

# Implications of COVID-19 for the safe management of general dental practice

## A practical guide

**Version 2**  
2<sup>nd</sup> October 2020

[www.cgdent.uk](http://www.cgdent.uk)

[www.fgdp.org.uk](http://www.fgdp.org.uk)

© College of General Dentistry and Faculty of General Dental Practice (UK) 2020

This is an open access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license (CC-BY-NC 4.0), a copy of which is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. For use outside the scope of the license terms, please contact the Faculty of General Practice (UK) at [FGDP@fgdp.org.uk](mailto:FGDP@fgdp.org.uk).

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication, no guarantee can be given that all errors and omissions have been excluded. The College of General Dentistry and Faculty of General Dental Practice (UK) can accept no responsibility for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of material in this publication.

Version 1 published 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020

Version 1.1 published 16<sup>th</sup> June 2020

Version 2 published 2 October 2020 (with significant amendments highlighted)

## Contributors

Development of this guidance has been underpinned by cooperation, collaboration and teamwork, and we are indebted to the individuals who have given so generously of their time. We are grateful to the following individuals and their organisations who have made a significant contribution to the development of this guidance.

We would like to express particular thanks to Dr Vanessa Davies and Dr Chet Trivedy who have been the driving force behind the creation of this guidance. A list of the contributors are included below:

Richard Ablett	Clinical Director, Association of Dental Groups
Mick Armstrong	General Dental Practitioner, Chair British Dental Association
Toni Batty	Dental Practice Manager, Honorary Lecturer Peninsula Dental School
Maria Clark	Patient Representative
Vanessa Davies	Independent Policy Advisor
Onkar Dhanoya	Chair, General Dental Practitioner, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Jacqueline Elsdon	Previously BAPD DCP Committee (President British Association of Dental Nurses)
Rebecca Harris	Professor / Honorary Consultant Dental Public Health, University of Liverpool
Mick Horton	General Dental Practitioner, Trustee of College of General Dentistry; National Advisory Board of Human Factors in Dentistry
Helen Kaney	Lead Dento-legal Consultant & Head of Dental Services, Scotland for MPS, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Roshni Karia	General Dental Practitioner, Vice-Dean FGDP(UK)
Tashfeen Kholasi	General Dental Practitioner, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Jonathan Lack	Specialist Periodontist, Alpha Omega Dental Fraternity, London Chapter & Charitable Trust, Scientific Committee
Ian Mills	General Dental Practitioner, Dean FGDP(UK), Honorary Associate Professor, Peninsula Dental School
Donald McNicol	General Dental Practitioner, Council Member FDS Glasgow
Govin Murugachandran	Chief Executive Officer, Flynotes
Susan Nelson	General Dental Practitioner, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Eimear O'Connell	General Dental Practitioner, President of Association of Dental Implantology
Dominic O'Hooley	General Dental Practitioner
Abhi Pal	General Dental Practitioner, Senior Vice Dean FGDP(UK)
Andrew Parashchak	General Dental Practitioner, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Mark Richardson	Chief Dental Officer (RAF and Defence), Board Member FGDP(UK)
Diane Rochford	BAPD DCP Committee, President Elect, British Society of Dental Hygiene & Therapy
Jason Smithson	General Dental Practitioner, Executive Committee of British Association of Private Dentistry
Sami Stagnell	General Dental Practitioner, Specialist Oral Surgeon, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Suzanne Sykes	Special Care Dentist, Board Member FGDP(UK)
Phil Taylor	Professor of Prosthodontics Barts, Dean Elect of FDS Edinburgh
Chet Trivedy	Consultant in Emergency Medicine, Brighton & Sussex University Hospital
Jason Wong	General Dental Practitioner, Deputy Chief Dental Officer England

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the following individuals for their contribution in the development, production or dissemination of this guidance:

Simon Thornton-Wood; Jamie Woodward; Victoria Barnett; Bethan Liddy; Max Thomas; Soha Dattani; Tracy Stockdale; Ed Martin

This guidance was updated in September 2020 and we are grateful to the following members of the Revision Group for undertaking the majority of this work:

Richard Ablett, Onkar Dhanoya, Mick Horton, Roshni Karia, Jonathan Lack, Ian Mills, Dominic O’Hooley, Abhi Pal, and Chet Trivedy.

We are also grateful to **Professor Jennie Wilson** (University of West London) for her advice and guidance on aspects of Infection Prevention and Control, and to **Professor Owen Addison** (Kings College London) for sharing pre-publication research on aerosol production from dental handpieces and **Simon Heywood** (MD, Hertfordshire Building Control) for advice on air ventilation. We would also like to acknowledge the significant contribution from SDCEP Team, led by **Professor Jan Clarkson**, and members of the AGP Rapid Review Group who influenced many of the changes within our revised guidance.

## Foreword

The Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP[UK]) and the College of General Dentistry (CGDent) are committed to raising the standards of care provided to our patients through postgraduate education and the provision of evidence-based guidance for the dental profession. FGDP(UK) has a long and proud history of producing guidance documents which are highly respected within the profession, and we are delighted to work with the new College of General Dentistry to produce what we believe to be an important set of guidelines at this critical time. Our guidelines are developed primarily by general dental practitioners, and are aimed at colleagues working in general dental practice. This has been particularly important at this critical time, but we could not have delivered this guidance without the support and expertise of many colleagues who work across all fields of health care.

We have faced a huge challenge over the last few months, both as a profession and as a nation, as we deal with the COVID-19 pandemic. Many colleagues have been touched by tragedy, and the dental profession has had to face significant hardship as dental practices across the country battle to support their patients, colleagues and businesses. The level of uncertainty during the pandemic led to fear, anxiety and at times anger, as we struggled to cope with the unknown. It was clear that the profession needed specific guidance to support a safe return to practice in the knowledge that they would be able to continue to provide high quality care for their patients.

As a profession, we are all aware of the desperate need to restore oral health care services for our patients and the wider population, but we are also fully cognisant that this cannot be at the expense of safety. This is an unenviable position to be in, but in the opinion of the FGDP(UK) Executive Board, the situation demands a risk-based approach to identify the risks and provide guidance to mitigate them.

As the academic home for general dental practice, it would seem appropriate that FGDP(UK) in conjunction with CGDent should convene a Task Group to produce guidance for a safe return to practice, with the primary focus on developing a risk-based approach. As part of this risk-based approach, the Task Group have elected to adopt the terminology “aerosol generated exposure” (AGE), to complement “aerosol generating procedure” (AGP). It was considered that this promotes a risk-based approach and encourages dental professionals to consider AGEs from a quantitative perspective, and to consider the risk from droplet and aerosol spread from natural exposures, such as gagging, coughing or spluttering. In the short time since writing the first draft of this guidance and this update we have witnessed an incredible amount of unity and resolve within the dental profession to deal with this crisis. The profession has responded to the needs of the UK public to provide dental care not only in challenging circumstances, but enhanced the public perception of dentistry as health care heroes in line with other health care professionals. We are confident that the dental profession will have a growing role moving forward in helping the government with activities such as COVID-19 testing when the accuracy and availability of POC

testing is available and playing a role in the mass vaccination programme for COVID-19 which may be only months away.

We would like to thank every member of the dental profession for their commitment to patient care during this unprecedented and difficult time.

We believe through our update we have successfully achieved our objective, and we sincerely hope that this document will support and guide our colleagues through the difficult weeks and months ahead. On behalf of the Task Group Management Team, we would like to acknowledge the enormous effort and dedication of those involved in developing the guidance, particularly given the incredibly short space of time. Task Group members were recruited from a large cross section of our profession and the diversity of roles and attitudes was undoubtedly one of the strengths of the group dynamic. It is a credit to our profession that we were able to work collaboratively and constructively to reach consensus under extreme time constraints. The Task Group were expertly supported by Dr Vanessa Davies and members of the FGDP (UK) team, and without their direction, expertise and encouragement, this would not have been possible.

An on-line Fallow Time Calculator (FTC) has been developed to support dental health care workers, both in relation to calculating the fallow time based on mitigation, but also as a method of reliably recording the data. Two members of our Task Group have been responsible for developing this tool, Govin Murugachandran and Jason Wong, and we are extremely grateful to them for the contribution which they have made.

We would strongly encourage all dental professionals to read these guidelines and consider how they can be adopted within their own practice setting. This is a fluid document which reflects the novel nature of COVID-19, and this guidance will need to evolve as our scientific knowledge and understanding expands.

**Ian Mills**  
Dean  
FGDP (UK)

**Mick Horton**  
Trustee  
CGDent

**Onkar Dhanoya**  
Chairman  
COVID-19 Task Group

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The role and aim of the guidance</b>	<b>9</b>
The guidance and government requirements, statutory emergency measures and the regulation of dental professionals and practices	10
How the guidance has been developed	11
The risk- and evidence-based approach	12
How the guidance is structured	14
Pervasive points	15
Communication and consent	15
Normal operating protocols	16
Human factors overall in the return to the workplace	16
<b>The technical sections</b>	<b>17</b>
The narrative explanations	17
Bibliography	17
How to read the tables/risk matrices	17
<b>Section 1: Pre-appointment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Section 2: Patient attendance (pre-treatment)</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Section 3: During treatment</b>	<b>29</b>
Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)	34
Procedural risk mitigation	37
<b>Section 4: After treatment</b>	<b>42</b>
Fallow period after high AGE risk in a dental surgery	42
<b>Section 5: Management tasks</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Protecting vulnerable dental health care workers</b>	<b>67</b>
The impact of COVID-19 on vulnerable groups	67
Moderate risk of developing complications from coronavirus (COVID-19) infection	69
<b>Frequently asked questions</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>75</b>

## Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has been one of the greatest challenges humanity has faced in the last century. The SARS-CoV-2 virus has been responsible for nearly 33 million cases and global deaths exceeding one million. The UK has been severely affected with over 42,072 reported deaths at the time of writing (29<sup>th</sup> September 2020; for latest figures see [www.worldometers.info](http://www.worldometers.info)). In addition, the virus, which is spread through droplets, contact and possibly opportunistic aerosols has also taken the lives of at least 245 health and social care workers in the UK since March 2020.

We are continuing to learn more about the SARS-Cov-2 virus and although the medical management of COVID complications in hospitalised patients has improved, the prognosis for those severely affected is still poor and 'long COVID' is an emerging concern. We are still waiting for a breakthrough for an effective vaccine and a number of promising clinical trials suggest that this may become a reality in the near future.

In response to the pandemic, the UK Government introduced lockdown measures on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2020. This had a significant impact on the daily lives of its citizens, including dentists and their practices. Across the UK, dental practices were instructed to limit the scope of practice, which caused significant disruption to the provision of oral health services. Access to urgent and emergency care was re-established by introducing a network of Urgent Dental Centres that dealt with the increasing demand for care. Cessation of routine dental services has undoubtedly had a profound effect on the availability of urgent care, and the impact on the oral health of the UK population cannot be overestimated.

Accessibility to dental services has been variable across the four Nations, and the approach to maintaining some level of service has also differed. Dental practices have gradually begun to restore services, but the rate has been variable and any return to normal is likely to face further delays as a result of enhanced COVID-19 measures. The summer months of July and August saw the number of cases of COVID-19 decline in the UK, but there has been a steep increase in the daily number of reported cases during September. The number of hospital admissions is also steadily increasing in some areas, although the numbers of admissions and deaths are currently at a significantly lower rate than seen during the height of the pandemic. There do not appear to be any plans for a second national lock down at this stage, although local measures are being introduced for local hotspots. It is important for all dental professionals to be aware of the national alert levels, but also fully cognisant of the local threat and comply with whatever measures have been applied to their location.

The first version of this guidance, which was released in June, pre-empted this eventuality and was written in order that practitioners could gauge their COVID-19 mitigation response using our risk matrix and adapt accordingly to either national or local threat levels. Despite the second wave, we are confident that these guidelines

are robust enough to provide the safety, security and flexibility to allow dental teams to continue to deliver patient care irrespective of the prevalence rate.

At the current time (September 29<sup>th</sup>), the UK Government has declared a COVID-19 “**alert level 4**”, which indicates that the risk of transmission is “**severe**”, with a higher risk of infectivity. The NHS COVID Alert Level is a five-point system which ranks the threat level of the virus on a scale of 1 (safe) to 5 (critical). The alert level is adjusted according to medical and scientific data including the R number (rate of infection) and the number of infections recorded. The current UK R number is 1.2-1.5 and appears to be growing at 4-8% a day.

The National Alert Level does not take into consideration local “hotspots” or “flare-ups” which continue to occur across the UK. It has been suggested that prevalence figures are more accurate, particularly when they are considered at a local or regional level. The National Alert Level system has also been criticised due to the weakness of the data used and the subjectivity of the scale. However, it does provide an indication of threat, no matter how subjective, and it is linked to the social distancing measures imposed within the UK.

The rise in the R-number has prompted enhanced measures in some parts of the UK to halt the spread of the virus. One of the worries about this rise is that we are entering the flu season where respiratory viruses tend to be on the increase and there are already significant pressures on hospital services (“winter pressures”). By controlling the R number with measures such as local lockdowns, social distancing and the use of the “track and trace” system which is a free smartphone app, alerting users if they have been in the vicinity of other app users who have tested positive for COVID-19. It also allows users to track the number of COVID-19 cases in their local vicinity thereby monitoring local threat. Marketed as “protect your loved ones”, the track and trace system provides another opportunity for dental professionals to gauge their individual risks to COVID-19 (<https://www.nhs.uk/apps-library/nhs-covid-19> ).

At the time of writing, shielding has generally been temporarily paused in the UK, although this may change in light of the increase in the R-number. There has also been a reclassification of the risk status of those who are at greater risk and this is discussed in more detail on pages 66-68.

## **Terminology**

In our original guidance document we proposed that in considering the risk of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through both natural droplets and aerosols, the term **Aerosol Generated Exposure (AGE)** should be used with a risk stratification applied. This decision was influenced by our concerns over the term “non-AGP” which implied a binary relationship where a dental procedure either posed an aerosol risk, or it did not. The view of our Task Group was that this was potentially inaccurate and a more nuanced approach was deemed appropriate within dentistry.

It is now widely recognised that all patient encounters have the potential to expose all dental health care workers (DHCW) and patients to bioaerosols, although the risks are extremely variable and have yet to be quantified. This approach has been adopted by SDCEP with procedures categorised by risk and would seem to validate our original decision to abandon the term non-AGP. The SDCEP Rapid Review looked specifically at dental procedures and uses the term Aerosol Generated Procedure (AGP), but within this guidance, which has a wider remit, we continue to refer to AGEs, which is a broader term which encompasses the risks from both naturally-produced and procedurally generated aerosols.

Consideration of AGE in assessing the quantifiable risk of transmission should also take into account the duration of a procedure, patient factors (such as respiratory disease), the ability to employ procedural mitigation factors and the probability of their success. Natural exposures, which include contact transmission and both droplet and aerosol caused by coughing, sneezing and exposure to respiratory droplets during expiration, can also be factored in.

It is important to understand that the risk of transmission within the dental practice is extremely low, based on the prevalence data and the high standards of infection prevention and control which are maintained. However, the consequences of contracting COVID-19 can be potentially extremely serious for certain individuals. There is a potential for dental practices to be a centre of a local outbreak if IPC protocols are not rigorously applied, which could have a catastrophic impact on the practice, the community and the wider dental profession. We have a responsibility to our colleagues, our patients and the wider community to ensure that we provide high standards of care in a safe environment, and this must be taken seriously.

It is clear that specific groups of individuals are at greater risk of serious illness, hospitalisation, long COVID and death. A number of risk factors have been identified and these include age, sex, comorbidities and ethnicity. An increased mortality rate of health care workers from black, Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds has been widely reported. There is strong evidence to suggest that these specific groups of individuals may be at greater risk of serious illness, complications and death following an infection with COVID-19. This would indicate that many factors need to be taken into consideration in terms of the risk of contracting COVID-19, and in terms of morbidity and mortality. Although the cause is still not fully understood, it is thought that the high incidence of co-morbidities, such as diabetes, hypertension, and obesity, which are all disproportionately represented within this group, may be underlying factors. This supports a risk-based approach to managing the pandemic as part of a strategy to deliver oral health services within a safe environment. Those at increased risk of serious sequelae from COVID-19 infection are members of our teams, our patient bases, our families and friends. It is our duty to recognise this as a central pillar of our risk mitigation approach.

At the end of May 2020, each devolved administration introduced a separate roadmap for supporting a gradual reopening of dental practices across the UK, which are being continuously adapted and modified. The priority remains safety, and this guidance provides a framework for dental teams to provide a risk assessment-based strategy for the safe treatment of patients at practice level.

## **The role and aim of the guidance**

1. The guidance aims to facilitate the ongoing safe practice of dentistry within primary care as we enter the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. This is vital to securing the oral health of the nation, and to maintaining public confidence in the profession. We are confident that these robust measures will allow dental professionals to continue to deliver care during this time.
2. The guidance supports dentists to take a risk and evidence-based approach to providing care in the current circumstances. It is structured to be flexible enough to provide support and set out minimum requirements, irrespective of the national, regional or local COVID-19 threat. It enables DHCWs to adjust measures depending on their individual risks and those of their patients. Dental professionals and patients may have different risk profiles which may include the practice environment, the geographical location, scope of practice and personal circumstances.
3. The guidance helps the dental profession to identify risks and mitigate them appropriately, as well as develop specific strategies for their individual practice needs, rather than being a “one size fits all” for the whole profession. It aims to be pragmatic about what can be safely and practically achieved in primary dental care with limited resources. All team members should undertake a risk assessment; those with particular risks may need additional measures to protect themselves.
4. The guidance seeks to be neutral and objective, without bias towards any given business model for the delivery of primary dental care.
5. The guidance is based on the best available evidence. High quality evidence for COVID-19 in relation to primary dental care is currently extremely limited. We draw on relevant best practice from other professions and other countries, and the common judgment of a large, diverse group of professionals.
6. We are grateful to the diverse group of professionals and their organisations who have contributed to the development of this guidance. Some of those organisations have developed their own advice for return to practise. The British

Dental Association's COVID Special Guidance on Returning to Routine Care offers practical complementary advice to our own guide. There are a number of other guidance documents available.

## **The guidance and government requirements, statutory emergency measures and the regulation of dental professionals and practices**

In the management of the pandemic across the UK and its nations, to whose governments health care responsibility is devolved, a combination of local NHS measures, Chief Dental Officers' communications and statutory provisions have determined which dental services the public can receive (and are likely to do so for the foreseeable future).

This guidance supports measures for safe practice which may vary according to the national, regional or local threat. These can be applied to any strategy or road map for the resumption of dental services due to the adoption of a risk-based approach which allows flexibility and adaptation depending on circumstances.

All DHCWs, whether NHS or in the private sector, will need to consider not only this guidance but also the applicable national situation and advice which may have been given, or requirements set by national authorities where there is a contractual or legal obligation to do so. We signpost some of this in the five technical sections of this guidance.

The GDC has said the following (21<sup>st</sup> May 2020) about professional judgement and regulation:

*'Expert advice on the clinical aspects of COVID-19 will continue to come from the health authorities of the four nations and we will continue to signpost to this guidance as and when it is updated. But that guidance will inevitably not cover every potential scenario, and therefore, **dental professionals will need to continue exercising their professional judgement and weigh the risks in any given situation** [our emphasis]. They will also need to continue to assess whether they are trained, competent and indemnified to carry out the activity in question.*

*However, in the recent joint statement from the health care regulators we said that we understand that in highly challenging circumstances, **professionals may need to depart from established procedures to care for patients** and that should concerns be raised, relevant **environmental and human factors would be taken into account.**'*

As regards practice-level regulation, the CQC (for example) said on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2020:

*'The decision to offer dental care services is one for the provider to take.*

*Alongside guidance given by Public Health England (PHE) and the General Dental Council (GDC), CQC encourage dental providers to give proper consideration to the communications from the Chief Dental Officer (CDO) regardless of whether their practice is NHS, private, or mixed.*

*CQC cannot require providers of dental care services to close, unless we find clear evidence of a breach of our regulations that requires consideration of the use of our powers under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations.*

*As part of our regulatory function we will assess the extent to which providers are providing an appropriate level of safety within the context of our regulations. In doing so we will refer to prevailing guidance, not limited to but including guidance from PHE, the CDO and GDC to help us reach a judgement on the extent to which the service currently being provided complies with our Regulations.'*

We have also considered FGDP(UK)'s *Standards in Dentistry* in general, and sections 1.7 and 1.8 in particular, regarding the responsibility of dentists to remain abreast of minimum standards for safe practice in the interests of patients.

We believe that following this guidance together with the considerations set out above can provide a sound basis for safe practice of dentistry across the UK. As a very general principle, the further a practitioner departs from the guidance and other reference points, they would be well advised to document thoroughly and contemporaneously their reasons for doing so. The focus of the guidance is on how to practise where the alert level is at 5, 4 or 3 (critical reducing to substantial). However, practitioners should note that where the mitigations in place for higher alert levels have led to improved outcomes for patients and safer, more caring, efficient and responsive service and better-led practices, we would encourage the retention of those measures into a "new normal" when the alert level has reduced to 1.

## **How the guidance has been developed**

The dental profession has a rich diversity of sub-specialities as well as different business models for delivering dental care. These both complement and compete with each other, so there may be different priorities and viewpoints on practice resulting from the delivery model. The guidance aims to meet these varied needs, whilst maintaining as its top priorities the delivery of safe, appropriately risk-differentiated clinical care to patients and to ensure that the personal risks to staff are mitigated by adopting an individualised risk assessment for all members of the dental team.

The Task Group membership reflects the diversity of specialisms, the range of delivery models and geographical differences, including across the four nations of the UK (see Contributors section for full details of members). It includes expertise from lay patients

and the wider dental team (DHCW and practice management), academia, the medical profession, trade unions and defence organisations.

Since the release of the first version of this guidance, the task group have been actively engaging with professionals both within dentistry as well as expert advisors from the fields of virology, particle physics, infection prevention and control (IPC), and air ventilation experts. This level of interprofessional engagement has enabled us to ensure that the guidance is robust, contemporaneous, accessible and able to support continued safe delivery of oral health care throughout the UK.

## The risk- and evidence-based approach

No guidance can eliminate risk, but this guidance provides a framework that assists in identifying and mitigating the key risks to which the dental profession and patients may be exposed. The COVID-19 landscape is moving rapidly with new information appearing daily. The dental profession has had less exposure to COVID-19 than the medical profession and as a result, the evidence for best practice and lessons from exposure are much more limited. The guidance is based on a synthesis of best evidence from reliable sources which are publicly available and cited in the bibliography.

The guidance adopts the ABC (Aspirational, Basic, Conditional) approach to measures which are to be taken, with Basic measures being those which represent a minimum standard to be put in place. This is consistent with other guidance and standards issued by FGDP(UK).

The “patient journey” is at the heart of the risk assessment. This will be the greatest challenge in the delivery of dental services in the primary care setting, where there may be limitations in space, other resources and finances. The dental team must remain mindful of the challenges which patients may also be facing in terms of their own personal circumstances as well as their oral health. Concerns about how safe it currently is to go back to the dentist, together with confusion in general guidance to the public on interactions outside the home, may exacerbate pre-existing fear of dental treatment. The measures in the guidance seek to address this.

A key feature of the guidance is the adoption of personalised risk assessment for dentists and other members of the dental team. We already know that people with certain characteristics and co-morbidities are more likely to suffer adverse outcomes if they become infected with COVID-19. It is very important to stress that this does **not** mean that people with a higher risk *from* the infection are at greater risk of *transmitting* the infection, and great care should be taken with this distinction. We say more about this below and in the relevant technical sections 1-5.

We would always recommend documenting any risk assessments, providing helpful evidence if needed later.

In summary, good evidence, risk assessment for DHCW, consideration of patient needs and the overall COVID-19 alert level are the foundations on which safety – and a return to practise - are built.




Figure 1: The hierarchy for developing a risk-based approach to mitigation in relation to COVID-19

## How the guidance is structured

The guidance is structured to provide a quick and easy-to-use tool for practice, signposting to other resources. Drawing on the guidance enables members of the dental team to:

- i. Understand the key areas of the patient journey which may be affected during the pandemic.
- ii. Undertake a personalised risk assessment in relation to the risk implication of a COVID-19 infection (co-morbidities/age/sex/ethnicity/pregnancy etc.) for patients and staff, as this will impact on additional adaptations that may need to be considered.
- iii. Appreciate the context of the guidance in relation of the UK alert level 1-5 (or any other phasing used by any the four nations of the UK). As well as the local measures which are being implemented in response to local spikes in the number of COVID-19 cases.
- iv. Use the ABC approach as in other FGDP(UK) guidance to identify which measures are the minimum necessary, or most relevant.

We have divided the guidance into five sections, the first four of which reflect the “patient journey” and the fifth concerning general management of practice matters, which underpins the patient journey. Each is explained in more detail at the start of the relevant section:

- i. Pre-appointment
- ii. Patient attendance (pre-treatment)
- iii. During treatment
- iv. After treatment
- v. Management/governance tasks

Each section consists of a summary narrative and a series of tables or matrices.

Task Group member opinions were collated in a manner loosely based on the Delphi approach to identify priority risk areas, and an in-depth review process within each of the domains identified. This included a comprehensive review of the current evidence. Potential mitigations in the context of the relevant alert level, as well as any additional mitigation measures for practitioners and patients who may be vulnerable to more adverse outcomes from COVID-19, were identified.

The resulting information is set out in a table which can be used by practitioners as a quick reference guide to determine the risks for each part of the patient journey. It clearly identifies any measures that may be required in their practice in light of the alert level at that time. It also highlights additional measures that they should implement for any staff members or patients who may be vulnerable to COVID-19.

A narrative accompanies the matrices and this highlights key issues and areas which may require particular attention or where nuance or difference in views need to be understood.

The measures set out are not prescriptive, but identify the risk levels and the proportionate measures to take, enabling dentists to exercise their professional judgment accordingly. A further explanation of how to use the tables is set out below, but there are additional, generic (“pervasive”) points to bear in mind as well.

### **Pervasive points**

DCHW are well versed in the most stringent IPC policies, but we feel that it is worth reinforcing the importance of rigorous hand hygiene and it is essential that this is observed at all times. IPC experts are quite clear that this is one of the most important and basic measures we have to combat the transmission of the virus and to protect ourselves, our teams and our patients.

We have identified a number of issues and themes which need to be kept in mind throughout the technical sections, and as a result, are not explicitly repeated within those sections. These issues remain extremely important and should be seen as an integral part of the guidance.

Many of these are rooted in the GDC’s nine principles which govern the conduct of dental professionals. Some of these principles may have added considerations as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic which may be less obvious to practitioners, or merit reinforcing in order to enhance public confidence in the return to practice.

Standards by which dentists’ services are regulated at a practice level are also deemed in our guidance to be pervasive and are not repeated explicitly in the technical sections. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) requirements, for example, of safe, effective, caring, responsive to people’s needs and well-led are also assumed, as are the analogous standards at practice level set by Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW), Healthcare Improvement Scotland (HIS) and the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA). Again, the COVID-19 situation may bring some of those more to the forefront than previously.

Practitioners should fully take into account the advice disseminated by the respective Chief Dental Officers for each Nation of the UK.

### **Communication and consent**

The measures recommended will mean significant changes to the way dentistry is delivered. Effective, meaningful communication about these is vital to ensuring not

only that service is well-received, but that valid consent to treatment has been received from the patient.

### **Normal operating protocols**

Any procedure that would reasonably be considered normal operational standards (e.g. instruments ready, flushing waterlines, no PPE in non-clinical areas such as reception) is not repeated in the technical section.

Anything which is in place as part of national guidance to the population – such as, but not limited to, whether to wear a (non-medical) face mask in public – has not been specifically referred to in the guidance.

All guidance regarding infection prevention and control assumes adherence to HTM01-05 or equivalent depending on national requirements.

### **Human factors overall in the return to the workplace**

The issues set out previously have an underlying common theme: human factors. We can only see as far as our personal horizon, and we must understand that a key purpose of this guidance is to expand our horizon to enable us to see further with greater clarity. Errors that occur are often the result of poor systems and processes; if we redesign the systems to cross check and make it easier to do the right thing, we will reduce these errors.

We should create a culture of informing others of our errors to allow learning to occur, in order to reduce recurrence. In order to achieve this, we must all take responsibility for safety regardless of our position or environment.

We recognise the universal nature of human fallibility and that errors will inevitably occur. With those assumptions firmly embedded, it is clear there is a requirement to design systems within the workplace to minimise the likelihood of errors occurring or their impact. We know that distraction, familiarity, arrogance, tiredness, stress and lack of resources all lead to reductions in performance and contribute to avoidable errors. We cannot remove these contributing factors from our day to day lives so we must look at ways of mitigating their impact.

When we design the workplace in accordance with this guidance to accommodate the limitations of the humans working within it, the following areas will require vigilance:

- Communication
- Distraction
- Lack of resources
- Pressure
- Lack of awareness
- Lack of knowledge

- Stress
- Complacency
- Lack of teamwork
- Fatigue
- Lack of assertiveness
- Norms

As we continue to work with our new protocols, there is a risk of familiarisation which can lead to complacency. It is important that standards are maintained through continuing education and training, with regular review of all protocols and processes. It is also important to encourage both individual and collective responsibility with certain team members assigned the task of updating the protocols where the use of checklists and reminders may prove useful. Practice risk assessments should be regularly reviewed and updated.

There may be stigma attached to being labelled COVID-19 positive, and this may also have financial implications for those required to self-isolate. This may result in incomplete information being divulged regarding status and history, and teams should be vigilant and cross check information where possible. Teams should ensure that they are complying with current patient facing track and trace guidance.

Social distancing, in addition to screens in reception areas, may result in discussions being carried out in a less discrete way than previously. It is important to maintain patient confidentiality in these circumstances and appropriate measures implemented to ensure information of a confidential nature is protected.

## The technical sections

### The narrative explanations

The narratives provide additional notes which complement the details within the matrices. They also provide context, and where there exists debate on an issue, they provide a rationale.

### Bibliography

We have included an extensive bibliography at the end of this document to highlight the broad range of resources and evidence that was used to create this guidance.

### How to read the tables/risk matrices

**Domain:** Refers to the aspects of the patient journey in question (or the management section) and the sub-topics within it which the guidance covers. This is also repeated at the start of each technical section.

**Risk Status:** This part of the table describes the risk in question and makes a judgment about how likely the issue is to occur, and what the effect of it would be without the specific measures or mitigating actions listed. The likelihood is measured as one of *rare, unlikely, possible, likely* or *almost certain*. The severity of the impact is measured as one of *negligible, minor, moderate, major* or *catastrophic*.

The mitigating actions we set out are judged to be proportionate to the risk status, i.e. the most robust and stringent measures will be in place for risks with a rating of *almost certain/catastrophic* and the least stringent measures (or none at all) for *rare/negligible* rated risks.

**ABC based risk mitigation measures:** The steps which should be taken to ensure safe practice. “**General mitigations**” are described in relatively limited detail and intended to apply across a domain, and are to be read as basic requirements (so “B” category). “A” measures are **aspirational** and represent the best possible practice. “B” (**basic**) measures represent a minimum standard which must be in place for the procedures or topic in question and reflect a balance of the safety requirements relative to the risk and alert level and practical operating and resourcing constraints. “C” measures are **conditional**, i.e. they denote basic measures (minimum requirements) in specific circumstances, e.g. if a dentist or a patient are in a high-risk category for adverse outcomes from COVID-19 infection. “**Specific mitigations**” indicates where a measure we recommend is differentiated according to the COVID-19 alert level in place.

**COVID-19 alert level:** Refers to the UK government 5-level alert description (see our FAQ for fuller framework), where 5 is critical, 4 is severe, 3 is substantial, 2 is moderate and 1 is low. Because the impact on safe practice is very similar, we have generally grouped levels 5 and 4 together, and often 3, 4 and 5. Once the alert level has returned to 1, general dental practice minimum standards may well be those which existed before COVID-19 arrived in the UK.

## **Not in scope**

The focus of this guidance is on general dental practice in a primary care setting. Where a procedure is not routinely provided in that setting, it has not been covered in this guidance. For example, the following are not covered:

- Inhalation sedation
- Domiciliary care
- Secondary care
- Dental laboratories

General dental practitioners who do offer these services can use the approach adopted in the guidance, i.e. based on risk assessments and in accordance with the

nine GDC principles, to make a professional judgment about what mitigating measures might need to be in place relevant to the national alert level on a case by case basis.

## Section 1: Pre-appointment

Pre-appointment preparation is essential in providing safe care, ensuring patients are well informed and suitably prepared ahead of their visit to the dental practice. Communication is central to mitigating risk and establishing expectations of how and what dentistry can be delivered within the limitations of the pandemic.

Patient information should be available online and contact should be made with patients prior to their appointment. Digital communication should be utilised wherever possible but other forms of contact should be available to ensure that access to information is readily available for all. Communication for various patient groups will need to be considered, such as language barriers, patients with additional needs and children and young people with carers. Practices may need to consider providing digital literacy support for patients and staff to encourage online channel usage in addition to aiding in shared decision making and process management.

It is important to reduce administrative tasks which would previously have been carried out at the reception desk or surgery, in order to minimise face to face contact and reduce time spent at the dental practice. Key considerations include a pre-attendance COVID-19 screening assessment, updated medical history, training and support and the use of digital technology for communication. Video conferencing has become increasingly popular and offers a useful alternative method of engaging with patients.

Practices should consider preparing a digital strategy for communication using digital means to support social distancing. Practices may wish to consider preparation of a digital pre-appointment pack (PAP) to include all practice forms (patient questionnaire, medical history, FP17, risk assessments, patient preparation information, consent forms and payment methods) for patients/carers to complete and return in advance of their visit.

A health risk assessment should be considered as part of pre-planning to take into account ethnicity, age, sex, pre-existing health conditions and pregnancy. Early evidence indicates an increased risk of COVID-19 deaths relating to people from a black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds. Increased COVID-19 mortality

### Box 1: Pre-appointment key points

- Up to date information should be available on line and widely disseminated to patients
- Patient communication ahead of dental practice visit is vital
- Digital communication should be encouraged but other methods made readily available
- Administrative tasks should be undertaken ahead of the visit where possible and should include:
  - Patient questionnaire
  - COVID-19 screening
  - Medical history
  - Patient forms – FP17, estimate, consent
  - Information on payment
- Review of technology should be considered with appropriate support and training put in place

risk has also been reported for men, people of older age, and individuals with pre-existing medical conditions, such as heart and circulatory disease including high blood pressure, diabetes and being overweight. Patient risk assessments should be undertaken and appropriate mitigations put in place.

At the highest local risk levels, practices should also consider appropriate signage at the entrance doors with the possible (re-)introduction of a closed-door policy to minimise the risk of infection transmission within the practice. Use of the NHS COVID-19 App (Test and Trace) may be helpful in determining local risk levels.

<b>Matrix 1: Pre-appointment</b>		
<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<p><i>Pre-appointment</i></p> <p><i>Access/information/booking appointments</i></p>	<p><i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i></p> <p><i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i></p> <p><i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels</p>
	<p>Potential impact: Detrimental impact on access to services. There is a risk of miscommunication with patients and a lack of understanding of specific needs. Impact of flow of patients through the ineffective zoning of patient diaries.</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Almost certain</p> <p>Severity: Minor</p>	<p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p><b>A</b> = Digital media consultation considering where possible any communication issues that some patients may have. Using digital media to facilitate a better understanding of the patient journey. Practices should consider developing a practice specific pre-appointment pack.</p> <p><b>B</b> = Using all forms of communication (digital/telephone/written) to deliver a consistent message. Digital Pre-appt pack to send to patients, e.g. medical history/FP17/GDPR Consent/Patient preparation information (what to expect from us and we expect from patients/escorts). The patients' medical history should be checked in order to ensure they are not experiencing any COVID-19 symptoms. Also, patients who are shielding or have any specific health issues should be identified. Zoning of appointment booking to allow appropriate recognition of patient's circumstances (and risks of infectivity, or if self isolating). Sign posting should be used to access other services appropriately if required. Patients should be directed to the practice website where they can access further information as well as any advice (self-help). Patients should be advised to only bring essential items.</p> <p><b>C</b> = In the event that it is not possible to use digital means, a pre-appt pack can be sent to the patient. Consider email as a method to receive pictures of prescriptions or pathology (interpret with caution). Special considerations may be required for those who may not speak English and the use of telephone translation as well as other services to deal with any communication issues. Application use of text translators which may address the needs of those who wear hearing aids should be considered.</p>

<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels</i></li> </ul>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p>	<p>All appointments made via remote access (telephone/video/email/SMS). There will be a closed-door policy and all patients and visitors will be directed to follow instructions on the door.</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 3</p>	<p>All appointments made via remote access (telephone/video/email/SMS). There will be a closed-door policy and all patients and visitors will be directed to follow instructions on the door.</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2</p>	<p>There will be an open-door policy but patients and visitors will be directed to follow instructions on the door.</p>
<p><b>Conditional</b> mitigation measures for patients who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>Practices may need to implement extra measures to ensure patients and other members of the public who may have conditions such as learning difficulties and disabilities, visual or hearing impairments, are catered for in terms of making appointments and liaising with carers.</p>	

## Section 2: Patient attendance (pre-treatment)

This section covers patient attendance at the practice from entering the building to accessing the clinical area. The focus is on pre-assessment and management of the reception area in terms of social isolation, with the primary focus on protecting patients and reception staff.

Communication is key to the smooth and safe running of the practice, and patients should already be aware of the current protocols regarding their safe entry into the building in view of the pre-visit protocols (see Section 1). Ideally, this should have been discussed at the telephone triage appointment, with additional information available on the practice website, social media and direct electronic communications with the patient.

### Box 2: Patient attendance (pre-treatment) key points

- Communicate arrangements and protocol for social distancing
- Minimise contamination of public areas by:
  - Provide antiseptic hand gel on entrance and exit
  - Minimise waiting times in common areas
  - Adoption of high level of infection control and prevention
- Protection of reception staff by social distancing, wearing of appropriate PPE, and or barrier screens
- Appointment times tailored to new ways of working
- Temporal and spatial zoning for vulnerable patients
- Temperature checks deemed unreliable
- Testing seen as aspirational
- Ongoing training for all staff

Alternative arrangements will need to be considered to ensure all patients have access to the information required, including those who are unable to access digital media or require information in different formats. Clear signage and information should be displayed at the practice to support the patient journey.

To minimise the risk of contamination, patients will be requested to comply with the practice Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), based on updated practice infection control and prevention policies. This should include, but not be limited to, the use of antiseptic hand gel on entry, clear signage on hand hygiene when using toilet facilities, and promotion of rigorous infection control and prevention standards. The use of safety screens at the reception desk should be considered as an effective method of protection for both staff and patients. The routine use of surgical masks by all reception staff, in addition to strict social distancing protocols, should also be considered as an essential method of protection.

All patients attending the practice need to be asked the current COVID-19 assessment questions on entry. Any patient with signs or symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 should be advised to return home immediately and contact NHS 111. If urgent or

emergency dental treatment is indicated in a patient with suspected COVID-19, appropriate referral should be arranged. Signposting to appropriate services should be provided.

Universal temperature checks have been widely advocated, but some methods of temperature testing (such as the non-contact method) have been shown to be unreliable (explained in Matrix 2). Temperature checks may be appropriate as part of a risk assessment or for staff or patients who are feeling unwell, but are not recommended as a routine screening tool.

There have been significant advances in the methods for antigen and antibody test which will hopefully allow for rapid screening for COVID-19 in the dental setting in the future. These techniques are still being evaluated for their accuracy, but when available, may provide an important adjunct to providing safe care within the dental practice environment, contributing to a reduced risk of transmission for both patients and staff.

To support the principles of social distancing, patients will be encouraged to attend alone where appropriate, arrive promptly at the time of their appointment and ideally have completed all pre-appointment paperwork prior to arrival. Alternative arrangements will need to be available to accommodate any patient who is unable to comply with this. Consideration should be given as to how to minimise the level of form filling and paperwork, and the use of remote digital technology encouraged.

Appointment intervals may need to be lengthened to allow for any additional infection prevention and control arrangements, with appointment times staggered to minimise the waiting time for patients and facilitate the maintenance of social distancing within the reception area. Every effort should be made to avoid delays and ideally the patient should be taken directly into the surgery as quickly as possible following arrival.

Infection with SARS-CoV-2 is via three potential modes of transmission: contact, droplets and airborne particles. The most common mode of transmission is via droplets as a result of close face to face contact over a period of time (generally considered to be at least 15 minutes), contact spread, by direct or indirect contact. Droplet transmission is due to contamination from infected droplets (>5 µm), including saliva, coming in contact with mucous membranes, such as the nose, mouth or conjunctiva. Such droplets are produced by coughing and sneezing and can travel significant distances. Protection is provided by social distancing (maintaining a distance of at least 2 m) and wearing appropriate PPE. When droplets land on a surface they form fomites, which can then be transferred through contact with contaminated surfaces. This is particularly important within the reception area where compromised hand hygiene or inadequate social distancing can lead to contamination from surfaces, such as door handles, desktops, or chairs. Adherence to local policies and national standards of infection control and prevention, both in the surgery and throughout the practice, are critical in safeguarding patients and staff. Within the dental

surgery, airborne transmission is also a potential issue through the production of aerosols, which is addressed in Section 3.

It is clear that contact and droplet transmission are highly important vectors in the potential transmission of COVID-19 within the dental practice. Staff need to be cognisant of this and ensure that protocols are in place to mitigate these risks. The most effective method of prevention is good hand hygiene for both patients and staff.

The reception area should be designed to support social distancing by including designated seating, clear patient/staff pathways, laminated notices and floor markings. Consideration should be given to separation of staff and the provision of barrier screens as a mitigation for droplet transmission.

Thought must be given to the provision of care for patients who have been categorised as vulnerable (see current guidance). Spatial or temporal separation through zoning may be appropriate to support protection. A risk assessment of patients with mobility issues should be undertaken to minimise the possibility of falls and contamination from, or of, their mobility device. An individual case by case risk assessment of whether parents/carers/guardians should be present in the surgery during treatment should be considered. If their presence within the surgery is deemed necessary, the safety and comfort of both the patient and the carer should be taken into consideration.

A clear and documented training programme will need to be followed to support this guidance, with regular reviews to update as required. All staff need to understand the importance of following these guidelines and managers will be required to carry out regular audits to ensure compliance.

<b>Matrix 2: Patient attendance (pre-treatment)</b>		
<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<i>Patient attendance</i>  <i>Pre-treatment preparation</i>	<i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i>  <i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i> <i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i>	<b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice <b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements <b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels
	Potential impact: Managing the arrival stage of the patient journey will affect patient and staff safety and the ability to access services.  Likelihood of impact: Possible  Severity: Major	<b>General mitigation measures (ABC approach)</b>  <b>B</b> - Patients should have already undertaken a COVID-19 risk assessment before attending including a medical history. This needs to be updated and confirmed on arrival. It should be noted that many patients with a normal temperature (asymptomatic) may still be potentially infectious. There is some doubt as to the reliability of non-touch infra-red scanning thermometers. Some patients with dental infections may present with a high temperature and thus be denied treatment. We advise to use temperature checks based on a risk assessment on a case-by-case basis. Patients' should be discouraged from bringing personal items/valuables into the surgery. It may be impractical to clean all door handles and other surfaces and items that have been touched by patients/staff, and the importance of hand hygiene is therefore critical. .
<b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels</i>	COVID-19 alert level 4-5	At higher alert levels each practice should address the need for specific measures, such as Perspex screens and social distancing measures.
	COVID-19 alert level 3	At higher alert levels each practice should address the need for specific measures, such as Perspex screens and social distancing measures.
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	At low alert levels each practice should reassess the need for specific measures, such as Perspex screens and social distancing measures.

<p><b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures to protect patients who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>In line with national guidance, staff, patients and visitors to the practice should comply with current recommendations on masks and simple face coverings. A risk assessment of patients with mobility issues should be undertaken to minimise the possibility of falls and contamination of their mobility device. There should be an individual case by case risk assessment of whether parents/carers or guardians should be present in the surgery during treatment and make sure that this is done as safely as possible where this is deemed essential.</p>
---	---

## Section 3: During treatment

In pandemics of highly infectious diseases, such as COVID-19, dental teams and patients may be at a potentially higher risk of infection due to their close proximity during appointments. It is imperative that risk assessments are carried out to ensure the safety of both staff and patients. During treatment, consideration should be given to PPE, procedural risk mitigation, decontamination and medical emergencies.

### Risk stratification of dental aerosol generating procedures

Transmission of COVID-19 via aerosolisation has been identified by Public Health England and the World Health Organisation (WHO), as a potential risk within the dental surgery due to the production of aerosol which could be contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 during various dental procedures. This has led to widespread restriction of dental Aerosol Generating Procedures (AGPs) in order to safeguard patients and DHCW. As a result, there has been limited access to certain dental treatments, with AGPs only undertaken when absolutely necessary. Enhanced levels of PPE have been advocated for all AGPs.

Aerosol generating procedures have been described as “*medical procedures that have been reported to be aerosol generating and consistently associated with an increased risk of pathogen transmission*” (WHO, 2014). It is important to note that aerosols may also be produced naturally during breathing, speaking, sneezing and coughing, and these events must be acknowledged as a potential mode of transmission of COVID-19, via both droplet and aerosol transmission. SDCEP have provided a comprehensive list of dental procedures with categorisation of their perceived associated risks in relation to aerosolisation.

All dental visits involve risk of exposure to aerosols and droplets, whether they be naturally occurring or produced by mechanical interventions. This is primarily due to the close proximity of the working position over a reasonable period of time and it is therefore imperative that all staff take appropriate precautions in relation to social distancing (two metres) and the use of the correct PPE.

All dental procedures do not create the same level of bioaerosol, and therefore do not have the same level of risk in terms of transmission. It is therefore important to

#### Box 3: During treatment key points

- Aerosol generated exposures are a potential risk within the dental surgery
- Standard IPC protocols apply
- AGE needs to be considered as higher risk/lower risk
- Standard PPE for lower risk AGE procedures considered as BASIC
- Higher risk procedures require FFP2/3, visor and gown as BASIC
- Use of rubber dam and high-volume suction are important mitigating measures
- Appropriate fallow period should be implemented following a higher risk AGE.

acknowledge that a risk gradient exists, although in the absence of strong evidence it is difficult to quantify the risk. Our original guidance promoted a model of stratification based on the available evidence, expert opinion and consensus. Several influencing factors were taken into consideration, including:

- Exposure to aerosols and droplets, which can arise from natural sources (coughing, sneezing, talking and respiratory function)
- Type of procedure
- Level of aerosol created
- Length of time of procedure
- Utilisation of mitigating factors, such as high-volume aspiration or using rubber dam

Combining a stratified approach with predictive analytics identifies risk in a non-binary manner. Accordingly, a sixty-minute full mouth root surface debridement will be assessed to be more likely to pose a greater risk than a five-minute access cavity under rubber dam with the use of high-volume suction, which in turn presents a greater risk than dental examination without the use of a 3-in-1. This approach has been adopted by SDCEP and refined further to develop a risk categorisation of dental procedures. (See Table 1)

We therefore advocate this comprehensive, multi-factorial approach in addition to compliance with national protocols.

<b>Table 1: Risk stratification for Aerosol Generated Exposure (AGE)</b>		
	<b>LOWER RISK (aerosol exposure)</b>	<b>HIGHER RISK (aerosol exposure)</b>
<b>INSTRUMENTS</b>	Hand scaling instruments Extraction Forceps/ Elevators 3 in 1 (air-only/water-only)* Slow speed /electric handpiece (i.e < 60 000 rpm)* Prophylaxis with pumice (using slow-speed handpiece/ prophy cup)* Diathermy	Ultrasonic scaler (including piezo) High speed air rotor /electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm) Piezo surgical Handpiece Air polishers 3 in 1 (air and water together)

	Denture/ortho adjusting using slow speed handpiece*	
	Surgical and Implant Handpieces *	
<b>PROCEDURES</b>	Dental Procedures that may produce splatter but are unlikely to produce aerosol particles < 5 µm  (including use of powered low velocity instruments following a detailed risk assessment)	Dental Procedures that will produce Aerosol Particles < 5 µm  Includes use of Powered high velocity instruments that emit or require <u>aerated</u> water or irrigants for coolant  (including use of powered low velocity instruments following a detailed risk assessment)
<b>Oral hygiene instruction</b>	Maintaining social distance with face covering or wearing PPE	X
<b>Tooth Prophylaxis</b>	Minimal use of prophy paste/reduced speed revolutions/tooth isolation/ high volume suction.	Avoid tooth prophylaxis if unable to mitigate risk of splatter / aerosol exposure, unless already using enhanced PPE.
<b>Extra-oral radiography/ CBCT</b>	Maintaining social distance with a face covering or wearing PPE	X
<b>Intra-oral radiography</b> <i>(Risk assess the need in relation to COVID-19)</i>	Those without a cough reflex/adult, well tolerated	Poorly tolerated (e.g. cough reflex or paediatric pts)  Full mouth peri-apical radiographs (due to time)
<b>Dental photography</b>	Extra oral with social distancing and face covering  Intra oral (if unlikely to trigger cough reflex)	Intra oral (if likely to trigger cough reflex)
<b>Clinical examination</b>	Avoid use of combined 3-in-1 syringe*	Where examination of the posterior oro-pharynx is likely to induce a cough reflex
<b>Direct restoration of a tooth</b>	Use of low speed /electric handpiece (i.e < 60 000 rpm)*	

	3-in-1 syringe - irrigation function only followed by low pressure air flow	Use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)
<b>(Re)cementation crown or bridge</b>	Cementation with use of powered instruments <60,000rpm and with appropriate isolation  3-in-1 syringe - irrigation function only followed by low pressure air flow	Use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)
<b>Removable prosthodontics</b>	When well tolerated for all stages	When poorly tolerated for all stages
<b>Adjustment and repair of removable prosthesis</b>	With disinfection of prosthesis and use of appropriate PPE	X
<b>Extraction of tooth</b>	Non-surgical extraction  Surgical extraction involving bone removal / sectioning using a surgical handpiece running at <60,000rpm*	Extraction involving sectioning / bone removal with use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece running at >60 000 rpm
<b>Restoration or repair of implant retained prosthesis</b>	Restoration or repair <b>NOT</b> requiring use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)	Restoration or repair requiring use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)
<b>Implant Placement</b>	Implant surgery with implant surgical handpiece  Due consideration for surgery involving direct exposure of maxillary sinus	Piezo surgery unit
<b>Endodontic procedures</b>	That are possible with use of slow speed /electric handpiece (i.e < 60 000 rpm) and hand instruments	That require use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)
<b>Periodontal procedures</b>	Periodontal debridement with hand instruments using high-volume aspiration	Using Ultrasonic scaler (including piezo)  Osseous-surgery using handpieces >60,000rpm

<b>Fissure sealants</b>	Fissure sealant procedure avoiding combined use of 3 in 1 air and water	Fissure sealant procedure using 3 in 1 (combined air and water)  Poor compliance
<b>Minimally invasive restoration</b>	That are possible with use of slow speed /electric handpiece (i.e < 60 000 rpm) and hand instruments  3-in-1 syringe - irrigation function only followed by low pressure air flow	That require use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)
<b>Incise and drain abscess</b>	Mitigation with use of high-volume aspiration	X
<b>Orthodontic treatment</b>	Debonding or repairs with use of slow speed /electric handpiece (i.e < 60 000 rpm) and hand instruments*	That require use of high-speed air rotor/electric handpiece (i.e > 60 000 rpm)

*\*A further risk assessment of exactly how the instrument is used will be required to determine whether to follow the precautions recommended for High Risk procedures*

*Originally adapted with permission from Ashley, M. Guidelines for prioritisation of patient care during COVID-19 recovery phases, restorative dentistry. RD-UK. In progress. [Accessed ahead of publication 2020 May 29].*

*Subsequent adaption based on SDCEP Mitigation of Aerosol Generating Procedures in Dentistry (2020)*

**Table 1 should not be considered as a comprehensive list but is simply included for illustrative purposes. It must also be stressed that all dental procedures are part of a risk continuum in terms of aerosol production, and the context of the procedure must be taken into consideration. This may include factors such as the length of the procedure, use of procedural mitigation, patient factors or potential risk to staff or patients. It may therefore be appropriate to recategorise certain procedures based on clinical judgement, experience and an appropriate risk assessment.**

Treatment offered should be based on risk assessment of patient, operator, time and difficulty of procedure.

Various dental specialists' groups are providing excellent advice and guidance on specific procedures which will be highly relevant to general dental practice. This additional guidance and information may be useful in supporting a risk-based decision.

While the 3 in 1 syringe with combined air and water is categorised as high risk, when used very briefly, the amount of aerosol produced is likely to be considerably less than that produced by any other high-risk procedure. Consequently, if a risk assessment establishes that the combined 3 in 1 will only be used very briefly and no other high-risk procedures are planned, the precautions for low risk procedures can be followed.

It is important to recognise that the R number or prevalence rate should not impact on the infection prevention protocols within the practice, nor the decision on whether to provide all dental care or not. Practices should be implementing universal precautions with the assumption that all patients and staff are potentially infectious. The importance of the R number and prevalence rate may, however, have a significant impact on Government recommendations on travel or social distancing, and this must be considered when undertaking a risk assessment.

## **Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)**

Appropriate PPE should be selected following a risk assessment of the procedure, the staff, the patient, as well as the current national alert level in order to best protect all concerned. A risk assessment should also be conducted for any accompanying carers.

Hands can easily become contaminated when PPE is removed and hand hygiene is therefore critical. The most effective way for staff to protect themselves is to ensure that they wash their hands / use gel regularly - after contact with patient, after treatments, after removing PPE, before touching mucous membranes, before eating.

**Mask selection** will be dependent on the risk assessment (see Table 2). It is currently a requirement that all FFP2/FFP3 respirators should be Fit tested to ensure maximal

protection. FFP2 / FFP3 respirators work by filtering the aerosol particles and to do this effectively they must have a close fit to the face around the mouth and nose.

Concerns have been raised about the availability of testing, the validity of the qualitative test and the decision of some countries to omit the need for testing. We would currently recommend testing and would emphasise the importance of checking on each occasion the mask is worn.

Counterfeit PPE has been reported and it is important to ensure that all equipment and materials used conform to BS, EN and ISO standards. It is recommended that all PPE is purchased through reputable suppliers to minimise the risk of counterfeit materials being used, leading to compromised safety.

FFP3 respirators can provide some marginal benefit in terms of protection compared to an FFP2 respirator. It may be worth considering the use of a higher-grade respirator (FFP3) if a risk assessment indicates that this would be worthwhile. Any benefit in protection may be offset by issues of operator comfort which can directly impact on compliance and safety. In most instances, an FFP2 mask would seem to provide adequate protection for higher AGE risk. Whichever mask is worn, it must be appropriately Fit tested, and it should be stressed that mitigating measures, such as rubber dam usage, high volume suction and four handed dentistry are all key factors in reducing exposure to aerosol.

DHCWs who are unable to wear a FFP2/FFP3 mask either due to a failure of Fit testing or as a result of having a beard have the option of wearing a Powered Air Purifying Respirator (PAPR) hood. A PAPR hood functions at the level of an FFP3 respirator but is reusable and does not require Fit testing. One of the limitations of the PAPR is that expired air is not filtered, like non-valved FFP2/FFP3 respirators which allow filter exhaled air through the body of the mask. In contrast, valved respirators allow the passage of unfiltered exhaled air through a port on the front of the mask. The use of a simple FRSM mask over a valved FFP2/FFP3, in addition to the visor, may offer additional protection, but is not recommended as standard practice.

<b>Table 2: Descriptor of key PPE usage in relation to alert levels and AGE risks</b> <i>It is assumed that gloves will be worn for all procedures in the normal manner.</i>			
	<b>ASPIRATIONAL</b>	<b>BASIC</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL</b>
<b>High alert level/higher AGE risk</b>	Not applicable	FFP2/FFP3/PAPR masks, visor, gown	Not applicable
<b>High alert level/lower AGE risk</b>	Not applicable	FRSM, visor, apron (if risk of splatter contamination)	FFP2/FFP3 mask/PAPR, visor, gown in view of procedural risk and risk to operator / nurse (see page 7)
<b>Low alert level/high or lower AGE risk</b>	Not applicable	FRSM, appropriate eye protection	FFP2/FFP3/PAPR mask, visor, gown in view of procedural risk and risk to operator / nurse (see page 7)

Reusable masks with appropriate filters are available, however, it is important that doffing and disinfection of these masks is carried out following a strict protocol to prevent contamination.

**Eye protection** is an essential part of the barrier component of PPE. Evidence suggests that conjunctivae could be exposed to infective droplets during close contact. A full-face visor will reduce the amount of exposed skin on the face and neck that may be subject to splash or droplet contamination.

Evidence to support the use of **fluid repellent gowns** in preventing transmission of disease is inconclusive. However, for alert levels 3-5 and high AGE risk it is advisable to wear a long-sleeved fluid repellent gown, which should be changed between patients. It is important that all team members are trained in the correct procedures for safe doffing of all PPE, including gowns. Reusable washable gowns may confer some benefits in terms of cost and environmental sustainability.

The use of full gowns in high risk situations will protect scrubs worn under the gown, therefore, it will not be necessary to change scrubs between sessions in one day. Scrubs should be changed daily and washed at a minimum of 60 degrees. In low risk situations, the policy of “bare below the elbow” can be used with diligent hand hygiene for disease prevention, including washing and drying the forearms and wrists.

It may be appropriate to wear head covering when indicated by a risk assessment. DHCWs who wear turbans, hijabs or other head covering may consider wearing protective covering in high risk situations. Wipeable indoor shoes covering the toes should be worn. The risk of spread or transfer of contaminants by shoes in a dental practice setting is low.

## Procedural risk mitigation

**High volume aspiration (HVA)** has been shown to significantly reduce bio-aerosols and must be considered as a key mitigating measure in the reduction of aerosol spread. High volume suction is considered to be the equivalent of greater than 250l/min and it is advisable to have this checked at regular intervals.

**A rubber dam** should be used whenever possible to reduce the risk of contamination from splatter or aerosol during restorative procedures. Where it is not possible to place a rubber dam, high volume aspiration, ideally with an orifice diameter of at least 8mm, should be used. It is reported that this can reduce the quantity of bio-aerosol by 90-98%. **Four-handed dentistry** will improve efficiency and help limit the spread of the aerosol.

There is a lack of evidence of virucidal activity for use of pre-operative **mouthwash**. The evidence base for an effective protocol against COVID-19 is currently weak. SARS-CoV-2 is predominantly a respiratory virus; as the action of any mouthwash will be limited to the oral cavity, recolonisation is likely to ensue within a short space of time, thus negating the effects of the mouth rinse. If the use of pre-operative mouthwash is chosen it is important to obtain valid consent and be cautious of any potential adverse effects.

Prepublication research into aerosol generation from dental handpieces, undertaken by Kings College London / Imperial College London, was included within the SDCEP Review. The findings of this research suggests that **dental handpieces** operated at speeds of less than 60,000 rpm have a significantly reduced risk of atomisation, which results in decreased production of aerosol. An additional critical factor reported in relation to aerosol production is the mix of air and water with high velocity drills. Other factors may also influence the volume of aerosol produced such as design of hand piece, type of bur, and the tooth position being operated on.

The findings from this research have clear practical implications in relation to dento-alveolar surgery, including implantology, where the drill speed is generally significantly lower than 60,000rpm and the irrigation is often external and delivered by means of a peristaltic pump. The study results may also have practical application in terms of restorative dentistry, as it was noted that reduced aerosol production can be achieved with an electric micromotor and speed increasing handpiece by turning off the air component from the water spray and operating at a reduced speed of less than 60,000 rpm. This may only have limited application in terms of tooth preparation, but could be of potential benefit in relation to minimally invasive techniques, or minor adjustment of restorations or teeth.

The information detailed above on **procedural mitigation**, should be used in conjunction with the corresponding matrix to aid risk assessment and mitigation.

<b>Matrix 3: During treatment</b>		
<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<p><i>During treatment</i></p> <p><b>Safety and PPE considerations</b></p>	<p><i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i></p> <p><i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i></p> <p><i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels</p>
	<p><b>Potential impact:</b> In some DHCWs, inadequate PPE may increase the risk of more adverse outcomes from COVID-19 infection. This can result in significant illness or even death. Health care workers who are in high risk groups (see page 7) may also be at higher risk of adverse outcomes from COVID-19 and should perform a risk assessment in relation to their PPE practices.</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Possible</p> <p>Severity: Catastrophic</p>	<p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>The distinction between Aerosol Generating Procedures (AGP) and non-AGP does not address the exposure to natural droplets and aerosols arising from coughing, sneezing, talking and respiration. Other factors, such as the alert level, patient and staff considerations as well as the nature and length of the procedure will impact on the overall risk. We have taken an exposure-based approach to defining our risk as opposed to just looking at procedures that generate aerosol, as even talking to our patients will have a background potential exposure to aerosols and droplets through respiration. We therefore propose looking at aerosol generated exposure (AGE) as the basis of defining the risk. Some members of the team who are unable to wear FFP2/FFP3 mask may need to consider the use of a PARP hood which is discussed in more detail in the narrative.</p> <p>It is assumed that gloves will be worn as standard and appropriate hand hygiene will be carried out for every dental procedure.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also give consideration to local measures and local risk level</i></p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p>	<p><b><u>High alert level (3-5)/high AGE risk</u></b></p> <p><b>Basic</b> - FFP2/FFP3, visor, gown</p> <p><b>Conditional</b> – PAPR hood (if unable to wear FFP2/FFP3 respirator), gown</p> <p><b><u>High alert level (3-5)/low AGE risk</u></b></p> <p><b>Basic</b> – Fluid resistant surgical mask (FRSM), visor, apron (<i>if the risk assessment allows</i>)</p> <p><b>Conditional</b> - FFP2/FFP3/PAPR hood, visor, gown, if deemed appropriate in view of procedural risk and risk to operator/nurse (see page 7)</p>

	COVID-19 alert level 3	See alert level 4-5
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	<p><b><u>Low alert level (1-2)/high or low AGE risk</u></b></p> <p><b>Basic</b> – FRSM, appropriate eye protection</p> <p><b>Conditional</b> - FRSM, visor, apron if deemed appropriate in view of procedural risk and risk to operator/nurse (see page 7)</p> <p>All FFP2/FFP3/PAPR masks should be appropriately Fit tested and the DHCW should consider the use of power hood respirators and reusable FFP2/FFP3/PAPR where feasible to reduce the environmental impact of waste. DHCW should consider any religious/cultural considerations (beards/head wear) when choosing their PPE. Given the considerable impact of disposable PPE on the environment, reusable gowns should be sourced whenever possible and safe to do so.</p> <p>At present, there is inadequate evidence to support the efficacy of the use of prophylactic mouthwash for COVID-19 risk mitigation. We recommend that practitioners discuss the use of such products following a risk assessment in relation to potential adverse effects/benefits and obtain consent for its use.</p>
<b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures for members of the dental profession who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences	DHCWs who feel they may be high risk for having more adverse consequences of a COVID-19 infection should conduct a detailed risk assessment with their medical practitioner and evaluate their suitability for patient facing duties (see page 7).	

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p><i>During treatment</i></p> <p><i>Adjunct to clinical procedures</i></p>	<p><i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i></p> <p><i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i></p> <p><i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also give consideration to local measures and local risk levels</p>
	<p>Potential impact: Some adjuncts are proposed as mitigation the transmission of COVID-19. Their efficacy remains unproven.</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Unlikely</p> <p>Severity: Moderate</p>	<p><b>General</b> mitigation measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>Where feasible, rubber dam should be employed where AGE is a risk, and where it clinically appropriate and practical to do so: clearly there are areas where placement cannot be achieved; for example, but not limited to hygiene with ultrasonic scalers, oral and periodontal surgery where handpieces are employed and the preparation of teeth for indirect restorations with subgingival margins. In these instances, we recommend four handed dentistry with high volume aspiration to reduce bioaerosols. We recommend this adjunct particularly for alert levels 3-5. Operator team trained and efficient in four-handed dentistry may be helpful. Use of HVA with minimum 8mm orifice aspirator where AGE is a risk during alert levels 3-5. This statement includes treatments that risk AGE and are carried out by therapists and hygienists.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk / threat levels</p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p>	<p>As above</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 3</p>	<p>As above</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2</p>	<p>No additional measures necessary</p>

<p><b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures for members of the dental profession who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>No additional measures necessary</p>
--	---

## Section 4: After treatment

At the end of a treatment visit, the patient should leave the room immediately, then clean their hands directly outside the surgery using alcohol gel provided with laminated instructions for guidance.

After providing dental treatment for a patient, it is imperative that correct procedures and protocols are followed to protect staff and all subsequent patients. Dental procedures that involve high speed drilling, ultrasonic equipment, and air/water spray will produce an aerosol. There is currently no consensus on whether COVID-19 is spread via aerosols, but in view of the potential consequences of transmission, additional precautions need to be taken. The appropriate PPE has been covered in the Section 3.

### Box 4: After treatment key points

- Standard decontamination procedures should be followed
- Routine cleaning where the risk of AGE is low
- High AGE risk requires appropriate doffing of gown, with mask retained and removed outside the surgery
- Higher risk AGEs require a fallow time
- Fallow time may be calculated using the FGDP Fallow Time Calculator (FTC)
- Floor cleaning should be undertaken at the end of each high-risk AGE or the end of each session
- No paper records should be retained in the surgery while the risk of AGE is high or during the fallow period
- Scrubs should be changed daily

Following treatment where an aerosol has been generated, the clinical team should doff their PPE in the surgery (unless a dedicated adjacent room is available), except their masks (which can be removed in a designated doffing area), strictly adhering to the doffing guidance published by Public Health England (PHE). All clinical staff should be meticulously trained in donning and doffing techniques, including washing the forearms during hand hygiene.

### Fallow period after high AGE risk in a dental surgery

Clearance of infectious particles after risk of AGE in dentistry is usually considered to be dependent on the ventilation and air change within the room. However, other factors, such as the type of procedure carried out, the use of HVA, the use of rubber dam, the duration of aerosol generation and the size and shape of the room also have to be taken into account when deciding how long it would take for clearance of infectious viral particles after a particular procedure. A Risk Stratification Matrix has been developed to assist practitioners in assessing the risks posed by AGE (see Section 3).

At the time of writing, the current guidance from PHE based on advice from the New and Emerging Respiratory Virus Threats Advisory Group (NERVTAG), recommends a fallow period in a treatment room with 10-12 air changes per hour (ACH) of 20

minutes, 60 minutes in rooms with 6 ACH or less from the point that the AGE procedure is completed.

Recent research has provided additional data on clearance time for potentially infectious aerosols which informed the recently published SDCEP Rapid Review on AGPs. A fallow time is recommended for procedures which are likely to produce a significant aerosol, and therefore carry a potentially higher risk of viral transmission. Such procedures are identified as Group A procedures by SDCEP and are detailed as “**higher risk procedures**” within our guidance, details of which have been included within the preceding section. Despite the slightly different approach, there is close alignment between SDCEP Group A with FGDP / CGDent higher risk procedures; and Group B and C with lower risk procedures.

The SDCEP recommendations were based on the available evidence, expert opinion and consensus. It is suggested within SDCEP recommendations that determination of the fallow time is calculated using a multifactorial approach with a ‘benchmark’ of 15-30 minutes. Procedural and environmental mitigation is key in reducing the fallow time with air ventilation seen as a critical element in reducing risk. (See Figure 2 – produced with permission of SDCEP).

Mitigating factors can be considered as procedural or environmental, and can either act to reduce the production of the aerosol or work to remove or dilute the bioaerosol. Procedural mitigation includes use of rubber dam and high-volume aspiration, while environmental mitigation may include air ventilation or air cleaners. Other environmental mitigation methods have been promoted, such as fogging, but there is inadequate evidence to support their widespread usage at the present time.

When selecting an appropriate fallow time, practitioners must justify the decision to stray from the 60-minute default time advised by PHE, record mitigation factors which allowed reduction of the time and include details in the patient clinical record. It is recommended that this information is recorded for each patient and an audit trail is available should this be requested at a later date.


As our knowledge of COVID-19 and its transmission through dental AGE increases, the duration of the fallow period is likely to be reviewed. In practical terms, consideration should be given to careful diary planning for high AGE risk procedures to allow appropriate fallow times to be implemented whilst allowing efficient patient treatment flows.

It is widely considered that many dental procedures create a negligible level of aerosol, and should be considered a low AGE risk. In these circumstances, the operating area can be decontaminated without implementation of a fallow period.

The FGDP(UK) / CGDent in collaboration with other organisations, have developed a Fallow Time Calculator (FTC), accessible at [www.myftc.co.uk](http://www.myftc.co.uk) which may be of benefit.

The FTC allows important data to be recorded in relation to fallow time calculation providing information, justification and a capability of recording the key data in the clinical records. As future research improves knowledge on how the production of dental aerosols is affected by mitigation factors, the FTC tool will be updated accordingly.

Figure 2 - SDCEP, Mitigation of Aerosol Generating Procedures in Dentistry, A Rapid Review, Version 1.0, 25 September 2020



Reproduced with the kind permission of SDCEP, 29/09/2020

## Environmental Mitigation

Air ventilation is an important factor in providing a safe and comfortable workplace, and this is widely recognised within healthcare guidance and building control regulations. Adequate air ventilation is considered important in terms of general health and wellbeing and current guidance recommends 10 air changes per hour for new buildings which include health treatment rooms.

Until very recently, air ventilation within dental surgeries has perhaps not had the focus which it deserved, but this is likely to change with the impending publication of a revised version of HTM 03-01 in late 2020. In addition to the benefits of an adequately ventilated work place, air ventilation has been identified as an important factor in eliminating aerosols within a dental surgery following an AGE / AGP, and is considered a key mitigation in reducing the risk of contamination via bioaerosol.

PHE, NSS SBAR and SDCEP have all highlighted the importance of increasing air changes per hour (ACH) in a dental surgery as a means of reducing fallow-time, and this is now being considered as a critical element in reducing risk.

Particulate aerosols of <5µm, can potentially contain viable SarsCo-V2 virus. Particles of <5µm can suspend in the air for a significant period of time and can theoretically be inhaled by patients or dental staff, settle in the lower respiratory system and cause infection. It should be noted that there is little evidence to indicate the risk of transmission from a dental aerosol and the minimum infective dose is currently unknown.

The use of air ventilation as an environmental mitigation is based on the process of dilution of the aerosol by either introducing 'fresh air from outside' or by cleaning the existing air. Ventilation can be provided by natural or mechanical means and there are a variety of methods which can be considered to achieve dilution of the bioaerosol.:

1. **Natural ventilation** – windows, doors, vents

2. **Mechanical ventilation**

- a. **Negative pressure** - mechanical ventilation where air is actively extracted from the room which creates a negative pressure allowing fresh air to enter from outside via additional air vents.
- b. **Positive pressure** – mechanical ventilation where air is actively pushed into the room. Used in operating theatres where provision of clean air is via wall/ceiling diffusers and escape vents are located above floor level.
- c. **Supply and extract system** – mechanical ventilation where air is both actively pushed into the room and actively removed with the inlet / outlet strategically positioned to optimise clean air flow within the dental surgery.

3. **Air cleaners / “scrubbers”** – mechanical process of ‘cleaning the air’ through HEPA or UV filters. These devices are typically recirculating units which enhance the effective air change rate by removing or inactivating airborne virus.

**Natural ventilation**, i.e. opening a window, may allow for fresh air to mix with room air and dilute any aerosols, but has the greatest variation in effectiveness and it is not possible to quantify the level of dilution or the number of ACH. The nominal value of 1 ACH is assigned to a room with windows, irrespective of the size of the room, the number of windows, size of opening, height of the building or climactic conditions outside. In practical terms it is not possible to calculate the ACH from natural ventilation in a dental surgery. This will undoubtedly impact on the ability to use this form of environmental mitigation to reduce fallow time, although it will invariably improve air ventilation and air quality within the room.

**Mechanical ventilation** – any of the methods described previously will increase ACH, the value of which will be dependent on the size of the room and the output of the mechanical ventilation. The number of air changes per hour can be easily calculated if the air flow rate of the mechanical ventilation and the volume of the room are known. This information can either be obtained from the manufacturer, the installation engineer or ideally an independent report obtained from a ventilation expert.

The use of window or wall mounted extraction fans may be considered to be an effective method of increasing ACH, but consideration needs to be given to the impact on the air temperature within the room. There are likely to be significant financial and environmental costs to maintaining an optimal room temperature, when there is a significant temperature gradient to the outside. A heat exchange system may mitigate to a certain extent, but installation costs are likely to be higher. It is recommended that practice owners seek expert advice on the system which is most effective for their own premises. It is important to recognise that many factors can impact on the performance and efficiency of any mechanical ventilation system, and the effectiveness may vary from that stated by the manufacturer. The performance and efficiency of one-way extractor fans can be affected by the air pressure within the room and will be related to the availability and position of passive inlet / outlet vents.

**Air cleaners (air scrubbers)** – recirculating air cleaners do not provide fresh air from outside, but may be effective in improving the quality of air within the surgery by removing or diluting contaminated aerosol and thus reducing the risk of contamination. The air particles, including bioaerosol, is filtered by the use of High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filtration or UV irradiation. The efficiency of such units has been questioned in view of the risk of recirculation of the same air when located in one position. It is recommended that the units be positioned close to the source of the aerosol production (i.e. head or the foot of the dental chair) to mitigate against this risk. Positioning of the unit behind the operator or nurse should be avoided. The effectiveness of air cleaning devices will depend on the air flow rate of the device, the

efficiency of air cleaning and the size of the room. Any introduction of such devices must consider these elements as well as cleaning, maintenance and safety.

In view of concerns over the efficiency of recirculation units, NSS SBAR recommended that their effectiveness should be “downgraded” to 50% of their manufacturers output when calculating ACH. The value of air cleaners was recognised within the SDCEP Report although it did not go as far as recommending them, in view of the lack of evidence to support their use. PHE would appear to be supportive of the use of air cleaners through their involvement and endorsement of the SBAR document.

The FGDP (UK) / CGDent would support the use of air cleaners especially in dental surgeries where alternative means of environmental mitigation may not be feasible or practical. In view of the concerns raised within the NSS SBAR Report, a 50% reduction in efficiency is seen as pragmatic, unless evidence to the contrary can be provided by an independent expert. The type, design and manufacture of recirculating air cleaners is highly important, as not all models are equally effective. Care should be taken in selecting the appropriate machine and practitioners have a responsibility to ensure that it is fit for purpose and regularly maintained.

**In summary:**

- Aerosol generated procedures should not be conducted in a windowless room without mechanical ventilation or an air cleaner.
- Natural ventilation cannot be calculated reliably and needs to be discounted in relation to achieving a “reduced fallow time” by use of environmental mitigation. This translates into 30 minutes fallow time for all procedures in a room which is solely reliant on natural ventilation with no procedural mitigation employed.
- FGDP / CGDent supports the application of the SDCEP recommendations on mitigation-based reductions for fallow time.
- FGDP / CGDent support the use of mechanical ventilation to achieve at least 6 ACH to improve air quality and reduce fallow time.
- This guidance supports the use of air cleaners / scrubbers as an acceptable recirculation method of removing bioaerosol, and should therefore be considered an effective method of environmental mitigation, although their relative efficiency in terms of ACH must be taken into consideration.



## Surgery decontamination

It is recommended that team members wear fluid-resistant surgical masks, eye protection and plastic aprons during decontamination of the surgery. Surfaces should be cleaned using a detergent and then disinfected using a virucidal agent (ideally chlorine-based detergent).

The floor should be cleaned thoroughly with a mop, and this should ideally be done at the end of each session, unless excessive contamination of the floor indicates that more frequent cleaning is necessary. We recommend the use of reusable or washable mop heads where possible, to reduce both the financial and environmental costs. Risk of contamination can be mitigated by using a suitable virucidal solution (ideally chlorine-based detergent) to clean the mop or consider a detachable mop head or cleaner which can be washed and reused. We do not advocate the use of single use mops in view of the environmental impact, and would recommend a more pragmatic and cost-effective, risk-based approach. If no high-risk AGEs have been undertaken, floor cleaning should be done at the end of each day.

Team members should be trained in appropriate environmental cleaning methods, and this is facilitated by decluttering all work surfaces and removing wall art. Reusable instruments should be decontaminated in accordance with national guidelines.

Digital clinical records may be completed in the surgery while wearing PPE, or in a clean area following doffing of PPE and hand hygiene. If not washable, the keyboard and mouse should be covered with single-use cling film. SARS-CoV-2 remains viable for 24 hours on cardboard. Copies of radiographs should be placed in a clear plastic sleeve that can be disinfected or disposed of as infectious waste. Paper records should be completed in a clean area following doffing of PPE and hand hygiene.

Scrubs should not be worn outside the practice. They should be taken home for washing after a day's wear in a sealed plastic bag, pillowcase or dissolvable single-use bag. They should be washed at the highest possible temperature in a half-full load and then tumble dried or ironed. Dilution is key, and it is best to avoid a full load when washing potentially contaminated scrubs.

<b>Matrix 4: After treatment</b>		
<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<i>After treatment Decontamination and disinfection</i>	<i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood  (Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i>	<i><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice <b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements <b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels COVID-19 related complications (see page 7)</i>

	<p><i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i></p>	
	<p>Potential impact: Potential transmission of COVID-19 within the practice. Compliance with statutory bodies. Poor compliance with decontamination and disinfection would have a detrimental impact on public confidence.</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Possible</p> <p>Severity: Catastrophic</p>	<p><b>General</b> mitigation measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>We propose there is no change from national guidelines (HTM01-05) in the disinfection processes.</p> <p>All staff members involved in decontamination and disinfection, including cleaning staff, must be provided with and wear the appropriate PPE in consideration of a personalised risk assessment. They should also receive any specific safety training required.</p> <p><b>Conditional:</b> For COVID-19 alert levels 3-5, the current PHE guidance for the fallow period following an Aerosol Generating Procedure created by a dental procedure is 60 minutes (NERVTAG). However, due to patient needs, following a risk assessment it may be appropriate in some circumstances to review the fallow period from the cessation of the procedure. Environmental factors, such as air exchange/ventilation, maybe taken into account. This specific area has recently been reviewed by SDCEP with a benchmark fallow time recommended between 15-30 minutes with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>This should be followed by a thorough clean of all exposed surfaces. We also propose opening any accessible windows during this period to allow the circulation of air.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to a cleaning checklist.</p> <p>In rooms with sub-optimal ventilation, consideration can be given to the use of adjuncts, such as air cleaners following a thorough risk assessment. However, evidence for their use is still evolving.</p> <p>For alert levels 3-5 where high AGE risk activity has been performed, safe practice of donning (putting on PPE) and doffing (the removal of potentially contaminated PPE) is critical. This involves the secure application of Fit tested</p>

		FFP2/FFP3 masks or a PAPR which does not require Fit testing as well as the use of full-sleeved gowns. It may be helpful to adopt a “buddy” system where a colleague will assess the application of the mask and gown efficacy. Donning should be carried out in a clean area. Doffing should be performed cautiously in the designated area where there is access to hand washing facilities and clinical waste disposal. We recommend a formal record of Fit testing and PPE etiquette training be kept ensuring compliance.
<b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels	COVID-19 alert level 4-5	See above
	COVID-19 alert level 3	See above
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	Conduct a risk assessment and undertake appropriate action.
<b>Conditional</b> mitigation measures for members of the dental profession who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences	All staff members should undertake a personalised risk assessment to ascertain their personal safety in relation to the use of PPE.	

## Section 5: Management tasks

The efficient management of the practice is important to ensure safety to staff, patients and other visitors. It is vital that protocol and measures are reviewed and adjusted in line with the risk assessment and alert level.

It is suggested that a lead should be appointed to provide oversight, and that someone should also be responsible for wellbeing within the practice.

Physical barriers, such as reception screens, will provide safety and reassurance for staff and patients. Where this is not possible, masks and visors would be appropriate, along with appropriate social distancing.

### Box 5: Management tasks key points

- Protocols reviewed regularly to reflect the level of risk
- Identify members of staff to fulfil specific duties:
  - Management/governance lead
  - Health and wellbeing lead
- Facilities prepared to support social distancing with appropriate signage/demarcation
- Risk assessment of staff prior to recommencement of work
- Access and occupational health support available for staff
- Appropriate training in place, including medical emergencies
- Stock control reviewed and ensure appropriate PPE available

Alcohol hand gel should be placed at the entry and exit points. Where possible, a flow through the work area should be implemented with clear separation of the clinical and non-clinical workspaces.

There will be a need for a review of staff training, particularly in relation to medical emergencies in line with the Resuscitation Council (UK) guidance as there are some subtle but important changes. Simulation exercises may be a useful tool in this respect; this would also give practices the opportunity to ensure the correct functioning of equipment.

A thorough medical history will be important and where possible should be completed prior to patient attendance and checked on arrival. There are cases where the patient's medical condition will necessitate a risk assessment prior to treatment during which the balance of treatment versus patient risk should be assessed. Likewise, staff working in the environment should undergo a thorough risk assessment via a robust occupational health policy prior to recommencing their duties. This should involve a survey of any factors that may result in a higher risk of an adverse outcome from COVID-19. DHCWs who are found to be high risk following their assessment should seek appropriate advice from either occupational health or their own medical practitioner for the most appropriate and safe course of action.

Staff should also be mindful of the increased prevalence of safeguarding issues relating to children, vulnerable patients and the elderly. Patients may also present with increased psychological health problems due to issues around COVID-19 related anxiety.

There should be an open culture within the practice to encourage staff to report if they feel unwell. Access to occupational health and mental health wellbeing is important and practices should be able to signpost to these services, while being cognisant that availability of such services may also be under considerable pressure during and after the pandemic. The impact of COVID-19 on the health and well-being of dental personnel could be considerable with the additional pressures of “new ways of working”; increased responsibility, anxieties around transmission, job insecurity and financial pressures. Increased stress and pressure at work will almost be inevitable as we return to practice, and it is important to acknowledge that this may be felt unequally. Some staff may feel vulnerable, and all DHCW need to be mindful of discrimination and bullying. Practice policies may need to be revisited to ensure adequate support is in place.

Risk assessments should be used to produce protocols for safe practice in both clinical and non-clinical areas. Clinical and non-clinical waste should be securely sealed and stored appropriately, and the practice should develop protocols to deal with external visitors such as waste carriers, deliveries or engineers, so that everyone is adequately protected in accordance with the alert level. Locum staff should be screened prior to attendance and should be made aware of local protocols.

It is accepted that these have been difficult times financially for all businesses and that there may be pressure on practice accounts resulting in supply issues. It is important that sufficient PPE is available. It needs to be of the appropriate type and compliant with the required safety standard. Following a long period of closure, it is important that equipment is checked prior to the practice resuming appropriate services and the expiry date of all materials and emergency drugs are checked and recorded. A method of stock control to maintain supply of vital materials and equipment should be reinforced.

It is possible that some dental professionals may have reduced their indemnity cover following lockdown and it is important that they review this to ensure it is appropriate for their level of activity and scope of practice.

Adaptation to new working conditions and refreshment of working practices will be needed following a long period of closure to regain confidence and maintain safety. Staff should undergo regular and practical training on relevant CPD topics so that they retain the appropriate skill mix. This can be delivered via digital media to mitigate the impact on face to face training. It is recommended that staff should keep their CPD and PDP portfolios up to date and record any training they may have undertaken.

It is for individual practices to ensure a risk assessment is carried out and the appropriate levels of mitigation are in place to reduce any areas of potential concern. This narrative should be used in conjunction with the remainder of this document as an aid to mitigation of risk.

<b>Matrix 5: Management tasks</b>		
<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<b>Management</b>  <b>Medical emergencies</b>	<i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i>  (Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic) (Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)	<b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice <b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements <b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels
	Potential impact: This can have a significant impact on patient safety as well as staff safety if the response is not conducted in a safe manner with appropriate PPE  Likelihood of impact: Unlikely  Severity: Catastrophic	<b>General mitigation measures (ABC approach)</b>  <b>Basic</b> - All patients should have their medical history checked on arrival in case of any changes since the last visit. It will be helpful to check if the patient is in the high or moderate risk category for COVID-19 (see pages 66-68). In the event that a patient is shielding (subject to government guidance), the clinician should conduct their own risk assessment and assess the risk versus benefit of delaying treatment (e.g. a diabetic with a dental abscess may get worse if untreated). A medical emergency is an unlikely event in the dental surgery, but the dental team needs to be prepared for such an eventuality. For most emergencies, the management will be no different from the pre-COVID time except for situations that involve the airway and breathing (cardiac arrest, asthma and choking) which will generate a significant risk of AGE. In the event of a cardiac arrest, the current Resuscitation Council (UK) guidance is as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Recognise cardiac arrest by looking for the absence of signs of life and the absence of normal breathing. Do not listen or feel for breathing by placing your ear and cheek close to the patient's mouth. If you are in any doubt about confirming cardiac arrest, the default position is to start chest compressions until help arrives.</li> <li>• Make sure an ambulance is on its way. If COVID 19 is suspected, tell them when you call 999.</li> <li>• If there is a perceived risk of infection, rescuers should place a cloth/towel over the victim's mouth and nose and attempt compression only CPR and early defibrillation until the ambulance (or advanced care team) arrives. Put</li> </ul>

		<p>hands together in the middle of the chest and push hard and fast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early use of a defibrillator significantly increases the person's chances of survival and does not increase risk of infection.</li> <li>• If the rescuer has access to any form of personal protective equipment (PPE) this should be worn.</li> <li>• After performing compression-only CPR, all rescuers should wash their hands thoroughly with soap and water; alcohol-based hand gel is a convenient alternative. They should also seek advice from the NHS 111 coronavirus advice service or medical adviser.'</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Specific</u></b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	COVID-19 alert level 4-5	As above
	COVID-19 alert level 3	As above
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	As above
<p><b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>All staff should be mindful of their personal safety when responding to emergencies and should ensure they wear the appropriate PPE.</p>	

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p>Management</p> <p>Occupational health</p>	<p>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</p> <p>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic) (Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice  <b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements  <b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
	<p>Potential impact: Poor staff health can compromise patient safety, staff safety and loss of workforce and potentially reputational risk.</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Possible</p> <p>Severity: Major</p>	<p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p><b>Aspirational</b> - Local access to occupational health and mental health support to consider the development of a practice wellbeing lead to support staff.</p> <p><b>Basic</b> - All staff should undergo a risk assessment prior to recommencing their duties. This should involve review of any high-risk factors that may result in an adverse outcome from COVID-19 (see page 7). This should be a prerequisite and conducted with the support of the medical practitioners where indicated. At the advice of their Occupational Health/Medical Practitioner, DHCWs may consider modifying their roles.</p> <p>The practice should develop clear guidance on staff who become unwell and how they report their sickness. They should not attend work and should follow the current government guidance on self-isolation. They should also socially isolate at home and contact medical services (NHS111) if they suspect they have a COVID-19 related illness. Staff and patients who may have been in contact with the member of staff may also need to be traced and contacted. Staff who are self-isolating should have regular welfare checks to ensure their safety and wellbeing. Practices should be aware of their local COVID-19 testing sites. Adopting the track and trace app may help in identifying those at risk.</p> <p>The occupational health policy should form a part of the overall governance strategy that deals with the obligations of the organisation.</p> <p>An occupational health risk assessment should be conducted as deemed appropriate in accordance with staff needs. All new and temporary staff should also undergo an</p>

		occupational risk assessment before commencing work.
<b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels	COVID-19 alert level 4-5	None
	COVID-19 alert level 3	None
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	None
<b>Conditional</b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences	Staff who have been identified as being vulnerable of having a more adverse effect of COVID-19 should be supported to work safely following the recommendations of a medical practitioner or qualified independent occupational health advisor.	

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p>Management</p> <p>Finance</p>	<p>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</p> <p>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic) (Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</p> <p>Potential impact: Possible closures and loss of service. Severe impact to patient access. Reputational loss, wider impacts on dependents, psychological stress from financial uncertainty</p> <p>Likelihood of impact: Almost certain</p> <p>Severity: Major</p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice <b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements <b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p> <p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>This risk comprises a number of key challenges that are difficult to mitigate against in the current situation. This may include the risks around the practice having the capacity to meet its business costs.</p> <p>Mitigating measures such as support from the central government (loans and limited financial support). Short term flexibility in loan repayments is available.</p> <p>It may also help to have open discussions with staff around working patterns and their contracts.</p> <p>Political and public support may also be helpful in expediting measures to urgently address this issue.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p> <p>COVID-19 alert level 3</p> <p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2</p>	<p>As above</p> <p>As above</p> <p>As above</p>
<p><b>Conditional</b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

<b>Domain in the patient journey</b>	<b>Potential risk status and likelihood</b>	<b>ABC based risk mitigation measures</b>
<i>Management</i> <i>Facilities</i> <i>IT</i> <i>Payment</i> <i>Staff areas</i>	<i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i>  <i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i> <i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i>	<b>A - Aspirational advice/best practice</b> <b>B - Basic minimum requirements</b> <b>C - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</b>
<i>Toilets</i> <i>Imaging</i> <i>Clinical and non-clinical waste</i> <i>Decon area</i> <i>Storage areas</i> <i>Reception</i> <i>Waiting</i> <i>Shared space</i> <i>Furniture</i> <i>Decluttering areas</i>	Potential impact: Facilities may become contaminated with COVID-19 and this may propagate the infection risk between clinical and non-clinical areas.  Likelihood: Possible  Severity: Minor	<b>General mitigation measures (ABC approach)</b>  <b>Basic</b> - There should be clear guidance and a practice policy around the management of facilities, especially staff areas such as the staff room to reduce the risk of cross infection. This would involve the strict no PPE in the non-clinical areas, rigorous hand hygiene and regular cleaning of all areas. Appropriate signage to identify non-PPE areas. It is the responsibility of all staff members to ensure that all areas are kept clean and tidy at all times and free of waste. Clinical and non-clinical waste should be sealed and disposed of in the appropriate colour coded bags. IT elements, such as computer keyboards, mice and telephones are potential for fomite spread and should be cleaned after each use and be wiped down and sanitised for other users. Toilets should be cleaned regularly. The practice should also review their policies on practice furniture, soft furnishing and other items, such as magazines and toys, in order to reduce the risk of cross contamination when the alert levels are 3-5. <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels
<b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels	COVID-19 alert level 4-5	Thorough approach to mitigating cross contamination risks between clinical and non-clinical areas
	COVID-19 alert level 3	Thorough approach to mitigating cross contamination risks between clinical and non-clinical areas
	COVID-19 alert level 1-2	We feel that this should be adopted as best practice even with a low COVID-19 infection risk

<b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences	N/A
---	-----

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p><i>Management</i></p> <p><i>Patient safety</i></p>	<p><i>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</i></p> <p><i>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</i></p> <p><i>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</i></p> <p>Potential impact: Patient safety has been the key priority of health care. There is also a significant reputational risk for the practice as well as medicolegal concerns and may raise issues around fitness to practice.</p> <p>Likelihood: Possible</p> <p>Severity: Catastrophic</p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p> <p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>Safety measures (such as staff wearing surgical masks and hand hygiene) should be employed at all levels of the patient journey to ensure that the risk of harm is minimised. High-quality care should be provided, embracing the highest level of protection and universal prevention measures in relation to COVID-19 infection. Patients and other visitors should wear simple face coverings, in line with the latest government advice. Staff should also be mindful of the increased prevalence of safeguarding issues relating to children, vulnerable patients and the elderly. Patients may also present with increased psychological health problems due to issues around COVID-19 related anxiety.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level. <i>also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 3</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level. <i>Also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level. <i>Also</i> consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>

**Conditional**  
mitigation  
measures for  
DHCW who may  
be at higher risk  
of COVID-19  
consequences

All patients and protocols should be risk assessed and reviewed to reflect new knowledge and guidance in order to mitigate the risks of human or systems error.

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p>Management</p> <p>Staff Safety</p> <p>Psychological health</p> <p>Risk of COVID-19 (patients/other staff/external visitors)</p>	<p>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</p> <p>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</p> <p>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
<p>Equipment failure related harm</p> <p>Unfamiliarity with the work environment temporary staff</p>	<p>Likelihood: possible</p> <p>Severity: catastrophic</p> <p>Impact: The COVID-19 crisis is likely to put significant stresses on staff wellbeing in terms of psychological health, physical health (risk of COVID-19 infection) and financial security.</p>	<p><b>General</b> mitigation measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>It is important for staff wellbeing and overall morale of the practice that staff are supported to conduct their work safely. This will involve the provision of appropriate PPE as well the training on how to use it safely. Local protocols should be written to help develop pathways where they may have to interact with external visitors (delivery drivers or engineers).</p> <p>Staff should have refresher training on using equipment preceding the return to work. This may be especially applicable to locum/temporary staff who may be unfamiliar with the practice and should have an induction to familiarise themselves with the COVID-19 specific policies.</p> <p>There is also a potential risk of bullying and harassment of staff in the workplace in relation to COVID-19. Practices should review their work policies to mitigate this. The practice should also have a zero-tolerance policy towards abuse from patients.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level. also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 3</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level. also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2</p>	<p>Risks related to patient safety should be correlated with a number of factors, such as patient factors also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels, the environment and the COVID-19 alert level.</p>

<p><b><u>Conditional</u></b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>	<p>All staff members should undergo a risk assessment to identify any areas that may affect their ability to work with patients via a robust occupational health policy. Staff members may also need access to confidential counselling for psychological support if required.</p>
--	--

Domain in the patient journey	Potential risk status and likelihood	ABC based risk mitigation measures
<p>Management</p> <p>Staff training</p> <p>Safe working</p> <p>PPE etiquette</p> <p>Medical emergencies</p>	<p>Describe the impact of the risk and score severity and likelihood</p> <p>(Negligible, minor, moderate, major, catastrophic)</p> <p>(Rare, unlikely, possible, likely, almost certain)</p>	<p><b>A</b> - Aspirational advice/best practice</p> <p><b>B</b> - Basic minimum requirements</p> <p><b>C</b> - Conditional advice based on the risk of high alert levels (1-5) and for those that may have a higher risk of COVID-19 related complications (see page 7) also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>
<p>IT constraints</p> <p>Telephone/video triage</p> <p>Safeguarding</p>	<p>Likelihood: Likely</p> <p>Severity: Major</p> <p>Impact: Patient safety and staff welfare relies heavily on staff being well trained in clinical as well as non-clinical areas.</p>	<p><b>General mitigation</b> measures (ABC approach)</p> <p>Staff should undergo regular and practical training on relevant CPD topics so that they retain the appropriate level of training. This can be delivered via digital media to mitigate the impact on face to face training. All staff should keep their CPD and PDP portfolios up to date.</p>
<p><b>Specific</b> mitigating measures in the context of COVID-19 alert levels</p>	<p>COVID-19 alert level 4-5 also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>There may be a reduced opportunity for face to face training</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 3 also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>There may be a reduced opportunity for face to face training</p>
	<p>COVID-19 alert level 1-2 also consideration regarding local measures and local risk/threat levels</p>	<p>Face to face training should be phased back in when it is deemed safe to do so</p>
<p><b>Conditional</b> mitigation measures for DHCW who may be at higher risk of COVID-19 consequences</p>		<p>Staff should be supported in their training needs, especially when this relates to change in practice and COVID-19 specific knowledge and training in areas, such as PPE use (donning and doffing), Fit testing, medical emergencies, disinfection and dental triage.</p>

# Protecting vulnerable dental health care workers

## The impact of COVID-19 on vulnerable groups

Most people (>80%) who get a COVID-19 infection will have mild or, as is increasingly understood, almost no symptoms at all and some studies have suggested that up to 60% of people may have asymptomatic COVID-19. This means that it will be almost impossible to identify many of the patients who attend the surgery and are potentially infective. This is why we need to take the appropriate precautions so that we can protect our patients, other members of the dental team and ourselves from COVID-19 infections. In the future, it is likely that rapid Point of Care (PoC) testing will allow dental teams to conduct COVID-19 tests in the dental surgery to better understand the COVID-19 risks in patients as well as staff. Until then the recommendations are to use a combination of personalised risk assessments and universal precautions to protect staff.

There have been discussions of, and media attention on, the impact of COVID-19 on high risk groups. It is crucial to note that they are not at high risk of *spreading* COVID-19 but are at a higher risk of becoming *more ill* if they develop COVID-19 and require an ITU admission. Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (CEBM) found that excess hospital deaths due to COVID-19 were 1.5 times higher than expected for Indians living in the UK, 2.8 times for the Pakistani population and 3 times higher for the Bangladeshi population. With respect to black communities, the figures were even higher with the black African population having 4.3 times higher hospital deaths than expected. For the black Caribbean group, it was 2 times higher and for other BAME groups it was 1.6 times higher. The data was also backed up with the Office of National Statistics (ONS) which showed a similar pattern. Furthermore, the analysis of 119 deaths of health care workers showed the majority were from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities.

Although the reasons for this are not clear, it is thought it could be due to increased prevalence of conditions such as heart disease, diabetes, obesity in these communities. Given that nearly half of the UK dental workforce is from BAME communities we feel it is essential that BAME workers take the appropriate steps to mitigate this risk. It is not just members of the BAME community; those who have other illnesses are also at risk. Often the risk may be so high that these workers and patients have been asked to shield themselves as the risk of an adverse form of COVID-19 is just too great. It does not mean that these groups are high risk of transmitting COVID-19, but that they are more susceptible to adverse outcomes following a COVID-19 infection.

At the start of the pandemic in early March 2020, NHS England released a list of those who are vulnerable to COVID-19 and as our knowledge of COVID-19 increases this list is likely to change. The current guidance has paused shielding, but if the R number

continues to rise, it may be reintroduced and this may affect staff and patients alike. Practices should be aware of official terminology concerning individual 'at risk' factors. PHE identifies People at High Risk (clinically extremely vulnerable) or People at Moderate Risk (clinically vulnerable). As official guidance is subject to change as new evidence emerges, practitioners should keep abreast of any developments in terminology and definitions, and their implications for patient and DHCW risk and related practitioner responsibilities.

If DHCWs are identified as vulnerable, it is recommended that advice is sought from a qualified occupational health expert or general medical practitioner. PHE guidance for secondary care recommends that vulnerable individuals should be redeployed or isolate at home. This approach may present challenges in general dental practice, specifically for those who are self-employed. A risk assessment in conjunction with appropriate occupational health advice may identify specific mitigation measures which could be adopted, including avoidance of certain procedures or the use of enhanced PPE.

#### **Clinically extremely vulnerable people may include:**

- solid organ transplant recipients
- people with specific cancers:
  - people with cancer who are undergoing active chemotherapy
  - people with lung cancer who are undergoing radical radiotherapy
  - people with cancers of the blood or bone marrow such as leukaemia, lymphoma or myeloma who are at any stage of treatment
  - people having immunotherapy or other continuing antibody treatments for cancer
  - people having other targeted cancer treatments that can affect the immune system, such as protein kinase inhibitors or PARP inhibitors
  - people who have had bone marrow or stem cell transplants in the last 6 months or who are still taking immunosuppression drugs
- people with severe respiratory conditions including all cystic fibrosis, severe asthma and severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)
- people with rare diseases that significantly increase the risk of infections (such as severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID), homozygous sickle cell)
- people on immunosuppression therapies sufficient to significantly increase risk of infection
- women who are pregnant with significant heart disease, congenital or acquired

- other people who have also been classed as clinically extremely vulnerable, based on clinical judgement and an assessment of their needs. GPs and hospital clinicians have been provided with guidance to support these decisions

### **Moderate risk of developing complications from coronavirus (COVID-19) infection**

Patients are at moderate risk of developing complications from coronavirus (COVID-19) where:

- they meet the criteria that make them eligible for the annual flu vaccination (except those aged 65 to 69 year old inclusive who have no other qualifying conditions)
- and they do not meet the CMO criteria for the high risk group for COVID-19

This includes the following patient groups:

- aged 70 or older (regardless of medical conditions)
- under 70 with an underlying health condition listed below (for adults this is usually anyone instructed to get a flu jab as an adult each year on medical grounds):
  - chronic (long-term) respiratory diseases, such as asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), emphysema or bronchitis
  - chronic heart disease, such as heart failure
  - chronic kidney disease
  - chronic liver disease, such as hepatitis
  - chronic neurological conditions, such as Parkinson's disease, motor neurone disease, multiple sclerosis (MS), a learning disability or cerebral palsy
  - diabetes
  - those with a weakened immune system caused by a medical condition or medications such as steroid tablets or chemotherapy
  - being seriously overweight (a BMI of 40 or above)
  - those who are pregnant.

Patients with head and neck cancer/post radiotherapy/chemotherapy may also be more vulnerable although they were not officially included in the patient list.

Every day we are learning more about the risks associated with COVID-19 and it is likely that this list will change over time. We are also learning more about testing for COVID-19 (antigen swabs which detect the virus using techniques such as Polymerase Chain Reaction [PCR] and also antibody tests which detect antibodies to the virus). Although the accuracy of the tests is improving (but not yet enough to use in the dental setting) it is only a matter of time before a reliable test which can be used to screen for COVID-19 is available. In the meanwhile, it is essential that members of

the profession remain vigilant to the risks of COVID-19 and use a risk-based approach to mitigate any risk for their patients, other members of the dental team or themselves.

## **Frequently asked questions**

### **1. What is a risk matrix?**

A risk matrix provides a structured approach to thinking about risk. It helps identify risks, consider their impacts, their likelihood and what can be done to reduce them. Risks cannot be eliminated, and certainly not with COVID-19; but a risk matrix can help to reduce them substantially. We learn from experience and mistakes, which we can draw on to identify potential triggers of danger for the future. Our matrix gives structure to that analysis.

Everyone faces different circumstances and will have a different approach to mitigating the risks they identify, so the matrix should be personalised to the dental practice and to the individual.

### **2. Why do we need a risk matrix?**

We lack evidence about the threat of COVID-19, but we do know that it affects people differently, and we know that the nature of the threat is evolving as the pandemic progresses. We need to be ready to adapt as the threat evolves.

We think that using a risk matrix will be more useful and more sustainable as the effect of the disease on society changes. Our guidance must be flexible if it is to be relevant as the official alert level changes. It should take account of people's evolving circumstances. Our knowledge of the disease will improve, and the guidance should aim to accommodate future improvements in understanding of its implications for DHCWs and patients.

### **3. How do I use the matrix?**

The matrix has been devised to follow the patient journey:

- Pre-appointment - before arrival
- Patient attendance (pre-treatment)
- During treatment
- After treatment
- General management

The approach is designed to help the reader to identify areas in the work environment and their daily routine that may need to be considered. The patient journey is

addressed in more detail within each domain. The explanatory text relating to each domain will help you to construct your risk matrix and conduct the assessment effectively.

### *Risk status and impact*

We have assigned particular risks with a broad risk status indicator, reflecting severity and likelihood. We have made this judgement in relation to a generalised risk for the whole profession in the UK. Our risk indicator may not reflect the risk for everyone: hence, again the emphasis on a personal risk assessment.

- Severity is ranked as ‘negligible’, ‘minor’, ‘moderate’, ‘major’ or ‘catastrophic’.
- Likelihood is ranked as ‘rare’, ‘unlikely’, ‘possible’, ‘likely’ or ‘almost certain’.

‘Impact’ describes the nature of adverse effect on the relevant part of the patient journey. It provides the impetus to revise practice policies, or specific mitigation measures. It is difficult to cover every eventuality, but the exercise is helpful in giving priority to those consequences that are best avoided.

### *Mitigation measures*

Risk cannot be eliminated entirely but we can attempt to mitigate it, drawing on what we have previously discovered (‘best evidence’) and what appears to be safe and pragmatic. Practices will differ in their capacity to accommodate some measures we have identified, so we have adopted an “ABC” approach, in common with other FGDP(UK) guidance and standards:

- A. Aspirational advice: ‘best practice’
- B. Basic, or minimum requirements
- C. Conditional advice: depending upon the personal level of risk and national alert designation at the time.

We have suggested further information for each of the mitigation measures which members of the Task Group have identified as useful. This information is not necessarily endorsed by the group’s sponsoring bodies.

## **4. Other countries have already produced guidance; why can’t we use theirs?**

We can certainly learn from the experience of others, but every country has faced its own particular challenges and responded in ways that have seemed appropriate for them.

In particular, the guidance produced by other countries reflects the disease exposure they have faced, and their own model of health care delivery. Australia, New Zealand and Canada, for instance, have implemented measures appropriate to the lower level of threat that they have faced. The UK has experienced one of the highest levels of disease in the world. Their health care systems operate in very different ways, and certainly different to the UK.

## **5. What is a personalised risk assessment?**

In an emergency, governments introduce general measures that take no account of the different circumstances around the country, as was done with COVID-19; from suddenly restricting dentistry to only few emergency procedures in highly-controlled centres at the moment of crisis, services will be gradually permitted nationwide. But not all parts of the country are exposed to the same risk, and both governments and regulators will expect practitioners to make their own competent assessment of the threat to their patients, their practice and their colleagues. DHCWs are very experienced in undertaking risk assessments; there will be added emphasis on doing so in such challenging circumstances. Regulators will expect a particular emphasis on safety to retain public confidence in dentistry over the months and years ahead.

A personalised risk assessment should consider the personal circumstances of team members: their age, sex, ethnicity, and co-morbidities are all relevant. Pregnancy is a consideration.

Other important considerations include geographical location, the characteristics of the patient population, the sub specialisms of the practice, surgery design, the equipment available and to be used, access to the practice and access to digital dentistry.

This is not an exhaustive list. Engagement with all members of the team will help to identify the particular risks to which your practice, and every individual within it, is exposed.

## **6. How can I put all this together?**

This is a stressful and confusing time for all members of the team, and many want simply to get back to work to provide the treatment our patients want and need. A personalised risk assessment will help you to take control and to reassert the autonomy and responsibility that has been taken away in a crisis. Identifying the risks, to the practice and to individuals, is a first step to dealing with them. By working together as a team, all can proceed with confidence and help to sustain trust in dentistry overall.

## 7. There is so much guidance out there already; I am confused – which should I use?

The wealth of advice and guidance that is readily available places additional responsibility on individual practitioners in making the right choices. However, there appears to be general congruence in the guidance that is available, albeit often with application to specific circumstances and settings.

It is our intention that our guidance will provide you with the tools to make your own assessment of risk and appropriate decisions tailored to your own circumstances. We do so as independent membership organisations, committed to the interests of patients, setting standards and cultivating professionalism in dentistry.

It is beyond the scope of this guidance to comment on the advice of others; but it is important to appreciate that what works well in one set of circumstances – one country's health care system, for instance – may not be so applicable in others.

## 8. What are the COVID-19 alert levels?

We expect the government assigned “alert” designation to fluctuate between 4 and 2 (on the 5-point scale) over the coming months, but it is unpredictable. Given the perceived intrinsic risks associated with dentistry, practices may have to remain shut if governments are not confident that they can manage the risks associated with opening; and when open, a strictly phased approach to the introduction of procedures may be considered necessary. The approach we have set out in this guidance is designed to help practices through the rest of the pandemic; to build public confidence in our ability to manage the risks effectively, to adapt to the evolving alert designation, and to protect patients and staff.

5	Critical	A strict lockdown is required; the virus is spreading fast and could overwhelm the NHS
4	Severe	Care services are stretched but are coping
3	Substantial	The virus is in general circulation and the NHS is operating at extra capacity. Some restrictions will need to remain in place, but it will be safe to relax some measures
2	Moderate	There is a low level of virus transmission and the NHS is operating normally. Schools and businesses should be able to open, subject to social distancing measures
1	Safe	The virus is no longer present in the UK. No behavioural restrictions will be needed, and public and private sectors will be able to operate normally

## **9. What about the evidence base used to develop the matrix?**

There is very little high-quality peer reviewed evidence (systematic reviews, meta-analysis or randomised controlled trials) either to support or to contradict some of our recommendations. There is no shortage, nevertheless, of opinion being expressed in print, along with studies that lack the rigour of peer review. Such poorly-founded “evidence” can spread quickly without much challenge.

It is important to be wary of any claim of evidence for one approach or another; particularly when the outcome associated with a specific risk might be catastrophic. Every day we learn more about COVID-19, but all evidence needs to be clearly and carefully appraised before it is relied upon.

## Bibliography

Allison JR, Currie CC, Edwards DC, et al. Evaluating aerosol and splatter following dental procedures: addressing new challenges for oral healthcare and rehabilitation. *J Oral Rehabil.* 2020; Online ahead of print.

Ashley, M. Guidelines for prioritisation of patient care during Covid-19 recovery phases, restorative dentistry. RD-UK. In progress. [Accessed ahead of publication 2020 May 29].

Avasthi A. High Volume Evacuator (HVE) in reducing aerosol- an exploration worth by clinicians. *J Dent Health Oral Disord Ther.* 2018;9(3):165-166. DOI: 10.15406/jdhodt.2018.09.00371.

Belting CM, Habermelde GC, Juhl LK. Spread of Organisms from Dental Air Rotor. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1964;68:648-651.

Bennett AM, Fulford MR, Walker JT, Bradshaw DJ, Martin MV, Marsh PD. Microbial aerosols in general dental practice. *Br Dent J.* 2000;189(12):664-667.

British Dental Association. The impact of Covid-19 on high street dental practice survey. Summary results. Personal Communication. 2020.

Beigel JH, Ackermann M, Ortega R. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:1564-1567. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973.

Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (CEBM). BAME COVID-19 DEATHS - What do we know? Rapid Data & Evidence Review. [Internet]. Oxford: CEBM; May 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/bame-covid-19-deaths-what-do-we-know-rapid-data-evidence-review/>.

Chief Dental Officer, Scottish Government. NHS: PCA(D)(2020)11 Remobilisation of NHS Dental Services: Aerosol Generating Procedures (AGPs). Letter of 7 August 2020. 2020; <https://www.scottishdental.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/PCAD202011-Remobilisation-of-NHS-Dental-Services-Phase-3-Inclusion-of-AGPs-7-August-2020.pdf>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Chief Dental Officer, England. Issue 6, Preparedness letter for primary dental care - 28 August 2020. 2020; <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/C0690-Letter-from-Sara-Hurley-28-August-2020.pdf>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Chief Dental Officer England's Short Life Working Group. Investigation into the resilience of mixed NHS/Private dental practices following the first wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic. 2020; <http://www.bsdt.org.uk/publications/DHC/Investigation%20into%20the%20resilience%20of%20mixed%20dental%20practices%20following%20the%20first%20wave%20of%20the%20COVID-19%20Pandemic.pdf>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Chen C, Zhao B, Cui W, Dong L, An N, Ouyang X. The effectiveness of an air cleaner in controlling. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 2010 7, 1105-1118 Published:23 December 2009 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2009.0516> [Accessed 29 September 2020]

Clarkson J, Ramsay C, Richards D, Robertson C, Aceves-Martins M. Aerosol Generating Procedures and their Mitigation in International Dental Guidance Documents - A Rapid Review. 2020; <https://oralhealth.cochrane.org/news/aerosol-generating-procedures-and-their-mitigation-international-guidance-documents>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

COVID-19 Dental Services Evidence Review (CoDER) Working Group. Recommendations for the re-opening of dental services: a rapid review of international sources. [Internet]. London: Cochrane Oral Health; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from [https://oralhealth.cochrane.org/sites/oralhealth.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/covid19\\_dental\\_review\\_16\\_may\\_2020\\_update.pdf](https://oralhealth.cochrane.org/sites/oralhealth.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/covid19_dental_review_16_may_2020_update.pdf)

Cochrane. Protective clothes and equipment for healthcare workers to prevent them catching coronavirus and other highly infectious diseases.[Internet]. London: Cochrane; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.cochrane.org/CD011621/protective-clothes-and-equipment-healthcare-workers-prevent-them-catching-coronavirus-and-other>.

Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), Public Health Wales (PHW), Public Health Agency (PHA) Northern Ireland, et al. COVID-19 infection prevention and control guidance. [Internet]. London: PHE; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/886668/COVID-19\\_Infection\\_prevention\\_and\\_control\\_guidance\\_complete.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/886668/COVID-19_Infection_prevention_and_control_guidance_complete.pdf)

Department of Health and Social Care. Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05). [Internet]. London: Department of Health and Social Care; 2013. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/decontamination-in-primary-care-dental-practices>.

Department of Health. Heating and ventilation systems. Health Technical Memorandum 03-01: Specialised ventilation for healthcare premises. Part A: Design and validation. 2007; [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/144029/HTM\\_03-01\\_Part\\_A.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/144029/HTM_03-01_Part_A.pdf). Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) PHWP, Public Health Agency (PHA) Northern Ireland, Health Protection Scotland (HPS)/National Services Scotland, Public Health England (PHE), NHS England. COVID-19: Guidance for the remobilisation of services within health and care settings. Infection prevention and control recommendations. 2020; [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/910885/COVID-19\\_Infection\\_prevention\\_and\\_control\\_guidance\\_FINAL\\_PDF\\_20082020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/910885/COVID-19_Infection_prevention_and_control_guidance_FINAL_PDF_20082020.pdf). Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Doremalen NV, Bushmaker T, Morris D, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of HCoV-19 (SARS-CoV-2) compared to SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Mar 17. Epub ahead of print DOI: 10.1101/2020.03.09.20033217.

Faculty of General Dental Practice (UK) (FGDP(UK)). Standards in Dentistry. London: FGDP(UK); 2018.

Greenhalgh, Trish. What is the efficacy of standard face masks compared to respirator masks in preventing COVID-type respiratory illnesses in primary care staff? [Internet]. Washington, D.C.: Pan American Health Organization, World Health Organization; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://covid19-evidence.paho.org/handle/20.500.12663/1369>.

GOV.UK. COVID-19: infection prevention and control (IPC). [Internet]. London: GOV.UK; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-infection-prevention-and-control>.

Guo Z-D, Wang Z-Y, Zhang S-F, et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Apr 10;26(7). DOI: 10.3201/eid2607.200885.

Harrel SK, Molinari J. Aerosols and splatter in dentistry: a brief review of the literature and infection control implications. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2004;135(4):429-437.

Health Facilities Scotland, NHS National Services Scotland. Scottish Health Planning Note 36 Part 2. NHS Dental Premises in Scotland. 2006; <http://www.hfs.scot.nhs.uk/publications/1476434760-SHPN%2036%20Part%202%20DentalFinal.pdf>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Health Technology Wales. COVID-19 – Evidence digest 11 May 2020. [Internet]. Cardiff: Health Technology Wales; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.healthtechnology.wales/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/20200511-COVID-19-EvidenceDigest.pdf>.

HM Government. The Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document F Ventilation (2010, as amended 2013). 2013; [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/468871/ADF\\_LOCKED.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/468871/ADF_LOCKED.pdf). Accessed 29 September, 2020.

33. Hinds WC. *Aerosol Technology: Properties, Behavior, and Measurement of Airborne Particles*. 2nd ed: Wiley; 1999.

Holliday IR, Allison JR, Currie CC, et al. Evaluating Dental Aerosol and Splatter in an Open Plan Clinic Environment: Implications for the COVID-19 Pandemic. Preprint. *OSF Preprints* 2020; 7th September: <https://osf.io/md49f/>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Horton MA. Human Factors in Dentistry. *Prim Dent J.* 2019 Aug 15;8(2):30-33. DOI: 10.1308/205016819827103403.

Iacobucci G. Covid-19: NHS bosses told to assess risk to ethnic minority staff who may be at greater risk. *BMJ.* 2020 May 4;369:m1820. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m1820.

Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). Data protection self assessment. [Internet]. Wilmslow, Cheshire: ICO; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/data-protection-self-assessment/>.

Innes N, Johnson I, Al-Yaseen W, et al. A Systematic Review of Droplet and Aerosol Generation in Dentistry. Preprint. *medRxiv* 2020; 2020.2008.2028.20183475. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/medrxiv/early/2020/09/01/2020.08.28.20183475.full.pdf>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Institute of Medicine. Environmental Health Sciences Decision Making: Risk Management, Evidence, and Ethics: Workshop Summary. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2009.

Izzetti R, Nisi M, Gabriele M, et al. COVID-19 Transmission in Dental Practice: Brief Review of Preventive Measures in Italy. *J Dent Res.* 2020 Apr 17;22034520920580. DOI: 10.1177/0022034520920580.

Kennedy S, Yaldren J, Nevins, et al. A look at digital literacy in health and social care. *Br J Card Nurs.* 2017;12(9):428-432.

Li RWK, Leung KWC, Sun FCS, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and the GDP. Part II: Implications for GDPs. *Br Dent J.* 2004;197(3):130-134.

Micik RE, Miller RL, Mazzarella MA, Ryge G. Studies on dental aerobiology. I. Bacterial aerosols generated during dental procedures. *J Dent Res.* 1969;48(1):49-56.

- Miller RL. Characteristics of blood-containing aerosols generated by common powered dental instruments. *Am Ind Hyg Assoc J*. 1995;56(7):670-676.
- Miller RL, Micik RE, Abel C, Ryge G. Studies on dental aerobiology. II. Microbial splatter discharged from the oral cavity of dental patients. *J Dent Res*. 1971;50(3):621-625.
- National Services Scotland Short Life Working Group SBAR: Ventilation, water and environmental cleaning in dental surgeries relating to COVID-19. 2020; <https://www.scottishdental.org/ventilation-water-and-environmental-cleaning-in-dental-surgeries-relating-to-covid-19/>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.
- NHS Scotland. National Infection Prevention and Control Manual. 2020; <http://www.nipcm.scot.nhs.uk/>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.
- Nestel D, Tierney T. Role-play for medical students learning about communication: Guidelines for maximising benefits. *MC Med Educ*. 2007 Mar 2;7(3). DOI: 10.1186/1472-6920-7-3.
- Neville P. Exploring the ethnic diversity of UK dentistry. *MedEdPublish*. 2018;55. DOI: 10.15694/2018.0000055.1
- National Health Service (NHS). Who's at higher risk from coronavirus. [Internet]. London: NHS; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/people-at-higher-risk-from-coronavirus/whos-at-higher-risk-from-coronavirus/>.
- National Health Service (NHS). NHS workforce: Ethnicity facts and figures. [Internet]. London: NHS; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/workforce-and-business/workforce-diversity/nhs-workforce/latest>.
- National Health Service (NHS). Risk Assessment for BAME, Vulnerable and Pregnant Staff and Coronavirus Exposure. [Internet]. London: NHS; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.guysandstthomas.nhs.uk/resources/coronavirus/occupational-health/risk-assessment-matrix-vulnerable-staff-COVID19.pdf>.
- NBS. Welsh HTM 01-05 Decontamination in primary care dental practices and community dental services. Revision 1. [Internet]. London: NBS; 2014. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.thenbs.com/PublicationIndex/Documents/Details?DocId=307146>.
- Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) roundup. [Internet]. London: Office for National Statistics; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/coronaviruscovid19roundup/2020-03-26>.
- Office for National Statistics. Which occupations have the highest potential exposure to the coronavirus (COVID-19)? [Internet]. London: GOV.UK; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/which-occupations-have-the-highest-potential-exposure-to-the-coronavirus-covid-19>.
- Panayiotou A, Gardner A, Williams S, et al. Language Translation Apps in Health Care Settings: Expert Opinion. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019 Apr;7(4):e11316. DOI: 10.2196/11316.
- Pickles HG. Re: Covid-19: NHS bosses told to assess risk to ethnic minority staff who may be at greater risk. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1820.
- Public Health England (PHE). COVID-19 personal protective equipment (PPE). [Internet]. London: PHE; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-infection-prevention-and-control/covid-19-personal-protective-equipment-ppe>.

Public Health England (PHE). Guidance on shielding and protecting people who are clinically extremely vulnerable from COVID-19. [Internet]. London: PHE; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19>.

Public Health England (PHE). Transmission characteristics and principles of infection prevention and control. [Internet]. London: PHE; 2019. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-infection-prevention-and-control/transmission-characteristics-and-principles-of-infection-prevention-and-control>.

Public Health England (PHE). PHE Strategy 2020 to 2025. [Internet]. London: PHE; 2019. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/phe-strategy-2020-to-2025>.

Public Health England (PHE). Quick guide - gown version: Removal of (doffing) personal protective equipment (PPE) for aerosol generating procedures (AGPs). [Internet]. London: PHE; 2020. [Accessed 2020 June 16]. Available from [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/879104/PHE\\_COVID-19\\_Doffing\\_quick\\_guide\\_gown\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879104/PHE_COVID-19_Doffing_quick_guide_gown_version.pdf)

Resuscitation Council UK (RCUK). Press Release: Life-saving charity supports returning NHS staff with free clinical training. [Internet]. London: RCUK; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.resus.org.uk/media/statements/resuscitation-council-uk-statements-on-covid-19-coronavirus-cpr-and-resuscitation/in-hospital-settings/press-release-rcuk-online-training/>.

Radonovich LJ, Simberkoff MS, Bessesen MT, et al. N95 Respirators vs Medical Masks for Preventing Influenza Among Health Care Personnel. *JAMA*. 2019 Sep 3;322(9):824-833. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2019.11645.

Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme (SDCEP). Mitigation of Aerosol Generating Procedures in Dentistry – A Rapid Review. [Internet]. Dundee: SDCEP; 2020. [Accessed 2020 Sept. 29]. Available from <https://www.sdcep.org.uk/published-guidance/covid-19-practice-recovery/rapid-review-of-agps/>

Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme (SDCEP). Managing Decontamination in Dental Practice. [Internet]. Dundee: SDCEP; 2016. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from [https://www.sdcep.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SDCEP\\_-\\_Managing\\_Decontamination\\_in\\_Dental-Practice\\_Jan2016.pdf](https://www.sdcep.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SDCEP_-_Managing_Decontamination_in_Dental-Practice_Jan2016.pdf).

Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme (SDCEP). Cleaning of Dental Instruments Dental Clinical Guidance. 2nd Edition. [Internet]. Dundee: SDCEP; 2014. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from [https://www.sdcep.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SDCEP\\_Cleaning\\_of\\_Dental\\_Instruments\\_2nd\\_Edition\\_Jan2016.pdf](https://www.sdcep.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SDCEP_Cleaning_of_Dental_Instruments_2nd_Edition_Jan2016.pdf).

Schofield C. How the UK coronavirus alert levels work and what the 5 stages mean. [Internet]. London: Inews; May 28, 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://inews.co.uk/news/covid-alert-system-coronavirus-uk-levels-5-stages-meaning-formula-explained-2849555> (2020, accessed May 29, 2020).

Sergis A, Wade WG, Gallagher JE, et al. Mechanisms of atomization from rotary dental instruments and its mitigation - Personal communication (Addison,O). 2020.

Steele J. NHS dental contract pilots – Learning after first two years of piloting. [Internet]. London: Department of Health; 2014. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/282760/Dental\\_contract\\_pilots\\_evidence\\_and\\_learning\\_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/282760/Dental_contract_pilots_evidence_and_learning_report.pdf).

The Australian Dental Association (ADA). The Prime Minister has announced a move back to Level 2 restrictions, effective 27th April. [Internet]. St Leonards, NSW: ADA; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.ada.org.au/News-Media/News-and-Release/Latest-News/The-Prime-Minister-has-announced-a-move-back-to-Le>.

The Australian Dental Association (ADA). Key Guidelines and Restrictions. [Internet]. St Leonards, NSW: ADA; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://www.ada.org.au/Covid-19-Portal/Dental-Professionals>.

Ting DSW, Carin L, Dzau V, et al. Digital technology and COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26:459-461. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0824-5>

Tompkins J, Quincey P, Allerton J, Williams K. National Physical Laboratory. Feasibility Study on the Detection of Airborne Particulates in a Dental Surgery using an Optical Particle Counter - Personal Communication. 2020.

Trivedy C, Mills I, Dhanoya O. The impact of the risk of COVID-19 on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) members of the UK dental profession May 2020. (Submitted to BDJ May 14 2020).

van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(16):1564-1567.

Walsh LJ, Brostek. Minimum intervention dentistry principles and objectives. *Aust Dent J*. 2013 Jun;58 Suppl 1:3-16. DOI: 10.1111/adj.12045.

World Health Organization. Considerations for the provision of essential oral health services in the context of COVID-19. 2020; <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-2019-nCoV-oral-health-2020.1>. Accessed 29 September, 2020.

World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Situation Report – 115. 2020; [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200514-covid-19-sitrep-115.pdf?sfvrsn=3fce8d3c\\_6](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200514-covid-19-sitrep-115.pdf?sfvrsn=3fce8d3c_6). Accessed 29 September, 2020.

Williamson E, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran KJ, et al. Open SAFELY: factors associated with COVID-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic health records of 17 million adult NHS patients. 2020. Epub ahead of print July 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.06.20092999.

Working group publishes rapid review for re-opening dental services. *Br Dent J*. 2020;228(743). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-1660-1>.

World Health Organization (WHO). Infection prevention and control during health care when COVID-19 is suspected: interim guidance, 19 March 2020. [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2020. [Accessed 2020 May 29]. Available from <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331495>.

Zemouri C, Soet Hde, Crielaard W, et al. A scoping review on bio-aerosols in healthcare and the dental environment. *PLoS One*. 2017 May 22;12(5):e0178007. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0178007.