Communication

From Polycausal Disease to “Paint-and-Go”: Evidence-to-Policy Drift in Early Childhood Caries, SDF “Magic Paint,” and the Risks of Delegation Without Deliberation

Ziad D. Baghdadi *

Posted Date: 22 January 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

Keywords: early childhood caries; silver diamine fluoride; SDF; caries risk assessment; CCRAT; indigenous health; implementation science; risk of bias; CONSORT; ROB-2; STROBE

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

Communication

From Polycausal Disease to "Paint-and-Go": Evidence-to-Policy Drift in Early Childhood Caries, SDF "Magic Paint," and the Risks of Delegation Without Deliberation

Ziad D. Baghdadi

Independent Researcher, Canada; Drziadeddin.albaghdadi@gmail.com

Abstract

Early childhood caries (ECC) is routinely described as a complex, multifactorial disease shaped by biofilm ecology, host susceptibility, diet, behavior, and social context. Yet, a growing strand of public-health messaging and implementation practice increasingly treats ECC as a one-step problem solvable by a topical "magic paint" (most prominently silver diamine fluoride, SDF) and deliverable by non-dental or minimally trained providers. This commentary argues that the **core contradiction**—declaring ECC polycausal while operationalizing it as monocausal—drives a harmful *evidence-to-policy drift*: research designs favor short-term, easily marketable surrogate endpoints (e.g., "arrest" defined partly by SDF-induced black staining) and implementation strategies shift diagnosis and management to underprepared personnel without robust guardrails. Using a journal-style critical lens anchored in **ROB-2**, **CONSORT**, and **STROBE** principles, I examine recent Canadian work frequently cited to justify "paint-and-go" approaches, including open-label randomized trials of SDF application intervals and microbiome-focused substudies, and I integrate the delegation axis through the Canadian Caries Risk Assessment Tool (CCRAT) and its embedding into primary care workflows. While SDF and non-dental screening can be valuable *adjuncts* in a continuum of care, overselling them as substitutes for dentist-led diagnosis, pulpal assessment, and definitive rehabilitation risks institutionalizing a two-tier standard for children—especially for Indigenous and remote communities. I conclude with concrete research and policy guardrails: comparator-driven trials, multilevel modeling, lesion-specific sampling where mechanistic claims are made, patient-centered outcomes, defined referral timelines, and a dental-home–anchored pathway that treats SDF as a bridge—not a destination.

Keywords: early childhood caries; silver diamine fluoride; SDF; caries risk assessment; CCRAT; indigenous health; implementation science; risk of bias; CONSORT; ROB-2; STROBE

1. Introduction: When "Complex Disease" Becomes a Slogan

ECC is not a single lesion; it is a **systemic disease** manifesting in teeth. Its trajectory emerges from microbial community structure, host factors (including genetics and taste pathways), behaviors (especially sugar exposure and hygiene), and structural determinants such as access, poverty, and rurality. A recent integrative analysis combining taste genetics with plaque microbiome data illustrates this point with unusual clarity: predictive performance improves when **host, microbiome, and social variables** are modeled together—precisely the opposite of what "single-intervention" narratives imply.

The paradox in today's pediatric oral health discourse is therefore not scientific—it is *operational*: we endorse complexity rhetorically, then design systems that behave as if ECC were a one-variable equation. That operational contradiction is now being normalized through two coupled moves:

1. **Therapeutic simplification**: "paint-and-go" caries control, in which a topical agent (often SDF) is framed as a near-cure endpoint rather than an interim measure.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

2. **Workforce simplification**: shifting screening, risk assessment, and sometimes intervention to non-dental providers using brief tools (e.g., CCRAT), despite documented training gaps and weak system integration.

This commentary does not argue against SDF, nor against medical–dental collaboration. It argues against **category errors**: substituting a medication for a care pathway, and substituting a checklist for diagnosis.

2. Oversimplification of ECC—"Magic-Bullet" Paints as a Substitute for Care

SDF is a useful material. It is also an unusually easy material to oversell.

The "magic paint" storyline typically runs like this: ECC is widespread, access is limited, therefore we should prioritize high-throughput approaches—"lift the lip," score risk, paint SDF, and move on. That storyline becomes institutionally seductive when success is measured by endpoints that are (a) easy to collect in community settings, (b) quick to improve, and (c) visually dramatic.

But what looks like success in a spreadsheet can be failure in a child's life. "Arrest" does not automatically mean restored function, restored esthetics, restored sleep, restored nutrition, or restored development. And it does not replace pulpal diagnosis.

Systematically, the risk is not that SDF exists. The risk is that SDF becomes **the ceiling** instead of the **floor**—particularly for children already assigned, by geography or inequity, to limited options.

3. What the Evidence Actually Supports About SDF (and What It Doesn't)

A high-quality synthesis of the SDF literature emphasizes a recurring reality: evidence across outcomes and regimens is heterogeneous, and many conclusions—especially about prevention, long-term durability, and comparative effectiveness—remain uncertain or of low certainty depending on the outcome and study design.

Professional guidance also frames SDF as a **topical, non-restorative management** option with well-known trade-offs (notably black staining) and the practical need for **ongoing follow-up** rather than a single-application "cure."

The scientific and ethical problem arises when these realities are translated into messaging that implies:

- "One paint cures ECC," or
- "Arrest is equivalent to treatment completion," or
- "Diagnosis and pulpal assessment can be bypassed because access is hard."

That translation is not an evidence-based leap. It is an evidence-based *collapse*.

4. Evidence Appraisal I: The Canadian SDF-Interval Open-Label RCT—When Pragmatic Becomes Permissive

A recent Canadian open-label, parallel-group randomized clinical trial compared different SDF application intervals in preschool children with cavitated lesions treated with **38% SDF plus 5% NaF varnish** at two initial visits, spaced 1, 4, or 6 months apart. The trial reports higher short-term arrest in the shorter-interval arms.

4.1. CONSORT Lens: What the Trial Asks vs. What the System Hears

On its own terms, the trial asks an operational question: Does *earlier re-application increase early "arrest" in community clinics?* That is a legitimate pragmatic question.

The problem is what happens next—how this narrow operational result becomes broadcast as a generalizable justification for "paint more often" programs and delegated delivery, while ECC remains uncontrolled at scale.

This is where **CONSORT** is not a reporting bureaucracy; it is a boundary against overinterpretation. CONSORT exists to keep what a trial *shows* from being inflated into what it *means*.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

4.2. ROB-2 Lens: Domain-Level Concerns That Weaken Causal Confidence

Using **ROB-2** domains as a structured framework, several risk-of-bias concerns arise.

(A) Bias in measurement of the outcome (detection / incorporation bias):

"Arrest" is commonly defined by tactile hardness and color change—yet black staining is an expected SDF effect. When outcome criteria include a treatment signature, open-label assessment becomes vulnerable to incorporation bias. In related work from the same trial network, lesions were "deemed arrested if found to be black and hard," illustrating exactly how treatment imprint can become outcome proof.

(B) Deviations from intended interventions / performance bias:

Open-label designs in community settings can alter behaviors (e.g., provider counseling, caregiver expectations, hygiene changes), and those shifts can confound short-term outcomes—especially when no robust behavioral/dietary measurement is built into the design.

(C) Analysis unit problems (pseudo-replication risk):

When hundreds of lesions are analyzed within dozens of children, lesion-level analyses require multilevel methods to avoid inflated precision. In the microbiome RCT linked to this program, lesion counts and arrests are reported alongside group comparisons, underscoring the importance of explicitly modeling clustering rather than assuming independence.

(D) Missing outcome / limited follow-up:

Short follow-up captures early surface hardening, but not **tooth survival**, reactivation, pulpal progression, fracture, or later need for OR-based rehabilitation—the outcomes that matter most for children and systems.

4.3. The Deeper Issue: Surrogate Endpoints Become Policy Currency

The trial's most consequential output may not be its clinical finding; it may be its *marketable metric*. "Arrest rate at final visit" is a high-throughput number that institutions can deploy quickly. But it is not the same as:

- disease control,
- functional rehabilitation,
- quality of life,
- or equity in comprehensive care.

This is the first mechanism of evidence-to-policy drift: **surrogates become substitutes**.

5. Evidence Appraisal II: The "Bacteriome/Mycobiome" RCT—Mechanistic Language Without Mechanistic Sampling

A randomized clinical trial examining microbiome changes under different SDF regimens recruited 45 children, treated 195 lesions with SDF plus NaF varnish, and sampled supragingival plaque at each visit. Importantly, plaque was collected by scrubbing **all available tooth surfaces** with a sterile interdental brush; the authors also state that samples were **not site-specific** and therefore could not localize changes to treated lesions.

5.1. CONSORT Framing: "Adheres to CONSORT" Is Not the Same As "Answers the Claimed Question."

The study explicitly states adherence to CONSORT and describes open-label methods and non-blinded personnel.

But the key scientific question is not whether the protocol is described—it is whether the **sampling frame** matches the **inference frame**.

If the implied claim is lesion-level ecological transformation, then lesion-level sampling is not optional. Sampling the whole mouth and then attributing shifts to lesion-level intervention is classic ecological inference drift.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

5.2. Core Methodological Contradictions

(A) Non–site-specific sampling undermines lesion-level inference

The study's own methods specify interdental-brush sampling across all available tooth surfaces, and its discussion acknowledges the limitation: the microbiome data cannot be localized to the carious lesion site.

That single point collapses many mechanistic interpretations into hypothesis-generating observations.

(B) Small sample size + attrition in mycobiome pipelines

The trial reports loss of samples due to low reads and removal for paired analysis (including multiple excluded fungal samples).

In 'omics work with high dimensionality, these losses matter: they amplify instability, especially when paired with multiple-testing burdens and flexible analytic choices.

(C) No true control group for attribution

All groups receive SDF plus NaF varnish, so observed changes reflect a combined regimen over time rather than isolating SDF's contribution.

The literature demonstrates that combining fluoride modalities can alter arrest outcomes compared with SDF alone, underscoring the need for a proper comparator structure.

(D) Outcome definition loops back into bias

In this microbiome RCT, lesions were "deemed arrested if found to be black and hard," and personnel were not blinded.

That is not a fatal flaw for pragmatic care delivery, but it is a serious limitation when arrest is used as a hard endpoint to justify expanded delegation.

5.3. The Interpretive Leap: Microbiome "Noise" Used As A Mechanistic Defense for Simplified Care

The more subtle problem is rhetorical: microbiome language can be used to create an aura of mechanistic depth around an intervention model that is, clinically, shallow. If a study cannot localize its sampling to the treated lesion, then "microbiome shift" should be framed as **exploratory ecology**, not as proof that a paint-and-pray pathway is biologically sufficient.

6. The Delegation Axis: CCRAT, Primary Care Integration, and the Risks of Shifting Diagnosis Without Infrastructure

The "magic paint" movement does not travel alone. It is increasingly coupled with **risk tools** that enable non-dental providers to identify high-risk children and trigger preventive actions within medical workflows.

6.1. CCRAT: What It Is and What It Can Realistically Do

The Canadian Caries Risk Assessment Tool (CCRAT) was designed for **non-dental primary care providers** and embedded in early childhood records (e.g., well-child frameworks).

As a screening adjunct, this can be valuable—*if* the downstream pathway exists.

But the tool's validation data also matters. A pilot validation study in dental clinics reports **high sensitivity (~87%) but modest specificity (~43%)** for predicting new cavitated lesions, meaning many children will be flagged "high risk" who may not progress as predicted.

That is not a condemnation—it is what many screening tools look like. The danger is using a low-specificity screen to justify large-scale delegated management without a robust referral-and-treatment system.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

6.2. STROBE Lens: What Is Missing When Validation Becomes Advocacy

STROBE is not a ritual; it is a demand for transparent limits in observational inference.

In the CCRAT validation study, several features constrain generalizability and causal interpretation:

- validation occurred in **dental clinics** with a dentist examiner, not in real-world primary care settings where the tool is intended to operate;
- The examiner was reportedly **not blinded** to CCRAT items during assessment.
- and performance metrics derived from high-risk clinic populations may not transport cleanly into Indigenous, rural, or structurally different contexts.

This is where the "delegation without deliberation" risk becomes concrete: a tool validated under one set of conditions can be rhetorically repurposed to justify scope shifts under very different conditions.

6.3. Implementation Reality Check: Training Gaps and Workflow Barriers Are Not Minor Details

Two recent strands of evidence deepen the concern:

(A) Training-needs evidence (Frontiers, 2025):

Non-dental professionals value CRA tools and find them feasible, but many report limited formal preparation and emphasize a need for culturally appropriate, hands-on education before competent engagement.

(B) Qualitative implementation evidence in Indigenous pediatric primary care (BMC, 2025):

Healthcare providers describe structural barriers and a critical communication problem: some parents interpret preventive actions (e.g., fluoride varnish) as equivalent to "dental care," potentially delaying definitive dental visits.

If screening and varnish become psychologically coded as completion, then "integration" becomes a paradox: it can expand contact while inadvertently extending time-to-treatment.

6.4. The Ethical Trap: Two-Tier Dentistry Disguised As Equity

It is easy to claim equity while lowering the standard. True equity expands **access to the full spectrum of care**, not access to a reduced menu.

If CCRAT flags risk but the system cannot deliver timely pediatric dental care, then risk identification becomes a bureaucratic loop: children are labeled, not treated.

7. Research-to-Policy Drift: How the Field Ends Up Supporting Simplification With Weak Evidence

Across these SDF and CCRAT streams, the same drift pattern appears:

1. Choose outcomes that are easy to measure (arrest at a short horizon).
2. Use designs that are pragmatic but bias-vulnerable (open-label + subjective endpoints).
3. Avoid comparators that would force real clinical choices (no Hall/ART/restorative arms when feasible).
4. Translate a limited result into a broad claim ("This can be done by anyone, anywhere, as a substitute for care").

The result is not fraudulent science—it is *thin science over-weighted by policy ambition.*

A useful conceptual reminder comes from the caries prediction literature: risk tools and prediction models can become "risky" when treated as deterministic substitutes for clinical pathways rather than as probabilistic aids embedded in robust systems.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

8. What "Good" Looks Like: A Continuum-of-Care Model With Guardrails (Not Pedestals)

A scientifically coherent public-health strategy does not reject simplification; it disciplines it.

8.1. Clinical Guardrails for SDF (Minimum Standard)

- **Diagnosis remains dentist-led** when treatment planning is involved, especially for cavitated lesions and pulpal risk.
- **Case selection**: SDF for appropriate lesions without signs/symptoms of pulpal involvement; explicit referral/definitive plan when deeper disease is suspected.
- **Reapplication as a protocol, not an afterthought**, aligned with guideline framing that SDF is not a one-time cure.
- **Outcomes beyond "arrest"**: function, pain, sleep, feeding, parental acceptance, child-centered OHRQoL, tooth survival/time-to-failure.

8.2. System Guardrails for CCRAT Integration (Minimum Standard)

- **CCRAT is for early identification only**, not independent diagnosis or management.
- **Mandatory referral pathways with defined timelines** for high-risk children—measured as completed visits, not referrals written.
- **Training with boundaries**: culturally safe, competency-based training for screening and counseling, coupled with explicit "stop points" that trigger dental referral.
- **Equity metrics that matter**: dental-home establishment by age one, referral completion rates, reduction in OR-based rehabilitation, and caregiver-reported outcomes—rather than isolated arrest percentages.

9. Research Recommendations: What Future Studies Must Do to Earn the Claims They Want to Make

If we want the public and policymakers to treat ECC as a serious disease, our research must stop acting like "arrest at next visit" is the gold standard.

9.1. CONSORT Upgrades for ECC Pragmatic RCTs

- **Comparator arms that match real choices**: SDF regimens versus Hall/ART/conventional restorations where feasible, or well-defined stepped-care pathways.
- **Blinded, calibrated outcome assessment** whenever endpoints are subjective or treatment-signatured.
- **Multilevel models** when lesions are clustered within children—pre-specified and powered accordingly.
- **Longer horizons** with tooth survival and reactivation, not just early hardening.

9.2. 'Omics Discipline for Mechanistic Claims

- If the claim is lesion-level biology, **sample the lesion site** (and ideally, subsurface where feasible), or explicitly limit claims to overall plaque ecology.
- Pre-register analytic pipelines and control false discovery risks transparently.

9.3. STROBE Discipline for Tool Validation and Implementation Studies

- Validate in the **intended setting** (primary care), with real users (non-dental providers), and measure downstream effectiveness (referral completion, treatment uptake), not merely usability.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

10. Conclusion: SDF Belongs on the Shelf, Not on a Pedestal

SDF is an access tool. CCRAT is a screening tool. Neither is a replacement for pediatric dentistry.

When ECC is treated as complex in theory but simplified in practice, the system drifts toward a two-tier model: comprehensive care for children with proximity and privilege, and "paint-and-go" for children with distance and disadvantage. The tragedy is that this drift can be framed as progress.

A science-aligned pathway is possible: dentist-led diagnosis, team-delivered prevention, structured follow-up, meaningful outcomes, and culturally safe integration that builds dental homes rather than checklists. If our data can model ECC as polycausal, our policies must stop pretending a single paint can cure it.

References

1. Khan MW, et al. Integrative analysis of taste genetics and the dental plaque microbiome in early childhood caries. *Cell Reports*. 2025;44(9):116245. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2025.116245.
2. Hajishengallis E, Parsaei Y, Klein MI, Koo H. Advances in the microbial etiology and pathogenesis of early childhood caries. *Mol Oral Microbiol*. 2017;32(1):24–34.
3. Manerkar M, Cruz de Jesus V, Mittermuller B-A, Lee VHK, Singh S, Bertone M, Chelikani P, Schroth RJ. Effects of silver diamine fluoride on oral bacteriome and mycobiome: a randomized clinical trial. *BMC Oral Health*. 2025;25:1643. doi:10.1186/s12903-025-06986-0.
4. Schroth RJ, et al. An open-label, parallel-group, randomized clinical trial of different silver diamine fluoride application intervals to arrest dental caries. *BMC Oral Health*. 2024. doi:10.1186/s12903-024-04791-9.
5. Worthington HV, Lewis SR, et al. Topical silver diamine fluoride (SDF) for preventing and managing dental caries in children and adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2024;2024(11):CD012718. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012718.pub2.
6. Slayton RL, Urquhart O, Araujo MWB, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice guideline on nonrestorative treatments for carious lesions. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2018;149(10):837–849.e19. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.07.001.
7. American Dental Association. Silver diamine fluoride (SDF). ADA Oral Health Topics (web resource).
8. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Policy on the use of silver diamine fluoride for pediatric dental patients. AAPD policy statement (web/PDF resource).
9. Abdellatif EB, El Kashlan MK, El Tantawi M. Silver diamine fluoride with sodium fluoride varnish versus silver diamine fluoride in arresting early childhood caries: a 6-month follow-up of a randomized field trial. *BMC Oral Health*. 2023;23:875. doi:10.1186/s12903-023-03597-5.
10. Schroth RJ, Siray N, Lee VHK, et al. Pilot validation of the new Canadian Caries Risk Assessment Tool for preschoolers. *Can J Dent Hyg*. Early view PDF, 2025.
11. Public Health Agency of Canada. Release notice: Canadian Caries Risk Assessment Tool for preschoolers (integration into early-child frameworks such as the Rourke Baby Record). *HPCDP*. 2021.
12. Canadian Dental Association. Canadian Caries Risk Assessment Tool (CCRAT) for non-dental primary care providers (web resource).
13. Alai-Towfigh H, Bertone M, Hu R, et al. A mixed methods approach to obtaining health care provider feedback for the development of a Canadian pediatric dental caries risk assessment tool for children under 6 years of age. *Front Oral Health*. 2023;4:1266107. doi:10.3389/froh.2023.1266107.
14. Bertone M, Olatosi OO, Lee VHK, et al. Identifying training needs of healthcare providers to implement caries risk assessment. *Front Oral Health*. 2025;6:1641307. doi:10.3389/froh.2025.1641307.
15. Olatosi OO, Schroth RJ, DeMaré D, et al. Healthcare providers' perspectives on CCRAT implementation in Indigenous pediatric primary care: a qualitative study. *BMC Oral Health*. 2025;25:708. doi:10.1186/s12903-025-06036-9.
16. Schroth RJ, et al. Canadian dentists' awareness, attitudes, and behavior regarding the first dental visit for young children. *Front Oral Health*. 2022;3:1002421. doi:10.3389/froh.2022.1002421.
17. Divaris K. Predicting dental caries outcomes in children: a "risky" concept. *J Dent Res*. 2016;95(3):248–254.
18. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202601.1768.v1

19. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D; CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c332. doi:10.1136/bmj.c332.
20. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement. *PLoS Med*. 2007;4(10):e296. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040296.
21. Zwarenstein M, Treweek S, Gagnier JJ, et al. Improving the reporting of pragmatic trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a2390.
22. Baghdadi ZD. Silver diamine fluoride, microbiome outcomes, and early childhood caries: comments on Manerkar et al. BMC Oral Health (Submitted)