Original Article

Assessing perceptions of oral health related quality of life in dental implant patients. Experience of a tertiary care center in India

Arun Paul S, Siby Simon S*, Saurabh Kumar, Rabin K Chacko

CMCH, Vellore, TN, India

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Dental implants
Oral health related quality of life (OHRQoL)
Social media
Internet
OHIP 14
Perceptions

ABSTRACT

Background: Patients perception of treatment outcomes are invaluable assessment tools and are effective indicators for future prognosis. Various tools of measurement have been used to assess the same. The oral health impact profile questionnaire (OHIP 14) has been effectively used to evaluate the oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) with regards to individual perceptions. This study was conducted to assess OHRQoL in patients who have had dental implants to replace missing teeth in the Department of Dental Surgery, Unit 1, Christian Medical College and Hospital, Vellore, TN, India by using the OHIP 14 questionnaire.

Materials and Methods: A total of 107 patients who had treatment with dental implants were sent a modified form of the OHIP 14 questionnaire. An attempt was made to draw an inference by correlating scores of the OHIP 14 with data pertaining to key independent variables. Gamma regression was applied to the results as the outcome score distribution was skewed. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Version 21.0.

Results: The mean score for the OHIP 14 was 16.82 with the highest score of 30 for a total score of 70. OHIP 14 scores were higher in patients with implant-supported fixed dental prosthesis as compared to patients with single implant supported crowns ($P = 0.0069$). Patients with no complaints scored 9% lesser than those who reported complaints ($P = 0.0438$).

Conclusion: Assessing quality of life with regards to specific treatment interventions may help to draw critical inferences that determine overall success. Results from the study enabled us to delineate and appreciate the success imparted by esthetics and function from the general well being imparted by treatment with dental implants. Social media could be used to positively improve responses in questionnaire based studies. Future studies using implant specific OHRQoL questionnaire may help to elicit unbiased patient perception in dental implant patients.

1. Introduction

Edentulism and resulting dental disability have shown to cause functional limitation, physical, psychological and social handicap with severe impact to the health and overall well being.^{1,2} Rehabilitation of edentulous sites with dental implants has had long term success with more patients considering dental implant supported prostheses as appropriate replacements for their lost dentition with marked improvements to their OHRQoL.³ A fast growing digital economy is sensitizing the urban Indian population to their dental needs with awareness to dental implants and other dental treatments.⁴ Scope of treatment with dental implants continues to be intangible due to improved economic and resource factors.⁵

Tools assessing the quality of life (QoL) have become invaluable aids to gauge patient's perception of treatment outcomes and their wider impact on the life outcomes. OHRQoL as an entity is defined as an

individual's assessment of how functional factors, psychological factors, social factors, and experience of pain/discomfort affect an individual's well being in relation to orofacial concerns.^{6,7} Various authors such as Slade and Spencer (1994), Leao and Sheiham (1996), Slade (1997), Slade et al (1998), McGrath and Bedi (2001), and Allen and Locker (2002) have developed questionnaire based tools to record patient's perception of treatment outcomes. The original OHIP 49 questionnaire developed by Locker and Miller (1994) modified later by Slade (1997) into the OHIP 14 is adapted from the WHO's framework used to classify impairments, disabilities, and handicaps. It has emerged as a highly validated and reliable tool to assess the OHRQoL and consists of 14 items organized in seven subscales namely functional limitation, physical pain, psychological discomfort, physical disability, psychological disability, social disability, and handicap. The English version of the oral health impact profile questionnaire (OHIP 14) as a psychometric tool with appropriate validation has been used in study designs of the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: arunpaul@segi.edu.my (A. Paul S), simoncmc@cmcvellore.ac.in (S. Simon S), saurabh@cmcvellore.ac.in (S. Kumar), rabinchacko@cmcvellore.ac.in (R.K. Chacko).

Indian population to measure various aspects related to oral health and also interpreted with other psychometric tools and clinical situations.⁹ The OHIP 14 has also been translated and validated in the Indian national language Hindi and Gujarati language.^{10–12} Studies exclusively pertaining to assessment of OHRQoL in patients treated with dental implants in various sub groups among the Indian population are being documented. The aim of this study was to assess the OHRQoL in patients who had received treatments with dental implants by using a validated and modified version of the OHIP 14 questionnaire through various modalities of sending the questionnaire to elicit response from the participants and to correlate the score with independent variables to help draw inference to gain better understanding of the overall success.

2. Materials and methods

All patients who had received dental implants to replace missing teeth in the Department of Dental Surgery, unit 1, Christian Medical College and hospital, Vellore, TN, India, were identified and those with adequate contact details were informed about the study and questionnaires sent based in their convenience of receipt. These patients were treated with two implant systems (Zimmer Dental, Carlsbad, CA; Nobel Biocare USA, Inc., Yorba Linda, CA) over a period of 15 years from 2002 to 2016. The original english version of the OHIP 14 questionnaire was assessed for face and content validity through a pilot study on a convenient sample ($n = 13$). The feedback provided in the survey was used to modify the latter part of each of the 14 OHIP questionnaire by replacing the words "mouth or dentures" to "after treatment with dental implants". The altered questionnaire was assessed for reliability and content validity.

Questionnaire based studies have traditionally used postal methods and face to face interviews to obtain data. Based on the convenience and accessibility of the patients a hybrid approach of sending the questionnaires through, inviting patients for a face to face interview with the principal investigator (PI) and dispensing the link to the questionnaire through email and a popular encrypted messaging service 'Whatsapp' for achieving maximum response among the study sample was employed. The questionnaires included an information sheet and informed consent. Participants in all the categories were invited for a face to face interview or call the PI in case of difficulties.

The three part questionnaire consisted of patient demographics including non dependent variables, the 14 item OHIP questionnaire, and general feedback respectively. The response strategy to the 14 item OHIP questionnaire was based on a Likert scale model with five responses each with a score: Never (1), Hardly ever (2), Occasionally (3), Fairly often (4), Very often (5). The scores were added to obtain the final value. The lowest scores represented a higher satisfactory perception of an individual's OHRQoL and vice versa. Responses were collated and analysed using appropriate tools.

3. Statistical analysis

Mean and median (Minimum-Maximum) were calculated for outcome scores. Frequencies (percentages) were analysed for the independent variables like gender, level of education, area of implant placement, type of prosthesis, total number of implants and implant experience with regards to complaints. As the scores were skewed with outcomes displaying continuous but non-normal data with constant coefficient of variation, the risk factor analysis was performed using gamma regression. $P \leq 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant. All the data were collected and entered into spreadsheets and processed using SPSS software (Version 21.0., IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of the Helsinki declaration. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee.

Table 1
Method of administering questionnaire.

Method of administering questionnaire	Response	Non Response	Total
Whatsapp	32 (84.3%)	06 (15.7%)	38 (35.51%)
Email	26 (86.6%)	04 (13.3%)	30 (28.03%)
Letter	02 (8.69%)	21 (91.3%)	23 (21.49%)
Face to face	16 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (14.95%)
Total	76 (71.02%)	31 (28.97%)	107 (100%)

4. Results

A total of 151 patients were identified as possible participants for the study out of which 107 were sent questionnaires based on the adequate reliable contact details. Validation of the modified questionnaire was achieved using Cronbachs alpha in which the reliability between the original and modified OHIP 14 questionnaire among a sample ($n = 10$) showed 73% and 63% respectively. There was also no significant difference between the sum of the original and the modified questionnaire. The mean (SD) of the original and modified were 18.10 (3.81) and 17.3(3.06) respectively ($P = 0.61$). The questionnaires were sent by post with a prepaid return envelope, and link sent through email, and 'Whatsapp'. Besides these, a few patients preferred face to face interview. The response percentage of each mode is displayed (Table 1). A total of 76 patients (females $n = 41$; males $n = 35$) responded to the questionnaire with a 71.02% participation ratio. The maximum number of implants in any one patient ranged from a maximum of 6 and minimum 1. The various sites in which implants were placed are described (Table 2). The type of prosthesis in these patients ranged from implant supported single crowns (78.95%), partial fixed prosthesis (13.16%), multiple single and partial fixed prosthesis (2.63%) and removable denture retained by implants (5.26%). A total of 72.37% of patients did not report complaints. The remaining 27.63% experienced loose crowns (14.47%), pain (6.58%), food impaction (2.63%) and caries to adjacent teeth (2.63%) with varying frequency. The mean, median and frequency was analyzed (Table 3). The reported OHIP 14 scores ranged between 14 and 30 out of a possible maximum score of 70. Higher OHIP 14 scores indicated poor OHRQoL, while lower OHIP 14 scores indicated better OHRQoL. The skewed outcome was analyzed using gamma regression. It was observed that with an increase in the number of dental implants the score of OHIP 14 decreased ($1-0.91 = 0.09$, that is 9%), which was statistically significant ($P = 0.0001$). As compared to patients with single crowns, patients with fixed dental implant based prosthesis had higher scores (1.19, that is 19%) ($P = 0.0069$). Statistically significant results were obtained in 'No complaint' subjects' with scores 9% lesser ($1-0.91 = 0.09$, that is 9%) as compared to subjects who experienced some complaints ($P = 0.0438$) (Table 4).

Table 2
Site of implant.

Site of implant	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Lower front jaw	4	5.26	4	5.26
Lower left jaw	8	10.53	12	15.79
Lower right jaw	17	22.37	29	38.16
Upper front jaw	19	25.00	48	63.16
Upper left jaw	3	3.95	51	67.11
Upper right jaw	8	10.53	59	77.63
Multiple sites	17	22.37	76	100.00

Table 3
Analysis of OHIP-14 Score.

N	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Minimum	Maximum
76	16.8421053	3.3825144	16.000000	14.000000	30.000000

Table 4
Risk Factor analyses: Outcome = Total Score (Using Gamma regression).

Variables	Estimate	SE	RR	95% CI of RR	p-value
Gender					
Male			1.00		
Female	0.02	0.04	1.02	0.94 to 1.10	0.6184
Level of Education					
Post doctoral	0.08	0.09	1.09	0.91 to 1.30	0.3675
Postgraduate	0.12	0.07	1.12	0.97 to 1.30	0.1075
Undergraduate	0.08	0.08	1.08	0.93 to 1.26	0.3245
Below higher secondary			1.00		
Area of Implant placement					
Lower	−0.13	0.07	0.88	0.77 to 1.01	0.0675
Upper	−0.12	0.07	0.89	0.77 to 1.03	0.1258
Multiple sites			1.00		
Total No of Implants	−0.09	0.02	0.91	0.87 to 0.96	0.0001
Type of Prosthesis					
Single crown			1.00		
Fixed bridge	0.17	0.06	1.19	1.05 to 1.34	0.0069
Multiple prosthesis	0.03	0.13	1.03	0.80 to 1.32	0.8445
Removable denture retained by one or more implants	0.14	0.09	1.16	0.97 to 1.37	0.0993
Implant Experience					
Have complaints			1.00		
No complaints	−0.09	0.0442	0.91	0.84 to 0.99	0.0438

5. Discussion

Studies involving tooth loss and OHRQoL have shown significant results with negative impact in individuals who had not replaced lost dentition.¹³ Mika et al have observed significant correlations between various entities of the OHIP 14 in a study to assess the association between perceived chewing ability and the OHRQoL in partially dentate patients.¹⁴ The fact that prosthodontic appliances can either be totally or be partially fixed improves assurance as compared to persisting uncertainty that exists with conventional removable prosthesis relying on adhesives and stomatognathic adaptation for retention. However, indications for dental implants are limited with regards to availability of bone, systemic status, habits, costs and skills. Studies across populations have shown that patients with implant retained or implant supported prosthesis have a better OHRQoL and an associated overall improvement in the general health as compared to patients with similar edentulous situations treated with conventional strategies.^{15, 16}

Scoring methods based on ordinal scores are prone to produce skewed results when the range of possible responses is narrow resulting in positively skewed distributions which results in the mean becoming greater than the median as was present in our study. Most biological responses take on only positive values. The normal distribution in principle assigns positive probability to all values on the real line, negative and positive whereas the gamma probability distribution

describes the probabilities with which a random variable, that is the outcome, takes on positive values. In general, the gamma regression is a model for continuous but non-normal/skewed data with constant coefficient of variation. The scores to the OHIP 14 in our study ranged from a minimum of 14 and maximum of 30. It concedes with results from similar studies among other population groups on the positive impact to the OHRQoL when dental implants are used to treat edentulous situations as compared to conventional rehabilitative approaches.^{17, 18} In the present study, 27.63% of respondents reporting complaints had a lower OHRQoL score. Treatment with dental implants have shown to achieve a high positive psychological impact over functional satisfaction in fully and partially edentulous patients.¹⁹ OHRQoL studies have been carried out in implant patients in combination with the assessment of psychological traits to help predict treatment success.²⁰ Patients with more number of implants in our study (n = 2) showed lower OHIP 14 scores as compared to patients in other categories. This outcome may have changed if more number of patients within that variable would have been among the study population and hence it could not be inferred that patients with more implants have a better OHRQoL.

The survey questionnaire is a well recognized primary data collection instrument in social, health and epidemiological research with varying modes of data collection, the method of contacting respondents, the vehicle of delivering the questionnaire, and in the way in which questions are administered. These modes may have affected the accuracy and quality of the data obtained which may be considered a limitation in this study. The average Indian populace is currently experiencing a surge in access to internet technology and associated social media. The preference of 76.31% of the respondents in this study to use internet based resources for participation is proof of a paradigm shift from earlier traditional postal techniques to disperse questionnaire which involved additional effort in man power and handling stationary though this could be considered an assumption unless verified through a meta-analysis.^{21, 22} Using the existing version of the OHIP 14 questionnaire and modifying it to evaluate the OHRQoL may be considered a limitation in this study. Future studies with implant specific OHRQoL questionnaires like the Quality of Life with Implant Prosthesis (QoLIP-10) could be attempted as responsiveness maybe improved by employing disease specific measures to detect subtle changes in specific conditions. As India is a vast country of varied ethnicity and dialects the need to translate the questionnaire to the various mainstream languages must be weighed and justified against the desired outcomes especially when studying a sample with varied backgrounds as in this study. Future studies could also include results from clinical and radiological examination as part of continuous follow-up which could help evaluate the overall success. The response rate would have improved if the entire 151 patients could have been contacted which highlighted shortcomings in data collection pertaining to patient demographics. Current trends in digital storage of patient information added with the trend of retaining constant phone numbers facilitates review and recall among dental implant patients which is pertinent for long term implant maintenance and performance. Social desirability bias of the sample population in relation to the PI who was also the primary caregiver may have directly impacted the outcomes based on patient perception, which leaves scope for future studies that may be blinded to overcome bias.

6. Conclusion

Dental implants are being more frequently considered in treatment planning at present than before in India. Outcomes of treating edentulous conditions with dental implants on function and esthetics are known. Knowledge of the impact of dental implant treatment on the overall quality of life may help these treatment modalities to be considered more often by clinicians and the benefit transferred to patients. Within limitations, our study infers a high value of assessing the impact

of treatment interventions with dental implants to the oral health related quality of life in patients. The availability of digital technology and associated social networking applications may enhance follow up and assessment. Long term assessment of the OHRQoL at regular intervals in dental implant patients may help to identify specific issues that could be improved to impart a holistic implant experience.

Conflict of interest

None.

References

- Petersen PE. Priorities for research for oral health in the 21st century-the approach of the WHO global Oral health programme. *Community Dent Health*. 2005;22:71–74.
- Locker D. Measuring oral health: a conceptual framework. *Community Dent Health*. 1988;5:3–18.
- Blomberg S, Lindquist LW. Psychological reactions to edentulousness and treatment with jawbone-anchored bridges. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 1983;68:251–262.
- Gharpure AS, Bhange PD, Gharpure AS. Awareness of dental implant treatment in an Indian metropolitan population. *J Dental Implants*. 2016;6:62–68.
- Carlsson GE. Some issues related to evidence based implantology. *J Indian Prosthodont Soc*. 2016;16:116–623.
- Inglehart MR, Bagramian RA. Oral health related quality of life: an introduction. In: Rohr Inglehart Marita, Robert Bagramian A, eds. *Oral health related quality of life*. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing; 2002:1–6.
- Naito M, Yuasa H, Nomura Y, Nakayama T, Hamajima N, Hanada N. Oral health status and health-related quality of life: a systematic review. *J Oral Sci*. 2006;48:1–7.
- Acharya S. Oral health-related quality of life and its associated factors in an Indian adult population. *Oral Health Prev Dent*. 2008;6:175–184.
- Batra M, Aggarwal VP, Shah AF, Gupta M. Validation of hindi version of oral health impact profile-14 for adults. *J Indian Assoc Public Health Dentistry*. 2015;13:469–474.
- Deshpande NC, Nawathe AA. Translation and validation of hindi version of Oral health impact profile-14. *J Indian Soc Periodontol*. 2015;19:208–210.
- Goje SK, Patel J, Kalyan P, Kulkarni N, Shah R, Modi B. Translation of English version of oral health impact profile-14 into Gujarati. *J Int Oral Health*. 2017;9:16–19.
- Gerritsen AE, Allen PF, Witter DJ, Bronkhorst EM, Creugers NH. Tooth loss and oral health-related quality of life: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Health Q Life Outcomes*. 2010;8:126–137.
- Inukai M, John MT, Igarashi Y, Baba K. Association between perceived chewing ability and oral health-related quality of life in partially dentate patients. *Health Q Life Outcomes*. 2010;8:118–124.
- Strassburger C, Kerschbaum T, Heydecke G. Influence of implant and conventional prostheses on satisfaction and quality of life: a literature review. Part 2: Qualitative analysis and evaluation of the studies. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2006;19:339–348.
- Swelem AA, Gurevich KG, Fabrikant EG, Hassan MH, Aqou S. Oral health-related quality of life in partially edentulous patients treated with removable, fixed, fixed-removable, and implant-supported prostheses. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2014;27:338–347.
- Nickenig HJ, Wichmann M, Andreas SK, Eitner S. Oral health-related quality of life in partially edentulous patients: assessments before and after implant therapy. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. 2008;36:477–480.
- AlZarea BK. Oral health related quality-of-life outcomes of partially edentulous patients treated with implant-supported single crowns or fixed partial dentures. *J Clin Exp Dent*. 2017;9:e666–e671.
- Eitner S, Wichmann M, Schlegel KA, Kollmannsberger JE, Nickenig HJ. Oral health-related quality of life and implant therapy: an evaluation of preoperative, intermediate, and post-treatment assessments of patients and physicians. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. 2012;40:20–23.
- Ra'ed Omar AH, Mahmoud Khalid AO, Ahed Mahmoud AW. Psychological impact on implant patients' oral health-related quality of life. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2006;17:116–123.
- Kongsved SM, Basnov M, Holm-Christensen K, Hjøllund NH. Response rate and completeness of questionnaires: a randomized study of internet versus paper-and-pencil versions. *J Med Internet Res*. 2007;9:e25.
- Horevoorts NJ, Vissers PA, Mols F, Thong MS, van de Poll-Franse LV. Response rates for patient-reported outcomes using web-based versus paper questionnaires: comparison of two invitational methods in older colorectal cancer patients. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17:e111.