Paper 4

The relationship between caries in the primary dentition at 5 years of age and permanent dentition at 10 years of age – a longitudinal study.

Skeie MS, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Bergen, Norway
Raadal M, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Bergen, Norway
Strand GV, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Bergen, Norway
Espelid I, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Oslo, Norway

Correspondence to:
Marit S. Skeie
University of Bergen
Department of Odontology
Aarstadveien 17
N-5009 Bergen
Norway
Phone +47 55586576
Fax +47 55586461
E-mail: marit.skeie@odont.uib.no

Running head: Caries relationships between primary and permanent teeth

Summary. *Objectives.* To explore a possible relationship between the caries experience and pattern in the primary dentition at 5 years of age and the permanent dentition at 10 years of age. Further, **to** examine the possibility of predicting children in a caries risk group at 5 years verified at 10 years of age. *Materials and methods.* A sample of 186 children (90 males) were clinically examined as 5-year-olds and re-examined as 10-year-olds by calibrated dentists. A five-graded diagnostic system including enamel caries was used. Bitewing radiographs were taken. A true risk group of children at 10 years was defined as those with at least one dentin or filled lesion on the mesial surface of 6-year-molars, and/or on incisors, and/or total DMFS more than one SD above the mean. The prediction was measured in terms of OR, sensitivity/specificity, and ROC-curves. *Results.* Statistically significant correlations (r=0.5) were found between the caries experience in the two dentitions as well as between the primary second molars at baseline and the permanent teeth at 10 years. "Primary second molars" and "All primary molars" were the most powerful predictors for allocation into the risk group (24% of the sample). The highest achieved sum of sensitivity and specificity, 148 %, was attained at a cut-off point above two carious surfaces in enamel and/or dentin in primary second molars. *Conclusions.* Statistically significant relationship in disease between the dentitions was found. More than two surfaces with caries experience in primary second molars is suggested as a clinically useful predictor at 5 years of age for being at high risk at age 10.

Introduction

It is well established that the caries status in the young permanent dentition is related to the corresponding status in the primary dentition [1] Nevertheless, this relationship is not sufficiently clear-cut for measurement of caries experience in primary teeth to fully predict new caries of permanent teeth. The potential caries promotive exposures time vary between dentitions [2] as do the range of inter-related factors acting in the caries process [3]. These make the ideal stability needed for prediction impossible. Within these limitations, when caries first is established, past caries experience remains the most powerful known single predictor of future caries in the young permanent dentition [1, 4].

However, many of the previous studies in this area suffer from obvious methodical weaknesses. Retrospective study designs are common, where for practical reasons baseline data have been obtained from previous records. In these cases reliability might be questioned, since prior inter-examiner calibration is usually lacking. By contrast, prospective longitudinal study designs allow the same diagnostic methods to be used and may include calibration training programs and the same caries criteria both at baseline and at the endpoint examination. This latter type of design is to be preferred, either when the focus is to look for caries associations between primary and permanent teeth at two points of time or to identify the children who might constitute a risk group in the future or both.

There are also questions concerned with the validity of some previous study designs. The diagnostic method chosen should be based on current scientific knowledge that dental caries is a complex multifactorial disease, resulting from a disturbance in the balance between teeth and existing oral flora present in biofilms. Those sites where biofilms are allowed to mature and remain especially favour new caries development [5]. The dynamics of the disease should therefore be included, reflecting all different stages from small white spot lesions to large cavities and teeth with extensive destructions [6]. Acceptable levels of inter-examiner reproducibility may now be achieved with detailed caries diagnostic criteria and provision of

suitable training [7, 8]. Previous authors have also focused on the predictive strength of incipient caries lesions [9, 10]. It may therefore be stated that validity in predictive studies is reduced if initial lesions are excluded from the caries diagnoses. This typically occurs if x-ray examination is omitted [7, 11].

The time span from 5 to 10 years covers a period where teeth of both dentitions coexist, sharing the exposures related to caries occurrence. The impact of these caries promoting conditions has been described in detail by Mejare [12]. In view of the recent caries increase seen among Norwegian 5-year olds [13], concern is emerging that this negative trend will in future years come to affect the permanent dentition. Primarily, this period is of outmost importance for the future health of the permanent first molars, these being the most caries-susceptible teeth in the young permanent dentition [14, 15]. The approximal surfaces (mainly the mesial surfaces up to 10 years of age) are especially prone to caries onset and progression up to five to six years after the eruption [14]. These surfaces are particularly refractive towards preventive strategies [16].

Insight into disease in this specific period, contributing to a drop in the number of restorations of permanent first molar, would benefit dental health in child-, adolescent- and adult. Prevention of mesial surface restorations would save considerable tooth substance and simultaneously reduce life-long need of restoration replacement [17]. It is also noteworthy that the age period up to 10 years is one where initiation and onset of dental anxiety may occur, due to negative experience during restorative treatment [18]. If invasive operative treatment could be avoided during this period, the prevalence of dental anxiety might as well be reduced.

It may be concluded from past research that not only is the identification of high caries-risk individuals important in itself, but also that the identification of those children with

distinct caries pattern is of value, since these individuals are likely to need invasive restorative treatment in future.

The aims of this prospective, longitudinal study were therefore

- Explore a possible relationship between the caries prevalence and pattern in the primary dentition at 5 years of age and the permanent dentition at 10 years of age

- Examine the predictive power of caries experience at 5 years for identifying children most likely to develop a severe caries pattern in the permanent dentition at 10 years of age (risk group).

Methods

Study design

This was a prospective, longitudinal study, based upon two caries examinations of the same children at 5 and 10 years of age respectively, living in the city of Bergen, Norway.

Subjects

The whole cohort was made up of children who attended three clinics of Public Dental Health Service (PDHS) where they were offered annual check-ups and treatment free of charge from 3 years of age. The first examination included in this study took place when they were five years of age in 1993 (n=217, 108 males) and the second when they were 10 in 1998 (n=186, 90 males). Moving and unwillingness to participate were the main reasons for drop-outs (n=31, 18 males), these latter children failing to respond to several attempts to a recall. Social-economically, the catchment area was intended so as to include children from a variety of socio- economic backgrounds. When analysed, however, the parents showed an average educational level above the average level of the whole country [19, 20]

Examiners

At baseline five dentists examined the 5-year-old children, while this was done by only one when they were 10. To achieve high inter-examiner reproducibility, a calibration program for the examiners was performed before the study began, consisting of both radiographic and clinical training sessions. A group of 20 patients, randomly selected, were re-examined by each examiner, and measurements of the intra- and inter-examiner reproducibility were based on these repeat clinical examinations. The Cohen's kappa values obtained have been published previously (ranging from 0.62 to 0.90) [7, 20].

Caries examination

The procedure followed for caries examination as well as the caries diagnostic system chosen were the same at both baseline and endpoint sessions. Before carrying out the clinical examinations, teeth were polished with prophylactic paste and dried with air and cotton rolls. Good lightening, using operating lights, were used for clinical examinations and at each examination bitewing radiographs were taken whenever the approximal surfaces of molars could not be inspected clinically.

The caries diagnostic system used was detailed, using five caries grades (from 1 to 5) from outer enamel to inner dentin [7]. A fissure sealant on occlusal surface was counted as sound surface, this is in contrast to a preventive resin restoration, which was registered as filled. When there was doubt about the type, distinction was made by checking dental records. Extracted teeth or teeth indicated for extractions (except for orthodontic reasons) were counted as two affected surfaces in the dmfs index. Teeth restored because of trauma were registered as sound. Baseline caries data and the caries increment in the primary dentition during the follow-up period 5-10 years have been published previously [20, 21].

Risk group

A risk group of children at age 10 was defined according to the caries status of the permanent teeth where the severity of the caries lesions, the surface type (prone to invasive operating treatment), and total caries experience were considered. Children included in the risk group were 1) those with one or more dentin or filled lesions on the mesial surface of 6-yr-molars, and/or 2) same type of lesions on any incisor, and/or 3) total $D_{1-5}MFS$ more than one SD above the mean. Erupted premolars and permanent second molars were not included in the calculation of the risk group, since these teeth were not present in a majority of the children. The clinical practice in PDHS with respect to criteria for operative caries treatment is in most cases to wait until the lesions reaches the dentin [22].

Ethical approval

A written, informed consent was obtained from all parents before the study. The investigation was also approved by the Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics and the Norwegian Data Inspectorate.

Statistical methods

Analyses were performed by the Statistical Package Social Sciences (SPSS, Inc. Chicago IL), version 11.0.

Data on caries prevalence in the permanent dentition included all erupted teeth, but only the permanent first molars and incisors were used in the analyses of prediction. Chi-square statistics, and independent-sample *t*- tests were used for measuring differences between groups of children. To assess the associations between caries experience in the two dentitions Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was chosen. A logistic regression model was constructed to measure the probability of predicting inclusion the risk group at 10 (dichotomous dependent variable) at the age of 5 years. A number of possible predictors (independent variables) were tested, and were given the value 1 for an expected positive relationship and 0 if not. Statistically significant predictors from bivariate regression were included in a multivariate stepwise logistic regression model (Table 3). To identify the potentially best predictors the measures were based on values from regression analyses (odds ratio values), values of sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values, proportion of children correctly classified (crude hit rate) and ROC curves (the receiver operating curves). Areas beneath ROC curves were calculated using SPSS.

The level of statistical significance was set at 5 per cent.

Results
Caries prevalence in the permanent teeth at 10 years of age

Caries experience at 5 years (dmft) amongst the group who were lost to the study by the age of 10 did not differ from the study group at baseline (drop-outs 3.94, SD=3.22 vs follow-up group 3.74, SD=4.02, t=0.262, p=0.794).

At 10 years of age, all incisors, 36.6% of the canines, 23.7% of premolars, all permanent first molars and 3.6% of the permanent second molars had erupted.

D_{1-5}MFT was 2.43 (SD=1.97) and D_{1-5}MFS 3.52 (SD=3.47), ranging from 0 to 18 surfaces. Tables 1 and 2 give further details of the caries distribution and severity. No statistically significant sex difference in D_{1-5}MFS was found.

Frequencies

The percentage of caries free children (D_{1-5}MFS=0) amounted to 24.7% (n=46). Almost 71% (70.9%) of all caries was found in 33.8% of the children when incipient caries was included (D_{1-5}MFS). When only manifest caries (D_{3-5}MFS) was considered, the same percentage (70.9%) of the caries burden affected 17.2%. No extractions were reported. Dentin caries and /or filled lesions (D_{3-5}MFS) affected 41.9% of the children (n=78).

The permanent first molars had the highest portion of the caries burden (91.8% of D_{1-5} MFS). A total of 45.7% (n=85) of the children had one or more mesial caries lesions (D_{1-5}MFS) in the permanent first molars at the age of 10, while 12.9% (n=24) had at least one dentin lesion (D_{3-5}MFS) on these surfaces. Out of all mesial lesions (D_{1-5}FS) 61.6% belonged to 17.2% of the children. Sixty-one children (32.8%) had caries on all four permanent first molars while 27 (14.5%) had three affected molars.

Seventeen children (9.1%) had at least one caries lesion in the permanent incisors (D_{1-5}MFS), of them seven (3.8%) with manifest or filled caries lesions (D_{3-5}MFS). The canines were caries-free (D_{1-5}MFS=0) in all individuals.

Relationship between caries in the primary teeth at 5 years of age and caries in the permanent dentition at age 10.

A statistically significant correlation was found between caries in the primary dentition at 5 years of age ($d_{1-5}mfs$) and in permanent teeth at 10 years of age ($D_{1-5}MFS$) (r=0.5, p< 0.01). Exactly the same correlation (r=0.5, p<0.01) was obtained between caries in all the primary second molars at baseline and caries in the permanent dentition, whereas the correlation between caries in primary first molars and in the permanent dentition was 0.4 (p<0.01).

Among children with no caries at baseline (n=57), 61.4% (n=35) had caries in their permanent dentition by 10 years of age, whereas this was the case for 81.4% (n=105) of the children with caries experience at 5 (n=129), (χ^2=8.49, p=0.004). The great majority (92.2%, n=71) of children with dentin and/or filled caries lesions and/or extractions at baseline had also caries in the permanent dentition at 10 years of age.

Risk group: children with the most severe caries patterns in the permanent dentition

The risk group defined at 10 years of age comprised of 19 boys and 26 girls, constituting 24.2% of the sample. The mean $D_{1-5}MFS$ amongst this group was 7.96 (SD=3.28) and the mean $D_{3-5}MFS$ was 3.36 (SD=3.04). Thirty three children (33/45, 73.3%) had a $D_{1-5}MFS$ higher than one SD above the mean of the whole sample, whereas seven children (7/45, 15.5%) had manifest caries ($D_{3-5}MFS$) in their incisors. The distribution of children according to their number of carious dentin lesions and filled surfaces on the mesial surface of the permanent first molars is shown in Fig 1.

The relationship between potential caries risk markers at 5 years of age and inclusion in the risk group, based on models of logistic regression, is shown in Table 3. The variable "Primary second molars", showed the highest odds ratio (OR=12.3). This was also the only variable left in the model after the final multiple stepwise regression analysis with inclusion in the risk group as the dependent variable.

Predictive power

The predictive power values for inclusion the risk group of five different cut-off points of caries (d_{1-5}fs) in "The primary second molars" only and "All primary molars" are shown in Table 4. The highest sum of sensitivity and specificity (148 %) was gained when the predictor was more than two lesions in "Primary second molars". At this cut-off point the sensitivity was 76%, and 73 % of the children were correctly classified. More than two lesions was also the cut-off point when the sum of sensitivity and specificity of "All primary molars" reached its highest value (146 %).

The ROC curves, drawn in Fig.2, are based on the data of sensitivity and specificity in Table 4. This graphical approach is used to compare the predictive power between different predictors, by measuring the areas under the respective curves. These areas were found to be almost equivalent for the two predictors. A_1 of "Primary second molars" was 0.75, CI=0.67-0.82 whereas A_2 of "All primary molars" was 0.76, CI=0.69-0.84.

Discussion

Because the educational level of the parents of the children in the present sample was above the mean of the general population, the findings can not be fully generalized to the Norwegian child population [19]. However, the proportion of 5-year-old children in the present sample with $d_{3-5}fmt=0$ in 1993, was found to be comparable to the national data of the current age group [19]. There are also reasons to argue that representativeness is of less importance in a longitudinal study compared to one of cross-sectional design, as long as the distribution of caries in the sample is reasonably similar to that in the general population.

In Norway annual caries prevalence data ($D_{3-5}MFT$) are reported nationally and regionally for specific child groups, though not for 10-year-olds. Sixty percent of the children closest in age (12-year-olds) were reported to have a $D_{3-5}MFT$ of 1.9 in1998 [23], an estimate higher than in the present study group as might be expected because of the difference in age. A study from Germany of 210 10-year-old children reported that 52.2% had caries (cavitated lesion criteria) with a mean DMFT of 1.2 (SD 1.4) [24]. Another study from Finland (66 children) assessed DMFT (WHO-criteria) from low and high sucrose intake groups to be 0.5 (SD 1.1) and 1.4 (SD 2.0) [25]. These Nordic data were in agreement with the $D_{35}MFT$ seen in the present study group. Furthermore, the cumulative caries frequency distribution found in the present study showed the typical trait of skewness, which is now characteristic for distribution of caries amongst children [26, 27]. All these observations of the study group's similarity to population data are reassuring, since it suggests that the distorting "baseline effects" seen in longitudinal studies without randomization are not too dominant. In this study missing data were not thought to have biased the results either, since no statistically significant difference was seen in caries experience between the drop-out and the study groups. However, the relative small sample size may constitute a limitation in the study.

A consequence of discrepancy in timing of both tooth emergence and exfoliation [28, 29], is that the tooth-specific times of being at risk differed between individuals. Undoubtedly, omission of available time-to-event statistical methods dealing with caries as an individual time-dependent process [30] is a study weakness and should be taken account. However in this study, this factor was partly accounted for by including in analyses only those tooth groups with all teeth erupted at the age of 10.

The time period chosen has been less covered by previous longitudinal studies in spite of the fact that it is an important period for children's future relationship towards dental health services. The well-documented positive relationship between caries in the primary and young permanent dentitions, makes this period particularly important for planning and implementation of caries preventive strategies. This challenging task requires detailed knowledge of caries prevalence and increment in both dentitions. Furthermore, in light of concern about increasing caries prevalence among 5-year-old children [13] this age period is also important if the same trend is not to be carried into the future. It is therefore discouraging that some dental health authorities give low priority to treatment of primary teeth [31, 32]. This may lead to a general acceptance of decay in primary teeth amongst the population, as is already seen among parents of some non-western cultures [33]. With an increasing influx of immigrants [34] this problem needs to be actively addressed.

Previous studies have revealed that the caries increment during this age period is high, resulting in extensive need for treatment of primary teeth [20, 35]. There are a variety of external explanatory factors for this which may include fading parental control, increasing access to money, vulnerability to advertising and peer influence [36]. Also the current trend towards more democratic attitudes within the family unit [36], have contributed to the fact that children of this age group now spend more money on sweet snacks than ever before [37].

Supervised tooth brushing as routine dental behaviour might also be less frequent during these years, due to the increasing independence of the children as they grow older.

Different considerations were taken into account when constructing the risk group, thus making it more challenging than the more traditional caries/no caries design (any risk model). Firstly, to endeavour a low level of "misclassification" of risk group children, the selection criteria were primary based on rather crude measurements [38]. Additionally, the awareness of possible bias associated with the practice of sealing permanent first molars shortly after eruption influenced the selection criteria [39, 40]. Efforts were also made to make the size of the group to represent a recommended range regarding practicality and to be cost-effective for preventive care [41]. These are important considerations in times of decreasing resources in most national health care systems [24].

As expected and in line with previous consistent reports [1], caries experience in the two dentitions was shown to be significantly related. Caries in "Primary second molars" ($d_{1-5}mfs$) as predictor showed the highest OR value in the logistic regression analyses, followed by caries in "All primary molars". These findings were the consistent result emerging from a multitude of analyses, in which various tooth groups, surfaces, caries graded severity or other constructed combinations were tried out as possible predictors. The high correlation values between caries in the primary molars and the young permanent dentition strengthened the finding of primary molars' impact on permanent teeth. In accordance with findings in previous literature reviews, the caries status of the most recently exposed surfaces is the most appropriate measure of past caries development [1]. In the primary dentition the primary molars should therefore be the appropriate choice.

As seen in Table 4, when the cut-off point level is increasing, with decreasing group size as a result, the sensitivity is reduced and the specificity increased. At cut-off points above two lesions the primary molars reached the highest sum of sensitivity and specificity

14

("Primary second molars: 148%, "All primary molars": 146%). The highest attained sum (148%) did, however, not reach a suggested minimum acceptable level of 160% [42], but it was found identical to the average sum, based on multifactorial prediction models in a literature review [1]. According to Hausen [43] few studies with the size of a risk group within the range 20-30% have attained sensitivity values above 60%. Therefore the sensitivity achieved by "Primary second molars" when the threshold was above two lesions may be classified as reasonably powerful (76%) [2, 41]. The proportion of children correctly classified (crude hit rate) found by the use of this predictor (73%) is almost similar to another Finish study covering the age span [44].

Seen in the light of the relative long period here studied, the particular age span, the reasonable size of the high risk group and the fact that no combination of predictors beyond past caries experience were chosen, these results might be estimated as "almost acceptable". The difference between the predictive areas of the two analysed predictors, illustrated by the ROC diagrams in Fig 2, is negligible. From a clinical point of view it might be suggested more practical to use the number of caries lesions in the four primary second molars instead of including all eight molars. This focus on primary second molars for future health of permanent teeth is in line with the findings of Mejare et al [14] who found that the distal surface caries status of the actual teeth affected the mesial surface of permanent first molars.

It is therefore concluded that more than two surfaces with caries in "Primary second molars" may be a clinically useful predictor at 5 years of age for the group for future caries development the next 5 years on permanent incisors, and/or on mesial surfaces of permanent first molars, and/or as a whole develop an extensive amount of lesions in permanent teeth (one SD above the mean). By using these results a practitioner can inform the child and parents at an early age which surfaces that are in need of special hygiene attention and explain that restorations still might be avoided, if these sites are given appropriate dental care.

Any opportunity of combining this predictor with other known risk factors should be considered, as several predictors usually provide a more efficient prediction than one [4]. However, up to now, no high risk strategy program has shown to be fully successful [45], and the high-risk preventive strategy should still be seen as a supplementary approach to the main population approach.

References

1.   Powell LV. Caries prediction: a review of the literature. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* 1998; **26**: 361-371.

2.   Powell LV. Caries risk assessment: relevance to the practitioner. *Journal of the American Dental Association* 1998; **129**: 349-353.

3.   Eriksen HM, Dimitrov V. Ecology of oral health: a complexity perspective. *European Journal of Oral Sciences* 2003; **111**: 285-290.

4.   Demers M, Brodeur JM, Simard PL, Mouton C, Veilleux G, Frechette S. Caries predictors suitable for mass-screenings in children: a literature review. *Community Dental Health* 1990; **7**: 11-21.

5.   Fejerskov O. Changing paradigms in concepts on dental caries: consequences for oral health care. Caries Research 2004; **38**: 182-191.

6.   Pitts NB. Diagnostic tools and measurements-impact on appropriate care. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* 1997; **25**: 24-35.

7.   Amarante E, Raadal M, Espelid I. Impact of diagnostic criteria on the prevalence of dental caries in Norwegian children aged 5, 12 and 18 years. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* 1998; **26**: 87-94.

8.   Fyffe HE, Deery C, Nugent ZJ, Nuttall NM, Pitts NB. Effect of diagnostic threshold on the validity and reliability of epidemiological caries diagnosis using the Dundee Selectable Threshold Method for caries diagnosis (DSTM). *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* 2000; **28**: 42-51.

9.   Seppä L, Hausen H. Frequency of initial caries lesions as predictor of future caries increment in children. *Scandinavian Journal of Dental Research* 1988; **96**: 9-13.

10.   Helfenstein U, Steiner M, Marthaler TM. Caries prediction on the basis of past caries including precavity lesions. *Caries Research* 1991; **25**: 372-376.

11.   Sköld U, Klock B, Lindvall A. Differences in caries recording with and without bitewing radiographs. A study on 5-year old children in the County of Bohuslän, Sweden. *Swedish Dental Journal* 1997; **21**: 69-75.

12.   Mejàre I, Stenlund H, Julihn A, Larsson I, Permert L. Influence of approximal caries in primary molars on caries rate for the mesial surface of the first permanent molar in swedish children from 6 to 12 years of age. *Caries Research* 2001; **35**: 178-185.

13.   Haugejorden O, Birkeland JM. Evidence for reversal of the caries decline among Norwegian children. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2002; **12**: 306-315.

14.   Mejàre I, Stenlund H. Caries rates for the mesial surface of the first permanent molar and the distal surface of the second primary molar from 6 to 12 years of age in Sweden. *Caries Research* 2000; **34**: 454-461.

15.   Whittle KW, Whittle JG. Dental caries in 12-year-old children and the effectiveness of dental services in Salford, UK in 1960, 1988 and 1997. *British Dental Journal* 1998; **184**: 394-396.

16.   Seppä L, Hausen H, Pollanen L, Karkkainen S, Helasharju K. Effect of intensified caries prevention on approximal caries in adolescents with high caries risk. *Caries Research* 1991; **25**: 392-395.

17.   Mjör IA, Dahl JE, Moorhead JE. Age of restorations at replacement in permanent teeth in general dental practice. *Acta Odontologica Scandinavica* 2000; **58**: 97-101.

18.   Raadal M, Strand GV, Amarante EC, Kvale G. Relationship between caries prevalence at 5 years of age and dental anxiety at 10. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2002; **3**: 22-26.

19.   Amarante EC. Prevalence of dental caries and periodontal disease in 5-, 12-, and 18-year-old children in Bergen, Norway [M.Sc. thesis]. Bergen: University of Bergen; 1995.

20.   Skeie MS, Raadal M. Caries in primary teeth at 5 and 10 years of age: a longitudinal study. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2004; **5**: 194-202.

21.   Raadal M, Amarante E, Espelid I. Prevalence, severity and distribution of caries in a group of 5-year-old Norwegian children. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2000; **1**: 13-20.

22.   Gimmestad AL, Holst D, Fylkesnes K. Changes in restorative caries treatment in 15-year-olds in Oslo, Norway, 1979-1996. *Community Dental and Oral Epidemiology* 2003; **31**: 246-251.

23.   Fylkestannlegen i Hordaland. Årsmelding 1998 for den off. tannhelsetenesta i Hordaland. Bergen, 1999.

24.   Zerfowski M, Koch MJ, Niekusch U, Staehle HJ. Caries prevalence and treatment needs of 7- to 10-year-old schoolchildren in southwestern Germany. *Community Dental and Oral Epidemiology* 1997; **25**: 348-351.

25.   Ruottinen S, Karjalainen S, Pienihakkinen K, Lagstrom H, Niinikoski H, Salminen M, et al. Sucrose intake since infancy and dental health in 10-year-old children. *Caries Research* 2004; **38**: 142-148.

26.   Macek MD, Heller KE, Selwitz RH, Manz MC. Is 75 percent of dental caries really found in 25 percent of the population? *Journal of Public Health Dentistry* 2004; **64**: 20-25.

27.   Vehkalahti M, Tarkkonen L, Varsio S, Heikkila P. Decrease in and polarization of dental caries occurrence among child and youth populations, 1976-1993. *Caries Research* 1997; **31**: 161-165.

28.   Koch G, Kreiborg S. Eruption and shedding of teeth. In: Koch G, Poulsen A (eds) *Pediatric Dentistry*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 2001; 301-319.

29.   Leroy R, Bogaerts K, Lesaffre E, Declerck D. Impact of caries experience in the deciduous molars on the emergence of the successors. *European Journal of Oral Sciences* 2003; **111**: 106-110.

30.   Kalwitzki M, Weiger R, Axmann-Krcmar D, Rosendahl R. Caries risk analysis: considering caries as an individual time-dependent process. *International Journal of Paedatric Dentistry* 2002; **12**: 132-142.

31.   Tickle M, Milsom K, King D, Kearney-Mitchell P, Blinkhorn A. The fate of the carious primary teeth of children who regularly attend the general dental service. *British Dental Journal* 2002; **192**: 219-223.

32.   Pitts NB, Boyles J, Nugent ZJ, Thomas N, Pine CM. The dental caries experience of 5-year-old children in England and Wales. Surveys co-ordinated by the British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry in 2001/2002. *Community Dental Health* 2003; **20**: 45-54.

33.   Ng MW. Multicultural influences on child-rearing practices: implications for today's pediatric dentist. *Pediatric Dentistry* 2003; **25**: 19-22.

34. Vassenden E, Bjertnæs S, Hauge I. Barn og unge med innvanderbakgrunn: aktuell statisstikk [Children and adolescents with immigrant background: current statistics]. Kongsvinger: Statistisk sentralbyrå, 2000. Report No.: 82-537-4795-0.

35. Alm A, Wendt LK, Koch G. Dental treatment in the primary dentition of 7-12 year-old Swedish schoolchildren. *Swedish Dental Journal* 2003; **27**: 77-82.

36. Roberts BP, Blinkhorn AS, Duxbury JT. The power of children over adults when obtaining sweet snacks. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 2003; **13**: 76-84.

37. Moynihan P. The British Nutrition Foundation Oral Task Force report-issues relevant to dental health professionals. *British Dental Journal* 2000; 188: 308-312.

38. Katz RV. Reactor paper: measurement issues in epidemiology of dental caries. In: Bader JD (ed) *Risk assessment in dentistry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Dental Ecology, 1990; 27-28.

39. Bravo M, Baca P, Llodra JC, Osorio E. A 24-month study comparing sealant and fluoride varnish in caries reduction on different permanent first molar surfaces. *Journal of Public Health Dentistry* 1997; **57**: 184-186.

40. Anderson M. Risk assessment and epidemiology of dental caries: review of the literature. *Pediatric Dentistry* 2002; **24**: 377-385.

41. Hausen H. Caries prediction. In: Fejerskov O, Kidd E (eds) *Dental caries. The disease and its clinical management.* Oxford: Blackwell Munksgaard, 2003; 327-341.

42. Kingman A. Statistical issues in risk models for caries. In: Bader. JD (ed) *Risk assessment in dentistry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Dental Ecology, 1990; 193-200.

43. Hausen H. Can caries be predicted? In: Thylstrup A, Fejerskov O (eds) *Textbook of clinical cariology,* 2th edn. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1994; 393-411.

44.   Seppä L. Past caries recordings made in Public Dental Clinics as predictors of caries prevalence in early adolescence. *Community Dental and Oral Epidemiology* 1989: 277-281.

45.   Hausen H, Karkkainen S, Seppa L. Application of the high-risk strategy to control dental caries. *Community Dental and Oral Epidemiology 2000*; **28**: 26-34.

Table 1. The caries prevalence at tooth level ($D_{1-5}MFT$) in permanent teeth at 10 years of age. (D_{1-2}: enamel lesions, D_{3-5}: dentin lesions).

	Mean (SD)
$D_{1-2}T$	1.47 (1.54)
$D_{3-5}T$	0.35 (0.84)
FT	0.61 (1.07)
MT	0.00
$D_{1-5}MFT$	2.43 (1.97)

Table 2. The caries prevalence and distribution at surface level ($D_{1-5}MFS$) in permanent teeth at 10 years of age. (D_{1-2}:enamel lesions, D_{3-5}:dentin lesions).

Surfaces	$D_{1-2}S$ Mean (SD)	$D_{3-5}S$ Mean (SD)	FS Mean (SD)	$D_{1-5}MFS$ Mean (SD)
Incisors (100 % present)				
Approximal	0.06 (0.30)	0.02 (0.16)	0.02 (0.13)	0.10 (0.46)
Buccal/lingual	0.05 (0.37)	0.01 (0.10)	0.01 (0.15)	0.07 (0.41)
Canines (36.6 % present)				
Approximal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Buccal/lingual	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Premolars (23.7 % present)				
Approximal	0.03 (0.22)	0.00	0.00	0.03 (0.22)
Buccal/lingual	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Occlusal	0.02 (0.18)	0.01 (0.07)	0.00	0.03 (0.19)
1. permanent molar (100 % present)				
Approximal	0.82 (1.16)	0.11 (0.41)	0.09 (0.38)	1.02 (1.41)
Buccal/lingual	0.45 (0.86)	0.09 (0.35)	0.22 (0.60)	0.76 (1.12)
Occlusal	0.82 (1.26)	0.15 (0.42)	0.49 (1.04)	1.46 (1.58)
2. permanent molar (3.6 % present)				
Approximal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Buccal/lingual	0.00	0.01 (0.15)	0.00	0.01 (0.15)
Occlusal	0.03 (0.25)	0.02 (0.16)	0.00	0.05 (0.36)
Total				3.53 (3.48)

Table 3. Results of the logistic regression analyses: Independent variables (possible predictors) at 5 years of age found to be significantly related to assignment to the risk group at 10 years of age.

Bivariate regression Baseline variables	n	% in target group	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p	Nagelkerke R Square
At least one caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "Primary second molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 117 No 69	35.9 4.3	12.3	3.6-41.6	< 0.001	0.21
At least one caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "All primary molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 126 No 60	33.3 5.0	9.5	2.8-32.1	< 0.001	0.16
At least one approximal caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "Primary first molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 73 No 113	39.7 14.2	4.0	2.0-8.1	< 0.001	0.12
At least one approximal caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "All primary molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 81 No 105	37.0 14.3	3.5	1.7-7.2	< 0.001	0.10
At least one approximal caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "Primary second molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 67 No 119	38.8 16.0	3.3	1.7-6.7	=0.001	0.09
At least one caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "Primary first molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 92 No 94	34.8 13.8	3.3	1.6-6.9	=0.001	0.09
Multiple regression (same independent variables). At least one caries lesion, $d_{1-5}fs$, in "Primary second molars". Yes = score 1 No = score 0	Yes 117 No 69	35.9 4.3	12.3	3.6-41.6	< 0.001	0.21

Table 4. Predictive values of assignment to the risk group at 10 years of age. True positive (TP), false positive (FP), true negative (TN), false negative (FN); sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), predictive value positive (Pv+), predictive value negative (Pv-).

Baseline $d_{1-5}fs$, primary molars x	TP	FP	TN	FN	Se (%)	Sp (%)	Pv + (%)	Pv − (%)	PHR Portion children at risk
>0	42	84	57	3	93	40	33	95	67.7
>1	39	69	72	6	87	51	36	92	58.1
>2	38	53	88	7	84	62	42	93	48.9
>3	35	46	95	10	78	67	43	90	43.5
>4	29	39	102	16	64	72	43	86	36.6
>5	25	29	112	20	56	79	46	85	29.0
Baseline $d_{1-5}fs$, primary 2. molar xx									
>0	42	75	66	3	93	47	36	96	62.9
>1	39	60	81	6	87	57	39	93	53.2
>2	34	40	101	11	76	72	50	90	39.8
>3	26	35	106	19	58	75	43	85	32.8
>4	14	23	118	31	31	84	38	79	19.9
>5	7	15	126	40	15	89	32	77	11.8

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Distribution of the children in the risk group according to their number of dentin lesions and filled caries surfaces on the mesial surface of the permanent first molars.

Fig. 2. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves, based on data presented in Table 4. The diagonal implies no diagnostic predictive value, while the area under each curve represents the predictive power of the respective predictors.

Figures

Risk group (n=45)

2 %
4 %
16 %
47 %
31 %

Legend:
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

Fig. 1.

ROC - curves

Fig. 2.