Comparison of clinical performance of sealants placed under General anesthesia versus without, A retrospective chart audit

Authors: Ambica Mallipeddi, BDS, DDS¹; Sujatha Sivaraman, BDS, DMD, MPH²; Shreekrishna Akilesh, DMD, MPH³

INTRODUCTION

- Pit and fissure sealants have been proven to prevent and control carious lesions in primary and permanent teeth.
- There is no data in the dental literature concerning the quality of the sealants performed under general anesthesia versus those without.
- The results of this study might bring more insight into the effect of treatment conditions on the clinical performance of sealants, thereby assisting practitioners in clinical decisionmaking and modifications for sealant placements.
- We anticipate that the sealants placed under general anesthesia would perform better clinically than those without general anesthesia.

PURPOSE

Study goal: To compare the clinical performance of sealants \bullet by evaluating the frequency of reapplication within the first two years of initial placement for those placed under general anesthesia vs. those without.



METHODS

- Hypothesis: Sealants placed under general anesthesia would perform better clinically than those without general anesthesia due to decreased patient movement, better isolation, and better application control during treatment with general anesthesia.
- Study Design: Retrospective study
- Study population: patients aged 0-16, received first-time sealants at Compass Pediatric Dental Clinic between 1/1/2018 to 12/31/2019.
- Primary outcomes: sealant success rate (measured by the number of sealant reapplications and further restorative treatments on the same tooth).
- Data analysis: controlled for the rendering provider, patient age, and gender.

	level	Overall
n		232
Patient Age in Years (Date of Service)		
(mean (SD))		7.56 (2.23)
Patient gender (%)	F	117 (50.4)
	М	115 (49.6)
Prior sealant exists (%)	N	232 (100.0)
Original Sealant Service Location (%)	Clinic	184 (79.3)
	OR	48 (20.7)
Use of General Anesthesia (Y/N) (%)	N	184 (79.3)
	Y	48 (20.7)
Orginal Sealant Rendering Provider (%)	SSS	232 (100.0)
Follow up adherence (Y/N) (%)	N	59 (25.7)
	Y	171 (74.3)
Re application of sealant: duration since		
last application (in months) (mean (SD))		28.76 (13.22)
Sealant Reapplied (Y/N) (%)	Ν	215 (93.1)
	Y	16 (6.9)
No. of times sealants reapplied (mean		
(SD)) Post sealant procedure: vearduration		0.08 (0.28)
since last Tx (sealant/procedure in		27 67 (11 44)
Bestorative Treatment done after initial	0	106 (84 5)
sealants (Y/N) (%)	1	24 (10 2)
search (1/14) (/0)	2	10 (4 3)
	3	2(09)

Female

DATA ANALY	'SIS							RESULTS
Ievel Overall n 232 Patient Age in Years (Date of Service) (mean (SD)) 7.56 (2.23) Patient gender (%) F 117 (50.4) M 115 (49.6) Prior sealant exists (%) N 232 (100.0) Original Sealant Service Location (%) Clinic 184 (79.3) OR 48 (20.7) Use of General Anesthesia (Y/N) (%) N 184 (79.3) V 48 (20.7) V 48 (20.7) Orginal Sealant Rendering Provider (%) SSS 232 (100.0) Follow up adherence (Y/N) (%) N 59 (25.7) Y 171 (74.3) Re application of sealant: duration since Iast application (in months) (mean (SD)) 28.76 (13.22) Sealant Reapplied (Y/N) (%) N 215 (93.1) No. of times sealants reapplied (mean (SD)) 0.08 (0.28) Post sealant procedure: yearduration since last Tx (sealant/procedure, in 27.67 (11.44) Restorative Treatment done after initial 0 196 (84.5) sealants. (Y/N) (%) 1 24 (10.3)		<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header>		snalysis	 91 patients [Age-Mean(SD)=7.56(2.23); Fe 232 teeth received initial sealant application Patients who had sealants placed under reapplied compared to patients in the non- Statistically significant difference (p = 0.012) GA have been replaced to the number of ti No statistically significant difference (p = 0.012) treated in the study period. CONCLUSIONS At 24 months, sealants placed under generations the placed without general anesthesia. General anesthesia has proven to be a betwithout using general anesthesia. Findings support the diagnosis and placematical under GA vertages. 			
n Patient Age in Years (Date of	level Ov Atient Age in Years (Date of		Sea N 215	alant reapplied Y 16	p test			REFERENCES
Service) (mean (SD)) Patient gender (%) Prior sealant exists (%) Original Sealant Service Location (%) Use of General Anesthesia (Y/N) (%) Orginal Sealant Rendering Provider (%) Follow up adherence (Y/N) (%) Re application of sealant: duration since last No. of times sealants reapplied (mean (SD)) Post sealant procedure: yearduration since last Tx Restorative Treatment done after initial sealants. (Y/N)	F M N Clinic OR N Y SSSS N Y	7.56 (2.23) 117 (50.4) 115 (49.6) 232 (100.0) 184 (79.3) 48 (20.7) 184 (79.3) 48 (20.7) 232 (100.0) 232 (100.0) 59 (25.7) 171 (74.3) 28.76 (13.22) 0.08 (0.28) 27.67 (11.44) 196 (84.5) 24 (10.3) 10 (4.3)	7.56 (2.27) 106 (49.3) 109 (50.7) 215 (100.0) 167 (77.7) 48 (22.3) 167 (77.7) 48 (22.3) 215 (100.0) 215 (100.0) 58 (27.2) 155 (72.8) NaN (NA) 0.00 (0.00) 26.77 (11.56) 182 (84.7) 21 (9.8) 10 (4.7)	7.50 (1.71) 10 (62.5) 6 (37.5) 16 (100.0) 16 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 16 (100.0) 16 (100.0) 16 (100.0) 15 (93.8) 28.56 (13.63) 1.06 (0.25) 36.67 (4.73) 3 (18.8) 0 (0.0)	0.92 0.448 NA 0.071 0.071 NA 0.12 NA 0.12	t-test NA chi-square NA chi-square NA t-test t-test	Table 2: Bivariate Analysis	 Komatsu H, Shimokobe H, Kawakami S, Yo ionomer sealant reapplication: study preser 1994;125(5):543-549. doi:10.14219/jada.ar Reeves A, Chiappelli F, Cajulis OS. Evidence sealants. J Calif Dent Assoc. 2006;34(7):54 Weintraub JA. The effectiveness of pit and Spec No):317-330. doi:10.1111/j.1752-7325 Şimşek H, Yazıcı AR, Güngör HC. In Vitro E Microleakage of Fissure Sealants Placed F 2020;44(4):240-248. doi:10.17796/1053-46 Primosch RE, Barr ES. Sealant use and pla Dent Assoc. 2001;132(10):1442-1461. doi:10.1016/1053-46 https://oralhealthnc.org/what-are-dental-sea 7. https://www.gaorthopedo.com/pediatric-der
ter (Intercept) Use of General Yes Anesthesia No Patient Age in Years	3 m s	2 (0.9) estimate 0.223 -0.129 -0.014	2 (0.9) std.error 0.082 0.051 0.009	0 (0.0) statistic 2.709 -2.518 -1.441	p.value 0.007 0.012 0.151	Table : Regres	3: Linear ssion	Institutional Affiliations: ¹ PGY2 Pediatric I Director ³ Seniro Associate Program Director

NYU Langone Health

emale=50.4%] met the criteria n, with 48 (20.7%) placed under GA. er GA had an average of 0.129 fewer sealants GA group.

2) in the number of times sealants placed under mes sealants placed without GA were replaced.

.370) in the proportion of male vs female patients

al anesthesia were replaced fewer times than

er setting for sealant placement compared to

ent of sealants as part of comprehensive dental sus deferring the treatment to later appointments.

shimura M. Caries-preventive effect of glass nts three-year results. J Am Dent Assoc. chive.1994.0082

ce-based recommendations for the use of 0-546.

issure sealants. J Public Health Dent. 1989;49(5) .1989.tb02090.x

Evaluation of Different Protocols for Preventing ollowing Saliva Contamination. J Clin Pediatr Dent. 25-44.4.5

acement techniques among pediatric dentists. J Am 0.14219/jada.archive.2001.0061

alants/

ntistry/dental-sealants/

Dental Resident, ²Associate Program ctor; NYU Langone Hospitals – Advanced Education in Pediatric Dentistry, 5800 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11220