Available online at <u>www.scholarsresearchlibrary.com</u>



Scholars Research Library

Der Pharmacia Lettre, 2016, 8 (15):169-175 (http://scholarsresearchlibrary.com/archive.html)



Evaluation of Health-Related Quality of Life among General Dentists

Anahita Mehralie¹, Fatemeh Rezaei^{2*}, Amirarsalan Iranmanesh³, Mona Mehralie³ and Solmaz Araghi⁴

¹School of Dentistry, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran ²Oral Medicine Departments, School of Dentistry, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran ³School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran ⁴Endodontics Departments, School of Dentistry, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to evaluate health-related quality of life (HRQOL) among general dentists. HRQOL was measured using the Persian version of the 36-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36). This cross-sectional study was conducted on general dentists in Kermanshah, 2014. Data were analyzed by SPSS-17, using t-test (P<0.05). The response rate was reported to be 91.6% (186/203). A total of 186 general dentists, 135 males (72.6%) and 51 females (%27.4) with mean age of 41.5±7.8 years participated in the study. The findings showed that the general dentists had a high quality life (69.6±14.7). The scores of physical and mental health component summaries were 70.1±18.3 and 63.1±16.9, respectively. The scores of domains varied from 86.5±16.3for physical functioning to 51.1±19.7 for public health. Higher HRQOL scores were significantly associated with younger age, single, lower work experience, and general health condition (P<0.05).However gender displayed no significant effect on HRQOL (P=0.822). General dentists showed an appropriate health-related quality of life. However, dentists with systemic diseases had low HRQOL. Accordingly, coping strategies are required to be implemented in order to achieve a better HRQOL.

Keywords: General Dentists, SF-36, Health Related Quality of Life,

INTRODUCTION

Dentists are exposed to many occupational risk factors such as systemic infections (HIV, hepatitis B and C), eye injuries, vibration, skin injuries, radiation, dental materials and noise pollution[1,2,3]. Musculoskeletal pain among dentists (61%) has been reported to be significantly higher compared with surgeons (37%), physicians (20%) [2] and pharmacists (26%) [3]. Dentists are exposed to a wide range of stressors in work environment, such as long working hours, treatment of restless children, and the need for high concentration were identified as the most common factors [4,5]. Constant work pressure and associated physical disorders may have negative effects on dentist's personal and professional behavior, mental and emotional performance, and general health [6] and finally can affect their quality of life.

Given a continuous interaction between dentists and their patients, healthy dentists are particularly important for successful dental practice and the well-being of patients.[7]

Health related quality of life (HRQOL), is quality of life relative to one's health or disease status. [8].SF-36 is a standardized and generic questionnaire used to measure HRQOL[9].

The aim of this study was to evaluate HRQOL by using Persian version of SF-36 questionnaire among general dentists in Kermanshah city in 2014.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this cross-sectional study, the general dentists working inKermanshahin2014were studied. The sample size was calculated based on a pilot study. According to the indicators of quality of life, including S = 22 (standard deviation), $\alpha = 0.05$ (confidence) and d = 3.3 (accuracy), the minimum sample sizewas183patientswhowereselected through simple random sampling.

$$n = \frac{Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}^2 S^2}{d^2} = 182.89$$

The researcher referred to the office and clinic of dentistry. This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences .The objectives and procedures of the study were explained to the dentists. If they were satisfied to take part in the study, signed informed consent form. For ethical considerations the questionnaires were completed anonymously. The instrument for data collection in this study consisted of the SF-36 questionnaire and demographic information section (age, gender, marital status, work experience and history of systemic and chronic diseases such as: musculoskeletal disorders, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, hypersensitivity, psychological disorders...).The validity and reliability of the Persian version of the Short Form SF-36 questionnaire, as a HRQOL questionnaire, were approved by the Research Center of Tehran University of Jihad [10].

The SF-36 questionnaire consists of 36 questions in 8 domains. Mean Physical health score includes: physical functioning, role of limitation due to physical function, bodily pain and general health domains, and mean mental health score includes: role limitation due to emotional function, energy / fatigue or vitality, emotional wellbeing and social functioning domains. Based on the number of options for each question, the scores were determined; 2-choice questions (scores of zero, 25, 50, 75 and 100), 3-choice questions (scores of zero, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100). The score of each domain was calculated by the sum of scores of questions divided by the number of questions relating to the domain. Mean Physical and Mental health score were computed by the sum of scores of four domains divided by four. Total score was calculated by the sum of score of all questions divided by 36, So each scores ranging from 0 to 100, 0 showed the worst and 100 the best condition. Data were analyzed using SPSS software (version 17). T-test was used to assess the impact of demographic variables on the quality of life. In this study, P<0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

From 203 questionnaires that were distributed among general dentists, 186 dentists completed the questionnaires(Response rate: 91.6%).Table1 shows demographic information of participants (age, gender, marital status, work experience and history of systemic diseases). All participants included 135 males (72.6%) and 51 females (27.4) with the age range of 24 to 65and mean age of 41.5 ± 7.8 years.35 (18.8%) of dentists were singles, 151(81.2%) were married.59 (31.7%) had work experience ≤ 10 years and 127 (68.3%) had work experience >10 years.127 (68.3%) were without systemic disease and 59(31.7%) had systemic disease (Table 1).

Total scores of health related quality of life and mean physical and mental scores based on demographic variables of dentists are shown in Table 2.

Total quality of life of dentists and physical and mental dimension of it were higher among dentists aged of 40>, single, work experience 10> and without systematic disease. But any difference between genders was not seen.

Table 3 consist the mean quality of life in eight domains scores. The score of eight domains varied from a maximum of 86.5 ± 16.3 (physical functioning) to a minimum of 51.3 ± 19.7 (public health).

The quality of life score in the eight domains was not significantly different between the male and female dentists (0.05 < P)(Table 4).Except for the domains of "role disruption-emotional", that not affected by age, marital status and history of systemic disease, the scores of other domains in the dentists aged ≤ 40 years, single dentists and dentists with no systemic diseases were significantly higher than those of the dentists aged>40 years, married dentists and dentists with systemic diseases, respectively (p<0.05)(Table 5, 6, 7).

The dentists with work experience of ≤ 10 years obtained higher scores than the dentists with >10 years experience in the eight domains (p<0.05) (Table 8).

Variable	Number	%
Gender:		
Man	135	72.6
Woman	51	27.4
Age group(years):		
40>	82	44.1
40<	104	55.9
Marital status:		
Single	35	18.8
Married	151	81.2
Work experience(years):		
10>	59	31.7
10<	127	68.3
Systemic disease:		
Yes	127	68.3
No	59	31.7

Table1. Distribution of frequency of dentists participating in study according to demographic variable

Table2.Comparison of the total quality of life and mean physical and mental scores based on demographic variables of dentists

Variable	Number(%)	Total score	Р	mental score	Р	physical score	Р
Gender:							
Man	(72.6%)135	69.4±15.2	0.822	69.8±18.7	0.781	63.7±17.4	0.445
Woman	(27.4%)51	70.0±13.5		70.6±17.4		61.59±15.7	
Age group(years):							
40>	(44.1%)82	76.7±9.9	< 0.001	80.1±10.1	< 0.001	66.6±16.0	0.013
40<	(55.9%)104	63.9±15.5		62.0±19.4		60.4±17.3	
Marital status:							
Single			-0.001		-0.001		
Married	(18.8%)35	78.7±9.7	< 0.001	82.7±10.1	< 0.001	69.2±15.1	0.017
	(81.2%)151	67.4±14.9		67.1±18.5		61.7±17.1	
Work experience(years):							
10>	(31.7%)59	78.6±8.6	< 0.001	82.0±9.1	< 0.001	69.3±14.9	0.001
10<	(68.3%)127	65.4±15.1		64.5±18.9		60.2±17.1	
Systemic disease:							
Yes	(68.3%)127	75.2±10.3	< 0.001	77.8±11.5	< 0.001	66.2±15.9	< 0.001
No	(31.7%)59	57.4±15.5		53.3±19.1		56.3±18.1	

Quality of Life	Score Mean±SD	
Total Quality of Life	14.7 ±69.6	
Mean Physical Score	18.3 ± 70.1	
Mean Mental Score	16.9 ± 63.1	
Physical functioning	16.3 ± 86.5	
Limitation due to physical function	32.5 ± 76.6	
Pain	20.9 ± 65.7	
General health	19.7 ± 51.3	
limitation due to emotional function	39.0 ± 61.1	
Energy/fatigue	59.1±14.7	
Emotional well being	68.3±16.3	
Social functioning	63.9±17.7	

Quality of life	Quality of life s	P value*		
Quality of file	Male	Female	r value.	
Quality of life(total)	69/4±15/2	70/0±13/5	0/822	
Mean Physical Score	69/8±18/7	70/6±17/4	0/781	
Mean Mental Score	63/7±17/4	61/59±15/7	0/445	
Physical functioning	85/9±17/3	87/9±13/3	0/463	
Limitation due to physical	75/9±32/6	78/4±32/4	0/641	
Pain	65/8±21/2	65/6±20/3	0/959	
General health	51/6±20/4	50/6±17/9	0/773	
limitation due to emotional	63/2±39/5	55/5±37/5	0/234	
Energy/fatigue	58/9±15/7	59/6±11/9	0/780	
Emotional well being	67/4±14/4	70/9±10/6	0/120	
Social functioning	65/3±17/8	60/2±17/0	0/081	
T tast analysis				

Table 4. Comparison of HRQOL of dentists according to sex

T-test analysis

Table 5. Comparison of HRQOL of dentists according to age

Quality of life	Quality of life s	P value*	
Quality of life	<u><</u> 40	>40	P value*
Quality of life(total)	76/7±9/9	$63/9 \pm 15/5$	<0/001
Mean Physical Score	$80/1 \pm 10/1$	$62/0 \pm 19/4$	<0/001
Mean Mental Score	$66/6 \pm 16/0$	$60/4 \pm 17/3$	<0/013
Physical functioning	$94/8 \pm 7/7$	$79/9 \pm 18/2$	<0/001
Limitation due to physical	$90/2 \pm 19/9$	$65/8 \pm 36/3$	<0/001
Pain	$75/6 \pm 14/6$	$58/0 \pm 21/9$	<0/001
General health	$60/0 \pm 15/8$	$44/5 \pm 19/9$	<0/001
limitation due to emotional	$62/6 \pm 38/9$	$59/9 \pm 39/2$	0/645
Energy/fatigue	$62/9 \pm 12/7$	$56/0 \pm 15/6$	0/001
Emotional well being	$72/5 \pm 12/5$	$65/1 \pm 13/6$	<0/001
Social functioning	$68/2 \pm 16/2$	$60/5 \pm 18/1$	0/003

T- test analysis

Table6. Comparison of HRQOL of dentists according to marital status

Quality of life	Quality of life s	Pvalue		
Quality of life	Single	Married	rvalue	
Quality of life(total)	$78/7 \pm 9/7$	$67/4 \pm 14/9$	<0/001	
Mean Physical Score	$82/7 \pm 10/1$	$67/1 \pm 18/5$	<0/001	
Mean Mental Score	$69/2 \pm 15/1$	$61/7 \pm 17/1$	0/017	
Physical functioning	$95/5 \pm 8/6$	$84/4 \pm 16/9$	<0/001	
Limitation due to physical	$96/4 \pm 12/3$	$72/0 \pm 34/0$	<0/001	
Pain	$80/4 \pm 15/9$	$62/3 \pm 20/5$	<0/001	
General health	$58/7 \pm 15/7$	$49/6 \pm 20/2$	0/014	
Limitation due to emotional	$68/5 \pm 40/3$	59/3±38/6	0/211	
Energy/fatigue	$64/8 \pm 12/3$	$57/7 \pm 15/0$	0/010	
Emotional well being	$73/3 \pm 11/6$	$67/2 \pm 13/8$	0/017	
Social functioning	$70/3 \pm 13/9$	$62/4 \pm 18/1$	0/018	
T-test analysis				

Table 7.Comparison of HRQOL of dentists according to systemic disease

Quality of life	Quality of life s	Pvalue	
Quanty of me	No	Yes	Fvalue
Quality of life(total)	$75/2 \pm 10/3$	$57/4 \pm 15/5$	<0/001
Mean Physical Score	$77/8 \pm 11/5$	$53/3 \pm 19/1$	<0/001
Mean Mental Score	$66/2 \pm 15/5$	$56/3 \pm 18/1$	<0/001
Physical functioning	92/6±10/5	$73/2 \pm 18/5$	<0/001
Limitation due to physical function	$88/3 \pm 21/7$	51/2±37/2	<0/001
Pain	$71/7 \pm 18/0$	52/9±21/1	<0/001
General health	$58/5 \pm 17/0$	$35/8 \pm 16/1$	<0/001
limitation due to emotional function	64/8±38/3	53/1±39/6	0/056
Energy/fatigue	$61/6 \pm 13/4$	53/6±16/1	<0/001
Emotional well being	71/1±12/7	$62/5 \pm 13/6$	<0/001
Social functioning	67/5±15/7	56/2±19/3	<0/001

T-test analysis

Quality of life	Quality of life s	P value	
Quality of life	<u><10</u>	>10	r value
Quality of life(total)	$78/6 \pm 8/6$	$65/4 \pm 15/1$	<0/001
Mean Physical Score	$82/0 \pm 9/1$	$64/5 \pm 18/9$	<0/001
Mean Mental Score	$69/3 \pm 14/9$	60/2±17/1	0/001
Physical functioning	$95/9 \pm 6/9$	$82/1 \pm 17/5$	<0/001
Limitation due to physical function	$93/2 \pm 15/2$	$68/8 \pm 35/4$	<0/001
Pain	$78/1 \pm 14/0$	$60/0 \pm 21/1$	<0/001
General health	$60/7 \pm 15/2$	$47/0 \pm 20/1$	<0/001
Limitation due to emotional function	$70/0 \pm 38/0$	56/9±38/9	0/033
Energy/fatigue	$63/5 \pm 12/1$	$57/0 \pm 15/4$	0/005
Emotional well being	$72/7 \pm 13/0$	$66/3 \pm 13/4$	0/003
Social functioning	$71/1 \pm 15/9$	$60/6 \pm 17/5$	<0/001

Table 8. Comparison of HRQOL of dentists according to work experience

T-test analysis

DISCUSSION

Some studies have demonstrated negative impact of health-related professions on quality of life [10-13]. Dentists are exposed to a variety of harmful occupational factors that could have an adverse effect on their various aspects of their life, including physical and mental health and social functioning. [14]

In other hand a healthy dentist is one of the most important components in s successful dental practice. [15] So HRQOL of dentists can affect the professional practice.

Therefore, this study constitutes the first attempt to assess health related quality of life of general dentists by using SF36 questioner.

In the present study, the participation rate was 91.6%, this high percentage of participants in the present study can be indicative of the status of quality of life among the whole population of general dentists in Kermanshah city.

Unfortunately the existing literature on HRQOL among dentists is not rich. Most studies found assessing the health status of dentists have used other generic health instruments (mostly General Health Questionnaire and Self-Reporting Questionnaire) and therefore a direct comparison between their findings and the results of the present study could not be made. So in the current study, we compare HRQOL of dentists with HRQOL of healthy working population such as nurses, doctors and a sample of general population in IRAN (elderly people) and quality of life in dentists by using other instruments.

Total score of quality of life in general dentists was 69.6 ± 14.7 , the mean physical score was 70.1 ± 18.3 and the mean mental score was 63.1 ± 16.9 . Klersy et al evaluated HRQOL in nurses and doctors working in hemodialysis centers by using SF-36 questionnaire and reported the physical and mental dimension scores of 50 ± 7.2 and 49.1 ± 9.7 among nurses and scores of 53.3 ± 5.8 and 49 ± 8.6 among doctors [16].

In this study, the maximum and minimum scores in the eight domains were 86.5 ± 16.3 (physical functioning) and 51.3 ± 19.7 (public health), respectively. In contrast to these findings, Aghamolaei et al examined a sample of people in Bandar Abass (IRAN) and reported the maximum and minimum scores of 92.9 ± 17.9 and 67.4 ± 20 for the eight domains, respectively[17], which is a much higher quality of life index than that of the present study.

Based on these findings, there was no significant difference between the male and female dentists in any of the cases of total quality of life, two dimensions and the eight domains. In contrast to this finding, Hopman et al in a study of Canadian population reported gender differences in terms of quality of life and showed the quality of life was higher in men than in women [18]. Tountas et al also investigated the patients admitted to hospitals in Greece and found that men obtained higher scores in total quality of life and all eight domains compared to women [19]. Moreover, in their study Aghamolaei et al found that men's quality of life was better than women [17]. In the present study, there was no difference between male and female dentists in terms of quality of life, which can be attributed to women's employment. It has been shown that job is the most important factor affecting the women's quality of life. In fact, education level and employment status effectively improve the quality of life [20]. The findings of the current study

showed that younger dentists (<40 years) had a better quality of life than older age groups. Only in the domain of "role disruption-emotional, there was no significant difference between <40 and >40 age groups.

In line with this finding, Aghamolaei et al examined a sample of general population in Bandar Abbas and found that quality of life scores reduced gradually between the ages of 15 and 64 years, followed by adrastic reduction in quality of life after the age of 65 years (17). In contradiction with the findings of the present study, Tountas et al showed that people over 50 years old had the highest level of quality of life, while the most adverse quality of life was reported for the age group of 40-20 years [19].

Based on these findings, single dentists showed a higher level of quality of life than married dentists except for the domains of "role disruption-emotional" that there wasn't significant difference between single and married people. The high score of the quality of life in single dentists can be attributed to their lower age and lower incidence of systemic diseases.

The study showed that dentists with less than 10 years of experience in dental profession had better quality of life than dentists with over 10 years of experience. Various factors, including a higher incidence of disease in the older age groups and hard working conditions over the years can reduce the quality of life in this age group. It has been shown that stress career fatigue (burnout syndrome), job strain, stress and lack of rest can reduce the quality of life of the people working in the health professions [21]. According to this study, the quality of life in dentists without systemic diseases (75.2 ± 103) was considerably higher than those with systemic diseases (57.4 ± 15.5). Only in the category of "role disruption-emotional, there was no significant difference between the dentists with and without systemic diseases. Poor quality of life has been shown to be associated with a variety of systemic diseases such as diabetes [22], heart disease [23], muscular – skeletal diseases[24], and ischemic strokes[25], kidney disease [26.27.28].

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study showed that the quality of life of examined general dentists was at an acceptable level(QOL score of 50). The quality of life was considerably better in dentists with lower age and work experience, single dentists and dentists with good general health. Gender did not have a significant impact on the dentists' quality of life. Since dentists with systemic diseases had lower levels of quality of life, it is necessary to implement compatible training programs to improve their quality of life.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Mr. Khodadadaki and all dentists who helped us conduct this study.

REFERENCES

[1] Hodacova L, Sustova Z, Cermakova E, Kapitan M, Smejkalova J. Ind Health 2015; 53(1): 48-55.

[2] Rambabu T, Suneetha K. Ann Med Health Sci Res 2014; 4(4): 578-82.

[3] AminianO, Alemohammad Z B, Hosseini M H. Neck and upper extremity symptoms among male dentists and pharmacists. Work **2014** Nov [Epub ahead of print]

[4] PozosRadillo BE, TórrezLópez TM, Aguilera Velasco Mde L, AcostaFernández M, González Perez GJ. *Braz Oral Res* 2008; 22(3): 223-8.

[5] Ayers KM, Thomson WM, Newton JT, Rich AM. Occup Med (Lond) 2008; 58(4): 275-81.

[6] Rada RE, Johnson-Leong C. J Am Dent Assoc 2004; 135(6): 788-94.

[7] PurieneA, JanulyteV, MusteikyteM, BendinskaiteR. Baltic Dental and Maxillofacial J 2007;9:10-20

[8] TamilynBakas,Susan M Mclennon,Janet S Carpenter, Janice M Buelow,Julie L Otte,Kathleen M Hanna ,et al. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* **2012**;10:134

[9] Azman AB, Sararaks S, Rugayah B, Low LL, Azian AA, Geeta S, Tiew CT. *Med J Malaysia* 2003; 58(5): 694-711.

[10] Montazeri A, Goshtasebi A, Vahdaninia M, Gandek B. Qual Life Res 2005; 14(3): 875-82.

[11] Mosadeghrad AM, Ferlie E, Rosenberg D. Health Serv Manage Res 2011; 24(4): 170-81.

[12] Sehlen S, Vordermark D, Schäfer C, Herschbach P, Bayerl A, Pigorsch S, Rittweger J, et al. *Radiat Oncol 2009*; 4: 6.

[13] Makabe S, Takagai J, Asanuma Y, Ohtomo K, Kimura Y. Impact of work-life imbalance on job satisfaction and quality of life among hospital nurses in Japan. *Ind Health* **2014** Dec 3. [Epub ahead of print]

[14] Doshi D, Jain A, Vinaya K, Kotian S. Indian J Dent Res 2011; 22(4): 552-5.

- [15] Fortney L, Luchterhand C, Zakletskaia L, Zgierska A, Rakel D. Ann Fam Med 2013; 11(5): 412-20.
- [16] Klersy C, Callegari A, Martinelli V, Vizzardi V, Navino C, Malberti F, et al. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2007; 22(8): 2283-90.

[17] Aghamolaei T, Tavafian SS, Zare S. Iran J Public Health 2011; 40(3): 128-35.

[18] Hopman WM, Towheed T, Anastassiades T, Tenenhouse A, Poliquin S, Berger C, et al. *CMAJ* 2000; 163(3): 265-71.

[19] Tountas Y, Demakakos PT, Yfantopoulos Y, Aga J, Houliara L, Pavi E. Health Qual Life Outcomes 2003; 1: 61.

[20] Saravi FK, Navidian A, Rigi SN, Montazeri A. BMC Womens Health 2012; 12: 41.

- [21] Hettiarachchi M, Fonseka CL, Gunasekara P, Jayasinghe P, Maduranga D. Med Educ Online 2014; 19: 22772
- [22] Chittleborough CR, Baldock KL, Taylor AW, Phillips PJ; Qual Life Res 2006; 15(4): 687-94.
- [23] Jenkinson C, Jenkinson D, Shepperd S, Layte R, Petersen S. Age Ageing 1997; 26(1): 7-13.
- [24] Picavet HS, Hoeymans N. Ann Rheum Dis 2004; 63(6): 723-9.
- [25] Kranciukaite D, Rastenyte D. Medicina (Kaunas) 2006; 42(9): 709-16.
- [26] Pakpour AH1, Saffari M, Yekaninejad MS, Panahi D, Harrison AP, Molsted S. Health-related quality
- [27] AbediGh, Rostami F. Health MED. 2012; 6(1): 24-28.

[28] Abedi, Gh, Mohammadi, A., Mohammadi, F, Alizadeh, A, Hosseini, H, Rostami, F. *International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine and Public Health*. June **2012**;4(6): 330-1336.