Sensitivity of direct tissue fluorescence visualization in screening for oral premalignant lesions in general practice
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Various specialty clinics and research centers have conducted studies of direct tissue fluorescence visualization as a screening technique for oral premalignant lesions and early oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC). The effectiveness of the VELscope in a private practice setting is unknown. This pilot study is the first report to assess the VELscope system as a screening adjunct among lower-risk populations seen by a primary care clinician in a general practice setting. This study involved a retrospective comparison of two oral cancer screening examination protocols conducted on a presumably low-risk patient population seen in a private general dentistry practice. For one year, all patients age 12 or older received oral examinations, according to a standard oral cancer screening protocol. The following year, the same population was examined according to the same protocol with the addition of direct tissue fluorescence visualization using the VELscope.

Screening with incandescent light examination yielded a prevalence of mucosal abnormalities of 0.83%, none of which were premalignant. Screening with incandescent light examination combined with direct tissue fluorescence visualization yielded a 1.3% prevalence of mucosal abnormalities; based on surgical biopsy and histopathologic examination, 83% of these were potentially premalignant epithelial dysplasia.

Materials and methods

Over a two-year period, a general dentist performed oral cancer screening examinations and compared the prevalence of mucosal abnormalities. The following year, the same population was examined with the addition of direct tissue fluorescence visualization using the VELscope. The prevalence of mucosal abnormalities increased to 1.3%, with 83% of these abnormalities being potentially premalignant epithelial dysplasia.
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screening examinations on all recall patients age 12 and older. The same patient base was seen by the same practitioner, using one of two protocols for detecting clinically abnormal areas. All examined patients were ambulatory and were American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) Class III or less.

Children as young as 12 were included because of recent reports that OSCC occurs in younger populations without risk factors. Other recent reports have associated OSCC with risk factors that include human papilloma virus (HPV) infection, marijuana use, and periodontal disease, in addition to the long-recognized associations with tobacco and alcohol use and genetic predisposition. The assumption was made that all adolescent and adult patients are at risk for development of premalignant lesions.

Oral cancer screening examinations were performed during all periodic oral examinations (D0120) and comprehensive oral examinations (D0150 and D0180) for each patient age 12 or older. A documented clinical examination technique with incandescent light illumination, visual inspection, and manual palpation was used to perform a standard oral cancer screening examination.

Standard oral cancer screening examination
From December 1, 2005 to November 30, 2006, 959 patients received a standard oral cancer screening examination using incandescent light illumination. Each examination was conducted as if the patient were a new patient who had not been examined previously by the same practitioner. According to a computerized practice analysis for modified Papanicolaou staining and microscopic examination by an oral pathologist.

Results
Standard oral cancer screening examination
From December 1, 2005 to November 30, 2006, 8 of the 959 patients examined were found to have clinically abnormal areas of the mouth that persisted for 14 days or longer. Brush samples from these patients were collected and examined. Six of the samples had a result of no abnormality, while the other two samples were diagnosed as mild atypia, with further investigation warranted. The two atypical samples were referred for surgical biopsy; histologic diagnoses for both were benign. One case was diagnosed as pigmentation due to exogenous material; the other was reactive hyperkeratosis with normal cellular morphology.

Standard oral cancer screening examination and direct tissue fluorescence visualization
From December 1, 2006 to November 30, 2007, 12 of the 905 patients examined were found to have clinically abnormal areas of the mouth that persisted for
14 days or longer (Fig. 1 and 2). Brush samples from these patients were collected and examined. Analysis of the brushed specimens showed abnormal results in all cases; these specimens were referred for surgical biopsy. Two cases were histologically benign; one of these was diagnosed as lichenoid mucositis and the other as a squamous papilloma. The remaining 10 cases were diagnosed as epithelial dysplasia, a potentially premalignant change.

Assuming a constant rate of premalignant and malignant epithelial abnormalities from one year to the next in this stable patient population, the incandescent light examination yielded a 0.83% prevalence of mucosal abnormalities, none of which were premalignant. The incandescent light and direct tissue fluorescence examination yielded a 1.3% prevalence of mucosal abnormalities, 83% of which were potentially premalignant.

**Discussion**

The standard of practice requires dental practitioners to perform regular clinical screening examinations of the extraoral head and neck and intraoral soft tissues. The screening examination is meant to recognize gross tissue abnormalities and make a clinical provisional diagnosis and a decision on the appropriate management.

Screening for disease entails testing people who apparently are symptom-free from the disease in question, to differentiate between those who probably have the disease and those who probably do not. Usually, screening tools are highly sensitive but are not specific; in addition, they may have high rates of false positive results. A false positive result occurs when the clinical diagnosis of an abnormality is investigated by surgical biopsy but the tissue is histopathologically normal. A screening technique does not provide a diagnosis. A surgical biopsy with microscopic examination by a pathologist remains the standard for diagnosing oral mucosal disease.

The VELscope is a form of direct tissue fluorescence visualization that utilizes the loss of natural fluorescent characteristics of metabolic intermediaries to identify...
dysplastic and hypermetabolic activity.\textsuperscript{15,16} Inflammation may have a similar appearance to early dysplasia; however, a properly conducted diascopy may be useful for interpreting non-fluorescent findings at the time of the screening examination.\textsuperscript{17} Regardless of diascopic results, all irregular findings should be re-evaluated in 14 days and any persistent lesions should be investigated with biopsy, even if they respond to diascopy.

When screening identifies early or occult oral mucosal lesions, general dentists can use minimally invasive epithelial cell collection techniques as case finding and patient education tools. These tests may be used to decide whether a surgical scalpel biopsy is indicated. A recent review by Patton et al emphasized that brush cytology is not appropriate for sampling obvious long-standing developmental or submucosal lesions.\textsuperscript{18} The review also emphasized that brush cytology is not appropriate for sampling obvious long-standing developmental or submucosal lesions.\textsuperscript{18} The review also emphasized that brush cytology is not recommended for assessing clinically suspicious lesions for which the practitioner normally would perform a scalpel or punch biopsy. If clinical judgment indicates that a surgical biopsy is appropriate for an abnormality detected by screening, the biopsy should be performed without a cytology.

Dentists have ethical and legal obligations to be proactive in detecting oral disease.\textsuperscript{19} The current standard of care uses direct visualization of the reflected white light from mucosal surfaces to detect gross tissue abnormalities, although reflection alone may fail to identify early epithelial dysplasia. There is a growing realization that some premalignant and early cancerous lesions may not be readily detectable with the naked eye.\textsuperscript{20} Additional clinical studies are needed to confirm reported sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive values of adjunctive screening techniques used to detect oral premalignant and malignant lesions.\textsuperscript{3,18-21}

To date, all peer-reviewed VELscope studies have been performed on patients with known oral dysplasia or OSCC confirmed by biopsy.\textsuperscript{4,22-24} Routine VELscope use has been challenged by the observation that the current literature pertaining to this particular device does not support all of the principles of evidence-based decision-making.\textsuperscript{3} Laronde et al emphasized the need to train dentists to use the device.\textsuperscript{4}

A recent review of adjunctive techniques for oral cancer examination called for additional study of the VELscope as an adjunct in low-risk populations and for primary care providers.\textsuperscript{18} The present study is the first to involve the VELscope as an adjunct for detecting occult abnormal mucosal findings in a low-risk general dental practice. The results of this retrospective, observational pilot study provide data for future studies in a community private practice setting.

**Conclusion**

In the present study, routine incorporation of the VELscope in the examination protocol for low-risk adolescents and adults in a general dental practice proved useful in identifying occult, potentially premalignant lesions.

**Author information**

Dr. Huff is a clinical instructor, Department of Comprehensive Care, Case School of Dental Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio, and also is in private practice in Dover, OH. Dr. Stark is an associate professor, Clinical and Scientific Research Center, Tufts University School of Dental Medicine in Boston, Massa-


Published with permission by the Academy of General Dentistry. © Copyright 2009 by the Academy of General Dentistry. All rights reserved.