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Management of post-orthodontic white spot lesions: an updated systematic review

Summary

Background/objectives: The management of post-orthodontic white spot lesions is based on remineralization strategies or a minimal-invasive camouflage of the lesions.

Aim: The aim of this systematic review was to identify and assess the quality of evidence for the various clinical technologies.

Search methods: Four databases were searched for relevant literature published in English between 2011 and October 31 2015 according to a pre-determined PICO. Only controlled clinical studies were considered. Abstract lists and the selected full-text papers were independently examined by two reviewers and any differences were solved in consensus. The Cochrane handbook and the AMSTAR tool were used for grading the risk of bias. The quality of evidence was rated according to GRADE.

Results: Out of 280 identified publications, 7 studies on remineralization, micro-abrasion and resin infiltration met the inclusion criteria. Two of them were assessed with low risk of bias. No pooling of results was possible due to study heterogeneity. The quality of evidence for all technologies was graded as very low.

Limitations: Only papers published in English with more than 20 adolescents or young adults were considered. Furthermore, a follow-up period of at least 8 weeks was required. The publication bias could not be assessed due to the paucity of included trials.

Conclusions/clinical implications: There is a lack of reliable scientific evidence to support remineralizing or camouflaging strategies to manage post-orthodontic white spot lesions. Further well-performed controlled clinical trials with long-term follow-up are needed to establish best clinical practice.
Introduction

White spot lesion development is a frequent side-effect to treatment with fixed orthodontic appliances (1). The prevalence is reported to vary from 2-96%, depending on method and criteria for detection as well as patient compliance with advocated preventive measures (2-4). White spot lesions can seriously jeopardize the esthetic outcome of the treatment; data indicate that such lesions have a limited ability to improve after appliance removal and white spots can sometimes be detectable even 12 years after treatment (5-7). Although primary prevention must be in focus, two major strategies on how to deal with existing lesions after debonding have been suggested; remineralizing or masking the lesions (8,9). The first is based on secondary prevention and reversing the lesions through remineralizing agents like topical fluoride, amorphous calcium phosphate or self-assembling peptides. The second strategy aims to mask and improve the esthetic appearance of the teeth through minimal-invasive measures, such as bleaching, micro-abrasion or resin infiltration. Since most published evaluations of the various technologies are made with aid of artificial lesions in vitro, the clinical benefits of the different strategies remain unclear. The aim of the present paper was therefore to examine the current evidence of effectiveness for clinical methods using remineralizing agents or minimal-invasive techniques to manage post-orthodontic white spot lesions, based on primary clinical trials and systematic reviews. This systematic review is an update of a previous publication from our research group (10) in which no firm evidence for any technology was unveiled.

Methods

The PICO was set up as follows; Population: adolescents and young adults (<30 year) with white spot lesions registered and scored within 3 months after the debonding of fixed orthodontic appliances; Intervention: any intervention, except laminate veneers, with aim to reverse the post-orthodontic
lesions or to improve their esthetic appearance; Control: no treatment, placebo or best clinical practice; Outcome: extent, hardness or appearance of white spot lesions with a follow-up period of at least eight weeks, as assessed with visual clinical scores, photographs, caries detection devices or patient/therapist satisfaction.

*Search strategy and inclusion criteria* – Four electronic sources were searched from 2011 throughout October 31, 2015 for systematic reviews and original studies of potential interest; PubMed, The Cochrane Library and the Citation and Trip Databases. In addition, https://clinicaltrials.gov/ was checked for ongoing studies. The search terms were “enamel caries”, “fixed orthodontic appliances”, “fluoride”, “micro-abrasion”, resin infiltration”, “remineralization”, “tooth bleaching” and “white spot lesions” in various combinations. The full search strategy is shown in Supplement 1. The abstract list, containing 280 hits, was independently assessed by two authors and papers of potential relevance were selected. Diverging opinions were solved in consensus. For each selected abstract, the information on related papers was checked in the database. To be considered for inclusion, a full description of a controlled clinical trial (randomized or non-randomized) including more than 20 subjects was required. Furthermore, a reported endpoint obtained at least after 8 weeks and expressed as continuous or categorical data was needed. Only papers published in English were accepted. Papers describing in vitro and in situ studies with artificial white spot lesions were not taken into account. The reference lists of the accepted papers and systematic reviews were hand-searched for additional literature. A flow-chart of the inclusion of papers is shown in Figure 1.

*Data extraction* - Key data from the accepted studies were extracted independently by two authors and compiled in tables.

*Quality assessment* - The quality of the selected publications was assessed according to predetermined criteria for methodology and performance by two authors. The criteria of Cochrane handbook for
interventions (11) was used and the risk of bias for each original paper was graded as “low”, “moderate” or “high”. Systematic reviews were assessed with the AMSTAR tool as described by Mejäre et al. (12). The quality of evidence was rated with the GRADE tool (13) in four categories: strong, moderate, low and very low.

**Data synthesis** - Due to the low number and diversity of the included studies, a narrative descriptive synthesis was carried out. Only studies with low or moderate risk of bias were used for grading the quality of evidence.

**Results**

Seven primary publications (14-20), describing eight clinical trials, were included. Five studies were on remineralization agents (14-16, 19, 20), one on microabrasion (15) and two trials were on resin infiltration (17, 18) as listed in Table 1. One study (15) evaluated the management of WSL both by remineralization agents and microabrasion, thus 8 clinical trials were included. One trial was from Turkey, one from China, two from USA, two from India and one from Germany. The assessed quality is summarized in Table 2. Two of the papers were assessed as being of low risk of bias (16, 18) while the rest appeared with high risk of bias. In addition, two systematic reviews relevant for the topic were identified and both were considered being of moderate to low risk of bias (21, 22). The excluded studies (23-42) with the main reason for exclusion are shown in Table 3.

**Remineralizing agents**

A systematic review based on seven included studies displayed a lack of reliable evidence to support the effectiveness of remineralizing agents (fluoride and casein phosphopeptide-amorphous calcium
phosphate; CPP-ACP) for the management of post-orthodontic white spot lesions (21). This was recently confirmed in a systematic review by Raphael and Blinkhorn (22). They found a tendency towards a benefit for the use of CPP-ACP, with and without fluoride, but the quality of evidence was limited. We identified two primary studies not included in the systematic review of Chen et al. (21) but both were assessed with high risk of bias (14, 15). One study with low risk of bias compared products with various concentrations of fluoride (varnish, mousse, adult toothpaste) but no differences in improving the appearance of white spot lesions was unveiled (16). The quality of evidence was rated as very low (⊕ΟΟΟ) and the possible beneficial effect of re-mineralizing agents versus no treatment (natural remineralization) remains a knowledge gap.

**Bleaching**

No recent studies concerning bleaching of post-orthodontic white spot lesions fulfilled the inclusion criteria.

**Micro-abrasion**

One study compared the effects of micro-abrasion (hydrochloric acid and pumice powder) with normal tooth brushing and found that the intervention performed in a superior way over a 6 month period (15). The study displayed however a high risk of bias and the quality of evidence was graded as very low (⊕ΟΟΟ).

**Resin infiltration**
Two papers based on two split-mouth studies with resin infiltration and describing follow-up periods of 8 weeks (17) and 6 months (18) were included. In one study, the lesions were pre-treated with a fine grit polishing disc before the resin infiltration (17). The findings of both papers revealed an immediate improved esthetical appearance of the WSL’s compared with untreated lesions. As only one small study with short follow-up was assessed with low risk of bias (18), the evidence for resin infiltration was graded as very low (⊕ΟΟΟ).

**Discussion**

White spot lesion development is a common side-effect to orthodontic treatment with fixed appliances and a toolbox for the management after debonding is available for the informed clinician. This is the first review investigating several approaches to post-management of WSL. It is important to stress that all suggested strategies, including “no treatment”, seem to result in lesion regression or a visual masking of the lesions (15, 16, 18). This systematic review, including several clinical methods remineralizing or masking the lesions, was however unable to provide scientific support for any superior way to manage the post-orthodontic white spot lesions in an evidence-based context due to a paucity of well-performed clinical trials. The multiple narrative reviews that are available on the topic rely mainly on in vitro projects which, needless to say, cannot adequately reflect or mimic the clinical situation. There were however some study limitations. First of all, only papers published in English were accepted. Secondly, we required a minimum of 20 independent subjects, not older than 30 years of age. The rationale for this was to avoid studies with insufficient power and keep the age span as homogenous as possible. Thirdly, the 8-week follow-up was a result of a compromise; we initially selected a minimum of 6 months but realized that important information would be lost in that case. The most common reasons for exclusion were the use of artificial lesions, very short follow-up
and inadequate sample size. Thus, future studies must be powered on the number of patients rather than the number of WSL and employ a 1 year follow-up period after debonding. It was not possible to estimate the risk of publication bias through a funnel plot due to paucity of included studies.

A primary proactive preventive approach during treatment with fixed orthodontic appliances, even including early debonding, is of course best clinical practice. There is evidence of moderate quality to suggest that fluoride varnish applications around the bracket base can prevent WSL development during treatment with fixed orthodontic appliances (43) but its use, being a high fluoride product, after debonding has been questioned (44, 45). In general pediatric dentistry, there is some evidence of effectiveness to treat early enamel lesions with topical fluorides (46) but post-orthodontic lesions differ in location and extent. High concentrations of fluoride may arrest remineralization through surface hyper-mineralization and an increased risk of permanent brown organic staining, which might jeopardize the esthetic treatment result. Interestingly, the study by Huang and coworkers (16) did not demonstrate any differences in WSL improvement between a fluoride varnish application and normal home care with fluoride toothpaste when assessed by both clinicians and lay persons. As natural saliva remineralization and self-applied fluoride toothpaste is the most cost-effective alternative to deal with the problem, this strategy must be regarded as the option of choice in most cases (conditional recommendation). A watchful waiting of at least 3-6 months after debonding is advocated but the patient must be carefully re-instructed on the optimal use of the fluoride-containing toothpaste twice daily and to avoid excessive rinsing with water after brushing (47).

Micro-abrasion and resin infiltration are invasive and micro-invasive methods that obviously can camouflage more severe and long-standing cases of post-orthodontic white spot lesions in an effective way. Both methods are however technique sensitive; the former must be repeated several times, while the latter normally is a single-appointment treatment. The question whether or
not surplus etching and/or non-removed bonding material could influence the outcome was only partially addressed in the included papers but seemed not to be a problem with the infiltration approach (18). However, since the follow-up period to date is limited to 12 months (27) the long-term success rate is yet unknown. The invasive methods should therefore be used selectively on the most challenging esthetic cases or when the compliance with the advocated homecare is proven insufficient during the first months after debonding.

**Conclusion**

Based on current literature, there is a lack of reliable evidence to support re-mineralizing or camouflaging strategies to manage post-orthodontic white spot lesions. Since daily use of fluoride toothpaste cannot be withdrawn for ethical reasons, this must be considered as best clinical practice. Further well-conducted controlled clinical trials with extended long-term follow-up are needed to establish best clinical practice.
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Figure legend

Figure 1. Flow-chart of the included studies.
Figure 1 Flow-chart of the included studies

Title list at search #4 in PubMed, Cochrane, Scitation and Trip databases (n=280)

Excluded titles and abstracts: Do not address the problem specifications (n=254)

Full text studies assessed for eligibility (n=26)

Excluded studies: Do not meet the inclusion criteria;
- Artificial/occlusal lesions (11)
  - Small sample (3)
  - Short follow-up (2)
  - Intervention (2)
  - Case report (1)
- Description of technique (1)
  (n=20)

Study from hand searching reference lists (n=1)

Studies included in present review (n=7)
### Table 1. Summary of included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year</th>
<th>n, Test/ctr</th>
<th>FU</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remineralization agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal, 2013(^{14})</td>
<td>31 (SM)</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>visual</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin, 2012(^{15})</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>FMR</td>
<td>no treatment</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>no treatment</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du, 2012(^{19})</td>
<td>47/49</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>F-varnish</td>
<td>saline</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, 2013(^{16})</td>
<td>34/41</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>CPP-ACP(^a)</td>
<td>home care(^b)</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40/41</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>F-varnish</td>
<td>home care(^b)</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashisht, 2013(^{20})</td>
<td>29/31</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>LF+visual</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microabrasion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin, 2012(^{15})</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>microabr.</td>
<td>no treatment</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resin infiltration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knösel, 2013(^{18})</td>
<td>21 (SM)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>resin</td>
<td>no treatment</td>
<td>spectro</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senestraro, 2014(^{17})</td>
<td>20 (SM)</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>abr.+resin</td>
<td>no treatment</td>
<td>visual</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)paste containing 900 ppm F; \(^{b}\)including adult fluoride toothpaste

Abbreviations: FU= follow-up; FTP=fluoride toothpaste; FMR= fluoride mouth rinse; CPP-ACP= casein phosphor peptide - amorphous calcium phosphate nano-complexes; LF=laser fluorescence; S=statistically significant difference; NS= no significant difference; SM=split-mouth
Table 2. Assessment of risk of bias for the included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author, year</th>
<th>Type of bias</th>
<th>Risk levela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selection</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remineralization agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal, 201314</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin, 201215</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du, 201219</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>SBb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, 201316</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashisht, 201320</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microabrasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin, 201215</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resin infiltration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knösel, 201318</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senestraro, 201417</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aHR= high risk of bias; LR=low risk of bias. bSB=single blind
Table 3. Excluded papers and main reason for their exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author, year</th>
<th>intervention</th>
<th>main reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baeshen, 2011</td>
<td>fluoride</td>
<td>short follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard, 2013</td>
<td>mixed techniques</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bröchner, 2011</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>short follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caglaroglu, 2012</td>
<td>abrasion</td>
<td>description of technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckstein, 2015</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>small sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammad, 2012</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>small sample, short follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanbin, 2015</td>
<td>micro-abrison</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, 2011</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>small sample, short follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krithikadatta, 2013</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>occlusal lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milly, 2014</td>
<td>bioactive glass</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuhaus, 2010</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>case report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, 2013</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliska, 2012</td>
<td>abrasion+ACP</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poosti, 2014</td>
<td>laser</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, 2011</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>intervention during FOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres, 2011</td>
<td>infiltration+fluoride</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetkiner, 2014</td>
<td>mixed techniques</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yim, 2014</td>
<td>resin infiltration</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan, 2014</td>
<td>methodology</td>
<td>artificial lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, 2012</td>
<td>CPP-ACP</td>
<td>intervention during FOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: CPP-ACP=casein phosphor peptide - amorphous calcium phosphate nanocomplexes; FOA=fixed orthodontic appliances