Topical fluoride treatment

Is topical fluoride treatment (TFT) effective in preventing demineralization/white spot lesions in orthodontic treatment?

Current evidence suggests that TFT offers some benefit in preventing the development of white spot lesions (WSL) during orthodontic treatment. DEMINERALIZATION OR WSL OF ENAMEL ADJACENT TO ORTHODONTIC APPLIANCES "IS TFT EFFECTIVE IN PREVENTING DEMINERALIZATION/WSL?" WAS FORMULATED BY USING THE PICO GUIDELINES (P, population [orthodontic patient]; I, intervention [TFT]; C, comparison [placebo or no treatment]; O, outcome [demineralization/WSL]), AND RELEVANT ARTICLES WERE SEARCHED ACCORDINGLY. TO FOCUS ON THE MODE OF FLUORIDE DELIVERY, TFT WAS DEFINED AS THE APPLICATION OF FLUORIDE TO THE TEETH IN THE FORM OF GELS, VARNISHES, TOOTHPASTES OR DENTIFRICES, AND MOUTH RINSES. OTHER LOCAL FLUORIDE DELIVERY METHODS SUCH AS FLUORIDE-RELEASEING BONDING MATERIALS, ELASTICS, CEMENTS, AND SEALANTS WERE EXCLUDED FOR THIS REVIEW. THE LITERATURE WAS SEARCHED FOR META-ANALYSES, SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS, AND RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS (RCTS; PUBLISHED AFTER THE LAST SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OR META-ANALYSIS) IN PUBMED, COCHRANE DATABASE, AND GOOGLE SCHOLAR; HAND SEARCHING WAS ALSO DONE OF REFERENCES LISTS, WITH THE KEY WORDS ORTHODONTICS, FLUORIDE, BRACES, WHITE SPOTS, CARIES, DEMINERALIZATION, AND PREVENTIVE THERAPY. SIX ARTICLES WERE IDENTIFIED THAT MET THE CRITERIA AND WERE INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW.

Of these 6 articles, the following are the critical appraisal and the synthesis of the evidence. The first 2 systematic reviews on the subject were written by the same authors. In both, they recommended that patients with fixed orthodontic appliances should rinse daily with a 0.05% sodium fluoride mouth rinse. These conclusions were essentially extrapolated from studies of nonorthodontic patients. Many studies related to orthodontic patients were reported in these systematic reviews but were found to be inadequate in research design with regard to randomization, allocation concealment, error method, assessor blinding, baseline comparison, and clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. It was also reported that compliance with daily use of a mouth rinse is less than 15% in the orthodontic population. Thus, the conclusions based on these 2 reviews are limited.

The systematic review by Derks et al found no convincing evidence about the efficacy of TFT in orthodontic patients. The authors reported that, although a trend for reduction of WSL was observed with a topical toothpaste and a gel with high fluoride (1500-5000 ppm), no specific guidelines for TFT recommendation could be drawn from this study.

Chadwick et al found evidence from qualifying studies that the use of topical fluorides (0.05% sodium fluoride rinse, 0.4% stannous fluoride gel, and sodium fluoride gel 1.1%, 5000 ppm) in addition to fluoride toothpaste (1000, 1500, 5000 ppm) in addition to fluoride toothpaste (1000, 1500, 5000 ppm)
and 5000 ppm) reduced the incidence of WSL in orthodontic patients. The preventive effect of fluoride was observed in orthodontic patients with both fluoridated and nonfluoridated water supplies. All formulations of fluoride were reported to decrease WSL, but there was no conclusive evidence that any method was superior. The authors reported that increasing the potency of fluoride preparations resulted in significantly fewer decalcification sites. It was found that brushing with a high-potency sodium fluoride gel (1.1%, 5000 ppm) after normal brushing at night, and high-potency (1.1%, 5000 ppm) sodium fluoride toothpaste used twice daily resulted in fewer WSL ($P < 0.05$) than in the control group brushing twice daily with a fluoride toothpaste (1000 ppm) and rinsing once a day with a 0.05% acidulated phosphofluoride rinse.

The systematic reviews presented only a qualitative assessment and a trend toward reduction of WSL in orthodontic patients with TFT. The authors noted that no selected study fulfilled all methodologic quality-assessment criteria. All COSA members concluded that the systematic reviews provided only weak, indirect, or secondary level of evidence for the use of TFT in orthodontic patients. The evidence suggests that increasing the potency of fluoride and the frequency of application might have value in increasing resistance to demineralization and prevention of WSL.

Since the last systematic review, 2 randomized trials have been published. Ogaard et al$^{12}$ reported evidence in favor of amine fluoride/stannous fluoride toothpaste (AmF/SnF$_2$; 140 ppm F; pH 4.5) used twice daily with a daily rinse of AmF/SnF$_2$ solution (250 ppm F; pH 4.0) over a sodium fluoride (NaF; 1400 ppm F; pH 6.7) toothpaste and NaF rinse (250 ppm; pH 6.3) combination used similarly. A limitation of this study was its lack of a control group. In addition, although statistical significance was observed in favor of 1 TFT modal, it did not eliminate the development of WSL completely.

The most recent RCT, by Steckens-Blicks et al.$^{13}$ presents the most robust evidence about the protective effect of regular topical fluoride varnish applications during orthodontic treatment. This was a double-blind RCT with 2 parallel arms in which consecutively treated patients were examined ($n = 273$; 257 subjects completed the trial). Both the experimental ($n = 132$) and the control ($n = 125$) groups had similar numbers of WSL before treatment. The active agent used in the experimental group was 0.1% fluoride as difluorosilane in a polyurethane varnish base (commercially available as Fluor Protector, Ivoclar Vivadent, Schaan, Lichtenstein). The placebo varnish had an identical composition but no fluoride. The varnish was applied every sixth week during the treatment period. Digital photographs were used by 2 examiners at debonding to assess the incidence and progression of WSL on the maxillary incisors, canines, and premolars. The post-treatment incidences of WSL were 7.4% in the fluoride varnish group and 25.3% in the placebo group ($P < 0.001$). The authors concluded that the results strongly suggest that regular topical fluoride varnish should be a routine preventive measure in orthodontic practice.$^{13}$ Once again, it was noted that, although fluoride varnish significantly reduced the incidence of WSL, it did not totally prevent WSL formation.

An absolute prevention of WSL perhaps requires both immaculate plaque control and increasing enamel resistance to demineralization. Plaque control depends on the patient, and should be emphasized and reinforced periodically. With regard to TFT, all COSA members agreed that there is some evidence that TFT is helpful in preventing WSL. However, it is still unclear which fluoride agents are most effective. Future RCTs are necessary to address the various formulations, concentrations, and frequencies of application.
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