



This is a repository copy of *Effectiveness, Costs and Patient Acceptance of a Conventional and a Biological Treatment Approach for Carious Primary Teeth in Children.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/133172/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

BaniHani, A., Deery, C. orcid.org/0000-0001-7526-7736, Toumba, J. et al. (1 more author) (2018) Effectiveness, Costs and Patient Acceptance of a Conventional and a Biological Treatment Approach for Carious Primary Teeth in Children. *Caries Research*, 53 (1). pp. 65-75. ISSN 0008-6568

<https://doi.org/10.1159/000487201>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

The title: Effectiveness, Costs and Patient Acceptance of a Conventional and a Biological Treatment Approach for Carious Primary Teeth in Children

Alaa BaniHani¹, Chris Deery², Jack Toumba¹, & Monty Duggal^{1,3}

¹ School of Dentistry, University of Leeds, UK, ² School of Clinical Dentistry, University of Sheffield, UK, ³ Faculty of Dentistry, National University of Singapore.

Short title: Cost Effectiveness and Treatment Acceptance of the Conventional and Biological Treatment Approaches.

Key words: Dental caries, primary teeth, conventional treatment, biological treatment, cost-effectiveness, treatment acceptance.

Correspondence to: Alaa BaniHani, Clinical lecturer and Specialist Registrar in Paediatric Dentistry, Leeds Dental Institute, University of Leeds, LS2 9LU, Leeds, UK

Telephone: 00447428437771

Email: A.BaniHani@leeds.ac.uk

1

2

3 **Declaration of interest:** The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Background.** Over the last years conventional restorations for the treatment of active carious
3 lesions in primary teeth have been challenged and a more biological approach has been
4 suggested. This approach involves less invasive techniques which alter the environment of
5 the carious lesion isolating it from the cariogenic biofilm and substrate.

6 **Aim.** To investigate the cost-effectiveness and patient acceptance of two treatment
7 approaches for the treatment of deep carious lesions in primary teeth in children.

8 **Methods.** This was a retrospective/prospective cohort study carried out in two UK specialist
9 hospital settings. Data on cost-effectiveness was extracted retrospectively from clinical dental
10 records of 246 patients aged 4-9 years. A prospective study design was used to explore
11 patient acceptance of the two treatment approaches. One hundred and ten patients aged 4-9
12 years and their carers completed two questionnaires on treatment acceptance.

13 **Results.** In total 836 primary teeth that had received treatment with either approach were
14 included. More than two thirds (75.7%) of the restorations in the conventional approach were
15 of non-selective removal to hard dentine followed by pulpotomy (24.3%). In the biological
16 approach, most of the restorations were stainless steel crowns placed with the Hall Technique
17 (95%) followed by selective removal to firm dentine (5%). The majority of the primary teeth
18 remained asymptomatic after a follow-up period of up to 77 months; 95.3% in the
19 conventional and 95.8% in the biological arm. When the treatment costs were analysed a
20 statistical significant difference was found between the mean costs of the two approaches
21 with a mean difference of £45.20 (Pound Sterling) ($p < 0.001$), in favour of the biological
22 approach. The majority of the children and carers were happy with the conventional or
23 biological restorations.

24 **Conclusion.** Although both approaches had similar successful outcomes, the biological
25 approach consisting mainly of Hall Technique was associated with reduced treatment costs.
26 Both approaches were accepted favourably by the children and carers.

27

28

29

30

1

2

3

4 **Introduction**

5 Although dental caries is a disease that results from an ecologic shift in the bacteria
6 favouring aciduric and acidogenic microflora within the dental plaque biofilm, it is not an
7 infectious disease and its sequelae, the carious lesion, does not need to be treated by
8 removing cariogenic bacteria. (Banerjee et al., 2017). Only if a preventive strategy of
9 managing behaviour change to achieve control of the causative factors fails, and the lesion
10 activity is not controlled, the cariogenic biofilm will promote further lesion progression
11 leading to pulpal inflammation, pain and dental infection in some patients (Banerjee et al.,
12 2017).

13 Management of carious primary teeth is a common aspect of dental care for young children
14 [Rodd et al., 2006]. According to Hunter and Hunter [2003], “The principal objective of
15 paediatric operative dentistry is the restoration of damaged teeth to healthy function”.
16 Currently, two treatment approaches are proposed for the management of active carious
17 lesion (CL) extending into dentine in primary teeth in the UK; the conventional and the
18 biological. Conventional restoration has been the traditional approach for restoring carious
19 primary teeth for decades [Ricketts et al., 2013; Schwendicke et al., 2013a]. It includes non-
20 selective removal to hard dentine, formerly known as complete removal of carious tissue
21 (CT), followed by placement of a suitable filling material with or without pulp therapy. On
22 the other hand, the biological approach involves less invasive techniques which alter the
23 environment of the carious lesion preventing progression by isolating it from the cariogenic
24 biofilm. Such approaches include the Hall Technique, selective removal to firm dentine,
25 selective removal to soft dentine and stepwise removal [Ricketts et al., 2013; Schwendicke et
26 al., 2013a; Page et al., 2014; Banerjee et al., 2017; Coll et al., 2017].

27 Over the last decade there has been much debate among paediatric dentists in the UK and
28 the rest of Europe on the merits of the conventional approach and whether to retain this
29 treatment modality as the standard technique in restoring primary teeth, or to shift more
30 towards a biological approach. The discussion about what might be the best treatment
31 approach for restoring active deep CL extending into the dentine in primary teeth within the

1 profession was triggered by research published with contradicting views on each treatment
2 [Innes et al., 2007; Franzon et al., 2014]. However, none of these studies explored the cost
3 effectiveness and acceptance from a child and carers perspective when these two approaches
4 were delivered by specialist paediatric dentists.

5 The cost of dental treatment is highly dependent on its complexity, material used and
6 success rate. When different treatment approaches exist for the restoration of primary teeth,
7 clinicians and carers` of patients want the choice of treatment to be based on techniques
8 which are cost-effective and evidence based [Cunningham, 2000]. In addition, treatment
9 providers such as the National Health Services (NHS), where the majority of child dental care
10 is provided in the UK, are likely to require increased evidence on clinical effectiveness of
11 treatments as well as information on “value of money” in the future, to inform decisions
12 [Cunningham, 2000].

13 Increasingly patients are rightly more involved in their own healthcare choices than before.
14 Treatment providers are adopting an approach that is more patient-centric in order to improve
15 the clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction [Marshman and Hall, 2008]. As a consequence,
16 patient-public involvement and engagement (PPIE) has become part of the research culture
17 with growing interest among the clinicians and researchers in getting patients to express their
18 opinions about their care experience [Marshman and Hall, 2008].

19 In light of the above, this retrospective prospective cohort study aimed to explore the cost-
20 effectiveness and patient and carer acceptance, response and satisfaction with the
21 conventional and biological treatment approaches. Such a study is essential before any
22 recommendations can be made on the best treatment modality for carious primary teeth. The
23 study on the outcome and effectiveness of two treatment approaches has recently been
24 reported [BaniHani et al., 2017]. This paper aimed to focus mainly on the cost effectiveness
25 and treatment acceptance of the two treatment approaches to patient and carer. The null
26 hypothesis of the current study is that there is no difference between the two treatment
27 approaches, a conventional and a biological, regarding their cost-effectiveness and their
28 acceptance to patient and carers.

29

30 **Materials and Methods**

31 **Study design and ethical approval**

1 The study was conducted in two dental hospitals in the North of England; Leeds (Leeds
2 Dental Institute) and Sheffield (School of Clinical Dentistry University of Sheffield).
3 Differing treatment approaches are practiced in these two dental centres. In the Leeds Dental
4 Institute (LDI), a conventional approach is predominantly practiced, whereas a biological
5 approach is the mainstay of dental treatment of the carious primary dentition in the School of
6 Clinical Dentistry University of Sheffield (SCD). The conventional approaches included for
7 the purposes of this study were non-selective removal to hard dentine with or without pulp
8 therapy of primary teeth. In the non-selective removal to hard dentine, all CT was excavated
9 for all parts of the cavity, peripherally and pulpally, by tungsten carbide bur and hand
10 instruments, and only hard sound dentine was left indicated by scratchy sound produced by
11 scraping the tooth surface with a sharp hand excavator or dental probe. Pulp therapy involved
12 pulpotomy and pulpectomy.

13 The biological approaches included in the study were restorations placed using the principles
14 of selective removal to firm dentine and the Hall Technique. Selective removal to firm
15 dentine involved complete removal of the CT from the cavity margins leaving affected
16 dentine pulpally that is resistant to a hand excavator.

17 Approval was obtained from the Dental Research Ethics Committee (DREC), University of
18 Leeds, and the National Research Ethics Service (NRES).

19 The cost-effectiveness of the two treatment approaches was assessed retrospectively
20 whereas patient and carer acceptance was explored prospectively.

21 The inclusion criteria for the study were:

- 22 • Patients aged 4 to 9 years at the time of dental treatment.
- 23 • Patient with no significant health problem (ASA Physical Status-1 and 2).
- 24 • Regular attender; a child who has attended at least once every 12 months.
- 25 • Patient had at least one primary tooth (molar or anterior) with active CL extending
26 into dentine on radiographs.
- 27 • Tooth had no history of infection or swelling and no evidence of periapical
28 pathology or pulp exposure on initial clinical and radiographic diagnosis. Teeth
29 were asymptomatic or showed signs of reversible pulpitis.
- 30 • Pre-operative radiographs were available.

- 1 • For the cost effectiveness: treatment was performed with or without the use of
2 local anaesthesia (LA), inhalation sedation or general anaesthesia (GA) by
3 paediatric post graduate students under supervision of specialist staff or staff.
- 4 • For the patient and carer acceptance: treatment was performed with or without the
5 use of local anaesthesia (LA) by paediatric post graduate students under
6 supervision of specialist staff or staff.
- 7 • Participants (carers and children) must have signed informed written consent and
8 assent prior to participation as well as speak and understand the English language.

9

10 **Study design for cost effectiveness analysis**

11 The study sample was selected from clinical dental records of paediatric patients who were
12 registered at the two dental units and who had received dental treatment by either approach
13 between 2006-2012. Clinical records were identified using the hospital's computer system
14 and were reviewed alphabetically by one of the authors (A.B). The cost effectiveness of the
15 conventional and biological approaches was calculated from data collected on whether the
16 treatment was performed with or without LA, inhalation sedation or GA, restorations placed
17 and treatment outcome from treatment visits, recall visits, emergency appointments and post-
18 operative radiographs, using the cost incremental ratio. Data was recorded on a standardised
19 data abstraction proforma by a trained data abstractor (A.B). The intra-examiner reliability
20 was measured by evaluating 15% of the cases twice and was calculated using the Kappa
21 statistic. Intra-examiner reliability was found to equal 0.90 for all the information collected.
22 A pilot study was carried out before the start of the main study to assess the feasibility and
23 ease of the data collection. Neither the study protocol nor the data extraction proforma were
24 modified in light of the pilot study. Data extracted from patients' records for the pilot study
25 were therefore included in statistical analysis of the main study.

26 The total cost of each treatment approach was calculated in Pound Sterling (£) and at the
27 patient level. It included:

- 28 ▪ Cost of time consumed by dentists and overheads such as the dental nurse to carry out
29 the treatment as proposed by Curtis 2012 which was found to equal £0.97 per minute.
- 30
- 31 ▪ Cost of treatment carried out including the cost of inhalation sedation and GAs. All
32 materials used for the treatment of carious primary teeth in the study ranging from a

1 cotton pledget to preformed metal crown (PMC) were noted and their cost was
2 calculated from different sources. The sources were mainly the suppliers` official
3 websites as well as invoices and figures of actual material costs, obtained from the
4 purchasing department staff in the NHS. Information on cost of materials was based
5 on manufacturer recommendations.

- 6
- 7 ■ Cost of treatment failures including extractions, restoration of recurrent caries,
8 replacement of a lost filling or crown and pulp therapies.
- 9

10 **Time consumed per treatment**

11 **Time consumed to carry out the conventional restoration**

12 The conventional approach including non-selective removal to hard dentine with or
13 without pulpotomy was timed prospectively from the moment the child sat on the dental
14 chair till the end of the dental treatment for 10 postgraduate students and staff. All
15 treatments were timed using an electronic timer by the researcher (A.B)

16 Half of the candidates performed non-selective removal to hard dentine restored with
17 resin composite (n= 15 teeth) whereas the other half did pulpotomy followed with PMCs
18 (n= 15 teeth).

19 The average time for both procedures was approximately 30 minutes if one primary tooth
20 was restored. Whereas if two primary teeth were to be restored, the average time of dental
21 treatment provided to the two teeth was found to be around 40 minutes.

22

23 **Time consumed to carry out the biological restoration**

24 Hall Technique was timed prospectively for four postgraduates and staff over two visits
25 for different patients (n= 12 primary molars). Separators were usually placed on the
26 patient`s first visit to the SCD followed by placing PMCs using the Hall Technique on
27 latter visits. Each clinician placed three PMCs using Hall Technique. All treatments were
28 timed using an electronic timer by the researcher (A.B).

29 Insertion of separators consumed 10 minutes on average whereas placing PMC using Hall
30 Technique consumed approximately 12 minutes if one primary molar was sealed with the
31 Hall Technique and 22 minutes if two primary molars received the Hall Technique at the
32 same visit.

1 Regarding the selective removal to firm dentine (n=5 primary teeth), it was found the
2 procedure consumed 30 minutes on average if one primary tooth to be restored and 40
3 minutes if two primary teeth were restored at the same visit.

5 **Study design for patient acceptance of treatment received**

6 The study sample was identified from paediatric patients and their carers who attended for
7 the treatment of the child's carious primary teeth at the two dental hospitals with either
8 approach from 2013-2015.

9 Potential participants were approached by the researchers (A.B for LDI and C.D for SCD) at
10 the new paediatric patient consultation clinic at the two dental units to invite them to
11 participate. Carers and children who fulfilled the inclusion criteria of the study completed a
12 questionnaire on the acceptance of the two treatment approaches following their dental
13 treatment. Children were assisted by the researchers reading the questions while the child
14 pointed to the appropriate face on the scale that represented their experience. The
15 interviewers were different from the staff that performed the dental treatments, and were
16 trained in the reading and intonation of each question, and option responses to avoid any
17 interference and bias. Questionnaires distributed to carers were self-administered.

18 In addition, dental anxiety towards dental treatment was assessed among the children in the
19 present study using the faces version of the Modified Child Dental Anxiety Scale (Howard
20 and Freeman, 2007). Patients completed the questionnaire prior to their dental treatment
21 using face to face interview. Children were assisted by the researchers by reading the
22 questions while the child pointed to the appropriate face on the scale that represented their
23 anxiety. This was carried out to ensure that participants who received conventional and
24 biological treatment approaches had similar anxiety level towards the dental treatment.

25 **Study measures**

26 Two questionnaires using a visual analogue scale were developed by the researcher (A.B)
27 which aimed to assess the acceptance of both treatment approaches, conventional and
28 biological, among children and carers receiving dental treatment with or without LA. The
29 questionnaires were named "Children satisfaction with dental treatment" and "Parents`
30 satisfaction with their children dental treatment". Some of the questions used were adapted
31 from questionnaires used previously at the University of Sheffield [Bell et al., 2010].

1 **Piloting and validation of the questionnaires**

2 The questionnaires were piloted among a sample of 30 pairs of carers and their children
3 aged 4-9 years. Participants in the pilot study were included in the main sample. Neither the
4 questions nor the answers were modified after the pilot study. In addition construct validation
5 was carried out for both questionnaires (n=110 for each questionnaire) after data collection to
6 establish the psychometric properties using factor analysis and screen plot. A cut off point of
7 0.30 was set for factor loading.

8 Further evaluation of the psychometric properties of the new questionnaires was assessed
9 using Exploratory Actor Analysis (Varimax rotated component matrix with Kaiser
10 normalisation) and Scree plot. In addition, internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha was
11 performed.

12 **Children's satisfaction with dental treatment questionnaire**

13 The questionnaire consisted of 12 questions in total; nine closed questions and three open
14 questions. Closed questions had 2 items aiming to explore children satisfaction with their
15 treatment experience at the dentist, 5 items exploring acceptance of the dental treatment they
16 received: dental injection, drilling, placing rubber dam on, having PMC or a filling placed.
17 Finally there were 2 items exploring children's communication with the dental team.
18 Responses to closed questions were given through 3 or 4-point scales aided by a
19 prompt/explanation card with appropriate faces. Responses to open questions were gathered
20 and grouped into themes.

21 **Parents' satisfaction with their children dental treatment**

22 The questionnaire consisted of nine questions in total; six closed questions and three open
23 questions. The closed questions aimed to explore carer's satisfaction with their child's
24 experience at the dentist (2 items), parent's acceptance of the conventional and biological
25 treatment their child received (1 item) and carers' communication with the dental team (3
26 items). Responses to closed questions were given through 3 and 5-point scales and responses
27 to open questions were gathered and grouped into themes.

28

29 **Sample size calculation**

30 Data obtained from the pilot study were used to calculate the power and sample size of the
31 retrospective cohort study using PASS (Power Analysis and Sample Size) software (version

1 11.0.8; PASS, NCSS, LLC). The total number of teeth obtained in the conventional and
 2 biological approaches in the pilot study was 92 and 50 teeth, respectively. In addition, 96% of
 3 the teeth in the conventional approach remained asymptomatic in place till the last follow-up
 4 visit compared to 100% for the teeth in the biological approach. Based on this data, it was
 5 found that a minimum of 192 teeth were required in each treatment approach in order to
 6 achieve 80% power to detect a difference between the group proportions of 0.04 using the
 7 two-sided Z test with pooled variance and significant level at 0.05.

8 Power and sample size of the prospective cohort study was calculated using the interclass
 9 correlation coefficient (ICC). Acceptance rates of 10% and 40% in the two treatment
 10 approaches respectively were assumed, in addition to a significance level of 5% and power of
 11 90%, a sample size of 49 participants was indicated per treatment. A dropout rate of 15% was
 12 anticipated; therefore the sample size was increased to 55 participants (carers and their
 13 children) from both participating specialist dental centres.

14

15 **Data Management and Data Analysis**

16 Data was entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 22. Data
 17 analysis for the cost effectiveness was carried out at patient level and probability values \leq
 18 0.05 were considered statistically significant. T-test was used to compare the mean cost of the
 19 two treatment approaches. The cost effectiveness of both approaches was calculated using the
 20 incremental cost ratio as below:

21 *Incremental cost ratio*

$$22 = \frac{\text{average cost of conventional approach per patient} - \text{average cost of biological approach per patient}}{\text{proportion of teeth remained asymptomatic in conventional} - \text{proportion of teeth in biological}}$$

23

24 To account for the clustering in the data, multi-level models were used to analyse the data in
 25 the study. Univariate general linear model using SPSS version 22 was fitted to assess the
 26 association of the independent variables with the “total cost of treatment” as dependent
 27 variable. The independent variables included treatment approach, treatment received
 28 (complete CT removal, pulpotomy, Hall Technique, and IPC), age of patient, gender, and
 29 initial diagnosis of the tooth (one surface cavities vs two surface cavities).

30

31 All data collected on parental and child acceptance of the conventional and biological
 32 treatment were presented in terms of proportions. All responses to the open questions were

1 grouped into themes and analyzed in terms of proportions. Cronbach's alpha was used to
2 assess the internal consistency of the newly developed questionnaires.

3
4

5 **Results**

6 **Baseline characteristics**

7 The clinical records of 1,200 patients were reviewed from LDI and SCD with 246 case notes
8 fulfilling the inclusion criteria; 114 were for the conventional approach and 132 for the
9 biological approach. In total, the cost effectiveness of 836 carious primary teeth with two
10 different treatment modalities were analyzed; 428 and 408 teeth were from the conventional
11 and biological approaches respectively. Description of the study sample is outlined in Table
12 1. The median age of the children was 5.8 ± 1.52 years (range 4-9 years) with more than half
13 of the patients being females.

14 In addition, 110 children and their carers completed questionnaires on treatment acceptance
15 with either approach and dental anxiety; 55 were from LDI and had received restorations with
16 a conventional approach and a same figure were from SCD and were treated with the
17 biological approach. The median age of the children was 7.0 ± 1.4 years (range 4-9 years)
18 with more than half of the patients being male (50.9%).

19 **Treatment characteristics**

20 Conventional and biological approaches were carried out on 51.2% and 48.8% of the teeth
21 in the sample, respectively. More than two thirds (75.7%) of the restorations in the
22 conventional approach were of non-selective removal to hard dentine followed by pulpotomy
23 (24.3%). In the biological approach, the majority of the restorations were placed with the
24 Hall Technique (95%) followed by selective removal to firm dentine (5%).

25 Of the 836 teeth; 46.4% (388) had the Hall Technique, 38.8% (324) had non-selective
26 removal to hard dentine, 12.4% (104) had pulpotomy and only 2.4% (20) received selective
27 removal to firm dentine.

28 Resin composite was the restoration of choice for most of the teeth with non-selective
29 removal to hard dentine (71.6%) while PMC was placed for most of the teeth with selective
30 removal to firm dentine (75%). All teeth that received pulpotomy and Hall Technique had

1 PMCs placed immediately after the dental treatment. Teeth were followed for a period up to
2 77 months (median = 12 ± 11.6).

3 Of the 110 patients in the prospective cohort study, 43.6% had non-selective removal to
4 hard dentine, 44.5% had PMC placed using Hall Technique, 6.4% had pulpotomy, and 5.5%
5 received selective removal to firm dentine. Resin composite was the restoration of choice for
6 teeth with non-selective removal to hard dentine. PMC was placed for all the teeth which
7 received pulpotomy and selective removal to firm dentine in the study. All patients in the
8 conventional approach received LA prior to the treatment compared to 8 patients in the
9 biological approach.

10 **Cost effectiveness of the two treatment approaches**

11 Of the 836 teeth followed up for the study, 95.3% of the teeth in the conventional approach
12 and 95.8% of the teeth in the biological approach remained asymptomatic in place at the final
13 follow-up visit after a median follow-up of 13 and 9 months, respectively ($p=0.722$). Using a
14 mixed-effect logistic regression model no significant association was found between
15 remained asymptomatic outcome and the approach used for treatment, age of the patient,
16 gender, initial diagnosis, and number of carious surfaces or tooth type. These results have
17 recently been reported [BaniHani et al., 2017]. However, the total cost of the conventional
18 restoration in the current study was almost two times the total cost of the biological
19 restoration with a mean cost of £168.68 per patient (Table 2). The mean cost of the biological
20 restoration was £78.97.

21 Using the incremental cost ratio, the conventional approach carried out with or without LA,
22 inhalation sedation and GA had a cost £89.6 more than the biological approach and was only
23 0.5% less effective in retaining primary teeth asymptotically in place ($p<0.001$). The
24 results were relatively similar when cost effectiveness was calculated for the two treatment
25 approaches performed with or without LA with the conventional restorations costing £47.43
26 more and 1.3% less effective in maintaining primary teeth asymptotically in place.

27 In addition, the majority of the patients in the current study were found to have six primary
28 teeth treated on average with either approach (17.2%) followed by four (16.7%) and three
29 teeth (15.6%). The mean cost of treatment provided to patients with six restored primary teeth
30 was compared for conventional versus biological approaches using independent sample t-test.

1 A statistically significant difference was found among the two approaches with a mean cost
2 of difference of £70.34 in favour of the biological approach ($p < 0.001$).

3 **The effect of independent factors on the cost of the two treatment approaches**

4 Only age of the patient and treatment approach were found to affect the total cost of
5 treatment provided using univariate general linear model of analysis after adjusting for the
6 independent factors namely age of patient, gender, initial diagnosis of the tooth (one surface
7 versus two or more surface cavities) and treatment approach (conventional versus biological)
8 ($p < 0.001$ and $p = 0.004$, respectively). Higher cost was seen with the conventional approach
9 in the younger age group of children.

10 **Children and carers acceptance of the conventional and biological approaches**

11 Description of children and carers' responses to 'children acceptance of dental treatment'
12 and 'parents' acceptance of dental treatment' questionnaires in both treatment approaches are
13 summarized in Tables 3-6. In the conventional approach, two thirds (70.9%) of the children
14 were positive about the conventional restorations they received and the majority (90.9%)
15 were very happy with their experience at the dentist. Likewise, the majority (>94.5%) of the
16 carers were pleased with the conventional restorations their children received and happy for
17 their children to have the treatment again.

18 For the biological approach, more than half (58.2%) of the children in the study were
19 positive about the crowns placed with the Hall technique or selective removal of caries they
20 received and two thirds (67.3%) were happy with their experience at the dentist. In addition,
21 most of the carers were happy (89.1%) with the biological restorations their children received
22 and would be happy (96.4%) for their children to have the treatment again.

23 The majority (80%) of the children in the study were not worried about going to the dentist
24 in general. No statistical significant difference was found between the total Faces version-
25 MCDAS scores among children received the conventional versus the biological approach ($p =$
26 0.841) suggesting that children who attended for the conventional and biological treatment
27 approaches had similar anxiety levels. The mean score of Faces version-MCDAS for the
28 sample was $12.4 (\pm 5.13)$; 12.1 ± 4.64 and 12.4 ± 5.6 for the conventional and biological
29 approaches, respectively. None of the participants were extremely dentally anxious (score of
30 ≥ 26)

31

1 Discussion

2 The current study is one of the first to investigate the cost effectiveness and patient
3 acceptance of these two treatment approaches, a conventional and a biological, from two
4 perspectives; child and carer, for the treatment of deep CL in primary teeth in children.

5 The methodology adopted for the study was robust in that the cost of every single material
6 and piece of equipment used was taken into consideration and entered into a detailed cost
7 analysis investigation. In addition, two new questionnaires using a visual analogue scale were
8 developed by the researcher bringing new elements into the literature. The questionnaires
9 aimed to assess patient and carer acceptance, response and satisfaction with both approaches.

10 The strength of the present study was that the two treatment approaches were carried out to
11 their highest standards as they were administered by specialist paediatric dentists at two
12 specialised dental hospitals in the UK. Teeth in the conventional and biological approaches
13 were restored after taking into consideration any possible pulp inflammation, longevity of the
14 restorative materials and principles of cavity design [Duggal et al., 2002]. Moreover,
15 specialist paediatric dentists are trained at putting the child at ease and reducing the
16 discomfort and anxiety associated with dental treatment. This child friendly environment
17 would nurture a positive dental attitude among the paediatric patients and the accompanying
18 carers.

19 This study's principal finding was that although the number of teeth that remained
20 asymptomatic at the last follow-up visit did not differ significantly among the two treatment
21 approaches, the biological approach was more cost effective. The present study's results were
22 in agreement with the limited data available in the literature. Schwendicke et al (2013b,
23 2014) reported that selective excavation (one-step incomplete) was more effective and less
24 costly than stepwise (two-step incomplete) and complete caries excavation for all posterior
25 teeth over the lifetime of a male German patient initially aged 15 and 18 years with a
26 remaining life expectancy of 60 years regardless of an individual's caries risk using tooth-
27 level Markov-model. Currently, no data is available in the literature on the cost-effectiveness
28 of the hall technique

29 The conventional restorations in the present study had cost nearly two times the cost of the
30 biological restorations. There are several factors that would have contributed to these
31 findings. The conventional approach in the present study included a slightly smaller number
32 of patients (114 compared to 132 patients), however, a greater number of teeth were treated

1 among this group of patients (428 teeth compared to 408 teeth). Therefore, greater number of
2 treatments were carried out in the latter intervention with more restorative material being
3 used. Unlike the biological approach, conventional restoration consumes more dental
4 materials such as LA, rubber dam, liner/base, restoration materials and pulpotomy materials
5 especially if Mineral Trioxide Aggregate (MTA) has been used as a pulpotomy medicament,
6 which is a relatively expensive material. In the current study, 20% of the teeth that received
7 pulpotomy had MTA as a pulpotomy medicament costing nearly £60 per pulpotomy. The
8 cost of MTA pulpotomy was found to be six times the cost of ferric sulphate pulpotomy.

9 The Hall Technique was found to cost the least among the four treatment groups. The latter
10 constituted the majority of the treatments included in the biological approach (95.1%)
11 contributing to the lower cost seen within this treatment approach in this study. In addition,
12 more patients in the conventional approach had their dental restoration under GA (7 patients)
13 and inhalation sedation (one patient) compared to one patient who received biological
14 restorations under GA with average cost of £837 and £703 for treatment under GA and
15 inhalation sedation per patient, respectively.

16 The significance of getting children as well as carers to express their opinions about
17 treatment experiences is becoming increasingly important in dentistry [Marshman and Hall,
18 2008]. At the present, there is a growing interest among the clinicians and researchers in
19 investigating the acceptability of the conventional and biological restorative approaches
20 [Innes et al., 2007; Page et al., 2014; Santamaria et al., 2015]. However, none of the
21 aforementioned studies explored children and carers satisfaction, acceptance and response to
22 the conventional and biological approaches from two perspectives: child and carers.

23 The most significant finding of the current study is that the two treatment approaches, the
24 conventional and biological, were very well accepted by children and carers for the treatment
25 of carious primary teeth. The majority of the children, slightly more for conventional (70.9%)
26 compared with the biological (58.2%), and their carers (>92.7% for the conventional
27 and >89.2% for the biological) in the current study were happy with the approach used for
28 their child. The present study's results were in agreement with the limited data available in
29 the literature. Santamaria et al. [2015] reported that the majority of the carers were very
30 satisfied with the Hall Technique that their children received and were happy for their
31 children to have the treatment again. Page et al. [2014] found that most of the children had

1 positive opinions about the Hall Technique, reporting an even higher rate of acceptance
2 (90%).

3 A common theme that arose from both treatment approaches was parental and children
4 perceptions of communication between the dental staff and the child patient and the carers.
5 Dentists at both dental units were acknowledged for being friendly, kind as well as for their
6 ability to put the child at ease and reduce his/her anxiety throughout the dental treatment.
7 Also dentists were valued for explaining the dental treatment and re-assuring the child
8 constantly all through the dental visit. The findings of the current study reflect the importance
9 of establishing effective communication and building a trusting relationship between dentist,
10 child and carer, whichever treatment approach might be agreed. The dentist`s attitude, body
11 language and communication skills are critical to create a positive dental visit for the child
12 and to gain trust from the child and carer. In addition, the clinical staff are an extension of the
13 dentist in behaviour guidance of the patient and communication with the carer.

14 Similarity was seen in the responses reported by carers and children in terms of the
15 advantages and disadvantages of the conventional restoration in the present study except for
16 the “Communication” which emerged as a unique theme related to the advantages of the
17 conventional treatment. Effective communication between the dentist and the child was the
18 key to successful treatment and it included pro-active engagement of the child by handing
19 him a mirror to watch the dental treatment and giving the child breaks during the treatment
20 session. Surprisingly, having a dental injection was among the advantages of the conventional
21 approach reported by children and carers. Other reported advantages were teeth drilling,
22 filling and having the PMC put on using the conventional approach.

23 On the other hand, the drawbacks of the conventional approach from child and carers`
24 perspective in the present study were mainly found to be elements of discomfort related to the
25 nature of the treatment. This included the discomfort associated with the dental injection, the
26 difficulty of the child keeping their mouth open and staying still throughout the dental
27 treatment, having the rubber dam on, tooth drilled, filling placed, and having the PMC put on
28 using the conventional approach.

29 Numerous advantages and disadvantages were noted for the biological restoration by the
30 carers and children in the study. No injection needed, the relative brevity of the procedure,
31 and the easiness of placing the Hall PMC as well as the separator bands for Hall Technique
32 were among the advantages of the biological restoration reported by carers. Some children

1 perceived Hall crowns as ‘cool’ and shiny (perception of specialness). Others reported the
2 ease of placing the Hall PMC and getting stickers as a reward for their cooperation during the
3 dental treatment among the advantages of the biological restoration. The latter highlighted the
4 significance of positive reinforcement in children behavior management. The lack of the need
5 to give the child a dental injection and the relative brevity of the procedure were advantages
6 the Hall Technique have previously been reported as potential advantages of the Hall
7 Technique [Innes et al., 2006; Innes and Evans, 2013; Page et al., 2014].

8 On the other hand, few common disadvantages were described by children and carers for the
9 biological restoration largely related to elements of treatment procedure. These included
10 discomfort and pain associated with pushing the Hall PMCs on as well as placing the
11 separators, the taste of “the glue” associated with Hall Technique and annoyance associated
12 with having the gauze in the mouth during the placement of the Hall PMCs. In a study by
13 Innes et al. [2007] children were found to dislike the taste of the excess glass ionomer cement
14 extruded from the margins of the crown in Hall Technique. Moreover, more than half of the
15 carers in a previously reported study [Page et al., 2014] had negative views about placing the
16 separator rings prior to the placement of Hall PMCs.

17 One of the concerns reported in the literature with the Hall Technique has been the occlusal
18 interference [Innes et al., 2007]. This was not an issue in the present study. None of the
19 children or carers complained of occlusal issues when they were interviewed either directly
20 following the dental treatment or at 3-6 months following the dental intervention.

21 The literature and recently published studies (BaniHani et al, 2017) have shown the
22 advantages and the successful outcomes of selective caries removal, or the biological
23 approach, which is associated with lower discomfort for children. The present study has
24 clearly shown a clear advantage of the biological approach consisting mainly of Hall
25 Technique in terms of its cost-effectiveness. Although this study had limitations that it was
26 carried out in two specialist centres and with an overwhelming choice of hall technique in
27 biological approach, a cautious extrapolation of the results to a primary care provider setting
28 can be made.

29 **Conclusion:**

30 Although both a conventional and a biological approach had similar outcomes for the
31 treatment of deep carious lesion in primary teeth in children, the biological approach adopted
32 in this study consisting mainly of Hall technique was significantly more cost-effective. The

1 conventional and biological treatment approaches were both highly accepted among children
2 and carers for the treatment of carious primary teeth.

3

4 **Acknowledgments**

5 The authors would like to thank Professor Claire Hulme (Professor of Economics at Leeds
6 Institute of Health Sciences) and Dr. Zoe Marshman (Honorary Consultant in Dental Public
7 Health, University of Sheffield) for their invaluable input in the study.

8 Author contributions: A.B, C.D, J.T and M.D conceived the ideas; A.B collected the data;
9 A.B analysed the data; A.B, C.D and M.D all contributed to the writing.

10

11

12 **References:**

13 Banerjee A, Frencken J.E, Schwendicke F, Innes N. Contemporary operative caries
14 management: consensus recommendations on minimally invasive caries removal. *British*
15 *Dental Journal* 2017; 223 (3): 215-222

16 BaniHani A, Duggal M, Toumba J, Deery C: Outcomes of the conventional and biological
17 treatment approaches for the management of caries in the primary dentition. In Press
18 *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2017: 1-11.

19 Bell SJ, Morgan AG, Marshman Z, Rodd HD: Child and parental acceptance of preformed
20 metal crowns. *European Archives of Paediatric Dentistry* 2010; 11(5): 218-224.

21 Cunningham S: Economics: Economic evaluation of healthcare—is it important to us?. *British*
22 *dental journal* 2000; 188(5): 250-254.

23

24 Coll JA, Seale NS, Vargas K, Marghalani AA, Al Shamali S, Graham L: Primary tooth vital
25 pulp therapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pediatric Dentistry* 2017; 39(1): 16-
26 123.

27

- 1 Duggal M, Nooh A, High A: Response of the primary pulp to inflammation: a review of the
2 Leeds studies and challenges for the future. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2002;
3 3(3): 111-114.
4
- 5 Franzon R, Guimarães LF, Magalhães CE, Araujo FB: Outcomes of one-step incomplete and
6 complete excavation in primary teeth: a 24-month randomized controlled trial. *Caries
7 research* 2014; 48(5): 376-383.
8
- 9 Howard, K, and Freeman, R: Reliability and validity of a faces version of the Modified Child
10 Dental Anxiety Scale. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2007; 17(4): pp.281-288.
11
- 12 Hume WR: The pharmacologic and toxicological properties of zinc oxide-eugenol. *The
13 Journal of the American Dental Association* 1986; 113(5): 789-791.
14
- 15 Innes NPT, Stirrups DR, Evans DJP, Hall N, Leggate M: A novel technique using preformed
16 metal crowns for managing carious primary molars in general practice. A retrospective
17 analysis. *British Dental Journal* 2006; 200(8): 451-454.
18
- 19 Innes N, Evans DJ, Stirrups DR: The Hall Technique; a randomized controlled clinical trial
20 of a novel method of managing carious primary molars in general dental practice:
21 acceptability of the technique and outcomes at 23 months. *BMC Oral Health* 2007; 7:1-21.
22
- 23 Marshman Z, Hall MJ: Oral health research with children. *International Journal of Paediatric
24 Dentistry* 2008; 18(4): 235-242.
25
- 26 Page L, Boyd DH, Davidson SE, McKay SK, Thomson WM, Innes N. Acceptability of the
27 Hall Technique to parents and children. *The New Zealand Dental Journal* 2014; 110: 12-17.
28
- 29 Ricketts D, Lamont T, Innes N, Kidd E, Clarkson JE. Operative caries management in adults
30 and children. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013; 3. Art. No.:
31 CD003808.DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003808.pub3.

1 Rodd HD, Waterhouse PJ, Fuks AB, Fayle SA, Moffat MA: Pulp therapy for primary molars.
2 International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry 2006; 16: 15-23.

3
4 Santamaria RM, Innes N, Machiulskiene V, Evans DJ, Alkilzy M, Splieth CH. Acceptability
5 of different caries management methods for primary molars in a RCT. International Journal
6 of Paediatric Dentistry 2015; 25: 9-17.

7
8 Schwendicke F, Dörfer CE, Paris S. Incomplete caries removal a systematic review and meta-
9 analysis. Journal of Dental Research 2013a; 92: 306-314.

10
11 Schwendicke F, Stolpe M, Meyer-Lueckel H, Paris S, Dörfer CE: Cost-effectiveness of one-
12 and two-step incomplete and complete excavations. Journal of Dental Research
13 2013b;10:880-887.

14
15 Schwendicke F, Paris S, Stolpe M. Cost-effectiveness of caries excavations in different risk
16 groups - a micro-simulation study. BMC Oral Health 2014; 14 (153); 1-9.

17
18 **Legends:**

19
20 Table-1: Baseline characteristics of the participants in the study sample including age (years),
21 gender, teeth treated, initial diagnosis of teeth and dmft (sample size n = 246 patients and 836
22 teeth, conventional approach n = 114 patients and 428 teeth, biological approach n = 132
23 patients and 408 teeth).

24 Table-2: Descriptive data of the cost of treatment of the conventional and biological
25 treatment approaches (in Pound Sterling)

26 Table-3: Distribution of children's responses to children acceptance of dental treatment
27 questionnaire in both treatment approaches, the conventional and biological.

28 Table-4: Description of the themes that emerged from the open questions of the children's
29 acceptance of conventional and biological treatment approaches

30 Table-5: Description of parents' responses to parents' acceptance of dental treatment
31 questionnaire in both treatment approaches, conventional and biological.

1 Table-6: Description of the themes that emerged from the open questions of the parent's
2 acceptance of conventional and biological treatments

3
4

5 Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the participants in the study sample including age (years),
6 gender, teeth treated, initial diagnosis of teeth and dmft (sample size n = 246 patients and 836
7 teeth, conventional approach n = 114 patients and 428 teeth, biological approach n = 132
8 patients and 408 teeth).

9

Variable	Conventional approach n (%)	Biological approach n (%)	Study sample n (%)
Age at time of dental treatment			
Minimum	4.0 (14.9%)	4.0 (24.2%)	4.0 (19.9%)
Maximum	9.0 (7%)	9.0 (6.1%)	9.0 (6.5%)
Median	6.0 ± 1.52	4.0 ± 1.5	5.8 ± 1.52
Total	114 patients	132 patients	246 patients
Gender			
Male	51 (44.7%)	63 (47.7%)	114 (46.3%)
Female	63 (55.3%)	69 (52.3%)	132 (53.7%)
Teeth treated			
Second primary molar	224 (52.3%)	250 (61.3%)	474 (56.7%)
First primary molar	148 (34.6%)	157 (38.5%)	305 (36.5%)
Anterior	56 (13.1%)	1.0 (0.2%)	57 (6.8%)
Total	428 teeth	408 teeth	836 teeth
Initial diagnosis of teeth			
One surface cavity	180 (42.1%)	201 (49.3%)	381 (45.6%)
Two or more surface cavity	248 (57.9%)	207 (50.7%)	455 (54.4%)
Total	428	408	836
dmft			
Range	13	13	13
Median	8.0 ± 2.7	7.0 ± 2.6	7.0 ± 2.7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Table 2: Descriptive data of the cost of treatment of the conventional and biological treatment approaches (in Pound Sterling)

Descriptive statistics	Conventional approach N (£)	Biological approach N (£)
Total cost	19229.9	10438.4
Median	113.1 ±184.7	66.6 ± 80.9
95% confidence interval	134.4-202.9	65.05-92.898
Minimum	35.04	28.66
Maximum	875.21	900.40
Range	840.17	871.74

- 1 Table-3: Distribution of children's responses to children acceptance of dental treatment
- 2 questionnaire in both treatment approaches, the conventional and biological.
- 3

Question	Conventional Tx	Biological Tx
What do you think about the dental treatment you just had?		
Positive	39 (70.9%)	32 (58.2%)
Neutral	14 (25.5%)	16 (29.1%)
Negative	2.0 (3.6%)	7.0 (12.7%)
Total	55	55
How do you feel about:		
Having your teeth put to sleep to have the treatment done:		
Not bothered	42 (76.4%)	2.0 (25%)
Neutral	7.0 (12.7%)	4.0 (50%)
Very bothered	6.0 (10.9%)	2.0 (25%)
Total	55	8
Sound of the drill:		
Not bothered	44 (80%)	2.0 (33.3%)
Neutral	8.0 (14.5%)	3.0 (50%)
Very bothered	3.0 (5.5%)	1.0 (16.7%)
Total	55	6
Having the rain coat on:		
Not bothered	37 (72.5%)	7.0 (87.5%)
Neutral	3.0 (5.9%)	-
Very bothered	11 (21.6%)	1.0 (12.5%)
Total	51	8
What do you think of having the silver cap put on your tooth?		
Positive	12 (85.7%)	36 (65.5%)
Neutral	-	15 (27.3%)
Negative	2.0 (14.3%)	4.0 (7.3%)
Total	55	55
What do you think of having the filling put on your tooth?		
Positive	36 (75%)	-
Neutral	8.0 (16.7%)	-
Negative	4.0 (8.3%)	-
Total	48	
How do you feel about your experience at the dentist?		
I am very happy	50 (90.9%)	37 (67.3%)
Neutral	4.0 (7.3%)	12 (21.8%)
I am very unhappy	1.0 (1.8%)	6.0 (10.9%)
Total	55	55
How friendly the staff was on our clinic?		
Were very friendly	55 (100%)	55 (100%)
Neutral	-	-
Were very unfriendly	-	-
Total	55	55

How well did the dentist explain things to you?		
Very well	54 (98.2%)	52 (94.5%)
Neutral	1.0 (1.8%)	3.0 (5.5%)
Things were not explained	-	-
Total	55	55

1
2
3

1 Table-4: Description of the themes that emerged from the open questions of the children's
 2 acceptance of conventional and biological treatment approaches

3

Themes emerged related to conventional treatment		Themes emerged related biological treatment	
Theme	n= number of children	Theme	n= number of children
What do you like the most about the treatment?(48/55)		What do you like the most about the treatment?(21/55)	
1. Communication		1. Perception of Specialness	
Positive reinforcement	3	Cap looks cool	1
Pro-active engagement	3	Cap is shiny	10
2. Treatment procedure		2. Treatment procedure	
Having the dental injection	7	Having the crown on	4
Teeth drilling	9	Being easy to push down	2
Having the raincoat on	6	Having the elastic bands on	1
Having the dental filling	9		
Having the cap on	8		
3. Having the teeth checked before the treatment		3. Positive reinforcement	
	3	Getting stickers after finishing the dental treatment	3
What do you hate the most about the treatment? (32/55)		What do you hate the most about the treatment? (32/55)	
1. Elements of discomfort related to nature of treatment		1. Elements of discomfort related to nature of treatment	
Having the injection	11	Cap feels tight	1
Teeth drilling	3	Cap hurt when pushed down	16
Having raincoat on	9	Placing separators	3
Having the filling	5		
2. Negative sensory experience		2. Negative sensory experience	
Seeing the needle prior to injection	1	Taste of the glue	10
Numb feeling	2	Having the gauze in the floor of the mouth	1
Taste of the acid etch	1	Feeling associated with touching the crown	1

4

5

1

2 Table-5: Description of parents' responses to parents' acceptance of dental treatment

3 questionnaire in both treatment approaches, conventional and biological.

4

Questions	Conventional Tx (n=55)	Biological Tx (n=55)
My child coped well during the dental treatment...		
Strongly agree	37 (67.3%)	36 (65.5%)
Agree	15 (27.3%)	17 (30.9%)
No opinion	2.0 (3.6%)	-
Disagree	1.0 (1.8%)	2.0 (3.6%)
Strongly Disagree	-	-
How do you feel about your child experience at the dentist?		
I am very happy	51 (92.7%)	49 (89.1%)
Neutral	4.0 (7.3)	6.0 (10.9%)
I am very unhappy	-	-
The dentist explained very well why my child needed the provided dental treatment		
Strongly agree	45 (81.8%)	44 (80%)
Agree	9.0 (16.4%)	10 (18.2%)
No opinion	1.0 (1.8%)	-
Disagree	-	1.0 (1.8%)
Strongly Disagree	-	-
The dental team were kind during my child's dental treatment		
Strongly agree	47 (85.5%)	51 (92.7%)
Agree	7.0 (12.7%)	4.0 (7.3%)
No opinion	1.0 (1.8%)	-
Disagree	-	-
Strongly Disagree	-	-
Would you be happy for your child to have the dental treatment again?		
Yes	52 (94.5%)	53 (96.4%)
Neutral	3.0 (5.5%)	2.0 (3.6)
No	-	-

5
6

1 Table-6: Description of the themes that emerged from the open questions of the parent's
 2 acceptance of conventional and biological treatments

3

Themes emerged related to conventional treatment	Themes emerged related to biological treatment
Theme n=number of children	Theme n= number of children
<p>Is there anything you would like to say about your child dental Tx? (n=26/55)</p> <p>1. Communication:</p> <p>Anxiety reduction 8</p> <p>Explanation 6</p> <p>Re-assurance 2</p> <p>Showing gratitude 5</p> <p>2. Treatment procedure</p> <p>All comments were positive 5</p>	<p>Is there anything you would like to say about your child dental Tx? (n=21/55)</p> <p>1. Communication:</p> <p>Anxiety reduction 13</p> <p>Explanation 4</p> <p>Re-assurance 3</p> <p>2. Treatment procedure</p> <p>No L.A needed and treatment was fast 1</p>
<p>What do you think your child found the easiest? (n=27/55)</p> <p>1. Treatment procedure:</p> <p>Giving injection 8</p> <p>Teeth drilling 5</p> <p>Teeth filling 7</p> <p>Having the cap on 3</p> <p>2. Communication</p> <p><u>Re-assurance:</u></p> <p>Child been involved and spoken to directly 1</p> <p>Given breaks 1</p> <p><u>Pro-active engagement</u> 2</p>	<p>What do you think your child found the easiest? (n=5/55)</p> <p>1. Treatment procedure:</p> <p>No injection needed 1</p> <p>Having the silver cap on 3</p> <p>Getting the bands on 1</p>
<p>What do you think your child found the hardest? (n=32/55)</p> <p>1. Elements of discomfort related to nature of treatment</p> <p>Giving injection 13</p> <p>Having raincoat on 6</p> <p>Teeth drilling 1</p> <p>Having filling 1</p> <p>Having cap 1</p> <p>Keeping mouth open and still 10</p>	<p>What do you think your child found the hardest? (n=16/55)</p> <p>1. Elements of discomfort related to nature of treatment</p> <p>Pushing in the crown 7</p> <p>Placing the separators 3</p> <p>Keep the mouth open and still 4</p> <p>2. Negative sensory experience</p> <p>Taste of the glue 1</p> <p>Having the gauze in the mouth 1</p>

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20