Glucosamine sulfate compared to ibuprofen for TMD osteoarthritis

**Patient or population:** TMD osteoarthritis  
**Intervention:** Glucosamine sulfate  
**Comparison:** Ibuprofen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>'of participants (Studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain during function</td>
<td>The mean pain during function in the intervention group was 0.73 RR higher (0.3 higher to 1.79 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39 (1 RCT)</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Significant improvement of pain during function both treatment groups. GS and ibuprofen reduce pain levels in patients with TMJ degenerative joint disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed with: VAS follow up: median 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported pain-change from baseline</td>
<td>The mean reported pain-change from baseline in the intervention group was 4.57 lower (9.91 lower to 0.77 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39 (RCTs)</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Significant improvement of reported pain, change from baseline, both treatment groups. GS and ibuprofen reduce pain levels in patients with TMJ degenerative joint disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed with: VAS follow up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain free maximum jaw opening</td>
<td>The mean pain free maximum jaw opening in the intervention group was 1.75 higher (4.1 lower to 7.6 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39 (RCTs)</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Significant improvement of pain free opening change from baseline, both treatment groups. GS and ibuprofen reduce pain levels in patients with TMJ degenerative joint disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed with: mm follow up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI questionnaire, pain intensity,</td>
<td>The mean BPI questionnaire, pain intensity, change from baseline in the intervention group was 2.69 lower (7.38 lower to 2 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39 (RCTs)</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Significant improvement of BPI- pain intensity, changes from baseline, both treatment groups. GS and ibuprofen reduce pain levels in patients with TMJ degenerative joint disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change from baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed with: VAS follow up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).*

**CI:** Confidence interval; **RR:** Risk ratio; **OR:** Odds ratio;

**GRADE Working Group grades of evidence**

- **High quality:** We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
- **Moderate quality:** We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
- **Low quality:** Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect
- **Very low quality:** We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

1. One study, few participants  
2. There is no placebo or other treatment group  
3. Unclear sponsorship

**Oppsummering:** Resultatene viser at glucosaminsulfat og ibuprofen kan reducere smertene hos pasienter med TMD (osteoartritt/-artrose). Grunnlaget for dokumentasjonen er basert på fem RCT studier med lav kvalitet.
### Oral benzodiazepine compared to placebo for TMD treatment

**Patient or population:** TMD  
**Intervention:** Oral benzodiazepine  
**Comparison:** Placebo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of participants (Studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Jaw pain**  
assessed with: VAS  
follow up: 3 weeks | The mean jaw pain in the intervention group was 20 MD lower (1.69 lower to 1.29 higher) | - | 28 (1 RCT) | ✨✨◯◯ LOW | There was no statistically significant difference between the effect of clonazepam and placebo on jaw pain |
| **Pain on palpation**  
assessed with: VAS  
follow up: 2 months | The mean pain on palpation in the intervention group was 0 higher (0 higher to 0 higher) | - | 20 (RCTs) | ✨✨◯◯ LOW | There was also no statistically significant difference between clonazepam and placebo in patient assessment of pain in the right temporomandibular joint. |

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI). CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

**GRADE Working Group grades of evidence**

**High quality:** We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect  
**Moderate quality:** We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different  
**Low quality:** Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect  
**Very low quality:** We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

1. Only one RCT with few participants  
2. Allocation, free of other bias?  
3. Adequate sequence generation, Allocation??

**Oppsummering:** Resultatene viser ingen forskjell på kjevesmerter for oralt administrerte benzodiazepiner sammenlignet med placebo. Dokumentasjonen er vurdert å være av lav kvalitet. Grunnlaget for dokumentasjonen er basert på to studier med få deltakere og med risiko for bias.
 Gabapentin compared to placebo for TMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects <em>(95% CI)</em></th>
<th>Relative effect <em>(95% CI)</em></th>
<th>N of participants (Studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous pain assessed with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this study, gabapentin demonstrated a statistically significant effect over placebo in reducing spontaneous pain in the TMDJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS follow up: 12 weeks</td>
<td>The mean spontaneous pain in the intervention group was 3.2 lower (4.71 lower to 1.69 lower)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 (1 RCT)</td>
<td>★★★ ◯◯ ◯◯ LOW ▲▲▲ ▲▲▲ ▲▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tender sites follow up:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this study, gabapentin demonstrated a statistically significant effect over placebo in the number of tender sites on the muscles of mastication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>The mean number of tender sites in the intervention group was 4.56 lower (6.99 lower to 2.13 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 (1 RCT)</td>
<td>★★★ ◯◯ ◯◯ LOW ▲▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global function follow up: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of global function showed no significant difference between the gabapentin and placebo groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeks</td>
<td>The mean global function in the intervention group was 1.5 lower (3.1 lower to 0.1 higher)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 (1 RCT)</td>
<td>★★★ ◯◯ ◯◯ LOW ▲▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

1. Only one study, few participants
2. Pharmaceutical industry sponsorship

Oppsummering: Resultatene viser redusert smerte og redusert antall ømme punkter hos TMD-pasienter ved bruk av gabapentin sammenlignet med placebo. For generell funksjon var det ingen statistisk signifikant forskjell mellom gabapentin og placebo. Grunnlaget for dokumentasjonen er basert på en studie med lav kvalitet.
Oppsummering: Trisykliskeantidepressiva (TCA) i behandling av TMD

GRADE kunne ikke benyttes, fordi ingen av studiene tilfredsstilte de metodiske og statistiske kravene for denne typen kvalitetsvurdering.


Cascos-Romero et al. (2009) brukte en graderingsmetode (tilsvarende GRADE) anbefalt av The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) og konkluderte: According to the principals of evidence-based dentistry, there is currently a scientific evidence level B in favor of using TCAs for the treatment of TMDs. No studies on this topic exist that fulfill the conditions for classification as scientific evidence level 1 according to SORT criteria. This means that the results published in the literature should be analyzed with caution since none have sufficient scientific basis, either because the sample size is inadequate, methodological defects are present, for example the lack of homogeneity of the populations studied, or, as commented above, because the results are extrapolated. There are no scientifically sound studies that demonstrate the effectiveness of TCAs in the treatment of TMDs, therefore, more controlled clinical trials are necessary to demonstrate this hypothetical efficacy, and to assess the dose required for each pathology type and its associated side effects, among other parameters.

Tolkning
- Level A: Good scientific evidence suggests that the benefits of the clinical service substantially outweigh the potential risks. Clinicians should discuss the service with eligible patients.
- Level B: At least fair scientific evidence suggests that the benefits of the clinical service outweigh the potential risks. Clinicians should discuss the service with eligible patients.
- Level C: At least fair scientific evidence suggests that there are benefits provided by the clinical service, but the balance between benefits and risks are too close for making general recommendations. Clinicians need not offer it unless there are individual considerations.
- Level D: At least fair scientific evidence suggests that the risks of the clinical service outweigh potential benefits. Clinicians should not routinely offer the service to asymptomatic patients.
- Level I: Scientific evidence is lacking, of poor quality, or conflicting, such that the risk versus benefit balance cannot be assessed. Clinicians should help patients understand the uncertainty surrounding the clinical service.

Summary of findings:

### Melatonin compared to placebo for TMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects <em>(95% CI)</em></th>
<th>Risk with Melatonin</th>
<th>Relative effect <em>(95% CI)</em></th>
<th>* of participants (Studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain reduction</td>
<td>The mean pain reduction in the intervention group was 44 adjusted MD lower (57 lower to 26 lower)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>⚫⚫⚫⚫</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>Significant reduced pain scores, increased pressure pain threshold compared with placebo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing of analgesic doses</td>
<td>The mean decreasing of analgesic doses in the intervention group was 0.6 adjusted MD lower (0.94 lower to 0.41 lower)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>⚫⚫⚫⚫</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>Significant decreased analgesic doses compared to placebo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).*  
CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;  
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence  
High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect  
Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different  
Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect  
Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect  

1. Only one study  
2. Few participants  
3. Kort oppfølgningsperiode

Oppsummering: Resultatene viser redusert smerte og redusert bruk av smertestillende medikamenter hos TMD-pasienter ved bruk av melatonin sammenlignet med placebo. Grunnlaget for dokumentasjonen er basert på en studie med få deltakere, og på studier som er behetet med stor risiko for systematiske skjevhet/feil i effektestimatene. Dokumentasjonen er vurdert å være av veldig lav kvalitet.