Journal of Indian Society of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry

Official publication of Indian Society of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry

Previous Article ToC Next Articl

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Year : 2015 | **Volume** : 33 | **Issue** : 3 | **Page** : 223-228

Behavioral response and pain perception to computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system and cartri syringe

TD Yogesh Kumar, J Baby John, Sharath Asokan, PR Geetha Priya, R Punithavathy, V Praburajan
Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, KSR Institute of Dental Science and Research, Tiruchengode, Tamil Nadu, India

Date of Web Publication 9-Jul-2015

Correspondence Address:
Dr. J Baby John
Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, KSR Institute of Dental Science and Research, Tiruchengode - 637 215, Tamil Nadu
India
Login to access the email ID

Source of Support: None, **Conflict of Interest:** None

DOI: 10.4103/0970-4388.160394

Abstract

Aim: The present study evaluated and compared the pain perception, behavioral response, physiological parameters, and the role of topical anesthetic administration during local anesthetic administration with ca syringe and computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system (CCLAD). **Design:** A randomized contr crossover study was carried out with 120 children aged 7-11 years. They were randomly divided into Grou Receiving injection with CCLAD during first visit; Group B: Receiving injection with cartridge syringe du first visit. They were further subdivided into three subgroups based on the topical application used: (a) 20% benzocaine; (b) pressure with cotton applicator; (c) no topical application. Pulse rate and blood pressure w recorded before and during injection procedure. Objective evaluation of disruptive behavior and subjective evaluation of pain were done using face legs activity cry consolability scale and modified facial image scal respectively. The washout period between the two visits was 1-week. **Results:** Injections with CCLAD pro significantly lesser pain response, disruptive behavior ($P < 0.001$), and pulse rate ($P < 0.05$) when compare cartridge syringe injections. Application of benzocaine produced lesser pain response and disruptive behav when compared to the other two subgroups, although the result was not significant. **Conclusion:** Usage of techniques which enhance behavioral response in children like injections with CCLAD can be considered possible step toward achieving a pain-free pediatric dental practice.

Keywords: Behavior, cartridge syringe, computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system, local anesth pain perception

How to cite this article:
Yogesh Kumar T D, John J B, Asokan S, Geetha Priya P R, Punithavathy R, Praburajan V. Behavioral res and pain perception to computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system and cartridge syringe. J Indian Pedod Prev Dent 2015;33:223-8

How to cite this URL:
Yogesh Kumar T D, John J B, Asokan S, Geetha Priya P R, Punithavathy R, Praburajan V. Behavioral res and pain perception to computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system and cartridge syringe. J Indian Pedod Prev Dent [serial online] 2015 [cited 2018 Aug 30];33:223-8. Available from: http://www.jisppd.com.proxy.library.stonybrook.edu/text.asp?2015/33/3/223/160394

Introduction

Dental anxiety and fear are a matter of concern for the treating dentist. The use of local anesthetic injectio

one of the most anxiety-provoking procedure in dentistry. [1] Though it produces pain and anxiety, [2] its p administration provides a relatively painless treatment and also helps in gaining the child's cooperation.

The present study was planned to assess the pain perception, behavioral response, physiological parameter role of topical anesthetic administration during local anesthetic administration with cartridge syringe and computer controlled local anesthetic delivery systems (CCLAD).

Materials and Methods

This randomized controlled trial with crossover design was carried out in the children who had reported as outpatients in Department of Pediatric Dentistry. The study protocol was approved by the institutional revi board and ethical committee consent (ref 011/KSRIDSR/EC/2011) was obtained. Written consent was obt from parents of participating children.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

One hundred and twenty children were included in the study based on the following inclusion criteria:

a. Age 7-11 years;
b. Children with American Society of Anesthesiologists I status;
c. No previous history of dental treatment and, who needed at least two clinical sessions of operative procedures preceded by local anesthetic injection, one on either side of the maxilla or mandible, neit which was due to emergency.

Exclusion criteria were:

a. Children allergic to local anesthetics (lignocaine);
b. Children under medications that could alter the pain perception;
c. Medically compromised and special children;
d. Uncooperative patients (Frankl behavior rating 1-definitely negative).

Randomization

The children were randomly divided into two groups: Group A - receiving injections with CCLAD (Single Anesthesia [STA] Wand, Milestone Scientific Pvt. Ltd., Livingston, USA) during first visit and then cartric injections; Group B - receiving injections with cartridge syringe (conventional) during first visit followed l CCLAD injections. Randomization pattern was generated using computer software (Random allocation software). Both the groups were further randomly divided into three subgroups: Subgroup one-children rec 20% topical benzocaine (Mucopain, IPCA Laboratories, Bangalore, India) gel, subgroup two children rece pressure using a cotton applicator; subgroup three children receiving no topical gel.

Measurement of baseline data

Before commencement of the treatment procedure, pulse oximeter probe (FTP-101, SCure Pvt. Ltd., Gujar India) and blood pressure (BP) cuff of digital BP monitor (Omron Healthcare Pvt. Ltd., Singapore) were fi the right hand index finger and on the left arm respectively. The baseline data of pulse rate and BP were ob in the counseling room 10 min before procedure with the patient seated on a chair in an erect position. Thr readings were taken and the mean score was calculated.

Injection procedure and interpretation

Children were familiarized with the interpretation of modified facial image scale (FIS) after being seated o dental chair. The injection procedure was explained to all the children using standard and similar euphemis The injection site was dried with cotton and topical anesthetic gel was applied and allowed to remain for 3 subgroup two, the cotton applicator stick was pressed firmly to the tissue near the injection site as a counte stimulation during the injection procedure. All injections which consisted of 2% lignocaine with 1:1,00,00 epinephrine were then administered with a one inch 30 gauge needle using the bi-rotational technique to minimize needle deflection. [3] In Group A, injections were administered with STA mode (1 cc per 207 s) used initially till 1/4 th of cartridge was administered followed by the normal mode (1 cc per 35 s). In Grou injections were given slowly at approximately 1 ml/min with an aspirating cartridge syringe (Septodont, F All the injections were given by the same operator/primary investigator, to ensure that the results were not influenced by inter-operator variability. Objective evaluation of disruptive behavior was done using face le activity cry consolability (FLACC) scale by a calibrated dental assistant. The physiological parameters (pu rate, BP) were recorded during the injection procedure. Subjective evaluation of pain was rated using a mc FIS after the injection procedure. The washout period between the visits was 1-week. [4] During the next appointment, the child was administered local anesthetic injection using the alternative technique on other the jaw.

Statistical analysis

The data obtained were statistically analyzed using SPSS software (15.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago Ill, USA). *t*-t Mann-Whitney test were used for comparing mean scores of FIS, FLACC of both modes of local anesthet administration. ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis test were used for comparing quantitative variables between t three subgroups. Tukey honestly significant difference test was used with ANOVA to compare the means c subgroups that were found to be statistically significant. $P \leq 0.05$ was considered as statistically significant

Results

One hundred and twenty children, 71 boys and 49 girls (mean age = 9.23 ± 1.52 years) were included in th study. The attrition rate was 4.5% ($n = 10$) as they did not report for the second appointment. 110 children subjected to both computerized and conventional (cartridge syringe) injection technique.

Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system versus cartridge syringe

Children who received injections with CCLAD showed a significant decrease ($P < 0.002$) in pain perceptio

seen by FIS scores when compared to cartridge group. There was a significant decrease ($P < 0.001$) in the disruptive behavior on comparing the two groups [Table 1]. Pulse rate was significantly increased ($P = 0.0$ cartridge group. There were no significant differences in systolic and diastolic BP ($P > 0.05$) among the gr during injection [Table 2].

Group	n	Mean ± SD†	P
FIS			
Cartridge	115	1.70±0.69	0.002
CCLAD*	115	1.42±0.60	
FLACC			
Cartridge	115	2.64±2.28	0.001
CCLAD	115	1.85±2.15	

*Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system †Standard deviation; FIS = Facial image scale; FLACC = Face legs activity cry consolability; CCLAD = Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system

Table 1: Comparison of mean FIS and FLACC scores in cartridge and CC group

Click here to view

Physiological parameters	n	Mean ± SD†	P
Pulse rate			
Baseline			
Cartridge	115	82.03±7.00	0.65
CCLAD*	115	81.58±8.08	
Pulse rate			
Injection			
Cartridge	115	98.08±13.02	0.04
CCLAD	115	92.96±14.02	
Systole			
Baseline			
Cartridge	115	106.85±6.81	0.95
CCLAD	115	106.90±6.70	
Systole			
Injection			
Cartridge	115	112.71±9.32	0.14
CCLAD	115	111.14±6.39	
Diastole			
Baseline			
Cartridge	115	64.90±5.81	0.66
CCLAD	115	64.55±6.24	
Diastole			
Injection			
Cartridge	115	65.69±6.56	0.92
CCLAD	115	65.77±5.77	

*Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system †Standard deviation; CCLAD = Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system

Table 2: Comparison of physiological parameters in cartridge and CCLAI group

Click here to view

Comparison between topical subgroups

There was a statistically significant difference between the three topical subgroups based on FIS and FLAC scores. Children who were given 20% benzocaine topical gel application showed lesser pain response and disruptive behavior when compared to applicator pressure and no topical gel subgroups, although it was nc significant. This was evident while receiving injections with cartridge syringe and CCLAD [Table 3].

Subgroups	n	Mean ± SD†			
		Cartridge		CCLAD*	
		FIS	FLACC	FIS	FLACC
Benzocaine	39	1.49±0.55	1.64±1.78	1.26±0.55	1.45±2.17
Applicator pressure	38	1.68±0.66	2.84±2.00	1.31±0.52	1.49±1.60
No topical gel	38	1.92±0.78	3.47±2.62	1.70±0.66	2.65±2.45
P		0.02	<0.001	<0.002	<0.025

*Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system †Standard deviation; FIS = Facial image scale; FLACC = Face legs activity cry consolability; CCLAD = Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system

Table 3: Comparison of mean FIS and FLACC scores of benzocaine, appl pressure, and no gel subgroups in cartridge and CCLAD group

Click here to view

On comparing the topical subgroups with each other, children who received injections with CCLAD show significant difference in FIS ($P = 0.94$) and FLACC ($P = 0.99$) scores between benzocaine and applicator pressure subgroups. Whereas, both benzocaine and applicator pressure subgroup was significantly better th topical gel group [Table 4]. In children receiving injections with cartridge syringe, there was a significant difference between benzocaine and no topical gel group when FIS ($P = 0.01$) and FLACC ($P = 0.001$) scor were compared. There was a significant difference between FLACC ($P = 0.04$) scores of benzocaine and applicator pressure group, whereas, FIS ($P = 0.407$) scores showed no significant differences [Table 4]. Th were no significant differences in physiological parameters irrespective of topical application method used both modes of local anesthetic administration.

Subgroup	Comparison group	P value			
		CCLAD*		Cartridge	
		FIS	FLACC	FIS	FLACC
Benzocaine	Applicator pressure	0.94	0.99	0.40	0.04
	No topical gel	0.004	0.04	0.015	0.001
Applicator pressure	No topical gel	0.01	0.04	0.28	0.41

*Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system; FIS = Facial image scale; FLACC = Face legs activity cry consolability; CCLAD = Computer controlled local anesthetic delivery system

Table 4: Comparison of FIS and FLACC score within the topical groups i CCLAD group

Click here to view

Patient behavior

The children receiving cartridge syringe injections showed more facial expressions, leg movements and w difficult to console when compared to CCLAD injections. On assessing the overall children's behavior, 71 children (64%) showed better behavioral response while receiving CCLAD injections. 13 children (12%) demonstrated better behavioral response with cartridge syringe injections. 26 children (26%) showed simil behavioral response during both modes of local anesthetic administration.

Patient preference

Thirty-eight children preferred receiving local anesthesia with CCLAD while only 6 children preferred car syringe injections. 66 children found both methods to be similar.

Discussion

Pediatric dentists prefer techniques and strategies that help to enhance the behavior of the children in the d office. Dental anxiety and fear are strongly related to the impairment of having a quality oral health care in individual's life. Successful dental treatment in a child depends not only on the quality of treatment, but als instilling a positive attitude toward dental care.

Various methods like usage of topical anesthesia and prolonged injection time, [5] distraction techniques, c stimulation, warming the anesthetic solution, [6] varying the rates of infiltration, buffering the local anesthe reduced speed of injection, [7] cooling of soft tissue injection site, [8] and change in appearance of anesthet delivery system [9] have been used to eliminate/minimize pain during injections.

Studies by Asarch *et al*., Gibson *et al*., Allen *et al*., Ram and Peretz, Tahmassebi *et al*., have compared the response during local anesthetic delivery with cartridge and CCLAD. [2],[10],[11],[12] Asarch *et al*., Ram an Peretz and Tahmassebi *et al*. found no significant differences in pain response and disruptive behavior betv both the techniques of administration. [2],[12],[13] Asarch *et al*., Ram and Peretz concluded that CCLAD pr lesser disruptive behavior than traditional syringe. [2],[12] Palm *et al*. stated that the measurement of associ change in physiological parameters during injection procedure would have minimized observer bias and pr validation for direct observation measures. [14] These parameters were assessed by San Martin-Lopez *et al* Langthasa *et al*. [15],[16] However, the results were contradictory and not conclusive. There is minimal evi which supports the role of topical anesthetic while administering injections with cartridge and CCLAD, wl provided the rationale for conducting the present study.

In the studies by Asarch *et al*., Gibson *et al*., Allen *et al*. parallel study design was followed where the chil were subjected to injection either by traditional syringe or CCLAD. [2],[10],[11] The possible demerit of thi design is that, in behavioral research the comparison of pain responses between individuals may be inappr as pain threshold differs in each person. Hence, in the present study crossover design was followed where children served as his/her control. This was in accordance with the studies done by Ram *et al*., Palm *et al*., Langthasa *et al*. [12],[14],[16]

The children aged 7-11 years belong to concrete operational period according to Jean Piaget's cognitive the The children in this age group become capable of reasoning logically when the problem is displayed befor which would help them in making the decision regarding pain perception. [17] Children who had a previou history of dental treatment were excluded as their previous experiences might influence the results of the s the present study, no attempt was made to sex match as the studies by Ram and Peretz, Tahmassebi *et al*. s there was no significant difference in pain reaction between girls and boys. [12],[13] However, Chapman HI Kirby Turner NC stated that girls in general report more fear than boys. [18]

Asarch *et al*., Gibson *et al*., Allen *et al*. in their studies blindfolded the patients and switched on the sound CCLAD during both injection procedures to reduce bias. [2],[10],[11] However, in our study we did not prac this as we believed blindfolding a child during the first visit for treatment might increase his/her anxiety le alter the pain perception and physiological parameters. Standard and similar euphemisms and distraction techniques were used as alternative methods to reduce anxiety in both the groups.

Facial image scale was used to assess the subjective pain response. This scale is a valid and reliable measu dental anxiety for employment with young children in clinical settings. [19] Ideally a scale should be short length to maximize response from children and minimize time for administration; easy to hold the attentio child and be simple to score and interpret. [20] In this study, the scale was modified to three faces signifyin

a. No discomfort,
b. Mild discomfort,
c. Severe discomfort.

This was done to reduce the confusion among children while assessing pain.

Objective evaluation provides better information about the discomfort experienced by the child during inje procedure. The subjective evaluation can also differ according to child's pain threshold level. In this study, FLACC scale was used to assess the behavior of the child during injection procedure. FLACC pain assessı tool incorporates five categories of pain behaviors: Facial expression; leg movement; activity; cry; and consolability. FLACC scale is a validated and a reliable scale used in assessing pain in acutely ill adults an children postgeneral anesthesia. [21] FLACC scale can be used for quantifying pain behaviors in children v cannot verbalize the presence or severity of pain.

The present study suggests that children who received injections with CCLAD showed significantly less p disruptive behavior when compared to children who received injection by cartridge. Gibson *et al*. compare CCLAD and traditional syringe in children of 5-13 years and concluded that no significant difference in pa ratings between them. [10] Palm *et al*. compared the pain perception while administering mandibular block CCLAD and traditional method in children aged 7-18 years and concluded that mandibular block was less painful with the CCLAD. [14] Langthasa *et al*. compared pain perception while experiencing injections wit comfort control syringe (CCS) and conventional syringe in children aged 6-14 years. Injections with CCS less painful and produced significantly less disruptive behaviors than a conventional syringe. [16] The age patients and site of injection varied in all the above studies. Thus, the use of CCLAD produced less pain ra irrespective of age and site of injection when compared to the traditional technique.

In the present study, children who received injections with cartridge showed more disruptive behavior as measured by FLACC scale. Gibson *et al*. reported that significantly fewer children cried or exhibited body movements while receiving injections with CCLAD during first 15 s. [10] Allen *et al*. reported a gradual in in disruptive behavior in CCLAD group after the initial 15 s contrary to the above results. [11] This may be increased injection time with CCLAD, which might result in restless behavior particularly in preschool chi [14] Asarch *et al*., Ram and Peretz reported no significant differences in disruptive behavior while receivin injections with CCLAD and a traditional method respectively. [2],[12]

Pulse rate was significantly increased in children receiving cartridge injection. This may be due to increase uncontrolled injection pressure while using cartridge syringe. The infiltration of injection fluid leads to inc pressure built up causing pain. [22] Kudo found a positive correlation between pressure at the start of injec and intensity of pain. [23] San Martin-Lopez *et al*. showed a significant difference in heart rate on compari computerized device and conventional syringe. [15] Langthasa *et al*. found no significant differences in pul BP and body temperature while administering injections with CCLAD and traditional syringe. There were significant differences in systolic and diastolic BP between both the techniques in the present study which in accordance with Langthasa *et al*. [16]

In this study, benzocaine gel application produced lesser pain response and disruptive behavior than the ot topical subgroups in children receiving both CCLAD and cartridge syringe injections, although it was not statistically different. Nayak and Sudha showed 18% benzocaine gel had the most rapid onset of action an superior in pain reduction when compared to 5% lignocaine ointment and 5% eutectic mixture of local anesthetics cream due to its low dissociation constant. [24]

In children who received CCLAD injections, the pain perception and behavioral response was nearly simil while using benzocaine and topical applicator pressure and was significantly better than no topical gel application. Thus, the injections with CCLAD were less painful irrespective of the topical application metl (benzocaine and counter-stimulation) used. Children who received injections with cartridge showed the significantly lesser disruptive behavior when benzocaine topical application was used. The subjective pain response showed no statistically significant difference irrespective of whether benzocaine or topical pressu used. Subjective evaluations may have differed due to variations in pain threshold among the children. Ho children may show a change in their behavior in the presence of pain.

The children who received cartridge syringe injections showed more facial expressions, leg movements an difficult to console when compared to CCLAD group. Ram and Peretz showed that there was no significan difference in crying, facial expression, hands, legs, and torso movements while receiving injections with C and conventional syringe. This was seen irrespective of the age group (3-5 years, 6-10 years) being compa [12] Body movements, crying and application of restraints occurred more frequently while using a traditior syringe. [25]

There were a few limitations in this study that need to be considered. The operator and subjects were not b to the mode of local anesthetic delivery. An attempt was made to minimize this bias by using an independe observer for coding the behaviors. The reliability of these results could have been further improved by videotaping the injection procedure and allowing a third investigator to evaluate it.

Techniques which enhance the behavioral response in children should be considered for a better pediatric

practice. Use of CCLAD can be considered as a possible step toward achieving a relatively pain-free and successful pediatric dental practice.

References

1. Ten Berge M, Veerkamp JS, Hoogstraten J. The etiology of childhood dental fear: The role of dental conditioning experiences. J Anxiety Disord 2002;16:321-9.
2. Asarch T, Allen K, Petersen B, Beiraghi S. Efficacy of a computerized local anesthesia device in ped dentistry. Pediatr Dent 1999;21:421-4.
3. Hochman MN, Friedman MJ. *In vitro* study of needle deflection: A linear insertion technique versus bidirectional rotation insertion technique. Quintessence Int 2000;31:33-9.
4. Ram D, Berson T, Moskovitz M, Efrat J. Unsweetened ice popsicles impart a positive feeling and rec self-mutilation after paediatric dental treatment with local anaesthesia. Int J Paediatr Dent 2010;20:3
5. Matthews R, Ball R, Goodley A, Lenton J, Riley C, Sanderson S, *et al*. The efficacy of local anaesth administered by general dental practitioners. Br Dent J 1997;182:175-8.
6. Ram D, Hermida LB, Peretz B. A comparison of warmed and room-temperature anesthetic for local anesthesia in children. Pediatr Dent 2002;24:333-6.
7. Abdellatif AM. Pain assessment of two palatal anesthetic techniques and their effects on the child's behaviour. Pediatr Dent J 2011;21:129-37.
8. Aminabadi NA, Farahani RM. The effect of pre-cooling the injection site on pediatric pain perceptio during the administration of local anesthesia. J Contemp Dent Pract 2009;10:43-50.
9. Kudo M, Ohke H, Katagiri Y. The shape of local anesthetic injection syringes with less discomfort a anxiety. Evaluation of discomfort and anxiety caused by various types of local anesthetic injection sy in high level trait-anxiety people. J Jpn Dent Soc Anesthesiol 2001;29:173-8.
10. Gibson RS, Allen K, Hutfless S, Beiraghi S. The CCLAD vs traditional injection: A comparison of p related behaviours. Pediatr Dent 2000;22:458-62.
11. Allen KD, Kotil D, Larzelere RE, Hutfless S, Beiraghi S. Comparison of a computerized anesthesia with a traditional syringe in preschool children. Pediatr Dent 2002;24:315-20.
12. Ram D, Peretz B. The assessment of pain sensation during local anesthesia using a computerized loc anesthesia (Wand) and a conventional syringe. J Dent Child (Chic) 2003;70:130-3.
13. Tahmassebi JF, Nikolaou M, Duggal MS. A comparison of pain and anxiety associated with the administration of maxillary local analgesia with CCLAD and conventional technique. Eur Arch Paed Dent 2009;10:77-82.

14. Palm AM, Kirkegaard U, Poulsen S. The wand versus traditional injection for mandibular nerve bloc children and adolescents: Perceived pain and time of onset. Pediatr Dent 2004;26:481-4.

15. San Martin-Lopez AL, Garrigos-Esparza LD, Torre-Delgadillo G, Gordillo-Moscoso A, Hernandez-S JF, de Pozos-Guillen AJ. Clinical comparison of pain perception rates between computerized local anesthesia and conventional syringe in pediatric patients. J Clin Pediatr Dent 2005;29:239-43.

16. Langthasa M, Yeluri R, Jain AA, Munshi AK. Comparison of the pain perception in children using c control syringe and a conventional injection technique during pediatric dental procedures. J Indian S Pedod Prev Dent 2012;30:323-8.
[PUBMED] Full Text

17. Sivakumar N, Muthu MS. Child psychology. In: Pediatric Dentistry-principles and Practice. 2 nd ed. Delhi: Elsevier India Pvt. Ltd.; 2011. p. 71-89.

18. Chapman HR, Kirby-Turner NC. Dental fear in children - A proposed model. Br Dent J 1999;187:40

19. Buchanan H, Niven N. Validation of a Facial Image Scale to assess child dental anxiety. Int J Paediat 2002;12:47-52.

20. Buchanan H. Development of a computerised dental anxiety scale for children: Validation and reliab Dent J 2005;199:359-62.

21. Voepel-Lewis T, Zanotti J, Dammeyer JA, Merkel S. Reliability and validity of the face, legs, activit consolability behavioral tool in assessing acute pain in critically ill patients. Am J Crit Care 2010;19:55-61.

22. Nieuwenhuizen J, Hembrecht EJ, Aartman IH, Krikken J, Veerkamp JS. Comparison of two compute anaesthesia delivery systems: Pain and pain-related behaviour in children during a dental injection. E Arch Paediatr Dent 2013;14:9-13.

23. Kudo M. Initial injection pressure for dental local anesthesia: Effects on pain and anxiety. Anesth Pr 2005;52:95-101.

24. Nayak R, Sudha P. Evaluation of three topical anaesthetic agents against pain: A clinical study. India Dent Res 2006;17:155-60.

25. Klein U, Hunzeker C, Hutfless S, Galloway A. Quality of anesthesia for the maxillary primary anteri segment in pediatric patients: Comparison of the P-ASA nerve block using CompuMed delivery syst traditional supraperiosteal injections. J Dent Child (Chic) 2005;72:119-25.

Tables

[Table 1], [Table 2], [Table 3], [Table 4]