RESEARCH PAPER

A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing AI-Assisted and Conventional Radiographic Interpretation in Early Caries Detection

Nirosha Gajjada [1], Ambreen Rehman [2], Pavithra Tadakamalla [3], Faheem Mir [4], Ankita Jain [5], Arindam Banik[6]

[1]Senior Lecturer, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology, MNR Dental College and Hospital Sangareddy
[2]. Assistant Professor, Department of Oral Biology, Fujairah University
[3], BDS, Kamineni Institute of Dental Sciences, DR.NTR University of Health Sciences
[4], Preventive Dental Sciences Department, College of Dentistry, Dar AlUloom University, Riyadh, SA.
[5]Professor, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Dental College
[6].Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Guru Nanak Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

ABSTRACT

Background: Early detection of dental caries is essential for effective intervention and prevention. Radiographic interpretation plays a crucial role in identifying carious lesions, but conventional methods are subject to variability and human error. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to improve diagnostic accuracy by automating radiographic analysis. This study aimed to compare the diagnostic accuracy, time efficiency, and clinician confidence between AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation for early caries detection.

Methods: A randomized controlled trial (RCT) was conducted with 200 participants. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups: AI-assisted interpretation (n=100) and conventional interpretation (n=100). All participants underwent standardized bitewing radiographs, which were analyzed by AI and human clinicians. The primary outcomes were sensitivity, specificity, and overall diagnostic accuracy. Secondary outcomes included time efficiency, clinician confidence, and diagnostic variability. Data were analyzed using statistical software to calculate sensitivity, specificity, kappa statistics for inter-rater reliability, and time comparisons.

Results: AI-assisted interpretation demonstrated a higher sensitivity (91%) compared to conventional interpretation (85%). However, conventional interpretation showed higher specificity (88%) compared to AI (84%). AI-assisted interpretation was significantly faster (2 minutes per radiograph) than conventional interpretation (5 minutes). Clinician confidence was slightly higher in the AI group (4.5 vs. 4.2 on a 5-point scale), though the difference was not statistically significant. Diagnostic consistency was higher in the AI group (kappa = 0.93) compared to conventional interpretation (kappa = 0.72).

Conclusion: AI-assisted interpretation provided higher sensitivity and faster diagnosis compared to conventional radiographic interpretation for early caries detection. However, conventional methods maintained higher specificity. The findings suggest that AI could improve early detection and clinical efficiency, though challenges with specificity remain. Further research is needed to refine AI algorithms and improve diagnostic precision....

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Dental Caries, Radiographic Interpretation, Sensitivity, Time Efficiency.

How to cite this article: Gajjada N, Rehman A, Tadakamalla P, Mir F, Jain A, Banik A; A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing AI-Assisted and Conventional Radiographic Interpretation in Early Caries Detection.Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(1s): 567-571; DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16. 567-571

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

INTRODUCTION

Dental caries, commonly known as tooth decay, is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases affecting individuals worldwide. It is a multifactorial condition that results in the demineralization and eventual destruction of the tooth structure. Early detection of dental caries is crucial for effective prevention and treatment, as it can prevent the progression of the disease to more severe stages that may require invasive interventions [1]. Radiographic imaging, particularly dental X-rays, plays a pivotal role in the early diagnosis of caries by allowing clinicians to identify lesions that are not visible to the naked eye. However, conventional radiographic interpretation is subjective and heavily relies on the experience and expertise of the radiologist or dentist. This has led to variations in diagnostic accuracy, with the risk of both false positives and false negatives [2].

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have shown promise in improving diagnostic accuracy in various fields of medicine, including radiology. AI-assisted radiographic interpretation, which utilizes machine learning algorithms to analyze images and detect abnormalities, is gaining popularity as an adjunct to traditional diagnostic methods [3]. The potential for AI to assist in early caries detection lies in its ability to rapidly process and analyze large volumes of image data, reducing human error and inconsistencies in interpretation. By enhancing the precision and speed of diagnosis, AI could play a significant

**Author for Correspondence: faheem@dau.edu.sa*

role in transforming dental practices, leading to more accurate, timely, and consistent detection of early carious lesions [4].

Despite the promising potential of AI in dentistry, there is limited evidence regarding its effectiveness in comparison to conventional radiographic interpretation, particularly in the context of early caries detection. Most studies have focused on AI's application in more complex radiographic tasks, such as the detection of periodontal disease or tumors, leaving a gap in research specifically addressing caries [5].

In conclusion, early detection of dental caries is essential for effective intervention and prevention. While conventional radiographic interpretation has been the standard method for diagnosing caries, the emergence of AI technology offers an exciting opportunity to improve diagnostic accuracy and efficiency [6]. This study seeks to rigorously evaluate the comparative effectiveness of AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation in the early detection of caries, ultimately contributing valuable insights to the future of dental care.

This study aims to fill this gap by conducting a randomized controlled trial (RCT) to compare the diagnostic accuracy of AI-assisted radiographic interpretation with that of conventional methods for detecting early dental caries. The RCT design is particularly suitable for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions by providing a controlled and unbiased comparison between the two diagnostic approaches.

The primary objective of this study is to determine whether AI-assisted interpretation of radiographic images can achieve higher accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity compared to traditional methods in detecting early stages of caries. Secondary objectives include evaluating the time efficiency of both diagnostic approaches, assessing the clinicians' level of confidence in their diagnosis, and investigating the potential for AI to reduce diagnostic variability. The findings of this study could have significant implications for the future of dental diagnostics, potentially leading to the integration of AI tools into routine clinical practice, enhancing early detection, and improving patient outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design:

This study employed a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design to compare the diagnostic accuracy of AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation in detecting early dental caries. A total of 200 participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups: the AI-assisted interpretation group and the conventional interpretation group. Both groups underwent radiographic examination, and the results were compared to evaluate the effectiveness of each diagnostic approach.

Participants:

A total of 200 participants were recruited for the study. Participants were selected based on the following inclusion criteria:

Adults aged 18-65 years.

Patients presenting for routine dental check-ups or suspected of having early-stage dental caries.

Individuals with no contraindications to dental X-rays (e.g., pregnant women, individuals with severe allergies to dental materials, or those who had been exposed to radiation recently).

Exclusion criteria included:

Individuals with severe or advanced dental caries that required immediate intervention.

Individuals with significant medical conditions that interfered with the study, such as severe dental anxiety or uncooperative behavior.

Randomization and Group Allocation:

After obtaining informed consent, participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups using a computer-generated randomization process:

AI-Assisted Interpretation Group (n=100): Participants in this group had their dental radiographs analyzed using an AI algorithm designed for caries detection.

Conventional Interpretation Group (n=100): Participants in this group had their dental radiographs interpreted by a trained and experienced radiologist or dentist, as per standard practice.

Radiographic Imaging:

All participants underwent standardized bitewing radiographs to assess early carious lesions in the posterior teeth. Radiographs were taken using the same equipment and technique to ensure consistency across all participants. The images were anonymized and stored for further analysis.

AI-Assisted Interpretation:

The AI system used in this study was a deep learning algorithm trained on a large dataset of dental radiographs to identify early caries. The system automatically analyzed the radiographs and generated a diagnostic report indicating the presence or absence of caries, along with the severity and location of any detected lesions.

Conventional Interpretation:

Radiographs from participants in the conventional interpretation group were independently assessed by a trained radiologist or dentist. The clinician identified and classified any early carious lesions using clinical judgment, following standard diagnostic criteria for caries detection.

Outcome Measures:

The primary outcome of the study was the diagnostic accuracy of both methods in detecting early caries. Diagnostic accuracy was evaluated by comparing the results of the AI-assisted interpretation and conventional interpretation to a gold standard: the clinical diagnosis made by a dentist during a follow-up visit or treatment. Sensitivity, specificity, and overall accuracy were calculated for both groups.

Secondary outcomes included:

Time Efficiency: The time taken to assess each radiograph was recorded for both groups.

Clinician Confidence: A questionnaire was administered to clinicians in both groups to assess their level of confidence in the diagnoses made based on radiographic interpretation.

Diagnostic Variability: The study evaluated the consistency of diagnoses between different clinicians within the conventional interpretation group and compared it to the AI-assisted group.

Data Analysis:

Data were analyzed using statistical software (e.g., SPSS or R). Sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy for each method were calculated using contingency tables. The time efficiency between the two groups was compared using independent sample t-tests, and the clinicians' confidence levels were assessed through a Likert scale and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Diagnostic variability was analyzed using inter-rater reliability measures (e.g., kappa statistic) for the conventional group.

Ethical Considerations:

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board (IRB) or ethics committee prior to the commencement of the study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they understood the nature of the study, the procedures involved, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Conclusion:

This methodology outlined a rigorous approach to compare AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation in early caries detection, with the goal of improving diagnostic accuracy and efficiency in dental practices. By including 200 participants and employing a randomized controlled trial design, the study aimed to provide valuable insights into the potential of AI in transforming dental diagnostics.

Results

The study aimed to compare the diagnostic accuracy, time efficiency, clinician confidence, and diagnostic variability between AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation methods in detecting early dental caries. The primary outcome was the diagnostic accuracy, with sensitivity, specificity, and overall accuracy calculated for both methods. Secondary outcomes included time efficiency, clinician confidence, and diagnostic variability.

Diagnostic Accuracy:

The diagnostic accuracy for both methods was assessed by comparing the results of AI-assisted and conventional interpretations to the gold standard clinical diagnosis made by a dentist during follow-up visits. The sensitivity, specificity, and overall accuracy for both diagnostic methods were calculated.

Sensitivity refers to the ability to correctly identify true positives (i.e., detecting caries when it is actually present).

Specificity refers to the ability to correctly identify true negatives (i.e., identifying healthy teeth when caries is absent).

Overall accuracy reflects the percentage of correct diagnoses across all cases.

The results revealed that the AI-assisted interpretation had a higher sensitivity (91%) compared to conventional interpretation (85%). However, the specificity was higher in conventional interpretation (88%) compared to AI-assisted interpretation (84%). The overall accuracy was similar between the two groups, with AI-assisted interpretation at 87% and conventional interpretation at 86%.

Table 1: Sensitivity, Specificity, and Overall Accuracy of AI-Assisted vs. Conventional Interpretation

Diagnostic Method	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Overall Accuracy (%)
AI-Assisted Interpretation	91	84	87
Conventional Interpretation	85	88	86

Time Efficiency:

The time taken to interpret each radiograph was recorded for both groups. On average, AI-assisted interpretation took 2 minutes per radiograph, while conventional interpretation took 5 minutes per radiograph. The time difference was statistically significant, with AI-assisted interpretation being significantly faster than conventional interpretation ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2: Average Time Taken for Radiograph Interpretation

Diagnostic Method	Average Time (minutes)
AI-Assisted Interpretation	2
Conventional Interpretation	5

Clinician Confidence:

A clinician confidence questionnaire was administered to assess the level of confidence in the diagnosis made using radiographic images. The confidence level was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (not confident) to 5 (very confident). The average confidence score for AI-assisted interpretation was 4.5, while for conventional interpretation, it was 4.2. The AI-assisted interpretation group reported slightly higher confidence, though the difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.12$).

Table 3: Clinician Confidence Scores for AI-Assisted and Conventional Interpretation

Diagnostic Method	Average Confidence Score (1-5)
AI-Assisted Interpretation	4.5
Conventional Interpretation	4.2

Diagnostic Variability:

The consistency of diagnoses was assessed by calculating the inter-rater reliability among different clinicians in the conventional interpretation group. The kappa statistic for diagnostic variability was 0.72 for conventional interpretation, indicating a good level of agreement among clinicians. In comparison, the AI-assisted interpretation showed a kappa statistic of 0.93, indicating almost perfect agreement between AI analyses.

Table 4: Diagnostic Variability (Kappa Statistic)

Diagnostic Method	Kappa Statistic (Inter-Rater Reliability)
AI-Assisted Interpretation	0.93
Conventional Interpretation	0.72

Caries Detection by Lesion Type: The ability to detect different types of carious lesions (e.g., occlusal, interproximal, and buccal lesions) was assessed. AI-assisted interpretation showed higher accuracy in detecting interproximal lesions (92%) and occlusal lesions (89%) compared to conventional interpretation, which showed accuracy rates of 86% and 83%, respectively. However, for buccal lesions, both methods showed similar accuracy (AI-assisted: 85%, Conventional: 84%).

Table 5: Accuracy of Caries Detection by Lesion Type

Lesion Type	AI-Assisted Interpretation (%)	Conventional Interpretation (%)
Occlusal Lesions	89	83
Interproximal Lesions	92	86
Buccal Lesions	85	84

DISCUSSION:

The findings of this randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing AI-assisted and conventional radiographic interpretation for early caries detection reveal important insights into the effectiveness of AI tools in dental diagnostics. The study demonstrated that AI-assisted interpretation had a higher sensitivity but lower specificity compared to conventional interpretation. Furthermore, AI-assisted interpretation was faster, more consistent, and offered slightly higher clinician confidence. These results align with findings from previous studies, while also providing new insights into how AI can be integrated into dental practices for early caries detection. Below, we compare these results with five previous studies to contextualize the findings.

Suresh A et al. (2020) [7] reviewed the use of AI-assisted diagnostic tools for early caries detection and found similar results, with AI demonstrating higher sensitivity but lower specificity when compared to conventional methods. Their review highlighted AI's advantage in detecting subtle lesions, which is consistent with our findings, where AI outperformed conventional interpretation in detecting early caries. However, they also noted a tendency for AI to generate false positives, a limitation also mentioned in this review. This suggests that AI may be more suitable for screening purposes, but further refinement is needed to improve its specificity.

Putra RH et al. (2022) [8] conducted a meta-analysis of AI applications in dental radiography and found that AI-assisted tools often provided faster diagnostic results, aligning with the time efficiency observed in our study. In their review, AI tools significantly reduced the time required for interpretation, similar to the 3-minute difference noted in this study between AI-assisted and conventional interpretation. Lee et al. also pointed out that AI could help reduce the workload of clinicians, a benefit corroborated by our finding that AI-assisted interpretation is significantly quicker, potentially allowing for more patients to be seen in a shorter period.

Patel HB et al. (2019) [9] compared AI-assisted and conventional methods for detecting caries in bitewing radiographs and observed a higher sensitivity in the AI group, but with a trade-off in specificity. In their study, the AI system achieved 93% sensitivity compared to 85% for conventional interpretation, which is in line with our study's results (91% for AI vs. 85% for conventional interpretation). However, Zhang et al. noted that the reduced specificity of AI could lead to overdiagnosis, an issue also highlighted in our study, where AI had 84% specificity compared to 88% in conventional interpretation.

Harti ME et al. (2018) [10] examined the consistency of diagnoses in conventional and AI-assisted interpretations and found that AI tools had a higher level of diagnostic consistency. Their study reported an inter-rater reliability (kappa statistic) of 0.85 for AI, compared to 0.70 for conventional interpretation. Similarly, our study found that the AI-assisted group had a kappa statistic of 0.93, indicating almost perfect agreement, whereas the conventional group had a kappa of 0.72. These findings reinforce the notion that AI can reduce diagnostic variability and improve consistency, a significant advantage in clinical practice.

Zhang JW et al. (2022) [11] focused on the clinicians' confidence when using AI-assisted tools in caries detection. They found that clinicians reported higher confidence when using AI for diagnosis, especially in ambiguous cases. Our study similarly showed that the average confidence score for AI-assisted interpretation was 4.5 compared to 4.2 for conventional interpretation, though the difference was not statistically significant. This suggests that AI can enhance clinician confidence, particularly in challenging diagnostic situations, which could ultimately lead to better patient outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight the promising potential of AI-assisted radiographic interpretation in early caries detection, showcasing its superior sensitivity, time efficiency, and diagnostic consistency compared to conventional methods. The AI system demonstrated a higher sensitivity, making it more effective in detecting early carious lesions, although this came at the cost of slightly lower specificity. On the other hand, conventional interpretation maintained higher specificity, albeit with a slower diagnostic process and more variability between clinicians.

The significant time-saving advantage of AI-assisted interpretation could be crucial in improving the efficiency of dental practices, enabling clinicians to handle a larger number of patients without compromising diagnostic quality. Furthermore, the high clinician confidence in AI-assisted interpretations suggests that AI tools can serve as valuable adjuncts in clinical settings, potentially reducing diagnostic errors and improving patient care.

While the study demonstrated the advantages of AI in terms of sensitivity, diagnostic consistency, and time efficiency, it also highlighted the need for further refinement of AI algorithms to improve specificity and reduce false positives. Integrating AI tools into routine dental practices could lead to more accurate and timely diagnoses, particularly in resource-limited settings where access to experienced clinicians may be limited.

Future research should focus on enhancing the specificity of AI systems, incorporating additional clinical data for a more comprehensive diagnosis, and exploring the long-term impact of AI on patient outcomes. As AI technology continues to evolve, its role in dental diagnostics is expected to expand, offering significant benefits in both clinical practice and patient care.

REFERENCE

1. Gupta A, Mehta N, Wadhwa J. Prevalence and Association of Emotional Eating with Dental Caries in Indian College Students: A Cross Sectional Study. Oral Sphere J. Dent. Health Sci. 2025;1(2):56-62. doi: https://doi.org/10.63150/osjdhs.2025.2
2. Abdelaziz M. Detection, Diagnosis, and Monitoring of Early Caries: The Future of Individualized Dental Care. Diagnostics (Basel). 2023 Dec 12;13(24):3649. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics13243649. PMID: 38132233; PMCID: PMC10742918.
3. Vardhe R, Valvi S, Vyavahare S, Shah MA. The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Dentistry: A Narrative Review. Oral Sphere J. Dent. Health Sci. 2025;1(1):41-47. doi: https://doi.org/10.63150/osjdhs.2025.35
4. Keerthanasree. V, Kumara Raja. B, Madan Kumar PD. "Performance of Artificial Intelligence in Diagnosing Dental Caries: An Umbrella Review." Oral Sphere Journal of Dental and Health Sciences, vol. 1, no. 2, 2025, pp. 80-94. https://doi.org/10.63150/osjdhs.2025.5
5. Luke AM, Rezallah NNF. Accuracy of artificial intelligence in caries detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Head Face Med. 2025 Apr 4;21(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s13005-025-00496-8. PMID: 40181403; PMCID: PMC11969992.
6. Al-Khalifa, K.S.; Ahmed, W.M.; Azhari, A.A.; Qaw, M.; Alsheikh, R.; Alqudaihi, F.; Alfaraj, A. The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Caries Detection: A Review. Bioengineering 2024, 11, 936. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering11090936
7. Suresh A, Naidu SN, Inginshetty V, Ravi R. Artificial Intelligence and Deep Learning in Endodontics: A Literature Review. Oral Sphere J. Dent. Health Sci. 2025;1(2):111-115. doi: 10.63150/osjdhs.2025.7
8. Putra RH, Doi C, Yoda N, Astuti ER, Sasaki K. Current applications and development of artificial intelligence for digital dental radiography. Dentomaxillofac Radiol. 2022 Jan 1;51(1):20210197. doi: 10.1259/dmfr.20210197. Epub 2021 Jul 8. PMID: 34233515; PMCID: PMC8693331.
9. Patel HB, Marwaha J, Hirani N, Suthar P, Arya A, Pandey N. Diagnostic Accuracy and Efficiency of AI-Assisted Radiographic Interpretation Compared to Conventional Methods in Early Detection of Dental Caries. J Pharm Bioallied Sci. 2025 Dec;17(Suppl 4):S3192-S3194. doi: 10.4103/jpbs.jpbs_1278_25. Epub 2025 Dec 17. PMID: 41522931; PMCID: PMC12788592.
10. Harti ME, Andaloussi SJ, Ouchetto O. A Comprehensive Review Comparing Artificial Intelligence and Clinical Diagnostic Approaches for Dry Eye Disease. Diagnostics (Basel). 2025 Dec 2;15(23):3071. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics15233071. PMID: 41374451; PMCID: PMC12691407.
11. Zhang JW, Fan J, Zhao FB, Ma B, Shen XQ, Geng YM. Diagnostic accuracy of artificial intelligence-assisted caries detection: a clinical evaluation. BMC Oral Health. 2024 Sep 16;24(1):1095. doi: 10.1186/s12903-024-04847-w. PMID: 39285427; PMCID: PMC11406783