Letter to Editor http://www.ijos.org.cn

doi: 10.4248/IJOS10078

## LETTERS TO EDITOR

## About the Article Entitled "Transplantation of Cryopreserved Teeth: a Systematic Review"

## To Editor,

We read with interest the article entitled "Transplantation of cryopreserved teeth: a systematic review" (Osathanon, 2010). Although the author is to be congratulated for his systematic approach to cryopreserved tooth transplantation (CTT), we would like to draw your attention to some technical limitations of this review.

Firstly, evidence-based medical practice (EBMP) mainly comprises 4 steps: (1) formulation of a clear clinical question from an "individual" case, (2) compilation of relevant clinical studies that are the "current best evidence", (3) critical appraisal of the quality, validity, and usefulness of the studies retrieved, and (4) implementation of findings in the case of the "individual" patient and generally in "routine clinical practice" (Slim 2005; Bhandari and Giannoudis, 2006). Identification and critical appraisal of the evidence, therefore, lies at the heart of EBMP. Unfortunately, Osathanon did not clearly stratify the included primary articles according to the hierarchy of evidence. *In vitro* and *in vivo* study results were mixed with clinical evidence. The best evidence of each subtopic is unclear. Mixing the evidence can mislead readers to prematurely include CTT in clinical practice. This is considered as the major drawback of this review. Many, including the Cochrane Collaboration, discourage an inclusion of different study types to address a specific question and generate a single summary estimate (Moher *et al.*, 2007; Wille-Jørgensen and Renehan, 2008).

Secondly, it is known that electronic searching can retrieve most of the relevant randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in English, and there is no influence of language restriction on the main outcome of most systematic reviews (Pitak-Arnnop *et al.*, in press). Our systematic review on management of osteoradionecrosis of the jaws showed that adding the literature in French and German was unlikely to change the study findings (Pitak-Arnnop *et al.*, 2008; 2010b). However, PubMed alone cannot locate over half of dental RCTs (Türp *et al.*, 2002) and German oral-maxillofacial surgery RCTs (Schulte *et al.*, 2004), and approximately 40% of the articles indexed by Embase (Zlowodzki *et al.*, 2006). This emphasizes the importance of manual searching, the use of multiple search engines, and inclusion of primary studies in multiple languages. Analyzing all relevant databases, including the "grey" literature (meeting proceedings, symposiums, abstracts, dissertations), and contacting experts in the field are also recommended (Pitak-Arnnop *et al.*, 2010a; in press).

Thirdly, it is recommended that the author(s) follow the guidelines for reporting of RCTs or systematic reviews (e.g. CONSORT, PRISMA) during the manuscript preparation. A flow diagram is essential to show journal readers the methods or results of the study (http://www.prisma-statement.org/statement.ht, http://www.consort-statement.org/consort-statement/13-19---results/). All of this information can be simply presented by a flow diagram. Hence, we recommend adding a flow diagram to present the number of hits in

http://www.ijos.org.cn Letter to Editor

PubMed, the number of primary articles included, the number of the added articles derived from the manual searching, and the final hierarchy of each included article. It is also interesting if the author does additional searching using other search engines such as Embase or Cochrane Library or Google Scholar, and compares the results with the search using PubMed. This would strengthen the scientific integrity of his systematic review.

Taken together, the Osathanon's article should be interpreted with caution. For details on pitfalls and limitations of EBMP, please refer to our previous publications (Pitak-Arnnop *et al.*, 2008; 2010a; in press).

Poramate Pitak-Arnnop DDS, MSc, Dsc\*, Niels Christian Pausch MD, DMD, PhD, Alexander Hemprich MD, DMD, PhD

Department of Oral, Craniomaxillofacial and Facial Plastic Surgery, Scientific Unit for Clinical and Psychosocial Research, Evidence-Based Surgery and Ethics in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University Hospital of Leipzig, Nürnberger Straße 57, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

\*E-mail: poramate.pitakarnnop@gmail.com

## References

Bhandari M, Giannoudis PV (2006). Evidence-based medicine: what it is and what it is not. Injury, 37(4): 302-306.

Moher D, Tetzlaff J, Tricco AC, Sampson M, Altman DG (2007). Epidemiology and reporting characteristics of systematic reviews. *PLoS Med*, 4(3): e78.

Osathanon T (2010). Transplantation of cryopreserved teeth: a systematic review. Int J Oral Sci, 2(2): 59-65.

Pitak-Arnnop P, Sader R, Dhanuthai K, Masaratana P, Bertolus C, Chaine A, *et al.* (2008). Management of osteoradionecrosis of the jaws: an analysis of evidence. *Eur J Surg Oncol*, 34(10): 1123–1134.

Pitak-Arnnop P, Sader R, Rapidis AD, Dhanuthai K, Bauer U, Hervé C, *et al.* (2010a). Publication bias in oral and maxillofacial surgery journals: an observation on published controlled trials. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*, 38(1): 4–10.

Pitak-Arnnop P, Hemprich A, Pausch NC (2010). Evidence-based oral and maxillofacial surgery: some pitfalls and limitations. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*, Nov 1. [Epub ahead of print].

Pitak-Arnnop P, Hemprich A, Dhanuthai K, Pausch NC (2010b). A systematic review in 2008 did not show value of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for osteoradionecrosis. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*, 68(10): 2644–2645.

Schulte JM, Antes G, Türp JC (2004). Deutschsprachige Artikel zu kontrollierten Studien in der Mund-, Kiefer- und Gesichtschirurgie. *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed*, 114(3): 202–206.

Slim K (2005). Limits of evidence-based surgery. World J Surg, 29(5): 606–609.

Türp JC, Schulte JM, Antes G (2002). Nearly half of dental randomized controlled trials published in German are not included in Medline. *Eur J Oral Sci*, 110(6): 405–411.

Wille-Jørgensen P, Renehan AG (2008). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses in coloproctology: interpretation and potential pitfalls. *Colorectal Dis*, 10(1): 21–32.

Zlowodzki M, Zelle BA, Keel M, Cole PA, Kregor PJ (2006). Evidence-based resources and search strategies for orthopaedic surgeons. *Injury*, 37(4): 307–311.