DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Adel Alag, Sumit Bedi, Khalid Hassan and Jehan AlHumaid (2017) .Use of platelet-rich plasma for regeneration in non-vital immature permanent teeth: Clinical and cone-beam computed tomography evaluation. Journal of International Medical Research.Vol. 45(2) 583–593. Doi: 10.1177/0300060517692935

Torabinejad M, Turman M. (2011). Revitalization of tooth with necrotic pulp and open apex by using platelet-rich plasma: a case report.J Endod. Feb;37(2):265-8. Doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2010.11.004

Nagy MM, Tawfik HE, Hashem AA, Abu-Seida AM (2014). Regenerative potential of immature permanent teeth with necrotic pulps after different regenerative protocols.J Endod. Feb;40(2):192-8. Doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2013.10.027

Diogenes A, Ruparel NB, Shiloah Y, Hargreaves KM (2016).Regenerative endodontics: A way forward.J Am Dent Assoc. May;147(5):372-80. Doi: 10.1016/j.adaj.2016.01.009.

Saoud TMA, Ricucci D, Lin LM, Gaengler P (2016). Regeneration and Repair in Endodontics-A Special Issue of the RegenerativeEndodontics-A New Era in Clinical Endodontics. Dent J (Basel). Feb 27;4(1):3. Doi: 10.3390/dj4010003

B.Suresh Chandra, MDS, V. Gopikrishna, MDS, FISDR (2014). Grossman's Endodontic Practice. 13Th Edition. India.

Valérie Orti, DDS-PhD, Pierre-Yves Collart-Dutilleul, DDS-PhD, Sofía Piglionico, DDS, Orsolya Pall, MSc, Frédéric Cuisinier, DDS-Professor, Ivan Panayotov, DDS-PhD (2018). Pulp regeneration concepts for non-vital teeth: from tissue engineering to clinical approaches. Doi:1089/ten.TEB.2018.0073

Bezgin T, Yilmaz AD, Celik BN, Kolsuz ME, Sonmez H (2015). Efficacy of platelet-rich plasma as a scaffold in regenerative endodontic treatment.

J Endod. 2015 Jan;41(1):36-44. Doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2014.10.004

Kinjal M. Gathani, Srinidhi Surya Raghavendra (2016). Scaffolds in regenerative endodontics:A review.Dent Res J;13:379-86.Doi: 10.4103/1735-3327.192266

Alex Pollock, Eivind Berge (2018). How to do a systematic review. International Journal of Stroke., Vol. 13(2) 138–156.. Doi: 10.1177/1747493017743796

Matthew J. Page et.al (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews.J. Biomed.central. 10:89. Doi: /10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4

Ganesh Jadhav, MDS, Naseem Shah, MDS, and Ajay Logani, MDS. (2012). Revascularization with and without Platelet-rich Plasma. J. Endod.;38:1581–1587. Doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2012.09.010

Hazim Mohamed Rizk, Mohamed Sherif Salah AL-Deen, and Asmaa Aly Emam (2019). Regenerative Endodontic Treatment of Bilateral Necrotic ImmaturePermanent Maxillary Central Incisors with Platelet-rich Plasmaversus Blood Clot: A Split Mouth Double-blinded RandomizedControlled Trial. Int J Clin Pediatr Dent. Jul-Aug; 12(4): 332–339. Doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-10005-1656

Louis M. Lin , Bill Kahler (2017). A Review Of Regenerative Endodontics: Current Protocols And Future Directions. J Istanbul Univ Fac Dent;51(3 Suppl 1):S41-S51. Doi :10.17096/jiufd.53911

K. M. Galler (2015).Clinical procedures for revitalization: current knowledge and considerations. Rieview. International Endodontic journal. Doi:10.1111/iej.12606

Tewari S, Goyal B, Duhan J, et al (2011). Comparative evaluation of platelet-rich plasma andguided tissue regeneration membrane in the healing of apicomarginal defects: a clinicalstudy. J Endod;37:773–80

Zhu W, Zhu X, Huang GTJ, et al (2013). Regeneration of dental pulp tissue in immature teeth with apical periodontitis using platelet-rich plasma and dental pulp cells. Int Endod J;46:962–70.

Torabinejad M, Turman M (2011). Revitalization of tooth with necrotic pulp and open apex by usingplatelet-rich plasma: A case report. *JEndod.*;37(2):265–268. Doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2010.11.004.

Carlson E, Roach RB (2002). Platelet-Rich Plasma. Clinical Applications in dentistry. *J Am Dent Assoc.*;133:1383–1386

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 : fkg@unhas.ac.id

SURAT BEBAS PERPUSTAKAAN

NO. 173 / PERPUST. FKG-UNHAS / 06 / 07 / 2021

Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini menerangkan dan menyatakan bahwa :

Nama	:	Elizabeth Murniati
Nim	:	J025181008
No. Anggota	:	008.018.2018
Alamat	:	Jl. Poros Kariango Kostrad No. 105 Batangase Maros
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

Lampiran 1

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.

Study details

Reference	

Study design

X Individually-randomized parallel-group trial
☐ Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial
☐ Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial

For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as

Experimental: Comparator:

Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias

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 <u>obtained</u> 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 <u>underlined in green</u> 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 / PY</u>/ PN / N / NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		<u>Y / PY</u>/ PN / N / NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		Y / PY / <u>PN / 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 / PN / N/ NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY/ PN / N/ NI
2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
2.5. If Y/PY/NIto 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA / Y / PY/ PN / N / NI
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		Y / PY/ PN / N / NI
2.7 If N/PN/NI 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 / PN / N/ 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 / PN / N/ NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?		NA / Y / PY/ PN / N / NI
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?		NA / Y / PY/ PN / N / 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?		Y / PY/ PN / N / NI
3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA / Y / PY/ PN / N
3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA / Y / PY/ PN / N/ NI
3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N/ 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 / PN / N/ NI
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA / Y / PY / PN / 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?		Y / PY/ PN / N / NI
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?		Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		Y / PY / PN / N/ NI
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

Lampiran 2

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.