

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Izidoro, et al. Combined Technique For Bleaching Non-Vital Teeth With 6 Month Clinical Follow-Up: Case Report, *Int J Oral Dent Health*. 2015;1(2):1
- Kansal, et al. Discoloration of Teeth:A Literature Review.*International Journal of Health and Clinical Research*. 2020; 3(2):59
- Hass, et al. Effects of Exposure to Cola-Based Soft Drink on Bleaching Effectiveness and Tooth Sensitivity of In-Office Bleaching: A Blind Clinical Trial. *Clinical, Cosmetic and Investigational Dentistry*.2019;11:383–392
- Deliperi S, David N, Aikaterini P. Clinical evaluation of a combined in-office and take-home bleaching system, *JADA*. 2004;135: 1-3
- Perdigao J. Tooth whitening: An evidence-based perspective, 1st ed, Springer, USA. 2016; 22-25.
- Cristina, et.al. Case Report New Parameter for In-Office Dental Bleaching. *Hindawi Publishing Corporation Case Reports in Dentistry Vol 2016: 1*
- Monika, Bhaskar DJ. Basics in Tooth Bleaching. *Int J Dent Med Res* 2015;1(6):182.
- Alharbi A, Ardu S, Bortolotto T. In-office bleaching efficacy on stain removal from CAD/CAM and direct resin composite materials. *Journal of Esthetic and Restorative*.2017: 2
- Dalanhol AP, Cunha T. Effect of light activation on tooth sensitivity after in-office bleaching *Operative Dentistry* 36(3): 2011: 251-257.
- Hargreaves KM, Berman LH. Cohen's Pathways Of The Pulp, Part III Bleaching. 11TH Ed. Elsevier Inc. 2016;106
- Gurgan S, Cakir F. Different light-activated in-office bleaching systems: a clinical evaluation. *Lasers Med Sci* .2010; 25
- Mena, et al. A Single-Blind Randomized Trial About the Effect of Hydrogen Peroxide Concentration on Light-Activated Bleaching. *Operative Dentistry*.2016; 2-7

- G. Kugel, S. Ferreira. Clinical Trial Assessing Light Enhancement of in-Office Tooth Whitening, *J Esthet Restor Dent.*2009;3
- Matheus, et al. Effect of violet LED light on in-office bleaching protocols: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Appl Oral Sci.*2020;1-5
- Rastelli AN, Dias HB. Violet LED With Low Concentration Carbamide Peroxide For Dental Bleaching: A Case Report. *Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther.* 2018;23(1):270-2. doi: 10.1016/j.pdpdt.2018.06.021
- Buchalla W, Attin T. External Bleaching Therapy With Activation By Heat, Light Or Laser-A Systematic Review *Dental Materials* .2007 ;23(5) 586-596.
- Kossatz, et al. Effect Of Light Activation On Tooth Sensitivity After In-Office Bleaching *Operative Dentistry* 36(3): 2011: 251-257.
- Gallinari M, Fagundes TC. A New Approach For Dental Bleaching Using Violet Light With Or Without The Use Of Whitening Gel: Study Of Bleaching Effectiveness. *Oper Dent.* 2019;44(5):521-9. doi: 10.2341/17-257
- Tay, et al. Long-Term Efficacy Of In-Office And At-Home Bleaching: A 2-Year Double-Blind Randomized Clinical Trial *American Journal Of Dentistry* .2012;25(4):199-204
- Eimar, et al. Hydrogen peroxide whitens teeth by oxidizing the organic structure. *Journal of Dentistry.*2012;25-33.
- Alomari, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial of In-Office Dental Bleaching with or without Light Activation. *The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice.* 2010 ;11(1):3-6
- Loung, et al. Effect Of Lights With Various Wavelengths On Bleaching By 30% Hydrogen Peroxide. *Lasers In Medical Science.*2018;1-6



KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET DAN TEKNOLOGI
UNIVERSITAS HASANUDDIN

FAKULTAS KEDOKTERAN GIGI

Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan Km. 10, Makassar 90245

Telepon (0411) 586012, Faximile. (0411) 584641

Website : www.dent.unhas.ac.id, Email : fgk@unhas.ac.id

SURAT BEBAS PERPUSTAKAAN

NO. 174 / PERPUST. FKG-UNHAS / 06 / 07 / 2021

Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini menerangkan dan menyatakan bahwa :

Nama : Serlita Wahyu Utami
Nim : J025181005
No. Anggota : 005.018.2018
Alamat : Jl. Kumala Blok. C No. 10 Makassar
Program Studi : PPDGS KONSERVASI

Telah menyelesaikan pinjaman buku pada Perpustakaan Fakultas Kedokteran Gigi Unhas dan tidak mempunyai sangkut paut lagi pada Perpustakaan FKG-Unhas.

Demikian surat bebas Perpustakaan ini diberikan untuk dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Makassar, 06 Juli 2021
Koordinator Ruang Baca Fkg-Unhas

Amiruddin, S.Sos.
NIP. 196611211992011003



Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2)

TEMPLATE FOR COMPLETION

Edited by Julian PT Higgins, Jelena Savović, Matthew J Page, Jonathan AC Sterne

on behalf of the RoB2 Development Group

Version of 22 August 2019

The development of the RoB 2 tool was supported by the MRC Network of Hubs for Trials Methodology Research (MR/L004933/2- N61), with the support of the host MRC ConDuCT-II Hub (Collaboration and innovation for Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures - MR/K025643/1), by MRC research grant MR/M025209/1, and by a grant from The Cochrane Collaboration.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Study details	
Reference	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 80px;"></div>
Study design	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individually-randomized parallel-group trial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial</p>
For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as	
Experimental:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 20px;"></div>
Comparator:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 20px;"></div>
Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 20px;"></div>

Specify the numerical result being assessed. In case of multiple alternative analyses being presented, specify the numeric result (e.g. RR = 1.52 (95% CI 0.83 to 2.77) and/or a reference (e.g. to a table, figure or paragraph) that uniquely defines the result being assessed.

Is the review team's aim for this result...?

- to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)
- to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the 'per-protocol' effect)

If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention*, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):

- occurrence of non-protocol interventions
- failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome
- non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants

Which of the following sources were obtained to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)

- Journal article(s) with results of the trial
- Trial protocol
- Statistical analysis plan (SAP)
- Non-commercial trial registry record (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov record)
- Company-owned trial registry record (e.g. GSK Clinical Study Register record)
- "Grey literature" (e.g. unpublished thesis)
- Conference abstract(s) about the trial
- Regulatory document (e.g. Clinical Study Report, Drug Approval Package)
- Research ethics application
- Grant database summary (e.g. NIH RePORTER or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)
- Personal communication with trialist
- Personal communication with the sponsor

Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in **red** are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of assignment to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.3. If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.4 If <u>Y/PY</u> to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.5. If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA / <u>Y / PY</u> / PN / N / NI
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		<u>Y / PY</u> / PN / N / NI
2.7 If <u>N/PN/NI</u> to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.3. [If applicable:] <u>If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2:</u> Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?		NA / <u>Y / PY</u> / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?		NA / <u>Y / PY</u> / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?		NA / <u>Y / PY</u> / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
2.6. <u>If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5:</u> Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?		NA / <u>Y / PY</u> / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
3.2 If <u>N/PN/NI</u> to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u>
3.3 If <u>N/PN</u> to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
3.4 If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		Y / PY / <u>PN</u> / N / NI
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		Y / PY / <u>PN</u> / N / NI
4.3 <u>If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2:</u> Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN</u> / N / NI
4.4 <u>If Y/PY/NI to 4.3:</u> Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN</u> / N / NI
4.5 <u>If Y/PY/NI to 4.4:</u> Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA / Y / PY / <u>PN</u> / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / <u>NI</u>
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...		
5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / <u>NI</u>
5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / <u>NI</u>
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Overall risk of bias

Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Lampiran

PRISMA 2020 item checklist

Section and topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	
Abstract			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist (Table 2).	
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	
Methods			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for	

		all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesise results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesised results.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.

Section and topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Results			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram (see Fig. 1).	
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesised results.	
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	
Discussion			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	

	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.
Other information		
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.
Availability of data, code, and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.
