

COMPARISON OF TWO ROOT COVERAGE PROCEDURES: SUBCUTANEOUS CONNECTIVE TISSUE GRAFT AND LATERAL PEDICLE FLAP: A CLINICAL STUDY

Arjun Bharat^A, Rubina Gupta^B, Akanksha Singh^C, Richa Aggarwal^A

^A - Assistant Professor, Dept. of Dental Surgery, Muzaffarnagar medical College, Muzaffarnagar

^B - Associate Professor, Dept. of Dental Surgery, Muzaffarnagar medical College, Muzaffarnagar

^C - Senior Resident, Dept. of Dental Surgery, LLRM medical College, Meerut

Dentistry

Manuscript reference number
NJMDR_5312_17

Article submitted on: 02 June 2017
Article accepted on: 09 June 2017

Corresponding Author

Dr. Rubina Gupta
Department of Dental Surgery,
Muzaffarnagar Medical College
and Hospital,
Opp. Begrajpur Industrial Area
Muzaffarnagar (U.P.) – 251203
Telephone no.: +91 82 220 01502
E-mail: dr.guptarubina@gmail.
com

Abstract:

AIM: The aims of the study are to compare two graft procedures for the amount of root coverage and the cosmetic integration of the operated zone within the mouth.

Material And Method: Thirty patients with Miller's class I or II gingival recession were treated with either lateral pedicle flap or subcutaneous connective tissue graft. The percentage of root coverage and the esthetic appearance of the flap post operatively were checked after 1 & 6 mths.

Result: Statistical analysis of the data (students t-test) shows that the difference in root coverage between the two methods is not significant ($p > .05$). For esthetics, though the relation is statistically non-significant, patient treated with SCTG showed better esthetics than patients treated with LPG.

Conclusion: The post-treatment assessment showed complete root coverage and an excellent aesthetic outcome of lateral pedicle graft and sub-epithelial connective tissue graft root coverage procedures of an isolated gingival recession.

Key Words: Two root coverage procedures, Subcutaneous connective tissue graft and lateral pedicle flap

Introduction

Gingival recession is the apical migration of marginal gingiva beyond the cemento-enamel junction, consequently exposing the root surface to the oral environment.¹ More than 50% of the population has one or more sites of gingival recession ≥ 1 mm.² Most common site of gingival recession is buccal surface of the tooth as a result of vigorous tooth brushing. However, there are several other factors that may also account for this unpleasant and unaesthetic effect like plaque induced gingival inflammation, lack of attached gingiva, malpositioned tooth, shallow vestibule or local iatrogenic factors.³ Gingival recession frequently leads to pain, hypersensitivity, esthetic problem,

retention of plaque hence inflamed gingiva, root caries, abrasion and fear of tooth loss.

Miller⁴ established the clinical classification of marginal tissue recession in the year 1985: Class I – The recession does not reach the mucogingival junction without loss of interproximal tissue; Class II – The recession reaches or surpasses the mucogingival junction without loss of interproximal tissue; Class III – Loss of interproximal tissue is seen, and the proximal gingival tissue is apically to the cemento-enamel junction and coronally to the recession; and Class IV – Proximal gingival tissue is at the recession base level. The higher the periodontal tissue loss (Miller's Class III and IV), the worse the prognosis related to root coverage amount

obtained after surgery.⁵

The coverage of denuded roots represents one of the challenges of periodontal treatment as clinician is not only required to treat disease and improve function but also cope with ever demanding esthetics of patients.⁶ Gingival recession can be managed by surgical or non-surgical approaches. Nonsurgical approaches include - restorations, crowns, veneers and gingival masks whereas surgical management includes various techniques of increasing the width of keratinized tissue such as frenectomy in case of high frenal attachment & root coverage procedures.

In periodontal surgery, the choice of procedure is based on the four cardinal principles of any surgery: success, reproducibility, lack of morbidity and economy.⁷ A number of surgical procedures have been proposed to treat gingival recession. These can be divided into three main groups: pedicle soft tissue grafts, free soft tissue grafts and regenerative techniques⁸

In pedicle grafts, there are rotation flaps – laterally/ horizontally repositioned flaps, double papilla flaps and oblique rotational flaps and the advanced flaps include coronally advanced flaps and semilunar flaps whereas soft tissue grafts include - connective tissue & free gingival grafts.⁹⁻¹²

In the present study, two graft procedures were studied and compared for the amount of root coverage and the cosmetic integration of the operated zone within the mouth.

Lateral pedicle graft (LPG), is a technique where graft is elevated from donor site which remains attached at its base for nourishment and is transferred to adjacent site in isolated denuded root. This technique was selected because of the advantages such as – single surgical area, preservation of blood supply of flap, the postoperative color being in harmony with surrounding tissue.

The sub epithelial connective tissue graft is one of the most versatile and predictable periodontal plastic surgical procedures. It consists of bilaminar reconstruction of the gingiva using both free and pedicle connective tissue layers to preserve graft viability over denuded root surfaces (Nelson, 1987; Harris, 1992). Improved root coverage is seen because of the dual supply of blood.

Material And Method

Thirty patients with gingival recession were selected. The patients (15 each) were randomly selected for either surgery. The inclusion criteria were: adjacent tooth with good periodontal condition with adequate keratinized gingival and no interproximal bone loss, systemically healthy, non-smoker and Miller's class I or II type defect.

Thorough scaling and root planning was done. On assessing the positive compliance from the patient they were educated, and consent was taken before performing surgical root coverage procedure.

The depths of the defects have been measured before surgery and at a follow-up examination after 6 months or later. Results in terms of mid-surface root coverage have been expressed in millimeters and as the percentage of original defect that has been covered. Also, percentage defects with complete coverage have often been reported.

To evaluate aesthetic results,¹³ impressions and photographs of the recessions were made preoperatively and 6 months later. The photographs and the impressions were examined and compared by two independent examiners who were blind to the given treatment. The evaluation of the aesthetic results was scored using a three-step scale: good, moderate or poor.

Surgical Procedure:

Sub Epithelial Connective Tissue Graft

Antisepsis was carried out through aqueous solution of 0.2% chlorhexidine digluconate. After local anesthesia with 2% lignocaine with adrenaline, scaling and root planing were executed on tooth #41 to remove the contaminated and exposed cementum. Then, preparation of the receptor site was performed through horizontal incisions, towards enamel-cementum junction direction, at each papilla. Following, two vertical relaxing incisions and one intrasulcular incision were executed. Next, full-thickness flap was raised, up to the mucogingival junction and continued as a partial-thickness flap based on this junction. Later, the papilla's epithelium was coronally removed up to their apices.

After preparing the receptor site and measuring the size of

graft required, we obtained the subepithelial conjunctive tissue graft from the palate (Figure 2), through the technique of two parallel incisions: one perpendicular to the tooth axis and the other parallel to the bone surface, deepening up to the desired graft height. A partial thickness flap was raised and connective tissue was obtained. The donor site was sutured with 4-0 silk thread. (Figure 3)

The graft was adapted onto the donor site through sutures and a suspensory suture was performed (silk thread 4-0, J&J Ethicon, USA), aiming to position the flap coronally onto the graft to improve therefore the graft's stabilization and nutrition on the receptor site. Also, complementary sutures were executed. (Figure 4 & Figure 5)

Lateral Pedicle Graft

Local anesthesia (2% lignocaine with 1:80,000 adrenaline) was used to anaesthetize the surgical site (31, 32 region). Recipient site was prepared by using 15 no. surgical blade, starting an internal bevel incision around denuded root of 31 removing adjacent epithelium and connective tissue. The incision skirted mesial surface of 31 with external bevel incision to expose the connective tissue surrounding the denuded root surface. Donor site was prepared by extending sulcular incisions from the distal surface of 31 till mesial surface of 33. Two vertical incisions were made, one at distal line angle of 31 and other at mesial line angle of 33. Vertical incisions were made continuous with horizontal incisions, and were extended apically to the mucosal tissue to permit adequate mobility of the flap. The flap was raised using a sharp dissection. A cut back releasing incision was made to ensure that the flap is free of tension is free enough to permit movement to the recipient site. (Figure 8) Before placing pedicle flap on denuded root, a though root planning was done using curettes. This was followed by copious irrigation with saline. The pedicle flap was positioned 1 mm coronal to cemento-enamel junction of tooth 31 and sutured by 4-0 silk sutures. (Figure 9) The area was protected with Coe-Pack.

At postoperative period, patient was oriented to use aqueous 0.12% chlorhexidine digluconate mouthrinse for 10 days, analgesics for pain and antibiotics for 3 days. Sutures were removed 7 days post-surgery. Oral hygiene instructions were reinforced, and patient was instructed to come for check-up at 30, 90 days and 6 months post-operatively. (Figure 6 & Figure 10)

Results

Thirty gingival recession cases were treated. 15 with sub-epithelial connective tissue graft and fifteen with lateral pedicle graft. Out of eighteen patients belonging to Miller's Class I, 10 were treated with SCTG and 8 with LPG. Out of twelve patients belonging to Miller's Class II, 5 were treated with SCTG and 7 with LPG.

In class I cases, the mean pre-operative recession was 2.5mm and the average width (measured at CEJ) was 4.05mm. In the Class II cases, the mean pre-operative recession was 4.25mm and the average width (measured at CEJ) was 4.55mm.

For Pedicle grafts, the average % of coverage after 2 mths was 61.9% and after 6 mths was 61.9%. For SCTG grafts, the average % of coverage after 2 mths was 67.9% and after 6 mths was 76.55%.

In 8 of the 15 patients subject to treatment with the SCTG method, there was a coverage of 100%, in two cases there was a coverage of 20% while the rest 5 cases showed a coverage of 75-80%. In the group of patients treated with laterally positioned pedicle flaps, 5 patients obtained a coverage of 100%, 1 case was there a 25% increase while the rest 9 cases showed a coverage of 75-80%.

If the data are analyzed on the basis of presurgical classification, the percentage of coverage in class I cases is 82.9% with the SCTG method and 72.9% with pedicle flaps. With respect to the class II cases, an average root coverage of 66.73% was obtained with the SCTG method, whereas an average root coverage of 62.05% was obtained in pedicle flap group.

The average increase of keratinized tissue at 6 mths was 4.5mm in the pedicle flap group. In the SCTG group it was 2.95 mm.

A statistical analysis of the data (students t-test) showed that the difference in root coverage between the two methods is not significant ($p > .05$).

For esthetics, the examiners were asked to evaluate 1) the Color and texture matching of the tissues i.e. Pre-existing keratinized tissues and Gingival graft and 2) Soft tissue appearance i.e. Lack of hypertrophic scars or fibrosis

No scar tissue or fibrosis was reported in 29 cases. Only 1 case with Miller's class II treated with lateral pedicle graft showed a little scarring.

For color and texture matching, 12 out of 15 patients treated with SCTG showed good esthetic results while 3 were classified as moderate esthetic appearance. These 3 cases belonged to Miller's class II. Out of 15 patients treated with LPG, only 10 showed esthetically good results, 4 were esthetically moderate while 1 showed poor results esthetically.

Though the relation is statistically non-significant, patient treated with SCTG showed better esthetics than patients treated with LPG.

Discussion

Gingival recession, the apical migration of gingival margin is a mucogingival defect of multifactorial origin. It can be defined as the exposure of root surface by an apical shift in the position of gingiva.¹⁴ The various consequences are clinical crown lengthening esthetic problem, hypersensitivity, root caries, abrasion and fear of tooth loss.^{15,16} The presence of gingival recessions at the anterior teeth may represent an esthetic problem. This disharmony may be apparent in the patient's smile or even at a functional level (phonics, chewing).

Root coverage has become an important treatment modality because of increasing cosmetic and functional treatment. The treatment of buccal gingival recession for aesthetics or root sensitivity is a frequent demand in patients.¹⁷ Several root coverage procedures have been tested to move the position of the gingival margin coronally including pedicle flaps, free soft tissue grafts, combination of pedicle flaps plus grafts or barrier membranes.¹⁰ The international literatures^{10-12,18} have thoroughly documented that gingival recession can be successfully treated using several surgical procedures, irrespective of the utilized technique, provided the biologic conditions for accomplishing root coverage are satisfied: no loss of interdental soft and hard tissue height.⁹ Irrespective of the surgical approach, the ultimate goal of a root coverage procedure is the complete coverage of the recession defect and an optimal integration of the covering tissue with the adjacent soft tissue.

Success criteria should not only be based upon the amount of

root coverage but also upon the cosmetic integration of the operated zone within the mouth.⁷ Success of root coverage procedures depends on several factors like elimination and control of etiology, interproximal bone level, and the choice of best coverage procedure based on the clinical situation.¹⁹ The selection of one surgical technique over another depends on several factors, some of which are related to the defect like the size of the recession defect, the presence or absence of keratinized tissue adjacent to the defect, the width and height of the interdental soft tissue, the depth of the vestibulum or the presence of frenuli while others are related to the patient.²⁰

Despite various surgical treatment modalities available for isolated gingival recessions, Lateral Pedicle Graft was the only surgical procedure available that could predictably produce root coverage.⁹ It was first described by Grupe and Warren as a surgical procedure comprising the use of a full thickness pedicle flap moved horizontally to cover the denuded root. This can consequently lead to exposure of donor area bone tissue.²¹ Staffileno recommended the use of partial thickness pedicle flap; consequently maintaining the donor area covered by periosteum.²² A further modification was suggested by Parkinson *et al.* called as double – papilla technique.²³ Localized gingival recessions treated with the LPG have a greater probability of obtaining root coverage.²⁴⁻²⁷ Also, the soft tissue utilized to cover root exposure is similar to that originally present at the buccal aspect of the tooth with the recession defect and thus the esthetic result is satisfactory and as various literature^{9,10,18,26} suggest that the use of LPG to cover the graft improves the root coverage predictability & esthetic result.

Advantages of using lateral pedicle graft over the SCTG procedure is that it requires only a single surgical site, with no separate donor site and offers good color matching of the graft tissue in harmony with surrounding tissues. It is also less invasive procedure with easy oral hygiene maintenances

The disadvantage of using lateral pedicle graft is possible bone loss and gingival recession on the donor site.

Its limitations that may contraindicate its use⁹ such as: An insufficient amount of gingival available for positioning, shallow vestibule, Secondary frenal attachment(s) at the donor site and Multiple adjacent recessions

In 1985, Langer and Langer¹ described a technique of

subepithelial connective tissue graft for root coverage in the treatment of recessions at single or multiple areas, attributing the procedure success to the double blood supply for the graft's nutrition, originating from the connective tissue of both the periosteum and flap. Additionally, this technique is less invasive at the palatal area, causing a minimum postoperative discomfort to patient and offering a great predictability of coverage. Consequently, this technique is the first choice in cases needing good aesthetical outcomes. The technique gains its clinical predictability by use of a bilaminar flap (Nelson 1987; Harris, 1992) design to ensure graft vascularity and a high degree of gingival cosmetics from the secondary intention healing of the connective tissue graft.

Technique also exhibit disadvantages like Need of a greater amount of tissue than the required for covering the area due to the contraction suffered by the tissue, from the surgery to its functional incorporation within the receptor site²⁸ and difficulty of standardization of the graft thickness, which may result in esthetical alterations.²⁹ Accordingly, these aspects must be observed during the surgical procedure.

Subepithelial connective tissue graft can be indicated for the treatment of single or multiple gingival recessions, correction of the papilla's volume or deformities of the edentulous gingival border, creation and/or increasing of the amount of the keratinized mucosa,³⁰ and perspective improvement of the root coverage associated with restorative procedures, abrasion, or dental caries.³¹

This procedure is the single most effective way to achieve predictable root coverage with a high degree of cosmetic enhancement.³² Historically, the underlying gingival connective tissue has been shown to be a viable source of cells for repopulating the epithelium (Karring and colleagues, 1971) and a somewhat predictable source for increasing the zone of keratinized gingiva (Edel, 1974; Becker and Becker, 1986).

The clinical and patient centered outcomes were excellent. Complete root coverage was obtained. No scars resulting in esthetically displeasing appearance were observed. Clinically, the grafted tissues seemed to be attached to the root surfaces. The obtained clinical outcomes may be considered the gold standard procedure for covering Miller Class I and II gingival recessions.³³ One of the advantages of SCTG over others procedures is that it produces a larger increase in the keratinized tissue compared with

repositioned flaps.^{34,35} The presence of thick attached keratinized tissue may constitute a protective factor against marginal inflammation or trauma.

Due to the high predictability of root coverage in Miller's Class I and Class II and dual blood supply for graft's nutrition, better maintenance of root coverage could be achieved. However, this technique presents less predictability for root coverage in Miller's Class III and IV recessions because of the difficulty of graft's adaptation and nutrition which may result in necrosis.

In the present study, it was found that both the surgical procedures showed complete root coverage and good esthetic results. Connective tissue grafts may be best suited to avoid the collapse of the flap onto the root surface, and to provide better restoration of the soft tissue morphology. Laterally positioned flaps can be proposed to increase the gingival height for root coverage of isolated recessions when neighbouring gingiva is sufficient.³⁶

The choice of the adequate technique and the long-term success of the procedure depend on the careful evaluation of the defect type, recession's etiology, operator's ability, presence of keratinized tissue, tissue width, predictability, single or multiple gingival recessions, healing, aesthetic result, and risk factors.³⁷

Subepithelial Connective Tissue Graft

Fig. 1: Pre-operative Photograph




Fig. 2: Palatal Graft



Fig. 6: post-operative photograph



Fig. 3: sutures placed at donor site



Lateral Pedicle Graft

Fig. 7: Pre-operative photograph



Fig. 4: graft placed




Fig. 8: pedicle graft from adjacent tooth



Fig. 5: suture at graft site




Fig. 9: suture placed



Fig. 10: post-operative photograph



Conclusion

To conclude, post-treatment assessment showed complete root coverage and an excellent aesthetic outcome of lateral pedicle graft and sub-epithelial connective tissue graft root coverage procedures of an isolated gingival recession.

Case selection is foremost important criteria for a successful treatment. It is important to provide optimum functional and aesthetic solution for the missing gingival tissue and simultaneously to preserve periodontal health.

Marked esthetic and functional results can be obtained with lateral pedicle grafts for replacing lost tissue where a large amount of tissue is missing. The success of subepithelial connective tissue graft may be due to the high predictability of root coverage and the double blood supply for the graft's nutrition

References:

1. Langer B, Langer L. Subepithelial connective tissue graft technique for root coverage. *J Periodontol* 1985; 56: 715-20.
2. Kassab MM, Cohen RE. The etiology and prevalence of gingival recession. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2003; 134: 220-5.
3. Martins TM, Bosco AF, Gazoni GG, Garcia SF. Laterally positioned flap associated with subepithelial connective tissue graft for coverage of isolated gingival recession. *RSBO* 2011; 8: 464-8.
4. Miller Jr. PD. A classification of marginal tissue recession. *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*. 1985; 5(2): 8-13.
5. Steffens JP, Santos FA, Pilatti GL.: Cirurgias mucogengivais para recobrimento radicular: O enxerto de conjuntivo subepitelial como técnica de sucesso para defeitos isolados. *Dent Sci* 2008;2:207-14
6. Daing A, Singh A. Isolated gingival recession coverage by lateral pedicle graft procedure: A case report. *Int J Clin Den Sci* 2015; 6: 1-3.
7. Bouchard P., Malet J. & Borghetti A.: Decision-making in aesthetics: root coverage revisited. *Periodontology* 2000; 2001; 27: 97-120
8. Del Pizzo M, Modica F, Bethaz N, Priotto P, Romagnoli R. The connective tissue graft: a comparative clinical evaluation of wound healing at the palatal donor site. A preliminary study. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2002; 29(9): 848-54.
9. Miller Jr. PD. Root coverage grafting for regeneration and aesthetics. *Periodontol* 2000. 1993; 1: 118-27.
10. Prato GP, Clauser C, Cortellini P. Periodontal plastic and mucogingival surgery. *Periodontol* 2000. 1995;9:90-105.
11. Dym H, Tagliareni JM. Surgical management of cosmetic mucogingival defects. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2012;56(1):267-79, xi.
12. De Sanctis M, Clementini M. Flap approaches in plastic periodontal and implant surgery: critical elements in design and execution. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2014;41 Suppl 15:S108-22.
13. Bouchard P, Etienne D, Ouhayoun JP, Nilve'us R. Subepithelial connective tissue grafts in the treatment of gingival recessions. A comparative study of two procedures. *J Periodontol* 1994; 65: 929-936.
14. Carranza FA, Newman MG, Glickman I. *Clinical Periodontology*. 8th ed. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1996.
15. Zucchelli G, Amore C, Sforza NM, Montebugnoli L, De Sanctis M. Bilaminar techniques for the treatment of recession type defects. A comparative

- clinical study. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2003;30(10):862-70.
16. Pabolu C, Nagubandi KK, Ramisetty A, Mutthinenei RB. Esthetic root coverage with lateral pedicle flap - A case report. *J Res Adv Dent* 2013;2:11-5.
 17. Gupta S, Pradhan S.: Lateral Pedicle Graft: A treatment modality for root coverage in the management of localized gingival recessions. *JNDA* 2015;15(1): 76-80
 18. Wennstrom JL, Zucchelli G. Increased gingival dimensions. A significant factor for successful outcome of root coverage procedures? A 2-year prospective clinical study. *J Clin Periodontol.* 1996; 23(8): 770-7.
 19. Greenwell H, Bissada NF, Henderson RD, Dodge JR. The deceptive nature of root coverage results. *J Periodontol* 2000; 71: 1327-37.
 20. Zucchelli G, De Sanctis M. Modified two stage procedures for the treatment of gingival recession. *Eur J Esthet Dent.* 2013;8(1):24-42.
 21. Grupe HE, Warren R. Repair of gingival defects by sliding flap operation. *J Periodontol* 1956; 27: 92-5.
 22. Staffileno H. Management of gingival recessions and root exposure problems associated with periodontal disease. *Dent Clin North Am* 1964; 3: 111-20.
 23. Parkinsom WM, Richards MA, Davies WI. A modified technique for the laterally repositioned flap. *Apex* 1971; 5: 51-2.
 24. Garber DA, Salama MA. The aesthetic smile: diagnosis and treatment. *Periodontol* 2000. 1996;11:18-28.
 25. Ozturan S, Durukan SA, Ozcelik O, Seydaoglu G, Haytac MC. Coronally advanced flap adjunct with low intensity laser therapy: a randomized controlled clinical pilot study. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2011;38(11):1055-62.
 26. Zuhr O, Baumer D, Hurzeler M. The addition of soft tissue replacement grafts in plastic periodontal and implant surgery: critical elements in design and execution. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2014;41 Suppl 15:S123-42.
 27. Pini-Prato GP, Cairo F, Nieri M, Franceschi D, Rotundo R, Cortellini P. Coronally advanced flap versus connective tissue graft in the treatment of multiple gingival recessions: a split-mouth study with a 5- year follow-up. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2010; 37(7): 644-50.
 28. Edel A. The use of a free connective tissue graft to increase the width of attached gingiva. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1975; 39: 341-6.
 29. Callan DP, Silverstein LH. Use of acellular dermal matrix for increasing keratinized tissue around teeth and implants. *Pract Periodontics Aesthet Dent* 1998;10:731-4
 30. Bernimoulin JP, Luscher B, Muhlemann HR. Coronally repositioned periodontal flap. Clinical evaluation after one year. *J Clin Periodontol.* 1975; 2(1): 1-13
 31. Nevins M, Melloning JT. *Periodontal therapy: clinical approaches and evidence of success.* Tokyo: Quintessence; 1998. 355-64.
 32. Chandra A, Gupta HL, Kumar P. Esthetic Root Coverage by Sub Epithelial Connective Tissue Graft Microsurgery: A Case Report. *IJSS Case Reports & Reviews* 2015; 2(7): 16-19.
 33. Chambrone L, Chambrone D, Pustigliani Fe, Chambrone La, Lima La.: Can subepithelial connective tissue grafts be considered the gold standard procedure in the treatment of Miller Class I and II recession-type defects?, *J Dent*, 2008, 36(9): 659-671.
 34. Harris RJ.: Connective tissue grafts combined with either double pedicle grafts or coronally positioned pedicle grafts: results of 266 consecutively treated defects in 200 patients, *Int J Periodontics Restorative Dent*, 2002, 22(5):663-671.
 35. Cordioli G, Mortarino C, Chierico A, Grusovin Mg, Majzoub Z.: Comparison of 2 techniques of

subepithelial connective tissue graft in the treatment of gingival recessions. *J Periodontol*, 2001; 72(11): 1470–1476

36. Harris RJ. A comparison of 2 root coverage techniques: guided tissue regeneration with bioabsorbable matrix style membrane versus a connective tissue graft combined with a coronally positioned pedicle graft without vertical incisions. Results of a series of consecutive cases. *J Periodontol* 1998; 69: 1426–1434.
37. Ottoni J, Magalhães LF. *Cirurgia plástica periodontal e periimplantar: beleza com proporção e harmonia*. São Paulo: Artes Médicas; 2006; 440.