

Roccuzzo Andrea (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-8079-0860)
 Stähli Alexandra Beatrice (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-5631-3300)
 Salvi Giovanni E (Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5523-3192)

Non-surgical mechanical therapy of peri-implantitis with or without repeated adjunctive diode laser application. A 6-month double-blinded randomized clinical trial

Andrea ROCCUZZO¹, Sabrina KLOSSNER^{1*}, Alexandra STÄHLI^{1*}, Jean-Claude IMBER¹,
 Sigrun EICK¹, Anton SCULEAN¹, Giovanni E. SALVI¹

*S.K. and A.S. contributed equally to the manuscript and share second author position.

¹Department of Periodontology, School of Dental Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Corresponding author

Andrea Roccuzzo
 University of Bern
 School of Dental Medicine
 Department of Periodontology
 Freiburgstrasse 7
 CH-3010 Bern, Switzerland
 andrea.roccuzzo@zmk.unibe.ch

Running title: Non-surgical peri-implantitis therapy with adjunctive diode laser

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Mr. Juan Luis Gómez Martínez (stHalley Statistics) for his valuable help in statistical analysis

Author contributions

A.R. and G.E.S. conceived the idea and led the writing, A.R. performed the treatment, S.K., A.St, J.C.I and S.E. collected, analyzed and interpreted the data, S.E and A.S. critically revised the manuscript.

Funding

The study was supported by a small grant of the International Team of Implantology (ITI) (Nr.1374-2019).

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interests with respect to this study. A.R. was the recipient of a 3-year scholarship from the Clinical Research Foundation (CFR) for the Promotion of Oral Health, Brienz, Switzerland. A.R. is the recipient of a 1-year scholarship from the International Team of Implantology (ITI). J.C.I was the recipient of a 1-year scholarship

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/clr.13969](https://doi.org/10.1111/clr.13969)

from the Osteology Foundation.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Abstract

Objectives: To investigate the outcomes following non-surgical therapy of peri-implantitis (PI) with or without adjunctive diode laser application.

Materials and methods: A double-blinded randomized controlled clinical trial was carried out in 25 subjects with 25 implants diagnosed with PI. Following curettage of granulation tissue, test implants (T) were treated with adjunctive application of a diode laser for 90 s (settings: 810 nm, 2.5 W, 50 Hz, 10 ms), while at control implants (C) non-activated adjunctive diode laser was applied. The entire treatment procedure was performed at day 0 (i.e., baseline), 7 and 14. The primary outcome measure was change in mean pocket probing depth (PPD). Clinical and microbiological outcomes, as well as host-derived inflammatory markers were evaluated at baseline, 3 and 6 months, while radiographic outcomes were assessed at baseline and at the 6-month follow-up.

Results: No statistically significant differences with respect to baseline patient characteristic were observed. After 6 months, both test and control implants yielded statistically significant PPD changes compared with baseline (T: 1.28 and C: 1.47 mm) but without statistically significant difference between groups ($p=0.381$). No statistically significant changes in peri-implant marginal bone levels were detected ($p=0.936$). No statistically significant differences between test and control implants were observed with respect to microbiological and host-derived parameters ($p>0.05$). At the 6-month follow-up, treatment success was observed in 41.7% ($n=5$) of test and 46.2% ($n=6$) of control patients, respectively ($p=0.821$).

Conclusion: Repeated adjunctive application of diode laser in the non-surgical management of PI failed to provide significant benefits compared with mechanical instrumentation alone.

INTRODUCTION

Following the last Consensus Conference on periodontal and peri-implant diseases, peri-implantitis was defined as a pathological condition around dental implants characterized by inflammation in the peri-implant connective tissue and progressive loss of supporting bone (Schwarz, Derks, Monje, & Wang, 2018). Peri-implantitis is a disease with growing incidence (Derks & Tomasi, 2015; Rokn et al., 2017; Romandini et al., 2021; Schwarz et al., 2017) that, if left untreated, leads to implant loss. The etiological factors of peri-implant infections are similar to those involved in periodontal diseases (L. J. Heitz-Mayfield & Lang, 2010). Consequently, the goals of peri-implantitis treatment must be the resolution of peri-implant soft tissue inflammation and stabilization of the bony attachment (e.g., the level of osseointegration) (Javed, Hussain, & Romanos, 2013). This can only be achieved under the condition that the majority of bacterial biofilms and hard deposits are eliminated on the implant surface to obtain a biologically acceptable surface conducive to wound healing (Aoki et al., 2015). Conventional non-surgical treatment procedures of peri-implant lesions showed limited predictability (L. J. Heitz-Mayfield & Mombelli, 2014; Karring, Stavropoulos, Ellegaard, & Karring, 2005; Renvert, Roos-Jansaker, & Claffey, 2008; Renvert, Samuelsson, Lindahl, & Persson, 2009; A. Roccuzzo, Stähli, Monje, Sculean, & Salvi, 2021). On the other hand, surgical interventions, whether resective (Carcuac, Derks, Abrahamsson, Wennström, & Berglundh, 2020; L. J. A. Heitz-Mayfield et al., 2018) or reconstructive (M. Roccuzzo, Fierravanti, Pittoni, Dalmaso, & Roccuzzo, 2020; M. Roccuzzo, Mirra, Pittoni, Ramieri, & Roccuzzo, 2021), yielded more promising clinical and radiographic outcomes (Tomasi, Regidor, Ortiz-Vigón, & Derks, 2019). Irrespective of the procedure applied (i.e. surgical vs. non-surgical), decontamination of the implant surface is of paramount importance (Koo et al., 2019) even though it is much more challenging when compared to the decontamination of natural root surfaces (Wong et al., 2017).

Accepted Article

To increase implant surface decontamination, several adjunctive tools have been proposed and investigated both in pre-clinical and clinical studies such as the use of photodynamic therapy (G. Romanos, Crespi, Barone, & Covani, 2006; G. E. Romanos & Nentwig, 2008) and lasers (Bach, Neckel, Mall, & Krekeler, 2000; Schwarz, Bieling, Bonsmann, Latz, & Becker, 2006; Schwarz, Nuesry, Bieling, Herten, & Becker, 2006; Schwarz et al., 2003; Sculean, Schwarz, & Becker, 2005). Positive outcomes in terms of changes in pocket probing depth (PPD), bleeding on probing (BoP) and suppuration were reported in a 2-year follow-up single group retrospective study (Mettraux, Sculean, Burgin, & Salvi, 2016). In that study, implant sites were treated with soft tissue curettage to remove the granulation tissue followed by repeated application of diode laser with a wave length of 810 nm (Mettraux et al., 2016). More recently, comparable treatment outcomes were obtained following non-surgical mechanical therapy of peri-implantitis alone or with adjunctive diode laser application with a wave length of 940 nm (Alpaslan Yayli et al., 2022).

However, as reported in a best evidence review from the American Academy of Periodontology (Lin, Suárez López Del Amo, & Wang, 2018), the magnitude of the adjunctive benefits of laser application seems to be limited to short-term changes in BoP.

Therefore, the aim of the present randomized clinical trial was to investigate the adjunctive effects of diode laser application in the non-surgical management of peri-implantitis following a 6-month healing period.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study protocol was submitted to and approved by the Ethical Committee of the Canton of Bern (KEK), Switzerland (Nr.: 2019-01163). The investigation was conducted according to the revised principles of the Helsinki Declaration (2013), and signed informed consent was obtained from each patient before entering the study. The trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04565886).

Study design and study group allocation

The present study was designed as a prospective, double-blinded, randomized, controlled, clinical trial with a parallel design of 6-month duration. The study flow chart is reported in Figure 1. Data are reported according the Consolidated Standards of Reporting (CONSORT) guidelines. Patients were randomly allocated to the test and control groups following randomization tables, while treatment allocation was concealed by using opaque envelopes which were labelled with the patient study number and opened immediately after local anesthesia administration by an external investigator not involved in the non-surgical intervention or in the outcome evaluations.

Hypothesis

The null-hypothesis (H0) was that no statistically significant difference with respect to the mean change in pocket probing depth (PPD) following non-surgical therapy with adjunctive diode laser application would be detected compared with mechanical instrumentation and non-activated diode laser application.

Study population

Subjects attending or referred to the Department of Periodontology at the University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland, were consecutively screened for recruitment. One experienced investigator (G.E.S.) evaluated the subjects and was responsible for the patients' enrollment process following the assessment of the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion criteria

- Male and female patients aged ≥ 18 years
- Patients in systemic health or with controlled medical conditions
- Patients with healthy or treated periodontal conditions rehabilitated with cemented or screw-retained implant-supported prostheses
- Tissue level (TL) implants with an SLA surface (Straumann Dental Implant System, Institute Straumann AG, Basel, Switzerland) supporting single-unit crowns (SUCs) or fixed dental prostheses (FDPs)
- Pocket Probing Depth (PPD) > 5 mm
- Presence of bleeding on probing (BoP) and /or suppuration
- Radiographic evidence of crestal bone loss ≥ 2 mm based on periapical radiographs following delivery of the final restoration
- Implant-supported prostheses accessible for self-performed plaque control
- Presence of at least 2 mm of keratinized and attached mucosa (KM)

Exclusion criteria

- Systemic diseases that could interfere with the treatment outcome (e.g. uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, chemotherapy, etc.)

- Previous peri-implantitis treatment
- Implant mobility
- Full-Mouth Plaque Score (FMPS) > 25%
- Full-Mouth Bleeding Score (FMBS) > 25%
- Cigarette smoking > 10 cig./day
- Intake of antibiotics in the previous 3 months

Intervention

Instructions on the use of manual or power-driven toothbrushes and interdental brushes were provided during the screening session.

As previously reported (Mettraux et al., 2016), following delivery of local anesthesia (Ubistesin Forte; 3M ESPE) the implant surfaces were debrided from hard deposits (i.e., cement excess and/or calculus) using titanium curettes and the inflamed peri-implant soft tissue wall was curetted with stainless steel curettes (Deppeler SA). Following mechanical debridement, the pockets around the implants were rinsed with sterile saline solution. At test implants adjunctive diode laser (settings: 810 nm, 2.5 W, 50 Hz, 10 ms) was applied 3 x for 30 s (i.e., 90 s per appointment) using a 0.4 mm thick fiber (WhiteStar, Orcos Medical AG, Küsnacht, Switzerland) under permanent sterile saline irrigation. The decontamination procedure of the implant surface with diode laser included the systematic movement of the laser tip along the submucosal implant surface in a vertical and horizontal scanning way. After 4-5 s the laser tip was checked for blood coagulation in order to prevent heat generation. In cases of blood coagulation, the tip of the fiber was cut off with a scissor. The laser was consequently activated for 4-5 s followed by 2-3 s of standby mode.

At control implants, non-activated adjunctive diode laser was applied. The entire treatment

procedure, including mechanical debridement, was performed at Day 0 (= baseline), 7 and 14. Adjunctive antiseptics or adjunctive systemic/local antibiotics were not prescribed.

Supportive peri-implant care

Supportive care consisting of oral hygiene monitoring and supramucosal prophylaxis by means of carbon fiber cures and rubber cup with polishing paste was provided at the 3- and 6-month follow-ups. In cases of suppuration or increase in PPD by ≥ 2 mm after 3 and 6 months, rescue treatment was provided. This consisted of submucosal instrumentation with carbon fiber cures, irrigation with sterile saline solution and adjunctive diode laser application 3 x for 30 s (settings: 810 nm, 2.5 W, 50 Hz, 10 ms) according to the randomization table.

Clinical and radiographic outcomes

Evaluation of the clinical parameters was performed at baseline (T0), after 3 (T1) and 6 months (T2) following completion of therapy, while the peri-implant marginal bone level changes were evaluated before treatment and the 6-month follow-up. The following clinical variables were recorded by the same blinded and calibrated examiner (A. St.) using a graduated manual periodontal probe (PCP-UNC 15; Hu-Friedy®, Chicago, IL, USA). The applied probing force ranged from 0.15 to 0.25 N.

- Plaque index (PII) (O'Leary, Drake, & Naylor, 1972);
- BoP, evaluated dichotomously with either presence/absence of bleeding within 30 s following probing;
- Suppuration on probing (SoP), with either presence/absence of suppuration after probing;
- Peri-implant PPD, measured from the mucosal margin to the bottom of the probable pocket and evaluated at six sites per implant (i.e. disto-buccal, mid-buccal, mesio-

buccal, mesio-lingual/palatal, mid-lingual/palatal, disto-lingual/palatal).

The implant-supported restorations were not removed prior to the assessment of the clinical parameters nor for delivery of treatment.

Radiographic assessment

The radiographic assessment was performed following the methodology proposed by Schmid et al. (Schmid et al., 2020; Schmid et al., 2021). Analog radiographs from intraoral dental films (Kodak Ultraspeed DF 58 - Eastman Kodak Company, New York, USA) were scanned and digitized using Microtek TMA 1600 and Microtek ScanPotter (settings on Mac OS X: 1600 dpi, Diafilm, Format.tif). Subsequently, each radiographic image was calibrated and evaluated by means of the software ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA). Based on the fact that all patients were rehabilitated with Straumann Tissue Level implants, the known distance between two implant threads (e.g. 1.25 mm) x 3 (1.25 mm x 3 = 3.75 mm) was used to calibrate the radiographs. Following identification of the mesial and distal edge of the implant shoulder a line was drawn between these two points and used as landmark. Measurements of the mesial and distal bone levels were taken from these 2 points perpendicular to the connecting line to the first bone to-implant contact (BIC). In order to accurately identify the true radiographic linear distance IS-BIC, the height of the supracrestal machined neck (i.e., 2.8 mm for standard implants and 1.8 mm for standard plus implants) was subtracted from the measured values. All positive values were defined as bone gain while bone loss was defined by negative values. All radiographic measurements were assessed in duplicate by two blinded and calibrated examiners (J.C.I - S.K.).

Treatment success

Treatment success was considered a scenario with PPD \leq 5 mm with absence of BoP or PPD \leq 4 mm irrespective of presence/absence of BoP and no further marginal bone loss detectible between baseline and 6 months (Blanco et al., 2022; Carcuac et al., 2016). All patients whose implants did not meet the success criteria were informed and additional treatment was offered according to their needs.

Crevicular fluid (CF) sampling and analysis

Peri-implant CF (PICF) samples for quantification of the host-derived biomarkers interleukin-1beta (IL-1 β), IL-10 and matrix-metalloproteinase-8 (MMP-8) were collected by means of sterile paper strips (Periopaper, Oraflow Inc., Smithtown, NY, USA). PICF samples were collected from a determined site (e.g. site with the deepest PPD at the baseline examination) around each experimental unit. The implant was first isolated with cotton rolls and a saliva ejector and then, air-dried. The paper strips were placed at the entrance of the crevice and left in place for 30 s. Subsequently, the paper strips were placed into a screw top plastic vial and placed immediately into dry ice. Paper strips were stored at -80°C until assayed. Samples were eluted at 4°C overnight into 700 μ l phosphate-buffered saline containing proteinase inhibitors (Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO, USA), a day before analysis. After being centrifuged at 400 g for 4 min, the paper strips were removed and 100 μ l aliquots of the supernatant were used. The concentrations of total MMP-8, IL-1 β and IL-10 were determined using commercially available enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay kits (R&D Systems Europe Ltd, Abingdon, UK) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The detection levels of the kits ranged from 1 pg/site for IL-1 β and IL-10 to 50 pg/site for MMP-8.

Submucosal bacterial sampling and analysis

Following crevicular fluid sampling, biofilm sampling was performed at the same site. Sterile paper points were inserted until the bottom of the pocket. The samples were placed in separate Eppendorf tubes and forwarded to microbiological analysis. DNA was extracted using the Chelex method.²² Then, two multiplex-real-time qPCR runs were performed. The first run quantified *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans*, *Porphyromonas gingivalis*, *Tannerella forsythia* and *Treponema denticola* and the second run *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, and *Campylobacter rectus*. PCR amplifications were carried out as described recently (Jentsch, Heusinger, Weickert, & Eick, 2020). The results are given as bacterial counts \log_{10} .

Data analysis

Sample size calculation was performed considering PPD change as the primary outcome variable. More specifically, assuming a mean of 1.0 mm PPD difference between study groups and a standard deviation in PPD of 0.9 mm in each group at the 6-months follow-up (de Tapia et al., 2019; Schwarz, Sahm, Schwarz, & Becker, 2010), 12 experimental subjects and 12 control subjects were needed to reject the null hypothesis with an alpha error of 0.05 and a beta error of 0.2 and a statistical power of 80%. In order to compensate for attrition over the 6-month follow-up, 15 patients/group were allocated to intervention. Each patient contributed with one dental implant only and was, therefore, considered as the statistical unit. Descriptive analysis was performed providing absolute and relative frequencies for categorical variables and mean, standard deviation, 95% confidence intervals or medians, for continuous variables. Normal distribution of the quantitative measures was checked by Shapiro-Wilk's test. Two-sample t-test was used to compare means of normally distributed parameters between both implant groups and paired t-test was used for intra-groups over time comparisons. For non-normally distributed parameters, Mann-Whitney's and Wilcoxon's tests were used respectively. All multiple post-hoc comparisons were corrected by Bonferroni's criteria. Chi² independence, Fisher's exact test and two-sample t-test were used to assess the association between sociodemographic and implant characteristics by group. The assessment of the linear radiographic measurements by two examiners yielded a Cohen's kappa coefficient of 0.72 across all radiographs. The calculated inter-examiner agreement with Dahlberg's d test was 0.23 mm and 0.29 mm at mesial and distal sites, respectively and the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) was 0.92 and 0.90 providing a very high level of reproducibility of the performed radiographic measurements. All the tests were two-tailed and the level of significance was set at 5%. The statistical analysis was performed with a commercially available

dedicated software (SPSS 15.0 (Chicago, IL. USA)).

Accepted Article

RESULTS

Subject accountability

Thirty-eight patients were assessed for their eligibility prior to entering the study. Of these, 8 patients were excluded: 6 because they did not meet the inclusion criteria, while 2 were not willing to participate (Figure 1). Consequently, 30 patients with 30 implants were enrolled and randomly allocated to test or control group, respectively. The last treatment appointment took place in May 2021. Five patients, 3 from the test group and 2 from the control group not anymore willing to take part to the study, did not attend the 6-month follow-up examination and therefore were excluded from the final analysis.

Study participants characteristics

Baseline characteristics of the 25 participants attending the 6-month follow-up are displayed in Table 1. The mean age of the participants was 67.3 ± 12.2 years and 61.0 ± 13.2 years ($p=0.232$) for test and control group, respectively. Five patients in the test group and 3 in the control group ($p=0.645$) were current smokers. All the included patients had a history of treated periodontitis. With respect to the implant position (i.e. maxilla vs. mandible) and type of retention of the restorations (i.e. screw vs. cemented), none of these parameters showed statistically significant differences between groups ($p > 0.05$). No rescue treatment was provided at any follow-up visit.

Clinical outcomes

The clinical outcomes over the study period are reported in Table 2. No adverse events such as pain and swelling were reported by any patient during the whole observation period.

At T0 (i.e. baseline), all the investigated variables did not statistically significantly differ between

test and control groups ($p > 0.05$). At T1 (i.e. 3 months) and T2 (i.e. 6 months), mean PPD changes both in the test and control group showed statistically significant reductions compared to baseline (T1: $1.13 \text{ mm} \pm 0.80$, $-1.54 \text{ mm} \pm 0.51$; T2: $-1.28 \text{ mm} \pm 0.70$; $-1.47 \text{ mm} \pm 0.68$) but not between groups ($p > 0.05$).

BoP values failed to change statistically significantly both at T1 and T2 in the test and control group (T1: $-9.7\% \pm 36.5$; $-19.2\% \pm 21.3$; T2 $-15.3\% \pm 30.5$; $-15.4\% \pm 31.5$) ($p > 0.05$). Implants in the test group displayed a statistically significant reduction in SoP ($50.0\% \pm 52.2$, $p=0.028$) after 3 months (T1). However, within ($p=0.650$) and between ($p= 0.728$) both groups, no statistically significant differences were observed at the 6-month follow-up.

Radiographic outcomes

At T0, no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) with respect to the average mesial/distal bone levels was observed between test and control groups. At the 6-month follow-up, the mean bone level (BL) was $-2.05 \text{ mm} \pm 0.95$ in the test and $-2.02 \text{ mm} \pm 0.59$ in the control group ($p= 0.922$), respectively. The mean BL changes recorded at the deepest site of each implant (BLd) was $0.11 \text{ mm} \pm 0.72$ in the test and $0.08 \text{ mm} \pm 0.30$ in the control group respectively ($p= 0.876$). Details of the radiographic measurements are reported in Table 3.

Treatment success

At the final 6-month evaluation, treatment success was observed in 41.7% ($n=5$) of test and 46.2% ($n=6$) of control patients, respectively ($p=0.821$) (Table 4).

Host-derived biomarkers outcomes

The biomarker levels of IL-1 β and IL-10 did not change over time neither in the test nor in the

control groups. In the test group, a decrease in the levels of MMP-8 was observed from T0 to T1 ($p=0.169$) and from T0 to T2 ($p=0.028$). A statistically significant difference in the biomarker levels between test and control groups was never recorded at any time point (Table 5).

Microbiological outcomes

A statistically significant difference in selected bacterial counts between test and control groups was not observed at any timepoint. At T1 to T0, counts of *P. gingivalis*, *T. forsythia*, *F. nucleatum*, and *C. rectus* decreased in the test group and of *P. gingivalis*, *T. denticola*, and *F. nucleatum* in the control group, respectively ($p<0.05$). Only the counts of *F. nucleatum* were statistically significantly lower ($p=0.028$) in the control group when comparing the timepoints T0 to T2 (Table 6).

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present randomized controlled trial (RCT) was to assess the adjunctive effect of repeated applications of diode laser to treat peri-implantitis lesions by means of a non-surgical approach. The outcomes failed to detect any statistically significant difference in clinical, radiographic, and microbiological outcomes after 6 months of follow-up. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Comparable treatment outcomes were recently obtained following non-surgical mechanical therapy of peri-implantitis alone or with adjunctive diode laser application (Alpaslan Yayli et al., 2022). It should, however, be pointed out, that adjunctive diode laser with a higher wavelength (i.e., 940 nm) was applied in that study (Alpaslan Yayli et al., 2022).

Despite the recently published large body of evidence on the different treatment modalities to re-establish healthy peri-implant conditions (Bianchini et al., 2019; Monje, Pons, Roccuzzo, Salvi, & Nart, 2020; Ramanauskaite, Becker, Juodzbaly, & Schwarz, 2018; A. Roccuzzo et al., 2021), only few studies investigated the non-surgical adjunctive efficacy of a diode laser to treat peri-implantitis (Lin et al., 2018). More specifically, only one RCT with a split-mouth design (Arisan, Karabuda, Arıcı, Topçuoğlu, & Külekçi, 2015) including 10 patients and 48 implants reported data comparable with those obtained in the present investigation. When focusing on the magnitude of PPD reduction, the 6-month results of the present study revealed a greater improvement compared with those reported by Arisan et al. (Arisan et al., 2015). A plausible explanation might be the higher baseline PPD values in the present study (i.e. 5.40 mm test and 5.29 mm control) compared with those reported by Arisan et al. (i.e. 4.71 mm test and 4.38 mm control) (Arisan et al., 2015). Indeed, a strict correlation between the magnitude of PPD reduction following peri-implantitis treatment irrespective of the intervention provided (i.e. surgical/non-surgical) and the initial PPD has been demonstrated (Monje et al., 2021).

One of the major concerns on the use of diode laser is the risk of heat development with consequent damage of the peri-implant hard and soft tissues. The results of the present study confirm those previously published by Mettraux et al. (Mettraux et al., 2016). Indeed, no adverse events such as pain and swelling were reported by the patients, indicating that peri-implant tissues hotspots could be avoided.

Peri-implant bleeding after gentle probing is a clinical finding difficult to be properly interpreted (Monje et al., 2021). Several anatomic and technical factors might lead to the clinical misinterpretation of bleeding on probing as a sign of trauma to the soft tissues instead of true mucosal inflammation (Hashim, Cionca, Combescure, & Mombelli, 2018). Consequently, it is nowadays widely accepted that the evaluation of the efficacy of the treatment of peri-implantitis should include a composite outcome (Sanz & Chapple, 2012). In the present study, 41.7% of test and 46.3% of control implants were defined as success at the 6-month follow-up. These results are consistent with those of recent publications following non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis and reporting similar percentages of treatment success (i.e. approximately 50%) (Nart et al., 2020) thus underling the challenges faced to achieve disease resolution. Nevertheless, it has to be emphasized that the results of the present study revealed that additional surgical treatment could be avoided in approximately half of the cases by means of nonsurgical therapy, irrespective of the adjunctive application of a diode laser.

With respect to mean peri-implant marginal bone level changes, no statistically significant differences were detected in the two groups, at the 6-month follow-up examination. This might be related to the short observation period (i.e. 6 months) to detect considerable bone level changes (De Waal, Vangsted, & Van Winkelhoff, 2021; Merli et al., 2020). On the other hand, a recent 12-month study evaluating the adjunctive use of systemic metronidazole to the non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis reported positive results in terms of radiographic bone gain

(2.33 mm vs. 1.13 mm), suggesting a correlation between antibiotics intake and the higher bone fill (Blanco et al., 2022). Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the radiographic assessment of the present study revealed that none of the treated sites experienced progressive peri-implant marginal bone loss.

Even-though the application of diode laser leads to a prompt decrease in microbial load, it has been previously demonstrated that re-colonization of the implant surfaces occurs very fast following treatment (Dostalova & Jelinkova, 2013). Our results corroborate this finding, indicating that at the 3- and 6-month follow-up examination no relevant differences in bacterial counts were noticed between the test and the control group. A few bacterial species were selected for microbiological analysis in the present study. As shown in studies analyzing the whole microbiome relative higher amounts of *P. gingivalis*, *T. forsythia* and *F. nucleatum* are found in peri-implantitis lesions when compared with peri-implant health (Al-Ahmad et al., 2018). In addition, the effects of non-surgical therapy of peri-implantitis on bacterial counts are reported in different ways. Adjunctive systemic metronidazole reduced the counts of *P. gingivalis* and *T. forsythia* up to 6 months, whereas there was no effect without antibiotics (Blanco et al., 2022). In a study by our group *P. gingivalis*, *F. nucleatum* and *T. forsythia* were found in decreased proportions 6 and 12 months after adjunctive application of local minocycline or photodynamic therapy (Bassetti et al., 2014). In that study, the levels of IL-1 β and MMP-8 decreased only in the local antibiotics group (Bassetti et al., 2014). In the present study, no major positive effects on microbiological and host-derived parameters were observed, irrespective of adjunctive diode laser application.

Unlike the majority of the published studies for the non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis (Blanco et al., 2022; Nart et al., 2020), where several implant types and implant surfaces were pooled and treated, this study evaluated the outcomes of submucosal mechanical

instrumentation with or without diode laser application on implants with the same surface characteristics, consequently eliminating this important confounding factor. Indeed, recent data suggested a plausible link between implant surface characteristics and the chances of successfully treating peri-implantitis lesions (M. Rocuzzo et al., 2020; M. Rocuzzo et al., 2021; M. Rocuzzo, Pittoni, Rocuzzo, Charrier, & Dalmaso, 2017). Nevertheless, it has to be pointed out that the generalizability of the results of the present study to implants with different micro- and macro-designs characteristics might be questionable.

The present study has some limitations including the relatively small sample size and the short-term follow-up (i.e. 6 months). In addition, the evaluation of a larger number of bacterial species and host-derived biomarkers may have provided additional relevant information. Furthermore, it has to be stated that the main focus of this study was set on PPD changes and that the assessment of peri-implant soft tissue margin changes (i.e. mucosal recession) was lacking, even though the presence of at least 2 mm of keratinized and attached mucosa at all treated implants sites at the latest follow-up might provide an indirect information on the quality of the peri-implant soft tissue conditions.

In conclusion, within their limits the present results have shown that the repeated adjunctive application of diode laser in conjunction with non-surgical mechanical treatment of peri-implantitis, failed to provide significant benefits compared with mechanical instrumentation alone.

References

- Al-Ahmad, A., Muzaffariy, F., Anderson, A. C., Wölber, J. P., Ratka-Krüger, P., Fretwurst, T., . . . Hellwig, E. (2018). Shift of microbial composition of peri-implantitis-associated oral biofilm as revealed by 16S rRNA gene cloning. *J Med Microbiol*, *67*(3), 332-340. doi:10.1099/jmm.0.000682
- Alpaslan Yayli, N. Z., Talmac, A. C., Keskin Tunc, S., Akbal, D., Altindal, D., & Ertugrul, A. S. (2022). Erbium, chromium-doped: yttrium, scandium, gallium, garnet and diode lasers in the treatment of peri-implantitis: clinical and biochemical outcomes in a randomized-controlled clinical trial. *Lasers Med Sci*, *37*(1), 665-674. doi:10.1007/s10103-021-03436-5
- Aoki, A., Mizutani, K., Schwarz, F., Sculean, A., Yukna, R. A., Takasaki, A. A., . . . Izumi, Y. (2015). Periodontal and peri-implant wound healing following laser therapy. *Periodontol 2000*, *68*(1), 217-269. doi:10.1111/prd.12080
- Arsan, V., Karabuda, Z. C., Arıcı, S. V., Topçuoğlu, N., & Külekçi, G. (2015). A randomized clinical trial of an adjunct diode laser application for the nonsurgical treatment of peri-implantitis. *Photomed Laser Surg*, *33*(11), 547-554. doi:10.1089/pho.2015.3956
- Bach, G., Neckel, C., Mall, C., & Krekeler, G. (2000). Conventional versus laser-assisted therapy of periimplantitis: a five-year comparative study. *Implant Dent*, *9*(3), 247-251. doi:10.1097/00008505-200009030-00010
- Bassetti, M., Schär, D., Wicki, B., Eick, S., Ramseier, C. A., Arweiler, N. B., . . . Salvi, G. E. (2014). 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*, *25*(3), 279-287. doi:10.1111/clr.12155
- Bianchini, M. A., Galarraga-Vinueza, M. E., Apaza-Bedoya, K., De Souza, J. M., Magini, R., & Schwarz, F. (2019). Two to six-year disease resolution and marginal bone stability rates of a modified resective-implantoplasty therapy in 32 peri-implantitis cases. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*, *21*(4), 758-765. doi:10.1111/cid.12773
- Blanco, C., Pico, A., Dopico, J., Gándara, P., Blanco, J., & Liñares, A. (2022). Adjunctive benefits of systemic metronidazole on non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis. A randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol*, *49*(1), 15-27. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13564
- Carcuac, O., Derks, J., Abrahamsson, I., Wennström, J. L., & Berglundh, T. (2020). Risk for recurrence of disease following surgical therapy of peri-implantitis-A prospective longitudinal study. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, *31*(11), 1072-1077. doi:10.1111/clr.13653
- Carcuac, O., Derks, J., Charalampakis, G., Abrahamsson, I., Wennström, J., & Berglundh, T. (2016). Adjunctive Systemic and Local Antimicrobial Therapy in the Surgical Treatment of Peri-implantitis: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. *J Dent Res*, *95*(1), 50-57. doi:10.1177/0022034515601961
- de Tapia, B., Valles, C., Ribeiro-Amaral, T., Mor, C., Herrera, D., Sanz, M., & Nart, J. (2019). The adjunctive effect of a titanium brush in implant surface decontamination at peri-implantitis surgical regenerative interventions: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol*, *46*(5), 586-596. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13095
- De Waal, Y. C. M., Vangsted, T. E., & Van Winkelhoff, A. J. (2021). Systemic antibiotic therapy as an adjunct to non-surgical peri-implantitis treatment: A single-blind RCT. *J Clin Periodontol*, *48*(7), 996-1006. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13464
- Derks, J., & Tomasi, C. (2015). Peri-implant health and disease. A systematic review of current epidemiology. *J Clin Periodontol*, *42 Suppl 16*, S158-171. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12334

- Dostalova, T., & Jelinkova, H. (2013). Lasers in dentistry: overview and perspectives. *Photomed Laser Surg*, 31(4), 147-149. doi:10.1089/pho.2013.3493
- Hashim, D., Cionca, N., Combescure, C., & Mombelli, A. (2018). The diagnosis of peri-implantitis: A systematic review on the predictive value of bleeding on probing. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 29 Suppl 16, 276-293. doi:10.1111/clr.13127
- Heitz-Mayfield, L. J., & Lang, N. P. (2010). Comparative biology of chronic and aggressive periodontitis vs. peri-implantitis. *Periodontol 2000*, 53, 167-181. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0757.2010.00348.x
- Heitz-Mayfield, L. J., & Mombelli, A. (2014). The therapy of peri-implantitis: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, 29 Suppl, 325-345. doi:10.11607/jomi.2014suppl.g5.3
- Heitz-Mayfield, L. J. A., Salvi, G. E., Mombelli, A., Loup, P. J., Heitz, F., Kruger, E., & Lang, N. P. (2018). Supportive peri-implant therapy following anti-infective surgical peri-implantitis treatment: 5-year survival and success. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 29(1), 1-6. doi:10.1111/clr.12910
- Javed, F., Hussain, H. A., & Romanos, G. E. (2013). Re-stability of dental implants following treatment of peri-implantitis. *Interv Med Appl Sci*, 5(3), 116-121. doi:10.1556/imas.5.2013.3.4
- Jentsch, H. F. R., Heusinger, T., Weickert, A., & Eick, S. (2020). Professional tooth cleaning prior to non-surgical periodontal therapy: A randomized clinical trial. *J Periodontol*, 91(2), 174-182. doi:10.1002/jper.19-0023
- Karring, E. S., Stavropoulos, A., Ellegaard, B., & Karring, T. (2005). Treatment of peri-implantitis by the Vector system. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 16(3), 288-293. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0501.2005.01141.x
- Koo, K. T., Khoury, F., Keeve, P. L., Schwarz, F., Ramanauskaite, A., Sculean, A., & Romanos, G. (2019). Implant Surface Decontamination by Surgical Treatment of Periimplantitis: A Literature Review. *Implant Dent*, 28(2), 173-176. doi:10.1097/id.0000000000000840
- Lin, G. H., Suárez López Del Amo, F., & Wang, H. L. (2018). Laser therapy for treatment of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis: An American Academy of Periodontology best evidence review. *J Periodontol*, 89(7), 766-782. doi:10.1902/jop.2017.160483
- Merli, M., Bernardelli, F., Giulianelli, E., Carinci, F., Mariotti, G., Merli, M., . . . Nieri, M. (2020). Short-term comparison of two non-surgical treatment modalities of peri-implantitis: Clinical and microbiological outcomes in a two-factorial randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Periodontol*, 47(10), 1268-1280. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13345
- Mettraux, G. R., Sculean, A., Burgin, W. B., & Salvi, G. E. (2016). Two-year clinical outcomes following non-surgical mechanical therapy of peri-implantitis with adjunctive diode laser application. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 27(7), 845-849. doi:10.1111/clr.12689
- Monje, A., Amerio, E., Farina, R., Nart, J., Ramanauskaite, A., Renvert, S., . . . Wang, H. L. (2021). Significance of probing for monitoring peri-implant diseases. *Int J Oral Implantol (Berl)*, 14(4), 385-399.
- Monje, A., Pons, R., Rocuzzo, A., Salvi, G. E., & Nart, J. (2020). Reconstructive therapy for the management of peri-implantitis via submerged guided bone regeneration: A prospective case series. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*, 22(3), 342-350. doi:10.1111/cid.12913
- Nart, J., Pons, R., Valles, C., Esmatges, A., Sanz-Martín, I., & Monje, A. (2020). Non-surgical therapeutic outcomes of peri-implantitis: 12-month results. *Clin Oral Investig*, 24(2), 675-682. doi:10.1007/s00784-019-02943-8
- O'Leary, T. J., Drake, R. B., & Naylor, J. E. (1972). The plaque control record. *J Periodontol*, 43(1), 38. doi:10.1902/jop.1972.43.1.38
- Ramanauskaite, A., Becker, K., Juodzbaly, G., & Schwarz, F. (2018). Clinical outcomes following surgical treatment of peri-implantitis at grafted and non-grafted implant sites: a retrospective analysis. *Int J Implant Dent*, 4(1), 27. doi:10.1186/s40729-018-0135-5

- Renvert, S., Roos-Jansaker, A. M., & Claffey, N. (2008). Non-surgical treatment of peri-implant mucositis and peri-implantitis: a literature review. *J Clin Periodontol*, 35(8 Suppl), 305-315. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2008.01276.x
- Renvert, S., Samuelsson, E., Lindahl, C., & Persson, G. R. (2009). Mechanical non-surgical treatment of peri-implantitis: a double-blind randomized longitudinal clinical study. I: clinical results. *J Clin Periodontol*, 36(7), 604-609. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2009.01421.x
- Roccuzzo, A., Stähli, A., Monje, A., Sculean, A., & Salvi, G. E. (2021). Peri-Implantitis: A Clinical Update on Prevalence and Surgical Treatment Outcomes. *J Clin Med*, 10(5). doi:10.3390/jcm10051107
- Roccuzzo, M., Fierravanti, L., Pittoni, D., Dalmaso, P., & Roccuzzo, A. (2020). Implant survival after surgical treatment of peri-implantitis lesions by means of deproteinized bovine bone mineral with 10% collagen: 10-year results from a prospective study. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 31(8), 768-776. doi:10.1111/clr.13628
- Roccuzzo, M., Mirra, D., Pittoni, D., Ramieri, G., & Roccuzzo, A. (2021). Reconstructive treatment of peri-implantitis infrabony defects of various configurations: 5-year survival and success. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 32(10), 1209-1217. doi:10.1111/clr.13818
- Roccuzzo, M., Pittoni, D., Roccuzzo, A., Charrier, L., & Dalmaso, P. (2017). Surgical treatment of peri-implantitis intrabony lesions by means of deproteinized bovine bone mineral with 10% collagen: 7-year-results. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 28(12), 1577-1583. doi:10.1111/clr.13028
- Rokn, A., Aslroosta, H., Akbari, S., Najafi, H., Zayeri, F., & Hashemi, K. (2017). Prevalence of peri-implantitis in patients not participating in well-designed supportive periodontal treatments: a cross-sectional study. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 28(3), 314-319. doi:10.1111/clr.12800
- Romandini, M., Lima, C., Pedrinaci, I., Araoz, A., Soldini, M. C., & Sanz, M. (2021). Prevalence and risk/protective indicators of peri-implant diseases: A university-representative cross-sectional study. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 32(1), 112-122. doi:10.1111/clr.13684
- Romanos, G., Crespi, R., Barone, A., & Covani, U. (2006). Osteoblast attachment on titanium disks after laser irradiation. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants*, 21(2), 232-236.
- Romanos, G. E., & Nentwig, G. H. (2008). Regenerative therapy of deep peri-implant infrabony defects after CO2 laser implant surface decontamination. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*, 28(3), 245-255.
- Sanz, M., & Chapple, I. L. (2012). Clinical research on peri-implant diseases: consensus report of Working Group 4. *J Clin Periodontol*, 39 Suppl 12, 202-206. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2011.01837.x
- Schmid, E., Morandini, M., Roccuzzo, A., Ramseier, C. A., Sculean, A., & Salvi, G. E. (2020). Clinical and radiographic outcomes of implant-supported fixed dental prostheses with cantilever extension. A retrospective cohort study with a follow-up of at least 10 years. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 31(12), 1243-1252. doi:10.1111/clr.13672
- Schmid, E., Roccuzzo, A., Morandini, M., Ramseier, C. A., Sculean, A., & Salvi, G. E. (2021). Clinical and radiographic evaluation of implant-supported single-unit crowns with cantilever extension in posterior areas: A retrospective study with a follow-up of at least 10 years. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*, 23(2), 189-196. doi:10.1111/cid.12973
- Schwarz, F., Becker, K., Sahm, N., Horstkemper, T., Rousi, K., & Becker, J. (2017). The prevalence of peri-implant diseases for two-piece implants with an internal tube-in-tube connection: a cross-sectional analysis of 512 implants. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 28(1), 24-28. doi:10.1111/clr.12609
- Schwarz, F., Bieling, K., Bonsmann, M., Latz, T., & Becker, J. (2006). Nonsurgical treatment of moderate and advanced periimplantitis lesions: a controlled clinical study. *Clin Oral Investig*, 10(4), 279-288. doi:10.1007/s00784-006-0070-3

- Schwarz, F., Derks, J., Monje, A., & Wang, H. L. (2018). Peri-implantitis. *J Clin Periodontol*, 45 Suppl 20, S246-s266. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12954
- Schwarz, F., Nuesry, E., Bieling, K., Hertel, M., & Becker, J. (2006). Influence of an erbium, chromium-doped yttrium, scandium, gallium, and garnet (Er,Cr:YSGG) laser on the reestablishment of the biocompatibility of contaminated titanium implant surfaces. *J Periodontol*, 77(11), 1820-1827. doi:10.1902/jop.2006.050456
- Schwarz, F., Rothamel, D., Sculean, A., Georg, T., Scherbaum, W., & Becker, J. (2003). Effects of an Er:YAG laser and the Vector ultrasonic system on the biocompatibility of titanium implants in cultures of human osteoblast-like cells. *Clin Oral Implants Res*, 14(6), 784-792. doi:10.1046/j.0905-7161.2003.00954.x
- Schwarz, F., Sahm, N., Schwarz, K., & Becker, J. (2010). Impact of defect configuration on the clinical outcome following surgical regenerative therapy of peri-implantitis. *J Clin Periodontol*, 37(5), 449-455. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2010.01540.x
- Sculean, A., Schwarz, F., & Becker, J. (2005). Anti-infective therapy with an Er:YAG laser: influence on peri-implant healing. *Expert Rev Med Devices*, 2(3), 267-276. doi:10.1586/17434440.2.3.267
- Tomasi, C., Regidor, E., Ortiz-Vigón, A., & Derks, J. (2019). Efficacy of reconstructive surgical therapy at peri-implantitis-related bone defects. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Periodontol*, 46 Suppl 21, 340-356. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13070
- Wong, R. L., Hiyari, S., Yaghsezi, A., Davar, M., Lin, Y. L., Galvan, M., . . . Pirih, F. Q. (2017). Comparing the Healing Potential of Late-Stage Periodontitis and Peri-Implantitis. *J Oral Implantol*, 43(6), 437-445. doi:10.1563/aaid-joi-D-17-00157

TABLE 1. Sociodemographic data at baseline (T0)

TABLE 2. Mean clinical parameters measured at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2). Mean \pm SD (95%CI) or median (m)

TABLE 3. Mean radiological parameters measured at baseline (T0) and 6 months (T2). Mean \pm SD (95%CI)

TABLE 4. Treatment success

TABLE 5. Levels of selected biomarkers at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2). Median [25 percentile, 75 percentile]

TABLE 6. Counts (Log_{10}) of selected bacteria at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2): Median [25 percentile, 75 percentile]

Figure 1. Study flow-chart

TABLE 1. Sociodemographic data at baseline (T0)

| | Total | Test group | Control group | p value |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Number of patients | 25 | 12 | 13 | |
| Number of implants | 25 | 12 | 13 | |
| Age, mean \pm SD | 64.0 \pm 12.9 | 67.3 \pm 12.2 | 61.0 \pm 13.2 | 0.232 (t-test) |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male, number (%) | 13 (52) | 6 (50) | 7 (53.8) | 0.848 (Chi ²) |
| Female, number (%) | 12 (48) | 6 (50) | 6 (46.2) | |
| Tobacco | | | | |
| Smokers \leq 10 cig./day, number (%) | 5 (20) | 3 (25) | 2 (15.4) | 0.645 (Fisher's exact test) |
| Never smokers, number (%) | 20 (80) | 9 (75) | 11 (84.6) | |
| Implant position | | | | |
| Maxilla, number (%) | 11 (44) | 5 (41.7) | 6 (46.2) | 0.821 (Chi ²) |
| Mandible, number (%) | 14 (56) | 7 (58.3) | 7 (53.8) | |
| Screw or cemented | | | | |
| Screw retained, number (%) | 9 (36) | 4 (33.3) | 5 (38.5) | 1.000 (Fisher's exact test) |
| Cemented, number (%) | 16 (64) | 8 (66.7) | 8 (61.5) | |

P-values obtained from Chi² test, Fisher's exact test and two-sample t-test

TABLE 2. Mean clinical parameters measured at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2). Mean ± SD (95%CI) or median (m)

| | Baseline (T0) | | | 3 - month (T1) | | | 6 - month (T2) | | | | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---|---|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---|---|---------|
| | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value | Changes T1-T0 Test group | Changes T1-T0 Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value | Changes T2-T0 Test group | Changes T2-T0 Control group | p value |
| PD | 5.40 ± 0.81 (4.89 5.92) | 5.29 ± 0.52 (4.98 5.61) | 0.694 | 4.28 ± 0.58 (3.91 4.65) | 3.76 ± 0.69 (3.34 4.17) | 0.053 | -1.13 ± 0.80 (-1.63 -0.62) p<0.001* | -1.54 ± 0.51 (-1.85 -1.23) p<0.001* | 0.134 | 4.13 ± 0.82 (3.60 4.65) | 3.82 ± 0.88 (3.29 4.35) | 0.381 | -1.28 ± 0.70 (-1.72 -0.83) p<0.001* | -1.47 ± 0.68 (-1.89 -1.06) p<0.001* | 0.484 |
| PDD | 7.00 ± 1.13 (m=7.0) | 7.23 ± 1.09 (m=7.0) | 0.689 | 5.58 ± 0.79 (m=6.0) | 4.92 ± 0.86 (m=5.0) | 0.087 | -1.42 ± 1.31 (m=-1.0) p=0.014* | -2.31 ± 0.95 (m=-2.0) p=0.002* | 0.068 | 5.33 ± 1.23 (m=5.5) | 4.77 ± 1.24 (m=5.0) | 0.320 | -1.67 ± 1.07 (m=-2.0) p=0.010* | -2.46 ± 0.97 (m=-3.0) p=0.002* | 0.087 |
| BOP | 62.5 ± 30.3 (43.3 81.7) | 62.8 ± 21.7 (49.7 75.9) | 0.976 | 52.8 ± 34.7 (30.7 74.8) | 43.6 ± 14.5 (34.8 52.4) | 0.390 | -9.7 ± 36.5 (-32.9 13.5) p=0.801 | -19.2 ± 21.3 (-32.1 6.31) p=0.085 | 0.431 | 47.2 ± 33.2 (26.1 68.3) | 47.4 ± 27.9 (30.6 64.3) | 0.986 | -15.3 ± 30.5 (-34.7 4.12) p=0.305 | -15.4 ± 31.5 (-34.4 3.67) p=0.262 | 0.993 |
| BOPm | 91.7 ± 28.9 (m=100) | 100 ± 0.0 (m=100) | 0.728 | 83.3 ± 38.9 (m=100) | 100 ± 0.0 (m=100) | 0.503 | -8.4 ± 51.5 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 0.0 ± 0.0 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 0.728 | 83.3 ± 38.9 (m=100) | 100 ± 0.0 (m=100) | 0.503 | -8.4 ± 51.5 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 0.0 ± 0.0 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 0.728 |
| SOP | 58.3 ± 51.5 (m=100) | 38.5 ± 50.6 (m=0.0) | 0.406 | 8.3 ± 28.9 (m=0.0) | 15.4 ± 37.6 (m=0.0) | 0.769 | -50.0 ± 52.2 (m=-50.0) p=0.028* | -23.1 ± 43.8 (m=0.0) p=0.166 | 0.270 | 16.7 ± 38.9 (m=0.0) | 7.7 ± 27.7 (m=0.0) | 0.728 | -41.6 ± 51.5 (m=0.0) p=0.050 | -30.8 ± 48.0 (m=0.0) p=0.092 | 0.650 |
| PI | 8.3 ± 16.7 (m=0.0) | 3.8 ± 10.0 (m=0.0) | 0.650 | 13.9 ± 13.9 (m=16.7) | 11.5 ± 19.7 (m=0.0) | 0.437 | 5.6 ± 26.9 (m=16.7) p=1.000 | 7.7 ± 22.2 (m=0.0) p=0.472 | 0.650 | 9.7 ± 13.2 (m=0.0) | 10.3 ± 27.7 (m=0.0) | 0.470 | 1.4 ± 25.1 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 6.5 ± 30.1 (m=0.0) p=1.000 | 0.769 |
| KM | 2.33 ± 0.99 (1.70 2.96) | 2.77 ± 0.99 (2.17 3.37) | 0.283 | 2.23 ± 0.79 (1.72 2.73) | 2.12 ± 0.46 (1.84 2.40) | 0.663 | -0.10 ± 0.42 (-0.37 0.16) p=1.000 | -0.65 ± 0.83 (-1.15 -0.15) p=0.005* | 0.048* | 2.27 ± 0.91 (1.69 2.85) | 2.50 ± 0.65 (2.11 2.89) | 0.473 | -0.06 ± 0.95 (-0.67 0.54) p=1.000 | -0.27 ± 0.81 (-0.76 0.22) p=0.840 | 0.562 |

PD: probing depth (mm); PDD: deepest probing depth (mm); BOP: bleeding on probing (%); BOPm: % of implants with at least 1 site with BOP; SOP: suppuration on probing (%); PI: presence of plaque (%); KM: keratinized mucosa (mm)

For normally distributed parameters (PD, BOP, KM) two-sample and paired t-tests were used for between and within-groups comparisons respectively.

For non-normally distributed parameters (PDD, BOPm, SOP, PI) Mann-Whitney's and Wilcoxon's tests were used for between and within-groups comparisons respectively.

Bonferroni's corrections were applied for multiple comparisons.

TABLE 3. Mean radiological parameters measured at baseline (T0) and 6 months (T2). Mean ± SD (95%CI)

| | Baseline (T0) | | | 6 - month (T2) | | | Changes T2-T0 Test group | Changes T2-T0 Control Group | p value |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--|---|------------|
| | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value | | | |
| BLm | -2.09 ± 1.00 (-2.72 -1.45) | -2.04 ± 0.48 (-2.34 -1.75) | 0.888 | -2.05 ± 0.95 (-2.65 -1.44) | -2.02 ± 0.59 (-2.37 -1.66) | 0.922 | 0.04 ± 0.50 (-0.28 0.36) p=0.721 | 0.03 ± 0.23 (-0.11 0.17) p=0.800 | 0.936 |
| BL distal | -2.16 ± 1.13 (-2.87 -1.44) | -2.06 ± 0.65 (-2.46 -1.67) | 0.801 | -2.12 ± 1.08 (-2.80 -1.43) | -2.08 ± 0.77 (-2.54 -1.61) | 0.913 | 0.04 ± 0.85 (-0.50 0.57) p=0.834 | -0.02 ± 0.18 (-0.13 0.10) p=0.929 | 0.840 |
| BL mesial | -2.02 ± 1.21 (-2.79 -1.25) | -2.03 ± 0.46 (-2.31 -1.75) | 0.988 | -1.98 ± 1.06 (-2.65 -1.31) | -1.96 ± 0.45 (-2.23 -1.68) | 0.949 | 0.04 ± 0.60 (-0.33 0.42) p=0.747 | 0.07 ± 0.31 (-0.12 0.26) p=0.595 | 0.895 |
| BLd | -2.58 ± 1.03 (-3.23 -1.93) | -2.25 ± 0.60 (-2.62 -1.89) | 0.332 | -2.47 ± 0.99 (-3.10 -1.84) | -2.18 ± 0.69 (-2.60 -1.76) | 0.394 | 0.11 ± 0.72 (-0.35 0.57) p=0.485 | 0.08 ± 0.30 (-0.10 0.26) p=0.620 | 0.876 |

BLm: bone level measured as an average of mesial and distal aspects; BLd: bone level measured at the deepest site per implant

All comparisons were conducted with two-sample and paired t-tests for between and within-groups comparisons respectively.

Bonferroni's corrections were applied for multiple comparisons.

TABLE 4. Treatment success

| | Total | Test group | Control group | p value |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Number of patients | 25 | 12 | 13 | |
| Number of implants | 25 | 12 | 13 | |
| Success | | | | |
| No, number (%; 95% CI) | 14 (56; 34.9-75.6) | 7 (58.3; 27.7-84.8) | 7 (53.8; 25.1-80.9) | 0.821 (Chi ²) |
| Yes, number (%; 95% CI) | 11 (44; 24.4-65.1) | 5 (41.7; 15.2-72.3) | 6 (46.2; 19.2-74.9) | |

P-values obtained from Chi² test

95%CI computed with exact binomial distribution

TABLE 5. Levels of selected biomarkers at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2). Median [25 percentile, 75 percentile]

| | Baseline (T0) | | | 3 months (T1) | | | 6 months (T2) | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value |
| IL-1 β (pg/site) | 20.78 [6.56, 48.86] | 3.63 [2.03, 22.86] | 0.193 | 18.23 [6.14, 60.89] | 2.99 [1.46, 10.70] | 0.112 | 15.77 [1.61, 42.45] | 8.45 [1.67, 31.49] | 1.000 |
| p value vs. T0 | | | | 0.859 | 0.929 | | 1.000 | 0.480 | |
| IL-10 (pg/site) | 10.32 [4.13, 15.91] | 14.07 [11.87, 19.45] | 0.104 | 6.69 [1.71, 15.30] | 15.49 [0.00, 17.20] | 0.314 | 11.68 [7.89, 15.60] | 14.89 [12.71, 17.10] | 0.093 |
| p value vs. T0 | | | | 0.093 | 0.328 | | 0.799 | 0.594 | |
| MMP-8 (ng/site) | 6.79 [5.38, 9.71] | 5.10 [2.79, 8.78] | 0.151 | 2.05 [0.61, 11.80] | 4.09 [2.79, 8.78] | 0.631 | 2.93 [1.64, 5.22] | 10.63 [2.55, 12.46] | 0.069 |
| p value vs. T0 | | | | 0.169 | 0.646 | | 0.028* | 0.239 | |

IL interleukin, MMP matrix metallo protease

All comparisons were conducted with Mann-Whitney's and Wilcoxon's tests for between and within-groups comparisons respectively.

Bonferroni's corrections were applied for multiple comparisons.

TABLE 6. Counts (Log₁₀) of selected bacteria at baseline (T0), 3 months (T1) and 6 months (T2): Median [25 percentile, 75 percentile]

| | Baseline (T0) | | | 3 months (T1) | | | 6 months (T2) | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value | Test group | Control group | p value |
| A.a. p value vs. T0 | 0.00 [0.00, 2.41] | 0.00 [0.00, 0.00] | 0.497 | 0.00 [0.00, 2.21] 1.000 | 0.00 [0.00, 1.09] 0.180 | 0.808 | 0.00 [0.00, 0.00] 0.180 | 0.00 [0.00, 0.00] 0.317 | 0.503 |
| P.g. p value vs. T0 | 6.99 [5.74, 7.42] | 6.04 [5.00, 6.75] | 0.181 | 5.72 [1.31, 7.20] 0.013* | 5.35 [0.00, 6.23] 0.028* | 0.432 | 5.18 [0.00, 7.02] 0.051 | 5.57 [0.00, 6.25] 0.116 | 0.860 |
| T.f. p value vs. T0 | 6.28 [5.92, 7.24] | 6.12 [5.05, 6.72] | 0.345 | 5.70 [5.41, 6.80] 0.013* | 4.44 [3.14, 5.34] 0.123 | 0.057 | 5.53 [5.01, 6.42] 0.093 | 5.18 [4.38, 6.71] 0.575 | 0.657 |
| T.d. p value vs. T0 | 0.00 [0.00, 4.94] | 3.20 [0.00, 5.06] | 0.497 | 0.00 [0.00, 4.30] 0.463 | 1.97 [0.00, 3.73] 0.046* | 0.702 | 1.83 [0.00, 5.61] 0.735 | 0.00 [0.00, 4.95] 0.173 | 0.710 |
| F.n. p value vs. T0 | 7.69 [6.82, 7.94] | 7.14 [6.37, 7.56] | 0.079 | 6.90 [5.39, 7.08] 0.002* | 6.39 [5.31, 6.83] 0.013* | 0.381 | 7.09 [5.50, 7.26] 0.182 | 6.32 [5.55, 6.68] 0.028* | 0.114 |
| C.r. p value vs. T0 | 6.10 [5.62, 6.75] | 2.94 [0.00, 6.80] | 0.356 | 4.64 [0.00, 6.37] 0.017* | 0.00 [0.00, 5.97] 0.068 | 0.796 | 5.32 [0.00, 6.03] 0.069 | 3.95 [0.00, 5.86] 0.686 | 0.815 |

A.a. *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans*, P.g. *Porphyromonas gingivalis*, T.f. *Tannerella forsythia*, T.d. *Treponema denticola*, F.n. *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, C.r. *Campylobacter rectus*

Mann-Whitney's and Wilcoxon's tests were used for between and within-groups comparisons respectively. Bonferroni's correction applied for multiple comparisons.



CONSORT

TRANSPARENT REPORTING of TRIALS

CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram

