Medical nurses may be effective in using silver diamine fluoride to prevent caries compared to dental hygienists in a school-based oral health program

Ryan Richard Ruff, PhD, MPH[1 2], Tamarinda J. Barry Godín, DDS, MPH[1], and Richard Niederman, DMD[1]

[1]*New York University College of Dentistry*

[2]*New York University School of Global Public Health*

March 2023

Abstract

Background: The sustainability of school-based oral health programs depends on the utilization of effective, efficient treatments and the availability of a trained clinical workforce. The objective of this study was to determine whether registered nurses are comparable to dental hygienists in the application and effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride (SDF) for the prevention of dental caries.

Methods: CariedAway was a school-based study of SDF versus dental sealants and atraumatic restorations. Within the SDF arm, subjects were treated by either a licensed dental hygienist or a registered nurse, both under the supervision of a pediatric dentist. Although initial treatment assignment in CariedAway was randomized, assignment to provider was not. The proportion of children who remained caries free after two years was assessed for non-inferiority using two-group proportion tests, adjusting for the clustering effect of schools.

Results: 417 children were analyzed including 298 treated by hygienists and 119 by nurses. The proportion of caries-free individuals was 0.812 and 0.798 for hygienists and nurses, respectively, for a difference of 0.014 (95% CI = -0.07, 0.098) and within the pre-determined non-inferiority margin.

Conclusions: Nurses may be effective in treating children with silver diamine fluoride in school-based oral health programs.

Introduction

The World Health Organization estimates dental caries to be the world's most common noncommunicable disease, disproportionately affecting low-income and minority populations and consuming between 5-10% of healthcare budgets of industrialized nations [1, 2]. Notably, those most at risk of dental caries typically lack access to traditional dental services, which results in substantial unmet need in vulnerable groups [3, 4, 5]. As a public health intervention to increase access to dental care, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends school-based sealant programs, which are effective [6, 7, 8], economical [9], and "allow the use of dental personnel to the top of their licensure" [10].

Silver diamine fluoride (SDF) is an efficient, economical treatment for dental caries [11] that is supported by the American Academy of Pediatric Dentists as part of a comprehensive caries management program [12]. Systematic reviews conclude that SDF is effective in the arrest of caries in primary teeth [13] and significantly reduces the development of new dentin caries after twenty-four months [14]. SDF is a colorless liquid similar in application to fluoride varnish [15], and the Association of State & Territorial Dental Directors (ASTDD) advocate for physicians, nurses, and assistants to provide SDF in addition to dentists and dental hygienists [16].

The CariedAway study was a longitudinal, school-based study of non-surgical interventions for dental caries [17]. Primary objectives of CariedAway were to compare the incidence and arrest of dental caries in children treated with either silver diamine fluoride or glass ionomer sealants and atraumatic restorations [18], and to assess oral health-related quality of life [19]. Within the SDF treatment arm, care was provided by either dental hygienists or registered medical nurses. Subjects were not randomized to different providers within this group. A secondary objective of CariedAway was to conduct a preliminary investigation of the variation in provider effectiveness in the use of SDF to prevent dental caries.

Methods

CariedAway is a registered study at www.clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03442309) beginning 22 February 2018, and received ethical approval from the New York University School of Medicine IRB.

Design and Participants

CariedAway was a longitudinal pragmatic non-inferiority trial conducted from 2018-2023 in New York City primary schools. The pragmatic design was chosen to test study hypotheses in real world settings that characterize school-based oral health programs. Schools that had a student population from at least 50% Hispanic/Latino or black ethnicities and at least 80% receiving free and reduced lunch (a proxy for low socio-economic status) were eligible for inclusion. Schools were further excluded if they already had a school-based oral health program that provided services. Within eligible and enrolled schools, all subjects were eligible for the study if they provided parental informed consent and child assent. Children were included in analysis if they were between the ages of 5 and 13 years.

Randomization

Although subjects were randomized to receive silver diamine fluoride, they were not randomized to be treated by either a dental hygienist or registered medical nurse. No systematic efforts were made to assign subjects to different providers. By law, nurses could only treat patients if standing orders were created by a supervising dentist. Subjects who were enrolled prior to visiting the school were thus eligible to be seen by nurses or hygienists. These subjects were seen by whichever provider was available. Any subject enrolled during the actual visit to schools (e.g., day-of enrollment) were seen only by hygienists.

Interventions and Data Collection

All subjects included in analysis received a single treatment consisting of 38% silver diamine fluoride (Elevate Oral Care Advantage Arrest 38%, 2.24 F-ion mg/dose) applied to all asymptomatic cavitated lesions and brushed on all pits and fissures of bicuspids and molars for 30 seconds. Fluoride varnish (5% NaF, Colgate PreviDent) was then applied to all teeth. Registered nurses and hygienists operated within a specific room in each school using a disposable mirror, disposable explorer, and head lamp with participants laying in a portable dental chair. Nurses and hygienists were under the supervision of a licensed pediatric dentist.

Study clinicians performed full-mouth visual-tactile oral examinations at each observation. Teeth were assessed as being present or missing intraorally. Individual tooth surfaces were assessed as being either intact/sound, sealed, restored, decayed, or arrested. All data were recorded on Apple iPads using an electronic dental health record designed for school-based programs (New England Survey Systems, Brookline, MA) and were securely uploaded each day to the Boston University School of Public Health Data Coordinating Center.

Blinding

All clinicians in this analysis provided silver diamine fluoride and thus were not blinded to their treatment assignment. However, examiners at follow-up were unable to identify the type of clinician that provided initial treatment until the examination was completed.

Clinician training

Registered nurses first completed modules on child oral health, caries risk assessment, fluoride varnish, and oral examinations from *Smiles for Life: A national oral health curriculum* [20], accredited by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on Accreditation. Nurses and hygienists further received approximately 70 hours of didactic instruction and practical training during the annual CariedAway orientation, including

111 dental screening and treatment protocols for silver diamine fluoride and fluoride varnish.
112 Examiner standardization was conducted via case study, utilization of dental models, and
113 through the recruitment of examinees attending pilot and training schools not included in
114 the CariedAway study population. Examiners were standardized using identical diagnostic
115 and treatment protocols. Caries diagnosis was performed according to guidelines of the
116 International Caries Detection and Assessment System (ICDAS) adapted criteria in
117 epidemiology and clinical research settings [21]. Full description of clinical protocols for
118 diagnosis, outcomes, and other protocol considerations is previously published. Clinicians
119 were standardized through agreement with the senior examiner, a licensed pediatric
120 dentist experienced in applying the dental screening and treatment protocols. The senior
121 examiner performed weekly chairside and data audits to ensure protocol compliance and
122 continuous quality improvement.

123

124 ## Impact of COVID-19

125 The original protocol for CariedAway stipulated that treatment and data collection were to
126 be conducted biannually. However, the COVID-19 pandemic suspended medical
127 interventions being conducted in New York City schools. As a result, the trial was
128 conducted in two phases. In phase 1, we completed baseline observations and initial
129 treatment from September 2019 to March 2020 with first follow-up observations
130 completed from September 2021 to March 2022. In phase two, additional data collection
131 was conducted in recurring six month intervals from March 2022 through June 2023.

132

133 ## Outcomes

134 The primary outcome was the proportion of subjects with no observed incidence of
135 decayed teeth from previously sound dentition (prevention). Nurses also provided
136 treatment for existing caries at baseline, but these subjects were excluded from analysis as
137 it was caries arrest.

Covariates

Data for demographic variables were obtained from informed consent documents and/or school records, including race/ethnicity, age at observation, and sex. For socioeconomic status, all enrolled schools in CariedAway had at least 80% of the student population receiving free or reduced lunch ("Title 1" schools).

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of provider variation used data from phase 1 of CariedAway.

Subjects were first ordered sequentially by visit and restricted to those assigned to the silver diamine fluoride arm and without dental caries at their baseline observation. Our primary independent variable, provider type, was dichotomized as either registered nurse or dental hygienist/pediatric dentist. Our primary dependent variable of any new evidence of dental decay was created as a dichotomous indicator reflecting whether each tooth presented at follow-up with either untreated caries or clinical evidence of having received an outside filling.

Non-inferiority of prevention by provider type was assessed using two-sample proportion tests with cluster adjustment for the school and the estimated intraclass correlation and by comparing the right-sided 95% confidence interval for the difference between providers to the pre-determined non-inferiority margin of 0.10. Power analysis for a two-group proportion test for non-inferiority with the predetermined threshold at 80% power was previously calculated to require a total sample size of 396. The degree of intraclass correlation was measured using intercept-only mixed effects multilevel regression modeling.

Results were subsequently compared to a confidence interval for the difference of hygienist minus nurse computed using bootstrap sampling with 10,000 replications. Logistic regression models were also conducted to explore the role of potential confounding variables on the provider/caries relationship.

165 Following per-protocol analysis, we conducted an intent to treat analysis using imputed
166 data. Five datasets were generated for all subjects receiving silver diamine fluoride and not
167 presenting with caries at baseline using multiple imputation and analyzed using logistic
168 regression. Analysis was performed using Stata v16.0 and R v1.4. Confidence intervals were
169 created at the 95% level and statistical significance was set at 0.05.

170 Results

171 Of the 4718 subjects enrolled and randomized in Phase 1, 2998 were enrolled from viable
172 grades. Those subjects enrolled in fourth and fifth grades were treated for ethical reasons
173 but were not viable as they would age out of the study prior to follow-up. We completed
174 follow-up data collection with 1398 subjects from September 2021 through 2 March 2022
175 (Figure 1). A total of 1070 enrolled subjects were treated with silver diamine fluoride and
176 did not have caries at baseline, and follow-up data was collected in 418 subjects. One
177 subject did not have provider recorded and thus was removed from analysis (N=417, Table
178 1). This analytic sample consisted of 298 subjects treated by dental hygienists and 119
179 treated by registered nurses. Approximately 10% of subjects presented at baseline with
180 dental sealants. In keeping with the study inclusion criteria, 81% of subjects were of
181 Hispanic/Latino or black ethnicity. The intraclass correlation coefficient was less than
182 .00001. There were no adverse events reported in children treated by either nurses or
183 hygienists.

184 The proportion of individuals who remained caries free after two years (prevention rate)
185 was 0.812 and 0.798 for subjects treated by dental hygienists and nurses, respectively, for a
186 difference of 0.014 (95% CI = -0.07, 0.098), just below the non-inferiority threshold (Table
187 2). Results were similar for bootstrapped confidence intervals (difference = 0.014, 95% CI
188 = -0.09, 0.098). Results from regression models show no differences between provider
189 after controlling for race, age at baseline, sex, and dental sealant prevalence (Table 3).

190 Imputed data for the baseline sample (N=1070) yielded 315 subjects with no baseline
191 decay that were treated by nurses and 755 subjects by hygienists. The proportion of
192 subjects who remained caries free at follow-up was 80.8% and 81% for nurses and

193 hygienists, respectively. The odds ratio for prevention comparing nurses to hygienists was
194 1.01 (95% CI = 0.68, 1.50). Results with imputed data remained non-inferior.

195 Discussion

196 Our results suggest that the effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride applied by registered
197 nurses may be comparable in the two-year prevention of caries compared to dental
198 hygienists in a school-based pragmatic setting. Specifically, the overall prevention rate in
199 predominantly low-income, minority children was approximately 80%. If left untreated,
200 dental caries can progress to severe infection [22] and negatively affects quality of life [23],
201 academic performance [24], and school attendance [24]. Thus the effective prevention of
202 dental caries in schools can not only improve health but overall child development.

203 The ubiquity and impact of school-based sealant programs depends in part on the
204 availability of properly trained dental professionals. In a prior survey of registered dental
205 hygienists, 54% of respondents were unfamiliar with SDF, 78% agreed that using SDF as a
206 treatment for dental caries falls within their scope of practice, and 82% believed it to be an
207 alternative to traditional restorative treatments [25]. Further, the use of traditional
208 preventive services like glass ionomer sealants can be prohibitively expensive when
209 treating large school populations, such as those found in New York City. In contrast, school
210 nursing services prevent millions of dollars in medical care costs and lost productivity [26]
211 and provide for safe and effective management of children with chronic health conditions,
212 improving both health and academic outcomes [27]. State medical or dental practice acts
213 can authorize nurses to treat children with silver diamine fluoride, thus their incorporation
214 into school-based dental programs can have substantial impact on the efficiency and reach
215 of care. For example, in New York, the state scope of practice implies that SDF is a topical
216 fluoride and able to be applied by registered nurses under the supervision of a licensed
217 dentist. This also aligns with professional practice, as the National Association of School
218 Nurses advocates for the school nurse to promote child oral health through prevention,
219 education, and coordination [28].

220 Our overall results are in line with the available evidence. Recent systematic reviews and
221 meta-analyses are available for the effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in the
222 prevention of caries in primary dentition and permanent first molars [29, 14], caries
223 control in exposed root surfaces [30], and in the arrest or reversal of both noncavitated and
224 cavitated lesions in primary and permanent teeth [31]. These studies indicate preventive
225 fractions for SDF versus placebo or active controls in the range of 70-90%, depending on
226 the comparator used.

227 This study has multiple limitations. The provider assignment in the SDF arm of CariedAway
228 was not a randomized one, and our results may be biased by unobserved differences across
229 subjects. Children who enrolled prior to school visitation received standing orders from the
230 supervising dentist and thus were able to be treated by either nurses or hygienists. These
231 subjects were seen on a first come, first served basis and were not ordered by any factor
232 such as disease severity, sex, or race. Those who enrolled during the study visit were only
233 eligible to be treated by dental hygienist. If pre-visit enrollees were systematically
234 different, this could introduce bias into our results. As a result, these findings should be
235 interpreted with caution and considered as preliminary evidence. Further study with
236 providers being a randomized factor is recommended.

237 The two year period between baseline and follow-up observations corresponded with the
238 onset and duration of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the suspension of all in-
239 school educational and clinical activities from March 2020 to August 2021. This had
240 multiple potential implications. As our analytic sample considered only those with no
241 untreated decay at baseline, exfoliation of decayed teeth was not a concern. Additionally,
242 our analysis accounted for both any newly observed untreated decay and any evidence of
243 having received a dental filling, which would suggest the incidence of new decay (and thus
244 prevention failure) in the intervening years. As a result, our findings should not be
245 confounded by receipt of traditional care in a dental office. Regardless, the low overall
246 follow-up rate due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic remains a lingering concern,
247 though our analysis with imputed subject data did not differ from primary results.

248 The CariedAway study utilized minimally-invasive treatments that were recently added to
249 the World Health Organization's list of essential medicines, which can be used to expand
250 the scope and reach of school caries prevention. Our results support the incorporation of
251 not only alternative non-restorative methods into traditional school-based prevention
252 programs but the inclusion of under-utilized health professionals in the provision of care.
253 As of 2018, an estimated 132,300 school nurses work in the United States [32], comprising
254 approximately 75% of the entire hygienist workforce. This represents a substantial
255 untapped resource to address oral health inequities.

256

257 **Funding**

258 Research reported in this publication was funded through a Patient-Centered Outcomes
259 Research Institute (PCORI) award (PCS-1609-36824). The content is solely the
260 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the
261 funding organization, New York University, or the NYU College of Dentistry.

262 **Author contributions**

263 RRR and RN were the principal investigators and conceived of and designed the study. TBG
264 served as the supervising dentist, directed clinical activities, and oversaw all data
265 collection. RRR performed all statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript. All authors
266 critically reviewed the manuscript and provided edits. All authors read and approved the
267 final manuscript.

268 **Acknowledgements**

269 We are grateful for the support of multiple people and organizations in their collaboration
270 on this initiative, including Rachel Whittemore, Nydia Santiago- Galvin, and Denise
271 Guerrero, without whom this work would not be possible. We are also thankful for our
272 clinical team who provided care and our patient/stakeholder board who provided
273 community perspectives on COVID- 19 and school guidance. We also wish to thank John
274 Roberge and Michael Stanley at New England Survey Systems (NESS), who worked with us
275 to continuously improve our ability to capture clinical data, and Joe Palmissano at the
276 Boston University School of Public Health. We thank Drs. Roger Platt, Ramneet Kalra, and
277 David Tepel at the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, who
278 facilitated access to New York City schools. Finally, we thank Drs. Dionne Richardson and
279 Michele Griguts at the New York State Department of Health, who provided guidance
280 during COVID-19.

281 **Conflicts of Interest**

282 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

References

1. [1] W. Marcenes, N. J. Kassebaum, E. Bernab´e, A. Flaxman, M. Naghavi, A. Lopez, and C. J. L. Murray. Global burden of oral conditions in 1990- 2010: a systematic analysis. Journal of dental research, 92(7):592–7, 2013.

2. [2] J. E. Frencken, P. Sharma, L. Stenhouse, D. Green, D. Laverty, and T. Di- etrich. Global epidemiology of dental caries and severe periodontitis - a comprehensive review. J Clin Periodontol, 44 Suppl 18:S94–S105, 2017.

3. [3] H. M. Treadwell. The nation's oral health inequities: Who cares. Am J Public Health, 107(S1):S5, 2017.

4. [4] S. Griffin, S. Naavaal, C. Scherrer, P. M. Griffin, K. Harris, and S. Chat- topadhyay. School-based dental sealant programs prevent cavities and are cost-effective. Health Aff (Millwood), 35(12):2233–2240, 2016.

5. [5] B. Dye, X. Li, and G. Thornton-Evans. Oral health disparities as deter- mined by selected healthy people 2020 oral health objectives for the united states, 2009-2010. NCHS Data Brief, 104:1–8, 2012.

6. [6] S. O. Griffin, S. Naavaal, C. Scherrer, M. Patel, S. Chattopadhyay, and Force Community Preventive Services Task. Evaluation of school-based dental sealant programs: An updated community guide systematic eco- nomic review. Am J Prev Med, 52(3):407–415, 2017.

7. [7] AUTHORS BLINDED. Longitudinal caries prevalence in a comprehensive, multicomponent, school-based prevention program. J Am Dent Assoc, 152(3):224–233, 03 2021.

8. [8] Barbara F. Gooch, Susan O. Griffin, Shellie Kolavic Gray, William G. Kohn, R. Gary Rozier, Mark Siegal, Margherita Fontana, Diane Brun- son, Nancy Carter, David K. Curtis, Kevin J. Donly, Harold Haering, Lawrence F. Hill, H. Pitts Hinson, Jayanth Kumar, Lewis Lampiris, Mark Mallatt, Daniel M. Meyer, Wanda R. Miller, Susan M. Sanzi-Schaedel, Richard Simonsen, Benedict I. Truman, and Domenick T. Zero. Prevent- ing dental caries through school-based sealant programs. The Journal of the American Dental Association, 140(11):1356–1365, 2009.

9. [9] AUTHORS BLINDED. An Economic Evaluation of a Comprehensive School-Based Caries Prevention Program. JDR Clin Trans Res, 4(4):378–387, 10 2019.

10. [10] 2018.

11. [11] S. S. T. Yeung and C. Arg´aez. Silver Diamine Fluoride for the Prevention and Arresting of Dental Caries or Hypersensitivity: A Review of Clinical Effectiveness, Cost-Effectiveness and Guidelines. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health, Ottawa (ON), 2017.

12. [12] Y. O. Crystal, A. A. Marghalani, S. D. Ureles, J. T. Wright, R. Sulyanto, K. Divaris, M. Fontana, and L. Graham. Use of silver diamine fluoride for dental caries management in children and adolescents, including those with special health care needs. Pediatr Dent, 39(5):135–145, 2017.

13. [13] N. Seifo, W. Al-Yaseen, and N. Innes. The efficacy of silver diamine fluoride in arresting caries in children. Evid Based Dent, 19(2):42–43, 2018.

14. [14] B. H. Oliveira, A. Rajendra, A. Veitz-Keenan, and R. Niederman. The effect of silver diamine fluoride in preventing caries in the primary dentition: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Caries Res, 53(1):24–32, 2018.

15. [15] N. Seifo, H. Cassie, J. Radford, and N. Innes. "It's really no more difficult than putting on fluoride varnish": a qualitative exploration of dental professionals' views of silver diamine fluoride for the management of carious lesions in children. BMC Oral Health, 20(1):257, 09 2020.

16. [16] 2022.

17. [17] AUTHORS BLINDED. Silver diamine fluoride versus therapeutic sealants for the arrest and prevention of dental caries in low-income minority children: study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. Trials, 19(1):523, 2018.

18. [18] AUTHORS BLINDED. Effect of Silver Diamine Fluoride on Caries Arrest and Prevention: The CariedAway School-Based Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2023;6(2):e2255458.

19. [19] AUTHORS BLINDED. Silver diamine fluoride, atraumatic restorations, and oral health-related quality of life in children aged 5-13 years: results from the CariedAway school- based cluster randomized trial. BMC Oral Health, 22(1):125, Apr 2022.

20. [20] K Sievers, M B Clark, A B Douglass, R Maier, W Gonsalves, A S Wright- son, R Quinonez, M Dolce, M Dalal, D Rizzolo, and et al., 2020.

21. [21] K. Shivakumar, S. Prasad, and G. Chandu. International Caries Detection and Assessment System: A new paradigm in detection of dental caries. J Conserv Dent, 12(1):10–16, Jan 2009.

22. [22] M. A. Peres, L. M. D. Macpherson, R. J. Weyant, B. Daly, R. Venturelli, M. R. Mathur, S. Listl, R. K. Celeste, C. C. Guarnizo-Herren˜o, C. Kearns, H. Benzian, P. Allison, and R. G. Watt. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. Lancet, 394(10194):249–260, Jul 2019.

23. [23] B. W. Chaffee, P. H. Rodrigues, P. F. Kramer, M. R. Vitolo, and C. A. Feldens. Oral health-related quality-of-life scores differ by socioeconomic status and caries experience. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol, 45(3):216– 224, 2017.

24. [24] R. R. Ruff, S. Senthi, S. R. Susser, and A. Tsutsui. Oral health, academic performance, and school absenteeism in children and adolescents: A sys- tematic review and meta-analysis. J Am Dent Assoc, 150(2):111–121 e4, 2019.

25. [25] S. K. Chhokar, L. Laughter, and D. J. Rowe. Perceptions of Registered Dental Hygienists in Alternative Practice Regarding Silver Diamine Fluo- ride. J Dent Hyg, 91(4):53–60, Aug 2017.

26. [26] L. Y. Wang, M. Vernon-Smiley, M. A. Gapinski, M. Desisto, E. Maughan, and A. Sheetz. Cost-benefit study of school nursing services. JAMA Pedi- atr, 168(7):642–648, Jul 2014.

27. [27] Z. C. Leroy, R. Wallin, and S. Lee. The Role of School Health Services in Addressing the Needs of Students With Chronic Health Conditions. J Sch Nurs, 33(1):64–72, Feb 2017.

28. [28] J. Buerlein. Promoting children's oral health. A role for school nurses in prevention, education, and coordination. NASN Sch Nurse, 25(1):26–29, Jan 2010.

29. [29] V. Contreras, M. J. Toro, A. R. Elias-Boneta, and A. Encarnacion-Burgos. Effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in caries prevention and arrest: a systematic literature review. Gen Dent, 65(3):22–29, 2017.

30. [30] B. H. Oliveira, J. Cunha-Cruz, A. Rajendra, and R. Niederman. Controlling caries in exposed root surfaces with silver diamine fluoride: A systematic review with meta-analysis. J Am Dent Assoc, 149(8):671–679 e1, 2018.

31. [31] O. Urquhart, M. P. Tampi, L. Pilcher, R. L. Slayton, M. W. B. Araujo, M. Fontana, S. Guzm´an-Armstrong, M. M. Nascimento, B. B. Novy´, N. Tinanoff, R. J. Weyant, M. S. Wolff, D. A. Young, D. T. Zero, R. Brignardello-Petersen, L. Banfield, A. Parikh, G. Joshi, and A. Carrasco- Labra. Nonrestorative Treatments for Caries: Systematic Review and Net- work Meta-analysis. J Dent Res, 98(1):14–26, 01 2019.

32. [32] M. A. Willgerodt, D. M. Brock, and E. D. Maughan. Public School Nursing Practice in the United States. J Sch Nurs, 34(3):232–244, Jun 2018.

Figure 1: Study flow diagram for the CariedAway randomized controlled trial



Table 1: Demographics overall and by provider type for the baseline sample (N=1070) and follow-up sample (N=417)

	Baseline Sample						**Follow-up Sample**					
	All		**Hygienist/Dentist**		**Nurses**		**All**		**Hygienist/Dentist**		**Nurses**	
	N/Mean	% / SD	N	%	N	%	N/Mean	% / SD	N	%	N	%
Subjects	1070	100	755	100	315	100	417	100	298	71.46	119	28.54
Female	540	50.47	286	52.45	144	45.71	221	53	167	56.04	54	45.38
Race												
Hispanic	481	44.95	372	49.27	109	34.6	240	57.55	176	59.06	64	53.78
Black	171	15.98	136	18.01	35	11.11	98	23.5	64	21.48	34	28.57
White	26	2.43	19	2.52	7	2.22	10	2.4	8	2.68	2	1.68
Asian	14	1.31	14	1.85	0	0	14	3.36	10	3.36	4	3.36
Multiple	21	1.96	15	1.99	6	1.9	5	1.2	4	1.34	1	0.84
Other	12	1.12	8	1.06	4	1.27	11	2.64	7	2.35	4	3.36
DK/Missing	345	32.24	191	25.29	154	48.89	39	9.35	29	9.73	10	8.4
Untreated decay, follow-up	–	–	–	–	–	–	61	14.43	46	15.44	15	12.61
Sealants at baseline	105	9.81	78	10.33	27	8.57	43	10.31	33	11.07	10	8.4

Table 2: Prevention rates after two years (N=417)

	Hygienists/Dentists			**Nurses**			**Difference**		**95% CI**	
	N	mean	SE	N	mean	SE	mean	SE	Lower	Upper
Prevention	298	0.81	0.023	119	0.8	0.037	0.014	0.043	-0.07	0.098

Table 3: Regression model results for provider type (N=417)

Variable	**OR**	**SE**	**95% CIL**	**95% CIU**
Provider	0.9	0.25	0.52	1.55
Race				
Black	0.78	0.23	0.43	1.41
White	0.52	0.37	0.13	2.1
Asian	1.35	1.06	0.29	6.29
Other	1.5	1.17	0.33	6.88
Unreported	0.63	0.26	0.28	1.4
Age	1.05	0.11	0.85	1.3
Sex (male)	1.19	0.3	0.72	1.96
Sealants	0.95	0.41	0.41	2.24

Table 4: Comparison of nurses to hygienists in caries prevention, imputed data (N=1070)

Variable	**OR**	**SE**	**p-value**	**95% CIL**	**95% CIU**
Provider	1.01	0.2	0.944	0.68	1.5