Evaluation of the quality of life of mono or bimaxillary edentulous individuals seeking care in the public health system

Tatiana Ganzer da Rosa, Vagner Flávio Reginato, Angélica Maroli, Mateus Bertolini Fernandes dos Santos, Alfonso Sanchez-Ayala, Ataís Bacchi Latiana Ganzer da Rosa, Vagner Flávio Reginato, Angélica Maroli, Mateus Bertolini Fernandes dos Santos, Alfonso Sanchez-Ayala, Ataís Bacchi Latiana Ganzer da Rosa, Vagner Flávio Reginato, Angélica Maroli, Mateus Bertolini Fernandes dos Santos, Alfonso Sanchez-Ayala, Ataís Bacchi Latiana Ganzer da Rosa, Ataís Bacchi Latiana Ganzer da Rosa Ganzer

¹School of Dentistry, Meridional University (IMED), Passo Fundo, RS, Brazil

- ²Department of Prosthodontics, School of Dentistry, State University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Piracicaba, SP, Brazil
- ³Department of Prosthodontics, School of Dentistry, Federal University of Pelotas (UFPel), Pelotas, RS, Brazil
- ⁴Department of Prosthodontics, School of Dentistry, State University of Ponta Grossa (UEPG), Ponta Grossa, PR, Brazil
- · Conflicts of interest: none declared.

ABSTRACT

Objective: the objective of this study was to evaluate the influence of partial or total edentulism on the quality of life of elderly patients. **Material and Methods:** the sample consisted of 120 individuals, divided into edentulous patients with bi-maxillary complete dentures (CD) (n = 60) or partially edentulous individuals with maxillary CD and mandibular removable partial denture (RPD) (n = 60). Patients' quality of life was assessed using the OHIP-EDENT-19 questionnaire and the data were analyzed using the SPSS software. **Results:** patients using RPD presented higher quality of life compared to users of double CD, according to the values presented in OHIP-EDENT. Statistically significant differences were found when comparing the groups between complaints related to chewing (difficulty chewing, discomfort when eating, avoiding eating, interruption of meals), psychological discomfort and incapacity (unable to eat), social incapacity (unsatisfactory life), and painful mouth and discomfort (unsuitable prostheses, sore mouth). **Conclusion:** the type of prosthesis used may influence self-reported quality of life.

Keywords: Dental Prosthesis; Quality of life; Complete denture; Removable partial denture.

Introduction

dentulism is an oral condition that corresponds to a public health problem because the dental loss is responsible for a series of alterations in the stomatognathic system. The edentulism has significant impact on the subject's quality of life, since tooth loss causes reduction of masticatory ability, aesthetic problems, phonetic alteration, as well as nutritional and psychological deficits.

Conventional removable prosthesis are one of the mainly adopted options to treat edentulous patients.³ Implant-retained or implant-supported prostheses would be most appropriate for providing greater masticatory ability, comfort, and satisfaction to the patients. However, rehabilitations with conventional prostheses still predominate mainly due to their more accessible cost.³⁻⁵ The confection a conventional removable prosthesis that satisfies the functional requirements might be impaired by some anatomical limitations, especially in the mandibular arch.⁶

Basic principles of biomechanics should be obtained for a correct effectiveness of the conventional removable prostheses, such as retention and stability. Several factors may negatively affect the obtaining of the mentioned principles, including deficiency of support tissues, anatomy of residual border or fibromucosa, salivary quantity and quality, and problems in neuromuscular coordination. Therefore, these factors may affect the correct prosthetic function, leading to masticatory deficiency, prosthesis instability, phonetic problems, mucosal lesion, reducing the patient's quality of life.

However, the success of the treatment is not exclusively

related to the technical quality of the prosthesis. The individual's ability to adapt to the new oral condition is an important factor for treatment acceptance, as each patient has different experiences and expectations. The inexperience with the use of prostheses tends to require a longer adaptation period, mainly in cases of patients that remained edentulous for a long time. In these cases, the need for longer follow-ups for prosthesis adjustment after the installation is expected. The installation is expected.

Oral health self-perception is a method that assesses the subjective experience of the individual on his oral health, functional, psychological, and social well-being. Through the evaluation of Oral Health-Related Quality of Life (OHRQoL) it is possible to quantify the individuals perception of the impact of prosthetic treatments on their quality of life. The method also allows obtaining information that is fundamental for the understanding and improvement of the forms of treatment.¹¹

This study aimed to evaluate the influence of partial or total edentulism on the quality of life of elderly patients. The authors hypothesized that fully edentulous patients would present lower quality of life indices when compared to those RPD wearers in the mandibular arch.

Material and Methods

Sample

The sample consisted of 120 individuals who sought treatment between march and june 2015 in a public health care center in the municipality of Marau in the FHS (Family Health Strategy) program. The sample was composed of 120 individuals and divided (n = 60) into edentulous patients (with upper and lower CDs) and partially edentulous (using a superior CD and lower RPD). Inclusion criteria for the selection of patients were the presence of healthy fibromucosa and healthy remaining teeth (when applicable) to support the prosthesis; adequate cognitive ability and comprehension to answer the questionnaires. Patients were excluded if they presented signs or symptoms of temporomandibular disorders diagnosed by the Research Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders (RDC / TMD).¹²

The study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (protocol number 480.504), and all patients signed a consent form to participate in the study.

Quality of Life Assessment

The patients' quality of life was assessed through the OHIP-EDENT-19 questionnaire, which allows the evaluation of the perception of oral health.¹³ All questionnaires were applied by a single examiner. The score was calculated by assigning points to the answers (0 = never, 1 = sometimes, 2 = almost always). OHIP-EDENT-19 response data were analyzed in four domains: ¹⁴ "chewing complaints" (questions 1, 5, 10 and 11); "Discomfort and psychological problems" (questions 8, 9, 12, 13 and 14); "Social incapacity" (questions 15-19); and "Oral discomfort and pain" (questions 2-4, 6 and 7).¹⁵ All questions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of the OHIP-EDENT questionnaire. Frequency (%) of additive scores (ADD) and responses for each OHIP-EDENT-19 question

	Answers											
	Questions	CD/RPD				00	Bimaxillary CD				P value	
Questions		Never	Sometimes	Almost always	ADD		Never	Sometimes	Almost always	ADD	r value	
1.	Difficulty chewing	38 (63.3)	19 (31.7)	3 (5.0)	86.1		20 (33.3)	20 (33.3)	20 (33.3)	66.7	<0.001	*
2.	Food catching	13 (21.7)	26 (43.3)	21 (35.0)	62.2		7 (11.7)	23 (38.3)	30 (50.0)	53.9	0.062	
3.	Dentures not fitting	43 (71.7)	11 (18.3)	6 (10.0)	87.2		30 (50.0)	26 (43.3)	4 (6.7)	81.1	0.042	*
4.	Painful aching	33 (55.0)	25 (41.7)	2 (3.3)	83.9		22 (36.7)	30 (50.0)	8 (13.3)	74.4	0.019	*
5.	Uncomfortable to eat	38 (63.3)	21 (35.0)	1 (1.7)	87.2		26 (43.3)	23 (38.3)	11 (18.3)	75.0	0.006	*
6.	Sore spot	36 (60.0)	23 (38.3)	1 (1.7)	86.1		27 (45.0)	31 (51.7)	2 (3.3)	80.6	0.096	
7.	Uncomfortable dentures	48 (80.0)	5 (8.3)	7 (11.7)	89.4		40 (66.7)	13 (21.7)	7 (11.7)	85.0	0.151	
8.	Worried	15 (25.0)	37 (61.7)	8 (13.3)	70.6		20 (33.3)	30 (50.0)	10 (16.7)	72.2	0.617	
9.	Self-conscious	40(66.7)	16 (26.7)	4 (6.7)	86.7		38 (63.3)	17 (28.3)	5 (8.3)	85.0	0.680	
10.	Avoids eating	44 (73.3)	14 (23.3)	2 (3.3)	90.0		27 (45.0)	24 (40.0)	9 (15.0)	76.7	0.001	*
11.	Interrupts meals	46 (76.7)	14 (23.3)	0 (0.0)	92.2		35 (58.3)	22 (36.7)	3 (5.0)	84.4	0.024	*
12.	Unable to eat	43 (71.7)	16 (26.7)	1 (1.7)	90.0		31 (51.7)	27 (45.0)	2 (3.3)	82.8	0.025	*
13.	Upset	49 (81.7)	10 (16.7)	1 (1.7)	93.3		43 (71.7)	12 (20.0)	5 (8.3)	87.8	0.156	
14.	Has been embarrassed	50 (83.3)	9 (15.0)	1 (1.7)	93.9		45 (75.0)	13 (21.7)	2 (3.3)	90.6	0.257	
15.	Avoids going out	59 (98.3)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	99.4		56 (93.3)	3 (5.0)	1 (1.7)	97.2	0.170	
16.	Less tolerant of others	57 (95.0)	3 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	98.3		53 (88.3)	7 (11.7)	0 (0.0)	96.1	0.188	
17.	Irritable with others	58 (96.7)	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	98.9		55 (91.7)	5 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	97.2	0.245	
18.	Unable to enjoy company	56 (93.3)	3 (5.0)	1 (1.7)	97.2		52 (86.7)	8 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	95.6	0.242	
19.	Life unsatisfying	43 (71.7)	13 (21.7)	4 (6.7)	88.3		28 (46.7)	25 (41.7)	7 (11.7)	78.3	0.007	*
	Mean of individual scores		88.5 ± 7.5					82.1 ± 11.7			0.002	*

OHIP-EDENT: Oral Health Impact Profile for edentulous individuals * Significant difference for P < 0.05 using Mann-Whitney test.

Statistical Analysis

Data were explored using SPSS® software (version 20, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA), and all inferences were performed using two-tailed tests using a 95% significance level and a statistical potential of 80%. Differences between overall OHIP-EDENT-19 values and individual responses were assessed by the Mann-Whitney U-test.

Results

Patients who used bi-maxillary complete denture had significantly lower scores on at least one question in relation to each domain evaluated. Statistically significant differences were found when comparing the groups between complaints related to chewing (difficulty in chewing p < 0.001, discomfort when eating p = 0.006, avoidance of eating p = 0.001, discontinuation of meals p = 0.024), psychological discomfort and incapacity p = 0.025), social incapacity (unsatisfactory life p = 0.007) and oral pain and discomfort (unsuitable prostheses p = 0.042, painful mouth p = 0.019). The mean score for users of bimaxillary complete denture (82.1) was also statistically lower than the partially edentulous patients (88.7) (p = 0.002). OHIP-EDENT revealed a significantly higher quality of life for users who did not use bimaxillary complete denture. The data are shown in Table 1.

Discussion

The treatment with dental prosthesis aims to restore the dentofacial normality. Adequate function must be recovered, providing the neuromuscular balance of the stomatognathic system, which is responsible for the physical, mental, and social well-being of the patient. The hypothesis of this study that fully edentulous patients would present lower indices of quality of life than partially edentulous patients was accepted. This hypothesis was based on the common complaints of complete denture wearers'. It has been suggested that the low stability of the prosthesis impairs their quality of life. The use of subjective indicators such as OHIP-EDENT allows assessing the perception of oral health, and this measurement is an important tool to evaluate the impact of the oral rehabilitations.¹⁶

Based on the findings of this study, it was possible to observe that patients who were RPD wearers' presented higher quality of life compared to those with bimaxillary CD, according to the values presented in OHIP-EDENT. The data presented in Table 1 show that RPD wearers have better subjective evaluations of their prostheses in the various items discussed, demonstrating that mandibular edentulism and rehabilitation with conventional removable CD leads to functional impairment and reduced patient satisfaction. According to the literature, ¹⁷ it is known that

the highest dissatisfaction of the fully edentulous patients rehabilitated with CD is related to the lower arch, because the prosthesis presents a lower basal area in the mandible compared to the maxilla, which leads to a greater prosthetic instability. In this context, the presence of dental remnants and the rehabilitation with RPD provides better biomechanical conditions for the retention and stability of the prostheses, which favors higher satisfaction and quality of life for patients.¹⁸

According to a previous study,¹⁹ both the dento-muco-supported and the dento-supported RPD present greater masticatory efficacy, retention, and support when compared to muco-supported CD. In addition, individuals
without dental remnants have higher oral limitations in
regards to food choice, difficulty, and discomfort during
mastication.²⁰ The findings of this study are in agreement
with a previous report,²¹ where the authors observed that
the type of prosthesis influenced the subjects' quality of
life, and RPD wearers had better subjective quality of life
indexes in relation to CD ones. Likewise, authors have reported that when considering mandibular rehabilitation,
CD wearers were more dissatisfied regarding the retention
of the prostheses when compared to the RPD group.²²

The main findings of the present study relate to the importance of oral health care in public health systems to maintain the remaining dental elements, specifically in the mandibular arch. Moreover, the retention and stability that the remaining teeth provide to the RPD are enough to guarantee a better quality of life for the patients, when compared to the use of lower CD. In addition, the findings of this study reinforce the importance of the subjective evaluation of the quality of life of the denture wearers patients, being that essential to understand the impact of prosthetic rehabilitation and the determination of clinical practice based on scientific evidence. As a limitation of this study, the fact that the sample was selected for convenience may be considered.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that the self-reported quality of life can be influenced by the type of prosthesis used. Patients with mandibular RPD presented better subjective levels of quality of life when compared to patients with bimaxillary CD.

The items that presented differences between the groups were those related to chewing (difficulty in chewing, discomfort in eating, avoiding eating, interruption of meals), psychological discomfort and incapacity (unable to eat), social incapacity (poor life), and oral pain and discomfort (unsuitable prostheses, sore mouth).

References

- 1.Cooper LF. The current and future treatment of edentulism. J Prosthodont. 2009;18(2):116-22.
- 2. Musacchio E, Perissinotto E, Binotto P, Sartori L, Silva-Netto F, Zambon S. Tooth loss in the elderly and its association with nutritional status, socio-economic and lifestyle factors. Acta Odontol Scand. 2007;65(2):78-86.
- 3. Cunha TR, Della Vecchia MP, Regis RR, Ribeiro AB, Muglia VA, Mestriner W, et al. A randomised trial on simplified and conventional methods for complete denture fabrication: Masticatory performance and ability. J Dent. 2013;41(2):133-42.
- 4. Thomason JM, Feine J, Exley C, Moynihan P, Müller F, Naert I, et al. Mandibular two implant-supported overdentures as the first choice standard of care for edentulous patients--the York Consensus Statement. Br Dent J. 2009;207(4):185-6.
- 5. Thomason JM. The Use of Mandibular Implant-retained Overdentures Improve Patient Satisfaction and Quality of Life. J Evid Based Dent Pract. 2010;10(1):61-3.
- 6. Feine JS, Carlsson GE, Awad MA, Chehade A, Duncan WJ, Gizani S, et al. The McGill consensus statement on overdentures. Mandibular two-implant overdentures as first choice standard of care for edentulous patients. Gerodontology. 2002;19(1):3-4.
- 7. Carlsson GE. Clinical morbidity and sequelae of treatment with complete dentures. J Prosthet Dent. 1998;79(1):17-23.
- 8. Wöstmann B, Michel K, Brinkert B, Melchheier-Weskott A, Rehmann P, Balkenhol M. Influence of denture improvement on the nutritional status and quality of life of geriatric patients. J Dent. 2008;36(10):816-21.
- 9. Luraschi J, Korgaonkar MS, Whittle T, Schimmel M, Müller F, Klineberg I. Neuroplasticity in the adaptation to prosthodontic treatment. J Orofac Pain. 2013;27(3):206-16.
- 10. Shigli K. Aftercare of the complete denture patient. J Prosthodont. 2009;18(8):688-93.
- 11. Sischo L, Broder HL. Oral health-related quality of life: what, why, how, and future implications. J Dent Res. 2011;90(11):1264-70.

- 12. Dworkin SF, LeResche L. Research diagnostic criteria for temporomandibular disorders: review, criteria, examinations and specifications, critique. J Craniomandib Disord. 1992:6(4):301-55.
- 13. Souza RF, Patrocínio L, Pero AC, Marra J, Compagnoni MA. Reliability and validation of a Brazilian version of the Oral Health Impact Profile for acessing edentulous subjects. J Oral Rehabil. 2007;34(11):821-6.
- 14. Souza RF, Leles CR, Guyatt GH, Pontes CB, Della Vecchia MP, Neves FD. Exploratory factor analysis of the Brazilian OHIP for edentulous subjects. J Oral Rehabil. 2010;37(3):202-8.
- 15. Goiato MC, Bannwart LC, Moreno A, dos Santos DM, Martini AP, Pereira LV. Quality of life and stoimulus perception in patients' rehabilitated with complete denture. J Oral Rehabil. 2012;39(6):438-45.
- 16 Pocztaruk RL, Frasca LC, Rivaldo EG, Mattia PR, Vidal RA, Fernandes E, et al. Satisfaction level and masticatory capacity in edentulous patients with conventional dentures and implant-retained overdentures. Braz J Oral Sci. 2006;5(19):1232-8.
- 17. Costa APS, Machado FLA, Pereira ALBP, Carreiro AFP, Ferreira MAF. Technical quality and satisfaction related to total dentures. Science collective health. 2013;18(2):453-60.
- 18. Beloni WB, Vale HF, Takahashi JMF. Evaluation of the degree of satisfaction and quality of life of patients with dental prosthesis. RFO. 2013;18(2);160-4.
- 19. Mojon P, Budtz-Jorgensen E, Rapin CH. Relationship between oral health and nutrition in very old people. Age Ageing. 1999;28(5):463-8.
- 20. Comparing the impact of oral disease in two populations of older adults: application of the geriatric oral health assessment index. J Public Health Dent. 1997;57(4):224-32.
- 21. Mesko ME, Patias R, Pereira-Cenci T. Is OHIP-EDENT similar to GOHAI when Measuring Ohrqol in Partial and Complete Denture Wearers? Dentistry. 2013:3(2):2-5
- 22. Celebić A, Knezović-Zlatarić D. A comparison of patient's satisfaction between complete and partial removable denture wearers. J Dent. 2003:31(7):445-51.

Mini Curriculum and Author's Contribution

- 1. Tatiana Ganzer da Rosa DDS. Contribution: data acquisition, data interpretation, and final approval.
- 2. Vagner Flávio Reginato DDS and PhD student. Contribution: preparation and writing of the manuscript, and final approval.
- 3. Angélica Maroli DDS. Contribution: data acquisition.
- 4. Mateus Bertolini Fernandes dos Santos DDS and PhD. Contribution: effective scientific and intellectual participation for the study.
- 5. Alfonso Sanchez-Ayala DDS and PhD. Contribution: effective scientific and intellectual participation for the study and statistical analysis.
- 6. Ataís Bacchi DDS and PhD. Contribution: conception and design, effective scientific and intellectual contribution to the study, final approval.

Submitted: 10/20/2017 / Accepted for publication: 12/03/2017

Corresponding Author Vagner Flávio Reginato

E-mail: vagner.reginato@hotmail.com