Policy on Interim Therapeutic Restorations (ITR) 1 2 **Originating Council** 3 4 Council on Clinical Affairs Review Council 5 Council on Clinical Affairs 6 7 Adopted 8 2001 9 Revised 10 2004, 2008, 2013, 2017 11 12 Purpose The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry (AAPD) recognizes that unique clinical circumstances 13 14 can result in challenges in restorative care for infants, children, adolescents, and persons with special health care needs. When circumstances do not permit traditional cavity preparation and/or placement 15 of traditional dental restorations or when caries control is necessary prior to placement of definitive 16 restorations, interim therapeutic restorations (ITR)¹ may be beneficial and are best utilized as part of 17 comprehensive care in the dental home. 2.3 This policy will differentiate ITR from 18 atraumatic/alternative techniques $(\mathbf{ART})^{\underline{4}}$ and describe the circumstances for its use. 19 20 21 Methods 22 This updated policy is based upon a review of current dental literature. Database searches were performed using key words dental caries, cavity, primary teeth, deciduous teeth, atraumatic 23 24 restorative treatment, interim therapeutic restoration, and glass ionomer. Search limits used were 25 humans, children 0-12 years, clinical trial, comparative study, controlled clinical trial, meta-analysis, 26 multicenter study, randomized controlled trial, systematic review, and validation studies. 27 This document is an update of the policy adopted in 2001 and last revised in 2013. The update included electronic database and hand searches of medical and dental literature using the following 28 parameters: Terms: dental caries, cavity, primary teeth, deciduous teeth, atraumatic restorative 29 30 treatment, interim therapeutic restoration, AND glass ionomer. Fields: all; Limits: within the last 10

years, humans, English, birth through age 18. Additionally, websites for the American Academy of

Pediatric Dentistry and the American Dental Association were reviewed. Expert and/or consensus

31

32

33 opinion by experienced researchers and clinicians was also considered. 34 Background 35 Atraumatic/alternative restorative technique (ART) has been endorsed by the World Health 36 37 Organization as a means of restoring and preventing caries in populations with little access to traditional dental care. 4-6 In many countries, practitioners provide treatment in non-traditional settings 38 that restrict restorative care to placement of provisional restorations. Because circumstances do not 39 40 allow for follow-up care, ART mistakenly has been interpreted as a definitive restoration. ITR utilizes 41 similar techniques but has different therapeutic goals. Interim therapeutic restoration more accurately 42 describes the procedure used in contemporary dental practice in the U.S. 43 44 ITR may be used to restore, arrest or and prevent the progression of carious lesions in young patients, 45 uncooperative patients, or patients with special health care needs or when traditional cavity preparation and/or placement of traditional dental restorations are not feasible and need to be 46 postponed. 7.8 Additionally, ITR may be used for step-wise excavation in children with multiple open 47 48 carious lesions prior to definitive restoration of the teeth, in erupting molars when isolation conditions are not optimal for a definitive restoration, or for caries control in patients with active lesions prior to 49 treatment performed under general anesthesia. 9,10 The use of ITR has been shown to reduce the levels 50 of cariogenic oral bacteria (e.g., Mmutans Sstreptococci, lactobacilli) in the oral cavity immediately 51 following its placement. 11-13 However, this level may return to pretreatment counts over a period of 52 53 six months after ITR placement if no other treatment is provided. 12 54 55 The ITR procedure involves removal of caries using hand or rotary instruments with caution not to expose the pulp. Leakage of the restoration can be minimized with maximum caries removal from the 56 periphery of the lesion. Following preparation, the tooth is restored with an adhesive restorative 57 material such as glass ionomer or resin-modified glass ionomer cement. 14 ITR has the greatest 58 success when applied to single surface or small two surface. 15,16 Inadequate cavity preparation with 59 subsequent lack of retention and insufficient bulk can lead to failure. 16.17 Follow-up care with topical 60 61 fluorides and oral hygiene instruction may improve the treatment outcome in high caries-risk dental 62 populations, especially when glass ionomers (which have fluoride releasing and recharging 63 properties) are used. 18-20

64

- 65 Policy statement
- The AAPD recognizes ITR as a beneficial provisional technique in contemporary pediatric restorative
- dentistry. ITR may be used to restore and prevent the progression of dental caries in young patients,
- uncooperative patients, patients with special health care needs, and situations in which traditional
- 69 cavity preparation and/or placement of traditional dental restorations are not feasible. ITR may be
- 70 used for caries control in children with multiple carious lesions prior to definitive restoration of the
- 71 teeth.

72 73

References

- 74 1. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Clinical guideline on pediatric restorative dentistry.
- 75 Pediatr Dent 2012; 34(special issue):173-80 2016.
- 76 2. Nowak AJ, Casamassimo PS. The dental home. J Am Dent Assoc 2002;133(1):93-8.
- 77 3. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Policy on the dental home. Pediatr Dent
- 78 2012;34(special issue):24-5 <u>2016</u>.
- 79 4. Frencken J, Pilot T, van Amerongen E, Phantumvanit P, Songpaisan Y. Manual for the
- 80 atraumatic restorative treatment approach to control dental caries. WHO Collaboration. Centre
- 81 for Oral Health Services Research, Groningen, The Netherlands; 1997, Available at:
- 82 "http://www.dentaid. org/data/dentaid/downloads/ART_Manual_English.pdf". Accessed June
- 83 $\frac{20,2013}{}$.
- 84 "https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Yupin Songpaisan/publication/228553340 Manual for t
- 85 <u>he_Atraumatic_Restaurative_Treatment_approach_to_control_dental_caries/links/02e7e51f0ef</u>
- 86 4f102d1000000.pdf". Accessed November 6, 2016. (Archived by WebCite® at
- 87 <u>"http://www.webcitation.org/6owJnTvED")</u>
- 88 5. World Health Organization. Atraumatic Restorative Treatment. Available at:
- 89 "http://new.paho.org/hq/index.php? option=com_content&view=article&id=7411&Itemid=39
- 90 633&lang=en". Accessed June 20, 2013 November 6, 2016. (Archived by WebCite® at
- 91 <u>"http://www.webcitation.org/6owJ9ZsBN")</u>
- 92 6. Frencken JE. The ART approach using glass-ionomers in relation to global oral health care.
- 93 Dent Mater 2010;26 (1):1-6.
- 94 7. Deery C. Atraumatic restorative techniques could reduce discomfort in children receiving
- 95 dental treatment. Evid Based Dent 2005:6:9.

- 96 8. Gryst ME, Mount GJ. The use of glass ionomer in special needs patients. Aust Dent J
 97 1999;44(4):268-74.
- 98 9. Vij R, Coll JA, Shelton P, Farooq NS. Caries control and other variables associated with
 99 success of primary molar vital pulp therapy. Pediatr Dent 2004;26(3):214-20.
- 10. Antonson SA, Antonson DE, Brener S, et al. Twenty-four month clinical evaluation of fissure
 sealants on partially erupted permanent first molars: Glass ionomer versus resin-based sealant.
- J Am Dent Assoc 2012;143(2): 115-22.
- 103 H. Bönecker M, Grossman E, Cleaton Jones PE, Parak R. Clinical, histological and
 104 microbiological study of hand excavated carious dentine in extracted permanent teeth. SADJ 105 2003;58(7):273-8.
- 106 <u>II. Bönecker M, Toi C, Cleaton-Jones P. Mutans streptococci and lactobacilli in carious dentine</u>
 107 before and after Atraumatic Restorative Treatment. J Dent. 2003 Aug;31(6):423-8.
- 12. Roshan NM, Shigli AL, Deshpande SD. Microbiological evaluation of salivary *Streptococcus* 109 *mutans* from children of age 5-7 years, pre- and post-atraumatic restorative treatment. Contemp
 110 Clin Dent 2010;1(2):94-7.
- 111 13. Wambier DS, dosSantos FA, Guedes-Pinto AC, Jaeger RG, Simionato MRL. Ultrastructural
 112 and microbiological analysis of the dentin layers affected by caries lesions in primary molars
 113 treated by minimal intervention. Pediatr Dent 2007;29(3):228-34.
- 14. Yip HK, Smales RJ, Ngo HC, Tay FR, Chu F. Selection of restorative materials for the
 atraumatic restorative treatment (ART) approach: A review. Spec Care Dent 2001; 21(6):216 221.
- 15. Mandari GJ, Frencken JE, van't Hof MA. Six-year success rates of occlusal amalgam and
 glass-ionomer restorations placed using three minimal intervention approaches. Caries Res
 2003;37(4):246-53.
- 120 16. da Franca C, Colares V, Van Amerongen E. Two-year evaluation of the atraumatic restorative
 121 treatment approach in primary molars class I and II restorations. Int J Paediatr Dent
 122 2011;21(4):249-53.
- 123 17. van Gemert-Schriks MCM, van Amerongen WE, ten Cate JM, Aartman IHA. Three-year
 124 survival of single- and two- surface ART restorations in a high-caries child population. Clin

125		Oral Investig 2007;11(4):337-43.
126 127	18.	Tam LE, Chan GP, Yim D. In vitro caries inhibition effects by conventional and resin modified glass ionomer restorations. Oper Dent 1997;22(1):4-14.
128 129	19.	Scherer W, Lippman N, Kaim J, LoPresti J. Antimicrobial properties of VLC liners. J Esthet Dent 1990;2(2):31-2.
130 131	20.	Tyas MJ. Cariostatic <u>effect</u> of glass ionomer cements: A five-year clinical study. Aust Dent J 1991;36(3):236-9.
132		