0 82 0 82		2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Kan - Officer on K. Racken, Mr. 2 Advis 47, 199, 17 Advis 47, 199, 17 Advis 47, 199, 199, 199, Advis 48, 199, 199, 199, Advis 48, 199, 199, 199, 199, 199, 199, 199, 19	7987 2013 2014 2004 2004	Nami Difference rit Henden, HT-C1
20	Electric ar Technology Scote of a Leon's Scote of a Leon's Research of a Leon's Research of A Leon Research of A Leon Scote Scote of A Leon Research of A Leon	Lase Mass 82 2.13 23 5.22 23 2.23 345/P 2.2 336/P 2.2 320/P 2.2 32	1 Tiddi 1 7 2 7 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8	Conti Mare 3 0.31 81 1.07 8.0 8 83 2.07 - 1.0 6 83 6 83 6 83 6 83 6 83 6 83		145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145	Bite Officeron N. Backin, Mr. D. -Critical, R. D. Max (Mexeron)	7947 2013 2014 2005 0 7947 2019 2019	Kan Dileman PC Mellin HTCD
20	Bendla art Tarbaccion Boole	Lange Mont D 173 57 173 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 5	1 Total 1 22 22 23 44 107,07 44 107,07 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	Canta 2019 8.1 0.21 8.2 1.0 ² = 0.4 0 8.2 2.0 ² = 0.4 Base 8 -0.28 8.2 0 8.1 -0.28 8.2 0 8.1 -1.0 ² = 0.4	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Base (2) Hore was SA Baselon, SOL 12 -4471 (-41, 2) -4471 (-41, 4) <td>7647 2013 2014 2008 0 7647 2019 2019</td> <td>Non Different P. Steller PT.C</td>	7647 2013 2014 2008 0 7647 2019 2019	Non Different P. Steller PT.C
20	Beels at 2010/00/ Book Store of al. 2007 Research at al. 2007 Research at al. 2007 Research at al. 2007 Research at all all all all all all all all all	Lange Mont D 173 57 173 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 5	1 Tuber 1 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Control 107 0.11 0.1 0.11 0.1 0.107 0.10 0.107 0.10 0.107 0.10 0.107 0.10 0.107 0.10 0.107 0.10	and 0 Table 9 20 0 20 0 0 20 0 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2010 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Base Obleweit № Robert № Robert ↓ 0000	7687 2013 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014	Nami Difference rit Hendrich HTLC1
20 28	Sink or Delayers Non-	Mass Si 6.13 0.1 6.13 0.1 6.13 0.1 1.10 0.0 2.2 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 1.10 0.0 4.1 1.0 1.10 0.0 4.1 1.0 4.3 1.0	1 Tuber 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D	Canton 1 0 10 0	and 0 Table 0 200 0 200 0 200 0 200 0 200 0 100 0 100 0 200 0	2014 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Ran Otherest Second Marcol Second M	7944 2013 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019	Kana Difference IY. Selling ATT C2
20	Stelle at Zoldpoint Norm of a 2, 252 ' Norm of a 2, 252 '	Lange Mass 30 6.13 3.1 6.13 3.1 1.10 5.1 2.2 3.1 1.10 5.1 1.2 3.1 1.10 5.1 1.2 3.0 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.10 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1.11 5.1 1	1 Tuber 1 P 2 P 2 P 2 P 2 P 2 P 2 P 2 P 2	Continue 1 0 11 11 11 0 11 11 0 11 11 0 11 11 0 1	and 0. Tanker 0. 20 0. 20 0. 20 0. 20 0. 20 0. 10 0. 10	20141 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016	Base Obleweit V Robert	Tear 2013 2014 2005 10 7007 2019 2019 2019 2019	Man Different P. Steller BTCC
20	Initia to Tubercom Book	Mass S 0.10 0.11 0.12 0.11 0.2 0.10 0.2 0.10 0.2 0.10 1.3 0.10 1.4 0.10 <td>17464 179 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20</td> <td>Cont 1: 0:11 0: 0:21 0: 1:02-10 0:12-10 0:12-10 0:0</td> <td>al 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>North Street Str</td> <td>Exac Otherent Solution Solutio</td> <td>7987 3015 2005 0 7987 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019</td> <td>Nami Difference Pr. Henden, HT C1</td>	17464 179 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Cont 1: 0:11 0: 0:21 0: 1:02-10 0:12-10 0:12-10 0:0	al 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	North Street Str	Exac Otherent Solution Solutio	7987 3015 2005 0 7987 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019	Nami Difference Pr. Henden, HT C1
20	Initia to Tuberonic Deal of 2, 2015 Tuberonic 2, 2015 Tuberonic 2, 2015 Tuberonic 2, 2015 Tuberonic 2, 2015 Tuberonic 2, 2017 Tuberonic 2, 2017	Lange Max 32 6.42 3.3 6.12 3.4 6.13 5.4 6.14 6.1 7.15 1.1 10.10 1.1 11.10 1.1 12.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 14.1 1.1 15.1 1.1 14.1 1.1 15.1 1.1 14.1 1.1 12.1 1.1 13.1 1.1 14.1 1.1 15.1 1.1 16.1 1.1 17.1 1.1 18.1 1.1 19.1 1.1	17464 179 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Cont 1 Mar 1 0.11 1 0.12 1 1.02 1	all 1 10 0 1 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 10	North States Sta	Base Officeredit V Robinson V Robinson V Robinson V Robinson V Robinson V Robinson Coll (2011) Coll (20	7987 2015 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014	Main Difference Tr. Stelling STL C2
20 28	Mediu ar Zudapizota Monitoria and Alexan Monitoria and Alexan Manual	Line Max 32 0.40 33 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34 0.40 34	17044 170 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 24	Control 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	al 20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Reader Street St	Bate: Colorestion 4 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 1 4 1	7 mar 2011 2014	Non Different P. Henden, HT-C1
20 28	Note a Tabapase Sector 2017 National 2017 Na	Lange Million 20 6,10 20 6,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 10,10 20 4,10 30 20,10 21 4,1 30 21,10 20 21,10 20 4,10 30 21,10 20 11,10 20	17.000 17.000 17.000 18.000 1.1000 1.1000 1.10000 1.10000 1.10000 1.100000	Control 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Image Total II 20 III 20 III 20 III 20 III 20 III 20 III 20 IIII 20 IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Reader Street List Market Market Street Mark	Bate: Offersonia data Construction	7 mar 2013 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2019 2019 2019 2019	Namio Differenza Processo de la construcción Processo de la construcción Recento de
20 21 21	Motion as Tablepoint Motion as Tablepoint Motion and the State Motion and th	Lane Non 20 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	1 Tield 1 D 2 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4	Cont 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Image Table N 100	2000 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Bate: Ofference - (20) (4.7); 131 - (20) (4.7); 131 - (20) (4.7); 131 - (20) (4.7); 132 - (20) (4.7); 143; 446 - (20) (4.7); 143; 146 - (20) (4.7); 146 - (20) (4.7); 146 - (20) (4.7); 146	Tear 2013 2014 2004 2004 2004 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017	Non Difference (1997)
20 21 21	Methor at Delayation Monte at 2014' Manager 2014 and 2014' Manager 2014' Manage	Lane Main 20 4110 (2014) 4110 (2014) 410	1 Tield 1 D 2 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4 d 4	Control 1990 1990 1990 1990 1990 1990 1990 199		2000 2000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	Har Chevrol 2 A Statistic View 4 Control 100 4 Control 100 4 Control 100 4 Control 100 5 C	Tear 2013 2014 2014 2014 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Non Difference (* Kensin MTCC) * * * * * * * * * * * * *
20 21 21	Note as Tabapano Second	Lance 1 4 min 2 4 m	1 Table 1 7 1 7 1 7 1 7 1 7 1 7 1 7 1 7	Core 1 1000 1 0 011 0 011 1 0 011 0		Name Notes 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145	Bate: Observation 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 6.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.13, 1.20) 1.001 (4.13, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001 (4.14, 1.20) 4.001 (4.14, 1.20) 1.001	7 mar 2013 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2019	Kasilikanan Y. Sanakanan Parakanan Parakanan Parakanan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasilikan Kasil
20 28 28	Holds at Tubercoll Ioon Tory T	Lano 2 Maria 2 (1) 10 (2) 1	1 Table 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 10 1 1	Control 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10		Value Andrew And	Rate: Offerences 4 (2014) (2014) (2014) 4 (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) 4 (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) 4 (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) 4 (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) 4 (2014) (Teat 2013 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2019	Non Difference P. Stelling STLC2
20 28 28	Note as Tabapase Sector 2017 Sector 2017 Internet as 2017	Line Line <thline< th=""> Line Line <thl< td=""><td>1 Table 1 T</td><td>Cont 1 10 1 1 2 10 1 1 2 10 1 2 10</td><td>Image Total N 100 N 100</td><td>AND A CONTRACTOR AND A</td><td>Har Chevrol 4</td><td>Tear 2013 2004 2005 2005 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010</td><td>Nam Difference (* Kensin MT-CT * Kensin MT-C</td></thl<></thline<>	1 Table 1 T	Cont 1 10 1 1 2 10 1 1 2 10	Image Total N 100	AND A CONTRACTOR AND A	Har Chevrol 4	Tear 2013 2004 2005 2005 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010	Nam Difference (* Kensin MT-CT * Kensin MT-C
20 28 28	Note a Tabapano Sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the	Lineary Main 30 Main 30 <td>1 Table 1 T</td> <td>Control 1000000000000000000000000000000000000</td> <td>Image: Note of the sector of the se</td> <td>2000 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410</td> <td>Bate: Observed 4.001(41,010) 4.001(41,010) 4.001(41,010) 6.001(41,010)</td> <td>Tear 2013 2014 2014 2014 2014 2015 2017</td> <td>Non Difference (10) Representation (10) Factor (10) Representation (1</td>	1 Table 1 T	Control 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Image: Note of the sector of the se	2000 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410 1410	Bate: Observed 4.001(41,010) 4.001(41,010) 4.001(41,010) 6.001(41,010)	Tear 2013 2014 2014 2014 2014 2015 2017	Non Difference (10) Representation (10) Factor (10) Representation (1
20 28 25	Stelle at Tubercoll South at Tubercoll South 2017 Manual Performance South 2017 Manual Performance South 2017 Manual Performance South 2017 Manual Performance Manual P	Нала 30 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	17440 1700 1000	Control 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Mail Table J N 201 N	A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	Har Character A Control 10 Control 10 C	7 mar 2013 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2010	Non Difference P. Stening HTCC P. Sten
20 28 28	Note a Tabarana International Control (1974) International Control (1974)	Line Line 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </td <td>1 1444 1 2 2 4 1 2</td> <td>Control 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td> <td>Image: Non-State State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State</td> <td>North States Sta</td> <td>Bate: Ofference 4.001(4:33:10)</td> <td>Teatr 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2010 2010 2010</td> <td>Non Different Provident STLC</td>	1 1444 1 2 2 4 1 2	Control 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Image: Non-State State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State Image: Non-State	North States Sta	Bate: Ofference 4.001(4:33:10)	Teatr 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2010 2010 2010	Non Different Provident STLC
20 28 28	Stelle at Tubercoll Instrument Section 2017 Section 2017 Se		1 Table 1 T	Correl 1 2017 - 10 0 12 0 1	Image: 1 Image: 2	North Action of the second sec	Bate: Observed 4.001410.0111 4.001410.0111 4.001410.0111 4.001410.0111 6.001410.0111 6.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.001410.0111 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.00140000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001 0.0014000001	7 mar 2013 2003 0 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	Non Difference (1997)

Figure 3.

 \bigcirc

Meta-analyses for the comparison of clinical parameters in surgical approach between groups with adjunctive laser therapy (test) and without laser therapy (control) among selected studies after a short follow-up period of 6 to 12 months. A) comparison of PD reduction; B) comparison of CAL gain; C) comparison of BOP reduction. IV = independent variable.





Figure 4.

Meta-analyses for the comparison of clinical parameters in surgical approach between groups with adjunctive laser therapy (test) and without laser therapy (control) among selected studies after a long-term follow-up period of 48 to 60 months. A) comparison of PD reduction; B) comparison of CAL gain; C) comparison of BOP reduction; D) comparison of PI. IV = independent variable.

Auth



Nuth

```
Table 1.
```

Features of the Included Articles Using a Non-Surgical Approach

	Stud	d Laser Patien Impla Follo Diagnosis (difference; mean ± SD)												
Auth or/	y Dasi	Groups Type	Laser Settin	ts Patien	Impla nts	w-up	Mucositis/	DD	CA	MB	DOD		, DEC	Conclusi
Year	gn		gs	(n)	(n)	(mont hs)	Implantiti	(mm)	L (m	L (m	бОР (%)	PI	(mm)	ons
							S		m)	m)				Laser
									T:			T:		group
									0.7		T:	0	T:	resulted
Schw		T. Laser							±		52.13	±	$-0.1 \pm$	in a
arz et		C: MI	2,940	T 10	T 16		D ·	T: 0.8	0.6		±	0.3	0.43	statisticall
al.	RCT	(plastic AG	nm,	1:10 C:10	1:10 C:14	6	Peri-	± 0.83	э С·		10.19 C·	3 C·	C:	y
20053		curets +	I/cm^2	C. 10	C. 14		impiantitis	± 1.05	0.6		21.57	0	$-0.1 \pm$ 0.58	t higher
<mark>4</mark> *		CHX)	5/0111					= 1.05	±		±	±	(increa	reduction
									1.0		14.01	0.3	se)	of BOP
									5			6	<i>,</i>	than
														control.
														Single
														non-
														surgical
														treatment
				II - IZ (data	II - IZ	24								of peri-
Schw			2.940	of only	of only	(only			0.8		60 60	0.1	$0.24 \pm$	implantiti
arz et	CS	Locar Er:Y	nm,	eight	eight	6-	Peri-	$1.86 \pm$	7 ±		68.63	3	0.39	s using
ai. 2006 <mark>3</mark>	CS	Laser AG	12.7	patient	implan	data	implantitis	0.61	0.7		± 12.85	$\frac{1}{0}$	(increa	LI. I AU
5			J/cm ²	S	ts	retriev			1		12.05	6	se)	not
- C				extract	extract	ed)								sufficient
				ea)	ed)									for the
														maintena
														nce of
														implants
														Both
			100											methods
Perss			mI/nii											failed to
on et		T: Laser E. V	lse	T 01	T. 66		D ·	T: 0.9						reduce
al.	RCT	C: Air- AG	and	1:21 C:21	1:55 C:45	6	Peri-	± 0.8						bacterial
20113		abrasive AU	10 Hz	C. 21	C. 43		impiantitis	± 0.5						Clinical
6			(12.7)					- 0.0						improvem
			J/cm ⁻)											ents were
		<u> </u>								_				limited.
			100							T:				Clinical
Renv			mJ/pu					Τ۰ΟΟ		-0. 2 ⊥				improvem
ert et		T: Laser	lse	т. 21	T∙ 55		Peri-	1.0.8 + 0.5		3 ± 0.0				similar
al.	RCT	C: Air- AG	and	C: 21	C: 45	6	implantitis	C: 0.9		C:				between
2011 <mark>3</mark>		abrasive	10 Hz				1	± 0.8		-0.				treatment
1.			(12.7) I/cm ²							1 ±				s using an
			<i>s,</i> em)							0.8				Er:YAG

Autho r/ Year	y Desi gn	Grou	ps Type	r Setti ngs	Patie nts (n)	Impla nts (n)	w-up (mont hs)	Mucositis/ Peri- Implantiti s	PD (mm)	CAM LI (m (r m) m	B	OP %)	PI	REC (mm)	Conclusi ons
Fe	atur	es of th	e Include	ed Art	icles Us	sing a N	on-Sur	gical Appro Diagnosis	ach (co Treatn	ontinu nent C	ed) Dutco	omes (diff	erence;	
Schär et al. 20134 R 1*	CT	T: MI air polishin g + H ₂ O ₂ + laser C: MI (titanit m curets) - air polishin g + minocy line		660 nm, 100 mW	T: 20 C: 20	T: 20 C: 20	6	Peri- implantitis	T: 0.3 ± 0.36 C: 0.4 ± 0.50	T: 0.1 $6 \pm$ 6 0.4 5 8 9 C: 0 0.1 9 \pm 0.4 4		BOP- positi ve sites T: 4.03 ± 1.66 to 1.51 ± 1.41 C: 4.41 ± 1.47 to 2.10 ± 1.55	$\begin{array}{c} T: \\ 0.1 \\ 3 \\ \pm \\ 0.1 \\ 0 \\ C: \\ 0.1 \\ 8 \\ \pm \\ 0.1 \\ 4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} T:\\ 0.20 \pm \\ 0.58\\ C:\\ 0.30 \pm \\ 0.66 \end{array}$	Both modalitie s had comparab le reduction s in inflammat ion and PD. Complete resolution of inflammat ion was not achieved with either therapy.
Depp e et al. P 20134 0	ʻilot	Air- abrasive + laser 1: modera e bone loss 2: severe bone loss		660 nm, 100 mW with 60 mW/c m ²	16	18	6	Peri- implantitis	1: 0.4 ± 0.63 2: -0.7 ± 0.91 (increased PD)	$\begin{array}{c} 1: \\ 1.4 \\ \pm \\ 0.9 \\ 3 \\ 2: \\ 7 \\ -0. \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 0.9 \\ 8 \\ (C \\ AL \\ loss \\) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1: \\ -0. \\ 3 \pm \\ 0.7 \\ 5 \\ 2: \\ 1.9 \\ \pm \\ 0.8 \\ 1 \end{array}$			1: 0.2 ± 0.43 2: 0.7 ± 1.29	laser or air- abrasive for debridem ent. Non- surgical diode laser treatment could stop bone resorption in moderate peri- implant defects but not in severe defects.

Thierb ach and Eger 2013 4 2	CS	MI (plastic curets) + laser. W: with pus WO: without pus	660 nm× 10 secon ds	28	W: 17 WO: 33	7	Peri- implantitis	W: 0.43 ± 0.1 WO: 1.13 ± 0.17	W: 1.7 9 ± 0.3 6 W O: 1.3 ± 0.9 3		W: 85.91 ± 11.53 WO: 54.98 ± 28.19			Non- surgical treatment was effective in managing peri- implantiti s without pus formation. Peri- implantiti s with pus formation required a combinati on of surgical and regenerati ve procedure s. Non- surgical mechanic
Basset ti et al. 20144 3*	RCT	T: MI + air- polishing + laser C: MI (titanium Diod curets) + e air- polishing + minocycl ine	660 nm, 100 mW x 10 secon ds	T: 20 C: 20	T: 20 C: 20	12	Peri- implantitis	T: 0.11 ± 0.44 C: 0.56 ± 0.52	$\begin{array}{c} T: \\ 0.0 \\ 8 \pm \\ 0.5 \\ 4 \\ C: \\ 0.3 \\ 1 \pm \\ 0.4 \\ 5 \end{array}$		T: 2.29 ± 0.97 C: 2.86 ± 0.0.8 8	T: 0.12 ± 0.10 C: 0.21 ± 0.09	T: 0.03 ± 0.57 C: 0.27 ± 0.71 (decrea sed)	al debridem ent with adjunctive diode laser was equally effective in the reduction of inflammat ion as adjunctive delivery of minocycli ne
Arısan et al. 2015 <mark>4</mark> 5*	RCT	T: MI + laser C: MH (plastic curets)	810 nm, 1W pulse d mode with 3	10	T: 24 C: 24	6	Peri- implantitis	$\begin{array}{c} T: \\ 0.17 \\ \pm \\ 0.41 \\ C: \\ 0.21 \\ \pm \\ 0.24 \end{array}$		T: -0. 66 ± 0.2 8 C: -0.	T: 100% to 95.8 % C:10 0% to 100%	T: 91.7 % to 54.2 % C: 91.7		microsphe res. Diode laser did not yield any additional positive influence on the

		+		J/cm ² × 1 minut e							28 ± 0 2	3	% to 41.7 %		peri- implant healing compared with conventio nal scaling alone.
Mettra ux et al. 20151 5	CS	MI (carbon fiber curets) + laser	Died	810 nm, 2.5 W, 50 Hz, 30s ×3	15	23	24	I imp	Peri- olantitis	Deep est PD bucc al: $7.5 \pm 2.6-$ 3.6 ± 0.7 Deep est PD oral: $7.7 \pm 2.1-$ 3.8 ± 0.9		% of impla nts with ≥ 1 site with BOP: 100% to 43%			Non- surgical treatment of peri- implantiti s with the use of diode laser resulted in significan t clinical improvem ents for at least 2 years.
Schwa rz et al. 20154 7	CS	M: peri- implant mueositi s, MI (carbon curets)+ CHX P: Peri- implantit is, laser	Er:Y AG	2.94 × 1 minut e, 12.7 J/cm ²	M: 17 P: 17	M: 24 P: 21	6	I	Both	P: 1.0 ± 0.9 M: 0.1 ± 0.6		P: 27.9 ± 18.5 M: 38.0 ± 23.1			Non- surgical treatment of peri- implant mucositis using MI + CHX or peri- implantiti s using laser was associated with significan t short- term clinical improvem ents.
Ta Fe	able 1 eatur	es of the I	nclude	d Artic	eles Us	ing a No	on-Sı	ırgica	ıl Appr	oach (c	ontinu	ed)			
Autho r/ Year	Stu y Des n	d ig Group	s Typ e	Laser Settin gs	Patie ts (n	en Impla) ts (n	Fo an 1) (n	ollow -up nonth s)	Diag Mucos er Impla	nosis sitis/P intitis	(diffe (diffe PD ((m) (m) n	atment Frence; CAMB LLL m (m n)m)	BO BO P (%)	mes = SD) RE P C I (m m)	Conclusio ns

Al Amri et al. 20164 8*	T: MI + laser 660 CCT C: MI Diod nm (ukraso e 100 nic mV scaler)) , T: 34) C: 33 V	T: 34 C: 33	12	Both	T: 15.8 ± 1.27 C: 15.2 ± 1.05	$\begin{array}{c} T: & f \\ -0.1 & 3: \\ \pm \\ 0.1 & 4 \\ C: & 0 \\ 0.0 & 2 \\ \pm \\ 0.21 & 3 \end{array}$	T: 3.9 ± .87 C: 1.2 ± 3.3	In patients with type 2 diabetes, MI with adjunctive diode laser treatment was more effective compared with MI alone. Diode
Lerari o et al. 2016 <mark>4</mark> 9*	CCT ind ind ind ind ind ind ind ind) , 1 x T:21 C:6 ond	T: 101 C: 24	12	Both	T: 2.66 ± 1.07 C: 0.94 ± 1.13	8.	T: 5.1 4 C: 7.7 8	seemed to be a valuable tool in the treatment of mucositis and peri- implantiti s. Significan t PD and BOP reduction were observed.

T = test; C = control; MI = mechanical instrumentation; CHX = chlorhexidine rinse; Er:YAG = erbium:yttriumaluminum-garnet.

*Article included in the meta-analyses.

Table 2.

Features of the Included Articles Using a Surgical Approach

Autho	Stud		Lase	Datio	Imnla	Follo	Diagnosis	Tı (dif	reatr ffere	nent nce;	Out mea	com n ± \$	es SD)	
r/ Year	y Desi gn	Туре	r Setti ngs	nts (n)	nts (n)	w-up (mont hs)	Mucositis/ Peri- Implantiti s	PD (m m)	CA L (m m)	MB L (m m)	BO P (%	PI	RE C (m m)	Conclusion s
Haas et al. 2000 <mark>3</mark> 3	CS GBR-flaser	Diod e	906 nm	17	24	mean 9.5	Peri- implantitis		,	2.0 ± 1.9				Photosensiti zing treatment and GBR resulted in significant reduction of the peri- implant bone defect.

Deppe et al. 20071 6*	T1: air abrasive + resective + laser T2: air abrasive + GBR + CCT laser C1: air abrasive + resective/ GBR C2: air abrasive + GBR	CO ₂	2.5W , 175 J/cm ² , 12 × 5 secon ds	T1: 10 T2: 9 C1: 6 C2: 7	T1: 22 T2: 17 C1: 19 C2: 15	60	Peri- implantitis	T1: 2.3 \pm 0.9 T2: 3.2 \pm 1.1 C1: 1.9 \pm 1.1 C2: 2.6 \pm 1.2	T1: T $0.6 \ 0$ \pm : $0.8 \ 1$ T2: T $3.2 \ 3$ \pm : $0.9 \ 0$ C1: C $0.3 \ -$ \pm 1 $0.8 \ 1$ T2: T $0.9 \ 0$ C1: C $0.3 \ -$ \pm 1 $0.8 \ 1$ C1: C $0.3 \ -$ \pm 1 $0.8 \ 1$ C1: C $0.3 \ -$ \pm 1 $0.8 \ 1$ C2: C $3.0 \ 2$ \pm : $0.8 \ 0$ $0.8 \ 1$ C2: C $0.8 \ 0$ C3: C $0.8 \ 1$ C2: C $0.8 \ 0$ C3: C $0.8 \ 1$ C2: C $0.8 \ 0$ C3: C C3:	1: .6 \pm .3 2: .1 \pm .9 1: 0. \pm .0 2: .7 \pm .9	$\begin{array}{c} T11\\ \vdots\\ 0.4\\ \pm\\ 0.7\\ T2\\ \vdots\\ 1.4\\ \pm\\ 0.7\\ C1\\ \vdots\\ 0.7\\ C1\\ \vdots\\ 0.7\\ C2\\ \vdots\\ 0.3\\ \pm\\ 0.2\\ \vdots\\ 0.3\\ \pm\\ 0.3\\ \pm\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ \pm\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ \pm\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3\\ 0.3$	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	CO ₂ laser decontamin ation might be more efficacious than conventiona l decontamin ation in deep and narrow bony defects.
Roma nos and Nentw ig 20081 7	CS MI (titanium curets) + GBR + laser	CO ₂	2.84 W, 1 minut e	15	19	45	Peri- implantitis	3.5 2± 0.4 9		6 5 5	$\begin{array}{c} 0.5 \\ 6. & 0.6 \\ 5 \\ \pm & 3 \\ 69. & 0.8 \\ 9 & 5 \end{array}$)	CO ₂ laser decontamin ation in combinatio n with GBR could be effective in treating peri- implantitis
Schwa rz et al. 2011 <mark>1</mark> 8*	T: MI + GBR + laser RCT C: MI (plastic curets) + GBR	Er:Y AG	11.4 J/cm ² , 10 pulse s per secon d	T: 15 C: 15	T: 19 C: 16	6	Peri- implantitis	T: 1.7 ± 1.4 C: 2.4 ± 1.5	T: 1.5 ± 1.4 C: 2.2 ± 1.4	4 8 3 0 5 0 3	$\begin{array}{l} \Gamma: \\ 5. \\ \pm \\ 5. \\ \pm \\ 5. \\ \pm \\ 5. \\ 0.5 $	T: 2 ± -0.2 2 ± 0.2 C: -0.2 ± 0.3	Laser treatment did not have significant benefit on surface decontamin ation.
Schwa rz et al. 20123 8	T: MI - GBR + laser RCT C: MI (plastic curets) + GBR	Er:Y AG	11.4 J/cm ² , 10 pulse s per secon d	T: 10 C: 14	T: 10 C: 14	24	Peri- implantitis	T: 1.1 ± 2.2 C: 1.5 ± 2.0	T: 1.0 ± 2.2 C: 1.2 ± 2.2	7 0 3 5 9 9 3	T: 5. T: 5. C: $52.$ \pm 6. 0.6 C: C: 54. 0.0 54. 0.0 54. 0.8 3.	T: 2 -0. 1 ± 0.4 C: 3 ± 0.6	Treatment outcomes following surgical therapy of peri- implantitis might be influenced by factors other than the method of surface decontamin ation.

Schwa rz et al. RC 20139 * Table 2.	T: MI+ GBR+ laser C: Mi (plastic curet) + GBR	Er:Y AG	11 J/c: , 1 pull s p sec c	.4 m ² 0 Ise T: her C: on	7 T: 10 C:	9 4 12 4	⁸ imj	Peri- plantitis	T: 1.3 ± 1.8 C: 1.2 ± 1.9	T: 1.2 ± 2.0 C: 1.5 ± 2.0		T: 71. 6 ± 24. 9 C: 85. 2 ± 16. 4	T: 0.4 ± 0.7 C: 0.0 ± 1.1	T: -0.1 ± 0.3 C: -0.3 ± 0.9	Tree outd foll surg ther wer infl by f othe the of s dec atio	atment comes owing gical apy e not uenced àactors er than method urface ontamin n.
Features Author/ Year	of the Includ Stud V Desi gn	ed Art	icles ype	Using Laser Setti ngs	a Surş Patie nts (n)	gical Ap Impla nts (n)	Follo w-up (mont hs)	h (contin Diagno Mucosi Peri- Implan s	ued) osis tis/ titi) (di PD (m m)	reati ffere CA L (m m)	nent nce; MB L (m m)	Out mea BO P (%)	tcom n ± ¦ PI	ies SD) RE C (m m)	Conclusion s
Schwarz et al. 201444	Laser MI tplas curets implar lasty GBR CTC	f + E f + E f + F f + G	r:Y AG	11.4 J/cm ²	10	13	6	Peri- implanti	tis	$2.5 \ 3 \pm 1.8 \ 0$	2.0 7± 1.9 3		74. 4± 28. 5	0.2 3 ± 0.5 9	0.46 ± 0.77	Regenerativ e and resective surgical therapy with soft tissue grafts might control peri- implantitis lesions without compromisi ng the
Bombecc ari et al. 2013 <mark>39</mark> *	TTM lase RCT (plas scaler CH2	I + er II Di tic Di) + X	iode	810 nm, 1W, 20 secon ds × 5	T: 20 C: 20	T: 20 C: 20	6	Peri- implanti	tis	T: 1.0 ± 0.3 1 C: 0.3 ± 0.5 2	$\begin{array}{c} T: \\ 0.5 \\ 4 \pm \\ 0.0 \\ 9 \\ C: \\ 0.1 \\ 0 \pm \\ 0.0 \\ 1 \end{array}$		T: 60 ± 50 C: 30 ± 48			esthetic outcome. A significantl y lower proinflamm atory index of peri- implantitis was observed in the laser group at 6 months of follow-up.

Papadopo ulos et al. Ro 2015 <mark>46</mark>	T: MI + laser T C: MI (plastic curets)	980n m, Diode 0.8W, 3 times	T: 8 C: 8	T: 8 C: 8	6	Peri- implantitis	T: T: 1.4 0.6 8 5 C: C: 1.2 0.1 1 7	T: T: 57. 9.6 4 C: C: 16. 5 7	adjunctive use of the diode laser was not beneficial in the surgical managemen
									t of peri- implantitis.

GBR = guided bone regeneration; T = test; C = control; MI = mechanical instrumentation; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; Er:YAG = erbium:yttrium-aluminum-garnet; CTG = connective tissue graft; CHX = chlorhexidine.

*Articles included in meta-analyses.

REFERENCES

<jrn>1. Midda M, Renton-Harper P. Lasers in dentistry. Br Dent J 1991;170:343-346. PubMed</jrn>

- <jrn>2. Midda M. The use of lasers in periodontology. Curr Opin Dent 1992;2:104-108. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>3. Midda M Lasers in periodontics. Periodontal Clin Investig 1992;14:14-20. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>4. Cobb CM Lasers in periodontics: A review of the literature. J Periodontol 2006;77:545-564. PubMed
- <jrn>5. Behdin S, Monje A, Lin GH, Edwards B, Othman A, Wang HL. Effectiveness of laser application for periodontal surgical therapy: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Periodontol* 2015;86:1352-1363. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>6. Nguyen NT, Byarlay MR, Reinhardt RA, Marx DB, Meinberg TA, Kaldahl WB. Adjunctive nonsurgical therapy of inflamed periodontal pockets during maintenance therapy using diode laser: A randomized clinical trial. *J Periodontol* 2015;86:1133-1140. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>7. Aral CA, Dilber E, Aral K, Sarica Y, Sivrikoz ON. Management of cyclosporine and nifedipine-induced gingival hyperplasia. J Clin Diagn Res 2015;9:ZD12-ZD15. PubMed </jrn>
- <jrn>8. Kumar P, Rattan V, Rai S. Comparative evaluation of healing after gingivectomy with electrocautery and laser. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res 2015;5:69-74. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>9. Schwarz F, Hegewald A, John G, Sahm N, Becker J. Four-year follow-up of combined surgical therapy of advanced peri-implantitis evaluating two methods of surface decontamination. *J Clin Periodontol* 2013;40:962-967, PubMed
- <jrn>10. Derks J, Tomasi C. Peri-implant health and disease. A systematic review of current epidemiology. J Clin Periodontol 2015;42(Suppl. 16):S158-S171. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>11. Renvert S, Roos-Jansåker AM, Claffey N. Non-surgical treatment of peri-implant mucositis and periimplantitis: A literature review. *J Clin Periodontol* 2008;35(Suppl.8):305-315. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>12. Heitz-Mayfield LJ, Mombelli A. The therapy of peri-implantitis: A systematic review. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2014;29(Suppl):325-345. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>13. Renvert S, Polyzois IN. Clinical approaches to treat peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis. *Periodontol 2000* 2015;68:369-404. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>14. Chan HL Lin GH, Suarez F, MacEachern M, Wang HL. Surgical management of peri-implantitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. *J Periodontol* 2014;85:1027-1041. <u>PubMed</u>/jrn>

- <jrn>15. Mettraux GR, Sculean A, Bürgin WB, Salvi GE. Two-year clinical outcomes following non-surgical mechanical therapy of peri-implantitis with adjunctive diode laser application. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016;27:845-849. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>16. Deppe H. Horch HH, Neff A. Conventional versus CO2 laser-assisted treatment of peri-implant defects with the concomitant use of pure-phase beta-tricalcium phosphate: A 5-year clinical report. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2007;22:79-86. PubMed
- <jrn>17. Romanos GE, Nentwig GH. Regenerative therapy of deep peri-implant infrabony defects after CO2 laser implant surface decontamination. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2008;28:245-255. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>18. Schwarz F. Sahm N, Iglhaut G, Becker J. Impact of the method of surface debridement and decontamination on the clinical outcome following combined surgical therapy of peri-implantitis: A randomized controlled clinical study. *J Clin Periodontol* 2011;38:276-284. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>19. Mailoa J. Lin GH, Chan HL, MacEachern M, Wang HL. Clinical outcomes of using lasers for periimplantitis surface detoxification: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Periodontol* 2014;85:1194-1202. <u>PubMed</u> oprn>
- <jrn>20. Heitz-Mayfield LJ, Schmid B, Weigel C, et al. Does excessive occlusal load affect osseointegration? An experimental study in the dog. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2004;15:259-268. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>21. Karoussis IK, Müller S, Salvi GE, Heitz-Mayfield LJ, Brägger U, Lang NP. Association between periodontal and peri-implant conditions: A 10-year prospective study. Clin Oral Implants Res 2004;15:1-7. <u>PubMed</u> //jrn>
- <jrn>22. Klokkevold PR, Han TJ. How do smoking, diabetes, and periodontitis affect outcomes of implant treatment? Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants 2007;22(Suppl):173-202. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>23. Salvi GE, Carollo-Bittel B, Lang NP. Effects of diabetes mellitus on periodontal and peri-implant conditions: Update on associations and risks. J Clin Periodontol 2008;35(Suppl.8):398-409. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>24. Schardt C, Adams MB, Owens T, Keitz S, Fontelo P. Utilization of the PICO framework to improve searching PubMed for clinical questions. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2007;7:16. PubMed
- <jrn>25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009;6:e1000097. <u>PubMed</u>
- <eref>26. Higgins JP, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available at: http://www.cochrane-handbook.org. Accessed June 27th, 2016.</eref>
- <jrn>27. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:726-732. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>28. Bach G, Neckel C, Mall C, Krekeler G. Conventional versus laser-assisted therapy of periimplantitis: A five-year comparative study. Implant Dent 2000;9:247-251. PubMed
- <jrn>29. Dörtbudak O, Haas R, Bernhart T, Mailath-Pokorny G. Lethal photosensitization for decontamination of implant surfaces in the treatment of peri-implantitis. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2001;12:104-108. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>30. De Angelis N, Felice P, Grusovin MG, Camurati A, Esposito M. The effectiveness of adjunctive lightactivated disinfection (LAD) in the treatment of peri-implantitis: 4-month results from a multicentre pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Oral Implantology* 2012;5:321-331. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>31. Eick S, Markauskaite G, Nietzsche S, Laugisch O, Salvi GE, Sculean A. Effect of photoactivated disinfection with a light-emitting diode on bacterial species and biofilms associated with periodontitis and peri-implantitis. *Photodiagn Photodyn Ther* 2013;10:156-167. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>32. Esposito, M, Grusovin MG, De Angelis N, Camurati A, Campailla M, Felice P. The adjunctive use of light-activated disinfection (LAD) with FotoSan is ineffective in the treatment of peri-implantitis: 1-year

results from a multicentre pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Oral Implantology* 2013;6:109-119. PubMed</jrn>

- <jrn>33. Haas R, Baron M, Dörtbudak O, Watzek G. Lethal photosensitization, autogenous bone, and e-PTFE membrane for the treatment of peri-implantitis: Preliminary results. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2000;15:374-382. PubMed
- <jrn>34. Schwarz F, Sculean A, Rothamel D, Schwenzer K, Georg T, Becker J. Clinical evaluation of an Er:YAG laser for nonsurgical treatment of peri-implantitis: A pilot study. Clin Oral Implants Res 2005;16:44-52. PubMed
- <jrn>35. Schwarz F, Bieling K, Bonsmann M, Latz T, Becker J. Non-surgical treatment of moderate and advanced periimplantitis lesions: A controlled clinical study. *Clin Oral Investig* 2006;10:279-288. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>36. Persson GR, Roos-Jansåker AM, Lindahl C, Renvert S. Microbiologic results after non-surgical erbium-doped:yttrium, aluminum, and garnet laser or air-abrasive treatment of peri-implantitis: A randomized clinical trial. *J Periodontol* 2011;82:1267-1278. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>37. Renvert/S, Lindahl C, Roos Jansåker AM, Persson GR. Treatment of peri-implantitis using an Er:YAG laser or an air-abrasive device: A randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol* 2011;38:65-73. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>38. Schwarz F, John G, Mainusch S, Sahm N, Becker J. Combined surgical therapy of peri-implantitis evaluating two methods of surface debridement and decontamination. A two-year clinical follow up report. *J Clin Periodontol* 2012;39:789-797. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>39. Bombeccari GP, Guzzi G, Gualini F, Gualini S, Santoro F, Spadari F. Photodynamic therapy to treat periimplantitis. *Implant Dent* 2013;22:631-638. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>40. Deppe H, Mücke T, Wagenpfeil S, Kesting M, Sculean A. Nonsurgical antimicrobial photodynamic therapy in moderate vs severe peri-implant defects: A clinical pilot study. *Quintessence Int* 2013;44:609-618. <u>PubMed</u> /jrn>
- <jrn>41. Schär D, Ramseier CA, Eick S, Arweiler NB, Sculean A, Salvi GE. Anti-infective therapy of periimplantitis with adjunctive local drug delivery or photodynamic therapy: Six-month outcomes of a prospective randomized clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2013;24:104-110. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>42. Thierbach R, Eger T. Clinical outcome of a nonsurgical and surgical treatment protocol in different types of peri-implantitis: A case series. *Quintessence Int* 2013;44:137-148. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>43. Bassetti M, Schär D, Wicki B, et al. Anti-infective therapy of peri-implantitis with adjunctive local drug delivery or photodynamic therapy: 12-month outcomes of a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2014;25:279-287. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>44. Schwarz F, Sahm N, Becker J. Combined surgical therapy of advanced peri-implantitis lesions with concomitant soft tissue volume augmentation. A case series. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2014;25:132-136. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>45. Arısan V, Karabuda ZC, Arıcı SV, Topçuoğlu N, Külekçi G. A randomized clinical trial of an adjunct diode laser application for the nonsurgical treatment of peri-implantitis. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2015;33:547-554. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>46. Papadopoulos CA, Vouros I, Menexes G, Konstantinidis A. The utilization of a diode laser in the surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. A randomized clinical trial. Clin Oral Investig 2015;19:1851-1860. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>47. Schwarz F, John G, Hegewald A, Becker J. Non-surgical treatment of peri-implant mucositis and periimplantitis at zirconia implants: A prospective case series. *J Clin Periodontol* 2015;8:783-788.
- <jrn>48. Al Amri MD, Kellesarian SV, Ahmed A, Al-Kheraif AA, Romanos GE, Javed F. Efficacy of periimplant mechanical debridement with and without adjunct antimicrobial photodynamic therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Photodiagn Photodyn Ther* 2016;14:166-169. <u>PubMed</u>

- <jrn>49. Lerario F, Roncati M, Gariffo A, et al. Non-surgical periodontal treatment of peri-implant diseases with the adjunctive use of diode laser: Preliminary clinical study. *Lasers Med Sci* 2016;31:1-6. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>50.,Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 1977;33:159-174. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>51. Pontoriero R, Tonelli MP, Carnevale G, Mombelli A, Nyman SR, Lang NP. Experimentally induced peri-implant mucositis. A clinical study in humans. Clin Oral Implants Res 1994;5:254-259. PubMed
- <jrn>52 Salvi GE Aglietta M, Eick S, Sculean A, Lang NP, Ramseier CA. Reversibility of experimental periimplant mucositis compared with experimental gingivitis in humans. Clin Oral Implants Res 2012;23:182-190. PubMed /jrn>
- <jrn>53. Schwarz F Becker K, Renvert S. Efficacy of air polishing for the non-surgical treatment of periimplant diseases: A systematic review. *J Clin Periodontol* 2015;42:951-959. PubMed
- <jrn>54. Kotsakis GA, Konstantinidis I, Karoussis IK, Ma X, Chu H. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of various laser wavelengths in the treatment of peri-implantitis. *J Periodontol* 2014;85:1203-1213. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>55. Brägger U, Bürgin WB, Hämmerle CH, Lang NP. Associations between clinical parameters assessed around implants and teeth. Clin Oral Implants Res 1997;8:412-421. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>56. Gerber JA, Tan WC, Balmer TE, Salvi GE, Lang NP. Bleeding on probing and pocket probing depth in relation to probing pressure and mucosal health around oral implants. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2009;20:75-78. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>57. Lang NP Wilson TG, Corbet EF. Biological complications with dental implants: Their prevention, diagnosis and treatment. Clin Oral Implants Res 2000;11(Suppl. 1):146-155. PubMed</jrn>
- <jrn>58. Monje A, Aranda L, Diaz KT, et al. Impact of maintenance therapy for the prevention of peri-implant diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Dent Res* 2016;95:372-379. <u>PubMed</u>
- <jrn>59 Fontana CR Kurachi C, Mendonça CR, Bagnato VS. Temperature variation at soft periodontal and rat bone tissues during a medium-power diode laser exposure. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2004;22:519-522. <u>PubMed</u></jrn>
- <jrn>60 Mellado JR Freedman AL, Salkin LM, Stein MD, Schneider DB, Cutler RH. The clinical relevance of microbiologic testing: A comparative analysis of microbiologic samples secured from the same sites and cultured in two independent laboratories. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2001;21:232-239. <u>PubMed</u> /jrn>
- <jrn>61. Salkin LM, Freedman AL, Mellado JR, Stein MD, Schneider DB, Butler L. The clinical relevance of microbiologic testing. Part 2: A comparative analysis of microbiologic samples secured simultaneously from the same sites and cultured in the same laboratory. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent* 2003;23:121-127. <u>PubMed</u>

Correspondence: Hom-Lay Wang, Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, 1011 North University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1078. Fax: (734) 936-0374; email: homlay@umich.edu.

‡ RevMan v.5.0, The Cochrane Collaboration, London, U.K.



This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Page 26 of 26