

Regence

Medical Policy Manual

Medicine, Policy No. 105

Low-Level Laser Therapy

Effective: October 1, 2026

Next Review: June 2027

Last Review: June 2026

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Medical Policies are developed to provide guidance for members and providers regarding coverage in accordance with contract terms. Benefit determinations are based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there may be any conflict between the Medical Policy and contract language, the contract language takes precedence.

PLEASE NOTE: Contracts exclude from coverage, among other things, services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers may bill members for services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers are encouraged to inform members before rendering such services that the members are likely to be financially responsible for the cost of these services.

DESCRIPTION

Low-level laser therapy, also called photobiomodulation, uses red-beam or near-infrared lasers at much lower intensity than surgical lasers. It is proposed as a treatment for a variety of conditions.

MEDICAL POLICY CRITERIA

Note: Clinical documentation to support criteria is required (See Required Documentation)

Medically Necessary

- I. Low-level laser therapy may be considered **medically necessary** when both of the following Criteria are met (A.-B.):
 - A. The device is FDA-approved; and
 - B. Request is for prevention of oral mucositis in individuals undergoing cancer treatment associated with increased risk of oral mucositis, including chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy, and/or hematopoietic cell transplantation.

Investigational

II. Low-level laser therapy is considered **investigational** when Criterion I. is not met.

NOTE: A summary of the supporting rationale for the policy criteria is at the end of the policy.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

It is critical that the list of information below is submitted for review to determine if the policy criteria are met. If any of these items are not submitted, it could impact our review and decision outcome.

- History and Physical/Chart Notes
- Current Symptomology and indication
- Manufacturer and model name of device being used
- Documentation of need for prevention of oral mucositis in individuals with cancer with high risk of developing oral mucositis including cancer treatment causing this risk

CROSS REFERENCES

None

BACKGROUND

Low-level laser therapy (LLLT), also called photobiomodulation (PBM), refers to the use of red-beam or near-infrared lasers with a wavelength between 600 and 1000 nm and power from 5 to 500 milliwatts. This contrasts with surgical lasers that typically use 300 watts. Low-level laser energy that is applied to acupuncture points on the body may be referred to as “laser acupuncture.”

When applied to the skin, low level lasers produce no sensation and do not burn the skin. Because of the low absorption by human skin, it is hypothesized that the laser light can penetrate deeply into the tissues where it has a photobiostimulative effect. The exact mechanism of its effect is unknown; hypotheses have included improved cellular repair and stimulation of the immune, lymphatic, and vascular systems.

LLLT has been proposed as a treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome, painful musculoskeletal disorders such as temporomandibular joint disfunction and low back pain, soft tissue injuries, tendinopathies, osteoarthritis, and macular degeneration. LLLT has been used outside the U.S. to treat oral mucositis associated with radiation and chemotherapy, stimulate healing of chronic wounds, treat nerve injuries, and as an adjunct to antituberculosis drug treatment.

REGULATORY STATUS

A number of low-level lasers have received US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 510(k) clearance, including:

- Super Pulsed Laser (Multi Radiance Medical)
- MicroLight ML830® (MicroLight Corporation of America)
- GRT LITE™ PRO-8A (GRT Solutions, Inc.)
- LightStream™ Low Level Laser (RJ Laser Canada Corp.)
- TouchOne™ (OTC)

- FX-635 (Erchonia Corporation)

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

The principal outcomes associated with LLLT treatment of musculoskeletal conditions, including carpal tunnel syndrome, and other disorders are relief of pain and/or improved functional status. Relief of pain is a subjective outcome typically associated with a placebo effect. Therefore, blinded and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are required to control for the placebo effect and determine its magnitude and whether any treatment effect provides a significant advantage over the placebo. The technology must also be evaluated in general groups of patients: (1) in patients with mild-to-moderate symptoms, low-level laser therapy (LLLT) may be compared with other forms of conservative therapy such as splinting, rest, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), or steroid injection; and (2) in patients who have exhausted conservative therapy.

The focus of this policy is on peer-reviewed publications of RCTs, which follow patients (with the exception of those undergoing preventive treatment for oral mucositis) for at least two weeks beyond the end of the treatment period.^[1]

LOW-LEVEL LASER TREATMENT

ACHILLES TENDINOPATHY

Systematic Review

A systematic review with meta-analysis on LLLT for Achilles tendinopathy was published by Martimbianco (2020).^[2] Four trials (N=119) were included in the analysis, two of the studies were conducted in Norway, the other two in New Zealand. One of the trials compared LLLT to sham, the other three evaluated the addition of LLLT to eccentric exercises, and treatment duration ranged from one session to eight weeks of treatment. High risk of attrition bias was found in three trials and three trials did not report prospectively published protocols. LLLT associated with eccentric exercises when compared to eccentric exercises and sham had very low to low certainty of evidence in pain and function assessment. While one trial reported favorable outcomes with LLLT laser therapy at two months (mean difference (MD) -2.55, 95% confidence interval (95% CI) -3.87 to -1.23), the CIs did not include important differences between groups at three and 13 months. Functional outcomes were not significantly improved in the LLLT groups for any timepoint evaluated. Adverse event reporting was poor across trials. Sub-group and sensitivity analyses were not possible due to insufficient data. The authors conclude “there were insufficient data to support clinical effects of low-level laser therapy for Achilles tendinopathy.”

Section Summary

There is not enough research to show that LLLT improves health outcomes for people with Achilles tendinopathy.

BELL’S PALSY

Systematic Review

Javaherian (2020) published a SR of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that compared the efficacy of the LLLT with placebo laser, exercise, massage, or no intervention in patients with

Bell's palsy (BP).^[3] Four studies (N=171) were included in the review, and the patients of all trials were in the sub-acute (less than one week) stage. Studies by Ordahan (2017) and Alayat (2013) summarized below were included in the review, the other two were published in Spanish. The only common outcome measure was the facial disability index (FDI), which was reported in only two studies. Significant differences between the groups after six weeks of laser application (830 nm, 100 mW) was found in two studies, and the other two studies did not identify any effectiveness following LLLT treatment with 670 and 830 nm wavelengths. Meta-analysis was not possible due to data limitations. No data on adverse effects during treatment and/or follow-up sessions were reported.

Randomized Controlled Trials

LLLT as an addition to facial exercise was evaluated in a study by Ordahan (2017).^[4] There were 46 patients (40 women) randomized to a facial exercise intervention alone or the exercise intervention plus LLLT. LLLT was performed three times a week for six weeks. Facial exercises were performed five times a week for the six weeks. The main outcome measured was the facial disability index (FDI) questionnaire. FDI scores showed significant improvement in the exercise only group at week six, and in the exercise plus LLLT group at weeks three and six. The improvements in the FDI were greater with the LLLT plus exercise group than in the exercise only group. However, the lack of blinding and of long-term follow-up, and use of combination therapy make it difficult to draw conclusions from this study.

Alayat (2013) reported on a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial of laser therapy for the treatment of 48 patients with Bell's palsy.^[5] Facial exercises and massage were given to all patients. Patients were randomized to one of three groups: high intensity laser therapy, low level laser therapy or exercise only. Each group included 17 patients that were blinded to treatment. Laser treatment was given three times per week to eight points of the affected side for six weeks. At three and six weeks after treatment, outcomes were assessed using the facial disability scale (FDI) and the House-Brackmann scale (HBS). The authors reported that significant improvements in recovery were seen in both laser therapy groups over exercise alone with the most improvement seen with high intensity laser.

Section Summary

The current evidence is limited to two small RCTs published in English that do not report long-term health outcomes and do not establish the clinical utility of LLLT for the treatment of Bell's palsy.

CARPAL TUNNEL SYNDROME

Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments

Evidence for the use of LLLT in carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) was evaluated in a 2010 BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC) Assessment, which concluded that the existing randomized clinical trials were insufficient to determine the effect of low-level laser therapy on CTS.^[1]

For inclusion in the assessment, studies had to meet the following: published in a peer-reviewed journal; randomized and sham-controlled; if adjunctive therapies were used, they had to be applied to both groups of patients; and outcomes had to be measured at least two weeks beyond the end of the treatment period. Only four studies met the above inclusion criteria, and findings from these studies were inconsistent. No one study was so methodologically sound

that its results were considered definitive. Overall, the available studies were small and most did not follow patients for sufficient periods of time beyond the treatment period to determine the durability of the treatment effects.

Lauxen (2025) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis examining the effectiveness of LLLT and light-emitting diodes (LEDs) (collectively referred to as PBM) in the treatment of CTS.^[6] Outcomes were focused on pain intensity, grip and pinch strength, and hand functionality. Thirteen randomized controlled trials were selected from 1,613 records. Meta-analysis results indicated no statistically significant advantage of LLLT over comparison conditions for pain reduction ($p=0.08$) or handgrip strength ($p=0.11$). However, improvements in hand functionality were observed. Limitations of this review include the relatively small number of included trials, high heterogeneity among studies, and a lack of standardized dosimetry protocols across primary studies.

A systematic review by Bekhet (2017) included eight RCTs that compared functional and electromyographic outcomes of LLLT with those of placebo.^[7] A random effects model meta-analysis found that there were no significant differences between groups for all primary outcomes: visual analogue scale (VAS), symptom severity scale (SSS), and functional status scale (FSS) scores. Grip strength was the only measure that was improved with LLLT compared to placebo. Another 2017 systematic review included nine RCTs, but did not perform a meta-analysis due to study heterogeneity.^[8] The authors similarly concluded that there was no strong evidence of LLLT efficacy on pain and function outcomes in carpal tunnel syndrome.

A 2017 Cochrane report assessed the benefits and harms of LLLT compared with placebo and compared with other non-surgical interventions in the management of CTS.^[9] Twenty-two RCTs ($N=1153$) were evaluated. Risk of bias varied across the studies but was high or unclear in most assessed domains in most studies. At short-term follow-up (less than three months), there was very low-quality evidence for any effect over placebo of LLLT on CTS for the primary outcome of Symptom Severity Score (scale 1 to 5, higher score represents worsening; MD - 0.36, 95% CI -0.78 to 0.06) or Functional Status Scale (scale 1 to 5, higher score represents worsened disability; MD -0.56, 95% CI -1.03 to -0.09). The authors concluded the quality of evidence was very low and found no data to support a clinical effect of LLLT in treating CTS.

Li (2016) published a systematic review (SR) that included seven RCTs of this topic, with similar results to those of the Bekhet (2017) review.^[10] Meta-analyses were conducted for the outcomes hand grip strength, pain measured by a VAS, SSS, and FSS. Short-term follow-up was defined as less than six weeks after treatment and long-term follow-up as at least 12 weeks after treatment. For six of the eight meta-analyses, there were not statistically significant between-group differences in outcomes. These include short-term assessment of hand grip, short-term assessment of pain by VAS, and short- and long-term assessment of SSS and FSS. Meta-analyses found stronger hand grip (three studies) and greater improvement in VAS score (two studies) at the long-term follow-up in the LLLT group compared with the control. Most data for these two positive analyses were provided by a single RCT. Reviewers concluded that additional high-quality trials with similar LLLT protocols are needed to confirm that the intervention significantly improves health outcomes.

Randomized Controlled Trials

RCTs not addressed in the 2016 Cochrane SR are discussed below.

Badıl Güloğlu (2022) published the results of a RCT comparing LLLT and corticosteroid injection in 87 patients (143 wrists) with moderate carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS).^[11] Outcomes were assessed at baseline and one- and six-months post-treatment. Outcome measures were numbness and pain, QuickDASH questionnaire, grasping tests, Tinel and Phalen tests, electrophysiological tests and MRI evaluations. Six-month outcome data were available for 80 patients (133 wrists). Corticosteroid injection and LLLT groups showed statistically significant difference at one-month post-treatment in favor of the corticosteroid group and no significant group difference at the six-month timepoint was found.

Barbosa (2015) evaluated the efficacy of orthoses and patient education with or without the addition of LLLT in patients with mild and moderate carpal tunnel syndrome.^[12] Laser treatment was provided twice a week for six weeks. Forty-eight patients were randomized and 30 (63%) completed the study protocol. Compared with baseline, outcomes, including scores on the Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire and its domains, did not differ significantly between groups after treatment.

Section Summary

The evidence for LLLT for the treatment of CTS includes several SRs, a technology assessment, and RCTs, and generally does not demonstrate that LLLT is an effective treatment for CTS.

CHRONIC NECK PAIN

Systematic Reviews

In a 2013 SR and meta-regression, Gross (2013) evaluated 17 trials on LLLT for neck pain.^[13] Ten of these trials were found to demonstrate high risk of bias. Two trials consisting of 109 subjects were considered to be of moderate quality and found LLLT produced better outcomes than placebo for chronic neck pain treatment. Evidence showed improved outcomes with LLLT compared to placebo for acute neck pain, acute radiculopathy and cervical osteoarthritis but was considered to be low quality. There was conflicting evidence on chronic myofascial neck pain.

A SR by Kadhim-Saleh (2013) analyzed eight RCTs (n=443 patients) to determine the efficacy of LLLT in reducing acute and chronic neck pain as measured by VAS.^[14] Authors concluded the evidence was inconclusive and the benefit seen in the use of LLLT did not constitute the threshold of minimally important clinical difference.

The 2010 BCBSA TEC Assessment also determined that the evidence was insufficient to allow conclusions regarding the effect of LLLT on chronic neck pain.^[1] The six trials that met the assessment inclusion criteria reported variable results, and no single study was methodologically sound. It was not possible to explain the differences in results due to the numerous differences in patient selection, treatment regimens, and trial co-interventions.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Subsequent to the publication of the 2010 technology assessment, an additional RCT was published.^[15] However, interpretation of results from this trial is limited by lack of study of treatment durability (follow-up for at least two weeks beyond end of the treatment period).

Section Summary

The current evidence on the use of LLLT for the treatment of chronic neck pain has methodological limitations and the conclusions of the reports are conflicting. Therefore, it cannot be determined if LLLT improves health outcomes.

ELBOW PAIN

Systematic Reviews

A single SR has been identified on the use of LLLT in elbow pain.^[16] Published in 2008, the review grouped placebo-controlled randomized clinical trials by application technique and laser wave length and reported on the 7 of 13 included trials with a common, narrowly defined regimen where lasers of 904 nm wavelength with low output (5-50 MW) were used to irradiate the tendon insertion at 2–6 points on the lateral elbow. Positive results in these trials were consistent with outcomes of pain and function, and significance persisted for at least 3–8 weeks after the end of treatment. However, among the articles included in this review, there were considerable differences in treatment protocol and type of patient treated, indicating that these results may not be generalizable to all patients with elbow pain. The authors noted that the conclusions of their review differed from conclusions of prior reviews of this topic.

Section Summary

The current evidence on LLLT for the treatment of elbow pain is insufficient due to the variability across studies in the patient population and treatment protocols used. Based on this evidence, it cannot be determined if health outcomes are improved on the use of LLLT for the treatment of elbow pain.

FIBROMYALGIA

Systematic Reviews

A SR with meta-analysis by Yeh (2019) included nine RCTs with 325 patients with fibromyalgia undergoing LLLT or placebo laser treatment with or without an exercise program.^[17] Primary outcomes evaluated were the total scores on the Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ), pain severity, and number of tender points. Secondary outcomes were changes in fatigue, stiffness, anxiety, and depression. Significantly greater improvement in FIQ scores (SMD: 1.16; 95% CI, 0.64-1.69), pain severity (SMD: 1.18; 95% CI, 0.82-1.54), number of tender points (SMD: 1.01; 95% CI, 0.49-1.52), fatigue (SMD: 1.4; 95% CI, 0.96-1.84), stiffness (SMD: 0.92; 95% CI, 0.36-1.48), depression (SMD: 1.46; 95% CI, 0.93-2.00), and anxiety (SMD: 1.46; 95% CI, 0.45-2.47) were found in patients receiving LLLT compared to those receiving placebo laser. The methodological quality of the included RCTs was considered to be low-to-middle, as there was no clear allocation process and only patients were blinded in most studies. Considerable heterogeneity in study protocols such as differences in laser types, energy sources, exposure times, and associated medication status were noted.

Honda (2018) published a SR with meta-analysis of RCTs evaluating pain relief modalities for fibromyalgia. Eleven studies with a total of 498 patients (range, 20-80) were included.^[18] Compared with control, LLLT was not associated with a reduction of VAS-measured pain (MD -4.0; 95% CI -23.4 to 15.4; $p=0.69$). A significant reduction in tender points (MD -2.21; 95% CI -3.51 to -0.92; $I^2=42\%$; $p=0.0008$) and in Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire score (MD -4.35; 95% CI -6.69 to -2.01; $I^2=62\%$; $p=0.03$) were found for LLLT compared with control groups. The analysis was limited by including only English language studies and studies with a pure

control group or placebo group (ie, no other intervention) as well as by the high heterogeneity score for included studies.

Section Summary

LLLT for treatment of fibromyalgia has been evaluated in several small RCTs and in two SRs. Although significant improvements in outcomes including disease severity and pain were found in one SR, another SR found no significant reduction in pain between LLLT and control groups. Studies are limited by small sample sizes and heterogeneity of study protocols. Additional RCTs with sufficient numbers of patients are needed.

LOW BACK PAIN

Systematic Reviews

Chen (2022) published a systematic review with meta-analysis of RCTs on LLLT for treating nonspecific chronic low back pain compared to placebo.^[19] Eleven trials were included that compared LLLT to placebo (N=836 patients); seven of these trials assessed LLLT alone compared to placebo and four trials assessed LLLT plus acupuncture compared to placebo. For the overall risk of bias in LLLT trials, eight were identified as low risk, two as having some concerns, and one as high risk. The primary outcomes of interest were changes from baseline in pain scores, measured by visual analogue scale (VAS), and disability measured by the ODI score. In pooled analyses, reviewers found a significant reduction in pain scores with all LLLT interventions compared to placebo posttreatment (SMD, -0.22; 95% CI, -0.38 to -0.05) and in disability scores for trials comparing LLLT therapy alone to placebo (SMD, -0.50; 95% CI, -0.79 to -0.21). In trials comparing LLLT plus acupuncture to placebo, there was no significant difference in disability scores posttreatment (SMD, 0.10; 95% CI, -0.15 to 0.35).

Glazov (2016) published a SR with meta-analysis of blinded sham-controlled trials evaluating LLLT for treatment of chronic low-back pain.^[20] Fifteen RCTs (total n=1039 patients) met reviewers' eligibility criteria. Reviewers found that 3 of the 15 trials were at higher risk of bias (using a modified Cochrane tool), mainly due to lack of blinding. The primary outcomes of interest to reviewers were pain measured by a VAS or a numeric rating scale, and a global assessment measure evaluating overall improvement and/or satisfaction with the intervention. Outcomes were reported immediately posttreatment (<1 week) and at short-term (1 to 12 weeks) follow-up. Longer term outcomes at 6 and 12 months were considered secondary measures. For the pain outcome, meta-analysis of 10 trials found significantly greater reduction in pain scores in the LLLT group at immediate follow-up (weighted mean difference [WMD] = -0.79 cm, 95% confidence interval [CI] -1.22 to 0.36 cm). In a meta-analysis of six trials, there was no significant difference in pain reduction at short-term follow-up. However, in subgroup analyses, there was significantly greater pain reduction with LLLT in trials that used a higher dose (>3 J/point), but not a lower dose, and in trials that included patients with a short duration of back pain (5 to 27 months) but not long duration (49 months to 13 years). The decisions regarding the cutoff to use for laser dose and duration of back pain was made post hoc and considered review findings. Findings were similar for the global assessment outcome. Meta-analyses found significantly higher global assessment scores at immediate follow-up (five trials) but not short-term follow-up (three trials). Only two trials reported pain or global assessment at six months and 12 months, and neither found statistically significant differences between the LLLT and sham groups.

Huang (2015) published a SR of RCTs on LLLT for treatment of nonspecific chronic low back pain.^[21] The review included trials comparing LLLT and placebo that reported pain and/or functional outcomes and reported a PEDro quality score. Seven trials (total n = 394 patients: 202 assigned to LLLT, 192 assigned to placebo) were included. Six of the seven trials were considered high quality (i.e., a PEDro score ≥ 7 ; maximum score, 11 points). Primary outcomes of interest were posttreatment pain measured by VAS score and disability measured by the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) score. Range of motion and change in pain scores were secondary outcomes. In pooled analyses of study data, the authors found a statistically significant benefit of LLLT on pain outcomes, but not disability or ROM. For the primary outcome (posttreatment pain scores) in a meta-analysis of all seven trials, mean VAS scores were significantly lower in the LLLT group than in the placebo group (WMD = -13.57, 95% CI -17.42 to -9.72). In a meta-analysis of four studies reporting the other primary outcome (ODI score), there was no statistically significant differences between the LLLT and the placebo groups (WMD = -2.89, 95% CI -7.88 to 2.29).

An update of the Cochrane Database SR of LLLT for nonspecific low back pain was conducted in 2008.^[22] The authors stated that “based on the heterogeneity of the populations, interventions, and comparison groups, we conclude that there are insufficient data to draw firm conclusions on the clinical effect of LLLT groups for low-back pain.”

A SR by Chou (2007) assessed benefits and harms of nonpharmacological therapies including LLLT for acute and chronic low back pain.^[23] The reviewers did not find good evidence of efficacy for LLLT for either indication.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Since publication of the Glazov (2016) SR described above, additional RCTs have been published.

Taradaj (2019) published a RCT evaluating LLLT for the treatment of nonspecific lumbar pain (NSLP).^[24] Sixty-eight patients were randomly assigned to four groups: high-intensity laser therapy for 10 minutes (HILT), sham (HILT placebo), low-level laser therapy for eight minutes (LLLTL), and sham (LLLTL placebo). Postural stability measurements were taken pre- and post-laser sessions (three weeks) and at follow-up time points (one and three months). The authors concluded that neither LLLTL nor HILT lead to a significant improvement in postural sway in patients with NSLP compared with standard stabilization training based on short- and long-term observations.

Koldaş Doğan (2017) reported a RCT that compared two different LLLTL regimens for chronic low back pain.^[25] Forty-nine patients were randomized to receive either hot-pack plus LLLTL 1 (1850 nm Gallium-Aluminum-Arsenide [Ga-Al-As] laser) or hot-pack plus LLLTL 2 (650 nm Helium-Neon [He-Ne], 785 ve 980 nm Ga-Al-As combined plaque laser), with a total of 15 sessions per treatment. Both groups reported improvements in pain and function, and neither regimen was superior for pain treatment. However, there was no non-LLLTL control group for comparison in the study.

Section Summary

The literature on LLLTL for low back pain consists of RCTs and several SRs of RCTs. Meta-analyses found that LLLTL resulted in significantly greater reductions in pain scores and global

assessment scores than a placebo control in the immediate posttreatment setting. Meta-analyses also found that other outcomes (eg, disability index, ROM) were significantly better immediately after treatment with active versus placebo LLLT, though not at longer-term follow-up.

LYMPHEDEMA

Systematic Reviews

Chiu (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis on LLLT on the treatment of breast cancer-related lymphedema.^[26] The systematic review included 11 RCTs published between 2003 and 2021. There were positive effects in the LLLT group compared to the control group in post-treatment QOL (3 studies; n=73; SMD, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.00 to 0.94; $I^2=0\%$; p=.05), reduction in swell at post-treatment (6 studies; n=204; SMD, -0.41; 95% CI, -1.01 to 0.18; $I^2=76\%$; p=.18), and reduction in swelling at one to three months post-treatment (5 studies; n=193; SMD, -1.06; 95% CI, -2.11 to -0.02; $I^2=90\%$; p=.05). Overall, limitations included a high heterogeneity among studies and varying follow-up periods among studies. The authors note larger studies with long-term follow-up are needed.

A 2019 SR with meta-analysis was published by Chen evaluating effectiveness of LLLT for the treatment of breast cancer–related lymphedema.^[27] The SR included nine RCTs. Six studies (N=316) were included in the meta-analysis. The primary outcome was the arm circumference or volume, and secondary outcomes were grip strength and pain scores. No significant difference in the reduction of the arm circumference or arm volume was found between LLLT and control groups after treatment, or at one-month, or at three-month follow-up. In addition, no significant differences in the change in grip strength or pain scores at any timepoint were identified between groups.

Smoot (2015) published a SR of studies on the effect of LLLT on symptoms in women with breast cancer–related lymphedema.^[28] The authors identified nine studies, seven RCTs and two single-group studies. Three studies had a sham control group, one used a waitlist control, and three compared LLLT to an alternative intervention (e.g., intermittent compression). Only three studies had blinded outcome assessment and, in three studies, participants were blinded. A pooled analysis of four studies found significantly greater reduction in upper-extremity volume with LLLT than with the control condition (effect size [ES], -0.62, 95% CI -0.97 to -0.28). Only two studies were suitable for a pooled analysis of the effect of LLLT on pain. This analysis did not find a significant difference in pain between LLLT and control (ES = -1.21, 95% CI -4.51 to 2.10).

Randomized Controlled Trials

Kozanoglu (2022) published a RCT evaluating the long-term effectiveness of combined intermittent pneumatic compression (IPC) therapy plus LLLT compared to IPC therapy alone in patients with postmastectomy upper limb lymphedema (PML).^[29] Group 1 received combined treatment with IPC plus LLLT (n = 21) and group 2 received only IPC (n = 21) for five sessions per week for four weeks. Clinical outcomes were assessed pre- and post-treatment at 3, 6, and 12-months. Statistically significant improvements in the circumference difference and grip strength were observed in both groups (for circumference, p=0.018 and p=0.032, respectively; for grip strength, p=0.001 and p=0.046, respectively). Visual analog scale values for arm pain and shoulder pain during motion decreased only in the combined treatment group (group 1).

A randomized double-blind sham-controlled trial of LLLT in 50 patients with post-mastectomy lymphedema was published by Omar (2010).^[30] The average length of time that patients had swelling was 14 months (range, 12 to 36 months). Patients were treated with active or sham laser three times a week for 12 weeks over the axillary and arm areas. In addition, all participants were instructed to perform daily arm exercises and to wear a pressure garment. Limb circumference, shoulder mobility, and grip strength were measured before treatment and at 4, 8, and 12 weeks. Limb circumference declined over time in both groups, with significantly greater reduction in the active laser group. Shoulder flexion and abduction were significantly better in the active laser group at 8 and 12 weeks. Grip strength was significantly better in the active laser group after 12 weeks (26.2 kg vs 22.4 kg). The durability of these effects was not assessed.

Section Summary

There is insufficient evidence in the available literature to determine if the use of LLLT for the treatment of lymphedema improves health outcomes.

MACULAR DEGENERATION

Systematic Reviews

Rassi (2024) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of three RCTs (247 eyes) evaluating LLLT (referred to as PBM) efficacy, of which Boyer (2024) was the largest.^[31, 32] The study found a statistically significant improvement with LLLT compared to sham treatment, but high heterogeneity was noted and all three studies had a high risk of bias. Further, the observed improvement of -0.12mm³ did not meet the threshold for minimally important clinical difference (MCID) of 0.39mm³. Trial sequential analysis suggested insufficient sample sizes for statistical inference (required information size [RIS] <555 eyes). The authors concluded that larger RCTs with longer follow-up are needed to determine the role of LLLT for dry AMD.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Jaffe (2026) conducted a randomized trial evaluating the 24-month safety and efficacy of multiwavelength PBM using the Valeda Light Delivery System in patients with nonexudative (dry) age-related macular degeneration (AMD).^[33] A total of 148 eyes from 100 subjects with dry AMD were randomized to receive either multiwavelength PBM or sham treatment, delivered in series of nine treatments three times per week over 3 to 5 weeks, and repeated every four months for 24 months. The study met its prespecified primary best-corrected visual acuity efficacy endpoint at month 21, demonstrating a statistically significant difference between treatment groups ($p=0.0036$) with a +6.2 letter gain in the PBM group. At month 21, 61.5% of PBM-treated eyes achieved ≥ 5 letter gains, 23.1% achieved ≥ 10 letter gains, and 4.4% achieved ≥ 15 letter gains. Disease progression to Geographic Atrophy was lower in the PBM group compared to sham at month 24 (6.8% vs. 24.0%; $p=0.007$). No signs of phototoxicity were observed. Limitations include the small sample size, the use of the eye rather than the individual subject as the primary unit of analysis which may introduce statistical dependencies, the restriction to a single PBM device and specific multiwavelength protocol limiting generalizability, and the short follow up period.

Boyer (2024) published a randomized controlled trial (RCT), LIGHTSITE III, that compared LLLT (referred to as PBM) to sham treatment in 100 subjects (148 eyes) with dry age-related macular degeneration (AMD).^[32] The primary outcome measure was the 13-month difference

in best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA) from baseline. There was a significant between-group difference in LLLT and sham (2.4 letters [SE 1.15], CI: -4.7 to -0.1, $P=0.02$) and the LLLT group had significantly fewer cases of new onset geographic atrophy ($p=0.024$). Thirty-Three (22.3%) of 148 eyes had at least one ocular-specific adverse event (AE) but only one serious AE was reported which was not considered to be treatment-related. Limitations of the study include that while the trial was an RCT, the sham treatment included a low light dose to ensure masking. The authors concluded that the 13-month outcomes demonstrated efficacy and safety, but longer-term follow-up is needed to determine the effectiveness of LLLT for dry AMD.

Section Summary

There is not enough high-quality evidence to demonstrate that LLLT to treat dry age-related macular degeneration leads to meaningful long-term improvement in visual acuity.

MEDIAL TIBIAL STRESS SYNDROME

Systematic Reviews

In a SR by Winters (2013) of treatments for medial tibial stress syndrome, LLLT was not found to be effective.^[34] All studies included in the SR were considered to have methodological bias.

Section Summary

The evidence is insufficient due to the methodological limitations identified in the available literature; therefore, it cannot be determined if the use of LLLT for the treatment of medial tibial stress syndrome improves health outcomes.

MENISCAL KNEE PAIN

Systematic Reviews

There are no reports of SRs of LLLT for meniscal knee pain.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Malliaropoulos (2013) reported on a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of LLLT in 64 patients with unilateral medial knee pain for more than six weeks that was related to meniscal pathology (i.e., grade 3 tiny attenuation or intrasubstance tears on MRI).^[35] Pain improved significantly more with LLLT than placebo ($p<0.0001$). However, four patients (12.5 %) did not have improvement with LLLT. Pain returned in three patients at six months and in five patients after one year. Repeat MRIs were not performed.

Section Summary

The current evidence consists of one RCT that is limited by a small study population, does not report long-term health outcomes, and does not establish the clinical utility of LLLT for the treatment of meniscal knee pain.

ORAL MUCOSITIS

Systematic Reviews

A SR with meta-analysis evaluating the relative effects of LLLT and/or cryotherapy in cancer patients with oral mucositis (OM) was published by Lai (2021).^[36] Twenty-six RCTs (N=1830) comparing groups receiving interventions of combined cryotherapy and LLLT, LLLT, cryotherapy and usual care (the control group) in patients with cancer were included. Treatment effects of combined cryotherapy and LLLT were better than those of usual care for none/mild and severe OM (ORs=106.23 [95% CI=12.15 to 929.17] and 0.01 [95% CI=0 to 0.57], respectively). Treatment effects with cryotherapy alone and LLLT alone were better than those with usual care for none/mild and severe OM (ORs = 3.13 [95% CI=1.56 to 6.27]; ORs=7.56 [95%CI = 3.84 to 14.88] and 0.25 [95% CI = 0.11 to 0.54]; ORs = 0.13 [95%CI 0.07 to 0.24], respectively). For patients with none/mild OM, treatment effects with combined cryotherapy and LLLT were better than those with only LLLT or cryotherapy (ORs=14.06 [95% CI=1.79 to 110.30] and 33.95 [95% CI=3.50 to 329.65], respectively). No difference in treatment effects among cryotherapy and/or LLLT intervention in cancer patients with moderate OM was found. Heterogeneity in treatment protocols and outcome measures were noted limitations across studies.

Peng (2020) conducted a SR with meta-analysis comparing LLLT to placebo, usual care, or no therapy in patients receiving chemotherapy or radiotherapy for hematologic malignancies with or without hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HCT) or head and neck squamous cell cancer (HNSCC).^[37] The SR included 30 studies including one with a stratified analysis. For the purposes of the meta-analysis, this was treated as an additional trial. Fourteen studies were conducted in Brazil and 10 were published between 2014 and 2018. Patients underwent HCT or chemotherapy in 19 studies: radiotherapy in five studies, and chemoradiotherapy in six studies. The application of LLLT was prophylactic in 26 studies and six studies reported on therapeutic LLLT use. Nineteen were considered high-quality (Jadad score of ≥ 3 out of 5) and 10 trials were low risk for bias. For use of prophylactic LLLT, a total of 22 studies (N=1190) evaluated the incidence of the primary outcome of severe oral mucositis during the treatment of hematologic disorders or head and neck cancer. Severe oral mucositis occurred significantly less in patients receiving LLLT compared to control (relative risk, 0.40; 95% CI, 0.25 to 0.57; $p < 0.01$). This significant reduction in severe oral mucositis incidence with LLLT therapy was sustained in multiple subgroup analyses including assessment by underlying condition/treatment regimen: HCT (relative risk, 0.46; 95% CI, 0.23 to 0.94; $p = 0.03$), chemotherapy (relative risk, 0.2; 95% CI 0.05 to 0.92; $p = 0.04$), and radiotherapy (relative risk, 0.36; 95% CI, 0.27 to 0.50; $p < 0.01$). An analysis of 15 trials (N=900) found that prophylactic LLLT numerically, but not significantly, reduced the incidence of oral mucositis of any grade (relative risk, 0.90; 95% CI, 0.98 to 1.00; $p = 0.06$). A subgroup analysis of patients receiving chemotherapy showed a significant reduction in any grade of mucositis with LLLT (relative risk, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.55 to 0.96; $p = 0.03$); this difference was not significant in patients receiving radiotherapy and chemoradiotherapy (relative risk, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.92 to 1.09; and relative risk, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.98 to 1.01, respectively).

Anscha (2019) published a SR with meta-analysis of RCTs on oral mucositis (OM) in patients during and/or after cancer therapy and in which the therapeutic approach was LLLT.^[38] Grade of OM was analyzed as a dichotomous variable, as improvement or no improvement in severe OM on the seventh day of therapy. Across the five RCTs (N= 315) a 62% risk reduction of severe mucositis on the seventh day of evaluation (RR = 0.38 [95% CI, 0.19-0.75]) was identified. A mean reduction of 4.21 days in the time of complete resolution of OM (CI - 5.65 to - 2.76) was found with LLLT.

In 2014, the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer (MASCC) and the International Society of Oral Oncology (ISOO) issued guidelines that reiterated findings from their 2012 SR recommending LLLT for the prevention of oral mucositis in patients receiving hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) conditioned with high-dose chemotherapy and for patients undergoing head and neck radiotherapy, without concomitant chemotherapy.^[39] The 2012 SR included 24 trials on a variety of prophylactic treatments. The recommendation on which LLLT for prevention of oral mucositis in patients receiving HSCT was based on what the authors considered to be one well-designed, placebo-controlled, randomized trial (described in more detail next),^[40] together with observational studies. The trial was double-blind and sham-controlled with 70 patients. Patients were randomized to 650 nm laser, 780 nm laser, or placebo.^[40] Patients in the 650-nm laser group were more likely to have received a total body irradiation (TBI)–containing regimen compared with the other two groups; otherwise, the groups were comparable. LLLT began on the first day of conditioning and continued for three days posttransplant. Of the 70 patients, 47 (67%) had complete or nearly complete mucositis measurements over time; the average number of visits per patient was similar among the three groups. The difference between groups in mean oral mucositis scores was greatest at day 11 (placebo, 24.3; 650 nm, 16.7; 780 nm, 20.6), but this difference between the 650-nm group and placebo group was not statistically significant ($p=0.06$). Patient-specific oral mucositis scores differed significantly between the two groups only when adjusted for TBI exposure. Of the 70 patients in the study, 17 (24%) were assessed for oral pain. With group sizes of five and six, the 650-nm group had significantly lower patient-specific average pain scores (15.6) than the placebo group (47.2). No adverse events from LLLT were noted. This study was flawed because it did not achieve statistical significance for the primary outcome measure and had a very small percentage of patients with pain assessments.

The MASCC/ISOO recommendation for LLLT for the prevention of oral mucositis in patients undergoing radiotherapy, without concomitant chemotherapy, for head and neck cancer was based on “weaker evidence” from three studies that showed positive results but had major flaws. Evidence was considered encouraging but insufficient to recommend LLLT in other populations. The authors emphasized that due to the range of laser devices and variations in individual protocols, results of each study applied exclusively to the cancer population studied and the specific wavelength and settings used.

Additional SRs have been published since the 2012 MASCC/ISOO SR.^[41, 42] Oberoi (2014) reported on a SR and meta-analysis of 18 RCTs on LLLT versus no treatment or placebo for oral mucositis.^[42] Eight RCTs assessed patients undergoing HSCT, eight evaluated head and neck cancer patients receiving radiotherapy or chemoradiation, and the rest studied patients with other conditions receiving chemotherapy. The investigators used the Cochrane risk of bias tool to evaluate the RCTs. Most studies were considered at low risk of bias on most domains. For example, 68% were at low risk of bias for blinding of patients and personnel, and 89% were at low risk of bias on incomplete outcome data. The primary outcome measure for the review was the incidence of severe mucositis. Ten studies (total $N=689$ patients) were included in a pooled analysis of this outcome. The overall incidence of severe mucositis (grades 3-4) decreased with prophylactic LLLT, with a risk ratio (RR) of 0.37 (95% CI 0.20 to 0.67, $p=0.001$). Moreover, the absolute risk reduction in the incidence of severe mucositis (-0.35) significantly favored LLLT (95% CI -0.48 to -0.21, $p<0.001$). Among secondary outcomes, LLLT also significantly reduced the overall mean grade of mucositis (standardized mean difference [SMD], -1.49; 95% CI, -2.02 to -0.95), duration of severe mucositis (WMD -5.32, 95% CI -9.45 to -1.19), and incidence of severe pain (VAS; RR=0.26, 95% CI 0.18 to 0.37). In a subgroup analysis of the primary outcome (incidence of severe mucositis), the investigators

did not find a statistically significant interaction between the type of condition treated and the efficacy of LLLT.

Randomized Controlled Trials

de Carvalho e Silva (2023) published an RCT evaluating the effectiveness of LLLT in the management of both xerostomia and oral mucositis in 53 patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck.^[43] The participants were being treated with radiation therapy or chemoradiotherapy with curative intent. Twenty-six patients were randomized to LLLT and 27 were randomized to a sham treatment on the first day of treatment. There was no significant difference in baseline dental health between the two groups ($p > 0.05$). Outcome measures were arithmetic means of a xerostomia-related quality of life (QOL) questionnaire and the presence or absence of oral mucositis lesions. Differences in mean scores on the QOL questionnaire were considered clinically relevant if they were $\geq 20\%$. In the sham treatment group, there was an increase in mean score for several items that indicated symptoms of xerostomia ($p < 0.0001$). In the treatment group, mean scores decreased, indicating absent or very mild xerostomia ($p = 0.0074$). Differences in mean scores were $\geq 20\%$ for eight of the 15 questions on the QOL questionnaire. Higher grades of oral mucositis were found in the sham group compared to those treated with LLLT ($p = 0.0001$). The study findings indicate that LLLT reduces both xerostomia and oral mucositis in patients being treated for head and neck cancer.

Legouté published the results of a phase III trial of LLLT to treat OM lesions grade ≥ 2 in patients with oral cavity or oro/hypopharyngeal cancers (stage III or IV) from seven French oncology centers.^[44] Severity of OM (incidence and duration of grades ≥ 3) was the primary endpoint. Among the 97 randomized patients, 83 (85.6%) were assessed; 32 patients had no laser therapy because of unreachable OM lesions. An acute OM (grade ≥ 3) was observed in 41 patients (49.4%): 23 patients (54.8%) of the active laser group versus 18 (43.9%) in the control group (modified intent to treat, $p = 0.32$). Tolerance was noted as excellent for every session for 91% of patients and 4.5% in most sessions. The five-year follow-up is targeted for March of 2021.

Two large RCTs evaluating LLLT for prevention of oral mucositis were published by Gautam in 2012.^[45, 46] One of these studies reported LLLT for the prevention of chemoradiotherapy-induced oral mucositis in 121 oral cancer patients.^[46] The second publication reported LLLT for the prevention of chemoradiotherapy-induced oral mucositis in 221 head and neck cancer patients.^[45] There is an apparent overlap in patients in these two reports, with the head and neck cancer study including the 121 patients with a primary tumor site in the oral cavity. Patients in these studies received LLLT before radiotherapy at 66 Gy delivered daily in 33 fractions, five days per week and concurrent with cisplatin. LLLT was delivered at a wavelength of 632.8 nm, power density of 24 mW/cm², and a dosage of 3 to 3.5 J. In the report on oral cancer, LLLT before radiotherapy led to significant reductions in the incidence of severe oral mucositis (29% vs 89%) and its associated pain (18% vs 71%, with a VAS score > 7), opioid analgesic use (7% vs 21%), and total parenteral nutrition (30% vs 39%), all respectively, during the last weeks of chemoradiotherapy. LLLT also reduced the duration of severe oral mucositis (4.07 days vs 13.96 days), severe pain (5.31 days vs 9.89 days), and total parenteral nutrition (14.05 days vs 17.93 days), all respectively. In the 221 patients treated for head and neck cancer, LLLT was reported to lead to significant reductions in the incidence and duration of severe oral mucositis (8.19 days vs 12.86 days) and its associated

pain (VAS score of approximately 4 vs 7), total parenteral nutrition (45.0% vs 65.5%), and opioid analgesic use (9% vs 26% for step III), respectively.

The next year, Gautam (2013) published an assessment of patient-reported outcomes from the same study of 221 head and neck cancer patients using the Oral Mucositis Weekly Questionnaire-Head and Neck (OMWQ-HN) and the Functional Assessment of Cancer Treatment- Head and Neck (FACT-HN) questionnaire.^[47] Patients received LLLT as described earlier in this paragraph. Patients in the LLLT group reported significantly better outcomes than the placebo group with lower scores on both the OMWQ-HN ($p<0.001$) and FACT-HN ($p<0.05$).

A number of small, double-blind, sham-controlled RCTs on prevention of oral mucositis in patients undergoing cancer treatment were published in the last several years. Gautam (2015) reported on 46 patients with head and neck cancer scheduled for radiotherapy and found significant reductions in the incidence and duration of severe oral mucositis ($p=0.002$) and severe pain ($p=0.023$) after LLLT versus sham.^[48] Oton-Leite (2015) reported on 30 head and neck cancer patients undergoing chemoradiation and found that oral mucositis grades were significantly lower in the LLLT group than in the control group at the week 1, 3, and 5 evaluations.^[49] For example, at the last clinical evaluation (week 5), the rates of grade 3 oral mucositis were 25% in the LLLT group and 54% in the control group. The third RCT, by Ferreira (2015), included 36 patients with hematologic cancer undergoing HSCT.^[50] The overall incidence of oral mucositis did not differ significantly between groups ($p=0.146$). However, the rate of severe oral mucositis (grade 3 or 4) was significantly lower in the laser group (18%) than in the control group (61%; $p=0.015$).

Section Summary

The literature on LLLT for the prevention of oral mucositis includes several SRs. A 2014 SR of LLLTs for prevention of oral mucositis included 18 RCTs, generally considered at low risk of bias, and found statistically significantly better outcomes with LLLT than with control conditions on primary and secondary outcomes. These findings were recapitulated in a 2019 SR which focused on only RCTs. A 2020 SR not limited to patients undergoing HCT showed benefit with using prophylactic LLLT compared to control in reducing the incidence of severe oral mucositis in patients undergoing chemotherapy or radiotherapy. A large SR including 26 RCTs and 1830 patients found LLLT to be beneficial for the reduction of mild and severe OM in patients with cancer.

OROFACIAL PAIN

Systematic Reviews

Altuhafy (2024) published a systematic review of RCTs that compare LLLT combined with orofacial myofunctional therapy (OMT) to OMT alone in the treatment of orofacial pain disorders.^[51] Ten RCTs were included in the SR. Treatment for temporomandibular disorders was the focus of five studies, three studies focused on Bell's Palsy, and two RCTs addressed fibromyalgia. Seven studies found that the combination of LLLT and OMT significantly reduced pain and improved function. Meta-analysis was not performed due to the variability of the included studies. These variabilities, including methodological inconsistencies in diagnostic criteria, and in LLLT and OMT protocols, limit the ability to draw definitive conclusions regarding the effectiveness of LLLT.

A SR on studies using LLLT for the treatment of trigeminal neuralgia was published by Ibarra in 2021.^[52] The review included five RCTs and one nonrandomized clinical trial. Sample sizes ranged from 12 to 53 across studies, for a total sample of 193. Study designs included one sham-controlled study, one study evaluating the same population at two timepoints, one comparing LLLT to electromagnetic therapy, one evaluating LLLT as an adjuvant therapy to ganglion block, and two studies evaluating photobiomodulation as an adjuvant therapy to pharmacotherapy. Risk of bias ranged from high (two studies) to low (three studies). Low sample size precluded pooled analysis. While the authors found that, qualitatively, LLLT appears to be as effective as conventional therapies for trigeminal neuralgia, they conclude that additional data with consistent outcome parameters and longer follow-up are needed.

DePedro (2020) published a SR of LLLT for the management of neuropathic orofacial pain which included 13 studies (eight RCTs, two prospective studies, and three case series).^[53] Ten of the studies were on burning mouth syndrome, three were on trigeminal neuralgia, and one on occipital neuralgia. Although all studies showed a reduction in pain intensity, not all were statistically significant. No meta-analysis was reported. The authors concluded that studies assessing medium and long-term outcome measures of chronic pain are needed, as is standardization of the technique.

Tengrungrun (2012) assessed the effectiveness of LLLT as a treatment for orofacial pain in 33 studies represented by 1,522 chronic pain patients meeting inclusion criteria in a SR.^[54] Trials were included if they were randomized, had a comparison group, had a study population with an orofacial pain condition including dentin hypersensitivity and musculoskeletal pain, and included a measurement of pain relief. In addition, a high-quality scoring system was used the literature was analyzed by two independent researchers. Of the 23 RCTs reviewed, all but two were rated as low quality. The review concluded there was limited evidence to conclude that LLLT was more effective than placebo, sham laser, and other active treatments.

Randomized Control Trials

Manca (2014) investigated the effects of ultrasound and LLLT on myofascial trigger points (MTP) of the upper trapezius muscle (uTM).^[55] In the double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study, 60 participants with at least one active MTP in uTM (28 women and 32 men; mean age 24.5 ± 1.44 years) were recruited and randomly assigned to one out of five groups: active ultrasound (n = 12), placebo US (n = 12), active LLLT (n = 11), placebo LLLT (n = 11) and no therapy (control, n = 14). After the 2-week intervention, all groups showed pressure pain threshold, numerical rating scale and cervical lateral flexion significant improvements ($p < 0.05$), which were confirmed at the follow-up. The authors concluded that ultrasound and LLLT provided significant improvements in pain and muscle extensibility.

A double-blind, randomized trial by Magri (2017) compared LLLT with placebo in a group of women with temporomandibular disorders.^[56] LLLT was performed twice a week for a total of eight sessions. Both LLLT (n=31) and placebo (n=30) groups showed decreases in pain from baseline, though only the LLLT group maintained a reduction in pain after 30 days. There were no changes in pain sensitivity noted with either treatment.

In a small RCT not included in the above SR, the effects of LLLT on masticatory performance, pressure pain threshold (PPT), and pain intensity in 21 patients with myofascial pain were evaluated.^[57] Patients were either assigned to the laser group (n=12) or the placebo group (n=9). A reduction in the geometric mean diameter of crushed particles and an increase in PPT were seen only in the laser group when comparing the baseline and end-of-treatment values.

Both groups showed a decrease in pain intensity at the end of treatment. Authors concluded that LLLT promoted an improvement in MP and PPT of the masticatory muscles. This is a study of limited sample size and the randomization of the patient population is not clear.

Section Summary

Findings from published RCTs on the use of LLLT in orofacial pain are insufficient to determine the added benefit of the technology on net health outcomes due to the methodological limitations in the study designs.

ORTHODONTIC PAIN

Systematic Reviews

He (2013) investigated the efficacy of LLLT in the management of orthodontic pain.^[58] Four RCTs, two quasi-RCTs, and two controlled clinical trials (CCTs) were selected from 152 relevant studies, including 641 patients. The meta-analysis demonstrated that 24% risk of incidence of pain was reduced by LLLT (RR = 0.76, 95% CI range 0.63-0.92, P = 0.006). In addition, compared to the control group, LLLT brought forward "the most painful day" (MD = -0.42, 95% CI range -0.74- -0.10, P = 0.009). Furthermore, the LLLT group also implied a trend of earlier end of pain compared with the control group (MD = -1.37, 95% CI range -3.37-0.64, P = 0.18) and the pseudo-laser group (MD = -1.04, 95% CI range -4.22-2.15, P = 0.52). Authors concluded due to the methodological shortcomings and risk of bias of included trials, the evidence for LLLT in delaying pain onset and reducing pain intensity was insufficient.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Owayda (2025) published updated results of a RCT on analgesic effects of LLLT and paracetamol-caffeine in controlling orthodontic pain induced by elastomeric separators in a total of 54 patients.^[59] Participants were assigned to one of three groups with assessment for both spontaneous and chewing pain immediately after treatment and at one, 24, 48 hours, one week, and on the next visit for any archwire replacement. Results indicated that pain perception peaked at 24 hours following any archwire replacement, with the highest pain levels occurring during the initial stages of treatment (separator placement and initial archwire engagement); LLLT produced lower pain scores compared to the control group after 48 hours of separation and after 24 and 48 hours of rectangular archwire insertion, while no significant differences were observed between the paracetamol-caffeine and control groups at any time point. LLLT demonstrated limited effectiveness beyond the initial treatment stages, and paracetamol-caffeine did not demonstrate meaningful pain reduction throughout the treatment course. Limitations include the small sample size, the restriction to patients with mild to moderate crowding which limits generalizability to more complex orthodontic cases, the absence of blinding, and the inability to draw conclusions about LLLT effectiveness across the full spectrum of orthodontic treatment stages given its inconsistent performance beyond initial archwire placement.

Owayda (2022) published the results of a RCT on analgesic effects of LLLT and paracetamol-caffeine in controlling orthodontic pain induced by elastomeric separators in a total of 54 patients.^[60] Group 1 (n = 18) received a single dose of laser treatment with a placebo medication, group 2 (n = 18) received paracetamol-caffeine tablets with a placebo light-emitting diode (LED) light, and patients in group 3 (n = 18) were exposed to the two placebo procedures. An 11-point numeric rating scale was used to assess spontaneous and chewing

pain perception immediately and at one hour, 24 hour, 48 hours, and one week after separator placement. The authors report similar pain levels in the laser and drug groups and decreased pain in the LLLT group compared with the placebo group. No impact of paracetamol-caffeine or LLLT were found for overall health related quality of life measures.

Celebi (2019) found no significant reduction in pain with LLLT compared to control or mechanical vibration following placement of an orthodontic archwire in 60 subjects [61] However, reduction in pain levels were found in LLLT treated patients compared to control in 84 subjects following placement of an orthodontic archwire in a study published by Lo Giudice (2019). [62] Martins (2019) published the results of a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled study in 62 patients, which found reduced pain immediately following separation of an orthodontic device, but no difference at 24 hours in patients treated with LLLT compared to control. [63] AlSayed Hasan (2017) evaluated two levels of LLLT (4 Joule or 16 Joule) in 26 patients treated with a fixed orthodontic appliance. [64] The study used a blinded, split-mouth design, in which one molar from each patient received the laser treatment, while one molar had sham treatment. The outcome measures of pain by VAS scale during mastication at various timepoints after LLLT were not significantly different between treatment groups.

Section Summary

The evidence from published studies on the use of LLLT to reduce orthodontic pain has not demonstrated consistent findings of improved outcomes. These inconsistent findings may be due to methodological limitations of the published studies.

OSTEOARTHRITIC (OA) KNEE PAIN

Systematic Reviews

Oliveira (2024) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs that compared LLLT as an isolated treatment to placebo in the treatment of knee OA. Ten studies involving 542 subjects were included. [65] The meta-analysis included six studies and found that LLLT significantly reduced pain at rest compared to placebo (SMD = -0.7 [95% CI = -1.0 to -0.3] points; moderate effect). However, the certainty of evidence was deemed very low. No significant effect was found for function, as measured by the Timed “Up & Go” Test (TUG). A high risk for bias was noted in 40% of the included studies, and the majority of studies (70%) showed an unclear risk of selective reporting bias. The authors concluded that LLLT can reduce pain and may improve function in people with knee OA, but the available evidence is of low quality.

Malik (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis assessing the effect of LLLT plus exercise on pain, range of motion (ROM), muscle strength, and function. [66] Fourteen RCTs involving 820 patients were included. There was a significant difference in pain both immediately after therapy (SMD: -0.58, $p=0.001$) and during follow-up (SMD: -1.35, $p=0.05$) but no significant differences in ROM, strength, or knee function either right after therapy or during follow-up.

Huang (2015) published a SR of RCTs comparing at least eight treatment sessions of LLLT and sham laser treatment in knee osteoarthritis patients. [67] To be eligible for inclusion in the review, trials had to report pain and/or functional outcomes and a PEDro quality score. A total of nine trials (total $n=518$ patients) met eligibility criteria. In these studies, interventions included between eight and 20 laser or sham sessions over two to six weeks. All nine trials

were considered high quality, as assessed using the PEDro scale (score of 7; maximum score, 11 points). Primary outcomes of interest were posttreatment pain measured by VAS scores and the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index (WOMAC) scores (Pain and Function). Meta-analyses did not find that LLLT led to significantly better pain scores than the sham control, either immediately after treatment or at the three-month follow-up. For example, a meta-analysis of five studies that reported 12-week pain scores did not find a statistically significant between-group difference (SMD = -0.06; 95% CI, -0.30 to 0.18). Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences between active and sham laser interventions on WOMAC Stiffness scores or WOMAC Function scores. The secondary outcome (range of motion after therapy) also did not significantly favor LLLT over a sham intervention.

Bjordal (2007) published a SR of placebo-controlled RCTs to determine the short-term efficacy of physical interventions for osteoarthritic knee pain.^[68] They included a total of 36 RCTs. The largest proportion of trials evaluated transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (n=11), followed by eight trials on LLLT and seven on pulsed electromagnetic fields. Also included were trials on electroacupuncture, manual acupuncture, static magnets, and ultrasound. The authors did not report findings of pooled analyses on LLLT for knee osteoarthritis. In a qualitative analysis, they stated that all the physical interventions but two (manual acupuncture, ultrasound) showed better results with active treatment over placebo.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Dos Santos Maciel (2025) conducted a double-blind, randomized controlled trial for evaluating the effects of PBM on pain, stiffness, and functional outcomes in patients with symptomatic knee osteoarthritis.^[69] A sample of 65 participants of both sexes were randomized into three groups: PBM treatment, sham (placebo), and control (no intervention). The PBM group received treatment across nine specific areas of the knee. Results indicated reductions in pain were observed in the PBM group compared to both the sham and control groups ($p < 0.05$). Improvements were also seen in pain, stiffness, and functional limitations within the PBM group from pre- to post-treatment ($p < 0.05$), while no significant changes were observed in the sham or control groups ($p > 0.05$). Limitations include the small sample size, the predominance of female participants across all groups (83-85%), the absence of long-term follow-up data to assess durability of treatment effects, and the restriction to a single laser wavelength and dosimetry protocol.

Elboim-Gabyzon (2023) published a single-blinded RCT comparing LLLT to pulsed electromagnetic field therapy (PEFT) in 40 people with low-grade knee osteoarthritis.^[70] Twenty patients were treated with LLLT and 20 were treated with PEFT. Primary outcomes were pain intensity and functional level. All patients completed therapy and no adverse events were documented. Both groups had significant improvement in pain intensity ($p < 0.0001$), but the PEFT group had a greater effect size in three of four activities (resting, standing, and climbing stairs). Similarly, both groups had significant improvement in function after therapy ($p \leq 0.0003$), but the PEFT group had a larger effect size. Limitations of the study include the results may not be generalizable to people with higher grades of knee osteoarthritis, and the researchers did not take participants medication usage into account.

De Matos Brunelli Braghin (2018) published the results of a RCT of LLLT on pain, stiffness, function, and spatiotemporal gait in patients with bilateral knee osteoarthritis.^[71] Patients with knee OA (Grades 1-3) were and randomized into four groups: Control Group (CG), untreated;

Laser Group (LG), treated with LLLT; Exercise Group (EG), treated with exercise; and Laser + Exercise Group (LEG), treated with laser and exercises. Treatment was twice a week for two months. Significant improvement in pain ($p = 0.006$) and function ($p = 0.01$) was found only in the EG. At eight weeks, all groups receiving intervention showed a significant increase in gait speed: LG versus CG ($p = 0.03$); EG versus CG ($p = 0.04$) and LEG versus CG ($p = 0.005$). Only the LEG group showed a significant increase in the cadence and duration of single right limb support ($p = 0.009$ and 0.04 , respectively), and only the EG and LEG groups showed significant decreases in the duration of right limb support ($p = 0.035$ and $p = 0.003$, respectively) compared to the CG. No long-term outcomes were reported.

Gopal Nambi (2016) evaluated LLLT in 34 patients with knee osteoarthritis in a double-blind, randomized trial.^[72] The placebo treatment consisted of laser therapy with the minimum emission of energy. The 17 subjects each in the LLLT group and placebo group had treatment sessions three times a week for four weeks, with additional exercise therapy and Kinesio taping. Pain was assessed by VAS. After eight weeks, VAS scores were significantly lower in the LLLT group than in the placebo group.

Section Summary

Though RCTs are available on the use of LLLT for the treatment of osteoarthritic knee pain, the interpretation of the results is limited due to small patient sizes and limited long-term follow-up of patients. Study results have been inconsistent. Systematic reviews have not shown that LLLT consistently improves pain and function for people with osteoarthritic knee pain.

PELVIC PAIN

Butrick (2022) conducted an observational cohort study evaluating the effects of transvaginal PBM on pelvic pain in women with interstitial cystitis/bladder pain syndrome (IC/BPS).^[73] Pain was measured using a 0-10 Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) with the primary outcome defined as a minimal clinically important difference (MCID) of ≥ 2 NRS point reduction from baseline after eight treatments. Of 140 patients who initiated transvaginal PBM therapy, 59.3% ($n = 83$) completed eight treatments. Of the 83 participants, 73.5% ($n = 61$) reported ≥ 1 NRS point improvement and 63.9% ($n = 53$) reported meaningful improvement of ≥ 2 points, with the proportion of patients reporting severe or moderate pain significantly decreasing from 83.1% ($n = 44$) to 38.5% ($n = 20$; $p < 0.001$). Large effect sizes were observed across all pain domains: overall pelvic pain (MCID = -2.7, $d = 1.07$), pain with urination (MCID = -2.6, $d = 1.0$), pain with exercise (MCID = -2.6, $d = 0.91$), and pain with intercourse (MCID = -2.5, $d = 0.82$). Limitations include the observational, non-randomized design without a control group, the self-selection of treatment by patients which introduces selection bias, the small final sample size completing treatment, and the inability to control for confounding variables inherent to a real-world clinical setting.

Kohli (2021) conducted an observational cohort study representing the first evaluation of transvaginal PBM for chronic pelvic pain (CPP), analyzing data from 128 women undergoing treatment across multiple gynecology practices.^[74] Outcomes were assessed using a 0-10 NRS over nine treatments for overall pain and pain with activities. MCID was defined as a ≥ 2 -point NRS reduction. Results indicated that 64.5% of women demonstrated clinically meaningful improvement by treatment nine across all pain domains, including overall pain (MCID = -2.4, $d = 0.9$), vulvar pain (MCID = -3.1, $d = 0.9$), pain with intercourse (MCID = -2.4, $d = 0.9$), and pain with bowel movement, exercise, urination, and sitting (MCID ranging from -2.0 to -2.1,

d=0.7), with no serious adverse events reported. Limitations include the observational design without a control group, the short study period, and the restriction to a single device and treatment protocol which limits generalizability to other PBM delivery systems.

Section Summary

Two observational cohort studies evaluating transvaginal PBM for pelvic pain found the majority of participants achieved clinically meaningful pain reductions across multiple pain domains, including overall pelvic pain, vulvar pain, pain with intercourse, urination, and exercise. Both studies reported large effect sizes. However, findings are limited by their observational, non-randomized designs without control groups. Methodological limitations such as selection bias, small sample sizes, and short study periods restrict the generalizability of these findings.

PLANTAR FASCIITIS

Systematic Reviews

Ferlito (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of 19 RCTs involving 1089 participants to assess the effects of LLLT related to pain and disability due to plantar fasciitis when compared to control conditions, other interventions, and adjunct treatments.^[75] The analysis found that LLLT may reduce short-term pain compared to placebo/control intervention with moderate certainty evidence (mean difference (MD) = -22.02, 95% CI -35.21 to -8.83, $I^2=46\%$, $p<0.001$) based on three trials, but a fourth study found LLLT did not improve short-term pain compared to placebo with low certainty evidence (MD=3.08, 95% CI -15.90 to 22.06). LLLT with exercise compared to exercise alone was associated with improved pain intensity based on moderate certainty evidence (MD= -21.84, 95% CI -26.14 to -17.54, $p<0.00001$). When compared to extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT) an analysis of six studies found LLLT with exercise was better than ESWT with exercise with low certainty evidence (MD= -19.59, 95% CI -29.03 to -10.15, $I^2 = 67\%$, $p=0.0005$). LLLT with exercise compared to ultrasound therapeutic (UST) plus exercise in four studies found LLLT was not superior to UST for short-term pain based on low certainty evidence (MD= -5.05, 95% CI -8.19 to -1.91, $p=0.02$). One study found LLLT to be superior to UST for medium term pain with low certainty evidence (MD=-10.79, 95% CI -14.51 to -7.07). LLLT with or without exercise did not improve disability when compared to placebo/control, exercise alone, or ESWT. There is some evidence LLLT with exercise is superior to UST with exercise for disability but the effect size is small so its clinical relevance is questionable (SMD = -.039, 95% CI -0.77 to 0.01, $p=0.04$). The authors point out that the LLLT dosage was not addressed. Further research is needed to understand if there is a dose-response relationship that is important in the delivery of LLLT to achieve therapeutic goals.

Guimaraes (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of multiple therapeutic interventions for plantar fasciitis that have been evaluated with RCTs.^[76] Nineteen treatments from 236 studies were evaluated. Outcomes were short, medium, and long-term pain. For short-term pain, LLLT was compared to a control group in five studies involving 231 participants. The meta-analysis found improvement in pain with moderate quality evidence ($p<0.01$). Two studies involving 172 subjects compared high-intensity laser therapy to LLLT and found no significant difference in short-term pain ($p=0.28$). No studies evaluated LLLT for medium or long-term pain.

Naterstad (2022) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of 18 RCTs evaluating LLLT in patients with lower extremity tendinopathy (seven trials of patellar or Achilles tendinopathy) or plantar fasciitis (11 trials).^[77] In an analysis of LLLT versus any control, both pain and disability were improved with LLLT. VAS scores were reduced immediately after therapy (n=260; SMD, 0.39; 95% CI, 0.09 to 0.7; I²=30%) and at 4 to 9 weeks follow-up (n=222; SMD, 0.32; 95% CI, 0.05 to 0.59; I²=4%) compared with control. LLLT did not significantly improve disability compared with other interventions immediately after therapy (n=76; SMD, 0.25; 95% CI, -0.21 to 0.7; I²=0%) or at 4 to 8 weeks follow-up (n=76; SMD, 0.24; 95% CI, -0.21 to 0.7; I²=0%).

Guimaraes (2022) published a systematic review (SR) with meta-analysis of 14 studies (N=817) comparing LLLT (alone or combined with other interventions) and control (placebo and other interventions) in patients with plantar fasciitis.^[78] Compared to the placebo group, LLLT improved pain in the short term of 0 to 6 weeks (four studies, N=234; moderate-quality evidence; MD, -2.28; 95% CI, -2.58 to -1.97; p<0.00001; I²=0%). No significant difference in short-term disability was found for individuals in the LLLT group compared to the placebo group. Compared to the conventional rehabilitation alone group, LLLT combined with conventional rehabilitation improved pain in the short term of 0 to 6 weeks (two studies, N=90; moderate-quality evidence; MD, -2.01; 95% CI, -2.89 to -1.13; p<0.00001; I²=0%). However, compared to extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT), LLLT did not significantly reduce pain intensity in the short term (four studies, N=175; low-quality evidence; MD, 0.45; 95% CI, -2.0 to 2.9; p=.72; I²=94%). The meta-analysis was limited by insufficient data for longer-term outcomes, the lack of multicenter studies, and lack of a large sample. Additionally, the quality of evidence for the outcome disability were low.

Wang (2019) published a SR with meta-analysis of six RCTs (N=315) comparing LLLT (alone or combined with other interventions) and controls (placebo or other interventions) in the treatment of plantar heel pain or plantar fasciitis.^[79] Compared with controls, VAS for pain was significantly reduced after treatment (SMD=-0.95; 95% CI -1.20 to -0.70; p<0.001), as well as remaining significantly better at 3 months (SMD= -1.13; 95% CI -1.53 to -0.72; p<0.001). The meta-analysis was limited by the small number of studies included, its small sample size, and insufficient data for longer-term outcomes.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Cinar (2018) conducted a prospective, single-blinded RCT investigating combination therapy consisting of LLLT plus exercise and orthotic care compared with orthotic care alone in persons with plantar fasciitis.^[80] Forty-nine individuals were randomized to LLLT (n=27) or a control therapy (n=22). Each person performed a home exercise routine and received orthotic care; persons in the LLLT group received treatment three times a week for a total of ten sessions. The function subscale of the American Orthopedic Foot and Ankle Society Score, a VAS, and the 12-minute walk test were used to measure progress. Scores were recorded at baseline, three weeks, and three months after treatment. At week three, both groups saw a significant improvement in American Orthopedic Foot and Ankle Society total score (LLLT, p<0.001; control, p=0.002). However, at the three-month follow-up, only the LLLT group progressed as assessed on the American Orthopedic Foot and Ankle Society total score (p=0.04). At all check-ins, the group scores for the 12-minute walk test were comparable. Both groups showed significant pain reductions at the three-month follow-up (LLLT, p<0.001; control, p=0.01); however, the LLLT group had a more significant reduction in pain at month three (p=0.03). Thus, reviewers concluded that combination therapy plus LLLT was more

effective in reducing pain and improving function for patients with plantar fasciitis than orthotic care alone. Limitations included a lack of a control group, which would have accounted for the natural progression of recovery in patients with plantar fasciitis; another limitation is that the LLLT dose may or may not have been precise enough for the conditions of this study. The same group also published a randomized trial comparing LLLT (n=24) to extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT) (n=25) or usual care (n=17).^[81] Significant improvements in pain were seen over three months for all groups, with the LLLT group demonstrating lower pain than the ESWT group (p=0.003) and control group (p=0.043). It was not clear whether different patients were used for these trials.

A double-blinded RCT by Macias (2015) assessed 69 patients with unilateral chronic plantar fasciitis and chronic heel pain of three months or longer that was unresponsive to conservative treatments (e.g., rest, stretching, physical therapy).^[82] Patients were randomized to twice weekly treatment for three weeks of LLLT or sham treatment. The primary efficacy outcome, reduction of heel pain pre- to posttreatment, differed significantly between groups (p<0.001). Mean VAS scores decreased from 69.1 to 39.5 in the LLLT group and from 67.6 to 62.3 in the sham group. The difference in Foot Function Index scores did not differ significantly between groups.

An RCT on LLLT was reported by Kiritsi (2010) on LLLT in 30 subjects with plantar fasciitis.^[83] The trial was double-blinded and sham-controlled trial and included 30 patients. Twenty-five (83%) patients completed the study, with treatment three times a week over six weeks. At baseline, plantar fascia thickness, measured by ultrasound was significantly greater in symptomatic compared with asymptomatic feet (5.3 mm vs 3.0 mm). Plantar fascia thickness decreased in both the LLLT and the sham groups during the study. Although plantar fascia thickness after 6 weeks of treatment did not differ significantly between the two groups (3.6 mm in LLLT, 4.4 mm in sham), there was a significant difference between groups in the change in thickness (1.7 mm LLLT vs 0.9 mm sham). VAS scores after night rest or daily activities improved significantly more in the LLLT group (59% improvement) than in the sham group (26% improvement). At baseline, pain after daily activities was rated as 67 out of 100 by both groups. At the end of treatment, VAS scores after daily activities were rated as 28 out of 100 for LLLT and 50 out of 100 for sham.

Section Summary

Sham-controlled RCTs have evaluated LLLT for plantar fasciitis, but findings were inconsistent. One RCT compared LLLT plus therapy with orthotic care alone, and while a significant advantage was observed in the LLLT treatment group, this treatment was a part of combination therapy. None of the studies presented long-term follow-up data. Three systematic reviews found that studies of LLLT for the treatment of plantar fascitis are limited by a lack of high quality evidence, small sample sizes, absence of long-term outcomes.

RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS (RA)

Systematic Reviews

Lourinho (2023) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on the effects of LLLT in adults with rheumatoid arthritis.^[84] Their literature search included 18 RCTs (n=793). There were varying intervention durations of four weeks to six months among the studies. Also, treatment regimens and comparisons varied among the studies. Some studies investigated laser acupuncture. The meta-analyses for the outcomes of interest, including pain, morning

stiffness, handgrip strength, functional capacity, inflammation, and disease activity, were reported in subgroups of two to four studies, with no statistically significant differences in effects. The authors noted that 17 of the 18 studies had an overall high risk of bias and the results show a low quality of evidence for LLLT in rheumatoid arthritis.

A 2005 Cochrane Review included five placebo-controlled randomized trials and found that relative to a separate control group, LLLT reduced pain and morning stiffness, and increased tip-to-palm flexibility.^[85] Other outcomes did not differ between groups, including functional assessment, range of motion, and local swelling. For RA, relative to a control group using the opposite hand (one study), there was no difference observed between the control and treatment hand for morning stiffness duration and no significant improvement in pain relief. The authors noted that “despite some positive findings, this meta-analysis lacked data on how LLLT effectiveness is affected by four important factors: wavelength, treatment duration of LLLT, dosage and site application over nerves instead of joints.”

Randomized Controlled Trials

A randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial comparing outcomes of pain reduction and improvement in hand function in 82 patients with RA treated with low-level laser or placebo laser was reported by Meireles (2010).^[86] However, co-treatment (such as pain medication) was not controlled during the trial and durability of treatment effects was not measured, limiting interpretation of these findings.

Section Summary

Studies on the use of LLLT for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis have methodological limitations that preclude the interpretation of the results; therefore, valid conclusions cannot be made to determine if the use of LLLT leads to improved health outcomes.

SHOULDER PAIN

Systematic Reviews

A 2015 SR and meta-analysis evaluated 17 RCTs (13 high quality; four moderate quality) LLLT studies that included outcome measures of pain relief by VAS and relative risk for global improvement.^[87] Results showed that patients treated with LLLT experienced significant and clinically relevant pain relief compared with placebo, for LLLT as monotherapy and as adjunct to exercise therapy. In addition, when LLLT was used in combination with physiotherapy, patients achieved significant pain reduction on VAS compared with placebo. Relative risks for global improvement were also statistically significant at 1.96 (95% CI 1.25 to 3.08) and 1.51 (95% CI 1.12 to 2.03), for laser as monotherapy or adjunctive in a physiotherapy regime, respectively. Study authors concluded that LLLT can offer clinically relevant pain relief and hasten improvement, both alone and in combination with physiotherapy.

A 2014 Cochrane review evaluated LLLT and other electrotherapy modalities for frozen shoulder.^[88] The review found limited evidence to draw conclusions on the effectiveness of electrotherapy modalities for frozen shoulder. Only one RCT of 40 patients compared LLLT with placebo. This trial administered LLLT for six days. On the 6th day, LLLT was considered to have some improvement in a global assessment of treatment success when compared to placebo. However, this study was considered to be of low quality and the small size and short follow-up limited interpretation of results. Another RCT on LLLT discussed in the Cochrane review, by Stergioulas (2008), was considered to be of moderate quality.^[89] In this study, 63

patients with frozen shoulder were included in an RCT comparing an 8-week program of LLLT (n=31) or placebo (n=32). Both groups also participated in exercise therapy. Compared with the sham group, the active laser group had a significant decrease in overall, night, and activity pain scores after four weeks and eight weeks of treatment, and at the end of eight more weeks of follow-up. At the same time intervals, a significant decrease in SPADI scores, and Croft shoulder disability questionnaire scores was observed, while a significant decrease in Disability of Arm, Shoulder, and Hand Questionnaire scores was observed at eight weeks of treatment and at 16 weeks postrandomization; and a significant decrease in health assessment questionnaire scores was observed at four weeks and eight weeks of treatment. However, 11 patients included in the original randomization were excluded from analysis after leaving the study to seek other treatments. It is not known how this loss might have biased the final outcomes of the study.

Favejee (2011) published results from a SR of RCTs on the use of non-surgical treatment (including LLLT) for frozen shoulder (adhesive capsulitis).^[90] Five Cochrane reviews and 18 RCTs were evaluated. The researchers reported finding a strong association between LLLT and reduced pain and disability. However, commentary on these findings points to the lack of distinction between primary (or idiopathic) capsulitis versus secondary adhesive capsulitis (due to trauma, diabetes, or thyroid dysfunction).^[91] Because secondary capsulitis is less responsive to treatment, lack of sub-group analysis of treatment outcomes by patient type may limit the generalizability of these results to a specific patient population.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Basaran (2025) investigated the use of LLLT and neuromuscular electrical nerve stimulation (NMES) to treat shoulder pain and impaired function after ischemic stroke.^[92] Participants with first-time ischemic stroke (n=75) were randomized evenly into three groups: LLLT with physical therapy (PT), NMES with PT, and PT alone. After four weeks of treatment, all three groups showed significant improvement in Brunnstrom (BRS) upper extremity, BRS hand, Bartel index, Shoulder Pain and Disability Index (SPADI), Fugl Meyer, and visual analog scale (VAS) measurements compared to baseline ($p<0.005$). However, the LLLT group had significant decreases in muscle tone using Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) scores in the shoulder ($p=0.008$), elbow ($p=0.008$), and hand ($p=0.008$). When comparing treatments to each other, differences in MAS scores, BRS upper extremity, and BRS hand were not significant. LLLT and NMES demonstrated significant improvement in Bartel index, SPADI pain, SPADI disability and VAS values compared to PT alone. Limitations of the study include lack of follow-up beyond four weeks. The authors concluded that LLLT shows some efficacy in the treatment of stroke but noted that it was associated with a reduction in muscle tone.

Badil Güloğlu (2021) randomized 64 patients with a recent diagnosis of subacromial impingement syndrome without treatment in the preceding four weeks to 15 sessions of LLLT (n=34) every weekday for three weeks or to weekly sessions of extracorporeal shock wave treatment (ESWT; n=30) for three weeks.^[93] In both groups, all range of motion measurements, visual analogue scale pain scores, and SPADI scores showed significant improvements both at the end of treatment and at the third month after treatment ($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in abduction between the groups except the change at the end of treatment. The ESWT group showed greater improvements in terms of SPADI disability and total scores at the end of treatment compared to LLLT. The improvements in VAS pain scores and SPADI scores at the third month after treatment was significantly more evident in the ESWT group ($p<0.05$).

Alfredo (2021) randomized 122 patients to LLLT plus exercise (group 1, n=44; 42 included in analysis), exercise alone (group 2, n=42), or LLLT alone (group 3, n=42) for the treatment of subacromial impingement syndrome.^[94] Therapy was given three times a week for eight weeks. The primary outcome was the change in shoulder pain and disability index (SPADI) and numeric pain rating scale and medication intake were secondary outcomes. SPADI scores at baseline, two month, and three month follow-up (p=0.001) were 60.8 (37.7 to 70.8), 3.8 (0.0 to 10.8) and 2.3 (0.8 to 10.8) for group 1; 61.5 (41.5 to 71.5), 9.2 (3.8 to 29.2) and 14.2 (1.5 to 38.0) for the group 12; and 73.3 (59.2-80.8), 34.2 (16.9 to 54.6) and 33.1 (22.3 to 49.2) for the group 3, respectively, all p<0.05. Pain scores at baseline (p=0.829), two- month (p=0.057) and three- month follow-up (p=0.004) were 6.8 (4.7 to 7.7), 0.2 (0.0 to 0.5) and 0.3 (0.0 to 1.0) for group 1; 6.6 (5.7 to 8.0), 0.5 (0.2 to 2.0) and 0.2 (0.0 to 3.3) for group 2; and 6.5 (5.1 to 7.4), 2.4 (0.1 to 6.7) and 4.0 (2.0 to 5.0) for group 3, respectively. While patients in the LLLT plus exercise group had a significantly greater improvement in SPADI compared to other groups, no between-group comparison was performed for patients receiving LLLT alone and exercise alone. This study was also limited by lack of blinding.

Eslamian and others evaluated the effects of LLLT in combination with conventional physiotherapy endeavors in 50 patients with rotator cuff tendinitis.^[95] A total of 25 patients were randomly assigned to the control group and received only routine physiotherapy. The additional 25 patients were assigned into the experimental group and received conventional therapy plus LLLT. Authors concluded that LLLT combined with conventional physiotherapy had superiority over routine physiotherapy in decreasing pain and improving the patient's function, but no additional advantages were detected in increasing shoulder joint range of motion in comparison to other physical agents. This study had a limited study population and did not include a sham group for comparison.

Results from additional RCTs remain limited by lack of sham control ^[95-98] and/or lack of treatment durability assessment.^[99-101]

Section Summary

In summary, conflicting results from available RCTs limit the conclusions that can be drawn about the effectiveness of LLLT in shoulder disorders.

TEMPOROMANDIBULAR JOINT PAIN

Systematic Reviews

Díaz (2025) conducted a systematic review evaluating the efficacy of LLLT in the management of temporomandibular disorders, with a focus on pain reduction, functional improvement, optimal laser parameters, and comparison with conventional treatment modalities.^[102] A comprehensive search was conducted yielding 44 RCTs encompassing 1,816 participants. Results indicated a mean VAS pain reduction of 60-70% and a 10-20% improvement in maximum mouth opening across included studies. The most effective wavelengths were identified as 810 nm, 830 nm, and 940 nm, with energy densities of 3-12 J/cm². Treatment protocols exceeding four weeks were associated with more sustained functional improvements. LLLT demonstrated superior or comparable pain relief to occlusal splints (40%) and NSAIDs. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation had similar pain reduction compared to LLLT. Limitations include the substantial variability in laser parameters and treatment protocols across included studies, and the inherent heterogeneity across studies in terms of patient populations, outcome measurement tools, and follow-up durations.

Zhang (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of laser therapy on temporomandibular disorders, including 28 RCTs.^[103] Overall, laser therapy had a statistically significant effect on VAS (21 studies; n=934; SMD: -1.88; 95% CI, -2.46 to -1.30; p<.00001; I^2 , 93%), maximum active vertical opening (17 studies; n=732; MD, 4.90; 95% CI, 3.29 to 6.50; p<.00001; I^2 , 72%), maximum passive vertical opening (5 studies; n=300; MD, 5.82; 95% CI, 4.62 to 7.01; p<.00001; I^2 , 40%), and right lateral movement (6 studies; n=261; MD, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.23 to 1.22; p=.004; I^2 , 0%). The authors note that while the results demonstrated effective pain relief, but limited effect on improvement of mandibular movement. There was variation among the included studies, including various laser parameter settings. RCTs with larger sample sizes are needed for higher quality evidence.

Arribas-Pascual (2023) published systematic review and meta-analysis on the effects of various physiotherapy interventions on pain and mouth opening in temporomandibular disorders.^[104] They conducted a sub-analysis on four studies of LLLT. They found a statistically significant effect of LLLT on pain intensity (SMD, 0.8; 95% CI, 1.44 to 0.17; p<.001; I^2 , 27%) and maximum mouth opening (SMD, 0.95; 95% CI, 1.5 to 0.39; p<.001; I^2 , 21%). The overall confidence of studies included in the systematic review were low or critically low. The systematic review did not adequately report sample sizes among the studies used in the LLLT sub-analyses. Overall, the results are of a low quality of evidence.

Tournavitis (2023) published a systematic review and meta-analysis that assessed conservative treatments for temporomandibular joint (TMJ) related pain.^[105] Twenty-eight studies were included and of those five included LLLT. Two studies used PMB, which the authors state is an umbrella term that includes LLLT. LLLT and PBM offered short-term improvement in TMJ pain when compared to a control group (LLLT vs. control; p = 0.001; LLLT vs. PBM vs control; p=0.033), but were less effective than occlusal splint (p = 0.35).

Hanna (2021) published a large systematic review of 44 RCTs of LLLT for temporomandibular joint (TMJ) pain.^[106] All included trials were at low risk for reporting missing outcome data. Seventy percent of the included trials were at low risk, 28% were at high risk, and 2% had some concerns in terms of reporting outcome measurement. Of the RCTs included, 98% were at low risk of bias for selective reporting of the results. Overall, 38% of studies had a low risk of bias, 46% were at high risk, and 16% had some concerns. Comparators across RCTs included sham placebo, drug therapy and physiotherapy. The primary outcome of interest was change in pain intensity reduction from baseline, measured by a visual analogue scale (VAS). Thirty-three studies (N=1163) were eligible for inclusion in the meta-analysis. In a meta-analysis, pooled change in VAS score from baseline to final follow-up evaluation demonstrated a significantly greater reduction with LLLT compared to comparator groups (pooled SMD, -0.55; 95% CI, -0.82 to -0.27; p<0.0001), however, heterogeneity was high (I^2 =78%).

Jing (2021) published the results of a SR with meta-analysis of 16 RCTs to evaluate the effects of different energy density LLLT in patients with TMJ pain.^[107] D1 laser therapy (energy density ranging from 0 to 10 J/cm²) was associated with more pain reduction than placebo (MD = 2.49, 95% CI ranging from 1.28 to 3.71) immediately following treatment based on "moderate" quality evidence. One month following treatment, d1 laser therapy also performed better than placebo (MD = 1.69, 95% CI = -0.78, 4.16) based on "low" quality evidence.

Chang (2014) published a meta-analysis of seven RCTs on LLLT for TMJ pain.^[108] Included RCTs compared LLLT to no treatment or placebo. Only six studies were sufficient to be included in the meta-analysis for a total of 223 patients. The number of treatment sessions

ranged from 4 to 20. The pooled effect size of pain relief using the VAS was a mean decrease of 0.6 [95% confidence interval (CI) -0.47 to -0.73].

A SR by Maia (2012) investigated the effect of LLLT on TMJ disorders (TMD).^[109] Of the 14 studies reviewed, authors concluded the lack of standardization across the studies limited the interpretation of the review's results. Authors suggested further research is necessary to obtain a consensus regarding the best application protocol for pain relief in patients with TMD.

Melis (2012) reviewed 14 studies evaluating the efficacy of LLLT for the treatment of TMD.^[110] The outcomes of the trials were controversial and not related to any features of the laser beam, to the number of laser applications, or their duration. Authors concluded that based on the results of the review no definitive conclusions could be drawn on the efficacy of LLLT for the treatment of TMD.

A SR by Petrucci (2011) included six sham-controlled randomized clinical trials of LLLT for TMD.^[111] Using change in pain by VAS as the primary treatment outcome, the researchers concluded that LLLT was not more effective than placebo alone.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Risbaf Fakour (2025) conducted a single-blind, prospective randomized controlled trial comparing the efficacy of PBM versus pharmacotherapy in patients with temporomandibular disorders, evaluating outcomes of pain, maximum mouth opening, joint clicking, tenderness, and lateral excursion.^[112] Forty-two patients with unilateral temporomandibular disorders were randomized into two groups: one receiving MEGAFEN (Acetaminophen 325mg/Caffeine 30mg/Ibuprofen 200mg) and the other receiving PBM with assessments conducted at baseline and on days seven, 14, and 28. Results indicated that the PBM group demonstrated lower mean pain levels and higher mean maximum mouth opening scores at day 28 ($p=0.001$ and $p=0.024$, respectively), as well as lower occurrence of joint clicking and tenderness across all follow-up time points (joint clicking: $p=0.008$, $p=0.004$, $p=0.001$; tenderness: $p=0.008$, $p=0.005$, $p=0.001$). No statistically significant differences in lateral excursion scores were observed between groups at any follow-up point ($p=0.259$, $p=0.172$, $p=0.172$). Limitations include the small sample size, the single-blind design, the absence of a placebo or sham control group, the lack of a standardized laser protocol, and a relatively short follow-up period of 28 days.

Chamani (2024) randomized 42 patients with temporomandibular disorders into three groups: LLLT ($n=14$), placebo ($n=15$), or standard treatment ($n=13$).^[113] The LLLT group received treatment twice per week for 10 sessions. All groups showed a statistically significant improvement in VAS ($p=.0001$), lateral jaw movements ($p=.0001$) forward jaw movement ($p=.007$), but not in maximum mouth opening. There was no significant difference between groups. The authors conclude that LLLT may be effective in treating temporomandibular disorders, but there was no difference to standard therapy. This study is limited by its small sample size and single-center design, so further evidence is needed.

Tanhan (2023) compared physical therapy (manual pressure release) with exercise to LLLT with exercise and to exercise alone in 75 participants with myofascial jaw pain and cervical myofascial pain.^[114] Compared to baseline all groups had improvement in pain ($p<0.01$). The combination of LLLT with exercise and manual release pressure with exercise relieved pain better than exercise alone. The authors conclude that multimodal approaches to TMJ pain should include exercise.

Desai (2022) randomized 60 patients with TMJ disorders to LLLT or placebo given for 20 sessions over 8 weeks.^[115] By week 8 both the placebo group and LLLT group had improvements from baseline with a final mean VAS of 5.2 in the placebo group and 3.2 in the LLLT group. There was no statistical comparison reported between groups. Mouth opening and lateral movement were also improved in both groups compared to baseline; however, improvements were numerically greater in the LLLT group. The small sample size, single-center design, and lack of comparison between active and placebo treatment limit generalizability of these findings.

Del Vecchio (2021) randomized 90 patients between the ages of 18 and 73 years old with TMJ disorders to home LLLT (808 nm, 5 J/min, 250 mW, 15 KHz for eight minutes twice daily), sham control, or standard conventional drugs (nimesulide 100 mg daily with five days of cyclobenzaprine 10 mg daily) for one week.^[116] Pain was measured using a 100-mm VAS, and the examiner was blinded. At the end of treatment, the reduction in VAS was greater in the LLLT group (MD, 13.030; $p=0.036$) and the drug group (MD, 14.409; $p=0.17$) compared to the sham group. However, no significant difference in pain reduction was observed between the LLLT group and the drug group (MD, 1.379; $p=1$). This study evaluated a specific at-home LLLT protocol limiting the generalizability of the findings to other LLLT regimens.

Aisaiti (2021) randomized 78 patients with TMJ pain to receive LLLT (810 nm, 6 J/cm², applied at five points for 30 seconds) or placebo once daily for seven consecutive days.^[117] Pain was measured on a 0 to 10 numerical rating scale and pressure pain thresholds. Only 50 patients, 25 per group, remained in the study to contribute data to analysis. Greater reduction in numerical rating scale pain scores were seen with LLLT than with placebo ($p=0.014$), but no significant interaction between time and intervention was found ($p=0.35$). For pressure pain thresholds, there was no significant difference found between interventions or interaction between time and intervention.

Madani (2020) published a randomized, double-blind clinical trial in 45 patients with TMD.^[118] Patients were randomized to group 1 (LLLT applied to the painful masticatory muscles two times a week for 5 weeks), group 2 (laser acupuncture therapy [LAT] emitted bilaterally on acupuncture points with the same settings as the LLLT group) or group 3 (placebo underwent treatment with sham laser). Patients were evaluated before treatment, after five and ten laser applications, and at month. No significant difference in mouth opening between the groups was identified ($p > 0.05$), but the amount of lateral excursive and protrusive movements was significantly greater in LLLT and LAT groups than the placebo group at some intervals ($p < 0.05$). No mid- or long-term follow-up data were reported.

A double-blind, placebo-controlled randomized trial by Shobha (2017) investigated the effectiveness of LLLT in patients with TMJ pain.^[119] Forty TMJ patients were evenly randomized to an active or a placebo group. Treatment included two to three weekly sessions of LLLT for a total of eight sessions. Patients were evaluated at baseline, after treatment, and at a 30-day follow-up. Both groups experienced pain reduction at all evaluation points. The most significant pain reduction was reported at the 30-day follow-up ($p=0.001$). There were no significant differences between groups at baseline ($p=0.214$), final session ($p=0.000$), or the 30-day follow-up ($p=0.230$). For a secondary outcome (the ability to open one's mouth), while both groups showed improvement, the difference between groups was not significant ($p=0.330$). Therefore, LLLT was determined to have no greater impact on healing or pain reduction over placebo.

Another clinical trial, by Ahrari (2013), assessed LLLT in 20 patients with myogenic TMD.^[120] Patients were randomly divided into laser and placebo groups. There was a significant increase in mouth opening and a significant reduction of pain symptoms in the laser group that was not observed in the placebo group. Between-group comparisons revealed no significant differences in pain intensity and mouth opening measurements at any of the evaluation time points. Using a very limited sample size, authors concluded that LLLT can produce a significant improvement in pain level and mouth opening in patients affected with myogenic TMD.

Additional RCTs lacking study of durability of treatment effects have also been published.^[121-128]

Nonrandomized studies

Nonrandomized studies have been published evaluating the effectiveness of LLLT in TMD, but have not identified significant impacts on health outcomes.

Section Summary

There are several SRs of LLLT for TMJ syndrome. Findings from these reviews, as well as from RCTs of this treatment, are mixed, and most trials do not show a benefit of LLLT. RCTs have not compared the impact of LLLT with physical therapy on health outcomes.

WOUND HEALING

Systematic Reviews

Fonseca (2026) conducted a systematic review analyzing the effects of PBM on wound healing at the palatal donor site following free gingival graft (FGG) surgery.^[129] The primary outcome evaluated was wound healing and the secondary outcome evaluated was pain. Eight randomized clinical trials encompassing 284 participants were included. The majority of included studies demonstrated that PBM positively influenced epithelialization, reduction in wound area, and tissue color during the first two postoperative weeks. However, the effect on pain control was inconsistent across studies, with only two of the eight trials reporting statistically significant reductions in pain. Statistical pooling of data for a meta-analysis was not feasible. Limitations include the small number of included trials, the limited total sample size, inconsistent reporting of laser dosimetry parameters across primary studies, and the absence of standardized treatment protocols.

Chen (2025) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of LLLT in the treatment of grade I-II diabetic foot ulcers (DFU).^[130] Eleven studies involving 657 participants were included. Reported outcomes include wound shrinkage area (n=6), wound area reduction rate (n=7), complete healing rate (n=7), healing time (n=2), and antibacterial effect (n=2). Meta-analysis found that wound shrinkage area was significantly higher in the LLLT group (4 studies; $p < 0.00001$) which was consistent on sensitivity analysis. Wound area reduction rate was significantly improved in the LLLT group ($p < 0.00001$), but sensitivity analysis indicated instability when studies were individually eliminated. Complete healing rate was significantly higher in the with LLLT ($p < 0.00001$), and antibacterial clearance rate was higher in the LLLT group ($p < 0.00001$). The difference in healing time was not significant ($p > 0.05$). The quality of the included evidence is deemed moderate. The authors noted the analysis was limited by differences in sample sizes, treatment regimens, and degrees of missing data, which limits the

ability to confirm whether LLLT improves wound area reduction or shortens healing time for grade I-II DFUs.

Li (2018) published a SR and meta-analysis of 7 RCTs (N=194) evaluating LLLT as a treatment for a diabetic foot ulcer.^[131] Ulcer area was significantly reduced with LLLT compared with control (WMD 34.18; 95% CI 19.38–48.99; $p<0.001$), and the complete healing rate significantly improved with LLLT (OR 6.72; 95% CI 1.99–22.64; $p=0.002$). The analysis was limited by the number of studies included and small sample size, and by each study having different parameters, demographic information, ulcer characteristics, follow-up time, and treatment period.

Machado (2017) published a SR evaluating the treatment of pressure ulcers with LLLT.^[132] Reviewers identified four studies meeting eligibility requirements (total $n=210$ patients). Outcomes were the ulcer area, healing rate, and overall healing rate. Two of the four studies used LLLT with a single wavelength;^[133, 134] and the other two used LLLT with probe cluster, which employs the simultaneous assimilation of different types of diodes and wavelengths.^[135, 136] In the study that employed the 658 nm wavelength, reviewers found that particular frequency reduced pressure ulcers by 71%. The other wavelengths did not produce any significant findings related to the study outcome; moreover, the studies using the probe cluster technique were also not successful in producing significant findings. While studies should be conducted to investigate further the success found in single wavelength at 658 nm, at this time there is insufficient evidence to suggest LLLT can significantly benefit patients with pressure ulcers.

Suter (2017) published a SR on the use of LLLT in patients with aphthous stomatitis, also known as canker sores.^[137] There were 11 studies included in the review, 10 of which were RCTs, and outcomes included pain relief, duration of wound healing, and reduction in frequency of episodes. Controls in the studies received either placebo, no therapy, or topical corticosteroids. LLLT was associated with reductions in immediate pain in five out of six studies, reductions in late pain in seven out of 10 studies, and with faster wound healing in five out of nine studies. The authors noted, however, that only two of the studies were double-blinded and studies were of a generally low quality, with a mean Jadad score of 1.0 out of 5.

Santinoni (2017) evaluated LLLT and maxillofacial wound healing in a SR focused on six studies that evaluated bone repair.^[138] Four of the studies showed improved bone formation with LLLT, two showed improvements at only one follow up point, and one showed no benefit. Because the LLLT treatments were not standardized, no specific conclusions could be drawn.

Additional evidence on LLLT for wound healing includes a SR from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) in 2004 and a 2014 Cochrane review.

The evidence report on vacuum-assisted and low-level laser wound therapies for treatment of chronic non-healing wounds prepared for the AHRQ was based on 11 studies of LLLT.^[139] The review concluded:

“The best available trial [of low level laser wound therapy] did not show a higher probability of complete healing at 6 weeks with the addition of low-level laser compared to sham laser treatment added to standard care. Study weaknesses were unlikely to have concealed existing effects. Future studies may determine whether different dosing parameters or other laser types may lead to different results.”

In 2014 a Cochrane review of RCTs on light therapy, including phototherapy, ultraviolet and laser, for pressure ulcers was published.^[140] The few trials available for analysis were of small size and very low quality. The reviewers found the available evidence overall was insufficient to draw conclusion on the effects light therapy on pressure ulcers.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Since the publication of the Cochrane review described above, there have been a number of RCTs evaluating LLLT for the healing of various wounds, including diabetic ulcers,^[141] sternotomy incisions,^[142] hip arthroplasty incisions,^[143] skin graft donor wounds,^[144] soft tissue injuries due to trauma,^[145] and periodontal wounds.^[146-150] For the most part, these have been small studies of varied quality, and they have yielded mixed results.

Section Summary

Evidence is limited on the use of LLLT for the treatment of wound healing and therefore valid conclusions cannot be made to determine if the use of LLLT leads to improved health outcomes.

OTHER INDICATIONS

Systematic Reviews

Yang (2025) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the impact of PBM on orthodontically induced inflammatory root resorption (OIIRR) during orthodontic treatment.^[151] A search rendered eight RCTs encompassing 185 participants were included, with meta-analysis performed. Results indicated that LED interventions produced reductions in root resorption (MD=-0.15, 95% CI -0.19 to -0.10; $p<0.00001$), while LLLT demonstrated a trend toward reduced root resorption that did not reach statistical significance (SMD=-1.69, 95% CI -3.52 to 0.14; $p=0.07$). The overall change in root length was not statistically significant except at the canine tooth, where a reduction in resorption was observed (MD=-0.49, 95% CI -0.95 to -0.03; $p=0.04$). Subgroup analysis indicated that a wavelength of 850 nm or longer, a fluence exposure greater than 10 J/cm², irradiance less than 25 mW/cm², treatment durations exceeding two minutes, and more than six treatment sessions were associated with a beneficial effect in reducing orthodontically induced inflammatory root resorption. Limitations include the small number of included studies ($n=8$) and limited total sample size of 185 participants, heterogeneity across studies, the absence of standardized PBM protocols, and insufficient long-term follow-up data.

LLLT has been studied in RCTs for use in indications such as treatment of venous leg ulcers,^[133] perineal pain after episiotomy,^[152] chronic periodontitis,^[153] sternotomy healing,^[154] and improvement of visual acuity in amblyopia.^[155] A SR of active-control clinical trials (some lacking randomization to treatment) has also been published on the use of LLLT for treatment of hypertrophic scars.^[156] A SR of LLLT in the management of tinnitus evaluated ten RCTs and concluded the effectiveness of the technology was not established and adequately powered RCTs with longer-term outcomes were needed.^[157] A SR evaluating studies of LLLT for acceleration of orthodontic tooth movement concluded that further studies are needed to overcome limitations resulting from heterogeneity among study designs.^[158] Before this evidence can be used to make determinations about treatment benefit in this indications, all individual studies require replication with one or more subsequent RCTs to validate any

findings of treatment benefit.^[133, 152, 153, 155] Where present evidence lacks placebo control,^[133, 153, 156] any such replication should include comparison with sham.

Section Summary

Published studies on the use of PBM for other indications, including orthodontically induced inflammatory root resorption, venous leg ulcers, perineal pain after episiotomy, chronic periodontitis, tinnitus, orthodontic tooth movement, and improvement of visual acuity in amblyopia, have not demonstrated consistent findings of improved outcomes. These inconsistent findings are likely due to methodological limitations such as small sample sizes, heterogeneity across study designs, absence of standardized protocols, and lack of adequate placebo controls. Available evidence is therefore insufficient to make conclusions about the effectiveness of PBM across these indications.

LASER ACUPUNCTURE (LA)

HEADACHE

Ebneshahidi (2005) performed a single-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of 50 patients with chronic tension headache and reported that laser acupuncture using a LLLT device may provide benefit over placebo.^[159] The study was small and the acupuncturists administering the true or sham treatments as well as the assessors were aware of the allocation and thus could have positively influenced the laser acupuncture group. In addition, the baseline measures were different from the subsequent measurements performed in follow-up. The results from this small study need to be validated in a larger, randomized, double-blind clinical trial.

A trial of laser acupuncture on 43 children with both migraine and tension headaches provided highly individualized treatment and additional therapies which do not permit conclusions regarding the independent effects of laser treatment.^[160]

LOW BACK PAIN

Yang (2023) published a RCT of laser acupuncture for low back pain in nurses in China.^[161] Seventy-six nurses were randomized to have low-level laser acupuncture combined with auricular acupressure or sham acupuncture without laser energy output. Outcome measures were pain using the Brief Pain Inventory and quality of life measured with the Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire. Pain was measured at 2.4, and 8 weeks after intervention, and significant differences were seen in favor of laser acupuncture at each time-point. Quality of life was also better in the treatment group at weeks 4 and 8. Participants were similar in their usage of pain medication and muscle relaxants but the study results do not account for medication usage.

Cheng (2022) performed an RCT comparing laser acupuncture to usual care in post-partum women with low back pain.^[162] The study included 106 women and the treatment group had 10 sessions of laser acupuncture. Laser acupuncture was associated with significantly lower pain ($p<0.001$), fewer limitations of daily activities ($p<0.001$) and physical activities ($p<0.001$) and less perceived stress ($p=0.001$). Salivary cortisol levels were also lower in the treatment group ($p=0.02$). It is not known if the participants also used medication for low back pain.

Glazov (2014) assessed the effect of infrared LA for reducing pain and disability in treatment of chronic low back pain (LBP).^[163] The double-blind sham laser controlled trial included 144

adults with chronic non-specific LBP. Participants were followed-up at one and six weeks, and six and 12 months post-treatment. The analysis showed no difference between sham and the laser groups at six weeks for pain or disability. There was a significant reduction in mean pain and disability in all groups at six weeks ($p < 0.005$); Numerical Pain Rating Scale (NPRS): sham (-1.5, 95% CI -2.1 to -0.8), low dose (-1.3, 95% CI -2.0 to -0.8), high dose (-1.1, 95% CI -1.7 to -0.5). ODI: sham (-4.0, 95% CI -7.1 to -1.0), low dose (-4.1, 95% CI -6.7 to -1.5), high dose (-2.6, 95% CI -5.7 to 0.5). All secondary outcomes also showed clinical improvement over time but with no differences between groups. The authors concluded that laser acupuncture using energy density range (0-4 J/cm²) for the treatment of chronic non-specific LBP resulted in clinical improvement unrelated to laser stimulation.

A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial by Shin (2015) evaluated laser acupuncture for low back pain.^[164] Study participants were randomly assigned to either the laser acupuncture group ($n = 28$) or the sham laser acupuncture group ($n = 28$). The study only lasted for one week and included three sessions. There were no significant differences in any of the measured outcomes.

OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL PAIN

Kamau (2026) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the effectiveness and safety of LA for pain, function, and mobility in patients with knee osteoarthritis (KOA),^[165] comparing LA against sham, placebo, electroacupuncture, or standard care across major databases. Thirteen RCTs encompassing 611 participants were included, with outcomes measured across multiple pain scales (VAS, WOMAC-Pain, NPRS), functional assessment (WOMAC-Function), and range of motion (knee flexion). Meta-analysis results indicated that LA did not produce statistically significant improvements in WOMAC pain (SMD=0.04; 95% CI -0.36 to 0.45), pain VAS (SMD=0.12; 95% CI -0.91 to 1.15), or NPRS (SMD=-0.23; 95% CI -0.58 to 0.12). Functional outcomes showed a nonsignificant trend toward improvement (SMD=-0.32; 95% CI -0.94 to 0.30), and knee flexion outcomes were similarly nonsignificant (SMD=0.10; 95% CI -0.39 to 0.59). Funnel plots did not suggest marked publication bias across included studies. Limitations include heterogeneity across studies, dosage protocols, and acupoint selection, the moderate total sample size of 611 participants across 13 trials, the inability to draw conclusions about optimal LA parameters due to inconsistent treatment protocols, and the absence of sufficient data to conduct meaningful subgroup analyses that could identify patient populations most likely to benefit from LA treatment.

Mota (2024) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs to determine the effectiveness of LA on pain due to TMJ.^[166] Five studies were included, and high risk of bias was noted. Compared to counseling, occlusal splint (OS) (-2.47; [CI 95% -3.64, -1.30]) and PT (-2.64; [CI 95% -3.94, -1.34]) were associated with reduced pain intensity in people with TMJ. Using a random effects model, LA ranked third in effectiveness, behind OS and PT when compared to counseling (-0.42; CI 95% -1.98; 1.13]). The authors concluded that there is not enough evidence to support the use of LA to treat pain from TMJ.

Da Silva Mira (2024) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of the use of LLLT to acupuncture points to treat TMJ.^[167] Seven studies were included that involved 275 participants. Three studies were placebo-controlled RCTs. The included studies had low to moderate heterogeneity. Compared to a control group, LLLT at acupoints reduced spontaneous pain ($p < 0.0001$). The increase in mouth opening was statistically significantly improved after LLLT application ($p = 0.002$). However, the studies were inconsistent in the

density and dose of laser irradiation, as well as irradiation time. The authors note the importance of determining the irradiation parameters for safe and effective delivery of LLLT at acupuncture points.

Han (2024) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of laser acupuncture (LA) use for knee osteoarthritis.^[168] Twenty-five RCTs involving 2075 participants were included. Comparators to LA included for the meta-analysis were sham treatment, LLLT without acupuncture, LA plus acupuncture compared to LA alone, acupuncture without LLLT. The authors concluded that LA is “more or less effective” for osteoarthritis, and its overall efficacy is similar to LLLT. However, some studies found LA superior to acupuncture alone. The authors noted barriers to outcome comparisons included variability in disease staging and laser parameters, as well as selection of acupoints; and called for standardization of participant selection and LA interventions in future research.

Huang (2022) published a single-blind, placebo-controlled RCT that randomized 82 patients who had total knee arthroplasty (TKA) to receive post-operative laser acupuncture or placebo acupuncture.^[169] The laser acupuncture group had less pain at hours 10-72 post surgery ($p<0.05$) and less morphine consumption at hours 48 and 72 ($p<0.05$).

A sham-controlled study by Kibar (2017) randomized 73 patients with subacromial impingement syndrome.^[170] At baseline and after 15 sessions of laser or sham treatment, pain (VAS), range of motion, and functional status were assessed. All outcomes showed significantly more improvement in laser acupuncture group compared with the sham group.

Fleckenstein (2016) reported results of a five-arm RCT comparing needle acupuncture, laser acupuncture, sham needle acupuncture, sham laser acupuncture, and no intervention for delayed-onset muscle soreness.^[171] There were 60 participants that had delayed-onset muscle soreness induced in the study. None of the interventions were found to improve the outcomes assessed: pain intensity, pain threshold, or maximum isometric voluntary force.

Two studies reported no significant difference between patients treated with active vs. sham laser acupuncture for the treatment of whiplash injury^[172] and knee osteoarthritis^[173]. A third RCT^[174] assessed the effectiveness of acupuncture plus stretching to reduce pain and improve range of motion in patients afflicted by cervical myofascial pain syndrome ($n=19$). Health outcomes were measured immediately after treatment and up to 30 minutes following treatment. Patients had significantly increased range of motion after the application of acupuncture and stretching compared with sham placebo ($p<0.05$). However, the study was limited by lack of generalizability to wider patient populations.

Results of laser acupuncture are conflicting for knee osteoarthritis. An RCT evaluated laser acupuncture for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis among older adults.^[175] Results showed that neither laser nor needle acupuncture resulted in treatment benefits compared with sham therapy in this patient population, and study authors do not recommend its use. Another small RCT^[176] showed that short-term application of LLLT to specific acupuncture points in association with exercise and advice is effective at significantly reducing pain and improving quality of life (QOL) in patients with knee osteoarthritis. Both studies evaluated small patient populations and lacked statistical power. Results were generally not generalizable to wider patient populations.

WEIGHT LOSS

In a study by Tseng (2016), 52 obese subjects were randomly assigned to either the laser acupuncture group or the sham group.^[177] Treatment lasted for eight weeks and then after a two-week washout period, the opposite treatment. The authors concluded that laser acupuncture improved anthropometric measurements and appetite sensations in obese subjects. This was a small study with methodological limitations. A similar, single-blind study by Hung (2016) randomized 66 postpartum patients to laser acupuncture or sham for weight loss.^[178] Treatment was performed five times per week for 12 sessions. There were no significant differences between groups for any of the outcomes measured, including body mass index and body fat percentage.

A study by El-Mekawy (2015) evaluated laser acupuncture combined with a diet and exercise intervention for metabolic syndrome.^[179] Twenty-eight obese, post-menopausal women were randomly assigned and followed for 12 weeks. Both groups showed a significant decrease in the anthropometric and metabolic parameters. The laser acupuncture group showed a significantly greater decrease in the waist and hip circumferences, cholesterol, and insulin levels compared to the control group.

OTHER INDICATIONS

Shirnasab (2026) conducted a double-blind randomized clinical trial evaluating the efficacy of photobiomodulation (PBM) therapy applied at acupuncture points on pain, maximum mouth opening, and quality of life (QOL) in patients with TMDs.^[180] Twenty patients with TMD referred to a facial pain clinic were randomly assigned to either a treatment group (n=10) receiving low-power PBM for three minutes at 10 acupuncture points across 10 sessions delivered twice weekly, or a placebo group (n=10) receiving only the guiding light of the device at the same points. Results indicated differences between treatment and placebo groups for both pain relief and maximum mouth opening ($p < 0.05$, Mann-Whitney). No significant difference was observed between groups for QOL as measured by the Oral Health Impact Profile-14, while the Short Form Health Survey-36 demonstrated significant improvements in the physical health subscale in the treatment group. Limitations include the small sample size, the short treatment duration, the absence of follow-up assessments beyond the end of treatment, and the restriction to a single clinical site.

Hasanin (2025) conducted a randomized controlled trial investigating the effects of low-level laser biostimulation at neurogenic-sensitized acupoints on pelvic pain perception, pain intensity, and quality of life in 36 women with chronic pelvic pain (CPP) resulting from pelvic inflammatory disease (PID).^[181] Participants were randomly divided into two equal groups, with both groups receiving non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and the study group additionally receiving LLLT at sensitized acupoints for 6 weeks. Outcomes were assessed before and after intervention using the Visual Analog Scale for pain (VAS-P), a pressure algometer for Pressure Pain Thresholds (PPT), and the 12-item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-12) for quality of life. Results indicated significant interaction effects of treatment and time ($F = 38.34$, $p = 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.96$) and significant main effects of both treatment ($F = 9.74$, $p = 0.001$) and time ($F = 110.1$, $p = 0.001$). Post-treatment, the study group demonstrated greater reductions in VAS scores ($MD = -1.00$, $p = 0.001$), improvements in Short Form Health Survey-12 scores ($MD = 9.11$, $p = 0.001$), and increased PPT values at multiple anatomical points ($p = 0.001-0.01$) compared to the control group. Limitations include the small sample size, the restriction to a single etiology of CPP, the relatively short intervention and follow-up period, the absence of blinding, and the lack of a control group.

Abd El Azeem (2023) conducted an RCT comparing laser acupuncture along with behavioral therapy and dietary modification to a laxative combined with behavioral therapy and dietary modification in 40 children with chronic constipation.^[182] The therapy was over four weeks with four-month follow-up. Both groups had higher median frequency of bowel movements from baseline, but the laser acupuncture group was higher than the control group both after treatment ($p=0.01$) and at three months ($p=0.03$). Laser acupuncture was also associated with improved stool consistency after treatment compared to the laxative group ($p=0.03$). The authors noted that prior research has shown conflicting results and more study is needed to know whether laser acupuncture is superior to other treatments for chronic constipation in children.

Laser acupuncture with usual vitamin supplementation was studied in post-menopausal women by Hassan (2023) to determine if laser acupuncture is an effective therapy for pain and osteoporosis.^[183] Sixty-eight women were randomized to receive laser acupuncture with usual vitamin therapy (calcium and vitamin D3) or vitamin therapy alone. Both groups showed increased bone density after treatment. The laser acupuncture group had a significantly higher increase in bone density and improved pain scores than the vitamin group alone ($p<0.0001$). The study is limited by short follow-up and small sample size.

Kannon (2022) published a systematic review and meta-analysis on the use of acupuncture in children for the treatment of nocturnal enuresis.^[184] Thirteen studies involving 890 participants were included and six studies used laser acupuncture. Only one study was deemed to have low risk of bias. Meta-analysis did not find significant differences in studies that compared laser acupuncture to sham acupuncture or in studies comparing laser acupuncture to pharmacologic intervention.

Juan (2019) published the results of a RCT on efficacy of laser acupuncture in patients with idiopathic mild-to-moderate carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS).^[185] Eighty-four consecutive patients were randomly divided into the treatment arm, treated once a day, five times a week for four weeks ($n = 43$) or the sham arm using the same device and protocol with the laser acupuncture device switched off ($n = 41$). Patients completed the Global Symptom Score (GSS) at baseline and two and four weeks later. Nerve conduction studies (NCSs) were performed at baseline and repeated at the end of the study. There was a significantly greater reduction in GSS in the treatment group than in the placebo group at week two (-9.30 ± 4.94 vs. -2.29 ± 4.27 , respectively, $p < 0.01$) and at week four (-10.67 ± 5.98 vs. -2.90 ± 5.61 , respectively, $p < 0.01$). However, no significant difference in NCS between the two groups was found. No long-term outcomes were reported.

Laser acupuncture was evaluated as a treatment for pain from kidney biopsy in mainly pediatric patients in a double-blind trial by Oates (2017).^[186] A total of 69 treatments were given to patients aged 7 to 26 years: 33 low-level laser applications to 10 acupuncture points and 36 low-level laser applications to sham points. There were significant differences in favor to the acupuncture group for changes pain scores (0.044), heart rate ($p=0.043$), and respiratory rate ($p=0.045$), but the clinical significance of these differences is uncertain.

Alsharnoubi (2017) reported the results of a trial comparing laser acupuncture to treatment with desmopressin for nocturnal enuresis in children.^[187] The 45 children in the study were randomized to receive either laser acupuncture, desmopressin acetate, or a combination of both treatments. Laser treatments were given twice a week for three months, and desmopressin (60µg) was given daily for three months. All patients were provided with

behavioral therapy in addition to other treatments. There was a significantly higher rate of complete recovery in the acupuncture group (73.3%) compared with the desmopressin alone group (20.0%), or the combination therapy group (13.3%). The authors explained the surprisingly low cure rate in the combination group by stating that only seven of the 15 children in this group actually received the complete treatment course, but there was no mention of the compliance rate in the other groups.

Dabbous (2016) evaluated low-level laser on acupuncture points compared to conventional physiotherapy in hemiplegic spastic cerebral palsy children.^[188] Forty spastic hemiplegic cerebral palsy children aged one to four years were randomly divided into control (n=20) and study groups (n=20). The low-level laser group had significantly better muscle tone (wrist flexors and plantar flexors) but there was no difference for range of motion. The authors concluded that laser acupuncture has a beneficial effect on reducing spasticity in spastic cerebral palsy, however there was no blinding in the study, which indicates significant potential for bias.

A study by Lee (2016) compared the effects of laser acupuncture, manual acupuncture, and electromagnetic field stimulation on heart rate variability in 56 patients.^[189] Patients were randomized to four groups: the three treatment groups and a control group that received no stimulation. Heart rate variability was calculated from electrocardiogram (ECG) and assigned to high frequency (HF: 0.15 to 0.4 Hz), low frequency (LF: 0.04 to 0.15 Hz) domains. The LF and LF/HF ratio were found to be higher in the laser acupuncture group and lower in the manual acupuncture and electromagnetic stimulation groups, compared to controls, while this pattern was reversed for variation in the HF domain. The authors attribute these findings to differential stimulation of the parasympathetic and sympathetic nervous systems, but did not offer a potential mechanism for these differences.

Section Summary

The current evidence base does not permit conclusions concerning the impact of laser acupuncture on health outcomes for any of these conditions. The evidence is limited by small sample size and short-term follow-up and is significantly heterogeneous.

PRACTICE GUIDELINE SUMMARY

ACADEMY OF ORTHOPAEDIC PHYSICAL THERAPY

In 2024, the Academy of Orthopaedic Physical Therapy (AOPT) of the American Physical Therapy Association published a guideline on Achilles pain, Stiffness, and Muscle Power Deficits.^[190] The guideline indicates “Clinicians should not use low-level laser therapy for individuals with midportion Achilles tendinopathy.” The evidence was rated a “C” recommendation meaning it was weak.

NORTH AMERICAN SPINE SOCIETY

In 2020, the North American Spine Society published a guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain.^[191] The guideline was based on a systematic review of the literature to address key clinical questions regarding the diagnosis and treatment of adults with nonspecific low back pain and included the following regarding laser therapy:

Guideline Recommendation (Grade of Recommendation)

- It is suggested that the combination of laser therapy (low-level or high-level) with exercise provides better short-term relief of pain than either exercise or laser therapy alone. (B=Fair evidence [Level II or III studies with consistent findings] for or against recommending intervention)
- There is conflicting evidence that the combination of laser therapy with exercise provides better short-term improvement in function compared to exercise or laser therapy alone. (I=Insufficient or conflicting evidence not allowing a recommendation for or against intervention.)
- It is suggested that there is no short-term benefit of laser therapy (low-level or high-level) when compared with exercise alone. (B=Fair evidence [Level II or III studies with consistent findings] for or against recommending intervention)

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEONS (AAOS)

The AAOS published an updated guideline on the management of carpal tunnel syndrome in 2024 that includes laser therapy as a non-operative treatment that does not improve long-term outcomes for carpal tunnel syndrome.^[192] The quality of evidence was rated “high.”

The AAOS 2016 clinical practice guideline on the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome rated laser therapy as having “limited evidence.”^[193] The guidelines state: “limited evidence supports that laser therapy might be effective compared to placebo.”

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS (ACP)

In 2020, the ACP and American Academy of Family Physicians published joint guidelines on the nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic management of acute pain from non-low back, musculoskeletal injuries in adults.^[194] The guideline recommends interventions that improved at least two outcomes related to pain and function. The guideline notes that laser therapy improved only one outcome (symptom relief) and with low-certainty evidence.

The 2017 ACP clinical practice guideline on noninvasive treatments for acute, subacute, and chronic low back pain list LLLT among a number of potentially recommended treatments for patients with chronic low back pain based on low-quality evidence.^[195]

AMERICAN PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSOCIATION (APTA)

In 2023, the APTA published clinical practice guidelines for plantar fasciitis that state, “Clinicians should use low-level laser therapy as a part of a rehabilitation program in those with acute or chronic plantar fasciitis to decrease pain in the short term;” Grade B (moderate evidence).^[196]

In 2018, the American Physical Therapy Association published an updated guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of Achilles tendinitis.^[197] The use of LLLT was given a level D recommendation, meaning that no recommendation could be made due to contradictory evidence.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE (ACOEM)

- In recommendations regarding treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) published in 2011, the ACOEM recommended against the use of LLLT for CTS.^[198] This

recommendation was based upon Level C evidence (at least intermediate evidence that harms and costs exceed benefits based on limited evidence”).

- In a 2009 update to existing guidelines on disorders other than CTS of the hand, wrist, and forearm, the ACOEM recommended against the use of LLLT for treatment of hand or finger osteoarthritis based upon a Level B recommendation (“moderately not recommended,” based upon “intermediate evidence that the intervention is ineffective, or that harms or costs outweigh benefits”).^[199]

MUCOSITIS PREVENTION GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT GROUP

In 2021, the Clinical Practice Guideline for the Prevention of Oral and Oropharyngeal Mucositis in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant Patients was updated from the 2017 Mucositis Prevention Guideline Development Group.^[200] Regarding PBM, the guideline states:

- Use intraoral photobiomodulation therapy in the red light spectrum (620–750 nm) for pediatric patients undergoing autologous or allogeneic HSCT and for pediatric patients who will receive radiotherapy for head and neck carcinoma (Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence).
- Consider using intraoral photobiomodulation therapy in the red light spectrum (620–750 nm) for pediatric patients who will receive radiotherapy for head and neck cancers other than carcinoma (Conditional recommendation, moderate quality evidence).

MULTINATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPPORTIVE CARE IN CANCER AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF ORAL ONCOLOGY

In 2020, the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer (MASCC) and the International Society of Oral Oncology (ISOO) updated the guidelines on the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy.^[201] The guidelines state:

- The panel recommends the use of intraoral PBM therapy using low-level laser therapy for the prevention of OM in adult patients receiving HSCT conditioned with high-dose CT, with or without TBI, using one of the selected protocols listed in Table 2 (Level of evidence: I).
- The panel recommends the use of intraoral PBM therapy using low-level laser therapy for prevention of OM in adults receiving RT to the H&N (without CT) (Table 2); safety considerations unique to patients with oral cancer should be considered (Level of evidence: II).
- The panel recommends the use of intraoral PBM therapy using low-level laser therapy for the prevention of OM in adults receiving RT-CT for H&N cancer (Table 2); safety considerations unique to patients with oral cancer should be considered (Level of evidence: I).
- For all PBM guidelines, it is recommended that the specific photobiomodulation therapy parameters of the selected protocol will be followed for optimal therapy.

Table 2: Recommended Intraoral Photobiomodulation Therapy Protocols for the Prevention of Oral Mucositis

Cancer Treatment Modality	Wavelength, nm	Power Density (Irradiance), mW/cm ²	Time per Spot, s	Energy Density (Fluence), J/cm ²	Spot Size, cm ²	No. of Sites	Duration
HSCT	632.8	31.25	40	1.0	0.8	18	From the d after cessation of conditioning for 5 d
	650	1000	2	2.0	0.04	54-70	From the first d of conditioning to d +2 post-HSCT (for 7-13 d)
RT	632.8	24	125	3.0	1.00	12	Entire RT course
RT-CT	660	417	10	4.2	0.24	72	Entire RT course
	660	625	10	6.2	0.04	69	Entire RT course

Abbreviations: CT, chemotherapy; HSCT, hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation; RT, radiotherapy.

SUMMARY

Medically Necessary

There is enough research to show that low-level laser therapy (LLLT), with a U.S Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved device, can improve health outcomes for people with an increased risk of oral mucositis due to some cancer treatments and/or hematopoietic cell transplantation. Therefore, LLLT may be considered medically necessary for prevention of oral mucositis in individuals undergoing cancer treatment associated with increased risk of oral mucositis, including chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy, and/or hematopoietic cell transplantation when policy criteria are met.

Investigational

There is not enough research to show that low-level laser therapy (LLLT), including laser acupuncture, can improve health outcomes for individuals that have conditions other than oral mucositis, including but not limited to carpal tunnel syndrome, various musculoskeletal conditions, and wound healing. Therefore, LLLT is investigational when policy criteria are not met.

REFERENCES

1. TEC Assessment 2010. "Low-Level Laser Therapy for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome and Chronic Neck Pain." BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center, Vol. 25, Tab 4.
2. Martimbianco ALC, Ferreira RES, Latorraca COC, et al. Photobiomodulation with low-level laser therapy for treating Achilles tendinopathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil.* 2020;34(6):713-22. PMID: 32204620
3. Javaherian M, Attarbashi Moghaddam B, Bashardoust Tajali S, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy on management of Bell's palsy: a systematic review. *Lasers in medical science.* 2020;35(6):1245-52. PMID: 32318918
4. Ordahan B, Karahan AY. Role of low-level laser therapy added to facial expression exercises in patients with idiopathic facial (Bell's) palsy. *Lasers in medical science.* 2017;32(4):931-36. PMID: 28337563
5. Alayat MS, Elsodany AM, El Fiky AA. Efficacy of high and low level laser therapy in the treatment of Bell's palsy: a randomized double blind placebo-controlled trial. *Lasers in medical science.* 2014;29(1):335-42. PMID: 23709010
6. Lauxen AC, Machado DR, Pereira DS, et al. Photobiomodulation in carpal tunnel syndrome with pain, strength, and functionality analysis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science.* 2025;40(1):12. PMID: 39776290
7. Bekhet AH, Ragab B, Abushouk AI, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy in carpal tunnel syndrome management: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science.* 2017. PMID: 28580494
8. Burger M, Kriel R, Damon A, et al. The effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on pain, self-reported hand function, and grip strength compared to placebo or "sham" treatment for adults with carpal tunnel syndrome: A systematic review. *Physiotherapy theory and practice.* 2017;33(3):184-97. PMID: 28272964
9. Rankin IA, Sargeant H, Rehman H, et al. Low-level laser therapy for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2017(8). PMID: CD012765
10. Li ZJ, Wang Y, Zhang HF, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser on carpal tunnel syndrome: A meta-analysis of previously reported randomized trials. *Medicine.* 2016;95(31):e4424. PMID: 27495063
11. Badil Guloglu S, Bilgilişoy Filiz M, Kilic KK, et al. Treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome by low-level laser therapy versus corticosteroid injection: a randomized, prospective clinical study. *Lasers in medical science.* 2022;37(4):2227-37. PMID: 35022874
12. Barbosa RI, Fonseca MC, Rodrigues EK, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy associated to orthoses for patients with carpal tunnel syndrome: A randomized single-blinded controlled trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation.* 2015. PMID: 26444330
13. Gross AR, Dziengo S, Boers O, et al. Low Level Laser Therapy (LLLT) for Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression. *Open Orthop J.* 2013;7:396-419. PMID: 24155802
14. Kadhim-Saleh A, Maganti H, Ghert M, et al. Is low-level laser therapy in relieving neck pain effective? Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rheumatology international.* 2013. PMID: 23579335
15. Konstantinovic LM, Cutovic MR, Milovanovic AN, et al. Low-level laser therapy for acute neck pain with radiculopathy: a double-blind placebo-controlled randomized study. *Pain Med.* 2010;11(8):1169-78. PMID: 20704667
16. Bjordal JM, Lopes-Martins RA, Joensen J, et al. A systematic review with procedural assessments and meta-analysis of low level laser therapy in lateral elbow tendinopathy (tennis elbow). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2008;9:75. PMID: 18510742

17. Yeh SW, Hong CH, Shih MC, et al. Low-Level Laser Therapy for Fibromyalgia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Pain physician*. 2019;22(3):241-54. PMID: 31151332
18. Honda Y, Sakamoto J, Hamaue Y, et al. Effects of Physical-Agent Pain Relief Modalities for Fibromyalgia Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Pain research & management*. 2018;2018:2930632. PMID: 30402199
19. Chen YJ, Liao CD, Hong JP, et al. Effects of laser therapy on chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Rehabil*. 2022;36(3):289-302. PMID: 34757882
20. Glazov G, Yelland M, Emery J. Low-level laser therapy for chronic non-specific low back pain: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Acupunct Med*. 2016;34(5):328-41. PMID: 27207675
21. Huang Z, Ma J, Chen J, et al. The effectiveness of low-level laser therapy for nonspecific chronic low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arthritis research & therapy*. 2015;17:360. PMID: 26667480
22. Yousefi-Nooraie R, Schonstein E, Heidari K, et al. Low level laser therapy for nonspecific low-back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008(2):CD005107. PMID: 18425909
23. Chou R, Huffman LH. Nonpharmacologic therapies for acute and chronic low back pain: a review of the evidence for an American Pain Society/American College of Physicians clinical practice guideline. *Ann Intern Med*. 2007;147(7):492-504. PMID: 17909210
24. Taradaj J, Rajfur K, Rajfur J, et al. Effect of laser treatment on postural control parameters in patients with chronic nonspecific low back pain: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Brazilian journal of medical and biological research = Revista brasileira de pesquisas medicas e biologicas*. 2019;52(12):e8474. PMID: 31778436
25. Koldas Dogan S, Ay S, Evcik D. The effects of two different low level laser therapies in the treatment of patients with chronic low back pain: A double-blinded randomized clinical trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2017;30(2):235-40. PMID: 27472858
26. Chiu ST, Lai UH, Huang YC, et al. Effect of various photobiomodulation regimens on breast cancer-related lymphedema: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science*. 2023;39(1):11. PMID: 38129368
27. Chen HY, Tsai HH, Tam KW, et al. Effects of photobiomodulation therapy on breast cancer-related lymphoedema: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2019;47:102200. PMID: 31780036
28. Smoot B, Chiavola-Larson L, Lee J, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on pain and swelling in women with breast cancer-related lymphedema: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of cancer survivorship : research and practice*. 2015;9(2):287-304. PMID: 25432632
29. Kozanoglu E, Gokcen N, Basaran S, et al. Long-Term Effectiveness of Combined Intermittent Pneumatic Compression Plus Low-Level Laser Therapy in Patients with Postmastectomy Lymphedema: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Lymphat Res Biol*. 2022;20(2):175-84. PMID: 33826415
30. Ahmed Omar MT, Abd-El-Gayed Ebid A, El Morsy AM. Treatment of post-mastectomy lymphedema with laser therapy: double blind placebo control randomized study. *The Journal of surgical research*. 2011;165(1):82-90. PMID: 20538293

31. Rassi TNO, Barbosa LM, Pereira S, et al. Photobiomodulation efficacy in age-related macular degeneration: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Int J Retina Vitreous*. 2024;10(1):54. PMID: 39148091
32. Boyer D, Hu A, Warrow D, et al. LIGHTSITE III: 13-Month Efficacy and Safety Evaluation of Multiwavelength Photobiomodulation in Nonexudative (Dry) Age-Related Macular Degeneration Using the Lumithera Valeda Light Delivery System. *Retina*. 2024;44(3):487-97. PMID: 37972955
33. Jaffe GJ, Boyer D, Hu A, et al. Long-Term Efficacy and Safety of Photobiomodulation in Dry Age-Related Macular Degeneration (Lightsite Iii: 24-Month Analysis). *Retina*. 2026;46(5):783-95. PMID: 41791029
34. Winters M, Eskes M, Weir A, et al. Treatment of medial tibial stress syndrome: a systematic review. *Sports Med*. 2013;43(12):1315-33. PMID: 23979968
35. Malliaropoulos N, Kiritsi O, Tsitas K, et al. Low-level laser therapy in meniscal pathology: a double-blinded placebo-controlled trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2013;28(4):1183-8. PMID: 23093133
36. Lai CC, Chen SY, Tu YK, et al. Effectiveness of low level laser therapy versus cryotherapy in cancer patients with oral mucositis: Systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2021;160:103276. PMID: 33716203
37. Peng J, Shi Y, Wang J, et al. Low-level laser therapy in the prevention and treatment of oral mucositis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*. 2020;130(4):387-97 e9. PMID: 32624448
38. Anschau F, Webster J, Capra MEZ, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser for treatment of cancer oral mucositis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science*. 2019;34:1053-62. PMID: 30729351
39. Lalla RV, Bowen J, Barasch A, et al. MASCC/ISOO clinical practice guidelines for the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy. *Cancer*. 2014;120(10):1453-61. PMID: 24615748
40. Schubert MM, Eduardo FP, Guthrie KA, et al. A phase III randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trial to determine the efficacy of low level laser therapy for the prevention of oral mucositis in patients undergoing hematopoietic cell transplantation. *Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2007;15(10):1145-54. PMID: 17393191
41. Figueiredo AL, Lins L, Cattony AC, et al. Laser therapy in the control of oral mucositis: a meta-analysis. *Rev Assoc Med Bras*. 2013;59(5):467-74. PMID: 24119379
42. Oberoi S, Zamperlini-Netto G, Beyene J, et al. Effect of prophylactic low level laser therapy on oral mucositis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2014;9(9):e107418. PMID: 25198431
43. de Carvalho ESRM, Mendes FM, Degasperri GR, et al. Photobiomodulation for the management of xerostomia and oral mucositis in patients with cancer: a randomized clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2023;38(1):101. PMID: 37060370
44. Legoute F, Bensadoun RJ, Seegers V, et al. Low-level laser therapy in treatment of chemoradiotherapy-induced mucositis in head and neck cancer: results of a randomised, triple blind, multicentre phase III trial. *Radiat Oncol*. 2019;14:83. PMID: 31118057
45. Gautam AP, Fernandes DJ, Vidyasagar MS, et al. Low level laser therapy for concurrent chemoradiotherapy induced oral mucositis in head and neck cancer patients - a triple blinded randomized controlled trial. *Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology*. 2012;104(3):349-54. PMID: 22884841

46. Gautam AP, Fernandes DJ, Vidyasagar MS, et al. Low level helium neon laser therapy for chemoradiotherapy induced oral mucositis in oral cancer patients - a randomized controlled trial. *Oral oncology*. 2012;48(9):893-7. PMID: 22502814
47. Gautam AP, Fernandes DJ, Vidyasagar MS, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on patient reported measures of oral mucositis and quality of life in head and neck cancer patients receiving chemoradiotherapy--a randomized controlled trial. *Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2013;21(5):1421-8. PMID: 23224689
48. Gautam AP, Fernandes DJ, Vidyasagar MS, et al. Low level laser therapy against radiation induced oral mucositis in elderly head and neck cancer patients-a randomized placebo controlled trial. *Journal of photochemistry and photobiology B, Biology*. 2015;144:51-6. PMID: 25704314
49. Oton-Leite AF, Correa de Castro AC, Morais MO, et al. Effect of intraoral low-level laser therapy on quality of life of patients with head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy. *Head & neck*. 2012;34(3):398-404. PMID: 21472883
50. Ferreira B, da Motta Silveira FM, de Orange FA. Low-level laser therapy prevents severe oral mucositis in patients submitted to hematopoietic stem cell transplantation: a randomized clinical trial. *Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2016;24:1035-42. PMID: 26248655
51. Altuhafy M, Ahmed S, Jabr L, et al. Effectiveness of photobiomodulation and orofacial myofunctional therapy in orofacial pain disorders. A systematic review of randomized control trials. *Lasers in medical science*. 2024;39(1):127. PMID: 38722392
52. Ibarra AMC, Biasotto-Gonzalez DA, Kohatsu EYI, et al. Photobiomodulation on trigeminal neuralgia: systematic review. *Lasers in medical science*. 2021;36(4):715-22. PMID: 33219445
53. de Pedro M, Lopez-Pintor RM, de la Hoz-Aizpurua JL, et al. Efficacy of Low-Level Laser Therapy for the Therapeutic Management of Neuropathic Orofacial Pain: A Systematic Review. *Journal of oral & facial pain and headache*. 2020;34(1):13-30. PMID: 31339967
54. Tengrungsun T, Mitriattanakul S, Buranaprasertsuk P, et al. Is low level laser effective for the treatment of orofacial pain?: A systematic review. *Cranio*. 2012;30(4):280-5. PMID: 23156969
55. Manca A, Limonta E, Pilurzi G, et al. Ultrasound and Laser as Stand-Alone Therapies for Myofascial Trigger Points: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. *Physiotherapy research international : the journal for researchers and clinicians in physical therapy*. 2014. PMID: 24382836
56. Magri LV, Carvalho VA, Rodrigues FC, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on pain intensity, pressure pain threshold, and SF-MPQ indexes of women with myofascial pain. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(2):419-28. PMID: 28054261
57. de Moraes Maia ML, Ribeiro MA, Maia LG, et al. Evaluation of low-level laser therapy effectiveness on the pain and masticatory performance of patients with myofascial pain. *Lasers in medical science*. 2012. PMID: 23143142
58. He WL, Li CJ, Liu ZP, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy in the management of orthodontic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science*. 2013;28(6):1581-9. PMID: 23001570
59. Owayda AM, Hajeer MY, Al-Sabbagh R, et al. A randomized controlled trial on the effectiveness of low-level laser therapy versus paracetamol-caffeine for pain control during overall orthodontic treatment. *Sci Rep*. 2025;15(1):30839. PMID: 40847180
60. Owayda AM, Hajeer MY, Murad RMT, et al. The efficacy of low-level laser therapy versus paracetamol-caffeine in controlling orthodontic separation pain and changes in

- the oral-health-related quality of life in Class I malocclusions: A 3-arm, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *J World Fed Orthod*. 2022;11(3):75-82. PMID: 35110003
61. Celebi F, Turk T, Bicakci AA. Effects of low-level laser therapy and mechanical vibration on orthodontic pain caused by initial archwire. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics : official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics*. 2019;156(1):87-93. PMID: 31256846
 62. Lo Giudice A, Nucera R, Perillo L, et al. Is Low-Level Laser Therapy an Effective Method to Alleviate Pain Induced by Active Orthodontic Alignment Archwire? A Randomized Clinical Trial. *The journal of evidence-based dental practice*. 2019;19(1):71-78. PMID: 30926104
 63. Martins IP, Martins RP, Caldas S, et al. Low-level laser therapy (830 nm) on orthodontic pain: blinded randomized clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2019;34:281-86. PMID: 29998356
 64. AlSayed Hasan MMA, Sultan K, Hamadah O. Evaluating low-level laser therapy effect on reducing orthodontic pain using two laser energy values: a split-mouth randomized placebo-controlled trial. *European journal of orthodontics*. 2017. PMID: 28472453
 65. Oliveira S, Andrade R, Valente C, et al. Effectiveness of Photobiomodulation in Reducing Pain and Disability in Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review With Meta-Analysis. *Physical therapy*. 2024;104(8). PMID: 38775202
 66. Malik S, Sharma S, Dutta N, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy plus exercise therapy on pain, range of motion, muscle strength, and function in knee osteoarthritis - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Somatosens Mot Res*. 2023;40(1):8-24. PMID: 36576096
 67. Huang Z, Chen J, Ma J, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage / OARS, Osteoarthritis Research Society*. 2015;23(9):1437-44. PMID: 25914044
 68. Bjordal JM, Johnson MI, Lopes-Martins RA, et al. Short-term efficacy of physical interventions in osteoarthritic knee pain. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised placebo-controlled trials. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2007;8:51. PMID: 17587446
 69. Dos Santos Maciel T, Correa Lima Chamy N, Dos Santos Maciel M, et al. Effect Of Photobiomodulation (Low-Level Laser Therapy) In Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2025;40(1):293. PMID: 40545487
 70. Elboim-Gabyzon M, Nahhas F. Laser therapy versus pulsed electromagnetic field therapy as treatment modalities for early knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr*. 2023;23(1):144. PMID: 36922781
 71. de Matos Brunelli Braghin R, Libardi EC, Junqueira C, et al. The effect of low-level laser therapy and physical exercise on pain, stiffness, function, and spatiotemporal gait variables in subjects with bilateral knee osteoarthritis: a blind randomized clinical trial. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2019;41(26):3165-72. PMID: 30324827
 72. S GN, Kamal W, George J, et al. Radiological and biochemical effects (CTX-II, MMP-3, 8, and 13) of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) in chronic osteoarthritis in Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(2):297-303. PMID: 27913970
 73. Butrick CW, Lamvu G. Transvaginal Photobiomodulation Improves Pain in Women with Pelvic Muscle Tenderness and Interstitial Cystitis/Bladder Pain Syndrome: A Preliminary Observational Study. *Urology*. 2022;170:14-20. PMID: 36116559

74. Kohli N, Jarnagin B, StoeHR AR, et al. An observational cohort study of pelvic floor photobiomodulation for treatment of chronic pelvic pain. *J Comp Eff Res*. 2021;10(17):1291-99. PMID: 34490787
75. Ferlito JV, Silva CF, Almeida JC, et al. Effects of photobiomodulation therapy (PBMT) on the management of pain intensity and disability in plantar fasciitis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science*. 2023;38(1):163. PMID: 37464155
76. Guimarães JS, Arcanjo FL, Leporace G, et al. Effects of therapeutic interventions on pain due to plantar fasciitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil*. 2023;37(6):727-46. PMID: 36571559
77. Naterstad IF, Joensen J, Bjordal JM, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy in patients with lower extremity tendinopathy or plantar fasciitis: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(9):e059479. PMID: 36171024
78. Guimaraes JS, Arcanjo FL, Leporace G, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on pain and disability in patients with plantar fasciitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Musculoskelet Sci Pract*. 2022;57:102478. PMID: 34847470
79. Wang W, Jiang W, Tang C, et al. Clinical efficacy of low-level laser therapy in plantar fasciitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*. 2019;98:e14088. PMID: 30653125
80. Cinar E, Saxena S, Uygur F. Low-level laser therapy in the management of plantar fasciitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2018;33(5):949-58. PMID: 29273892
81. Cinar E, Saxena S, Uygur F. Combination Therapy Versus Exercise and Orthotic Support in the Management of Pain in Plantar Fasciitis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Foot & ankle international*. 2018;39(4):406-14. PMID: 29327602
82. Macias DM, Coughlin MJ, Zang K, et al. Low-Level Laser Therapy at 635 nm for Treatment of Chronic Plantar Fasciitis: A Placebo-Controlled, Randomized Study. *The Journal of foot and ankle surgery : official publication of the American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons*. 2015;54(5):768-72. PMID: 25769363
83. Kiritsi O, Tsitas K, Malliaropoulos N, et al. Ultrasonographic evaluation of plantar fasciitis after low-level laser therapy: results of a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2010;25(2):275-81. PMID: 19841862
84. Lourinho I, Sousa T, Jardim R, et al. Effects of low-level laser therapy in adults with rheumatoid arthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled trials. *PloS one*. 2023;18(9):e0291345. PMID: 37683021
85. Brosseau L, Robinson V, Wells G. Low level laser therapy (Classes I, II and III) for treating rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2005(4):CD002049. PMID: No PMID Entry
86. Meireles SM, Jones A, Jennings F, et al. Assessment of the effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on the hands of patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a randomized double-blind controlled trial. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2010;29(5):501-9. PMID: 20082104
87. Haslerud S, Magnussen LH, Joensen J, et al. The efficacy of low-level laser therapy for shoulder tendinopathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Physiotherapy research international : the journal for researchers and clinicians in physical therapy*. 2015;20(2):108-25. PMID: 25450903
88. Page MJ, Green S, Kramer S, et al. Electrotherapy modalities for adhesive capsulitis (frozen shoulder). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;10:CD011324. PMID: 25271097
89. Stergioulas A. Low-power laser treatment in patients with frozen shoulder: preliminary results. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2008;26(2):99-105. PMID: 18341417

90. Favejee MM, Huisstede BM, Koes BW. Frozen shoulder: the effectiveness of conservative and surgical interventions--systematic review. *British journal of sports medicine*. 2011;45(1):49-56. PMID: 20647296
91. Tashjian RZ. The effectiveness of nonoperative treatment for frozen shoulder: a systematic review. *Clinical journal of sport medicine : official journal of the Canadian Academy of Sport Medicine*. 2012;22(2):168-9. PMID: 22388345
92. Başaran P, Büyükşireci DE. Comparison of low-level laser therapy versus neuromuscular electrical nerve stimulation at hemiplegic shoulder pain and upper extremity functions. *Lasers in medical science*. 2025;40(1):42. PMID: 39853536
93. Badil Guloglu S. Comparison of low-level laser treatment and extracorporeal shock wave therapy in subacromial impingement syndrome: a randomized, prospective clinical study. *Lasers in medical science*. 2021;36(4):773-81. PMID: 32638239
94. Alfredo PP, Bjordal JM, Junior WS, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy combined with exercise for subacromial impingement syndrome: A randomised controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2021;35(6):851-60. PMID: 33307783
95. Eslamian F, Shakouri SK, Ghojazadeh M, et al. Effects of low-level laser therapy in combination with physiotherapy in the management of rotator cuff tendinitis. *Lasers in medical science*. 2011. PMID: 22052627
96. Bal A, Eksioglu E, Gurcay E, et al. Low-level laser therapy in subacromial impingement syndrome. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2009;27(1):31-6. PMID: 19250050
97. Calis HT, Berberoglu N, Calis M. Are ultrasound, laser and exercise superior to each other in the treatment of subacromial impingement syndrome? A randomized clinical trial. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2011;47:375-80. PMID: 21946399
98. Otadi K, Hadian MR, Olyaei G, et al. The beneficial effects of adding low level laser to ultrasound and exercise in Iranian women with shoulder tendonitis: a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2012;25(1):13-9. PMID: 22398262
99. Yeldan I, Cetin E, Ozdinciler AR. The effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on shoulder function in subacromial impingement syndrome. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2009;31(11):935-40. PMID: 19031167
100. Dogan SK, Ay S, Evcik D. The effectiveness of low laser therapy in subacromial impingement syndrome: a randomized placebo controlled double-blind prospective study. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2010;65(10):1019-22. PMID: 21120304
101. Abrisham SM, Kermani-Alghoraishi M, Ghahramani R, et al. Additive effects of low-level laser therapy with exercise on subacromial syndrome: a randomised, double-blind, controlled trial. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2011;30(10):1341-6. PMID: 21538218
102. Diaz L, Restelli L, Valencia E, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on temporomandibular disorders. A systematic review of randomized clinical trials. *Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther*. 2025;53:104558. PMID: 40096874
103. Zhang Y, Qian Y, Huo K, et al. Efficacy of laser therapy for temporomandibular disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2023;74:102945. PMID: 36997006
104. Arribas-Pascual M, Hernández-Hernández S, Jiménez-Arranz C, et al. Effects of Physiotherapy on Pain and Mouth Opening in Temporomandibular Disorders: An Umbrella and Mapping Systematic Review with Meta-Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med*. 2023;12(3). PMID: 36769437
105. Tournavitis A, Sandris E, Theocharidou A, et al. Effectiveness of conservative therapeutic modalities for temporomandibular disorders-related pain: a systematic review. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 2023;81(4):286-97. PMID: 36354093

106. Hanna R, Dalvi S, Bensadoun RJ, et al. Role of Photobiomodulation Therapy in Modulating Oxidative Stress in Temporomandibular Disorders. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Human Randomised Controlled Trials. *Antioxidants (Basel)*. 2021;10(7). PMID: 34202292
107. Jing G, Zhao Y, Dong F, et al. Effects of different energy density low-level laser therapies for temporomandibular joint disorders patients: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of parallel randomized controlled trials. *Lasers in medical science*. 2021;36(5):1101-08. PMID: 33230581
108. Chang WD, Lee CL, Lin HY, et al. A Meta-analysis of Clinical Effects of Low-level Laser Therapy on Temporomandibular Joint Pain. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2014;26(8):1297-300. PMID: 25202201
109. Maia ML, Bonjardim LR, Quintans Jde S, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on pain levels in patients with temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review. *Journal of applied oral science : revista FOB*. 2012;20(6):594-602. PMID: 23329239
110. Melis M, Di Giosia M, Zawawi KH. Low level laser therapy for the treatment of temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review of the literature. *Cranio*. 2012;30(4):304-12. PMID: 23156972
111. Petrucci A, Sgolastra F, Gatto R, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy in temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of orofacial pain*. 2011;25(4):298-307. PMID: 22247925
112. Risbaf Fakour S, Shahraki M, Amirpour Haradasht S, et al. Pharmacotherapy versus photobiomodulation therapy in patients with temporomandibular disorders: randomized clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2025;40(1):408. PMID: 41047425
113. Chamani G, Zarei MR, Rad M, et al. Comparison of low-level laser therapy and standard treatment for temporomandibular disorders: An assessment of therapeutic and placebo effects. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2024;51(4):657-65. PMID: 38012102
114. Tanhan A, Ozer AY, Polat MG. Efficacy of different combinations of physiotherapy techniques compared to exercise and patient education in temporomandibular disorders: A randomized controlled study. *Cranio*. 2023;41(4):389-401. PMID: 33818314
115. Desai AP, Roy SK, Semi RS, et al. Efficacy of Low-Level Laser Therapy in Management of Temporomandibular Joint Pain: A Double Blind and Placebo Controlled Trial. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2022;21(3):948-56. PMID: 36274894
116. Del Vecchio A, Floravanti M, Boccassini A, et al. Evaluation of the efficacy of a new low-level laser therapy home protocol in the treatment of temporomandibular joint disorder-related pain: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Cranio*. 2021;39(2):141-50. PMID: 30999823
117. Aisaiti A, Zhou Y, Wen Y, et al. Effect of photobiomodulation therapy on painful temporomandibular disorders. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):9049. PMID: 33907210
118. Madani A, Ahrari F, Fallahrastegar A, et al. A randomized clinical trial comparing the efficacy of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) and laser acupuncture therapy (LAT) in patients with temporomandibular disorders. *Lasers in medical science*. 2020;35:181-92. PMID: 31396794
119. Shobha R, Narayanan VS, Jagadish Pai BS, et al. Low-level laser therapy: A novel therapeutic approach to temporomandibular disorder - A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial. *Indian journal of dental research : official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research*. 2017;28(4):380-87. PMID: 28836528

120. Ahrari F, Madani AS, Ghafouri ZS, et al. The efficacy of low-level laser therapy for the treatment of myogenous temporomandibular joint disorder. *Lasers in medical science*. 2013. PMID: 23318917
121. da Cunha LA, Firoozmand LM, da Silva AP, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy in the treatment of temporomandibular disorder. *Int Dent J*. 2008;58(4):213-7. PMID: 18783114
122. Emshoff R, Bosch R, Pumpel E, et al. Low-level laser therapy for treatment of temporomandibular joint pain: a double-blind and placebo-controlled trial. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2008;105(4):452-6. PMID: 18329580
123. Fikackova H, Dostalova T, Navratil L, et al. Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy in temporomandibular joint disorders: a placebo-controlled study. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2007;25(4):297-303. PMID: 17803388
124. Marini I, Gatto MR, Bonetti GA. Effects of superpulsed low-level laser therapy on temporomandibular joint pain. *Clin J Pain*. 2010;26(7):611-6. PMID: 20664343
125. Pereira TS, Flecha OD, Guimaraes RC, et al. Efficacy of red and infrared lasers in treatment of temporomandibular disorders--a double-blind, randomized, parallel clinical trial. *Cranio*. 2014;32(1):51-6. PMID: 24660647
126. Panhoca VH, de Fatima Zanirato Lizarelli R, Nunez SC, et al. Comparative clinical study of light analgesic effect on temporomandibular disorder (TMD) using red and infrared led therapy. *Lasers in medical science*. 2013. PMID: 24197518
127. Madani AS, Ahrari F, Nasiri F, et al. Low-level laser therapy for management of TMJ osteoarthritis. *Cranio*. 2014;32(1):38-44. PMID: 24660645
128. Leal de Godoy CH, Motta LJ, Santos Fernandes KP, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on adolescents with temporomandibular disorder: a blind randomized controlled pilot study. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery : official journal of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons*. 2015;73(4):622-9. PMID: 25542604
129. Fonseca MA, Lima GC, Araujo SL, et al. Photobiomodulation-assisted surgical wound healing at palatal donor site area: a systematic review. *Quintessence Int*. 2026;57(3):230-41. PMID: 41410039
130. Chen B, Lin Z, Zou S, et al. Intervention effects of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) on grade I-II ulcers in diabetic foot patients: A meta-analysis. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2025;33(2):e70021. PMID: 40186874
131. Li S, Wang C, Wang B, et al. Efficacy of low-level light therapy for treatment of diabetic foot ulcer: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes research and clinical practice*. 2018;143:215-24. PMID: 30009935
132. Machado RS, Viana S, Sbruzzi G. Low-level laser therapy in the treatment of pressure ulcers: systematic review. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(4):937-44. PMID: 28116536
133. Taradaj J, Franek A, Cierpka L, et al. Early and long-term results of physical methods in the treatment of venous leg ulcers: randomized controlled trial. *Phlebology / Venous Forum of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2011;26(6):237-45. PMID: 21478141
134. Lucas C, van Gemert MJ, de Haan RJ. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy in the management of stage III decubitus ulcers: a prospective, observer-blinded multicentre randomised clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2003;18(2):72-7. PMID: 12928815
135. Nussbaum EL, Biemann I, Mustard B. Comparison of ultrasound/ultraviolet-C and laser for treatment of pressure ulcers in patients with spinal cord injury. *Physical therapy*. 1994;74(9):812-23; discussion 24-5. PMID: 8066108
136. Taly AB, Sivaraman Nair KP, Murali T, et al. Efficacy of multiwavelength light therapy in the treatment of pressure ulcers in subjects with disorders of the spinal cord: A

- randomized double-blind controlled trial. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2004;85(10):1657-61. PMID: 15468027
137. Suter VGA, Sjolund S, Bornstein MM. Effect of laser on pain relief and wound healing of recurrent aphthous stomatitis: a systematic review. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(4):953-63. PMID: 28345122
 138. Santinoni CD, Oliveira HF, Batista VE, et al. Influence of low-level laser therapy on the healing of human bone maxillofacial defects: A systematic review. *Journal of photochemistry and photobiology B, Biology*. 2017;169:83-89. PMID: 28292696
 139. Samson D, Lefevre F, Aronson N. Wound-healing technologies: low-level laser and vacuum-assisted closure. *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ)*. 2004(111):1-6. PMID: 15663354
 140. Chen C, Hou WH, Chan ES, et al. Phototherapy for treating pressure ulcers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;7:CD009224. PMID: 25019295
 141. Mathur RK, Sahu K, Saraf S, et al. Low-level laser therapy as an adjunct to conventional therapy in the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(2):275-82. PMID: 27896528
 142. Lima AC, Fernandes GA, de Barros Araujo R, et al. Photobiomodulation (Laser and LED) on Sternotomy Healing in Hyperglycemic and Normoglycemic Patients Who Underwent Coronary Bypass Surgery with Internal Mammary Artery Grafts: A Randomized, Double-Blind Study with Follow-Up. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2017;35(1):24-31. PMID: 27564925
 143. Langella LG, Casalechi HL, Tomazoni SS, et al. Photobiomodulation therapy (PBMT) on acute pain and inflammation in patients who underwent total hip arthroplasty-a randomized, triple-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2018. PMID: 29909435
 144. Vaghardoost R, Momeni M, Kazemikhoo N, et al. Effect of low-level laser therapy on the healing process of donor site in patients with grade 3 burn ulcer after skin graft surgery (a randomized clinical trial). *Lasers in medical science*. 2018;33(3):603-07. PMID: 29368069
 145. Jana Neto FC, Martimbianco ALC, Mesquita-Ferrari RA, et al. Effects of multiwavelength photobiomodulation for the treatment of traumatic soft tissue injuries associated with bone fractures: A double-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Biophotonics*. 2023;16(5):e202200299. PMID: 36640122
 146. Kahraman SA, Cetiner S, Strauss RA. The Effects of Transcutaneous and Intraoral Low-Level Laser Therapy After Extraction of Lower Third Molars: A Randomized Single Blind, Placebo Controlled Dual-Center Study. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2017. PMID: 28294694
 147. Heidari M, Paknejad M, Jamali R, et al. Effect of laser photobiomodulation on wound healing and postoperative pain following free gingival graft: A split-mouth triple-blind randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of photochemistry and photobiology B, Biology*. 2017;172:109-14. PMID: 28549319
 148. Santamaria MP, Fernandes-Dias SB, Araujo CF, et al. 2-Year Assessment of Tissue Biostimulation With Low-Level Laser on the Outcomes of Connective Tissue Graft in the Treatment of Single Gingival Recession: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of periodontology*. 2017;88(4):320-28. PMID: 27834120
 149. Demirturk-Gocgun O, Baser U, Aykol-Sahin G, et al. Role of Low-Level Laser Therapy as an Adjunct to Initial Periodontal Treatment in Type 2 Diabetic Patients: A Split-Mouth, Randomized, Controlled Clinical Trial. *Photomed Laser Surg*. 2017;35(2):111-15. PMID: 27855270

150. Ustaoglu G, Ercan E, Tunali M. Low-Level Laser Therapy in Enhancing Wound Healing and Preserving Tissue Thickness at Free Gingival Graft Donor Sites: A Randomized, Controlled Clinical Study. *Photomed Laser Surg.* 2017;35(4):223-30. PMID: 28092488
151. Yang J, Zhang Q, Zheng D, et al. Photobiomodulation and orthodontic root resorption: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther.* 2025;54:104659. PMID: 40451374
152. Santos JD, Oliveira SM, Nobre MR, et al. A randomised clinical trial of the effect of low-level laser therapy for perineal pain and healing after episiotomy: A pilot study. *Midwifery.* 2011. PMID: 21982202
153. Makhoulouf M, Dahaba MM, Tuner J, et al. Effect of adjunctive low level laser therapy (LLLT) on nonsurgical treatment of chronic periodontitis. *Photomed Laser Surg.* 2012;30(3):160-6. PMID: 22233558
154. Helmy ZM, Mehani SHM, El-Refaey BH, et al. Low-level laser therapy versus trunk stabilization exercises on sternotomy healing after coronary artery bypass grafting: a randomized clinical trial. *Lasers in medical science.* 2019;34:1115-24. PMID: 30547261
155. Ivandic BT, Ivandic T. Low-level laser therapy improves visual acuity in adolescent and adult patients with amblyopia. *Photomed Laser Surg.* 2012;30(3):167-71. PMID: 22235969
156. Vrijman C, van Drooge AM, Limpens J, et al. Laser and intense pulsed light therapy for the treatment of hypertrophic scars: a systematic review. *The British journal of dermatology.* 2011;165(5):934-42. PMID: 21711337
157. Talluri S, Palaparthi SM, Michelogiannakis D, et al. Efficacy of photobiomodulation in the management of tinnitus: A systematic review of randomized control trials. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis.* 2022;139(2):83-90. PMID: 33685826
158. AlShahrani I, Togoo RA, Hosmani J, et al. Photobiomodulation in acceleration of orthodontic tooth movement: A systematic review and meta analysis. *Complementary therapies in medicine.* 2019;47:102220. PMID: 31780019
159. Ebneshahidi NS, Heshmatipour M, Moghaddami A, et al. The effects of laser acupuncture on chronic tension headache--a randomised controlled trial. *Acupunct Med.* 2005;23(1):13-8. PMID: 15844435
160. Gottschling S, Meyer S, Gribova I, et al. Laser acupuncture in children with headache: a double-blind, randomized, bicenter, placebo-controlled trial. *Pain.* 2008;137(2):405-12. PMID: 18022318
161. Yang HH, Chung YC, Szeto PP, et al. Laser acupuncture combined with auricular acupressure improves low-back pain and quality of life in nurses: A randomized controlled trial. *J Integr Med.* 2023;21(1):26-33. PMID: 36402666
162. Cheng HY, Wu BY, Tung TH, et al. Laser Acupuncture Analgesia on Postpartum Low Back Pain: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Study. *Pain Manag Nurs.* 2023;24(1):89-95. PMID: 36058819
163. Glazov G, Yelland M, Emery J. Low-dose laser acupuncture for non-specific chronic low back pain: a double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Acupunct Med.* 2014;32:116-23. PMID: 24280948
164. Shin JY, Ku B, Kim JU, et al. Short-Term Effect of Laser Acupuncture on Lower Back Pain: A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Double-Blind Trial. *Evidence-based complementary and alternative medicine : eCAM.* 2015;2015:808425. PMID: 26516333
165. Kamau VN, Lee G, Kim JH. Efficacy of laser acupuncture for patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Lasers in medical science.* 2026;41(1):13. PMID: 41571928

166. Mota MML, Aguiar I, de Lima AS, et al. Effectiveness of Laser Acupuncture for Reducing Pain and Increasing Mouth Opening Range in Individuals with Temporomandibular Disorder: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Curr Pain Headache Rep.* 2024;28(7):723-42. PMID: 38648000
167. da Silva Mira PC, Biagini A, Gomes MG, et al. Laser acupuncture to reduce temporomandibular disorder (TMD) symptoms: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lasers in medical science.* 2024;39(1):66. PMID: 38374226
168. Han R, Guo C, Lau K, et al. Efficacy of knee osteoarthritis by use of laser acupuncture: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine.* 2024;103(25):e38325. PMID: 38905420
169. Huang CH, Yeh ML, Chen FP, et al. Low-level laser acupuncture reduces postoperative pain and morphine consumption in older patients with total knee arthroplasty: A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *J Integr Med.* 2022;20(4):321-28. PMID: 35459599
170. Kibar S, Konak HE, Evcik D, et al. Laser Acupuncture Treatment Improves Pain and Functional Status in Patients with Subacromial Impingement Syndrome: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Sham-Controlled Study. *Pain Med.* 2017;18(5):980-87. PMID: 27816913
171. Fleckenstein J, Niederer D, Auerbach K, et al. No Effect of Acupuncture in the Relief of Delayed-Onset Muscle Soreness: Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clinical journal of sport medicine : official journal of the Canadian Academy of Sport Medicine.* 2016;26(6):471-77. PMID: 26540600
172. Aigner N, Fialka C, Radda C, et al. Adjuvant laser acupuncture in the treatment of whiplash injuries: a prospective, randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Wien Klin Wochenschr.* 2006;118(3-4):95-9. PMID: 16703253
173. Yurtkuran M, Alp A, Konur S, et al. Laser acupuncture in knee osteoarthritis: a double-blind, randomized controlled study. *Photomed Laser Surg.* 2007;25(1):14-20. PMID: 17352632
174. Wilke J, Vogt L, Niederer D, et al. Short-term effects of acupuncture and stretching on myofascial trigger point pain of the neck: a blinded, placebo-controlled RCT. *Complementary therapies in medicine.* 2014;22(5):835-41. PMID: 25440373
175. Hinman RS, McCrory P, Pirotta M, et al. Acupuncture for chronic knee pain: a randomized clinical trial. *Jama.* 2014;312(13):1313-22. PMID: 25268438
176. Al Rashoud AS, Abboud RJ, Wang W, et al. Efficacy of low-level laser therapy applied at acupuncture points in knee osteoarthritis: a randomised double-blind comparative trial. *Physiotherapy.* 2014;100(3):242-8. PMID: 24418801
177. Tseng CC, Tseng A, Tseng J, et al. Effect of Laser Acupuncture on Anthropometric Measurements and Appetite Sensations in Obese Subjects. *Evidence-based complementary and alternative medicine : eCAM.* 2016;2016:9365326. PMID: 27051454
178. Hung YC, Hung IL, Hu WL, et al. Reduction in postpartum weight with laser acupuncture: A randomized control trial. *Medicine.* 2016;95(34):e4716. PMID: 27559981
179. El-Mekawy HS, ElDeeb AM, Ghareib HO. Effect of laser acupuncture combined with a diet-exercise intervention on metabolic syndrome in post-menopausal women. *J Adv Res.* 2015;6:757-63. PMID: 26425364
180. Shirnasab M, Karbasi N, Davari M, et al. Efficacy of Photobiomodulation Therapy on the Acupuncture Points on Pain, Maximum Mouth Opening, and Quality of Life in Patients with Temporomandibular Joint Disorders: A Double-Blinded Randomized Clinical Trial. *Photobiomodul Photomed Laser Surg.* 2026;44(2):88-93. PMID: 41060870

181. Hasanin ME, Aly SM, Taha MM, et al. The Effect of Laser Biostimulation at Sensitized Acupoints on Chronic Pelvic Pain and Quality of Life in Women with Pelvic Inflammatory Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. 2025;61(2). PMID: 40005470
182. Abd El Azeem AM, Alsharnoubi J, Abd El-Rahman Mohamed M. Laser acupuncture improving functional chronic constipation in children: a randomized controlled trial. *Lasers in medical science*. 2023;38(1):72. PMID: 36790507
183. Hassan ES, Maged AM, Kotb A, et al. Effect of laser acupuncture on pain and density of bone in osteoporotic postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial. *Menopause*. 2023;30(5):545-50. PMID: 36944142
184. Kannan P, Bello UM. The efficacy of different forms of acupuncture for the treatment of nocturnal enuresis in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Explore (NY)*. 2022;18(4):488-97. PMID: 34893441
185. Juan CW, Chang MH, Lin TH, et al. Laser Acupuncture for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: A Single-Blinded Controlled Study. *J Altern Complement Med*. 2019;25(10):1035-43. PMID: 31502856
186. Oates A, Benedict KA, Sun K, et al. Laser acupuncture reduces pain in pediatric kidney biopsies: a randomized controlled trial. *Pain*. 2017;158(1):103-09. PMID: 27749608
187. Alsharnoubi J, Sabbour AA, Shoukry AI, et al. Nocturnal enuresis in children between laser acupuncture and medical treatment: a comparative study. *Lasers in medical science*. 2017;32(1):95-99. PMID: 27744492
188. Dabbous OA, Mostafa YM, El Noamany HA, et al. Laser acupuncture as an adjunctive therapy for spastic cerebral palsy in children. *Lasers in medical science*. 2016;31:1061-7. PMID: 27147077
189. Lee NR, Kim SB, Heo H, et al. Comparison of the Effects of Manual Acupuncture, Laser Acupuncture, and Electromagnetic Field Stimulation at Acupuncture Point BL15 on Heart Rate Variability. *Journal of acupuncture and meridian studies*. 2016;9(5):257-63. PMID: 27776764
190. Chimenti RL, Neville C, Houck J, et al. Achilles Pain, Stiffness, and Muscle Power Deficits: Midportion Achilles Tendinopathy Revision - 2024. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*. 2024;54(12):CPG1-CPG32. PMID: 39611662
191. North American Spine Society Evidence-Based Clinical Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Spine Care: Diagnosis & Treatment of Low Back Pain. [cited 5/12/2026]. 'Available from:' <https://www.spine.org/Portals/0/assets/downloads/ResearchClinicalCare/Guidelines/LowBackPain.pdf>.
192. Management of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guideline. 5/18/2024 [cited 5/12/2026]. 'Available from:' <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/carpal-tunnel/carpal-tunnel-2024/cts-cpg.pdf>.
193. Graham B, Peljovich AE, Afra R, et al. The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guideline on: Management of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2016;98(20):1750-54. PMID: 27869627
194. Qaseem A, McLean RM, O'Gurek D, et al. Nonpharmacologic and Pharmacologic Management of Acute Pain From Non-Low Back, Musculoskeletal Injuries in Adults: A Clinical Guideline From the American College of Physicians and American Academy of Family Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(9):739-48. PMID: 32805126
195. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(7):514-30. PMID: 28192789

196. Koc TA, Jr., Bise CG, Neville C, et al. Heel Pain - Plantar Fasciitis: Revision 2023. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*. 2023;53(12):Cpg1-cpg39. PMID: 38037331
197. Martin RL, Chimenti R, Cuddeford T, et al. Achilles Pain, Stiffness, and Muscle Power Deficits: Midportion Achilles Tendinopathy Revision 2018. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*. 2018;48(5):A1-a38. PMID: 29712543
198. Carpal tunnel syndrome. In: Hegmann KT, editor(s). Occupational medicine practice guidelines. Evaluation and management of common health problems and functional recovery in workers. 3rd ed. Elk Grove Village (IL): American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM); 2011. p. 1-73.
199. Hand, wrist, and forearm disorders not including carpal tunnel syndrome. In: Hegmann KT, editor(s). Occupational medicine practice guidelines. Evaluation and management of common health problems and functional recovery in workers. 3rd ed. Elk Grove Village (IL): American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM); 2011. p. 1-188.
200. Patel P, Robinson PD, Baggott C, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the prevention of oral and oropharyngeal mucositis in pediatric cancer and hematopoietic stem cell transplant patients: 2021 update. *Eur J Cancer*. 2021;154:92-101. PMID: 34252760
201. Elad S, Cheng KKF, Lalla RV, et al. MASCC/ISOO clinical practice guidelines for the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy. *Cancer*. 2020;126(19):4423-31. PMID: 32786044

CODES

Codes	Number	Description
CPT	0552T	Low-level laser therapy, dynamic photonic and dynamic thermokinetic energies, provided by a physician or other qualified health care professional
	0936T	Photobiomodulation therapy of retina, single session
	1011T	Photobiomodulation (PBM) therapy of oral cavity, including placement of an oral device, monitoring of patient tolerance to treatment, and removal of the oral device
	1026T	Transvaginal laser photobiomodulation therapy of pelvis, provided by a physician or other qualified health care professional
	97037	Application of a modality to 1 or more areas; low-level laser therapy (ie, nonthermal and non-ablative) for post-operative pain reduction
	97039	Unlisted modality (specify type and time if constant attendance)
HCPCS	S8948	Application of a modality (requiring constant provider attendance) to one or more areas; low level laser, each 15 minutes

Date of Origin: January 2003