Message from the Director

It’s hard to believe, but the 2008-2009 academic year at the OHSU School of Dentistry has begun. I hope everyone had a great summer, full of fun activities and time for family, friends, and relaxation. The rest of the newsletter will address PROH’s various activities, but I would like to take a moment to reflect on the past. This fall marks the fifth anniversary for the Practice-based Research in Oral Health (PROH) network. As many of you are aware, the concept behind PROH is to conduct clinical studies in the same setting where most oral health care is provided: the dental practice. In that way, we can reach a large and diverse population, while maintaining an adequate level of control of the design and conduct of the study, to provide “real world” research results to the profession. PROH came into existence thanks to a $200,000 grant from the Oregon Opportunity campaign, a 2001 public/private partnership to advance biomedical research at OHSU. However, all ongoing PROH activities must be self-supporting. In other words, we must secure outside grants to pay for any research we conduct. That makes for a tough fiscal environment, but PROH has done well. Here is a brief review of PROH accomplishments, thanks to your support and efforts:

Research Projects

Cracked tooth survey. A preliminary evaluation of the presence and location of cracks in teeth. 129 dental offices invited and 48 participated.

3M temporary crown clinical trial. A clinical evaluation of the new Protemp temporary crown system. 10 dental offices invited and all participated.

Kerr Premise posterior composite clinical trial in progress. A clinical evaluation of Premise composite and Optibond All-in-one adhesive. 5 dental offices invited and all are participating.

Effects of eugenol concentration in ZOE survey. A survey asking about practitioners’ understanding of the effects of eugenol-containing materials on adhesive bonding. 96 dental offices invited and 30 participated.

Unmet dental needs screening. A screening examination by a medical clinic and a patient survey in Baker City on unmet dental problems. 1 dental office and 1 medical office invited and both participated.

Electronic survey to determine acceptance of online surveys. A survey on surveys: an attempt to get an idea of how many PROH practitioners would be willing to participate in electronic surveys. 99 dentists invited and 53 participated.

Electronic survey of conference topics. A survey soliciting feedback for topics for the 2008 annual PROH continuing education course on “dental myths and controversies.” 129 dentists invited and 44 participated.

School of Dentistry curriculum survey. A request from the department of restorative dentistry for practitioners to provide input on topics that should be included in the undergraduate curriculum. 123 dentists invited and 38 participated.

Results from the first two studies were accepted for presentation at the International Association for Dental Research annual meetings in 2007 and 2008.

Continuing Education and Annual Meeting

Another great success has been the annual PROH meeting. We have had some wonderful continuing education presentations, and the business lunch meeting after the continuing education course has allowed us to socialize and get everyone updated on PROH’s status and future plans. Last year, the continuing education course focused on a fast-paced, evidence-based series of presentations on a variety of topics titled “Dental (Continued on page 7)
The agenda is set and speakers are eagerly awaiting the fifth annual Practice-based Research in Oral Health (PROH) conference scheduled for Friday, Nov. 21st at the World Trade Center in Portland. In response to the success of last year’s continuing education course and, in keeping with our mission of contributing to the advancement of evidence-based dental practice, we are presenting “Dental Myths and Controversies II.” All of the topics were suggested by you via an online survey.

We have a power-packed lineup of six OHSU faculty members who will address some of the most contentious myths and controversies facing us in dentistry today. Each speaker will have approximately 30 minutes to introduce the topic(s), identify the opposing viewpoints, review the relevant research, present their position on the topic based on their understanding of the evidence and then answer your questions. Making the session even more interesting and interactive for the audience, the first 100 attendees that arrive will have the opportunity to vote electronically (and anonymously) before and after the evidence is presented as to where they fall on the issue. Topics and speakers can be seen to the right.

You and your dental staff won’t want to miss this important and timely information of vital importance to all practitioners. Use the insert to sign up or contact OHSU’s Continuing Dental Education office at 503.494.8857.

Following the continuing education course, join us for the business luncheon to review results of completed studies and plan for future studies.

Interested in serving as a Steering Committee member?
Contact Tom Hilton for more information.
503.494.8672 or hiltont@ohsu.edu

PROH Weighs in on SOD Curriculum

What skills/knowledge should be taught in dental school? Educators always struggle with limited time and a plethora of topics that could be included. New technology and information are being generated at a rapid rate in dentistry. Dental education must continually reassess its curricular content to ensure that the new dentist is provided with the appropriate skills and knowledge to begin practice. As experienced dental practitioners, the PROH network is a valuable resource for providing input about current and future curricular content for restorative dentistry.

In designing this survey, we excluded essential components (e.g., full dentures, PFM crowns, etc.) and we focused on areas that may be a bit more controversial or variable in terms of emphasis from dental school to dental school. The survey asked to have seven components of undergraduate dental education rated using the following scale:

*Essential knowledge/skill for current/future dental practice;
*Important and appropriate to cover to some extent, but not essential;
*Not essential and/or not necessary to include;
*Unsure or no strong feeling either way.

We also asked for other topics that you felt should be emphasized in the restorative dentistry curriculum. See the results on page six.
Join us for an exciting, fast-paced morning with six speakers addressing some of those confusing and contentious myths and controversies in dentistry. OHSU faculty members will each introduce their topic, identify the opposing viewpoints, review the relevant research, present their position on the topic based on their understanding of the evidence, and answer your questions. Topics and speakers are as follows:

“What is the best material for pulp capping?” by Tom Hilton, D.M.D., M.S., Alumni Centennial Professor in Operative Dentistry. He directs the PROH network and maintains a part time private dental practice.

“Caries management: Is fluoride enough?” by Juliana da Costa, D.D.S., M.S., assistant professor, department of restorative dentistry and a practitioner in the OHSU Faculty Dental Practice.

“Does orthodontic treatment harm, improve, or have any affect on a patient’s periodontal status?” by Jennifer Crowe, D.M.D., third-year resident, department of orthodontics.

“What is the best biopsy technique?” by Cindy Kleinegger, D.D.S., M.S., associate professor, department of pathology and radiology and a practitioner in the OHSU Faculty Dental Practice.

“Adhesive systems: Does simpler = better?” by Jack Ferracane, Ph.D., chair, department of restorative dentistry and division director, biomaterials and biomechanics. He is also a principal investigator for the PROH network.

“Is local anesthetic nerve damage affected by injection technique or drug used?” by Leon A. Assael, D.M.D., professor and chair, department of oral and maxillofacial surgery and director of the oral and maxillofacial surgery residency program.

You won’t want to miss this important and timely information of vital importance to all practitioners.
PROH Conference Registration Form

You will receive acknowledgement of your enrollment by mail.  
One registration form for each person

Last name: ___________________________ First name: ___________________________ M.I.: ________
Address: ___________________________ City, State, Zip: ___________________________
Office phone: _______________ Home phone: ___________________________
Fax number: ___________________________ E-mail address: ___________________________
License/ADA/GD/EFDA #: ___________________________ (for CE credit recording only)
Title (please circle): DDS  DMD  RDH*  CDA/EFDA*  CDT*  Retired  Other

*Employer name: ___________________________

Please register me for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental Myths and Controverses II 8:00-12:00</td>
<td>$70** dentist $80 staff</td>
<td>$75** dentist $85 staff</td>
<td>$140 dentist $120 staff</td>
<td>$150 dentist $130 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROH Business Meeting and Luncheon 12:15-1:45</td>
<td>Dentists only - No charge</td>
<td>Dentists only - No charge</td>
<td>Dentists only Come learn about practice-based research! $10</td>
<td>Dentists only Come learn about practice-based research! $10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount Enclosed $_________ $_________

** This rate is only available to those attending the PROH Business Meeting and Luncheon.

______ Check/Money Order payable to OHSU
______ Mastercard  ______ Visa
Card number: ___________________________ Exp. Date: ________
Signature of card holder: ___________________________

Return to: OHSU – CDE Department, 611 SW Campus Drive, Portland, OR 97239-3097 Phone: 503-494-8857 or 800-232-6478 Fax: 503-494-2973 E-mail: kingg@ohsu.edu
PROH Completes Clinical Evaluation of a New 3M™ ESPE™ Temporary Crown

Study Objectives. The objective of this study was to clinically evaluate the use of the new temporary crown system, Protemp (3M ESPE™), after two-to-four weeks of clinical function.

Methods. 3M ESPE Protemp Temporary Esthetic Crown is a self-supporting, soft, malleable composite material that allows for a custom fit. The crowns were cemented using a non-eugenol temporary cement (TempBond NE, Kerr) to minimize the obtundant effect of eugenol on post-operative sensitivity. A combined lecture and hands-on training session was held for ten practitioners and office personnel participating in the study. Each practitioner placed ten temporary crowns. Baseline and Recall assessment score sheets were completed for each composite temporary crown placed. The baseline review was completed at the crown preparation / temporary crown fit appointment, and the recall assessment was carried out at the appointment for the temporary crown removal and final seating of the permanent crown. The following areas were assessed: retention, health of the adjacent gingival tissues, proximal and occlusal contacts, post operative temperature and biting sensitivity, surface roughness, marginal integrity, marginal discoloration, color match, and surface staining. In addition, practitioners were asked to assess the ease of adaptation and placement of the Protemp crowns compared to their normal technique.

Results. The study consisted of 101 subjects attending 10 dental clinics from April 2007 to October 2007. The distribution of teeth included in the study are as follows: Maxillary second molars 5, maxillary first molars 26, maxillary second premolars 9, maxillary first premolars 9, mandibular second molars 17, mandibular first molars 19, mandibular second premolars 13, mandibular first premolars 3. The overall retention loss rate of a temporary crown was 13% (most due to fracture). Specific results were as follows:

- **Temperature Sensitivity.** There was no significant change in the overall patient reported temperature pain scores pre-op and post-op (p=0.92).
- **Biting sensitivity.** The difference between biting sensitivity pre-op and post-op was not significant (p=0.81).
- **Gingival Health.** There was no overall significant change in gingival health between pre-op and post-op (p=.86).
- **Anatomic Form.** There was no overall significant change in anatomic form between pre-op and post-op (p=.82).
- **Number of Attempts.** Among the study participants, 80 percent received a successful crown on the first attempt. There was a significant increase in the odds of re-cement as the difficulty of placement increased (p=0.006). In other words, the more trouble the practitioner had in fitting the temporary crown initially, the more likely the temporary crown would need to be re-cemented before the permanent crown seating appointment.
- **Surface Stain.** The change in the staining was not statistically significant, although there was a trend towards increasing surface stain between pre-op and post-op (p=.08).
- **Color Match.** The change in color match between pre-op and post-op was not statistically significant (p=.16), although there was a trend towards a more yellow hue with time.
- **Marginal Discoloration.** There was a significant increase in marginal discoloration between pre-op and post-op (p<.001).
- **Marginal Integrity.** The change in marginal integrity between pre-op and post-op was not statistically significant (p=.96).
- **Surface Roughness.** The difference in surface roughness between pre-op and post-op was not statistically significant (p=.11).
- **Ease of Use:** Forty-eight percent of practitioners rated the ease of placement to be comparable to their current temporary crown technique, 27 percent rated it better than their current technique and 25 percent rated it worse than their current technique.

Budget. $48,875; all funds used for practitioner reimbursement and PROH study support (none of the OHSU investigators received any funds or salary support).

An online survey was sent to 124 members of the PROH network. There were a total of 38 responses. Below is a summary of those responses. See how your thoughts compare to your colleagues!

### Single Unit Restoration
- All-ceramic inlays/onlays: 26% Essential, 55% Important, 19% Non-essential/uncertain
- All ceramic crowns: 65% Essential, 35% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain
- Composite inlays/onlays: 11% Essential, 63% Important, 26% Non-essential/uncertain
- Composite crowns: 5% Essential, 59% Important, 66% Non-essential/uncertain
- 3/4 to 7/8 crowns: 24% Essential, 53% Important, 24% Non-essential/uncertain
- Cast post and cores: 29% Essential, 50% Important, 21% Non-essential/uncertain
- Prefabricated metal posts: 53% Essential, 40% Important, 8% Non-essential/uncertain
- Prefabricated fiber posts: 45% Essential, 47% Important, 8% Non-essential/uncertain
- CAD/CAM restorations: 13% Essential, 47% Important, 40% Non-essential/uncertain
- "Prep-less" porcelain veneers: 5% Essential, 45% Important, 50% Non-essential/uncertain

### Impression Techniques
- Custom trays for final impressions: 60% Essential, 24% Important, 16% Non-essential/uncertain
- Stock trays for final impressions: 49% Essential, 38% Important, 13% Non-essential/uncertain
- Triple trays: 60% Essential, 32% Important, 8% Non-essential/uncertain
- Optical impressions: 14% Essential, 54% Important, 32% Non-essential/uncertain

### Multiple Unit Restorations
- Casting 3-unit FPD for clinical case: 41% Essential, 35% Important, 24% Non-essential/uncertain
- Soldering FPD components for clinical case: 22% Essential, 25% Important, 53% Non-essential/uncertain
- All-ceramic FPD: 35% Essential, 43% Important, 22% Non-essential/uncertain
- Fiber reinforced resin composite FPD: 3% Essential, 44% Important, 53% Non-essential/uncertain

### Removable Partial Dentures
- RPDs with attachments to survey crowns: 62% Essential, 38% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain
- RPDs with attachments to implants: 67% Essential, 30% Important, 3% Non-essential/uncertain
- Non-traditional RPD designs: 32% Essential, 41% Important, 27% Non-essential/uncertain
- Implant supported dentures: 73% Essential, 27% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain

### Occlusion
- Full mouth rehabilitation: 24% Essential, 60% Important, 16% Non-essential/uncertain
- Treatment of TMD patients: 41% Essential, 54% Important, 5% Non-essential/uncertain
- Equilibration of natural dentition: 49% Essential, 43% Important, 8% Non-essential/uncertain

### Preventive/Conservative
- Minimally invasive dentistry: 47% Essential, 50% Important, 3% Non-essential/uncertain
- Remineralization therapies: 40% Essential, 55% Important, 5% Non-essential/uncertain
- Use of bioactive materials: 35% Essential, 57% Important, 8% Non-essential/uncertain
- Preventive resin restorations: 70% Essential, 19% Important, 11% Non-essential/uncertain
- Pulp capping with non-CaOH materials: 40% Essential, 55% Important, 5% Non-essential/uncertain

### General
- Evidence-based dental practice: 73% Essential, 27% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain
- Reviewing the literature: 62% Essential, 35% Important, 3% Non-essential/uncertain
- Developing critical thinking skills: 86% Essential, 14% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain
- Specific training in ethics and professionalism: 81% Essential, 19% Important, 0% Non-essential/uncertain

Of note is the fact that Preventive/Conservative topics were uniformly rated as essential or important. The same can be said of the General topics, with developing critical thinking skills and specific training in ethics and professionalism scoring highest in the survey as being essential to the curriculum. Custom trays, stock trays and triple trays for final impressions were
(Continued from page 1)

Myths and Controversies.” It proved to be so popular that we are using the same general theme this year, but with different “myths and controversies” that you suggested in our recent survey. More details about that continuing education course are provided in this newsletter.

Northwest PRECEDENT
Several years ago, the National Institute for Dental and Craniofacial Research (NIDCR), a group within the National Institutes of Health (NIH), sent out a request for proposals to develop regional dental practice-based research networks. OHSU and the University of Washington joined forces to submit a successful proposal, resulting in approximately $25 million in funding to develop a five-state research network (Northwest PRECEDENT) and conduct 16 to 20 studies over seven years. Although none of this money goes to support PROH, NIDCR allowed that OHSU’s experience with PROH was a key component in the proposal’s acceptance. OHSU is proud to now be a part of two successful dental practice-based research networks.

Challenges
All of you should be pleased with PROH’s successes to date. But, as with any worthwhile endeavor, there are trials that we face as we go forward. Without a doubt, securing funding for research projects continues to be our greatest challenge. Most of our individual research project funding has come from industrial sources, i.e., companies that want PROH practitioners to evaluate their products. We continue to look for a variety of funding sources, but it is a difficult time for such efforts. To use the vernacular of the oil fields (a popular topic these days), we drill a lot of dry holes before we hit a gusher.

Recruiting and retaining practitioners who will actively participate in PROH activities is another challenge for us. Part of the difficulty is that we just don’t have enough funded research projects to be able to use all of our practitioners in studies on a regular basis. Another part of the equation is that while we have approximately 125 practitioners who have signed up for PROH, only about one-third participate in our activities.

To address these issues, one of the suggestions at last year’s meeting was to use email and electronic surveys to keep practitioners engaged and participating. We are trying to increase your interest by giving you the results of the studies before they become generally available to the practicing profession. Despite this, our response rate consistently falls below 50 percent.

We are also attempting to design studies that are as easy to implement as possible, and will have minimal impact on your practice. But, this is a challenge since we need to abide by all of the regulations relating to clinical research involving human subjects, as well as develop a protocol that all participants will follow exactly.

The PROH Steering Committee provides the executive oversight of PROH, as well as reviewing and approving any studies that we undertake. We have lost several members in the past year due to retirements or for personal reasons, and we have put out requests for interested individuals to join the Steering Committee, but we have yet had no response. The time commitment is kept to a minimum, and most business is handled via email. Typically, we only meet once per year. To keep PROH “practitioner-centric,” and focused on the interests and needs of the practicing community, we need dentists who believe in PROH’s efforts to further the cause of evidence-based dentistry. Please contact us if you are interested in helping serve.

We are appreciative of all of you who actively support PROH. Without your efforts, none of the above successes would have been possible. It’s a challenging financial environment, but with your help, we can continue to grow PROH and make it a force in the dental clinical research arena.

Thomas J. Hilton, D.M.D., M.S.
PROH Director, hiltont@ohsu.edu

PROH Weighs in on SOD Curriculum

(Continued from page 6)

all considered equally high in importance for inclusion in the curriculum, but optical impressions have not reached the point of being an essential topic. Prefabricated metal and fiber posts were considered to be equally high in importance, and were actually considered more essential than cast post and cores.

Many respondents took full advantage of the opportunity to suggest additional topics. Of the 74 suggestions offered, 22 related to the business of dentistry, 21 discussed specific clinical techniques, 6 related to ethics, 4 related to patient communication and management, and 4 discussed clinical diagnoses leaving an array of 16 miscellaneous topics.

The time and input provided by the respondents is appreciated. These findings have been shared with the faculty of the Department of Restorative Dentistry, as well as those with responsibility for curriculum development.
Are you interested in applying for a faculty appointment at the OHSU School of Dentistry? One of the benefits of participating in PROH is the opportunity for appointment as an adjunct assistant professor.

Once you have completed our online HIPAA and Responsible Conduct of Research courses, send the following documents to Cindy Barnes:

- Current Curriculum Vitae
- Copy of your diploma
- Copy of your dental license
- Two letters of recommendation (from colleagues or current faculty)

We will submit your application to the Dean’s Office.