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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of oral health risk assessment by non-dental health professionals for improving oral health outcomes in pediatric patients younger than six years old?

2. What are the evidence-based guidelines for non-dental health professionals regarding the delivery of oral health risk assessments of children from birth to six years?

KEY FINDINGS

One systematic review, one randomized controlled trial, eight non-randomized studies, and five evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding oral health risk assessment by non-dental health professionals for improving oral health outcomes in pediatric patients younger than six years old.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library, University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit retrieval by publication type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2006 and February 9, 2016. Internet links were provided, where available.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Designs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and evidence-based guidelines.

One systematic review, one randomized controlled trial, eight non-randomized studies, and five evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding oral health risk assessment by non-dental health professionals for improving oral health outcomes in pediatric patients younger than six years old. No relevant health technology assessments were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One systematic review, one randomized controlled trial, and eight relevant non-randomized studies were identified. The results of these studies are summarized in Table 2. Generally, the results of the studies suggest that dental assessment by non-dental providers was able to detect caries in children but suggested that non-dental practitioners may require further education and training to more accurately identify children at higher risk of early childhood caries.

Five evidence-based guidelines were identified. The guidelines differ slightly in terms of recommending when initial risk assessment should be undertaken. The guidelines recommend dental risk assessment be undertaken by six months of age or by one year of age. One guideline determined there is insufficient evidence to recommend routine screening for dental caries by primary physicians for children five years of age and younger. The recommendations suggest primary care physicians should prescribe oral fluoride supplementation after six months.
of age for children whose water supply does not contain fluoride and should apply fluoride varnish to all primary teeth of all children starting at the age of initial tooth eruption.\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of Included Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Author, Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematic Reviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou, 2014\textsuperscript{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Randomized Controlled Trials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slade, 2011\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Randomized Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, 2015\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranz, 2015\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of Included Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author, Year</th>
<th>Population/Provider</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achembong, 2014⁴</td>
<td>Children 0 to 4 years of age (from primarily low income families) Preventive dentistry program in primary care medical offices</td>
<td>After the implementation of a preventive dental care program, mean dmft per kindergarten student initially increased from 1.53 to 1.84, then decreased to 1.59.</td>
<td>The authors concluded that the program was successful at decreasing dental caries in the targeted, vulnerable study population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas, 2013⁶</td>
<td>15 months to 5 years of age Pediatric health providers</td>
<td>Providers were able to identify visible plaque on maxillary incisors on 39% of children (55% sensitivity, 80% specificity). Agreement with a dental hygienist measured a kappa score of 0.34.</td>
<td>Visible plaque exams performed by clinicians at well child visits were not always accurate. The authors concluded that providers may require further training in conducting oral health exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, 2012⁷</td>
<td>Children less than 36 months of age Pediatricians</td>
<td>Using a POORT, pediatricians assessed risk factors for early childhood caries. Of the children assessed, 6.8% were identified as needing an evaluation by a dentist.</td>
<td>The authors observed low referral rates by physicians and determines that interventions were required to increase the rate of referral of children to dentists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann, 2011⁵</td>
<td>Children less than 3 years of age (non-fluoridated, rural setting) Community-based dental health intervention</td>
<td>Children in the intervention group (fluoridated toothpaste, educational interventions) experienced fewer dental caries than those in the control group at the first two exams. The differences were no longer apparent at exam 3.</td>
<td>The authors concluded that the intervention was successful for reducing caries earlier in life but became less effective as the participants had less contact with the community health workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Summary of Included Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author, Year</th>
<th>Population/Provider</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minah, 2008&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Children aged 6 to 27 months (low income) Pediatric primary care clinic</td>
<td>Children in the intervention group received preventive services (risk assessment, fluoride varnish, counselling, dental referral) and experienced fewer mean carious dental surfaces.</td>
<td>The authors concluded that administering preventive measures to children of low socioeconomic status was effective to reduce dental caries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, 2007&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Children less than 3 years of age Non-dental providers in medical settings</td>
<td>4.4% (29/655) patients were reported to have one or more caries. 14.1% (94/655) patients were referred to a dentist.</td>
<td>The authors concluded that the intervention was effective and also contributed to the financial viability of the clinic in which the intervention took place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*dmft = decayed, missing, and filled primary teeth; POHS = preventive oral health services; POORT = priority oral health risk assessment and referral tool*
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No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
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See: Recommendations, page 8
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