International Journal of
Science, Architecture, Technology and Environment

Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI) – A Terse Review

B. Lakshmana Rao[1*]

[1]*Prof and HOD, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, A.P.*

kushulubathala@gmail.com

[*]*Corresponding author*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63680/ijsate0525147.13

Abstract

In order to standardize the diagnosis and treatment planning of patients who are dentate, partially edentulous, and edentulous, the American College of Prosthodontists developed the Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI). It overcomes the drawbacks of earlier classification by accounting for anatomical, functional, and aesthetic factors. The PDI divides cases into four classes (I to IV), from minimally to severely compromised, based on primary diagnostic criteria such as bone height, residual ridge morphology, maxillomandibular relationships, occlusion, and abutment condition. Additional diagnostic characteristics, such as systemic health, psychological factors, and aesthetic requirements, also influence clinical decision-making. The PDI enhances patient care, advances educational objectives, and facilitates better clinician communication. However, it may not capture all patient-specific complexities, and accurate application necessitates the right training. All things considered, the PDI is a helpful tool in contemporary prosthodontics for achieving predictable and consistent outcomes.

Keywords: Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI); Diagnostic Criteria in Completely Edentulous; PDI in Dentate Conditions; Residual Ridge Morphology.

INTRODUCTION

The Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI) is a classification system used primarily in prosthodontics to assess the complexity of restorative needs for patients who are edentulous (who are either completely or partially toothless) or dentate. It serves as a standardized method for professional communication, treatment planning, and direct clinical education. McGarry et al. introduced the first PDI for patients who were completely edentulous in 1999. [1]

1. Evolution of the PDI

Initially derived from the Kennedy Classification (for partial edentulism), the PDI evolved to offer a broader diagnostic tool, considering esthetic, functional, and anatomical factors beyond the number and location of

missing teeth.

2. Purpose of PDI

To standardize diagnosis and treatment planning. To evaluate the level of difficulty in prosthodontic cases. To help in educational curriculum and outcome assessments and to aid in referral decisions and resource allocation.

3. Indications

Evaluation of edentulous or partially edentulous patients for complete dentures, removable partial dentures, or implant-supported prostheses. Classification of complexity in prosthodontic rehabilitation. As a tool in academic training and clinical examinations.

4. Contraindications

Not appropriate as a standalone tool—requires clinical correlation. Acute medical or psychological conditions that overshadow oral rehabilitation needs. May be less applicable in non-prosthodontic specialties.

5. Uses of PDI

Helps determine the skill level required to treat a patient (e.g., undergraduate vs. specialist). Assists in case documentation, referrals, and insurance coding. Guides the selection of prosthetic design (fixed vs. removable). Supports research through consistent case grouping. [**1-5**]

PDI Classification System Overview **[1-5]**

The Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI) provides a classification for:

1. Completely Edentulous patients
2. Partially Edentulous patients
3. Completely Dentate patients
4. Edentulous patients requiring implant therapy

Each of these has four classes (I to IV) based on increasing complexity:

Class I: Ideal or minimally compromised
Class II: Moderately compromised
Class III: Substantially compromised
Class IV: Severely compromised, often requiring referral to a specialist

I. Primary Diagnostic Criteria (PDC)

The most important characteristics used to assign a PDI classification are the Primary Diagnostic Criteria. Initially, a case is categorized according to one or more of these important factors. Prosthodontic cases are

categorized into Classes I through IV for treatment planning using the Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index's (PDI) Primary Diagnostic Criteria and Additional Features. These standards aid in determining case complexity and standardizing the diagnostic procedure.

A. For Completely Edentulous Patients

Primary Diagnostic Criteria	**Description**
Mandibular Bone Height	Measured radiographically. Lower height = higher class. Critical for denture stability.
Residual Ridge Morphology	Assessed clinically. Classified as A (ideal) to D (severely resorbed).
Maxillomandibular Relationship (MMR)	Assesses jaw alignment. Class I (normal), II (moderate discrepancy), III (severe discrepancy).
Muscle Attachments	High or abnormal muscle attachments compromise denture fit and retention.

Class	Mandibular Bone Height	Maxillo Mandibular Relation (MMR)	Ridge Morphology	Other Factors
I	≥ 21 mm	Class I	Type A	Favorable
II	16–20 mm	Class I/II	Type B	Mild compromise
III	11–15 mm	Class II	Type C	Compromised
IV	≤ 10 mm	Class III	Type D	Severe compromise

B. For Partially Edentulous Patients

Primary Diagnostic Criteria	**Description**
Location and Extent of Edentulous Areas	More extensive edentulous spans → higher class.
Residual Ridge Conditions	Ridge height, width, undercuts, and quality affect RPD design.
Condition of Abutment Teeth	Periodontal support, crown/root ratios, restorability.
Occlusal Scheme	Class I occlusion is favorable; malocclusion or VDO loss adds complexity.

Class	Features
I	Single edentulous area, good ridge, ideal abutments
II	Multiple edentulous areas, minor compromise in ridge or abutments
III	Extensive edentulous areas, poor ridge, unfavorable abutments
IV	Severe compromise requiring advanced therapy

C. For Completely Dentate Patients

Primary Diagnostic Criteria	**Description**
Tooth Condition	Extensive caries, wear, or fracture increase treatment difficulty.
Occlusion and Function	Disrupted occlusion (e.g., crossbite, deep bite) raises complexity.
Esthetic Demands	Higher esthetic expectations in the anterior zone → higher class.

Class	Features
I	Healthy dentition, minimal esthetic concerns
II	Moderate restorative needs, functional concerns
III	Multiple restorations, occlusal dysfunction
IV	Severe wear, trauma, esthetic demands needing full-mouth rehab

D. For Edentulous Implant Patients

Primary Diagnostic Criteria	**Description**
Bone Quantity & Quality	Poor volume/density = Class III or IV.
Restorative Space	Insufficient vertical or buccolingual space complicates prosthesis.
Anatomical Limitations	Sinus proximity, mandibular nerve, or poor ridge → increased class.
Class	**Features**
I	Adequate bone, predictable implant placement
II	Minor augmentation needed
III	Moderate grafting, challenging anatomy
IV	Severe bone loss, multiple surgeries needed

II. Additional Diagnostic Features

The primary criteria's classification is supported or modified by additional features. They assist in clinical decision-making and can elevate a case to a higher class if multiple are present, even though they don't alter the class on their own.

Common Additional Features (across all categories)

Feature	Impact
Systemic health conditions (ASA III or IV)	May contraindicate surgery or prolong treatment.
Psychological factors	Unrealistic expectations, anxiety, or previous failed prostheses.
Parafunctional habits	Bruxism, clenching—lead to rapid prosthesis wear or failure.
Previous prosthetic history	Failed dentures or RPDs may indicate complex anatomy or compliance issues.
Esthetic challenges	High smile line, asymmetry, or facial disharmony increase demand.

Differences between PDI Classifications and other conventional Classifications:

[6-9]

1. Comprehensive Diagnostic Range

Anatomy, function, aesthetics, systemic health, and prosthetic complexity are all incorporated into PDI. Conventional systems usually concentrate on one dimension, such as the surgical site (Vancouver), bone volume (Misch), or missing teeth (Kennedy).

2. Prognostic Relevance

The classes I–IV of the Prognostic Relevance Index (PDI) are correlated with the prognosis and case complexity, which directs specialist care and referral. Traditional systems, such as Kennedy and Vancouver, describe circumstances but do not forecast success or difficulty.

3. Cross-Subspecialty Integration

PDI is utilized in maxillofacial prosthodontics, implant cases, and complete/partial edentulism.
Every traditional classification is restricted to a particular domain (e.g., Misch for implants, Kennedy for partials).

4. A Tool for Education and Communication

A unified diagnostic framework for research, clinical communication, and instruction is offered by PDI. Traditional systems lack uniformity in various domains and differ in formality.

System	Used for	Type
PDI	Complete edentulism, partial edentulism, maxillofacial defects, dentate conditions	Prognostic and diagnostic
Kennedy Classification	Partial edentulism	Anatomical
Cawood and Howell	Ridge morphology in edentulism	Anatomical/morphological
Vancouver Classification	Maxillofacial (surgical) defects	Surgical-anatomical
Misch Classification	Bone quantity/quality in implant planning	Prosthetic-surgical
House Classification	Prosthetic-surgical	Psychological

Advantages of PDI Classification Over Conventional Systems

A. Comprehensive Case Assessment: PDI takes into account a number of variables, including prosthetic complexity, ridge morphology, occlusion, systemic health, bone height, interarch space, and aesthetics.
B. Predictive Value for Treatment Complexity: Patients are categorized by PDI (Class I–IV) according to their increasing prosthodontic difficulty, which helps with treatment planning and referrals.
C. Uniform Communication Among Clinicians: enhances uniformity in prosthodontic education and patient care by offering a common diagnostic language across specialties and institutions.
D. Educational Utility: Curriculum design, student competency evaluation, and clinically challenging patient management training are all aided by PDI.
E. Supports Evidence-Based Treatment Planning: PDI facilitates the selection of implant, fixed, or removable prostheses by classifying patients according to functional and anatomical characteristics.
F. Adaptable to All Prosthodontic Subspecialties: There are versions for dentate conditions, edentulous with maxillofacial defects, partial edentulism, and complete edentulism.
G. Incorporates Systemic Health: PDI takes into account systemic conditions that impact prognosis, in contrast to traditional classifications (e.g., Kennedy or Cawood & Howell).
[**1-6, 10**]

Disadvantages

Requires training and calibration for consistent use. May not consider all patient-specific nuances (psychosocial, behavioral). Subjective interpretation of some parameters (e.g., esthetics, residual ridge morphology). Not widely adopted outside prosthodontic circles. **[1-5]**

Conclusion

A thorough and standardized classification system, the Prosthodontic Diagnostic Index (PDI) is essential to prosthodontic diagnosis, treatment planning, and communication. It helps physicians to evaluate the complexity of each case and make well-informed clinical decisions by objectively classifying patients according to anatomical, functional, and aesthetic criteria. Its organized framework directs resource allocation and referrals while fostering uniformity in clinical practice, research, and education. Despite certain drawbacks, including the requirement for calibration and the possibility of subjectivity, the system is still a very useful tool for improving outcomes and predictability in prosthodontic rehabilitation. The PDI makes a substantial contribution to the provision of excellent, patient-centered prosthodontic care when properly trained and incorporated into practice.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.

References

1.McGarry TJ, Nimmo A, Skiba JF, Ahlstrom RH, Smith CR, Koumjian JH. Classification system for complete edentulism. J Prosthodont. 1999;8(1):27–39. doi:10.1111/j.1532-849X.1999.tb00006.x

2.Zarb GA, Bolender CL, Eckert SE, Jacob RF, Fenton AH, Mericske-Stern RD. Prosthodontic Treatment for Edentulous Patients: Complete Dentures and Implant-Supported Prostheses. 13th ed. St. Louis: Mosby; 2013.

3.American College of Prosthodontists. Guidelines for the classification of partially edentulous arches. J Prosthodont. 2002;11(3):181–193. doi:10.1053/jpro.2002.126849

4.The American College of Prosthodontists. Classification System for Complete Edentulism and Partial Edentulism [Internet]. Chicago: ACP; c2005 [cited 2025 May 16]. Available from: https://www.prosthodontics.org

5.Bidra AS, Agar JR. Prosthodontic diagnostic index for partially edentulous patients. J Prosthodont. 2010;19(2):93–99. doi:10.1111/j.1532-849X.2009.00536.x

6. Okay DJ, Genden E, Buchbinder D, Urken ML. "Prosthodontic guidelines for surgical reconstruction of the maxilla." J Prosthet Dent. 2001;86(4):352–363.

7.Misch CE. Contemporary Implant Dentistry, 3rd ed. Mosby; 2008.

8.House MM. "The relation of oral conditions to treatment planning for complete dentures." J Am Dent Assoc. 1931;18(7):1073–1082.

9. Cawood JI, Howell RA. "A classification of the edentulous jaws." Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1988;17(4):232–236.

10. Lang BR, et al. "The Role of the Diagnostic Index in Prosthodontics." J Prosthet Dent. 2009;102(3):139–147.