

1
2 **Medical nurses may be effective in using silver**
3 **diamine fluoride to prevent caries compared to**
4 **dental hygienists in a school-based oral health**
5 **program**

6
7 **Ryan Richard Ruff, PhD, MPH^{1 2}, Tamarinda J. Barry Godín, DDS,**
8 **MPH¹, and Richard Niederman, DMD¹**

9 *¹New York University College of Dentistry*

10 *²New York University School of Global Public Health*

11
12 **March 2023**

13
14 **Abstract**

15 Background: The sustainability of school-based oral health programs depends on the utilization of
16 effective, efficient treatments and the availability of a trained clinical workforce. The objective of
17 this study was to determine whether registered nurses are comparable to dental hygienists in the
18 application and effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride (SDF) for the prevention of dental caries.

19 Methods: CariedAway was a school-based study of SDF versus dental sealants and atraumatic
20 restorations. Within the SDF arm, subjects were treated by either a licensed dental hygienist or a
21 registered nurse, both under the supervision of a pediatric dentist. Although initial treatment
22 assignment in CariedAway was randomized, assignment to provider was not. The proportion of
23 children who remained caries free after two years was assessed for non-inferiority using two-group
24 proportion tests, adjusting for the clustering effect of schools.

25 Results: 417 children were analyzed including 298 treated by hygienists and 119 by nurses. The
26 proportion of caries-free individuals was 0.812 and 0.798 for hygienists and nurses, respectively,
27 for a difference of 0.014 (95% CI = -0.07, 0.098) and within the pre-determined non-inferiority
28 margin.

29 Conclusions: Nurses may be effective in treating children with silver diamine fluoride in school-
30 based oral health programs.

31 Introduction

32 The World Health Organization estimates dental caries to be the world's most common
33 noncommunicable disease, disproportionately affecting low-income and minority
34 populations and consuming between 5-10% of healthcare budgets of industrialized nations
35 [1, 2]. Notably, those most at risk of dental caries typically lack access to traditional dental
36 services, which results in substantial unmet need in vulnerable groups [3, 4, 5]. As a public
37 health intervention to increase access to dental care, the Centers for Disease Control and
38 Prevention recommends school-based sealant programs, which are effective [6, 7, 8],
39 economical [9], and "allow the use of dental personnel to the top of their licensure" [10].

40 Silver diamine fluoride (SDF) is an efficient, economical treatment for dental caries [11]
41 that is supported by the American Academy of Pediatric Dentists as part of a
42 comprehensive caries management program [12]. Systematic reviews conclude that SDF is
43 effective in the arrest of caries in primary teeth [13] and significantly reduces the
44 development of new dentin caries after twenty-four months [14]. SDF is a colorless liquid
45 similar in application to fluoride varnish [15], and the Association of State & Territorial
46 Dental Directors (ASTDD) advocate for physicians, nurses, and assistants to provide SDF in
47 addition to dentists and dental hygienists [16].

48 The CariedAway study was a longitudinal, school-based study of non-surgical interventions
49 for dental caries [17]. Primary objectives of CariedAway were to compare the incidence
50 and arrest of dental caries in children treated with either silver diamine fluoride or glass
51 ionomer sealants and atraumatic restorations [18], and to assess oral health-related quality
52 of life [19]. Within the SDF treatment arm, care was provided by either dental hygienists or
53 registered medical nurses. Subjects were not randomized to different providers within this
54 group. A secondary objective of CariedAway was to conduct a preliminary investigation of
55 the variation in provider effectiveness in the use of SDF to prevent dental caries.

56

57 **Methods**

58 CariedAway is a registered study at www.clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03442309) beginning 22
59 February 2018, and received ethical approval from the New York University School of
60 Medicine IRB.

61

62 **Design and Participants**

63 CariedAway was a longitudinal pragmatic non-inferiority trial conducted from 2018-2023
64 in New York City primary schools. The pragmatic design was chosen to test study
65 hypotheses in real world settings that characterize school-based oral health programs.
66 Schools that had a student population from at least 50% Hispanic/Latino or black
67 ethnicities and at least 80% receiving free and reduced lunch (a proxy for low socio-
68 economic status) were eligible for inclusion. Schools were further excluded if they already
69 had a school-based oral health program that provided services. Within eligible and enrolled
70 schools, all subjects were eligible for the study if they provided parental informed consent
71 and child assent. Children were included in analysis if they were between the ages of 5 and
72 13 years.

73

74 **Randomization**

75 Although subjects were randomized to receive silver diamine fluoride, they were not
76 randomized to be treated by either a dental hygienist or registered medical nurse. No
77 systematic efforts were made to assign subjects to different providers. By law, nurses could
78 only treat patients if standing orders were created by a supervising dentist. Subjects who
79 were enrolled prior to visiting the school were thus eligible to be seen by nurses or
80 hygienists. These subjects were seen by whichever provider was available. Any subject
81 enrolled during the actual visit to schools (e.g., day-of enrollment) were seen only by
82 hygienists.

83

84 **Interventions and Data Collection**

85 All subjects included in analysis received a single treatment consisting of 38% silver
86 diamine fluoride (Elevate Oral Care Advantage Arrest 38%, 2.24 F-ion mg/dose) applied to
87 all asymptomatic cavitated lesions and brushed on all pits and fissures of bicuspid and
88 molars for 30 seconds. Fluoride varnish (5% NaF, Colgate PreviDent) was then applied to
89 all teeth. Registered nurses and hygienists operated within a specific room in each school
90 using a disposable mirror, disposable explorer, and head lamp with participants laying in a
91 portable dental chair. Nurses and hygienists were under the supervision of a licensed
92 pediatric dentist.

93 Study clinicians performed full-mouth visual-tactile oral examinations at each observation.
94 Teeth were assessed as being present or missing intraorally. Individual tooth surfaces were
95 assessed as being either intact/sound, sealed, restored, decayed, or arrested. All data were
96 recorded on Apple iPads using an electronic dental health record designed for school-based
97 programs (New England Survey Systems, Brookline, MA) and were securely uploaded each
98 day to the Boston University School of Public Health Data Coordinating Center.

99

100 **Blinding**

101 All clinicians in this analysis provided silver diamine fluoride and thus were not blinded to
102 their treatment assignment. However, examiners at follow-up were unable to identify the
103 type of clinician that provided initial treatment until the examination was completed.

104

105 **Clinician training**

106 Registered nurses first completed modules on child oral health, caries risk assessment,
107 fluoride varnish, and oral examinations from *Smiles for Life: A national oral health*
108 *curriculum* [20], accredited by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on
109 Accreditation. Nurses and hygienists further received approximately 70 hours of didactic
110 instruction and practical training during the annual CariedAway orientation, including

111 dental screening and treatment protocols for silver diamine fluoride and fluoride varnish.
112 Examiner standardization was conducted via case study, utilization of dental models, and
113 through the recruitment of examinees attending pilot and training schools not included in
114 the CariedAway study population. Examiners were standardized using identical diagnostic
115 and treatment protocols. Caries diagnosis was performed according to guidelines of the
116 International Caries Detection and Assessment System (ICDAS) adapted criteria in
117 epidemiology and clinical research settings [21]. Full description of clinical protocols for
118 diagnosis, outcomes, and other protocol considerations is previously published. Clinicians
119 were standardized through agreement with the senior examiner, a licensed pediatric
120 dentist experienced in applying the dental screening and treatment protocols. The senior
121 examiner performed weekly chairside and data audits to ensure protocol compliance and
122 continuous quality improvement.

123

124 **Impact of COVID-19**

125 The original protocol for CariedAway stipulated that treatment and data collection were to
126 be conducted biannually. However, the COVID-19 pandemic suspended medical
127 interventions being conducted in New York City schools. As a result, the trial was
128 conducted in two phases. In phase 1, we completed baseline observations and initial
129 treatment from September 2019 to March 2020 with first follow-up observations
130 completed from September 2021 to March 2022. In phase two, additional data collection
131 was conducted in recurring six month intervals from March 2022 through June 2023.

132

133 **Outcomes**

134 The primary outcome was the proportion of subjects with no observed incidence of
135 decayed teeth from previously sound dentition (prevention). Nurses also provided
136 treatment for existing caries at baseline, but these subjects were excluded from analysis as
137 it was caries arrest.

138 **Covariates**

139 Data for demographic variables were obtained from informed consent documents and/or
140 school records, including race/ethnicity, age at observation, and sex. For socioeconomic
141 status, all enrolled schools in CariedAway had at least 80% of the student population
142 receiving free or reduced lunch ("Title 1" schools).

143

144 **Statistical Analysis**

145 Analysis of provider variation used data from phase 1 of CariedAway.

146 Subjects were first ordered sequentially by visit and restricted to those assigned to the
147 silver diamine fluoride arm and without dental caries at their baseline observation. Our
148 primary independent variable, provider type, was dichotomized as either registered nurse
149 or dental hygienist/pediatric dentist. Our primary dependent variable of any new evidence
150 of dental decay was created as a dichotomous indicator reflecting whether each tooth
151 presented at follow-up with either untreated caries or clinical evidence of having received
152 an outside filling.

153 Non-inferiority of prevention by provider type was assessed using two-sample proportion
154 tests with cluster adjustment for the school and the estimated intraclass correlation and by
155 comparing the right-sided 95% confidence interval for the difference between providers to
156 the pre-determined non-inferiority margin of 0.10. Power analysis for a two-group
157 proportion test for non-inferiority with the predetermined threshold at 80% power was
158 previously calculated to require a total sample size of 396. The degree of intraclass
159 correlation was measured using intercept-only mixed effects multilevel regression
160 modeling.

161 Results were subsequently compared to a confidence interval for the difference of hygienist
162 minus nurse computed using bootstrap sampling with 10,000 replications. Logistic
163 regression models were also conducted to explore the role of potential confounding
164 variables on the provider/caries relationship.

165 Following per-protocol analysis, we conducted an intent to treat analysis using imputed
166 data. Five datasets were generated for all subjects receiving silver diamine fluoride and not
167 presenting with caries at baseline using multiple imputation and analyzed using logistic
168 regression. Analysis was performed using Stata v16.0 and R v1.4. Confidence intervals were
169 created at the 95% level and statistical significance was set at 0.05.

170 Results

171 Of the 4718 subjects enrolled and randomized in Phase 1, 2998 were enrolled from viable
172 grades. Those subjects enrolled in fourth and fifth grades were treated for ethical reasons
173 but were not viable as they would age out of the study prior to follow-up. We completed
174 follow-up data collection with 1398 subjects from September 2021 through 2 March 2022
175 (Figure 1). A total of 1070 enrolled subjects were treated with silver diamine fluoride and
176 did not have caries at baseline, and follow-up data was collected in 418 subjects. One
177 subject did not have provider recorded and thus was removed from analysis (N=417, Table
178 1). This analytic sample consisted of 298 subjects treated by dental hygienists and 119
179 treated by registered nurses. Approximately 10% of subjects presented at baseline with
180 dental sealants. In keeping with the study inclusion criteria, 81% of subjects were of
181 Hispanic/Latino or black ethnicity. The intraclass correlation coefficient was less than
182 .00001. There were no adverse events reported in children treated by either nurses or
183 hygienists.

184 The proportion of individuals who remained caries free after two years (prevention rate)
185 was 0.812 and 0.798 for subjects treated by dental hygienists and nurses, respectively, for a
186 difference of 0.014 (95% CI = -0.07, 0.098), just below the non-inferiority threshold (Table
187 2). Results were similar for bootstrapped confidence intervals (difference = 0.014, 95% CI
188 = -0.09, 0.098). Results from regression models show no differences between provider
189 after controlling for race, age at baseline, sex, and dental sealant prevalence (Table 3).

190 Imputed data for the baseline sample (N=1070) yielded 315 subjects with no baseline
191 decay that were treated by nurses and 755 subjects by hygienists. The proportion of
192 subjects who remained caries free at follow-up was 80.8% and 81% for nurses and

193 hygienists, respectively. The odds ratio for prevention comparing nurses to hygienists was
194 1.01 (95% CI = 0.68, 1.50). Results with imputed data remained non-inferior.

195 Discussion

196 Our results suggest that the effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride applied by registered
197 nurses may be comparable in the two-year prevention of caries compared to dental
198 hygienists in a school-based pragmatic setting. Specifically, the overall prevention rate in
199 predominantly low-income, minority children was approximately 80%. If left untreated,
200 dental caries can progress to severe infection [22] and negatively affects quality of life [23],
201 academic performance [24], and school attendance [24]. Thus the effective prevention of
202 dental caries in schools can not only improve health but overall child development.

203 The ubiquity and impact of school-based sealant programs depends in part on the
204 availability of properly trained dental professionals. In a prior survey of registered dental
205 hygienists, 54% of respondents were unfamiliar with SDF, 78% agreed that using SDF as a
206 treatment for dental caries falls within their scope of practice, and 82% believed it to be an
207 alternative to traditional restorative treatments [25]. Further, the use of traditional
208 preventive services like glass ionomer sealants can be prohibitively expensive when
209 treating large school populations, such as those found in New York City. In contrast, school
210 nursing services prevent millions of dollars in medical care costs and lost productivity [26]
211 and provide for safe and effective management of children with chronic health conditions,
212 improving both health and academic outcomes [27]. State medical or dental practice acts
213 can authorize nurses to treat children with silver diamine fluoride, thus their incorporation
214 into school-based dental programs can have substantial impact on the efficiency and reach
215 of care. For example, in New York, the state scope of practice implies that SDF is a topical
216 fluoride and able to be applied by registered nurses under the supervision of a licensed
217 dentist. This also aligns with professional practice, as the National Association of School
218 Nurses advocates for the school nurse to promote child oral health through prevention,
219 education, and coordination [28].

220 Our overall results are in line with the available evidence. Recent systematic reviews and
221 meta-analyses are available for the effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in the
222 prevention of caries in primary dentition and permanent first molars [29, 14], caries
223 control in exposed root surfaces [30], and in the arrest or reversal of both noncavitated and
224 cavitated lesions in primary and permanent teeth [31]. These studies indicate preventive
225 fractions for SDF versus placebo or active controls in the range of 70-90%, depending on
226 the comparator used.

227 This study has multiple limitations. The provider assignment in the SDF arm of CariedAway
228 was not a randomized one, and our results may be biased by unobserved differences across
229 subjects. Children who enrolled prior to school visitation received standing orders from the
230 supervising dentist and thus were able to be treated by either nurses or hygienists. These
231 subjects were seen on a first come, first served basis and were not ordered by any factor
232 such as disease severity, sex, or race. Those who enrolled during the study visit were only
233 eligible to be treated by dental hygienist. If pre-visit enrollees were systematically
234 different, this could introduce bias into our results. As a result, these findings should be
235 interpreted with caution and considered as preliminary evidence. Further study with
236 providers being a randomized factor is recommended.

237 The two year period between baseline and follow-up observations corresponded with the
238 onset and duration of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the suspension of all in-
239 school educational and clinical activities from March 2020 to August 2021. This had
240 multiple potential implications. As our analytic sample considered only those with no
241 untreated decay at baseline, exfoliation of decayed teeth was not a concern. Additionally,
242 our analysis accounted for both any newly observed untreated decay and any evidence of
243 having received a dental filling, which would suggest the incidence of new decay (and thus
244 prevention failure) in the intervening years. As a result, our findings should not be
245 confounded by receipt of traditional care in a dental office. Regardless, the low overall
246 follow-up rate due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic remains a lingering concern,
247 though our analysis with imputed subject data did not differ from primary results.

248 The CariedAway study utilized minimally-invasive treatments that were recently added to
249 the World Health Organization’s list of essential medicines, which can be used to expand
250 the scope and reach of school caries prevention. Our results support the incorporation of
251 not only alternative non-restorative methods into traditional school-based prevention
252 programs but the inclusion of under-utilized health professionals in the provision of care.
253 As of 2018, an estimated 132,300 school nurses work in the United States [32], comprising
254 approximately 75% of the entire hygienist workforce. This represents a substantial
255 untapped resource to address oral health inequities.

256

257 **Funding**

258 Research reported in this publication was funded through a Patient-Centered Outcomes
259 Research Institute (PCORI) award (PCS-1609-36824). The content is solely the
260 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the
261 funding organization, New York University, or the NYU College of Dentistry.

262 **Author contributions**

263 RRR and RN were the principal investigators and conceived of and designed the study. TBG
264 served as the supervising dentist, directed clinical activities, and oversaw all data
265 collection. RRR performed all statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript. All authors
266 critically reviewed the manuscript and provided edits. All authors read and approved the
267 final manuscript.

268 **Acknowledgements**

269 We are grateful for the support of multiple people and organizations in their collaboration
270 on this initiative, including Rachel Whittemore, Nydia Santiago- Galvin, and Denise
271 Guerrero, without whom this work would not be possible. We are also thankful for our
272 clinical team who provided care and our patient/stakeholder board who provided
273 community perspectives on COVID- 19 and school guidance. We also wish to thank John
274 Roberge and Michael Stanley at New England Survey Systems (NESS), who worked with us
275 to continuously improve our ability to capture clinical data, and Joe Palmisano at the
276 Boston University School of Public Health. We thank Drs. Roger Platt, Ramneet Kalra, and
277 David Tepel at the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, who
278 facilitated access to New York City schools. Finally, we thank Drs. Dionne Richardson and
279 Michele Griguts at the New York State Department of Health, who provided guidance
280 during COVID-19.

281 **Conflicts of Interest**

282 The authors report no conflicts of interest.


283 References

- 284 1. [1] W. Marcenes, N. J. Kassebaum, E. Bernabé, A. Flaxman, M. Naghavi, A. Lopez, and
285 C. J. L. Murray. Global burden of oral conditions in 1990- 2010: a systematic analysis.
286 *Journal of dental research*, 92(7):592–7, 2013.
- 287 2. [2] J. E. Frencken, P. Sharma, L. Stenhouse, D. Green, D. Laverty, and T. Di- etrich.
288 Global epidemiology of dental caries and severe periodontitis - a comprehensive
289 review. *J Clin Periodontol*, 44 Suppl 18:S94–S105, 2017.
- 290 3. [3] H. M. Treadwell. The nation’s oral health inequities: Who cares. *Am J Public*
291 *Health*, 107(S1):S5, 2017.
- 292 4. [4] S. Griffin, S. Naavaal, C. Scherrer, P. M. Griffin, K. Harris, and S. Chat-
293 topadhyay. School-based dental sealant programs prevent cavities and are cost-effective. *Health*
294 *Aff (Millwood)*, 35(12):2233–2240, 2016.
- 295 5. [5] B. Dye, X. Li, and G. Thornton-Evans. Oral health disparities as deter-
296 mined by selected healthy people 2020 oral health objectives for the united states, 2009-
297 2010. *NCHS Data Brief*, 104:1–8, 2012.
- 298 6. [6] S. O. Griffin, S. Naavaal, C. Scherrer, M. Patel, S. Chattopadhyay, and Force
299 Community Preventive Services Task. Evaluation of school-based dental sealant
300 programs: An updated community guide systematic eco-
301 nomic review. *Am J Prev*
Med, 52(3):407–415, 2017.
- 302 7. [7] AUTHORS BLINDED. Longitudinal caries prevalence in a comprehensive,
303 multicomponent, school-based prevention program. *J Am Dent Assoc*, 152(3):224–
304 233, 03 2021.
- 305 8. [8] Barbara F. Gooch, Susan O. Griffin, Shellie Kolavic Gray, William G. Kohn, R. Gary
306 Rozier, Mark Siegal, Margherita Fontana, Diane Brun-
307 son, Nancy Carter, David K.
308 Curtis, Kevin J. Donly, Harold Haering, Lawrence F. Hill, H. Pitts Hinson, Jayanth
309 Kumar, Lewis Lampiris, Mark Mallatt, Daniel M. Meyer, Wanda R. Miller, Susan M.
310 Sanzi-Schaedel, Richard Simonsen, Benedict I. Truman, and Domenick T. Zero.
311 Prevent-
ing dental caries through school-based sealant programs. *The Journal of*
the American Dental Association, 140(11):1356–1365, 2009.
- 312 9. [9] AUTHORS BLINDED. An Economic Evaluation of a Comprehensive School-Based
313 Caries Prevention Program. *JDR Clin Trans Res*, 4(4):378–387, 10 2019.
- 314 10. [10] 2018.
- 315 11. [11] S. S. T. Yeung and C. Arg’aez. Silver Diamine Fluoride for the Prevention and
316 Arresting of Dental Caries or Hypersensitivity: A Review of Clinical Effectiveness,
317 Cost-Effectiveness and Guidelines. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in
318 Health, Ottawa (ON), 2017.

- 319 12. [12] Y. O. Crystal, A. A. Marghalani, S. D. Ureles, J. T. Wright, R. Sulyanto, K. Divaris,
320 M. Fontana, and L. Graham. Use of silver diamine fluoride for dental caries
321 management in children and adolescents, including those with special health care
322 needs. *Pediatr Dent*, 39(5):135–145, 2017.
- 323 13. [13] N. Seifo, W. Al-Yaseen, and N. Innes. The efficacy of silver diamine fluoride in
324 arresting caries in children. *Evid Based Dent*, 19(2):42–43, 2018.
- 325 14. [14] B. H. Oliveira, A. Rajendra, A. Veitz-Keenan, and R. Niederman. The effect of
326 silver diamine fluoride in preventing caries in the primary dentition: A systematic
327 review and meta-analysis. *Caries Res*, 53(1):24–32, 2018.
- 328 15. [15] N. Seifo, H. Cassie, J. Radford, and N. Innes. "It's really no more difficult than
329 putting on fluoride varnish": a qualitative exploration of dental professionals' views
330 of silver diamine fluoride for the management of carious lesions in children. *BMC*
331 *Oral Health*, 20(1):257, 09 2020.
- 332 16. [16] 2022.
- 333 17. [17] AUTHORS BLINDED. Silver diamine fluoride versus therapeutic sealants for the
334 arrest and prevention of dental caries in low-income minority children: study
335 protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, 19(1):523, 2018.
- 336 18. [18] AUTHORS BLINDED. Effect of Silver Diamine Fluoride on Caries Arrest and
337 Prevention: The CariedAway School-Based Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw*
338 *Open*. 2023;6(2):e2255458.
- 339 19. [19] AUTHORS BLINDED. Silver diamine fluoride, atraumatic restorations, and oral
340 health-related quality of life in children aged 5-13 years: results from the
341 CariedAway school- based cluster randomized trial. *BMC Oral Health*, 22(1):125,
342 Apr 2022.
- 343 20. [20] K Sievers, M B Clark, A B Douglass, R Maier, W Gonsalves, A S Wright- son, R
344 Quinonez, M Dolce, M Dalal, D Rizzolo, and et al., 2020.
- 345 21. [21] K. Shivakumar, S. Prasad, and G. Chandu. International Caries Detection and
346 Assessment System: A new paradigm in detection of dental caries. *J Conserv Dent*,
347 12(1):10–16, Jan 2009.
- 348 22. [22] M. A. Peres, L. M. D. Macpherson, R. J. Weyant, B. Daly, R. Venturelli, M. R.
349 Mathur, S. Listl, R. K. Celeste, C. C. Guarnizo-Herrenõ, C. Kearns, H. Benzian, P.
350 Allison, and R. G. Watt. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. *Lancet*,
351 394(10194):249–260, Jul 2019.
- 352 23. [23] B. W. Chaffee, P. H. Rodrigues, P. F. Kramer, M. R. Vitolo, and C. A. Feldens. Oral
353 health-related quality-of-life scores differ by socioeconomic status and caries
354 experience. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*, 45(3):216– 224, 2017.

- 355 24. [24] R. R. Ruff, S. Senthil, S. R. Susser, and A. Tsutsui. Oral health, academic
356 performance, and school absenteeism in children and adolescents: A systematic
357 review and meta-analysis. *J Am Dent Assoc*, 150(2):111–121 e4, 2019.
- 358 25. [25] S. K. Chhokar, L. Laughter, and D. J. Rowe. Perceptions of Registered Dental
359 Hygienists in Alternative Practice Regarding Silver Diamine Fluoride. *J Dent Hyg*,
360 91(4):53–60, Aug 2017.
- 361 26. [26] L. Y. Wang, M. Vernon-Smile, M. A. Gapinski, M. Desisto, E. Maughan, and A.
362 Sheetz. Cost-benefit study of school nursing services. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 168(7):642–
363 648, Jul 2014.
- 364 27. [27] Z. C. Leroy, R. Wallin, and S. Lee. The Role of School Health Services in
365 Addressing the Needs of Students With Chronic Health Conditions. *J Sch Nurs*,
366 33(1):64–72, Feb 2017.
- 367 28. [28] J. Buerlein. Promoting children’s oral health. A role for school nurses in
368 prevention, education, and coordination. *NASN Sch Nurse*, 25(1):26–29, Jan 2010.
- 369 29. [29] V. Contreras, M. J. Toro, A. R. Elias-Boneta, and A. Encarnacion-Burgos.
370 Effectiveness of silver diamine fluoride in caries prevention and arrest: a systematic
371 literature review. *Gen Dent*, 65(3):22–29, 2017.
- 372 30. [30] B. H. Oliveira, J. Cunha-Cruz, A. Rajendra, and R. Niederman. Controlling caries
373 in exposed root surfaces with silver diamine fluoride: A systematic review with
374 meta-analysis. *J Am Dent Assoc*, 149(8):671–679 e1, 2018.
- 375 31. [31] O. Urquhart, M. P. Tampi, L. Pilcher, R. L. Slayton, M. W. B. Araujo, M. Fontana, S.
376 Guzmán-Armstrong, M. M. Nascimento, B. B. Novy, N. Tinanoff, R. J. Weyant, M. S.
377 Wolff, D. A. Young, D. T. Zero, R. Brignardello-Petersen, L. Banfield, A. Parikh, G.
378 Joshi, and A. Carrasco-Labra. Nonrestorative Treatments for Caries: Systematic
379 Review and Network Meta-analysis. *J Dent Res*, 98(1):14–26, 01 2019.
- 380 32. [32] M. A. Willgerodt, D. M. Brock, and E. D. Maughan. Public School Nursing
381 Practice in the United States. *J Sch Nurs*, 34(3):232–244, Jun 2018.
- 382
- 383
- 384
- 385
- 386
- 387
- 388
- 389

390 *Figure 1: Study flow diagram for the CariedAway randomized controlled trial*



391

392

393 *Table 1: Demographics overall and by provider type for the baseline sample (N=1070) and*
 394 *follow-up sample (N=417)*

	Baseline Sample						Follow-up Sample					
	All		Hygienist/D entist		Nurses		All		Hygienist/D entist		Nurses	
	N/Me an	% / SD	N	%	N	%	N/Me an	% / SD	N	%	N	%
Subjects	1070	100	755	100	31	100	417	100	298	71.46	11	28.
Female	540	50. 47	286	52.45	14	45. 4	221	53	167	56.04	54	45. 38
Race												
Hispani c	481	44. 95	372	49.27	10	34. 9	240	57. 55	176	59.06	64	53. 78
Black	171	15. 98	136	18.01	35	11. 11	98	23. 5	64	21.48	34	28. 57
White	26	2.4 3	19	2.52	7	2.2 2	10	2.4	8	2.68	2	1.6 8
Asian	14	1.3 1	14	1.85	0	0	14	3.3 6	10	3.36	4	3.3 6
Multiple	21	1.9 6	15	1.99	6	1.9	5	1.2	4	1.34	1	0.8 4
Other	12	1.1 2	8	1.06	4	1.2 7	11	2.6 4	7	2.35	4	3.3 6
DK/Mis sing	345	32. 24	191	25.29	15	48. 4	39	9.3 5	29	9.73	10	8.4
Untreat ed decay, follow- up	-	-	-	-	-	-	61	14. 43	46	15.44	15	12. 61
Sealants at baseline	105	9.8 1	78	10.33	27	8.5 7	43	10. 31	33	11.07	10	8.4

395

396

397

398

399 *Table 2: Prevention rates after two years (N=417)*

	Hygienists/Dentists			Nurses			Difference		95% CI	
	N	mean	SE	N	mean	SE	mean	SE	Lower	Upper
Prevention	298	0.81	0.023	119	0.8	0.037	0.014	0.043	-0.07	0.098

400

401

402

403 *Table 3: Regression model results for provider type (N=417)*

Variable	OR	SE	95% CIL	95% CIU
Provider	0.9	0.25	0.52	1.55
Race				
Black	0.78	0.23	0.43	1.41
White	0.52	0.37	0.13	2.1
Asian	1.35	1.06	0.29	6.29
Other	1.5	1.17	0.33	6.88
Unreported	0.63	0.26	0.28	1.4
Age	1.05	0.11	0.85	1.3
Sex (male)	1.19	0.3	0.72	1.96
Sealants	0.95	0.41	0.41	2.24

404

405

406

407 *Table 4: Comparison of nurses to hygienists in caries prevention, imputed data (N=1070)*

Variable	OR	SE	p-value	95% CIL	95% CIU
Provider	1.01	0.2	0.944	0.68	1.5

408