

INTRODUCTION

Hospital

Nicklaus Children's

Historically, ECC and caries was treated and managed with a surgical approach. Recently, a paradigm shift towards chronic disease management of ECC surfaced to combat dental caries in children by switching the thought process to a disease management approach versus the traditional surgical approach.

Chronic disease management (CDM) aims to incorporate a medical rather than a surgical approach when considering restorative dental treatment options for ECC. CDM is viewed as an intervention on a treatment spectrum between prevention and acute care. CDM considers dental caries as a life-long disease that can be managed with individual risk assessment, behavioral changes, and close collaboration between providers and patients.

Through implementation of accurate caries diagnosis, caries risk assessment and prevention, understanding a proper restorative threshold, and switching from a surgical perspective to a more chronic disease management approach, Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MID) is encouraging dentists to embrace a more cost-effective way of practicing dentistry.

As it stands, there is a gap in the literature with insufficient documentation on concepts being taught and implemented regarding MID and CDM in post-doctoral pediatric dentistry residency programs in North America. The aim of this study is to determine the topics within the domains of Chronic Disease Management and Minimally Invasive Dentistry that are being taught and incorporated in their clinical protocols, as well as to identify the barriers for incorporation.

METHODS

Review and approval for the study, categorized as exemption status, was obtained from the Research Institute of Nicklaus Children's Hospital, Miami, Fla., USA, and the Western Copernicus (Institutional Review Board), Puyallup, Wash., USA.

A 19-question online survey with the following domains: (1) program characteristics; (2) MID and CDM concepts taught in didactic versus clinical settings of pediatric dentistry residency programs; (3) time utilized by residents to discuss MID and CDM; and (4) perceptions of program directors for barriers to implementation of MID and CDM was electronically sent to all pediatric dentistry residency program directors in North America via Redcap.

Curricular Practices on Chronic Disease Management and Minimally Invasive Dentistry among Post-Doctoral Pediatric Dentistry Residency Programs

Table 1: North American Pediatric Dentistry Residency Program Profile								
	Overall	Hospital	University	Combined	Other (O)			
	N (%)	based (H)	based (U)	(C)	N (%)			
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)				
Age of Residency Program								
<5 years	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
5-10 years	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
11-20 years	6 (30)	1 (16.7)	2 (50)	1 (12.5)	2 (100)			
21-30 years	2 (10)	2 (33.3)	0	0	0			
>30 years	12 (60)	3 (50)	2 (50)	7 (87.5)	0			
Faculty Distribution (mean)								
Full-time total	5.15	4.0	5.25	6.38	3.5			
Full-time with board certification	4.3	3.83	3.75	5.25	3.0			
Part-time total	6.7	3.5	5.75	10.5	3.0			
Part-time with board certification	5.8	3.0	4.25	9.5	2.0			

Table 3: Comparison of Programs Reporting CDM and MID Taught in Didactic vs Clinical:

	Didactic Portion				Clinical Portion					
	Overall	(H)	(U)	(C)	(O)	Overall	(H)	(U)	(C)	(O)
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
CDM	20	6	4	8	2	19	6	3	8	2
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(95)	(100)	(75)	(100)	(100)
MID	20	6	4	8	2	20	6	4	8	2
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Active	20	6	4	8	2	19	6	3	8	2
Surveillance	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(95)	(100)	(75)	(100)	(100)
Nutritional	19	6	4	7	2	19	5	4	8	2
Counseling	(95)	(100)	(100)	(87.5)	(100)	(95)	(83.3)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Caries Risk	20	6	4	8	2	20	6	4	8	2
Assessment	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Motivational	18	4	4	8	2	15	3	3	7	2
Interviewing	(90)	(66.7)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(75)	(50)	(75)	(87.5)	(100)
ICCMS	14	3	2	8	1	8	2	1	4	1
	(70)	(50)	(50)	(100)	(50)	(40)	(33.3)	(25)	(50)	(50)
Teledentistry	12	4	2	5	1	13	3	2	7	1
	(60)	(66.7)	(50)	(62.5)	(50)	(65)	(50)	(50)	(87.5)	(50)

Sandoval P, Arevalo O, Hui N, Chattopadhyay A

RESULTS

Table 2: Time utilized in clinic per resident for discussion of CDM/MID								
	Overall N (%)	Hospital Based (H)	University Based (U)	Combined (C)	Other (O) N (%)			
N (%)N (%)Caries prevention and parent education on caries disease process per appointment								
1-5 minutes	8 (40) 12 (60)	2 (33.3)	2 (50) 2 (50)	3 (37.5) 5 (62.5)	1 (50) 1 (50)			
11-15 minutes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
Caries Risk Assessment (CRA) per appointment								
1-5 minutes 6-10 minutes	19 (95)	0 (0)	4 (100) 0 (0)	7 (87.5) 1 (12.5)	2 (100) 0 (0)			
11-15 minutes 16+ minutes	0 (0) 0 (0)	0 (0) 0 (0)	0 (0) 0 (0)	0 (0) 0 (0)	0 (0) 0 (0)			
Diet and nutrition 1-5 minutes	nal guidance pe 15 (75)	r appointment 4 (66.7)	4 (100)	6 (75)	1 (50)			
6-10 minutes	4 (20) 1 (5)	2 (33.3) 0 (0)	0 (0) 0 (0)	2 (25) 0 (0)	0 (0) 1 (50)			
16+ minutes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			

Table 4: Program Director's Reported Barriers to Implementation

N (%) Based (H) Based (U) N (%) N (%) N (%) Concerns about parental acceptance: Disagree 13 (65) 3 (50) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 4 (20) 0 (0) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) <td< th=""><th></th><th>Overall</th><th>Hospital</th><th>University</th><th>Combined (C)</th><th>Other (O)</th></td<>		Overall	Hospital	University	Combined (C)	Other (O)				
N (%) Discret (y) N (%) N (%) Concerns about parental acceptance: Disagree 13 (65) 3 (50) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 4 (20) 0 (0) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 1 (50) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Refee 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>Based (H)</th><th>Based (U)</th><th></th><th></th></t<>			Based (H)	Based (U)						
N (%) N (%) Concerns about parental acceptance: Disagree 13 (65) 3 (50) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 1 (50) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3)		N (%)			N (%)	N (%)				
Concerns about parental acceptance: Disagree 13 (65) 3 (50) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 4 (20) 0 (0) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) A (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 2 (100) A (35) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (0) A (35) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 2 (100) <th< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>N (%)</th><th>N (%)</th><th></th><th></th></th<>			N (%)	N (%)						
Disagree 13 (65) 3 (50) 2 (50) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 4 (20) 0 (0) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use:	Concerns about parental acceptance:									
Neutral 4 (20) 0 (0) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: 1 (50) Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 2 (25) 1 (50) Regree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (450) 0 (0) Agree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Retrat 6 (30) 3 (50) <t< th=""><th>Disagree</th><th>13 (65)</th><th>3 (50)</th><th>2 (50)</th><th>/ (87.5)</th><th>1 (50)</th></t<>	Disagree	13 (65)	3 (50)	2 (50)	/ (87.5)	1 (50)				
Agree 3 (15) 3 (50) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) Concerns about off label use:	Neutral	4 (20)	0(0)	2 (50)	1 (12.5)	1 (50)				
Concerns about off label use: Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: 1 (50) Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Oisagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Rearry Ø (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) <	Agree	3 (15)	3 (50)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)				
Disagree 16 (80) 5 (83.3) 3 (75) 7 (87.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence: 1 1 50 1 1 1 1 50 0 (0) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) 4 (20) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: 0 (0) 1 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) 0 Rearry 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) 0 <tr< th=""><th colspan="9">Concerns about off label use:</th></tr<>	Concerns about off label use:									
Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 1 (50) Concerns about quality of evidence:	Disagree	16 (80)	5 (83.3)	3 (75)	7 (87.5)	1 (50)				
Concerns about quality of evidence: Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Reare 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 6 (75) 0 (0)	Neutral	3 (15)	1 (16.7)	0 (0)	1 (12.5)	1 (50)				
Disagree 15 (75) 6 (100) 3 (75) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: 0 (0) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: 0 (0) 1 (50) Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 2 (100) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0)	Concerns about quality of evidence:									
Neutral 1 (5) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 4 (20) 0 (0) 1 (25) 2 (25) 1 (50) Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 2 (100) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Disagree 9 (45) 2 (33.3)	Disagree	15 (75)	6 (100)	3 (75)	5 (62.5)	1 (50)				
Agree4 (20)0 (0)1 (25)2 (25)1 (50)Concerns about reimbursement/costs:Disagree7 (35)2 (33.3)1 (25)4 (50)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)2 (50)0 (0)1 (50)Agree9 (45)3 (50)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Concerns about standardization among faculty:Disagree5 (25)2 (33.3)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral6 (30)2 (33.3)0 (0)2 (25)2 (100)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)2 (50)5 (62.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:UDisagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Reading agree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:UUU0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Program is understaffed:UUUUUDisagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1	Neutral	1 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)				
Concerns about reimbursement/costs: Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Garee 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 1 (25) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree	Agree	4 (20)	0 (0)	1 (25)	2 (25)	1 (50)				
Disagree 7 (35) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 4 (50) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 0 (0) 2 (25) 2 (100) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 2 (100) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Regree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Disagree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) <	Concerns abo	ut reimbursen	nent/costs:							
Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 2 (50) 0 (0) 1 (50) Agree 9 (45) 3 (50) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50) Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 0 (0) 2 (25) 2 (100) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 2 (100) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 6 (75) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Obsagree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 2 (25) 1 (50) Pogram is understaffed: Disagree 9 (45) 2 (33.3)<	Disagree	7 (35)	2 (33.3)	1 (25)	4 (50)	0 (0)				
Agree9 (45)3 (50)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Concerns abut standardization among faculty:Disagree5 (25)2 (33.3)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral6 (30)2 (33.3)0 (0)2 (25)2 (100)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)2 (50)5 (62.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns abut impact of patient flow:UUUDisagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:UUUUUDisagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Neutral	4 (20)	1 (16.7)	2 (50)	0 (0)	1 (50)				
Concerns about standardization among faculty: Disagree 5 (25) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 6 (30) 2 (33.3) 0 (0) 2 (25) 2 (100) Agree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 5 (62.5) 0 (0) Faculty skepticism: Disagree 6 (30) 3 (50) 2 (50) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Neutral 4 (20) 1 (16.7) 0 (0) 1 (12.5) 2 (100) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 6 (75) 0 (0) Agree 10 (50) 2 (33.3) 2 (50) 6 (75) 0 (0) Concerns about impact of patient flow: Disagree 9 (45) 2 (33.3) 1 (25) 5 (62.5) 1 (50) Neutral 3 (15) 1 (16.7) 1 (25) 1 (12.5) 0 (0) Agree 8 (40) 3 (50) 2 (50) 2 (25) 1 (50) Program is understaffed: Disagree 7 (35) 1 (16.7) 1 (25) 4 (50) 1 (50)	Agree	9 (45)	3 (50)	1 (25)	4 (50)	1 (50)				
Disagree5 (25)2 (33.3)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral6 (30)2 (33.3)0 (0)2 (25)2 (100)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)2 (50)5 (62.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed: </th <th>Concerns abo</th> <th>ut standardiza</th> <th>tion among fac</th> <th>ulty:</th> <th></th> <th></th>	Concerns abo	ut standardiza	tion among fac	ulty:						
Neutral6 (30)2 (33.3)0 (0)2 (25)2 (100)Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)2 (50)5 (62.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Disagree	5 (25)	2 (33.3)	2 (50)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)				
Agree9 (45)2 (33.3)2 (50)5 (62.5)0 (0)Faculty skepticism:Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:0000Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:001 (150)1 (150)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Neutral	6 (30)	2 (33.3)	0 (0)	2 (25)	2 (100)				
Faculty skepticism:Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Agree	9 (45)	2 (33.3)	2 (50)	5 (62.5)	0 (0)				
Disagree6 (30)3 (50)2 (50)1 (12.5)0 (0)Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:UDisagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Faculty skepticism:									
Neutral4 (20)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)2 (100)Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:UDisagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Disagree	6 (30)	3 (50)	2 (50)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)				
Agree10 (50)2 (33.3)2 (50)6 (75)0 (0)Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Neutral	4 (20)	1 (16.7)	0 (0)	1 (12.5)	2 (100)				
Concerns about impact of patient flow:Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Agree	10 (50)	2 (33.3)	2 (50)	6 (75)	0 (0)				
Disagree9 (45)2 (33.3)1 (25)5 (62.5)1 (50)Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Concerns about impact of patient flow:									
Neutral3 (15)1 (16.7)1 (25)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Disagree	9 (45)	2 (33.3)	1 (25)	5 (62.5)	1 (50)				
Agree8 (40)3 (50)2 (50)2 (25)1 (50)Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Neutral	3 (15)	1 (16.7)	1 (25)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)				
Program is understaffed:Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Agree	8 (40)	3 (50)	2 (50)	2 (25)	1 (50)				
Disagree7 (35)1 (16.7)1 (25)4 (50)1 (50)Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Program is understaffed:									
Neutral2 (10)1 (16.7)0 (0)1 (12.5)0 (0)Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Disagree	7 (35)	1 (16.7)	1 (25)	4 (50)	1 (50)				
Agree11 (55)4 (66.7)3 (75)3 (37.5)1 (50)	Neutral	2 (10)	1 (16.7)	0 (0)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)				
	Agree	11 (55)	4 (66.7)	3 (75)	3 (37.5)	1 (50)				

DISCUSSION

The results reveal several noteworthy findings. Despite all programs stating their use of Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MID) and Caries Disease Management (CDM) into both didactic and clinical protocols, there seems to be a disconnect as programs aren't uniformly utilizing concepts such as International Caries Classification Management System (ICCMS), Teledentistry or Motivational Interviewing which may lead to less invasive approaches, increased parental involvement and enhanced outcomes.

In terms of barriers, 45% of programs, particularly hospital-programs and other-combined-communityhealth-center programs, report reimbursement/costs as a significant barrier to implementation. This challenge is exacerbated by the fact that teaching programs have significant operational costs and serve mostly populations insured through the Medicaid program. The combination of these factors leads to programs running at a deficit and need for subsidization. Moreover, manpower shortage emerges as a nationwide concern, with 66.7% of hospital-based programs and 75% of university-based programs expressing worry about their programs being under-staffed. Program directors stressed concerns about lack of standardization and skepticism among faculty. These findings are concerning as these individuals are responsible for shaping the next generations of pediatric dentists.

These findings underscore the complexity of challenges faced by pediatric dentistry residency programs in North America, suggesting a need for targeted strategies and support to address these barriers effectively and support standardization in implementation of all concepts of MID/CDM to ensure comprehensive education and consistent patient care.

Further research and dialogue are needed to investigate and develop effective interventions and policies to identify and address these concerns.

Hospital