



Response to letter to the editor by Jan Kühnisch

Falk Schwendicke¹ · Christian Splieth² · Lorenzo Breschi³ · Avijit Banerjee⁴ · Margherita Fontana⁵ · Sebastian Paris¹ · Michael Burrow⁶ · Felicity Crombie⁷ · Lyndie Foster Page⁸ · Patricia Gatón-Hernández^{9,10} · Rodrigo A. Giacaman¹¹ · Neeraj Gugnani¹² · Reinhard Hickel¹³ · Rainer A. Jordan¹⁴ · Soraya Leal¹⁵ · Edward Lo⁶ · Hervé Tassery¹⁶ · William Murray Thomson⁸ · David J. Manton⁷

Received: 19 March 2020 / Accepted: 26 March 2020 / Published online: 24 April 2020
© The Author(s) 2020

We welcome Dr. Kühnisch's critique and the chance to comment on it. We see three main aspects to be commented on: (1) The generalizability or, vice versa, specification of our recommendations to health systems, dentitions, and individuals. (2) The use of cavitation, cleansability, lesion activity, and caries extent as decision parameters. (3) The application of what we termed "mixed interventions" for different dentitions and different depth of lesions.

We would like to respond briefly as follows: (1) The recommendations attempted to provide decision principles which are widely applicable and independent from specific healthcare systems. Wherever possible, we tried to lay out dentition specific aspects and clarified the dentition as the modifier for decision making. The same applies to individuals of different (caries) risk. A recommendation paper such as ours and consented recommendations like those made are not very useful when they are too specific, as then they are

rather highly granular and usually only applicable for specific healthcare situations and indications, and not generalizable any longer. It goes without saying that healthcare specific recommendations, for example, along with remuneration aspects, are beyond the scope of a document like ours. It was also clarified that national papers, possibly allowing more specific dedication to such aspects, will be or have been published. (2) The laid-out principles and decision parameters are those the group felt most suitable, applicable, and grounded in evidence (notably, and also clarified, usually not on strong levels of evidence). We would like to point out that if there was strong evidence, such a consensus statement would probably not be as relevant and required any longer, as the evidence "speaks for itself". Especially in areas where strong evidence is absent (and, for some questions, may remain absent indefinitely), clinicians may benefit from expert opinion. We also add that we agree with Dr. Kühnisch and his point

✉ Falk Schwendicke
falk.schwendicke@charite.de

¹ Department of Operative and Preventive Dentistry, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Aßmannshäuser Str. 4-6, 14197 Berlin, Germany

² Preventive & Pediatric Dentistry, University of Greifswald, Greifswald, Germany

³ Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, DIBINEM, University of Bologna-Alma Mater Studiorum, Bologna, Italy

⁴ Conservative & MI Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences, King's Health Partners, King's College London, London, UK

⁵ Department of Cariology, Restorative Sciences and Endodontics, School of Dentistry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

⁶ Faculty of Dentistry, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong, SAR, China

⁷ Melbourne Dental School, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

⁸ Department of Oral Sciences, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Otago, Otago, New Zealand

⁹ Department of Dentistry, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

¹⁰ Faculdade de Odontologia de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

¹¹ Cariology Unit, Department of Oral Rehabilitation, University of Talca, Talca, Chile

¹² Department of Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry, DAV (C) Dental College, Yamunanagar, Haryana, India

¹³ Department of Conservative Dentistry and Periodontology, University Hospital, LMU, Munich, Germany

¹⁴ Institute of German Dentists, Cologne, Germany

¹⁵ Department of Dentistry, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil

¹⁶ Faculty of Dentistry, AMU University, Marseille, France

about caries extent: Caries extent or experience has been found a relevant marker to assess caries risk and therefore its assessment is recommended. We included caries risk in our paper as a decision modifier. (3) Mixed interventions have been applied in a range of indications, e.g., Hall Technique in primary molars and non-restorative cavity control (NRCC) in both primary teeth and root caries in permanent teeth. We do not insinuate the application of both techniques beyond these indications. Moreover, we make very clear that the evidence supporting the Hall Technique is reassuring, while that for NRCC is rather weak and dentists should only carefully apply this measure. We welcome our recommendations being complemented by other statements or guidelines and do not necessarily see any contradictions. We highlight several points where decision making will be guided by a range of factors not reflected in such consensus statements, including further patient and tooth level factors, but also the dentist's experience and patient's expectations as well as health system contexts. Overall, we appreciate Dr. Kühnisch's comments, as they complement our recommendations and contribute to a constructive debate on this most important topic.

Funding information Open Access funding provided by Projekt DEAL. The conference was kindly sponsored by DMG (Hamburg, Germany). This included travel, accommodation, and conference costs for panel members. The sponsor had no role in design or conduct of the conference

or the content of this manuscript and was not present during the conference. No honoraria were given to any of the panel members.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Informed consent For this type of study, formal consent is not required.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Schwendicke, F; Splieth, C; Breschi, L; Banerjee, A; Fontana, M; Paris, S; Burrow, M; Crombie, F; Page, LF; Gatón-Hernández, P; Giacaman, RA; Gugnani, N; Hickel, R; Jordan, RA; Leal, S; Lo, E; Tassery, H; Thomson, WM; Manton, DJ

Title:

Response to letter to the editor by Jan Kuhnisch

Date:

2020-04-24

Citation:

Schwendicke, F., Splieth, C., Breschi, L., Banerjee, A., Fontana, M., Paris, S., Burrow, M., Crombie, F., Page, L. F., Gatón-Hernández, P., Giacaman, R. A., Gugnani, N., Hickel, R., Jordan, R. A., Leal, S., Lo, E., Tassery, H., Thomson, W. M. & Manton, D. J. (2020). Response to letter to the editor by Jan Kuhnisch. CLINICAL ORAL INVESTIGATIONS, 24 (6), pp.2139-2140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-020-03269-6>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/252046>

File Description:

Published version

License:

cc-by