

1 **Teledentistry for improving access to, and quality of oral**
2 **health care: A protocol for an overview of systematic reviews**
3 **and meta-analyses**

4

5 Pascaline Kengne Talla^{1*}, Paul Allison¹, André Bussi eres^{2,3}, Nicolas Giraudeau⁴, Svetlana,
6 Komarova¹, Quentin Basiren¹, Fr ed eric Bergeron⁵, Elham Emami¹

7

8

9 1. Faculty of Dental Medicine and Oral Health Sciences, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec,
10 Canada

11 2. Universit e de Qu ebec   Trois rivi eres, D epartement de Chiropratique,

12 3. School of Physical and Occupational Therapy, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

13 4. Facult e d'Odontologie, Universit e de Montpellier, Montpellier, France

14 5. Laval University, Department of preventive and social medicine, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada

15 *Corresponding author

16 Email: pascaline.kengnetalla@mcgill.ca (PKT)

17

18

19

20

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Digital technologies are becoming essential to address and optimize the suboptimal performance of
24 healthcare systems. Teledentistry involves the use of information and communication technology to
25 improve access to oral health care and the quality of oral health care delivery. Several systematic
26 reviews (SRs) have been conducted to synthesize evidence on the effectiveness of teledentistry but
27 with conflicting results. The aim of this review is to comprehensively summarize available SRs and
28 provide evidence on the impact of teledentistry on access to oral care, patients' and oral healthcare
29 providers' outcomes, quality of oral health care and costs. This protocol has been registered with
30 the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO CRD42022373964). Six
31 electronic databases including MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Embase.com), CINAHL (EBSCO),
32 Web of Science, Cochrane Library and Epistemonikos will be searched for SRs of quantitative,
33 qualitative, and mixed reviews evaluating teledentistry modalities involving both patients and/or
34 oral health care providers (OHCPs). We will include only studies published in English or French.
35 The primary outcomes will be considered from the patients' perspective (e.g., access to oral health
36 care, patient-reported outcomes, and experiences). The secondary outcomes will include outcomes
37 from patients and OHCPs (e.g., clinical outcomes, safety, behaviors, and costs). Two independent
38 reviewers will perform data screening, data extraction and will assess the quality of included studies
39 using the AMSTAR 2 and ROBIS tools. Data will be synthesized narratively and presented by
40 tables and graphs. We will report any overlap of primary studies in the SRs. A statement on the
41 strength of evidence for each outcome will be provided if possible. This review will inform
42 decision-makers, patients, OHCPs, and researchers on the potential effectiveness, benefits, and
43 challenges of teledentistry and support them in making recommendations for its use. Results will be
44 disseminated through peer-reviewed publications, presentations at conferences, and on social
45 media.

46

48 **Introduction**

49 Oral diseases globally affect more than 3.5 billion people, highlighting the need for interventions
50 that could improve accessibility to and affordability of oral health care [1]. Information and
51 communication technologies (ICTs) are promising approaches to address some of the inadequacies
52 of healthcare systems, to improve patients' access to and experiences of care, to reduce the costs of
53 care delivery and to promote high value care [2-8]. In addition, digital technologies can improve the
54 quality of health care (e.g equity, safety, effectiveness, patient-centered and timely care) [9, 10].
55 The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the use of these technologies in all health-related
56 disciplines including dentistry [11], paving the way for the development of virtual dental care. They
57 have reshaped the delivery of oral health care including patient-clinician interaction, screening,
58 diagnosis of oral diseases, monitoring of patients, treatment planning and management of care [12].

59
60 Emerging evidence suggests that teledentistry, a branch of telehealth, is cost-effective at the micro,
61 meso and macro levels involving patients, oral health care providers (OHCPs) and allied health care
62 workers, and decision makers [13-16]. Teledentistry includes synchronous and asynchronous
63 modes, and uses different vehicles such as telephones, smartphones, tablets and computers, as well
64 as various approaches such as calls, text and voice messaging, videos, and applications [17, 18].
65 Teledentistry has been used in the context of dental education, training, and transfer of information
66 or for the delivery of dental care/services. It involves the interaction between OHCPs and their
67 peers, or with other health care providers or with their patients and/or caregivers to improve
68 patients' outcomes and the quality of care.

69
70 Multiple reviews have synthesized the evidence on the benefits and implementation challenges of
71 teledentistry [19-22], the process of teledentistry, and the outcomes and experiences [13, 14, 23-25]
72 from the perspective of patients, healthcare organizations and OHCPs [26]. However, the results are
73 often conflicting [22, 27, 28], inconsistent or inconclusive [21, 29, 30]. Although systematic

74 reviews are a compelling means of synthesizing research, a systematic review of existing systematic
75 reviews (SRs) can provide a broader assessment of the quality and credibility of available evidence
76 [31, 32], and offer valuable information for patients, families, health professionals, researchers, and
77 policy-makers. The information generated by such overview can be used to enhance both clinical
78 practice and population health. In this study, we will use the term ‘overview’ due to the lack of
79 consistency in the literature on the terminology of the compilation data from multiple SRs to
80 provide a single summary of relevant evidence [33, 34]. A published overview on teledentistry
81 evaluated its accuracy and effectiveness for the delivery of oral health care [35]. A major limitation
82 of this overview is the lack of risk of bias assessments of the included SRs. Moreover, it has only
83 focused on accuracy of screening, diagnosis, and therapeutic management of dental care outcomes.
84 Other health outcomes related to access to oral care (e.g., utilization of services) and patients’ and
85 OHCPs’ behaviors to improve the quality of oral healthcare would be important to consider to
86 inform practice, policy decision-making, and future research [36]. Another available overview is
87 limited to tele-orthodontics to improve compliance in orthodontic patients [37]. Therefore, there is a
88 need to address the gaps in literature by conducting a comprehensive overview of existing SRs
89 using a rigorous methodology with valid quality assessment of the evidence [38]. This proposed
90 overview of existing SRs aims to compile and contrast the existing evidence from systematic
91 reviews published on teledentistry [31]. Accurate information resulting from this overview will
92 assist decision-makers on the effectiveness of teledentistry and inform the development of
93 guidelines to support OHCPs in its implementation.

94

95 **Research question**

96 We will answer to the following research question: “From the perspective of a range of
97 stakeholders, to what extent is teledentistry effective in improving access to, and quality of oral
98 healthcare, while reducing related costs?”

99 **Methods**

100 The review is guided by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Manual for Evidence synthesis for
101 umbrella reviews [39], and the Cochrane handbook for overview of reviews [40], and is written in
102 accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols
103 (PRISMA-P) guidance [41]. The PRISMA checklist is available as S1 checklist.

104

105 **Study registration**

106 This overview has been registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews
107 (PROSPERO CRD42022373964).

108

109 **Eligibility criteria**

110 We will use the “PICOSS” format: Participants, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Study design
111 and Setting.

112

113 **Participants/Population**

114 We will include SRs involving patients receiving oral healthcare services performed by any
115 licensed OHCPs (general dental practitioners, dental specialists, dental hygienists, dental
116 nurses/assistants, and dental therapists) and the SRs involving OHCPs with or without the patients.

117

118 **Intervention**

119 Teledentistry refers to use of information and communication technologies including the
120 transmission of clinical information and images between an oral health professional and patient or
121 between two health professionals, including at least one oral health professional, who are separated
122 by distance for dental consultations, diagnosis and treatment planning [18]. Teledentistry is a
123 modality used to provide remote access to healthcare services to patients. It includes the use of a
124 group of technologies and modalities, which can be categorized as follows [17]: i) Store and

125 forward, which is used to keep patients' oral health records such as radiographs and photographs; ii)
126 Remote patient monitoring, used for patient data collection from a remote site and then transferring
127 them to a dental practitioner in another location; iii) Live video, involving the use of a real-time
128 interaction between a patient and an OHCP, using audio-visual communication for screening,
129 diagnosis, treatment planning or follow-up; and iv) Mobile health, making use of mobile
130 communication devices such as phones and tablets to provide virtual oral healthcare services. Other
131 terms referring to teledentistry encompass e-health, virtual care, telemedicine oral health and
132 mobile oral health. Irrespective of the term used, we will include all interventions that involve oral
133 health care delivery through telecommunication systems in the presence of at least one member of
134 dental staff.

135

136 **Comparator**

137 We will include any SRs where the comparator could be one of the following types of interventions
138 or cases: in-person or face-to face interventions or usual care; no intervention; synchronous versus
139 asynchronous; synchronous versus mobile health; synchronous versus remote monitoring; and other
140 digital technologies (e.g. electronic dental records, virtual reality).

141

142 **Outcomes**

143 The primary outcomes are reported from the patients' perspective. They will include access to oral
144 health care (e.g. use of oral healthcare services, number of consultations, use in emergency cases,
145 delay of treatment, waiting time); patient-reported outcomes (e.g. oral health related- and overall
146 quality of life; self-reported clinical outcomes; pain management, oral functions; psychosocial
147 impact) and experiences with oral health care (e.g. satisfaction with care; communication with
148 OHCPs, patient-centered care and empowerment; acceptance and understanding of information and
149 confidence in the treatment, and experience with the technology such as ability to use the
150 application).

151

152 Secondary outcomes will be reported as they relate to:

- 153 • Patient indicators: Clinical outcomes reported by OHCPs (e.g. plaque index, gingival index
154 and white spot lesions); Adherence/compliance to treatment (e.g. medication, oral health
155 prevention and promotion practices); Knowledge, attitude, and behavior; Barriers and
156 enablers towards the use of teledentistry; Safety; Adverse outcomes; and Costs (e.g. travel
157 time, transportation, missing work/school, loss of the productivity and consultation time).
- 158 • OHCP indicators: Accuracy of diagnosis; Awareness, knowledge, attitude, and behavior;
159 Barriers and enablers towards the adoption of teledentistry; Prescribing (e.g. testing,
160 medication); Monitoring of patients; Coordination and management of oral health care;
161 Communication with patients, dental specialists, dental staff and other health professionals;
162 Costs (e.g. equipment, number of patients per day, number of consultations per day, waiting
163 time, training in the use of the equipment for teledentistry); and Equity.

164

165 **Study designs**

166 We will include systematic reviews with or without meta-analysis of quantitative (randomized
167 control trials, quasi-experimental studies such as non-randomized controlled trials, before and after
168 controlled studies and interrupted series studies, or observational studies), qualitative and mixed
169 methods studies using any teledentistry modalities (asynchronous, remote monitoring, real-time,
170 and mhealth). The term SR refers to a reproducible, standardized and transparent approach aiming
171 to identify, evaluate and summarize the evidence from primary studies on a particular topic, thereby
172 making it more accessible to decision-makers [42]. We will include only SRs that have conducted
173 searches in at least two databases, have clear inclusion/exclusion criteria, performed quality
174 assessment, and synthesized included studies [32, 42, 43].

175

176 **Setting**

177 We will capture the evidence from SRs on teledentistry conducted in any dental setting (e.g., dental
178 offices, school, community, hospital, home care), geographical region (e.g., rural, urban), and
179 country (low-, middle- or high income).

180

181 **Exclusion criteria**

182 We will exclude any types of knowledge synthesis systematic reviews lacking a formal
183 methodological quality or risk of bias assessment or where a search was conducted in a single
184 database (26). We will exclude studies on teledentistry focusing only on education and training in
185 dentistry and research without a care delivery component.

186

187 **Search strategy**

188 We will search electronic databases in MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase, CINAHL (EBSCO), Web of
189 Science, The Cochrane Library and Epistemonikos (<https://www.epistemonikos.org/>) using a search
190 strategy that has been developed using an interactive process by members of the research team with
191 the support of an expert librarian. The search strategy will be conducted from database inception
192 using the following keywords: (“teledentistry” OR “remote care*” OR “mobile health”) AND
193 (“reviews” OR “meta-analysis” OR “systematic review). We will also perform a search in
194 Sociological Abstract (Proquest), Academic Search Premier (EBSCO), and Proquest Dissertations
195 & Theses. We will contact experts in the field by email if additional data are required. In addition,
196 we will check the reference lists of included SRs and any identified overviews for any eligible
197 articles. See S1 file for the search strategy conducted in Medline. We will update the search prior
198 to the publication of the review to identify any new relevant systematic reviews. There will be no
199 restrictions for countries, age of participants, publication date and settings. However, we will
200 consider only studies published in English or French because of the limited resources for
201 translation.

202

203 **Study selection**

204 SRs identified by the search will be imported into Covidence software [44]. The research team will
205 discuss the selection criteria to ensure a shared understanding before pairs of assessors will
206 independently pilot the initial screening phase (i.e., titles and abstracts) on 10% of total number of
207 citations retrieved. Disagreements at each stage will be resolved through discussion or consultation
208 with a third reviewer whenever necessary. We will adjust the grid following this calibration
209 exercise. Reviewers will consider "include", "exclude", or "Maybe" as modalities of the studies
210 selection. All studies rated "include" or "unclear" will be considered for the second phase (i.e. full
211 text review). The decisions and reasons for exclusion will be recorded in Covidence software.

212

213 **Data extraction**

214 Two research team members will independently perform data extraction using a form in Excel that
215 is based on the JBI data extraction form for review of systematic reviews[39]. The data extraction
216 form is provided as S2 file. We will conduct a pilot data extraction on 10% of eligible SRs until a
217 consensus on extracted data is reached between reviewers. Any discrepancies will be resolved
218 through discussion, or by consultation with a third reviewer. We will not extract data from the
219 primary studies included in the reviews, nor re-synthesize their findings. Extracted information will
220 include:

- 221 1. Review characteristics: first author, year of publication, country, type of review with or
222 without meta-analysis; aim of the study; publication language; published protocol; number
223 of databases searched, range date of search strategy; any restrictions (e.g. language,
224 geographic or date), inclusion/exclusion criteria;
- 225 2. Participants: number and profile of participants (e.g patients, OHCPs);

- 226 3. Intervention and comparators: intervention(s) of interest and comparators; domains in
227 dentistry; reported definition of intervention from authors;
- 228 4. Outcomes: primary outcomes (access to oral health care, patient -reported outcomes, patient
229 reported-experiences); secondary outcomes relevant to patients and OHCPs; effect size
230 metric(s) reported (e.g. risk ratio) for categorical outcomes and (e.g., standard mean
231 differences) for continuous outcomes;
- 232 5. Setting: type of settings likely community, dental office, university, hospital;
- 233 6. Methods: type of study designs included (e.g. randomized controlled trials, observational
234 studies or both); number of included studies, number of studies reporting data for meta-
235 analyses, use of theoretical framework in the intervention or for data analysis; main primary
236 outcomes of interest; risk of bias tools; statistical methods used to combine studies;
237 synthesis and summary of data, estimates including heterogeneity measures, and any
238 additional analyses (e.g. subgroup analysis or sensitivity analysis); the level of evidence, for
239 instance the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation
240 (GRADE) from included studies;
- 241 7. Other details: main conclusions, limitations, next steps, funding source and conflicts of
242 interest.

243 If we have missing data, we will search for additional information such as protocols or contact
244 study authors to find the available information.

245

246 **Quality assessment of reviews**

247 The quality assessment of SRs is an essential component when we conduct an overview of
248 systematic reviews [32]. It includes both the methodological quality and the risk of bias which are
249 distinct concepts [45, 46]. The quality assessment examines compliance with the highest possible
250 standards in conducting and reporting their research process [47, 48], while risk of bias assessment

251 (the appraisal of internal validity) examines any concerns with the design, conduct, analysis,
252 interpretation, or reporting of a study which could affect the study's results [49].

253

254 To conduct the quality assessment, we will use two valid and reliable tools covering complementary
255 criteria: i) the AMSTAR-2 checklist (the Assessment of Multiple Systematic Reviews 2) to evaluate
256 the methodological quality [50]; and ii) the ROBIS tool to assess comprehensively the risk of bias
257 [51]. AMSTAR-2 is applicable to systematic reviews of both randomized controlled trials (RCTs)
258 and non-randomized controlled trials (non-RCTs). This tool consists of 16 items, with 7 critical
259 domains (items 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15). The assessment comprises three options, "yes"
260 (item/question fully addressed), "no" (item/question not addressed), or "partial" (item/question not
261 fully addressed). The overall confidence on the results of the review is classified into high,
262 moderate, low, and critically low [50].

263

264 The ROBIS tool aims to assess the risk of bias in reviews related to interventions, etiology,
265 diagnosis and prognosis [51]. It consists of 24 questions across three phases: Phase 1 assesses the
266 relevance (optional); phase 2 identifies concerns with the review process; and phase 3 judges the
267 risk of bias in the review. Phase 2 and 3 questions are answered with the following options: yes;
268 probably yes; probably no; no; or no information. The concerns regarding phase 2 and phase 3
269 domains are classified as high, low, or unclear. We will focus only on phases 2 and 3 to give an
270 overall score on the risk of bias in each review. Phase 2 identifies the concerns in the review across
271 four domains: study eligibility criteria; identification and selection of studies; data collection and
272 study appraisal; and synthesis and findings. There are signaling questions and a judgment of
273 concerns about risk of bias for each domain (low, high or unclear). Phase 3 summarizes the
274 concerns identified during the Phase 2 assessment [51]. Finally, we will provide a judgment
275 regarding the overall risk of bias.

276

277 Despite the relevance of these tools and the growing number of reporting guidelines, they are
278 mostly for SRs of quantitative reviews and there is a lack of critical appraisal tools [52] to assess
279 the quality of SRs of qualitative studies [53]. In fact, some criteria from AMSTAR-2 and ROBIS
280 tools are not adapted for quality assessment of factors such as risk of bias, publication bias,
281 heterogeneity, meta-analysis in SRs of qualitative research [53]. However, we will use both these
282 tools to conduct the quality assessment within the limit of their utilization.

283

284 Two reviewers will independently assess each review using both tools. Any discrepancies will be
285 resolved by discussion or a consultation with a third reviewer. We will not perform any quality
286 assessment of primary studies in included reviews.

287

288 **Data synthesis**

289 We will perform a narrative synthesis of the data. We will present results in tabular form in tables
290 describing characteristics of included studies (e.g. first author's name, language of publication,
291 country, settings, year of publication, profile of participants, study purpose), information on
292 teledentistry (e.g. definition, teledentistry modalities), methods (e.g. SR with or without meta-
293 analysis, type of analysis), additional results (e.g. assessment of quality, appraisal tool used,
294 heterogeneity of the results, and level of evidence), and outcomes (e.g. primary outcomes and
295 secondary outcomes from included studies). We will categorize the SRs into sub-groups, according
296 to the type of intervention such as teledentistry modalities. If possible, we will perform a narrative
297 synthesis of the subgroups.

298

299 An important concern in conducting an overview is the likelihood of overlap in primary studies
300 across included reviews, which may result in overestimates in results (36) and confuse clinicians
301 making decisions amongst competing interventions in their clinical practices. Thus, we will

302 summarize key details from the studies included and will not perform a meta-synthesis of included
303 meta-analyses. We will report any overlap between SRs in the tables as a matrix.

304

305 We will report the overall score of the two measurement tools (AMSTAR-2 and ROBIS), the level
306 of evidence from the credibility assessment, and the percentage overlap between primary studies
307 within included SRs and SR-meta- analysis (SR-MAs).

308

309 We will assess the certainty of evidence defined as any of evaluation of the totality or strength of
310 the evidence on the impact of teledentistry using the following criteria for credibility assessment as
311 proposed in four categories [38, 54]: Class I (Convincing evidence): associations with a statistical
312 significance of P -value $< 10^{-6}$, include more than 1000 cases (or more than 20 000 participants for
313 continuous outcomes), have the largest component study reporting a significant result ($P < 0.05$),
314 have a 95% prediction interval that excludes the null, does not have large heterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$),
315 and shows no evidence of small study effects ($P > 0.10$) and excess significance bias ($P > 0.10$);
316 Class II (Highly suggestive evidence): associations with a significance of $P < 0.001$, include more
317 than 1000 cases (or more than 20 000 participants for continuous outcomes), and have the largest
318 component study reporting a statistically significant result ($P < 0.05$); Class III (Suggestive
319 evidence): associations that report a significance of $P < 0.01$ with more than 1000 cases (or more
320 than 20000 participants for continuous outcomes); Class IV (Weak evidence): remaining significant
321 associations with $P < 0.05$. If we do not have sufficient data, we will analyse the certainty of
322 evidence using data reported in the included SRs.

323

324 **Discussion**

325 This review will contribute to a comprehensive body of knowledge on the potential effectiveness of
326 teledentistry. To our knowledge, this overview is the first concerning teledentistry that will include

327 a broad definition of teledentistry incorporating various modalities, participants, study designs,
328 types of SRs and a combination of evidence, thereby increasing the understanding of the potential
329 of teledentistry. This overview has implications for dental practice, policy, education and research.
330 Beyond using a broad definition of teledentistry, this review will provide valuable knowledge on
331 the use of digital technologies, including teledentistry, to improve oral health care systems.
332 Teledentistry can be used to enhance the quality of oral health care as well as enhance oral health
333 equity. The lack of high-quality information on the effectiveness of teledentistry has often been
334 reported as a strong barrier to its implementation. This review has the potential to close that gap and
335 will contribute to inform decision-makers, researchers, clinicians, and patients on the effectiveness
336 of teledentistry for the delivery of care and to improve patients' outcomes and experiences, as well
337 as inform the needs for the future research. For instance, results will highlight teledentistry's
338 benefits and challenges, thereby identifying where it could potentially be used. These findings may
339 also support the development and implementation of guidelines on teledentistry in clinical practice.

340

341 We anticipate some limitations. A first limitation relates to the overlap between the primary studies
342 included in more than one SR in our overview, which can cause an overestimation of the effects for
343 a given outcome. We will report the percentage of overlap between the included studies and will
344 discuss the impact of the overlap on our results. The second limitation is the restriction of our
345 overview to SRs only, which could result in missing some relevant primary studies published
346 during the completion of our review. To mitigate this issue, we will repeat our search just before we
347 finish our manuscript and will identify any additional relevant published SRs, but we will only
348 include them if they fulfill our inclusion criteria. We will document and report any deviations to the
349 protocol during the review. In addition, we will mention any limitation in the lack of available
350 critical appraisal tool for any designs (quantitative, qualitative and mixed reviews) [53].

351

352 **Dissemination plan**

353 Results of this overview will be disseminated through presentations at national and international
354 scientific and professional conferences, publication in peer-review journals and social media, such
355 as Twitter, plus the website of the Faculty of Dental Medicine and Oral health Sciences, at McGill
356 University.

357

358 **Acknowledgement**

359 The authors thank the summer students for their involvement in the first steps of data screening.

360

361 **Supporting information**

362 S1 checklist: PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis

363 Protocols) 2015 checklist: Recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol.

364 S1 file: Search strategy

365 S2 file: Data extraction sheet

366

367 **Funding**

368 None

369 **Competing interests**

370 None

371 **Availability of data and materials**

372 Not applicable

373

374 **References**

- 375 1. Peres MA, Macpherson LMD, Weyant RJ, Daly B, Venturelli R, Mathur MR, et al. Oral
376 diseases: a global public health challenge. *The Lancet*. 2019;394(10194):249-60.
- 377 2. Gandhi S, Chen S, Hong L, Sun K, Gong E, Li C, et al. Effect of Mobile Health
378 Interventions on the Secondary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: Systematic Review and
379 Meta-analysis. *The Canadian journal of cardiology*. 2017;33(2):219-31.
- 380 3. Fjeldsoe BS, Marshall AL, Miller YD. Behavior change interventions delivered by mobile
381 telephone short-message service. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;36(2):165-73.
- 382 4. Abaza H, Marschollek M. mHealth Application Areas and Technology Combinations*. A
383 Comparison of Literature from High and Low/Middle Income Countries. *Methods of information in*
384 *medicine*. 2017;56(7):e105-e22.
- 385 5. Toniazzo MP, Nodari D, Muniz F, Weidlich P. Effect of mHealth in improving oral
386 hygiene: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Journal of clinical periodontology*.
387 2019;46(3):297-309.
- 388 6. Irving M, Stewart R, Spallek H, Blinkhorn A. Using teledentistry in clinical practice as an
389 enabler to improve access to clinical care: A qualitative systematic review. *Journal of telemedicine*
390 *and telecare*. 2018;24(3):129-46.
- 391 7. Aquilanti L, Santarelli A, Mascitti M, Procaccini M, Rappelli G. Dental Care Access and the
392 Elderly: What Is the Role of Teledentistry? A Systematic Review. *International journal of*
393 *environmental research and public health*. 2020;17(23).
- 394 8. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Krupinski EA, Grigsby J, Kvedar JC, Weinstein RS, et al.
395 National telemedicine initiatives: essential to healthcare reform. *Telemedicine journal and e-health* :
396 *the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*. 2009;15(6):600-10.
- 397 9. Ibrahim MS, Mohamed Yusoff H, Abu Bakar YI, Thwe Aung MM, Abas MI, Ramli RA.
398 Digital health for quality healthcare: A systematic mapping of review studies. *Digital health*.
399 2022;8:20552076221085810.

- 400 10. World Health Organisation (WHO). Global strategy on digital health 2020-2025. Geneva:
401 World Health Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. Geneva
402 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/gS4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf)
403 [source/documents/gS4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/gS4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf); 2021.
- 404 11. Achmad H, Tanumihardja M, Ramadhany YF. Teledentistry as a solution in dentistry during
405 the covid-19 pandemic period: A systematic review. International Journal of Pharmaceutical
406 Research. 2020;12:272-8.
- 407 12. Daniel SJ, Kumar S. Teledentistry: a key component in access to care. J. 2014;14
408 Suppl:201-8.
- 409 13. Estai M, Bun S, Kanagasingam Y, Tennant M. Cost savings from a teledentistry model for
410 school dental screening: an Australian health system perspective. Australian Health Review.
411 2018;42(5):482-90.
- 412 14. Estai M, Kanagasingam Y, Tennant M, Bunt S. A systematic review of the research
413 evidence for the benefits of teledentistry. Journal of telemedicine and telecare. 2018;24(3):147-56.
- 414 15. Marino R, Ghanim A. Teledentistry: a systematic review of the literature. Journal of
415 Telemedicine & Telecare. 2013;19:179-83.
- 416 16. Khan SA, Omar H. Teledentistry in practice: literature review. Telemed J E Health.
417 2013;19:565-7.
- 418 17. American Dental Association (ADA). ADA Policy on Teledentistry 2015 [Available from:
419 [https://www.ada.org/en/about-the-ada/ada-positions-policies-and-statements/statement-on-](https://www.ada.org/en/about-the-ada/ada-positions-policies-and-statements/statement-on-teledentistry)
420 [teledentistry](https://www.ada.org/en/about-the-ada/ada-positions-policies-and-statements/statement-on-teledentistry).
- 421 18. World Health Organisation (WHO). Mobile technologies for oral health: an implementation
422 guide. Geneva: World Health Organization and International Telecommunication Union, 2021.
423 Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240035225>. 2021.
- 424 19. Tan SHX, Lee CKJ, Yong CW, Ding YY. Scoping review: Facilitators and barriers in the
425 adoption of teledentistry among older adults. Gerodontology. 2021;38:351-65.

- 426 20. Böhm da Costa C, Peralta FDS, Ferreira de Mello ALS. How Has Teledentistry Been
427 Applied in Public Dental Health Services? An Integrative Review. *Telemedicine journal and e-*
428 *health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*. 2019.
- 429 21. Estai M, Kanagasingham Y, Tennant M, Bunt S. A systematic review of the research
430 evidence for the benefits of teledentistry. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*.
431 2018;24:1357633X16689433.
- 432 22. Aquilanti L, Santarelli A, Mascitti M, Procaccini M, Rappelli G. Dental Care Access and the
433 Elderly: What Is the Role of Teledentistry? A Systematic Review. *International journal of*
434 *environmental research and public health*. 2020;17:1-13.
- 435 23. Alabdullah JH, Daniel SJ. A Systematic Review on the Validity of Teledentistry.
436 *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*.
437 2018;24:639-48.
- 438 24. Daniel SJ, Wu L, Kumar S. Teledentistry: A Systematic Review of Clinical Outcomes,
439 Utilization and Costs. *Journal of dental hygiene : JDH / American Dental Hygienists' Association*.
440 2013;87:345-52.
- 441 25. Madrid Troconis C, Rodriguez J, Puello P. Impact of Teledentistry Programs on Dental
442 Service in Rural Areas: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Applied Engineering*
443 *Research*. 2018:14417-23.
- 444 26. Islam MRR, Islam R, Ferdous S, Watanabe C, Yamauti M, Alam MK, et al. Teledentistry as
445 an Effective Tool for the Communication Improvement between Dentists and Patients: An
446 Overview. *Healthcare*. 2022;10(8):1586.
- 447 27. Lima IFP, Vieira WD, Bernardino ID, Costa PA, Lima APB, Pithon MM, et al. Influence of
448 reminder therapy for controlling bacterial plaque in patients undergoing orthodontic treatment: A
449 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Angle Orthod*. 2018;88:483-93.

- 450 28. Mohammed H, Rizk MZ, Wafaie K, Ulhaq A, Almuzian M. Reminders improve oral
451 hygiene and adherence to appointments in orthodontic patients: a systematic review and meta-
452 analysis. *European journal of orthodontics*. 2019;41(2):204-13.
- 453 29. Patil S, Hedad IA, Jafer AA, Abutaleb GK, Arishi TM, Arishi SA, et al. Effectiveness of
454 mobile phone applications in improving oral hygiene care and outcomes in orthodontic patients. *J*
455 *Oral Biol Craniofac Res*. 2021;11:26-32.
- 456 30. Al-Moghrabi D, Alkadhimi A, Tsihklaki A, Pandis N, Fleming PS. The influence of mobile
457 applications and social media-based interventions in producing behavior change among orthodontic
458 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2021;01:01.
- 459 31. Becker LA, Pieper D, Hartling L. Chapter V: Overviews of Reviews. In: Higgins JPT TJ,
460 Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA editor. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic*
461 *Reviews of Interventions* version 63 (updated February 2022) Cochrane, 2022 Available from
462 www.trainingcochrane.org/handbook2022.
- 463 32. Krnic Martinic M, Pieper D, Glatt A, Puljak L. Definition of a systematic review used in
464 overviews of systematic reviews, meta-epidemiological studies and textbooks. *BMC Medical*
465 *Research Methodology*. 2019;19(1):203.
- 466 33. Kim JSM, Pollock M, Kaunelis D, Weeks L. Guidance on review type selection for health
467 technology assessments: key factors and considerations for deciding when to conduct a de novo
468 systematic review, an update of a systematic review, or an overview of systematic reviews.
469 *Systematic Reviews*. 2022;11(1):206.
- 470 34. Rouleau G, Hong QN, Kaur N, Gagnon MP, Côté J, Bouix-Picasso J, et al. Systematic
471 Reviews of Systematic Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Studies Reviews in Healthcare
472 Research: How to Assess the Methodological Quality of Included Reviews? *Journal of Mixed*
473 *Methods Research*. 2021:15586898211054243.
- 474 35. Gurgel-Juarez N, Torres-Pereira C, Haddad AE, Sheehy L, Finestone H, Mallet K, et al.
475 Accuracy and effectiveness of teledentistry: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Evid*. 2022.

- 476 36. Hennessy EA, Johnson BT. Examining overlap of included studies in meta-reviews:
477 Guidance for using the corrected covered area index. *Research synthesis methods*. 2020;11(1):134-
478 45.
- 479 37. Wafaie K, Rizk MZ, Basyouni ME, Daniel B, Mohammed H. Tele-orthodontics and sensor-
480 based technologies: a systematic review of interventions that monitor and improve compliance of
481 orthodontic patients [published online ahead of print, 2023 May 3]. *Eur J Orthod*. 2023;cjad004.
482 doi:10.1093/ejo/cjad004
- 483 38. Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evidence Based*
484 *Mental Health*. 2018;21(3):95-100.
- 485 39. Aromataris E, F, R., , Godfrey C, Holly C, Khalil H, Tungpunkom P. Chapter 10: Umbrella
486 Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI, 2020.
487 Available from <https://synthesismanual.jbi.global>. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-11>. 2020.
- 488 40. Pollock M, Fernandes RM, Becker LA, Pieper D, Hartlin L. Chapter V: Overviews of
489 Reviews. In: Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA editor. *Cochrane*
490 *Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 63 (updated February 2022) Cochrane,
491 2022 Available from www.trainingcochrane.org/handbook2022.
- 492 41. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
493 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement.
494 *Systematic Reviews*. 2015;4(1):1.
- 495 42. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. *Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for*
496 *undertaking reviews in health care*. Ont, Canada: University of York, ISBN 978-1-900640-47-3.
497 https://www.york.ac.uk/media/crd/Systematic_Reviews.pdf; 2009.
- 498 43. Puljak L. If there is only one author or only one database was searched, a study should not
499 be called a systematic review. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2017;91:4-5.
- 500 44. Covidence. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne,
501 Australia. Available at www.covidence.org 2021 [

502

503 45. Gates A, Gates M, Duarte G, Cary M, Becker M, Prediger B, et al. Evaluation of the
504 reliability, usability, and applicability of AMSTAR, AMSTAR 2, and ROBIS: protocol for a
505 descriptive analytic study. *Systematic Reviews*. 2018;7(1):85.

506 46. Banzi R, Cinquini M, Gonzalez-Lorenzo M, Pecoraro V, Capobussi M, Minozzi S. Quality
507 assessment versus risk of bias in systematic reviews: AMSTAR and ROBIS had similar reliability
508 but differed in their construct and applicability. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2018;99:24-32.

509 47. Rouleau G, Gagnon M-P, Côté J, Payne-Gagnon J, Hudson E, Dubois C-A, et al. Effects of
510 E-Learning in a Continuing Education Context on Nursing Care: Systematic Review of Systematic
511 Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Studies Reviews. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(10):e15118-e.

512 48. Perry R, Whitmarsh A, Leach V, Davies P. A comparison of two assessment tools used in
513 overviews of systematic reviews: ROBIS versus AMSTAR-2. *Systematic Reviews*. 2021;10(1):273.

514 49. Storman M, Storman D, Jasinska KW, Swierz MJ, Bala MM. The quality of systematic
515 reviews/meta-analyses published in the field of bariatrics: A cross-sectional systematic survey using
516 AMSTAR 2 and ROBIS. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for
517 the Study of Obesity*. 2020;21(5):e12994.

518 50. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical
519 appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of
520 healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ*. 2017;358:j4008.

521 51. Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JP, Caldwell DM, Reeves BC, Shea B, et al. ROBIS: A new
522 tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*.
523 2016;69:225-34.

524 52. Munthe-Kaas HM, Glenton C, Booth A, Noyes J, Lewin S. Systematic mapping of existing
525 tools to appraise methodological strengths and limitations of qualitative research: first stage in the
526 development of the CAMELOT tool. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2019;19(1):113.

527 53. Rouleau G, Hong QN, Kaur N, Gagnon MP, Côté J, Bouix-Picasso J, et al. Systematic
528 Reviews of Systematic Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Studies Reviews in Healthcare
529 Research: How to Assess the Methodological Quality of Included Reviews? Journal of Mixed
530 Methods Research.0(0):15586898211054243.

531 54. Papatheodorou S. Umbrella reviews: what they are and why we need them. European
532 Journal of Epidemiology. 2019;34.

533

534