LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Responding to manuscript CLOI-D-10-00562: Reliability of shade selection using an intraoral spectrophotometer

Siegbert Witkowski • Nao-Daniel Yajima • Martin Wolkewitz • Jorg R. Strub

Received: 12 December 2012 / Accepted: 24 January 2013 / Published online: 15 February 2013 © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

The questions raised by Sabour and colleagues are justified and require explanations. In our original submission, we calculated general statistics to measure repeatability and reliability. One reviewer asked us to calculate instead the mean color difference from the mean which is a quantity to evaluate measurement uncertainties given the L^* , a^* , and b^* values. This is a specific and supposed to be an established measure in color technology. To give a better picture of the data, we now provide the general measurements such as the intraclass correlation (reliability coefficient estimate) [1], with information of the variance between and within teeth (Table 1). These values show that the spectrophotometer gives repeatable results: the intraclass correlation is close to 1 in all scenarios (ranging from 0.92 to 0.99). In addition, the outcome measures are also reliable since observers 1 and

S. Witkowski (⊠) · N.-D. Yajima · J. R. Strub
Department of Prosthodontics, School of Dentistry,
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg,
Hugstetter Strasse 55,
79106 Freiburg, Germany
e-mail: siegbert.witkowski@uniklinik-freiburg.de

M. Wolkewitz Institute of Medical Biometry and Medical Informatics, University Hospital Center Freiburg, Stefan-Meier-Strasse 26, 79104 Freiburg, Germany e-mail: wolke@imbi.uni-freiburg.de

M. WolkewitzFreiburg Center of Data Analysis and Modeling, Albert-Ludwigs University Freiburg, Eckerstrasse 1, 79104 Freiburg, Germany

J. R. Strub

Department of Prosthodontics, College of Dentistry, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia 2 (reflecting changed environmental conditions) provide the same agreement (intraclass correlation ranges from 0.96 to 0.99). This is in line with our conclusion.

To the second point, Sabour and colleagues are absolutely right: validity and reliability are two completely different methodological issues. Our study can only give information about repeatability and reliability. For validity, however, one needs to compare the measurements with a gold standard.

References

1. Lachin JM (2004) The role of measurement reliability in clinical trials. Clin Trials 1(6):553–566

	Obse	Observer 1											Obsei	Observer 2										
	L^*				a^*				p^*				L^*				a^*				p^*			
	Μ	Vb	Vw	ICC	Μ	Vb	Vw	ICC	М	M Vb Vw ICC	Vw	ICC	Μ	Vb	Vw	ICC	Μ	Vb	Vw	ICC	Μ	Vb	Vw	ICC
Cervical 73 150 0.29 0.98 2.6 17 0.05 0.97 20 85	73	150	0.29	0.98	2.6	17	0.05	0.97	20	85	0.1	0.1 0.99 74 129 0.26 0.98 2.7 16.6 0.09 0.94 20 87 0.7	74	129	0.26	0.98	2.7	16.6	0.09	0.94	20	87	0.7	0.92
Body	74	130	0.13	0.99	74 130 0.13 0.99 0.97 5.9 0.02	5.9	0.02	0.96 17	17	95.4 0.1	0.1	0.99	75	75 115 0.15 0.99	0.15	0.99	0.98	7	0.02	0.97 17	17	98	0.09	0.99
Incisal 70 85 0.11 0.99 0.8 4.7 0.02	70	85	0.11	0.99	0.8	4.7	0.02	0.95 14		80	0.09	0.99	70	75	0.16	0.16 0.98 0.76 5.2 0.02	0.76	5.2	0.02	0.97 13.8	13.8	86 0.1	0.1	0.99

Copyright of Clinical Oral Investigations is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.