

Title: Negative Clinical Outcomes Between Silver Diamine Fluoride, Sedation, and General Anesthesia Treatment for Children with Early Childhood Caries: A Cohort Study

Authors: David Okuji, DDS, MBA, MS¹; Yen Dinh, DMD²; Tony McClure, DDS³; Myeonggyun Lee, PhD⁴

¹Senior Associate Director, NYU Langone Dental Medicine, Hansjörg Wyss Department of Plastic Surgery, Division of Dental Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, 5800 Third Avenue, 3rd Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11220

²Predoctoral Student, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, 188 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115

³Associate Director, NYU Langone Dental Medicine, Southcentral Foundation/Alaska Native Medical Center, 4441 Diplomacy Drive, Anchorage, Alaska 99508

⁴Biostatistician, Division of Biostatistics, Department of Population Health, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, 180 Madison Ave., 5th Floor, New York, NY 10016

Short Title: Silver diamine fluoride, sedation, general anesthesia outcomes

Keywords: early-childhood-caries, silver-diamine-fluoride, sedation, general-anesthesia, outcomes

Corresponding Author:

David Okuji, DDS, MBA, MS
NYU Langone Hospitals
5800 Third Avenue, 3rd Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11220
Email: david.okuji@nyulangone.org

Word Count: Text 3,749 (3,500 maximum), Abstract 249 (250 maximum)

Abstract

Purpose:

This study compared the wait-time for treatment completion and pre- and post-treatment outcomes of treating early childhood caries with silver diamine fluoride, sedation, and general anesthesia.

Methods:

This retrospective study examined children with early childhood caries treated with either silver diamine fluoride, sedation, or general anesthesia at federally qualified health centers. Demographics, wait-time for treatment completion, and pre- and post-treatment clinical outcomes were compared with analysis of variance for continuous variables and the Chi-square test for categorical variables. This study was reviewed and approved by Southcentral Foundation Research Review.

Results:

The outcomes between the silver diamine fluoride, sedation, and general anesthesia groups were respectively: 1) average wait-times to complete treatment at 49.6, 62.5, and 116.3 days, 2) mean number of pre-treatment visits at 1.08, 1.25, and 1.61, 3) mean number of post-treatment visits at 1.41, 1.29, and 1.45.

Multiple negative outcomes were identified when the sedation and general anesthesia groups were compared with the silver diamine fluoride reference group for 1) pre-treatment visits with un-planned visits (for general anesthesia only), pain, intra-oral swelling, and prescriptions for pain and antibiotic medications (general anesthesia only) and 2) post-treatment visits with new carious lesions on permanent molars, new carious lesions on primary teeth (sedation only), intra-oral swelling (sedation only only), broken restorations, displaced restorations, and pulpal therapy (sedation only).

Conclusions:

Silver diamine fluoride provides timely and effective caries management with lower wait-time for treatment completion, clinical outcomes consistent with minimally invasive treatment, and mitigation for the risk of negative pre- and post-operative clinical outcomes compared to treatment under sedation or general anesthesia.

Introduction

According to the 2016 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, caries is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases among children in the United States.¹ Early childhood caries (**ECC**) refers to carious lesions in infants and preschool children. ECC has severe negative impacts on young children. ECC causes pain, infection, difficulty eating, poor weight gain, and behavioral issues when left untreated.² The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry defines ECC as one or more decayed, missing, or filled tooth surfaces due to caries in any primary tooth of a child under 6 years old. In children under three years old, severe early childhood caries (**S-ECC**) refers to any signs of tooth decay on smooth tooth surfaces. For children age 3-5, S-ECC is when there is one or more cavitated, missing, or filled smooth surfaces in primary maxillary anterior teeth or decayed, missing, or filled score ≥ 4 (age 3), ≥ 5 (age 4), or ≥ 6 (age 5).³

Dentists treat ECC and S-ECC through a combination of preventive measures and restorative treatments. Despite numerous effective treatment options, however, challenges often arise because young patients have fear of the dentist, or are unable to understand and cooperate for the duration of the procedure.⁴ For these patients, pharmacological management ranging from minimal sedation (**SED**) to general anesthesia (**GA**) has been the standard of care to facilitate a safer environment for patients to receive comprehensive, high-quality dental care.²

While these time-efficient methods reduce patient discomfort and enable clinicians to provide complete dental treatment, they also come with risks that require careful consideration. Sedation and GA in young children can result in allergic reactions, respiratory complications,

cardiovascular issues, and in some cases, even death.⁵⁻⁹ Studies on animal models have shown that when exposed to sedation and GA for prolonged periods or repeatedly during early development, neurons may undergo apoptosis, resulting in persistent functional impairments that affect learning, memory, and behavior.¹⁰ According to clinical studies, repeated exposure to GA before the age of two has been identified as a significant risk factor for the development of learning disorders and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.^{11,12}

While sedation and GA provide an optimal environment for dental treatment, they can have high failure rates for restoration in young children with ECC. Studies indicate that parents do not recognize the importance of regular dental check-ups after sedation or GA procedures, resulting in a lack of follow-up care.¹³ Factors such as nursing bottle time after GA, duration and techniques children use to brush their teeth, and inadequate dental care contribute to the need for repeat treatment under sedation or GA.¹⁴ Furthermore, children with ECC are particularly vulnerable to the development of new and recurrent carious lesions. Lin et al. conducted a cross-sectional study involving 79 pediatric patients who previously received treatment under GA for ECC, which found that 79.7 percent of the children had developed new carious lesions at the 12-month follow-up examination.¹⁵

Access to sedation and GA services can be challenging for some children due to long wait times, limited insurance coverage, high demand for GA services, reduced operating room capacity, and a shortage of trained clinicians to perform GA. Studies have shown that longer wait times for dental procedures are associated with a number of negative outcomes, including increased pain, a higher number of teeth treated than originally planned, and more frequent pre- and post-operative visits.¹⁶ Another significant barrier occurs when insurance companies refuse to reimburse for sedation and GA dental procedure.¹⁷ Patients are often left to bear the burden of these out-of-pocket costs, which can range from hundreds to thousands of dollars, disproportionately affecting low-income patients who already face significant barriers to accessing dental care.¹⁸

Due to the aforementioned drawbacks of sedation and GA, alternative approaches, such as minimally invasive care with silver diamine fluoride (**SDF**), have gained increasing attention in recent years for their potential to provide non-invasive, effective treatment with fewer associated risks and costs. SDF is the most concentrated fluoride product commercially available for caries management, containing approximately 25 percent silver, eight percent amine, five percent fluoride, and 62 percent water.¹⁹ Multiple clinical trials and systematic reviews have demonstrated the effectiveness of SDF in arresting or halting the progression of carious lesions while promoting remineralization of the surface zone.²⁰⁻²³

SDF is applied topically with a micro-brush. The resulting arrested lesion is stained black, with no other major complications reported.²¹ Although staining, particularly on anterior teeth, is undesirable, most parents still prefer SDF over the use of sedation and general anesthesia.²⁴ SDF has also demonstrated greater efficacy in preventing new carious lesions compared to topical fluoride, while being a more cost-effective alternative to sealants.²⁵ As its potential benefits appear to outweigh the drawbacks, researchers and clinicians are increasingly advocating for the use of SDF.²⁶⁻²⁸ However, additional research on the clinical outcomes of patients is necessary to gain a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness and potential long-term effects of SDF compared to the current standard of care.

This present study aims to compare the wait-time for treatment completion and negative clinical outcomes of treating children with ECC with SDF, sedation, or GA treatment modalities; with the null hypothesis that there are no differences in pre-treatment and post-treatment negative clinical outcomes.

Methods

Study Design & Setting

A cohort study design with a retrospective chart review was conducted for children with ECC who were treated with either SDF, under sedation, or under GA at NYU Langone Dental

Medicine-Advanced Education in Pediatric Dentistry program training locations in seven states (Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, and Tennessee) between January 1, 2010, and April 24, 2022. The study was approved by the NYU Grossman School of Medicine Institutional Review Board under protocol number 20-00142.

Participants, Variables, Data Sources/Measurement

Eligible participants were included as follows: 1) patients of record at an NYU Langone Dental Program training location; 2) less than 7-years old on the date of the treatment plan for SDF, sedation, or GA; 3) American Society of Anesthesiologists (**ASA**) classification I, II, and III; 4) recorded with <4 pre-treatment visits between the treatment planning date and the treatment date; 5) SDF participants had <4 total SDF visits; 6) sedation participants had <4 total sedation visits; and 7) all participants had <6 post-treatment visits between the final treatment date and the next regularly scheduled 6-month recall visit.

Participants were assigned to their categorical variable of treatment modalities by filtering of electronic health records with Current Dental Terminology codes definitions, as follows: 1) SDF treatment as “D1354 (interim caries arresting medication),” sedation treatment as “D9248 (non-intravenous conscious sedation),” and general anesthesia treatment as “D9420 (Hospital Call).”

For cases where invasive procedures are not feasible or suitable, SDF is a minimally invasive care treatment employed to manage and halt the progression of dental caries during the patient’s visit. For patients with anxiety and fear during the dental procedure, various levels of SED are utilized to induce a relaxed and calm state while keeping the patient conscious and responsive throughout the treatment. GA induces a state of unconsciousness and is primarily employed for complicated or invasive procedures, as well as for patients with special health care needs or complex medical conditions, extreme anxiety and fear, or limited cooperation.

Data obtained from each chart included demographic information such as age, sex, ethnicity, race, payer source, date of initial treatment plan consultation, date of treatment plan completion, and pre- and post-treatment data. The treatment data included ASA classification; purpose of visits; new carious lesions on primary and permanent teeth; pain, intra-oral and extra-oral swelling; analgesic and antibiotic prescriptions; extractions; intra-oral incision and drainage; pulpal therapy; definitive, broken, and displaced restorations; SDF topical application; and interim therapeutic restorations.

Bias

Information bias, due to missing chart information, was addressed by excluding incomplete records from the analysis under the missing at random assumption since there was a sufficiently large number of participant observations. Confounding bias was addressed with adjustments in the statistical analyses for the confounding variables of child's age, gender, race/ethnicity, and payor source.

Study Size

A power analysis based upon the results for the effect size for appointment wait-times from a similar study,¹⁶ estimated a sample size of 805 participants to yield an 80 percent power level at alpha equal to 0.05. The sample size for this present study exceeded that of the power analysis estimate to ensure a sufficient statistical power level.

Quantitative Variables

Wait-time for treatment completion (in days) was defined as a continuous variable from the date of the initial treatment plan consultation to the date of completed intervention.

The negative pre- and post-treatment clinical outcomes were defined "Yes" responses as follows:

1. New carious lesions on permanent molars
2. New carious lesions on primary teeth
3. Presence of pain
4. Presence of extra-oral swelling
5. Presence of intra-oral swelling
6. Presence of broken restorations and/or space maintainers (i.e., “broken” restorations/space maintainers included those with marginal breakdown, deep marginal ditching, tooth discoloration, chipped or fractured restoration, tooth fracture, and secondary caries²⁹)
7. Observation of displaced restoration(s) and/or space maintainers (i.e., partial- or full-displacement)
8. Prescription for pain medication(s)
9. Prescription for antibiotic medication(s)
10. Performance of dental extraction(s)
11. Performance of incision and drainage (intra-oral only)
12. Performance of pulpal therapy
13. Performance of definitive restoration(s)
14. Performance of SDF topical application
15. Performance of interim therapeutic restoration(s)

In addition, the negative post-treatment clinical outcomes included the additional variable as follows:

Purpose of visit category checked as “Planned,” “Unplanned,” or “Other.”

Statistical Methods

For descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and frequency and percentage for categorical variables were calculated. The descriptive statistics

were reported overall in the pooled data. Each variable, including demographics, wait-time for treatment completion, and clinical outcomes, were compared across the three treatment groups with the analysis of variance for continuous variables and the Chi-square test for categorical variables. Because the variable for wait-time for treatment completion was right-skewed, the reported median with interquartile range and the p-value using Kruskal-Wallis test as a nonparametric test were additionally reported.

To compare wait-time for treatment completion between the three groups, adjusted for potential confounders, a generalized linear model with the log of mean response (i.e., Gamma model with the log link) where the waiting time outcome is right-skewed was conducted. Logistic regressions for each question from pre- and post-treatment visits were conducted to identify the association of treatment while adjusting for the confounders.

All statistical tests were two-sided, with Wald type confidence intervals provided, and $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed in R version 4.2.1.³⁰

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive analyses and statistically significant inferential associations across three treatment modalities. Descriptively, the sample size was 4,730 child-participants, with a mean age of 3.9 years old, 52.5 percent of male, 46.0 percent Hispanic, 13.6 percent White, and 90.5 percent with Medicaid insurance. The GA group had the highest number of pre-treatment visits (mean of 1.61), followed by the SED (1.25) and SDF (1.08) groups with $p < 0.001$.

In post-treatment visits, the GA group had the highest number (1.45), followed by SDF (1.41) and SED (1.29) with $p < 0.001$. The hierarchy of mean average wait-times for treatment completion, in days, was GA (116.3), SED (62.5), and SDF (49.6) with $p < 0.001$. After adjusting for potential confounders, the wait-times for treatment completion for the GA and SED groups

were respectively 2.36 (= exp (0.86)) and 1.30 (= exp (0.26)) times higher compared to SDF group with $p < 0.001$ (Figure 1).

Table 2 provides a comprehensive breakdown of pre-treatment visits and clinical outcomes based on the three treatment modalities. The GA group had the highest proportion of unplanned visits, pain, prescription for antibiotic medications, and other procedures performed followed by SED and SDF ($p < 0.001$). Additionally, the GA group also had the highest proportion of prescriptions for pain medication, dental extraction(s), and interim therapeutic restoration(s) followed by SDF and SED, respectively ($p < 0.001$). The SED group had the highest proportion of at least one erupted permanent molar and intra-oral swelling followed by GA and SDF ($p < 0.001$). The SDF group had the highest proportion of new caries on primary teeth and exam, prophylaxis, topical fluoride, and/or radiograph procedures followed by GA and SED ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the SDF also had the highest proportion of pulpal therapy and definitive restoration procedures followed by SED and GA ($p < 0.001$). In terms of intra-oral incision and drainage procedures, SED and GA had the highest proportion, followed by SDF ($p < 0.001$).

Table 3 outlines the post-treatment visits and the corresponding clinical outcomes for each of the three treatment modalities. The SED group had the highest proportion of exam, prophylaxis, topical fluoride and/or radiographs performed, as well as at least one erupted permanent molar and new carious lesion on permanent tooth, followed by GA and SDF ($p < 0.001$). The SED group also had the highest proportion of new caries on primary teeth, prescription for antibiotic medication, presence of pain, intra-oral swellings, and pulpal therapy performed followed by SDF and GA, respectively ($p < 0.05$). The GA group had the highest proportion of broken or displaced restoration(s)/space maintainer(s) followed by SED and SDF ($p < 0.001$). The GA group also had the highest proportion of "other" procedures performed followed by SDF and SED ($p < 0.001$). In terms of prescriptions for pain medication, GA and SDF had the highest proportion, followed by SED ($p < 0.001$). The SDF group had the highest

proportion of dental extraction(s), definitive restoration(s), SDF topical application, and interim therapeutic restoration(s) performed, followed by SED and GA ($p < 0.001$).

During pre-treatment visits, GA group was more likely to have an unplanned visit compared to the SDF group (Figure 2). The odds ratio (**OR**) of unplanned visits for GA vs. SDF groups was 4.22 ($p < 0.001$). Both SED and GA groups were respectively less likely to have a new carious lesion on primary teeth compared to the SDF group (OR=0.07 and 0.10 for SED and GA groups, respectively, at $p < 0.001$). For presence of pain and intraoral swelling, and other procedures, the SED and GA groups were more likely to answer “Yes” compared to the SDF group (Figure 2). The GA group was more likely to be “Yes” for pulpal therapy and definitive restoration than the SED and SDF groups. The GA group also had a higher proportion in prescriptions for pain medication and antibiotic medication than the SDF group, but there was no difference between the SED and SDF groups on these questions (Figure 2).

For post-treatment visits, SED and GA were more likely to have an unplanned visit than the SDF group (Figure 3). Compared to the SDF group, the SED group was more likely to answer “Yes” in new carious lesions on the partially or fully erupted permanent molar, new carious lesion on primary tooth/teeth, presence of intraoral swelling and broken restoration and/or space maintainer, observation of displaced restoration and/or space maintainer, pulpal therapy, and the exam, prophy, topical fluoride, and/or radiographs questions. The GA group was less likely to answer “Yes” in definitive restoration and SDF topical application (Figure 3). For patients who had GA treatment, the presence of broken restorations and/or space maintainer, observation of displaced restoration and/or space maintainer, and other procedures were more likely to be “Yes” compared to the SDF group, while the GA group was lower in the new carious lesions on primary teeth, prescription for antibiotic medication, dental extraction, pulpal therapy, definitive restoration, and SDF topical application compared to the SDF group (Figure 3).

Discussion

Findings and Hypothesis, Comparison to Literature, and Significance and Implications

This study represents the first known investigation to report disparities in the clinical outcomes among SDF, SED, and GA. These disparities show that the SED and GA groups, respectively, had 1.30- and 2.36-times higher wait-times for treatment completion compared to the SDF group. As well, the SDF group, compared to the SED and GA groups, had higher odds for the clinical outcomes of 1) pre-treatment new carious lesions on primary teeth, pulpal therapy, and definitive restorations, 2) post-treatment new carious lesions on primary tooth (for GA only), intra-oral swelling (for GA only), prescription for antibiotic medication (for GA only), dental extractions (for GA only), pulpal therapy (for GA only), definitive restorations, SDF topical application, and interim therapeutic restorations. Since the primary goal of minimally invasive care is to manage the overall caries activity and stabilization of the general oral function, not the restoration of single lesions, these pre-treatment results align with the expected outcomes of the minimally invasive care approach for SDF treatment.³¹

More important, this study demonstrated multiple negative clinical outcomes when SED and GA treatments were compared with SDF treatment, such that SED and/or GA treatments have higher odds for 1) pre-treatment visits with un-planned visits (for GA only), pain, intra-oral swelling, and prescriptions for pain and antibiotic medications (for GA only) and 2) post-treatment visits with new carious lesions on permanent molars, new carious lesions on primary teeth (for SED only), intra-oral swelling (for SED only), broken restorations, displaced restorations, and pulpal therapy (for SED only) which align with the expected negative outcomes of invasive care treatment approach for SED and GA treatment due to the longer wait-times for treatment completion as reported in the existing literature.^{16,32-35} These results reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis that there are statistically significant differences for negative clinical outcomes of SED and GA treatment when compared to SDF treatment.

Although the current literature does not include studies which directly compare SDF, SED, and GA treatment together for wait-time for treatment completion and pre- and post-treatment clinical outcomes, reported studies exist which investigate one or two of these treatment modalities separately.

The present findings are consistent with existing research demonstrating a greater wait-time for dental treatments under GA. Multiple studies have reported wait-times of 71.0, 100.1 (14.3 weeks), 110.6, 137.0, and 365.0 days.^{32-33,16, 34-35} Crystal *et al.* studied the wait-times for both sedation and general anesthesia treatments with wide ranges, respectively, from one-week to twelve-months and four-weeks to fourteen-months.³⁶

With regard to pre-treatment clinical outcomes, Boehmer demonstrated determined that four- to five-year-old patients had the longest wait times for dental rehabilitation under GA, with 43 percent of them developing complications such as oral pain in the meantime.³⁷ A British study found that while patients waited for treatment under GA, 41 percent had increased pain which required more analgesics and 49.4 percent required more antibiotics.³⁸ This present study aligns with the findings of these studies for pre-treatment clinical outcomes.

From a post-treatment perspective, Eidelman compared clinical outcomes between SED and GA treatment and found that 74 percent of children treated under sedation required additional post-treatment compared to 59 percent of children treated under general anesthesia, with the main reasons for additional treatment due to new carious lesions, defective restorations (i.e., marginal adaptation and anatomic form), and secondary caries.³⁹ Berkowitz reported new carious lesions in over 50 percent of children six months after GA treatment.⁴⁰ For GA treatment, an expert panel headed by Splieth found annual restoration failure rates from five to 25 percent at the single tooth level, with high probability of complications in children with multiple teeth treated and overall results ranging from low to unacceptable.³¹

A 2020 systematic review by Schmoeckel summarizes and supports this study's results with the review findings that "there is high evidence to support a high effect of SDF in arresting,

especially cavitated lesions” and “a low level of evidence of moderately high and clinical relevant failure rates for restorative care.⁴¹”

Given the long wait time and significant occurrence of unplanned visits in the GA group, as well as the negative post-treatment clinical outcomes observed in the SED and GA groups, SDF is a valuable interim treatment alternative. SDF effectively addresses these challenges by providing timely intervention and effective caries management, thereby reducing wait times, and mitigating the risk of negative outcomes. By offering a reliable interim solution, SDF contributes to evidence-based treatment pathways and improves patient experiences while awaiting definitive care and dental rehabilitation.

Strengths, Limitations, and Generalizability

The strength of this study includes the large and geographically distributed sample size of 4,730 ethnically diverse participants which yielded over 80 percent statistical power. The primary limitation, which negatively impacts the generalizability of this study, is the risk for selection bias with over 90 percent of the participants categorized with Medicaid as the payor source, which serves as a proxy for low socioeconomic status. Hence, the results may not be generalizable to the entire population, since moderate and high socioeconomic status populations were under-represented.

Future Studies

To reduce selection bias, future studies might broaden socioeconomic sampling breadth by including private practices and dental service organizations as sources of data. Additionally, re-designing future studies as a prospective, longitudinal model would yield long-term clinical outcomes and predictive models of the treated modalities. This would provide valuable insights into the recurrence rate of carious lesions and the potential need for additional intervention,

allowing for a better understanding of the optimal timescale for monitoring and managing dental health following various treatment modalities.

Conclusions

Based upon this study's results, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Dentists should be aware that:

a. Compared to SDF, the SED and GA groups, respectively, had 1.30- and 2.36-times higher wait-times for treatment completion.

b. Compared to SDF, the SED and GA groups demonstrated higher odds for multiple pre- and post-treatment negative clinical outcomes.

c. With the average age for the respective three groups at 3.43 years (SDF), 4.34 years (SED), and 3.99 years (GA), dentists should adhere to the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry guideline to encourage the establishment of a dental home for infants by 12 months of age.⁴²

c. SDF provides timely and effective caries management with lower wait-time for treatment completion, clinical outcomes consistent with minimally invasive treatment, and mitigation for the risk of negative pre- and post-operative clinical outcomes compared to treatment under sedation or general anesthesia.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge and thank the participants in this study, including the Alaska Native/American Indian peoples who participated through receiving care at the NYU Langone pediatric dentistry training site in Anchorage, Alaska, Hansjorg Wyss Department of Plastic Surgery, NYU Langone Health for funding support and pediatric dental residents Amna Anwar, DDS, Janyn Baird, DDS, Kelsey Coria, DDS, Nikki Crislip, DMD, Joseph Cucolo, DDS, Cory Daley, DMD, Matthew Davidson, DMD, Aleksandra Dragojevic, DDS, Nicole Endo, DDS,

Christopher Gordon, DMD, Katherine Gouveia, DMD, Arin Haghverdian, DMD, Nathanael Harrison, DMD, Stephen Hartzog, DMD, Chauncey Hensley, DMD, Louis Jackson, DDS, Melissa Jaramillo, DMD, Yu Jeong Kim, DDS, Alyssa Klaus, DMD, Patricia Larosiliere, DMD, Marc Levicoff, DMD, Horton Li, DMD, Jennifer Macintyre, DDS, Sara Merhi, DDS, Richa Rashmi, DMD, Cody Sia, DMD, James Stewart, DMD, Jacqueline St. Pierre, DMD, MPH, Andrew Stucki, DMD, Cynthia Thomas, DMD, Elizabeth Vaidyan, DMD for data collection contributions.

References

1. Griffin S, Wei L, Gooch B, Weno K, Espinoza L. Vital Signs: Dental Sealant Use and Untreated Tooth Decay Among U.S. School-Aged Children.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6541e1>
2. Oubenyahya H, Bouhabba N. General anesthesia in the management of early childhood caries: an overview. *J Dent Anesth Pain Med.* 2019;19(6):313-322.
doi:10.17245/jdapm.2019.19.6.313
3. Policy on Early Childhood Caries (ECC): Classifications, Consequences, and Preventive Strategies. *Pediatr Dent.* 2016;38(6):52-54.
4. Slayton RL, Palmer EA. Pediatric dentistry complications and challenges. In: Termeie DA, ed. *Avoiding and Treating Dental Complications.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc; 2016:176-201.
doi:10.1002/9781118988053.ch8
5. McIlwain M, Primosch R, Bimstein E. Allergic reaction to intranasal midazolam HCl: a case report. *Pediatr Dent.* 2004;26(4):359-361.
6. Razavi SS, Malekianzadeh B. The Efficacy and Complications of Deep Sedation in Pediatric Dental Patients: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Anesthesiol Res Pract.* 2022;2022:5259283.
doi:10.1155/2022/5259283
7. Campbell RL, Shetty NS, Shetty KS, Pope HL, Campbell JR. Pediatric Dental Surgery Under

General Anesthesia: Uncooperative Children. *Anesth Prog*. 2018;65(4):225-230.

doi:10.2344/anpr-65-03-04

8. Lee HH, Milgrom P, Starks H, Burke W. Trends in death associated with pediatric dental sedation and general anesthesia. *Paediatr Anaesth*. 2013;23(8):741-746.
doi:10.1111/pan.12210
9. Coté CJ, Notterman DA, Karl HW, Weinberg JA, McCloskey C. Adverse sedation events in pediatrics: a critical incident analysis of contributing factors. *Pediatrics*. 2000;105(4 Pt 1):805-814. doi:10.1542/peds.105.4.805
10. Jevtovic-Todorovic V, Hartman RE, Izumi Y, et al. Early exposure to common anesthetic agents causes widespread neurodegeneration in the developing rat brain and persistent learning deficits. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*. 2003;23(3):876-882.
doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-03-00876.2003
11. Flick RP, Katusic SK, Colligan RC, et al. Cognitive and behavioral outcomes after early exposure to anesthesia and surgery. *Pediatrics*. 2011;128(5):e1053-1061.
doi:10.1542/peds.2011-0351
12. Sprung J, Flick RP, Katusic SK, et al. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder after early exposure to procedures requiring general anesthesia. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2012;87(2):120-129.
doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2011.11.008
13. Jamieson WJ, Vargas K. Recall rates and caries experience of patients undergoing general anesthesia for dental treatment. *Pediatr Dent*. 2007;29(3):253-257.
14. Sheller B, Williams BJ, Hays K, Mancl L. Reasons for repeat dental treatment under general anesthesia for the healthy child. *Pediatr Dent*. 2003;25(6):546-552.
15. Lin YT, Lin YTJ. Factors associated with the risk of caries development after comprehensive dental rehabilitation under general anesthesia. *J Dent Sci*. 2016;11(2):164-169.
doi:10.1016/j.jds.2016.01.004
16. Okuji DM, Lin J. Predicting Negative Outcomes While Awaiting Dental Treatment Under

General Anesthesia. *J Dent Child (Chic)*. 2021;88(1):3-10

17. Policy on Third-party Reimbursement of Medical Fees Related to Sedation/General Anesthesia for Delivery of Oral Health Care Services. *Pediatr Dent*. 2017;39(6):115-117.
18. Rashewsky S, Parameswaran A, Sloane C, Ferguson F, Epstein R. Time and cost analysis: pediatric dental rehabilitation with general anesthesia in the office and the hospital settings. *Anesth Prog*. 2012;59(4):147-153. doi:10.2344/0003-3006-59.4.147
19. Yan IG, Zheng FM, Gao SS, Duangthip D, Lo ECM, Chu CH. Ion Concentration of Silver Diamine Fluoride Solutions. *Int Dent J*. 2022;72(6):779-784. doi:10.1016/j.identj.2022.04.005
20. Contreras V, Toro MJ, Elías-Boneta AR, Encarnación-Burgos A. Effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in caries prevention and arrest: a systematic literature review. *Gen Dent*. 2017;65(3):22-29.
21. Gao SS, Zhao IS, Hiraishi N, et al. Clinical Trials of Silver Diamine Fluoride in Arresting Caries among Children: A Systematic Review. *JDR Clin Transl Res*. 2016;1(3):201-210. doi:10.1177/2380084416661474
22. Chibinski AC, Wambier LM, Feltrin J, Loguercio AD, Wambier DS, Reis A. Silver Diamine Fluoride Has Efficacy in Controlling Caries Progression in Primary Teeth: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Caries Res*. 2017;51(5):527-541. doi:10.1159/000478668
23. Mei ML, Lo ECM, Chu CH. Clinical Use of Silver Diamine Fluoride in Dental Treatment. *Compend Contin Educ Dent Jamesburg NJ 1995*. 2016;37(2):93-98; quiz100.
24. Crystal YO, Janal MN, Hamilton DS, Niederman R. Parental perceptions and acceptance of silver diamine fluoride staining. *J Am Dent Assoc 1939*. 2017;148(7):510-518.e4. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2017.03.013
25. Horst JA, Heima M. Prevention of Dental Caries by Silver Diamine Fluoride. *Compend Contin Educ Dent Jamesburg NJ 1995*. 2019;40(3):158-163; quiz 164.
26. Wright JT, White A. Silver Diamine Fluoride: Changing the Caries Management Paradigm and Potential Societal Impact. *N C Med J*. 2017;78(6):394-397. doi:10.18043/ncm.78.6.394

27. Nguyen T, Tonmukayakul U, Hall M, Calache H. Cost-effectiveness analysis of silver diamine fluoride to divert dental general anaesthesia compared to standard care. *Aust Dent J*. 2022;67(4):352-361. doi:10.1111/adj.12936
28. Thomas ML, Magher K, Mugayar L, Dávila M, Tomar SL. Silver Diamine Fluoride Helps Prevent Emergency Visits in Children with Early Childhood Caries. *Pediatr Dent*. 2020;42(3):217-220.
29. Kanzow P, Wiegand A, Göstemeyer G, Schwendicke F. Understanding the management and teaching of dental restoration repair: Systematic review and meta-analysis of surveys. *J Dent*. 2018;69:1-21. doi:10.1016/j.jdent.2017.09.010
30. Team, R.C. (2013). *A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org>. Accessed August 23, 2023
31. Splieth CH, Banerjee A, Bottenberg P, et al. How to Intervene in the Caries Process in Children: A Joint ORCA and EFCD Expert Delphi Consensus Statement. *Caries Res*. 2020;54(4):297-305. doi:10.1159/000507692
32. Lewis CW, Nowak AJ. Stretching the safety net too far: Waiting times for dental treatment. *Pediatr Dent* 2002;24(1):6-10
33. Lee VHK, Grant CG, Mittermuller BA, et al. Association between early childhood oral health impact scale (ECOHIS) scores and pediatric dental surgery wait times. *BMC Oral Health*. 2020;20(1):285. Published 2020 Oct 17. doi:10.1186/s12903-020-01263-8
34. Goodwin M, Sanders C, Davies G, Walsh T, Pretty IA. Issues arising following a referral and subsequent wait for extraction under general anaesthetic: Impact on children. *BMC Oral Health* 2015;15:3
35. Park MS, Sigal MJ. The role of hospital-based dentistry in providing treatment for persons with developmental delay. *J Can Dent Assoc* 2008;74(4): 3537
36. Crystal YO, Janal MN, Yim S, Nelson T. Teaching and utilization of silver diamine fluoride

and Hall-style crowns in US pediatric dentistry residency programs. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2020;151(10):755-763. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2020.06.022

37. Boehmer J, Stoffels JA, van Rooji IA, Heyboer A. Complications due to waiting period for dental treatment under general anaesthesia. *Ned Tijdschr Tandheelkd* 2007;114(2):69-75
38. North S, Davidson LE, Blinkjorn AS, Mackie IC. The effects of a long wait for children's dental general anaesthesia. *Int J Pediatr Dent* 2007;17(2): 105-9
39. Eidelman E, Faibis S, Peretz B. A comparison of restorations for children with early childhood caries treated under general anesthesia or conscious sedation. *Pediatr Dent.* 2000;22(1):33-37
40. Berkowitz RJ, Moss M, Billings RJ, Weinstein P. Clinical outcomes for nursing caries treated using general anesthesia. *ASDC J Dent Child.* 1997;64(3):210-228
41. Schmoeckel J, Gorseta K, Splieth CH, Juric H. How to Intervene in the Caries Process: Early Childhood Caries - A Systematic Review. *Caries Res.* 2020;54(2):102-112
42. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Perinatal and infant oral health care. The Reference Manual of Pediatric Dentistry. Chicago, Ill.: American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry; 2022:277-81

Table 1: Demographic and main effect outcomes between SDF, SED, and GA treatment modalities

	Overall	SDF	SED	GA	p-value
n (%)	4730 (100.0)	1171 (24.8)	1642 (34.7)	1917 (40.5)	
Child's age in years; mean (sd); Continuous	3.98 (1.26)	3.43 (1.30)	4.34 (1.18)	3.99 (1.18)	<0.001
Sex (%); Nominal					0.131
Male	2483 (52.5)	623 (53.2)	827 (50.4)	1033 (53.9)	
Female	2238 (47.3)	547 (46.7)	809 (49.3)	882 (46.0)	
Other	3 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	
No response	6 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	
Child's Race/Ethnicity n (%); Nominal					<0.001
Hispanic	2174 (46.0)	674 (57.6)	687 (41.8)	813 (42.4)	
White, Non-Hispanic	641 (13.6)	141 (12.0)	193 (11.8)	307 (16.0)	
Black or African American, Non-Hispanic	275 (5.8)	62 (5.3)	101 (6.2)	112 (5.8)	
American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic	183 (3.9)	26 (2.2)	78 (4.8)	79 (4.1)	
Asian, Non-Hispanic	170 (3.6)	47 (4.0)	51 (3.1)	72 (3.8)	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	353 (7.5)	89 (7.6)	160 (9.7)	104 (5.4)	
Two or more races, Non-Hispanic	108 (2.3)	41 (3.5)	29 (1.8)	38 (2.0)	
No response	826 (17.5)	91 (7.8)	343 (20.9)	392 (20.4)	
ASA Classification; n (%); Nominal					<0.001
ASA 1	4048 (85.6)	1021 (87.2)	1440 (87.7)	1587 (82.8)	
ASA 2	636 (13.4)	142 (12.1)	200 (12.2)	294 (15.3)	
ASA 3	46 (1.0)	8 (0.7)	2 (0.1)	36 (1.9)	
Payor Source; n (%); Nominal					<0.001
Medicaid	4279 (90.5)	1056 (90.2)	1455 (88.6)	1768 (92.2)	
Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)	11 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	6 (0.4)	4 (0.2)	
Commercial Insurance	208 (4.4)	59 (5.0)	103 (6.3)	46 (2.4)	
No Insurance	78 (1.6)	36 (3.1)	20 (1.2)	22 (1.1)	

Multiple insurance coverage	31 (0.7)	7 (0.6)	11 (0.7)	13 (0.7)	
No response	123 (2.6)	12 (1.0)	47 (2.9)	64 (3.3)	
Average number of pre-treatment visits; mean (SD)	1.41 (0.78)	1.08 (0.34)	1.25 (0.62)	1.61 (0.90)	<0.001
Average number of post-treatment visits; mean (SD)	1.39 (0.73)	1.41 (0.83)	1.29 (0.63)	1.45 (0.73)	<0.001
waiting time, mean (SD)	81.07 (100.63)	49.57 (51.27)	62.45 (88.62)	116.27 (120.50)	<0.001
waiting time, median (IQR)	49 (72)	38 (39)	42 (55)	77 (116)	<0.001*

Table 2: Pre-treatment clinical outcomes between SDF, SED, and GA treatment modalities

PRE-TREATMENT VISITS	Overall	SDF	SED	GA	p-value
N	2141	293	541	1307	
Purpose of pre-treatment visit; Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
Planned visit	1854 (86.6)	270 (92.2)	495 (91.5)	1089 (83.3)	
Unplanned visit	265 (12.4)	12 (4.1)	42 (7.8)	211 (16.1)	
Other	4 (0.2)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.2)	
No Response	18 (0.8)	10 (3.4)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.3)	
Is at least one permanent molar partially or fully erupted? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	1838 (85.8)	262 (89.4)	430 (79.5)	1146 (87.7)	
Yes	214 (10.0)	18 (6.1)	88 (16.3)	108 (8.3)	
No Response	89 (4.2)	13 (4.4)	23 (4.3)	53 (4.1)	
New carious lesions on the partially or fully erupted permanent molar? Nominal; n (%)					0.364
No	1962 (91.6)	267 (91.1)	501 (92.6)	1194 (91.4)	
Yes	25 (1.2)	1 (0.3)	8 (1.5)	16 (1.2)	
No Response	154 (7.2)	25 (8.5)	32 (5.9)	97 (7.4)	
New carious lesion on primary tooth/teeth? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	1709 (79.8)	119 (40.6)	478 (88.4)	1112 (85.1)	
Yes	359 (16.8)	164 (56.0)	48 (8.9)	147 (11.2)	
No Response	73 (3.4)	10 (3.4)	15 (2.8)	48 (3.7)	
Presence of pain? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	1666 (77.8)	270 (92.2)	414 (76.5)	982 (75.1)	
Yes	432 (20.2)	13 (4.4)	117 (21.6)	302 (23.1)	
No Response	43 (2.0)	10 (3.4)	10 (1.8)	23 (1.8)	

Presence of Extraoral swelling? Nominal; n (%)					0.167
No	2057 (96.1)	280 (95.6)	524 (96.9)	1253 (95.9)	
Yes	36 (1.7)	3 (1.0)	5 (0.9)	28 (2.1)	
No Response	48 (2.2)	10 (3.4)	12 (2.2)	26 (2.0)	
Presence of Intraoral swelling? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	1878 (87.7)	273 (93.2)	455 (84.1)	1150 (88.0)	
Yes	213 (9.9)	10 (3.4)	74 (13.7)	129 (9.9)	
No Response	50 (2.3)	10 (3.4)	12 (2.2)	28 (2.1)	
Presence of broken restorations(s) and/or space maintainer(s)? Nominal; n (%)					0.47
No	2052 (95.8)	283 (96.6)	518 (95.7)	1251 (95.7)	
Yes	8 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.3)	
No Response	81 (3.8)	10 (3.4)	19 (3.5)	52 (4.0)	
Observation of displaced restoration(s) and/or space maintainer(s)? Nominal; n (%)					0.275
No	2051 (95.8)	283 (96.6)	517 (95.6)	1251 (95.7)	
Yes	12 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	6 (1.1)	6 (0.5)	
No Response	78 (3.6)	10 (3.4)	18 (3.3)	50 (3.8)	
Prescription for pain medication(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	2078 (97.1)	282 (96.2)	535 (98.9)	1261 (96.5)	
Yes	44 (2.1)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	42 (3.2)	
No Response	19 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	5 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	
Prescription for antibiotic medication(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	2022 (94.4)	277 (94.5)	520 (96.1)	1225 (93.7)	
Yes	99 (4.6)	6 (2.0)	15 (2.8)	78 (6.0)	
No Response	20 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	6 (1.1)	4 (0.3)	
Dental extraction(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001

	No	2011 (93.9)	270 (92.2)	517 (95.6)	1224 (93.6)	
	Yes	111 (5.2)	13 (4.4)	19 (3.5)	79 (6.0)	
	No Response	19 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	5 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	
Incision and drainage (intraoral only) performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	2119 (99.0)	283 (96.6)	535 (98.9)	1301 (99.5)	
	Yes	3 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	
	No Response	19 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	5 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	
Pulpal therapy performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	2106 (98.4)	277 (94.5)	533 (98.5)	1296 (99.2)	
	Yes	16 (0.7)	6 (2.0)	3 (0.6)	7 (0.5)	
	No Response	19 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	5 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	
Definitive restoration(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	2042 (95.4)	250 (85.3)	516 (95.4)	1276 (97.6)	
	Yes	81 (3.8)	33 (11.3)	21 (3.9)	27 (2.1)	
	No Response	18 (0.8)	10 (3.4)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.3)	
Interim Therapeutic Restoration(s)-ITR performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	2072 (96.8)	277 (94.5)	528 (97.6)	1267 (96.9)	
	Yes	51 (2.4)	6 (2.0)	9 (1.7)	36 (2.8)	
	No Response	18 (0.8)	10 (3.4)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.3)	
Exam, prophylaxis, topical fluoride, and/or radiographs performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	982 (45.9)	106 (36.2)	293 (54.2)	583 (44.6)	
	Yes	1141 (53.3)	177 (60.4)	244 (45.1)	720 (55.1)	
	No Response	18 (0.8)	10 (3.4)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.3)	
Other procedure(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	1665 (77.8)	262 (89.4)	427 (78.9)	976 (74.7)	
	Yes	457 (21.3)	21 (7.2)	109 (20.1)	327 (25.0)	

No Response	19 (0.9)	10 (3.4)	5 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	
-------------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	--

Table 3: Post-treatment clinical outcomes between SDF, SED, and GA treatment modalities

POST-TREATMENT VISITS	Overall	SDF	SED	GA	p-value
N	6367	1607	2070	2690	
Purpose of post-treatment visit; Nominal; n (%)					0.132
Planned visit	5901 (93.1)	1490 (94.1)	1910 (92.4)	2501 (93.0)	
Unplanned visit	431 (6.8)	90 (5.7)	155 (7.5)	186 (6.9)	
Other	8 (0.1)	4 (0.3)	1 (0.0)	3 (0.1)	
No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Is at least one permanent molar partially or fully erupted? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	5054 (79.7)	1412 (89.1)	1505 (72.8)	2137 (79.4)	
Yes	1182 (18.6)	143 (9.0)	526 (25.5)	513 (19.1)	
No Response	104 (1.6)	29 (1.8)	35 (1.7)	40 (1.5)	
New carious lesions on the partially or fully erupted permanent molar? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	5498 (86.7)	1229 (77.6)	1868 (90.4)	2401 (89.3)	
Yes	167 (2.6)	16 (1.0)	84 (4.1)	67 (2.5)	
No Response	675 (10.6)	339 (21.4)	114 (5.5)	222 (8.3)	
New carious lesion on primary tooth/teeth? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	4970 (78.4)	1096 (69.2)	1398 (67.7)	2476 (92.0)	
Yes	1354 (21.4)	486 (30.7)	660 (31.9)	208 (7.7)	
No Response	16 (0.3)	2 (0.1)	8 (0.4)	6 (0.2)	
Presence of pain? Nominal; n (%)					0.005
No	5801 (91.5)	1451 (91.6)	1858 (89.9)	2492 (92.6)	
Yes	526 (8.3)	132 (8.3)	200 (9.7)	194 (7.2)	
No Response	13 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	8 (0.4)	4 (0.1)	

Presence of Extraoral swelling? Nominal; n (%)					0.065
No	6298 (99.3)	1573 (99.3)	2047 (99.1)	2678 (99.6)	
Yes	33 (0.5)	11 (0.7)	13 (0.6)	9 (0.3)	
No Response	9 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.3)	3 (0.1)	
Presence of Intraoral swelling? Nominal; n (%)					0.002
No	6081 (95.9)	1526 (96.3)	1955 (94.6)	2600 (96.7)	
Yes	252 (4.0)	58 (3.7)	106 (5.1)	88 (3.3)	
No Response	7 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	
Presence of broken restorations(s) and/or space maintainer(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	6064 (95.6)	1576 (99.4)	1923 (93.1)	2565 (95.4)	
Yes	125 (2.0)	6 (0.4)	45 (2.2)	74 (2.8)	
No Response	152 (2.4)	3 (0.2)	98 (4.7)	51 (1.9)	
Observation of displaced restoration(s) and/or space maintainer(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	5949 (93.8)	1573 (99.3)	1883 (91.1)	2493 (92.7)	
Yes	237 (3.7)	9 (0.6)	83 (4.0)	145 (5.4)	
No Response	154 (2.4)	2 (0.1)	100 (4.8)	52 (1.9)	
Prescription for pain medication(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	6287 (99.2)	1574 (99.4)	2038 (98.6)	2675 (99.4)	
Yes	31 (0.5)	10 (0.6)	6 (0.3)	15 (0.6)	
No Response	22 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	22 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	
Prescription for antibiotic medication(s)? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	6201 (97.8)	1553 (98.0)	1988 (96.2)	2660 (98.9)	
Yes	115 (1.8)	31 (2.0)	55 (2.7)	29 (1.1)	
No Response	24 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	23 (1.1)	1 (0.0)	
Dental extraction(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001

	No	6142 (96.9)	1509 (95.3)	1992 (96.4)	2641 (98.2)	
	Yes	197 (3.1)	75 (4.7)	73 (3.5)	49 (1.8)	
	No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Incision and drainage (intraoral only) performed? Nominal; n (%)						0.489
	No	6335 (99.9)	1582 (99.9)	2064 (99.9)	2689 (100.0)	
	Yes	4 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	
	No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Pulpal therapy performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	6259 (98.7)	1563 (98.7)	2010 (97.3)	2686 (99.9)	
	Yes	80 (1.3)	21 (1.3)	55 (2.7)	4 (0.1)	
	No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Definitive restoration(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	5993 (94.5)	1442 (91.0)	1912 (92.5)	2639 (98.1)	
	Yes	346 (5.5)	142 (9.0)	153 (7.4)	51 (1.9)	
	No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
SDF topical application performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	5991 (94.5)	1327 (83.8)	1998 (96.7)	2666 (99.1)	
	Yes	346 (5.5)	256 (16.2)	67 (3.2)	23 (0.9)	
	No response	3 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	
Interim Therapeutic Restoration(s)-ITR performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	No	6219 (98.1)	1494 (94.3)	2047 (99.1)	2678 (99.6)	
	Yes	120 (1.9)	90 (5.7)	18 (0.9)	12 (0.4)	
	No Response	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Exam, prophy, topical fluoride, and/or radiographs performed? Nominal; n (%)						<0.001
	\ No	1524 (23.6)	446 (26.7)	397 (19.0)	681 (25.3)	

Yes	4843 (76.4)	1161 (73.3)	1673 (81.0)	2009 (74.7)	
No Response	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Other procedure(s) performed? Nominal; n (%)					<0.001
No	5788 (90.9)	1481 (92.0)	1920 (92.7)	2387 (88.7)	
Yes	579 (9.1)	126 (8.0)	150 (7.3)	303 (11.3)	
No Response	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	

Figure 1: Linear regression of wait-time for treatment completion.




Figure 2: Odd ratios of pre-treatment clinical outcomes between SDF, SED, and GA treatment modalities.




Figure 3: Odd ratios of post-treatment clinical outcomes between SDF, SED, and GA treatment modalities.

