

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Canellas et al.
Xenograft materials in maxillary
sinus floor elevation surgery: a
systematic review and network
meta-analysis protocol. Inplasy
protocol 202060106. doi:
10.37766/inplasy2020.6.0106

Received: 28 June 2020

Published: 28 June 2020

Corresponding author:
João Vitor Canellas

drcanellas@icloud.com

Author Affiliation:
Rio de Janeiro State University

Support: None.

**Review Stage at time of this
submission:** The review has
not yet started.

Conflicts of interest:
The authors have stated
explicitly that there are no
conflicts of interest.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: What
xenograft material produces greater new
bone formation in maxillary sinus
augmentation?

Rationale: Two-stage sinus floor elevation
using a lateral window technique

Xenograft materials in maxillary sinus floor elevation surgery: a systematic review and network meta-analysis protocol

Canellas, JV¹; Drugos, L²; Ritto, FG³; Fischer, RG⁴; Medeiros, PJ.⁵

Review question / Objective: What xenograft material
produces greater new bone formation in maxillary sinus floor
elevation procedure?

Condition being studied: Two-stage sinus floor elevation
technique using different xenograft materials before dental
implant surgery. The dental implant rehabilitation of the
posterior maxillary region is frequently inhibited by the
amount of available bone. Bone-substitute materials from
animal source are commonly used to increase bone volume in
the deficient posterior maxilla.

Information sources: We will search the following electronic
bibliographic databases: EMBASE, PubMed, Cochrane
Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), LILACS
database, Scopus database, Web of Science database, and
ClinicalTrial.gov. We will conduct manual searches in the
reference list of the eligible studies, and a comprehensive
manual search in the relevant journals.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with
the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and
Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 28 June 2020 and was last
updated on 28 June 2020 (registration number
INPLASY202060106).

represents the most widely technique to
perform bone augmentation in the
maxillary posterior region. Because intra-
oral donor sites provide a limited quantity
of bone and the extra-oral site is not well
accepted by the patients, various types of
bone-substitute materials have been
suggested for maxillary posterior
augmentation procedure. Previous studies

showed that xenograft materials are the most used bone substitutes. However, no previous systematic reviews comparing the available xenograft materials using direct and indirect evidence are available. Therefore, the authors will be performed a frequentist network meta-analysis to provide evidence for comparing different xenograft materials used for maxillary sinus augmentation.

Condition being studied: Two-stage sinus floor elevation technique using different xenograft materials before dental implant surgery. The dental implant rehabilitation of the posterior maxillary region is frequently inhibited by the amount of available bone. Xenograft materials are commonly used to increase bone volume in the deficient posterior maxilla.

METHODS

Search strategy: The search strategy will be published only after the acceptance of the paper. We will send the information as supplementary materials.

Participant or population: Participants are adults with insufficient bone volume in the maxillary posterior region, making dental implant rehabilitation unfeasible. No restrictions on age, ethnicity, gender will be applied.

Intervention: Two-stage Sinus floor elevation technique using Bio-Oss as bone-substitute.

Comparator: Two-stage Sinus floor elevation technique using a different xenograft material, or a different association including Bio-Oss.

Study designs to be included: Parallel and split-mouth randomized clinical trials.

Eligibility criteria: Studies will be selected according to the PICOS criteria (Participant, intervention, comparator, outcomes, and study design) outlined in the referred sections. Additionally, we will include only studies that performed the biopsies six months after sinus lift surgery.

We will exclude studies with no description of the biomaterial trademark or using experimental grafting. Similarly, studies using a one-stage sinus floor elevation technique, studies without new bone formation data, or with incomplete results will be excluded. Studies with more than one biopsy per sinus will also be excluded.

Information sources: We will search the following electronic bibliographic databases: EMBASE, PubMed, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), LILACS database, Scopus database, Web of Science database, and ClinicalTrial.gov. We will conduct manual searches in the reference list of the eligible studies, and a comprehensive manual search in the relevant journals.

Main outcome(s): The percentage of newly formed bone measured by histomorphometric analysis. 2) The percentage of residual bone-substitute measured by histomorphometric analysis. The main outcomes must be measured after a healing period of 6 months.

Additional outcome(s): The authors will analyze the following clinical outcomes: 1) implant survival and peri-implant bone resorption at least 12 months after functional loading; 2) Implant success rates.

Data management: The studies will be imported into Endnote X9 software (Thompson Reuters, Philadelphia, PA, USA) where duplicates will be automatically removed. All analyses will be performed using the software R version 3.6.2 or updated Mac OS X computer system. The package "netmeta" will be used to run network meta-analysis. This package is available from the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN).

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: Two review authors will independently assess the risk of bias. We will use the Cochrane tool for assessing the risk of bias. Sequence generation - Describe the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an

assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups. Allocation concealment - Describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen in advance of, or during, enrollment. Blinding of participants, personnel, and outcome assessors - Describe all measures used, if any, to blind study participants and personnel from the knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Incomplete outcome data - Describe the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions, from the analysis. State whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group, reasons for attrition/exclusions where reported, and any re-inclusions in analyses performed by the review authors. Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed? Selective outcome reporting - State how the possibility of selective outcome reporting was examined by the review authors, and what was found. Other sources of bias - State any important concerns about bias not addressed in the other domains in the tool.

Strategy of data synthesis: A frequentist network meta-analysis using direct and indirect evidence of eligible comparisons will be accomplished. We will provide a quantitative and narrative synthesis. We will provide summaries of intervention effects for each study by calculating standardized mean differences or mean differences. We will pool the results using a fixed or random-effects meta-analysis. Heterogeneity will be assessed using both the τ^2 test and the I^2 statistic. We will consider an I^2 value greater than 50% indicative of substantial heterogeneity. The heterogeneity within designs and between designs will be analyzed. Additionally, the assumption of transitivity and similarity based on clinical and methodological characteristics will be assessed. The inconsistency will be explored using the Net Heat Plot. We will also assess evidence of publication bias.

Subgroup analysis: None.

Sensibility analysis: None.

Language: No language restrictions will be applied.

Country(ies) involved: Brazil and The United States of America.

Other relevant information: This study will be performed by a frequentist approach, which will enable us to estimate which intervention has the highest probability to be the best using net rank function.

Keywords: maxillary sinus augmentation; Bio-Oss; xenograft; systematic review; network meta-analysis.

Dissemination plans: The results of this systematic review will be disseminated through peer-reviewed journal.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - João Vitor Canellas - The author will draft the protocol and the manuscript. Contributed to the development of the selection criteria, the risk of bias assessment strategy, and data extraction criteria. The referred author developed the search strategy and provided statistical expertise. The risk of bias assessment and screening of search studies against eligibility. The author will read and approve the final manuscript.

Author 2 - Luciana Drugos - The author will draft the manuscript. The risk of bias assessment and screening of search studies against eligibility criteria. The author will read and provide feedback.

Author 3 - Fabio Gambôa Ritto - The author will read, perform the risk of bias assessment, supervise, provided feedback. The author will read and approve the final manuscript.

Author 4 - Ricardo Guimarães Fischer - The authors will read, supervise, provided feedback. The author will read and approve the final manuscript.

Author 5 - Paulo Jose Medeiros - The authors will read, supervise, provide feedback, and approve the final manuscript.