

3. Pohl V, Thoma DS, Sporniak-Tutak K, et al. Short dental implants (6 mm) versus long dental implants (11–15 mm) in combination with sinus floor elevation procedures: 3-year results from a multicentre, randomized, controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Periodontol* 2017;**44**:438–45.
4. Rossi F, Botticelli D, Cesaretti G, et al. Use of short implants (6 mm) in a single-tooth replacement: a 5-year follow-up prospective randomized controlled multicenter clinical study. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2016;**27**:458–64.
5. Naenni N, Sahrman P, Schmidlin PR, et al. Five-year survival of short single-tooth implants (6 mm): a randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Dent Res* 2018;**97**:887–92.

Eduardo Anitua<sup>a,b,c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University Institute for Regenerative Medicine and Oral Implantology, UIRMI (UPV/EHU-Fundación Eduardo Anitua), Vitoria, Spain

<sup>b</sup> Private practice in oral implantology, Clínica Eduardo Anitua, Vitoria, Spain

<sup>c</sup> BTI Biotechnology Institute, Vitoria, Spain  
 Mohammad Hamdan Alkhraisat<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University Institute for Regenerative Medicine and Oral Implantology, UIRMI (UPV/EHU-Fundación Eduardo Anitua), Vitoria, Spain

<sup>b</sup> BTI Biotechnology Institute, Vitoria, Spain

\* Corresponding author at: Eduardo Anitua Foundation, C/ Jose Maria Cagigal 19, 01007 Vitoria, Spain.  
 Tel.: +34 945160653.

E-mail address: [eduardo@fundacioneduardoanitua.org](mailto:eduardo@fundacioneduardoanitua.org)  
 (E. Anitua)

Available online 28 March 2019

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2019.03.005>

## Re: re: Comparison of clinical outcomes of treatment of dysfunction of the temporomandibular joint between conventional and ultrasound-guided arthrocentesis

Sir,

We thank Şentürk and Gülşen for the critical evaluation of our recent paper, which we have read with due respect.<sup>1,2</sup>

The conventional arthrocentesis technique can be used with either the single puncture, which is also called the concentric-needle technique, or the double-puncture technique. In our institution, we have abandoned the single puncture or concentric-needle technique because it is not as successful, and the double-puncture technique has a much more predictable outcome. To improve accuracy, we have started using ultrasound for guidance, so the study was done to evaluate the outcome of the double-puncture technique with and without ultrasound. This is the reason for the title we used. We have no argument regarding the method of classification as far as the study is concerned.

## Conflict of interest

We have no conflicts of interest.

## Ethics statement/confirmation of patient's permission

Not applicable.

## References

1. Şentürk MF, Gülşen U. Re: Comparison of clinical outcomes of treatment of dysfunction of the temporomandibular joint between conventional and ultrasound-guided arthrocentesis. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2019 [In press].
2. Antony PG, Sebastian A, Annapoorani D, et al. Comparison of clinical outcomes of treatment of dysfunction of the temporomandibular joint between conventional and ultrasound-guided arthrocentesis. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2019;**57**:62–6.

P.G. Antony

Dept. of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Government Dental College, Kottayam, Kerala University of Health Science, India

Aneesh Sebastian\*

Dept. of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, PMS College of Dental Sciences and Research, Trivandrum, Kerala India

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +919946071832.

E-mail addresses: [drpgantony@yahoo.com](mailto:drpgantony@yahoo.com) (P.G. Antony),  
[draneesh2008@gmail.com](mailto:draneesh2008@gmail.com) (A. Sebastian)

Available online 28 March 2019

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2019.03.008>

## Re: Comparison of clinical outcomes of treatment of dysfunction of the temporomandibular joint between conventional and ultrasound-guided arthrocentesis

Sir,

We read with interest the article by Antony, et al.<sup>1</sup> To limit the complexities surrounding the concepts related to techniques of arthrocentesis of temporomandibular joint (TMJ), Şentürk and Cambazoğlu<sup>2</sup> classified them as either single-puncture or double-puncture arthrocentesis. Within this classification, the traditional or conventional procedure uses two cannulas inserted through two separate puncture sites.

Ultrasound-guided arthrocentesis is not a part of this classification, but could be used with the single or double puncture technique. Like cone-beam computed tomography, it can only be used as for guidance.<sup>3–5</sup>

The authors did double-puncture arthrocentesis both with ultrasound and without, and called their methods the “ultrasound-guided technique” and “conventional technique”. We think that the title of the paper should therefore