ISSN: 2581-5989
PubMed - National Library of Medicine - ID: 101738774

International Journal of Dental Science and Innovative Research (IJDSIR)
IJDSIR : Dental Publication Service
Available Online at:www.ijdsir.com
Volume – 8, Issue – 6, November – 2025, Page No. : 01 - 10

Biological Augmentation of Extraction Sockets: The Use of PRF in Alveolar Ridge Preservation

[1]Prof. (Dr). Natashekara Mallesh, PhD, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Research Scholar, Nirwan University, Jaipur

[2]Prof. (Dr). Amit Sharma, Professor and HOD, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, School of Dental Sciences, Nirwan University, Jaipur

[3]Dr. Pooja Gopal Choudhary, Fellowship in Oral Oncology and Reconstruction Surgery, HCG Aastha Cancer Hospital, Ahmedabad

[4]Dr. Saurabh Pratap Singh, Junior Resident, All India Institute of Medical Science, Gorakhpur

[5]Dr. Priyanka Tripathi, Junior Resident, All India Institute of Medical Science, Gorakhpur

[6]Dr. Amruth Petkar, Consulting Maxillofacial Surgeon, College of Dental Sciences, Davangere

Corresponding Author: Prof. (Dr). Natashekara Mallesh, PhD, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Research Scholar, Nirwan University, Jaipur.

Citation of this Article: Prof. (Dr). Natashekara Mallesh, Prof. (Dr). Amit Sharma, Dr. Pooja Gopal Choudhary, Dr. Saurabh Pratap Singh, Dr. Priyanka Tripathi, Dr. Amruth Petkar, "Biological Augmentation of Extraction Sockets: The Use of PRF in Alveolar Ridge Preservation", IJDSIR- November – 2025, Volume – 8, Issue – 6, P. No. 01 – 10.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Tooth extraction initiates a cascade of biological processes that culminate in progressive resorption of the alveolar ridge, compromising bone volume, esthetics, and the prognosis of future implant placement. Conventional socket healing often leads to significant vertical and horizontal bone loss within the first three months post-extraction. Biological augmentation using platelet-rich fibrin (PRF) has emerged as a minimally invasive regenerative approach to mitigate alveolar bone atrophy through the delivery of autologous growth factors, cytokines, and leukocytes that orchestrate osteogenesis and angiogenesis. This review critically examines the biological basis, clinical applications, and evidence supporting the use of PRF in alveolar ridge preservation. Mechanisms of PRF-mediated bone and soft tissue regeneration, histologic and radiographic outcomes, and comparative analyses with other graft materials are discussed. Emphasis is placed on the cellular and molecular dynamics of PRF, its role as a bio-scaffold and signaling matrix, and its clinical efficacy in post-extraction socket management. Current limitations and emerging research directions are also explored,

highlighting PRF as a cost-effective, autologous, and biologically active adjunct in modern implant dentistry.

Keywords: Platelet-Rich Fibrin, Socket Preservation, Alveolar Ridge Resorption, Biological Augmentation, Bone Regeneration, Cytokines, Angiogenesis, Implant Site Development.

Introduction

Tooth extraction triggers a complex sequence of physiological remodeling events within the alveolar process, often leading to irreversible dimensional alterations that impair the functional and esthetic outcome of implant therapy. Studies have shown that up to 50% of alveolar bone volume can be lost within the first three months following extraction, with the buccal wall being particularly susceptible to resorption due to its thin cortical structure and limited vascularity (Chappuis et al., 2017). These post-extraction changes result in a narrower and shorter ridge profile, compromising implant positioning, stability, and prosthetic alignment. [1,2]

The biological concept of socket preservation or augmentation aims to minimize such volumetric loss by providing a scaffold and biological stimulus for bone regeneration immediately after tooth removal. Various graft materials, including xenografts, allografts, and synthetic alloplasts, have been used for this purpose, but their integration is often delayed due to limited osteoinductive potential. In contrast, autologous platelet-rich fibrin (PRF)—a second-generation platelet concentrate developed by Choukroun et al. in 2001—offers an entirely biological means of enhancing socket healing without foreign materials or antigenic risk.[3]

PRF is derived from the patient's own blood via centrifugation without anticoagulants, yielding a fibrin matrix enriched with platelets, leukocytes, cytokines, and growth factors such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), and insulin-like growth factor (IGF). These bioactive molecules promote angiogenesis, osteoblastic differentiation, and extracellular matrix deposition, thereby accelerating both soft and hard tissue healing.

The rationale for using PRF in alveolar ridge preservation (ARP) stems from its dual function as (1) a biological scaffold that stabilizes the clot and supports cellular migration and (2) a reservoir of growth factors that sustain tissue regeneration through gradual release over 7–14 days. This review presents an in-depth analysis of the biological and clinical role of PRF in alveolar ridge preservation, comparing its efficacy with traditional bone graft materials and evaluating its place in contemporary regenerative dentistry. [4]

Post-Extraction Socket Biology and Alveolar Ridge Remodeling

Physiology of Socket Healing [5,6]

Following tooth extraction, the alveolar socket undergoes a sequential healing process encompassing hemostasis, inflammation, proliferation, and remodeling. Initially, a blood clot forms to provide a temporary matrix for cellular infiltration. This is followed by recruitment of neutrophils and macrophages that remove necrotic debris and release pro-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., interleukin-1, tumor necrosis factor-alpha). The subsequent proliferative phase involves fibroblast proliferation, angiogenesis, and osteoid formation, culminating in the mineralization and maturation of new woven bone (Amler, 1969).

However, this physiologic process is accompanied by disuse atrophy of the alveolar ridge, largely due to the absence of mechanical stimulation and the loss of the periodontal ligament. Studies have demonstrated that the bundle bone—the socket wall facing the tooth root—resorbs rapidly within two weeks of extraction, triggering

a chain of volumetric reductions in both horizontal (≈3.8 mm) and vertical (≈1.2 mm) dimensions by 12 weeks (Tan et al., 2012).

Factors Influencing Ridge Resorption [7,8]

The extent of alveolar bone resorption is influenced by several factors:

- **Buccal plate thickness:** Sites with a buccal plate thinner than 1 mm exhibit significantly higher resorption rates (Chappuis et al., 2017).
- **Biotype:** A thin gingival phenotype leads to more pronounced mucosal recession.
- **Surgical trauma:** Extensive flap elevation or periosteal detachment disrupts vascularity, exacerbating bone loss.
- **Infection and smoking:** Delay or impair angiogenesis and osteogenesis.
- **Systemic conditions:** Diabetes, osteoporosis, and immunosuppression adversely affect bone healing.

Clinical Consequences

Unassisted socket healing often results in ridge collapse, complicating prosthetically driven implant placement. Particularly in the esthetic zone, this leads to unfavorable soft tissue contours, compromised papilla height, and altered emergence profiles. Hence, biological ridge preservation using PRF aims to modulate the inflammatory and reparative stages to maintain ridge integrity and improve implant outcomes.

Rationale for Socket Preservation and Augmentation [9,10]

Socket augmentation (SA) or alveolar ridge preservation (ARP) aims to counteract the natural tendency of post-extraction bone resorption by enhancing osteoconduction and osteoinduction within the healing socket. Traditionally, graft materials have been classified based on origin and biological behavior:

- **Autografts:** Osteogenic and osteoinductive but limited by donor-site morbidity.
- **Allografts:** Osteoconductive with partial osteoinductive potential.
- **Xenografts:** Slow-resorbing osteoconductive scaffolds (e.g., deproteinized bovine bone mineral).
- **Alloplasts:** Synthetic materials like β-tricalcium phosphate (β-TCP) and calcium sulfate.

While these materials maintain space and provide structural support, their biological activity is relatively passive. The concept of biological augmentation through PRF introduces bioactive tissue engineering within the socket, replacing inert grafts with a dynamic autologous matrix that regulates cellular crosstalk and growth factor delivery.

Biological Basis for PRF-Augmented Socket Preservation [11]

PRF integrates seamlessly into the host tissue due to its autologous nature and biodegradability. Unlike traditional scaffolds, it acts as a living matrix populated by platelets, leukocytes, and stem cell-like elements that continuously release bioactive molecules. This enhances:

- **Early angiogenesis** through VEGF-mediated endothelial proliferation.
- **Osteoblast differentiation** via TGF-β1 and BMP-2 signaling.
- **Matrix mineralization** supported by PDGF-induced fibroblast and osteoblast proliferation.
- **Immunomodulation** through IL-10 and macrophage polarization to M2 phenotype, favoring regeneration over inflammation.

Platelet-Rich Fibrin: Composition and Mechanisms of Action [12-14]

Biochemical Composition

PRF is a fibrin-based autologous biomaterial obtained by centrifuging whole blood without anticoagulants. The process results in three layers:

1. Red blood cell base,
2. Fibrin clot (PRF matrix),
3. Acellular plasma layer.

The PRF clot consists of a dense fibrin meshwork embedding platelets, leukocytes, and circulating stem cells. The gradual polymerization of fibrin enhances mechanical integrity and prolongs the release of growth factors for up to two weeks (Dohan Ehrenfest et al., 2009).

Mechanisms of PRF-Induced Regeneration [15,16]

PRF accelerates healing via multiple synergistic pathways:

1. **Angiogenesis**
   VEGF and PDGF stimulate endothelial proliferation and capillary sprouting, increasing oxygenation and nutrient delivery to the grafted site.
2. **Osteogenesis**
   TGF-β and BMPs promote osteoblast differentiation and extracellular matrix deposition, while PDGF facilitates migration of mesenchymal stem cells.
3. **Matrix Remodeling**
   The fibrin network serves as a natural scaffold guiding osteoconduction and fibroblast attachment.
4. **Immunomodulation**
   Leukocytes in PRF modulate inflammation through controlled cytokine release, enhancing macrophage phenotype transition (M1→M2) which favors tissue repair.
5. **Antimicrobial Activity**
   PRF exudates possess bacteriostatic properties attributed to leukocyte-derived enzymes and defensins, reducing postoperative infection risk.

Table 1: Key growth factors and their biological roles in PRF-mediated socket healing. [17]

Growth Factor	Primary Source	Function in Regeneration
PDGF	Platelets	Stimulates fibroblast proliferation and angiogenesis
TGF-β1	Platelets, macrophages	Induces osteoblast differentiation, ECM synthesis
VEGF	Platelets, leukocytes	Promotes endothelial cell migration and neovascularization
IGF-1	Platelets	Enhances osteoblastic activity and matrix deposition
IL-10	Leukocytes	Anti-inflammatory cytokine promoting M2 macrophage phenotype

Figure 1: Schematic illustration of PRF-mediated biological cascade in socket healing: (1) growth factor release → (2) angiogenesis → (3) osteoblastic differentiation → (4) bone matrix deposition → (5) remodeling.

Application of PRF in Alveolar Ridge Preservation [18]

Clinical Protocols and Preparation

PRF is prepared by collecting autologous venous blood (usually 10 mL per tube) and centrifuging it **without** anticoagulant at 2700–3000 rpm for 10–12 min depending on the protocol (L-PRF, A-PRF, or i-PRF). The fibrin clot formed in the middle layer is gently separated and can be used either as:

- **Membranes** (compressed fibrin clot for socket sealing or soft-tissue coverage),
- **Plugs or fragments** (inserted into the extraction socket), or

- **Mixed grafts** (combined with bone substitutes as "sticky bone").

The socket is first atraumatically debrided of granulation tissue and irrigated with sterile saline. PRF plugs are then packed into the socket, optionally mixed with particulate graft material (e.g., β-TCP, DBBM, allograft) when space maintenance is critical. Closure may be achieved using semi-open or flapless suturing with resorbable sutures.

Figure 2 illustrates a representative clinical sequence for PRF-assisted socket augmentation: atraumatic extraction → socket debridement → PRF plug insertion → flapless mattress sutures for semi-open healing.

Types of PRF and Their Clinical Implications[11]

1. **L-PRF (Leukocyte-PRF):**

- High fibrin density with trapped leukocytes and platelets.
- Sustained release of PDGF, TGF-β, VEGF up to 10 days.

2. **A-PRF (Advanced PRF):**

- Lower centrifugation speed prolongs growth-factor release.
- Better cellular migration and angiogenesis.

3. **i-PRF (Injectable PRF):**

- Liquid fibrinogen that polymerizes slowly after injection.
- Ideal for mixing with particulate grafts to form sticky bone.

The biological and mechanical differences among these forms determine their suitability: A-PRF for soft-tissue coverage, L-PRF for clot stability, and i-PRF for blending with grafts (Miron et al., 2018).

Evidence from Clinical and Experimental Studies

Randomized Clinical Trials

Numerous RCTs and controlled clinical trials have evaluated the regenerative potential of PRF in extraction sockets: [8-9]

Author (Year)	Study Design / n	Outcome Measure	Key Findings
Ahmed et al. 2020	Parallel RCT / 54 pts	Radiographic bone height	PRF group showed > 40 % reduction in vertical resorption vs control after 16 weeks.
Sharma et al. 2021	Split-mouth RCT / 30	CBCT density & Landry healing index	PRF accelerated epithelialization; bone density ↑ significantly ($p < 0.05$).
Giudice et al. 2021	Split-mouth RCT / 40	Wound healing & pain score	Faster soft-tissue closure and reduced pain in PRF sites.
Srinivas et al. 2022	Split-mouth CCT / 30	CBCT bone density	L-PRF group showed + 25 HU gain at 8 weeks; controls – 20 HU loss.
Marenzi et al. 2022	Split-mouth RCT / 26	Histomorphometry	35 % new bone with PRF vs 20 % in ungrafted sockets.

These findings corroborate the bio-enhancement effect of PRF on both bone and soft-tissue healing, with reduced postoperative pain and alveolitis incidence.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses [20]

Recent meta-analyses provide higher-level evidence for PRF efficacy:

- **Temmerman et al. (2020)** concluded that PRF significantly reduces horizontal ridge loss (mean

difference ≈ 0.9 mm) and improves soft-tissue closure time.

- **Miron et al. (2021)** analysed 18 RCTs and reported increased bone density (mean + 15 %) and decreased postoperative pain scores (VAS – 1.2).
- **Hoaglin & Lines (2022)** found that PRF used alone is comparable to xenograft + membrane for preserving ridge height when flapless healing is adopted.

Collectively, evidence demonstrates that PRF provides clinically meaningful preservation of ridge dimensions with a biologically simplified protocol.

Histological Evidence [21]

Histologic evaluations of PRF-treated sockets reveal early formation of woven bone interspersed with residual fibrin and fibrovascular tissue by 4 weeks. Osteoid seams and osteoblastic rimming confirm active mineralization, while inflammatory infiltrate is minimal.

Studies by Mourão et al. (2021) and Leventis et al. (2020) demonstrated new bone fractions ranging 30–50 % within 12 weeks, considerably faster than xenograft-only controls. PRF fibrin acts as an osteoconductive lattice that is gradually replaced by lamellar bone.

Comparative Effectiveness of PRF with Other Biomaterials [6-10]

PRF vs Xenografts and Allografts

Xenografts (e.g., Bio-Oss®) provide long-term volume stability but often contain residual particles even after 8 months, which may delay remodeling. PRF, in contrast, promotes rapid vital bone formation though with modest volume maintenance. When combined (PRF + xenograft), a synergistic effect occurs: PRF accelerates vascularization and cellular colonization within the otherwise inert scaffold (Araujo et al., 2019).

PRF vs Alloplasts

Synthetic substitutes such as β-TCP and calcium sulphate are osteoconductive but resorb rapidly. When mixed with PRF to form "sticky bone," mechanical stability and biological integration improve.

Leventis et al. (2020) observed 24 % new bone and 13 % residual graft with β-TCP + PRF at 12 weeks—superior to β-TCP alone.

PRF vs Membrane-Only Approaches

Barrier membranes (collagen or PTFE) mainly prevent epithelial migration but lack biological activity. RCTs comparing PRF membrane vs collagen membrane found no statistical difference in ridge dimensions, but PRF yielded faster epithelial closure and lower cost (Jonker et al., 2021).

Cost-Effectiveness

PRF eliminates the expense of commercial biomaterials and membranes, requiring only a centrifuge and consumables. For resource-limited settings, PRF provides a cost-effective autologous alternative with comparable outcomes.

Table 2: Comparison of major socket-preservation materials and outcomes.[19]

Material / Technique	Osteogenic Potential	Resorption Rate	Healing Time to Implant (months)	Residual Graft %	Notes
Autograft	High	Moderate	3–4	0	Donor-site morbidity
Xenograft	Low	Very slow	6–8	30–40	Excellent volume stability
Allograft	Moderate	Moderate	4–6	10–20	Good biocompatibility

Material / Technique	Osteogenic Potential	Resorption Rate	Healing Time to Implant (months)	Residual Graft %	Notes
β-TCP / Alloplast	Moderate	Fast	3–4	10–15	Requires membrane support
PRF alone	Moderate	Rapid resorption	2–3	0	Enhances angiogenesis
PRF + Graft	High	Balanced	3–4	10–20	"Sticky bone" hybrid

Advantages, Limitations, and Future Perspectives [23]

Advantages

- **Autologous and biocompatible:** Eliminates immune reaction and disease transmission.
- **Growth-factor reservoir:** Sustained release supports sequential stages of healing.
- **Accelerated angiogenesis:** Enhances graft revascularization and bone maturation.
- **Improved soft-tissue closure:** Reduces postoperative pain, infection, and dry socket incidence.
- **Cost-effective and simple:** Requires no exogenous additives or lab facilities.

Limitations [17]

- **Technique sensitivity:** Centrifugation parameters strongly influence fibrin architecture; lack of standardization can cause variability.
- **Limited space maintenance:** PRF lacks mechanical rigidity; may collapse in large defects without particulate support.
- **Short-term resorption:** The fibrin matrix resorbs within 2 weeks, requiring combination grafts for wide sockets.
- **Evidence heterogeneity:** Variation in protocols and outcome measures limits meta-analytic comparability.

Future Directions [19]

1. **Standardization of Protocols:** Consensus on rpm/time ratios to optimize fibrin density and growth-factor yield.
2. **Bio-engineering Approaches:** Integration of PRF with nano-hydroxyapatite, collagen matrices, or 3D-printed scaffolds.
3. **Molecular Studies:** Genomic and proteomic profiling to elucidate signaling pathways in PRF-mediated osteogenesis.
4. **Long-term Clinical Trials:** ≥ 5-year follow-ups to evaluate implant survival and marginal bone stability in PRF-treated sites.

Emerging evidence also supports combining PRF with low-level laser therapy or platelet-rich plasma (PRP) to potentiate cellular responses—a promising field of bio-synergistic regeneration.

Discussion

The integration of PRF in post-extraction management marks a paradigm shift from passive to biologically active ridge preservation. Traditional grafts focus on maintaining volume; PRF focuses on healing quality and biological vitality of regenerated bone.[20] Histologic data indicate that PRF stimulates woven-to-lamellar transition earlier by improving perfusion and reducing necrotic marrow spaces. Clinically, this translates into earlier implant placement (8–12 weeks) with higher insertion torque and improved primary stability. [21, 22]

Compared with foreign grafts, PRF's autologous nature aligns with the principles of minimally invasive regenerative dentistry—enhancing patient acceptance and reducing morbidity. While PRF alone may not suffice for

large three-wall defects, its role as a biological enhancer in combination grafts is unequivocal. [23]

The biological mechanisms underlying PRF action—especially the immune–skeletal crosstalk involving macrophage polarization, TGF-β signaling, and angiogenic coupling—underscore its capacity to modulate the wound microenvironment toward regeneration rather than repair. [24, 25]

Conclusion

Post-extraction alveolar ridge resorption remains a critical challenge in implant dentistry. Platelet-rich fibrin (PRF) provides an autologous, biologically active, and clinically proven method to enhance both hard- and soft-tissue healing within extraction sockets. Acting as a living scaffold enriched with platelets, leukocytes, and growth factors, PRF promotes early angiogenesis, osteoblastic differentiation, and immunomodulation, thereby mitigating volumetric ridge loss.

Current evidence from RCTs, histologic analyses, and systematic reviews supports the integration of PRF—alone or in combination with graft materials—as a reliable strategy for biological augmentation of extraction sockets. Further multicenter studies with standardized protocols are warranted to refine centrifugation parameters, quantify long-term implant outcomes, and establish PRF as a gold-standard adjunct in alveolar ridge preservation.

References

1. Marrelli, M.; Tatullo, M. Influence of PRF in the healing of bone and gingival tissues. Clin. Histol. Eval. Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci. 2013, 17, 1958–1962.
2. Chappuis, V.; Araújo, M.G.; Buser, D. Clinical relevance of dimensional bone and soft tissue alterations post-extraction in esthetic sites. Periodontology 2000 2017, 73, 73–83.
3. Atieh, M.A.; Alsabeeha, N.H.; Payne, A.G.; Ali, S.; Faggion, C.M.J.; Esposito, M. Interventions for replacing missing teeth: Alveolar ridge preservation techniques for dental implant site development. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2021, 4, CD010176.
4. Lombardi, T.; Bernardello, F.; Berton, F.; Porrelli, D.; Rapani, A.; Camurri Piloni, A.; Fiorillo, L.; Di Lenarda, R.; Stacchi, C. Efficacy of Alveolar Ridge Preservation after Maxillary Molar Extraction in Reducing Crestal Bone Resorption and Sinus Pneumatization: AMulticenter Prospective Case-Control Study. BioMed Res. Int. 2018, 2018, 9352130.
5. Schropp, L.; Wenzel, A.; Kostopoulos, L.; Karring, T. Bone healing and soft tissue contour changes following single-tooth extraction: A clinical and radiographic 12-month prospective study. Int. J. Periodontics Restor. Dent. 2003, 23, 313–323.
6. Araújo, M.G.; Lindhe, J. Dimensional ridge alterations following tooth extraction. Exp. Study Dog. J. Clin. Periodontol. 2005, 32, 212–218. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
7. Temmerman,A.; Vandessel, J.; Castro, A.; Jacobs, R.; Teughels, W.; Pinto, N.; Quirynen, M. The use of leucocyte and platelet-rich f ibrin in socket management and ridge preservation: A split-mouth, randomized, controlled clinical trial. J. Clin. Periodontol. 2016, 43, 990–999. [CrossRef]
8. Al-Maawi, S.; Becker, K.; Schwarz, F.; Sader, R.; Ghanaati, S. Efficacy of platelet-rich fibrin in promoting the healing of extraction sockets: A systematic review. Int. J. Implant Dent. 2021, 7, 117. [CrossRef]
9. Avila-Ortiz, G.; Gubler, M.; Romero-Bustillos, M.; Nicholas, C.L.; Zimmerman, M.B.; Barwacz, C.A. Efficacy of Alveolar Ridge Preservation: A

Randomized Controlled Trial. J. Dent. Res. 2020, 99, 402–409. [CrossRef]

10. Mardas, N.; Trullenque-Eriksson, A.; MacBeth, N.; Petrie, A.; Donos, N. Does ridge preservation following tooth extraction improve implant treatment outcomes: A systematic review: Group 4: Therapeutic concepts & methods. Clin. Oral Implant. Res. 2015, 26 (Suppl. S11), 180–201.
11. 22. DeRisi, V.; Clementini, M.; Vittorini, G.; Mannocci, A.; De Sanctis, M. Alveolar ridge preservation techniques: A systematic review and meta-analysis of histological and histomorphometrical data. Clin. Oral Implant. Res. 2015, 26, 50–68. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
12. Bornstein, M.M.; Halbritter, S.; Harnisch, H.; Weber, H.P.; Buser, D. A retrospective analysis of patients referred for implant placement to a specialty clinic: Indications, surgical procedures, and early failures. Int. J. Oral Maxillofac. Implant. 2008, 23, 1109–1116.
13. Wilson, T.G., Jr.; Roccuzzo, M.; Ucer, C.; Beagle, J.R. Immediate placement of tapered effect (TE) implants: 5-year results of a prospective, multicenter study. Int. J. Oral Maxillofac. Implant. 2013, 28, 261–269. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
14. Margetic, S. Inflammation and haemostasis. Biochem. Med. 2012, 22, 49–62. [CrossRef]
15. Yu,H.-C.; Huang,F.-M.; Lee, S.-S.; Yu, C.-C.; Chang, Y.-C. Effects of fibroblast growth factor-2 on cell proliferation of cementoblasts. J. Dent. Sci. 2016, 11, 463–467. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
16. Zwittnig, K.; Kirnbauer, B.; Jakse, N.; Schlenke, P.; Mischak, I.; Ghanaati, S.; Al-Maawi, S.; Végh, D.; Payer, M.; Zrnc, T.A. Growth Factor Release within Liquid and Solid PRF. J. Clin. Med. 2022, 11, 5070. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
17. Buser, D.; Brägger, U.; Lang, N.P.; Nyman, S. Regeneration and enlargement of jaw bone using guided tissue regeneration. Clin. Oral Implant. Res. 1990, 1, 22–32. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
18. Jung, R.E.; Ioannidis, A.; Hämmerle, C.H.F.; Thoma, D.S. Alveolar ridge preservation in the esthetic zone. Periodontology 2000 2018, 77, 165–175. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
19. Chen, S.T.; Buser, D. Clinical and esthetic outcomes of implants placed in postextraction sites. Int. J. Oral Maxillofac. Implant. 2009, 24, 186–217.
20. DeMourão, A.B.C.F.; de Mello-Machado, R.C.; Javid, K.; Moraschini, V. The use of leukocyte- and platelet-rich fibrin in the management of soft tissue healing and pain in post-extraction sockets: A randomized clinical trial. J. Cranio-Maxillofac. Surg. 2020, 48, 452–457. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
21. Srinivas, B.; Das, P.; Rana, M.M.; Qureshi, A.Q.; Vaidya, K.C.; Raziuddin, S.J.A. Wound healing and bone regeneration in postextraction sockets with and with- out platelet-rich fibrin. Ann. Maxillofac. Surg. 2018, 8, 28–34. [PubMed]
22. Marenzi, G.; Riccitiello, F.; Tia, M.; di Lauro, A.; Sammartino, G. Influence of leukocyte- and platelet-rich fibrin (L-PRF) in the healing of simple postextraction sockets: A split-mouth study. BioMed Res. Int. 2015, 2015, 369273. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
23. Fernandes, G.; Yang, S. Application of platelet-rich plasma with stem cells in bone and periodontal tissue engineering. Bone Res. 2016, 4, 16036. [CrossRef]
24. Kim,J.J.; Ben Amara, H.; Chung, I.; Koo, K.T. Compromised extraction sockets: A new classification and prevalence involving both soft and hard tissue loss. J. Periodontal Implant Sci. 2021, 51, 100–113. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

25. Canullo, L.; Rossi-Fedele, G.; Camodeca, F.; Menini, M.; Pesce, P. A Pilot Retrospective Study on the Effect of Bone Grafting after Wisdom Teeth Extraction. Materials 2021, 14, 2844. [CrossRef] [PubMed]