

# Acceptability of Silver Diamine Fluoride for Treating Early Childhood Caries



Sooji Choi, DMD<sup>1</sup>, Suhong Tong, MS<sup>3</sup>, Anne R Wilson, DDS, MS<sup>2,3</sup>, Tamanna Tiwari, MPH, MDS, BDS<sup>1,3</sup>
Children's Hospital Colorado<sup>1</sup>, Pediatric Dentistry, School of Dental Medicine<sup>2</sup>, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

**Parameter** 

**Concern for Re-Retreatment** 

**Concern for Being Away from** 

Hx of Dental Pain

## **BACKGROUND**

- Silver Diamine Fluoride (SDF) is a clear liquid applied to teeth to arrest caries in both primary and permanent teeth
- SDF causes permanent black staining of treated tooth surface with caries due to oxidation of silver ions after application which has received poor parental acceptance due to esthetic reasons
- There has been a paradigm shift toward preventative dentistry and renewed interest in its quick, painless and easy application
- The purpose of this study was to evaluate primary caregivers' acceptability of SDF as a treatment option for Early Childhood Caries (ECC) compared with commonly available traditional treatment

# **METHODS**

Survey data were collected from 104 primary caregivers of a child seen at the Dental Clinic at the Children's Hospital Colorado on their perceptions related to SDF treatment. The survey also included items on demographics, dental history of the child, and concerns regarding dental treatment and was collected electronically through REDCap. The Chi-Square test or Fisher's exact test was used to compare the proportions between the groups. Univariate and multivariable analysis was conducted to evaluate the acceptability of SDF with independent variables.

# **RESULTS**

Table 1: Caregiver Acceptability of SDF vs Traditional Dental Treatment							
Treatment Type	Overall	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic				
Traditional				0.1253			
Unfavored	67 (64.4%)	48 (69.6%)	19 (54.3%)				
Neutral	11 (10.6%)	8 (11.6%)	3 (8.6%)				
Favor	26 (25.0%)	13 (18.8%)	13 (37.1%)				
SDF Overall				0.7698			
Unfavored	28 (26.9%)	19 (27.5%)	9 (25.7%)				
Neutral	5 (4.8%)	4 (5.8%)	1 (2.9%)				
Favor	71 (68.3%)	46 (66.7%)	25 (71.3%)				
SDF Anterior				0.2247			
Unfavored	37 (35.6%)	27 (39.1%)	10 (28.6%)				
Neutral	7 (6.7%)	6 (8.7%)	1(2.8%)				
Favored	60 (57.7%)	36 (52.2%)	24 (68.6%)				
SDF Posterior				0.9916			
Unfavored	23 (22.1%)	15(21.7%)	8 (22.9%)				
Neutral	6 (5.8%)	4 (5.8%)	2 (5.7%)				
Favored	75 (72.1%)	50 (72.5%)	25 (71.4%)				

		Error		0.223
Intercept	22.68	4.0	<.0001	
Parentage	-0.06	0.0	0.2444	
Female	-5.64	2.3	0.0160	
Male	0.00.			
White	-1.04	2.1	0.6353	
Black	-2.48	1.8	0.1929	
Hispanic	-2.19	1.3	0.1143	
All Others	0.00.			
Concern for Local Anesthesia	0.45	0.4	0.3187	
Concern for Drill	0.55	0.4	0.1999	
Concern for Staining	-0.85	0.3	0.0157	
Hx of Dental Tx	0.83	0.9	0.3879	
Concern for Being Away from Work	-0.62	0.3	0.0603	
Table 3: Multivariable Modeling	on Factors /	Scaciated wi	th Accordance of SD	_
Posterior Teeth	3 OII I actors A			
Posterior Teeth	Estimate	Standard		R-Square
Posterior Teeth  Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	Pr >  t	<b>R-Square</b> 0.168
Posterior Teeth  Parameter		Standard Error		R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept	Estimate	Standard Error 4.33	Pr >  t	<b>R-Square</b> 0.168
Parameter Intercept Parentage	Estimate 28.76	Standard Error 4.33 0.05	Pr >  t  <.0001	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female	28.76 -0.08	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female Male	28.76 -0.08 -4.19	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female Male White	28.76 -0.08 -4.19	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female Male White Black	28.76 -0.08 -4.19 0.00 -0.82	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18 . 2.10 1.82	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female Male White Black Hispanic	28.76 -0.08 -4.19 0.00 -0.82 -1.37	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18 . 2.10 1.82 1.32	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586 0.6978 0.4548	R-Square 0.168
Posterior Teeth Parameter Intercept Parentage Female Male White Black Hispanic All Others	28.76 -0.08 -4.19 0.00 -0.82 -1.37 -0.54	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18 . 2.10 1.82 1.32	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586 0.6978 0.4548	R-Square 0.168
Parameter  Intercept Parentage Female Male White Black Hispanic All Others Concern for Local	28.76 -0.08 -4.19 0.00 -0.82 -1.37 -0.54 0.00	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18 . 2.10 1.82 1.32 . 0.43	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586 0.6978 0.4548 0.6825	R-Square 0.168
	28.76 -0.08 -4.19 0.00 -0.82 -1.37 -0.54 0.00 0.40	Standard Error 4.33 0.05 2.18 . 2.10 1.82 1.32 . 0.43 0.40	Pr >  t  <.0001 0.1493 0.0586 0.6978 0.4548 0.6825	R-Square 0.168

-0.54

-1.51

-0.28

0.35

0.65

0.31

0.1278

0.0227

0.3806

Table 2: Multivariable Modeling on Factors Associated with Acceptance of SDF or

**Front Teeth** 

Standard

Estimate

 $Pr > |t|_{R-Square}$ 

#### CONCLUSIONS

Out of the participants, 25% of primary caregivers were in favor of traditional treatment, while 68% of primary caregivers were in favor of SDF treatment overall. Of the primary caregivers who were in favor of SDF treatment, 58% accepted SDF treatment on the front teeth and 72% accepted SDF treatment on back teeth.

Increase in worry of having dark teeth decreased SDF acceptance overall (P= 0.0065), in the front (P=0.023) and the back (P=0.108). Caregivers with minimal history of tooth pain or no history of tooth pain for the child had decreased SDF acceptance overall (0.0107) and in the back (0.0403). Decreased or no dental treatment experience correlated with increased acceptance of SDF in front, although it was not significant. Increased concerns regarding the use of a drill increased acceptance of SDF in the front (0.045)

## DISCUSSION

This cross-sectional study showed that the majority of caregivers were in favor of SDF compared to traditional treatment offered in the dental clinic. Its acceptability may be influenced by history of dental pain, dental treatment, and concerns regarding use of a drill. There were no significant demographic correlation to acceptability of SDF. With increased awareness of the benefits of SDF by caregivers and knowledge on factors that influence parents, providers can further advocate towards a preventative and conservative approach against ECC