

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Sacco. More than four decades of temporomandibular joint arthroscopy to manage articular dysfunction: where are we at? An umbrella review of systematic and meta-analyses reviews. Inplasy protocol 202170059. doi: 10.37766/inplasy2021.7.0059

Received: 19 July 2021

Published: 19 July 2021

Corresponding author:
Roberto Sacco

roberto.sacco@manchester.ac.uk

Author Affiliation:
The University of Manchester,
Division of Dentistry, School of
Medical Sciences, Oral
Surgery Department,
Manchester, UK.

Support: No Financial Support.

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

Conflicts of interest:
None declared.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: What is the current state of evidence related to temporomandibular joint closed procedures arthroscopy in managing any

More than four decades of temporomandibular joint arthroscopy to manage articular dysfunction: where are we at? An umbrella review of systematic and meta-analyses reviews.

Sacco, R¹.

Review question / Objective: What is the current state of evidence related to temporomandibular joint closed procedures arthroscopy in managing any type of articular dysfunction? - **Population (P):** any (no limits of age) patients undergone to temporomandibular joint closed arthroscopy procedures; - **Interventions (I):** Any level of arthroscopy (level I, level II and level III); - **Comparison (C):** no comparison; - **Outcome (O):** resolution and or improvement of the temporomandibular dysfunction and related pain; - **Study (S):** systematic review (SR) or meta-analysis (MA).

Condition being studied: Temporomandibular joint arthroscopy to manage articular dysfunction.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 19 July 2021 and was last updated on 19 July 2021 (registration number INPLASY202170059).

type of articular dysfunction? - **Population (P):** any (no limits of age) patients undergone to temporomandibular joint closed arthroscopy procedures; - **Interventions (I):** Any level of arthroscopy (level I, level II and level III); - **Comparison**

(C): no comparison; - Outcome (O): resolution and or improvement of the temporomandibular dysfunction and related pain; - Study (S): systematic review (SR) or meta-analysis (MA).

Condition being studied: Temporomandibular joint arthroscopy to manage articular dysfunction

METHODS

Participant or population: Any (no limits of age) patients undergone to temporomandibular joint closed arthroscopy procedures.

Intervention: Any level of arthroscopy (level I, level II and level III).

Comparator: No comparison.

Study designs to be included: Systematic review (SR) or meta-analysis (MA).

Eligibility criteria: Any type of systematic reviews and meta-analyses studies since 2009.

Information sources: A multi-database search (PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE and CINAHL) will be performed to identify related multi-language papers published from January 2009 until present. An additional manual search was also performed in systematic review registries (PROSPERO, INPLASY, JBI and OFS) to identify possible missing reviews.

Main outcome(s): Evaluate the current state of knowledge regarding the temporomandibular joint arthroscopy closed procedures as it relates with resolution and or improvement of the temporomandibular dysfunction related pain.

Additional outcome(s): Evaluate factors such as: • Type of studies included in the reviews; • Number of patients included in the review; • Patients demographic; • Type of condition (e.g. Myofascial pain and dysfunction, TMJ functional derangement,

TMJ degenerative/inflammatory joint disease); • Most common adverse events.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: Independent review authors will appraise the included studies. The methodological quality of each reviews will be evaluated using the Confidence in Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research (CERQual) tool recommended by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Working Group (GRADE). The CERQual evaluation tool enabled the authors to evaluate the included studies, according four key domains: (1) the methodological limitations of the individual qualitative studies contributing to a review finding, (2) the coherence of the review finding, (3) the adequacy of data supporting a review finding, (4) the relevance of the data from the primary studies supporting a review finding to the context (perspective or population, phenomenon of interest and/ or setting) specified in the review question.

Strategy of data synthesis: Following the screening of the eligible studies, all selected papers will be carefully read to identify study and to assess primary and secondary outcomes. Data will be extracted from each study and analysed. This will be done independently by selected authors. Where pooling of results is inappropriate, the results will be reported as narrative descriptions using a detailed commentary.

Subgroup analysis: All participants will be included in the final analysis. If data permits, a subgroup analysis will be included in this review.

Sensitivity analysis: If sufficient data are extracted, a sensitivity analysis will be conducted to check the stability of the outcome results by excluding low methodological quality or high risk of bias studies.

Language: No language restrictions will be applied.

Country(ies) involved: United Kingdom.

Keywords: Temporomandibular joint,
Temporomandibular disfunction,
Arthroscopy, Review.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Roberto Sacco.

Email: roberto.sacco@manchester.ac.uk