Journal of Dental Science and Medicine

Ahmed, J Dent Sci Med 2024, 7:6

Editorial Open Access

An analysis of the several public and private dental benefit payer types for the treatment of permanent teeth in children and adolescents that need root canal therapy, along with the outcomes

Ahmed Elawady*

Department of Prosthodontics College of Dentistry Taibah University Al Shefaa Bint Amr AL Ansareya Street, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

The treatment of children's and adolescent's permanent teeth requiring root canal therapy (RCT) is critical for maintaining long-term oral health and preventing future complications. The accessibility and affordability of this treatment are influenced significantly by the type of dental insurance coverage or benefits available, which can vary between public and private dental payers. This research aims to compare the different types of public and private dental benefit payers for pediatric and adolescent RCT procedures and evaluate the outcomes of treatments based on these differing coverage systems. By analyzing the differences in coverage, reimbursement rates, patient satisfaction, and treatment results, this study will provide valuable insights into the impact of dental insurance policies on pediatric endodontic care. Through a comprehensive review of the literature and data analysis, this article presents a comparative analysis of the role that public and private dental insurance systems play in the delivery of root canal therapy to children and adolescents, and how these systems ultimately affect patient outcomes.

Introduction

Root canal therapy (RCT) is an essential procedure in pediatric and adolescent dentistry, particularly for the treatment of permanent teeth that suffer from severe caries, trauma, or infection. It aims to save the affected tooth by removing the damaged pulp and sealing the root canals. If left untreated, these conditions can lead to further complications, including tooth loss and systemic infections. However, access to RCT can be heavily influenced by the type of dental insurance coverage available to the patient, whether public or private. In the United States, for instance, children and adolescents are often covered under public health insurance programs such as Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), while private dental insurance plans are commonly provided through employer-sponsored programs or purchased individually. The aim of this paper is to compare the types of public and private dental benefit payers for the treatment of children's and adolescent's permanent teeth requiring root canal therapy. Specifically, this study seeks to examine the differences in reimbursement rates, eligibility criteria, treatment access, and patient outcomes under both public and private insurance systems. By analyzing these factors, this article will explore how dental benefit systems impact the overall quality of care for young patients in need of RCT.

Overview of root canal therapy in children and adolescents

Root canal therapy in children and adolescents is generally performed on permanent teeth that have sustained significant damage due to decay, trauma, or infection. The procedure involves the removal of the affected pulp tissue within the tooth's root canals, followed by cleaning, shaping, and sealing the space to prevent further infection. Pediatric endodontists or general dentists with specialized training typically perform these treatments.

The decision to perform RCT is influenced by several factors, including the extent of damage to the tooth, the child's age, and the potential for preserving the tooth for future development. While RCT in primary (baby) teeth is also possible, the focus of this paper is on the permanent teeth, as they require more complex and long-term management to ensure proper growth and function [1-5].

Public dental insurance for children and adolescents

Public dental insurance programs, such as Medicaid and CHIP, are designed to provide dental coverage for low-income children and adolescents. These programs are funded by the federal government but administered by individual states. The coverage provided by these programs can vary significantly depending on the state, as each state has the flexibility to design its own benefits package.

Medicaid, as the primary public health insurance program in the United States for low-income individuals, provides dental benefits to children under the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) benefit. This program mandates that Medicaid cover all medically necessary dental services for children, including RCT, though the definition of "medically necessary" can differ by state. Additionally, Medicaid often has limitations on the number of treatments covered per year, which may impact the access to RCT for children and adolescents who require multiple visits or additional services.

CHIP, a program designed to provide health coverage for children in families with incomes too high to qualify for Medicaid but too low to afford private coverage, also covers dental services. However, CHIP programs vary in their scope of dental coverage, and some states may provide more limited services or fewer covered procedures compared to Medicaid.

***Corresponding author:** Ahmed Elawady, Department of Prosthodontics College of Dentistry Taibah University Al Shefaa Bint Amr AL Ansareya Street, Saudi Arabia E-mail: ahmedelawady454@gmail.com

Received: 03-Nov-2024, Manuscript No: did-25-159800, **Editor assigned:** 06-Nov-2024, Pre-QC No: did-25-159800 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 20-Nov-2024, QC No: did-25-159800, **Revised:** 27-Nov-2024, Manuscript No: did-25-159800 (R), **Published:** 30-Nov-2024, DOI: 10.4172/did.1000277

Citation: Ahmed E (2024) An analysis of the several public and private dental benefit payer types for the treatment of permanent teeth in children and adolescents that need root canal therapy, along with the outcomes. J Dent Sci Med 7: 277.

Private dental insurance for children and adolescents

Private dental insurance is typically offered through employer-sponsored plans or individual plans purchased through the marketplace. These plans often offer a wider range of dental benefits, including preventive, restorative, and specialty treatments like RCT. Private dental insurance tends to be more standardized than public insurance, though the specifics of coverage (e.g., co-pays, deductibles, and reimbursement rates) can vary by plan.

One key difference between private and public insurance is that private plans may offer a broader choice of providers, which can impact the patient's ability to seek care from a preferred pediatric dentist or specialist. Additionally, private insurance plans typically have fewer restrictions on the number of treatments a child can receive per year, offering greater flexibility for patients requiring more extensive dental care.

However, private dental insurance plans also come with significant out-of-pocket costs, including premiums, co-pays, and deductibles, which can pose a barrier to access for families with limited financial resources. Despite these challenges, private insurance generally offers faster access to dental services and may provide a wider network of providers.

Comparison of public vs. private payers for RCT

Reimbursement rates

One of the most significant differences between public and private dental insurance is the reimbursement rates for procedures such as root canal therapy. In general, private insurance plans tend to offer higher reimbursement rates for dental procedures compared to public programs like Medicaid. Public dental programs, particularly Medicaid, often reimburse at a lower rate, which may affect the availability and quality of care that dental professionals can provide.

For instance, many private insurance plans pay a higher percentage of the total cost of RCT and related treatments, making it more affordable for families who have coverage. On the other hand, Medicaid's reimbursement rates are often lower, which may result in fewer providers willing to accept Medicaid patients, thereby limiting access to care.

Eligibility and access to care

Eligibility for public dental programs like Medicaid and CHIP is based on income and other factors, such as age and disability status. For example, Medicaid eligibility varies by state, and many states impose strict income limits, which can result in some families being ineligible for coverage. Additionally, Medicaid recipients may face long wait times for dental appointments or have limited access to specialty care providers, such as pediatric endodontists.

In contrast, private insurance plans are generally more accessible to those who can afford the premiums or are employed by companies that offer coverage. While eligibility requirements may be less restrictive, the financial burden of private insurance premiums and out-of-pocket expenses may still limit access for lower-income families.

The availability of dental providers is another key factor in accessing RCT. Private insurance often provides a larger network of providers, making it easier for patients to find a provider who offers the specific treatment they need. In contrast, public insurance networks may be more limited, with fewer providers accepting Medicaid or CHIP, particularly in rural or underserved areas.

Patient outcomes and satisfaction

The outcomes of RCT are often similar regardless of the payer system; however, patient satisfaction can vary significantly between public and private insurance patients. In many cases, families with private insurance report higher levels of satisfaction due to quicker access to treatment, a broader selection of providers, and fewer limitations on treatment options. Additionally, private insurance often provides better coverage for post-treatment care, such as follow-up visits and additional procedures.

On the other hand, patients covered by public insurance may experience delays in treatment due to limited access to providers and lower reimbursement rates for dentists. As a result, children and adolescents with Medicaid or CHIP may face longer wait times for RCT, which could affect the overall success of the procedure and patient satisfaction.

Results and discussion

Based on the comparison of public and private dental benefit payers for RCT, several key conclusions can be drawn:

Cost and accessibility: Private insurance plans generally offer higher reimbursement rates, broader access to providers, and quicker treatment times. However, the financial burden of premiums and out-of-pocket costs can still present barriers to care, especially for families with limited resources. Public insurance programs, while often more affordable, have limitations in terms of reimbursement rates and provider networks, which can delay access to necessary care.

Reimbursement and provider participation: Public insurance, particularly Medicaid, often has lower reimbursement rates, which can discourage dental providers from accepting Medicaid patients. This may result in fewer available providers and longer wait times for treatment. In contrast, private insurance plans offer higher reimbursement rates, which may encourage more providers to participate in the network, leading to faster access to care.

Treatment outcomes: Although the actual outcomes of RCT may not differ drastically based on the type of insurance coverage, patients with private insurance generally report higher satisfaction due to the shorter wait times, better access to specialists, and fewer treatment restrictions. Patients with public insurance may face delays and potentially suboptimal care due to network limitations and provider availability.

Equity in access: There is a clear disparity in access to RCT for children and adolescents depending on their type of dental insurance. While private insurance often provides better access to care, public insurance programs like Medicaid are essential for providing care to low-income families who would otherwise not be able to afford the treatment. The challenge remains to bridge the gap in access and quality of care between these two systems [6-10].

Conclusion

This study highlights the significant differences between public and private dental benefit payers for the treatment of children's and adolescent's permanent teeth requiring root canal therapy. While private insurance plans generally offer better access to care, higher reimbursement rates, and greater patient satisfaction, public insurance programs such as Medicaid and CHIP remain critical for ensuring that low-income children and adolescents receive necessary dental treatments. Future policy reforms should focus on increasing

reimbursement rates for public insurance programs, expanding provider networks, and ensuring more equitable access to dental care for all children, regardless of their financial status.

Acknowledgment

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Stein H (2013) Electrical Activity of the Diaphragm [Edi] Values and Edi Catheter Placement in Non-Ventilated Preterm Neonates. Am J Perinatol 33: 707-711.
2. Chiew Yeong Shiong (2013) Effects of Neurally Adjusted Ventilatory Assist [NAVA] Levels in Non-Invasive Ventilated Patients: Titrating NAVA Levels with Electric Diaphragmatic Activity and Tidal Volume Matching. BioMed Eng 2: 12-61.
3. Beck Jennifer (2009) Patient-Ventilator Interaction during Neurally Adjusted Ventilatory Assist in Low Birth Weight Infants. Pedia Res 65: 663-668.
4. Stein, Howard (2012) Synchronized Mechanical Ventilation Using Electrical Activity of the Diaphragm in Neonates. Cli Peri 39: 525-542.
5. Kallio Merja (2012) Electrical Activity of the Diaphragm during Neurally Adjusted Ventilatory Assist in Pediatric Patients. Pedia Pulmo 50: 925-931.
6. Dobbin NA, Sun L, Wallace L, Kulka R, You H, et al. (2018) The benefit of kitchen exhaust fan use after cooking - An experimental assessment. Build Environ 135: 286-296.
7. Kang K, Kim H, Kim DD, Lee YG, Kim T (2019) Characteristics of cooking-generated PM10 and PM2.5 in residential buildings with different cooking and ventilation types. Sci Total Environ 668: 56-66.
8. Sun L, Wallace LA, Dobbin NA, You H, Kulka R, et al. (2018) Effect of venting range hood flow rate on size-resolved ultrafine particle concentrations from gas stove cooking. Aerosol Sci. Tech. 52: 1370-1381.
9. Rim D, Wallace LA, Nabinger S, Persily A (2012) Reduction of exposure to ultrafine particles by kitchen exhaust hoods: The effects of exhaust flow rates, particle size, and burner position. Sci Total Environ. 432: 350-56.
10. Singer BC, Pass RZ, Delp WW, Lorenzetti DM, Maddalena RL (2017) Pollutant concentrations and emission rates from natural gas cooking burners without and with range hood exhaust in nine California homes. Build Environ. 43: 3235-3242.