

# Prevalence of Errors Present in Intra Oral Periapical Radiographs in Patients Visiting a Private Dental College

Manjari Chaudhary\*, Ramya G

Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Saveetha Dental College and Hospital  
Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science (SIMATS), Saveetha University  
Chennai, India

## ABSTRACT

### BACKGROUND

Radiographs have become an important tool for diagnosis in dentistry as well as treatment planning. Proper techniques, safety measures and knowledge regarding taking radiographs is imperative for a dental professional.

### AIM

The aim of this study was to assess the prevalence of errors present in intraoral periapical radiographs (IOPA) in patients visiting a private dental college.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in the Department of Oral Medicine And Radiology. A total of 100 periapical radiographs were included in the current study. All the assessed intraoral periapical radiographs were taken using digital radiography in the bisecting angle technique.

### RESULTS

A total of 100 radiographs were included in the stud, out of which 66 % of the IOPAs were found to possess no error, 10 % of the IOPAs had cone cut, in 8 %, angulation defects were found, 6 % had foreshortening, elongation found in 5 % of the IOPAs, 5 % were blurred as assessed in this study. The study population showed a female predilection.

### CONCLUSION

This study has classified and evaluated all the faults that can occur in recording an IOPA. Hence this will help us to overcome the faults in practising dental radiograph by the dental students.

### KEYWORDS

Faulty radiographs, Intraoral periapical radiographs, Quality assurance, Radiographic errors

### Corresponding Author:

Manjari Chaudhary, Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Saveetha Dental College and Hospital Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science (SIMATS), Saveetha University, Chennai, India.  
E-mail: Manjaric.sdc@saveetha.com

### How to Cite This Article:

Chaudhary M, Ramya G. Prevalence of Errors Present In Intra Oral Periapical Radiographs in Patients Visiting a Private Dental College. *J Evid Based Med Healthc* 2022; 9(7):42.

Received date: 08-March-2022;  
Manuscript No: JEBMH-22-50958;  
Editor assigned date: 11-March-2022;  
PreQC No. JEBMH-22-50958(PQ);  
Reviewed date: 25-March-2022;  
QC No. JEBMH-22-50958;  
Revised date: 30-March-2022;  
Manuscript No. JEBMH-22-50958(R);  
Published date: 05-April-2022;  
DOI: 10.18410/jebmh/2022/09.07.42

Copyright © 2022 Chaudhary M, et al.  
This is an open access article distributed under Creative Commons Attribution License [Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)]

## INTRODUCTION

Radiographs are an integral component in the aspect of diagnosis and treatment in dentistry.<sup>1</sup> As a dental surgeon, one should be equipped with knowledge of taking, handling, processing and interpreting radiographs. Although there is a standard for subjective quality rating of radiographs defined, there is nonetheless widespread evidence that many general practitioners fail to achieve these standardized levels.<sup>2-5</sup> Film rejection analysis is an important tool for identification of factors associated with sub optimal radiographic images and subsequent rectification. While traditional X - rays are considered safe, digital radiographs have now taken over the era. Digital radiography (DR) is an advanced form of x - ray inspection which produces a digital radiographic image instantaneously on a computer. It uses x - ray sensitive plates to capture data during object examination, which is immediately transferred to a computer thereby eliminating the intervention of an intermediate cassette. The incident x - ray radiation is converted into an equivalent electric charge and then to a digital image through a detector sensor. Digital X - rays produce 80 % less radiation than the conventional radiography methods.<sup>6,7</sup> The advantages of digital radiography over conventional radiographs include lesser chairside time due to immediate results, elimination of any processing or handling errors, eliminates processing chemicals hence safe for environment, digital image enhancement and data storage, higher productivity, portability, easy to transfer to clients electronically, etc.<sup>8,9</sup> However, even in digital radiographs, the tube head direction and receptor positioning have to be done manually, which can lead to faults sometimes. Some of the common errors include cone cuts, angulation errors, foreshortening, elongation, blurring, overlapping. Although faulty radiographs are unavoidable, better practical approaches can prevent faulty radiographs and avoid unnecessary exposure to the patient.<sup>10-12</sup> Our team has extensive knowledge and research experience that has translate into high quality publications.<sup>13-32</sup> The aim of the current study was to perform a retrospective analysis to assess the prevalence of faults in IOPAs in the department of oral medicine and radiology taken in a private dental institute.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was performed as a retrospective study under a University setting. The required data was procured by reviewing patient records and analyzing data of 100 patients who visited the outpatient department of a private dental college. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional committee. The total sample size achieved after fulfilling inclusion and exclusion criteria was n = 100. Verification of the data was done with the help of additional reviewers, procedure notes and radiographs. Stratification and randomization of the data was done. All available data were included without any sorting process so as to minimize sampling error. Incomplete data, i.e. data without notes were excluded. Internal validity - yes, while external validity is not applicable. The procured data was sorted and tabulated in excel in a methodological manner and verified manually. Various parameters required for assessment pertaining to the study were sequentially entered and transferred to the IBM SPSS software analysis. The various parameters assessed include:

- Age
- Gender
- Errors - present / absent
- Type of error

The procured data was sorted in MS Excel and prevalence and association between the parameters were statistically analyzed using the IBM SPSS software version 23 and the results interpreted as graphs and tabulations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Among the analyzed radiographs, a prevalence of 34% was found for errors in IOPA's as observed in this study.
2. The gender distribution of the study showed a female predilection, with 64 % of the study population being females.
3. On statistical analysis performed to find if there was any significant association between gender and the errors perceived, Chi-Square analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between gender and type of error as observed in this study, (p = 0.05).

The graph depicts the association between mean age, gender and radiographic errors as observed in this study. As a dental surgeon one should be aware of the protocol of taking radiographs and deriving the diagnosis by interpreting them. Radiography serves as a key diagnostic tool in dentistry which renders good and quality radiographs as a prime requisite to attain an appropriate diagnosis.<sup>33,34</sup> Radiographs with poor diagnostic value not only hinder the process of diagnosis and disease management but also creates a hazardous scenario where the patient and operator are subjected to unwanted radiation and other discomforts. Hence the X-ray unit, technique chosen, exposure parameters, skill of operating personnel, patient education is of equal importance.<sup>35</sup> In the present study, which included 00 IOPA's, faults such as cone cuts, elongation, foreshortening, elongation, blurring type of errors were detected. Cone cut was the most common fault perceived in this study, which accounted for about 10 % of the errors. This prevalence is in accordance with previous studies conducted.<sup>36,37</sup> This can be attributed to factors such as cone not covering the area of interest which can be due to minimum expertise of the operating personnel, displacement of the film, when a film holder is used or patient moved. 5 % of the Radiographs assessed showed elongation, which is due to increased angulation that can be attributed to the limited skill of the operating personnel. Angulation errors due to incorrect film placement or improper positioning of the tube head, accounted for 8 % of the errors as observed in this study. Our study results were found to be in concordance with previous literature.<sup>38</sup> Foreshortening was observed to be 6% in this study, occurring due to increased angulation which is attributed to the knowledge of operator and positioning of the tube head. The proficiency of operating personnel plays a pivotal role.<sup>39,40</sup> Blurring defect was observed in 5 % of the IOPA's analyzed. Blurring occurs due to movement of the patient, receptor or the tube head during the time of exposure.<sup>41</sup> 66 % of the radiographs were found to be present without any faults as observed in this study, which thorns an insight on the developing knowledge and skill of the students towards positioning of the machine and handling of the same. On association between ages, gender with the errors in radiographs, both did not yield any association which was of statistical significance. This could be attributed to factors such as study being unicentric, limited sample size, geographic trends not assessed. The intraoral dental x-ray is among the most powerful diagnostic weapons in the dentist's arsenal. The quality of any radiograph depends on accurate technique and careful processing of the image. Correct positioning of the patient is essential for a sharp, accurate, and undistorted image, which is not affected by ghost images. In addition, quality control is crucial when interpreting the image (Tables 1-4).

	AGE	GENDER	RADIOGRAPHIC ERRORS IF ANY
N VALID	100	100	100
MISSING	0	0	0
MEAN	38.34	0.36	1.89

**Table 1. Statistics**

	VALUE	D.F.	ASYMPTOTIC SIGNIFICANCE (2-SIDED)
PEARSON CHI-SQUARE	3.984	5	0.557
LIKELIHOOD RATIO	4.049	5	0.542
LINEAR BY LINEAR ASSOCIATION	0.074	1	0.785
N OF VALID CASES	100		

**Table 2. Chi - Square Tests**

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
VALID NO ERROR	66	66	66	66
CONE CUT	10	10	10	76
ANGULATION	8	8	8	84
FORESHORTNING	6	6	6	90
ELONGATION	5	5	5	95
BLURRING	5	5	5	100
TOTAL	100	100	100	


**Table 3. Radiographic Errors If Any**

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
VALID FEMALE	64	64	64	64
MALE	36	36	36	100
TOTAL	100	100	100	

**Table 4. Gender**

**CONCLUSION**

Radiographs form an important component in the aspect of diagnosis and treatment in the dental field. The present study aimed to identify the faults which are encountered during routine radiography and thereby understand the technical knowledge related to radiation thereby overcoming these faults and reduce the repeated exposures.<sup>42</sup>



**REFERENCES**

- White SC, Pharoah MJ. Oral Radiology: Principles and Interpretation. Mosby Incorporated 2004;741.
- Karjodkar FR. Textbook of Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology. Jaypee Brothers, Medical Publishers Pvt. Limited. 2008: 992.
- Great Britain. National Radiological Protection Board, Royal College of Radiologists (Great Britain). Guidelines on Radiology Standards for Primary Dental Care: Report. 1994;57.
- British Dental Association, National Radiological Protection Board, Great Britain. Department of Health Guidance Notes for Dental Practitioners on the Safe Use of X-ray Equipment. 2001;58.
- Wilkins EM. Clinical Practice of the Dental Hygienist. 1999;990.
- Svenson B, Eriksson T, Kronstrom M, et al. Quality of intraoral radiographs used for prosthodontic treatment planning by general dentists in the public dental health service. Swed Dent J 1995;19(1-2):47-54.
- Inglehart MR, Bagramian R. Oral Health-related Quality of Life. Quintessence Publishing Company. 2002;208.
- Patel JR, Greer DF. Evaluating student progress through error reduction in intraoral radiographic technique. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1986;62(4):471-474.
- Whaites E, Drage N. Essentials of Dental Radiography and Radiology E-Book. Elsevier Health Sci 2020;528.
- Rushton VE, Horner K, Worthington HV. The quality of panoramic radiographs in a sample of general dental practices. Br Dent J 1999;186(12):630-3.
- Wanderley VA, Oliveira ML, Silva ALP, et al. Evaluation of the combined assessment of two digital enhancement filters

in periapical radiographs obtained with different projection angles in the detection of simulated dental root fractures. *Oral Radiol* 2021.

12. Bayraktar Y, Ayan E. Diagnosis of interproximal caries lesions with deep convolutional neural network in digital bitewing radiographs. *Clin Oral Invest* 2021.

13. Jayasree R, Kumar PS, Saravanan A, et al. Sequestration of toxic Pb(II) ions using ultrasonic modified agro waste: Adsorption mechanism and modelling study. *Chemosphere* 2021;285:131502.

14. Sivakumar A, Nalabothu P, Thanh HN, et al. A Comparison of Craniofacial Characteristics between Two Different Adult Populations with Class II Malocclusion-A Cross-Sectional Retrospective Study. *Biology* 2021;10(5).

15. Uma Maheswari TN, Nivedhitha MS, Ramani P. Expression profile of salivary micro RNA-21 and 31 in oral potentially malignant disorders. *Braz Oral Res* 2020;34:e002.

16. Avinash CKA, Tejasvi MLA, Maragathavalli G, et al. Impact of ERCC1 gene polymorphisms on response to cisplatin based therapy in oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) patients. *Indian J Pathol Microbiol* 2020;63:538.

17. Chaitanya NC, Muthukrishnan A, Rao KP, et al. Oral Mucositis Severity Assessment by Supplementation of High Dose Ascorbic Acid During Chemo and/or Radiotherapy of Oro-Pharyngeal Cancers-A Pilot Project. *Indian J Pharm Educ Res* 2018;52(3):532–539.

18. Gudipani RK, Alam MK, Patil SR, et al. Measurement of the Maximum Occlusal Bite Force and its Relation to the Caries Spectrum of First Permanent Molars in Early Permanent Dentition. *J Clin Pediatr Dent* 2020;44(6):423–8.

19. Chaturvedula BB, Muthukrishnan A, Bhuvanaraghan A, et al. Dens invaginatus: a review and orthodontic implications. *Br Dent J* 2021;230(6):345–50.

20. Patil SR, Maragathavalli G, Ramesh DNS, et al. Assessment of Maximum Bite Force in Pre-Treatment and Post Treatment Patients of Oral Submucous Fibrosis: A Prospective Clinical Study. *J Hard Tissue Biol* 2021;30:211–216.

21. Ezhilarasan D, Apoorva VS, Ashok Vardhan N. Syzygium cumini extract induced reactive oxygen species-mediated apoptosis in human oral squamous carcinoma cells. *J Oral Pathol Med* 2019;48(2):115–121.

22. Sharma P, Mehta M, Dhanjal DS, et al. Emerging trends in the novel drug delivery approaches for the treatment of lung cancer. *Chem Biol Interact* 2019;309:108720.

23. Perumalsamy H, Sankarapandian K, Veerappan K, et al. In silico and in *vitro* analysis of coumarin derivative induced anticancer effects by undergoing intrinsic pathway mediated apoptosis in human stomach cancer. *Phytomedicine* 2018;46:119–130.

24. Rajeshkumar S, Menon S, Venkat Kumar S, et al. Antibacterial and antioxidant potential of biosynthesized copper nanoparticles mediated through *Cissus arnotiana* plant extract. *J Photochem Photobiol B* 2019;197:111531.

25. Mehta M, Dhanjal DS, Paudel KR, et al. Cellular signalling pathways mediating the pathogenesis of chronic inflammatory respiratory diseases: an update. *Inflammopharmacology* 2020;28(4):795–817.

26. Rajakumari R, Volova T, Oluwafemi OS, et al. Nano formulated proanthocyanidins as an effective wound healing component. *Mater Sci Eng C Mater Biol Appl* 2020;106:110056.

27. PradeepKumar AR, Shemesh H, Nivedhitha MS, et al. Diagnosis of Vertical Root Fractures by Cone-beam Computed Tomography in Root-filled Teeth with Confirmation by Direct Visualization: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Endod* 2021;47(8):1198-214.

28. R H Ramani P, Tilakaratne WM, Sukumaran G, et al. Critical appraisal of different triggering pathways for the pathobiology of pemphigus vulgaris-A review. *Oral Dis* 2021.

29. Ezhilarasan D, Lakshmi T, Subha M, et al. The ambiguous role of sirtuins in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Dis* 2021.

30. Sarode SC, Gondivkar S, Sarode GS, et al. Hybrid oral potentially malignant disorder: A neglected fact in oral submucous fibrosis. *Oral Oncol.* 2021;105390.

31. Kavarthapu A, Gurumoorthy K. Linking chronic periodontitis and oral cancer: A review. *Oral Oncol* 2021;105375.

32. Preethi KA, Lakshmanan G, Sekar D. Antagomir technology in the treatment of different types of cancer. *Epigenomics* 2021;13(7):481–4.

33. Mourshed F. A study of intraoral radiographic errors made by dental students. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1971;32(5):824–828.

34. Sato J, Sawada S, Aizawa H, et al. Analysis of Intra-Oral Radiographic Errors Made by Dental Students. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol* 1975;4:66–66.

35. Mourshed F, McKinney AL. A comparison of paralleling and bisecting radiographic techniques as experienced by dental students. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1972;33(2):284–296.

36. Elangovan S, Mahabob MN, Jaishankar S, et al. Faulty radiographs: A cross-sectional analysis among dental college students in Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu, India. *J Pharm Bioallied Sci* 2016;8(1):S116–118.

37. Acharya S, Pai K, Acharya S. Repeat film analysis and its implications for quality assurance in dental radiology: An institutional case study. *Contemp Clin Dent* 2015;6:392.

38. Peker I, Alkurt MT. Evaluation of radiographic errors made by undergraduate dental students in periapical radiography. *N Y State Dent J* 2009;75(5):45–48.

39. Zhang ZL, Yang X, Zhao Y. A study of errors of radiography in 10000 intraoral periapical radiographs. *Shanghai J stomatol* 1995;4(3):142.

40. Gorurgoz C, Haciosmanoglu N, Oztaş B. Conventional radiography to digital: artifacts and errors encountered in intraoral phosphorus plate systems. *Yeditepe J Dent* 2020;16: 26170.

41. Çalışkan A, Pinar Sumer A. Definition, classification and retrospective analysis of photostimulable phosphor image artefacts and errors in intraoral dental radiography. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol* 2017;46:20160188.

42. R P Pramod R. Causes of Faulty Radiographs. *Textbook of Dental Radiology.* 2011;88–88.