

UTILIZING TELEDENTISTRY TO DELIVER PEDIATRIC ORAL HEALTH EDUCATION TO CAREGIVERS

Imani Behrens DMD¹, Brittaney Hill DDS MS MPH¹, Leda Mugayar DDS MS¹, Geisel Collazo MD², David Avenetti DDS MSD MPH¹

¹Department of Pediatric Dentistry, UIC College of Dentistry, ²Department of Pediatrics, UIC College of Medicine (Chicago, IL)

BACKGROUND

- Early Childhood Caries (ECC) is the most common chronic disease in young children, especially in disadvantaged populations. It can cause pain and infection, impacting eating, speaking, and sleeping¹.
- **Nighttime bottle feeding** with liquids other than water increase ECC risk³. Educating caregivers about these risks and the importance of brushing with fluoridated toothpaste before bedtime is essential for ECC prevention⁶.
- Access to dental care remains a challenge for many children, particularly those living in underserved areas. Barriers such as finding providers, limited appointments, and transportation issues contribute to delayed dental visits⁴.
- Utilizing frequent pediatrician visits in the first three years of life, often reaching up to 15 times, offers a unique opportunity for early education and intervention targeting **primary prevention** among high-risk groups².
- **Teledentistry** has become an effective method for enhancing pediatric dental care access, allowing dental professionals to offer treatment advice, patient monitoring, diagnoses, screenings, and oral health education remotely⁵.

OBJECTIVES

Objectives: Assess the effectiveness of motivational interviewing **(MI)** delivered via teledentistry to caregivers in improving oral health behaviors in children 6-35 months (**Primary outcomes:** toothbrushing behaviors, fluoride toothpaste usage, and nighttime bottle/breastfeeding).

Hypothesis: 1) MI through teledentistry is more effective than providing oral health materials alone in improving behaviors, and 2) that the effect on behaviors from educational materials, dental products, and teledentistry differs among these interventions.

Figure 1: CONSORT Diagram

Assessed for eligibility (n =64)

Randomized (n =64)

Allocated to control.

Received oral health

Lost to follow up (n = 13)

Analyzed (n =19)

Completed post-test surve

60-75 days from recruitmen

materials and brochure

Completed demographics and baseline survey.

Excluded (n =0)

Declined to participate (n =0)

Received oral health materials and

Completed demographics and baseline

Completed pre-test survey, then received 10-1

ntervention: 30-45 days from recruitment

Teledentistry Intervention (n=19)

Lost to follow up (n = 13)

Completed post-test survey

METHODS

Study Type: Randomized Controlled Trial

Study Setting/Population: Caregivers of healthy children with well-child visits were recruited from the UIH Dept. of Pediatrics from Aug-Dec 2023 for this RCT. IRB # 2023-0780

Inclusion Criteria: Caregivers were legal guardians, fluent in English, and had telephone access. Children were healthy, 6-35 months with no previous dental treatment beyond preventative procedures.

Table 2 Baseline Knowledge and Oral Health Behaviors *					
Table 2 baseline Kilowicage al	Intervention	Control			
Oral Health Knowledge					
Not or Somewhat Confident	22 (68.75%)	19 (59.38%)			
Very Confident	10 (31.25%)	13 (40.63%)			
Bottle Usage (per week)					
0 nights	19 (59.38%)	16 (50.00%)			
1-6 nights	4 (12.50%)	4 (12.50%)			
7 nights	9 (28.13%)	12 (37.50%)			
Breastfed at night					
Non Breastfeeders	30 (93.75%)	29 (90.63%)			
Breastfeeders	2 (6.25%)	3 (9.38%)			
Cleaning teeth frequency					
0 nights	18 (56.25%)	18 (56.25%)			
1-6 nights	6 (18.75%)	8 (25.00%)			
7 nights	8 (25.00%)	6 (18.75%)			
Cleaning teeth tools					
Do not Clean	18 (56.25%)	17 (53.13%)			
Toothbrush and/or Adjunct	14 (43.75%)	15 (46.88%)			
Person cleaning teeth					
No One	18 (56.25%)	16 (50.00%)			
Someone (child or legal guardian)	14 (43.75%)	16 (50.00%)			
Toothpaste usage					
Fluoride Toothpaste	5 (15.63%)	10 (31.25%)			
Fluoride Free or No Toothpaste	27 (84.38%)	22 (68.75%)			
Has child been seen by a dentist					
Yes	1 (3.13%)	6 (18.75%)			
No	31 (96.88%)	26 (81.25%)			
* no significant difference between intervention and control for any of the demographic variables. Tests were run using independent t-test, Chi-squared test, or Fisher's exact test					

	owledge and Oral Health Behaviors *			
- 1 1.1	Intervention	Control	P-value*	
Oral Health Knowledge				
Not or Somewhat Confident	2 (10.53%)	7 (36.84%)	0.12	
Very Confident	17 (89.47%)	12 (63.16%)	0.12	
Bottle Usage (per week)				
0 nights	12 (63.16%)	8 (42.11%)		
1-6 nights	7 (36.84%)	3 (15.79%)	0.01	
7 nights	0 (0%)	8 (42.11%)		
Breastfed at night				
Non Breastfeeders	18 (94.74%)	19 (100%)		
Breastfeeders	1 (5.26%)	0 (0%)	1	
Cleaning teeth frequency				
0 nights	3 (15.79%)	6 (31.58%)	0.04	
1-6 nights	6 (31.58%)	16 (84.21%)		
7 nights	10 (52.63%)	3 (15.79%)		
Cleaning teeth tools				
Do not Clean	3 (15.79%)	6 (31.58%)	0.45	
Toothbrush and/or Adjunct	16 (84.21%)	13 (68.42%)		
Person cleaning teeth				
No One	3 (15.79%)	6 (31.58%)	0.45	
Someone	16 (84.21%)	13 (68.42%)		
Toothpaste usage				
Fluoride Toothpaste	16 (84.21%)	7 (36.84%)	0.003	
Fluoride Free or No Toothpaste	3 (15.79%)	12 (63.16%)		
Has child been seen by a dentist				
Yes	3 (15.79%)	1 (5.26%)	0.6	
No	16 (84.21%)	18 (94.74%)		

RESULTS

able 4 Effect of Intervention in Intervention and Control Groups *							
	<u>Intervention</u>			<u>Control</u>			
	Baseline vs. Pre-test	Pre-test vs. Post-test	Baseline vs. Post-test	Baseline vs. Post-Test			
ral Health Knowledge							
Not or Somewhat Confident	0.046	0.008	0.0009				
Very Confident	0.040	0.000	0.0003	NS			
ottle Usage (per week)							
0 nights	i						
1-6 nights	NS	NS	NS	NS			
7 nights							
reastfed at night							
Non Breastfeeders	NS	NS	NS	NS			
Breastfeeders	NS	No	143	143			
eaning teeth frequency							
0 nights	0.03	NS	0.0047	0.008			
1-7 nights	0.03	INO	0.0047	0.008			
eaning teeth tools							
Do not Clean	0.03	NS	0.0047	0.03			
Toothbrush and/or Adjunct		143					
erson cleaning teeth							
No One	0.03	NS	0.0047	NS			
omeone (child or legal guardian)	0.03	0.03	0.0047	NS			
oothpaste usage							
Fluoride Toothpaste	0.01	0.01	0.0003	NC			
Fluoride Free or No Toothpaste	0.01	0.01	0.0003	NS			
as child been seen by a dentist?							
Yes	NC	NS	NS	NS			
No	NS	INO	CNI	INO			
P-value reflects Chi-Squared or McNemar's Test							

KEY FINDINGS

- Intervention and control groups were allocated randomly with no baseline differences. Both groups showed diverse demographics and were predominantly Medicaid-enrolled (*Table 1*).
- Intervention and control groups were allocated randomly with no baseline differences between knowledge or oral health behaviors. Knowledge and behaviors showed significant opportunity for improvement in both groups (Table 2).
- Post-intervention knowledge and oral health behaviors showed differences between groups (Table 3):
 - o Bottle usage frequency: intervention group used bottles less than the control group
 - O Cleaning teeth frequency: control group brushed less frequently than intervention group
 - Fluoride toothpaste usage: control group used fluoride toothpaste less than intervention group
- The control group's teeth cleaning frequency improved by receiving oral health cleaning tools, but knowledge, bottle usage, and toothpaste use did not improve (*Table 4*).
- The intervention group's knowledge, teeth cleaning frequency, parental assistance with brushing, and toothpaste usage increased by receiving oral health cleaning tools. This change was sustained postintervention. Oral health knowledge and toothpaste usage further improved following the teledentistry intervention (Table 4).

CONCLUSIONS

- Oral health products <u>effectively</u> initiate oral health behaviors, while motivational interviewing significantly reinforces this knowledge and encourages behavioral changes, specifically in cleaning teeth frequency, tools used, person cleaning child's teeth, and fluoride toothpaste usage.
- Motivational interviewing (MI) via teledentistry significantly improves caregivers' oral health behaviors, particularly nighttime bottle feeding, more effectively than simply providing oral health products and written educational material.
- •The study highlights the potential of **teledentistry** as a valuable tool for delivering impactful and accessible oral health education to caregivers, especially those from low socioeconomic backgrounds in primary care settings.

Acknowledgements: Dr. Hajwa Kim (UIC CCTS)