Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	The impact of the Dental Practicality Index on treatment planning
Type	Article
URL	https://clok.uclan.ac.uk/id/eprint/38004/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-021-2948-5
Date	2021
Citation	Hamer, Samantha, Kanagasingam, Shalini, Sonde, Nargis, Mannocci, Francesco and Patel, Shanon (2021) The impact of the Dental Practicality Index on treatment planning. British Dental Journal. ISSN 0007-0610
Creators	Hamer, Samantha, Kanagasingam, Shalini, Sonde, Nargis, Mannocci, Francesco and Patel, Shanon

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-021-2948-5

For information about Research at UCLan please go to http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/

Abstract

Aim To compare the treatment planning decisions made by undergraduate and postgraduate dental students before and after training on the use of the Dental Practicality Index (DPI).

Methodology One hundred and eight undergraduate and postgraduate dental students were randomly assigned to test (DPI) or control groups. The baseline knowledge was assessed in the first session, both groups were shown 15 clinical scenarios and asked to assign one of four treatment plan options (no treatment, simple treatment, complex treatment or extract). The most appropriate treatment plan had been agreed by a consensus panel of experienced dentists. The test group was then trained on the use of the DPI. In the second session, both groups were shown the same clinical scenarios again in a different order and asked to assign one of the four treatment plan options. Both groups completed the confidence questionnaire.

Results Training with the DPI improved the test group (DPI) mean scores from 9.1 in the first session to 10.3 out of 15 in the second session, which was a statistically significant difference (p-value = 0.005) when compared to the control group mean scores of 8.9 in the first session to 9.2 out of 15 in the second session. The mean confidence score of the students was 6.5 out of 10. There was no correlation between self-reported confidence scores of the students and the treatment planning result scores.

Conclusions The DPI aids in the systematic assessment and appropriate treatment planning of dental restorative problems by dental students.

Keywords dental practicality index, restorative indices, decision-making, treatment planning

Introduction

Dental treatment planning can be challenging and requires the clinician to consider many inter-related factors to devise a coherent treatment strategy. The tooth structural integrity and periodontal and endodontic status (the restorative status) must be assessed and contextualised in relation to the patient's medical and dental conditions, as well as the patient's expectations and the clinician's clinical skills (the context) (Mindiola *et al.* 2006).

The General Dental Council 2015 learning outcomes highlight treatment planning as an essential clinical skill for a registered dental practitioner (GDC 2015). However, there has been minimal literature published on the teaching of treatment planning and there is no consistent teaching format in dental curricula (Tokede *et al.* 2013). Treatment planning has been shown to be one of the most important skills for a graduate dental student to develop to prepare them for clinical practice (Ali *et al.* 2014). However, it has been found that undergraduate dental students felt less confident in formulating a comprehensive treatment plan and knowing when to refer a case, when compared to the confidence they felt in performing other clinical tasks (Ali *et al.* 2017). These findings were similar to a study of 186 newly qualified dentists and their educational supervisors, with 56% of the educational supervisors reporting that the trainees were 'poorly' or 'very poorly' prepared for diagnosis and treatment planning in general practice (Patel *et al.* 2006).

This has led to the introduction of various treatment planning indices which aid clinical decision-making. However, in practice many clinicians have found that these guides are sometimes too complex or time consuming to complete, resulting in a poor uptake in their use (Curry 2009). Other indices limit the guidance to just one aspect of dental treatment and therefore do not offer the clinician a holistic approach to treatment planning. The Tooth Restorability Index (TRI) (McDonald & Setchell 2005) assesses the restorability of the remaining tooth structure by quantifying the volume and position of the remaining dentine on the tooth into a numerical score. The index assesses the suitability of a single tooth for a cuspal coverage restoration and does not take into consideration the periodontal or endodontic status of the tooth in question or any other aspect of the patients' oral and overall health.

The American Association of Endodontists (AAE) Endodontic Case Difficulty Assessment (Curtis & Simon 1999) takes into account the difficulty of 17 aspects relating to endodontic treatment. It considers patient factors, such as the medical history, mouth opening and gag reflex, as well as treatment considerations such as tooth position, morphology, radiographic findings and periodontal disease. However, the comprehensive nature of the assessment form can be a disadvantage. It has been found that the guide is used by less than 10% of American general dental practitioners (GDP) due to the time taken to complete the form (Curry 2009). To improve the use of case assessment forms, a simplified index was developed, the Dutch Endodontic Treatment Index (DETI). This form took 1-2 minutes to complete by 90% of the clinicians and discriminated between uncomplicated and complicated endodontic cases (Ree *et al.* 2003). Although simple to complete, it only focuses on the complexity of endodontic treatment and does not consider the periodontal status, overall restorability of the tooth or patient factors.

The Restorative Dentistry Index of Treatment Need (RDITN) (Royal College of Surgeons 2001) was developed to produce an index which would allow dental restorative treatment need to be identified and ranked by complexity. (Falcon *et al.* 2001). The RDITN is separated into four complexity components; periodontal, endodontic, fixed and removable prosthodontic treatment assessment. Each complexity component is assessed as, low (1), moderate (2) or high (3) and then a 'modifying factor' can be applied. The modifying factors are specific to each component and attempt to assess the biomedical and psychological aspects of providing dental treatment. The RDITN aims to convert clinical findings into numerical data which can indicate the complexity of treatment need and be used to allocate funding to provide these services. These indices measure the severity of the need, but do not indicate the complexity of providing the treatment for individual patients or monitor the progress or success of treatment. Another disadvantage of the RDITN index, is that it does not apply to the treatment of children and does not include the provision of complete dentures (Townsend 2008). The reproducibility of the root canal treatment assessment component of the RDITN was evaluated (Muthukrishnan *et al.* 2007) and although it was found to be easy to use, the grading system was incomplete and there were some reproducibility issues, such as the potential for variable interpretation of root canal access, angulation and negotiability.

The Dental Practicality Index (DPI) (Dawood & Patel 2017) (Table 1) weights the structural integrity of the tooth, periodontal status and endodontic status, and crucially puts these in context with the local and general factors, such as the state of, or absence of nearby teeth, and the social, dental, and medical history. The DPI aims to encourage clinicians to plan treatment systematically and holistically, and crucially to improve confidence in assessing which treatments are within the clinician's competency and when to refer to secondary or tertiary (specialist) care for appropriate advice and/or management.

The Tooth structural integrity, Periodontal treatment need, Endodontic treatment need, and Context are each evaluated and scored as '0' if no intervention is required, '1' if simple treatment is required, '2' if the treatment is more complex and '6' if it would not be practical to treat. Additional scores are given for 'context', which are modifying factors which will complicate the treatment, for example, radiotherapy of the head and neck region, caries rate, intravenous bisphosphonate medication, or active periodontal disease. The cumulative score from each of these categories is added to give the overall DPI score, a DPI $\geq$ 6 indicates that restoring the tooth may not be advisable and alternative treatment should be discussed.

The effectiveness of the DPI index to predict the outcome of root canal retreatment has been evaluated (Tifooni *et al.* 2019). The study found that for a molar tooth with a DPI score below 3 (Table 1), there was a favourable outcome of 96%, compared to a 74% favourable outcome for a molar tooth with a DPI score above 3. This represents a 10-fold greater chance of a favourable outcome if the DPI is below 3. Indicating that the systematic evaluation of a tooth using the DPI index can give a good prediction of the outcome for root canal retreatment, and therefore helps clinicians formulate treatments plans, i.e. whether it is practical to consider treating a tooth versus no treatment or extraction.

The aim of this study was to compare the treatment planning decisions made by the undergraduate and postgraduate dental students, before and after training on the use of the DPI index.

Weighting	Tooth structure integrity	Periodontal treatment need	Endodontic treatment need	Context
0 **No treatment required**	Unrestored Existing restoration ok	Probing <3.5mm (BPE 0-2) Periodontal disease treated	Vital pulp Existing RCT ok	**Local:** Adjacent teeth are healthy **General:** History of IV bisphosphonates, head & neck radiotherapy
1 **Simple treatment required**	Simple direct or indirect restoration Suitable for GDP	Probing 3.5-5.5mm (BPE 3) RSD suitable for hygienist or GDP	Simple RCT Canal(s) visible, straight	**Local:** Will this tooth be a bridge abutment **General:** Planned radiotherapy of head & neck region immunocompromised patient
2 **Complex treatment required**	Minimal sound tooth Subgingival margins Post-core	Probing >5.5mm (BPE 4) Short root Crown lengthening Grade 2 mobility Grade 2-3 furcation involvement	Complex root canal system Sclerosed canal(s) Acute curvatures Fractured instrument removal Perforations	**Local:** Prosthodontic treatment planned of multiple teeth **General:** High caries rate Poor oral hygiene Parafunctional habits Extensive tooth surface loss Active periodontal disease
6 **Impractical to treat**	Inadequate structure for ferrule	Untreatable periodontal disease	Untreatable root canal system	**Local:** Keeping the tooth would compromise a simple plan e.g. 1 remaining over-erupted tooth affecting denture construction **General:** Potentially life-threatening medical conditions where the objective of dental treatment is pain relief only

Table 1 Dental Practicality Index (DPI) (Dawood & Patel 2017)

Materials and methods

The dental students

Ethical approval was obtained from King's College London (KCL) ethics committee (Remas: LRU-17/18-6993) and University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) ethics committee (STEMH 1008). Undergraduate and postgraduate students were asked to volunteer to participate in the multi-centre study. Each student was given a written information leaflet and consent form, detailing the purpose of the study and that their involvement was voluntary. The participants were advised they could withdraw from the study at any point and given details on how their confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained and how the data from the study would be stored and handled in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations 2016 (GDPR).

The dental students represented a range of experience levels. The undergraduate students were in their 3rd or 4th year of training at KCL or UCLan and the postgraduate students were dental core trainees or studying for a diploma in endodontics at KCL.

The dental students were randomly assigned to one of two groups, the test group and the control group. In the first session both groups were shown the same 15 clinical scenarios and asked to assign a treatment plan, this gave a base line test score for each student, allowing statistical analysis to take into account the variation in baseline knowledge of each student. The test group was then trained on the use of the DPI, while the control group left the room. In the second session on the same day, both groups were then shown the same clinical scenarios as in the first session but in a different order and asked to assign a treatment plan. For completeness and fairness to the participating volunteers, the control group was trained on the use of the DPI following completion of the second session (Table 2). Both groups completed the confidence questionnaire, using a 10-point Likert scale.

	Test Group	Control Group
First Session	Confidence Questionnaire 15 Clinical Scenarios	Confidence Questionnaire 15 Clinical Scenarios
	⬇	⬇
Second Session	Training on DPI	Leave the room
	⬇	⬇
	15 Clinical Scenarios (different order)	15 Clinical Scenarios (different order)
	⬇	⬇
	Leave the room	Training on DPI

Table 2 Sequence of testing for the test group and the control group.

Case scenarios

Clinical scenarios of 15 teeth with periapical radiographs and clinical photographs were included in the study (Figure 1). The cases were chosen to represent a range of clinical scenarios, that would typically be encountered in primary care. Each of the 15 cases had been assigned a treatment plan (Table 3) by a consensus panel of 3 experienced dental educators, who were involved designing and implementing dental curricula and teaching undergraduate and postgraduate dental students, as well as working in specialist referral practice.

Figure 1 One of the clinical case scenarios used for treatment planning (Case 5 in session one = Case 3 in session two) Permission: ©SAGE Publications

DPI Score	Treatment Plan	Explanation
0	No Treatment	No treatment or review
1	Simple Treatment	Straight forward treatment / GDP level

		Recognise the complexities of treatment
2	Complex Treatment	Additional training maybe required to complete the case successfully or referred to secondary or tertiary care
6	Extract	Impractical to treat (leave or extract)

Table 3 Treatment options assigned to clinical scenarios

The dental students were shown the 15 clinical scenarios on a PowerPoint presentation (Microsoft Office 365®, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) and asked to assign one of the four treatment plan options (No treatment, Simple treatment, Complex treatment, Extract) to each clinical scenario. The clinical scenarios were assessed in quiet seminar rooms. The data was entered on to an Excel database (Microsoft Office 365®, Microsoft Corporation, USA) and statistically analysed (Excel Analysis, Microsoft Corporation, USA). Frequencies were used to examine the responses of the dental students compared to the consensus panel and describe the demographics of the dental students.

Results

Demographics

In total, 108 undergraduate and postgraduate dental students participated in the study, with 47 males and 61 females. The test group consisted of 24 males and 30 females, with an age range of 20-46 years. The control group consisted of 23 males and 31 females, with an age range of 21-51 years. The mean age of both the test and control group was 27 years.

The mean self-reported confidence levels of the dental students in the test group was 6.5, and the control group was 6.6 out of a maximum confidence score of 10 on the Likert scale. There was no correlation between the students' self-reported confidence levels and the score they achieved in the first treatment planning session.

The mean score for the first treatment planning session for was 9.1 and 8.9 for the test and control group, respectively. Following training with the DPI the test group mean score increased by 1.2 to 10.3 in the second treatment planning session, and the control group score marginally increased by 0.3 to 9.2 in the second treatment planning session (Table 4). An unpaired 2 tailed t-test was conducted to compare the mean difference in scores of the test group and the control group, finding a statistically significant difference with p = 0.005.

	Mean Score First Session		Mean Score Second Session	
	Test Group	Control Group	Test Group	Control Group
KCL Undergraduate Students	7.4	7.1	8.6	7.4
UCLan Undergraduate Students	9.2	9.4	10.2	9.6
KCL Postgraduate Students	10.5	9.8	11.6	10.2
All Students	9.1	8.9	10.3	9.2

Table 4 Showing mean scores in the first and second treatment planning sessions

The majority of dental students agreed with the consensus panel in 10 out of the 15 clinical scenarios in the first treatment planning session. The percentage of agreement ranged from 5% to 95%. In 11 out of the 15 clinical scenarios the most frequently given answer by the dental students agreed with the consensus panel answer (Table 5).

	108 Test and Control Groups answers for first treatment planning session						
	Expected Answer	**No Answer**	**No Treatment**	**Simple**	**Complex**	**Extract**	**% Agreement**
1	**Simple**	1	4	**103**	0	0	95%

		No Answer	No Treatment	Simple	Complex	Extract	% Agreement
2	**Extract**	1	1	15	8	**83**	77%
3	**Complex**	1	0	26	**74**	7	69%
4	**Simple**	1	1	**64**	27	15	59%
5*	**Complex**	0	2	77	**6**	23	5%
6	**Extract**	0	0	7	36	**65**	60%
7	**Complex**	1	4	45	**57**	1	53%
8	**Extract**	0	2	14	45	**47**	44%
9	**No Treatment**	1	**96**	9	1	1	89%
10	**Complex**	0	50	11	**42**	5	39%
11	**Simple**	0	7	**98**	3	0	91%
12	**Extract**	1	0	58	7	**42**	39%
13	**Extract**	1	12	61	2	**32**	30%
14	**Complex**	0	0	24	**72**	12	67%
15	**Simple**	1	9	**98**	0	0	91%

Table 5 Comparing the dental student answers in first treatment planning session to the consensus group answers. (* Case 5 in session one = Case 3 in session two)

The majority of dental students agreed with the consensus panel in 10 out of the 15 clinical scenarios in the second treatment planning session following training on the DPI. The percentage of agreement ranged from 31% to 91%. In 14 out of the 15 clinical scenarios the most frequently given answer by the dental students agreed with the consensus panel answer (Table 6).

54 Test Group answers for Second Treatment Planning Session							
	Expected Answer	**No Answer**	**No Treatment**	**Simple**	**Complex**	**Extract**	**% Agreement**
1	**Simple**	0	0	**45**	9	0	83%

2	**Extract**	0	0	17	18	**19**	35%
3*	**Complex**	0	0	16	**20**	18	37%
4	**Complex**	0	0	4	**46**	4	85%
5	**Complex**	0	22	4	**17**	11	31%
6	**Complex**	0	2	12	**40**	0	74%
7	**Extract**	0	7	15	11	**21**	39%
8	**Simple**	0	3	**49**	2	0	90%
9	**Extract**	0	0	2	13	**39**	72%
10	**Extract**	0	1	0	4	**49**	91%
11	**Complex**	0	0	6	47	1	87%
12	**No Treatment**	0	**46**	2	5	1	85%
13	**Simple**	0	1	**26**	23	4	48%
14	**Simple**	0	3	**49**	2	0	91%
15	**Extract**	0	0	4	8	**42**	78%

Table 6 Comparing the test group dental student answers in second session to the consensus group answers. (* Case 3 in session two = Case 5 in session one)

Discussion

The aim of the study was to investigate how training dental students on the use of the DPI influenced their treatment planning decisions for a variety of restorative dental problems. The study of 108 undergraduate and postgraduate dental students found a statistically significant difference in treatment planning answers following training on the DPI ($p=0.005$), achieving a greater level of agreement with the consensus panel. The study methodology utilised a test-retest method and an experimental control method to evaluate the effect of the training on the students' treatment planning decisions.

It would seem logical to assume that any training would improve the skills of all students, however, this will only be the case if the training is effective. To know if the training is having the desired impact requires evaluation and testing of the training techniques employed. The Kirkpatrick Model is a four-step evaluation for analysing

educational programmes, taking into account the reaction to training, learning evaluation, behavioural change and organisational performance (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick 2006). This study demonstrated learning evaluation by showing that the training was effective at influencing the way the dental students evaluated dental restorative treatment planning. Further research could be done to evaluate behaviour change and assess how the students utilised these techniques in future clinical practice.

The methodology minimised sampling bias, and improved external validity by conducting the study at two centres (KCL and UCLan) and including both undergraduate and postgraduate dental students. The variation in baseline knowledge of the undergraduate and postgraduate dental students was taken into account by conducting a baseline test and measuring the change in scores for each student following training on the DPI or no additional training. The internal validity was improved by managing confounding variables, i.e. by randomly assigning the students to the groups, having a control group and conducting the study on the same day which maintained 100% participation throughout the study. Undertaking the first and second treatment planning sessions on two different days, to allow more time for the test group to become familiar with utilising the DPI was discussed, however, it would have been very difficult to ensure that the test group did not discuss the DPI with anyone in the control group between the first and second sessions, so to reduce this risk the first and second sessions of the study were conducted on the same day in both centres.

The use of a consensus panel to formulate an opinion on a given topic has sometimes been called the method of last resort, as it is not clear if the answer derived by the panel is actually "correct". However, a consensus panel can be useful when unanimity of opinion on a topic does not exist due to insufficient scientific evidence or when the evidence available gives differing results. In constructing the consensus panel, it is important to maximise the benefits of having an informed panel consider the problem, while minimising the problems associated with collective decision making. (Jones & Hunter 1995). The quality of a consensus panel can be improved by ensuring diversity, with each panel member having variation in clinical training, speciality and experience with differing socioeconomic, racial and ethnic groups (Gabel *et al.* 2010). In this study, the panel members were chosen for their wealth and variety of experience in

undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and treating patients in multiple specialist restorative practices. Each panel member independently reviewed the clinical scenarios and assigned a treatment plan based on the DPI, where differences existed, these cases were discussed collectively to achieve consensus, there was a high level of inter-rater reliability between the panel members.

The study found high levels of agreement between the dental student treatment plan answers and the consensus panel treatment plan answers. In 11 out of the 15 clinical scenarios in the first treatment planning session the most frequently given answer by the dental students agreed with the consensus panel answer and following training with the DPI, the most frequently given answer by the dental students agreed with the consensus panel answers in 14 out of the 15 clinical scenarios in the second treatment planning session. Training on the DPI aided the dental students to assess the clinical scenarios with a systematic approach, which helped to identify if additional challenges were present, however, even with training some variation in treatment planning decisions were still present. Variation in clinicians' treatment planning decisions has been attributed to, the ambiguity of clinical data, variations in its interpretation, uncertainty of the presence of disease and uncertainty about the effects of treatment (Dental Protection – Complexity 2016).

The clinical scenario shown in Figure 1 had the largest degree of disagreement between the dental student's answer in session one and the consensus panel answer, with 71% of dental students choosing the option; Simple treatment (GDP level). The consensus panel assigned this case; Complex treatment and thought that this case would require additional training for the treatment to be completed, as the case requires root canal treatment with no canals visible in the mesial root and calcified pulp chamber, a post core would be required due to loss of coronal tooth structure and the distal margin is 1mm above the alveolar crest, necessitating crown lengthening to achieve a good margin on sound tooth for the cuspal coverage restoration. The confidence expressed by the dental students in their ability to treat this case may reflect their lack of experience and ability to assess the complexities of the case and could indicate unconscious incompetence (Ali *et al.* 2014). However, following training with the DPI the test student's level of agreement with the consensus panel answer increased (Table 6). Training on the DPI increased the dental student's agreement

with the consensus panel to 37%, indicating that the DPI assisted the students in identifying the complexities of treating this case.

The study found no correlation between the self-reported student confidence and the treatment planning result scores, which concurs with a previous systematic review of the literature on self-reported levels of competence in medical doctors (Davis *et al.* 2006). The systematic review concluded that although the quality of the evidence was poor, the evidence does suggest that clinicians have a limited ability to accurately self-report their level of competency. The complexity of assessing how confidence relates to competence has been evaluated and found that it lacks objectivity and is biased by the beliefs and values individuals hold about themselves. When a clinician is faced with clinical uncertainty and unknowns, they need to assess if they can perform the procedure and know when to stop if they are unsuccessful. An overconfident clinician may undertake procedures without fully appreciating and evaluating the risks and may not have the competency to adequately carry out the procedure. Whereas an underconfident, but competent clinician may struggle to work independently. Ideally, a clinician should be able to temper confidence with a knowledge of their personal limitations, weaknesses and have the ability to self-evaluate their own competence (Stewart *et al.* 2000).

Decision-making is influenced by the dentist's training and competency, patient preferences and environment and resource factors, such as equipment availability. A study found that diagnosis and treatment decisions for endodontic conditions varied depending on the dental speciality training of the dentist (McCaul *et al.* 2001). It has also been noted that there is also considerable bias in making clinical decisions due to the limitations in human memory and judgement (McCreery & Truelove 1991a). In a review of 11 decision making studies, 10 were focused on the variation of dentists' treatment planning, with many studies showing a wide variation amongst dentists. However, establishing that variation in treatment planning occurs is only one aspect in decision making, research should now be focused on aiding improvements in establishing diagnoses, criteria for treatment, cost-benefit analysis and integration of patient preferences (McCreery & Truelove 1991b). It has been found that reflecting and discussing complicated treatment planning cases can also be a useful way of

highlighting issues in treatment planning which may not have been initially apparent and aid the clinician to provide practical and predictable treatment (Alani *et al.* 2010).

Studies into decision-making have attempted to address this variation by providing a common model on which to base dental practice and standardise treatment, but there is a lack of research-based evidence to formulate coherent guidelines. Some have questioned if variation is always undesirable and that strict adherence to guidelines could reduce the innovation necessary for continued development of the knowledge base. It may also have the potential unintended effect of an increased risk of litigation if a clinician does not follow the guidelines (McCaul *et al.* 2001). However, it has been found that decision aids can have a positive effect on clinician-patient communication, with a decrease in decisional conflict relating to the patient feeling uninformed. Following a consultation using a decision aid, patient's felt they had an increased knowledge of their condition and were equally or more satisfied with their treatment decision (Stacey *et al.* 2017).

The DPI provides a structured format to assess the inter-related factors which should be taken into consideration during the dental treatment planning process, including when to seek advice and consider referral to a more experienced clinician. It also encourages reflection and providing holistic patient centred care, by assisting the clinician in the decision-making process, rather than providing rigid guidelines on what treatment should be provided. The index helps to methodically assess the patient and highlights potential complications with treatment, which can then be discussed with the patient before commencing treatment, to manage the patient's expectations and provide the best treatment for the patients' own unique circumstances.

Conclusion

The study has shown that training on the DPI aids in the systematic assessment and appropriate treatment planning of dental restorative problems by dental students.

Further large-scale studies will be required to enhance the validity of the results and assess the long-term impact of the training.

References

Alani A, Bishop K, Djemal S (2010) The influence of specialty training, experience, discussion and reflection on decision making in modern restorative treatment planning. *British Dental Journal* **210**, E4.

Ali K, Tredwin C, Kay EJ, Slade A, Pooler J (2014) Preparedness of dental graduates for foundation training: a qualitative study. *British Dental Journal* **217**, 145-149

Ali K, Slade A, Kay E, Zahra D, Tredwin C (2017) Preparedness of undergraduate dental students in the United Kingdom: a national study. *British Dental Journal* **222**, 472-477.

Curtis EK, Simon DC (1999) Endodontic case difficulty assessment: the team approach. *General Dentistry* **47**, 340-344.

Curry M (2009) *The utilization of case difficulty assessment when determining endodontic referral.* Master's Dissertation, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina.

Davis DA, Mazmanian PE, Fordis M, Van Harrison R, Thorpe KE, Perrier L (2006) Accuracy of Physician Self-assessment Compared with Observed Measures of Competence. *Journal of American Medical Association* **296**, 1094-1102.

Dawood A, Patel S (2017) The Dental Practicality Index – assessing the restorability of teeth. *British Dental Journal* **222**, 755-8.

Dental Protection Continuum Series – Complexity. Dental Protection 2016.

Falcon HC, Richardson P, Shaw MJ, Bulman JS, Smith BGN (2001) Developing an index of restorative dental treatment need. *British Dental Journal* **190**, 479-486.

Gabel MJ, Foster NL, Heidebrink JL, Higdon R, Aizenstein HJ, Arnold SE, Barbas NR, Boeve BF, Burke JR, Clark CM, DeKosky ST, Farlow MR, Jagust WJ, Kawas CH, Koeppe RA, Leverenz JB, Lipton AM, Peskind ER, Turner RS, Womack KB, Zamrini EY (2010) Validation of Consensus Panel Diagnosis in Dementia. *Archives of Neurology* **67**, 1506-1512.

General Dental Council. Preparing for practice: Dental team learning outcomes for registration. GDC 2015.

Jones J, Hunter D (1995) Qualitative Research: Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *British Medical Journal* **311**, 376-380.

Kirkpatrick DL, Kirkpatrick JD (2006) Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels. Third Edition Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco

McCaul LK, McHugh S, Saunders WP (2001) The influence of specialty training and experience on decision making in endodontic diagnosis and treatment planning. *International Endodontic Journal* **34**, 594-606.

McCreery AM, Truelove E (1991a) Decision making in dentistry. Part 1: A historical and methodological overview. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* **65**, 447-451.

McCreery AM, Truelove E (1991b) Decision making in dentistry. Part II: Clinical applications of decision methods. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* **65**, 575-585.

McDonald AV, Setchell DJ (2005) Developing a tooth restorability index. *Dental Update* **32**, 343-8.

Mindiola MJ, Mickel AK, Sami C, Jones JJ, Lalumandier JA, Nelson SS (2006) Endodontic treatment in an American Indian population: a 10-year retrospective study. *Journal of Endodontics* **32**, 828-832.

Muthukrishnan A, Owens J, Bryant S, Dummer PM (2007) Evaluation of a system for grading the complexity of root canal treatment. British Dental Journal 202, E26.

Patel J, Fox K, Grieveson B, Youngson CC (2006) Undergraduate training as preparation for vocational training in England: a survey of vocational dental practitioners' and their trainers' views. *British Dental Journal* **201 S5**, 9-15.

Ree MH, Timmerman MF, Wasselink PR (2003) An evaluation of the usefulness of the two endodontic case assessment forms by general dentists. *International Endodontic Journal* **36**, 545-555.

Royal College of Surgeons. *Restorative Dentistry Index of Treatment Need Complexity Assessment.* Department of Health/Clinical Effectiveness Committee of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, 2001. Document authors: Professor Jeremy Shaw, Professor Bernard Smith, Ms Helen Falcon.

Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis F, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L (2017) Decision aids to help people who are facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.*

Stewart J, O'Halloran C, Barton, Singleton JR, Harrigan P, Spencer J (2000) Clarifying the concepts of confidence and competence to produce appropriate self-evaluation measurement scales. *Medical Education* **34**, 903-909.

Tifooni A, Al-Nuaimi N, Dawood A, Mannocci F, Patel S (2019) Validation of the effectiveness of the Dental Practicality Index in predicting the outcome of root canal retreatments. *International Endodontic Journal* **52**, 1403-1409.

Townsend D (2008) An audit of the Restorative Dentistry Index of Treatment Need Complexity Assessment. *Journal of Disability and Oral Health* **9**, 100-112.

Tokede O, Walji M, Ramoni R, White JM, Schoonheim-Klein M, Kimmes NS, Vanderhobli R, Stark PC, Patel VL, Kalenderian E (2013) Treatment planning in

dentistry using an electronic health record: implications for undergraduate education. *European Journal of Dental Education* **17**, e34-e43