doi: 10.48047/ijprt/15.02.118

### Improving Oral Health in Special Needs Populations: Challenges and Solutions

Muhammad Junaid Hashmi<sup>1</sup>, Hussain Mujtaba Malik<sup>2</sup>, Hafiz Muhammad Tufail<sup>3</sup>, Saleem Adil<sup>4</sup>, Asma Rafi Chaudhry<sup>5</sup>, Muhammad Sami Iqbal<sup>6</sup>

#### **Affiliations:**

- <sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Shahida Islam Medical and Dental College, Lodhran, Drjunaidhashmi57@gmail.com.
- <sup>2</sup> MPH, Boston University School of Public Health, hmmalik@bu.edu.
- <sup>3</sup> Professor of Dentistry, Iqra University Chak Shehzad Campus, Islamabad, dr.tufail55@gmail.com.
- <sup>4</sup> Associate Professor Community Medicine, Pak Red Crescent Medical and Dental College, Lahore, salimadil@gmail.com.
- <sup>5</sup> Associate Professor, Orthodontics Department, Institute of Dentistry, CMH Lahore Medical College, National University of Medical Sciences, asmach2012@hotmail.com.
- <sup>6</sup> Associate Professor (B-19), Preventive and Public Health Dentistry Department, Bolan Medical College, Quetta, Dr.samiiqbal1981@gmail.com.

### **Abstract**

Individuals with intellectual, developmental, or physical disabilities often encounter disproportionate barriers to oral healthcare, including reduced access to preventive services, diminished capacity for daily hygiene, and behavioral or communication limitations. In this mixedmethods interventional study involving 120 special needs individuals (aged 5–30 years), a tailored oral hygiene education program—comprising caregiver training, behavior-modified brushing instruction, and quarterly professional cleanings—was implemented and compared to standard care over 12 months. The interventional group demonstrated significant reductions in plaque index (mean  $\Delta - 1.54 \pm 0.32$  vs  $-0.46 \pm 0.28$ ; p < 0.001), gingival index ( $\Delta - 1.38 \pm 0.27$  vs  $-0.42 \pm 0.25$ ; p < 0.001), and incidence of new carious lesions (12% vs 27%; p = 0.02) compared to controls. Qualitative caregiver feedback revealed increased confidence, reduced dental anxiety in participants, and enhanced caregiver-provider collaboration. Key challenges included behavioral resistance, communication barriers, and resource constraints. Solutions entailed individualized oral hygiene aids, caregiver engagement protocols, and integration of dental services into multidisciplinary care plans. These findings underscore the efficacy of targeted, behaviorally informed strategies in improving oral health outcomes within special needs groups and support. **Keywords:** special needs oral health; caregiver training; behavior-modified hygiene.

### Introduction

Oral health disparities disproportionately affect special needs populations—comprising individuals with intellectual disabilities, autism spectrum disorders, cerebral palsy, Down syndrome, and other conditions—who often experience higher prevalence of dental diseases with limited access to tailored care<sup>(1-4)</sup>. Cognitive limitations, motor impairments, sensory sensitivities, and communication challenges compound difficulties in maintaining adequate oral hygiene and seeking regular dental treatment<sup>(5-7)</sup>. As a result, plaque accumulation, gingivitis, and caries are more prevalent and progress more rapidly than in the general population<sup>(8)</sup>.

Traditional preventive strategies, including twice-daily toothbrushing and routine dental checkups, often fail to address the behavioral and sensory needs of these individuals. Children and young adults with autism spectrum disorders, for instance, may exhibit aversive reactions to standard brushing routines or dental environments, leading to event-triggered oral neglect<sup>(9-11)</sup>. Physical disabilities further impede manual dexterity, necessitating assistive devices and adaptive techniques for effective plaque control.

Caregiver involvement is critical, given that many special needs individuals require assistance or scoring supervision for oral hygiene maintenance. However, caregivers frequently report insufficient training, perceived time constraints, and lack of confidence in performing effective oral care. Simultaneously, access to dentists trained in management of special needs patients—adept at behavior guidance, sedation techniques, and environmental modification—remains limited, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

The existing literature supports the promise of tailored interventions, such as visual aids, social stories, sensory-friendly clinics, adaptive toothbrushes, and timed brushing routines, in overcoming barriers. Pilot studies employing such strategies have demonstrated plaque and gingival index reductions of 30–50% over six months. Yet, these studies are often limited by small sample sizes, brief follow-up, and heterogeneous methodologies.

To address this gap, the present mixed-methods study assessed a structured oral health program combining caregiver training, behavior-adapted hygiene instruction, personalized adaptive aids, and professional cleanings against standard care over 12 months. Quantitative outcomes (plaque

index, gingival index, caries incidence) were supplemented by caregiver interviews examining perceived feasibility, satisfaction, and sustained behavior change. This study aims to inform inclusive oral health models and provider training programs responsive to the needs of special needs populations.

#### Methodology

A mixed-methods, controlled-intervention design was conducted at Shahida Islam medical and dental college, lodhran. Eligible participants were individuals aged 5–30 years with intellectual and/or physical disabilities, diagnosed per DSM-5 or ICD-11 criteria, who required caregiver-supported oral hygiene and had at least 10 erupted permanent teeth. Exclusion criteria included medical instability, recent antibiotic use, or ongoing orthodontic treatment. Ethical approval was obtained, and informed consent obtained from caregivers; assent was sought from participants as appropriate.

Participants (n = 120) were stratified by age and cognitive impairment level and randomly assigned to intervention or control groups (n = 60 each). The intervention comprised: caregiver workshops, visual brushing schedules, adaptive toothbrushes (e.g., electric with wide handles), quarterly professional prophylaxis with positive reinforcement, and behavior-guidance techniques. The control group received routine advice and annual prophylaxis.

Primary outcomes were Simplified Oral Hygiene Index (OHI-S), Löe–Silness Gingival Index, and the number of new decayed, missing, or filled surfaces ( $\Delta$ DMFS) at baseline and 12 months. Sample size calculation via Epi Info (detecting 30% change in OHI-S,  $\alpha$ =0.05, power=80%) indicated 54 participants per arm; 60 per arm allowed for attrition. Secondary outcomes included caregiver stress (validated questionnaire) and qualitative semi-structured interviews at 12 months.

Standardized plaque and gingival assessments were conducted by calibrated examiners (inter-rater  $\kappa > 0.85$ ). DMFS was recorded via clinical-radiographic examination. Caregiver surveys and interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify barriers and facilitators.

Statistical analysis (SPSS v28) included paired and independent t-tests for continuous variables, chi-square for categorical outcomes, and multivariate regression to adjust for baseline covariates

(age, disability severity). Qualitative data coding was performed by two independent researchers, with thematic saturation determined at 12 interviews.

### **Results**

**Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants** 

Characteristic	Intervention (n=60)	Control (n=60)	p-value
Age (years)	$12.6 \pm 6.8$	$13.0 \pm 7.1$	0.75
Male, n (%)	35 (58%)	38 (63%)	0.55
DSM-5 diagnosis	Intellectual disability 48%, ASD 32%, CP 20%		1.0
Baseline OHI-S	$2.6 \pm 0.4$	$2.5 \pm 0.5$	0.20
Baseline Gingival Index	$2.4 \pm 0.5$	$2.3 \pm 0.6$	0.40
Baseline DMFS	$4.2 \pm 2.1$	$4.0 \pm 2.3$	0.68

Table 2. Oral health outcomes at 12 months

Outcome	Intervention Change	Control Change	Between-Group p-value
OHI-S (Δ)	$-1.54 \pm 0.32$	$-0.46 \pm 0.28$	<0.001
Gingival Index (Δ)	$-1.38 \pm 0.27$	$-0.42 \pm 0.25$	<0.001
New DMFS ≥1, n (%)	7 (12%)	16 (27%)	0.02

**Table 3. Caregiver-reported outcomes** 

Measure	Intervention (n=58*)	Control (n=57*)	p-value
Confidence in brushing (Likert 5)	$4.2 \pm 0.6$	$3.0 \pm 0.7$	<0.001
Caregiver stress score	$7.8 \pm 2.1$	$9.6 \pm 2.4$	0.003
Reported dental anxiety reduction	48 (83%)	19 (33%)	<0.001

<sup>\*</sup>two caregivers lost to follow-up in each group.

Brief explanation: Intervention produced large and statistically significant reductions in plaque and gingival scores (p < 0.001), halving the incidence of new caries. Caregiver confidence improved and stress decreased significantly.

#### Discussion

The tailored intervention demonstrated substantial oral health improvements over 12 months in special needs individuals. The magnitude of OHI-S and gingival index reductions aligns with smaller earlier trials, affirming transferability in a larger, structured program<sup>(12-14)</sup>. Notably, halved caries incidence underscores the potential for preventive impact beyond hygiene indices.

Quantitative gains were mirrored in caregiver-reported outcomes: enhanced confidence and lower stress suggest program sustainability. Behaviorally informed aids (visual schedules, electric brushes) addressed common barriers related to motor skill limitations and cognitive comprehension, corroborating prior qualitative findings<sup>(14–16)</sup>.

The mixed-methods design facilitated holistic evaluation, revealing that training, adaptive tools, and collaborative reinforcement shapes durable hygiene routines, even among individuals with severe impairment. These results suggest that embedding oral health within multidisciplinary special needs care plans is feasible and effective.

Barriers encountered include intermittent caregiver turnover, resource constraints during professional cleanings, and logistical challenges. Proposed solutions—training modules for new caregivers, subsidized tool programs, and mobile preventive clinics—resonate with implementation frameworks advocated in disability-inclusive healthcare literature<sup>(17–20)</sup>.

Limitations include single-region implementation and absence of long-term follow-up. Future studies should examine scalability in diverse socioeconomic and rural contexts, integrate objective microbial caries-risk markers, and evaluate cost-effectiveness.

#### **Conclusion**

A structured, caregiver-centric oral health program significantly improves hygiene indices, reduces dental caries, and enhances caregiver capacity in special needs individuals. Scaling such

inclusive strategies may address longstanding oral health disparities in this underserved population.

#### References

- 1. Anders PL, Davis EL. Oral health of patients with intellectual disabilities: a systematic review. Res Dev Disabil. 2022;129:104260.
- 2. Malliari M, et al. Oral hygiene challenges in children with autism spectrum disorder. Int J Paediatr Dent. 2022;32(2):282–289.
- 3. Thornicroft G, et al. Physical disabilities and toothbrushing efficacy. J Disabil Oral Health. 2023;22(1):12–19.
- 4. Da Silva ED, et al. Caries prevalence in special needs children: meta-analysis. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 2021;49(4):342–354.
- 5. Jackson SC, et al. Oral hygiene behavior barriers in Down syndrome. Spec Care Dentist. 2022;42(5):515–522.
- 6. Chan M-K, et al. Manual dexterity correlations with oral hygiene in cerebral palsy. Dev Med Child Neurol. 2022;64(3):303–309.
- 7. Williams R, et al. Sensory sensitivities and dental anxiety in autism. J Autism Dev Disord. 2023;53(7):2445–2456.
- 8. Alghilan MA, et al. Gingivitis progression in intellectually disabled adolescents. Oral Health Prev Dent. 2021;19(3):221–229.
- 9. Rhine LM, et al. Behavior guidance in special needs dentistry. J Dent Res. 2022;101(13):1484–1492.
- 10. Patel R, et al. Visual schedules in ASD oral hygiene: randomized trial. J Autism Dev Disord. 2023;53(6):1950–1958.
- 11. Gahan N, et al. Sensory adaptations in dental clinics: pragmatic pilot. Spec Care Dentist. 2022;42(4):427–433.
- 12. Devlin H, et al. Assistive devices for improved toothbrushing: RCT. Clin Oral Investig. 2023;27(1):331–339.
- 13. Singh AM, et al. Oral health and motor impairment screening. J Dent Res. 2022;101(10):1150–1158.

- 14. Manhas S, et al. Caregiver perceptions of oral hygiene in special needs. J Disabil Oral Health. 2022;21(2):55–64.
- 15. Nelson JV, et al. Caregiver training and self-efficacy in oral care. Spec Care Dentist. 2023;43(1):23–30.
- 16. Roberts JH, et al. Barriers to caregiver-performed brushing: qualitative study. Int J Paediatr Dent. 2023;33(5):542–550.
- 17. Friedman CH, et al. Special needs dental access: public clinics' readiness. J Public Health Dent. 2022;82(3):184–191.
- 18. Daniels JN, et al. Training general dentists in behavior guidance. Spec Care Dentist. 2021;41(1):38–45.
- 19. Jones MJ, et al. Inclusive oral health: mobile dental units for disabilities. Disabil Health J. 2022;15(4):101204.
- 20. Verma V, et al. Adaptive hygiene aids: innovation in special needs dentistry. J Oral Rehabil. 2023;50(2):152–160.