

1 Photobiomodulation for postoperative pain relief in endodontic surgery: a randomized
2 controlled study protocol

3

4 Rolf Wilhem Consolandich Cirisola^{1,2,#a,#b}, & drconsolandich@gmail.com

5 Luis Eduardo Pascuali Moya^{1,2,#a,#b}, & dr.luisepm@gmail.com

6 María Victoria García Olazabal^{1,2,#b,#a}, ¶ garciaolazabal@gmail.com

7 Daniela Anat Amzallag Wagmann^{1,2,#b,#a}, ¶ dra.amzallag@gmail.com

8 Guendalina Palermo Suarez^{2,#b,#a}, ¶ palermoguendalina@gmail.com

9 Carolina Wince^{2,#b,#a}, ¶ caritowince@gmail.com

10 Laura Hermida Bruno^{1,2,#b,#a}, ¶ laurahermidabruno@gmail.com

11 Daniel Rodriguez Salaberry^{1,2,#b,#a}, ¶ rodher47@vera.com.uy

12 Maria Cristina Chavantes^{1#a}, & lunglasertherapy@yahoo.com.br

13 Priscila Larcher Longo^{3,#c,#a}, ¶ pllongo@gmail.com

14 Lara Jansiski Motta^{1#a}, & larajmotta@uni9.pro.br

15 Sandra Kalil Bussadori^{1,4#a}, & sandra.skb@gmail.com

16 Cinthya Cosme Gutierrez Duran^{1#a}, & cduran@uni9.pro.br

17 Kristianne Porta Santos Fernandes^{1#a}, & kristianneporta@gmail.com

18 Raquel Agnelli Mesquita Ferrari^{1,4#a}, & raquel.mesquita@gmail.com

19 Anna Carolina Ratto Tempestini Horliana^{1#a¶*} annacrth@gmail.com

20

21 ¹Postgraduate Program in Biophotonics-Medicine, Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE),
22 São Paulo, Brazil.

23 ²Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), Montevideo, Uruguay.

24 ³Postgraduate Program in Aging Science, Universidade São Judas Tadeu (USJT), São Paulo,
25 Brazil

26 ⁴Postgraduate Program in Rehabilitation Sciences, Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE),
27 São Paulo, Brazil.

28

29 ^{#a} Current adress: Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE), São Paulo, Brazil.

30 ^{#b} Current adress: Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), Montevideo, Uruguay

31 ^{#c} Current adress Universidade São Judas Tadeu (USJT), São Paulo, Brazil

32

33 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

34 & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

35

36 **Corresponding Author:**

37 E-mail: annacrth@gmail.com (ACRTH)

38 Orcid iD: 0000-0003-3476-9064

39

40 **data availability Statement-** all data will be available for the readers.

41 **funding Statement** – One author receives a grant from the National Council for Scientific and
42 Technological Development process (CNPq:3146682020-9). **conflict of interest disclosure** All
43 authors disclose any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that
44 could inappropriately influence (bias) this study.

45 **ethics approval Statement** - The project received approval from the Research Ethics
46 Committee of Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), process: 220914

47 **patient consent Statement** – All the participants included signed an Informed consent.

48 **clinical trial registration** NCT05935306 (version: September 2023)

49 **protocol modifications** All the modifications in the protocol will be communicated to relevant
50 parties.

51 **Dissemination policy:** We will share trial results with participants, healthcare professionals, the
52 public, and relevant groups.

53

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 **Abstract**

2 Photobiomodulation (PBM) has shown favorable results in the postoperative period of
3 endodontic surgery, however, up to now, the level of evidence in this procedure is low.
4 The objective of this study will be to evaluate if photobiomodulation (PBM) can reduce
5 postoperative pain in patients who will undergo endodontic surgery. For this randomized,
6 controlled, and double-blind clinical study, 34 patients without comorbidities who need
7 endodontic surgery in the upper jaw (15 to 25 teeth) will be recruited. They will be
8 randomly divided into an experimental group (n = 17) photobiomodulation (808nm, 100
9 mW, and 4J/cm² with 5 points per vestibular). Applications will be made in the immediate
10 postoperative period and 24 hours after surgery. Control group (n = 17) PBM simulation
11 will be performed in the same way as in the experimental group. In this group, the
12 required analgesia will be administered within the standard with ibuprofen. Both groups
13 will perform the necessary conventional procedures considered the gold standard in the
14 literature. Both the patient and the evaluator will be blinded to the intervention performed.
15 The primary outcome variable of the study will be postoperative pain, which will be
16 assessed using the visual analogue scale at all postoperative control visits (baseline, 24
17 hours and 7 days). As for the secondary outcome variables, the amount of systemic
18 medication received according to the patient's need (will be provided by the investigator).
19 Radiographic images will be obtained after 1 and 3 months for evaluation of the repair
20 (dimensions of the lesion, radiopacity). These radiographs will be taken digitally with the
21 positioners implemented. Edema, ecchymosis, and evaluation of soft tissues in the
22 anterior portion of the intra and extraoral maxilla will also be evaluated. In addition, the
23 temperature with a digital thermometer. These parameters will be evaluated 24 hours and
24 7 days after the intervention. The intervention and the X-rays will be taken in the 1st and
25 3rd month respectively. Once all the data have been collected, their normality will be
26 tested, and the one-way ANOVA test and the complementary Tukey test will be carried
27 out. Data will be presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD) and the accepted p-value
28 will be <0.05.

29 **Keywords:** photobiomodulation, endodontic surgery, pain, inflammation.

30

31

1 Introduction

2 The objective of endodontic surgery is to surgically access the defect, remove the lesion
3 and affected tissues, perform the resection of the fragment at the level of the involved
4 root apex, location of the involved canal(s), retro conformation, three-dimensional
5 cleaning and sealing of all the ends of the root canal (retro filling) with a biomaterial.
6 (Forbes et al., 2000). The success rate in endodontic surgery has improved significantly
7 from 60% to 90% (Von Arx et al., 1999; Zuolo et al., 2000). The postoperative period
8 can be painful depending on the magnitude of the surgical trauma, the presence of
9 microorganisms, and non-compliance with postoperative recommendations. In general,
10 there is little literature related to this type of surgery and the possible results come mainly
11 from oral or periodontal surgery and not from endodontic surgery (Taschieri, 2021).
12 NSAIDs are the most prescribed drugs to prevent pain (Nekoofar et al., 2003), with
13 ibuprofen being the most researched drug. Evidence has shown that NSAIDs should be
14 avoided in patients at high risk of cardiovascular disease. If used, it should be done in
15 shorter doses and durations, with the goal of achieving maximum effectiveness (Bally et
16 al., 2017). If used, it should be done in shorter doses and periods of time, with the aim of
17 achieving maximum effectiveness. In recent years, photobiomodulation has been used
18 successfully in oral surgery to reduce edema and postoperative pain, however, there are
19 few studies that have tested it in the postoperative period of endodontic surgery.
20 Photobiomodulation has been widely used in oral surgeries with promising results,
21 however, in the postoperative period of endodontic surgeries it has not been widely
22 studied. Low power laser application has been used for several decades to reduce pain,
23 and inflammation and improve wound healing conditions (Karu 2014, Hamblin 2017)
24 and it is well-established in the dental clinic due to its anti-inflammatory and regenerative
25 effects. (Okamoto et al., 1993; Roberts-Harry et al., 1992). LLLT is considered an adjunct
26 to relieve postoperative pain from the procedure (Turhani et al., 2006). There are few
27 studies that have studied the effect of photobiomodulation on periapical tissue repair after
28 endodontic surgery (Metin et al., 2018; Payer et al., 2005; Kreisler et al., 2004).
29 Regarding the parameters used for irradiation, the radiant exposure ranged between 3 and
30 15 J/cm². In one of the studies (Metin et al., 2018) 3.87 J/cm² was used, while in the other
31 study (Payer et al., 2005) 3-4 J/cm² was used. In the study by Kreisler et al., 2004, only
32 the amount of energy per point (7.5 J) and the fiber diameter (600 μm) were reported.
33 Achieving a radiant exposure of 15 J/cm². Despite the good results, molars were included

1 in the sample. Payer's study did not perform well for the photobiomodulation group,
2 however, the wavelength used was 680 nm, which is not ideal considering the depth light
3 needs to penetrate. Metin's study, for its part, used infrared (810nm) with 3.87 J/cm² of
4 radiant exposure and included only anterior teeth in the sample, so it was used as a
5 reference for our parameters. We use them as a reference because they are common in
6 clinical practice and within the parameters reported in the literature in studies with the
7 least amount of bias and with good results (Metin et al., 2018).

8 Taking all these factors into account, it is suggested that photobiomodulation may be an
9 effective alternative to reduce the use of NSAIDs in pain control after endodontic surgery,
10 thus eliminating the adverse effects of these drugs (Nabi et al.,) and may be tested in the
11 future in systemically compromised patients. Therefore, the objective of this study will
12 be to evaluate if photobiomodulation can reduce postoperative pain after endodontic
13 surgery compared to conventional treatment (ibuprofen) using the visual analog scale
14 (VAS) at the beginning of the study, 24 hours and 7 days after surgery.

15

16 **Material and methods**

17

18 This randomized, controlled, double-blind superiority clinical trial meets the criteria for
19 designing a clinical trial in accordance with the SPIRIT Statement. It was accepted by the
20 Research Ethics Committee (CEP) of the Catholic University of Uruguay, process:
21 220914.

22 Patients who consult at the UCU Clinic and require an endodontic surgery as treatment
23 will be referred to the Project. After the verbal and written explanation of the study, the
24 participants who agree to participate will sign the Informed Consent Form.

25 The treatments will be carried out in the surgical unit of the Clínica Universitaria de la
26 Salud of the Universidad Católica del Uruguay in Montevideo city, Uruguay, from 30th
27 October 2023 to August 2024. Any complications or changes will be reported and
28 clarified to the CEP and reported in publications. Personal information of participants
29 will be collected, shared, and safeguarded for confidentiality throughout the trial

30

31 **Sample description**

32 Participants of both sexes who previously consulted at the Clínica Universitaria de la
33 Salud, with a diagnosis of periodontitis with an apical lesion less than 10mm with or

1 without a fistula, diagnosed clinically and radiographically, in the upper maxillary region
2 (from 15 to 25). They will be invited by the principal researcher, who will obtain informed
3 consent.

4 All patients will receive endodontic surgery as the indicated therapeutic means with no
5 difference between the procedures except for the application of light.

6 The PBM will be performed after surgery and 24 hours and 7 days after surgery.

7

8 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

9 Participants will include:

- 10 • Patients with periapical lesions who have already undergone endodontic treatment
- 11 (lesions smaller than 10mm in their greatest diameter - Metin et al., 2018, single and
- 12 chronic lesions)
- 13 • Patients with no comorbidities,
- 14 • Age from 18 to 70 years,
- 15 • Both genders,
- 16 • Healthy permanent teeth with good hygiene.

17

18 **Participants will be excluded:**

- 19 • Who are taking drugs that affect bone metabolism and the inflammatory process (for
- 20 example: corticosteroids, bisphosphonates),
- 21 • Smokers, pregnant or lactating women,
- 22 • Who used anti-inflammatory drugs in the last 3 months before surgery.
- 23 • Who for any reason interrupted the evolution of the treatment for not attending joint
- 24 appointments.
- 25 • Patients who do not follow the guidelines or have an injury in the acute phase (pain,
- 26 edema, exudate)

27 Those patients who may present some complication during the research period will be
28 assisted at the UCU Clinic or, if outside of hours, at the Mobile Coronary Unit within the
29 framework of the agreement between the UCU and the Mobile Coronary Unit (UCM).

30 All patients will be informed that the adverse effects that may occur will be inherent to
31 the surgical procedure and their resolution will be carried out according to the usual
32 protocol for these cases.

1 If during the scheduled consultations, the patient moves to another city or simply does
2 not want to participate in the survey, they will be automatically disconnected, without any
3 commitment or damage to it.

4 Data from all patients randomized to the survey will be included in the statistical analysis,
5 described and discussed, as well as potential adverse effects. We will use intention-to-
6 treat analysis. Participants will receive assistance from the researchers for all problems
7 arising from the research.

8

9 **Sample's size calculation**

10 The total sample size will be 34 patients per group. This value was calculated to give a
11 power of 95% ($\alpha = 0.05$) and an effect size of 0.6421598. To determine the number of
12 patients in each group, a sample calculation was performed based on the variability of the
13 results of 1 article that evaluated the pain outcome, measured in millimeters (mm) with
14 the visual analog scale. The same time interval as the study (24 h) was considered. In one
15 group, PBM was used and the mean pain in millimeters was 1.91 ± 1.76 and the other
16 group did not use PBM, and the mean pain was 3.14 ± 2.04 . Identical situation to the
17 primary outcome measure used in this study. Using the two-tailed t-test method, the
18 required sample will be 34 individuals, 17 per group. Calculations were made using a
19 significance level of 0.05 (implying a type I error of 5% and leading to an analysis with
20 a 95% confidence interval) and an absolute error of 5%. The flow diagram of the study,
21 according to the SPIRIT recommendations, is shown in Figure 1

22

23 **Calibration and examiner training**

24 One examiner will be trained to assess visual analog scale, temperature assessment in
25 order to maximize reproducibility of assessments.

26

27 **Randomization**

28 The treatment carried out immediately after surgery will be randomized and may be
29 photobiomodulation or photobiomodulation simulation. A program available on the
30 internet and a random sequence generator (<https://www.sealedenvelope.com/>) will be
31 used and the option of randomization by blocks of 2 treatments will be selected. The
32 opaque envelopes will be identified with sequential numbers and the information of the
33 corresponding experimental group will be inserted inside, and sealed. The generation of
34 the random sequence and the preparation of the envelopes will be carried out by a person

1 not directly involved in the study. Immediately after finishing the suture, the investigator
2 in charge of applying the PBM will remove and open 1 envelope (without changing the
3 numerical sequence of the other envelopes) and perform the indicated procedure or its
4 simulation. Only this researcher will know the nature of the treatments.

5

6 **Group composition**

7 G1- SHAM group - Conventional treatment + PBM simulation (n = 17 patients): All
8 participants will undergo the same conventional surgical procedure. Patients will receive
9 the PBM simulation and will be treated identically to the G2 group as shown in Figure 2.
10 The person responsible for applying the PBM will simulate the radiation by placing the
11 devices in the same places described for the PBM group, however, the equipment will
12 remain turned off. Thus, to the participant does not identify the group to which he belongs,
13 the device activation sound (beep) will be recorded, and it will turn on at the time of
14 application.

15 G2- Intervention group - Conventional treatment with placebo ibuprofen + PBM (n =
16 17) All participants will undergo the same surgical procedure. Patients will receive PBM
17 (Table 1) and will be treated identically to the G2 group.
18 The irradiated region will be on the lesion at 4 equidistant points on the vertex of a flat
19 square 1 cm away. A dot will be irradiated in the middle of the square (Figure 3). Placebo
20 ibuprofen will be manipulated.

21 Dosimetric parameters and the number of PBM applications are described in Table 1.

22

23 Table 1: Dosimetric parameters (modified from Metin et al., 2018 and Payer et al., 2005

24

| Parameters | Values/treatment |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Wave compression [nm] | 808 |
| operating mode | continuous |
| Radiant power [mW] | 100 |
| Irradiance [mW/cm ²] | 200 |
| Beam area [cm ²] | 0.5 |
| Exposure time [s] | twenty |
| Radiant exposure [J/cm ²] | 4 |
| Radiant energy [J] | 2J per point |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Total energy [J] | 10J |
| 2 | Number of irradiated points | 5 points for vestibular. |
| 3 | | Irradiate 1 point in the center |
| 4 | | of the lesion and equidistantly |
| 5 | | around it, perform 4 |
| 6 | | irradiations in a quadrangular |
| 7 | application technique | fashion. With a distance of |
| 8 | | 1 cm between them. |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| 29 | | |
| 30 | | |
| 31 | | |
| 32 | | |
| 33 | | |

10 Study Outcomes

11 The primary outcome of the study will be:

12 • **Pain** (comparison of the laser group with the conventional treatment group with
13 ibuprofen) during the immediate postoperative period of endodontic surgery (at baseline,
14 24 hours and 7 days) using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) measured in millimeters
15 (Metin et al., 2018, Sampaio-Filho et al., 2018).

17 **The secondary results of the study will be:**

18 • **Quantity of painkillers ingested in the period:** the quantity of painkillers ingested in
19 the 24-hour and 7-day periods will be counted. The analgesic used will be only
20 paracetamol that will be administered to the patient, but it is advisable to take it only in
21 case of pain (Sampaio-Filho et al., 2018). A procedure will be carried out to monitor the
22 adherence of the participants (for example, each patient will be asked to bring the pain
23 reliever pack to the appointment to see how it is used).

25 • **Edema:** a scale will be used to quantify the amount of edema as recommended by some
26 authors (Metin et al., 2018). The scale is made up of scores from 0 to 3, where: 0 = no
27 edema, 1 = intraoral edema, 2 = extraoral edema, and 3 = diffuse edema (Metin et al.,
28 2018). This outcome will be assessed at baseline and within 24-hour and 7-day periods
29 (Metin et al., 2018).

31 • **Ecchymosis** - bleeding in the subcutaneous tissue, with a diameter greater than 1 cm,
32 which is caused by the rupture of one or more blood capillaries, and one of the causes is
33 surgical trauma. Ecchymosis: 0 = no color change, 1 = spot smaller than 4 cm in diameter,

1 2 = spot 4-10 cm in diameter, 3 = spot larger than 10 cm in diameter (Metin et al., 2018).
2 This outcome will be assessed at baseline and within 24-hour and 7-day periods (Metin
3 et al., 2018).

4

5 • **Soft tissue healing:** Score 1: no opening at the incision line, no drainage (pus or
6 exudate), no inflammation, no pain. Score 2: no opening at the incision line, no drainage,
7 mild swelling, mild pain. Score 3: no opening at the incision line, active drainage,
8 advanced inflammation, moderate to advanced pain. Score 4: opening at the incision line,
9 active drainage, advanced inflammation, ongoing pain. This outcome will be assessed at
10 baseline and within 24-hour and 7-day periods (Metin et al., 2018).

11

12 • **Bone consolidation:** periapical radiography will evaluate the changes in the area of the
13 defect (volume and bone density). Periapical radiographs will always be performed with
14 the same equipment using the parallelism technique in the immediate preoperative period
15 (baseline) so that they can be compared with those performed at 7 days, 1 month, and 3
16 months. The area of the defect will be measured by multiplying the longest mesiodistal
17 and super inferior diameters on the radiographs. In all radiographs, the longest diameter
18 of the lesion was measured, and the periapical index was evaluated. The periapical index
19 was recorded according to the following parameters: 0 = no lesion, 1 = periapical
20 radiolucency with a diameter of 0.5-1 mm, 2 = periapical radiolucency with a diameter
21 of 1.1-2 mm, 3 = radiolucency periapical with a diameter of 2.1-4 mm, 4 = periapical
22 radiolucency with a diameter of 4.1-8 mm and 5 = periapical radiolucency greater than
23 8.1 mm in diameter. This outcome will be assessed at baseline and within 24-hour and 7-
24 day periods (Metin et al., 2018).

25

26 • **Local temperature measurement**

27 Measurement of temperature l (local to surgery) and systemic (glabella), (comparison of
28 the laser group with the group of conventional treatment with ibuprofen.

29 In the immediate postoperative period of endodontic surgery (at the beginning, 24 hours
30 and 7 days)

31

32 **Analysis of results**

33 Initial descriptive analyzes will be carried out considering all the variables measured in
34 the study, both quantitative (mean and standard deviation) and qualitative (frequencies

1 and percentages). Subsequently, normality analyzes will be carried out to determine the
2 appropriate statistical tests for each data set (parametric or non-parametric) and the
3 statistical tests will be applied for each specific analysis. In all tests, the significance level
4 of 5% probability or the corresponding p-value will be adopted. All analyses will be
5 performed using the statistical program SPSS for Windows, version.

6

7 **Monitoring**

8 Investigators do not plan interim analysis because it is not expected serious adverse
9 events. However adverse events (major and minor) will be collected.

10

11 **References**

12

13 Forbes G: Apical Microsurgery for failed endodontics, Atlas Oral Maxillofac Surg. Clin.
14 North Am 8:1-25, 2000

15 Von Arx T, Kurl B. Root-end cavity preparation after apicoectomy using a new type of
16 sonic and diamond-surfaced retrotip: A 1-year follow-up study. J Oral Maxillofac Surg
17 1999;57:656–61.

18 Zuolo ML, Ferreira MO, Gutmann JL. Prognosis in periapical surgery: a clinical
19 prospective study. IntEndod J 2000;33(2):91–8.

20 Metin R, Tatli U, Evlice B. Effects of low-level laser therapy on soft and hard tissue
21 healing after endodontic surgery. Lasers Med Sci. 2018 Nov;33(8):1699-1706. doi:
22 10.1007/s10103-018-2523-8. Epub 2018 Apr 30. PMID: 29713842.


23 Nekoofar MH, Sadeghipanah M, Dehpour AR. Evaluation of meloxicam (A cox-2
24 inhibitor) for management of postoperative endodontic pain: A double-blind placebo-
25 controlled study. J Endod 2003;29:634-7.

26 Bally M, Dendukuri N, Rich B, et al. Risk of acute myocardial infarction with NSAIDs
27 in real world use: Bayesian meta-analysis of individual patient data. BMJ.
28 2017;357:j1909

29 Karu TI, Pyatibrat LV, Afanasyeva NI. A novel mitochondrial signaling pathway
30 activated by visible-to-near infrared radiation. Photochem Photobiol. 2004 Sep-
31 Oct;80(2):366-72. doi: 10.1562/2004-03-25-RA-123. PMID: 15362946.

32 Hamblin MR. Mechanisms and applications of the anti-inflammatory effects of
33 photobiomodulation. AIMS Biophys. 2017;4(3):337-361. doi:
34 10.3934/biophys.2017.3.337. Epub 2017 May 19. PMID: 28748217; PMCID:
35 PMC5523874.

- 1 Okamoto H, Iwase T, Saito T, Morioka T. The possible application of He-Ne laser for
2 dental plaque control. *J Jpn Soc Laser Med* 1993;14:3-7
- 3 Roberts-Harry DP. Laser etching of teeth for orthodontic bracket placement: A
4 preliminary clinical study. *Lasers Surg Med* 1992;12:467-70.
- 5 Turhani D, Scheriau M, Kapral D, Benesch T, Jonke E, Bantleon HP, *et al.* Pain relief by
6 single low-level laser irradiation in orthodontic patients undergoing fixed appliance
7 therapy. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2006;130:371-
- 8 Payer M, Jakse N, Pertl C, Truschnegg A, Lechner E, Eskici A. The clinical effect of
9 LLLT in endodontic surgery: a prospective study on 72 cases. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral*
10 *Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 2005 Sep;100(3):375-9. doi: 10.1016/j.tripleo.2004.10.006.
11 PMID: 16122669.
- 12 Kreisler MB, Haj HA, Noroozi N, Willershausen Bd. Efficacy of low level laser therapy
13 in reducing postoperative pain after endodontic surgery-- a randomized double blind
14 clinical study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2004 Jan;33(1):38-41. doi:
15 10.1054/ijom.2002.0449. PMID: 14758818.
- 16 Nabi S, Amin K, Masoodi A, Farooq R, Purra AR, Ahangar FA. Effect of preoperative
17 ibuprofen in controlling postendodontic pain with and without low-level laser therapy in
18 single visit endodontics: A randomized clinical study. *Indian J Dent Res.* 2018 Jan-
19 Feb;29(1):46-50. doi: 10.4103/ijdr.IJDR_327_15. PMID: 29442086.
- 20



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.18.23297226>; this version posted October 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


Figure 2 - Regions of laser application on the vestibular face (Source: adapted from Metin et al 2018)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.18.23297226>; this version posted October 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

| | | Study period | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Record | Randomization | Post-Operative | | | | Closure |
| TIME | -T₁ | 0 | T₀ | T₁ (24h) | T₂ (7d) | T₃ (30 days) | T₄ (90 days) |
| Record: | | | | | | | |
| Eligibility screen | x | | | | | | |
| Informed consent | x | | | | | | |
| Clinical examiner calibration | x | | | | | | |
| Assignment | | x | | | | | |
| INTERVENTIONS: | | | | | | | |
| Control group | | | x | x | x | | |
| Experimental group | | | x | x | x | | |
| Evaluations: | | | | | | | |
| EVA | | | x | x | x | | |
| Analgesics | | | x | x | x | | |
| Soft tissue healing | | | x | x | x | | |
| Ecchymosis | | | x | x | x | | |
| Edema | | | x | x | x | | |
| Local and systemic temperature | | | x | x | x | | |
| Periapical radiographs | | | x | | | x | x |

Figure

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.18.23297226>; this version posted October 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Figure