Received: 3 December 2018 | Revised: 6 May 2019 | Accepted: 7 May 2019

DOI: 10.1111/jcpe.13130

SUPPLEMENT ARTICLE

WILEY Journal of Clinical Periodontology

Biological factors involved in alveolar bone regeneration

Consensus report of Working Group 1 of the 15th European Workshop on Periodontology on Bone Regeneration

William V. Giannobile[1] | Tord Berglundh[2] | Bilal Al-Nawas[3] | Mauricio Araujo[4] | P. Mark Bartold[5] | Philippe Bouchard[6] | Iain Chapple[7] | Reinhard Gruber[8] | Pernilla Lundberg[9] | Anton Sculean[10] | Niklaus P. Lang[11] | Petter Lyngstadaas[12] | Moritz Kebschull[7] | Pablo Galindo-Moreno[13] | Zvi Schwartz[14] | Lior Shapira[15] | Andreas Stavropoulos[16] | Janne Reseland[12]

[1]Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

[2]Department of Periodontology, Institute of Odontology, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

[3]Department of Oral, Maxillofacial and Plastic Surgery, J. Gutenberg University of Mainz, Mainz, Germany

[4]State University of Maringa, Parana, Brazil

[5]School of Dentistry, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

[6]Department of Periodontology, Paris 7 University, Paris, France

[7]School of Dentistry, Institute of Clinical Sciences, College of Medical & Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

[8]Department of Oral Biology, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[9]Department of Odontology, Division of Molecular Periodontology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

[10]Department of Periodontology, School of Dental Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

[11]University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

[12]Faculty of Dentistry, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[13]University of Granada, Granada, Spain

[14]Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

[15]Department of Periodontology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

[16]Department of Periodontology, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

Correspondence
Tord Berglundh, Department of Periodontology, Institute of Odontology, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, PO Box 450, SE 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden.
Email: tord.berglundh@odontologi.gu.se

Funding information
Funds for this workshop were provided by the European Federation of Periodontology in part through an unrestricted educational grant from Geistlich Pharma AG.

Abstract

Background and Aims: To describe the biology of alveolar bone regeneration.

Material and Methods: Four comprehensive reviews were performed on (a) mesenchymal cells and differentiation factors leading to bone formation; (b) the critical interplay between bone resorbing and formative cells; (c) the role of osteoimmunology in the formation and maintenance of alveolar bone; and (d) the self-regenerative capacity following bone injury or tooth extraction were prepared prior to the workshop.

Results and Conclusions: This summary information adds to the fuller understanding of the alveolar bone regenerative response with implications to reconstructive procedures for patient oral rehabilitation. The group collectively formulated and addressed critical questions based on each of the reviews in this consensus report to advance the field. The report concludes with identified areas of future research.

KEYWORDS
bone remodelling, bone turnover, osteogenesis, osteoimmunology, regenerative medicine, wound healing

1 | PREAMBLE

The remit of Group I was to describe the biology of alveolar bone regeneration. The focus was made on the molecular and cellular processes of intramembranous bone regeneration of the alveolus following injury (such as subsequent to tooth extraction) or diseases (occurring around teeth or dental implants). The interface of the periodontal ligament and cementum as a part of periodontal regeneration was not addressed. However, with respect to bone regeneration, it may include both the alveolar bone and/or the alveolar bone proper in the case of tooth-supporting bone regeneration. The group considered the bone regenerative process in systemically healthy individuals contrasted with compromised wound healing affected at the local or systemic levels. *Bone regeneration* was defined as the re-growth or reconstitution of a lost or damaged bone to restore its former architecture and function, whilst *bone remodelling* was considered as the physiologic remodelling of bone that takes place in a biologically coupled system of activation, resorption and formation (Broggini et al., 2007).

The evidence focused on in vitro and in vivo models of bone regeneration to better understand the biological basis of alveolar bone regeneration. The group identified early stage, pre-clinical in vivo models as well as those with a closer translation to the human clinical situation. Human studies available for evaluation were few.

The report was based on four comprehensive reviews on (a) mesenchymal cells and differentiation factors leading to bone formation (Bartold, Gronthos, Haynes, & Ivanovski, 2019); (b) the critical interplay between bone resorbing and formative cells (Lerner, Kindstedt, & Lundberg, 2019); (c) the role of osteoimmunology in the formation and maintenance of alveolar bone (Gruber, 2019); and (d) the self-regenerative capacity following bone injury or tooth extraction (Sculean, Stavropoulos, & Bosshardt, 2019). These works add to the fuller understanding of the alveolar bone regenerative response with implications to reconstructive procedures for patient rehabilitation. The group collectively formulated and addressed critical questions based on each of the reviews in this consensus report. The group also identified areas of future research.

Q1. What are the critical biological phases characterizing bone regeneration?

Alveolar bone regeneration follows a temporal series of events (Araujo, Silva, Misawa, & Sukekava, 2015; Bastian et al., 2011; Stegen, van Gastel, & Carmeliet, 2015):

- Haemostasis and establishment of the blood coagulum
- Inflammatory phase
- Angiogenesis: cellular recruitment and capillary ingrowth
- Mesenchymal cell recruitment, provisional non-mineralized matrix deposition followed by interactive processes involving mineralization, bone-forming cell differentiation and finally bone formation
  - o Role of growth and differentiation factors
  - o Processes of woven and lamellar bone formation
- Remodelling of newly formed bone; coupling of osteoclasts and osteoblasts which continues throughout life.

Other critical events identified at the molecular and cellular levels need to be explored before definite conclusions defining the sequence of events involved in bone regeneration can be made.

Q2. What biologic/growth factors are involved in the bone regeneration process?

Growth and differentiation factors/signalling molecules are well documented in pre-clinical in vivo models (table 2; Bartold et al., 2019) but less well characterized for humans.

Major growth and differentiation factors identified to date include

- Bone-derived Growth Factors and Differentiation Factors
  - Bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs)
    - *BMP-2*
    - *BMP-7*
  - Growth differentiation factors (GDFs)
  - Platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF-BB)
  - Fibroblast growth factors (FGFs)
    - *aFGF*
    - *FGF-2*
  - Transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β)
  - Insulin-like growth factors (IGFs)
    - *IGF-1*
    - *IGF-2*
  - Vascular endothelial cell growth factor (VEGF)
  - Skeletal growth factor (SGF)
  - Parathyroid hormone-related peptide (PTHrP)
- Bone Growth and Regeneration Signaling Pathways
  - *TGF-β family signalling*
  - *FGF signalling*
  - *Wnt signalling*
  - *Hh signalling*
- Bone Growth and Regeneration Families of Transcription Factors
  - Homeobox gene family of transcription factors
    - *Dlx homeobox gene family*

Homeobox gene family
Hox homeobox gene family
Paired box (Pax) homeobox gene family
LIM homeobox gene family (Lhx)
Paired-like (Pitx) homeobox gene family
Runx transcription factors
SRY-related HMG-box family of transcription factors
bHLH family of transcription factors
Twist
D proteins
The myogenic regulatory factors (MRFs)
Snail family of transcription factors
Smad transcription factors
β-Catenin/LEF/TCF transcription factors
Gli transcription factors
Forkhead family of transcription factors

Q3. What is the role of mesenchymal stem cells, their niche and extracellular matrix in bone regeneration?

Mesenchymal stem cells provide the reservoir for new bone-forming cells.

Niches associated with the alveolar bone (e.g. marrow and periosteal locales) provide potential sources and environment of MSC for bone regeneration and include blood, perivascular source, cells lining the wall of bone defect and periosteum. These provide a source of pluripotent stem cells capable of differentiating and initiating tissue regeneration.

Critical to tissue regeneration is the production of a new extracellular matrix that provides the environment for subsequent cell differentiation and neo-ossification. Thus, the role of the extracellular matrix is to provide a platform for the initiation of tissue-specific regeneration. Fibrous and non-fibrous elements of the extracellular matrix provide a number of critical functions central to tissue regeneration and include

- A reservoir of growth and differentiation factors that can be released in well-controlled spatial and temporal sequences;
- Induction of angiogenesis;
- Homing signals for mesenchymal stem cells;
- Bioactive space maintaining matrix for cell differentiation; and
- An environment of both osteoinduction and osteoconduction.

Q4. What coupling factors regulate bone remodelling?

Coupling between bone resorption and bone formation refers to the process in which osteoclastic bone resorption is linked to the differentiation of osteoblasts and their bone-forming activity. This process is mediated by factors released from the bone matrix during bone resorption, that is, soluble and membrane products of the osteoclasts and signals from osteocytes and osteoblasts. Osteoclast-derived factors include BMP6, WNT 10b, CT-1 and S-1-P; matrix-derived factors include BMPs, TGF-β, IGF-1, FGFs, EGFRs and its ligands as well as miRNAs. Osteocyte/osteoblast-derived factors include sclerostin, Dickkopf-1, WNT-1, RANKL/OPG and PTHrp. Combined osteocyte/osteoblast and osteoclast factors include semaphorins, ephrins and ephrin receptors.

Q5. What coupling factors involved in bone remodelling have regenerative potential for clinical use?

BMP-2 and BMP-7 are in clinical use and BMP-5, BMP-6, BMP-9 exhibit osteogenic properties. Currently, the most studied signalling pathway associated with bone regeneration is the WNT system. Neutralizing antibodies to sclerostin have been demonstrated to increase bone mass in phase III studies. Other factors with potential for regeneration are described in detail in reports from Group 2.

Q6. What is the role of inflammation and its resolution in the process of bone regeneration?

There is a large body of data from pre-clinical models supporting the general concept that inflammation is an important component of bone regeneration. Data need to be interpreted carefully as fracture and osteotomy defect models were utilized involving long bones and genetically distinct murine models. However, genetic ablation of cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2) in rodents treated with COX-2-selective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs led to impaired fracture healing (Simon, Manigrasso, & O'Connor, 2002) that could be rescued by activation of prostaglandin E_2 receptor subtype 4 (Xie et al., 2009). Mice lacking the 5-lipoxygenase gene (Manigrasso & O'Connor, 2010) and systemic inhibition of 5-lipoxygenase were associated with increased bone regeneration. In addition, TNF-α receptor-deficient animals and systemic administration of anti-TNF led to impaired fracture healing. Application of low concentrations of TNF-α promotes fracture repair. Moreover, IL6 and IL17A knockout animals display impaired fracture healing.

There is emerging evidence from pre-clinical in vivo studies in small and large animals that pro-resolving lipid mediators such as RvE1 and LxA_4 have positive modulatory effects on bone regeneration, beyond their inflammation-resolving properties. These appear to be receptor-mediated (ERV1 and BLT-1) and reduce osteoclast differentiation and activation, whilst at the same time promoting osteoblast-mediated healing. The presence of RvD1 in the acute phase of the inflammatory response to an implanted biomaterial had a positive role in subsequent bone tissue repair (Vasconcelos et al., 2018).

Q7. What is the role of different macrophage phenotypes, in particular osteomacs, in bone regeneration?

Pre-clinical models support a critical role for macrophages in bone regeneration. Macrophage depletion by Fas-induced apoptosis in mice or clodronate liposome delivery showed impaired intramembranous osteotomy defects and endochondral bone regeneration

in fracture models. Depletion of CD169 expressing macrophages ("Osteomacs") led to impaired intramembranous and endochondral ossification (Batoon et al., 2017).

Q8. What is the role of lymphocytes in bone regeneration?

The majority of studies reviewed investigated the role of T and B lymphocytes in bone regeneration using fracture models. T and B lymphocytes infiltrate the fracture callus and participate in bone remodelling. Bone remodelling is accelerated in RAG1 knockout mice, which do not possess mature B and T lymphocytes. Similarly, others found RAG1 knockout mice to have a larger but lower density callus compared to controls (Nam et al., 2012). Depletion of CD8 T cells in a murine osteotomy model resulted in enhanced fracture regeneration, whereas a transfer of CD8 (+) T cells impaired the healing process (Reinke et al., 2013). In animals, deficient in γδ T cells, bone regeneration was inhibited. The absence of B cells in mice does not compromise bone formation in a tibial injury model (Raggatt et al., 2013). It appears therefore that heterogeneity exists in T-cell behaviour, with some T-cell populations influencing osteolysis, whereas others (γδ T cells) are associated with enhanced bone formation.

Q9. What is the role played by osteoclasts in bone regeneration?

Bone resorption occurs as an important stage in the regeneration process (Vasak et al., 2014). The molecular mechanisms underpinning this process may be initiated by the release of induction signals for osteoclastogenesis by apoptotic osteocytes and subsequent resorption of necrotic elements of the alveolar bone (Cha et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2018). In contrast to bone remodelling, bone formation within osteotomy sites or micro-cracks is not a coupled process and can arise independently of bone resorption. Knowledge of the role played by osteoclasts in bone regeneration is derived from studies employing bisphosphonates and RANKL activity blockade. Bisphosphonate administration and RANKL blockade using Denosumab increased fracture callus volume with a retained trabecular bone structure in rodents (Amanat, McDonald, Godfrey, Bilston, & Little, 2007; Gerstenfeld et al., 2009). Moreover, bisphosphonate use and RANKL activity blockade also increased bone formation in osteotomy defects (Bernhardsson, Sandberg, & Aspenberg, 2015) and supported early bone formation around implants (Aspenberg, 2009). The available literature supports the contention that early bone formation does not appear to require osteoclasts, but bone maturation requires bone remodelling and thus the coupling of osteoclast to osteoblast function.

Q10. Does bone regeneration in alveolar extraction sites in animals reflect the clinical situation in humans?

The sequential phases of regeneration after tooth extraction appear to be similar among rodents, canines, non-human primates and humans. However, bone remodelling in general takes a longer time in humans as compared to the other species.

Q11. Does the morphology and location of the defect affect the regenerative capacity?

The available data indicate that defect morphology (e.g. number of bony walls and defect dimensions, that is depth, width and volume), location (e.g. extraction sockets, periapical, symphysis or ramus donor sites), and closed or open healing environment substantially influence regeneration of bone defects. Data indicate that the cells responsible for bone regeneration originate from the surrounding bony walls and periosteum. Blood supply, wound stability and availability of cells are influenced by defect morphology and location.

Q12. What is the regenerative capacity of cystic defects or intra-oral bone graft donor sites?

Defects following periapical surgery or cystectomy possess a substantial self-regenerative capacity and largely heal with bone in the vast majority of cases without the use of any adjunct measures. The strong intrinsic potential for regeneration of bone defects after periapical surgery or cystectomy is most likely due to their favourable morphology and location. At bone graft donor sites such as the mandibular symphysis or ramus, repair of the defects following bone block harvesting is generally incomplete. There are no data to draw conclusions on the size of the defect that is critical for complete regeneration in cystic or intra-oral bone graft donor sites.

2 | FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research efforts will need to target both stem cells and biologics through well-controlled clinical trials based on the in vitro and pre-clinical studies published to date. Combining cell-based therapies with controlled temporal delivery of regulatory molecules, using tissue engineering approaches, offers many exciting prospects for bone regeneration. It is not until we understand the process of formation that regeneration will become an achievable and predictable clinical endpoint for managing disease and trauma. This will certainly be the case for bone regeneration.

For cell and biological therapies, manipulation of extracellular matrix to enhance regenerative outcomes will be of value and include identify stem cell niches and the influence that different niches have on the ultimate phenotype of stem cell differentiation; understanding mechanisms of cell–cell and cell–matrix communication through the secretome; explore lab-on-a-chip technologies as matrix modulation models that may substitute for pre-clinical in vivo studies.

Pre-clinical models to study molecular mechanisms of bone regeneration will be developed. These will include models testing the role of single mediators or pathways using technology such as point mutations, gene deletion or gene over-expression. In addition, the field will benefit from molecules with possible future therapeutic

use such as antibodies, inhibitors or small RNAs. A major challenge with several of these agents lies in the delivery and targeting to the site as well as the management of potential off-target side effects.

Macrophages demonstrate significant plasticity in model systems and respond to various environmental cues and other molecular signals that influence differentiation into either type-1 (M1) or type-2 (M2) cells. The association of the M1 phenotype with pro-inflammatory responses and the M2 class with anti-inflammatory and/or pro-resolving activities is rather simplistic and requires further research. Emerging evidence indicates that induction of the M2 phenotype is associated with decreased expression of RANKL and a reduced number of osteoclasts (Zhuang et al., 2019). However, the role of M1 and M2 cells in bone regeneration requires further research. In addition, the use of cytokines, chemokines, transcription factors and micro-RNAs to influence a shift in the balance of M1 and M2 macrophages for bone regeneration is worthy of investigation.

More information is needed on modifying factors that affect regeneration of bone (such as epigenetic influences, ageing (inflammaging), smoking, drugs and systemic conditions). The role of the gut and oral microbiomes in bone regeneration remains to be explored. Potential avenues need to account for interactions between the microbiome and the osteoimmune response in order to determine specific biological pathways.

More information is needed on the influence of defect morphology, location and closed or open healing environments, on bone regeneration in extraction sites, cystic and intra-oral bone graft donor sites.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Corporate Representative: Ela Bingel-Erlenmeyer; Osteology Representative: Kristian Tersar; UCM Staff: Nerea Sanchez.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Workshop participants filed detailed disclosure of potential conflict of interest relevant to the workshop topics, and these are kept on file. Declared potential dual commitments included having received research funding, consultant fees and speaker fee from Biomet Zimmer, BioHorizons, Colgate, Dentaid, Dentsply Implants, Dentium, Geass, Geistlich Pharma AG, Klockner, MIS Implants, Osteogenics Biomedical, Osteology Foundation, Procter & Gamble, Straumann, Sweden & Martina, Sunstar SA and VITA Zahnfabrik.

ORCID

William V. Giannobile https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7102-9746
Tord Berglundh https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5864-6398

REFERENCES

Amanat, N., McDonald, M., Godfrey, C., Bilston, L., & Little, D. (2007). Optimal timing of a single dose of zoledronic acid to increase strength in rat fracture repair. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, *22*(6), 867–876.

Araujo, M. G., Silva, C. O., Misawa, M., & Sukekava, F. (2015). Alveolar socket healing: What can we learn? *Periodontology 2000*, *68*, 122–134.

Aspenberg, P. (2009). Bisphosphonates and implants: An overview. *Acta Orthopaedica*, *80*, 119–123.

Bartold, P. M., Gronthos, S., Haynes, D., & Ivanovski, S. (2019). Mesenchymal stem cells and biologic factors leading to bone formation. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, *46*(Suppl. 21), 12–32.

Bastian, O., Pillay, J., Alblas, J., Leenen, L., Koenderman, L., & Blokhuis, T. (2011). Systemic inflammation and fracture healing. *Journal of Leukocyte Biology*, *89*, 669–673.

Batoon, L., Millard, S. M., Wullschleger, M. E., Preda, C., Wu, A. C., Kaur, S., … Pettit, A. R. (2017). CD169(+) macrophages are critical for osteoblast maintenance and promote intramembranous and endochondral ossification during bone repair. *Biomaterials*, *196*, 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2017.10.033

Bernhardsson, M., Sandberg, O., & Aspenberg, P. (2015). Anti-RANKL treatment improves screw fixation in cancellous bone in rats. *Injury*, *46*, 990–995.

Broggini, N., Buser, D., Cochran, D. L., Garcia, L. T., Giannobile, W. V., Hjorting Hansen, E., & Taylor, T. D. (2007). In W. Laney (Ed.), *Glossary of oral and maxillofacial implants*. Berlin, Germany: Quintessence, p25.

Cha, J. Y., Pereira, M. D., Smith, A. A., Houschyar, K. S., Yin, X., Mouraret, S., … Helms, J. A. (2015). Multiscale analyses of the bone-implant interface. *Journal of Dental Research*, *94*, 482–490.

Chen, C. H., Pei, X., Tulu, U. S., Aghvami, M., Chen, C. T., Gaudilliere, D., … Helms, J. A. (2018). A comparative assessment of implant site viability in humans and rats. *Journal of Dental Research*, *97*, 451–459.

Gerstenfeld, L. C., Sacks, D. J., Pelis, M., Mason, Z. D., Graves, D. T., Barrero, M., … Einhorn, T. A. (2009). Comparison of effects of the bisphosphonate alendronate versus the RANKL inhibitor denosumab on murine fracture healing. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, *24*(2), 196–208.

Gruber, R. (2019). Osteoimmunology: Inflammatory osteolysis and regeneration of the alveolar bone. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, *46*(Suppl. 21), 52–69.

Lerner, U. H., Kindstedt, E., & Lundberg, P. (2019). The critical interplay between bone resorbing and bone forming cells. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, *46*(Suppl. 21), 33–51.

Manigrasso, M. B., & O'Connor, J. P. (2010). Accelerated fracture healing in mice lacking the 5-lipoxygenase gene. *Acta Orthopaedica*, *81*, 748–755.

Nam, D., Mau, E., Wang, Y., Wright, D., Silkstone, D., Whetstone, H., … Alman, B. (2012). T-lymphocytes enable osteoblast maturation via IL-17F during the early phase of fracture repair. *PLoS ONE*, *7*, e40044.

Raggatt, L. J., Alexander, K. A., Kaur, S., Wu, A. C., MacDonald, K. P., & Pettit, A. R. (2013). Absence of B cells does not compromise intramembranous bone formation during healing in a tibial injury model. *American Journal of Pathology*, *182*, 1501–1508.

Reinke, S., Geissler, S., Taylor, W. R., Schmidt-Bleek, K., Juelke, K., Schwachmeyer, V., … Duda, G. N. (2013). Terminally differentiated CD8(+) T cells negatively affect bone regeneration in humans. *Science Translational Medicine*, *5*, 177ra136.

Sculean, A., Stavropoulos, A., & Bosshardt, D. (2019). Self-regenerative capacity of intraoral bone defects. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 46(Suppl. 21):70–81.

Simon, A. M., Manigrasso, M. B., & O'Connor, J. P. (2002). Cyclo-oxygenase 2 function is essential for bone fracture healing. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, *17*, 963–976.

Stegen, S., van Gastel, N., & Carmeliet, G. (2015). Bringing new life to damaged bone: The importance of angiogenesis in bone repair and regeneration. *Bone*, *70*, 19–27.

Vasak, C., Busenlechner, D., Schwarze, U. Y., Leitner, H. F., Munoz Guzon, F., Hefti, T., … Gruber, R. (2014). Early bone apposition to hydrophilic and hydrophobic titanium implant surfaces: A histologic and histomorphometric study in minipigs. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, *25*, 1378–1385.

Vasconcelos, D. P., Costa, M., Neves, N., Teixeira, J. H., Vasconcelos, D. M., Santos, S. G., … Barbosa, J. N. (2018). Chitosan porous 3D scaffolds embedded with resolvin D1 to improve in vivo bone healing. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A*, *106*, 1626–1633.

Xie, C., Liang, B., Xue, M., Lin, A. S., Loiselle, A., Schwarz, E. M., … Zhang, X. (2009). Rescue of impaired fracture healing in COX-2-/- mice via activation of prostaglandin E2 receptor subtype 4. *American Journal of Pathology*, *175*, 772–785.

Zhuang, Z., Yoshizawa-Smith, S., Glowacki, A., Maltos, K., Pacheco, C., Shehabeldin, M., … Sfeir, C. (2019). Induction of M2 macrophages prevents bone loss in murine periodontitis models. *Journal of Dental Research*, *98*(2), 200–208.

How to cite this article: Giannobile WV, Berglundh T, Al-Nawas B, et al. Biological factors involved in alveolar bone regeneration. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2019;46(Suppl. 21):6–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13130