

Effectiveness of Oral Health Education Intervention Strategies Among 12-15-Year-Old School Children in Dharan, Nepal: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Krishna Subedi (✉ idebusanhsirk.ks@gmail.com)

Pokhara Academy of Health Sciences <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5409-1751>

Ashish Shrestha

BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences

Tarakant Bhagat

BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences

Dharanidhar Baral

BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences

Research article

Keywords: Effectiveness, Oral health education, Schoolchildren

Posted Date: September 9th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-56726/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: School aged adolescents are in particular need of preventive program to ensure positive long-term oral health and hygiene. However, due to lack of health education and insufficient preventive measures, the oral health status of these students is not always good resulting in high morbidity. The objective of this study was to assess the effectiveness of an oral health education intervention on oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP), plaque control and gingival health among 12-15 years old school children in Dharan sub-metropolitan city, Nepal.

Methods: A randomized controlled trial was conducted with parallel study groups, comprising 12-15-year-old school children, 120 in each group (experimental and control group). Interview of the participants were done using a 23-item questionnaire for assessment of oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP). Oral examination was done using mouth mirror and WHO probe to record Turesky-Gilmore-Glickman modification of the Quigley-Hein plaque index (1970), Gingival index (Loe H and Silness J 1963) and Dentition status and treatment needs at baseline and third and sixth months of the study period. Analysis was done using chi-square test for categorical data and Independent t test, repeated ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis test, Friedman test, Mann-Whitney U test for quantitative data. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results: There was 54.58% improvement in overall oral hygiene KAP in experimental group ($p = 0.001$) whereas no improvement was seen in control group after 6 months of intervention. The mean plaque score was improved by 57.67% ($p = 0.001$) in experimental group in comparison to 4.56% in control group. Gingival index was improved by 49.90% ($p = 0.001$) in experimental group in comparison to 0.7% ($p = 0.05$) in control group. Caries experience was increased in both groups but no significant difference was seen.

Conclusions: The study concluded that oral health education was effective in improving oral hygiene KAP, plaque control and gingival health.

Trial registration: The trial was retrospectively registered with Clinical Trial Registry India (CTRI) with identifier no. CTRI/2018/05/013985, registered on 05/21/2018. (http://www.ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pdf_generate.php?trialid=23651&EncHid=&modid=&compid=%27,%2723651det%27). Institutional Review Committee, B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences (BPKIHS), Dharan, Nepal provided the ethical approval (Ref. No.: 292/074/075-IRC).

Background

The worldwide prevalence of dental disease is a constant reminder of the universal need for effective dental health education programs [1]. World Health Organization (WHO) reports 70–95% of school-aged children have experienced dental caries in South-East Asia [2]. Health education is a key strategy in the process of acquisition of behaviors that promote and maintain health(3). Mastrantonio and Garcia point out that it is possible to transform negative attitudes into healthy habits to the population through

education [3]. Adolescence is a window of opportunity to intervene early for preventing the initiation of risk behaviors as well as influencing adherence to healthy behaviors that last throughout life [3]. Oral health education and promotion is critical in this period, which enable the teenagers to make a healthy transition to adulthood [3]. Oral health is indispensable to general health and quality of life [4, 5]. Oral health is multifaceted and includes the ability to speak, smile, smell, taste, touch, chew, swallow, and convey a range of emotions through facial expressions with confidence and without pain, discomfort, and disease of the craniofacial complex [6].

Few aspects of health which are accessible to personal control such as oral hygiene, can be improved by simple behavioral changes. The objective of Oral health education (OHE) program is to improve the knowledge and oral hygiene status of the participants which would have obvious merits. As a result of OHE, there has been improvement of self-reported oral health related practices and behavior as well as clinical parameters of oral health such as oral hygiene, gingival health and dental caries [7].

Many of the oral diseases in the advanced stages lead to pain, discomfort and handicap. In a cross-sectional survey of 106 schools in different parts of Nepal, 45% of 4770 school children from age 8 to 14 years experienced toothache. Major impact included inability to eat (61%) loss of sleep (14%), financial burden (7%), inability to play (6%), missed school (5%), inability to do homework (2%) and all the above (6%) [8].

About 37 percent of the total population of Nepal is in between 5 to 14 years, and out of them nearly 92% children are enrolled in school [9]. The 2004 National Pathfinder Survey of Nepal showed that 41% of 12–13 years old schoolchildren suffer from dental caries with mean DMFT of 1.1 [8]. Prevalence of dental caries among public school children in eastern Nepal is 60.30% in primary dentition and 55.6% in permanent dentition [10]. A study in eastern Nepal found fair plaque control in 62.3% and poor plaque control in 37.7% in 10–13 years school children. It concluded that a community based oral health intervention program was necessary [11].

Oral health education and promotion can be delivered at different forums like hospitals, primary health care centers, private dental clinics, school, etc. [7]. However, schools are perhaps the best place for promoting oral health because schools form an ideal setting by offering an efficient and effective way to reach over 1 billion children worldwide and through them, their families as well as communities [4, 5, 7]. School based approach seems to be more productive in delivering preventive and curative services as compared to community-based approach. Perhaps, school aged adolescents are in particular need of preventive program to ensure positive long-term oral health and hygiene. However, due to lack of health education and insufficient preventive measures, there is high prevalence of morbidity and the health status of these students is not always good [7]. Children who are suffering from poor oral health are 12 times most likely to have restricted daily activities including missing schools as compared to those who have good oral health [4, 5, 7]. Due to this poor oral health, more than 50 million school hours are lost annually which could lead to negative impact on the long-term performances of children at school and success in future [4, 5, 7].

In recent years, attention has been drawn toward assessing the effectiveness of oral health education programs. This is in line with demand for evidence-based research and will help to inform policy makers on how to allocate resources. A number of systematic reviews have been conducted on the available evidence. These have shown that oral health education can be effective in increasing knowledge in the short term and to some extent, behavior such as tooth brushing and healthy eating [12]. However, no such studies have been done in Nepal.

To the best of our knowledge no such educational intervention studies have been done till now in Nepal. In a country like Nepal where majority of people who are unaware and inaccessible to oro-dental care, there is strong and urgent need of oral health education intervention which will reduce mortality and morbidity. The objective of this study was to assess the effectiveness of an oral health education intervention on oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP), plaque control and gingival health among 12–15 years old school children in Dharan sub-metropolitan city, Nepal.

Null hypothesis

Oral health education is not effective in improving oral hygiene KAP, plaque control and gingival health among 12-15 years old school children.

Methods

Trial design and study participants

This trial was a randomized controlled concurrent parallel trial conducted from October 2017 to September 2018. Children belonging to 12-15-year-old age group studying in grade 8 and 9 in public and private schools of Dharan sub-metropolitan city, Nepal were included in the study.

Ethical considerations and trial registration

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Committee, B.P.Koirala Institute of Health Sciences (BPKIHS), Dharan (Ref. No.: 292/074/075-IRC and Code No: IRC/1086/017). Approval was also obtained from Thesis Protocol Evaluation Committee of BPKIHS, Dharan (Ref. No.: Acd/978/074/075). The study was registered as a clinical trial (www.ctri.nic.in) in the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)- National Institute of medical Statistics; the Clinical Trial Registry India identifier no. CTRI/2018/05/013985

([http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/rmaindet.php?](http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/rmaindet.php?trialid=23651&EncHid=57035.73346&modid=1&compid=19)

[trialid=23651&EncHid=57035.73346&modid=1&compid=19](http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/rmaindet.php?trialid=23651&EncHid=57035.73346&modid=1&compid=19)). Official permission was obtained from the Dharan sub-metropolitan city and the concerned school authorities before commencing the study. A written informed consent was obtained from all parents of the study participants and assent from each child.

Eligibility Criteria:

Secondary schools providing co-education and cooperative 12-15 years old school children studying in grade 8 and 9 whose parents gave their written informed consent and children who provided the assent were included in this study. Children with any systemic disease, requiring any emergency dental treatment, with orthodontic appliances and involved in similar other studies were excluded.

Randomization: Total 18 public schools and 42 private schools of Dharan sub-metropolitan city met the inclusion criteria. After getting verbal permission from the principals of the schools, 4 public and 8 private schools (20% of total) were randomly selected using lottery method, by an assistant who was not participating in the field study. A randomization master list was prepared based on computer generated random numbers and each school was assigned to a group (Group 1, Group 2) by a biostatistician. Allocation concealment were done using opaque envelope methods.

Selection of participants in experimental and control group:

Systematic random sampling was done to include the students from the schools in each study group. Number of students from type of schools (public or private) and each school was selected on the basis of population proportion ratio.

Assessment at baseline and follow up period:

Baseline assessment was done in January-February 2018, second and third assessment was done in April-May and August 2018 respectively. On each visit oral health education was given as intervention for experimental group.

Sample Size:

This study considered (95% CI) and 80% power to estimate the sample size. For this purpose, mean \pm SD (gingival index) value of intervention group (2A) 0.78 \pm 0.42 and mean \pm SD value of control group (1B) 0.94 \pm 0.3822 respectively were taken. Therefore, mean of control group (μ_1) = 0.94, mean of intervention group (μ_2)=0.78 and average standard deviation of control and intervention group ($\bar{\sigma}$)=0.40 [13].Using following formula, Sample Size (n)= $(2 \bar{\sigma}^2 (z_{\alpha/2}+z_{\beta/2})^2)/(\mu_1-\mu_2)^2$, the sample size was calculated as 98. Considering 20% attrition rate total sample size was increased to 120 in each group.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained pretested standardized closed ended questions which were selected from previous researches (Annexure 1). Face and content validity of the structured questionnaire was done by three subject experts. A 23-item questionnaire was translated and validated in Nepali language (local language) through standard back translation method.

Face to face interview of the participants were done by the single investigator (KS). Time taken for each interview was 4-5 minutes. Demographic variables included age, gender, grade, type of school (public or private) and socioeconomic status (SES). SES was calculated using Kuppuswamy scale and classified

as per the modifications done in the year 2009 (Ghosh and Ghosh, 2009) [14] using current consumer price index for the year 2017. The current consumer price index was obtained online from Nepal Rastra Bank website (Nepal RB 2017) and the conversion factor was calculated (Conversion factor = consumer price index 2017 divided by consumer price index of 1976) [15]. The computed conversion factor was 26.7 (114.8/4.3). For simplicity, SES was categorized into upper (26-29), middle (11-25) and lower ($\leq 5-10$) class.

Clinical Examination

A pilot study was conducted among 25 participants of similar school children with similar age, grade and socioeconomic status, who were not involved in the main study, for training and calibration of the examiner, feasibility assessment of the study and the reliability of questions.

All children were examined at their schools, lying on a bench with the examiner seated behind the subject's head, under artificial light. Oral examination was carried out by using sterilized instruments including mouth mirror, WHO probe and disposable gloves. Oral examinations were done to record Turesky-Gilmore-Glickman modification of the Quigley-Hein plaque index (1970), Gingival index (Loe H and Silness J 1963) and Dentition status and treatment needs at baseline and 3rd and 6th months of the study period.

Duplicate examinations were performed among 25 participants during the study to test the intra-examiner reliability which was measured by interclass correlation coefficient (ICC).

Intervention:

Oral health education included topics like importance of teeth, type of dentition, brushing and flossing techniques and dental caries – its etiology, signs and symptoms, complications, preventive methods, the role of fluorides, plaque and calculus and its effect in gingival and periodontal health, diet and nutrition, importance of oral health to general health. OHE using tooth models and PowerPoint presentation was given to 12-15 children in a single session to the experimental group.

No OHE was given to the control group. In the experimental group, reinforcement of OHE was done at the 3rd and 6th months. To avoid contamination, only one group (either control or experimental) was included from one school. After completion of study (after 6 months) OHE was given to the control group. During first and second follow up time maximum 3 visits to every schools was done to include the maximum number of children. Those children who were not present during examination at follow up periods were considered as missing.

Evaluation of intervention:

Intervention was evaluated by assessing the improvements in oral hygiene knowledge, practice and attitude (correct answers) and changes in plaque and gingival scores in experimental group compared with the control group.

Overall oral hygiene knowledge, practice and attitude assessment:

Each of the 23 multiple choice questions had a single correct answer. All questions had a binary outcome which was coded as one for correct and zero for incorrect. Every correct answer in baseline, 3 and 6 months after intervention was scored as 1 and wrong answers were scored zero. An overall composite score was then created, by adding the individual scores on each question. The highest possible score for oral health knowledge was 11 for each individual. The highest possible score for oral health practices and attitude were 8 and 4 respectively. The highest possible overall score for oral hygiene KAP was 23. The mean score was then calculated for each group and then compared. The percentage change was calculated by subtracting the pre-test percentage from the post-test percentage [$100 \times (\text{baseline mean score} - \text{6 months score}) / \text{baseline score}$]

Outcomes:

The primary outcome measures were change in mean score of oral hygiene KAP, plaque control, gingival health and dentition status and treatment need after intervention at 3 and 6 months in experimental and control group.

Blinding:

Coding was given as 1 and 2 to the 2 different groups. It was not revealed during the data entry time and analysis time. The two groups 1 and 2 were revealed as control and experimental respectively only after completing the analysis.

Statistical Analysis:

After completion of the trial, data obtained were entered in Microsoft Excel Sheet version 2007 and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 11.5). The level of significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$. Intra-examiner reproducibility for coding was measured by intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC).

Descriptive analysis was performed to summarize the clinical and socio-demographic characteristics of each group at baseline in order to assess how comparable the groups were at beginning of the study. Descriptive statistics including the mean and standard deviations were computed for oral hygiene KAP, plaque index (PI), gingival index (GI) and DMFT. Frequency of dentition status and treatment needs were assessed.

Chi-square test was used to find the significance of study characteristics on categorical scale. Repeated-measures ANOVA was used to find the significance of oral hygiene knowledge, practice and attitude, plaque index and gingival index scores among the three groups at baseline, 3 and 6 months respectively. Independent t test was used to find the pairwise significance between the groups regarding oral hygiene KAP, plaque index and gingival index scores. Friedman test was used to find the significance of mean

DMFT at baseline, 3 and 6 months. Mann-Whitney u test was used to find the pairwise significance between 2 groups regarding mean DMFT.

Results

During the study intra-examiner reproducibility was assessed among 25 randomly selected participants by doing duplicate examination. While using intra-class correlation coefficient intra-examiner reliability for GI was 0.98 and 0.91 for PI.

There were total of 240 school children (120 male and 120 female) allocated into two groups with a mean age of 14.25 ± 0.73 years. Figure 1 presents the CONSORT flow diagram tracking subject participation for the entire study. The dropout rate was 17.5% for experimental and 14.16% for control groups. Ninety-nine from experimental and 103 from control groups completed the study.

Overall, 49.5% male and 50.5% female completed the study with mean age of 14.39 ± 0.65 and 14.11 ± 0.79 in experimental and control group respectively. Gender ($P = 0.78$), grade (0.47) and type of school ($P = 0.60$) did not show any significant differences in both the groups. More number of school children belonged to medium socioeconomic status ($P = 0.009$) and 14–15 age groups ($P = 0.02$) in experimental group as compared to control group (Table 1).

Table 1
Distribution of children according to demographic characteristics (N = 202)

Age in years	Experimental group N (%)	Control group N (%)	Pearson chi-square	P value
Mean age	14.39 ± 0.65	14.11 ± 0.79		
12–13	9 (9.1%)	21 (20.4%)	5.09	0.02
14–15	90(90.9%)	82(79.6%)		
Total	99(100%)	103(100%)		
Gender				
Male	50(50.5%)	50(48.5%)	0.07	0.78
Female	49(49.5%)	53(51.5%)		
Total	99(100%)	103(100%)		
Grade				
8	54(54.5%)	51(47.6%)	0.51	0.47
9	45(45.5%)	52(52.4%)		
Total	99(100%)	103(100%)		
Socioeconomic status				
Low	32(32.3%)	52(50.5%)	6.85	0.009
Medium	67(67.7%)	51(48.5%)		
Total	99(100%)	103(100%)		
Type of School				
Public	42 (42.4%)	40(38.8%)	0.27	0.60
Private	57(57.6%)	63(61.2%)		
Total	99(100%)	103(100%)		

Table 2 shows the intragroup and intergroup comparison of oral hygiene knowledge, practices, attitude and overall oral hygiene KAP in 2 groups (experimental and control group). There were no significant differences between 2 groups regarding oral hygiene knowledge, practices, attitude and overall oral hygiene KAP at the baseline. However, the intergroup comparison showed the significant improvements in the experimental group at 3 and 6 months except the oral hygiene attitude at 3 months. Oral hygiene attitude was improved at 3 months in experimental group but not statistically significant (P = 0.130). But it was found to be statistically significant at 6 months (P = 0.001). Regarding oral hygiene knowledge,

intragroup comparison showed that there were 77.51% improvement in experimental group (P = 0.001) and 6.6% improvement in the control group (P = 0.107) at the end of 6 months. Regarding intragroup comparison of oral hygiene practice, 31.87% improvement was seen in experimental group and 7.82% reduction in control group. Oral hygiene attitude was improved by 35.93% in experimental group and decreased by 4.94% in control group at 6 months. The overall oral hygiene KAP was improved by 54.58% in experimental group whereas it was found almost similar to the baseline in control group at 6 months.

Table 2

Intragroup and intergroup comparisons of knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) regarding on oral hygiene in control and experimental group at baseline, 3 and 6 months after intervention (N = 202)

Mean oral hygiene knowledge	Experimental group (Mean \pm SD)	Control Group (Mean \pm SD)	T value	p# value
Baseline	5.47 \pm 1.80	5.75 \pm 2.0	1.015	0.312
3 months	8.47 \pm 1.52	6.07 \pm 1.78	-10.263	0.001
6 months	9.71 \pm 1.10	6.13 \pm 1.71	-17.748	0.001
F value	253.689	2.302		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.107		
% change	77.51	6.6		
Mean oral hygiene practice				
Baseline	3.42 \pm 1.34	3.45 \pm 1.144	0.127	0.899
3 months	4.34 \pm 1.45	3.46 \pm 1.15	-4.799	0.001
6 months	4.51 \pm 1.03	3.18 \pm 1.31	-7.926	0.001
F value	32.215	2.254		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.108		
% change	31.87	-7.82		
Mean oral hygiene attitude				
Baseline	2.56 \pm 0.84	2.63 \pm 0.86	0.627	0.531
3 months	2.89 \pm 0.79	2.72 \pm 0.79	-1.522	0.130
6 months	3.48 \pm 0.69	2.50 \pm 0.79	-9.368	0.001
F value	47.375	3.291		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.039		
% change	35.93	-4.94		
Overall oral hygiene KAP				
Baseline	11.45 \pm 2.52	11.83 \pm 2.80	0.325	0.371
3 months	15.72 \pm 2.48	12.24 \pm 2.55	-9.790	0.001
6 months	17.70 \pm 2.03	11.82 \pm 2.70	-17.520	0.001

- Independent t test Δ - Repeated ANOVA

Mean oral hygiene knowledge	Experimental group (Mean ± SD)	Control Group (Mean ± SD)	T value	p# value
F value	286.823	1.472		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.232		
% change	54.58	-0.084		
# - Independent t test Δ - Repeated ANOVA				

Table 3 showed that there were no significant differences in mean plaque scores at baseline between experimental and control group. Intergroup comparison showed that it was significantly improved in experimental group at 3 and 6 months compared to control group. Intragroup comparison showed that it was significantly improved in both group at 6 months. It was 57.67% improvement in experimental group and 4.56% improvement in control group at 6 months.

Table 3
Intragroup and intergroup comparisons of mean plaque index scores in control and experimental group (N = 202)

Mean plaque index scores	Experimental group (Mean ± SD)	Control group (Mean ± SD)	T value	p# value
Baseline	2.15 ± 0.52	2.19 ± 0.41	0.493	0.622
3 months	1.44 ± 0.46	2.23 ± 0.49	11.687	0.001
6 months	0.91 ± 0.40	2.09 ± 0.53	17.558	0.001
F value	275.518	3.732		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.026		
% change	57.67	4.56		
# - Independent t test Δ - Repeated ANOVA				

Table 4 showed that there were no significant differences in GI at the baseline between experimental and control group. Intergroup comparison showed that it was significantly improved at 3 and 6 months in experimental group. Intragroup comparison showed that significant improvement in mean GI scores at 6 months in experimental group. There was 40.90% significant improvement in mean GI in the experimental group and only 0.7% improvement in the control group.

Table 4
Intragroup and intergroup Comparisons of mean Gingival Index (GI) scores between control and experimental group (N = 202)

	Experimental group GI score (Mean ± SD)	Control group GI score (Mean ± SD)	T value	P# value
Baseline	1.32 ± 0.25	1.36 ± 0.21	1.192	0.235
3 months	0.86 ± 0.30	1.30 ± 0.26	11.123	0.001
6 months	0.78 ± 0.31	1.35 ± 0.22	14.793	0.001
F value	190.801	2.948		
P ^Δ value	0.001	0.05		
% change	40.90	0.7		
# - Independent t test Δ - Repeated ANOVA				

Table 5 showed that there was no significant difference in mean DMFT between experimental and control group at the baseline 3 and 6 months. Intragroup comparison showed that it was significantly increased overtime in both groups. It was more in control group (142.39%) than experimental group (98.71%) over a period of 6 months.

Table 5
Mean DMFT at baseline, 3 months and 6 months after intervention in control and experimental group (N = 202)

Group	Baseline Mean ± SD	3 months Mean ± SD	6 months Mean ± SD	P [□] value	% change
Experimental group	0.78 ± 1.41	1.41 ± 2.45	1.55 ± 2.87	0.001	98.71
Control	0.92 ± 1.52	1.80 ± 3.55	2.23 ± 4.27	0.001	142.39
U value	4792.00	4906.00	4633.50		
P [⊠]	0.413	0.623	0.237		
⊠ - Friedman test ⊠ - Mann-Whitney U test					

Discussion

School is an ideal place for developing oral hygiene and health programs for children which is favorable for adopting preventive measures [16]. Health education plays a vital role in adopting healthy behaviors to improve awareness and for motivation to maintain good oral health [17]. However, oral health behavior is a result of lifelong learning process which can be achieved by multidisciplinary collaboration among

dentists and professionals in other areas, such as psychologists and teachers [16]. A systematic and structured approach of oral care for school children result in good oral health which is economically advantageous for the society [16]. In this study 12-15-year-old school children were taken as study population because it is likely that by this age all the permanent teeth except the third molars will have erupted. Therefore, age 12 years has been a global indicator for comparisons and surveillance of disease trends at international level [18, 19]. Proper use of a toothbrush requires a certain degree of dexterity and skill. Nonetheless, children as young as 11 years of age have the ability to brush effectively [20]. It was expected that at this age student can clearly understand the subject being taught to them. They have enough manual dexterity to master the proper technique of brushing [21]. They are in the very influential stages of life; the habits, beliefs, skills and attitudes that have developed would tend to last longer [22]. A study conducted by Ingle et al found that eight years old children are not appropriate group to start with oral health education intervention as they could not follow the oral hygiene instructions properly [23].

The results showed that oral hygiene knowledge was increased by 77.51% in experimental group ($p = 0.001$) and 6.6% in control group ($p = 0.107$) when compared to baseline. It was almost similar to the study done by Rajesh et al. [24] where oral hygiene knowledge was increased by 57.25% vs 0.80% in computer method of oral education vs control group at 3 months. In Walsh study [25] dental health knowledge was increased by 44.80% vs 5.49% in experimental and control group. A study conducted by Haque et al. [7] found that oral health knowledge was increased from 19.3% (baseline) to 75.9% ($p \leq 0.001$) at 6 months after intervention. Similarly, the oral health knowledge was increased after intervention in experimental group in the studies conducted by Al Saffan et al. [26] and D'Cruz et al [27]. Oral hygiene attitude and practices was improved by 35.5% ($p = 0.001$) and 31.87% ($p = 0.001$) respectively in experimental group whereas it was decreased by 4.94% ($p = 0.039$) and 7.82% ($p = 0.108$) in control group. The findings of this study were in accordance with the study conducted by Haque et al. [7] where oral health attitude and practices was increased by 43.1% ($p \leq 0.001$) and 36.2% ($p \leq 0.001$) respectively in the intervention group after 6 months. Similarly, the oral health attitude and practices were significantly increased in the study conducted by Sanadhya et al. [28] after intervention. The overall oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices was increased by 54.58% in experimental group ($p = 0.001$) and almost no change in control group ($p = 0.232$).

There were 57.67% reduction ($p = 0.001$) in mean plaque index scores in experimental group and 4.56% reduction ($p = 0.026$) in control group. These findings were found to be in accordance with the studies done by Shahapur et al. [21], Lakshmi et al. [29], Worthington et al. [30], Gauba et al. [31], Redmond et al. [32], Sharma et al. [33] and Ajithkrishnan et al. [34] where significant reduction in mean plaque levels was reported after intervention. In contrast to this study Frencken et al. [35] and Palenstein et al. [36] found no significant reduction in plaque scores after intervention.

Ganesh et al. [37] reported reduction of 17.5% mean plaque level and 27.8% mean GI ($p \leq 0.001$) after 4 weeks of intervention. In a study by Bhardwaj et al. [38] mean plaque and gingival score decreased significantly after intervention irrespective of gender in 12- and 15-years old school children. Damle et al.

[39] reported that mean PI and GI was significantly improved after 3 months intervention in 12-15-year-old school children.

There were 40.90% reduction ($p = 0.001$) in mean gingival index in experimental group and 0.7% reduction ($p = 0.05$) in control group after 6 months of oral health education. These findings were found to be in accordance with the studies done by De Farias et al. [16], Gauba et al. [31] and Sharma et al. [33] where significant reduction in mean GI score was reported after intervention. In contrast to this study Ajithkrishnan et al. [34] found no significant reduction in gingival scores after intervention.

The present study did not show any significant changes in mean DMFT in between and among the groups. The percentage increase in mean DMFT was higher in control group (142.39%) as compared to experimental group (98.71%). It was similar to study conducted by Vanobbergen et al. [40] where mean DMFT was found to be higher in the control group but not significantly different. A study conducted by Frencken et al. [35] reported that mean caries increment in experimental (0.04) and control group (0.19) was not found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.06$) over a period of 3.5 years. Sharma et al. [33] and Palenstein et al. [36] also reported similar findings. In contrast to this study Hausen et al. [41] found mean DMFS increments were significantly lower for experimental group than control group after average follow up of 3.4 years. Reason for this difference may be due to longer duration of their study and provision of patient-centered regimen for caries control.

Improvement in oral hygiene knowledge and plaque scores seen in control group. This may have occurred as a result of Hawthorne effect [16, 27, 42]. Hawthorne effect is a form of reactivity whereby subjects improve an aspect of their behavior being studied, and not in response to any particular experimental manipulation [42]. These changes may have occurred because of interest of some children to gain knowledge about various aspects of oral health through varied sources [27, 42]. The mere presence of dentist in the school and possibility of greater attention provided to the students and a questionnaire likely to have some influence in motivating for better self-care [16, 27].

Strengths And Limitations

Random sampling technique for selection of school and children is the strength of the study which accounts for representativeness and generalizability of the study among school children of Dharan, Nepal.

Since examiner was not blinded observational bias might have occurred. No environmental factors and lifestyle changes were advocated. Inherent bias i.e. over-reporting of favorable behaviors (related to oral hygiene practices) can be expected.

Conclusions

This study concluded that school based oral health education is effective in improving oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices that leads to better plaque control and better improvement in the

gingival health. Repetition and reinforcement of oral health education program plays a key role in sustainability of oral health behavior.

Recommendations

The study showed the effectiveness of oral health education program in improving oral hygiene knowledge, attitude and practices, plaque control level and better gingival health in school children of Dharan, Nepal. A further large-scale trials with longer duration of the study should be conducted throughout the country to confirm the findings of this study. School based oral health education program is easy to organize and inexpensive which can improve the oral hygiene cleanliness and gingival health among school children. Such oral health education intervention programs should be included in the academic curriculum of the school which would be effective in developing country like Nepal.

Abbreviations

ANVOA Analysis of Variance

BPKIHS B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences

CI Confidence Interval

CTRI Clinical Trial Registry India

DMFT Decayed Missing Filled Tooth

DMFS Decayed Missing Filled Surface

GI Gingival Index

ICC Intraclass correlation coefficient

KAP Knowledge Attitude and Practice

OHE Oral Health Education

PI Plaque Index

SD Standard Deviation

SES Socioeconomic Status

SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences

WHO World Health Organization

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Committee, B.P.Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal (Ref. No.: 292/074/075-IRC and Code No: IRC/1086/017). Approval was also obtained from Thesis Protocol Evaluation Committee of BPKIHS, Dharan (Ref. No.: Acd/978/074/075). The study was registered as a clinical trial (www.ctri.nic.in) in the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)- National Institute of medical Statistics; the Clinical Trial Registry India identifier no. CTRI/2018/05/013985. It was retrospectively registered on 05/21/2018.

http://www.ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pdf_generate.php?

[trialid=23651&EncHid=&modid=&compid=%27,%2723651det%27](http://www.ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pdf_generate.php?trialid=23651&EncHid=&modid=&compid=%27,%2723651det%27). Official permission was obtained from the Dharan sub-metropolitan city and the concerned school authorities before commencing the study. A written informed consent was obtained from all parents of the study participants and assent from each child.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Funding: There was no funding to support this study.

Author's contributions

KS was a principal investigator and a major contribution in conceptual framework, data collection, data entry, manuscript writing and literature search. AS was a co-investigator assisted in selection of title, conceptual framework, design of study and manuscript writing. TKB was a co-investigator assisted in selection of title, conceptual framework, design of study and manuscript writing. DDB was a co-investigator and a major contributor in statistics. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This work could not have been successful without the invaluable help from my senior Dr. Santosh Kumari Agrawal (Assistant Professor), colleagues Dr. Abanish Singh, Dr. Ujwal Gautam, Dr. Sudeep Subedi, Dr. Aashma Sapkota, Dr. Naresh Prasad Joshi and Dr. Resham Koirala.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all the participants without whom my research work would not have been completed.

Authors' information

Affiliations

Dental Department, Pokhara Academy of Health Sciences, Kaski, Pokhara

Dr. Krishna Subedi (Public Health Dentist)

Department of Public Health Dentistry, College of Dental Surgery

B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal

Professor Dr. Ashish Shrestha (Head of Department) and Dr. Tarakant Bhagat (Associate Professor)

School of Public Health and Community Medicine

B. P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal

Dharanidhar Baral (Assistant professor)

References

1. World Health Organization. Dental health education: report of a WHO Expert Committee [meeting held in Geneva from 2 to 8 December 1969]. World Health Organization; 1970.
http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/38209/1/WHO_TRS_449.pdf. Accessed Dec 4, 2016.
2. World Health Organization. Strategy for oral health in South-East Asia, 2013–2020. World Health Organization Regional Office for South-East Asia, 2013.
http://origin.searo.who.int/nepal/mediacentre/2013_strategy_for_oral_health.pdf. Accessed Dec 4 2016.
3. Bica I, Cunha M, Reis M, Costa P, Costa J, Albuquerque C. Educational Intervention for Oral Health. *Procedia - Soc Behav Sci*. 2015 Jan;171:613–9.
4. Kwan SYL, Petersen PE, Pine CM, Borutta A. Health-promoting schools: an opportunity for oral health promotion. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2005;9.
5. WHO . WHO information series on school health, Doc 11: Oral health promotion through schools. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003. :69.
6. Glick M, Williams DM, Kleinman DV, Vujicic M, Watt RG, Weyant RJ. A new definition for oral health developed by the FDI World Dental Federation opens the door to a universal definition of oral health. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2017 Feb;151(2):229–31.

7. Haque SE, Rahman M, Itsuko K, Mutahara M, Kayako S, Tsutsumi A, et al. Effect of a school-based oral health education in preventing untreated dental caries and increasing knowledge, attitude, and practices among adolescents in Bangladesh. *BMC Oral Health*. 2016 Dec;16(1):44.
8. National oral health policy. 2004. healthlinknepal.org/uploads/files/National%20Oral%20Health%20Policy.pdf. Accessed Dec 7, 2016.
9. 2017 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: Nepal. <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5bd05ae00.pdf>. Accessed Dec 8, 2017. 2017;9.
10. Bhagat T, Shrestha A. Prevalence of dental caries among public school children in the Eastern Nepal. *J Chitwan Med Coll*. 2014 Jul 30;4(1):30-2. *J Chitwan Med Coll*. 2014;3.
11. Kumr A, Singh VP. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Oral Hygiene in Children of Eastern Nepal. *IOSR J Dent Med Sci*. 2014;13(6):93–9.
12. Nakre P, Harikiran A. Effectiveness of oral health education programs: A systematic review. *J Int Soc Prev Community Dent*. 2013;3(2):103.
13. Shenoy RP, Sequeira PS. Effectiveness of a school dental education program in improving oral health knowledge and oral hygiene practices and status of 12-to 13-year-old school children. *Indian J. Dent. Res*. 2010 Apr 1;21(2):253.
14. Ghosh A, Ghosh T. Modification of Kuppuswamy's Socioeconomic Status Scale in context to Nepal. *Indian Pediatrics*. 2009 Dec;46(12):1104.
15. Nepal RB 2017. Nepal Rastra Bank. Recent Macroeconomic and financial Situation. Research department, Statistics Division, Kathmandu, Nepal. <https://nrb.org.np/ofg/current.../CME%20Nine%20Months%20Tables%202073-74.xlsx>. Accessed Feb 4 2017.
16. De Farias IA, De Araújo Souza GC, Ferreira MÃF. A Health Education Program for Brazilian Public Schoolchildren: The Effects on Dental Health Practice and Oral Health Awareness. *J Public Health Dent*. 2009 Sep;69(4):225–30.
17. Ramesh Kumar S, Aswath Narayanan M, Jayanthi D. Comparison of oral hygiene status before and after health education among 12–18-year-old patients. *J Indian Assoc Public Health Dent*. 2016;14(2):121.
18. Vangipuram S, Jha A, Raju R, Bashyam M. Effectiveness of peer group and conventional method (dentist) of oral health education programme among 12-15 year old school children-a randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Diagn Res*. 2016 May;10(5):ZC125
19. World Health Organization. Oral health surveys: basic methods. 5th edition. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013. 125 p.
20. Ramsay DS. Patient compliance with oral hygiene regimens: A behavioural self-regulation analysis with implications for technology. *Int Dent J*. 2000 Dec;50(S6_Part1):304–11.
21. Shahapur RP, Shahapur PR. Evaluation of Oral Health Education Intervention on Oral Hygiene Status Among High School Students. *International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences*. 2013 Apr;4(2):39-44.

22. Srivastava R, Murali R, Shamala A, Yalamalli M, Kumar Av. Effectiveness of two oral health education intervention strategies among 12-year-old school children in North Bengaluru: A field trial. *J Indian Assoc Public Health Dent*. 2016;14(2):126.
23. Ingle NA, Reddy VC, Chaly PE, Priyadarshni VI. Effect of short oral health education intervention on oral hygiene of 8-10 years old school children, Maduravoyal, Chennai. *J. Indian Assoc. Public Health Dent*. 2011 Oct 1;9(18):321.
24. Rajesh G, Prasad KV, Mohanty VR, Javali SB. Effect of various methods of oral health education on oral health knowledge and oral health status of high school children in Gadag town-A randomized control trial. *J. Indian Assoc. Public Health Dent*. 2008 Jan 1;6(11):22.
25. Walsh MM. Effects of school-based dental health education on knowledge, attitudes and behavior of adolescents in San Francisco. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 1985 Jun;13(3):143–7.
26. Al Saffan A, Baseer M, Alshammary A, Assery M, Kamel A, Rahman G. Impact of oral health education on oral health knowledge of private school children in Riyadh city, Saudi Arabia. *J Int Soc Prev Community Dent*. 2017;7(9):186.
27. D’Cruz A, Aradhya S. Impact of oral health education on oral hygiene knowledge, practices, plaque control and gingival health of 13- to 15-year-old school children in Bangalore city. *Int J Dent Hyg*. 2013 May;11(2):126–33.
28. Sanadhya YK, Thakkar JP, Divakar DD, Pareek S, Rathore K, Ganta S, et al. Effectiveness of oral health education on knowledge, attitude, practices and oral hygiene status among 12–15-year-old schoolchildren of fishermen of Kutch district, Gujarat, India. :7.
29. Lakshmi Sv, Kulkarni S, Doshi D, Reddy Bs, Shaheen Ss, Reddy Mp. Impact of oral health education on plaque scores with and without periodic reinforcement among 12-year-old school children. *J Indian Assoc Public Health Dent*. 2016;14(2):116.
30. Worthington HV, Hill KB, Mooney J, Hamilton FA, Blinkhorn AS. A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial of a Dental Health Education Program for 10-year-old Children. *J Public Health Dent*. 2001 Mar;61(1):22–7.
31. Gauba A, Bal I, Jain A, Mittal H. School based oral health promotional intervention: Effect on knowledge, practices and clinical oral health related parameters. *Contemp Clin Dent*. 2013;4(4):493.
32. Redmond CA, Blinkhorn FA, Kay EJ, Davies RM, Worthington HV, Blinkhorn AS. A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial Testing the Effectiveness of a School-based Dental Health Education Program for Adolescents. *J Public Health Dent*. 1999 Mar;59(1):12–7.
33. Sharma G, Vashishth S. Effectiveness of dental health education program in improving the oral health status of 6-13 year old government residential school children of mysore district. *Global journal for research analysis*. 2018 Jan 22;6(12)..
34. Ajithkrishnan CG, Thanveer K, Sudheer H, Abhishek S. Impact of oral health education on oral health of 12 and 15 year old schoolchildren of Vadodara city, Gujarat state. *J Int Oral Health*. 2010 Oct 1;2(3).

35. Frencken JE, Borsum-Andersson K, Makoni F, Moyana F, Mwashenyi S, Mulder J. Effectiveness of an oral health education programme in primary schools in Zimbabwe after 3.5 years. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 2001 Aug;29(4):253–9.
36. Palenstein Helderma WH, Munck L, Mushendwa S, Hof MA, Mrema FG. Effect evaluation of an oral health education programme in primary schools in Tanzania. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 1997 Aug;25(4):296–300.
37. Ganesh SA, Bhat PK, Jyothi C. Initial Impact of Health Education Program on Oral Health, Knowledge and awareness among 15-year-old Children of Government High School, Sarakki, Bangalore. *J. Indian Assoc. Public Health Dent.* 2007 Jan 1;5(10):57.
38. Bhardwaj V, Jhingta P, Justa A, Luthra R, Sharma K, Sharma D. Impact of school-based oral health education program on oral health of 12 and 15 years old school children. *J Educ Health Promot.* 2013;2(1):33.
39. Damle S, Damle D, Jain S, Patil A, Chopal N. Effectiveness of supervised toothbrushing and oral health education in improving oral hygiene status and practices of urban and rural school children: A comparative study. *J Int Soc Prev Community Dent.* 2014;4(3):175.
40. Vanobbergen J, Declerck D, Mwalili S, Martens L. The effectiveness of a 6-year oral health education programme for primary schoolchildren. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 2004 Jun;32(3):173–82.
41. Hausen H, Seppä L, Poutanen R, Niinimaa A, Lahti S, Kärkkäinen S, et al. Noninvasive Control of Dental Caries in Children with Active Initial Lesions. *Caries Res.* 2007;41(5):384–91.
42. Hebbal M, Vadavi D, Ankola A, Patel K. Evaluation of knowledge and plaque scores in school children before and after health education. *Dent Res J.* 2011;8(4):189.

Figures




Figure 1

CONSORT flowchart of the children screened for the study

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Annexure1.docx](#)