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Abstract

Objective: The aim of this study was to identify factors related to the prevalence of caries in 12-year-old schoolchildren. Methods: A cross-sectional study was carried out using a representative sample (n = 1217) of the population of 12-year-old schoolchildren in Galiza (northwest Spain). Independent variables were measured through a questionnaire, and dependent variables were determined through oral examination. Multiple and logistic regression were applied.

Results: The decayed, missing and filled permanent teeth/demayed, filled primary teeth (DMFT-dft) value in the sample was 1.83 (95% confidence interval [CI], 1.67-1.98), the DMFT value was 1.53 (95% CI, 1.37-1.67), and the prevalence of caries was 61% (95% CI, 57.7-64.5). The prevalence of caries was directly related to a low frequency of brushing, greater use of toothpaste, and a higher consumption of sweets. The prevalence of caries was higher in rural than in urban areas. In contrast, the higher the mother’s level of education and the greater the subject’s knowledge of dental health, the lower the prevalence of caries.

Conclusions: The main goals of dental health programmes should be to achieve quality brushing every day in children, to reduce the consumption of sweets, and to increase knowledge of dental health.


Introduction

Epidemiological studies about dental caries in schoolchildren are numerous. However, many of these studies only analyse caries prevalence, as the prevalence rate of caries, or through the different caries ratios defined in the bibliography (DMFT, decayed, missing, filling in definitive tooth; dmft, decayed, missing, filling in temporary tooth; dft,
decayed, filling in temporary tooth)\(^1\).\(^2\). Dental caries is a
disease in which cultural and hygienic habits are decisi-
ve, so prevalence found in different habitats and different
moments could be strong related with these factors.

On the other hand, determining the factors associated
with the appearance of caries is of greater interest, given
that these factors present high geographical and tem-
poral stability\(^4\). However, the number of articles that
analyse these factors is lower, and despite there being
studies on the factors associated with caries in 12 year
olds\(^5\)\(^6\)\(^7\), studies that use multivariate methodology in-
cluding cultural variables are scarce\(^8\), a method that
allows us to isolate the contribution of each of the risk
factors.

The objectives of this study were: to determine car-
ries prevalence in 12-year-old pupils and to identify the
factors related to caries prevalence.

Methods

Design and sample

This study has a cross-sectional design, and the
study participants were 28,297 children aged 12 years
old. The pool of schools was stratified by province (A
Coruña, Lugo, Ourense, Pontevedra) and habitat (ur-
ban; and rural). Eight clusters were generated. A total
of 95 schools were selected proportional to cluster size.
Finally, each school had a number of sampled pupils
proportional to its size. This sample is comprised of 1,217
subjects.

Data collection

For data collection, six teams were created and each
one of them were made up of two persons: 1 dentist
and 1 assistant who administered out the questionnai-
re. Diagnosis criteria between the six teams were ca-
librated by a training of two weeks. The training was
made in 4 schools.

The teams visited the schools during the second term
of the year 2000. Before the team visited the schools,
they were contacted to set dates and determine requi-
ments to carry out the questionnaire and the explo-
ration. Authorisation from the pupils’ parents was re-
quested.

Taking previous studies as a starting point, we col-
lected socio-demographic and medical variables, which
could be associated with dental caries, through the ques-
tionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to be short
and easy to fill. Pupils were asked whether they con-
sidered they had a healthy mouth, and what pathology
they had. Pupils were also queried about their beliefs
on health: whether they believed it was important to look
after their teeth, if they thought that with age their teeth
would be less healthy, and if they believed that su-
gar produces caries. Pupils were also queried about
sweets’ consumption.

In as far as their hygienic habits were concerned,
the pupils were asked whether they cleaned their teeth
habitually, if they used dental floss and if they used an
electric toothbrush. Pupils were also asked at what age
they had started cleaning their teeth, when was the last
time they had cleaned their teeth, how many times they
clean their teeth a day, when was the last time they chan-
ged their toothbrush, how much toothpaste they put on
the toothbrush, and who showed them how to clean their
teeth.

The pupils were also asked about their use of fluo-
rinated toothpaste, fluoride tablets, fluoride drops, and
fluorinated mouthwashes. Pupils were also queried about
whether they had been to the dentist, and if the dentist
had advised them to wash their teeth. The schoolchil-
dren’s knowledge was also measured on the usefulness
of fluoride and on prevention of caries and gingivitis.

Independent variables were obtained through mouth
exploration of the schoolchildren carried out by the den-
tist. This information was registered using a modified
exploration form\(^9\).

Independent variables

Pupils were also queried about their knowledge on
dental health through 6 questions, giving 0 (incorrect)
or 1 (correct) point to each answer. A variable with va-
ues between 0 and 10 was generated, given that some
questions had a multiple answer. The questions consi-
dered were: a) sugar provokes caries, 0 = none, 0 = lit-
tle, 1 = quite a lot or a lot; b) fluoride is good so that, 1
= teeth are more resistant, 0 = teeth are whiter, 0 = teeth
are sparkler; c) caries is a disease, 1 = that destroys
teeth, 0 = that makes your gums bleed, 0 = that gives
a bad smell, 0 = in which your teeth get whiter; d) gin-
givitis is a disease, 0 = that destroys your teeth, 1 = that
makes your gums bleed, 0 = that gives a bad smell, 0
= in which your teeth get whiter; e) I can avoid having
caries, 1 = with hygiene, 1 = eating few sweets, 1 = using
fluorine, 1 = going for check ups, and f) I can avoid gin-
givitis, 1 = with hygiene, 0 = eating few sweets, 0 = using
fluorine, 1 = going for check ups.

In as far as their hygienic habits, the pupils were
asked when they had cleaned their teeth last (today, yes-
terday, day before yesterday, or more than two days ago);
and how much toothpaste they had put on the tooth-
brush (a third, two thirds, or complete).

Pupils were queried about their consumption of swe-
ets and where they eat them habitually (doesn’t eat them,
at school, at home, with friends, in other situations). This
variable is part of the models as the number of situations in which they eat sweets (doesn’t eat them, in 1 situation, in 2, in 3, or in 4). Pupils were also queried about visiting a dentist: when was the last time they had visited the dentist (never visited, more than 1 year ago, between 3 months and one year, less than 3 months ago). Finally, pupils were also queried about orthodontic treatment (yes/no).

One socio-economic variable was considered: mother’s education (no education, primary, secondary, university). In addition, an ecological variable which measures the socio-economic habitat was considered: municipality (rural, urban).

Dependent variables

We defined 3 variables to measure caries affectation: 1. Presence of decayed tooth, missing pieces or with fillings due to caries, dichotomous variable (0 = no; 1 = yes); 2. DMFT-value; 3. DMFT-dft-value, average decayed teeth surface in temporary and definite pieces.

Data analysis

The weighted Cohen’s Kappa was used to evaluate the concordance between gold standard (evaluation of specialist-professor) and the teams in four schools. A univariate (prevalence) analysis was performed. To analyse the factors related to DMFT-value and DMFT-dft-value (continuum variable) linear multiple regression was used. To study the factors related to caries presence we carried out a logistic regression analyses. Taking into account that our study is a cross-sectional study, odds ratios calculated are really prevalence odds ratio (POR).

According to the hypothesis, maximum models were generated. We excluded from the logistic models variables that had no effect and were not cofounders of the other independent variables (change in coefficients > 10%). We used the Hosmer-Lemeshow test to determine the goodness of fit of the models to the data.

Results

Of the 1217 pupils in our sample, 1105 pupils participated in the study (90.8%). The caries prevalence in the studied population was 61.1% (95% confidence interval [CI], 57.7-64.5). The DMFT-dft value in the sample was 1.82 (95% CI, 1.67-1.98), and the DMFT value 1.52 (95% CI, 1.37-1.67). The kappa statistics for concordance ranged from 0.75 to 0.95.

Table 1. Description of subjects studied for the main dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decayed tooth by subject (temporary and definitive, D-d)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.90-1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMFT-value (decayed, missing, filling in definitive tooth)</td>
<td>1.52 (1.37-1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dft-value (decayed, filling in temporary tooth)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.26-0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMFT-dft</td>
<td>1.82 (1.67-1.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMFM (first permanent molar)</td>
<td>1.23 (1.12-1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of subjects with decayed pieces (D-d) (%)</td>
<td>42.6 (38.9-46.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of subjects with missing pieces (M) (%)</td>
<td>3.09 (3.14-4.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of subjects with fillings (F-f) (%)</td>
<td>33.5 (29.9-37.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of subjects with caries (prevalence caries, DMFT-dft) (%)</td>
<td>61.1 (57.7-64.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants; in as far as the main dependent variables are concerned. Table 2 shows the distribution of subjects according to the different categories of the variables of knowledge.

Table 3 shows multiple regression models including the variables chosen for DMFT value and DMFT-dft value as outcomes. The DMFT-dft value and the DMFT value reduce with knowledge on dental health, and with educational level. On the other hand, low frequency in brushing teeth, the use of a lot of toothpaste, and the consumption of sweets are related to higher ratios. The ecological habitat variable (rural/urban) is significant, given that a rural habitat is associated with higher ratios.

Logistic regression model is shown in table 4. The model includes all the variables comprised in the table. This table also includes the description of the sample through independent variables and caries prevalence in different groups.

Discussion

The results of this study show that caries is directly related to a low frequency in brushing, the use of more toothpaste, and a higher consumption of sweets. The study has also shown that there is higher caries prevalence in rural habitats compared to urban habitats. On the other hand, the higher the mother’s level of education is and the more knowledge on dental health the subjects have, the lower the caries prevalence.

According to the results of the study, subjects with low knowledge of dental health show more caries (POR = 1.32; 95% CI, 1.20-1.61) than those subjects with higher knowledge. Different studies have found that health education could reduce caries affectation, concluding that higher knowledge generates more positive attitudes that in turn generate healthier habits. On the other hand, the results of our study show that knowledge has
Table 2. Distribution of subjects according to the different categories of the variables of knowledge. The numbers shows the percentage of subjects that agree with the statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK/DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar provokes caries</td>
<td>47.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroys tooth</td>
<td>87.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes your gums bleed</td>
<td>30.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives a bad smell</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitens your tooth</td>
<td>79.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can avoid having caries&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75.3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can avoid gingivitis&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With hygiene</td>
<td>87.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating less candies</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using fluor</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to reviews</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluor is for teeth to be&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75.3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Answers that are considered as correct in the evaluation of knowledge.  
<sup>b</sup>Doesn't know, doesn't answer.  
<sup>c</sup>Questions with multiple answers. The percentages do not add up to 100%.

Table 3. Related factors with DMFT-dft value and DMFT-value in 12 year old. Linear multiple regression coefficients (Coef), confidence intervals (95% CI) and statistical significance (p-value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMFT-dft-value</th>
<th>DMFT-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coef*</td>
<td>95% CI*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental health knowledge&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last time brushed teeth&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much toothpaste used&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet consumption&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the dentist&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodontics&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Adjusted for the other independent variables included in this table.  
<sup>c</sup>Measurements on four question (0 = all questions wrongly answered or doesn't answer… 10 = all questions correctly answered).  
<sup>1</sup>1 = today, 2 = yesterday, 3 = day before yesterday, 4 = more than two days ago.  
<sup>2</sup>1 = a third of the toothbrush, 2 = two thirds, 3 = the toothpaste covers the toothbrush completely.  
<sup>3</sup>Five possibilities don’t have any, at school, with friends, in my house, others (0 = doesn’t consume… 4 = consumes in all situations).  
<sup>4</sup>1 = less than 3 months, 2 = less than three months and less than a year, 3 = more than a year, 4 = I’ve never been to the dentist.  
<sup>5</sup>0 = no, 1 = yes.  
<sup>6</sup>1 = without education, 2 = primary education, 3 = secondary education, 4 = university education.  
<sup>7</sup>0 = urban, 1 = rural.

an effect on its own, independently of being able to modify attitudes and habits.

The fact that the models have been adjusted for follow brushing guidelines, visits to the dentist and consumption of sweets indicates that with the same habits, the subjects with more knowledge on oral health show less caries. There are 2 possible explanations for this result: first, better knowledge is related to better brushing techniques, although when adjusting by the quantity of toothpaste used, part of this effect should be controlled, and second, a certain amount of residual confounding cannot be ignored due to the misclassification introduced in the variables that measure the habits.<sup>7</sup> In as far as the effect of brushing on caries is concerned, the results of our study are consistent with those found by different authors.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, considering the subjects who cleaned their teeth today as a reference category, among those who cleaned their teeth yesterday, we found more caries (POR = 1.48; 95% CI, 1.22-1.78), (POR = 1.57; 95% CI, 0.91-2.33) among those who brus-
Table 4. Factors related with caries presence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge on dental health</th>
<th>n*</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Prevalence odds ratio (POR)</th>
<th>(95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More knowledge (5-10 points)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less knowledge (0-4 points)</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>(1.20-1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last time you brushed your teeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesterday</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>(1.22-1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day before yesterday</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>(0.91-2.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two days ago</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>(1.20-2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much toothpaste do you use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A third</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two thirds</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>(0.87-2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole toothbrush</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>(1.10-2.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1 situation</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>(0.88-2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2 situations</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>(0.95-2.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 3 situations</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>(1.02-2.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 4 situations</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>(1.06-2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>(1.27-5.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 months and 1 year</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>(1.12-2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3 months</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>(1.05-2.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have orthodontic treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>(1.24-2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>(1.32-2.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>(1.01-1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>(1.06-1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>(1.42-2.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of subjects and percentage (n), percentage of subjects with caries (DMFT-dft) (%).

a Adjusted for the effects of the other independent variables included in the table.

b Hosmer-Lemeshow test. p-value > 0.05.

c Reference category.

hed their teeth before yesterday and among those who brushed their teeth more than two days ago (POR = 1.60; 95% CI, 1.20-2.28). These results are of statistical significance.

The final models also considered the variable of quantity of toothpaste on the toothbrush. Taking as a reference category those who use a third of the toothbrush with toothpaste, the subjects who use two thirds show more caries (POR = 1.32; 95% CI, 1.10-2.16), and those who use the whole brush (POR = 1.52; 95% CI, 1.20-1.61). These results show a clear significant tendency. This association between quantity of toothpaste and caries could be due to 3 reasons: a) the variable quantity of toothpaste could be a proxy of the quality of brushing. Therefore, the subjects who use less toothpaste are probably those who have more knowledge on the more adequate way to brush their teeth; b) the quantity of toothpaste used is related to the frequency of brushing (p = 0.02). Therefore, it is reasonable to think that the subjects who brush their teeth more frequently use less toothpaste, and c) the use of great quantities of toothpaste could generate a false sensation of cleanliness (production of great amounts of foam and a pleasant sensation), which reduces brushing time.

Consistently with previous studies, a high consumption of sweets is related to higher caries prevalence, these results are consistent with the bibliography [12-15], even though the consumption between meals could be a more suitable measure. Therefore, taking the subjects who never consume as a reference category, we found...
increasing values of caries prevalence as the situations in which they are consumed increase: in one situation (POR = 1.39); in two situations (POR = 1.44); in three situations (POR = 1.46), and in four situations (POR = 1.68). The fact that the models have been adjusted according to brushing, quantity of toothpaste, or visits to the dentist, allows us to confirm the negative effect that the number of times we eat sweets has on caries, independently of the subject maintaining adequate hygienic habits.

In as far as the variable of education of the mother is concerned, a univariate analysis shows how caries prevalence increases as the level of education decreases, we go from a prevalence of 49.7% in children with mothers with higher education, to a prevalence of 78.8% in children with mothers who have no education. These results are consistent with those in the bibliography5,16, which generally show worse dental health in the lower economic strata17-19.

However, when analysing prevalence odds ratio we observe different data: taking higher education as a reference category, caries prevalence odds ratio in secondary education is POR = 1.62, while in the categories of primary and no education this increase is lower POR = 1.40. These results show an important confusing effect of the remaining variables, an effect that has not been described in the bibliography.

The lower caries prevalence in subjects belonging to the lower cultural strata compared with the middle cultural strata is not easy to explain. Perhaps the subjects belonging to a lower socio-economic strata consume less refined sugar products20, although we cannot ignore that this difference in prevalence may be a sample effect, in fact, the confidence intervals are not significant.

We also considered one aggregate variable of the municipality where the pupils live, rural municipalities and urban municipalities, finding that there is a lower level of dental health in rural habitats. Traditionally, there has always been a lower economical and cultural level in rural habitats, and less possibility of access to a dentist. And despite including the parents’ level of education and check ups in the models, we cannot ignore a certain degree of residual confounding. Moreover, the level of studies is a proxy of socio-cultural level, but both are not equal. In any case, these interpretations must be made with caution, due to the possibility of «ecological fallacy» in the measurement of these variables11.

Moreover, the models include variables of orthodontics and visits to the dentist. These variables have been included solely to adjust the models, and their coefficients have no direct interpretation on the models.

Since the current analysis is based on cross-sectional data, the validity of the conclusions could be limited by the difficulty in differentiating between cause and effect. In this case however, the factors associated with caries (i.e. habitat, socio-economical level, oral hygiene, sweet consumption) are variables that are unlikely to change during the period of time in which the dependent variable is measured11.

This study may give health educators, planners and other health professionals’ information that will help to reduce dental caries. The main goals of dental health programmes should to be achieve quality brushing every day in children, to reduce the consumption of sweets, and to increase knowledge on dental health.
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