Table S1. PRISMA-ScR Checklist.

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Title
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	Initial introduction
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	End of introduction
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	Dedicated section in M&M
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	Dedicated section in M&M
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	Dedicated section in M&M
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Dedicated section in M&M
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	Dedicated section in M&M
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Dedicated section in M&M
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Dedicated section in

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
			M&M
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	Dedicated section in M&M
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	Dedicated section in M&M
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	Dedicated table
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	Dedicated table
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	Dedicated table
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Dedicated table
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	Dedicated table
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	Followed
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	Followed
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	Followed
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	None

Table S2: Search strategies for electronic databases.

Database	Search strategy
PubMed (MEDLINE)	#1 “Photobiomodulation” [MESH] OR (PBM) #2 “PBMT” [MESH] OR (LLLT) #3 “Diode laser photobiomodulation” [MESH] OR (Low level laser therapy) OR (Photobiomodulation laser therapy) #4 “Nerve injury” [MESH] OR (Nerve lesion) AND “Oral” #5 “Nerve damage photobiomodulation [Subheading]” OR (Treatment) OR (Therapy) AND “Oral” #6 #1 OR #2 AND #5 #7 #1 OR #2 AND #4 #8 #3 OR #4 AND #5
SCOPUS	#1 “Photobiomodulation” [MESH] OR (PBM) #2 “PBMT” [MESH] OR (LLLT) #3 “Diode laser photobiomodulation” [MESH] OR (Low level laser therapy) OR (Photobiomodulation laser therapy) #4 “Nerve injury” [MESH] OR (Nerve lesion) AND “Oral” #5 “Nerve damage photobiomodulation [Subheading]” OR (Treatment) OR (Therapy) AND “Oral” #6 #1 OR #2 AND #5 #7 #1 OR #2 AND #4

#8 #3 OR #4 AND #5

Table S3. JBI critical appraisal checklist for randomized controlled trials, a tool used for risk of bias assessment.

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

Reviewer_____Date_____

Author_____Year_____ Record Number_____

		Yes	No	Unclear	NA
1.	Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	Were participants blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)