https://www.scielo.br/journal/bor/about/#instructions

Thematic area: Dentistry

Informatic tools for diagnosis in dentistry. A compilation review.

Authors

Alain Manuel Chaple Gil *[1], https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8571-4429

Email: alain.chaple@uauatonoma.cl

Solanch de la Caridad Damas Heredia[2], https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6151-3091

Email: solanchdamas1999@gmail.com

Kelvin I. Afrashtehfar[3], https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6053-8967

Email: kelvin.afrashtehfar@unibe.ch

[1]Universidad Autónoma de Chile. Faculty of Health Sciences Temuco, Chile.

[2]Clínica Estomatológica "Ana Betancourt". La Habana, Cuba.

[3]Clinical Sciences Department, College of Dentistry, Ajman University, Ajman City, UAE.

*Corresponding author: alain.chaple@uautonoma.cl

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to compile the computer tools available in the scientific literature aimed at diagnosis in dentistry. A scoping review was conducted using *PubMed*, *Scopus*, and *Web of Science*. Were include, original researches type articles, Articles that reported the usefulness of a computer/technological tool that helps diagnosis in dental practice, Articles published in the last 20 years (period 2004- 2024) and written in English and Spanish. Online tool *Rayyan®* was used to establish homogeneity in the review of the authors on a single online platform where they had access and could centralize the results. Variables were extracted from the articles included in the study. In total, 12648 records were retrieved from the database. After decantation, 39 reports described 36 computer tools used for diagnosis in dentistry. More informatic tools related to "Restorative Dentistry' have been developed than the rest of the specialties 14 (40%). Python was the predominant programming language, 83.3% of the tools were validated, and 27.8% were free. Informatics tools in dentistry enhance the diagnosis and treatment planning. However, a robust regulatory framework is required for validation prior to clinical implementation. Continuous training of dental professionals using these technologies is crucial to maximize their benefits and ensure optimal patient care. More research is needed to explore the potential of informatics applications in dentistry, their integration into existing health systems, and their accessibility in resource-limited areas.

Keywords (MeSH): Clinical Informatics; Medical Informatics Applications; Dental Informatics; Medical Informatics Computing; Oral Diagnosis.

INTRODUCTION

Dentistry, like other medical disciplines, has undergone a significant digital transformation over the past few decades. The incorporation of digital technologies has improved the efficiency, precision, and scope of dental procedures, positively affecting both professionals and patients. However, the availability of a wide range of digital tools for diagnosis in dentistry poses a significant challenge due to the mercantilist stocks of the most widely used.[1, 2]

A health informatics tool is a system or platform designed to acquire, process, interpret, and use healthcare data efficiently.[3] These tools aim to improve patient safety by identifying the hazards and risks associated with health information technology.[4] They play a crucial role in improving health service delivery by ensuring that the information reaches the right person at the right time. Such tools help in decision making, access to information, disease prevention, and improved communication, allowing patients and their families to manage their health

effectively. These tools span various technologies, such as wearable devices, passive monitoring tools, and smart homes, providing personalized interventions based on patient-generated health data.[5]

Computer tools are increasingly used in dental practice for diagnostic purposes. These tools use intelligent systems and machine learning algorithms to analyze dental images and detect various dental conditions such as periodontal disease, alveolar bone loss, and dental pathologies. The use of deep convolutional neural networks (CNN) has yielded promising results in accurately detecting and classifying these conditions based on radiographic images.[6] In addition, machine vision algorithms applied to high-resolution images can help diagnose periapical lesions and plan endodontic treatment.[7] Computerized dental office systems also contribute to improved efficiency and diagnostic tasks, such as early detection of cavities, through image processing software and digital X-rays.[8] In addition, computer systems that implement neural networks can process dental images to detect and diagnose pathological conditions, providing a graphical user interface for visualization and correlation with dental medical records.[9] These informatics tools offer valuable support for dental diagnosis, treatment planning, and patient education, and improve the overall quality of dental care.[6, 8, 10]

The proliferation of computer tools for diagnosis in dentistry presents opportunities, but also generates a series of questions and difficulties for dentists.[11, 12] There is a wide variety of these, from radiographic image analysis software to treatment design and planning systems, to augmented reality applications and intraoral scanners. This diversity makes it difficult to identify the most appropriate tools for each case.[12]

The identification and selection of appropriate informatics tools for diagnosis in dentistry is crucial to improve diagnostic accuracy, as they can provide additional and more accurate information for diagnosis, allowing for better treatment planning.[13] They optimize workflow by being able to streamline diagnostic processes, improving efficiency and productivity and can help visualize, explain problems and treatment options to the patient, improving understanding and decision-making.[14]

Purpose Definition

The purpose of this review was to identify the informatics tools reported in the scientific literature that have been tested to aid diagnosis in dental practice. Based on this approach, the research problem is shown through the following question: What are the computer tools reported by science that could help establish diagnoses in dental practice?

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this study was to compile the informatics tools available in the scientific literature aimed at diagnosis in dentistry.

METHODOLOGY

A scoping review was conducted between January and April 2024. The *PubMed*, *Scopus*, and *Web of Science* (WOS) databases were used for this development. The reporting guidelines for literature reviews described in the PRISMA guidelines were followed.

Inclusion criteria

Were include, original researches type articles, Articles that reported the usefulness of a computer/technological tool that helps diagnosis in dental practice, Articles published in the last 20 years (period 2004- 2024) and written in English and Spanish.

Exclusion Criteria

Review articles of any kind (narrative, systematic, and meta-analyses), letters, case presentations, books, theses, *preprints*, articles describing computer tools for diagnosis unrelated to stomatology, articles describing generic software for the visualization of images taken with CAD-CAM or similar equipment whose validations are frankly demonstrated, articles written in languages other than English and Spanish and Articles that did not specify a name for the tool they report were excluded.

Search strategy

A search was carried out using advanced formulations on the three platforms described in Table 1. Entered keywords combined with wildcards and Boolean operators were displayed.

Table 1. Formulations of the search by database used

Database	Formulation
Pubmed	((application[Title/Abstract]) OR (program[Title/Abstract]) OR (tool[Title/Abstract]) OR (informatic[Title/Abstract]) OR (computer[Title/Abstract]) OR (digital[Title/Abstract]) OR (apk[Title/Abstract]) OR (system[Title/Abstract]) OR (automatic[Title/Abstract])) AND ((dental[Title/Abstract]) OR (dentistry[Title/Abstract])) AND ((diagnosis[Title/Abstract]) OR (diagnoses[Title/Abstract]))

Scopus	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (program*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (application*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (tool*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (comput*) TITLE-ABS-KEY (informatic*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (apk) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (system*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (digital*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (automa*)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY (dent*)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY (diagnos*))
WOS	(TI=(program*) OR TI=(application*) OR TI=(tool*) OR TI=(comput*) OR TI=(informatic*) OR TI=(apk) OR TI=(system*) OR TI=(digital*) OR TI=(automa*)) AND (TI=(dent*)) AND (TI=(diagn*))

Methodology for the selection of articles

In the databases where the searches were performed, automated filters were applied to discard articles that were not of the type described in the inclusion criteria and to establish the publication time range.

Records extracted from the databases were exported to *Clartivates* Analytics EndNote 21. In this same system, duplicate articles that did not meet the eligibility criteria were decanted at first glance.

Calibration was performed among the authors to evaluate the articles to be selected. The degree of coincidence of the evaluations made by the reviewers was determined using Orwin's method of 1994, and a Kappa statistic was performed to measure the agreement among the reviewers who would make simple decisions about inclusion/exclusion. Kappa values between 0.40 and 0.59 were considered to reflect acceptable agreement, 0.60 to 0.74 to be an adequate agreement, and 0.75 or more to reflect excellent agreement.

The online tool *Rayyan®* was used to establish homogeneity in the authors' review on a single online platform where they had access and could centralize the results. When the two reviewers did not agree to the decision to include or exclude a registry, a third party intervened to make the final decision.

First, duplicate reports written in languages other than English and Spanish were discarded, applying obvious inclusion/exclusion criteria such as type of document and year of publication. Subsequently, articles that did not meet the criteria were discarded based on their titles and abstracts. Reports with titles and abstracts that were doubtful of being discarded or were not

discarded were read to determine this. Once those articles that did not meet the criteria were discarded, the included articles were read in detail to extract the necessary data related to the research variables.

Variables

The following variables were extracted from each article included in the study: name and surname of the first author, year of publication, Article Title, Journal in which it was published, citation details (including volume, number, and pages), the URL or DOI of the document (preferably the DOI), name of the tool described, country where it was developed, Tool Platform (this refers to the programming language in which the tool was developed), environment (Windows, Linux, Unix, Android, iOS, or other), dental specialty to which it pays, a brief description of the usefulness of the tool, tool validation (dichotomous yes or no), open source (dichotomous yes or no), and usage charge (dichotomous yes or no). For the Payment model, *full payment* is considered: users pay a one-time price to access the app and all its functionalities, a recurring fee (monthly, yearly, etc.) to access the application and its functionalities, or a license is purchased to use the application for a certain period or in perpetuity. *Freemium*: The app can be used for free, but it offers optional in-app purchases to unlock additional features, exclusive content, or to remove advertising. In addition, it was included that they were free versions with basic functionalities and paid versions with more advanced functionalities. *Trial model*: This offers a free trial period during which all features can be accessed. After the trial period, the user must pay to continue using the app and *Free Model*: Completely free, without any payment or restrictions.

In addition, the URL through which the user manual and/or instructions for the installation and use of each tool can be downloaded was included, if available.

Data management

The records of the variable data extracted from the included articles were captured in a Microsoft® Excel® spreadsheet to later favor the analysis and preparation of tables and figures for better understanding.

In cases in which the articles were not sufficiently explicit, the authors were contacted via email for more information. Respondents increased the scope of the information for this research. Articles by authors who did not respond within a reasonable period of time and the information in the articles that did not appear sufficiently for data collection were excluded.

The database of the articles included in the study with all the details collected according to the variables is located in the Mendeley Data repository (https://doi.org/10.17632/yx9jts8mv7.1), which advocates for the reproducibility, sharing, and systematicity of data according to the principles of Open Science.

Ethical aspects

The protocol for this study was approved by the Scientific Council of the "Ana Betancourt" Dental Clinic in Havana, Cuba.

RESULTS

The calibration of the authors who reviewed the articles included in the study was excellent in all cases.

The search was conducted on January 28 2024. In the primary search, 3397 records were established in Pubmed, 7563 in *Scopus*, and 221 in WOS, for a total of 12648. After applying the filter of publication time (2004 – 2024) and the type of article, there were 46 results in *PubMed* (only for *clinical trials* and *randomized controlled trial articles*), 5678 in *Scopus*, and 162 in WOS, resulting in 5886 records.

After removing duplicates, 4159 articles remained, and applying the inclusion criteria of article type 3937 and excluding articles in languages other than English and Spanish, 3655 entries remained. (Figure 1)

When examining the titles and abstracts of the remaining articles, 3287 articles were excluded, leaving 368 reports that were downloaded in full text and excluded five for not exactly describing a telematic tool for diagnosis in dentistry, 95 were excluded because they lacked the necessary details for the adequate collection of information, another 11 were discarded for loss of access through URLs, and 257 were not strictly complying with the criteria inclusion/exclusion. At the end of the process, 39 reports described 36 computer tools used for diagnosis in dentistry. (Figure 1)



Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram for systematic reviews. (**Source**: Developed by authors)

Table 2 shows the list of articles included in the study with a predominance of articles published in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health"[15, 16, 17, 18] with 4 reports for 10.3% of the total, followed by the "Diagnostics"[19, 20, 21] with three (7.7%) reports. Only O'Toole[22, 23] matched two (5.1%) articles as the first author. The years of publication of the articles ranged from 2015 to 2023, with 2022 predominating[17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30] and 10 (25.6%) reports.

Table 2. List of articles included in the study with the first author's surname, year of publication, title, and journal in which they were published.

#	1st Author	Year	Article Title	Journal
1	Abd El Galil[31]	2021	Evaluation of two computer-aided design software on the adaptation of digitally constructed maxillary complete denture	Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society
2	Abuabara[32]	2023	Evaluation of Endo 10 mobile application as diagnostic tool in endodontics	J Clin Exp Dent
3	Alalharith[15]	2020	A deep learning-based approach for the detection of early signs of gingivitis in orthodontic patients using faster region-based convolutional neural networks	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health

4	Altukroni[33]	2023	Detection of the pathological exposure of pulp using an artificial intelligence tool: a multicentric study over periapical radiographs	BMC Oral Health
5	Amorim[24]	2022	Smartphone and computer cephalometric analysis: A trueness and precision study	Revista Portuguesa de Estomatologia, Medicina Dentaria e Cirurgia Maxilofacial
6	Anacleto[34]	2019	Superimposition of 3d maxillary digital models using open-source software	Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics
7	Barreto[35]	2016	Reliability of digital orthodontic setups	Angle Orthodontist
8	Baydar[19]	2023	The U-Net Approaches to Evaluation of Dental Bite-Wing Radiographs: An Artificial Intelligence Stud	Diagnostics
9	Bonfanti-Gris[25]	2022	Evaluation of an Artificial Intelligence web-based software to detect and classify dental structures and treatments in panoramic radiographs	Journal of Dentistry
10	Cavalcante[16]	2020	Computing and oral health: Mobile solution for collecting, data analysis, managing and reproducing epidemiological research in population groups	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health
11	Cui[36]	2021	TSegNet: An efficient and accurate tooth segmentation network on 3D dental model	Medical Image Analysis
12	Dayı[20]	2023	A Novel Deep Learning-Based Approach for Segmentation of Different Type Caries Lesions on Panoramic Radiographs	Diagnostics
13	De Angelis[17]	2022	Artificial Intelligence: A New Diagnostic Software in Dentistry: A Preliminary Performance Diagnostic Study	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health
14	Di Fede[37]	2023	Doctoral: A smartphone-based decision support tool for the early detection of oral potentially malignant disorders	Digital Health
15	do Vale Voigt[38]	2020	DSDapp use for multidisciplinary esthetic planning	Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry
16	Estai[39]	2017	End-user acceptance of a cloud-based teledentistry system and Android phone app for remote screening for oral diseases	Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare
17	Fatima[40]	2023	Deep Learning-Based Multiclass Instance Segmentation for Dental Lesion Detection	Healthcare (Switzerland)
18	Fazio[18]	2022	LinguAPP: An m-Health Application for Teledentistry Diagnostics	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health
19	Gullberg[26]	2022	The challenge of applying digital image processing software on intraoral radiographs for osteoporosis risk assessment	Dentomaxillofacial Radiology
20	Haron[41]	2020	M-Health for Early Detection of Oral Cancer in Low- and Middle-Income Countries	Telemedicine and e-Health
21	Jiang[42]	2021	RDFNet: A Fast Caries Detection Method Incorporating Transformer Mechanism	Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine
22	Johannes[43]	2023	Evaluation of AI Model for Cephalometric Landmark Classification (TG Dental)	Journal of Medical Systems
23	Kapoor[27]	2022	Development, testing, and feasibility of a customized mobile application for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) risk assessment: A hospital-based pilot study	Journal of Oral Biology and Craniofacial Research
24	Kim[44]	2019	DeNTNet: Deep Neural Transfer Network for the detection of periodontal bone loss using panoramic dental radiographs	Scientific Reports
25	Liu[45]	2020	A Smart Dental Health-IoT Platform Based on Intelligent Hardware, Deep Learning, and Mobile Terminal	IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics
26	Livas[46]	2019	Concurrent validity and reliability of cephalometric analysis using smartphone apps and computer software	Angle Orthodontist
27	Lo Giudice[47]	2021	A new software architecture proposal for an evidence-based decision support system in dentistry	Minerva Dental and Oral Science
28	Mazzoli[48]	2017	Use of MIMICS® software in three-dimensional cephalometric evaluation of soft tissues of the face	Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering: Imaging and Visualization
29	Muhammed Sunnetci[28]	2022	Periodontal bone loss detection based on hybrid deep learning and machine learning models with a user-friendly application	Biomedical Signal Processing and Control
30	Najmuddin[49]	2018	Logicon: A third eye for caries detection	Journal of Indian Academy of Oral Medicine and Radiology
31	Orhan[50]	2023	Determining the reliability of diagnosis and treatment using artificial intelligence software with panoramic radiographs	Imaging Science in Dentistry

32	O'Toole[23]	2019	Investigation into the validity of WearCompare, a purpose-built software to quantify erosive tooth wear progression	Dental Materials
33	O'Toole[22]	2020	Influence of scanner precision and analysis software in quantifying three-dimensional intraoral changes: Two-factor factorial experimental design	Journal of Medical Internet Research
34	Preus[51]	2015	A new digital tool for radiographic bone level measurements in longitudinal studies	BMC Oral Health
35	Reyes Salgado[29]	2022	Design of Open Code Software to Downs and Steiner Lateral Cephalometric Analysis with Tracing Landmarks	Digital
36	Roehl[30]	2022	Tooth Wear Evaluation System (TWES) 2.0—Reliability of diagnosis with and without computer-assisted evaluation	Journal of Oral Rehabilitation
37	Santeiro-Hermida[52]	2023	Validation Analysis of Panoramic Dental Application (PDApp) Software as a Tool for Predicting Third Molar Eruption Based on Panoramic Radiograph Images	Applied Sciences (Switzerland)
38	Sayar[53]	2017	Manual tracing versus smartphone application (app) tracing: a comparative study	Acta Odontologica Scandinavica
39	Zadrożny[21]	2022	Artificial Intelligence Application in Assessment of Panoramic Radiographs	Diagnostics

n=39

Source: Developed by authors

Table 3 shows the relationship of computer tools described by the articles with the country where they were developed, year of creation, programming language, platforms on which they can be used, the specialty with which they are related, whether they were validated, open source, free, and the payment model to which they are subject. “CephNinja, ”[46, 53] “Diagnocat, ”[21, 50] “OneCeph”[24, 46] y “WearCompare”[22, 23] were the recurrent tools and that 2 (5.1%) articles each described their use. Only six [18, 26, 31, 36, 41, 48] (15.4%) validation processes were not referred to in the articles, and the rest were validated.

The United States was the most representative country for the development of five (14.3%) of these computer tools (3D Slicer, CephNinja, Diagnocat, Geomagic, and Logicon). (Table 3)

More informatic tools related to "Restorative Dentistry" have been developed than the rest of the specialties of the dental sciences with 14 (40%), followed by the tools related to "Orthodontics" 9 (25.7%) and those useful for "Oral Surgery" 5 (13.9%). (Tables 3 and 4)

The most predominant programming language for tool development was Python, with 7 (19.4%), followed by C++, which was used for the development of 5 (13.8%). (Table 3)

Thirty (83.3%) tools were validated, and six (16.7%) were not specified due to lack of information in the articles. A total of six (16.7%) open-code tools were described, another 16 (44.4%) were not, and of the rest, no records of this data were found in the articles. In addition, 10 (27.8%) tools were declared free, 10 (27.8%) were not, and the rest were not provided in the articles. (Table 3)

Table 3. List of informatic tools extracted from articles with general data on development and availability.

#	Tool name	Country	Year	Programming language	Platforms	Specialty	Validated	Open code	Free	Payment model
1	3D Slicer[34]	USA	1999	C++	Windows, macOS y Linux.	O	Yes	Yes	Yes	FM
2	Apox[17]	Netherlands	2022	NR	NR	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR
3	Artifical_Intelligence_Toolbox[28]	Turkey	NR	MATLAB 2020b - GUI	Windows, Android	P	Yes	NR	NR	NR
4	Boneprox[26]	Sweden	2021	NR	Windows	RD	NR	NR	NR	NR
5	Cephalopoint[29]	Mexico	2022	Octave	Android, iOS, Linux Windows, Unix	O	Yes	Yes	Yes	FM
6	CephNinja[46, 53]	USA - India	NR	NR	Android, iOS	O	Yes	NR	NR	NR
7	CranioCatch[19]	Turkey	2022	Python (PyTorch)	Android, iOS, Linux Windows, Unix	RD	Yes	No	No	FPM
8	Decision Support System[47]	Italy	NR	Visual C#	NR	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR
9	DCDNet[20]	Turkey	2022	Python (TensorFlow)	NR	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR
10	Denti.Ai[25]	Canada	2017	Faster R-CNN, VGG-16	Android, iOS, Linux Windows, Unix	RD	Yes	No	No	FPM
11	DeNTNet[44]	South Korea	NR	NR	NR	P	Yes	NR	NR	NR
12	Diagnocat[21, 50]	USA	2017	Python	Any Web Navigator	OS	Yes	No	No	FPM
13	DoctOral[37]	Italy	2014	NR	Android, iOS	OS	Yes	No	Yes	FM
14	DSDapp[38]	Brazil	2018	NR	iOS	RD	Yes	No	No	FPM
15	Endo 10[32]	Brazil	2021	NR	Android, iOS	E	Yes	NR	Yes	FM
16	Faster R-CNN[15]	Saudi Arabia	2020	Python (TensorFlow)	Linux, Windows, macOS	P	Yes	NR	NR	NR
17	Geomagic[31]	USA	1996	NR	Windows	OR	NR	No	No	TM
18	iHome DentalHealth-IoT[45]	China	2018	NR	Android, iOS	RD	Yes	No	NR	NR
19	ImageJ (Plugin)[51]	Norway	2015	NR	Windows, macOS, Linux	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	F
20	LinguAPP[18]	Italy	2020	JavaScript	Android, iOS	OS	NR	No	Yes	FM
21	Logicon[49]	USA	2002	NR	NR	RD	Yes	No	No	NR
22	MSC[33]	Saudi Arabia	2021	Python - Yolov5-x	Windows, Linux, macOS.	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR

23	Mask-RCNN[40]	NR	NR	Python (Tensorflow, Keras)	NR	E	Yes	NR	NR	NR
24	MeMoSA[41]	Malaysia	2017	React Native	Android	OS	NR	NR	NR	NR
25	MIMICS[48]	Belgium	NR	C++	Windows, Linux	O	NR	No	No	FPM
26	NutriOdonto[16]	Brazil	2018	NR	Android	RD	Yes	Yes	Yes	FM
27	OneCeph[24, 46]	India	NR	NR	Android	O	Yes	No	Yes	NR
28	OrthoAnalyzer[35]	Denmark	2014	NR	NR	O	Yes	No	No	FPM
29	OSA-Risk Assessment Tool[27]	India	2020	HTML, PHP	Any Web Navigator	O	Yes	Yes	Yes	FM
30	PDApp[52]	Spain	2022	C++	Linux, Windows	OS	Yes	No	NR	NR
31	RDFNet [42]	China	2021	Python (Pytorch)	Windows, Linux, MacOS	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR
32	Remote-I[39]	Australia	2015	NR	Android	RD	Yes	NR	NR	NR
33	TG Dental[43]	NR	NR	NR	NR	O	Yes	NR	NR	NR
34	TWES[30]	Germany	2020	MariaDB	Windows, macOS	OR	Yes	No	No	FPM
35	TSegNet[36]	Hong Kong	2019	NR	iOS	O	NR	No	No	FPM
36	WearCompare[22, 23]	United Kingdom	2019	C++	Windows, Linux	RD	Yes	Yes	Yes	FM

n=36

Source: Developed by authors - **Caption**: O (Orthodontics), OS (Oral surgery), OR (Oral Rehabilitation), RD (Restorative dentistry), P (Periodontics), E (Endodontics), NR (Not referred), FPM (Full Paid Model), FM (Free Model), F (Freemium), TM (Test Model)

Table 4 shows the grouping of the tools according to the specialties in which they are useful for diagnosis to facilitate consultation according to the affinity of interested readers.

Table 4. Distribución de herramientas informáticas según especialidad en la que ayudan al diagnóstico.

RESTORATIVE DENTISTRY	ORTHODONTICS	ORAL SURGERY	PERIODONTICS	PROSTHODONTICS	ENDODONTICS
Apox	3D Slicer	Diagnocat	Artifical_Intelligence_Toolbox	Geomagic	Endo 10
Boneprox	Cephalopoint	DoctOral	DeNTNet	TWES	Mask-RCNN
CranioCatch	CephNinja	LinguAPP	Faster R-CNN		
Decision Support System	MIMICS	MeMoSA	ImageJ (Plugin)		
DCDNet	OneCeph	PDApp			
Denti.Ai	OrthoAnalyzer				
DSDapp	OSA-Risk Assessment Tool				
iHome DentalHealth-IoT	TG Dental				
Logicon	TSegNet				
MSC					
NutriOdonto					
RDFNet					
Remote-I					
WearCompare					

n=36

DISCUSSION

The search engines used to carry out this research were Scopus, Web of Science, and PubMed, which are essential databases for systematic reviews owing to their wide coverage and unique characteristics. Scopus, as highlighted by Schwager and Schalk[54], demonstrated high sensitivity in retrieving relevant articles, while Web of Science, as shown in Kumpulainen and Seppänen[55], efficiently identified additional studies by searching for citations. PubMed, which is renowned for its extensive coverage of the biomedical literature, is crucial for health-related systematic reviews. The use of these databases ensures a thorough search process, as highlighted in the work of Alfandaria and Taylor[56], who found that replicability varied from platform to platform. Each database contributes to minimizing bias and maximizing the retrieval of relevant studies, aligning with best practices for systematic literature searches.[57] Based on these approaches, the reason why these databases were chosen for the search of articles in this research is shown.

The tools described in the results have great potential to improve diagnosis, treatment planning, and information management in the field of dentistry and can be grouped to provide a complete overview and analyze them in detail according to their specialization and functions.

Among the tools for cephalometric analysis and diagnosis, Cephalopoint[29] and OneCeph[24, 46] offer digital cephalometric analysis, facilitating the diagnosis and planning of orthodontic treatments. CephNinja[46, 53] allows digital cephalometric plotting on mobile devices, further streamlining the process. In addition, MIMICS[48] provides three-dimensional cephalometric evaluation of facial soft tissues, which is crucial for assessing facial harmony and orthodontic planning.

Studies by da Fonseca Reis et al.[58] and Prince et al.[59] argue that computer tools that enable cephalometric tracking offer several advantages in orthodontic diagnosis and treatment planning. These tools improve the accuracy, reproducibility, and efficiency of cephalometric image analyses. On the other hand, they eliminate human errors associated with manual tracking, allow automatic detection of landmarks, and offer a high level of agreement with manual methods.[60] In addition, according to Reyes Salgado[29] computerized cephalometric tracing methods are more reliable and consistentthano manual tracing, ensuring accurate measurements for treatment proposals and diagnostic hypotheses.

For the diagnosis of cavities and other dental diseases, we found Logicon,[49] RDFNet, [42] and DCDNet[20], which specialize in detecting cavities in dental imaging, while Mask-RCNN[40] focuses on the detection and classification of periapical lesions. In addition, Denti.Ai[25] y Diagnocat[21, 50] uses AI to identify a variety of dental pathologies, with Denti.Ai[25] also focusing on implants and crowns. On the other hand, TG Dental[43] classifies malocclusions without manual identification of landmarks using AI to speed up diagnosis and planning.

Computer tools for diagnosing tooth decay from images offer objective verification, aid in doctor-patient communication, teledentistry, and potentially improve diagnostic accuracy and efficiency in the detection of oral diseases.[61] Studies such as Tareq et al. [62] argue that these applications make it possible to predict dental cavitations from non-standardized photographs with reasonable clinical accuracy, improving access to oralhealthcaree in resource-limited areas. In addition, the use of deep learning in panoramic images makes it possible to accurately detect various tooth-related diseases in real-time, helping to plan treatment in time and reducing the risk of misdiagnosis.[63]

To support clinical decisions, we have a Decision Support System"[47] that standardizes the decision-making process in dentistry and offers evidence-based therapeutic options. For specific

treatments and risk assessment, Endo 10[32] focuses on diagnosis in endodontics, whereas the OSA-Risk Assessment Tool[27] assesses the risk of obstructive sleep apnea.

The useful tools for teledentistry and remote diagnosis was Remote-I, which facilitates remote screening for oral diseases, ideal for contexts where patients cannot physically visit clinics.[39] Telediagnostic services have demonstrated high accuracy rates, comparable to face-to-face examinations, making them a reliable alternative for clinical support, especially in remote areas.[64]

For the evaluation of prosthodontics and prosthesis adjustments, Geomagic[31] is available, a tool that ensures that prostheses such as dentures fit correctly to the models of the patient's mouth. For research data development and management NutriOdonto[16] it facilitates the management of epidemiological data in oral health, which is crucial for research and diagnosis using the epidemiological method.

In addition, 3D Slicer[34] and WearCompare[22, 23] used 3D models to evaluate tooth movements and adjustments during treatment.

The specialized tools for diagnosis and prevention found in the present study were Apox[17], which analyzes panoramic X-rays providing essential clinical details such as the presence of implants and crowns, the Artificial IntelligenceToolbox[28], which detects periodontal bone loss using AI models, and Boneprox[26], which assesses the risk of osteoporosis through dental X-rays.

Kolokythas et al.[65] argued that AI in dentistry simplifies complex protocols, helps deliver high-quality care, and improves decision-making skills, thus benefiting both doctors and patients. By using large data sets and learning patterns, machine learning can predict disease risks and aid early intervention, which could have a significant impact on patients' lives.[66] In addition, artificial intelligence applications can help doctors diagnose oral diseases, optimize treatment plans, and improve treatment outcomes, especially in pediatric dentistry.[67]

The large number of computer tools found in this study focused on the diagnosis and management of specific diseases. DoctOral[38] focused on the diagnosis of oral lesions. LinguAPP[18] it helps in the diagnosis of soft tissue injuries in the oral cavity. MSC[33] can be used to detect pathological pulp exposure on periapical radiographs. MeMoSA[41] it facilitates the documentation of oral injuries and communication between dentists and specialists. The iHome DentalHealth-IoT[45] detects a wide range of dental problems, from cavities to periodontal diseases. ImageJ (Plugin) [51] It reduces bias in the measurement of bone loss in radiographic images. PDApp[52] predicts the potential for eruption or retention of third molars using a user-

friendly interface for radiological image manipulation. Faster R-CNN[15] Detects gingivitis in orthodontic patients using intraoral imaging. The DSDapp[38] facilitates the planning of multidisciplinary aesthetic treatments. TSegNet[36] Uses Deep Learning for Dental Segmentation in 3D models.

The limitations of the evidence included in the review may be derived from the insufficient information needed regarding each of the tools, such as the validation of some tools. In addition, excessive concentration in certain specialties, such as restorative dentistry, shows a possible limitation in the diversity of areas covered in the research.

CONCLUSIONS

The incorporation of informatics tools into dental practice has notable benefits in terms of diagnostic accuracy and efficiency in treatment planning. However, there is evidence for the need for a more robust regulatory framework to ensure the proper validation of these technologies before their clinical implementation. In addition, it is crucial to encourage the continuous training of dental professionals in the use of these technologies to maximize their benefits and ensure optimal patient care. This review underlines the importance of further research to explore the full potential of informatics applications in the dental field, particularly with regard to their integration into existing health systems and accessibility in resource-limited areas.

REFERENCES

1. Suazo Galdames IC. Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Dentomaxillofacial Diagnosis. Rev Cubana Estomatol. 2024 [acceso: 2024-04-21];61(e4934 pp.] Disponible en: https://revestomatologia.sld.cu/index.php/est/article/view/4934

2. Portella PD, de Oliveira LF, Ferreira MFC, Dias BC, de Souza JF, Assunção LRS. Improving accuracy of early dental carious lesions detection using deep learning-based automated method. Clinical Oral Investigations. 2023;27(12):7663-70. 10.1007/s00784-023-05355-x

3. Annappa B, Manoj Kumar MV, Thomas L. Chapter 1 - Foundations of healthcare informatics. In: N P, Kautish S, Peng S-L, editors. Demystifying Big Data, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning for Healthcare Analytics: Academic Press; 2021. p. 3-15.

4. Habli I, Jia Y, White S, Gabriel G, Lawton T, Sujan M, et al. Development and piloting of a software tool to facilitate proactive hazard and risk analysis of Health Information Technology. Health Informatics J. 2020;26(1):683-702. 10.1177/1460458219852789

5. Demiris G. Personal Health Informatics: New Tools and Roles for Health Care: The authors and IOS Press; 2022. Available from: https://ebooks.iospress.nl/doi/10.3233/SHTI220941.

6. Kale IP, Mhapuskar AA, Jhawar M, Hiremutt DRP. Artificial intelligence in oral medicine and oral radiology. SRM Journal of Research in Dental Sciences. 2023;14(4):199-205. 10.4103/srmjrds.srmjrds_106_23

7. Alotaibi G, Awawdeh M, Farook FF, Aljohani M, Aldhafiri RM, Aldhoayan M. Artificial intelligence (AI) diagnostic tools: utilizing a convolutional neural network (CNN) to assess periodontal bone level radiographically—a retrospective study. BMC Oral Health. 2022;22(1):10.1186/s12903-022-02436-3

8. Aswini Kumar K, Prabhu Y, Mirna G, Shruti Vishal D, Purna Chandra M, Tapan Kumar P, et al. Clinical Computing in Dentistry. In: Monika Elzbieta M, editor. Computer Vision in Dentistry. Rijeka: IntechOpen; 2019. p. Ch. 5.

9. Bertaud-Gounot V, Chaumeil B, Ehrmann E, Fages M, Valcarcel J. Computerizing the Dental Office. In: Venot A, Burgun A, Quantin C, editors. Medical Informatics, e-Health: Fundamentals and Applications. Paris: Springer Paris; 2014. p. 365-403.

10. Osmanovic A, Halilovic S, Jukic S, Kevric J, Hadziabdic N, editors. Application of a Computer-Aided Diagnostic System for Early Identification of Periapical Lesions—A Pilot Study2020; Cham: Springer International Publishing.

11. Al-Ibrahim IK, Alshammari FA, Alanazi SM, Madfa AA. The Attitude of Saudi Dentists Towards CAD/CAM in Restorative Dentistry. Open Dent J. 2023;17(1):10.2174/18742106-v17-230316-2022-99

12. Rokhshad R, Ducret M, Chaurasia A, Karteva T, Radenkovic M, Roganovic J, et al. Ethical considerations on artificial intelligence in dentistry: A framework and checklist. Journal of Dentistry. 2023;135(10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104593

13. Uhrin E, Domokos Z, Czumbel LM, Kói T, Hegyi P, Hermann P, et al. Teledentistry: A Future Solution in the Diagnosis of Oral Lesions: Diagnostic Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. Telemedicine e-Health. 2023;29(11):1591-600. 10.1089/tmj.2022.0426

14. Flores APdC, Roxo-Gonçalves M, Batista NVR, Gueiros LA, Linares M, Santos-Silva AR, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of a telediagnosis service of oral mucosal diseases: A multicentric survey. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2022;134(1):65-72. 10.1016/j.oooo.2022.02.005

15. Alalharith DM, Alharthi HM, Alghamdi WM, Alsenbel YM, Aslam N, Khan IU, et al. A deep learning-based approach for the detection of early signs of gingivitis in orthodontic patients using faster region-based convolutional neural networks. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(22):1-10. doi:10.3390/ijerph17228447

16. Cavalcante NV, Oliveira AH, de Sá BVC, Botelho G, Moreira TR, da Costa GD, et al. Computing and oral health: Mobile solution for collecting, data analysis, managing and reproducing epidemiological research in population groups. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(3):doi:10.3390/ijerph17031076

17. De Angelis F, Pranno N, Franchina A, Di Carlo S, Brauner E, Ferri A, et al. Artificial Intelligence: A New Diagnostic Software in Dentistry: A Preliminary Performance Diagnostic Study. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022;19(3):doi:10.3390/ijerph19031728

18. Fazio M, Lombardo C, Marino G, Marya A, Messina P, Scardina GA, et al. LinguAPP: An m-Health Application for Teledentistry Diagnostics. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022;19(2):doi:10.3390/ijerph19020822

19. Baydar O, Różyło-Kalinowska I, Futyma-Gąbka K, Sağlam H. The U-Net Approaches to Evaluation of Dental Bite-Wing Radiographs: An Artificial Intelligence Study. Diagnostics. 2023;13(3):doi:10.3390/diagnostics13030453

20. Dayı B, Üzen H, Çiçek İB, Duman ŞB. A Novel Deep Learning-Based Approach for Segmentation of Different Type Caries Lesions on Panoramic Radiographs. Diagnostics. 2023;13(2):doi:10.3390/diagnostics13020202

21. Zadrożny Ł, Regulski P, Brus-Sawczuk K, Czajkowska M, Parkanyi L, Ganz S, et al. Artificial Intelligence Application in Assessment of Panoramic Radiographs. Diagnostics. 2022;12(1):doi:10.3390/diagnostics12010224

22. O'Toole S, Bartlett D, Keeling A, McBride J, Bernabe E, Crins L, et al. Influence of scanner precision and analysis software in quantifying three-dimensional intraoral changes: Two-factor factorial experimental design. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(11):doi:10.2196/17150

23. O'Toole S, Osnes C, Bartlett D, Keeling A. Investigation into the validity of WearCompare, a purpose-built software to quantify erosive tooth wear progression. Dent Mater. 2019;35(10):1408-14. doi:10.1016/j.dental.2019.07.023

24. Amorim M, Diamantino F, Pereira R, Jardim L. Smartphone and computer cephalometric analysis: A trueness and precision study. Rev Port Estomatol Med Dent Cir Maxilofac. 2022;63(4):204-12. doi:10.24873/J.RPEMD.2022.12.1044

25. Bonfanti-Gris M, Garcia-Cañas A, Alonso-Calvo R, Salido Rodriguez-Manzaneque MP, Pradies Ramiro G. Evaluation of an Artificial Intelligence web-based software to detect and classify dental structures and treatments in panoramic radiographs. Journal of Dentistry. 2022;126(doi:10.1016/j.jdent.2022.104301

26. Gullberg J, Al-Okshi A, Asan DH, Zainea A, Sundh D, Lorentzon M, et al. The challenge of applying digital image processing software on intraoral radiographs for osteoporosis risk assessment. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology. 2022;51(1):doi:10.1259/DMFR.20210175

27. Kapoor P, Chowdhry A, Sengar P, Mehta A. Development, testing, and feasibility of a customized mobile application for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) risk assessment: A hospital-based pilot study. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res. 2022;12(1):109-15. doi:10.1016/j.jobcr.2021.11.004

28. Muhammed Sunnetci K, Ulukaya S, Alkan A. Periodontal bone loss detection based on hybrid deep learning and machine learning models with a user-friendly application. Biomedical Signal Processing and Control. 2022;77(doi:10.1016/j.bspc.2022.103844

29. Reyes Salgado JJ. Design of Open Code Software to Downs and Steiner Lateral Cephalometric Analysis with Tracing Landmarks. Digital. 2022;2(2):120-42. doi:10.3390/digital2020008

30. Roehl JC, Jakstat HA, Becker K, Wetselaar P, Ahlers MO. Tooth Wear Evaluation System (TWES) 2.0—Reliability of diagnosis with and without computer-assisted evaluation. Journal of Oral Rehabilitation. 2022;49(1):81-91. doi:10.1111/joor.13277

31. Abd El Galil E, Mohamed S, Rizk F, Sabet M. Evaluation of two computer-aided design software on the adaptation of digitally constructed maxillary complete denture. J Indian Prosthodontic Soc. 2021;21(4):383-90. doi:10.4103/jips.jips_137_21

32. Abuabara A, de Castro JP, Locks MEN, Pezzin APT, Mattos NHR, de Araújo CM, et al. Evaluation of Endo 10 mobile application as diagnostic tool in endodontics. J Clini Exp Dent. 2023;15(8):e612-e20. doi:10.4317/jced.60342

33. Altukroni A, Alsaeedi A, Gonzalez-Losada C, Lee JH, Alabudh M, Mirah M, et al. Detection of the pathological exposure of pulp using an artificial intelligence tool: a multicentric study over periapical radiographs. BMC Oral Health. 2023;23(1):doi:10.1186/s12903-023-03251-0

34. Anacleto MA, Souki BQ. Superimposition of 3d maxillary digital models using open-source software. Den. 2019;24(2):81-91. doi:10.1590/2177-6709.24.2.081-091.bbo

35. Barreto MS, Faber J, Vogel CJ, Araujo TM. Reliability of digital orthodontic setups. Angle Orthod. 2016;86(2):255-9. doi:10.2319/120914-890.1

36. Cui Z, Li C, Chen N, Wei G, Chen R, Zhou Y, et al. TSegNet: An efficient and accurate tooth segmentation network on 3D dental model. Med Image Anal. 2021;69(doi:10.1016/j.media.2020.101949

37. Di Fede O, Panzarella V, Buttacavoli F, La Mantia G, Campisi G. Doctoral: A smartphone-based decision support tool for the early detection of oral potentially malignant disorders. Digit Health. 2023;9(doi:10.1177/20552076231177141

38. do Vale Voigt M, Espíndola-Castro LF, de Melo Monteiro GQ, Ortigoza LS, dos Santos Torreão A, Georg R. DSDapp use for multidisciplinary esthetic planning. J Esthetic Restorative Dent. 2020;32(8):738-46. doi:10.1111/jerd.12637

39. Estai M, Kanagasingam Y, Xiao D, Vignarajan J, Bunt S, Kruger E, et al. End-user acceptance of a cloud-based teledentistry system and Android phone app for remote screening for oral diseases. Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare. 2017;23(1):44-52. doi:10.1177/1357633X15621847

40. Fatima A, Shafi I, Afzal H, Mahmood K, Díez IDLT, Lipari V, et al. Deep Learning-Based Multiclass Instance Segmentation for Dental Lesion Detection. Healthcare (Basel). 2023;11(3):doi:10.3390/healthcare11030347

41. Haron N, Zain RB, Ramanathan A, Abraham MT, Liew CS, Ng KG, et al. M-Health for Early Detection of Oral Cancer in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Telemedicine e-Health. 2020;26(3):278-85. doi:10.1089/tmj.2018.0285

42. Jiang H, Zhang P, Che C, Jin B. RDFNet: A Fast Caries Detection Method Incorporating Transformer Mechanism. Comp Math Methods Med. 2021;2021(doi:10.1155/2021/9773917

43. Johannes T, Akhilanand C, Joachim K, Shankeeth V, Anahita H, Saeed Reza M, et al. Evaluation of AI Model for Cephalometric Landmark Classification (TG Dental). Journal of Medical Systems. 2023;47(1):doi:10.1007/s10916-023-01977-6

44. Kim J, Lee HS, Song IS, Jung KH. DeNTNet: Deep Neural Transfer Network for the detection of periodontal bone loss using panoramic dental radiographs. Scientific Reports. 2019;9(1):doi:10.1038/s41598-019-53758-2

45. Liu L, Xu J, Huan Y, Zou Z, Yeh SC, Zheng LR. A Smart Dental Health-IoT Platform Based on Intelligent Hardware, Deep Learning, and Mobile Terminal. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics. 2020;24(3):898-906. doi:10.1109/JBHI.2019.2919916

46. Livas C, Delli K, Spijkervet FKL, Vissink A, Dijkstra PU. Concurrent validity and reliability of cephalometric analysis using smartphone apps and computer software. Angle Orthod. 2019;89(6):889-96. doi:10.2319/021919-124.1

47. Lo Giudice G, Lizio AS, Lo Giudice R. A new software architecture proposal for an evidence-based decision support system in dentistry. Minerva Dental and Oral Science. 2021;70(1):7-14. doi:10.23736/S2724-6329.20.04416-7

48. Mazzoli A, Antonio G, Masi A, Siciliani G. Use of MIMICS® software in three-dimensional cephalometric evaluation of soft tissues of the face. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Eng Imaging and Visualization. 2017;5(1):3-15. doi:10.1080/21681163.2014.947007

49. Najmuddin M, Katti G, Ara SA, Saheb SAK, Byatnal A, Wahajuddin M. Logicon: A third eye for caries detection. J Indian Acad Oral Med Radiol. 2018;30(4):380-4. doi:10.4103/jiaomr.jiaomr_83_18

50. Orhan K, Belgin CA, Manulis D, Golitsyna M, Bayrak S, Aksoy S, et al. Determining the reliability of diagnosis and treatment using artificial intelligence software with panoramic radiographs. Imaging Science in Dentistry. 2023;53(3):199-207. doi:10.5624/isd.20230109

51. Preus HR, Torgersen GR, Koldsland OC, Hansen BF, Aass AM, Larheim TA, et al. A new digital tool for radiographic bone level measurements in longitudinal studies. BMC Oral Health. 2015;15(1):doi:10.1186/s12903-015-0092-9

52. Santeiro-Hermida S, Fernández-Delgado M, Cernadas E, Gallas-Torreira M. Validation Analysis of Panoramic Dental Application (PDApp) Software as a Tool for Predicting Third Molar Eruption Based on Panoramic Radiograph Images. Appl Sci. 2023;13(5):doi:10.3390/app13052848

53. Sayar G, Kilinc DD. Manual tracing versus smartphone application (app) tracing: a comparative study. Acta Odontol Scand. 2017;75(8):588-94. doi:10.1080/00016357.2017.1364420

54. Schwager R, Schalk L. How systematic are systematic literature searches? Atti del 5° Convegno sulle didattiche disciplinari; 11/012022. p. 510-6. Disponible en:https://doi.org/10.33683/dida.22.05.83

55. Kumpulainen M, Seppänen M. Combining Web of Science and Scopus datasets in citation-based literature study. Scientometrics. 2022;127(10):5613-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04475-7

56. Alfandari R, Taylor BJ. Systematic Bibliographic Database Searching for Literature Reviews: Case Study on Child Protection Decision-Making. The British Journal of Social Work. 2021;52(1):518-35. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcab013

57. Cantrell A, Booth A, Chambers D. A systematic review case study of urgent and emergency care configuration found citation searching of Web of Science and Google Scholar of similar value. Health Information & Libraries Journal. 2022;2022(n/a):1-16. https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12428

58. da Fonseca Reis E, Attilas Aleva N, de Morais Barros L, Onibene Castro HH, Rodrigues Silva D, Clemente de Abreu J. Comparisons of Cephalometric image analysis by Information Technology (IT) in the treatment of Dentomaxillofacial Changes. International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science. 2022;9(5):044-63. https://www.doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.95.4

59. Prince STT, Srinivasan D, Duraisamy S, Kannan R, Rajaram K. Reproducibility of linear and angular cephalometric measurements obtained by an artificial-intelligence assisted software (WebCeph) in comparison with digital software (AutoCEPH) and manual tracing method. Dental Press J Orthod. 2023;28(01):e2321214. https://doi.org/10.1590/2177-6709.28.1.e2321214.oar

60. Gaharwar JS. Computerised and manual cephalometry used for accuracy and reliability of landmark identification. Indian Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Research. 2020;6(1):12-5. https://doi.org/10.18231/j.ijodr.2020.004

61. Moharrami M, Farmer J, Singhal S, Watson E, Glogauer M, Johnson AEW, et al. Detecting dental caries on oral photographs using artificial intelligence: A systematic review. Oral Dis. n/a(n/a):https://doi.org/10.1111/odi.14659

62. Tareq A, Faisal MI, Islam MS, Rafa NS, Chowdhury T, Ahmed S, et al. Visual Diagnostics of Dental Caries through Deep Learning of Non-Standardised Photographs Using a Hybrid YOLO Ensemble and Transfer Learning Model. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2023;20(7):10.3390/ijerph20075351

63. Mallick M, M. K A, Govindaraju S, Kumar AS, Kandasamy M, Anitha P, editors. Analysis of Panoramic Images using Deep Learning For Dental Disease Identification. 2023 Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Smart Energy (ICAIS); 2023 2-4 Feb. 2023.

64. Chaple-Gil AM, Afrashtehfar KI. Telegram Messenger: A suitable tool for Teledentistry. J Oral Res. 2020;9(1):4-6. https://doi.org/10.17126/joralres.2020.001

65. Kolokythas A. Can Artificial Intelligence (AI) assist in the diagnosis of oral mucosal lesions and/or oral cancer? Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2022;134(4):413-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oooo.2022.07.004

66. Chater A. Advances in Oral Cancer Diagnosis: Is AI the Magic Tool? Adv Can Res & Clinical Imag. 2023;3(5):000574. https://doi.org/10.33552/ACRCI.2023.03.000574

67. Cieślińska K, Zaborowicz K, Biedziak B. Use of digital techniques in the diagnosis of oral diseases in children. Medical Studies/Studia Medyczne. 2022;38(1):68-73. 10.5114/ms.2022.115149