

DR. ANDREA RAVIDÀ (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-3029-8130)

DR. GIUSEPPE TROIANO (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5647-4414)

PROF. HOM-LAY WANG (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-4238-1799)

Article type : Original Article Clinical Periodontology

The influence of the interaction between staging, grading, and extent on tooth loss due to periodontitis

Andrea Ravidà¹, Musa Qazi¹, Maria Vera Rodriguez¹, Matthew Galli¹, Muhammad H. A. Saleh², Giuseppe Troiano³, Hom-Lay Wang¹

¹Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

²Department of Periodontics, University of Louisville School of Dentistry, Louisville, KY, USA.

³Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Foggia, Foggia, Italy.

Correspondence to:

Hom-Lay Wang, DDS, MSD, PhD

Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine

University of Michigan School of Dentistry

1011 North University Avenue

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1078, USA

TEL: +1 (734) 763-3325

E-mail address: homlay@umich.edu

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/JCPE.13430](https://doi.org/10.1111/JCPE.13430)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

ORCID: [0000-0003-4238-1799](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4238-1799)

Running title: Interactions between staging, grading, and extent and tooth loss

Word count: 3980

Tables and figures: 4 tables, 3 figures, 6 supplementary tables, 2 supplementary figures

Number of references: 28

Key words: periodontitis, supportive periodontal maintenance therapy, tooth loss

Conflict of interest: The authors do not have any financial interests, either directly or indirectly, in the products or information listed in the paper.

Data availability: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Clinical Relevance

Scientific Rationale: A recent classification system for periodontal diseases was released, however, scientific validation utilizing pre-existing databases is needed in order to study how staging, grading, and extent interact to influence tooth loss due to periodontitis over a long-term follow-up.

Principal Findings: Interactions between stage and grade were found to be the strongest predictors of tooth loss due to periodontitis; patients with higher concomitant staging and grading experienced greater tooth loss due to periodontitis over time. Extent played a role only in patients with severe disease (stage IV or grade C).

Practical Implications: Patient stratification based on staging and grading can act as the foundation for the delivery of precision periodontal therapy.

ABSTRACT:

Aim: To assess the ability of two-way interactions between baseline stage, grade and extent to predict tooth loss due periodontitis (TLP) over a long-term follow-up period.

Materials and Methods: Patients treated for periodontal disease with a complete medical history, baseline periodontal chart, full mouth radiographs and a minimum of ≥ 10 years follow-up were recruited. Supportive periodontal therapy (SPT) visits were recorded during the entire follow-up period. Algorithms published by Tonetti and Sanz (2019) were utilized to categorize patients according to their stage, grade and extent. The absolute survival at 10-, 20-, and 30-years follow-up was calculated for TLP. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were plotted at the tooth-level and multilevel Cox regression frailty models were constructed in order to assess the association among predictive variables and TLP by taking into account the hierarchical patient-teeth structure.

Results: 442 patients (11,125 teeth) with a mean follow-up of 23 years met the inclusion criteria and were included in this study. The most prevalent diagnosis at baseline was stage III grade B (30.3%), followed by stage II grade B (23.5%). Among the parameters analyzed, stage and grade were found to be the best predictors of TLP. Statistically significant differences were observed for extent only in patients with severe disease (stage IV or grade C). The Multilevel cox regression analysis demonstrated that patients with higher concomitant baseline staging and grading developed greater TLP over the follow-up period.

Conclusions: Higher concomitant staging and grading corresponded to greater risk for TLP and generalized extent only became a significant predictor in patients with stage IV or grade C disease.

INTRODUCTION:

Periodontitis is a chronic inflammatory disease with a multifactorial etiology associated with dysbiotic microbial biofilms and characterized by progressive destruction of the tooth-supporting apparatus (Hajishengallis & Lamont, 2012). The public health burden associated with periodontal diseases is substantial, as periodontitis is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases and a major cause of tooth loss in adult populations. It has recently been reported that up to 42.2% of US dentate adults aged 30 years and older have periodontitis, with elderly patients, certain races, and smokers exhibiting an increased risk (Eke et al., 2018). Over the last 50 years, as new scientific evidence has emerged surrounding the pathogenesis and etiology of periodontitis, different classification systems were proposed to provide clinicians with a framework for diagnostic and treatment purposes. A few years after publishing their seminal paper in 1976 describing the pathogenesis of periodontitis, Page and Schroeder developed a preliminary classification system dividing periodontitis into four categories: 1) adult, 2) rapidly progressive, 3) juvenile, and 4) pre-pubertal (Page & Schroeder, 1976). In

1989, The World Workshop in Clinical Periodontics (AAP 1989) classified periodontitis based on disease progression, although the reasons for variable rates of progression were still unclear at the time (Periodontology, 1989). Although this classification system was widely used, drawbacks involving significant overlap between disease categories and the inappropriate emphasis on age of onset necessitated a revised classification. Ten years later, the AAP 1999 classification was introduced following a framework proposed by the AAP workshop (Armitage, 1999). In this classification system, the term “adult” was replaced with “chronic”, and “early onset periodontitis” was replaced with “aggressive periodontitis”. Furthermore, the extent of disease was defined as either localized or generalized based on the number of sites involved using a threshold of 30%. In 2015, a task force was formed to revisit the classification resulting in the introduction of the term “reduced periodontium” and the addition of age as a distinguishing factor between chronic and aggressive periodontitis (more or less than 25 years old) ("American Academy of Periodontology Task Force Report on the Update to the 1999 Classification of Periodontal Diseases and Conditions," 2015).

Recently in 2017, the first “World Workshop” combining contributions from international experts around the world was successful in reviewing the literature to make evidence-based conclusions regarding both periodontal and implant-related diseases and conditions. A new classification of periodontal and peri-implant diseases and conditions based on a multidimensional staging and grading system was introduced to overcome some of the limitations related to older classifications. Staging describes the extent and distribution of the disease and is dependent on the severity and complexity of disease management, while grading denotes the rate of periodontitis progression and facilitates risk stratification based upon radiographic bone loss, clinical attachment loss, case phenotype, smoking status and diabetic status. The new classification system provides clinicians with a solid framework to stratify cases based on disease risk in support of both research and clinical care with the intention of improving both periodontal and systemic health. In one of the main articles of the new classification, Papapanou and coworkers suggested using existing databases as well as developing new databases in order to facilitate the implementation, validation, and continuous refinement of the new classification system (Papapanou et al., 2018). In a previous article from our group, we investigated staging, grading, and extent as independent variables in a compliant cohort of 292 patients and we found that staging and grading at baseline were significantly associated with risk for tooth loss due to periodontitis (TLP) (Ravida et al., 2020). However, the sample size was not large enough to allow for powerful analysis of two-way interactions between prognostic variables. This is because we only

included highly compliant patients who attended at least one maintenance visit per year for a minimum of 10 years follow-up. In the present paper, the sample size was increased by including patients with variable maintenance frequencies but still maintaining a minimum of 10 years follow-up to assess the ability of two-way interactions between baseline stage, grade and extent to predict tooth loss due periodontitis over a long-term follow-up period.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

This investigation was conducted in agreement with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 (World Medical Association, 1975) as revised in 2013 (World Medical, 2013). The protocol was approved by the University of Michigan, School of Dentistry, Institutional Review Board for Human Studies (HUM00157260). This retrospective study involved periodontal patients screened and treated in the time period between January 1966 and January 2008 at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, MI, USA. This study was conducted by obtaining anonymized data, thus, there was no need for informed consent.

Study population

Data were retrospectively retrieved from physical and electronic charts for patients who underwent nonsurgical and, if indicated, surgical periodontal treatment between January 1966 and January 2008 at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry. Inclusion and exclusion criteria, data collection, and patient allocation according to the 2017 World Workshop case definitions that include stage (I,II,III, and IV), grade (A, B, and C), and extent (localized, generalized, and molar-incisor pattern) (Tonetti, Greenwell, & Kornman, 2018) are described elsewhere (Ravida et al., 2020). In contrast to our previous article, the inclusion criteria were modified to include erratically maintained patients (<1 SPT/year) in order to increase the sample size and to facilitate more powerful sub-analyses of the interactions between staging, grading, and extent on TLP. Briefly, patients treated for periodontal disease (a session of scaling and root planing (SRP) and/or surgical therapy) with a complete medical history, baseline periodontal, full mouth radiographs, and a minimum of ≥ 10 years follow-up at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry were included. Patients receiving care outside the School of Dentistry were excluded. Staging and grading algorithms published by Tonetti and Sanz (2019) were utilized to categorize patients according to their stage and grade based on baseline clinical and radiographic parameters. Extent was calculated after determining stage and was evaluated as the percentage of teeth at the stage-defining severity level (Sanz,

Papapanou, Tonetti, Greenwell, & Kornman, 2020a). Baseline was defined as T_0 : the first SRP appointment of the patient at the periodontal department. The date of the last SPT visit for which data were available was defined as T_1 . Staging and grading was conducted by a single investigator (MS) using clinical data collected at the time of initial active periodontal therapy (T_0) after being calibrated by one of the authors of the new classification system (HG) (Tonetti et al., 2018). Data on pertinent patient characteristics, the number of SPT visits per year, and relevant medical history (history of diabetic status and self-reported smoking history at baseline) were collected. Radiographic bone loss (RBL, % of root length) at baseline was measured from periapical radiographs to assess periodontitis stage and grade (Pepelessi, Tsiklakis, & Diamanti-Kipiotti, 2000). Tooth-specific data on clinical parameters including periodontal probing depth (PPD), clinical attachment level (CAL) calculated as the difference between PPD and the distance from the free gingival margin to the cemento-enamel junction, bleeding on probing (BOP), and furcation involvement were also collected. Information about masticatory dysfunction, drifting, flaring, bite collapse, and plaque accumulation were retrieved from patient records when available. Patient charts were reviewed for TLP and TLO (overall tooth loss) by comparing the number of teeth present at T_0 and T_1 . For each non-third molar tooth that was lost, the date and reason for extraction were recorded. The reason for any extraction (TLP, caries, etc..) was always recorded in the patient files as per clinic policy. Teeth extracted during the active treatment phase (teeth deemed as hopeless at or prior to T_0) were not considered in the calculation of TLO and TLP. However, TLP during active therapy was utilized to assess the baseline stage of patients as suggested recently by Sanz and coworkers (Sanz, Papapanou, Tonetti, Greenwell, & Kornman, 2020b). In the cases where teeth were extracted due to a combination of pathologies (ie. periodontitis, caries, periapical pathology), the overriding reason for tooth loss was evaluated by the specialist who deemed the tooth as hopeless. Also, in the rare case where the cause for tooth loss could not be precisely ascertained (21 teeth total), the tooth loss event was not considered as TLP.

Statistical analysis

At patient-level, Chi-squared independent t-test, and one-way ANOVA models were used to assess the homogeneity of patient clinical profiles at baseline and compliance of maintenance between stage-grade subgroups. Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to assess homogeneity of distributions of absolute loss rates between staging, grading, and extent. At the tooth-level, time to event TLP was analyzed using Kaplan-Meier survival

methodology. Cumulative survival functions were plotted and compared between different categories of stage, grade, and extent using Log-rank tests. Multilevel Cox regression frailty models were used to assess the association among predictive variables (stage, grade, extent, gender, age and average number of SPT visits per year) for different combinations of classification parameters on TLP. Hazard ratio estimations and corresponding 95% CI were obtained. The significance levels used in analysis were 5% ($\alpha=0.05$). Regarding the power analysis, a post-hoc estimation was obtained. A sample size of 11,125 independent teeth provided 99.9% power at a 95% confidence to detect a relative risk $RR=3.0$ as significant using a Cox multiple regression model to assess the influence of a two-level factor (e.g. extent) and assuming that 95% of observations were censored. However, teeth were not independent, and this power must be corrected because of the two-level structure of the data. Each patient provided 25 teeth on average and within-subject correlation $CCI=0.5$ (moderate) was assumed, leading to a correcting coefficient of $D=13.0$. Therefore, 11,125 dependent teeth provided the same power as 855 independent teeth, calculated at 88% power under the aforementioned conditions ($RR=3.0$; 95% confidence).

RESULTS:

Characteristics of patient cohort

A total number of 11,125 teeth in 442 patients (219 males and 223 females) with a follow-up of 275.5 ± 80.7 months (range 124 to 583 months; 10.3 to 48.6 years) were included in the present retrospective investigation. The profile of each patient group based on all possible two-way combinations of staging and grading is reported in Table 1. There were no significant differences between groups for the average follow-up period, gender, and number of teeth at baseline. For patients diagnosed with stage I, II, or III, mean age was significantly lower with increasing grade. Only for patients with stage 1 periodontitis, the average number of SPT visits per year was significantly higher for grade A compared to grade B ($p=0.001$).

Prevalence of patients according to the 2018 classification

The prevalence of each combination of periodontitis stage and grade in the studied population is shown in Figure 1. The prevalence of grade A disease decreased with increasing stage ranging from 44.44% (stage I) to 6.12% (stage IV), whereas the prevalence of grade C disease increased from 0% (stage I) to 46.94% (stage IV). The prevalence of stage 1 disease decreased with increasing grade from 47.62% (grade A) to 0% (grade C), whereas the

prevalence of stage 4 disease increased with increasing grade from 7.14% (grade A) to 20.18% (grade C). The most prevalent diagnosis at baseline was stage III grade B (30.3%; 134/442) followed by stage II grade B (23.5%; 104/442), and stage III grade C (16.3%; 72/442), whereas the least prevalent diagnoses were stage II grade A (2.5%; 11/442), stage III grade A (1.8%; 8/442), stage IV grade A (0.6%; 3/442), and stage I grade C (0%; 0/442) (Figure 1).

Tooth loss due during specific time intervals

Overall, 1297 (11.7%) teeth were lost during the follow-up period. A total of 554 teeth (4.98%) were lost due to periodontitis throughout the follow-up. From 0-10 years, 10-20 years, and >20 years follow-up, 184 (1.65%), 223 (2.04%), and 147 (1.37%) teeth were extracted for periodontal reasons, respectively. The mean number of TLP for each group throughout the follow-up can be seen in Supplementary Tables 1-4.

Effect of grade on TLP according to different stages

During the first ten years, grade was a significant predictor of TLP for stage IV cases (Supplementary Table 1). During the first 20 years grade was a significant predictor of TLP for stages I, II, and IV, with no significant differences for stage III. From baseline to the last follow-up, grade was a significant predictor of TLP for all stages.

Effect of stage on TLP according to different grades

Stage was directly associated with increased risk for TLP for grades B and C during all time intervals evaluated throughout the follow-up (0-10, 0-20, and baseline-last follow-up) (Supplementary Table 2). Stage was not a significant predictor of TLP for grade A cases for all the time intervals analyzed.

Effect of extent on TLP according to different stages and grades

Stage IV generalized periodontitis was associated with significantly increased risk for TLP relative to localized for 0-20 years and baseline to last follow-up (Supplementary Table 3). A strong trend ($p=0.056$) was seen regarding the risk for TLP based on extent for grade C cases when the entire follow-up period was considered (Supplementary Table 4).

Tooth lost due to periodontitis (Kaplan Mayer analysis)

Tooth-level Kaplan Mayer analysis showed significant associations between stage, grade, and extent at baseline with TLP throughout the follow-up (Figure 2). As stage and grade increased, the difference in risk for TLP between localized and generalized periodontitis at baseline increased (Figure 3).

Effect of grade on TLP according to different stages

Stage I grade A (98%) exhibited significantly lower cumulative survival ($p=0.048$) compared to stage I grade B (99%) (Figure 2A). Regarding the stage II subcategory, there was a significant difference ($p<0.001$) in cumulative survival between grade A (98.3%), B (95.9%), and C (83.3%). Grade C exhibited significantly lower survival than grades A and B while no significant difference were found between A and B (Figure 2B). Stage III (Figure 2C) displayed a significant difference ($p<0.001$) in cumulative survival between grade A (98.5%), B (88.0%), and C (86.8%) with grades B and C showing a lower survival rate than grade A. For stage IV (Figure 2D) there was a significant difference in cumulative survival rate between patients diagnosed with grade A (92.1%), B (72.1%), and C (68.6%) ($p<0.001$) periodontitis at baseline.

Effect of stage on TLP according to different grades

There was no significant difference ($p=0.317$) in cumulative survival rates for grade A (Figure 2E) between patients diagnosed with stage I (98.0%), II (98.3%), III (98.5%), or IV (92.1%) periodontitis at baseline. Grade B showed significant differences ($p<0.001$) in cumulative survival rate between stage I (99.0%), stage II (95.9%), stage III (88.0%), and stage IV (72.1%), with survival rate decreasing as stage increased (Figure 2F). For grade C there were also significant differences ($p<0.001$) in cumulative survival rates between stage II (83.3%), stage III (86.8%), and stage IV (68.8%), with survival rate significantly decreasing as stage increased (Figure 2G).

Effect of extent on TLP according to different stages and grades

No significant differences in cumulative survival rates were found for stages I, II, and III between localized and generalized periodontitis at baseline (Figure 3A-C). However, statistically significant differences ($p<0.001$) were found for stage IV in cumulative survival between localized (73.2%) and generalized (69.5%) periodontitis at baseline (Figure 3D). In terms of grading, only C displayed a significant ($p<0.001$) difference (84.6% vs.79.0%) (Figure 3 E-G).

Multilevel Cox Regression Survival Analysis

Effects of grade on tooth loss by Stage

Stepwise multilevel multivariate Cox regression analysis controlling for gender, age, and number of maintenance visits per year using grade A as a reference revealed that the hazard ratio for TLP increased with higher stage and grade (Table 2). Stage I grade B demonstrated a significantly lower risk for TLP relative to grade A (HR 0.17; 0.05-0.56; $p=0.003$). For stage II, there was no significant difference in risk for TLP between grades A and B, but grade C demonstrated a significantly increased risk relative to grade A (HR 6.50; 1.78-23.7; $p=0.005$). Stage III displayed a significant difference in risk for TLP between grades A and B (HR 5.00; 1.43-17.5; $p=0.011$), as well as between grades A and C (HR 8.29; 2.35-29.2; $p=0.001$). Finally, stage IV showed a significant difference in risk for TLP between grades A and C (HR 6.08; 1.12-33.1; $p=0.037$), but not between grades A and B ($p=0.396$).

Effect of stage on tooth loss by Grade

Using stage I as a reference, the hazard ratio for TLP increased with higher stage and grade (Table 3). For grade A there were no significant differences in risk of TLP among groups. Patients with grade B displayed significantly higher risk of TLP for stage III (HR 6.47; 2.18-19.3; $p<0.001$) and IV (HR 11.9; 3.67-38.9; $p<0.001$) relative to stage I. For grade C, stage II was used as a reference due to the limited prevalence of detectable stage I grade C disease ($n=0$). No significant difference in risk of TLP between stages II and III was recorded, but there was a significant difference between stages II and IV (HR 2.39; 1.14-5.00; $p=0.020$).

Effect of extent on tooth loss by stage and grade

Only generalized stage IV (HR 1.87; 1.01-3.46; $p=0.046$) and generalized grade C (HR 1.73; 1.07-2.82; $p=0.027$) exhibited a significantly higher risk for TLP relative to localized disease (Table 4 and Supplementary Table 5).

Overall tooth loss analysis

The impact of the staging and grading on TLO is shown utilizing both Kaplan Mayer survival analysis (Supplementary figures 1 and 2) and multilevel Cox regression analysis (Supplementary Table 6 A-D). Grade exhibited a significant effect on overall tooth loss for

stages II, III, and IV. In contrast to tooth loss due to periodontitis, no significant effects were found for either stage on tooth loss by grade, or extent on tooth loss by stage and grade.

DISCUSSION

In the present study we found that higher concomitant staging and grading corresponded to a greater risk for TLP. Generalized extent only became a significant predictor of TLP in patients with stage IV or grade C disease. To the best of our knowledge, no study has previously explored this interaction before. Furthermore, it is difficult to find another article studying TLP with a similar follow-up time and sample size. Indeed, although numerous studies have investigated TLO (Axelsson & Lindhe, 1981; Eickholz, Kaltschmitt, Berbig, Reitmeir, & Pretzl, 2008; Graetz et al., 2019; Jansson & Lagervall, 2008; McGuire & Nunn, 1996; Papantonopoulos, 2004; Pretzl, Kaltschmitt, Kim, Reitmeir, & Eickholz, 2008), studies specifically investigating TLP over a long-term follow-up with large sample sizes are scarce in the literature (Chambrone & Chambrone, 2006; Fardal, Johannessen, & Linden, 2004; Martinez-Canut, 2015). The present manuscript also shed light on the importance of analyzing TLP at the time of validating a diagnostic system as opposed to TLO. The impact of increased disease severity (effect of stage on tooth loss by grade) and the effect of extent on tooth loss according to stage and grade were better captured when TLP was analyzed.

Since Hirschfeld and Wasserman (1978), the present article is the second largest in terms of sample size and has the longest follow-up. These authors investigated TLP in a population of 600 patients followed over a mean period of 22 years and found that 83.2% of the population lost 0-3 teeth, whereas 12.6% lost 4-9 teeth, and 4.2% lost 10-23 teeth. Analyses rested on dividing patients based on three different responses to treatment according to the tooth loss pattern (well-maintained, downhill, and extreme downhill), whereas our study focused on evaluating the risk for TLP based on baseline diagnosis according to the 2018 classification system. Studies such as this are essential in order to increase understanding of the different possible trajectories for disease progression after an initial diagnosis according to the recent classification system (Ravida et al., 2020).

In the present study, the most prevalent diagnoses in a population of periodontal patients treated in an academic setting were stage III grade B, followed by stage II grade B, and stage III grade C. The least prevalent diagnoses were stages II grade A, stage III grade A, stage IV grade A, and stage I grade C. Indeed, no stage I grade C patients were found making this the least prevalent diagnosis. This is perhaps due to the difficulty of detecting disease at an early stage in rapidly progressing cases using current diagnostic tools. Indeed, current gold

standard diagnostics (periodontal charting and radiographic analysis) are limited in their ability to detect early breakdown, predict future progression, and conduct real-time assessments of disease activity (Goodson, Haffajee, & Socransky, 1984; Ortman, McHenry, & Hausmann, 1982). Our results are in agreement with Graetz et al. (2019) where most patients were diagnosed as generalized stage III grade C, stage IV grade C, or stage III grade B. In both studies which involved long-term follow-up of maintenance patients after an active treatment phase, an imbalance in relative prevalence was found favouring severe and rapidly progressing disease (Graetz et al., 2019).

Overall the results demonstrate that the risk for TLP increases with higher staging and grading. A trend for increased TLP for higher staging and grading was noted based on the slopes of the Kaplan Meier survival curves which increased for higher stages and grades. In addition, the spread between the Kaplan Meier survival curves increased with higher staging and grading indicating that as stage increases, the difference in the risk for TLP between various grades increases. Likewise, as grade increases, the difference in risk for TLP between various stages increases. Although patients diagnosed with stage I grade B at baseline exhibited significantly lower risk for TLP relative to stage I grade A patients, overall TLP was relatively low for stage 1 patients throughout the follow-up meaning the clinical significance of this result is limited. There were no significant differences in the risk for TLP between grade A groups when comparing stages I-IV reflecting that tooth extraction is rare in treatment of grade A disease. Interestingly, in the first 10 years stage III grade C patients exhibited higher TLP than stage II grade C patients, but after 10 years and from baseline to last follow-up, the reverse was seen. This is likely due to an increased tendency to treat stage III grade C patients with extractions at an earlier time point coupled with the fact that stage II patients have no previous history of TLP, whereas stage III patients have usually lost I-IV teeth (Tonetti et al., 2018). Although the univariate analysis demonstrated a significantly increased risk for TLP for stage II grade C relative to stage III grade C, no significant difference was found for the stepwise multilevel Cox regression when controlling for gender, age, and number of SPT visits per year. In addition, the prevalence of stage II grade C was relatively limited which may have impacted our analysis. In our previous study we found no significant difference in risk for TLP between localized and generalized periodontitis at baseline when extent was analyzed as an independent variable (Ravida et al., 2020). The present study found significant differences due to consideration of the interaction between staging, grading, and extent. Since the present study only found an increased risk for TLP for generalized periodontitis relative to localized for stage IV and grade C disease, this suggests

that the difference in risk for TLP between localized and generalized disease patterns only becomes significant at higher-level staging and grading.

The present study is not free from limitations. Indeed, we analyzed the various two-way interactions between staging, grading, and extent. Although conducting a three-way analysis would likely yield more accurate results, doing so was not possible due to limitations in the sample size of subgroups. In addition, the variable of SPT was controlled using a yearly rate which did not take into account the variability which may exist in maintenance patterns where patients may become more and less compliant on an annual basis. Additionally, analysis of smoking habits did not consider the impact of the event of smoking cessation during the follow-up. However, past research has shown that a washout period of 11 years is required after successfully quitting for a former smoker to return to the baseline periodontal disease risk of a non-smoker (Tomar & Asma, 2000). In addition, the washout period for TLP has been estimated at 15 years (Ravidà et al., 2020). For diabetes, changes in glycemic control have been shown to influence periodontal disease risk with poorly controlled diabetics (HbA1c >9%) having a 2.9-fold higher risk for severe disease (Tsai, Hayes, & Taylor, 2002). The present study did not consider dynamic changes in glycemic control throughout the follow-up, but instead utilized a baseline HbA1c value to assess diabetic status. Finally, the goal of this paper was to study tooth loss which is the end outcome of periodontitis. For patients diagnosed with initial/early disease (lower staging and grading), perhaps the variable of TLP may not be able to accurately capture the true risk for disease progression as sensitively as changes in CAL and RBL, as these patients may still experience appreciable attachment loss and periodontal destruction without requiring tooth extractions. Whereas when disease is advanced, TLP likely becomes a much more significant indicator of disease progression.

CONCLUSION

Stage III grade B was the most prevalent diagnosis, whereas diagnosis with stage II, III, or IV coupled with grade A, as well as stage I grade C were the least prevalent. Overall, risk for TLP increased significantly at higher stage and grade combinations. Extent only had a significant impact on risk for TLP for stage IV and grade C subgroups indicating that the difference in risk for TLP between localized and generalized disease is most appreciable in advanced cases. Analysis of TLP better captured the impact of increased disease severity and extent compared to TLO.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This manuscript was partially supported by the University of Michigan Periodontal Graduate Student Research Fund. The authors do not have any financial interests, either directly or indirectly, in the products or information listed in the paper.

Author Contributions:

Andrea Ravidà: Contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of the data and drafting of the article

Musa Qazi: Contributed to the acquisition of data

Maria Vera: Contributed to the acquisition of data

Matthew Galli: Contributed to the acquisition of data and drafting of the article

Muhammad H. A. Saleh: Contributed to the acquisition of data

Giuseppe Troiano: Contributed to the conception and design of the study, data analysis and interpretation

Hom-Lay Wang: Contributed to the conception, critical revision of the article and final approval of the version to be published

References:

- American Academy of Periodontology Task Force Report on the Update to the 1999 Classification of Periodontal Diseases and Conditions. (2015). *J Periodontol*, 86(7), 835-838. doi:10.1902/jop.2015.157001
- Armitage, G. C. (1999). Development of a classification system for periodontal diseases and conditions. *Ann Periodontol*, 4(1), 1-6. doi:10.1902/annals.1999.4.1.1
- Axelsson, P., & Lindhe, J. (1981). The significance of maintenance care in the treatment of periodontal disease. *J Clin Periodontol*, 8(4), 281-294. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051x.1981.tb02039.x
- Chambrone, L. A., & Chambrone, L. (2006). Tooth loss in well-maintained patients with chronic periodontitis during long-term supportive therapy in Brazil. *J Clin Periodontol*, 33(10), 759-764. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2006.00972.x
- Eickholz, P., Kaltschmitt, J., Berbig, J., Reitmeir, P., & Pretzl, B. (2008). Tooth loss after active periodontal therapy. 1: patient-related factors for risk, prognosis, and quality of outcome. *J Clin Periodontol*, 35(2), 165-174. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2007.01184.x
- Eke, P. I., Thornton-Evans, G. O., Wei, L., Borgnakke, W. S., Dye, B. A., & Genco, R. J. (2018). Periodontitis in US Adults: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2009-2014. *J Am Dent Assoc*, 149(7), 576-588 e576. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2018.04.023
- Fardal, O., Johannessen, A. C., & Linden, G. J. (2004). Tooth loss during maintenance following periodontal treatment in a periodontal practice in Norway. *J Clin Periodontol*, 31(7), 550-555. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2004.00519.x
- Goodson, J. M., Haffajee, A. D., & Socransky, S. S. (1984). The relationship between attachment level loss and alveolar bone loss. *J Clin Periodontol*, 11(5), 348-359. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051x.1984.tb01331.x
- Graetz, C., Mann, L., Krois, J., Salzer, S., Kahl, M., Springer, C., & Schwendicke, F. (2019). Comparison of periodontitis patients' classification in the 2018 versus 1999 classification. *J Clin Periodontol*, 46(9), 908-917. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13157
- Hajishengallis, G., & Lamont, R. J. (2012). Beyond the red complex and into more complexity: the polymicrobial synergy and dysbiosis (PSD) model of periodontal

disease etiology. *Mol Oral Microbiol*, 27(6), 409-419. doi:10.1111/j.2041-1014.2012.00663.x

- Jansson, L., & Lagervall, M. (2008). Periodontitis progression in patients subjected to supportive maintenance care. *Swed Dent J*, 32(3), 105-114.
- Martinez-Canut, P. (2015). Predictors of tooth loss due to periodontal disease in patients following long-term periodontal maintenance. *J Clin Periodontol*, 42(12), 1115-1125. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12475
- McGuire, M. K., & Nunn, M. E. (1996). Prognosis versus actual outcome. III. The effectiveness of clinical parameters in accurately predicting tooth survival. *J Periodontol*, 67(7), 666-674. doi:10.1902/jop.1996.67.7.666
- Ortman, L. F., McHenry, K., & Hausmann, E. (1982). Relationship between alveolar bone measured by 125I absorptiometry with analysis of standardized radiographs: 2. Bjorn technique. *J Periodontol*, 53(5), 311-314. doi:10.1902/jop.1982.53.5.311
- Page, R. C., & Schroeder, H. E. (1976). Pathogenesis of inflammatory periodontal disease. A summary of current work. *Lab Invest*, 34(3), 235-249.
- Papantonopoulos, G. H. (2004). Effect of periodontal therapy in smokers and non-smokers with advanced periodontal disease: results after maintenance therapy for a minimum of 5 years. *J Periodontol*, 75(6), 839-843. doi:10.1902/jop.2004.75.6.839
- Papapanou, P. N., Sanz, M., Buduneli, N., Dietrich, T., Feres, M., Fine, D. H., . . . Tonetti, M. S. (2018). Periodontitis: Consensus report of workgroup 2 of the 2017 World Workshop on the Classification of Periodontal and Peri-Implant Diseases and Conditions. *J Periodontol*, 89 Suppl 1, S173-S182. doi:10.1002/JPER.17-0721
- Pepelassi, E. A., Tsiklakis, K., & Diamanti-Kipiotti, A. (2000). Radiographic detection and assessment of the periodontal endosseous defects. *J Clin Periodontol*, 27(4), 224-230. doi:10.1034/j.1600-051x.2000.027004224.x
- Periodontology, A. A. o. (1989). *The World Workshop in Clinical Periodontics - Proceedings*.
- Pretzl, B., Kaltschmitt, J., Kim, T. S., Reitmeir, P., & Eickholz, P. (2008). Tooth loss after active periodontal therapy. 2: tooth-related factors. *J Clin Periodontol*, 35(2), 175-182. doi:10.1111/j.1600-051X.2007.01182.x
- Ravida, A., Qazi, M., Troiano, G., Saleh, M. H. A., Greenwell, H., Kornman, K., & Wang, H. L. (2020). Using periodontal staging and grading system as a prognostic factor for

- future tooth loss: A long-term retrospective study. *J Periodontol*, 91(4), 454-461.
doi:10.1002/JPER.19-0390
- Sanz, M., Papapanou, P. N., Tonetti, M. S., Greenwell, H., & Kornman, K. (2020a). Guest Editorial: Clarifications on the use of the new classification of periodontitis. *J Periodontol*. doi:10.1002/JPER.20-0166
- Sanz, M., Papapanou, P. N., Tonetti, M. S., Greenwell, H., & Kornman, K. (2020b). Guest Editorial: Clarifications on the use of the new classification of periodontitis. *J Clin Periodontol*. doi:10.1111/jcpe.13286
- Tomar, S. L., & Asma, S. (2000). Smoking-Attributable Periodontitis in the United States: Findings From NHANES III. *J Periodontol*, 71(5), 743-751.
doi:10.1902/jop.2000.71.5.743
- Tonetti, M. S., Greenwell, H., & Kornman, K. S. (2018). Staging and grading of periodontitis: Framework and proposal of a new classification and case definition. *J Clin Periodontol*, 45 Suppl 20, S149-S161. doi:10.1111/jcpe.12945
- Tsai, C., Hayes, C., & Taylor, G. W. (2002). Glycemic control of type 2 diabetes and severe periodontal disease in the US adult population. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*, 30(3), 182-192. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0528.2002.300304.x
- World Medical, A. (2013). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*, 310(20), 2191-2194.
doi:10.1001/jama.2013.281053

Table and Figure Legends

Figure 1: Prevalence of various combinations of staging and grading diagnoses at baseline (A-G).

Figure 2: Tooth-level univariate analysis of tooth survival demonstrating effect of grade on TLP according to different stages (A-D) and effect of stage on TLP according to different grades (E-G).

Figure 3: Tooth-level univariate analysis of tooth survival demonstrating effect of extent on TLP according to different stages (A-D) and grades (E-G).

Table 1: Patient-level profile of different groups of included patients subdivided based on periodontitis stage and grade at baseline. Results of Chi² test, two sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA for comparisons between grades within each stage group. Subgroups including less than 5 cases were excluded from comparisons.

Table 2: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using grade A and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval were reported.

Table 3: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using stage I and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval were reported.

Table 4: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using localized disease and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval were reported.

Supplementary Table 1: Distribution of teeth lost due to periodontal reasons was analyzed based on stage, extent, and time period since baseline. Mean (\pm standard deviation) number of lost teeth were reported. Mann-Whitney test (p-value) was used for comparing distributions between extent for each stage.

Supplementary Table 2: Distribution of tooth loss due to periodontal reasons was analyzed based on stage, grade, and time period since baseline. Mean (\pm standard deviation) number of

lost teeth were reported. Kruskal-Wallis test (p-value) used for comparing distributions between grades for each stage.

Supplementary Table 3: Distribution of tooth loss due to periodontal reasons was analyzed based on stage, grade, and time period since baseline. Mean (\pm standard deviation) number of lost teeth were reported. Kruskal-Wallis test (p-value) was used for comparing distributions between stages for each grade.

Supplementary Table 4: Distribution of tooth loss due to periodontal reasons was analyzed based on grade, extent, and time period since baseline. Mean (\pm standard deviation) number of lost teeth were reported. Mann-Whitney test (p-value) was used for comparing distributions between extent for each grade.

Supplementary Table 5: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using localized disease and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio and 95% confidence interval were reported.

Supplementary Table 6 A-D: Results from tooth-level univariate analysis of tooth survival and stepwise multilevel Cox regression on the overall tooth loss.

Supplementary Figure 1: Tooth-level univariate analysis of tooth survival demonstrating effect of grade on TLO according to different stages (A-D) and effect of stage on TLO according to different grades (E-G).

Supplementary Figure 2: Tooth-level univariate analysis of tooth survival demonstrating effect of extent on TLO according to different stages (A-D) and grades (E-G).

Author Manuscript

Table 1: Patient-level profile of different groups of included patients subdivided based on periodontitis stage and grade at baseline. Results of Chi² test, two sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA for comparisons between grades within each stage group. Subgroups including less than 5 cases were excluded from comparisons.

Stage	Total	I			II				III				IV			
Grade		A	B	P value	A	B	C	P value	A	B	C	P value	A	B	C	P value
N (Subjects)	442	20	25		11	104	19		8	134	72		3	23	23	
Months Follow-up (Patient-level)	275.5 ± 80.7	271.7 ± 51.1	267.1 ± 78.4	0.823	222.5 ± 53.1	267.9 ± 81.7	265.7 ± 85.1	0.207	295.9 ± 61.1	274.5 ± 77.9	298.9 ± 91.1	0.116	280.0 ± 68.2	268.7 ± 80.0	286.7 ± 88.7	0.473
N (male)	219 (49.5%)	10 (50.0%)	9 (36.0%)	0.345	4 (36.4%)	55 (52.9%)	10 (52.6%)	0.577	6 (75.0%)	62 (46.3%)	40 (55.6%)	0.164	0 (0.0%)	11 (47.8%)	12 (52.2%)	0.768
N (Female)	223 (50.5%)	10 (50.0%)	16 (64.0%)		7 (63.6%)	49 (47.1%)	9 (47.4%)		2 (25.0%)	72 (53.7%)	32 (44.4%)		3 (100%)	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	
Age (y)	47.5 ± 11.8	44.8 ± 13.5	36.4 ± 10.0	0.022*	61.1 ± 12.5	47.6 ± 10.6	42.4 ± 12.0	<0.001***	57.5 ± 8.9	49.5 ± 10.9	43.8 ± 10.7	<0.001***	61.7 ± 11.2	51.7 ± 11.8	48.5 ± 12.1	0.372
Number of teeth at T0	25.2 ± 3.2	26.9 ± 1.7	26.5 ± 1.9	0.452	25.2 ± 2.8	26.0 ± 2.6	25.8 ± 2.0	0.583	24.8 ± 2.0	25.7 ± 2.6	25.7 ± 2.3	0.563	19.7 ± 4.7	20.0 ± 4.7	20.7 ± 4.1	0.598
Average Number of maintenance visits (pat-level)	40.2 ± 15.9	43.3 ± 13.9	32.4 ± 11.7	0.007**	27.6 ± 10.2	36.9 ± 18.0	44.0 ± 22.9	0.064	45.6 ± 17.5	40.9 ± 19.5	44.6 ± 25.1	0.465	51.3 ± 21.2	33.7 ± 20.1	36.7 ± 29.2	0.682
Average Number of maintenance visits / Years of follow-up (pat-level)	1.70 ± 0.68	1.89 ± 0.50	1.45 ± 0.36	0.001**	1.59 ± 0.77	1.62 ± 0.55	1.99 ± 0.89	0.060	1.89 ± 0.72	1.77 ± 0.69	1.76 ± 0.77	0.898	2.14 ± 0.37	1.49 ± 0.70	1.43 ± 0.79	0.802

*p < 0.05;
 **p < 0.01;
 ***p < 0.001

Table 2: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using grade A and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval were reported.

Periodontal-Related Survival									
		Stage							
		I		II		III		IV	
Grade		HR 95%(CI)	P-Value	HR 95%(CI)	P-Value	HR 95%(CI)	P-Value	HR 95%(CI)	P-Value
		A	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
	B	0.17 (0.05-0.56)	0.003**	1.09 (0.32-3.72)	0.892	5.00 (1.43-17.5)	0.011*	2.13 (0.37-12.2)	0.396
	C	---		6.50 (1.78-23.7)	0.005**	8.29 (2.35-29.2)	0.001**	6.08 (1.12-33.1)	0.037*
Gender	Female	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
	Male	0.42 (0.14-1.30)	0.132	1.29 (0.71-2.37)	0.406	1.13 (0.76-1.69)	0.553	0.91 (0.44-1.89)	0.793
Age		1.02 (0.98-1.06)	0.216	1.00 (0.97-1.03)	0.933	1.03 (1.01-1.05)	0.011*	1.01 (0.96-1.06)	0.719

*=p<0.05

**= p<0.01

***= p<0.01

HR: Hazard ratio

N° of Maintenances per year	0.22 (0.04-1.22)	0.084	0.55 (0.32-0.97)	0.039*	0.74 (0.43-1.28)	0.278	0.95 (0.49-1.86)	0.884
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------	---------------------	---------------	---------------------	-------	---------------------	-------

Table 3: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using stage 1 and female gender as

Periodontal-Related Survival							
		Grade					
		A		B		C	
Stage		HR 95%(CI)	P-Value	HR 95%(CI)	P-Value	HR 95%(CI)	P-Value
	I	1.00		1.00		---	
	II	0.74 (0.11-4.89)	0.755	2.83 (0.90-8.90)	0.075	1.00	
	III	0.62 (0.13-2.98)	0.553	6.47 (2.18-19.3)	<0.001***	0.65 (0.34-1.26)	0.204
	IV	2.45 (0.43-14.0)	0.314	11.9 (3.67-38.9)	<0.001***	2.39 (1.14-5.00)	0.020*
Gender	Female	1.00		1.00		1.00	
	Male	0.79 (0.30-2.09)	0.633	1.14 (0.75-1.71)	0.543	0.99 (0.62-1.58)	0.967
Age		1.01 (0.96-1.06)	0.783	1.03 (1.01-1.05)	0.005**	1.01 (0.98-1.03)	0.665
N° Maintenances per year		0.77 (0.31-1.89)	0.563	0.76 (0.49-1.19)	0.231	0.79 (0.46-1.36)	0.396

reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95%

confidence interval were reported.

Author

*= $p < 0.05$

**= $p < 0.01$

***= $p < 0.001$


HR: Hazard ratio

Table 4: Results from stepwise multilevel Cox regression using localized disease and female gender as reference for vertical comparisons. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval were reported.



Periodontal-Related Survival										
		Stage								
		I		II		III		IV		
Extent		HR 95%(CI)	<i>P-Value</i>	HR 95%(CI)	<i>P-Value</i>	HR 95%(CI)	<i>P-Value</i>	HR 95%(CI)	<i>P-Value</i>	
		Localized	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
		Generalized	0.53 (0.12-2.33)	0.397	1.04 (0.40-2.68)	0.933	1.16 (0.70-1.92)	0.561	1.87 (1.01-3.46)	0.047*
Gender	Female	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		
	Male	0.76 (0.20-2.87)	0.685	1.25 (0.68-2.31)	0.468	1.14 (0.75-1.73)	0.548	1.09 (0.55-2.16)	0.798	
Age		1.05 (1.01-1.09)	0.021*	0.99 (0.96-1.02)	0.424	1.02 (0.99-1.05)	0.084	0.99 (0.95-1.04)	0.728	
N° of Maintenances per year		0.76 (0.16-3.59)	0.732	0.74 (0.40-1.36)	0.337	0.69 (0.39-1.23)	0.208	0.84 (0.43-1.65)	0.622	

*=p<0.05

HR: Hazard ratio




jcpe_13430_f1.tiff



jcpe_13430_f2.tiff

Effect of Extent on TLP according to different Stages & Grades



jcpe_13430_f3.tiff

Author Manuscript