

## **An open-label, parallel-group, randomized clinical trial of different silver diamine fluoride application intervals to arrest dental caries**

Robert J. Schroth<sup>1-4\*</sup>, Sukeerat Bajwa<sup>1</sup>, Victor H. K. Lee<sup>1,3</sup>, Betty-Anne Mittermuller<sup>1,3</sup>, Sarbjeet Singh<sup>1,3</sup>, Vivianne Cruz de Jesus<sup>1,3,6</sup>, Mary Bertone<sup>5</sup>, Prashen Chelikani<sup>3,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Preventive Dental Science, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Max Rady College of Medicine, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>4</sup>Shared Health Inc., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>5</sup>School of Dental Hygiene, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Department of Oral Biology, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

### **\*Corresponding author:**

Dr. Robert J. Schroth

507-715 McDermot Avenue

Winnipeg, Manitoba R3E 3P4

Canada

E-mail: [robert.schroth@umanitoba.ca](mailto:robert.schroth@umanitoba.ca)

Telephone: 204-975-7764

Fax: 204-977-5691

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Background: Non-surgical interventions are preferred to address the widespread issue of early  
3 childhood caries (ECC). Silver diamine fluoride (SDF) is an antimicrobial agent and alternative  
4 treatment option that can be used to arrest dental decay. While there is optimism with SDF with  
5 regard to caries management, there is no true consensus on the number and frequency of  
6 applications for children. The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of 38%  
7 SDF to arrest ECC at three different application regimen intervals.

8 Methods: Children with ECC were recruited from community dental clinics into an open-label,  
9 parallel-group, randomized clinical trial. Participants were randomized to one of three groups:  
10 visits one month, four months, or six months apart. Participants received applications of 38%  
11 SDF, along with 5% sodium fluoride varnish (NaFV), at the first two visits to treat cavitated  
12 carious lesions. Lesions were followed and arrest rates were calculated. Lesions were considered  
13 arrested if they were hard on probing and black in colour. Statistics included descriptive and  
14 bivariate analyses. A  $p$ -value of  $\leq 0.05$  was considered significant.

15 Results: Eighty-four children participated in the study (49 males and 35 females, mean age: 44.4  
16  $\pm$  14.2 months). Treatment groups were well matched with 28 participants per group. A total of  
17 374 teeth and 505 lesions were followed. Posterior lesions represented only 29.1% of affected  
18 surfaces. Almost all SDF treated lesions were arrested for the one-month (98%) and four-month  
19 (95.8%) interval groups at the final visit. The six-month group experienced the lowest arrest  
20 rates; only 72% of lesions were arrested ( $p < 0.001$ ). The duration of application intervals was  
21 inversely associated with improvements in arrest rates for all lesions.

22 Conclusions: Two applications of 38% SDF and 5% NaFV in one-month and four-month  
23 intervals were comparable and very effective in arresting ECC. Applications six months apart  
24 were less effective and could be considered inferior treatment.

25 Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04054635 (first registered 13/08/2019).

26 **Keywords:** randomized clinical trial, silver diamine fluoride, early childhood caries, primary  
27 teeth, antimicrobial, arrest rates, non-restorative treatment

## 28 INTRODUCTION

29 Early childhood caries (ECC), defined as the presence of dental caries in the primary  
30 dentition of children under six years of age, is a significant issue. Recent prevalence estimates in  
31 Canada range from 28% to 98% (1-3). The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry (AAPD)  
32 recognizes the widespread and virulent nature of ECC, and supports the implementation of non-  
33 surgical interventions whenever possible (4). Non-surgical interventions delay or decrease the  
34 need for dental surgery to treat severe cases of ECC. Conscious sedation or general anesthesia in  
35 operating rooms are frequently used to facilitate restorative treatment of young children with  
36 ECC. However, they come with increased costs for treatment and greater risks for the child.  
37 Restorative treatment is still the predominant method of managing ECC. It is important to note  
38 that restorative treatment alone does not address the underlying cause of ECC. Consequently,  
39 there is a high risk of recurrence and many children form new carious lesions (5, 6).

40 Unfortunately, many children experience limited access to dental care and go through life  
41 with untreated caries, which can pose a serious health risk (7). The consequences of ECC are  
42 comprehensive. They include greater risk of carious lesion in the primary and permanent  
43 dentition, increased hospitalization and emergency visits, higher treatment costs, and reduced  
44 oral health-related quality of life (5, 8, 9). Furthermore, ECC can affect a child's nutritional  
45 status and disrupt school attendance and performance (10-14). The multifactorial nature of ECC  
46 creates challenges in identifying effective primary prevention strategies (15). There were no  
47 effective non-surgical products available for secondary prevention until recently.

48 Reports have identified silver diamine fluoride (SDF) as an antimicrobial agent that can  
49 successfully arrest dental decay (16). It can potentially address untreated caries in young

50 children, which would reduce the need for rehabilitative dental surgery under general anesthesia  
51 (17-22). SDF is a good alternative for children with ECC who may not be cooperative with  
52 traditional treatment approaches (23, 24). One systematic review with meta-analysis found that  
53 SDF was safe and effective in arresting dental caries in primary teeth. In eight studies that used  
54 38% SDF to treat active caries, 81% of lesions were arrested (25). The American Dental  
55 Association (ADA) practice guidelines for non-restorative treatments of dental caries  
56 recommends the prioritization of 38% SDF over other products to manage cavitated carious  
57 lesions (26). Despite this information, true consensus on the frequency of SDF applications for  
58 children with ECC is lacking. The current AAPD clinical practice guidelines for SDF urge  
59 researchers to conduct well-designed randomized clinical trials to compare the use and outcomes  
60 of SDF treatment on both primary and permanent teeth (27).

61 While Advantage Arrest<sup>TM</sup> (38% SDF) received approval for clinical use in Canada in  
62 2017, there has been little guidance on the frequency and duration of its application. Proposed  
63 protocols may not translate well into some clinical and dental public health settings.  
64 Recommendations for frequent re-application may not be practical or realistic in remote  
65 communities where access to dental care is limited and where frequent follow-up visits are not  
66 possible in a short amount of time (20, 25, 28).

67 The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of SDF to arrest cavitated  
68 carious lesions in primary teeth at three different application regimen intervals (one month, four  
69 months, and six months apart). To our knowledge, this is the first randomized clinical trial of  
70 SDF conducted in Canada for young children. This study aimed to provide new information that

71 may aid clinicians in the decision-making process for SDF application for the greater benefit of  
72 patients.

## 73 **METHODS**

74 This open-label, parallel-group, randomized clinical trial was registered at  
75 ClinicalTrials.gov (registration number: NCT04054635, first registered 13/08/2019). Participants  
76 were recruited between October 2019 and June 2021 from community dental clinics in  
77 Winnipeg, Canada (Access Downtown, Mount Carmel Clinic, and SMILE plus). Study visits  
78 also took place at the Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba. Children under 72  
79 months of age were included if they had teeth that met International Caries Detection and  
80 Assessment System (ICDAS) codes 5 or 6 criteria, with softer caries extending into dentin  
81 without signs of pulpal involvement (29). Children were excluded if they had a silver allergy,  
82 developmental enamel defects, severe medical issues, dental conditions requiring immediate  
83 rehabilitation under general anesthesia, or if they had teeth that met any PUFA (Pulpal  
84 involvement, Ulceration, Fistula, and Abscess) index criteria. Analyses of radiographs were not  
85 conducted, as not every child had them done. Parents/caregivers provided written informed  
86 consent.

87 A total of 84 participants were recruited for the study. Sample size was determined based  
88 on a pilot study and in consultation with a biostatistician. In the pilot study, 40 children had 239  
89 lesions (approximately six lesions per child) that could estimate an arrest rate with a 95%  
90 confidence interval (CI) to be accurate within  $\pm 6.5\%$ . With at least 400 lesions in a proposed  
91 sample, the 95% CI would be  $\pm 5\%$ . Anticipating an average of six lesions per child, three  
92 regimen groups with 23 children each would produce approximately 414 lesions to be studied.

93 To deal with potential drop-outs/loss to follow-up, we over-recruited by 27.3% and sought 28  
94 children for each group.

95 Participants came for three study visits (Figure 1). Children underwent dental  
96 examinations at each visit. Teeth meeting ICDAS codes 5 or 6 criteria were identified at  
97 baseline, and the location, size, hardness (soft, medium, or hard), colour (yellow, brown, or  
98 black), and activity of lesions were recorded. Dmft (decayed, missing, and filled primary teeth)  
99 index scores were calculated. Lesions were treated with 38% SDF (Advantage Arrest, Oral  
100 Science, Brossard, Québec, Canada) at the first and second visits and were followed for the  
101 duration of the study. The liquid product was applied with a microbrush for one minute, and  
102 surfaces were wiped with wet gauze and rinsed with water. Participants received applications of  
103 5% sodium fluoride varnish (NaFV) following SDF application. One attending dentist carried  
104 out all clinical activities, while other research staff conducted all non-clinical activities.  
105 Parents/caregivers were also administered questionnaires at each visit. The questionnaires asked  
106 for information on sociodemographic characteristics, oral hygiene, pain, oral health-related  
107 quality of life, and the appearance of teeth.

108 The time between SDF treatments and study visits depended on the child's regimen. Prior  
109 to recruitment, the research coordinator prepared sealed envelopes containing details for one of  
110 three regimens: treatment/visits one month apart (proposed in the AAPD's clinical practice  
111 guideline), four months apart (protocol frequency adopted by the Winnipeg Regional Health  
112 Authority), or six months apart (recommended by ADA) (30-32). When a child was recruited  
113 into the study, research staff randomly selected an envelope, thus assigning the child to one of  
114 the three groups. Participants were followed for a total of two months, eight months, or 12

115 months. The first participant was enrolled 19 October 2019, and the last participant was seen 12  
116 February 2022. Examiners and research staff were not blinded to the prior status of lesions.

117 The primary outcome measure was arrest rates among individual treatment groups.  
118 Lesions that were hard upon tactile probing and black in colour were considered arrested.  
119 Overall arrest rates and specific arrest rates for anterior (primary incisors and canines) and  
120 posterior (primary molars) lesions at the second and third visits were calculated. Intention-to-  
121 treat analysis was used, where participants lost to follow-up were still included in the study, and  
122 we acted as though there were no changes to lesions for these individuals at subsequent (missed)  
123 visits. This approach was chosen since it preserved randomization and was the best neutral  
124 response for the unknown status of lesions—to assume no effect either way (33). Data were  
125 entered into REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture), a secure web application for online  
126 databases, and were analyzed using Number Cruncher Statistical Software Version 9.0 (NCSS;  
127 Kaysville, Utah). Descriptive statistics were also calculated for relevant questionnaire  
128 information. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Pearson’s Chi-squared  
129 test were performed when appropriate. A  $p$ -value of  $\leq 0.05$  was considered statistically  
130 significant.

131 The ADA maintains that 5% NaFV is largely unproductive as a treatment for cavitated  
132 lesions (26). We did not consider a control group receiving only 5% NaFV, as this would be  
133 considered unethical substandard care. Sodium fluoride is included in treatments following the  
134 application of SDF because it prevents caries on surfaces by strengthening the tooth structure and  
135 increasing resistance to acidic demineralization (30, 34).

136

## 137 RESULTS

138 Participant characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Forty-nine male participants and 35  
139 female participants were randomized into three groups of 28 children. The mean age of children  
140 recruited into the study was  $44.4 \pm 14.2$  months. The overall sample was diverse, with  
141 participants having different African (38.1%), Asian (28.6%), European (9.5%), or Canadian  
142 Indigenous (23.8%) ancestry. Few children (16.7%) were newcomers to Canada. There were no  
143 significant differences between the three groups in terms of age, sex, and ethnicity. A majority of  
144 participants brushed their teeth twice a day (61.9%) and used toothpaste containing fluoride  
145 (82.1%). Most participants (69.1%) also had some form of dental insurance that covered all or  
146 part of their dental care expenses. These results were consistent across all three groups in the  
147 study. Only five children experienced any tooth pain at their first study visit.

148 Two participants were lost to follow-up. A child in the four-month interval group did not  
149 attend their third visit (4/8 lesions arrested at second visit; 2/2 anterior lesions and 2/6 posterior  
150 lesions), and a child in the six-month group did not attend either of their follow-up visits (18  
151 lesions treated at baseline; 12 anterior lesions and six posterior lesions). Because of intention-to-  
152 treat analysis, we assumed no changes in lesion status for these children since their last visit (i.e.,  
153 4/8 lesions were recorded as arrested at the third visit for the child in the four-month group, and  
154 no lesions were recorded as arrested at subsequent visits for the child in the six-month group).

155 A total of 374 teeth and 505 lesions were treated with 38% SDF and 5% NaFV. The  
156 number of teeth differed significantly by group classification ( $p = 0.03$ ), with 143 teeth treated in  
157 the one-month interval group, 121 teeth treated in the four-month interval group, and 110 teeth  
158 treated in the six-month interval group. The number of lesions also differed significantly by

159 group classification ( $p = 0.002$ ); the one-month interval group had 196 lesions treated, the four-  
160 month interval group had 166 lesions treated, and the six-month interval group had 143 lesions  
161 treated. More anterior teeth (260) and lesions (358) were treated than posterior teeth (114) and  
162 lesions (147). The number of anterior and posterior teeth and lesions did not vary significantly  
163 between groups. Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA found no significant difference between  
164 groups in mean dmft. Overall, participants had a mean dmft of  $6.8 \pm 4.5$ .

165 Lesion arrest rates are summarized in Table 2 and Figure 2. The one-month interval  
166 group and the four-month interval group had high arrest rates at the first follow-up after the  
167 initial application of SDF and NaFV, with 78.1% and 81.3% of lesions arrested, respectively.  
168 The six-month interval group had just 61.5% of lesions arrested at that time. At the second  
169 follow-up visit (i.e., the third and final visit), almost all lesions were arrested for the one-month  
170 (98%) and four-month (95.8%) interval groups. The six-month interval group only had 72% of  
171 lesions arrested at that time. Pearson's Chi-squared test revealed significant associations between  
172 group classification and arrest rates ( $p < 0.001$ ). The duration of the application regimen interval  
173 was inversely associated with improvements in arrest rates from the second to third study visit.  
174 The one-month interval group showed the greatest improvement in their condition with a 19.9%  
175 increase in arrested lesions, the four-month interval group was second with a 14.5% increase,  
176 and the six-month interval group showed the least improvement with a 10.5% increase.

177 Anterior-specific analyses showed higher arrest rates for primary incisors and canines  
178 with the one-month (83.6%), four-month (83.6%), and six-month (65.7%) interval groups at the  
179 first follow-up. Pearson's Chi-squared test results were significant for these findings ( $p = 0.001$ ).  
180 At the second follow-up visit, almost all lesions were arrested for the one-month (98.6%, +15.0%

181 improvement) and four-month (98.3%, +14.7% improvement) interval groups. The six-month  
182 interval group, however, experienced less success and only had 69.6% of lesions arrested at that  
183 last visit (+3.9% improvement). These findings were significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

184           Posterior-specific arrest rates at the first follow-up for the one-month (63.2%), four-  
185 month (76.0%), and six-month (51.2%) interval groups were lower than overall and anterior-  
186 specific arrest rates at that time ( $p = 0.05$ ). Almost all molar lesions were arrested for the one-  
187 month (96.4%) and four-month (90.0%) interval groups at the second follow-up visit. The six-  
188 month interval group only had 78% of lesions arrested at that time. All posterior-specific  
189 findings were significant ( $p = 0.02$ ). Despite the low arrest rate at the first follow-up visit, the  
190 one-month interval group showed good improvement in their condition and had a 33.2% increase  
191 in arrested lesions. The six-month group also recovered and had a 26.8% increase in arrested  
192 lesions. The four-month group experienced a +14.0% differential.

## 193 **DISCUSSION**

194           This randomized clinical trial investigated whether three different application intervals of  
195 38% SDF, along with 5% NaFV, performed similarly with respect to arresting caries lesions.  
196 Overall, two applications of SDF and NaFV either one month or four months apart were very  
197 successful in arresting lesions in primary teeth and resulted in similar arrest rates. Applications  
198 six months apart were less successful and more lesions were not arrested. Shorter intervals  
199 between treatments (i.e., one month and four months) appeared to be more effective than longer  
200 intervals (i.e., six months). Greater improvements in conditions following primary applications  
201 of SDF and NaFV were seen for individuals with more immediate follow-up visits.

202           Research on the use of SDF is mixed and there is no consensus on the number or  
203 frequency of applications to arrest dental caries in children. Some studies have also shown  
204 underwhelming results with semi-annual applications of SDF. Mabangkhu et al. examined the  
205 results of 38% SDF applications in children at six-month intervals, and found low arrest rates at  
206 first (20.5%, 228/1111 lesions) and second (35.7%, 397/1111 lesions) follow-up visits. These  
207 results were greater than those seen in a 5% NaFV control group at first (12.3%, 140/1138  
208 lesions) and second (20.9%, 238/1138 lesions) follow-up visits ( $p < 0.001$ ) (35). Fung et al.  
209 repeated applications of SDF every six months for young children with ECC in Hong Kong, and  
210 found a comparable arrest rate of 75.7% (685/905 lesions) at a 30-month follow-up (23). Despite  
211 an increase in the amount of applications over a prolonged time frame, there was no outstanding  
212 difference in the outcome.

213           Conversely, additional time made a difference in a study conducted by Zhi et al., where  
214 semi-annual applications of 38% SDF became more effective over a two-year period. They  
215 found that arrest rates increased for each follow-up visit at six months (43.3%), 12 months  
216 (53%), 18 months (82.9%), and 24 months (90.7%) (36). In this case, treatments at six-month  
217 intervals worked with greater use of SDF and a longer wait. Our methods were more confined in  
218 this present study. Meta-analysis of data from eight clinical studies of SDF pooled results from  
219 six-month follow-ups and found that 86% of caries had arrested at that time (25). This is more  
220 optimistic than what we found.

221           Several studies have reported good success (arrest rates) with SDF (22, 31, 36). In some  
222 cases, SDF has worked quickly in treated lesions in primary teeth. Despite equivocal evidence,  
223 SDF is a valuable treatment option for dental caries in clinical and community settings (37). The

224 adoption of an SDF intervention protocol has been shown to significantly reduce preventable  
225 dental hospitalizations, arrest caries in children that are unable to tolerate other restorative  
226 treatments, and improve oral health-related quality of life (38). Our study supports two  
227 applications of 38% SDF in one-month or four-month intervals to treat dental caries in children  
228 under 72 months of age. Two applications of SDF six months apart may be inferior treatment.  
229 Since the one-month and four-month groups were similar, our findings will undoubtedly be  
230 welcome news for busy dental public health programs and clinics in rural and remote regions  
231 where it may be next to impossible to have children return for re-application of SDF within a  
232 month of the initial application.

233 To our knowledge, this is the first randomized clinical trial of SDF conducted in Canada  
234 for young children. This study provides new information that may aid clinicians in the decision-  
235 making process for SDF application for the greater benefit of patients. Our sample of children  
236 recruited from community dental clinics in Winnipeg are representative of the target population  
237 with dental decay that requires SDF treatment. Hence, our results should be relevant to other  
238 considerations. These findings may have broader applications to other populations as well. The  
239 specificity of the inclusion criteria actually helps mitigate sampling bias, and similarities  
240 between treatment groups justify their comparability and allow us to interpret the relationship  
241 between intervention and outcome.

242 Our results are contingent on the use of intention-to-treat analysis, which attempts to be  
243 realistic in its assessment of an intervention (39). This approach preserves randomization and  
244 usually allows users to draw unbiased conclusions regarding the effectiveness of treatments (33).  
245 That said, it is important to note that 18 lesions were deemed not arrested for the one child in the

246 six-month interval group that did not attend either of their follow-up visits. This number of  
247 lesions entails some ambiguity. An extremely optimistic view of SDF treatment could have  
248 involved a 12.6% increase in the overall arrest rate for the six-month regimen. However, even if  
249 all 18 of those lesions had been arrested, the percentage of successful treatments would still be  
250 lower than the one-month and four-month groups.

251 Another limitation of this study is the significant difference in the number of total teeth  
252 and lesions treated between the three groups. The number of teeth and lesions treated were in  
253 decreasing order from the one-month group, to the four-month group, and to the six-month  
254 group. Since arrest rates were analyzed using a pooled sample, the six-month interval group,  
255 along with the four-month interval group, may have been disadvantaged from the lack of  
256 additional teeth and lesions to be examined. Furthermore, anterior teeth have been shown to have  
257 higher arrest rates than posterior teeth when treated with SDF (24, 36, 40). Despite the  
258 comparability of the location of affected teeth between our groups, the disparity in anterior and  
259 posterior lesions may misrepresent the average effect of treatment. A greater number of posterior  
260 lesions could have been beneficial. It is also important to recognize the possibility of other  
261 unmeasured confounding factors that may have caused variation among participants and the  
262 outcomes of associated teeth/lesions.

## 263 **CONCLUSIONS**

264 Two applications of 38% SDF, along with 5% NaFV, in one-month and four-month  
265 intervals were more effective in arresting ECC than two applications in six-month intervals.  
266 Findings from this study will help inform the refinement of existing clinical treatment protocols

267 for SDF for use in dental public health settings. More clinical trials are needed to confirm the  
268 number and frequency of SDF applications to arrest caries lesions in young children.

## 269 **DECLARATIONS**

270 Ethics approval and consent to participate: This study was approved by the University of  
271 Manitoba's Biomedical Research Ethics Board (HS22998/B2019:068). Parents/caregivers of  
272 child participants provided written informed consent.

273 Consent for publication: Not applicable.

274 Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are  
275 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

276 Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

277 Funding: Funds for this study were provided by the Children's Hospital Research Institute of  
278 Manitoba and the Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry. Dr. Robert J. Schroth also held a  
279 Canadian Institutes of Health Research Embedded Clinician Researcher Salary Award.

280 Authors' contributions: RJS contributed to conception and design, data acquisition, analysis, and  
281 interpretation, drafting the manuscript, and critically revising the manuscript. SB contributed to  
282 design, data analysis, and interpretation, drafting the manuscript, and critically revising the  
283 manuscript. VHKL contributed to data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, drafting the  
284 manuscript, and critically revising the manuscript. BAM contributed to data acquisition and  
285 analysis, and critically revising the manuscript. SS contributed to data acquisition and critically  
286 revising the manuscript. VCJ contributed to data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation and

287 critically revising the manuscript. MB contributed to data interpretation and critically revising  
288 the manuscript. PC contributed to conception and design, data analysis and interpretation, and  
289 critically revising the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

290 Acknowledgments: We would like to thank the staff at Access Downtown, Mount Carmel Clinic,  
291 and SMILE plus for their assistance with this study.

## 292 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

293 AAPD (American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry), ADA (American Dental Association),  
294 ANOVA (analysis of variance), CI (confidence interval), dmft (decayed, missing, and filled  
295 primary teeth), ECC (early childhood caries), ICDAS (International Caries Detection and  
296 Assessment System), NaFV (sodium fluoride), NCSS (Number Cruncher Statistical Software),  
297 PUFA (Pulpal involvement, Ulceration, Fistula, and Abscess), REDCap (Research Electronic  
298 Data Capture), SD (standard deviation), SDF (silver diamine fluoride).

## REFERENCES

1. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry Council on Clinical Affairs. Policy on Early Childhood Caries (ECC): Classifications, Consequences, and Preventive Strategies. *Pediatr Dent*. 2018;40(6):60-2.
2. Schroth RJ, Pang JL, Levi JA, Martens PJ, Brownell MD. Trends in pediatric dental surgery for severe early childhood caries in Manitoba, Canada. *J Can Dent Assoc*. 2014;80:e65.
3. Pierce A, Singh S, Lee J, Grant C, Cruz de Jesus V, Schroth RJ. The Burden of Early Childhood Caries in Canadian Children and Associated Risk Factors. *Front Public Health*. 2019;7:328.
4. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Caries-risk assessments and managements for infants, children, and adolescents. *The Reference Manual of Pediatric Dentistry*. Chicago, Ill: American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry; 2022. p. 266-72.
5. Schroth RJ, Rothney J, Sturym M, Dabiri D, Dabiri D, Dong CC, et al. A systematic review to inform the development of a Canadian caries risk assessment tool for use by primary healthcare providers. *Int J Paediatr Dent*. 2021;31(6):767-91.
6. Schroth RJ, Smith WF. A review of repeat general anesthesia for pediatric dental surgery in Alberta, Canada. *Pediatr Dent*. 2007;29(6):480-7.
7. Lee H, Milgrom P, Huebner CE, Weinstein P, Burke W, Blacksher E, et al. Ethics Rounds: Death After Pediatric Dental Anesthesia: An Avoidable Tragedy? *Pediatrics*. 2017;140(6).
8. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry Council on Clinical Affairs. Policy on Early Childhood Caries (ECC): Unique Challenges and Treatment Options. *Pediatr Dent*. 2018;40(6):63-4.
9. Schroth RJ, Harrison RL, Moffatt ME. Oral health of indigenous children and the influence of early childhood caries on childhood health and well-being. *Pediatr Clin North Am*. 2009;56(6):1481-99.
10. Khanh LN, Ivey SL, Sokal-Gutierrez K, Barkan H, Ngo KM, Hoang HT, et al. Early Childhood Caries, Mouth Pain, and Nutritional Threats in Vietnam. *Am J Public Health*. 2015;105(12):2510-7.
11. Jackson SL, Vann WF, Jr., Kotch JB, Pahel BT, Lee JY. Impact of poor oral health on children's school attendance and performance. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101(10):1900-6.
12. Grant CG, Daymont C, Rodd C, Mittermuller BA, Pierce A, Kennedy T, et al. Oral Health-Related Quality of Life of Canadian Preschoolers with Severe Caries After Dental Rehabilitation Under General Anesthesia. *Pediatr Dent*. 2019;41(3):221-8.
13. Schroth RJ, Levi J, Kliwer E, Friel J, Moffatt ME. Association between iron status, iron deficiency anaemia, and severe early childhood caries: a case-control study. *BMC Pediatr*. 2013;13:22.
14. Schroth RJ, Levi JA, Sellers EA, Friel J, Kliwer E, Moffatt ME. Vitamin D status of children with severe early childhood caries: a case-control study. *BMC Pediatr*. 2013;13:174.
15. Schroth R, Wilson A, Prowse S, Edwards J, Gojda J, Sarson J, et al. Looking back to move forward: Understanding service provider, parent, and caregiver views on early childhood oral health promotion in Manitoba, Canada. *Can J Dent Hyg*. 2014;48(3):99-108.
16. Seifo N, Cassie H, Radford JR, Innes NPT. Silver diamine fluoride for managing carious lesions: an umbrella review. *BMC Oral Health*. 2019;19(1):145.

17. Peng JJ, Botelho MG, Matinlinna JP. Silver compounds used in dentistry for caries management: a review. *J Dent*. 2012;40(7):531-41.
18. Chu CH, Lo EC, Lin HC. Effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride and sodium fluoride varnish in arresting dentin caries in Chinese pre-school children. *J Dent Res*. 2002;81(11):767-70.
19. Rosenblatt A, Stamford TC, Niederman R. Silver diamine fluoride: a caries "silver-fluoride bullet". *J Dent Res*. 2009;88(2):116-25.
20. Horst JA, Ellenikiotis H, Milgrom PL. UCSF Protocol for Caries Arrest Using Silver Diamine Fluoride: Rationale, Indications and Consent. *J Calif Dent Assoc*. 2016;44(1):16-28.
21. Milgrom P, Horst JA, Ludwig S, Rothen M, Chaffee BW, Lyalina S, et al. Topical silver diamine fluoride for dental caries arrest in preschool children: A randomized controlled trial and microbiological analysis of caries associated microbes and resistance gene expression. *J Dent*. 2018;68:72-8.
22. Clemens J, Gold J, Chaffin J. Effect and acceptance of silver diamine fluoride treatment on dental caries in primary teeth. *J Public Health Dent*. 2018;78(1):63-8.
23. Fung MHT, Duangthip D, Wong MCM, Lo ECM, Chu CH. Randomized Clinical Trial of 12% and 38% Silver Diamine Fluoride Treatment. *J Dent Res*. 2018;97(2):171-8.
24. Crystal YO, Niederman R. Silver Diamine Fluoride Treatment Considerations in Children's Caries Management. *Pediatr Dent*. 2016;38(7):466-71.
25. Gao SS, Zhao IS, Hiraishi N, Duangthip D, Mei ML, Lo ECM, et al. Clinical Trials of Silver Diamine Fluoride in Arresting Caries among Children: A Systematic Review. *JDR Clin Trans Res*. 2016;1(3):201-10.
26. Slayton RL, Urquhart O, Araujo MWB, Fontana M, Guzman-Armstrong S, Nascimento MM, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice guideline on nonrestorative treatments for carious lesions: A report from the American Dental Association. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2018;149(10):837-49 e19.
27. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Use of Silver Diamine Fluoride for Dental Caries Management in Children and Adolescents, Including Those with Special Health Care Needs. *Pediatr Dent*. 2017;39(6):146-55.
28. Horst JA. Silver Fluoride as a Treatment for Dental Caries. *Adv Dent Res*. 2018;29(1):135-40.
29. Ismail AI, Sohn W, Tellez M, Amaya A, Sen A, Hasson H, et al. The International Caries Detection and Assessment System (ICDAS): an integrated system for measuring dental caries. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 2007;35(3):170-8.
30. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Chairside Guide: Silver Diamine Fluoride in the Management of Dental Caries Lesions. *Pediatr Dent*. 2018;40(6):492-517.
31. Sihra R, Schroth RJ, Bertone M, Martin H, Patterson B, Mittermuller BA, et al. The Effectiveness of Silver Diamine Fluoride and Fluoride Varnish in Arresting Caries in Young Children and Associated Oral Health-Related Quality of Life. *J Can Dent Assoc*. 2020;86:k9.
32. American Dental Association Science and Research Institute. Silver Diamine Fluoride Chicago: American Dental Association Science and Research Institute; 2021 [cited 2023 May 2]. Available from: <https://www.ada.org/en/resources/research/science-and-research-institute/oral-health-topics/silver-diamine-fluoride>.
33. McCoy CE. Understanding the Intention-to-treat Principle in Randomized Controlled Trials. *West J Emerg Med*. 2017;18(6):1075-8.

34. Strohmenger L, Brambilla E. The use of fluoride varnishes in the prevention of dental caries: a short review. *Oral Dis.* 2001;7(2):71-80.
35. Mabangkhu S, Duangthip D, Chu CH, Phonghanyudh A, Jirattanasopha V. A randomized clinical trial to arrest dentin caries in young children using silver diamine fluoride. *J Dent.* 2020;99:103375.
36. Zhi QH, Lo EC, Lin HC. Randomized clinical trial on effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride and glass ionomer in arresting dentine caries in preschool children. *J Dent.* 2012;40(11):962-7.
37. Contreras V, Toro MJ, Elias-Boneta AR, Encarnacion-Burgos A. Effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in caries prevention and arrest: a systematic literature review. *Gen Dent.* 2017;65(3):22-9.
38. Yawary R, Hegde S. Silver Diamine Fluoride Protocol for Reducing Preventable Dental Hospitalisations in Victorian Children. *Int Dent J.* 2022;72(3):322-30.
39. Detry MA, Lewis RJ. The intention-to-treat principle: how to assess the true effect of choosing a medical treatment. *JAMA.* 2014;312(1):85-6.
40. Fung MHT, Duangthip D, Wong MCM, Lo ECM, Chu CH. Arresting Dentine Caries with Different Concentration and Periodicity of Silver Diamine Fluoride. *JDR Clin Trans Res.* 2016;1(2):143-52.

**Table 1.** Participant characteristics at baseline.


| Variable                            | All participants<br>(n = 84) | One-month<br>interval<br>group<br>(n = 28) | Four-month<br>interval<br>group<br>(n = 28) | Six-month<br>interval<br>group<br>(n = 28) | p-<br>value        |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------|
| Mean age (months) ± SD:             | 44.4 ± 14.2                  | 43.9 ± 15.0                                | 40.5 ± 12.6                                 | 48.9 ± 14.2                                | 0.11 <sup>a</sup>  |
| Sex:                                |                              |  |   |  |                    |
| Male                                | 49 (58.3%)                   | 19 (67.9%)                                 | 13 (46.4%)                                  | 17 (60.7%)                                 | 0.25 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Female                              | 35 (41.7%)                   | 9 (32.1%)                                  | 15 (53.6%)                                  | 11 (39.3%)                                 |                    |
| Background:                         |                              |  |   |  |                    |
| African                             | 32 (38.1%)                   | 15 (53.6%)                                 | 11 (39.3%)                                  | 6 (21.4%)                                  | 0.24 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Asian                               | 24 (28.6%)                   | 5 (17.9%)                                  | 7 (25.0%)                                   | 12 (42.9%)                                 |                    |
| European                            | 8 (9.5%)                     | 3 (10.7%)                                  | 2 (7.1%)                                    | 3 (10.7%)                                  |                    |
| Indigenous                          | 20 (23.8%)                   | 5 (17.9%)                                  | 8 (28.6%)                                   | 7 (25.0%)                                  |                    |
| Newcomer to Canada:                 | 14 (16.7%)                   | 5 (17.9%)                                  | 4 (14.3%)                                   | 5 (17.9%)                                  | 0.92 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Frequency of tooth<br>brushing:     |                              |  |   |  |                    |
| Twice daily                         | 52 (61.9%)                   | 18 (64.3%)                                 | 17 (60.7%)                                  | 17 (60.7%)                                 | 0.59 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Once daily                          | 24 (28.6%)                   | 6 (21.4%)                                  | 8 (28.6%)                                   | 10 (35.7%)                                 |                    |
| Less than once a day                | 8 (9.5%)                     | 4 (14.3%)                                  | 3 (10.7%)                                   | 1 (3.6%)                                   |                    |
| Use of fluoridated<br>toothpaste:   |                              |  |   |  |                    |
| Yes                                 | 69 (82.1%)                   | 23 (82.1%)                                 | 24 (85.7%)                                  | 22 (78.6%)                                 | 0.78 <sup>b</sup>  |
| No                                  | 6 (7.1%)                     | 3 (10.7%)                                  | 1 (3.6%)                                    | 2 (7.1%)                                   |                    |
| Do not know                         | 9 (10.7%)                    | 2 (7.1%)                                   | 3 (10.7%)                                   | 4 (14.3%)                                  |                    |
| Has dental insurance:               | 58 (69.1%)                   | 19 (67.9%)                                 | 20 (71.4%)                                  | 19 (67.9%)                                 | 0.95 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Has tooth pain:                     | 5 (6.0%)                     | 2 (7.1%)                                   | 1 (3.6%)                                    | 2 (7.1%)                                   | 0.81 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Total number of teeth<br>treated:   | 374                          | 143 (38.2%)                                | 121 (32.4%)                                 | 110 (29.4%)                                | 0.03 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Anterior teeth treated              | 260 (69.5%)                  | 99 (38.1%)                                 | 88 (33.8%)                                  | 73 (28.1%)                                 | 0.57 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Posterior teeth treated             | 114 (30.5%)                  | 44 (38.6%)                                 | 33 (28.9%)                                  | 37 (32.5%)                                 |                    |
| Total number of lesions<br>treated: | 505                          | 196 (38.8%)                                | 166 (32.9%)                                 | 143 (28.3%)                                | 0.002 <sup>b</sup> |
| Anterior lesions                    | 358 (70.9%)                  | 140 (39.1%)                                | 116 (32.4%)                                 | 102 (28.5%)                                | 0.94 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Posterior lesions                   | 147 (29.1%)                  | 56 (38.1%)                                 | 50 (34.0%)                                  | 41 (27.9%)                                 |                    |
| Mean dmft ± SD:                     | 6.8 ± 4.5                    | 7.0 ± 4.7                                  | 6.2 ± 4.7                                   | 7.3 ± 4.1                                  | 0.41 <sup>a</sup>  |

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, <sup>b</sup>Pearson's Chi-square test, SD (standard deviation), dmft (decayed, missing, and filled primary teeth).


**Table 2.** Arrest rates after SDF and 5% NaFV application(s).

| Overall lesions arrest rates   |                                      |                                      |                                       |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Participants                   | At second visit<br>(first follow-up) | At third visit<br>(second follow-up) | Second to third visit<br>differential |
| All participants               | 74.5% (376/505)                      | 89.9% (454/505)                      | +15.4%                                |
| One-month interval group       | 78.1% (153/196)                      | 98.0% (192/196)                      | +19.9%                                |
| Four-month interval group      | 81.3% (135/166)                      | 95.8% (159/166)                      | +14.5%                                |
| Six-month interval group       | 61.5% (88/143)                       | 72.0% (103/143)                      | +10.5%                                |
| <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> value    | < 0.001                              | < 0.001                              |                                       |
| Anterior lesions arrest rates  |                                      |                                      |                                       |
| Participants                   | At second visit<br>(first follow-up) | At third visit<br>(second follow-up) | Second to third visit<br>differential |
| All participants               | 78.5% (281/358)                      | 90.2% (323/358)                      | +11.7%                                |
| One-month interval group       | 83.6% (117/140)                      | 98.6% (138/140)                      | +15.0%                                |
| Four-month interval group      | 83.6% (97/116)                       | 98.3% (114/116)                      | +14.7%                                |
| Six-month interval group       | 65.7% (67/102)                       | 69.6% (71/102)                       | +3.9%                                 |
| <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> value    | 0.001                                | < 0.001                              |                                       |
| Posterior lesions arrest rates |                                      |                                      |                                       |
| Participants                   | At second visit<br>(first follow-up) | At third visit<br>(second follow-up) | Second to third visit<br>differential |
| All participants               | 64.6% (95/147)                       | 89.1% (131/147)                      | +24.5%                                |
| One-month interval group       | 63.2% (36/56)                        | 96.4% (54/56)                        | +33.2%                                |
| Four-month interval group      | 76.0% (38/50)                        | 90.0% (45/50)                        | +14.0%                                |
| Six-month interval group       | 51.2% (21/41)                        | 78.0% (32/41)                        | +26.8%                                |
| <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> value    | 0.05                                 | 0.02                                 |                                       |

Note: <sup>a</sup>Pearson's Chi-square test.



**Figure 1.** Flow diagram of study process (recruitment, randomization, visits and activities, duration, and analysis)



**Figure 2.** Early childhood caries arrest rates after SDF treatment for different application regimen intervals: (a) overall lesions, (b) anterior lesions, and (c) posterior lesions.