

1 **Explaining Time Changes in Oral Health-Related Quality of Life in England: a decomposition**
2 **analysis**

6 **Authors:**

8 Georgios Tsakos ¹
9 Carol C. Guarnizo-Herreño ^{1,2} (Corresponding author)
10 Rhiannon O'Connor ³
11 John Wildman ⁴
12 Jimmy G. Steele ³
13 Patrick Finbarr Allen ⁵

16 ¹ Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
17 University College London, London, United Kingdom

19 ² Departamento de Salud Colectiva, Facultad de Odontología
20 Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia

22 ³ School of Dental Sciences and Centre for Oral Health Research
23 Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

25 ⁴ Economics, Newcastle Business School
26 Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

28 ⁵ NUS Faculty of Dentistry and University Dental Cluster, NUH
29 National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

33 Corresponding author:

35 Carol C. Guarnizo-Herreño
36 1-19 Torrington Place | London WC1E 7HB
37 Tel: +44 (0)20 7679 1699 | Fax: +44 (0)20 7813 0280
38 Email: c.guarnizo-herreno.11@ucl.ac.uk

45 Total Word Count: 2,959

46 Number of references: 34

1 **Abstract**

2 Background: Oral diseases are highly prevalent and impact upon oral health-related quality of
3 life (OHRQoL). However, time changes in OHRQoL have been scarcely investigated in the current
4 context of general improvement in clinical oral health. This study aims to examine changes in
5 OHRQoL between 1998 and 2009 amongst adults in England, and to analyse the contribution of
6 demographics, socioeconomic characteristics and clinical oral health measures.

7 Methods: Using data from two nationally representative surveys in England, we assessed
8 changes in the Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14), in both the sample overall (n=12,027)
9 and by quasi-cohorts. We calculated the prevalence and extent of oral impacts and summary
10 OHIP-14 scores. An Oaxaca-Blinder type decomposition analysis was used to assess the
11 contribution of demographics (age, gender, marital status), socioeconomic position (education,
12 occupation) and clinical measures (presence of decay, number of missing teeth, having advanced
13 periodontitis).

14 Results: There were significant improvements in OHRQoL, predominantly among those that
15 experienced oral impacts occasionally, but no difference in the proportion with frequent oral
16 impacts. The decomposition model showed that 43% (-4.07/-9.47) of the decrease in prevalence
17 of oral impacts reported occasionally or more often was accounted by the model explanatory
18 variables. Improvements in clinical oral health and the effect of aging itself accounted for most
19 of the explained change in OHRQoL, but the effect of these factors varied substantially across
20 the lifecourse and quasi-cohorts.

21 Conclusions: These decomposition findings indicate that broader determinants could be
22 primarily targeted to influence OHRQoL in different age groups or across different adult cohorts.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Key Words: Epidemiology, Adult, Quality of life, Dental Caries, Tooth Loss, Periodontal Diseases

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2

3 Over the past fifty years, there has been a major shift in health status. Improved life expectancy
4 has been largely associated with better living standards and improved therapies for many life-
5 threatening conditions.[1] In economically prosperous countries, the financial burden of
6 healthcare has shifted towards the management of chronic conditions and comorbidities, often
7 with rapidly increasing costs. Concepts of measurement have also broadened, from purely
8 clinical assessment of disease to the inclusion of the people’s perceptions, such as quality of life
9 and well-being, so managing symptom severity rather than complete cure is often a more
10 appropriate primary goal.

11

12 In the context of oral health, the most prevalent diseases are dental caries and periodontal
13 disease.[2] These are abundant chronic diseases and their manifestations accumulate and
14 change over time, with the potential of tooth loss as an endpoint. Oral diseases result in
15 considerable burden on people’s quality of life[3] and high costs,[4] so it is important to have an
16 understanding of their impact on the population and how this changes across life.

17

18 Describing the impact of oral conditions is complex. The way a person interprets and feels about
19 any oral condition will vary with their age but also between generations. A further consideration
20 is whether health gains over time are shared evenly across the population. Indeed, there is a
21 body of evidence suggesting that there are growing socio-economic inequalities in health.[5-9]
22 Predicting how the impact of oral health may change over the next ten or twenty years is
23 important as any organisation needs to understand, plan and manage problems, with sensible
24 decisions taken about a likely future. Such predictions must be based on up-to-date evidence
25 identifying how oral diseases and their impact on people’s quality of life are changing, whether
26 this is happening in different ways across the population, and why such changes are occurring.

27

28 Time changes in oral impacts among adult populations have been previously investigated in
29 cohort studies with follow-up periods of up to seven years.[10-13] Data from national population
30 surveys have been helpful at given points in time, but they are cross-sectional and have provided
31 only limited evidence about changes over time.[14] In the United Kingdom, national oral health
32 surveys have been undertaken every 10 years since 1968. The most recent were in 1998 and
33 2009, and both included clinical and subjective measures of oral health, including oral health

1 related quality of life (OHRQoL). This allows the opportunity for time point comparisons between
2 different generations, but also within generations as people age, thereby looking at, and
3 potentially explaining, both generation and age effects.

4
5 This study examined changes in OHRQoL amongst nationally representative samples of adults in
6 England across an eleven-year time period, with subsequent deconstruction of the relative
7 contribution of demographic, socioeconomic and clinical oral health characteristics to the
8 observed changes for different age groups.

10 **METHODS**

12 **Data Source**

14 We analysed data from the 1998 and 2009 Adult Dental Health Surveys (ADHS), the two most
15 recent national surveys of adults' oral health in the UK.[15, 16] Both employed a multi-stage
16 cluster and probabilistic sampling design that provided representative data of individuals aged
17 16 years and over. Households were selected initially, then all adults in selected households
18 were invited to participate in an interview and those with natural teeth were also invited to a
19 clinical dental examination. Full details of the surveys' designs can be found elsewhere.[15, 16]

21 **Study measures**

22 Interviews in both surveys included the Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14), a widely used
23 14-item OHRQoL measure.[17, 18] Individuals were asked how often they had experienced
24 negative impacts due to oral problems during the last 12 months with responses of never, hardly
25 ever, occasionally, fairly often and very often. We derived four summary measures:[19-23] a) a
26 binary variable for responding 'very often' or 'fairly often' to any question (FOVO prevalence);
27 b) a binary variable for those that responded 'occasionally', 'fairly often' or 'very often' to any
28 question (OFOVO prevalence); c) the number of items with responses of 'occasionally', 'fairly
29 often' or 'very often' (OFOVO extent); d) the OHIP-14 score, corresponding to the sum of ordinal
30 responses, with higher scores indicating poorer OHRQoL.

31
32 Demographic characteristics included age, gender and marital status. Socioeconomic
33 characteristics included educational attainment (no qualifications; qualifications below degree

1 level; qualifications at degree level or equivalent) and occupational social class (managerial and
2 professional; intermediate; routine and manual, according to the UK three-category National
3 Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC)). We used three measures representing
4 different aspects of clinical oral health: presence of decay or any unsound teeth, number of
5 missing teeth, and having advanced periodontitis (presence of probing pocket depth \geq 6mm).
6 These clinical measures were identified as the main oral health issues worldwide.[2] They also
7 exhibited significant differences between 1998 and 2009 in our data, therefore could potentially
8 explain changes in OHRQoL.

9

10 **Statistical analysis**

11 Firstly, changes between 1998 and 2009 for each OHIP-14 summary measure were evaluated in
12 the whole sample and also by age groups. In addition, we looked at changes by quasi-cohorts,
13 aiming to capture cohort effects by defining groups as they aged during this eleven-year period,
14 e.g. participants aged 16-34 years in 1998 were compared to those aged 27-45 years in 2009.

15

16 We then used decomposition analyses to evaluate the contribution of demographic,
17 socioeconomic and clinical oral health characteristics to changes in OHRQoL (measured by
18 OFOVO prevalence, as it was the most meaningful outcome that showed significant change)
19 between 1998 and 2009, in both the whole sample and by quasi-cohorts. Oaxaca-Blinder type
20 decomposition models are used to quantify how much of the difference in an outcome between
21 two groups (or time periods) is explained by respective differences in the distributions of
22 selected independent variables.[24, 25] Such models have previously been used to understand
23 health inequalities and time trends in health and health care outcomes.[26-29] We quantified
24 how much of the decrease in OFOVO prevalence between 1998 and 2009 was explained by
25 changes in socio-demographic (age, gender, marital status, education, occupational social class)
26 and clinical variables (presence of decay or unsound teeth, number of missing teeth, having
27 advanced periodontitis) over this period. Since the dependent variable was binary, we used the
28 Fairlie model for nonlinear binary outcomes (a nonlinear variant of Oaxaca-Blinder
29 decomposition).[24] The independent variables were categorical, apart from age and number of
30 missing teeth, which were continuous.

31

1 Various steps were followed to decompose the difference in OFOVO prevalence between the
2 two surveys. First, conditional probabilities of the outcome were predicted for each observation.
3 Then, to equal the size of the 1998 sample, a subsample of individuals in 2009 (the largest
4 sample) was randomly selected. In these two equally-sized samples, each individual/observation
5 was rank-ordered according to the predicted outcome probability and observations with equal
6 rank in the two samples were matched. Next, for each independent variable, values of the
7 variable in 1998 were replaced by values of this variable from the matched 2009 observations.
8 The difference in the outcome probability when using the 1998 and 2009 values was then
9 estimated to represent the time difference explained by a particular independent variable. Since
10 results depend on the specific selected 2009 subsample, we obtained 2000 randomly selected
11 ADHS 2009 subsamples and the decomposition results were averaged across these subsamples.
12 Additionally, as the order in which values are substituted (from 1998 to 2009) could affect the
13 decomposition results for each variable category, we randomly selected the category order for
14 each ADHS 2009 subsample, expecting that the 2000 replications approximate the average result
15 from all potential variable-category orderings.[24, 25] For sensitivity analysis, we additionally
16 carried out similar decomposition analyses for the mean OHIP-14 score change.

17
18 Analyses referred to data from 12,027 dentate participants in England (n=3,010 in 1998 and
19 n=9,017 in 2009) as OHIP-14 questions were only asked to the dentate adults in ADHS 1998. For
20 decomposition analyses, the sample was further restricted to participants that were clinically
21 examined and those aged ≥ 21 to ensure accurate data on educational attainment. Furthermore,
22 204 individuals were excluded from ADHS 1998 and 587 from ADHS 2009 because of incomplete
23 information on socio-demographic or clinical variables. Hence, the decomposition analyses
24 sample contained 6,549 individuals (n=1,842 in 1998; n=4,707 in 2009). No imputation of missing
25 data was carried out as missing data was less than 7% for all study variables.[30] Analyses used
26 the surveys' sampling probability weights, accounting for the sampling strategy and non-
27 response, to provide population representative data.

28

29 **RESULTS**

30 In the overall sample, there were significant reductions in the summary OHIP measures between
31 1998 and 2009, except from FOVO prevalence which showed no significant change. When
32 stratifying by age groups, there was an increase in FOVO prevalence among those aged 55-74

1 years but a reduction by almost half in the oldest group (75+ years). OFOVO prevalence, OFOVO
2 extent, and the mean OHIP-14, showed significant reductions across all age groups apart from
3 55-74 years-olds (Table 1). Examination of time changes for each OHIP-14 item showed larger
4 declines in prevalence in the 'occasionally' and 'hardly ever', rather than the 'fairly often' or 'very
5 often' ratings (Appendix Table 1).

6
7 Assessing time changes for the different quasi-cohorts (Table 2), we found that FOVO prevalence
8 remained very similar between 1998 and 2009 across quasi-cohorts, whereas OFOVO prevalence
9 decreased by around 10 percentage points over that period. The decline was slightly larger in
10 the youngest cohort (13.3%) and became smaller in older cohorts (7.6% in oldest). Reductions
11 in OFOVO extent and the mean OHIP score were similar across cohorts with declines of around
12 0.3 and 1.5 respectively.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Table 1 – Changes in summary OHIP-14 measures: dentate adults in England, 1998 and 2009, by age groups (weighted estimates)

Age	FOVO (%)			OFOVO (%)			Mean extent OFOVO (SD)			Mean OHIP-14 score (SD)		
	1998	2009	p-value ^a	1998	2009	p-value ^a	1998	2009	p-value ^a	1998	2009	p-value ^a
All (16+)	15.6	15.2	0.607	50.8	39.2	<0.001	1.6 (2.4)	1.2 (2.2)	<0.001	5.1 (6.6)	3.5 (6.3)	<0.001
16-34	16.1	14.0	0.119	52.1	36.1	<0.001	1.6 (1.7)	1.1 (1.8)	<0.001	5.4 (4.7)	3.3 (5.0)	<0.001
35-54	15.8	16.2	0.802	53.0	41.0	<0.001	1.7 (2.0)	1.3 (2.3)	<0.001	5.3 (5.3)	3.8 (6.3)	<0.001
55-74	12.5	16.2	0.021	44.2	41.5	0.222	1.3 (1.7)	1.2 (2.3)	0.550	4.2 (5.2)	3.5 (6.6)	0.016
75+	24.2	12.8	0.002	50.2	35.7	0.004	1.3 (1.7)	0.8 (1.6)	0.025	4.2 (4.8)	2.5 (4.8)	0.006

^a p-values from tests for differences between 1998 and 2009

FOVO: prevalence of responding 'very often' or 'fairly often' to any OHIP-14 question

OFOVO: prevalence of responding 'occasionally', 'fairly often' or 'very often' to any OHIP-14 question

1 Table 2 – Changes in OHIP-14 summary measures, demographics, socioeconomics and clinical oral health by quasi-
 2 cohorts: dentate adults in England, 1998 & 2009 (weighted estimates)

	Quasi-Cohort 1			Quasi-Cohort 2			Quasi-Cohort 3		
	1998 (21-34)	2009 (32-45)	p-value ^a	1998 (35-54)	2009 (46-65)	p-value ^a	1998 (55-74)	2009 (66-85)	p-value ^a
<i>OHIP-14 summary measures</i>									
FOVO (%)	16.7	15.6	0.464	15.8	17.1	0.341	12.5	13.4	0.570
OFOVO (%)	53.2	39.9	<0.001	53.0	42.2	<0.001	44.2	36.6	0.001
Mean extent OFOVO (SD)	1.7 (1.9)	1.3 (2.2)	<0.001	1.7 (2.0)	1.4 (2.4)	<0.001	1.3 (1.7)	0.9 (1.8)	<0.001
Mean OHIP score (SD)	5.5 (5.1)	3.7 (6.2)	<0.001	5.3 (5.4)	3.8 (6.8)	<0.001	4.2 (5.1)	2.7 (5.4)	<0.001
<i>Demographics</i>									
Mean age (SD)	28.5 (3.1)	38.8 (3.7)	<0.001	43.8 (4.6)	54.9 (6.1)	<0.001	63.1 (4.3)	73.5 (6.3)	<0.001
Gender (%)									
Female	49.6	49.8	0.922	48.0	46.9	0.641	48.7	49.0	0.925
Male	50.4	50.2	0.922	52.0	53.1	0.641	51.3	51.0	0.925
Marital status (%)									
Married/cohabiting	41.7	63.6	<0.001	70.0	65.5	0.038	76.2	56.5	<0.001
Single	52.1	24.2	<0.001	14.0	10.6	0.032	4.6	7.6	0.060
Separated/divorced	6.1	11.5	<0.001	5.0	19.7	0.006	7.2	10.6	0.079
Widowed	0.1	0.7	0.036	1.0	4.2	<0.001	12.0	25.3	<0.001
<i>Socioeconomics</i>									
Educational attainment (%)									
Degree/equivalent	21.8	37.4	<0.001	20.6	26.6	0.002	10.5	19.2	<0.001
Below degree level	69.8	55.1	<0.001	63.2	59.8	0.129	49.0	46.2	0.403
No qualifications	8.4	7.5	0.572	16.2	13.6	0.112	40.5	34.6	0.076
Occupation (NS-SEC) (%)									
Managerial and professional	35.6	53.3	<0.001	43.2	45.1	0.412	33.2	42.5	0.004
Intermediate	23.1	18.8	0.054	19.0	20.7	0.337	23.8	23.0	0.782
Routine and manual	41.3	27.9	<0.001	37.8	34.2	0.102	43.0	34.4	0.009
<i>Clinical oral health</i>									
Decay or any unsound teeth (%)	60.0	37.8	<0.001	51.4	42.1	<0.001	52.6	41.5	<0.001
Mean number of missing teeth (SD)	3.7 (1.9)	4.1 (2.8)	0.001	6.1 (3.4)	7.4 (5.3)	<0.001	12.6 (5.8)	12.9 (7.8)	0.583
Any pockets ≥ 6mm (%)	2.4	6.8	<0.001	5.9	14.1	<0.001	11.7	14.6	0.207

^a p-values from tests for differences between 1998 and 2009

FOVO: prevalence of responding 'very often' or 'fairly often' to any OHIP-14 question

OFOVO: prevalence of responding 'occasionally', 'fairly often' or 'very often' to any OHIP-14 question

1 The decomposition of the 1998-2009 change in OFOVO prevalence for the sample overall (Table
2 3) showed that 43% (-4.07/-9.47) of the decrease in OFOVO was explained by changes in the
3 distribution of socio-demographic characteristics and clinical oral health indicators. The decline
4 in the prevalence of decay or unsound teeth (Appendix Table 2) and the increase in mean age
5 each explained 16.2%, while the decrease in number of missing teeth accounted for 11.0% of
6 the reduction in OFOVO (Table 3). In contrast, the increase in prevalence of pocketing \geq 6mm
7 worked against the overall decrease in OFOVO (-2.7%). Other demographic and socioeconomic
8 variables had no significant effect on the change in OFOVO over time (Table 3). When clinical
9 variables were removed from the model, the proportion of the 1998-2009 change in OFOVO
10 explained greatly decreased: from 43% in the full model (Table 3) to 12% in the model without
11 clinical variables (Appendix Table 3). Decomposing the mean OHIP-14 score change, results
12 confirmed that age and clinical characteristics were the most important factors. In this model,
13 changes in the distribution of the socio-demographic and clinical variables explained 53% of the
14 decrease in OHIP-14 score (Appendix Table 4).

15
16 Finally, time differences in OFOVO prevalence were decomposed for each quasi-cohort,
17 assessing changes as generations aged (Table 4). For the two younger quasi-cohorts, the
18 decomposition model explained around 30% of the decrease in OFOVO prevalence but for the
19 oldest quasi-cohort the model accounted for 85% of the decrease in OFOVO. In the youngest
20 quasi-cohort, the reduction in decayed or unsound teeth accounted for 22%, whilst an
21 improvement in social class accounted for 13% of the decline in OFOVO (Table 4). Increasing age
22 and a reduction in decay and unsound teeth accounted for 50% and 12% respectively of the
23 decrease in OFOVO in the middle quasi-cohort and for 92% and 11% respectively of the decrease
24 in OFOVO in the oldest quasi-cohort. Increases in the number of missing teeth and the
25 prevalence of periodontal pocketing \geq 6mm in these quasi-cohorts as they aged worked against
26 the observed declines in OFOVO between 1998 and 2009 (Table 4).

Table 3 – Non-linear decomposition of the change in the OHIP-14 prevalence (OFOVO), in dentate adults aged ≥ 21 in England, between 1998 & 2009.

Predicted prevalence OFOVO 1998	0.5204		
Predicted prevalence OFOVO 2009	0.4257		
Difference in prevalence between 1998/2009	-0.0947		
Difference explained by decomposition model	-0.0407		
Explained ^a %	43.02		
Unexplained ^a %	56.98		
<i>Contributions of study variables (explained component)- Coefficient (SE), p-value and % contribution (where p<0.05)</i>			
<i>Demographics</i>			
Age	-0.0153 (0.0019)	<0.001	16.2%
Gender (female)	0.0002 (0.0002)	0.269	
Marital status	0.0014 (0.0009)	0.108	
<i>Socioeconomics</i>			
Educational attainment	-0.0027 (0.0023)	0.245	
Occupational social class (NS-SEC)	-0.0014 (0.0013)	0.297	
<i>Clinical oral health</i>			
Existence of decay or any unsound teeth	-0.0153 (0.0021)	<0.001	16.2%
Number of missing teeth	-0.0104 (0.0010)	<0.001	11.0%
Any pockets ≥ 6 mm	0.0026 (0.0007)	<0.001	(-)2.7%

^a Proportion of the 1998/2009 change in OFOVO explained and unexplained by the decomposition model.

Explained= related to change in endowments, attributable to 1998-2009 changes in the magnitude of the explanatory variables.

Unexplained= related to change in coefficients, attributable to 1998-2009 changes in the effects of the explanatory variables.

OFOVO: prevalence of responding 'occasionally', 'fairly often' or 'very often' to any OHIP-14 question

1 Table 4 – Non-linear decomposition of the change in the OHIP-14 prevalence (OFOVO), by quasi-cohort of dentate
 2 adults in England, between 1998 & 2009

	Quasi-Cohort 1 1998 (21-34 years) 2009 (32-45 years) n=1,872	Quasi-Cohort 2 1998 (35-54 years) 2009 (46-65 years) n=2,632	Quasi-Cohort 3 1998 (55-74 years) 2009 (66-85 years) n=1,300
Predicted prevalence OFOVO 1998	0.5515	0.5340	0.4520
Predicted prevalence OFOVO 2009	0.4403	0.4399	0.3754
Difference in prevalence between 1998 & 2009	-0.1112	-0.0941	-0.0767
Difference explained by the decomposition model	-0.0354	-0.0273	-0.0655
Explained ^a %	31.80	29.00	85.36
Unexplained ^a %	68.20	71.00	14.64

Contributions of study variables (explained component) – Coefficient (SE), p-value and % contribution (where p<0.05)

Demographics

Age	-0.0025 (0.0332)	0.939		-0.0468 (0.0207)	0.024	49.7%	-0.0704 (0.0295)	0.017	91.8%
Gender (female)	0.0001 (0.0007)	0.883		-0.0003 (0.0004)	0.476		0.0011 (0.0013)	0.403	
Marital status	-0.0090 (0.0079)	0.251		0.0013 (0.0025)	0.630		0.0038 (0.0063)	0.534	

Socioeconomics

Educational attainment	-0.0036 (0.0043)	0.404		-0.0010 (0.0019)	0.601		0.0042 (0.0040)	0.294	
Occupation (NS-SEC)	-0.0143 (0.0049)	0.003	12.9%	0.0019 (0.0011)	0.067		-0.0024 (0.0032)	0.461	

Clinical oral health

Decay or unsound teeth	-0.0240 (0.0058)	<0.001	21.6%	-0.0113 (0.0025)	<0.001	12.0%	-0.0081 (0.0035)	0.021	10.6%
Number of missing teeth	0.0123 (0.0024)	<0.001	(-)11.1%	0.0225 (0.0027)	<0.001	(-)23.9%	0.0058 (0.0014)	<0.001	(-)7.6%
Any pockets ≥ 6mm	0.0058 (0.0026)	0.025	(-)5.2%	0.0063 (0.0026)	0.015	(-)6.7%	0.0003 (0.0015)	0.842	

3 ^a Proportion of the 1998/2009 change in OFOVO explained and unexplained by the decomposition model

4 OFOVO: prevalence of responding 'occasionally', 'fairly often' or 'very often' to any OHIP-14 question

5

1 **DISCUSSION**

2
3 Clinical oral health has radically improved in the United Kingdom in the last 50 years,[31] but this
4 does not inevitably mean there will be a change in OHRQoL. However, our analysis has shown an
5 overall improvement in OHRQoL in England between 1998 and 2009, both among the dentate adult
6 population overall, but also within quasi-cohorts (through comparing different age groups between
7 surveys to capture certain cohort effects during this eleven-year period).

8
9 An important challenge in evaluating changes relates to the different ways to score OHRQoL data,
10 which may result in different interpretations. We initially used 4 different ways of scoring OHIP-14
11 data. For the sample overall, three of these showed statistically significant improvements in
12 OHRQoL across the 11 years, and some of these differences were quite substantial; for example,
13 there was an 11% reduction in OFOVO prevalence (Table 1). However, looking at the smaller group
14 experiencing the more frequent problems (FOVO), there had been no reduction in prevalence at all,
15 with the exception of the oldest group (aged 75+), probably related to their clear experience of
16 retaining natural teeth unlike many of their predecessors. The issue, therefore, is that what we see
17 as change over a period depends on where we “draw the line”. The overall improvement in OHRQoL
18 was predominantly among those that experienced oral impacts just occasionally, while the
19 proportion of adults (around 15%) with frequent oral impacts showed no difference between 1998
20 and 2009. We are not aware of any published data on changes in OHRQoL in other general adult
21 populations for direct comparisons.

22
23 Focussing on three quasi-cohorts (capturing young, middle aged and older generations as they
24 aged), we again showed non-significant changes in FOVOs, but significant improvements in the
25 other three OHIP-14 outcomes in all three cohorts after 11 years (Table 2). This raises a question
26 about whether resources should particularly concentrate on the group with frequent oral impacts,
27 or whether focusing on those with less frequent impacts can yield further marginal improvements
28 in OHRQoL. Previous studies investigating OHRQoL changes with age demonstrated either overall
29 improvements or no change as cohorts aged but are limited to elderly cohorts.[10, 11]

30
31 Having established the pattern of overall change in OHRQoL between equivalent age groups and
32 ageing quasi-cohorts, we further decomposed these changes to allow a deeper understanding as to
33 which factors can explain these changes. Looking at OFOVO prevalence change in the overall sample

1 (Table 3), changes in demographic, socioeconomic and clinical oral health determinants collectively
2 accounted for 43% of the improvement in OHRQoL over this period. Most of this was down to
3 changes in clinical oral health, specifically lower levels of decay/unsound teeth and fewer missing
4 teeth, adding evidence that these clinical measures are a major determinant of OHRQoL.[32, 33]
5 Increased age of the sample also accounted for some of the OHRQoL improvement, but sex, marital
6 status, and socioeconomic position played no real role in this. When clinical variables were removed
7 from the model, the change in OFOVO explained was greatly decreased (from 43% to 12%), further
8 highlighting the role of improved clinical oral health for the improvement in OHRQoL of the dentate
9 general population over this period.

10

11 Decomposition analyses within the quasi-cohort groups revealed that different generations respond
12 differently as they go through the aging process. For younger populations (aged 21-34 years in 1998
13 and 32-45 years in 2009), the age change itself over 11 years was not an important determinant of
14 their considerable improvement in OHRQoL. This was in contrast to the older groups. For those aged
15 35-54 years in 1998 and 46-65 years in 2009, almost half of the explained improvement related to
16 their increasing age, whilst in the oldest group (aged 55-74 years in 1998 and 66-85 years in 2009)
17 this was more than 90%. The importance simply of age in explaining OHRQoL improvements in the
18 older generations may be a reflection of lower expectations regarding oral health and also perhaps
19 of the relatively lower priority of oral health compared to increasing general health issues.[34] This
20 research supports the concept that quality of life is a dynamic construct and people's perceptions,
21 experiences and the factors that determine their quality of life may change with age.

22

23 In addition to ageing, improvements in occupational social class explained a substantial proportion
24 of the improvement in OHRQoL for the youngest quasi-cohort only (12.9%). The other significant
25 contributors to OHRQoL changes within the quasi-cohorts were all measures of clinical oral health.
26 However, effects varied between measure and quasi-cohort. Reductions in caries/unsound teeth
27 contributed to the improvement in OHRQoL in all quasi-cohorts, but the contribution was
28 considerably higher in the younger (21.6%) than the older quasi-cohorts (just over 10%). In contrast,
29 due to their cumulative nature, the number of missing teeth and presence of advanced periodontitis
30 worsened over the eleven-year period and contributed to a decline in OHRQoL. The number of
31 missing teeth contributed significantly across all three quasi-cohorts, but in a more substantive way
32 among those in middle adulthood. Longitudinal studies of elderly cohorts also found that tooth loss
33 contributed to declines in OHRQoL.[10, 11] The respective role of advanced periodontitis was

1 modest for the two younger quasi-cohorts and non-significant for the oldest. Clearly, the
2 contribution of these clinical factors to OHRQoL varies across the life course. Furthermore, they may
3 well be tapping into different domains of OHIP-14, as missing teeth may primarily impact on function
4 while caries can potentially lead to pain.

5
6 Our decomposition models explained a considerable part of the improvement in OHRQoL over the
7 11-year period. However, there was still an overall 57% of the improvement among all adults, and
8 higher proportions for the two younger quasi-cohorts, which could not be explained. This may be
9 partly due to unmeasured variables or changes in the strengths of associations between the
10 assessed determinants and the outcome; for example, growing social inequalities in oral health
11 between the two surveys.[5, 35, 36] Such hypotheses were not addressed through our analyses. For
12 the quasi-cohort analyses, the sample is not drawn from a true “cohort”, but reflects changes in
13 populations as they age over time. Therefore, we must be mindful that associations are being drawn
14 at the population level, rather than at the individual level.

15
16 In summary, there were considerable improvements in the OHRQoL of dentate adults in England
17 between 1998 and 2009, both for the population overall and across aging generations. These
18 improvements were related to lower levels of occasional oral impacts in the population, but not to
19 the frequent oral impacts experienced by fewer people. In the population overall, improvements in
20 clinical oral health accounted for most of the explained improvement in OHRQoL. In the quasi-
21 cohorts, the effect of aging itself and changes in clinical oral health accounted for most of the
22 explained change, but the effect of these factors varied substantially across the lifecourse. These
23 decomposition findings are relevant for health policy and public health action, as they can indicate
24 which broader determinants could be primarily targeted to influence OHRQoL in different age
25 groups or across different adult cohorts.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

What is already known on this subject?

- Oral diseases are highly prevalent with a considerable burden on people’s quality of life.
- In high income countries, most oral diseases have declined in prevalence in the last 20 years.
- To date, no study has analysed time changes in oral health related quality of life and assessed to what extent these have been influenced by sociodemographic and clinical factors in the context of general improvement in clinical oral health.

What this study adds?

- This study assessed changes in oral health related quality of life between 1998 and 2009 among adults in England and examined the contribution of demographic, socioeconomic and clinical oral health characteristics.
- In this eleven year period, there was an overall improvement in oral health related quality of life, though this was confined to the section of the population that reported infrequent oral impacts, leaving a sizeable minority consistently reporting frequent oral impacts.
- The improvement in oral health related quality of life was explained mainly by changes in clinical oral health and the effect of aging itself, but the contribution of the analysed determinants varied substantially across the lifecourse and quasi-cohorts.

1 **Competing Interest statement**

2 Competing Interest: None to declare

3

4 **Funding**

5 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-
6 for-profit sectors.

7

8 **Licence for Publication**

9 The Corresponding Author grants on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis
10 to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in JECH and any
11 other BMJ PGL products.

12

13 **Contribution to authorship**

14 GT, JS and PFA conceived the study. GT, JS, PFA, ROC and CGH developed the analysis strategy; CGH
15 carried out the analyses; GT, JS, PFA, ROC, JW and CGH collectively interpreted the findings and
16 drafted the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

17

18 **Ethics Approval Statement**

19 The ADHS 1998 was approved by the North Thames Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee, and
20 the ADHS 2009 by the Oxford B Research Ethics Committee. For this specific analysis no protocol
21 approval was necessary because we obtained data from secondary sources. The data used was
22 already anonymized.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

1 REFERENCES

- 2
- 3 1 National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, US Department of Health &
4 Human Services, *et al.* Global Health and Aging. Geneva, Switzerland. 2011.
- 5 2 Marcenes W, Kassebaum NJ, Bernabe E, *et al.* Global burden of oral conditions in 1990-
6 2010: a systematic analysis. *J Dent Res* 2013;**92**:592-7.
- 7 3 Gerritsen AE, Allen PF, Witter DJ, *et al.* Tooth loss and oral health-related quality of life:
8 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2010;**8**:126.
- 9 4 Kassebaum NJ, Bernabe E, Dahiya M, *et al.* Global Burden of Severe Tooth Loss: A
10 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Dent Res* 2014;**93**:20S-8S.
- 11 5 Roncalli AG, Sheiham A, Tsakos G, *et al.* Socially unequal improvements in dental caries
12 levels in Brazilian adolescents between 2003 and 2010. *Community dentistry and oral
13 epidemiology* 2015;**43**:317-24.
- 14 6 Watt R, Sheiham A. Inequalities in oral health: a review of the evidence and
15 recommendations for action. *Br Dent J* 1999;**187**:6-12.
- 16 7 Mackenbach JP, Kulhanova I, Menvielle G, *et al.* Trends in inequalities in premature
17 mortality: a study of 3.2 million deaths in 13 European countries. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
18 2014.
- 19 8 Imkampe AK, Gulliford MC. Increasing socio-economic inequality in type 2 diabetes
20 prevalence--repeated cross-sectional surveys in England 1994-2006. *Eur J Public Health*
21 2011;**21**:484-90.
- 22 9 Singh GK, Jemal A. Socioeconomic and Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Cancer Mortality,
23 Incidence, and Survival in the United States, 1950-2014: Over Six Decades of Changing Patterns
24 and Widening Inequalities. *Journal of environmental and public health* 2017;**2017**:2819372.
- 25 10 Enoki K, Ikebe K, Matsuda KI, *et al.* Determinants of change in oral health-related quality
26 of life over 7 years among older Japanese. *Journal of oral rehabilitation* 2013;**40**:252-7.
- 27 11 Gulcan F, Nasir E, Ekback G, *et al.* Change in Oral Impacts on Daily Performances (OIDP)
28 with increasing age: testing the evaluative properties of the OIDP frequency inventory using
29 prospective data from Norway and Sweden. *BMC oral health* 2014;**14**:59.
- 30 12 Crocombe LA, Brennan DS, Slade GD. The influence of dental attendance on change in
31 oral health-related quality of life. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2012;**40**:53-61.
- 32 13 Gagliardi DI, Slade GD, Sanders AE. Impact of dental care on oral health-related quality
33 of life and treatment goals among elderly adults. *Aust Dent J* 2008;**53**:26-33.
- 34 14 Nuttall N, Tsakos G, Lader D, *et al.* *Outcome and impact-A report from the Adult Dental
35 Health Survey 2009*. London: The NHS Information Centre for Health and Social Care 2011.
- 36 15 O'Sullivan I, Lader D, Beavan-Seymour C, *et al.* Foundation Report: Adult Dental Health
37 Survey 2009 (Technical information). NHS Information Centre. 2011.
- 38 16 Kelly M, Steele J, Nuttall N, *et al.* *Adult dental health survey: oral health in the United
39 Kingdom 1998*. London: Stationery Office 2000.
- 40 17 Slade GD. Assessment of oral health-related quality of life. In: Inglehart MR, Bagramian
41 R, eds. *Oral health-related quality of life*: Quintessence Pub. 2002:29-46.
- 42 18 Allen PF. Assessment of oral health related quality of life. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
43 2003;**1**:40.
- 44 19 Locker D, Quinonez C. To what extent do oral disorders compromise the quality of life?
45 *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2011;**39**:3-11.
- 46 20 Silvola AS, Rusanen J, Tolvanen M, *et al.* Occlusal characteristics and quality of life before
47 and after treatment of severe malocclusion. *European journal of orthodontics* 2012;**34**:704-9.
- 48 21 Aleksejuniene J, Holst D, Eriksen HM, *et al.* Psychosocial stress, lifestyle and periodontal
49 health. *J Clin Periodontol* 2002;**29**:326-35.
- 50 22 Slade GD, Nuttall N, Sanders AE, *et al.* Impacts of oral disorders in the United Kingdom
51 and Australia. *Br Dent J* 2005;**198**:489-93.

1 23 Yoon HS, Kim HY, Patton LL, *et al.* Happiness, subjective and objective oral health status,
2 and oral health behaviors among Korean elders. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2013;**41**:459-
3 65.

4 24 Fairlie RW. An extension of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition technique to logit and
5 probit models. *J Econ Soc Meas* 2005;**30**:305-16.

6 25 Sinning M, Hahn M, Bauer TK. The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition for nonlinear
7 regression models. *The Stata Journal* 2008;**8**:480-92.

8 26 Gonzalez Alvarez ML, Barranquero AC. Inequalities in health care utilization in Spain due
9 to double insurance coverage: An Oaxaca-Ransom decomposition. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;**69**:793-
10 801.

11 27 Wehby GL, Murray JC, McCarthy AM, *et al.* Racial gaps in child health insurance coverage
12 in four South American countries: the role of wealth, human capital, and other household
13 characteristics. *Health Serv Res* 2011;**46**:2119-38.

14 28 de Meijer C, Bakx P, van Doorslaer E, *et al.* Explaining declining rates of institutional LTC
15 use in the Netherlands: a decomposition approach. *Health Econ* 2015;**24 Suppl 1**:18-31.

16 29 Bosomprah S, Aryeetey GC, Nonvignon J, *et al.* A decomposition analysis of change in
17 skilled birth attendants, 2003 to 2008, Ghana Demographic and Health Surveys. *BMC pregnancy*
18 *and childbirth* 2014;**14**:415.

19 30 Bennett DA. How can I deal with missing data in my study? *Aust N Z J Public Health*
20 2001;**25**:464-9.

21 31 Steele JG, Treasure ET, O'Sullivan I, *et al.* Adult Dental Health Survey 2009:
22 transformations in British oral health 1968-2009. *Br Dent J* 2012;**213**:523-7.

23 32 Lawrence HP, Thomson WM, Broadbent JM, *et al.* Oral health-related quality of life in a
24 birth cohort of 32-year olds. *Community Dentistry & Oral Epidemiology*; **36**:305-16.

25 33 Tan H, Peres KG, Peres MA. Retention of Teeth and Oral Health-Related Quality of Life. *J*
26 *Dent Res* 2016;**95**:1350-7.

27 34 Slade GD, Sanders AE. The paradox of better subjective oral health in older age. *J Dent*
28 *Res* 2011;**90**:1279-85.

29 35 Nasseh K, Vujicic M. The effect of growing income disparities on U.S. adults' dental care
30 utilization. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2014;**145**:435-42.

31 36 Rozier RG, White BA, Slade GD. Trends in Oral Diseases in the U.S. Population. *J Dent Educ*
32 2017;**81**:eS97-eS109.

33
34
35