

Exaltation and Glorification in the Field of Pediatric Dental Anesthesia: A Review of Anesthetic Agents

Dr. Manish Haribhau Raut¹, Dr. Shashank Gaur², Dr. Neha Singh³, Dr. Akanksha Mishra⁴, Dr. Gyan Prakash Sahu⁵

¹Post Graduate Student, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India

²Professor and Head, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India

³Professor, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India (Corresponding Author)

⁴Associate Professor, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India

⁵Post Graduate Student, Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India

Corresponding Author: Dr. Neha Singh, Professor,
Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, Bhabha College of Dental Sciences, Bhopal (MP), India

Received: 30-07-2026 **Revised:** 24-08-2026 **Accepted:** 18-09-2026 **Published:** 08-10-2026

Abstract

Pain is a fundamental barrier to successful pediatric dental care. Children's fear, anxiety, and negative pain memories can shape their lifelong attitudes toward dentistry, making effective pain control both a clinical and psychological priority. Local anesthetic agents are the most effective means of managing pain, but their role in pediatric dentistry extends far beyond simple analgesia. Over the past century, anesthetic agents have undergone remarkable refinements, leading to their **exaltation**—scientific elevation through innovation—and **glorification**—the translation of these innovations into enhanced clinical, social, and psychological outcomes. This review focuses exclusively on anesthetic agents in pediatric dentistry, both topical and injectable, and their delivery systems. Developments include advanced topical formulations such as Cetacaine, Oraqix, clove–papaya gel, DentiPatch, and intranasal sprays, as well as injectable innovations like centbucridine, buffered lignocaine, and reversal agents such as Oraverse. Further, delivery systems including computer-controlled local anesthetic delivery (CCLAD), jet injectors, intraosseous anesthesia, and the use of insulin syringes have transformed the child's experience of anesthesia. By synthesizing pharmacological details, clinical trial evidence, and psychosocial implications, this review highlights how anesthetic agents have been exalted scientifically and glorified clinically, reshaping pediatric dental practice into a more compassionate, effective, and child-centered specialty.

Keywords: Pediatric Dentistry, Local Anesthesia, Topical Anesthetics, Injectable Anesthetics, Centbucridine, Oraverse, CCLAD, Exaltation, Glorification

Introduction

Pain management has always been central to dentistry, but in pediatric practice, its importance is magnified by the unique vulnerabilities of children. Odontogenic pain is one of the leading reasons for emergency visits in children, often causing distress for both patients and parents [1]. Dental pain in children has consequences beyond the immediate discomfort: it leads to school absenteeism, poor nutrition, sleep disturbances, and impaired daily functioning. More importantly, painful dental experiences in childhood leave lasting psychological imprints. Children's pain perception is strongly influenced by developmental stage and previous experiences. Younger children often lack the cognitive framework to contextualize pain, leading to exaggerated fear responses. Psychological studies demonstrate that negative pain memories in children

amplify subsequent pain experiences, creating a vicious cycle of anxiety and avoidance [2]. Thus, pediatric anesthesia is not merely a pharmacological intervention but also a behavioral and psychological one. The success of pediatric dentistry depends heavily on effective pain control. Anesthesia allows clinicians to perform procedures safely and efficiently, reduces disruptive behavior, and fosters trust between the dentist and child. Parents, too, view effective pain management as a marker of quality care. Over the years, local anesthetics have moved beyond being simple analgesic agents; they have become tools for building cooperation, preventing dental phobia, and enhancing the reputation of dentistry itself.

To understand the broader impact of anesthetic agents, it is useful to frame their evolution in terms of **exaltation and glorification**

- **Exaltation** refers to the scientific and technical advances that elevated anesthetic agents—improving onset, safety, duration, and delivery methods.
- **Glorification** refers to their clinical and societal success—improving patient comfort, acceptance, parental trust, and the overall reputation of pediatric dentistry.

This dual framework underscores that anesthesia is not just science but also art: the science of blocking pain and the art of transforming a child's experience of dentistry. This review focuses exclusively on anesthetic agents—both topical and injectable—and their delivery systems. Non-pharmacological adjuncts such as behavioral distraction, cryoanesthesia, and virtual reality are excluded, to emphasize the pharmacological armamentarium that has exalted and glorified pediatric anesthesia.

Historical Perspective of Local Anesthetics in Pediatric Dentistry

The story of anesthetic agents in dentistry reflects broader trends in medical science. Cocaine, first used as a local anesthetic in 1884, provided profound anesthesia but carried unacceptable risks of addiction and toxicity. By 1905, procaine (Novocain) was introduced as a safer alternative, but it was short-acting, relatively weak, and often associated with allergic reactions. The introduction of lidocaine by Nils Löfgren in 1943 marked the beginning of the modern era of local anesthetics [3]. Lidocaine offered superior potency, safety, and versatility, and rapidly became the gold standard for dental anesthesia. For pediatric dentistry, however, unique challenges emerged. Children are not merely “small adults”; their physiology, psychology, and behavior necessitate tailored anesthetic approaches. Early reliance on lidocaine alone was effective but insufficient to address the challenges of needle fear, post-operative numbness, and poor cooperation. This gap fueled innovations in both formulations and delivery systems.

Over the decades, progress in anesthetic agents has followed two major pathways:

1. **Pharmacological refinements:** Development of safer, more effective topical anesthetics, alternative injectables, reversal agents, and buffered solutions.
2. **Delivery innovations:** Designing child-friendly systems like CCLAD, jet injectors, intraosseous devices, and insulin syringes to reduce fear and improve cooperation.

From a historical perspective, the exaltation of anesthetic agents represents the scientific strides that made them safer and more effective. The glorification, in turn, is reflected in the improved clinical experiences of children and the increased confidence of dentists and parents.

Topical Anesthetic Agents

Topical anesthetics are indispensable in pediatric dentistry. Their primary role is to reduce discomfort associated with needle penetration, scaling, and minor mucosal procedures. For children, topical anesthesia has psychological importance far beyond its pharmacological effect: it builds confidence, reduces anticipatory anxiety, and improves overall cooperation. Over the past few decades, several topical agents have been introduced and refined, each contributing to the exaltation and glorification of pediatric dental anesthesia.

Cetacaine

Cetacaine is a ternary eutectic mixture composed of benzocaine (14%), butamben (2%), and tetracaine hydrochloride (2%). Each component contributes uniquely to the anesthetic effect.



Figure 1: Cetacaine

Benzocaine provides rapid onset due to its low solubility. **Butamben** prolongs the duration of action.



Figure 2: Butamben

Tetracaine contributes profound surface anesthesia due to high lipid solubility. Pharmacodynamically, Cetacaine blocks sodium channels in nerve membranes, preventing depolarization and conduction of pain impulses. Its onset is rapid (20–30 seconds), and it provides anesthesia lasting 30–60 minutes, longer than conventional benzocaine gels [4]. In pediatric dentistry, Cetacaine is used to reduce injection pain during infiltration or block anesthesia. Randomized controlled trials comparing Cetacaine to benzocaine gel

demonstrate superior reduction in pain scores among children receiving maxillary infiltrations [4]. Children also report better taste acceptability, an important factor in compliance. The **exaltation** of Cetacaine is reflected in its multi-drug design that overcomes the limitations of single-agent benzocaine. The **glorification** is seen in its clinical acceptance, particularly in needle-phobic children, where it transforms a distressing experience into a manageable one. Limitations include the potential risk of methemoglobinemia in very young patients, necessitating careful dosage control.



Figure 3: Tetracaine

Oraqix

Oraqix is a eutectic mixture of 2.5% lidocaine and 2.5% prilocaine, delivered as a thermosetting gel. At room temperature, Oraqix is liquid, but upon contact with mucosa, it solidifies, ensuring prolonged adhesion. Its mechanism of action involves reversible blockade of voltage-gated sodium channels in peripheral nerves, similar to injected local anesthetics [5]. The onset of action is rapid (within 30 seconds), with anesthesia lasting approximately 20 minutes. Unlike traditional gels, Oraqix spreads easily into sulci and adheres to tissues, making it highly effective for scaling and root planing.



Figure 4: Oraqix

In pediatrics, Oraqix has been evaluated for use in:

- **Orthodontic procedures:** reducing pain during separator placement.
- **Restorative dentistry:** minimizing discomfort during rubber dam clamp application.
- **Palatal injections:** reducing pre-injection

discomfort [6,7]. Clinical studies consistently demonstrate that Oraqix provides superior comfort compared to benzocaine gels. Children and parents both perceive it positively, often describing it as “magic gel” that avoids needles. The **exaltation** of Oraqix lies in its innovative delivery system that converts a gel into a solid at body temperature, ensuring efficacy and adherence. Its **glorification** is reflected in widespread acceptance by children and their parents. Challenges include high cost and limited availability, especially in low-resource settings.

Clove–Papaya Gel

The trend toward natural and phytotherapeutic products has influenced pediatric dental anesthesia as well. A clove–papaya gel combines the analgesic properties of eugenol, derived from clove, with the proteolytic enzyme papain, derived from papaya. Eugenol exerts local anesthetic and anti-inflammatory effects by interfering with sodium channel activity, while papain promotes tissue softening and comfort [8]. Clinical studies comparing clove–papaya gel with benzocaine gels and cryoanesthesia show comparable pain reduction during needle penetration and rubber dam clamp application [8].

Importantly, children often report higher acceptability of herbal gels due to milder flavor and the perception of natural safety. Parents, too, are more likely to consent to natural formulations. The **exaltation** of clove–papaya gel lies in integrating traditional herbal medicine with modern formulations, offering a safe and effective alternative. Its **glorification** arises from cultural acceptance and enhanced parental trust, especially in regions where herbal remedies are favored. Limitations include variability in formulation quality and the need for larger multicenter clinical trials.

DentiPatch

DentiPatch was developed as a trans-mucosal adhesive patch containing 10–20% lidocaine. Unlike gels, which may be swallowed or diluted by saliva, DentiPatch adheres firmly to mucosa, releasing anesthetic over a controlled period. The patch provides anesthesia within 3–5 minutes, with a duration of 45 minutes to 1 hour [9].

In pediatric practice, DentiPatch has been evaluated for reducing injection pain, with children reporting significantly lower pain scores compared to benzocaine gels [9,10]. Another advantage is its novelty—children perceive the patch as a “sticker” rather than medicine, which improves cooperation. The **exaltation** of DentiPatch lies in its pharmaceutical engineering, delivering controlled doses without risk of ingestion. Its **glorification** stems from its popularity with children and parents as a painless, acceptable alternative. However, discontinuation from the market limits current use, though it set a precedent for future mucoadhesive systems.



Figure 5: Dentipatch

Intranasal Sprays

One of the most revolutionary topical systems is the intranasal anesthetic spray (Kovanaze®), a combination of 3% tetracaine and 0.05% oxymetazoline. Delivered intranasally, it diffuses through nasal mucosa to reach branches of the trigeminal nerve, producing pulpal anesthesia of maxillary teeth [11–14]. Clinical trials in adults demonstrate success rates of 85–90% for maxillary anterior teeth, with some efficacy extending to premolars [11]. Pediatric studies are limited, but initial findings suggest effectiveness and high acceptance, especially among needle-phobic children [12]. The **exaltation** of intranasal sprays is in their novel pharmacological route of delivery—achieving pulpal anesthesia without injections. The **glorification** is seen in children's positive perception, as the greatest source of dental fear—the syringe—is eliminated. Limitations include high cost, potential systemic absorption, and lack of extensive pediatric data.



Figure 6: Intranasal Sprays

Summary of Topical Agents

Topical anesthetics represent the frontline of pediatric anesthesia. From multi-drug gels like Cetacaine to thermosetting formulations like Oraqix, herbal alternatives like clove–papaya gel, trans-mucosal systems like DentiPatch, and needle-free intranasal sprays, these innovations demonstrate the **exaltation** of pediatric anesthesia through pharmacological sophistication. Their **glorification** is reflected in improved acceptance, cooperation, and reduced fear among children, alongside greater parental trust.

Injectable Anesthetic Agents

Centbucridine

Centbucridine (0.5%) is a quinoline derivative offering faster onset, longer duration, and reduced systemic toxicity compared to lidocaine. Importantly, it possesses intrinsic vasoconstrictor activity, reducing the need for epinephrine. Pediatric trials confirm its superior efficacy and safety over 2% lignocaine [15,16]. The **exaltation** of centbucridine lies in its purposeful design as a dental anesthetic. Its **glorification** lies in its ability to provide longer anesthesia with fewer complications, positioning it as a potential future gold standard in pediatric practice. Global availability remains limited.

Oraverse (Phentolamine Mesylate)

Children are prone to soft-tissue injury from prolonged numbness after procedures. Oraverse, an α -adrenergic antagonist, accelerates recovery by enhancing vasodilation and drug clearance. Clinical trials confirm its safety and efficacy in pediatric patients, reducing soft-tissue anesthesia duration by up to 50% [17–19]. The **exaltation** of Oraverse lies in addressing a neglected post-operative problem. Its **glorification** stems from increased parental satisfaction, reduced risk of lip biting, and better overall experience for children.



Figure 7: Oraverse

Buffered Lignocaine

Standard lignocaine formulations are acidic, causing pain at injection. Buffering with sodium bicarbonate neutralizes pH, reduces sting, and accelerates onset. Pediatric studies confirm reduced discomfort and improved cooperation [20–23]. The **exaltation** of buffered lignocaine lies in transforming a century-old agent into a modern, child-friendly drug. Its **glorification** comes from children reporting injections as less painful, enhancing compliance with routine procedures.

Delivery Innovations in Anesthetic Agents Computer-Controlled Local Anesthetic Delivery (CCLAD)

CCLAD systems, including Wand® and QuickSleeper®, regulate flow rate and pressure, preventing sudden painful distension. Their pen-like

design reduces syringe fear. Pediatric trials consistently show improved cooperation and reduced pain with CCLAD compared to conventional syringes [24–27]. The **exaltation** of CCLAD is its precise pharmacological delivery. Its **glorification** is in transforming the injection into a nearly painless, child-friendly experience, enhancing the reputation of dentistry as gentle.



Figure 8: Computer-Controlled Local Anesthetic Delivery

Jet Injectors

Jet injectors deliver anesthetic without needles, using high pressure. While theoretically appealing, pediatric studies show mixed results. Some children perceive pressure discomfort, while others prefer them over needles [28–31]. The **exaltation** of jet injectors lies in the promise of eliminating needles. The **glorification** remains limited due to inconsistent acceptance.

Intraosseous Anesthesia

Intraosseous anesthesia involves direct deposition into cancellous bone, producing rapid and profound pulpal anesthesia. Pediatric applications include treating molar incisor hypo-mineralization and pulpotomies [32–36]. The **exaltation** of intraosseous anesthesia lies in its reliability where conventional methods fail. Its **glorification** is in enabling pain-free management of difficult pediatric cases, enhancing clinician confidence.



Figure 9: Jet Injectors

Insulin Syringes

Children are highly sensitive to the visual intimidation of syringes. Using small insulin syringes reduces anxiety and perceived pain. Clinical trials confirm improved acceptance in palatal and infiltration injections [37–39]. The **exaltation** of insulin syringes lies in their simplicity. Their **glorification** is seen in universal applicability across pediatric practices, improving cooperation without costly equipment.

Exaltation: Scientific Elevation of Pediatric Dental Anesthesia

Exaltation captures the scientific triumphs of anesthetic agents. Cetacaine optimized surface anesthesia through synergistic mixtures. Oraqix introduced thermosetting gels. Clove–papaya gel integrated phytotherapy. DentiPatch pioneered trans-mucosal patches. Intranasal sprays eliminated syringes altogether. Centbucridine offered superior injectable pharmacology. Buffered lignocaine refined a standard agent, while Oraverse reversed unwanted effects. CCLAD systems perfected delivery. Collectively, these innovations exalt pediatric anesthesia to unprecedented scientific sophistication.

Glorification: Clinical and Psychosocial Transformation

Glorification reflects the translation of pharmacological advances into clinical transformation. Children no longer dread injections when given via CCLAD. Parents express relief when lip biting is prevented with Oraverse. Families favor natural anesthetic gels for cultural reasons. Intranasal sprays allow needle-phobic children to receive care. These transformations glorify pediatric dentistry, elevating it from a painful necessity to a compassionate, child-centered specialty.

Limitations and Future Scope

Despite remarkable progress, challenges persist. Costs of Oraqix, CCLAD, and intranasal sprays restrict access. Centbucridine is not globally available. Jet injectors show inconsistent acceptance. Future directions include:

Pharmacogenomics: tailoring anesthetic choice and dose to genetic profiles.

Nanotechnology: targeted drug delivery reducing systemic exposure.

Bioengineered herbal anesthetics: integrating natural safety with pharmaceutical precision.

Artificial intelligence: optimizing delivery systems through adaptive algorithms.

The exaltation and glorification of anesthetic agents is therefore ongoing, with future innovations promising to further transform pediatric practice.

Conclusion

The history of pediatric dental anesthesia is a story of scientific exaltation and clinical glorification. From crude early agents to sophisticated formulations, anesthetic agents have evolved to ensure safety, efficacy, and acceptance in children. Topical innovations such as Cetacaine, Oraqix, and intranasal

sprays exalt anesthesia by providing new methods of pain control. Injectable innovations such as centbucridine, Oraverse, and buffered lignocaine exalt established drugs into child-friendly solutions. Delivery systems such as CCLAD, jet injectors, intraosseous anesthesia, and insulin syringes glorify dentistry by transforming the injection experience. Exaltation is the scientific refinement; glorification is the human impact. Together, they redefine pediatric dental anesthesia as not just a means of pain control, but a symbol of compassion, trust, and excellence in child-centered care.

References

- Muller CE, Junior MFS, Dadalto ECV, Gomes APM, Sarmiento LC, Gomes AMM. Prevalence of odontogenic pain and associated factors in children treated at a pediatric dental emergency service. *Rev OdontoCien.* 2017;32:115-20.
- Appukuttan DP. Strategies to manage patients with dental anxiety and dental phobia: literature review. *ClinCosmetInvestig Dent.* 2016;8:35-50.
- Malamed SF. Clinical action of specific agents. In: *Handbook of local anesthesia*. 6th ed. Missouri: Elsevier; 2013. p.52.
- Dasaraju RK, Svsg N. Comparative efficacy of three topical anesthetics on 7-11-year-old children: a randomized clinical study. *J Dent Anesth Pain Med.* 2020;20:29-37.
- vanSteenbergh D, Bercy P, De Boever J, Adriaens P, Geers L, Hendrickx E, et al. Patient evaluation of a novel non-injectable anesthetic gel: a multicenter crossover study. *J Periodontol.* 2004;75:1471-8.
- Al-Melh MA, Andersson L. The effect of a lidocaine/prilocaine topical anesthetic on pain and discomfort associated with orthodontic elastomeric separator placement. *ProgOrthod.* 2017;18:1.
- Al-Melh MA, Andersson L. Comparison of topical anesthetics (EMLA/Oraqix vs. benzocaine) on pain experienced during palatal needle injection. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod.* 2007;103:e16-20.
- Anantharaj A, Sabu JM, Ramakrishna S, Jagdeesh RB, Praveen P, Shankarappa PR. A comparative evaluation of pain perception following topical application of benzocaine gel, clove-papaya based anesthetic gel and precooling of the injection site before intraoral injections in children. *J Indian SocPedodPrev Dent.* 2020;38:184-9.
- Wu SJ, Julliard K. Children's preference of benzocaine gel versus the lidocaine patch. *Pediatr Dent.* 2003;25:401-5.
- Shehab LA, Basheer B, Baroudi K. Effectiveness of lidocaineDentiPatch® system versus lidocaine gel as topical anesthetic agent in children. *J Indian SocPedodPrev Dent.* 2015;33:285-90.
- Galui S, Biswas R, Pandey N, Chatterjee AN, Saha S, Sarkar S. A new horizon in needle-less anesthesia: intranasal tetracaine/oxymetazoline spray for maxillary dental anesthesia – an overview. *J Oral Res Rev.* 2020;12:101-5.
- Hersh EV, Saraghi M, Moore PA. Intranasal tetracaine and oxymetazoline: a newly approved drug formulation that provides maxillary dental anesthesia without needles. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2016;32:1919-25.
- Hersh EV, Pinto A, Saraghi M, Saleh N, Pulaski L, Gordon SM, et al. Double-masked, randomized, placebo-controlled study to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of intranasal K305 (3% tetracaine plus 0.05% oxymetazoline) in anesthetizing maxillary teeth. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2016;147:278-87.
- Ciancio SG, Marberger AD, Ayoub F, Garlapo DA, Pantera EA Jr, Pantera CT, et al. Comparison of 3 intranasal mists for anesthetizing maxillary teeth in adults: a randomized, double-masked, multicenter phase 3 clinical trial. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2016;147:339-47.
- Goyal A, Jain G, Jain A, Ansari T, Bumb S. A new era of local anaesthetic agent: Centbucridine. *Arch Cran Oro Fac Sc.* 2013;1:40-3.
- Gune NS, Katre AN. Comparison of 0.5% centbucridine and 2% lignocaine as local anesthetic agents for dental procedures in children: a randomised controlled trial. *Indian J Pediatr.* 2020;87:268-74.
- Tavares M, Goodson JM, Studen-Pavlovich D, Yagiela JA, Navalta LA, Rogy S, et al. Reversal of soft-tissue local anesthesia with phentolaminemesylate in pediatric patients. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2008;139:1095-104.
- Hersh EV, Lindemeyer R, Berg JH, Casamassimo PS, Chin J, Marberger A, et al. Phase four, randomized, double-blinded, controlled trial of phentolaminemesylate in two- to five-year-old dental patients. *Pediatr Dent.* 2017;39:39-45.
- Vinnakota DN, Kamatham R. Safety profile of phentolaminemesylate as reversal agent of pulpal and soft tissue dental anesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Quintessence Int.* 2019;50:568-75.
- Brandis K. Alkalinisation of local anaesthetic solutions. *AustPrescr.* 2011;34:173-5.
- Logothetis DD. Anesthetic buffering: new advances for use in dentistry. *Regist Dent Hyg.* 2013;33:61-6.
- M M A, Khatri A, Kalra N, Tyagi R, Khandelwal D. Pain perception and efficacy of local analgesia using 2% lignocaine, buffered lignocaine, and 4% articaine in pediatric dental procedures. *J Dent Anesth Pain Med.* 2019;19:101-9.
- Aulestia-Viera PV, Braga MM, Borsatti MA. The effect of adjusting the pH of local anaesthetics in dentistry: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *IntEndod J.* 2018;51:862-76.
- Kwak EJ, Pang NS, Cho JH, Jung BY, Kim KD, Park W. Computer-controlled local anesthetic delivery for painless anesthesia: a literature review. *J Dent Anesth Pain Med.* 2016;16:81-8.
- Garret-Bernardin A, Cantile T, D'Antò V, Galanakis A, Fauxpoint G, Ferrazzano GF, et al. Pain experience and behavior management in pediatric dentistry: a comparison between traditional local anesthesia and the wand computerized delivery system. *Pain Res Manag.* 2017;2017:7941238.
- Mittal M, Kumar A, Srivastava D, Sharma P, Sharma S. Pain perception: computerized versus traditional local anesthesia in pediatric patients. *J ClinPediatr Dent.* 2015;39:470-4.
- Smail-Faugeron V, Muller-Bolla M, Sixou JL, Courson F. Evaluation of intraosseous computerized injection system (quicksleeper™) vs conventional infiltration anaesthesia in paediatric oral health care: a multicentre, single-blind, randomized controlled trial. *Int J Paediatr Dent.* 2019;29:573-84.
- Arapostathis KN, Dabarakis NN, Coolidge T, Tsirlis A, Kotsanos N. Comparison of acceptance, preference, and efficacy between jet injection INJEX and local infiltration

- anesthesia in 6- to 11-year-old dental patients. *AnesthProg*. 2010;57:3-12.
29. Altan H, Belevcikli M, Coşgun A, Demir O. Comparative evaluation of pain perception with a new needle-free system and dental needle method in children: a randomized clinical trial. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2021;21:301.
 30. Mohamed LSED, Abd Al Gawad RY, Aly MM. Pain control of needle-less jet anesthesia versus conventional infiltration anesthesia for pulpotomy of maxillary primary molars in children: a randomized controlled trial. *Adv Dent J*. 2023;5:198-209.
 31. Alameeri AA, AlShamsi HA, Murad A, Alhammadi MM, Alketbi MH, AlHamwi A, et al. The feasibility of needleless jet injection versus conventional needle local anesthesia during dental procedures: a systematic review. *J Korean Assoc Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2022;48:331-41.
 32. Tom K, Aps J. Intraosseous anesthesia as a primary technique for local anesthesia in dentistry. *Clin Res Infect Dis*. 2015;2:1012.
 33. Dixit UB, Joshi AV. Efficacy of intraosseous local anesthesia for restorative procedures in molar incisor hypomineralization-affected teeth in children. *ContempClin Dent*. 2018;9(Suppl 2):S272-7.
 34. Remmers T, Glickman G, Spears R, He J. The efficacy of intraflowintraosseous injection as a primary anesthesia technique. *J Endod*. 2008;34:280-3.
 35. Sixou JL, Marie-Cousin A. Intraosseous anaesthesia in children with 4% articaine and epinephrine 1:400,000 using computer-assisted systems. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent*. 2015;16:477-81.
 36. Clark TM, Yagiela JA. Advanced techniques and armamentarium for dental local anesthesia. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2010;54:757-68.
 37. Kour G, Masih U, Singh C, Srivastava M, Yadav P, Kushwah J. Insulin syringe: a gimmick in pediatric dentistry. *Int J ClinPediatr Dent*. 2017;10:319-23.
 38. Prabhu S, Faizel S, Pahlajani V, Prabhu SJ. Making nasopalatine blocks comfortable: a randomised prospective clinical comparison of pain associated with the injection using an insulin syringe and a standard disposable 3 ml syringe. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2013;12:436-9.
 39. Tirupathi SP, Rajasekhar S, Tummakomma P, Gangili AA, Khan ARA, Khurramuddin M, et al. Auto-controlled syringe vs insulin syringe for palatal injections in children: a randomized crossover trial. *J Contemp Dent Pract*. 2020;21:604-8.