**Critically Appraised Topic (CAT)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Team:**  |
| **Group 6B** |
| **Project Team Participants:**  |
| **Scott Sutton, Lato Nguyen, Hanfrey Dang, Abigail Yurs** |
| **Clinical Question:** |
| **How does an implantsupported prosthesis compare to a traditional removable prosthesis for restoring this patients form and function?** |
| **PICO Format:** |
| **P:** |
| **Partial edentulous patients** |
| **I:** |
| **Implant supported****prosthesis** |
| **C:** |
| **Traditional RPD** |
| **O:** |
| **Better oral health-related****quality of life (OHRQoL)** |
| **PICO Formatted Question:** |
| **In partial edentulous patients, do Implant supported****prostheses provide better Oral health-related quality of****life compared to traditional RPD?** |
| **Clinical Bottom Line:** |
| **Implant supported prosthesis has both short- and longterm positive effects on OHRQoL**** Traditional RPDs positively affected OHRQoL in the short****term.**** However, Implant supported prosthesis showed greater****short-term improvement in OHRQoL than Traditional****RPD.** |
| **Date(s) of Search:**  |
| **10/10/2020** |
| **Database(s) Used:** |
| **PubMed** |
| **Search Strategy/Keywords:** |
| **Traditional RPDs, Implant****supported prosthesis, oral health-related quality of life,****partially edentulous patients.** |
| **MESH terms used:** |
| **denture, partial, removable, dental****implants, oral health, quality of life.** |
| **Article(s) Cited:** |
| **Citation:Ali Z, Baker SR, Shahrbaf S, Martin N, Vettore****MV. Oral health-related quality of life after****prosthodontic treatment for patients with partial****edentulism: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J****Prosthet Dent. 2019 Jan;121(1):59-68.e3. doi:****10.1016/j.prosdent.2018.03.003. Epub 2018 Jul 10.****PMID: 30006220.****https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30006220/** |
| **Study Design(s):** |
| **systemic review & meta analysis** |
| **Reason for Article Selection:** |
| **Random-effects models were used to compare OHRQoL****change scores**** 95% confidence intervals** |
| **Article(s) Synopsis:** |
| **Methods**** Electronic database and manual searches were****conducted to identify cohort studies and clinical****trials by 2 independently reviewers.**** Criteria = individuals receiving implant-supported****crowns (ISCs), implant-supported fixed dental****prostheses (IFDPs), implant-supported removable****dental prostheses (IRDPs), tooth-supported fixed****dental prostheses (TFDPs), and removable partial****dentures (RPDs).**** Sample size = 2147 identified studies**** Met inclusion criteria:**** 2 randomized controlled trials**** 21 cohort studies****Results**** Pooled mean OHRQoL change ≤9 months**** 15.3 for TFDP, 11.9 for RPD, 14.9 for IFDP**** Pooled standardized mean change OHRQoL change >9 months**** 13.2 for TFDP, 15.8 for IFDP**** Conclusions**** Direct comparisons ≤9 months between TFDP against IFDP and****RPD against IFDP significantly favored IFDP in both cases.**** Limitations & Bias**** Studies were of low or moderate risk of bias** |
| **Levels of Evidence:** (For Therapy/Prevention, Etiology/Harm) See <http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025>[x]  **1a** – Clinical Practice Guideline, Meta-Analysis, Systematic Review of Randomized Control Trials (RCTs)[ ]  **1b** – Individual RCT[ ]  **2a** – Systematic Review of Cohort Studies[ ]  **2b** – Individual Cohort Study[ ]  **3** – Cross-sectional Studies, Ecologic Studies, “Outcomes” Research[ ]  **4a** – Systematic Review of Case Control Studies[ ]  **4b** – Individual Case Control Study[ ]  **5** – Case Series, Case Reports[ ]  **6** – Expert Opinion without explicit critical appraisal, Narrative Review[ ]  **7** – Animal Research[ ]  **8** – In Vitro Research |
| **Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT) For Guidelines and Systematic Reviews**See article **J Evid Base Dent Pract 2007;147-150**[x]  **A** – Consistent, good quality patient oriented evidence[ ]  **B** – Inconsistent or limited quality patient oriented evidence[ ]  **C** – Consensus, disease oriented evidence, usual practice, expert opinion, or case series for studies of diagnosis, treatment, prevention, or screening |
| **Conclusion(s):** |
| **Implant supported prosthesis has both short- and longterm positive effects on OHRQoL**** Traditional RPDs positively affected OHRQoL in the short****term.**** However, Implant supported prosthesis showed greater****short-term improvement in OHRQoL than Traditional****RPD.** |