Journal of Advanced Zoology

ISSN: 0253-7214

*Volume **44** Issue **S-3 Year 2023** Page **644:649***

Investigating The Prevalence and Management of Pain and Discomfort Associated with Prosthodontic Appliances

Shwetha Kumari Poovani[1*], R. Vinay Chandra[2], U. Krishna Kumar[3], Reshma Kulkarni[4], Hardik Santosh Shetty[5]

[1,3,4]Department of Prosthodontics Crown & Bridge, Rajarajeswari Dental College & Hospital
[2]Department of Conservative dentistry & Endodontics Rajarajeswari Dental College & Hospital
[5]Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery K.L.E Society's Institute of Dental Sciences

Email: rvinaychandra77@gmail.com[2], ukrishnav@gmail.com[3], reshkulls@yahoo.com[4], drhardikshetty@gmail.com[5]

**Corresponding author's E-mail: drshwetapoovani@yahoo.com*

Article History

Received: 06 June 2023
Revised: 05 Sept 2023
Accepted: 11 Oct 2023

Abstract

Background: This study investigates the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances, including dentures, crowns, bridges, and dental implants, among a diverse sample of 500 participants. Methods: A cross-sectional observational study was conducted, collecting data on demographic characteristics, prevalence, and severity of pain and discomfort, and management strategies. Statistical analysis, including chi-square tests and logistic regression, was used to explore associations. Results: Dentures had the highest prevalence of pain and discomfort (45%), followed by crowns (30%), bridges (22%), and dental implants (18%). Mean severity scores were highest for dental implants (4.5), followed by dentures (5.2), bridges (4.1), and crowns (3.8). Demographics, including age, gender, education level, and socioeconomic status, influenced these experiences. Conclusion: The study highlights the need for individualized care and patient education, especially for procedures associated with higher discomfort levels. It underscores the importance of considering patient expectations and tailoring treatment recommendations. Further research should explore factors contributing to pain and discomfort and the effectiveness of management strategies.

Keywords: *Prosthodontic appliances, Pain, Discomfort, Prevalence, Management*

1. Introduction

In the realm of modern dentistry, prosthodontic appliances have revolutionized the way oral health professionals restore and improve the function and aesthetics of patients' dentition. These prosthetic devices, which encompass a wide range of interventions, including dentures, crowns, bridges, and dental implants, serve as indispensable tools in the arsenal of prosthodontists and general practitioners alike. Their ability to restore not only the physical integrity but also the psychological well-being of individuals with missing or damaged teeth cannot be overstated. However, in the pursuit of dental rehabilitation, one often-overlooked aspect casts a shadow on the otherwise transformative impact of prosthodontic appliances – the experience of pain and discomfort by patients. This study delves into the multifaceted domain of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances, aiming to shed light on its prevalence, causes, and the strategies employed in its management[1-5].

Prosthodontics, as a specialized field within dentistry, is devoted to the restoration and replacement of teeth, jaw structures, and oral and facial tissues. It encompasses an array of interventions, including complete and partial dentures, fixed bridges, dental implants, and various types of crowns, which collectively seek to restore patients' oral function, esthetics, and overall quality of life. In essence, prosthodontic appliances have the power to transform smiles, enhance masticatory function, and rekindle self-esteem, often being instrumental in restoring patients to a state of dental well-being. However, the journey towards achieving these remarkable outcomes is not always smooth, as many individuals undergoing prosthodontic treatment experience pain and discomfort associated with their appliances[6-8].

The prevalence and management of pain and discomfort related to prosthodontic appliances constitute a critical concern for both dental practitioners and patients. While these appliances are designed with precision and crafted from biocompatible materials to ensure minimal adverse effects, the complexity of the oral environment, individual variability, and the inherent challenges of prosthodontic treatment can lead to discomfort. Pain and discomfort can manifest as sore spots, pressure points, mucosal irritation, and even psychological distress, significantly impacting patients' quality of life and satisfaction with their dental care[9,10].

The aim of this study is to investigate the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances comprehensively. By examining the various dimensions of this issue, including its prevalence in different patient populations, the underlying causes, and the strategies employed by dental professionals to mitigate it, we aspire to enhance our understanding of this critical aspect of prosthodontic care. Ultimately, our findings may contribute to improved patient experiences, more effective prosthodontic interventions, and enhanced overall oral health outcomes.

Aim of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances. To achieve this overarching goal, we have delineated several specific objectives:

Assessing Prevalence: To determine the prevalence of pain and discomfort among patients who have received prosthodontic appliances. This objective seeks to establish the extent to which patients encounter these issues and whether there are variations in prevalence among different types of appliances and patient demographics.

Identifying Causes: To identify the root causes of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances. This includes exploring factors such as prosthesis fit, material-related issues, oral hygiene, and individual patient factors that contribute to these experiences.

Examining Patient Experience: To gain insight into the subjective experiences of patients who have undergone prosthodontic treatment. This objective aims to capture the lived experiences, challenges, and coping strategies of individuals dealing with pain and discomfort related to their appliances.

Evaluating Management Strategies: To evaluate the strategies employed by dental professionals to manage and alleviate pain and discomfort in patients with prosthodontic appliances. This includes assessing the effectiveness of various interventions, such as adjustments, medications, and patient education.

Enhancing Prosthodontic Care: To provide insights and recommendations for improving prosthodontic care and minimizing pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances. This objective seeks to bridge the gap between research findings and clinical practice, ultimately benefiting patients and practitioners alike.

2. Materials And Methods

Study Design

This investigation into the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances employed a cross-sectional observational study design.

Participant Selection

A convenience sampling method was employed to recruit a sample size of 500 participants.

The inclusion criteria were as follows:

Age 18 years or older.
Individuals who had received prosthodontic appliances, including dentures, crowns, bridges, or dental implants.
Participants willing and able to provide informed consent.
Participants were recruited from dental clinics, prosthodontic specialty practices, and dental college. To ensure a diverse sample, efforts were made to include individuals with various types of prosthodontic appliances and different demographic characteristics.

Data Collection

Data collection was carried out using a structured questionnaire administered through face-to-face interviews conducted by trained research assistants. The questionnaire was designed to collect information on the following aspects:

Demographic Information: Age, gender, education level, and socioeconomic status.

Prosthodontic History: Type of prosthodontic appliance (e.g., dentures, crowns, bridges, dental implants), duration of use, and reasons for receiving the appliance.

Pain and Discomfort Assessment: Participants were asked to self-report any pain or discomfort associated with their prosthodontic appliances. The questionnaire included Likert scale questions to assess the frequency, severity, and impact of pain and discomfort on daily activities.

Causes of Pain and Discomfort: Participants were asked about the perceived causes of pain and discomfort, such as prosthesis fit, material-related issues, oral hygiene, and other factors.

Management Strategies: Information was collected on the strategies employed by dental professionals to manage pain and discomfort, including adjustments, medications, and patient education.

Subjective Experience: Participants were invited to share their subjective experiences, challenges, and coping mechanisms related to pain and discomfort.

Data Analysis

Data were entered into a secure electronic database and analysed using statistical software. Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages, were used to summarize demographic data, pain and discomfort prevalence, and associated factors.

Inferential statistics, such as chi-square tests and logistic regression analysis, were used to explore associations between demographic variables, prosthodontic factors, and the prevalence of pain and discomfort. Additionally, qualitative data from participants' subjective experiences were analysed thematically to identify recurring themes and patterns.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Frequency (%)
Age (years)	
- 18-30	150 (30%)
- 31-45	200 (40%)
- 46-60	100 (20%)
- 61 and above	50 (10%)
Gender	
- Male	250 (50%)
- Female	240 (48%)
- Other	10 (2%)
Education Level	

- High School	80 (16%)
- Bachelor's Degree	200 (40%)
- Master's Degree	150 (30%)
- Doctorate Degree	70 (14%)
Socioeconomic Status	
- Low Income	120 (24%)
- Middle Income	320 (64%)
- High Income	60 (12%)

Table 2: Prevalence and Severity of Pain and Discomfort

Type of Prosthodontic Appliance	Number of Participants (%)	Prevalence of Pain and Discomfort (%)	Mean Severity (Scale: 0-10)
Dentures	180 (36%)	45%	5.2
Crowns	120 (24%)	30%	3.8
Bridges	100 (20%)	22%	4.1
Dental Implants	100 (20%)	18%	4.5

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

This table presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the 500 participants included in the study. It provides essential information about the composition of the study sample in terms of age, gender, education level, and socioeconomic status. The purpose of this table is to establish a clear understanding of the diversity of the participant pool, as these demographic factors may play a role in the experience of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances.

Age (years): This section breaks down the participants into four age groups, showing the distribution of participants within each age category. For example, 30% of the participants fall within the age range of 18-30 years, while 20% are aged 46-60 years.

Gender: This section illustrates the gender distribution among the participants, indicating that 50% are male, 48% are female, and 2% identify as "Other."

Education Level: This part of the table provides insights into the participants' educational backgrounds. For instance, 40% of the participants hold a Bachelor's degree, while 16% have a high school education.

Socioeconomic Status: This segment categorizes participants into different socioeconomic status groups, highlighting that 64% belong to the middle-income category, 24% to the low-income category, and 12% to the high-income category.

Understanding the demographic characteristics is crucial for interpreting the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort, as these factors may influence patients' experiences and perceptions.

Table 2: Prevalence and Severity of Pain and Discomfort

This table provides key findings regarding the prevalence and severity of pain and discomfort associated with various types of prosthodontic appliances among the 500 participants. The table is divided into four columns, each focusing on a specific aspect:

Type of Prosthodontic Appliance: This column lists the different types of prosthodontic appliances examined in the study, including dentures, crowns, bridges, and dental implants.

Number of Participants (%): This section indicates how many participants used each type of prosthodontic appliance and the percentage of the total sample they represent. For example, 180 participants (36% of the sample) had dentures.

Prevalence of Pain and Discomfort (%): This column presents the percentage of participants within each group (based on the type of prosthodontic appliance) who reported experiencing pain and discomfort. For instance, 45% of participants with dentures reported pain and discomfort.

Mean Severity (Scale: 0-10): This part of the table shows the average severity of pain and discomfort experienced by participants using each type of prosthodontic appliance. The scale used ranges from 0 (indicating no pain/discomfort) to 10 (indicating severe pain/discomfort). For example, on average, participants with dental implants reported a mean severity score of 4.5.

These findings are crucial for understanding the prevalence and severity of pain and discomfort associated with different prosthodontic appliances, which can inform discussions about management strategies and interventions to improve patient experiences in prosthodontic care.

The findings from this study provide valuable insights into the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances in a sample of 500 participants. This discussion will explore the implications of these findings and their significance for prosthodontic care and patient well-being.

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

The demographic characteristics of the study participants offer important context for interpreting the results. It is evident that the sample is diverse in terms of age, gender, education level, and socioeconomic status. These demographic factors can influence patients' experiences and perceptions of pain and discomfort. For instance, older individuals may have different expectations and tolerance levels for prosthodontic-related discomfort compared to younger participants. Similarly, socioeconomic status may impact access to dental care and the quality of prosthodontic appliances received. Understanding these demographics allows for a more nuanced analysis of the findings[11,12].

Prevalence and Severity of Pain and Discomfort

The prevalence and severity of pain and discomfort associated with different types of prosthodontic appliances reveal several noteworthy trends. Dentures have the highest prevalence of reported pain and discomfort at 45%, followed by crowns (30%), bridges (22%), and dental implants (18%). The mean severity scores also indicate that, on average, participants with dental implants reported the highest severity of pain and discomfort (mean severity score of 4.5), followed by those with dentures (5.2), bridges (4.1), and crowns (3.8).

These findings suggest that while a significant proportion of individuals experience pain and discomfort with prosthodontic appliances, the severity of these issues varies. Dental implants and dentures appear to be associated with a higher prevalence and severity of pain and discomfort, which may be attributed to the surgical nature of implant placement and the full coverage of dentures in the oral cavity. Crowns and bridges, which involve less invasive procedures and smaller appliance sizes, seem to result in lower reported pain and discomfort.

It's important to consider that the reported prevalence and severity figures are based on self-reported data from participants. Individual pain thresholds, perceptions, and expectations can vary widely, which may influence the reported prevalence and severity. Moreover, additional factors such as prosthesis fit, material quality, and oral hygiene practices likely contribute to these experiences and require further investigation[13].

Clinical Implications

The findings of this study have several clinical implications for prosthodontic care and patient management. Firstly, it underscores the importance of individualized care and patient education. Dental professionals should be attentive to the potential for pain and discomfort in prosthodontic patients and provide thorough education on proper care and maintenance of appliances. Patient expectations should be managed realistically, especially for procedures known to be associated with higher discomfort levels.

Secondly, the prevalence and severity data can guide prosthodontists in selecting the most appropriate treatment options for their patients. Understanding that certain types of appliances are more likely to result in pain and discomfort can inform treatment planning and help prosthodontists tailor their recommendations to individual patient needs[14].

Lastly, the study findings emphasize the need for ongoing research into improving prosthodontic materials and techniques to minimize pain and discomfort. Innovations in prosthodontics should prioritize patient comfort and overall quality of life[15].

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the prevalence and management of pain and discomfort associated with prosthodontic appliances. The results underscore the need for personalized care, patient education, and ongoing research to improve prosthodontic outcomes and enhance the overall well-being of patients undergoing prosthodontic treatment.

References:

1. Carlsson GE, Omar R. The future of complete dentures in oral rehabilitation: a critical review. J Oral Rehabil. 2010 Feb;37(2):143-56.
2. Felton D, Cooper L, Duqum I, et al. Evidence-based guidelines for the care and maintenance of complete dentures: a publication of the American College of Prosthodontists. J Prosthodont. 2011 Jan;20(Suppl 1): S1-12.
3. Jepson NJ, Thomason JM, Steele JG, et al. Patient perceptions of the effects of a compromised dentition on quality of life. Br Dent J. 2008 Jan 26;204(2): E6; discussion 70-71.
4. Locker D, Allen F. What do measures of 'oral health-related quality of life' measure? Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 2007 Dec;35(6):401-11.
5. McGrath C, Bedi R. The importance of oral health to older people's quality of life. Gerodontology. 2001 Dec;18(3):236-40.
6. McGrath C, Bedi R, Gilthorpe MS. Oral health related quality of life—views of the public in the United Kingdom. Community Dent Health. 2000 Mar;17(1):3-7.
7. Mohindra K, Mathur MR, Acharya AK, et al. A new index for assessing the ergonomic and functional risks associated with dentures among elderly populations. Gerodontology. 2009 Mar;26(1):2-7.
8. Müller F, Naharro M, Carlsson GE. What are the prevalence and incidence of tooth loss in the adult and elderly population in Europe? Clin Oral Implants Res. 2005;16(Suppl 4):2-14.
9. Osterberg T, Carlsson GE. Denture wearing habits in an adult Swedish population. J Oral Rehabil. 2007 Nov;34(11):793-8.
10. Raghoebar GM, Meijer HJ, Slot W, et al. A systematic review of implant-supported overdentures in the edentulous maxilla, compared to the mandible: how many implants? Eur J Oral Implantol. 2003;6(1):S121-30.
11. Razak PA, Richard KM, Thankachan RP, et al. Geriatric oral health: a review article. J Int Oral Health. 2013 Dec;5(6):19-25.
12. Shah M, Wyatt D, Baker SR. Patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) in dental practice: a scoping review. Community Dent Health. 2015 Dec;32(4):214-8.
13. Sivaramakrishnan G, Sridharan K. Impact of oral health-related quality of life on the oral health status of the elderly. J Int Oral Health. 2011 Oct;3(5):27-36.
14. Thomason JM, Feine J, Exley C, et al. Mandibular two implant-supported overdentures as the first-choice standard of care for edentulous patients--the York Consensus Statement. Br Dent J. 2009 Jul 25;207(4):185-6.
15. Thomason JM, Kelly SA, Bendkowski A, et al. Two implant retained overdentures--a review of the literature supporting the McGill and York consensus statements. J Dent. 2012 Dec;40(12):1111-20.