Received: 24 Nov. 2019 Accepted: 27 Jan. 2020

Effect of children's oral health on families' quality of life: A cross-sectional study in Rafsanjan, Iran

Mohtasham Ghaffari PhD¹, Sakineh Rakhshanderou PhD², Leili Mazar³, Mostafa Nasirzadeh PhD⁴0

Original Article

Abstract

BACKGROUND AND AIM: Oral and dental health condition besides its impact on quality of life (QOL) is a significant aspect of public health appraisal. Recognition of this impact and various dimensions is required to design evidence-based programs. This study was conducted to determine the impact of children's oral health on families' QOL in Rafsanjan City, south of Iran, in 2017.

METHODS: This descriptive cross-sectional research was carried out on 631 parents of elementary students who were selected from schools using simple random sampling. Data collecting tool was a 3-section questionnaire including demographic characteristics, Family Impact Scale (FIS), and 6 items of health behaviors associated with oral health. Data were analyzed through SPSS software using statistical tests of Pearson correlation, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), independent t-test, and chi-square test at a significance level of 0.050.

RESULTS: The mean score of FIS was 8.59 ± 8.20 out of 42. Major harms to family QOL occurred respectively in terms of concern about the child's future, upsetting family members, and needing more care compared to other family members. There was a significant relationship between FIS score and use of toothbrush, toothpaste, dental floss, junk foods, and regular check-up every 6 months (P < 0.010). Regular check-up (B = -3.54), regular brushing (B = 2.10), and less use of junk foods (B = 1.40) were three main factors in FIS (P < 0.001).

CONCLUSION: Considering the association between oral health behaviors and FIS, evidence-based interventional programs for children and parents are recommended. Also, to remove financial barriers, available and affordable services are recommended.

KEYWORDS: Oral Health; Family; Quality of life; Child; Iran

Citation: Ghaffari M, Rakhshanderou S, Mazar L, Nasirzadeh M. Effect of children's oral health on families' quality of life: A cross-sectional study in Rafsanjan, Iran. J Oral Health Oral Epidemiol 2020; 9(2): 65-72.

ral health is essential to general health and quality of life (QOL). It is a state of being free from mouth and facial pain, oral and throat cancer, oral infection and sores, periodontal (gum) disease, tooth decay, tooth loss, and other diseases and disorders that limit an

individual's capacity in biting, chewing, smiling, speaking, and psychosocial wellbeing.¹ Oral and dental health condition and its impact on QOL and daily living are significant aspects of public health appraisal.²

Health-related QOL (HRQOL) is a multidimensional concept which is one of the main

¹⁻ Professor, Department of Public Health, School of Public Health and Safety, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

²⁻ Assistant Professor, Department of Public Health, School of Public Health and Safety, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

³⁻ Department of Health Education and Health Promotion, School of Health, Student Research Committee, Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences, Rafsanjan, Iran

⁴⁻ Assistant Professor, Department of Health Education and Health Promotion, School of Health, Occupational Environment Research Center, Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences, Rafsanjan, Iran

Address for correspondence: Mostafa Nasirzadeh PhD; Assistant Professor, Department of Health Education and Health Promotion, School of Health, Occupational Environment Research Center, Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences, Rafsanjan, Iran Email: mnasirzadeh13@rums.ac.ir

criteria for assessing community health. Oral and dental health has been considered in promoting society health so that it has been recognized as one of the eleven significant slogans chanted in 21st century.3 Despite the numerous advances in fighting against disease around the world, dental disease particularly decay is still the most common disease in the world. Dental decays are observed in 60-90 percent of children and about 100% among adults.4 Studies have reported adopting oral health behaviors as a support for fundamental actions such as awareness promotion, changing attitude and beliefs of families and children (risk factors), increasing skills, and facilitating treating and therapeutic services.⁵⁻⁹ In case of absence of primary preventive services at right time, spreading oral diseases leads to physical, social, and mental-spiritual consequences for children and their families. Naturally, implications of children's oral diseases influence over working and activity time, rest time, economic status, and parents' mental conditions. 10 Therefore, oral diseases not only affect various dimensions of children's QOL but also influence family members, parents, siblings, and nurses.4

Family Impact Scale (FIS) evaluates family's QOL at different scales affected by child's inappropriate oral health during three past months.¹¹ The National Oral Health Program (NOHP) has been operating in Iran since 2014. Pregnant women, children under 6 years, and those aged 6 to 14 years were the target groups of the program. The ultimate goal of this program is to promote oral health through activities such as: education, regular and care, distribution of examination mouthwashes, fluoride therapy, and fissure sealant.12 Since children are the most sensitive and vulnerable groups to dental decay and their health directly associates with society health. this study was conducted determine children's oral health impact on families' QOL in Rafsanjan City, Iran.

Methods

This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted on 631 parents of elementary

students living in Rafsanjan, in 2017. Based on the formula Z^2S^2/D^2 and the study of Al-Riyami et al.,¹³ the minimum sample size estimated in this study was 552 (S = 3, D = 0.25, and Z = 1.96). The final sample size was estimated to be 614 with 10% missing. Because Rafsanjan is a no-zoning city, simple random sampling was used and selected schools comprised 6 male and female public schools out of 18 schools.

Data collecting tool was a 3-section questionnaire including demographic characteristics with 10 items (child and parents age, class grade, birth order, economic status, education level, job, family size, gender of child, and public health status), family QOL appraisal affected by children's oral health and evaluated by FIS (14 items), and children's oral health-related behaviors including 6 items. FIS evaluates the impact of oral problems on family during the past three months. Responding scale was 4-point Likert scale from never to always including score domain of 0-42. Higher scores indicated more family QOL in terms of various dimensions of children's inappropriate oral health. Parents' responding method was based on self-report. This standard instrument was developed by Jokovic et al.11 and Nilchian et al.;14 Cronbach's alpha coefficient was reported 0.83 in the study of Nilchian et al.14

In third section, some behaviors such as regular appointment with dentist every 6 months and using toothbrush and dental floss regularly were considered. All parts of questionnaire were filled out by parents. According to class differentiation, parents were invited and asked to complete the questionnaires after expressing research Inclusion criterion was parents' consent to participate in research. Data were analyzed after inserting to SPSS software (version 16, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and testing their normality. Tests of Pearson correlation, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), independent t-test, and chi-square test at significance level of 0.050 were used.

This study derived from the results of a collaborative research project between

Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences and Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran (Code No. 350 in Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences and Code No. 8555 in Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences.) with ethical code of IR.RUMS.REC.1397.134.

Results

The average age of parents was 38.01 ± 5.91 years (range: 17-58 years); there were 4 members averagely in each family with highest household size equal to 4 members (about 46%). Majority of students (51.8%) were the first child of family and most parents had diploma degree. Other demographic characteristics are reported in table 1. Student's average age was 9.6 ± 1.8 years (range: 7-13 years).

The Tukey's test showed a significant difference in the mean score of FIS between families with poor economic status and those with moderate or good economic status (P < 0.050). In terms of parental education, there was only a significant difference in the mean score of FIS between the elementary and academic level (P = 0.003). Tukey's test also showed a significant difference in the mean

score of FIS between worker and retired people (P = 0.010). There was no significant difference between the mean scores of other groups' FIS in the variables of family economic status, educational level, and job (P > 0.050).

Majority of parents, 73% and 46%, described optimal public health situation and oral health of children, respectively. Chi-square test indicated a significant relationship between description of children's public health and oral health status (P < 0.001).

The mean score of FIS was 8.59 ± 8.21 out of 42. Parents' responses to questions have been described in table 2 that according to its results, the most serious harms to family QOL due to children's inappropriate oral health respectively included: being concerned for children situation, being sad, needing more care compared to other family members, and economic problems.

In this research, 214 members (34.1%) used toothbrush regularly, 31 members (4.9%) used toothpaste regularly, 57 members (9.0%) used dental floss regularly, 151 members (25.3%) often used junk foods, 503 members (81.0%) referred to the dentist due to pain and dental problems, and 288 members (45.9%) visited dentist regularly every 6 months (Table 3).

Table 1. Participants' demographic characteristics and their relationship with Family Impact Scale (FIS)

Variables	·				·		P	F or t
Class grade	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	0.280^{*}	F = 1.25
n (%)	93 (14.8)	98 (15.6)	70 (11.1)	133 (21.0)	97 (15.4)	139 (22.0)		
Mean \pm SD	$8.93 \pm$	7.18 ± 7.10	8.65 ± 8.20	9.86 ± 8.40	8.15 ± 8.10	8.47 ± 8.10		
	8.30							
Economic	c Poor		Moderate		Good		0.005^{*}	F = 5.43
situation								
n (%)	69 (11.6)		464 (74.0)		62 (10.4)			
Mean \pm SD	11.36 ± 8.00		8.55 ± 8.20		6.60 ± 7.40			
Parents'	Elementary		Middle	Diploma	Academic		0.004^{*}	F = 4.49
education			school					
n (%)	55 (8.9)		94 (15.3)	258 (41.9)	209 (33.9)			
Mean \pm SD	11.50 ± 8.50		8.95 ± 7.80	8.90 ± 8.20	7.18 ± 7.70			
Parents' job	Worker		Employee	Self-employed	Retired		0.017^{*}	F = 3.43
n (%)	150 (24.8)		132 (22.7)	152 (25.2)	165 (27.3)			
Mean \pm SD	8.36	± 8.30	6.80 ± 7.90	9.86 ± 7.70	8.93 =	± 8.20		
Gender of	Girl		Boy		0.680^{**}	t = -0.41		
child								
n (%)	278 (49.38)			285 (50.62)				
Mean \pm SD		8.66 ± 8.46		8.37 ± 7.57				

SD: Standard deviation; ANOVA: Analysis of variance

*One-way ANOVA, **Independent t-test

Table 2. Frequency distribution of responses provided on the Family Impact Scale (FIS)

Questions (events experienced	Response scale				Mean ± SD	Priority
during the past 3 months due to	Never	Once or	Sometimes	Often or		
dental problems of children)		twice		always		
Concerned about the child's future	234 (37.7)	133 (21.4)	163 (26.2)	91 (14.7)	1.18 ± 1.09	1
Upsetting family members	264 (41.9)	169 (26.8)	145 (23.0)	52 (8.3)	0.98 ± 0.99	2
Needing more care compared to	308 (48.9)	161 (25.6)	135 (21.4)	26 (4.1)	0.81 ± 0.91	3
other family members						
Economic problems	378 (60.7)	102 (16.4)	88 (14.1)	55 (8.8)	0.71 ± 1.01	4
Feelings of humiliation, shame,	393 (63.0)	82 (13.1)	104 (16.7)	45 (7.2)	0.68 ± 0.99	5
and guilt						
Less attention to other family	389 (62.1)	116 (18.5)	103 (16.5)	18 (2.9)	0.60 ± 0.86	6
members						
Discomfort in public	408 (65.4)	95 (15.2)	95 (15.2)	25 (4.0)	0.58 ± 0.88	7
Creating controversy and debate	415 (66.8)	97 (15.6)	85 (13.7)	24 (3.9)	0.55 ± 0.86	8
in family						
Taking leave from work	104 (64.6)	123 (19.6)	91 (14.5)	9 (1.4)	0.53 ± 0.79	9
Sleep disturbance	409 (64.8)	116 (18.4)	100 (15.8)	6 (1.0)	0.52 ± 0.79	10
Creating frustration and	461 (74.4)	74 (11.9)	65 (10.5)	20 (3.2)	0.43 ± 0.80	11
family disputes						
Blaming each other	455 (72.8)	88 (14.1)	63 (10.1)	19 (3.0)	0.41 ± 0.79	12
Family function impairment	457 (71.9)	99 (15.7)	71 (11.4)	6 (1.0)	0.41 ± 0.72	13
Creating jealousy and mistreatment	502 (80.7)	58 (9.3)	50 (8.0)	12 (1.9)	0.31 ± 0.70	14

SD: Standard deviation

Independent t-test indicated a significant relationship between FIS score and regular appointment with dentist every 6 months (P < 0.001, t = 6.03). Families that set regular appointment with dentist for their children experienced less children's oral and dental

pain impact on their QOL. One-way ANOVA test showed a significant relationship between FIS and use of toothbrush (P < 0.001, F = 13.06), use of toothpaste (P = 0.001, F = 7.67), use of dental floss (P = 0.010, F = 4.63), and use of junk foods (P < 0.001, F = 36.66) (Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of behaviors related to children's oral health and mean and standard deviation (SD) of Family Impact Scale (FIS)

Oral health behavior	urs	Response sca	ale for oral healt	Statistical test, P, F or t	
		Yes,	Yes,	No	
		regularly	sometimes		
Use of toothbrush	n (%)	214 (34.1)	381 (60.6)	33 (5.3)	One-way ANOVA,
	Mean \pm SD	6.44 ± 7.40	9.58 ± 8.36	12.03 ± 8.37	P < 0.001, F = 13.06
Use of toothpaste	n (%)	31 (4.9)	235 (37.4)	363 (57.7)	One-way ANOVA,
	Mean \pm SD	4.23 ± 6.14	7.72 ± 7.98	9.47 ± 8.29	P = 0.001, F = 7.67
Use of dental floss	n (%)	57 (9.0)	519 (82.4)	54 (8.6)	One-way ANOVA,
	Mean \pm SD	6.56 ± 8.64	8.50 ± 8.12	11.33 ± 7.89	P = 0.010, F = 4.63
Use of junk foods		Rarely	Sometimes	Often or	One-way ANOVA,
				always	P < 0.001, F = 36.66
	n (%)	192 (32.2)	254 (42.5)	151 (25.3)	
	Mean \pm SD	5.00 ± 5.56	10.28 ± 7.95	11.08 ± 9.61	
Referring to the		Yes	No		Independent t-test,
dentist due to pain	n (%)	503 (81.0)	118 (19.0)		P < 0.001, t = 4.79
and dental problems	roblems Mean \pm SD 5.29 \pm 6.67 9.35 \pm 8.31		8.31		
Regular check-up		Yes	No		Independent t-test,
every 6 months	n (%)	288 (45.9)	340 (54.1)		P < 0.001, $t = 6.03$
	Mean \pm SD	6.79 ± 7.52	10.75 ± 8.47		

ANOVA: Analysis of variance; SD: Standard deviation

Table 4. Determining the impact of independent variables on Family Impact Scale (FIS) (multiple linear regression)

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	P
	В	SE	Beta		
Constant	23.345	5.005	-	4.664	0.0001
Birth rank	1.332	0.524	0.150	2.540	0.0110
Economic situation	-1.609	0.750	-0.093	-2.144	0.0330
Parents' education	-1.101	0.437	-0.124	-2.519	0.0120
Parents' job	0.225	0.325	0.031	0.691	0.4900
Parents' age	-0.145	0.071	-0.104	-2.046	0.0410
Family size	-0.659	0.411	-0.083	-1.604	0.1090
Referring to the dentist due to dental problems	-2.387	0.990	-0.111	-2.411	0.0160
Regular check-up	-3.543	0.746	-0.217	-4.750	0.0001
Use of junk foods	1.470	0.257	0.236	5.717	0.0001
Toothbrush	2.119	0.662	0.146	3.202	0.0001
Toothpaste	0.766	0.641	0.054	1.195	0.2330
Dental floss	-1.182	0.843	-0.059	-1.403	0.1610

SE: Standard error

Dependent variable: FIS

One-way ANOVA test showed a significant relationship between FIS and parents' academic education (P = 0.004), employed parent (P = 0.017), and good economic situation of the family (P = 0.005) (Table 1). There was no significant relationship between FIS mean score with child and parent age, class grade, birth rank, gender of child, and family size (P > 0.050).

There was a significant difference between the FIS mean score of students who rarely consumed junk food and the students who sometimes, often, or always consumed it (P < 0.001). This test showed a significant difference between the FIS mean scores of students who regularly or sometimes brushed and students who did not brush (P < 0.001). There was also a significant difference in the three groups of students who regularly or sometimes used dental floss and students who did not use it at all (P < 0.050).

Multiple linear regression showed that three variables of regular visitation every six months for check-up (B = -3.54), regular brushing (B = 2.10), and less use of junk food (B = 1.40) were the most powerful factors in enhancing family QOL associated with children oral health (P < 0.001) (Table 4). In exchange for regular check-up, the FIS score was reduced by 3.54 and the family QOL improved. In general, the variables and

health behaviors listed in this table predicted 46% mean score of FIS.

Discussion

Theory of oral health impact on person and family QOL is associated with oral health or disease impact of person and family QOL and performance. One significant advantage of oral HRQOL (OHRQOL) indicators' application can be observed in demanding programs and purposeful interventions promoting oral health;⁴ hence, this study was carried out to examine the effect of Iranian children's oral health on their family QOL.

The mean score of FIS was 8.59 out of 42. Concerning about children situation, needing more care compared to other family members, economic problems, and being sad were the most serious harms to family QOL. Approximately, 34.0% used toothbrush, 9.0% used dental floss, and 45.9% visited dentist every 6 months, regularly.

Aldrigui et al.¹⁵ and Jamieson et al.¹⁶ reported more harms to family QOL due to children's inappropriate oral health in terms of concerning for children situation, being sad, sense of guilt and shame, sense of discomfort in presence of others and various situations, and lack of sufficient relationship with family members; these results were in line with results of present study.

Considering the serious oral health impact on various dimensions of family QOL, it is recommended to families to learn required teachings in relation with oral health and QOL. In this regard, health beneficiaries should provide specific facilities for promoting children's oral health.

There was a significant relationship between FIS mean score and regular appointment with dentist (every 6 months) indicating that families who have set regular appointment with dentist for their children experienced lower children's oral health impact. Birungi et al.,17 Chaffee et al.,18 and Bahmanpour et al.19 reported a significant relationship between FIS and variables including parents' job and education, economic status, using dental floss and toothbrush, and junk food consumption; this result is matched with the result obtained by present paper. Hence, it was concluded that some behaviors such as correct and regular tooth brushing, regular use of dental floss, and regular dentist visits could promote children's oral health and family QOL. Families with lower education level and economic status experienced higher children's oral health impact indicating positive impact of family education and economic status on oral health and person QOL. The mentioned findings have been reported by Hooley et al.20 Accordingly, it is recommended to take into account interventional programs in order to provide inexpensive oral health services for poor population living in city margin. According to the obtained results, employed families obtained lower FIS mean score while retired families obtained higher mean score; these results were in line with findings obtained by Abanto et al.21 Families who reported regular use of dental floss and toothbrush as well as lower junk food consumption obtained lower FIS mean score; this finding was matched with study of Keikhaee et al.,²² Pakpour et al.,²³ and Shirzai and Ghanbariha.²⁴ According to the overall results, it is recommended to promote level of awareness, attitude, and beliefs among

persons and their families toward the studied case.25-27 This study showed a significant relationship between children's public health and their oral health; there was also a significant relationship between oral health and family QOL. The mentioned results were also reported by Karki et al.,²⁸ Ortiz-Barrios et al.,29 and Khodadadi et al.30 Hence, children's oral health should be essentially considered due to the relation between public health and oral health as well as its impact on family QOL. One of the most important limitations of the research was the lack of parents' participation in completing the questionnaires. Another limitation was the recall bias in answering FIS questionnaire.

Conclusion

In this research, optimal mean score was obtained for OHRQOL and serious harms to families included: concerning about children situation and future, upsetting family members, and needing more care compared to other family members. There was a significant relationship between FIS score and use of toothbrush, toothpaste, dental floss, junk foods, regular check-up every 6 months, parent academic education, employed parents, and good economic situation of the family.

Hence, it is essential to facilitate referral, costs, and accessibility processes, distribute resources fairly, provide dentistry facilities and services especially in deprived areas, expand information and teach through mass media, and give toothbrush, toothpaste, and dental floss among poor people in order to achieve oral health optimal level. Moreover, it is recommended to design, implement, and evaluate interventional programs for families to expand information, attitude, and behaviors related to oral health.

Conflict of Interests

Authors have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to appreciate the

authorities of Rafsanjan University of Medical Sciences and Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Education and Training Ministry of Rafsanjan, managers, teachers of schools, parents, and students who helped the implementation of this research project.

References

- 1. World Health Organization. Oral health: Key facts [Online]. [cited 2020 Mar 25]; Available from: URL: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/oral-health
- 2. Baiju RM, Peter E, Varghese NO, Sivaram R. Oral health and quality of life: Current concepts. J Clin Diagn Res 2017; 11(6): ZE21-ZE26.
- 3. Garcia-Perez A, Irigoyen-Camacho ME, Borges-Yanez SA, Zepeda-Zepeda MA, Bolona-Gallardo I, Maupome G. Impact of caries and dental fluorosis on oral health-related quality of life: A cross-sectional study in schoolchildren receiving water naturally fluoridated at above-optimal levels. Clin Oral Investig 2017; 21(9): 2771-80.
- 4. World Health Organization. Oral Health Country/Area Profile Project [Online]. [cited 2019 Jul 20]; Available from: URL: https://capp.mau.se/
- 5. Alkhtib A, Morawala A. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices of mothers of preschool children about oral health in Qatar: A cross-sectional survey. Dent J (Basel) 2018; 6(4): E51.
- 6. Tinanoff N, Baez RJ, Diaz GC, Donly KJ, Feldens CA, McGrath C, et al. Early childhood caries epidemiology, aetiology, risk assessment, societal burden, management, education, and policy: Global perspective. Int J Paediatr Dent 2019; 29(3): 238-48.
- 7. Solis-Riggioni A, Gallardo-Barquero C, Chavarria-Bolanos D. Prevalence and severity of dental caries in foster-care children and adolescents. J Clin Pediatr Dent 2018; 42(4): 269-72.
- 8. Ghaffari M, Nasirzadeh M, Rakhshanderou S, Ramezankhani A. Some of the strongest predisposing factors on the behavior of tooth brushing among Iranian school age children. Int J Pediatr 2017; 5(4): 4783-91.
- 9. Mohtasham G, Nasirzadeh M, Sakineh R, Ramezankhani A. Unacceptable status of oral and dental health-related knowledge among Iranian primary school students. Biosci Biotechnol Res Commun 2017; 10(1): 260-6.
- 10. Tahani B, Heidary A. Assessment of oral hygiene and oral health status of 4-12-year-old children with hearing impairment. J Mashad Dent Sch 2016; 40 (1): 59-72. [In Persian].
- 11. Jokovic A, Locker D, Stephens M, Kenny D, Tompson B, Guyatt G. Validity and reliability of a questionnaire for measuring child oral-health-related quality of life. J Dent Res 2002; 81(7): 459-63.
- 12. Ministry of Health and Medical Education, Ministry of Education. Executive Agreement on Joint Cooperation of Students' Oral Health Program, Between the Ministry of Health & Medical Education and the Ministry of Education. [Online]. [cited 2015 Mar 11]; Available from: URL: http://iums.ac.ir/uploads/daneshAmoozi-18 71147.pdf
- 13. Al-Riyami IA, Thomson WM, Al-Harthi LS. Testing the Arabic short form versions of the Parental-Caregivers Perceptions Questionnaire and the Family Impact Scale in Oman. Saudi Dent J 2016; 28(1): 31-5.
- 14. Nilchian F, Jabbarifar SE, Larijani M, Navaei H. Evaluation of the impact of children's oral health on their family quality of life in Amol, Iran. J Isfahan Dent Sch 2013; 8(7): 662-8. [In Persian].
- 15. Aldrigui JM, Abanto J, Carvalho TS, Mendes FM, Wanderley MT, Bonecker M, et al. Impact of traumatic dental injuries and malocclusions on quality of life of young children. Health Qual Life Outcomes 2011; 9: 78.
- 16. Jamieson LM, Paradies YC, Gunthorpe W, Cairney SJ, Sayers SM. Oral health and social and emotional well-being in a birth cohort of Aboriginal Australian young adults. BMC Public Health 2011; 11: 656.
- 17. Birungi N, Fadnes LT, Nankabirwa V, Tumwine JK, Astrom AN. Caretaker's caries experience and its association with early childhood caries and children's oral health-related quality of life: A prospective two-generation study. Acta Odontol Scand 2016; 74(8): 605-12.
- 18. Chaffee BW, Rodrigues PH, Kramer PF, Vitolo MR, Feldens CA. Oral health-related quality-of-life scores differ by socioeconomic status and caries experience. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2017; 45(3): 216-24.
- 19. Bahmanpour K, Nouri R, Nadrian H, Salehi B. Determinants of oral health behavior among high school students in Marivan County, Iran based on the Pender's Health Promotion Model. J Sch Public Health Inst Public Health Res 2011; 9 (2):93-106. [In Persian].
- 20. Hooley M, Skouteris H, Boganin C, Satur J, Kilpatrick N. Parental influence and the development of dental caries in children aged 0-6 years: A systematic review of the literature. J Dent 2012; 40(11): 873-85.
- 21. Abanto J, Paiva SM, Raggio DP, Celiberti P, Aldrigui JM, Bonecker M. The impact of dental caries and trauma in children on family quality of life. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2012; 40(4): 323-31.
- 22. Keikhaee R, Rakhshani F, Izadi S, Hashemi Z. Survey of oral health behaviors and its associated factors in female students of primary schools in Zabol based on Health Belief Model. J Rostamineh Zabol Univ Med Sci 2012; 4(2):

- 33-41. [In Persian].
- 23. Pakpour AH, Hidarnia A, Hajizadeh E, Kumar S, Harrison AP. The status of dental caries and related factors in a sample of Iranian adolescents. Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal 2011; 16(6): e822-e827.
- 24. Shirzai M, Ghanbariha M. Evaluation oral hygiene index in the 12-years-old students. Zahedan J Res Med Sci 2011; 13(5): 38-42.
- 25. Kumar G, Dhillon JK, Vignesh R, Garg A. Knowledge, attitude, and practical behavior of parents regarding their child's oral health in New Delhi. J Indian Soc Pedod Prev Dent 2019; 37(1): 3-7.
- 26. Guerra F, Rinaldo F, Mannocci A, Mazur M, Corridore D, Di Giorgio G, et al. Knowledge, attitude and behavior towards oral health: Gender differences between parents. Clin Ter 2017; 168(6): e361-e370. [In Italian].
- 27. Yousefvand H, Taleghani F, Bahrami T, Rejeh N. Comparison of the efficacy of electronic and moulage dental training models on adolescents. Journal of Nursing Education 2018; 6(6):33-40. [In Persian].
- 28. Karki S, Pakkila J, Laitala ML, Humagain M, Anttonen V. Influence of dental caries on oral health-related quality of life, school absenteeism and school performance among Nepalese schoolchildren. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2019; 47(6): 461-9.
- 29. Ortiz-Barrios LB, Granados-Garcia V, Cruz-Hervert P, Moreno-Tamayo K, Heredia-Ponce E, Sanchez-Garcia S. The impact of poor oral health on the oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) in older adults: the oral health status through a latent class analysis. BMC Oral Health 2019; 19(1): 141.
- 30. Khodadadi E, Motallebnejad M, Alizadeh M. Oral health related quality of life among adults reffered to dental clinic of Babol Faculty of Dentistry in 2009-2011. Caspian J Dent Res-March 2013, 2(1):53-60.