

1  
2 **International consensus on fluoride programmes for Early**  
3 **Childhood Caries prevention in early education settings**

4  
5  
6  
7 Lamis Abuhaloob<sup>1\*</sup>, David I Conay<sup>1</sup>, Alex Blokland<sup>1&3</sup>, Al Ross<sup>2\*</sup>

8  
9  
10  
11 <sup>1</sup>School of Medicine, Dentistry, and Nursing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

12 <sup>2</sup>School of Health, Science and Wellbeing, Centre for Health Innovation, Staffordshire University,  
13 Staffordshire, UK.

14 <sup>3</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

15  
16 \*Corresponding authors

17 E-mail: [lamisabuhaloob@yahoo.com](mailto:lamisabuhaloob@yahoo.com)

18 E-mail: [al.ross@staffs.ac.uk](mailto:al.ross@staffs.ac.uk)

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

28

## 29 **Abstract**

### 30 **Background**

31 The World Health Organisation has set out a clear priority for the implementation of interventions to  
32 reduce the burden of Early Childhood Caries (ECC), a global public health problem affecting over 500  
33 million children around the world and having a substantial impact on child well-being and health system  
34 expenditure.

35 The aim of this study was to assess and develop international expert consensus on the evidence for  
36 fluoride-based interventions in early-year education settings (kindergartens/nursery and primary  
37 schools) for reducing ECC and to synthesise clear programme-level recommendations with regard to  
38 ECC prevention in this setting.

### 39 **Methods**

40 A systematic overview of systematic reviews, trials, and observational studies was performed to identify  
41 and critically appraise the available evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of fluoride-  
42 based interventions in early-years education settings to prevent ECC.

43 This was followed by a three-stage modified Delphi panel study (n= 21) consisting of: round 1, an  
44 online survey to gather opinions on safety, effectiveness and feasibility of interventions; round 2, an  
45 iterative survey to consider collated group opinion and gather feedback on review findings; and finally,  
46 an online workshop with presentations and facilitated in-depth, recorded group discussions.

### 47 **Results**

48 There was high-quality evidence and consensus on delivering supervised toothbrushing in kindergartens  
49 (nurseries) and primary/elementary schools; this is safe and cost-effective, shows greater benefit to  
50 more disadvantaged children, helps child social development, and is feasible in high and low/middle-  
51 income countries. There was more moderate support for the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of  
52 fluoride varnish application in this setting (especially where supervised toothbrushing with fluoride is  
53 in place). It was agreed that policy makers should prioritise at-risk groups where resources are limited,

54 and that systemic fluoride interventions (Fluoride tablets, drops, milk, and salt) in this setting are no  
55 longer a priority.

## 56 **Conclusion**

57 Supervised toothbrushing with fluoridated toothpaste is the most effective, cost-effective, feasible and  
58 safest mechanism for children in early education settings. Universal coverage is preferred but where  
59 resources are limited targeting based on need is indicated. Panel consensus is that it remains appropriate  
60 in water fluoridated areas and is largely feasible in low/middle-income countries.

61

## 62 **Introduction**

63 The World Health Organisation (WHO) has set out a clear priority for the implementation of  
64 programmatic interventions to reduce the burden of Early Childhood Caries (ECC), a non-  
65 communicable disease and global public health problem affecting children around the world [1]. Recent  
66 reports indicate that 514 million children worldwide (43% of the population) have dental caries in their  
67 deciduous teeth, with three -quarters of those living with untreated decay living in low/middle-income  
68 countries [2].

69 In 2019 the WHO published an implementation manual for ending ECC [3] that outlined a number of  
70 important principles for preventive programmes, including involvement of primary care teams and  
71 recognition of the role of school-based programmes. Key fluoride-based interventions outlined in the  
72 manual which can be delivered in education settings are: routine brushing of infants' and children's  
73 teeth with fluoride toothpaste [4]; fluoridated salt or milk programmes [5-8]; and regular application of  
74 5% sodium fluoride varnish [9, 10].

75 Fluoride varnish is currently recommended in clinical guidance as a safe, topical treatment for caries  
76 prevention in children [11] which is supported by high quality reviews [9]. However, some new  
77 emerging evidence needs to be considered. A recent systematic review [12] concluded that "there is  
78 modest and uncertain evidence for fluoride varnish reducing the risk of developing dentine caries in  
79 pre-school children". Similarly, a recent double-blind, two-arm randomised controlled trial embedded  
80 within the Childsmile programme (Protecting Teeth at Three; PT@3) found a modest non-significant

81 reduction in the worsening of d3mft in the nursery Fluoride varnish group compared to Treatment as  
82 Usual (universal supervised toothbrushing) in the nursery setting for children at high risk, concluding  
83 that it was neither effective or cost-effective [13, 14].

84 Studies of effectiveness generally show improvement in the dental health of young children associated  
85 with exposure to toothbrushing with fluoride toothpaste in the education setting. Cost analysis to  
86 inform the development of national nursery toothbrushing programmes in Scotland showed a cost  
87 saving of approximately GBP6.0 million over eight years compared with health service costs associated  
88 with dental treatments [13, 14].

89 Evidence for systemic fluoride in education settings largely predates the use of topical fluoride. The  
90 effectiveness of fluoride supplements (tablets, drops, lozenges) on deciduous teeth (nursery or early  
91 primary school children) appears unclear (there is some reported reduction in caries increment for older  
92 children with permanent teeth) and there is limited information on adverse effects. Similarly, evidence  
93 on fluoridated salt (typically containing 250ppm fluoride) is substantially over 20 years old, but  
94 supportive in children at primary/elementary school age and above. There is some evidence for  
95 effectiveness of fluoridated milk (versus non-fluoridated milk) in longitudinal cohorts but concerns  
96 about risk of bias and applicability to different populations.

97 Thus, prevention of dental caries in young children is an agreed priority for policy-makers due to the  
98 high disease levels and potential savings from associated expensive treatment costs, and delivery of  
99 fluoride in education settings can play a role. There are questions remaining about the best  
100 intervention(s) in terms of safety, efficacy and feasibility, and therefore there is need for appraisal of  
101 the relative merits and demerits of toothbrushing, fluoride varnish, and other fluoride-based  
102 programmes for children in education settings as part of population oral health improvement policies  
103 and programmes.

104

## 105 **Aims**

106 This study aimed to assess and develop an international expert consensus on fluoride-based  
107 interventions in early years educational settings for reducing ECC in young children.

108 The objectives were:

- 109 • Collate and evaluate up-to-date scientific evidence and clinical guidance on fluoride varnish
- 110 and toothbrushing interventions for the prevention of ECC,
- 111 • Determine expert consensus on fluoride-based interventions in early years educational settings,
- 112 • Synthesise and summarise findings in a concise and accessible form to inform implementation
- 113 efforts.

114

## 115 **Materials and Methods**

116 The study was a mixed- methods project with a systematic overview and appraisal of evidence being  
117 fed into iterative consensus-building ‘rounds with a mixture of quantitative and qualitative procedures.

### 118 **Systematic overview**

119 The overview was registered in the International prospective register of systematic reviews [15]. A  
120 systematic literature search syntax was developed for MEDLINE and adapted for the following  
121 databases: EMBASE, Web of Science Core Collection, and Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied  
122 Health Literature (CINAHL). Filters based on the recommended SIGN filters were used to target the  
123 search at interventions (trial and evaluation papers).

### 124 **Inclusion/ exclusion criteria**

- 125 • All peer-reviewed study designs were included (i.e. systematic reviews, Randomised  
126 Controlled Trials, observational designs)
- 127 • No restrictions on language or publication dates were placed
- 128 • Studies were restricted to those delivered directly in early education settings  
129 (nursery/kindergarten or primary/elementary school).
- 130 • Only studies of fluoride-based interventions (e.g. fluoride toothpaste, fluoride gel or foam,  
131 fluoride varnish, fluoride rinsing, fluoride tablets, and supplements in milk) were included
- 132 • No restrictions were made on comparators or reported outcomes

133

134 We excluded study protocols, systematic review protocols, non-peer reviewed reports and conference  
135 abstracts for which no full text was available. We also excluded minimally invasive techniques such  
136 as Silver Diamine Fluoride (SDF) and Atraumatic Restorative Treatment (ART).

### 137 **Study appraisal and data extraction**

138 The cohort of identified papers (Fig 1) was managed in Covidence Systematic Review Software [16].  
139 Title and abstract screening and full text screening was carried out by at least two independent reviewers.  
140 Any ambiguity/disagreements were discussed between all three reviewers to reach an agreement. For  
141 excluded papers with reasons for exclusion see S1Table.

142 Quality appraisal and assessment of the risk of bias was again undertaken independently by at least two  
143 reviewers, after which disagreements were discussed, using appropriate tools for systematic reviews  
144 (AMSTAR and ROBIS) and primary studies (CASP) [17-19].

145 Data extraction included capturing: study design; study setting; target population; sample size; brief  
146 description of the intervention; comparators / treatment as usual; clinical outcomes (efficacy, safety)  
147 and/or cost/economic outcomes.

148 Because of the high heterogeneity (setting/population, intervention/control, duration, outcomes)  
149 random effects meta-analysis could not be performed and data synthesis is in narrative form. Results  
150 which were fed into the Delphi rounds were extracted from high and medium quality papers – starting  
151 with Systematic Reviews, supplemented by further evidence from separate primary studies not included  
152 in reviews. After quality, recency of data was prioritised. Lower quality evidence is summarised briefly.

153

### 154 **The Modified Delphi consensus-building exercise**

155 The Modified Delphi exercise followed conventional steps for remote/online consensus building [20].

156 The methodology is a validated systematic method to measure and develop consensus when empirical  
157 evidence is emerging, lacking, limited, or contradictory [21].

158 There were three rounds to the Modified Delphi exercise. First, the panel were sent an initial survey to  
159 gather ‘baseline’ opinions on safety, efficacy and priorities for implementation in both high and  
160 low/middle-income settings. For ‘round 2’, survey proposition statements from the systematic overview

161 were fed in for opinion as well as collated priority data, and selected qualitative opinions, from round  
162 1. Survey results helped set the questions/scope for a final online meeting of the group (workshop;  
163 around 150 minutes). This involved presentations from the research team with questions/answers and  
164 then three parallel ‘break out’ facilitated discussions.

#### 165 Procedures

166 Participants were purposively selected due to their expertise and their ability to further the aims of the  
167 work. They were targeted through existing connections: senior researchers and clinical academics  
168 including the Cochrane Oral Health Group; Dental Public Health leads; senior Government and  
169 policy/programme leads in childhood caries prevention.

170 Data gathering for the Delphi consensus exercise was through MS Forms, hosted on the University of  
171 Glasgow’s secure OneDrive, with access restricted to the named project team. Workshop was facilitated  
172 through MS Teams. The meeting was password protected. Teams allows recording directly to the  
173 University server (OneDrive) and storage of sessions without recourse to third-party software. All data  
174 was stored on a secure university drive on a password protected computer, in accordance with the  
175 University of Glasgow’s data security protocol which is in full compliance with the General Data  
176 Protection Regulation (GDPR 2018).

177 Workshop consent was secured by email in advance. The workshop discussion was recorded and  
178 transcribed. Transcripts were disidentified with quotations attributed to unique participant ID numbers  
179 only.

180 Surveys responses were analysed by way of descriptive statistics in IBM SPSS Statistics 26 software  
181 and presented into stacked bar chart. Workshop’s discussions were transcribed, and were analysed using  
182 thematic analysis based on the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research [22] facilitated  
183 by QSR NVivo 12.0 data analysis software.

184 Study ethical approval was granted by the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences Ethics  
185 Committee, University of Glasgow (Project No: 200210053).

186

## 187 **Results**

188 Fig 1 shows 1951 initial papers were identified from the databases; 304 (Fig 1) were appraised at full  
189 text screening and a final 74 papers were included for quality appraisal and data extraction: 13  
190 systematic reviews including 3 economic reviews; 23 randomised controlled trials; 29 observational  
191 studies; and 9 economic studies.

192 Extracted data from all primary studies (design, population, setting, sample, outcomes and key findings)  
193 and reviews (type, quality appraisal, interventions, outcomes, key findings, education setting findings  
194 where distinct) in the overview are shown in S2 and S3 Tables.

195 Results of the overview and Delphi exercise are summarised below by intervention, with a focus on  
196 high and moderate quality papers. Twenty-one experts responded to the first round Delphi survey and  
197 fifteen to the second round (71%). Qualitative feedback from the panel for all interventions was then  
198 summarised thematically.

### 199 **Comparing interventions**

200 The panel were asked, based on their opinions on effectiveness and safety, to rank the interventions in  
201 terms of priority as part of efforts to reduce early childhood caries, where 1 = highest priority and 7 =  
202 lowest priority. Results are shown in Fig 2.

203 The panel were then asked, taking into account cost and other potential barriers, to rank the interventions  
204 in terms of their feasibility of implementation in high income, and low/middle income countries  
205 separately, where 1 = highest priority and 7 = lowest priority.

206 Results for high income countries are shown in Fig 3. The results for low/middle-income countries  
207 (Fig4) were similar, with changes restricted to: fluoride gel or foam down from rank 4 to 5; fluoridated  
208 milk up from 5 to 4.

### 209 **Supervised daily toothbrushing with fluoride toothpaste**

210 It can be seen from Figs 2 and 3 that daily supervised toothbrushing with fluoride toothpaste was clearly  
211 the top-ranked intervention, with 18/21 (86%) ranking it as the top priority in terms of effectiveness



212 and safety and 19/21 (90%) ranking it as the most feasible in high income countries. In low/middle-  
213 income countries 16 (76%) ranked it first and 4 (19%) ranked it second. No other intervention received  
214 more than one vote for top rank.

215 This collated opinion was closely aligned with strong supportive evidence from the systematic overview.  
216 As can be seen from S2 Table, studies showed a significant reduction (33-40%) in dental caries  
217 increment with daily supervised toothbrushing using 1000 to 1450 ppm Fluoride toothpaste in children  
218 aged 2-12 years old in nurseries and primary schools [4, 23, 24].

219 A recent high-quality economic study of a national supervised toothbrushing programme in nursery  
220 schools in Scotland found that after eighth year of the toothbrushing implementation, the expected  
221 savings (£4,731,097) were more than two and a half times the costs of the programme implementation  
222 (£1,762,621 per year).

223 Furthermore, a population standardised analysis by deprivation groups showed that the largest decrease  
224 in modelled costs was for the most deprived cohort of children [14]. There is limited evidence for  
225 supervision *per se* (against unsupervised brushing, see thematic findings). Additionally, an indicative  
226 qualitative survey response was *'I still hold daily toothbrushing with fluoridated toothpaste will confer*  
227 *more consistent protection against dental caries, when compared to periodic delivery of fluoride*  
228 *through varnish'*.

229 In round 2, 13/15 respondents (87%) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition that *'toothbrushing*  
230 *with fluoride toothpaste should be universal for all children in early years education'*. However, in  
231 terms of targeting, 11/15 (73%) agreed or strongly agreed that *'if resource is limited, [it is] fair enough*  
232 *to only offer [toothbrushing] in areas of relative deprivation'*.

### 233 **Fluoride varnish application**

234 Fluoride varnish application (usually 2-4 times yearly, see S2 Table) was consistently the second-ranked  
235 intervention, with two top ranks for effectiveness/safety and 19/21 (90%) ranking it first or second  
236 priority. This intervention received one first and 14 (67%) second rankings for feasibility in high-  
237 income countries. In low/middle-income countries, fluoride varnish was still clearly ranked second in

238 terms of feasibility to daily supervised toothbrushing, but the percentage of first or second rank fell  
239 from 15/21 (71%) to 8/21 (38%).

240 In round 2, just one person reported that the overview summary matched their own understanding of  
241 the evidence for fluoride varnish in nurseries and schools ‘to a very large extent’. Eleven out of 15  
242 (73%) did agree it matched ‘to a large extent’ whilst two were unsure and one said it matched ‘to very  
243 little extent’. This compared to six people (40%) who felt the toothbrushing overview matched their  
244 own understanding ‘to a very large extent’.

245 The overview demonstrated that fluoride varnish delivered in nurseries or primary schools typically  
246 focuses on two-to-four applications a year of sodium fluoride varnish containing around 22,600 ppm  
247 fluoride. One RCT reported a 49% reduction in dental caries ( $P < 0.001$ ) in high-risk pre-school children  
248 receiving fluoride varnish four times in Kosovo [25]. Two other high-quality trials reported a modest  
249 non-significant reduction in the worsening of d3mft in a low socioeconomic nursery setting in Scotland  
250 [13]; and no significant caries-preventive effect in a primary school setting within a high-risk  
251 community in South Africa [26].

252 A more recent fluoride varnish review - not restricted to education settings, which was rated as moderate  
253 quality, showed a modest and uncertain anti-caries effect in pre-schoolers and called for more cost-  
254 effectiveness analyses [27].

255 The highest quality review shows mixed (positive, negative and inconclusive) results in the education  
256 setting where there is a paucity of high-quality randomised trials [9]. In Survey 2, 93% of respondents  
257 declared that this evidence matched their understanding of the evidence about fluoride varnish in early  
258 education settings. Three respondents illustrated that they don't have a full understanding of  
259 observational studies and were unaware of the negative results on cost-effectiveness.

260 Our review was feeding in a question about fluoride varnish to the panel. As one qualitative survey  
261 response had it, *‘you have told me it is not as strongly supported by evidence as I previously thought’*.

262 When asked whether they agreed that “There is questionable value in continuing fluoride varnish in the  
263 early education setting where children are undergoing supervised toothbrushing with fluoride”, four  
264 strongly agreed, three agreed, seven (47%) were ‘not sure’ and one person disagreed. This suggest this  
265 is an area where consensus is somewhat lacking and in need of further consideration.

## 266 **Other fluoride-based interventions**

267 There was broad consensus that other fluoride-based interventions are less of a priority in terms of  
268 effectiveness/safety and feasibility (Figs 2 and 3). The data extracted during the review (S2 and S3  
269 Tables) show, for example, that there is limited information on the adverse effects of fluoride mouth  
270 rinse application in educational settings to reduce ECC [28, 29]. The reported caries preventive benefit  
271 was larger among children in high-risk schools [30] and in areas of non-fluoridated water [31]. High-  
272 quality evidence showed that cost-effectiveness is increased where teachers supervise such programmes  
273 [32]. However, a highly rated Cochrane review reported that the size of the preventive effect of such  
274 interventions in school settings is uncertain [33].

275 Fluoride gel (typically applied quarterly, containing up to 12,300ppm fluoride) effectiveness in reducing  
276 dental caries in permanent dentition was supported with moderate quality evidence; there is low-quality  
277 evidence for caries prevention via fluoride gel in primary dentition and there is again limited  
278 information on its adverse effects [34].

279 Similarly, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the benefits of milk fluoridation (typically  
280 containing 250ppm fluoride) in education settings. [35]. A parallel arm longitudinal cohort study in  
281 Bulgaria reported a 61% reduction in caries permanent teeth from a community milk fluoridation  
282 programme [8]; concerns remain regarding the generalisability of these findings.

283 Delphi results confirmed the view that fluoride supplement evidence substantially predates the use of  
284 topical fluoride. The effectiveness of fluoride supplements on deciduous teeth (nursery or early primary  
285 school children) appears unclear and there is limited information on adverse effects [36]. Evidence on  
286 fluoridated salt (typically containing 250ppm fluoride) is substantially over 20 years old but supportive  
287 in slightly older children (primary school age and above aged 10-12 years old) [37]. In a more recent  
288 study in Gambia - a country [38] with low levels of fluoride in drinking water (0.1 mg F – /L) and a  
289 high caries burden, it was found that the use of fluoridated salt to prepare school meals resulted in 66.3%  
290 caries-preventive effect in preschool children [39]. Generally, there is unclear evidence on the  
291 effectiveness of administration of combined interventions in education settings versus single  
292 interventions.

293 In the survey, 100% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that salt as a way of delivering fluoride  
294 should be questioned because it is a risk factor for hypertension. they illustrated that it is '*indicated [as*  
295 *a risk factor] in other non-communicable diseases and [...] targeted for reduction in many foods*'. Ten  
296 out of 15 (67%) experts agreed or strongly agreed that there is insufficient high-quality evidence on  
297 mouth rinse to recommend it.

298 Finally, more experts (82%) agreed that fluoride-based interventions should be implemented over and  
299 above dental health education for children than those (58%) who agreed that fluoride-based  
300 interventions should be implemented over and above community water fluoridation. They collectively  
301 (87%) highlighted the vital value of environmental sustainability and cost-effectiveness data to inform  
302 policies on fluoride-based interventions in education settings. In addition, they agreed that fluoride  
303 varnish application in education settings would effectively tackle dental caries in high deprivation areas  
304 (80%), The majority of the experts (86%) recommend universal application of toothbrushing  
305 intervention in early education settings, irrespective of high/middle/low-income country status and  
306 irrespective of presence/absence of community water fluoride.

### 307 **Workshop discussions**

308 Finally, Table 1 shows illustrations of Delphi workshop discussion groups, arranged by cross-cutting  
309 themes.

310

311 **Table 1 Delphi workshop themes with illustrative quotations**

312

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Illustrative quotations</b>
<b>Prioritising Interventions</b>	Consensus on the relative importance of regular, habitual fluoride toothbrushing	<i>I think there's a huge difference between having Fluoride varnish twice a year and brushing twice a day, in terms of the societal impact and instilling the habits in the family. So, I think in the long run I would support supervised brushing [Group 3 R2]</i>
	Low consensus on the effectiveness of fluoride varnish when brushing is in place	<i>I guess with the [addition of the fluoride varnish...] we don't know enough to say for sure that it's having no effect, and from the evidence in the report here we just don't feel there's enough that make you feel comfortable taking something away. Because once it's gone it's gone. [Group 3 R1] It seems like the evidence is, kind of, weak for additional benefit, right. So I think that's something important because then if the benefit is very small, it's not going to be cost-effective, right? [Group 2 R6]</i>
	Consensus on other interventions being less of a priority	<i>... [we] got fluoridated milk to work at a time when caries prevalence was much higher than it is now, and the dose of fluoride that they had in the milk was much higher than it is now. But that again is not a practical solution, at least for the UK. [Group 3 R4] I'd agree; I don't think there's any sort of sound evidence to warrant taking fluoridated milk forward. [Group 3 R3]</i>
<b>Targeting at socioeconomic need</b>	Consensus on targeting based on socio-economic disadvantage	<i>[...] we couldn't afford to have universal toothbrushing. So, it is targeted here [...] within each health board area the scheme runs in the most deprived nurseries in those areas. So, by default we ended up with kind of proportionate universalism before Marmot coined that term really. [Group 3 R4] It just might raise a question of the targeting [...] the targeting is even more important to get to those children who are really going to need it. [Group 2 R3]</i>
<b>Feasibility and resources</b>	Consensus on coverage being dependent on resources	<i>A lot of it depends on what your commissioning arrangements are. I know in Wales and Scotland – apologies, I don't know about Northern Ireland – they're centralised so you can do the whole country. Whereas in England the responsibility lies with the local authorities, and it will depend on the funding they've got in that area. So, it goes back to resources. And if you've only got limited resources [Group 3 R3] And I think it's fair to say people did agree that if you've got limited resources you simply would go to where the need is, but ideally you would be able to scale up and have a universal programme. Because, again, of that good habit and socialisation element to toothbrushing, you would want to do it as widely as possible, but it's not always possible [Group 1 summariser] There are the issues around about the acceptability of the intervention, and the practicalities in delivering it. And I think in looking at these interventions we need to think of all of those things in the round. So, I'm not sure if anyone is just thinking of this just purely in terms of caries effectiveness, but I think we need to think of all of those things. [Group 3 R4]</i>
	Consensus on using the dental team	<i>[...] I think one of the great things about fluoride varnish in Iran was using the community health workers instead of dentists and dental nurses. [...] In many low income settings dental personnel doesn't exist to support such a vast programme at national level. [...] So one of the potentials [...] is using non-dental care professionals – which is politically very sensitive, I understand the profession may oppose it – but at the same time that's something that we could potentially explore in our discussion, you know, the fact that it doesn't have to be done by dentists as there are not enough of us in the world [Plenary R8]</i>

		<i>In Childsmile in Scotland we use dental nurses, extended duty dental nurses. It's not dentists. There is an argument about could you use a non-registrant in this space, we have non-registered phlebotomists, you know, doing things to us, there's lots of health care support workers. Perhaps there is another discussion about what is the skill mix that we need? Do we have it right yet? [Plenary R4]</i>
Sustainability	Consensus on need to address sustainability with regards to plastic	<i>[...] just one point quickly, the environmental sustainability and the issue of plastic caused by toothbrushing [...] In Scotland, I think my understanding is, correct me if I'm not right, there is an item considering the sustainability as part of the contract. There is a programme going to be implemented with [...] the toothbrush recycling. So it's a problem of environmental sustainability. [Group 1 R2]</i>
Other community interventions	Consensus that fluoride programmes in education are complementary to community water fluoride where it exists	<i>Well, I think it's just to note that children do still get caries even if they're living in a water fluoridated area and there's always going to be children in that group who are high-risk and they then do require additional fluoride, whether that's supervised brushing or Fluoride varnish application [...] So, yes, I think just because they live in an area of water fluoridation doesn't mean that they don't need these interventions [Group 2 R5]</i>
	Consensus that fluoride programmes should sit alongside sugar reduction efforts	<i>[...] the importance of healthy eating and the importance of sugar in your diet and the effect it has. So, those sorts of schemes do bring a lot more value than just the application of fluoride in whatever venue, in whatever way you can get it. And there'll certainly be something which I feel has got lots of added benefits that maybe we don't always talk about that much [Group 3 R6] I think you've got sugar reduction has to go with the fluoride. [...] it's not just brushing your teeth, but reducing the frequency and amount of sugar [Group 3 R1]</i>

313

314

315

## 316 **Prioritising the intervention**

317 Thematically, there was consensus on supervised toothbrushing with fluoridated toothpaste as the ‘front  
318 line’ intervention in the early education setting. As well as being effective and safe, the intervention  
319 establishes healthy behaviour from an early age (it was felt studies fail to capture all benefits of  
320 supervised brushing e.g. the potential lifelong benefit of forming a healthy habit). This intervention was  
321 generally though feasible, but there may be some issues in countries that do not provide free nursery  
322 care.

323 During the workshop, some people felt that the evidence on fluoride varnish, while called into question,  
324 hadn’t changed sufficiently to withdraw existing programmes. It was also felt that clinical trials in high-  
325 income countries may not show effects that programmes in low-income countries could achieve: “[...]”  
326 *I’m starting to have real doubts about caries clinical trials in the UK and their ability to show*  
327 *effectiveness. We’ve had a number of big trials now that are showing non-effectiveness”* [Group 3 R4].

## 328 **Targeting based on socioeconomic need**

329 The universal approach is supported but experts agree that targeting the most socioeconomically  
330 deprived in the first instance should be the priority. With limited resources, experts would prefer to  
331 target the most socioeconomically deprived children for longer (to older age) rather than aim for  
332 universality (it can be challenging to target schools based on geographical indicators of socioeconomic  
333 need).

## 334 **Feasibility and resources**

335 Many barriers in implementation were agreed to be important. Whilst toothbrushing might be  
336 undertaken supervised without the need for running water (‘dry toothbrushing’), it does require  
337 engagement and involvement of teachers or community health workers. Barriers in resources and  
338 feasibility terms included: fluoride gels being messy and impractical; the need for refrigeration for  
339 fluoridated milk etc. As the group one summariser said: *“it was a very sort of pragmatic discussion.*  
340 *And so rather than a theoretical or esoteric academic discussion, we were talking about things like*  
341 *funding and resources and commissioning.”*

## 342 **Sustainability**

343 It was agreed that fluoride interventions in education settings are not currently the most environmentally  
344 sustainable programmes. Recycling plastic and examining elements such as staff travel is likely to be a  
345 focus in future. However, with regard to environmental sustainability, it was stressed that preventing a  
346 significant disease is ultimately the most sustainable thing to do. Efforts to reduce a carbon footprint  
347 need to measure the end product such as reduced treatment costs, rather than simply look at the input.

## 348 **Other community interventions**

349 The discussions highlighted the importance of a common risk factor approach and how focusing solely  
350 on fluoride risks missing benefits of sugar reduction, in particular for wider public health. In areas with  
351 water fluoridation, evidence of additional benefit from toothbrushing is emerging. The panel was clear  
352 that children still get dental caries in water fluoridated areas and therefore require other interventions.

353

## 354 **Discussion**

355 This project used evidence collected from a systematic overview and Delphi exercise to develop an  
356 international expert consensus on fluoride-based interventions in early years educational settings for  
357 reducing ECC in young children. We excluded studies of minimally invasive techniques such as Silver  
358 Diamine Fluoride (SDF) and Atraumatic Restorative Treatment (ART) from this review because they  
359 are curative rather than preventive methods for dental caries. The review of moderate and high-quality  
360 papers revealed that supervised toothbrushing delivered in nurseries or primary schools using  
361 fluoridated toothpaste containing 1000 to 1450 ppm fluoride, significantly reduced caries and was of  
362 high benefit to most disadvantaged children. Panel consensus was that this is still safe and effective  
363 in water fluoridated areas and is largely feasible in low/middle-income countries. Fluoride varnish  
364 application was generally protective against caries, however, evidence for delivery in an education  
365 setting was less clear, especially when delivered alongside supervised toothbrushing.

366 The evidence for all other modalities of fluoride interventions (fluoride rinse, gel and foam, fluoride  
367 supplements, fluoridated milk and fluoridated salt) in nurseries/kindergartens or primary/elementary



368 schools was not supported with high-quality evidence and the information on adverse effects of such  
369 interventions was limited.

370 Results supported the recommended actions set by the WHO Oral Health Draft Global Oral Health  
371 Action Plan (2023–2030), i.e. actions 27 to 31, which highlight the importance of delivering  
372 toothbrushing programmes to reduce dental caries prevalence and using school settings as a platform  
373 for securing broader access to children at early ages [40].

374 The Delphi exercise allowed for these results to be fed into the survey and discussions with international  
375 experts. The literature broadly matched their existing opinions on effective and feasible interventions.

376 The panel agreed toothbrushing with fluoridated toothpaste should be universal for all children in early  
377 years education which is supported by WHO recommended actions for the coming decades. [40] [2]

378 The panel was in agreement that toothbrushing is a good vehicle for promoting health behaviour and  
379 that, for example, sugar restriction interventions beyond fluoride were important but evidence for  
380 restriction per se is limited. [41] The support for supervised brushing with fluoridated toothpaste held  
381 even with respect to areas where there is optimal water fluoridation. [42]

382 Resource issues were felt to be serious, including demands on staff and curricular time. Additionally,  
383 political support and priorities, and monitoring of outcomes were felt to be important. Lack of political  
384 priority and oral health data are key global challenges to Universal Oral Health Coverage [43].

385 The experts also raised issues related to education partners (headteachers and class teachers prioritising  
386 curriculum activities, availability of school facilities, and fear of cross-infection post-COVID-19), and  
387 the importance of solving plastic recycling issues to attain better long-term environmental sustainability,  
388 which also required political and governmental support to be resolved. Sustainability and recycling of  
389 plastic is becoming more of an important consideration and should be considered in the light of long-  
390 term benefits.

391

## 392 **Conclusion**

393 In conclusion, daily supervised toothbrushing with fluoride toothpaste emerged to be the highest priority  
394 intervention for preventing early childhood dental caries in early education (nurseries/kindergarten and

395 school) settings. Ideally, this intervention would be universal and extended to older children, but  
396 resource, sustainability and feasibility issues are important considerations. Providers need to consider  
397 whether there is sufficient added benefit (in terms of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness) from fluoride  
398 varnish programmes in education settings where supervised toothbrushing with fluoridated toothpaste  
399 is in place.

400

## 401 **Acknowledgement:**

402 The authors would like to acknowledge:

403 The Borrow Foundation for having provided valuable funds for the project.

404 Childsmile Programme staff for additional support, funded by the Scottish Government Health  
405 Directorate.

406 Emma Pacey, University of Cambridge Department of Health and Social Care for significant help and  
407 contribution to data screening.

408

## 409 **References**

- 410 1. National Dental Inspection Programme. Report of the 2020 Detailed Inspection Programme  
411 of Primary 1 Children and the Basic Inspection of Primary 1 and Primary 7 children. Scotland, United  
412 Kingdom; 2020 20 October 2020.
- 413 2. World Health Organization. Global oral health status report: towards universal health  
414 coverage for oral health by 2030: executive summary. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health  
415 Organization; 2022 18 November 2022.
- 416 3. World Health Organization. Ending childhood dental caries: WHO implementation manual.  
417 2019.
- 418 4. Petersen P, Hunsrisakhun J, Thearmontree A, Pithpornchaiyakul S, Hintao J, Jürgensen N,  
419 Ellwood R. School-based intervention for improving the oral health of children in southern Thailand.  
420 *Community Dent Health*. 2015;32(1):44-50.
- 421 5. Moynihan P, Tanner L, Holmes R, Hillier-Brown F, Mashayekhi A, Kelly S, Craig D.  
422 Systematic review of evidence pertaining to factors that modify risk of early childhood caries. *JDR*  
423 *Clinical & Translational Research*. 2019;4(3):202-16.
- 424 6. O Mullane D, Baez R, Jones S, Lennon M, Petersen P, Rugg-Gunn A, et al. Fluoride and oral  
425 health. *Community Dent Health*. 2016;33(2):69-99.
- 426 7. Cagetti MG, Campus G, Milia E, Lingström P. A systematic review on fluoridated food in  
427 caries prevention. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 2013;71(3-4):381-7.
- 428 8. Petersen P, Kwan S, Ogawa H. Long term evaluation of the clinical effectiveness of com-  
429 munity milk fluoridation in Bulgaria. *Community Dent Health*. 2015;32:199-203.

- 430 9. Marinho VC, Worthington HV, Walsh T, Clarkson JE. Fluoride varnishes for preventing  
431 dental caries in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2013(7).
- 432 10. Gao SS, Zhang S, Mei ML, Lo EC-M, Chu C-H. Caries remineralisation and arresting effect  
433 in children by professionally applied fluoride treatment—a systematic review. *BMC oral health*.  
434 2016;16(1):1-9.
- 435 11. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme. Prevention and management of dental  
436 caries in children: dental clinical guidance. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme  
437 Dundee; 2010.
- 438 12. Timms L, Deery C. Fluoride varnish and dental caries in preschoolers: A systematic review  
439 and meta-analysis. *Evidence-Based Dentistry*. 2020;21(1):18-9.
- 440 13. McMahan AD, Wright W, Anopa Y, McIntosh E, Turner S, Conway DI, Macpherson LM.  
441 Fluoride Varnish in Nursery Schools: A Randomised Controlled Trial—Protecting Teeth@ 3. *Caries*  
442 *Res*. 2020;54(3):274-82.
- 443 14. Anopa Y, Macpherson L, McMahan A, Wright W, Conway D, McIntosh E. Economic  
444 Evaluation of the Protecting Teeth@ 3 Randomized Controlled Trial. *JDR Clinical & Translational*  
445 *Research*. 2022:23800844221090444.
- 446 15. Blokland A, Ross A, Conway D. A systematic overview of fluoride-based interventions  
447 delivered in early educational settings to prevent early childhood caries University of York - United  
448 Kingdom: PROSPERO; 2021 [Available from:  
449 [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42021284641](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021284641)].
- 450 16. Covidence. Covidence: Better Systematic Review Management 2023 [Available from:  
451 <https://www.covidence.org/>].
- 452 17. Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells GA, Boers M, Andersson N, Hamel C, et al. Development of  
453 AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC*  
454 *medical research methodology*. 2007;7:1-7.
- 455 18. Buccheri RK, Sharifi C. Critical appraisal tools and reporting guidelines for evidence-based  
456 practice. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*. 2017;14(6):463-72.
- 457 19. Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JP, Caldwell DM, Reeves BC, Shea B, et al. ROBIS: a new  
458 tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*.  
459 2016;69:225-34.
- 460 20. Murphy M, Black N, Lamping D, McKee C, Sanderson C, Askham J, Marteau T. Consensus  
461 development methods, and their use in clinical guideline development. *Health Technology*  
462 *Assessment (Winchester, England)*. 1998;2(3):i-88.
- 463 21. Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *BMJ: British*  
464 *Medical Journal*. 1995;311(7001):376.
- 465 22. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, Birken SA, Abadie B, Damschroder L. A systematic review  
466 of the use of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research. *Implementation Science*.  
467 2015;11(1):1-13.
- 468 23. Curnow M, Pine C, Burnside G, Nicholson J, Chesters R, Huntington E. A randomised  
469 controlled trial of the efficacy of supervised toothbrushing in high-caries-risk children. *Caries Res*.  
470 2002;36(4):294-300.
- 471 24. Pine C, Curnow M, Burnside G, Nicholson J, Roberts A. Caries prevalence four years after  
472 the end of a randomised controlled trial. *Caries Res*. 2007;41(6):431-6.
- 473 25. Latifi-Xhemajli B, Begzati A, Veronneau J, Kutllovci T, Rexhepi A. Effectiveness of fluoride  
474 varnish four times a year in preventing caries in the primary dentition: a 2 year randomized controlled  
475 trial. *Community Dent Health*. 2019;36(2):190-4.
- 476 26. Effenberger S, Greenwall L, Cebula M, Myburgh N, Simpson K, Smit D, et al. Cost-  
477 effectiveness and efficacy of fluoride varnish for caries prevention in South African children: A  
478 cluster-randomized controlled community trial. *Community Dentist Oral Epidemiol*. 2022;50(5):453-  
479 60.
- 480 27. de Sousa FSO, dos Santos APP, Nadanovsky P, Hujuel P, Cunha-Cruz J, de Oliveira BH.  
481 Fluoride Varnish and Dental Caries in Preschoolers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Caries*  
482 *Res*. 2019;53(5):502-13.

- 483 28. Matsuyama Y, Aida J, Taura K, Kimoto K, Ando Y, Aoyama H, et al. School-based fluoride  
484 mouth-rinse program dissemination associated with decreasing dental caries inequalities between  
485 Japanese prefectures: an ecological study. *Journal of epidemiology*. 2016;26(11):563-71.
- 486 29. Komiyama E, Kimoto K, Arakawa H. Relationship between duration of fluoride exposure in  
487 school-based fluoride mouthrinsing and effects on prevention and control of dental caries.  
488 *International Scholarly Research Notices*. 2012;2012.
- 489 30. Divaris K, Rozier R, King R. Effectiveness of a school-based fluoride mouthrinse program.  
490 *Journal of dental research*. 2012;91(3):282-7.
- 491 31. Aasenden R, DePaola P, Brudevold F. Effects of daily rinsing and ingestion of fluoride  
492 solutions upon dental caries and enamel fluoride. *Archives of Oral Biology*. 1972;17(12):1705-14.
- 493 32. Murthy AK, Fareed N. Economic evaluation of school-based caries preventive programs: A  
494 systematic review. *Community Dent Health*. 2020;37(3):205-15.
- 495 33. Marinho VC, Chong L-Y, Worthington HV, Walsh T. Fluoride mouthrinses for preventing  
496 dental caries in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2016(7).
- 497 34. Marinho VC, Worthington HV, Walsh T, Chong L-Y. Fluoride gels for preventing dental  
498 caries in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2015(6).
- 499 35. Yeung CA, Chong LY, Glenn AM. Fluoridated milk for preventing dental caries. *Cochrane*  
500 *Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2015(8).
- 501 36. Tubert-Jeannin S, Auclair C, Amsallem E, Tramini P, Gerbaud L, Ruffieux C, et al. Fluoride  
502 supplements (tablets, drops, lozenges or chewing gums) for preventing dental caries in children.  
503 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2011(12).
- 504 37. Haugejorden O, Heløe L. Fluorides for everyone: a review of school-based or community  
505 programs. *Community Dentist Oral Epidemiol*. 1981;9(4):159-69.
- 506 38. OECD. DAC List of ODA Recipients Paris - France: Organisation for Economic Co-  
507 operation and Development (OECD); 2022 [cited 2022 24 January 2022]. Available from:  
508 [https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/daclist.htm)  
509 [standards/daclist.htm](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/daclist.htm)
- 510 39. Jordan RA, Schulte A, Bockelbrink AC, Puetz S, Naumova E, Wärn LG, Zimmer S. Caries-  
511 preventive effect of salt fluoridation in preschool children in The Gambia: a prospective, controlled,  
512 interventional study. *Caries Res*. 2017;51(6):596-604.
- 513 40. World Health Organization. Draft Global Oral Health Action Plan (2023–2030). Geneva:  
514 World Health Organization; 2023.
- 515 41. Moores CJ, Kelly SAM, Moynihan PJ. Systematic Review of the Effect on Caries of Sugars  
516 Intake: Ten-Year Update. *J Dent Res*. 2022;101(9):1034-45.
- 517 42. Shen A, Bernabé E, Sabbah W. Systematic Review of Intervention Studies Aiming at  
518 Reducing Inequality in Dental Caries among Children. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(3).
- 519 43. Benzian H, Beltrán-Aguilar E. The return of oral health to global health is significant for  
520 public health everywhere. *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*. 2021;81(2):87-9.

521

522

## 523 Legend of Figures

524 **Fig 1.** PRISMA flow diagram for the systematic overview of fluoride interventions in early  
525 education settings

526 **Fig 2.** Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries/schools based on  
527 effectiveness and safety (n= 21)

528 **Fig 3.** Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries/schools based on feasibility  
529 of implementation in high income countries (n= 21)

530 **Fig 4.** Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries/schools based on feasibility  
531 of implementation in low/middle income countries (n= 21)

532

## 533 **Supporting Information**

534 **S1 Table.** Studies excluded from the systematic overview at full text stage

535 **S2 Table.** Data extraction and quality appraisal for trials and observational studies (n= 61)

536 **S3 Table.** Data extraction and quality appraisal for reviews (n= 13)

537

538




Fig 1. PRISMA flow diagram for the systematic overview




Fig 2. Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries.

Fluoride-based intervention




Fig 3. Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries






Fig 4. Expert panel ranking of fluoride interventions in nurseries.