

#### Oral Health Status of Chinese Diabetic Patients in Hong Kong

W.K. Leung<sup>1\*</sup>, S.C. Siu<sup>2</sup>, F.C.S. Chu<sup>1</sup>, K.W. Wong<sup>2</sup>, L.J. Jin<sup>1</sup> and C.S.P. Tsang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Dentistry, the University of Hong Kong and <sup>2</sup>Diabetes Mellitus Centre, Tung Wah Eastern Hospital, Hong Kong SAR, China

IADR SEA Divison Annual Meeting September 2003, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

### Introduction

In Hong Kong, prevalence of diabetes mellitus

Age	<u>Female</u>	Male
25-34	1.4%	2.0%
65-74	29.3%	21.7%

Prevalence of DM in working adults is 5%

- Average 10% of the adult population in Hong Kong are diabetics, 97% type 2
- 'Diabetic epidemic' as a threat to health care of developing countries e.g. India and China (King & Rewers 1993)
- Periodontal disease as one of diabetes complications. (Löe 1993)
- Diabetic complications affect quality of life of patients (UKPDS 1999) and increase the public health cost in management of diabetes mellitus

## Aim

- To describe and analyze the oral health status, particularly periodontal status of predominately low income, middle age to elderly Chinese type 2 diabetic subjects in Hong Kong
- To assess to what extent periodontal destruction is associated with diabetes mellitus in the population studied?

# Method

- Convenient sampling of all Chinese patients aged 41-84 years-old attending Monday clinic, Diabetes Mellitus Centre, Tung Wah Eastern Hospital
- Age- and sex-matched control subjects without major systemic conditions who attended the Monday General Out-patient Department, Tung Wah Eastern Hospital
- Medical team members responsible for subject recruitment
- Examiners were blind to grouping of subjects
- Survey took 8 weeks to finish

#### Medical History

 Diabetic history – age of onset, duration of diabetes, current HbAlc level

#### Social History

- Education level, income, smoking habit
- Dental History
  - Dental attendance, toothbrushing habit

# Oral Examination DMFT, CPI (WHO 1997); ALoss (Corbet et al. 2001) Denture status Calibration done on 10% subjects surveyed Kappa/Adjusted Kappa DMFT 0.83 Very Good O.79, 0.76, 0.69 Good ALoss 0.90, 0.86, 0.83 Very Good

#### Data Analysis

Modified considerable attachment loss categorization (Corbet et al 2001)

age	ALoss scoreable	ALoss score of $\geq y$ in $\geq z$ sextants			
group (yr)	$\geq$ x sextants				
< 45	4	1	2		
	3 or less	1	1		
45 - 64	4	1	3		
	3 or less	1	2		
	3 or less	2	1		
65 - 74	4	2	2		
	3 or less	2	1		
75 - 84	4	2	3		
	3 or less	2	2		
	3 or less	3	1		

#### Date Analysis

- Fisher Exact test
- Multiple comparison with Bonferroni adjustment
- Linear multiple regression

# **Results and Discussion**

# Demographic data and dental attendance of subjects

	Diabetic status	n	age	Last dental visit (Yr)
Men	DM	169	62.1 <u>+</u> 10.6	2.5 <u>+</u> 1.4
	Non-DM	75	64.4 <u>+</u> 11.1	2.7 <u>+</u> 1.2
Women	DM	195	64.9 <u>+</u> 9.4	2.3 <u>+</u> 1.4
	Non-DM	86	63.8 <u>+</u> 10.2	2.3 <u>+</u> 1.2
Total	DM	364	63.6 <u>+</u> 10.1	2.4 <u>+</u> 1.4
	Non-DM	161	64.1 <u>+</u> 10.6	2.5 <u>+</u> 1.2

## **Education Level**



#### Income



# **Smoking Habit**



### Diabetic history of subjects

		Age of onset		Time since DM diagnosis		HbA1c	
	n	(year)	SD	(year)	SD	%	SD
Men	169	55.3	11	6.8	6.4	7.8	1.3
Women	195	55.9	10.5	8.9 <sup>a</sup>	7	8	1.3
Total	364	55.6	10.7	8	6.8	7.9	1.3

<sup>a</sup> P<0.005, unpaired t-test

# Caries experience (mean values) of subjects according to gender and diabetic status

	Diabetic status	n	% with DMFT >0	DT	MT	FT	DMFT	DMFT (SE)
Men	DM	169	98	1.4	12.2	1.6	15.2	0.8
	Non-DM	75	97	2.4ª	9.2	1.5	13.2	1
Women	DM	195	100	1.2	15.3 <sup>b</sup>	1.6	18.1°	0.6
	Non-DM	86	100	1.7	11.7	2.3	15.7	0.9
Total	DM	364	99	1.3 <sup>d</sup>	13.9 <sup>e</sup>	1.6	16.8 <sup>f</sup>	0.5
	Non-DM	161	99	2.1	10.5	2	14.5	0.7

<sup>a</sup> Non-DM men vs DM men, Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.05

<sup>b</sup> DM women vs Non-DM women or DM men, Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.05

<sup>c</sup> DM women vs DM men, Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.05

<sup>d</sup>P<0.001, <sup>e</sup>P<0.0005, <sup>f</sup>P<0.05, unpaired t-test

#### Proportion of edentulous subjects

	Diabetic		
	status	n/Total	% Edentulism
Men <sup>*</sup>	DM	18/169	10.7
	Non-DM	2/75	2.7
Women*	DM	29/195	14.9
	Non-DM	3/86	3.5
Total <sup>*</sup>	DM	47/364	12.9
	Non-DM	5/161	3.1
*DM vs non-DM	group. Fisher exact test. P<	0.05	

	Percentage distribution of subjects according to highest CPI or ALoss score (by sextant)								
		Diabetic		Percentage subjects with highest score					
		status	n	0	1	2	3	4	
CPI	Men	DM	147	0	0	9.5	34	56.5	
		Non-DM	72	0	0	11.1	48.6	40.3	
	Women	DM	161	0	0	12.4	44.1	43.5	
		Non-DM	81	0	0	13.6	54.3	32.1	
	Total	DM	308	0	0	11	39.3	49.7*	
		Non-DM	153	0	0	12.5	51.6	35.9	
ALoss	Men	DM	145	8.3	33.1	36.6	17.2	4.8	
		Non-DM	72	4.2	43.1	37.5	9.7	5.6	
	Women	DM	158	10.1	46.2	30.4	8.9	4.4	
		Non-DM	78	17.9	52.6	23.1	6.4	0	
	Total	DM	303	9.2	39.9	33.3	12.9	4.6	
		Non-DM	150	11.3	48	30	8	2.7	
* ~ · · · ·	.1		1			01.1		~~	

<sup>\*</sup> Significantly more subjects in DM group having highest CPI as 4, Chi square test, P<0.02

# Mean numbers of sextants with different levels of CPI and ALoss scores

		Diabetic		Mea	Mean number of sextants with score				
		status	n	0	1+2+3+4	2+3+4	3+4	4	X
СРІ	Men	DM	147	0	5	5	3.4	1.3	1
		Non-DM	72	0	5.3	5.3	3.1	1	0.7
	Women	DM	16	0	4.7	4.6	2.9	0.9	1.4
		Non-DM	81	0	4.9	4.9	2.5	0.5	1.1
	Total	DM	308	0	4.8	4.8	3.1	1.1	1.2
		Non-DM	153	0	5.1	5.1	2.8	0.8	0.9
ALoss	Men	DM	145	1.3	3.3ª	1.3 <sup>b</sup>	0.3	0.1	1.4
		Non-DM	72	1.5	3.4°	1	0.2	0.1	1.1
	Women	DM	158	1.5	2.7	0.8	0.2	0.1	1.9
		Non-DM	78	2.2 <sup>d</sup>	2.3	0.4	0.1	0	1.4
	Total	DM	303	1.4 <sup>e</sup>	2.9	1 <sup>e</sup>	0.2	0.1	1.6 <sup>e</sup>
		Non-DM	150	1.9	2.8	0.7	0.1	0	1.3

<sup>a</sup>DM males vs females , Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.0001

<sup>b</sup>DM vs non-DM males; DM males vs females , Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.0001

<sup>c</sup>non-DM males vs females , Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.0001

<sup>d</sup>DM vs non-DM females; non-DM males vs females , Bonferroni multiple comparison, P<0.0001

<sup>e</sup>DM vs non-DM groups, ANOVA, P<0.05

Linear multiple regression analysis showed:

- Considerable attachment loss in
  - DM subjects associated with smoking habit but negatively correlated with age (P<0.0001)</li>
  - Control subjects was associated with number of missing teeth, years after last dental visit, smoking habit, lower income and negatively correlated with age (P<0.0001)</li>

#### Tooth loss

- in DM subjects, tooth loss was associated with age, denture wearing, considerable attachment loss and negatively correlated with self reported daily brushing frequency (P<0.000)</li>
- in Control subjects, tooth loss was associated with age, denture wearing, and considerable attachment loss and negatively correlated with years after last dental visit (P<0.001)</li>

## Summary

- Hong Kong Chinese middle age to elderly Type 2 diabetic patients seemed to have less caries experience in terms of decayed-filled teeth but more missing teeth (probably in relation to periodontitis) than age-and sexmatched controls;
- Half of the DM subjects surveyed had deep periodontal pockets whereas in around slightly more than 1/3 of the age-, sex-matched controls such condition was found
- DM subjects had more mean number of sextants with moderate to advanced attachment loss

#### Conclusion

- Both test (DM) and control groups of the middle age and elderly Chinese people surveyed had poor oral health
   DM patients seemed to suffer from more severe periodontal disease and its consequences
- Periodontal care, oral hygiene education and smoking cessation should be directed to this group of low income middle age to elderly Chinese type 2 DM subjects especially the younger members to prevent and attenuate the oral diabetic complication

Acknowledgements Nurses of DM Centre, TWEH DSAs of Periodontology, Reception and Primary Care, PPDH Dr. S. Anil Dr. K.L. Chan Dr. S.H. Fu