

Original Research Article

“ACCESSING DENTAL HYGIENE SERVICES IN PRICE COUNTY, WI: AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE AND QUALITY OF CARE”

Abstract:

PROBLEM STATEMENT: Little research exists documenting Quality of Care (CoC) and Quality of Life (QoL) for individuals accessing dental services through public health departments when dental hygienists are using a consultative/referral model. Using a consultative/referral model is one way of addressing the issues of declining funding, access to care and workforce development for improving oral health of families with economic disparities and cultural differences.

PURPOSE: The aim of this article was providing a descriptive review of the various preventive fluoride programs offered for children through the Price County public health department.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: A retrospective and longitudinal cohort study was conducted. Data analyzed was from the Secure Public Health Record Environment (SPHERE) database. Descriptive statistics were used.

Comment [N1]: Statistical model(s)?

RESULTS: From 2005~2011, 3633 oral health education sessions were provided. 2216 fluoride assessments were conducted; and 1734 (61%) children received systemic fluoride supplements. 1667 children were eligible for a weekly topical mouth rinse program, with 1258 (75%) participating. One thousand six hundred and six (71%) children received fluoride varnish. 59 minorities received care. 30-35% of clients served were either Medicaid or Badger Care recipients. Data documenting Quality of Care (QoC) and Quality of Life (QoL) was analyzed for described communities. Initial QoL data was ranked in the bottom half of state, while 70% of original determinant data was also ranked in the bottom half of reported metrics. Improvement in Quality-of-Life measures were noted through improved health outcomes and determinant metrics. Quality of Life (QoL) measures are annually re-normed statewide, requiring further study p value= >.05.

CONCLUSIONS: Data describes how Quality of Care and Quality of Life measures for individuals with economic disparities and cultural differences are affected in the service communities studied. This analysis describes positive impacts made, and efficacy of using a consultative/referral model when care required is outside the scope of dental hygiene practice.

Keywords: Quality of Care, Prevention, Access to Care, Public Health Services, Dental Hygiene Services

Accessing Dental Hygiene Services in Price County, WI: An Ongoing Investigation of Quality of Life and Quality of Care

INTRODUCTION:

Public health programs have the unequivocal opportunity for making significant impacts on community populations served throughout a lifespan: whether children, adults, or senior citizens¹⁻⁸. Sharing outcomes achieved by various public health programs allows practitioners to both conceptualize and consider application within their own communities some simple measures that have the capacity for impacting and improving the Quality of Care (QoC) and ultimately, Quality of Life (QoL) for the individuals living there⁹⁻¹⁶. A dental hygiene public health program housed within and as part of a county public health program in a rural, northern Wisconsin community has documented successes in providing care for populations that are both rurally located, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and have low numbers of allied health care workers in the surrounding community to serve them¹⁷⁻²⁵. The care model used allows for a unique blend of holistic care meeting the public county health departments' mission of 'providing care, promoting health, preventing disease, while protecting the environment'²⁶. Clinical care services provided included education, prevention, consultation, and referral for additional dental and/or medical services²⁷. Outcomes from sealant programs²⁸ and sealant retention²⁹⁻³⁰ have already been published. Survey results identifying patient perception of the quality of care received, and their families' quality of life is forthcoming. The programs studied, and resultant outcomes, can be achieved across the United States (US) and other countries while using interprofessional and public health domain settings for accomplishing them. The purpose of these interrelated studies²⁸⁻³⁰ included documenting care as guided by the National Dental Hygiene Research Agenda (NDHRA) area of Health Services: Investigation of how alternative models of dental hygiene care delivery can reduce health care inequities³¹. The aim of this article was providing a descriptive review of the various preventive fluoride programs offered for children through the Price County public health department.

Comment [N2]: Is this the Aim of the article?

Comment [OJ3]: Yes. rephrased

Where the fact access to care is a complex, multifactorial issue, the findings in this study continues describing care provision for a population located in a rural, diverse, and socioeconomically disadvantaged community in northern Wisconsin^{17-25, 28,30}. Sharing "best practices" from public health practice can aid allied care providers in identifying and using protocols and practices assuring high quality provision of care for individuals and communities^{17, 32}. The extent to which hygienists working collaboratively in alternative practice settings with other allied health professionals or organizations for improving health care outcomes should be documented and reported. Alternative care models for changing practice paradigms need to be documented in scientific literature. Public and community health departments are one avenue allowing for oral health care provision and could be overseen as part of a medical, rather than dental care model, allowing for improving access to care for individuals within communities⁵⁻¹⁶.

Public health dental hygienists, federally qualified health centers (FQHC'S), community health centers (CHC'S) and private practice dentists are leveraging systems for improving access for those without dental care, including those under 200% of the United States federal poverty level^{4-5,7,15,18,24}. Little research exists documenting public healthcare outcomes while using consultation and referral models³³ for providing care, and how the impact of these models affects both Quality of Care (QoC) and Quality of Life (QoL) for patients served²⁸⁻³⁰. This article addressed a seven-year retrospective descriptive analysis considered impacts made through preventive dental hygiene care delivered through local health departments. The purpose of this research included describing impacts made by dental hygienists working within public health departments. The consultation and referral model is not mandated by statute but is recognized standard of care when clients present with conditions outside practitioner's scope of practice³³.

Comment [N4]: Do the Authors mean the current article?

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

A longitudinal, retrospective cohort study was conducted. Institutional Review Board (IRB) was requested, and exemption status granted, because data analyzed used existing data sets. Evidence based practices and descriptive, statistical evidence gathered allowed for conducting a longitudinal analysis of these programs. Data was retrieved from the Secure Public Health Record Environment (SPHERE) database. Population included all individuals served in the SPHERE data base, and sample was specifically drawn from the Wisconsin county served. Sample size included 5162 patient records. Data analyzed was for the education and preventive programs associated with fluoride use in the service community between 2005-2011. Data continues being collected and reported to SPHERE. Descriptive statistics, including percentages and ranges, were used for data analysis of the sample within this care population. Researchers determined using inferential statistics for further analysis unnecessary, as the point of the study was describing the target population in the rural, socioeconomically disadvantaged community. Researchers did not want to be inferring study results to larger potentially different population groups than the one studied as to do so may be misleading.

RESULTS:

From 2005~2011, 5162 total children had some sort of oral health care activity within the population studied. Of those, 3633 oral health education sessions were provided within the rural service community. Prior to receipt of any preventive care services, families provided informed consent for their children to participate in the various oral care programs. All children whose families elected for them to receive services had to first participate in an oral health educational session. Once children engaged in the oral health educational sessions, data collected and reported in this primary, descriptive research was related to either systemic or topical, intraoral use of fluoride mouth rinses or varnishes. Twenty-two hundred and sixteen (2216) fluoride assessments were conducted, resulting in 1786 (80%) children receiving systemic fluoride supplements. Families of children eligible for topical fluoride use resulted in sixteen hundred sixty-seven (1667) children participating in a weekly topical mouth rinse program, with 1258 children (75%) actively participating. Three thousand twenty-eight (83%) children also received fluoride varnish. Summary data can be noted in Table 1.

Comment [N5]: State the number... Moreover, how did the Authors determine the study sample? Protocol? References? Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria? Selection/Recall Biases?

Comment [OJ6]: Addressed in modifications

Comment [N7]: What about the type of this data? Indices?

Comment [N8]: Retrospective studies must be analyzed based on statistical models.... In any other case the outcomes are invalid.....

Comment [N9]: Correct.....

Comment [N10]: Correct.....

Comment [N11]: Correct.....

Comment [N12]: Correct.....

Table 1: Summary: SPHERE Screenings & Services

Year	Total Clients w/Oral Health Activity	# of Oral Health Education Sessions	# of Fluoride Assessments	# of Children w/Fluoride Supplements	Total # Eligible Fluoride Rinse Program	# of Children receiving weekly Fluoride Mouth rinse	# of Children receiving Fluoride Varnishes
2005	531	261	282	406	250	182	169
2006	667	448	288	374	244	170	393
2007	784	517	231	213	197	147	459
2008	657	428	310	274	194	139	334
2009	681	424	398	259	259	198	389
2010	992	896	461	149	257	215	679
2011	850	659	246	108	266	207	605
Totals:	5162	3633	2216	1783	1667	1258	3028

Comment [N13]: The Authors should compare the possible differences among the tears examined.....

As the families of many individuals in the service area are also socioeconomically disadvantaged, it was also determined 30~35% of clients served were either Medicaid or Badger Care recipients. See Table 2.

Table 2: Summary: Minority & Socioeconomic Status in Service Area

Year	Minorities Served	# of Participating Districts	# served with Medicare or Badgercare
2005	19	9	26.5%
2006	4	8	34.45%
2007	6	6	31.08%
2008	13	6	34.81%
2009	9	7	45.24%
2010	4	9	36.8%
2011	4	9	30.7%
Average Totals:	59	7.7	30-34%

Fifty-nine (59) minorities received care. Data can be noted in Table3.

Native American	25
Black	10
Hispanic	10
Pacific Islander	8
Other	4
Asian	0
Non-reporting	2
TOTAL:	59

Outcomes related to sealant programs and sealant retention as measures associated with quality of care, in this community have previously been published. If program participants required advanced care, including restorative services, a consultative-referral model was used as a funnel to Federally Qualified Health Clinics (FQHCs), Community Health Centers (CHCs) or private practices for these services. Similarly, the program dental hygienist worked in an interprofessional alliance to assure patients needing services were able to access them..

DISCUSSION:

Access to care is a complex, multifactorial issue. This study described care provision for one population group located in a rural, socioeconomically disadvantaged community. Any population, whether rural, socioeconomically disadvantaged, or with other unique population characteristics either across the United States (US) or in other countries faces their own unique set of challenges with accessing care. Even though this study described the impacts made upon the oral health of children in a community accessing care through a public health department as an alternative model of dental hygiene care delivery for reducing health care inequities, interventions that have worked in other communities also need to be described and documented in the scientific literature. Sharing “best practices” from public health practice can aid care providers in identifying and using protocols and practices assuring high quality care provision for individuals and communities. Evidence based practices and descriptive, statistical evidence gathered allowed for conducting a descriptive, longitudinal analysis of other programs applying a conceptual model such as this one³²⁻³³.

The extent to which hygienists working collaboratively in alternative practice settings with other health professionals or organizations through interprofessional collaborations for improving health care outcomes should be documented. Alternative care models can be used for changing clinical practice paradigms and these approaches need to be shared in the scientific literature. Public health departments are one avenue where oral care provision could be provided and overseen as part of a medical, rather than dental care model, allowing for improving access to care for individuals across a lifespan⁹⁻¹⁶.

The descriptive results documented in Table 1 identify how over time, a community of families accessed oral health care, including educational and basic preventive services. A significant point to note in the success of these programs included they were either at no or reduced cost²⁷, provided ease of access for children and families, and the ability to access additional care, if necessary, through a consultative-referral model³³. High percentages of participation in a variety of programs have yielded results that could be replicatable in communities with similar population characteristics^{28,30}.

Another consideration for the future includes the declining number of allied health care providers located in rural population centers^{1,7,9,15}. The northern one third of the state studied is sparsely populated, with small towns located significant distances from each other. This type of geographic representation exists not only across the US, but in various other countries as well^{9, 13-16,20}. Health care providers are not necessarily willing to relocate to smaller isolated, rural communities far from a variety of services and activities. This lack of mobility creates an access problem as older clinicians are retiring and closing their practices and there are not enough new care providers to replace them^{9, 13-16}. A provider deficit in the service community already existed.

Comment [N14]: Irrelevant data.....

Comment [OJ15]: removed

Comment [N16]: Irrelevant data.....

Comment [OJ17]: removed

Using an interprofessional model with medical supervision for a variety of services using a consultative-referral model within a public health department may be one of the solutions for accessing care in the future^{12-15, 17, 24, 33}. Adaptation of these models can be applied globally in communities.

Quality care services can impact the quality of life within a community. Services discussed here document how preventive services can be offered through an alternative service model allowing for acceptable epidemiological population results¹⁸⁻²³. Quality of life is another consideration. The state used to gather and report quality of life measures, and these were then incorporated into state reported epidemiologic rankings. Data documenting Quality of Life (QoL) was analyzed for described communities. Quality of Life (QoL) measures were being re-normed annually statewide, and the research team believed this required further study in the service community. When this cohort analysis began, the initial QoL data results were always ranked in the bottom half of the state, while 70% of original determinant data was also ranked in the bottom half of reported metrics²⁸⁻³⁰. The research team subsequently identified the need to conduct a satisfaction survey specifically drawn from the service area, asking what the perceptions of care children and families received impacted their quality of life. The last paper within the series of this research addresses those findings.

Limitations included variable service population, sample size, researcher bias and descriptive, rather than inferential statistical analysis.

CONCLUSION:

Data provided describes how Quality of Care and Quality of Life measures for individuals with economic disparities and cultural differences are affected in the service communities studied. This analysis describes positive impacts made, and efficacy of using a consultative/referral model when care required is outside the scope of dental hygiene practice.

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

References cited:

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. National call to action to promote oral health: A public-private partnership under the leadership of the office of the surgeon general. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health. 2003.
2. Amschler DH. A hidden epidemic: dental disparities among children. *J Sch Health*. 2003;73(1):38-40
3. Edelstein BL. Disparities in Oral Health and Access to Care: Findings of National Surveys. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2002;2(2 Suppl):141-147.
4. The cost of delay: state dental policies fail one in five children. Pew Charitable Trust [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2015 March 26]. Available from: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/reports/2010/02/23/the-cost-of-delay-state-dental-policies-fail-one-in-five-children>
5. Zust BL, Moline K. Identifying Ethnic Populations Within a Community: The First Step in Eliminating Health Care Disparities Among Racial and Ethnic Minorities. *J Transcult Nurs*. 2003;14(1):66-74.
6. Harris R, Nicoll AD, Adair PM, Pine CM. Risk factors for dental caries in young children: a systematic review of the literature. *CDH*. 2004;21(Suppl 1):71-85.
7. Improving Access to oral Health Care for Vulnerable and Underserved Populations. Institute of Medicine [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2015 March 23]. Available from: <http://www.iom.edu/oralhealth>
8. Beltrán-Aguilar ED, Barker LK, Canto MT, et al. Surveillance for Dental Caries, Dental Sealants, Tooth Retention, Edentulism, and Enamel Fluorosis --- United States, 1988--1994 and 1999--2002. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. 2005.
9. Sanders, A., Slade, G., Sungwoo, L., & Reisine, S. Impact of oral disease on quality of life in the US and Australian populations. *Comm D&OE* 2009 37 (2), 171-181.
10. Tsakos G, Gherunpong S, Sheiham A. Can oral health-related quality of life measures substitute for normative needs assessments in 11 to 12-year-old children? *JPHD* 2009 66(4):263-268.
11. Vargas, C., Arevalo, O. How Dental Care Can Preserve and Improve Oral Health *DC NA*, 2009 53(3), 399-420 .
12. NA. A sociodental approach to assessing dental needs of children: concept and models. *BDJ*, 2009 200 (8), 499.
13. McGrath, C., & Bedi, R. Population based norming of the UK oral health related quality of life measure (OHQoL-UK©). *BDJ* 2002 193(9), 521.
14. Darby, Mary, and Lowell Dempsey. "Most Comprehensive Review of Dental Therapists Worldwide Shows They Provide Effective Dental Care to Millions of Children." *W. K. Kellogg Foundation*. Web. 10 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.wkcf.org/news/Articles/2012/04/Nash-report-is-evidence-that-dental-therapists-expand-access.aspx>>.
15. Niederman, R., Gould, E., Soncini, J., Tavares, M., Osborn, V., & Goodson, J. A model for extending the reach of the traditional dental practice. *JADA* 2008 139(8), 1040-1050.
16. S. Hyde, W.A. Satariano, and J.A. Weintraub Welfare Dental Intervention Improves Employment and Quality of Life *JDR* 2006 85, 79 - 84.
17. Rublee N. Price County seal a smile dental sealant agency protocol. Department of Health and Family Service, Division of Public Health [Internet]. 2005. Available from: http://www.cphfoundation.org/documents/PriceCountyWIOtherPHPrevention_000.pdf.
18. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. National call to action to promote oral health: A public-private partnership under the leadership of the office of the surgeon general. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, NIH. 2003.
19. Amschler DH. A hidden epidemic: dental disparities among children. *J Sch Health*. 2003;73(1):38-40
20. Edelstein BL. Disparities in Oral Health and Access to Care: Findings of National Surveys. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2002;2(2 Suppl):141-147.

21. The cost of delay: state dental policies fail one in five children. Pew Charitable Trust [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2017 March 26]. Available from: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/reports/2010/02/23/the-cost-of-delay-state-dental-policies-fail-one-in-five-children>
22. Züst BL, Moline K. Identifying Ethnic Populations Within a Community: The First Step in Eliminating Health Care Disparities Among Racial and Ethnic Minorities. *J Transcult Nurs*. 2003;14(1):66-74.
23. Harris R, Nicoll AD, Adair PM, Pine CM. Risk factors for dental caries in young children: a systematic review of the literature. *CDH*. 2004;21(Sup-pl 1):71-85.
24. Improving Access to oral Health Care for Vulnerable and Underserved Populations. Institute of Medicine [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2017 March 23]. Available from: <http://www.iom.edu/oralhealth>
25. Beltrán-Aguilar ED, Barker LK, Canto MT, et al. Surveillance for Dental Caries, Dental Sealants, Tooth Retention, Edentulism, and Enamel Fluorosis United States 1988—1994/1999--2002. CDC. 2005.
26. Price County Wisconsin Health & Human Services <https://www.co.price.wi.us/190/Health-Human-Services-Public-Health> [cited 2020 April 17].
27. Price County Wisconsin Health & Human Services <https://www.co.price.wi.us/973/Oral-Health> [cited 2020 April 17].
28. Olmsted, J.L., Rublee, N., Kleber, L., Zurawski, E. Public Health Dental Hygiene: An option for improved Quality of Care and Quality of Life, *JDH* 2013 87 (5) 298-307.
29. Olmsted, J.L. Sealant Application: Retention Improvement Practices; *Dim DH* 2017 15 (6) 31-32.
30. Olmsted, J.L., Rublee, N., Kleber, L., Zurawski, E. Independent Analysis: Efficacy of Sealant Materials Used in a Public Health Program; *JDH* 2015 89 86-90.
31. ADHA Council on Research. National Dental Hygiene Research Agenda American Dental Hygienists' Association *JDH* June 2016, 90 (suppl 1) 43-50.
32. Best Practice Approach: Prevention and Control of Early Childhood Tooth Dental decay. ASTDD 2010 [cited February 2017]. Available from: <http://www.astdd.org/docs/BPAEarlyChildhood.pdf>
33. O'Malley AS, Reschovsky JD. Referral and Consultation Communication Between Primary Care and Specialist Physicians: Finding Common Ground. *Arch Intern Med*. 2011;171(1):56-65. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2010.480