A school-based trial of silver diamine fluoride for caries incidence

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

1. *Department of Epidemiology & Health Promotion, New York University College of Dentistry*
2. *New York University College of Global Public Health*

Correspondence to:
Ryan Richard Ruff, PhD, MPH
NYU College of Dentistry
433 First Avenue, Room 712
New York, NY, 10010
Tel: 212-998-9663
E-mail: ryan.ruff@nyu.edu

Running title: CariedAway

Total number of pages, figures, and supplementary tables: 25
Submitted to: medRxiv
Date: 15.8.23

Keywords: oral health; caries incidence; silver diamine fluoride; dental sealants; school health

Abstract word count: 247
Manuscript word count: 3582
Figures: 1
Tables: 5

Abstract

Background: Dental caries is a global health crisis. School-based sealant programs are effective strategies to increase access to care and reduce the risk of caries but are often limited by financial restraints and/or dental workforce barriers.

Methods: CariedAway was a cluster-randomized, single-blind, pragmatic non-inferiority trial comparing silver diamine fluoride (SDF) to glass ionomer sealants and atraumatic restorations (ART) for dental caries. Each group also received fluoride varnish. The subject population included children enrolled in New York City primary schools serving primarily low-income, minority children. Subjects were treated by dental hygienists or registered nurses. We report on the four-year cumulative incidence and prevalence of caries. Data were analyzed using two-group proportion tests with bootstrapped confidence intervals and multilevel mixed-effects regression for incidence and prevalence.

Results: A total of 7418 children were enrolled and treated, of which 4100 completed at least one follow-up observation (55%). The overall baseline prevalence of caries was approximately 27%. The crude incidence of caries in children treated with SDF was 9.2 per 1,000 tooth-years, versus 8.9 per 1,000 tooth-years in children treated with sealants and ART. The odds of decay prevalence decreased longitudinally (OR = 0.79, 95% CI = 0.753, 0.828) and SDF was non-inferior compared to sealants with ART (OR = 0.94, 90% CI = 0.795, 1.11).

Conclusion: A minimally invasive treatment of SDF and fluoride varnish demonstrated similar caries prevalence and incidence compared to the standard of care over four years, offering an attractive alternative to traditional school-based prevention for severely under-resourced areas.

Introduction

Dental caries—the "silent epidemic"—is the world's most prevalent noncommunicable disease [1]. The National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research estimates that over 40% of children have experienced caries, and those from minority or low-income backgrounds face even greater burdens [2]. To address this global unmet need, the World Health Organization includes fluoride varnish, glass ionomer sealants, and silver diamine fluoride (SDF) on its Model List of Essential Medicines [3].

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends school sealant programs to increase access to care for disadvantaged populations and reduce the prevalence of caries [4]. Dental sealants can prevent the onset of carious lesions and arrests them in the early stages [5], and are effective in both children and adolescents [6]. However, the burgeoning costs of care and the need for supervising clinicians may limit the spread of school sealant programs [7]. Alternatively, topical silver diamine fluoride (SDF) is used internationally as an economically efficient treatment for caries. In clinical studies, SDF application prevents caries in the primary dentition compared to placebo [8], is comparable to dental sealants [8], and arrests root caries [9]. In 2017, the United States Food and Drug Administration granted breakthrough therapy status to SDF [10].

The CariedAway pragmatic trial explored the use of silver diamine fluoride as an acceptable therapy for school-based caries control and prevention [11]. We previously demonstrated that a single combinative treatment application of SDF with fluoride varnish was non-inferior to sealants/ART in the two-year arrest of existing dental caries [12] and did not negatively affect quality of life [13]. Here we report on the longitudinal effectiveness of application on the cumulative incidence and prevalence of caries over a 4-year period when applied in a school program.

Methods

Design and Participants

CariedAway was a longitudinal, cluster-randomized, single-blind, non-inferiority pragmatic [14] clinical trial conducted from 1 February 2019 to 1 June 2023. The trial was approved by the New York University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board (#i7-00578) and is registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov (#NCT03442309). A complete trial protocol is publicly-accessible [11]. The overall objective of CariedAway was to compare the effectiveness of alternative, minimally-invasive treatments for dental caries when used in a school-based model. Primary clinical outcomes from CariedAway include the non-inferiority of caries arrest and prevalence after two years [12] and the incidence of caries after four years. Secondary outcomes include oral health-related quality of life, academic performance, and the effectiveness of school nurses in the treatment of caries.

Participants for CariedAway were enrolled through a two-stage process. In the first stage, any school in the New York City metropolitan area with a total student population consisting of at least 50% Hispanic/Latino or black ethnicities and at least 80% receiving free or reduced lunch was eligible for inclusion. In the second stage, any child with parental informed consent and assent in participating schools was enrolled. While any child meeting these criteria was enrolled, inclusion into analysis was restricted to those aged 5-13 years. Additional exclusion criteria included if the school had a pre-existing oral health program or provider (Stage 1) or if the child did not speak English (Stage 2).

Interventions and Procedures

Our primary experimental condition consisted of a combinative treatment of silver diamine fluoride (38% Elevate Oral Care Advantage Arrest, 2.24 F-ion mg/dose) and fluoride varnish (5% NaF, Colgate Prevident) application. We selected glass ionomer sealants/atraumatic restorations (GC Fuji IX) as our active comparator. Subjects in the active comparator arm also received identical application of fluoride varnish (FV). For the experimental treatment, one to two drops of Elevate Oral Care Advantage Arrest SDF was dispensed into a disposable mixing well and applied for a minimum of 30 seconds. Treated sites were then air dried for a minimum of 60 seconds. For standard of care, cavity conditioner was applied to pits and fissures for 10

seconds. Fuji IX capsules were mixed for 10 seconds at 4,000 RPM and then applied directly via the finger-sweep technique, ensuring that closed margins were achieved.

At baseline, SDF was placed on all pits and fissures of bicuspids and molars, as well as any asymptomatic cavitated lesions. Glass ionomer sealants were similarly applied to all pits and fissures of bicuspids and molars, and atraumatic restorations were placed on asymptomatic cavitated lesions. SDF was then reapplied as described at successive observations, and sealants were reapplied to any unsealed or partially sealed bicuspids and molars. All treatments were provided in a dedicated room in each school using mobile equipment by dental hygienists or registered nurses with the support of assistants and under the supervision of a licensed dentist. No personalization of the treatment plan was required or performed.

Randomization

Schools were block-randomized to either the experimental (SDF) or active control (sealants+ART) arm using a random number generator performed by RRR and verified by TBG.

Blinding

Participants were blinded to their treatment assignments. However, due to the staining effect of silver diamine fluoride when applied to porous structure, patients would be able to derive their groups. Clinicians and examiners were not blinded as the procedures differed for each treatment.

Data Collection and Outcomes

At each observation, subjects received a full visual-tactile oral examination. Caries diagnosis was conducted following the International Caries Detection and Assessment System (ICDAS) adapted criteria for epidemiology and clinical research settings [15]. Each tooth surface was assessed as being either intact/sound, sealed, restored, decayed, or arrested. Examiners were standardized using identical diagnostic and treatment protocols (see supplementary materials, appendix). Data were recorded using proprietary Electronic Health Record software designed

for CariedAway (New England Software Systems, Boston, MA) and securely uploaded to a 128-bit encryption repository at the conclusion of each observation. Data were then processed by a Data Coordinating Center at Boston University and locally stored on secure systems at New York University.

Our primary outcomes were the incidence and prevalence of dental caries. At each observational visit, every tooth and surface was inspected for evidence of untreated decay. Any instance of decay was considered a treatment failure, regardless of how many surfaces or teeth were affected. Additionally, any clinical presentation of a filling (e.g., amalgam, composite, stainless steel crown) on a tooth that previously was recorded as sound was similarly considered to be failure as it may be indicative of disease incidence in the time since the preceding observation.

Impact of COVID-19

The original protocol for CariedAway included biannual data collection. However, due to the impact of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, schools in New York City were closed to healthcare providers from March 2020 through September 2021. Thus, the time elapsed between the observations corresponding to this period was approximately two years. Upon reopening of schools to healthcare services, the original schedule was resumed.

Statistical Analysis

We first organized subjects by observation and computed individual descriptive statistics for sociodemographic and clinical variables for each study arm. At each observation, the proportion of subjects in treatment groups with new caries or newly observed fillings was determined and bootstrapped confidence intervals for the difference were computed to account for any clustering effect of schools. The intraclass correlation coefficient for clinical outcomes was estimated using intercept-only mixed effects models.

We assessed longitudinal noninferiority using mixed effects logistic regression models, where the outcome was the presence or absence of any new caries at each observation. Models included random intercepts for individual subjects and school. Our noninferiority margin of 10% was previously selected based on historical evidence and clinical judgement as to what would be an acceptable difference in efficacy for the prevention of dental caries [16,17]. We converted the margin to the odds ratio scale by taking the average of the success proportion in the active control arm and determining the equivalent margin, yielding an δ_{OR} of 0.63 [18]. We first tested noninferiority at any measurement period by including an interaction between treatment and time, followed by a model with no interaction to assess non-inferiority marginally. Comparisons to δ_{OR} were made using a $(1-2\alpha)$ confidence interval for the effect of treatment [19]. Models adjusted for baseline decay, race/ethnicity, evidence of dental care received prior to study enrollment, and sex.

We calculated the incidence rate for the total number of individual teeth that developed caries (in tooth-years) and derived the rate ratio as the most efficient estimator due to the small degree of intra-cluster correlation in responses [20]. We then modeled the per-person number of caries present at each observation using multilevel mixed-effects negative binomial regression. Pre-specified subgroup analyses for the effect of treatment over time and by the presence or absence of caries at baseline were performed. Covariates for incidence models were the same as those of prevalence.

Finally, we performed a series of supplementary analyses. To account for possible bias due to interval and right-censored observations, we analyzed cares incidence using Cox proportional hazards regression with nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation [21]. We then restricted analysis of caries incidence to the subset of participants who were enrolled and received their first examination and treatment in the semester prior to school shutdowns due to COVID-19. This latter approach avoids differential rates of follow-up between each observation for subjects in the analytic set.

Statistical significance was determined at $p < 0.05$. Analysis was performed in R v4.0 and Stata v16.

Results

A total of 7418 participants were enrolled in CariedAway across 48 schools (Figure 1). After randomization, there were 3739 subjects in the experimental group and 3679 subjects in the active control group. There were 4100 subjects who completed at least one follow-up observation (55%). The total study observation time was 4 years, consisting of 507 days from baseline to first follow-up, 300 from first to second, 195 from second to third, 169 from third to fourth, and 171 from fourth to fifth. As a result of the two-year hiatus of health services in schools due to COVID-19, any enrolled subjects in the fourth or fifth grades had aged out of the study upon resumption of data collection. The overall prevalence of baseline untreated caries was 26.7%, or 27.17% (95% CI = 25.7, 28.6) for the experimental group and 26.2% (95% CI = 24.8, 27.6) for the active control group. The average age at baseline for the full sample was 7.58 years (SD = 1.90) and was comprised of 46% male.

The prevalence of subjects with no new caries or fillings at each observation (Table 2) show similar proportions in both groups, with differences in prevalence ranging from -.001 to 0.031 across study observations. For example, at the first follow-up observation recorded an average of 507 days post-baseline, the prevalence of subjects with no untreated caries or newly observed fillings was 67% in the active control group and 64% in the experimental group, for a difference of 0.031. The bootstrapped 95% confidence interval for this difference was (-0.004, 0.067). For mixed-model analyses of caries prevalence over time (Table 3), the intraclass correlation coefficient across individual study observations ranged from 0.013 to 0.015. The interaction effect between time and treatment was not significant, indicating that non-inferiority could be assessed marginally. Expressed as the estimate for active control relative to experimental treatment for determining non-inferiority, the OR and $(1-2\alpha)$ confidence interval

was 0.94 (CI = 0.817, 1.081). The confidence interval for the marginal effect was outside the estimated δ_{OR} of 0.63 and non-inferior.

For newly observed caries across the full study duration (Table 4), the crude incidence rate in the experimental group was 9.2 caries per 1,000 tooth-years. The rate in the active control was 8.9 caries per 1,000 tooth-years, for a rate ratio of 1.029 (95% CI = 0.987, 1.07) and a preventive fraction of 0.03 (95% CI = -0.013, 0.067). From adjusted models for longitudinal caries incidence (Table 5), the overall risk rate over time reduced (IRR = 0.84, 95% CI = 0.83, 0.86) with each observation. The risk comparing subjects in the dental sealants with ART group to those in the SDF group was 0.924 (95% CI = 0.825, 1.035). There were no significant interactions between treatment and time and treatment and baseline decay status.

For supplementary analyses, the hazard ratio comparing the active control to experimental for time to first observed carious lesion was 0.91 (95% CI = -.826, 1.08). Post-estimation inspection of Turnbull's nonparametric and Cox predicted survival curves indicated that the data did not violate the proportional-hazards assumption (Supplementary Figure 1).

For the sub-sample, 4718 CariedAway subjects were enrolled, randomized, and treated in the semester prior to school closures resulting from COVID-19 (September 2019 through March 2020), of which 2998 were viable for follow-up after pandemic restrictions were lifted (Supplementary Figure 2). At the completion of the trial, follow-up data were obtained for 1831 subjects. A total of 380 (12.7%) subjects successfully completed one follow-up observation, 416 (13.9%) participants completed two, 430 (14.3%) completed three, 563 (18.8%) completed four, and 42 (1.4%) completed five. The corresponding duration in days for each follow-up observation for the sub-sample was 768, 193, 187, 161, and 163, for a total of 1472 days or 4.03 years. Compared to the full sample, the longer duration from baseline to first follow-up was due to study suspension in response to COVID-19. Approximately 29% of children in the sub-sample had untreated decay at baseline (Supplementary Table 1) and the average age was 6.63 (SD=1.24). Results for longitudinal analyses for caries prevalence (Supplementary Table 2)

and incidence (Supplementary Table 3) were similar to that of full-sample analyses. The odds ratio comparing active control to SDF-treated subjects for caries prevalence was 1.04 (95% CI = 0.82, 1.31) and non-inferior. Similarly, the incident rate ratio for total number of decayed teeth was 0.995 (95% CI = 0.851, 1.163)

Discussion

School-based sealant programs have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing the risk of dental caries [22], yet can be underused due to financial constraints and restrictive policies governing the supervision of dental hygienists [7]. As a result, many children continue to suffer from untreated disease, which can lead to systemic infection and negatively affect child development [23]. We conclude that silver diamine fluoride is an attractive alternative for use in a school-based oral health program that may address these barriers. Not only can silver diamine fluoride with fluoride varnish effectively reduce the risk of dental caries in high-risk children when applied in schools, but prior findings from CariedAway indicate that these treatments were similarly effective when applied by registered nurses compared to dental hygienists [24]. This offers a substantial opportunity for expanding the capabilities of school-based dental programs. SDF may also be cost-effective when compared to other caries management strategies [25], though potential restrictions from Medicaid reimbursement may persist [26].

Our overall results show that repeat application of silver diamine fluoride with fluoride varnish was non-inferior to identical application of dental sealants/ART in the longitudinal prevalence of caries when used in a school-based program. Little evidence currently exists on the long-term implementation of silver diamine fluoride in school caries prevention. An assessment of caries arrest in Indian school children concluded that SDF outperformed atraumatic restorations after nine months [27], while a school-based study in the Philippines found that a single application of SDF was ineffective in preventing caries when compared to sealants [28]. Other non-school clinical trials of the preventive efficacy of SDF compared to glass ionomer cement (GIC) determined that GIC was not significantly different than SDF in preventing caries

in primary dentition at 12 months [8] and similar proportions of pit/fissure sites with caries were observed after 24 months [17].

Prior results from CariedAway concluded that a single application of SDF and varnish was non-inferior to sealants/ART for caries arrest after two years, however analysis was restricted to children who did not have caries at baseline [12]. The presented findings assessed non-inferiority inclusive of both children who did or did not begin the study with active untreated decay, which has previously not been reported. The inclusion of subjects with untreated caries at study start results in a higher risk of subsequent disease development, and addresses concerns that caries incidence rates in children who present with no evidence of decay may be driven largely by better oral hygiene behavior, dietary intake, or access to routine dental cleanings, instead of the included interventions.

Although silver diamine fluoride is primarily used as a caries arresting agent, it may also be effective in the prevention of new caries [29,30]. There is a reduced risk of new caries on surrounding sound dentition when existing lesions are treated [31] and SDF is more effective than fluoride varnish in preventing new caries in early childhood [32]. Other trials are ongoing [33,34]. The mechanistic action of topical fluorides relates to the fluoride release rate, and while a consistent fluoride release is observed in varnishes over extended periods, release from SDF is rapid and of much heavier initial concentration [35]. Our use of both treatments reflects a pragmatic approach to school-based care, but our results present an opportunity to implement different treatment protocols in school programs that are based on specific need. For example, schools or districts with economic of staffing limitations could derive considerable benefit from using silver diamine fluoride as the primary intervention. Alternatively, programs with the financial and professional means could utilize silver diamine fluoride as an immediate approach to control infection and then apply sealants and ART to restore form and function, or utilize only dental sealants, which remain an effective dental public health intervention.

Approximately 1 in 4 of children participating in CariedAway had untreated disease at baseline (1 in 3 for the COVID-19 sample), and we previously showed that only 11% had pre-existing sealants at their time of enrollment [36]. Following treatment, the overall risk of caries decreased over time in both study arms. The risk of incident caries was nearly identical in both treatment groups, resulting in a very small preventive fraction between the included interventions. This was not unexpected given the non-inferiority design. Similarly, the data indicate no significant differences across treatment in the risk of first caries eruption or when modeling the total number of new caries experienced overall, nor is there sufficient evidence to indicate whether there are differences in treatment effect over time or based on the presence of disease at baseline. Prior research on dental sealants estimates a 50% preventive fraction compared to placebo, and comparisons of children with and without dental sealants concludes that the prevention of over three million cavities would be attributable to sealants [37]. Our results may support a similar conclusion for the application of silver diamine fluoride.

Caregivers and community stakeholders participating in school sealant programs recommend that strategies supporting the use of silver diamine fluoride in schools include community engagement, child-centered outcomes, proper informed consent, and dissemination strategies to communicate findings [38]. The CariedAway study included a stakeholder and community advisory board that collaborated with investigators on the design and conduct of the trial, supported recruitment efforts, and assisted in interpretation and dissemination of results. Stakeholders also provided input on informed consent. The study advisory board included dental public health professionals, representatives from the city departments of health and education, school principals, nurses, teachers, and parents. This supported a patient-centered approach to school-based care and obviated potential issues with large-scale application of silver diamine fluoride in a pediatric population.

While the American Dental Association [39] and the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry [40] include silver diamine fluoride in their clinical recommendations for caries management, known complications with SDF application include potential oral soft tissue irritation, temporary

staining of the oral mucosa, and permanent staining of porous tooth structure such as caries or hypomineralization [29]. Despite thousands of SDF applications in CariedAway, we encountered no adverse events and received only one complaint regarding staining, which pertained to superficial skin staining from accidental spillage that was mistaken for bruising. Our prior findings from CariedAway similarly did not indicate a negative impact of SDF therapy on oral health-related quality of life, which included measures for aesthetic perceptions of the oral cavity [13]. Other research concludes that a high proportion of parents of children treated with silver diamine fluoride remain satisfied with their child's dental appearance [41], that aesthetic concerns are mitigated with posterior application [42], and that no differences were found in adverse events or aesthetic perceptions when comparing children treated with SDF or ART [43]. Our results suggest that use of SDF in a school-based program is well tolerated by both children and their caregivers.

As a pragmatic trial, there are concerns regarding subject attrition and the potential bias from external care. Our analysis used all available observations for study subjects and also considered a subset of participants that had equal rates of follow-up to address the disruption in study activities due to the effects of COVID-19. Additionally, assessment of caries incidence included not only active decay but any evidence of decay that was treated by an external clinician. We also included multiple definitions of prevention, including any incidence of decay, overall prevalence, time to first eruption, and estimates at both the tooth and person levels. Our analysis further adjusted for censoring, a common issue in the assessment of school-based programs. While attrition is a clear weakness, the pragmatic nature of the trial is also its strength. Our results reflect the practical, real-world impact of a school-based oral health model that utilizes silver diamine fluoride for long-term caries management.

In conclusion, children treated with silver diamine fluoride and fluoride varnish presented with similar incidence of caries compared to those receiving sealants and atraumatic restorations in an approximate four-year study of dental caries in a school-based program. The relative simplicity of SDF application, together with potential cost-saving benefits and versatility in

application by nurses, may overcome traditional barriers to the proliferation of school-based sealant programs and increase the reach of school caries prevention for high-risk children.

Author Contribution

RRR and RN conceived of the CariedAway study and obtained funding. RRR wrote the manuscript and performed analyses. TBG directed clinical operations, collected data, and managed study clinical teams. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript.

References

1. Bernabe E, Marcenes W, Hernandez CR, et al. Global, Regional, and National Levels and Trends in Burden of Oral Conditions from 1990 to 2017: A Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden of Disease 2017 Study. *Journal of dental research*. Apr 2020;99(4):362-373. doi:10.1177/0022034520908533
2. Dental Caries (Tooth Decay) in Children Age 2 to 11. Accessed 10 August, 2022. https://www.nidcr.nih.gov/research/data-statistics/dental-caries/children
3. WHO Model Lists of Essential Medicines. Accessed 10 August, 2022. https://www.who.int/groups/expert-committee-on-selection-and-use-of-essential-medicines/essential-medicines-lists
4. Griffin S, Naavaal S, Scherrer C, Griffin PM, Harris K, Chattopadhyay S. School-Based Dental Sealant Programs Prevent Cavities And Are Cost-Effective. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. Dec 1 2016;35(12):2233-2240. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2016.0839
5. Cabalen MB, Molina GF, Bono A, Burrow MF. Nonrestorative Caries Treatment: A Systematic Review Update. *International dental journal*. Jul 22 2022;doi:10.1016/j.identj.2022.06.022
6. Kashbour W, Gupta P, Worthington HV, Boyers D. Pit and fissure sealants versus fluoride varnishes for preventing dental decay in the permanent teeth of children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Nov 4 2020;11:CD003067. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003067.pub5
7. Patel N, Griffin SO, Linabarger M, Lesaja S. Impact of school sealant programs on oral health among youth and identification of potential barriers to implementation. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*. 2022;doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2022.05.011
8. Oliveira BH, Rajendra A, Veitz-Keenan A, Niederman R. The Effect of Silver Diamine Fluoride in Preventing Caries in the Primary Dentition: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Caries Res*. Jun 6 2018;53(1):24-32. doi:10.1159/000488686
9. Brignardello-Petersen R. Silver diamine fluoride seems to be effective in preventing and arresting root caries in older adults compared with placebo, but there is very low certainty in the magnitude of the benefit. *J Am Dent Assoc*. Aug 10 2018;doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.06.021
10. Horst JA. Silver Fluoride as a Treatment for Dental Caries. *Adv Dent Res*. Feb 2018;29(1):135-140. doi:10.1177/0022034517743750
11. Ruff RR, Niederman R. 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*. Sep 26 2018;19(1):523. doi:10.1186/s13063-018-2891-1

12. Ruff RR, Barry-Godin T, Niederman R. Effect of Silver Diamine Fluoride on Caries Arrest and Prevention: The CariedAway School-Based Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. Feb 1 2023;6(2):e2255458. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.55458
13. Ruff RR, Barry Godin TJ, Small TM, Niederman R. 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*. Apr 12 2022;22(1):125. doi:10.1186/s12903-022-02159-5
14. Ford I, Norrie J. Pragmatic Trials. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 4 2016;375(5):454-63. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1510059
15. Gugnani N, Pandit IK, Srivastava N, Gupta M, Sharma M. International Caries Detection and Assessment System (ICDAS): A New Concept. *Int J Clin Pediatr Dent*. May-Aug 2011;4(2):93-100. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10005-1089
16. Non-inferiority clinical trials to establish effectiveness: Guidance for Industry (Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration) (2016).
17. Liu BY, Lo EC, Chu CH, Lin HC. Randomized trial on fluorides and sealants for fissure caries prevention. *Journal of dental research*. Aug 2012;91(8):753-8. doi:10.1177/0022034512452278
18. Tunes da Silva G, Logan BR, Klein JP. Methods for equivalence and noninferiority testing. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. Jan 2009;15(1 Suppl):120-7. doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2008.10.004
19. Mascha EJ, Sessler DI. Equivalence and noninferiority testing in regression models and repeated-measures designs. *Anesth Analg*. Mar 2011;112(3):678-87. doi:10.1213/ANE.0b013e318206f872
20. Bennett S, Parpia T, Hayes R, Cousens S. Methods for the analysis of incidence rates in cluster randomized trials. *Int J Epidemiol*. Aug 2002;31(4):839-46. doi:10.1093/ije/31.4.839
21. Zeng D, Mao L, Lin DY. Maximum likelihood estimation for semiparametric transformation models with interval-censored data. *Biometrika*. Jun 2016;103(2):253-271. doi:10.1093/biomet/asw013
22. Starr JR, Ruff RR, Palmisano J, Goodson JM, Bukhari OM, Niederman R. Longitudinal caries prevalence in a comprehensive, multicomponent, school-based prevention program. *J Am Dent Assoc*. Mar 2021;152(3):224-233 e11. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2020.12.005
23. Ruff RR, Senthi S, Susser SR, Tsutsui A. Oral health, academic performance, and school absenteeism in children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Dent Assoc*. Feb 2019;150(2):111-121 e4. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.09.023
24. Ruff RR, Barry Godín TJ, Niederman R. Non-inferiority of silver diamine fluoride for caries prevention when applied by nurses compared to dental hygienists: Results from the CariedAway school-based clinical trial. *medRxiv*. 2023;doi:10.1101/2022.05.09.22274845
25. Yeung SST, Argaez C. *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; 2017.
26. Johhnson B, Serban N, Griffin PM, Tomar SL. Projecting the economic impact of silver diamine fluoride on caries treatment expenditures and outcomes in young U.S. children. *J Public Health Dent*. Sep 2019;79(3):215-221. doi:10.1111/jphd.12312
27. Satyarup D, Mohanty S, Nagarajappa R, Mahapatra I, Dalai RP. Comparison of the effectiveness of 38% silver diamine fluoride and atraumatic restorative treatment for treating

dental caries in a school setting: A randomized clinical trial. *Dent Med Probl*. Apr-Jun 2022;59(2):217-223. doi:10.17219/dmp/143547
28. Monse B, Heinrich-Weltzien R, Mulder J, Holmgren C, van Palenstein Helderman WH. Caries preventive efficacy of silver diammine fluoride (SDF) and ART sealants in a school-based daily fluoride toothbrushing program in the Philippines. *BMC oral health*. Nov 21 2012;12:52. doi:10.1186/1472-6831-12-52
29. Horst JA, Heima M. Prevention of Dental Caries by Silver Diamine Fluoride. *Compend Contin Educ Dent*. Mar 2019;40(3):158-163; quiz 164.
30. Llodra JC, Rodriguez A, Ferrer B, Menardia V, Ramos T, Morato M. Efficacy of silver diamine fluoride for caries reduction in primary teeth and first permanent molars of schoolchildren: 36-month clinical trial. *Journal of dental research*. Aug 2005;84(8):721-4. doi:10.1177/154405910508400807
31. Oliveira Branca H, Rajendra A, Veitz-Keenan A, Niederman R. The Effect of Silver Diamine Fluoride in Preventing Caries in the Primary Dentition: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Caries Research*. 2019;53(1):24-32. doi:10.1159/000488686
32. Deshpande A, Tailor B, Jain A, Shah YS, Jaiswal V. Effectiveness of Silver Diamine Fluoride and Sodium Fluoride Varnish in Preventing New Carious Lesion in Preschoolers: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *International Journal of Clinical Pediatric Dentistry*. 2023;16(1):1-8. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10005-2488
33. Gao SS, Chen KJ, Duangthip D, Wong MCM, Lo ECM, Chu CH. Preventing early childhood caries with silver diamine fluoride: study protocol for a randomised clinical trial. *Trials*. 2020;21(1)doi:10.1186/s13063-020-4088-7
34. Basheer NA, Jodalli PS, Nayak N, K SA, Badekkila AR. Effectiveness of Silver Diamine Fluoride for Early Childhood Caries Among Children Aged 24 to 72 Months: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. Jun 7 2023;12:e46144. doi:10.2196/46144
35. Fontana M, Guzmán-Armstrong S, Angeles Martínez Mier E, Nascimento MM, Slayton RL. Fluoride Varnish and Silver Diamine Fluoride:
Fluoride Release Analysis and Clinical Guidance. *ADA Professional Product Review*. 2017;12(2)
36. Ruff RR, Barry-Godin T, Whittemore R, Small TM, Santiago-Galvin N, Sharma P. Severity of dental caries in New York City children receiving school-based prevention and the impact of SARS- CoV-2: Results from the CariedAway pragmatic trial. *medRxiv*. 2022;doi:10.1101/2022.05.16.22275165
37. Griffin SO, Wei L, Gooch BF, Weno K, Espinoza L. Vital Signs: Dental Sealant Use and Untreated Tooth Decay Among U.S. School-Aged Children. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Oct 21 2016;65(41):1141-1145. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6541e1
38. Chi DL, Milgrom P, Gillete J. Engaging Stakeholders in Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Regarding School-Based Sealant Programs. *J Dent Hyg*. 2018;92(1):16-22.
39. Slayton RL, Urquhart O, Araujo MWB, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice guideline on nonrestorative treatments for carious lesions: A report from the American Dental Association. *J Am Dent Assoc*. Oct 2018;149(10):837-849 e19. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.07.002
40. Crystal YO, Marghalani AA, Ureles SD, et al. Use of Silver Diamine Fluoride for Dental Caries Management in Children and Adolescents, Including Those with Special Health Care Needs. *Pediatr Dent*. Sep 15 2017;39(5):135-145.

41. Duangthip D, Fung MHT, Wong MCM, Chu CH, Lo ECM. Adverse Effects of Silver Diamine Fluoride Treatment among Preschool Children. *Journal of dental research*. Apr 2018;97(4):395-401. doi:10.1177/0022034517746678
42. Crystal YO, Janal MN, Hamilton DS, Niederman R. Parental perceptions and acceptance of silver diamine fluoride staining. *J Am Dent Assoc*. Jul 2017;148(7):510-518 e4. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2017.03.013
43. Vollu AL, Rodrigues GF, Rougemount Teixeira RV, et al. Efficacy of 30% silver diamine fluoride compared to atraumatic restorative treatment on dentine caries arrestment in primary molars of preschool children: A 12-months parallel randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Dent*. Sep 2019;88:103165. doi:10.1016/j.jdent.2019.07.003

Table 1: Sample demographics overall and by treatment

	Overall		Experimental		Active Control	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Subjects	7418	100	3739	50.4	3679	49.6
Baseline decay	1980	26.69	1016	27.17	964	26.2
Sex (male)	3412	46	1785	47.74	1627	44.24
Race/Ethnicity						
Hispanic/Latino	3648	49.18	1766	47.23	1882	51.16
Black	1246	16.8	650	17.38	596	16.2
White	153	2.06	86	2.3	67	1.82
Asian	125	1.69	88	2.35	37	1.01
More than one	114	1.54	67	1.79	47	1.28
Other	90	1.21	56	1.5	34	0.92
Unreported	2042	27.53	1026	27.44	1016	27.62
Age at baseline	7.58	1.90 (SD)	7.55	1.92 (SD)	7.63	1.88 (SD)

Table 2: Prevalence of subjects without new caries or new fillings at each observation for active control (C) and experimental (T)

Observation	Duration	C	T	C-T	95% L	95% U
2nd	507	0.67	0.64	0.031	-0.004	0.067
3rd	300	0.69	0.69	-0.001	-0.042	0.039
4th	195	0.7	0.7	0.003	-0.047	0.051
5th	169	0.76	0.75	0.01	-0.029	0.059

Table 3: Longitudinal caries prevalence
(untreated decay)

	OR	SE	p-value	95% L	95% U
Observational period	0.789	0.019	< .001	0.753	0.828
Active control (vs exp)	0.94	0.08	0.465	0.795	1.11
Baseline decay	82.751	9.719	< .001	65.735	104.173
Previous care	0.755	0.116	0.067	0.56	1.019
Sex (Males)	1.063	0.09	0.466	0.9	1.256
Race/Ethnicity					
Black	1.057	0.116	0.614	0.842	1.31
White	0.655	0.188	0.141	0.372	1.151
Asian	0.802	0.244	0.468	0.442	1.454
Multiple	0.872	0.326	0.714	0.42	1.812
Other	2.104	0.638	0.014	1.16	3.81
Unreported	0.962	0.118	0.753	0.756	1.224

Table 4: Incidence rate of dental caries for experimental and active control

	Experimental	Active Control	Total
Caries	4855	4313	9168
Tooth-days	528527.4	483157.4	1011685
Incidence Rate	0.0092	0.0089	0.0091

	Estimate	95% CI
Incidence rate difference	0.0002	-.0001, .0006
Incidence rate ratio	1.029	0.987, 1.07

Table 5: Longitudinal caries incidence

	IRR	SE	p-value	95% L	95% U
Observational period	0.828	0.009	< .001	0.810	0.846
Active control (vs exp)	0.924	0.053	0.172	0.825	1.035
Baseline decay	17.277	1.018	< .001	15.393	19.391
Previous care	0.758	0.076	0.005	0.624	0.922
Sex (male)	1.050	0.055	0.349	0.948	1.164
Race/Ethnicity					
Black	0.987	0.068	0.854	0.863	1.130
White	0.721	0.133	0.076	0.503	1.035
Asian	0.907	0.170	0.602	0.627	1.310
Multiple	0.932	0.208	0.752	0.602	1.442
Other	1.742	0.304	0.001	1.237	2.452
Unreported	0.931	0.071	0.351	0.801	1.082

Figure 1: CONSORT Flow Diagram



Supplementary Table 1:



Supplementary Figure S1: CONSORT diagram, COVID-19 sample



Supplementary Table 1: Sample demographics overall and by treatment, COVID-19 sample

	Overall		Experimental		Active Control	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Subjects	2998	100	1554	51.83	1444	48.17
Baseline decay	874	29.15	482	31.02	392	27.15
Sex (male)	1432	47.77	664	45.98	769	49.42
Race/Ethnicity						
Hispanic	1631	54.4	810	52.12	821	56.86
Black	558	18.61	311	20.01	247	17.11
White	75	2.5	36	2.32	39	2.7
Asian	44	1.47	29	1.87	15	1.04
More than one	58	1.93	34	2.19	24	1.66
Other	41	1.37	24	1.54	17	1.18
Unreported	591	19.71	310	19.95	281	19.46
Age at baseline	6.63	1.24 (SD)	6.62	1.25 (SD)	6.65	1.24 (SD)

Supplementary Table 2: Longitudinal caries prevalence (untreated caries), COVID-19 sample

	OR	SE	p	95% L	95% U
Observational period	0.789	0.025	< .001	0.741	0.84
Active control (vs exp)	1.04	0.125	0.763	0.819	1.31
Baseline decay	46.57	7.18	< .001	34.43	62.99
Previous care	0.744	0.152	0.148	0.499	1.11
Sex (Males)	1.04	0.125	0.751	0.821	1.31
Race/Ethnicity					
Black	1.04	0.158	0.797	0.772	1.4
White	0.89	0.342	0.757	0.418	1.89
Asian	0.489	0.224	0.118	0.2	1.2
Multiple	0.663	0.363	0.454	0.227	1.94
Other	2.05	0.844	0.08	0.917	4.59
Unreported	1.07	0.205	0.723	0.735	1.56

Supplementary Table 3: Longitudinal caries incidence, COVID-19 sample

	IRR	SE	p-value	95% L	95% U
Observational period	0.816	0.013	< .001	0.792	0.841
Active control (vs exp)	0.995	0.079	0.948	0.851	1.163
Baseline decay	12.678	0.106	< .001	10.770	14.930
Previous care	0.776	0.103	0.056	0.598	1.001
Sex (male)	1.030	0.078	0.651	0.893	1.120
Race/Ethnicity					
Black	1.000	0.097	0.964	0.832	1.213
White	0.878	0.217	0.598	0.540	1.426
Asian	0.629	0.187	0.119	0.351	1.127
Multiple	0.728	0.244	0.345	0.377	1.406
Other	1.560	0.392	0.078	0.952	2.553
Unreported	0.981	0.117	0.873	0.776	1.240