

Staging and Grading Discussion of Borderline Cases in Gray Zones

Larissa Steigmann,* Celia Sommer,* Kenneth S. Kornman* and Hom-Lay Wang*

Introduction: Staging and grading for chronic periodontal disease, as described in 2018, is designed to focus on key distinctions with the recognition that there is a subset of individuals who are on a different clinical trajectory of disease. The staging and grading framework aids the clinician in generating a periodontal diagnosis, however, some cases fall into gray zones in which the simple diagnostic parameters make it challenging to categorize the patient. These cases do not present with clear clinical findings and medical and dental histories that fit within the simple guidelines defined in the staging and grading tables and subsequent algorithms.

Case Presentation: Two cases are presented and demonstrate typical clinical scenarios that fall into gray zones when it comes to differentiating whether the patient will respond predictably to standard principles of care. Case 1 presents a scenario in which the patient's early history suggests the potential for disease progression and increases the likelihood that the patient may develop a need for complex rehabilitation due to periodontal breakdown. Clinical judgment was used to evaluate whether the patient remained at elevated risk and the potential implications for disease progression. Case 1 was diagnosed with generalized Stage III, Grade B. The initial presentation of Case 2 had a higher severity and complexity and therefore was diagnosed with generalized Stage IV, Grade C. The need for complex rehabilitation in Case 2, however, was not primarily due to periodontitis.

Conclusion: Decision guidelines and algorithms help in establishing a standardized diagnosis, however cases that fall into gray zones require clinical judgment to establish the most appropriate diagnosis to guide a treatment plan that is personalized based on current knowledge. *Clin Adv Periodontics* 2021;11:98–102.

Key Words: Classification; diagnosis; disease management; periodontitis.

Background

Staging and grading for chronic periodontal disease, as described in 2018,¹ is designed to focus on key distinctions from prior classifications. The primary distinction is the recognition that there is a subset of individuals who are on a different clinical trajectory of disease that is evident by the early 30s² and even earlier. In addition, evidence supports that 20% to 25% of patients with periodontitis do not respond predictably to standard principles of prevention and treatment as established in the Michigan and Gothenburg studies.^{3,4} The new classification also acknowledges that there is currently inconsistent evidence that implicates specific microorganisms or an altered pathophysiology as the causal factors in the cases that are on a different disease trajectory.

The primary goals of the new classification were to provide key parameters that allow clinicians to more predictably differentiate between the periodontitis cases that should predictably respond to standard principles of prevention and treatment of periodontitis from cases that are unlikely to respond as predictably. The goal was not to provide a definitive diagnosis but to more reliably classify patients into multiple staging and grading categories that provide a classification framework to aid the clinician in

generating a treatment plan for control and long-term management of individual periodontitis and reconstruction cases as needed to establish masticatory function, esthetics, and comfort. However, it is clear that some cases do not present with clear clinical findings and medical and dental histories that fit within the simple guidelines defined in the staging and grading tables^{1,5} and subsequent algorithms.⁶ Experienced clinical judgment should bridge some of the “gray zones” as discussed below and previously.⁷ Both patients completed a written informed consent at consultation, where treatment options were discussed in detail.

Clinical Presentation

Case 1

A systemically healthy 66-year-old female with a family history of periodontitis and diagnosis of periodontitis at the age of 14 years (Figs. 1 and 2), had a history of non-surgical periodontal therapy, routine maintenance therapy every 6 months, and four tooth extractions due to periodontitis. Limited finances have prevented the patient from seeking professional periodontal care in the past 3 years. The patient exhibited signs of parafunctional bruxism and clenching, with secondary occlusal trauma, severe ridge defects, and tooth migration. The patient has generalized interproximal attachment loss ≥ 5 mm that is affecting $>30\%$ of the teeth, as well as generalized radiographic bone loss extending to the mid-third of the root with three localized vertical defects (tooth #13, #14,

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

Received June 20, 2020; accepted September 28, 2020

doi: 10.1002/cap.10129




FIGURE 3 Case 2. Healthy 64-year-old with no history of periodontal therapy. **3a** initial periodontal charting. **3b** intraoral photographs of the maxilla. **3c** classification of periodontitis with red outlines indicating the possible staging and blue indicating potential treatment needs and conditions. **3d** summary of clinical findings. **3e** intraoral photographs of the mandible. **Figure can be enlarged in online version of this article.**



FIGURE 4 Case 2. Healthy 64-year-old with no history of smoking and who is normoglycemic. **4a** radiographs with extent of bone loss indicated at the worst sites. **4b** intraoral photographs. **4c** primary criteria for grading. **4d** calculation for percent bone loss/age ratio. **Figure can be enlarged in online version of this article.**

patient had several periapical lesions and one implant with peri-implant disease (Figs. 3 and 4).

Case Management and Clinical Outcome

Both clinical cases represent scenarios in which the periodontal diagnosis distinction is not straightforward. The

main differentiating aspect between a Stage III or Stage IV classification is the complexity of the case, which includes the anticipated disease trajectory as part of the clinical judgment and anticipated treatment outcome. A complex case may require re-establishing the vertical dimension of occlusion, advanced surgical procedures to rehabilitate the patient with multiple implants, close monitoring

for potential periodontal breakdown and its effects on the overall treatment plan, and a more involved interdisciplinary team to rehabilitate and manage; therefore, being able to identify when a borderline Stage III/IV case has a potential to become a Stage IV complexity is key. The clinical judgment for the diagnosis of these two borderline cases demonstrates that there are complex factors involved in categorizing a patient into a disease classification.

Case 1 presents a patient with a clear Stage III/IV severity based on generalized clinical attachment loss (AL), radiographic bone loss, and tooth loss due to periodontitis. The patient has 24 remaining teeth, 11 occluding pairs, and no masticatory dysfunction. Although the patient has localized secondary occlusal trauma, severe ridge defects, and drifting, the need for complex rehabilitation does not yet exist given the patient's current occlusion (Fig. 1).⁸ A Stage III diagnosis would be appropriate given the patient's current clinical presentation. Given the patient's history of an early diagnosis of periodontitis and removal of teeth due to periodontitis, non-surgical periodontal therapy and management of the patient's occlusion may not be able to preserve her remaining dentition, which may result in the patient losing another three to five teeth to periodontal disease and may experience significant masticatory dysfunction. In spite of the history of an early periodontitis diagnosis the maximum radiographic bone loss percent/age is <1.0 and there are no clear signs of overt risk factors for progression. Although the periodontal destruction seems to be more than one might expect given relatively minor biofilm deposits, this characteristic is not a strong predictor of future progression given the amount of total tissue destruction at the patient's current age, therefore, a Grade B diagnosis seems to be appropriate for the rate of disease progression.

Case 2 presents a patient with generalized clinical AL and radiographic bone loss; however, the severity of the case is multifactorial. The patient has 25 remaining teeth, 13 occluding pairs, and concerns about reduced masticatory function on the right side (Fig. 4.). After removal of hopeless teeth, the patient will have a need for complex rehabilitation to regain sufficient masticatory function. This will leave the patient with ten occluding pairs, a deep impinging overbite, and secondary trauma from occlusion. Initial interpretation of this case suggests a Stage IV classification due to the complexity of the rehabilitation. The patient is susceptible to periodontal disease, and the radiographic bone loss given the patient's age qualifies the case for a Grade C classification which indicates that the patient should be monitored closely. Notably, it should be noted that the primary reason for the severity of the case appears to be strongly related to endodontic lesions, vertical root fractures, root perforations, heavy occlusal loads from existing restorative crowns, and a parafunctional bruxism habit. Despite the need for rehabilitation under the management of an interdisciplinary team, the

close monitoring of the case, as indicated by Grade C, is also justified to verify that the response to periodontal treatment and maintenance is consistent with all aspects of the risk profile of the case.

Discussion

Simple decision guidelines and algorithms facilitate the implementation of a diagnosis system in clinical practice; however, there comes a point in which intuitive judgment is needed to navigate the limitations of a binary algorithm. Cases that are borderline and fall into gray zones, such as the ones described, do not have a definitive diagnosis (Figs. 1 and 2 and Figs. 3 and 4.). Variability may exist between clinicians and may change during the course of treatment. The key is to integrate clinical judgment needed in establishing a diagnosis that is appropriate for the patient's overall health and the development of an individualized patient-specific treatment plan.

In the cases presented, neither patient has known comorbidities or any environmental factors, such as smoking, that contribute to the periodontal disease progression. What appears to distinguish these cases is the degree of periodontal disease susceptibility. The early onset of periodontitis in case 1 and the clinical and radiographic presentation in later years implicates intrinsic risk factors that adversely affected the patient's host response to bacterial challenges, but regular professional maintenance care (Figs. 1 and 2) appears to have helped to moderate progression of the patient's periodontitis for many years. The phenotypic response of case 1 may lead to continued tissue breakdown and could indicate a higher risk for future tooth loss.

Detailed evaluation of case 2 reveals a less severe phenotypic response that is exacerbated by non-periodontitis-related factors. It is anticipated that this patient will respond well to standard therapy given the overt presence of local contributing etiologies. With the limited amount of bone loss in areas where other etiologies are excluded and no history of therapy, the degree of progression is not nearly as severe as it initially appears. It is clear, however, that this case requires a multidisciplinary approach to manage current endodontic and reconstructive challenges.

Once a stage of the disease is determined, the patient receives a grading diagnosis that considers the patient's known risk factors to project anticipated rate of progression and likely responsiveness to current principles of treating periodontitis. The risk for future periodontal breakdown can be projected by an indirect measure of the patient's disease progression using a bone loss/age ratio. As demonstrated by case 2, the bone loss progression is severe and the calculated ratio would place the patient in a rapid rate of progression; however, the etiology is not entirely due to periodontitis and the case phenotype is one that resembles a less susceptible clinical presentation.

Rather than debate how borderline cases must fit into a specific diagnosis within the parameters of a simple guideline, we should embrace the strategy of using clinical experience in the decision-making process. A diagnostic distinction may be difficult to reach for borderline cases,

however, developing the appropriate treatment plan based on evidence-based therapeutic interventions and clinical experience is the ultimate goal. These cases highlight how clinical judgment is needed to arrive at the most appropriate diagnosis unique for each patient. ■

Summary

Why are these cases new information?

- Borderline cases require clinical judgment and often cannot be classified following simple diagnostic guidelines. Being able to identify when a borderline Stage III/IV has a potential to become a Stage IV complexity is a key discriminatory factor.

What are the keys to successful management of these cases?

- A thorough assessment of the patient's disease history, periodontal phenotype, and recognition of systemic and local contributing factors and how they interplay with existing primary etiologies are important assessments in composing an overall view of the patient's health. Borderline cases require clinicians to additionally rely on their clinical judgment to overcome strict algorithmic assessments outside of the parameters of the general guidelines to arrive at an appropriate diagnosis and treatment plan.

What are the primary limitations to success in these cases?

- Differences in clinical training and experience may result in different diagnoses among clinicians, however, this may also lead to meaningful discussions that help clinicians recognize borderline cases and implications for treatment. With continued scientific research and discoveries, the existing classification system will continue to evolve.

Author Contributions and Acknowledgments

Larissa Steigmann, Celia Sommer, Kenneth Kornman, and Hom-Lay Wang were responsible for case documentation, drafting the manuscript, and revisions. No author received any monetary compensation for this manuscript. The authors report no conflicts of interest related to this case report.

CORRESPONDENCE

Hom-Lay Wang, DDS, MSD, PhD, Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, School of Dentistry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
Email: homlay@umich.edu

References

1. Tonetti MS, Greenwell H, Kornman KS. Staging and grading of periodontitis: Framework and proposal of a new classification and case definition. *J Periodontol* 2018;89 Suppl 1:S159-S172.
2. Billings M, Holtfreter B, Papapanou PN, Mitnik GL, Kocher T, Dye BA. Age-dependent distribution of periodontitis in two countries: Findings

from NHANES 2009 to 2014 and SHIP-TREND 2008 to 2012. *J Periodontol* 2018;89 Suppl 1:S140-S158.

3. Ramfjord SP, Knowles JW, Nissle RR, Burgett FG, Shick RA. Results following three modalities of periodontal therapy. *J Periodontol* 1975;46:522-526.
4. Lindhe J, Nyman S. Long-term maintenance of patients treated for advanced periodontal disease. *J Clin Periodontol* 1984;11:504-514.
5. Papapanou PN, Sanz M, Buduneli N, et al. Periodontitis: Consensus report of workgroup 2 of the 2017 World Workshop on the Classification of Periodontal and Peri-Implant Diseases and Conditions. *J Periodontol* 2018;89 Suppl 1:S173-S182.
6. Tonetti MS, Sanz M. Implementation of the new classification of periodontal diseases: Decision-making algorithms for clinical practice and education. *J Clin Periodontol* 2019;46:398-405.
7. Kornman KS, Papapanou PN. Clinical application of the new classification of periodontal diseases: Ground rules, clarifications and "gray zones". *J Periodontol* 2020;91:352-360.
8. Gotfredsen K, Walls AWG. What dentition assures oral function? *Clin Oral Impl Res* 2007;18:34-45.

○ indicates key references.