

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56936/18290825-2026.20v.2-30>**STEM-CELL–DERIVED BIOENGINEERED DENTAL PULP
CONSTRUCTS FOR VITAL PULP THERAPY:
A RANDOMIZED LABORATORY TRIAL****JADHAV S.¹, PATRI G.², BEHERA S.S.P.³, BANIK A.⁴, ARYA A.⁵, MUSTAFA M.^{6*}**¹ HSRSM Hingoli Dental College, Hingoli, Maharashtra, India² Kalinga Institute of Dental Sciences, KIIT Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India³ SB Patil Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Bidar, Karnataka, India⁴ Guru Nanak Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kolkata, West Bengal, India⁵ College of Dentistry, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia.⁶ Centre for Transdisciplinary Research, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.*Received 2.12.2025; Accepted for printing 14.05.2026***ABSTRACT**

Introduction: Conventional vital pulp therapy relies primarily on calcium silicate-based cements that induce reparative dentin formation without restoring the native neurovascular architecture of the pulp tissue. Advances in tissue engineering using stem cells and biodegradable scaffolds offer the potential for true pulp regeneration rather than mere preservation.

Material and Methods: Human dental pulp stem cells were isolated from healthy third molars and encapsulated within gelatin methacryloyl hydrogel constructs. In this randomized laboratory trial, 60 standardized human tooth slices were allocated into three groups: negative control (empty), positive control (Biodentine™), and test group (human dental pulp stem cells-gelatin methacryloyl construct). Cell viability, proliferation, odontogenic differentiation, and angiogenic potential were assessed using Live/Dead staining, Cell counting Kit-8 colorimetric assay, and quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction analysis of dentin sialophosphoprotein, dentin matrix acidic phosphoprotein 1, and vascular endothelial growth factor expression.

Results: The quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction constructs demonstrated high cytocompatibility, with cell viability exceeding 94% at day 7. Proliferation was significantly greater in the test group compared with Biodentine at day 7 ($p < 0.01$). Odontogenic marker expression was comparable between the test and Biodentine groups, while vascular endothelial growth factor expression was markedly higher in the test group group, indicating superior angiogenic potential.

Conclusion: Stem cell–laden gelatin methacryloyl constructs exhibit enhanced regenerative properties compared with conventional bioceramic materials in an *ex vivo* tooth slice model. These findings support the translational potential of hydrogel-based regenerative strategies as next-generation approaches for vital pulp therapy.

KEYWORDS: vital pulp therapy, dental pulp stem cells, gelatin methacryloyl, GelMA, regenerative endodontics, tissue engineering, hydrogels

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS:

JADHAV S., PATRI G., BEHERA S.S.P., BANIK A.4, ARYA A., MUSTAFA M. (2026). Stem-Cell–Derived Bioengineered Dental Pulp Constructs for Vital Pulp Therapy: A Randomized Laboratory Trial; The New Armenian Medical Journal, vol.20 (2), 30-35; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56936/18290825-2026.20v.2-30>

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE:

Mohammed Mustafa; BDS, MDS, MFDS RCPS(Glasg), FDS RCS(Eng), Professor
Department of Conservative Dental Sciences College of Dentistry, Prince
Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University Al-Kharj 11942, Saudi Arabia
Tel.: +91 (9987697896)
E-mail: ma.mustafa@psau.edu.sa

INTRODUCTION

Dental pulp is a vascularized and innervated connective tissue, which is vital in the tooth vitality, tooth sensitivity, and repair. In cases where the pulp is damaged by deep caries or injury, most conventional standard of care is full pulpectomy (root canal treatment) making the tooth non-vital, weak, and susceptible to fracture [Bjørndal L et al., 2019]. Vital pulp therapy is designed to maintain the healthy undamaged pulp tissue. In the past, calcium hydroxide was the preferred material although it was replaced by calcium silicate based cements like mineral trioxide aggregate and Biodentine [Parirokh M et al., 2018]. Such materials are biocompatible and bioactive and they cause the development of a reparative dentin bridge that helps in protecting the underlying pulp [Camilleri J, 2008].

Nevertheless, modern vital pulp therapy approaches have serious shortcomings. Although calcium silicate cements are an excellent sealing agent of the pulp, they do not work as a regenerative scaffold; instead, they are a capping agent. They cause mineralization without restoring the regeneration of the functional pulp-dentin complex, the fine neurovascular system needed to provide immune defense and sensation [Ricucci D et al., 2014; Moussa D, Aparicio C, 2019]. As a result, in case of underestimation of the inflammation or failure to capped the tooth, the latter ends up in the endodontic treatment. This underscores an urgent requirement of regenerative endodontic procedures which transcend preservation to functional tissue restitution [Murray P et al., 2007; Diogenes A, Ruparel NB, 2017].

The triad of stem cells, scaffolds, and growth factors have been regarded as a possible solution through the use of tissue engineering [Abbass M et al., 2020]. The mesenchymal stem cell present in the pulp is termed Human Dental Pulp Stem Cells and have a high proliferative potential and can also be differentiated into odontoblasts, endothelial cells and neural cells [Gronthos S et al., 2000]. In order to provide these cells with the necessary delivery, the hydrogel scaffolds have been of interest because of tunable mechanical characteristics and resemblance to the natural extracellular matrix including Gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA) [Yue K et al., 2015; Khayat A et al., 2017].

Although in vitro tests have shown positive re-

sults in Petri dishes, there is a large gap in the research between being able to test the constructs in a physiologically relevant setting and then subjecting them to animal or human experimentation. The monolayer cultures do not replicate the intricate limitation of the pulp chamber to three dimensions and dentinal intercourse [Zhu X et al., 2018]. Organotypic tooth slice model is an intermediate ex vivo system to study the behavior of bioengineered construct in presence of real dentin walls.

Thus, this randomized laboratory study was designed to create a 3D pulp scaffold out of human dental pulp stem cells encasement in gelatin methacryloyl and compare its biological functionality, i.e., viability, proliferation, and angiogenic capacity, to a gold standard bioceramic material (Biodentine) in a human tooth slice model.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design and Ethical Considerations: This study was designed as a randomized, controlled, ex vivo laboratory trial. Teeth were obtained from healthy donors (aged 18–25 years) undergoing extractions of impacted third molars. All donors provided written informed consent.

Isolation and Characterization of human dental pulp stem cells: Pulp tissue was mechanically extracted from the teeth and digested in a solution of 3 mg/mL collagenase type I and 4 mg/mL dispase for 1 hour at 37°C. The single-cell suspension was cultured in Alpha minimum essential medium (α -MEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum and 1% penicillin/streptomycin. Cells at passage 3–4 were used. Flow cytometry confirmed the mesenchymal phenotype (positive for CD90, CD105, CD73; negative for CD34, CD45).

Preparation of gelatin methacryloyl hydrogel: Gelatin Methacryloyl (GelMA) was synthesized by reacting gelatin type A with methacrylic anhydride. The degree of methacrylation was verified via H-NMR. For the experiment, a 10% (w/v) gelatin methacryloyl precursor solution was prepared in phosphate-buffered saline containing 0.5% (w/v) lithium phenyl-2,4,6-trimethylbenzoylphosphinate as a photo-initiator.

Tooth Slice Model Preparation: Thirty extracted human third molars were cleaned and sectioned horizontally using a water-cooled diamond saw to produce 2-mm thick slices from the mid-coronal

region. The pulp tissue was removed, and the pulp chamber was enlarged to a standardized diameter of 4 mm using a sterile bur. The slices were sterilized by gamma irradiation and soaked in culture media for 24 hours.

Experimental Grouping and Randomization: A total of 60 tooth slices were randomly assigned to three groups (n=20 per group) using a computer-generated randomization list:

1. **Group A** (Negative Control): Empty tooth slices filled with culture media only.
2. **Group B** (Positive Control - Biodentine): Biodentine™ (Septodont) was mixed according to the manufacturer's instructions and placed into the pulp chamber space, leaving space for media.
3. **Group C** (Test Group - hDPSC/GelMA): human dental pulp stem cells were resuspended in the gelatin methacryloyl precursor solution at a density of 2×10^6 cells/mL. 50 μ L of this suspension was pipetted into the pulp chamber of the slice and photocrosslinked using visible light (405 nm) for 30 seconds to form a solid construct.

Cell Viability and Proliferation Assays: Cell viability within the hydrogel (Group C) and on the material surface (Group B) was assessed at 24 hours and 7 days using a Live/Dead Staining Kit (calcein-AM/ethidium homodimer-1) and visualized under confocal microscopy.

Proliferation was quantified using the Cell counting Kit-8 (CCK-8) colorimetric assay at days 1, 3, and 7. The reagent was added to the wells, incubated for 2 hours, and absorbance was measured at 450 nm using a microplate reader.

Gene Expression Analysis (quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction): At day 14, total RNA was extracted using TRIzol reagent. cDNA was synthesized, and quantitative PCR was performed to assess the expression of odontogenic markers (Dentin Sialophosphoprotein, Dentin matrix acidic phosphoprotein 1) and the angiogenic marker vascular endothelial growth factor. GAPDH was used as the housekeeping gene.

Statistical Analysis: Data were analyzed using SPSS software (Version 25.0). Results were expressed as mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD). Differences between groups were analyzed using one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's post-hoc test. A $p < 0.05$ was considered

statistically significant.

RESULTS

Cell Viability: Confocal microscopy analysis of the Live/Dead assay demonstrated high cytocompatibility in the Test Group. At 24 hours, cell viability in the hDPSC-GelMA constructs (Group C) was $96.5\% \pm 2.1\%$. At Day 7, viability remained high at $94.2\% \pm 3.5\%$, with cells exhibiting elongated morphology indicative of spreading within the 3D matrix. In contrast, Group B (Biodentine) showed viable cells adhered to the material surface, but with a distinct zone of inhibition immediately adjacent to the fresh cement, likely due to the high initial pH, resulting in $82.1\% \pm 4.8\%$ viability at 24 hours.

Cell Proliferation: The CCK-8 assay revealed time-dependent proliferation in both the Positive Control and Test groups (Table 1). However, the proliferation kinetics differed significantly. While Group B showed moderate growth, Group C demonstrated an exponential growth phase between Day 3 and Day 7. At Day 7, the optical density (OD) of the Test Group was significantly higher than both the Positive and Negative controls ($p < 0.01$), suggesting that the hydrogel environment provided superior support for cellular expansion compared to the bioceramic surface.

Odontogenic Differentiation: To assess the po-

TABLE 1.

Cell Proliferation Assessment
(optical density values at 450 nm)

Group	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7
Group A	0.15 ± 0.02	0.18 ± 0.03	0.16 ± 0.04
Group B	$0.42 \pm 0.05^*$	$0.68 \pm 0.07^*$	$0.98 \pm 0.09^*$
Group C	$0.45 \pm 0.06^*$	$0.88 \pm 0.11^\$$	$1.45 \pm 0.12^\ddagger$

NOTES: (*) - $p < 0.05$ vs. Group A; (§) - $p < 0.05$ vs. Group B; (‡) $p < 0.01$ vs. Group B

TABLE 2.

Relative Odontogenic Gene Expression
(Fold Change vs. Control)

Groups	Gene Marker	
	DSPP	DMP-1
Group A	1.00 ± 0.1	1.00 ± 0.2
Group B	5.8 ± 0.6	4.9 ± 0.5
Group C	6.2 ± 0.8	5.3 ± 0.7
p-value (B vs C)	> 0.05 (ns)	> 0.05 (ns)

NOTES: DSPP -dentin sialophosphoprotein, DMP -dentin matrix acidic phosphoprotein 1

tential for hard tissue formation, odontogenic gene expression was analyzed at Day 14 (Table 2). Both therapeutic groups significantly upregulated odontogenic markers compared to the negative control. Interestingly, there was no statistically significant difference in DSSP expression between the Biodentine group and the hDPSC-GelMA group ($p = 0.24$), indicating that the bioengineered construct is as effective as the clinical gold standard in promoting odontoblastic differentiation.

Angiogenic Potential: A critical requirement for pulp regeneration is vascularization. The expression of vascular endothelial growth factor was analyzed to determine the angiogenic capability of the treatments (Table 3). Group C (hDPSC-GelMA) showed a robust upregulation of vascular endothelial growth factor, approximately 4-fold higher than Group B. This suggests that while Biodentine promotes mineralization, it has limited

hydrogels [Monteiro N et al., 2018]. The 3D space enables the cells to preserve their spatial morphology which is essential to paracrine signaling. Conversely, Biodentine group cells had the restriction of growing on the 2D surface of the substance. Although Biodentine is bioactive, it has high levels of alkalinity during its setting which causes it to develop a zone of necrosis or limited growth at its initial setting as indicated by the Day 1 and Day 3 proliferation [Laurent P et al., 2008].

One of the findings of this study is that odontogenic differentiation is comparable in the groups. The functional odontoblasts have specific markers, dentin sialophosphoprotein and dentin matrix acidic phosphoprotein 1. It is noteworthy that the level of dentin sialophosphoprotein expression induced by the hDPSC-GelMA construct was comparable to that of Biodentine that is a substance specifically engineered to induce tertiary dentin [Nowicka A et al., 2013]. It implies that the construct can serve the major objective of vital pulp therapy: the sealing of pulp through the formation of dentin bridges. The mechanism is, however, probably different; the Biodentine works through the action of chemical irritation and calcium ion release [Sangwan P et al., 2013], the hDPSC construct works through lineage specific differentiation and the stiffness of the hydrogel matrix [Celiz AD et al., 2022].

Angiogenicity is the most clinically significant benefit of the bioengineered construct. The efficacy of regenerative endodontics solely relies on the re-establishment of blood circulation [Murray PE et al., 2007]. Vascular endothelial growth factor occupies the throne in angiogenesis control. The enhancement of the vascular endothelial growth factor expression in the Test Group is 4-fold, which suggests that pro-angiogenic factors are actively being released by the transplanted human dental pulp stem cells. The conventional bioceramics lack built-in angiogenic capabilities other than to provide a seal [Torabinejad M, Parirokh M, 2010; Iohara K, Nakashima M, 2015]. A material that fails to vascularize yet seals can result in either calcific metamorphosis or pulp necrosis, in the course of time in a clinical situation. hDPSC-GelMA constructs have the promise of biological integration as opposed to biological seal [Demarco FF et al., 2011].

The tooth slice model is a model that is used as

capacity to induce vascular signaling compared to the stem cell-laden hydrogel.

DISCUSSION

The present randomized lab trial shows that a bioengineered construct created with human dental pulp stem cells and gelatin methacryloyl hydrogel is better in regenerative ability than the conventional bio-ceramic capping in an ex vivo tooth slice model. Although Biodentine was also successful in triggering the signs of mineralization, the stem-cells construct was far superior to the material-only method in regard to cell proliferation and angiogenic capacity.

The viability (>94%), and strong growth of the Test Group justified the use of gelatin methacryloyl as a scaffold. The gelatin methacryloyl hydrogel includes the Arg-Gly-Asp peptide motifs that facilitate cell adhesion and spreading, circumventing the shortcomings of non-biological synthetic

TABLE 3.

Angiogenic Marker Expression (vascular endothelial growth factor)			
Metric	Group A	Group B	Group C
VEGF Expression (Fold Change)	1.0 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.3	6.8 ± 0.9
Significance vs Group A	-	p > 0.05	p < 0.001
Significance vs Group B	-	-	p < 0.001

an intermediate between monoculture and animal studies. In culturing the construct in the real pulp chamber we took into consideration the interaction with dentin-derived growth factors (DDGFs) released by the dentin walls, which is known to affect stem cell behavior [Smith AJ et al., 2012].

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS: This experiment employed an ex vivo model that did not have a systemic blood flow and a response of immune system. Although vascular endothelial growth factor upregulation indicates the possibility of vascularization, the actual formation of vessels (anastomosis) was not confirmed. Moreover, the experiment did not evaluate neurogenesis, which is another very important constituent of vital pulp [Paggella P et al., 2019]. The future studies need to be conducted in the orthotopic animal models to deter-

mine the capabilities of the construct to recruit the host vessels and nerves using the apical foramen.

CONCLUSION

Conclusively, the hDPSC-GelMA bioengineered construct exhibits superior cytocompatibility, strong proliferative abilities as well as superior angiogenic properties than the conventional Biodentine treatment in a slice of a human tooth. Although the two modalities are effective in the context of inducing odontogenic differentiation, the stem cell-laden hydrogel has the added benefit of encouraging vascular signaling, which is a requirement of the bona fide regeneration of the pulp. These results substantiate translation of the hydrogel-based stem cell therapy as an excellent alternative to the standard calcium silicate cements in vital pulp therapy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The corresponding author would like to thank the Deanship of Scientific Research, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia, for their support for this study.

REFERENCES

1. Abbass MMS, El-Rashidy AA, El-Moshy SM, Radwan IA, Rady D, El-Backly RM, et al. (2020). Hydrogel scaffolds in dental pulp tissue engineering: a review. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med.* 14(10):1425-47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/term.3100>
2. Bakhtiar H, Nekoofar MH, Aminishakib P, Abedi F, Moosavi F, Esnaashari E, et al. (2023). Human dental pulp stem cells in vital pulp therapy: a randomized clinical trial. *J Dent Res.* 102(8):889-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345231169881>
3. Bjørndal L, Simon S, Tomson PL, Duncan HF (2019). Management of deep caries and the exposed pulp. *Int Endod J.* 52(7):949-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iej.13128>
4. Camilleri J (2008). The chemical composition of mineral trioxide aggregate. *J Conserv Dent.* 11(4):141-3. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-0707.48834>
5. Celiz AD, Smith JG, Patel AK, Sewell H, Caetano-Faria A, Pfeifer S, et al. (2022). Materials-driven regeneration of the dental pulp. *MRS Bull.* 47:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1557/s43577-022-00357-2>
6. Demarco FF, Conde MC, Cavalcanti BN, Casagrande L, Sakai VT, Nör JE (2011). Dental pulp tissue engineering. *Braz Dent J.* 22(5):3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-64402011000500001>
7. Diogenes A, Ruparel NB (2017). Regenerative endodontic procedures: clinical outcomes. *Dent Clin North Am.* 61(1):111-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cden.2016.08.004>
8. Gronthos S, Mankani M, Brahimi J, Robey PG, Shi S (2000). Postnatal human dental pulp stem cells (DPSCs) in vitro and in vivo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 97(25):13625-30. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.240309797>
9. Iohara K, Nakashima M (2015). Regeneration of dental pulp after pulpotomy by transplantation of CD31(-)/CD146(-) side population cells from a canine tooth. *Regen Ther.* 1:38-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reth.2014.12.001>
10. Khayat A, Monteiro N, Smith EE, Pagni S, Zhang W, Khademhosseini A, et al. (2017). GelMA-encapsulated hDPSCs and HUVECs for dental pulp regeneration. *J Dent Res.* 96(2):192-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034516682005>

11. Laurent P, Camps J, De Méo M, Déjou J, About I (2008). Induction of specific cell responses to a Ca₃SiO₅-based posterior restorative material. *Dent Mater.* 24(11):1486-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2008.02.020>
12. Monteiro N, Thirvikraman G, Athirasala A, Tahayeri A, França CM, Ferracane JL, et al. (2018). Photopolymerization of cell-laden gelatin methacryloyl hydrogels using a dental curing light for regenerative dentistry. *Dent Mater.* 34(3):389-99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2017.11.020>
13. Moussa DG, Aparicio C (2019). Present and future of tissue engineering scaffolds for dentin-pulp complex regeneration. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med.* 13(1):58-75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/term.2769>
14. Murray PE, Garcia-Godoy F, Hargreaves KM (2007). Regenerative endodontics: a review of current status and a call for action. *J Endod.* 33(4):377-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2006.09.013>
15. Nowicka A, Lipski M, Parafiniuk M, Sporniak-Tutak K, Lichota D, Kosierkiewicz A, et al. (2013). Response of human dental pulp capped with biodentine and mineral trioxide aggregate. *J Endod.* 39(6):743-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2013.01.005>
16. Pagella P, Kaigler D, Nör JE (2019). Vascularization of dental pulp constructs. *Methods Mol Biol.* 1922:173-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9012-2_17
17. Parirokh M, Torabinejad M, Dummer PMH (2018). Mineral trioxide aggregate and other bioactive endodontic cements: an updated overview - part I: vital pulp therapy. *Int Endod J.* 51(2):177-205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iej.12841>
18. Ricucci D, Loghin S, Siqueira JF Jr (2014). Correlation between clinical and histologic pulp diagnoses. *J Endod.* 40(12):1932-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2014.08.010>
19. Sangwan P, Sangwan A, Duhan J, Rohilla A (2013). Tertiary dentinogenesis with calcium hydroxide: a review of proposed mechanisms. *Int Endod J.* 46(1):3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2591.2012.02101.x>
20. Smith AJ, Scheven BA, Takahashi Y, Ferracane JL, Shelton RM, Cooper PR (2012). Dentine as a bioactive extracellular matrix. *Arch Oral Biol.* 57(2):109-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2011.06.016>
21. Torabinejad M, Parirokh M (2010). Mineral trioxide aggregate: a comprehensive literature review - part II: leakage and biocompatibility investigations. *J Endod.* 36(2):190-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2009.09.010>
22. Yue K, Trujillo-de Santiago G, Alvarez MM, Tamayol A, Annabi N, Khademhosseini A (2015). Synthesis, properties, and biomedical applications of gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA) hydrogels. *Biomaterials.* 73:254-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2015.08.045>
23. Zhu X, Liu J, Yu Z, Wang C (2018). A miniature organotypic culture model of human dental pulp. *J Endod.* 44(7):1124-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2018.03.017>



CONTENTS

4. **DAS A.C., SAMIR P.V., KHAN S.H., FERNANDES B., ARYA A., MUSTAFA M.**
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THERAPEUTIC DECISION-MAKING FOR COMPLEX DENTAL DISEASES: A REVIEW
11. **ALAM M.K. ALMOHAMMED Y.E.M., HAJEER M.Y., ALANAZI A.W.N., ALANAZI F.S.A., ALNAWMASI Y.M.F.**
LABORATORY ASSESSMENT OF CRISPR-MEDIATED MODULATION OF OSTEOBLASTIC AND OSTEOCLASTIC GENE EXPRESSION UNDER SIMULATED ORTHODONTIC FORCE
17. **GEORGE A.L., PANICKER P., FRANCIS F., RAGHUNANDANAN S., MOHIDEEN K., ALMUTAIRY M.F.**
CAR-T-INSPIRED IMMUNOMODULATORY NANOVESICLES FOR TARGETED ELIMINATION OF ORAL SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA CELLS
23. **ALFAWZAN A.A., ALAM M.K., HAJEER M.Y.**
IN-VITRO EVALUATION OF NANOPARTICLE-REINFORCED ORTHODONTIC ADHESIVES FOR ENHANCED SHEAR BOND STRENGTH AND ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY
30. **JADHAV S., PATRI G., BEHERA S.S.P., BANIK A., ARYA A., MUSTAFA M.**
STEM-CELL-DERIVED BIOENGINEERED DENTAL PULP CONSTRUCTS FOR VITAL PULP THERAPY: A RANDOMIZED LABORATORY TRIAL
36. **TUENKAR Y.A., SHANKARGOUDA S., SEHDEV B., SINGH R.B., RAMAMURTHY J., MAHAPATRA N.**
AI-GUIDED PERSONALIZED DRUG-DELIVERY NANOPARTICLES FOR PRECISION TREATMENT OF PERI-IMPLANTITIS: A MULTICENTER EVALUATION
42. **SADAT MANSOURI S., DADEHBEIGLOU P., NEMATI ANARAKI S., RAHMATPANAH K.**
CYANOACRYLATE VS. DENTIN BONDING ON REDUCING DENTAL SENSITIVITY
50. **JALALUDDIN M., CALIAPEROMAL S.K., JAYANTI I., PATIL M., RAMAMURTHY J., MUSTAFA M.**
MRNA-BASED REGENERATION OF PERIODONTAL LIGAMENT FIBROBLASTS: A TRANSLATIONAL PILOT STUDY
56. **AZATYAN V.YU., YESSAYAN L.K., SHMAVONYAN M.V., MURADYAN A.A.**
EVALUATING THE EFFECTS OF CIGARETTE SMOKING AND HEATED TOBACCO PRODUCTS ON THE ORAL MUCOSA AND PERIODONTIUM IN PATIENTS WITH HEPATIT C VIRUS IN ARMENIA: A PILOT STUDY
65. **MOHAMMADI E., NAZARBAGHI S., HAJIESMAELLO M.**
COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF LOW-LEVEL LASER THERAPY AND TRANSCUTANEOUS ELECTRICAL NERVE STIMULATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF DIABETIC PERIPHERAL NEUROPATHY: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL
73. **HOSSEINIAZAR M.M., KABOUDMEHRI M., ROOSTA Y.**
PREDICTIVE VALUE OF SERUM TRACE ELEMENTS FOR CHEMOTHERAPEUTIC EFFICACY IN GASTRIC AND COLON CANCER: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY
82. **ESMAELZADEH M., ASHT'A'RI MEHRJARDI A., MOHAMMADINIA O., MOHAMMADPOUR S., HOKMABADI M.E., AMINI F., AZIZI T., VAKILI AHRARI RODI M.**
NEW HORIZONS IN SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDER: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EPIGENETIC MECHANISMS AND MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVES (2023–2025)
90. **SHAHROKHI-FARD P., SAGHEBI A., TALAEI A.**
EFFECTIVENESS OF ACCEPTANCE AND COMMITMENT THERAPY ON COVID-19 PROTECTION INDICATORS, PHYSICAL DISORDER SYMPTOMS, AND PERCEIVED STRESS IN HEALTHCARE PERSONNEL IN MASHHAD HOSPITALS
98. **SURKUNDA T.S., STANLEY W., ELENJICKAL V., BALLAL A., NAGARAJU S., BOPPE S., KAMATH N., SHASTRY B.**
CLINICAL FEATURES, OUTCOMES AND COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA OF INVASIVE ASPERGILLOSIS AT A TERTIARY CARE CENTRE: A RETROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY
- 108 **SABERI M.K., MOKHTARI H., HOSEINI AHANGARI S.A., OUCHI A., SHOURCHEH B.**
THE ONLINE ATTENTION TO SPIRITUAL HEALTH RESEARCH: AN ALTMETRIC ANALYSIS
- 118 **LETTER TO THE EDITOR**
A GENERALIZED ANALYTICAL REVIEW OF ARTICLES IN A ISSUE 2 ON ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES IN MODERN STOMATOLOGY



The Journal is founded by
Yerevan State Medical
University after M. Heratsi.

Rector of YSMU

Armen A. *MURADYAN*

Address for correspondence:

Yerevan State Medical University
2 Koryun Street, Yerevan 0025,
Republic of Armenia

Phones:

(+37410) 582532 YSMU

(+37493) 588697 Editor-in-Chief

Fax: (+37410) 582532

E-mail: namj.ysmu@gmail.com, ysmiu@mail.ru

URL: <http://www.ysmu.am>

Our journal is registered in the databases of Scopus, EBSCO
and Thomson Reuters (in the registration process)



SCOPUS



EBSCO



THE GUFO

Print in "Monoprint" LLC
Director: Armen Armenakyan
Andraniks St., 96/8 Bulding
Yerevan, 0064, Armenia
Phone: (+37491) 40 25 86
E-mail: monoprint1@mail.ru

TheGufo is an online database platform designed to help researchers publish and share their scientific work on a global scale. Our company was founded to address the need for affordable and user-friendly platform that removes many of the barriers traditionally imposed by the publishing industry. All scientific work published through TheGufo complies with Creative Commons 4.0 and other recognized standards to ensure authenticity, proper referencing, and academic integrity. Each submission undergoes a detailed peer-review process prior to publication.

Our mission is to provide researchers worldwide with a professional, accessible, and cost-effective platform to share both new and existing work with their peers. To further encourage participation, we also offer special promotional programs for academic institutions.

Dear reader, to access our website, please follow the link below
<https://thegufo.com/> <https://>

Editor-in-Chief

Arto V. *ZILFYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Deputy Editors

Hovhannes M. *MANVELYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Hamayak S. *SISAKYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Executive Secretary

Stepan A. *AVAGYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Editorial Board

Armen A. *MURADYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Drastamat N. *KHUDAVERDYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Suren A. *STEPANYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Foregin Members of the Editorial Board

Waleed *GHANIMA* (Oslo, Norway)

Carsten N. *Gutt* (Memmingen, GERMAY)

Ming-Hua *ZHENG* (Wenzhou, China)

Coordinating Editor (for this number)

Farzad *KARIMPOUR* (Yasuj, IR Iran)

Editorial Advisory Council

Vahe Yu. *AZATYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Ara S. *BABLOYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Ines *BANJARI* (Osijek, Croatia)

Azat A. *ENGIBARYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Mahdi *ESMAEILZADEH* (Mashhad, IR Iran)

Ruben V. *FANARJYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Gabriele *FRAGASSO* (Milano, Italy)

Samvel G. *GALSTYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Armen Dz. *HAMBARDZUMYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Airazat M. *KAZARYAN* (Oslo, Norway)

Seyran P. *KOCHARYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Levon M. *MKRTCHYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Ashot M. *MKRTUMYAN* (MoscowRussia)

Mariam R *MOVSIYAN* (Gumri, Armenia)

Mikhail Z. *NARIMANYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Sevak *SHAHBAZYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Arthur K. *SHUKURYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Gevorg N. *TAMAMYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Marine M. *TANASHYAN* (Moscow, Russia)

Hakob V. *TOPCHYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Alexander *WOODMAN* (London, England)

Konstantin B. *YENKOYAN* (Yerevan, Armenia)

Yumei *NIU* (Harbin, China)

Peijun *WANG* (Harbin, Chine)