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Clinical relevance

Scientific rational for study: Poor oral health is recognised as a potential risk factor for hospital acquired infections. Therefore a systematic review of the evidence for the effect of hospitalisation on oral health is needed.

Principal findings: The evidence suggests that oral health deteriorates during hospitalisation. However, few studies have investigated this question and the strength of evidence is limited.

Practical implications: Oral care during hospitalisation needs to be strengthened together with further research investigating oral health changes in different settings and factors that facilitate the provision of care.
ABSTRACT

Background: Poor oral health of hospitalised patients is associated with an increased risk of hospital acquired infections and reduced life quality.

Objectives: To systematically review the evidence on oral health changes during hospitalisation.

Data sources: Cochrane library, Medline, OldMedline, Embase and CINAHL without language restrictions.

Study eligibility criteria: Observational longitudinal studies.

Data appraisal and synthesis methods: Two independent reviewers screened studies for inclusion, assessed risk of bias and extracted data. Risk of bias was assessed with the Ottawa Newcastle assessment scale. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

Results: Five studies before and after studies were included. The data suggest a deterioration in oral health following hospitalisation with an increase in dental plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation and a deterioration in mucosal health.

Limitations: Whilst before and after studies are at a general risk of bias, other specific study characteristics of were judged to be of low risk of bias. However, methodological issues such as unvalidated outcome measures and lack of assessor training limit the strength of the evidence.

Conclusion: Hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health, particularly in intubated patients.
INTRODUCTION

Maintenance of oral health is important for hospitalised patients. Oral health affects quality of life (Llewellyn & Warnakulasuriya 2003, Yu et al. 2008) and personal dignity and this impact appears to be more severe in medically compromised or hospitalised patients (Duke et al. 2005, Ingram et al. 2005, Locker et al. 2002, McMillan et al. 2005, Mulligan et al. 2008). Not surprisingly, poor oral health or dysfunction can also have a negative effect on nutritional status (Chai et al. 2006, Gil-Montoya et al. 2008, Rauen et al. 2006), whilst improvement of dental status raises levels of nutritional markers (Wostmann et al. 2008).

Poor oral health and oral hygiene can also contribute to an increased incidence of hospital acquired infections, particularly respiratory diseases (Azarpazhooh & Leake 2006, Shaw 2005). Furthermore, interventions that maintain or improve oral health can reduce the incidence of ventilator associated pneumonia (Chan et al. 2007). Similarly, benefits from effective oral hygiene have also been documented for pneumonia in non ambulatory (Scannapieco 2006) or elderly patients (Sjogren et al. 2008). Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care. Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care.

Although oral health can be maintained during hospitalisation with proper training of the caregivers (Peltola et al. 2007), there are difficulties in the provision of adequate oral care in hospitals and institutional facilities. Barriers to effective oral care reported by caregivers include the low priority of oral care (Grap et al. 200, Landstrom et al. 2009), fear of causing pain or injury to the patients (Jablonski et al. 2009), the perception that oral care does not provide significant benefits (Binkley et al. 2004, Jones et al. 2004), patients’ resistive behaviours (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009), inadequate nurse staffing (Grap et al. 2003) and lack of supplies (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009). To encourage provision of
effective oral care, guidelines have been published with recommended protocols for hospitalised patients (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004). However, the adherence to oral health protocols is reported to be low (Grap et al. 2003, Rello et al. 2007).

Whilst oral health status during hospitalisation is clearly an important public health issue, no systematic review has been conducted to critically evaluate the research data on this topic. The aim of this systematic review was therefore to address the focussed question, what is the effect of hospitalisation on oral health?

METHODS
We considered as eligible longitudinal prospective observational studies in people of all ages being hospitalised, that assessed changes of the following outcomes: tooth loss, any measures of periodontal health, dental caries and stomatological diseases. Intervention studies, cross sectional studies, case reports and reviews were excluded. Studies reporting specifically on patients with psychiatric disorders or on patients receiving treatment with frequently observed oral complications (e.g. chemo- or radiotherapy) were excluded.

Search strategy (Appendix)
The literature search for relevant articles was performed using Ovid MEDLINE and Ovid OLDMEDLINE (dating from January 1950 to January 2010), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (dating from 1982 to January 2010), Cochrane Library (up to 2010) and EMBASE (dating from 1981 to January 2010). We designed a sensitive search strategy as we anticipated that coding for relevant search terms was not well developed. The bibliographies of all potentially relevant studies and review articles were also searched.
Handsearching was performed in the following journals; *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology, Gerodontology, Journal of Disability and Oral Health and Special Care in Dentistry*. No language restrictions were applied on the search. When necessary we corresponded with the first authors of studies to elicit further information. One reviewer (ET) scanned the titles and abstracts of the studies identified by the search. When a study seemed to meet the eligibility criteria or information was insufficient to exclude, full text articles were obtained.

**Data extraction**

Two reviewers (ET, EA) independently screened all full text articles. They also extracted data from the included studies in specially designed forms. Disagreements that could not be resolved were arbitrated by a third author (IN). Training of reviewers for screening, study eligibility and quality assessment was performed by an experienced systematic review methodologist (IN). The calibration of the examiners was made on five randomly selected studies included for full paper screening.

**Quality assessment**

Studies were assessed by the two reviewers (ET, EA) using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort studies (Wells et al. 2008). Since we did not find studies with a non-exposed comparison group we omitted the comparability section of the scale. In addition, we assessed whether a power calculation was reported for each study and if so, the magnitude of a change that the study was powered to detect. Separately, we assessed the quality of the outcome assessment in terms of validity of the measure of oral health and conduct/reporting of assessor training in the measure.
Data synthesis

Pooling of data was based on the study design, population characteristics, types of oral hygiene measures used in the hospital units, setting characteristics of the studies and outcomes measured. We anticipated substantial heterogeneity between studies and planned a narrative synthesis of data.

RESULTS

A total of 9689 potentially relevant review records were found. 9652 were excluded on the basis of their titles or abstracts and the full papers of 37 studies were retrieved. Five papers were finally included (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). (Fig 1) Inter-examiner agreement for eligibility of included papers was 100%. The most common reasons for exclusion were no reported oral health outcomes or study design (e.g. intervention, cross sectional or retrospective).

Quality assessment

Agreement between reviewers on each aspect of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was 100%. In all studies the representativeness of the cohort was found to be adequate and the demonstration of outcomes of interest was made at baseline. Adequacy of follow up was judged to be good in all studies, considering the healthcare setting, despite the drop outs encountered. This was based on the fact that the reasons for drop out were either death or discharge from the hospital unit (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al 2009). The assessment of outcome was judged to be adequate for all studies in terms of the Newcastle-Ottawa criteria and the follow up period was long enough for the assessment of
dental plaque and gingival health changes. This period was arbitrarily defined as a minimum of three to five days (Eilers et al. 1988, Fitch et al. 1999) although too brief to detect either dental caries incidence or changes in periodontitis. The validity of the outcome measures was more problematic including the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with tools designed for population epidemiology (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). In addition, examiner training was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009).

**Population characteristics**

Four studies were located in ICU units (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009) and one investigated a mixed population of patients in ICU and a cardiosurgical ward (Dennesen et al. 2003). The population in three studies was intubated (Fourrier et al. 1998, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), while in two, the population was both intubated and not intubated (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000). One study investigated children only (Franklin et al. 2000), while the remainder reported on adult populations. The duration of the hospitalisation ranged from five to twenty days.

**Oral care regime**

There was marked variability in oral care protocols including sterile cloth drenched with 0.9% saline (Dennesen et al. 2003), rinsing with sterile water (Fourrier et al. 1998), foamsticks moistened with water (Franklin et al. 2000) and foam swabs or child toothbrushes with toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline (Prendergast et al. 2009).
one study, there were no details of the oral hygiene measures applied (Munro et al. 2006). Frequency of oral care provision ranged between two to six times per day.

Study setting

Two studies were based in the USA (Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), one in the UK (Franklin et al. 2000), one in France (Fourrier et al. 1998) and one in the Netherlands (Dennesen et al. 2003).

Power calculation

Power calculation was reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000). The sample size was estimated to identify a difference of 10 plaque covered surfaces significant at 5% with a power of 90% using a standard deviation of 15.0 for plaque on all tooth surfaces.

Dental plaque accumulation

Four out of the five included studies reported on the changes of dental plaque accumulation during hospitalisation period (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). Each study used a different measure. In one study no differences were observed during the observational period (Prendergast et al. 2009). Three studies reported increasing levels of plaque accumulation during hospitalisation (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006), which was statistically significant in two (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). The proportion of sites with abundant dental plaque (scores more than 2) increased from 23% at baseline to 93% at day 10 (Fourrier et al. 1998) and the other study showed mean difference of 3.3% in the O’Leary index (p=0.001) (Franklin et al. 2000).
Gingival inflammation

Three studies reported on the levels of gingival inflammation during hospitalisation using different indices (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000, Prendergast et al. 2009). Two of the studies found statistically significant increases in the severity of gingival inflammation. (OAG median value changes from 1 at baseline to 2 at day 14 (Prendergast et al. 2009) and mean difference of the sites presenting gingival inflammation of 1.4 (p=0.006) (Franklin et al. 2000)) One study reported ‘no statistically significant changes’ although no data were presented (Dennesen et al. 2003).

Periodontal disease

One study reported on the severity of periodontal disease using an index of assessment of treatment needs, but found no statistically significant change (Dennesen et al. 2003). However, this index was designed for epidemiology and is insensitive to small changes over short durations of time (Holmgren 1994).

Caries incidence

Two studies assessed the incidence of dental caries in hospitalised patients and reported no statistically significant changes following hospitalisation (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006).

Stomatological disease
Two studies evaluated the incidence of stomatological diseases (Dennesen et al. 2003, Prendergast et al. 2009). Both studies found a statistically significant increased incidence of mucositis intubated patients but with not in non-intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003).

**DISCUSSION**

Statement of principal findings

The five included studies suggest that oral health deteriorates following hospitalisation. Most studies were set in intensive care units including both intubated and non-intubated patients. Dental plaque accumulation and gingival and mucosal inflammation were the main oral health aspects affected in the examined populations and the findings were more evident in studies reporting on intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000).

Strengths and weaknesses of the review

We conducted a sensitive search including multiple electronic databases without language restriction and supplemented by handsearching. However, we were only able to identify five eligible studies enrolling a total of 271 patients. We were unable to retrieve two papers for the full article reading. Their abstracts were unavailable in the databases and no records of the journals were found in British Library. Other strengths of the review are that we appraised the methodological quality and risk of bias of included studies including the validity of the outcome measures in relation to oral health changes.

Since most of the studies were conducted in intensive care units, the results cannot be extrapolated to other hospital settings. Other than intubation, differences with other
settings could include level of dependency of patients for oral care, ease of provision of oral care and availability of staff to provide such care.

The quality of the evidence included in the review was affected by a number of methodological issues. Firstly, there was marked heterogeneity in the oral care routines and in addition, adherence to oral care was not reported in the majority of studies. Secondly, a wide variety of indices for assessing oral health were employed and their validity was not clear. Validity issues included the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with epidemiological tools (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). Furthermore, examiner training in this testing setting was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009). Study design also limits the strength of the conclusions. All studies were uncontrolled and changes in outcomes may simply relate to shifts in examiner characteristics over time. Including an appropriate ‘unexposed’ comparison group is challenging and its validity as a control would be questionable. Therefore, this needs to be accepted as a limitation to the evidence. Calibration of an examiner to a gold-standard with re-testing throughout the study might have helped counter any drift. The duration of follow-up was limited (to a maximum of 20 days) due to the nature of the hospitalisation. Although this period was adequate for the detection of changes in some oral health outcomes such as dental plaque accumulation (Theilade et al. 1966) and gingival inflammation (Loe et al. 1965), longer observational periods are required for the detection of a change in periodontitis (Goodson et al. 1982) or dental caries occurrence (Pitts and Stamm 2004). Finally, power calculations were reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000), thus hindering the interpretation of findings.
Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other reviews

We have not found other systematic reviews addressing this research question. However, a clinical effectiveness review was published in 1999 investigating oral care practices by nurses (Bowsher et al. 1999). The published report is limited in details of methodology making comparison difficult. However, the findings, even though published more than a decade ago, appear to hold true ‘This review confirms that current practice largely ignores the research evidence and is inadequate for ensuring optimum care. There is a clear need to develop and evaluate oral care protocols for hospitalised patients and to support nurses in their implementation.’

Meaning of the review, possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policy makers.

This review suggests that hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health and this could have profound implications for health and wellbeing. On the basis of current evidence, a deterioration in oral health would be expected to increase the risk of hospital acquired infections, increase care costs and have negative impact on health related quality of life.

We were not able to conclude whether this impact results from a low priority of oral care provision, the implementation of improper oral care regimes, from hospitalisation per se or from a combination of factors. Guidelines for the provision of oral care in hospital settings have been published (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske, et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004) although they provide limited detail for carers.
Additional protocols/guidelines are therefore needed and should be based on the best available evidence with sufficient detail to guide carers and patients. Such development should include the breadth of relevant stakeholders such as nursing, medical and dental professionals as well as patients and address the different settings in which will need to be provided such as units with fully dependent patients and those where patients are able to carry out oral hygiene themselves. More challenging will be implementation (Rello et al. 2007) and this will need to be planned together with evaluation of success prior to introduction.

In terms of interventions, chemical plaque control was the regime of choice in three out of five included studies (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). Although the clinical application of chemicals such as antiseptics seems straightforward, their effect against established dental plaque is marginal due to its organisation as a biofilm in which bacteria are considerably less sensitive to antimicrobial treatments than free-living planktonic bacteria (Pratten et al. 1998). This is corroborated by a systematic review of chlorhexidine for prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) which reported no effect on VAP incidence (Pineda et al. 2006). Therefore, mechanical removal or disruption of dental plaque will be needed such as can be achieved through toothbrushing.

Suggestions for further research

More robust evidence is needed to understand the impact of hospitalisation on oral health. In particular, we recommend studies conducted in a wider range of hospital settings including outside of critical care units. There are many outcomes measures that are validated in oral health research and these should be selected for hospital-based studies.
Furthermore, training of examiners should be provided together and outcomes of training (such as agreement levels) reported. Where feasible, longer observational periods could be employed to investigate other oral health outcomes such as dental caries and periodontitis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>Type of oral care provided:</th>
<th>Hospital department</th>
<th>Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</th>
<th>Quality assessment scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recruited</td>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflamation, dental health (OAG index)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast et al. 2009&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1. 45 patients</td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
<td>2. Oral care regime</td>
<td>2. Nurses (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>2. 49.16 years (18-85)</td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
<td>3. Frequency</td>
<td>3. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
<td>5. Adherence assessed</td>
<td>5. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1. 66 patients</td>
<td>2. 55 years (25-93)</td>
<td>1. Not reported</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflamation, gingival bleeding, purulence, candidiasis, calculus, caries, stain (Oral health assessment tool)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>3. D0: 66 patients</td>
<td>4. Fully dependent (intubated)</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Not reported (4-7 days)</td>
<td>3. 2.58 times per day (0-7 range)</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Not reported</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1. ICU: 24 patients</td>
<td>CS: 20 patients</td>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported</td>
<td>1. Periodontal disease (CPITN) and Oral mucositis (Quantitative scale of oral mucositis)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>2. ICU: 58 years (SD 18.6)</td>
<td>CS: 61 years (41-77)</td>
<td>CS: Not reported</td>
<td>2. Dental hygienists (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: 20.4 days (SD 7.5) (14 days)</td>
<td>CS: Not reported</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: Not reported</td>
<td>CS: Not reported</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Included study characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>Type of oral care provided:</th>
<th>1. Hospital department</th>
<th>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</th>
<th>Quality assessment scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
<td>2. Oral care regime</td>
<td>2. UK</td>
<td>dental plaque accumulation (O’ Leary index),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
<td>3. Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>gingival inflammation (binary assessment),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dependency/intubated</td>
<td>4. Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous gingival bleeding (binary assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
<td>5. Adherence assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000†</td>
<td>59 children</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>1. ICU</td>
<td>Dental plaque accumulation (Plaque index from one tooth)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 4.8 (1-16)</td>
<td>Foam sticks moistened with water.</td>
<td>2. France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 5 children</td>
<td>Antiseptics and antifungals were used at the discretion of the nurses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 12 children orally intubated. The rest nasally intubated or not intubated</td>
<td>Every 4-6 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 7.4 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998‡</td>
<td>57 patients</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 49 years (18-83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 29 patients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 44 patients intubated (77%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 14 days (2-82) (15 patients for 5 days and 13 patients for 10 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key* “D0, D1, D4, D5, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
Table 2: Reported results from included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Number of patients and duration of observation period</th>
<th>Dental plaque (index)</th>
<th>Gingival health (index)</th>
<th>Periodontal health (index)</th>
<th>Caries (index)</th>
<th>Stomatological disease incidence (index)</th>
<th>Other outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast et al. 2009</td>
<td>D0: 45 patients</td>
<td>Median values OAG: 1st-3rd quartile</td>
<td>Median values OAG: 1st-3rd quartile</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Median values OAG: 1st-3rd quartile</td>
<td>Total score in median values OAG: 1st-3rd quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4: 31 patients</td>
<td>D0: 2 (2-2)</td>
<td>D0: 1 (1-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D0: 1 (1-2)</td>
<td>D0: 12 (11-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D14: 2 (2-3)*</td>
<td>D14: 2 (1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D10: 16 (14-17)*</td>
<td>D10: 16 (14-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean period: 12.8 days (SD 7.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* statistically significant from baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006</td>
<td>D0: 66 patients</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4: 37 patients</td>
<td>D0: 21.27 (SD 23.66)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D7: 21 patients</td>
<td>D4: 22.72 (SD 20.47)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D7: 24.32 (SD 29.01)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003</td>
<td>ICU: 24 patients for 20.4 days (SD 7.5)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>CPITN</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>Median mucositis index (ICU)</td>
<td>% subjects n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS: 20 patients for 15 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>CPITN</td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>ICU: 2 (SD 3.2)</td>
<td>Quantitative scale of oral mucositis**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D21: 19 (SD 5.9)</td>
<td>0-39 (health: 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D14: 12%</td>
<td>D21: 19±5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D21: 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>Total score in median values OAG: 1st-3rd quartile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D0: 12 (11-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D4: 14 (13-15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D7: 15 (12-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>D10: 16 (14-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>* statistically significant from baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>* statistically significant from baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>* statistically significant from baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000</td>
<td>54 children for 7.5 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>O’Leary plaque index</td>
<td>Presence of gingival inflammation (yes/no)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>DMFT index (D0: Primary teeth: 1.0 (SD 2.2) Permanent teeth: 1.2 (SD 1.9))</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D0: 22.5% (SD 17.7)</td>
<td>D0: 4.1 sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D0: Primary teeth: 1.0 (SD 2.2) Permanent teeth: 1.2 (SD 1.9)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge: 25.8% (SD 18.5)</td>
<td>Discharge: 5.5 sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discharge: &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean difference: 3.3%</td>
<td>Mean difference: 1.4 sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI: 1-4.53</td>
<td>95% CI: 0.4-2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p: 0.001</td>
<td>p: 0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* statistically significant different (p&lt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>** statistically significant different (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998</td>
<td>Group 1: 15 patients for 5 days</td>
<td>Plaque index (one tooth)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: 13 patients for 10 days</td>
<td>Group 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D0: 1.1 (SD 0.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D5: 1.6 (SD 0.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D0: 1.0 (SD 0.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D5: 1.6 (SD 0.6)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D10: 2.0 (SD 0.4)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*statistically significant different (p&lt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* statistically significant different (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>** statistically significant different (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>** statistically significant different (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key*  “D0, D1, D4, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
APPENDICES

Search strategy for Ovid Medline

1. exp Hospitalization/
2. Hospital*.mp.
3. exp Intensive Care Units/
5. Intensive care ward*.mp.
6. ICU.mp.
7. Dental deposit*.mp.
8. Dental plaque.mp.
9. Dental calculus.mp.
10. Plaque accumulation.mp.
11. Plaque score.mp.
12. exp Dental Health Surveys/
13. Periodontal index.mp.
15. DMF index.mp.
16. exp Oral Hygiene/
17. Oral hygiene.mp.
19. exp candidiasis, oral/ or exp mucositis/ exp oral hemorrhage/ or exp periodontal diseases/ or exp stomatitis/
24. Probing depth*.mp
25. Bleeding on probing.mp.
27. Gingival hemorrhage.mp.
29. Oral mucositis.mp.
30. Stomatitis.mp.
31. tooth diseases/ or exp dental deposits/ or exp dental calculus/ or exp dental plaque/ or exp smear layer/ or exp tooth demineralization/ or exp dental caries/
32. Dental caries.mp.
33. Tooth decay.mp.
34. Tooth demineralisation.mp.
35. Tooth demineralization.mp.
36. Tooth decalcification.mp.
37. Tooth extraction.mp.
38. Tooth loss.mp.
39. exp Oral Health/
40. Oral health.mp.
41. or/1-6
42. or/7-40
43. 41 and 42

---

**Search strategy for EMBASE**

1. exp hospital patient/
2. exp hospitalization/
3. hospital*.mp.
4. exp intensive care/ or exp intensive care unit/
5. intensive care unit*.mp.
7. ICU.mp.
8. exp tooth calculus/
9. exp tooth plaque/
10. exp mouth hygiene/
11. exp mouth disease/
12. periodontal disease/
13. exp periodontitis/
14. exp thrush/
15. exp stomatitis/
16. exp dental caries/
17. exp tooth extraction/
18. dental deposit*.mp.
19. dental calculus.mp
20. dental plaque.mp.
21. plaque accumulation.mp.
22. oral hygiene.mp.
23. oral clean*.mp.
24. oral candidiasis.mp.
25. oral mucositis.mp.
26. stomatitis.mp.
27. periodont*.mp.
28. gingiv*.mp.
29. dental caries.mp.
30. tooth decay.mp.
31. tooth deminerali?ation.mp.
32. tooth decalcification.mp.
33. tooth loss.mp.
34. tooth extraction.mp.
35. oral health.mp
36. DMF index.mp
37. plaque score.mp.
38. or/1-7
39. or/8-37
40. 38 and 39

Search strategy for CINAHL

1. (MH "Hospitalization+)")
2. TX hospital*
3. (MH "Intensive Care Units+")
4. TX intensive care unit*
5. TX intensive care ward*
6. TX ICU
7. (MH "Tooth Diseases+")
8. (MH "Mouth Diseases+")
9. (MH "Oral Hygiene+")
10. (MH "Oral Health")
11. TX dental deposit*
12. TX dental calculus
13. TX plaque accumulation
14. TX periodont*
15. TX gingiv*
16. TX stomatitis
17. TX oral candid*
18. TX oral mucositis
19. TX dental caries
20. TX tooth decay
21. TX tooth demineralization
22. TX tooth decalcification
23. TX tooth decalcification
24. TX tooth loss
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25. TX tooth extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. TX probing depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. TX bleeding on probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. TX gingival hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. TX gingival haemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. TX plaque score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. TX DMF index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. TX oral clean*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. TX oral hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. TX oral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. or/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. or/7-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. 35 and 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modified quality assessment scale for cohort studies (based on Newcastle-Ottawa scale)

(Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item with the selection and outcome categories.)

Selection

1) Representativeness of the cohort:
   a) truly representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   b) somewhat representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure:
   a) secure record (e.g. surgical records) (*)
   b) structured interview (*)
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest at baseline:
   a) yes (*)
   b) no

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome:
   a) independent blind assessment (*)
   b) record linkage (*)
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur:
   a) yes (3-5 days for plaque and gingival changes)(*)
   b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts:
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for (*)
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost (subjects lost due to death or discharge from the hospital or unit) (*)
   c) no description of those lost or loss due to other reasons than death or discharge from the hospital/unit.
   d) no statement
The impact of hospitalisation on oral health. A systematic review.

Running title: Hospitalisation and oral health

Emmanuel Terezakis¹, Ian Needleman¹, Navdeep Kumar², David Moles³ & Elisa Agudo¹

1. Unit of Periodontology and International Centre for Evidence-Based Oral Health, UCL
   Eastman Dental Institute, 256 Gray’s Inn Road, London WC1X 8LD, UK

2. Department of Special Care Dentistry, UCL Eastman Dental Institute, 256 Gray’s Inn Road,
   London WC1X 8LD, UK

3. Peninsula Dental School, The John Bull Building, Research Way, Plymouth, Devon, PL6 8BU,
   UK

Corresponding author:

Professor Ian Needleman: Unit of Periodontology & International Centre for Evidence-Based Oral
Health, UCL Eastman Dental Institute, 256 Gray’s Inn Road, London WC1X 8LD

i.needleman@eastman.ucl.ac.uk:

Telephone: +44 (0) 207 915 2340

Fax: +44 (0) 207 915 1137

Keywords: Oral health, oral hygiene, hospitalization, hospital acquired infections

Word count:

Funding and conflict of interest
There was no external funding and all authors were supported by their institutions. This work was undertaken at UCLH/UCL who received a proportion of funding from the Department of Health’s NIHR Biomedical Research Centres funding scheme. There was no conflict of interest in this research.

**Clinical relevance**

Scientific rational for study: Poor oral health is recognised as a potential risk factor for hospital acquired infections. Therefore a systematic review of the evidence for the effect of hospitalisation on oral health is needed.

Principal findings: The evidence suggests that oral health deteriorates during hospitalisation. However, few studies have investigated this question and the strength of evidence is limited.

Practical implications: Oral care during hospitalisation needs to be strengthened together with further research investigating oral health changes in different settings and factors that facilitate the provision of care.
ABSTRACT

**Background:** Poor oral health of hospitalised patients is associated with an increased risk of hospital acquired infections and reduced life quality.

**Objectives:** To systematically review the evidence on oral health changes during hospitalisation.

**Data sources:** Cochrane library, Medline, OldMedline, Embase and CINAHL without language restrictions.

**Study eligibility criteria:** Observational longitudinal studies that measured the effect of hospitalisation on oral health.

**Data appraisal and synthesis methods:** Two independent reviewers screened studies for inclusion, assessed risk of bias and extracted data. Risk of bias was assessed with the Ottawa Newcastle assessment scale. Pooling of data was based on the study design, population characteristics, types of oral hygiene measures used in the hospital units, characteristics of the settings of the studies and outcomes measured. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

**Results:** Five studies were included. The data show a deterioration in oral health following hospitalisation with an increase in dental plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation and a deterioration in mucosal health.

**Limitations:** Risk of bias was judged to be low although methodological issues such as unvalidated outcome measures and lack of assessor training limit the strength of the evidence.

**Conclusion:** Hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health, particularly in intubated patients.

**Word count:** 199
INTRODUCTION

Maintenance of oral health is important for hospitalised patients. Oral health affects quality of life (Llewellyn & Warnakulasuriya 2003, Yu et al. 2008) and personal dignity and this impact appears to be more severe in medically compromised or hospitalised patients (Duke et al. 2005, Ingram et al. 2005, Locker et al. 2002, McMillan et al. 2005, Mulligan et al. 2008). Not surprisingly, poor oral health or dysfunction can also have a negative effect on nutritional status (Chai et al. 2006, Gil-Montoya et al. 2008, Rauen et al. 2006), whilst improvement of dental status raises levels of nutritional markers (Wostmann et al. 2008).

Poor oral health and oral hygiene can also contribute to an increased incidence of hospital acquired infections, particularly respiratory diseases (Azarpazhooh & Leake 2006, Shaw 2005). Furthermore, interventions that maintain or improve oral health can reduce the incidence of ventilator associated pneumonia (Chan et al. 2007). Similarly, benefits from effective oral hygiene have also been documented for pneumonia in non ambulatory (Scannapieco 2006) or elderly patients (Sjogren et al. 2008). Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care. Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care.

Although oral health can be maintained during hospitalisation with proper training of the caregivers (Peltola et al. 2007), there are difficulties in the provision of adequate oral care in hospitals and institutional facilities. Barriers to effective oral care reported by caregivers include the low priority of oral care (Grap et al. 2000, Landstrom et al. 2009), fear of causing pain or injury to the patients (Jablonski et al. 2009), the perception that oral care does not provide significant benefits (Binkley et al. 2004, Jones et al. 2004), patients’ resistive behaviours (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009), inadequate nurse staffing (Grap et al. 2003) and lack of supplies (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009). To encourage provision of
effective oral care, guidelines have been published with recommended protocols for hospitalised patients (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004). However, the adherence to oral health protocols, is reported to be low (Grap et al. 2003, Rello et al. 2007).

Whilst oral health status during hospitalisation is clearly an important public health issue, no systematic review has been conducted to critically evaluate the research data on this topic. The aim of this systematic review was therefore to address the focussed question, what is the effect of hospitalisation on oral health?

METHODS
We considered as eligible longitudinal prospective observational studies in people of all ages being hospitalised, that assessed changes of the following outcomes; tooth loss, any measures of periodontal health, dental caries and stomatological disease. Intervention studies, cross sectional studies, case reports and reviews were excluded. Studies reporting specifically on patients with psychiatric disorders or on patients receiving treatment with frequently observed oral complications (e.g. chemo- or radiotherapy) were excluded.

Search strategy
The literature search for relevant articles was performed using Ovid MEDLINE and Ovid OLDMEDLINE (dating from January 1950 to January 2010), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (dating from 1982 to January 2010), Cochrane Library (up to 2010) and EMBASE (dating from 1981 to January 2010). We designed a sensitive search strategy as we anticipated that coding for relevant search terms was not well developed. The bibliographies of all potentially relevant studies and review articles were also searched.
Handsearching was performed in the following journals; *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*, *Gerodontology*, *Journal of Disability and Oral Health and Special Care in Dentistry*. No language restrictions were applied on the search. When necessary we corresponded with the first authors of studies to elicit further information. One reviewer (ET) scanned the titles and abstracts of the studies identified by the search. When a study seemed to meet the eligibility criteria or information was insufficient to exclude, full text articles were obtained.

**Data extraction**

Two reviewers (ET, EPA) independently screened all full text articles. They also extracted data from the included studies in specially designed forms. Disagreements that could not be resolved were arbitrated by a third author (IN). Training of reviewers for screening, study eligibility and quality assessment was performed by an experienced systematic review methodologist (IN). The calibration of the examiners was made on five randomly selected studies included for full paper screening.

**Quality assessment**

Studies were assessed by the two reviewers (ET, EPA) using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort studies (Wells et al. 2008). Since we did not find studies with a non-exposed comparison group we omitted the comparability section of the scale. In addition, we assessed whether a power calculation was reported for each study and if so, the magnitude of a change that the study was powered to detect. Separately, we assessed the quality of the outcome assessment in terms of validity of the measure of oral health and conduct/reporting of assessor training in the measure.
Data synthesis

Pooling of data was based on the study design, population characteristics, types of oral hygiene measures used in the hospital units, setting characteristics of the studies and outcomes measured. We anticipated substantial heterogeneity between studies and planned a narrative synthesis of data.

RESULTS

A total of 9689 potentially relevant review records were found. 9652 were excluded on the basis of their titles or abstracts and the full papers of 37 studies were retrieved. Five papers were finally included (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). (Fig 1) Inter-examiner agreement for eligibility of included papers was 100%. The most common reasons for exclusion were no reported oral health outcomes or study design (e.g. intervention, cross sectional or retrospective).

Quality assessment

Agreement between reviewers on each aspect of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was 100%. In all studies the representativeness of the cohort was found to be adequate and the demonstration of outcomes of interest was made at baseline. Adequacy of follow up was judged to be good in all studies, considering the healthcare setting, despite the drop outs encountered. This was based on the fact that the reasons for drop out were either death or discharge from the hospital unit (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al 2009). The assessment of outcome was judged to be adequate for all studies in terms of the Newcastle-Ottawa criteria and the follow up period was long enough for the assessment of
dental plaque and gingival health changes. This period was arbitrarily defined as a minimum of three to five days (Eilers et al. 1988, Fitch et al. 1999) although too brief to detect either dental caries incidence or changes in periodontitis. The validity of the outcome measures was more problematic including the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with tools designed for population epidemiology (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). In addition, examiner training was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009).

**Population characteristics**

Four studies were located in ICU units (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009) and one investigated a mixed population of patients in ICU and a cardiosurgical ward (Dennesen et al. 2003). The population in three studies was intubated (Fourrier et al. 1998, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), while in two, the population was both intubated and not intubated (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000). One study investigated children only (Franklin et al. 2000), while the remainder reported on adult populations. The duration of the hospitalisation ranged from five to twenty days.

**Oral care regime**

There was marked variability in oral care protocols including sterile cloth drenched with 0.9% saline (Dennesen et al. 2003), rinsing with sterile water (Fourrier et al. 1998), foamsticks moistened with water (Franklin et al. 2000) and foam swabs or child toothbrushes with toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline (Prendergast et al. 2009). In
one study, there were no details of the oral hygiene measures applied (Munro et al. 2006). Frequency of oral care provision ranged between two to six times per day.

**Study setting**

Two studies were based in the USA (Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), one in the UK (Franklin et al. 2000), one in France (Fourrier et al. 1998) and one in the Netherlands (Dennesen et al. 2003).

**Power calculation**

Power calculation was reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000). The sample size was estimated to identify a difference of 10 plaque covered surfaces significant at 5% with a power of 90% using a standard deviation of 15.0 for plaque on all tooth surfaces.

**Dental plaque accumulation**

Four out of the five included studies reported on the changes of dental plaque accumulation during hospitalisation period (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). Each study used a different measure. In one study no differences were observed during the observational period (Prendergast et al. 2009). Three studies reported increasing levels of plaque accumulation during hospitalisation (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006), which was statistically significant in two (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). The proportion of sites with abundant dental plaque (scores more than 2) increased from 23% at baseline to 93% at day 10 (Fourrier et al. 1998) and the other study showed mean difference of 3.3% in the O’Leary index (p=0.001) (Franklin et al. 2000).
Gingival inflammation

Three studies reported on the levels of gingival inflammation during hospitalisation using different indices (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000, Prendergast et al. 2009). Two of the studies found statistically significant increases in the severity of gingival inflammation. (OAG median value changes from 1 at baseline to 2 at day 14 (Prendergast et al. 2009) and mean difference of the sites presenting gingival inflammation of 1.4 (p=0,006) (Franklin et al. 2000)) One study reported ‘no statistically significant changes’ although no data were presented (Dennesen et al. 2003).

Periodontal disease

One study reported on the severity of periodontal disease using an index of assessment of treatment needs, but found no statistically significant change (Dennesen et al. 2003). However, this index was designed for epidemiology and is insensitive to small changes over short durations of time (Holmgren 1994).

Caries incidence

Two studies assessed the incidence of dental caries in hospitalised patients and reported no statistically significant changes following hospitalisation (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006).

Stomatological disease
Two studies evaluated the incidence of stomatological diseases (Dennesen et al. 2003, Prendergast et al. 2009). Both studies found a statistically significant increased incidence of mucositis intubated patients but with not in non-intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003).

**DISCUSSION**

Statement of principal findings

The five included studies suggest that oral health deteriorates following hospitalisation. Most studies were set in intensive care units including both intubated and non-intubated patients. Dental plaque accumulation and gingival and mucosal inflammation were the main oral health aspects affected in the examined populations and the findings were more evident in studies reporting on intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000).

Strengths and weaknesses of the review

We conducted a sensitive search including multiple electronic databases without language restriction and supplemented by handsearching. However, we were only able to identify five eligible studies enrolling a total of 271 patients. We were unable to retrieve two papers for the full article reading. Their abstracts were unavailable in the databases and the no records of the journals were found in British Library. Other strengths of the review are that we appraised the methodological quality and risk of bias of included studies including the validity of the outcome measures in relation to oral health changes.

Since most of the studies were conducted in intensive care units, the results cannot be extrapolated to other hospital settings. Other than intubation, differences with other
settings could include level of dependency of patients for oral care, ease of provision of oral care and availability of staff to provide such care.

The quality of the evidence included in the review was affected by a number of methodological issues. Firstly, there was marked heterogeneity in the oral care routines and in addition, adherence to oral care was not reported in the majority of studies. Secondly, a wide variety of indices for assessing of oral health were employed and their validity was not clear. Validity issues included the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with epidemiological tools (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). Furthermore, examiner training in this testing setting was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009). The duration of follow-up was limited (to a maximum of 20 days) due to the nature of the hospitalisation. Although this period was adequate for the detection of changes in some oral health outcomes such as dental plaque accumulation (Theilade et al. 1966) and gingival inflammation (Loe et al. 1965), longer observational periods are required for the detection of a change in periodontitis (Goodson et al. 1982) or dental caries occurrence (Pitts and Stamm 2004). Finally, power calculations were reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000), thus hindering the interpretation of findings.

Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other reviews

We have not found other systematic reviews addressing this research question. However, a clinical effectiveness review was published in 1999 investigating oral care practices by nurses (Bowsher et al. 1999). The published report is limited in details of methodology
making comparison difficult. However, the findings, even though published more than a
decade ago, appear to hold true ‘This review confirms that current practice largely ignores
the research evidence and is inadequate for ensuring optimum care. There is a clear need to
develop and evaluate oral care protocols for hospitalised patients and to support nurses in
their implementation.’

Meaning of the review, possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policy
makers.
This review suggests that hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health and
this could have profound implications for health and wellbeing. On the basis of current
evidence, a deterioration in oral health would be expected to increase the risk of hospital
acquired infections, increase care costs and have negative impact on health related quality
of life.

We were not able to conclude whether this impact results from a low priority of oral care
provision, the implementation of improper oral care regimes, from hospitalisation per se or
from a combination of factors. Guidelines for the provision of oral care in hospital settings
have been published (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske, et al.
Additional protocols/guidelines are therefore needed and should be based on the best
available evidence with sufficient detail to guide carers and patients. Such development
should include the breadth of relevant stakeholders such as nursing, medical and dental
professionals as well as patients and address the different settings in which will need to be
provided such as units with fully dependent patients and those where patients are able to
carry out oral hygiene themselves. More challenging will be implementation (Rello et al. 2007) and this will need to be planned together with evaluation of success prior to introduction.

In terms of interventions, chemical plaque control was the regime of choice in three out of five included studies (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). Although the clinical application of chemicals such as antiseptics seems straightforward, their effect against established dental plaque is marginal due to its organisation as a biofilm in which bacteria are considerably less sensitive to antimicrobial treatments than free-living planktonic bacteria (Pratten et al. 1998). This is corroborated by a systematic review of chlorhexidine for VAP prevention which reported no effect on VAP incidence (Pineda et al. 2006). Therefore, mechanical removal or disruption of dental plaque will be needed such as can be achieved through toothbrushing.

Suggestions for further research

More robust evidence is needed to understand the impact of hospitalisation on oral health. In particular, we recommend studies conducted in a wider range of hospital settings including outside of critical care units. There are many outcomes measures that are validated in oral health research and these should be selected for hospital-based studies. Furthermore, training of examiners should be provided together and outcomes of training (such as agreement levels) reported. Where feasible, longer observational periods could be employed to investigate other oral health outcomes such as dental caries and periodontitis.
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Figure 1: Flowchart of inclusion of studies

Screening (9,689)

Full articles (37)

Excluded from screening (9652)

Excluded from full text reading (32)

Study design (21)

No clinical examination (8)

Population type (3)

Included studies (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Type of oral care provided</th>
<th>1. Hospital department</th>
<th>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</th>
<th>Quality assessment scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast et al. 2009</td>
<td>1. 45 patients 2. 49.16 years (18-85) 3. D0: 45 patients 4. D1: 31 patients 5. D10: 13 patients 6. Fully dependent (intubated) 7. 15.1 days (1-37) (12.8 days (1-31)</td>
<td>1. Nurse 2. Foam swabs or child toothbrush, toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline and lip lubricant. 3. Every 4-6 hours 4. 5-10 minutes 5. Yes (nurses’ notes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflammation, dental health (OAG index) 2. Nurses (3) 3. Yes 4. Yes</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006</td>
<td>1. 66 patients 2. 55 years (25-93) 3. D0: 66 patients 4. D4: 37 patients 5. D7: 21 patients 6. Fully dependent (intubated) 7. Not reported (4-7 days)</td>
<td>1. Not reported 2. Not reported 3. 2.58 times per day (0-7 range) 4. Not reported 5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Respiratory ICU 2. USA</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003</td>
<td>1. ICU: 24 patients 2. ICU: 58 years (SD 18.8) 3. CS: 61 years (41-77) 4. Not reported 5. ICU: intubated 6. ICU: intubated for less than 12 hours 7. ICU: 20.4 days (SD 7.5) (14 days) 8. CS: Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported 2. ICU: Sterile cloth drenched with NaCl 0.9% 3. CS: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ICU and Cardiosurgery Ward 2. Netherlands</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported 2. ICU: Sterile cloth drenched with NaCl 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Periodontal disease (CPITN) and Oral mucositis (Quantitative scale of oral mucositis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported 2. ICU: Sterile cloth drenched with NaCl 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Periodontal disease (CPITN) and Oral mucositis (Quantitative scale of oral mucositis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors (Type of study)</td>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td>Type of oral care provided:</td>
<td>1. Hospital department</td>
<td>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</td>
<td>Quality assessment scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
<td>2. Oral care regime</td>
<td>2. UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
<td>3. Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
<td>5. Adherence assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
<td>2. Foam sticks moistened with water. Antiseptics and antifungals were used at the discretion of the nurses.</td>
<td>2. ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
<td>3. Every 4-6 hours</td>
<td>2. France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dependency/intubated</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998</td>
<td>1. Recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Not reported</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation (Plaque index from one tooth)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key*: “D0, D1, D4, D5, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
Table 2: Reported results from included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Number of patients and duration of observation period</th>
<th>Dental plaque (index)</th>
<th>Gingival health (index)</th>
<th>Periodontal health (index)</th>
<th>Caries (index)</th>
<th>Stomatological disease incidence (index)</th>
<th>Other outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006</td>
<td>D0: 66 patients D4: 37 patients D7: 21 patients</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool D0: 21.27 (SD 23.66) D4: 22.72 (SD 20.47) D7: 24.32 (SD 29.01)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003</td>
<td>ICU: 24 patients for 20.4 days (SD 7.5) CS: 20 patients for 15 days</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>CPITN No data presented &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Median mucositis index ICU D0: 2 (SD 3.2) D21: 19 (SD 5.9) CS: No mucositis found</td>
<td>% subjects n ICU: D0: 79% D7: 25% D14: 12% D21: 0% Quantitative scale of oral mucositis*: 0-39 (health: 0) D0: 2±3.2 D21: 19±5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000</td>
<td>54 children for 7.5 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>O’Leary plaque index D0: 22.5% (SD 17.7) Discharge: 25.8% (SD 18.5) Mean difference: 3.3% 95% CI: 1.4-53 p: 0.001</td>
<td>Presence of gingival inflammation (yes/no) D0: 4.1 sites Discharge: 5.5 sites Mean difference: 1.4 sites 95% CI: 0.4-2.3 p: 0.006</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>DMFT index D0: Primary teeth: 1.0 (SD 2.2) Permanent teeth: 1.2 (SD 1.9) Discharge: &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998</td>
<td>Group 1: 15 patients for 5 days Group 2: 13 patients for 10 days</td>
<td>Plaque index (one tooth) Group 1: D0: 1.1 (SD 0.7) D5: 1.6 (SD 0.7) Group 2: D0: 1.0 (SD 0.7) D5: 1.6 (SD 0.6)** D10: 2.0 (SD 0.4)**</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key*</td>
<td>“D0, D1, D4, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

Search strategy for Ovid Medline

1. exp Hospitalization/
2. Hospital*.mp.
3. exp Intensive Care Units/
5. Intensive care ward*.mp.
6. ICU.mp.
7. Dental deposit*.mp.
8. Dental plaque.mp.
9. Dental calculus.mp.
10. Plaque accumulation.mp.
11. Plaque score.mp.
12. exp Dental Health Surveys/
13. Periodontal index.mp.
15. DMF index.mp.
16. exp Oral Hygiene/
17. Oral hygiene.mp.
19. exp candidiasis, oral/ or exp mucositis/ exp oral hemorrhage/ or exp periodontal diseases/ or exp stomatitis/
Search strategy for EMBASE

1. exp hospital patient/
2. exp hospitalization/
3. hospital*.mp.
4. exp intensive care/ or exp intensive care unit/
5. intensive care unit*.mp.
7. ICU.mp.
8. exp tooth calculus/
9. exp tooth plaque/
10. exp mouth hygiene/
11. exp mouth disease/
12. periodontal disease/
13. exp periodontitis/
14. exp thrush/
15. exp stomatitis/
16. exp dental caries/
17. exp tooth extraction/
18. dental deposit*.mp.
19. dental calculus.mp
20. dental plaque.mp.
21. plaque accumulation.mp.
22. oral hygiene.mp.
23. oral clean*.mp.
24. oral candidiasis.mp.
25. oral mucositis.mp.
26. stomatitis.mp.
27. periodont*.mp.
28. gingiv*.mp.
29. dental caries.mp.
30. tooth decay.mp.
31. tooth demineral?ation.mp.
32. tooth decalcification.mp.
33. tooth loss.mp.
34. tooth extraction.mp.
35. oral health.mp
36. DMF index.mp
Search strategy for CINAHL

1. (MH "Hospitalization+)
2. TX hospital*
3. (MH "Intensive Care Units+")
4. TX intensive care unit*
5. TX intensive care ward*
6. TX ICU
7. (MH "Tooth Diseases+")
8. (MH "Mouth Diseases+")
9. (MH "Oral Hygiene+")
10. (MH "Oral Health")
11. TX dental deposit*
12. TX dental calculus
13. TX plaque accumulation
14. TX periodont*
15. TX gingiv*
16. TX stomatitis
17. TX oral candid*
18. TX oral mucositis
19. TX dental caries
20. TX tooth decay
21. TX tooth demineralisation
22. TX tooth decalcification
23. TX tooth decalcification
24. TX tooth loss
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>TX tooth extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>TX probing depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>TX bleeding on probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>TX gingival hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>TX gingival haemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>TX plaque score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>TX DMF index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>TX oral clean*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>TX oral hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>TX oral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>or/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>or/7-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>35 and 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modified quality assessment scale for cohort studies (based on Newcastle-Ottawa scale)

(Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item with the selection and outcome categories.)

Selection

1) Representativeness of the cohort:
   a) truly representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   b) somewhat representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure:
   a) secure record (eg surgical records) (*)
   b) structured interview (*)
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest at baseline:
   a) yes (*)
   b) no

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome:
   a) independent blind assessment (*)
   b) record linkage (*)
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur:
   a) yes (3-5 days for plaque and gingival changes)(*)
   b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts:
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for (*)
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost (subjects lost due to death or discharge from the hospital or unit) (*)
   c) no description of those lost or loss due to other reasons than death or discharge from the hospital/unit.
   d) no statement
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Clinical relevance

Scientific rational for study: Poor oral health is recognised as a potential risk factor for hospital acquired infections. Therefore a systematic review of the evidence for the effect of hospitalisation on oral health is needed.

Principal findings: The evidence suggests that oral health deteriorates during hospitalisation. However, few studies have investigated this question and the strength of evidence is limited.

Practical implications: Oral care during hospitalisation needs to be strengthened together with further research investigating oral health changes in different settings and factors that facilitate the provision of care.
ABSTRACT

**Background:** Poor oral health of hospitalised patients is associated with an increased risk of hospital acquired infections and reduced life quality.

**Objectives:** To systematically review the evidence on oral health changes during hospitalisation.

**Data sources:** Cochrane library, Medline, OldMedline, Embase and CINAHL without language restrictions.

**Study eligibility criteria:** Observational longitudinal studies.

**Data appraisal and synthesis methods:** Two independent reviewers screened studies for inclusion, assessed risk of bias and extracted data. Risk of bias was assessed with the Ottawa Newcastle assessment scale. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

**Results:** Five before and after studies were included. The data suggest a deterioration in oral health following hospitalisation with an increase in dental plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation and a deterioration in mucosal health.

**Limitations:** Whilst before and after studies are at a general risk of bias, other specific study characteristics were judged to be of low risk of bias. However, methodological issues such as unvalidated outcome measures and lack of assessor training limit the strength of the evidence.

**Conclusion:** Hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health, particularly in intubated patients.
INTRODUCTION

Maintenance of oral health is important for hospitalised patients. Oral health affects quality of life (Llewellyn & Warnakulasuriya 2003, Yu et al. 2008) and personal dignity and this impact appears to be more severe in medically compromised or hospitalised patients (Duke et al. 2005, Ingram et al. 2005, Locker et al. 2002, McMillan et al. 2005, Mulligan et al. 2008). Not surprisingly, poor oral health or dysfunction can also have a negative effect on nutritional status (Chai et al. 2006, Gil-Montoya et al. 2008, Rauen et al. 2006), whilst improvement of dental status raises levels of nutritional markers (Wostmann et al. 2008).

Poor oral health and oral hygiene can also contribute to an increased incidence of hospital acquired infections, particularly respiratory diseases (Azarpazhooh & Leake 2006, Shaw 2005). Furthermore, interventions that maintain or improve oral health can reduce the incidence of ventilator associated pneumonia (Chan et al. 2007). Similarly, benefits from effective oral hygiene have also been documented for pneumonia in non ambulatory (Scannapieco 2006) or elderly patients (Sjogren et al. 2008). Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care. Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care.

Although oral health can be maintained during hospitalisation with proper training of the caregivers (Peltola et al. 2007), there are difficulties in the provision of adequate oral care in hospitals and institutional facilities. Barriers to effective oral care reported by caregivers include the low priority of oral care (Grap et al. 200, Landstrom et al. 2009), fear of causing pain or injury to the patients (Jablonski et al. 2009), the perception that oral care does not provide significant benefits (Binkley et al. 2004, Jones et al. 2004), patients' resistive behaviours (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009), inadequate nurse staffing (Grap et al. 2003) and lack of supplies (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009). To encourage provision of
effective oral care, guidelines have been published with recommended protocols for hospitalised patients (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004). However, the adherence to oral health protocols is reported to be low (Grap et al. 2003, Rello et al. 2007).

Whilst oral health status during hospitalisation is clearly an important public health issue, no systematic review has been conducted to critically evaluate the research data on this topic. The aim of this systematic review was therefore to address the focussed question, what is the effect of hospitalisation on oral health?

METHODS

We considered as eligible longitudinal prospective observational studies in people of all ages being hospitalised, that assessed changes of the following outcomes: tooth loss, any measures of periodontal health, dental caries and stomatological diseases. Intervention studies, cross sectional studies, case reports and reviews were excluded. Studies reporting specifically on patients with psychiatric disorders or on patients receiving treatment with frequently observed oral complications (e.g. chemo- or radiotherapy) were excluded.

Search strategy (Appendix)

The literature search for relevant articles was performed using Ovid MEDLINE and Ovid OLDMEDLINE (dating from January 1950 to January 2010), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (dating from 1982 to January 2010), Cochrane Library (up to 2010) and EMBASE (dating from 1981 to January 2010). We designed a sensitive search strategy as we anticipated that coding for relevant search terms was not well developed.

The bibliographies of all potentially relevant studies and review articles were also searched.
Handsearching was performed in the following journals; *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology, Gerodontology, Journal of Disability and Oral Health and Special Care in Dentistry*. No language restrictions were applied on the search. When necessary we corresponded with the first authors of studies to elicit further information. One reviewer (ET) scanned the titles and abstracts of the studies identified by the search. When a study seemed to meet the eligibility criteria or information was insufficient to exclude, full text articles were obtained.

**Data extraction**

Two reviewers (ET, EA) independently screened all full text articles. They also extracted data from the included studies in specially designed forms. Disagreements that could not be resolved were arbitrated by a third author (IN). Training of reviewers for screening, study eligibility and quality assessment was performed by an experienced systematic review methodologist (IN). The calibration of the examiners was made on five randomly selected studies included for full paper screening.

**Quality assessment**

Studies were assessed by the two reviewers (ET, EA) using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort studies (Wells et al. 2008). Since we did not find studies with a non-exposed comparison group we omitted the comparability section of the scale. In addition, we assessed whether a power calculation was reported for each study and if so, the magnitude of a change that the study was powered to detect. Separately, we assessed the quality of the outcome assessment in terms of validity of the measure of oral health and conduct/reporting of assessor training in the measure.
Data synthesis

Pooling of data was based on the study design, population characteristics, types of oral hygiene measures used in the hospital units, setting characteristics of the studies and outcomes measured. We anticipated substantial heterogeneity between studies and planned a narrative synthesis of data.

RESULTS

A total of 9689 potentially relevant review records were found. 9652 were excluded on the basis of their titles or abstracts and the full papers of 37 studies were retrieved. Five papers were finally included (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). (Fig 1) Inter-examiner agreement for eligibility of included papers was 100%. The most common reasons for exclusion were no reported oral health outcomes or study design (e.g. intervention, cross sectional or retrospective).

Quality assessment

Agreement between reviewers on each aspect of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was 100%. In all studies the representativeness of the cohort was found to be adequate and the demonstration of outcomes of interest was made at baseline. Adequacy of follow up was judged to be good in all studies, considering the healthcare setting, despite the drop outs encountered. This was based on the fact that the reasons for drop out were either death or discharge from the hospital unit (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al 2009). The assessment of outcome was judged to be adequate for all studies in terms of the Newcastle-Ottawa criteria and the follow up period was long enough for the assessment of
dental plaque and gingival health changes. This period was arbitrarily defined as a minimum of three to five days (Eilers et al. 1988, Fitch et al. 1999) although too brief to detect either dental caries incidence or changes in periodontitis. The validity of the outcome measures was more problematic including the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with tools designed for population epidemiology (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). In addition, examiner training was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009).

Population characteristics

Four studies were located in ICU units (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009) and one investigated a mixed population of patients in ICU and a cardiosurgical ward (Dennesen et al. 2003). The population in three studies was intubated (Fourrier et al. 1998, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), while in two, the population was both intubated and not intubated (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000). One study investigated children only (Franklin et al. 2000), while the remainder reported on adult populations. The duration of the hospitalisation ranged from five to twenty days.

Oral care regime

There was marked variability in oral care protocols including sterile cloth drenched with 0.9% saline (Dennesen et al. 2003), rinsing with sterile water (Fourrier et al. 1998), foamsticks moistened with water (Franklin et al. 2000) and foam swabs or child toothbrushes with toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline (Prendergast et al. 2009). In
one study, there were no details of the oral hygiene measures applied (Munro et al. 2006).

Frequency of oral care provision ranged between two to six times per day.

**Study setting**

Two studies were based in the USA (Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), one in the
UK (Franklin et al. 2000), one in France (Fourrier et al. 1998) and one in the Netherlands
(Dennesen et al. 2003).

**Power calculation**

Power calculation was reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000). The sample size was
estimated to identify a difference of 10 plaque covered surfaces significant at 5% with a
power of 90% using a standard deviation of 15.0 for plaque on all tooth surfaces.

**Dental plaque accumulation**

Four out of the five included studies reported on the changes of dental plaque accumulation
during hospitalisation period (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006,
Prendergast et al. 2009). Each study used a different measure. In one study no differences
were observed during the observational period (Prendergast et al. 2009). Three studies
reported increasing levels of plaque accumulation during hospitalisation (Fourrier et al.
1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006), which was statistically significant in two
(Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). The proportion of sites with abundant dental
plaque (scores more than 2) increased from 23% at baseline to 93% at day 10 (Fourrier et al.
1998) and the other study showed mean difference of 3.3% in the O'Leary index (p=0.001)
(Franklin et al. 2000).
Gingival inflammation

Three studies reported on the levels of gingival inflammation during hospitalisation using different indices (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000, Prendergast et al. 2009). Two of the studies found statistically significant increases in the severity of gingival inflammation. (OAG median value changes from 1 at baseline to 2 at day 14 (Prendergast et al. 2009) and mean difference of the sites presenting gingival inflammation of 1.4 (p=0.006) (Franklin et al. 2000)) One study reported ‘no statistically significant changes’ although no data were presented (Dennesen et al. 2003).

Periodontal disease

One study reported on the severity of periodontal disease using an index of assessment of treatment needs, but found no statistically significant change (Dennesen et al. 2003). However, this index was designed for epidemiology and is insensitive to small changes over short durations of time (Holmgren 1994).

Caries incidence

Two studies assessed the incidence of dental caries in hospitalised patients and reported no statistically significant changes following hospitalisation (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006).

Stomatological disease
Two studies evaluated the incidence of stomatological diseases (Dennesen et al. 2003, Prendergast et al. 2009). Both studies found a statistically significant increased incidence of mucositis intubated patients but with not in non-intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003).

DISCUSSION

Statement of principal findings

The five included studies suggest that oral health deteriorates following hospitalisation. Most studies were set in intensive care units including both intubated and non-intubated patients. Dental plaque accumulation and gingival and mucosal inflammation were the main oral health aspects affected in the examined populations and the findings were more evident in studies reporting on intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000).

Strengths and weaknesses of the review

We conducted a sensitive search including multiple electronic databases without language restriction and supplemented by handsearching. However, we were only able to identify five eligible studies enrolling a total of 271 patients. We were unable to retrieve two papers for the full article reading. Their abstracts were unavailable in the databases and no records of the journals were found in British Library. Other strengths of the review are that we appraised the methodological quality and risk of bias of included studies including the validity of the outcome measures in relation to oral health changes.

Since most of the studies were conducted in intensive care units, the results cannot be extrapolated to other hospital settings. Other than intubation, differences with other
settings could include level of dependency of patients for oral care, ease of provision of oral care and availability of staff to provide such care.

The quality of the evidence included in the review was affected by a number of methodological issues. Firstly, there was marked heterogeneity in the oral care routines and in addition, adherence to oral care was not reported in the majority of studies. Secondly, a wide variety of indices for assessing of oral health were employed and their validity was not clear. Validity issues included the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with epidemiological tools (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). Furthermore, examiner training in this testing setting was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009). Study design also limits the strength of the conclusions. All studies were uncontrolled and changes in outcomes may simply relate to shifts in examiner characteristics over time. Including an appropriate ‘unexposed’ comparison group is challenging and its validity as a control would be questionable. Therefore, this needs to be accepted as a limitation to the evidence.

Calibration of an examiner to a gold-standard with re-testing throughout the study might have helped counter any drift. The duration of follow-up was limited (to a maximum of 20 days) due to the nature of the hospitalisation. Although this period was adequate for the detection of changes in some oral health outcomes such as dental plaque accumulation (Theilade et al. 1966) and gingival inflammation (Loe et al. 1965), longer observational periods are required for the detection of a change in periodontitis (Goodson et al. 1982) or dental caries occurrence (Pitts and Stamm 2004). Finally, power calculations were reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000), thus hindering the interpretation of findings.
Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other reviews

We have not found other systematic reviews addressing this research question. However, a clinical effectiveness review was published in 1999 investigating oral care practices by nurses (Bowsher et al. 1999). The published report is limited in details of methodology making comparison difficult. However, the findings, even though published more than a decade ago, appear to hold true ‘This review confirms that current practice largely ignores the research evidence and is inadequate for ensuring optimum care. There is a clear need to develop and evaluate oral care protocols for hospitalised patients and to support nurses in their implementation.’

Meaning of the review, possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policy makers.

This review suggests that hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health and this could have profound implications for health and wellbeing. On the basis of current evidence, a deterioration in oral health would be expected to increase the risk of hospital acquired infections, increase care costs and have negative impact on health related quality of life.

We were not able to conclude whether this impact results from a low priority of oral care provision, the implementation of improper oral care regimes, from hospitalisation per se or from a combination of factors. Guidelines for the provision of oral care in hospital settings have been published (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske, et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004) although they provide limited detail for carers.
Additional protocols/guidelines are therefore needed and should be based on the best available evidence with sufficient detail to guide carers and patients. Such development should include the breadth of relevant stakeholders such as nursing, medical and dental professionals as well as patients and address the different settings in which will need to be provided such as units with fully dependent patients and those where patients are able to carry out oral hygiene themselves. More challenging will be implementation (Rello et al. 2007) and this will need to be planned together with evaluation of success prior to introduction.

In terms of interventions, chemical plaque control was the regime of choice in three out of five included studies (Dennesen et al. 2003, FOURRIER et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). Although the clinical application of chemicals such as antiseptics seems straightforward, their effect against established dental plaque is marginal due to its organisation as a biofilm in which bacteria are considerably less sensitive to antimicrobial treatments than free-living planktonic bacteria (Pratten et al. 1998). This is corroborated by a systematic review of chlorhexidine for prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) which reported no effect on VAP incidence (Pineda et al. 2006). Therefore, mechanical removal or disruption of dental plaque will be needed such as can be achieved through toothbrushing.

Suggestions for further research

More robust evidence is needed to understand the impact of hospitalisation on oral health. In particular, we recommend studies conducted in a wider range of hospital settings including outside of critical care units. There are many outcomes measures that are validated in oral health research and these should be selected for hospital-based studies.
Furthermore, training of examiners should be provided together and outcomes of training (such as agreement levels) reported. Where feasible, longer observational periods could be employed to investigate other oral health outcomes such as dental caries and periodontitis.
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Figure 1: Flowchart of inclusion of studies

- Screening (9,689)
- Full articles (37)
- Included studies (5)
- Excluded from screening (9,652)
- Excluded from full text reading (32)
- Study design (21)
- No clinical examination (8)
- Population type (3)
Table 1: Included study characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Age mean (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dependency/intubated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of oral care provided:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Oral care regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Adherence assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Hospital department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Examiner training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Blinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality assessment scoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prendergast et al. 2009&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>45 patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>49.16 years (18-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: 31 patients</td>
<td>Age mean (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10: 13 patients</td>
<td>Drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15: 15.1 days (1-37)</td>
<td>Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nurse</td>
<td>Type of oral care regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foam swabs or child toothbrush, toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline and lip lubricant.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Every 4-6 hours</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5-10 minutes</td>
<td>Adherence assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yes (nurses’ notes)</td>
<td>1. Neuroscience ICU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. USA</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflammation, dental health (OAG index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yes</td>
<td>2. Nurses (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yes</td>
<td>3. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yes</td>
<td>4. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66 patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>55 years (25-93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0: 66 patients</td>
<td>Age mean (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4: 37 patients</td>
<td>Drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7: 21 patients</td>
<td>Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not reported</td>
<td>Type of oral care regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2.58 times per day (0-7 range)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td>Adherence assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td>1. Respiratory ICU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. USA</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflammation, gingival bleeding, purulence, candidiasis, calculus, caries, stain (Oral health assessment tool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ICU: 24 patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>CS: 20 patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU: 58 years (SD 18.6)</td>
<td>Age mean (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS: 61 years (41-77)</td>
<td>Drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported</td>
<td>Duration of hospitalisation (observation period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ICU: Sterile cloth drenched with NaCl 0.9%</td>
<td>Type of oral care regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ICU: Not reported</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ICU: Not reported</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ICU: 2/day</td>
<td>Adherence assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ICU and Cardiosurgery Ward</td>
<td>1. Periodontal disease (CPITN) and Oral mucositis (Quantitative scale of oral mucositis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Netherlands</td>
<td>2. Dental hygienists (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality assessment scoring:

- Prendergast et al. 2009: 5/5
- Munro et al. 2006: 5/5
- Dennesen et al. 2003: 5/5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Type of oral care provided</th>
<th>1. Hospital department</th>
<th>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</th>
<th>Quality assessment scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al.</td>
<td>1. 59 children</td>
<td>1. Nurses</td>
<td>1. Pediatric ICU</td>
<td>1. Caries, missing, filled teeth (DMF index),</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2. 4.8 (1-16)</td>
<td>2. Foam sticks moistened with water, Antiseptics and antifungals were used at the discretion of the nurses.</td>
<td>2. UK</td>
<td>dental plaque accumulation (O’Leary index), gingival inflammation (binary assessment), spontaneous gingival bleeding (binary assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 5 children</td>
<td>3. Every 4-6 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>4. 12 children orally intubated. The rest nasally intubated or not intubated</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 7.4 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al.</td>
<td>1. 57 patients</td>
<td>1. Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU</td>
<td>Dental plaque accumulation (Plaque index from one tooth)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2. 49 years (18-83)</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td>2. France</td>
<td>2. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 29 patients</td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohort study)</td>
<td>4. 44 patients intubated (77%)</td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 14 days (2-82) (15 patients for 5 days and 13 patients for 10 days)</td>
<td>5. Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: "D0, D1, D4, D5, D7, D10": Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // "ICU": Intensive care unit // "CS": Cardiosurgical ward // "OAG": Oral Assessment Guide // "CPITN": Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // "DMFT index": Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Number of patients and duration of observation period</th>
<th>Dental plaque (index)</th>
<th>Gingival health (index)</th>
<th>Periodontal health (index)</th>
<th>Caries (index)</th>
<th>Stomatological disease incidence (index)</th>
<th>Other outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006</td>
<td>88 patients D4: 37 patients D7: 21 patients</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool D0: 21.27 (SD 23.66) D4: 22.72 (SD 20.47) D7: 24.32 (SD 29.61)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003</td>
<td>ICU: 24 patients for 20.4 days (SD 1.5) CS: 20 patients for 15 days</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>CPITN No data presented &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Median mucositis index ICU: D0: 2 (SD 3.2) D1: 19 (SD 5.9) CS: No mucositis found</td>
<td>% subjects r ICU: D0: 79% D1: 25% D14: 12% D21: 0%</td>
<td>Quantitative scale of oral mucositis*** 0:00 (health: 0) 0:30 (health: 0) 2:30 (health: 0) 13:05:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000</td>
<td>54 children for 7.5 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>O'Leary plaque index D0: 22.5% (SD 11.7) Discharge: 25.8% (SD 15.3) Mean difference: 3.3% 90%CI: 1.4-5.3 p: 0.001</td>
<td>Presence of gingival inflammation (yes/no) D0: 4.1 sites Discharge: 5.5 sites Mean difference: 1.4 sites 95%CI: 0.4-2.3 p: 0.006</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>DMFT Index D0: Primary teeth: 1:0 (SD 2.5) Permanent teeth: 1:2 (SD 1.0) Discharge: &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998</td>
<td>Group 1: 15 patients for 5 days Group 2: 19 patients for 10 days</td>
<td>Plaque index (one tooth) Group 1: D0: 1.1 (SD 0.7) D5: 1.6 (SD 0.7) D10: 1.0 (SD 0.7) D15: 1.6 (SD 0.6)** D20: 2.0 (SD 0.4)**</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key

“D0, D1, D4, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
APPENDICES

Search strategy for Ovid Medline

1. exp Hospitalization/
2. Hospital*.mp.
3. exp Intensive Care Units/
5. Intensive care ward*.mp.
6. ICU.mp.
7. Dental deposit*.mp.
8. Dental plaque.mp.
9. Dental calculus.mp.
10. Plaque accumulation.mp.
11. Plaque score.mp.
12. exp Dental Health Surveys/
13. Periodontal index.mp.
15. DMF index.mp.
16. exp Oral Hygiene/
17. Oral hygiene.mp.
19. exp candidiasis, oral/ or exp mucositis/ exp oral hemorrhage/ or exp periodontal diseases/ or exp stomatitis/
24. Probing depth*.mp
25. Bleeding on probing.mp.
27. Gingival hemorrhage.mp.
29. Oral mucositis.mp.
30. Stomatitis.mp.
31. tooth diseases/ or exp dental deposits/ or exp dental calculus/ or exp dental plaque/ or exp smear layer/ or exp tooth demineralization/ or exp dental caries/
32. Dental caries.mp.
33. Tooth decay.mp.
34. Tooth demineralisation.mp.
35. Tooth demineralization.mp.
36. Tooth decalcification.mp.
37. Tooth extraction.mp.
38. Tooth loss.mp.
39. exp Oral Health/
40. Oral health.mp.
41. or/1-6
42. or/7-40
43. 41 and 42

Search strategy for EMBASE

1. exp hospital patient/
2. exp hospitalization/
3. hospital*.mp.
4. exp intensive care/ or exp intensive care unit/
5. intensive care unit*.mp.
6. intensive care ward*.mp.
7. ICU.mp.
8. exp tooth calculus/
9. exp tooth plaque/
10. exp mouth hygiene/
11. exp mouth disease/
12. periodontal disease/
13. exp periodontitis/
14. exp thrush/
15. exp stomatitis/
16. exp dental caries/
17. exp tooth extraction/
18. dental deposit*.mp.
19. dental calculus.mp
20. dental plaque.mp.
21. plaque accumulation.mp.
22. oral hygiene.mp.
23. oral clean*.mp.
24. oral candidiasis.mp.
25. oral mucositis.mp.
26. stomatitis.mp.
27. periodont*.mp.
28. gingiv*.mp.
29. dental caries.mp.
30. tooth decay.mp.
31. tooth demineralization.mp.
32. tooth decalcification.mp.
33. tooth loss.mp.
34. tooth extraction.mp.
35. oral health.mp
36. DMF index.mp
Search strategy for CINAHL

1. (MH "Hospitalization+")
2. TX hospital
3. (MH "Intensive Care Units+")
4. TX intensive care unit
5. TX intensive care ward
6. TX ICU
7. (MH "Tooth Diseases+")
8. (MH "Mouth Diseases+")
9. (MH "Oral Hygiene+")
10. (MH "Oral Health")
11. TX dental deposit
12. TX dental calculus
13. TX plaque accumulation
14. TX periodont
15. TX gingiv
16. TX stomatitis
17. TX oral candid
18. TX oral mucositis
19. TX dental caries
20. TX tooth decay
21. TX tooth demineralization
22. TX tooth decalcification
23. TX tooth decalcification
24. TX tooth loss
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.
42.
43.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48.
49.
50.
51.
52.
53.
54.
55.
56.
57.
58.
59.
60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TX tooth extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>TX probing depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>TX bleeding on probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>TX gingival hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>TX gingival haemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>TX plaque score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>TX DMF index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>TX oral clean*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>TX oral hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>TX oral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>or/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>or/7-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>35 and 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modified quality assessment scale for cohort studies (based on Newcastle-Ottawa scale)

(Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item with the selection and outcome categories.)

Selection

1) Representativeness of the cohort:
   a) truly representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   b) somewhat representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure:
   a) secure record (eg surgical records) (*)
   b) structured interview (*)
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest at baseline:
   a) yes (*)
   b) no

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome:
   a) independent blind assessment (*)
   b) record linkage (*)
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur:
   a) yes [3-5 days for plaque and gingival changes] (*)
   b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts:
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for (*)
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost (subjects lost due to death or discharge from the hospital or unit) (*)
   c) no description of those lost or loss due to other reasons than death or discharge from the hospital/unit.
   d) no statement
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Clinical relevance

Scientific rational for study: Poor oral health is recognised as a potential risk factor for hospital acquired infections. Therefore a systematic review of the evidence for the effect of hospitalisation on oral health is needed.

Principal findings: The evidence suggests that oral health deteriorates during hospitalisation. However, few studies have investigated this question and the strength of evidence is limited.

Practical implications: Oral care during hospitalisation needs to be strengthened together with further research investigating oral health changes in different settings and factors that facilitate the provision of care.
ABSTRACT

Background: Poor oral health of hospitalised patients is associated with an increased risk of hospital acquired infections and reduced life quality.

Objectives: To systematically review the evidence on oral health changes during hospitalisation.

Data sources: Cochrane library, Medline, OldMedline, Embase and CINAHL without language restrictions.

Study eligibility criteria: Observational longitudinal studies.

Data appraisal and synthesis methods: Two independent reviewers screened studies for inclusion, assessed risk of bias and extracted data. Risk of bias was assessed with the Ottawa Newcastle assessment scale. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

Results: Five before and after studies were included. The data suggest a deterioration in oral health following hospitalisation with an increase in dental plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation and a deterioration in mucosal health.

Limitations: Whilst before and after studies are at a general risk of bias, other specific study characteristics were judged to be of low risk of bias. However, methodological issues such as unvalidated outcome measures and lack of assessor training limit the strength of the evidence.

Conclusion: Hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health, particularly in intubated patients.
INTRODUCTION

Maintenance of oral health is important for hospitalised patients. Oral health affects quality of life (Llewellyn & Warnakulasuriya 2003, Yu et al. 2008) and personal dignity and this impact appears to be more severe in medically compromised or hospitalised patients (Duke et al. 2005, Ingram et al. 2005, Locker et al. 2002, McMillan et al. 2005, Mulligan et al. 2008). Not surprisingly, poor oral health or dysfunction can also have a negative effect on nutritional status (Chai et al. 2006, Gil-Montoya et al. 2008, Rauen et al. 2006), whilst improvement of dental status raises levels of nutritional markers (Wostmann et al. 2008).

Poor oral health and oral hygiene can also contribute to an increased incidence of hospital acquired infections, particularly respiratory diseases (Azarpazhooh & Leake 2006, Shaw 2005). Furthermore, interventions that maintain or improve oral health can reduce the incidence of ventilator associated pneumonia (Chan et al. 2007). Similarly, benefits from effective oral hygiene have also been documented for pneumonia in non ambulatory (Scannapieco 2006) or elderly patients (Sjogren et al. 2008). Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care. Therefore, oral health requires management during in-patient care.

Although oral health can be maintained during hospitalisation with proper training of the caregivers (Peltola et al. 2007), there are difficulties in the provision of adequate oral care in hospitals and institutional facilities. Barriers to effective oral care reported by caregivers include the low priority of oral care (Grap et al. 200, Landstrom et al. 2009), fear of causing pain or injury to the patients (Jablonski et al. 2009), the perception that oral care does not provide significant benefits (Binkley et al. 2004, Jones et al. 2004), patients’ resistive behaviours (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009), inadequate nurse staffing (Grap et al. 2003) and lack of supplies (Jablonski, Munro, Grap et al. 2009). To encourage provision of
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effective oral care, guidelines have been published with recommended protocols for
hospitalised patients (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske et al.
2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004). However, the adherence to oral health protocols is
reported to be low (Grap et al. 2003, Rello et al. 2007).

Whilst oral health status during hospitalisation is clearly an important public health
issue, no systematic review has been conducted to critically evaluate the research data on
this topic. The aim of this systematic review was therefore to address the focussed question,
what is the effect of hospitalisation on oral health?

METHODS

We considered as eligible longitudinal prospective observational studies in people of all ages
being hospitalised, that assessed changes of the following outcomes: tooth loss, any
measures of periodontal health, dental caries and stomatological diseases. Intervention
studies, cross sectional studies, case reports and reviews were excluded. Studies reporting
specifically on patients with psychiatric disorders or on patients receiving treatment with
frequently observed oral complications (e.g. chemo- or radiotherapy) were excluded.

Search strategy (Appendix)

The literature search for relevant articles was performed using Ovid MEDLINE and Ovid
OLDMEDLINE (dating from January 1950 to January 2010), Cumulative Index to Nursing and
Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (dating from 1982 to January 2010), Cochrane Library (up
to 2010) and EMBASE (dating from 1981 to January 2010). We designed a sensitive search
strategy as we anticipated that coding for relevant search terms was not well developed.
The bibliographies of all potentially relevant studies and review articles were also searched.
Handsearching was performed in the following journals; *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*, *Gerodontology*, *Journal of Disability and Oral Health and Special Care in Dentistry*. No language restrictions were applied on the search. When necessary we corresponded with the first authors of studies to elicit further information. One reviewer (ET) scanned the titles and abstracts of the studies identified by the search. When a study seemed to meet the eligibility criteria or information was insufficient to exclude, full text articles were obtained.

**Data extraction**

Two reviewers (ET, EA) independently screened all full text articles. They also extracted data from the included studies in specially designed forms. Disagreements that could not be resolved were arbitrated by a third author (IN). Training of reviewers for screening, study eligibility and quality assessment was performed by an experienced systematic review methodologist (IN). The calibration of the examiners was made on five randomly selected studies included for full paper screening.

**Quality assessment**

Studies were assessed by the two reviewers (ET, EA) using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort studies (Wells et al. 2008). Since we did not find studies with a non-exposed comparison group we omitted the comparability section of the scale. In addition, we assessed whether a power calculation was reported for each study and if so, the magnitude of a change that the study was powered to detect. Separately, we assessed the quality of the outcome assessment in terms of validity of the measure of oral health and conduct/reporting of assessor training in the measure.
Data synthesis

Pooling of data was based on the study design, population characteristics, types of oral hygiene measures used in the hospital units, setting characteristics of the studies and outcomes measured. We anticipated substantial heterogeneity between studies and planned a narrative synthesis of data.

RESULTS

A total of 9689 potentially relevant review records were found. 9652 were excluded on the basis of their titles or abstracts and the full papers of 37 studies were retrieved. Five papers were finally included (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). (Fig 1) Inter-examiner agreement for eligibility of included papers was 100%. The most common reasons for exclusion were no reported oral health outcomes or study design (e.g. intervention, cross sectional or retrospective).

Quality assessment

Agreement between reviewers on each aspect of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was 100%. In all studies the representativeness of the cohort was found to be adequate and the demonstration of outcomes of interest was made at baseline. Adequacy of follow up was judged to be good in all studies, considering the healthcare setting, despite the drop outs encountered. This was based on the fact that the reasons for drop out were either death or discharge from the hospital unit (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). The assessment of outcome was judged to be adequate for all studies in terms of the Newcastle-Ottawa criteria and the follow up period was long enough for the assessment of
dental plaque and gingival health changes. This period was arbitrarily defined as a minimum of three to five days (Eilers et al. 1988, Fitch et al. 1999) although too brief to detect either dental caries incidence or changes in periodontitis. The validity of the outcome measures was more problematic including the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with tools designed for population epidemiology (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). In addition, examiner training was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009).

**Population characteristics**

Four studies were located in ICU units (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009) and one investigated a mixed population of patients in ICU and a cardiosurgical ward (Dennesen et al. 2003). The population in three studies was intubated (Fourrier et al. 1998, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), while in two, the population was both intubated and not intubated (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000). One study investigated children only (Franklin et al. 2000), while the remainder reported on adult populations. The duration of the hospitalisation ranged from five to twenty days.

**Oral care regime**

There was marked variability in oral care protocols including sterile cloth drenched with 0.9% saline (Dennesen et al. 2003), rinsing with sterile water (Fourrier et al. 1998), foamsticks moistened with water (Franklin et al. 2000) and foam swabs or child toothbrushes with toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline (Prendergast et al. 2009). In
one study, there were no details of the oral hygiene measures applied (Munro et al. 2006). Frequency of oral care provision ranged between two to six times per day.

**Study setting**

Two studies were based in the USA (Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009), one in the UK (Franklin et al. 2000), one in France (Fourrier et al. 1998) and one in the Netherlands (Dennesen et al. 2003).

**Power calculation**

Power calculation was reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000). The sample size was estimated to identify a difference of 10 plaque covered surfaces significant at 5% with a power of 90% using a standard deviation of 15.0 for plaque on all tooth surfaces.

**Dental plaque accumulation**

Four out of the five included studies reported on the changes of dental plaque accumulation during hospitalisation period (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006, Prendergast et al. 2009). Each study used a different measure. In one study no differences were observed during the observational period (Prendergast et al. 2009). Three studies reported increasing levels of plaque accumulation during hospitalisation (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006), which was statistically significant in two (Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). The proportion of sites with abundant dental plaque (scores more than 2) increased from 23% at baseline to 93% at day 10 (Fourrier et al. 1998) and the other study showed mean difference of 3.3% in the O’Leary index (p=0.001) (Franklin et al. 2000).
Gingival inflammation

Three studies reported on the levels of gingival inflammation during hospitalisation using different indices (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000, Prendergast et al. 2009). Two of the studies found statistically significant increases in the severity of gingival inflammation. (OAG median value changes from 1 at baseline to 2 at day 14 (Prendergast et al. 2009) and mean difference of the sites presenting gingival inflammation of 1.4 (p=0.006) (Franklin et al. 2000)) One study reported ‘no statistically significant changes’ although no data were presented (Dennesen et al. 2003).

Periodontal disease

One study reported on the severity of periodontal disease using an index of assessment of treatment needs, but found no statistically significant change (Dennesen et al. 2003). However, this index was designed for epidemiology and is insensitive to small changes over short durations of time (Holmgren 1994).

Caries incidence

Two studies assessed the incidence of dental caries in hospitalised patients and reported no statistically significant changes following hospitalisation (Franklin et al. 2000, Munro et al. 2006).

Stomatological disease
Two studies evaluated the incidence of stomatological diseases (Dennesen et al. 2003, Prendergast et al. 2009). Both studies found a statistically significant increased incidence of mucositis intubated patients but with not in non-intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003).

DISCUSSION

Statement of principal findings

The five included studies suggest that oral health deteriorates following hospitalisation. Most studies were set in intensive care units including both intubated and non-intubated patients. Dental plaque accumulation and gingival and mucosal inflammation were the main oral health aspects affected in the examined populations and the findings were more evident in studies reporting on intubated patients (Dennesen et al. 2003, Franklin et al. 2000).

Strengths and weaknesses of the review

We conducted a sensitive search including multiple electronic databases without language restriction and supplemented by handsearching. However, we were only able to identify five eligible studies enrolling a total of 271 patients. We were unable to retrieve two papers for the full article reading. Their abstracts were unavailable in the databases and no records of the journals were found in British Library. Other strengths of the review are that we appraised the methodological quality and risk of bias of included studies including the validity of the outcome measures in relation to oral health changes.

Since most of the studies were conducted in intensive care units, the results cannot be extrapolated to other hospital settings. Other than intubation, differences with other
settings could include level of dependency of patients for oral care, ease of provision of oral care and availability of staff to provide such care.

The quality of the evidence included in the review was affected by a number of methodological issues. Firstly, there was marked heterogeneity in the oral care routines and in addition, adherence to oral care was not reported in the majority of studies. Secondly, a wide variety of indices for assessing of oral health were employed and their validity was not clear. Validity issues included the use of subjective indices based on visual analogue scale measurements (Munro et al. 2006), assessments of gingival health with epidemiological tools (Dennesen et al. 2003) and use of partial recordings with indices not designed for this purpose (Fourrier et al. 1998). Furthermore, examiner training in this testing setting was reported in only one study (Prendergast et al. 2009). Study design also limits the strength of the conclusions. All studies were uncontrolled and changes in outcomes may simply relate to shifts in examiner characteristics over time or due to other effects such as changes in general health status. Therefore, this needs to be accepted as a limitation to the evidence. Calibration of an examiner to a gold-standard with re-testing throughout the study might have helped counter any drift. The duration of follow-up was limited (to a maximum of 20 days) due to the nature of the hospitalisation. Although this period was adequate for the detection of changes in some oral health outcomes such as dental plaque accumulation (Theilade et al. 1966) and gingival inflammation (Loe et al. 1965), longer observational periods are required for the detection of a change in periodontitis (Goodson et al. 1982) or dental caries occurrence (Pitts and Stamm 2004). Finally, power calculations were reported in only one study (Franklin et al. 2000), thus hindering the interpretation of findings.
Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other reviews

We have not found other systematic reviews addressing this research question. However, a clinical effectiveness review was published in 1999 investigating oral care practices by nurses (Bowsher et al. 1999). The published report is limited in details of methodology making comparison difficult. However, the findings, even though published more than a decade ago, appear to hold true ‘This review confirms that current practice largely ignores the research evidence and is inadequate for ensuring optimum care. There is a clear need to develop and evaluate oral care protocols for hospitalised patients and to support nurses in their implementation.’

Meaning of the review, possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policy makers.

This review suggests that hospitalisation is associated with a deterioration in oral health and this could have profound implications for health and wellbeing. On the basis of current evidence, a deterioration in oral health would be expected to increase the risk of hospital acquired infections, increase care costs and have negative impact on health related quality of life.

We were not able to conclude whether this impact results from a low priority of oral care provision, the implementation of improper oral care regimes, from hospitalisation per se or from a combination of factors. Guidelines for the provision of oral care in hospital settings have been published (Department of Health 2003, Department of Health 2007, Fiske, et al. 2000, NICE 2008, Tablan et al. 2004) although they provide limited detail for carers.
Additional protocols/guidelines are therefore needed and should be based on the best available evidence with sufficient detail to guide carers and patients. Such development should include the breadth of relevant stakeholders such as nursing, medical and dental professionals as well as patients and address the different settings in which will need to be provided such as units with fully dependent patients and those where patients are able to carry out oral hygiene themselves. More challenging will be implementation (Rello et al. 2007) and this will need to be planned together with evaluation of success prior to introduction.

In terms of interventions, chemical plaque control was the regime of choice in three out of five included studies (Dennesen et al. 2003, Fourrier et al. 1998, Franklin et al. 2000). Although the clinical application of chemicals such as antiseptics seems straightforward, their effect against established dental plaque is marginal due to its organisation as a biofilm in which bacteria are considerably less sensitive to antimicrobial treatments than free-living planktonic bacteria (Pratten et al. 1998). This is corroborated by a systematic review of chlorhexidine for prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) which reported no effect on VAP incidence (Pineda et al. 2006). Therefore, mechanical removal or disruption of dental plaque will be needed such as can be achieved through toothbrushing.

Suggestions for further research

More robust evidence is needed to understand the impact of hospitalisation on oral health. In particular, we recommend studies conducted in a wider range of hospital settings including outside of critical care units. There are many outcomes measures that are validated in oral health research and these should be selected for hospital-based studies.
Furthermore, training of examiners should be provided together and outcomes of training (such as agreement levels) reported. Where feasible, longer observational periods could be employed to investigate other oral health outcomes such as dental caries and periodontitis.
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Figure 1: Flowchart of inclusion of studies

Screening (9,689)

Full articles (37)

Excluded from screening (9652)

Excluded from full text reading (32)

Study design (21)

No clinical examination (8)

Population type (3)

Included studies (5)
# Table 1: Included study characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>Type of oral care provided:</th>
<th>1. Hospital department</th>
<th>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</th>
<th>Quality assessment scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast et al. 2009</td>
<td>1. 45 patients 2. 49.16 years (18-85) 3. D0: 45 patients D10: 13 patients 4. Fully dependent (intubated) 5. 15.1 days (1-37) (12.8 days (1-31)</td>
<td>1. Nurse 2. Foam swabs or child toothbrush, toothpaste, sterile water or normal saline and lip lubricant. 3. Every 4-6 hours 4. 5-10 minutes 5. Yes (nurses’ notes)</td>
<td>1. Neuroscience ICU 2. USA</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflammation, dental health (OAG index) 2. Nurses (3) 3. Yes 4. Yes</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006</td>
<td>1. 66 patients 2. 55 years (25-93) 3. D0: 66 patients D4: 37 patients D7: 21 patients 4. Fully dependent (intubated) 5. Not reported (4-7 days)</td>
<td>1. Not reported 2. Not reported 3. 2.58 times per day (0-7 range) 4. Not reported 5. Not reported</td>
<td>1. Respiratory ICU 2. USA</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation, gingival inflammation, gingival bleeding, purulence, candidiasis, calculus, caries, stain (oral health assessment tool) 2. Not reported 3. Not reported 4. Not reported</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003</td>
<td>1. ICU: 24 patients CS: 20 patients 2. ICU: 58 years (SD 18.6) CS: 61 years (41-77) 3. Not reported 4. ICU: intubated CS: intubated for less than 12 hours 5. ICU: 20.4 days (SD 7.5) (14 days) CS: Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU: Not reported CS: Not reported 2. ICU: Sterile cloth drenched with NaCl 0.9% CS: Not reported 3. ICU: Not reported CS: Not reported 4. ICU: 2/day CS: Not reported 5. Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU and Cardiosurgery Ward 2. Netherlands</td>
<td>1. Periodontal disease (CPITN) and Oral mucositis (Quantitative scale of oral mucositis) 2. Dental hygienists (2) 3. Not reported 4. Not reported</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td>Type of oral care provided:</td>
<td>1. Hospital department</td>
<td>1. Type of oral care changes assessed (index used)</td>
<td>2. Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000 15</td>
<td>1. 59 children 2. 4.8 (1-16) 3. 5 children 4. 12 children orally intubated. The rest nasally intubated or not intubated 5. 7.4 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>1. Nurses 2. Foam sticks moistened with water. Antiseptics and antifungals were used at the discretion of the nurses. 3. Every 4-6 hours 4. Not reported 5. Not reported</td>
<td>1. Pediatric ICU 2. UK</td>
<td>1. Caries, missing, filled teeth (DMF index), dental plaque accumulation (O’Leary index), gingival inflammation (binary assessment), spontaneous gingival bleeding (binary assessment) 2. Author 3. Not reported 4. Not reported</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998 44</td>
<td>1. 57 patients 2. 49 years (18-83) 3. 29 patients 4. 44 patients intubated (77%) 5. 14 days (2-82) (15 patients for 5 days and 13 patients for 10 days)</td>
<td>1. Not reported 2. Not reported 3. Not reported 4. Not reported 5. Not reported</td>
<td>1. ICU 2. France</td>
<td>1. Dental plaque accumulation (Plaque index from one tooth) 2. Not reported 3. Not reported 4. Not reported</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key* “D0, D1, D4, D5, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Number of patients and duration of observation period</th>
<th>Dental plaque (index)</th>
<th>Gingival health (index)</th>
<th>Periodontal health (index)</th>
<th>Caries (index)</th>
<th>Stomatological disease incidence (index)</th>
<th>Other outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munro et al. 2006**</td>
<td>D0: 66 patients D4: 37 patients D7: 21 patients</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool D0: 21.27 (SD 23.66) D4: 22.72 (SD 20.47) D7: 24.32 (SD 29.01)</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>No data presented</td>
<td>Oral health assessment tool**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennesen et al. 2003**</td>
<td>ICU: 24 patients for 20.4 days (SD 7.5) CS: 20 patients for 15 days</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>CPITN No data presented &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>CPITN No data presented &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Median mucositis index ICU: D0: 2 (SD 3.2) D21: 19 (SD 5.9)</td>
<td>% subjects n ICU: D0: 79% D14: 19% D21: 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al. 2000*</td>
<td>Group 1: 54 children for 7.5 days (SD 6.2)</td>
<td>O’Leary plaque index D0: 22.5% (SD 17.7) Discharge: 25.8% (SD 18.5) Mean difference: 3.3% 95% CI: 1.4-5.3 p: 0.001</td>
<td>Presence of gingival inflammation (yes/no) D0: 4.1 sites Discharge: 5.5 sites Mean difference: 1.4 sites 95% CI: 0.4-2.3 p: 0.006</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>DMFT index D0: Primary teeth: 1.0 (SD 2.2) Permanent teeth: 1.2 (SD 1.9) Discharge: &quot;No changes&quot; reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourrier et al. 1998**</td>
<td>Group 1: 15 patients for 5 days Group 2: 13 patients for 10 days</td>
<td>Plaque index (one tooth) Group 1: D0: 1.1 (SD 0.7) D5: 1.6 (SD 0.7) Group 2: D0: 1.0 (SD 0.7) D5: 1.6 (SD 0.6)* D10: 2.0 (SD 0.4)**</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key*  “D0, D1, D4, D7, D10”: Baseline, Day one, Day four, Day five, Day seven, Day ten // “ICU”: Intensive care unit // “CS”: Cardiosurgical ward // “OAG”: Oral Assessment Guide // “CPITN”: Community Periodontal Index for Treatment Needs // “DMFT index”: Decayed, missed and filled teeth index //
APPENDICES

Search strategy for Ovid Medline

1. exp Hospitalization/
2. Hospital*.mp.
3. exp Intensive Care Units/
5. Intensive care ward*.mp.
6. ICU.mp.
7. Dental deposit*.mp.
8. Dental plaque.mp.
9. Dental calculus.mp.
10. Plaque accumulation.mp.
11. Plaque score.mp.
12. exp Dental Health Surveys/
13. Periodontal index.mp.
15. DMF index.mp.
16. exp Oral Hygiene/
17. Oral hygiene.mp.
19. exp candidiasis, oral/ or exp mucositis/ exp oral hemorrhage/ or exp periodontal diseases/ or exp stomatitis/
24. Probing depth*.mp
25. Bleeding on probing.mp.
27. Gingival hemorrhage.mp.
29. Oral mucositis.mp.
30. Stomatitis.mp.
31. tooth diseases/ or exp dental deposits/ or exp dental calculus/ or exp dental plaque/ or exp smear layer/ or exp
tooth demineralization/ or exp dental caries/
32. Dental caries.mp.
33. Tooth decay.mp.
34. Tooth demineralisation.mp.
35. Tooth demineralization.mp.
36. Tooth decalcification.mp.
37. Tooth extraction.mp.
38. Tooth loss.mp.
39. exp Oral Health/
40. Oral health.mp.
41. or/1-6
42. or/7-40
43. 41 and 42

Search strategy for EMBASE

1. exp hospital patient/
2. exp hospitalization/
3. hospital*.mp.
4. exp intensive care/ or exp intensive care unit/
5. intensive care unit*.mp.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ICU.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>exp tooth calculus/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>exp tooth plaque/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>exp mouth hygiene/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>exp mouth disease/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>periodontal disease/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>exp periodontitis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>exp thrush/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>exp stomatitis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>exp dental caries/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>exp tooth extraction/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>dental deposit*.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>dental calculus.mp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>dental plaque.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>plaque accumulation.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>oral hygiene.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>oral clean*.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>oral candidiasis.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>oral mucositis.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>stomatitis.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>periodont*.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>gingiv*.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>dental caries.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>tooth decay.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>tooth demineraliation.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>tooth decalcification.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>tooth loss.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>tooth extraction.mp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>oral health.mp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>DMF index.mp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Search strategy for CINAHL

1. (MH "Hospitalization+")
2. TX hospital*
3. (MH "Intensive Care Units+")
4. TX intensive care unit*
5. TX intensive care ward*
6. TX ICU
7. (MH "Tooth Diseases+")
8. (MH "Mouth Diseases+")
9. (MH "Oral Hygiene+")
10. (MH "Oral Health")
11. TX dental deposit*
12. TX dental calculus
13. TX plaque accumulation
14. TX periodont*
15. TX gingiv*
16. TX stomatitis
17. TX oral candid*
18. TX oral mucositis
19. TX dental caries
20. TX tooth decay
21. TX tooth demineralization
22. TX tooth decalcification
23. TX tooth decalcification
24. TX tooth loss
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TX tooth extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TX probing depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TX bleeding on probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TX gingival hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TX gingival haemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TX plaque score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TX DMF index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TX oral clean*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TX oral hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TX oral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>or/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>or/7-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35 and 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modified quality assessment scale for cohort studies (based on Newcastle-Ottawa scale)

(Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item with the selection and outcome categories.)

Selection

1) Representativeness of the cohort:
   a) truly representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   b) somewhat representative of the average hospitalised patients in the community (*)
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure:
   a) secure record (e.g., surgical records) (*)
   b) structured interview (*)
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest at baseline:
   a) yes (*)
   b) no

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome:
   a) independent blind assessment (*)
   b) record linkage (*)
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur:
   a) yes (3-5 days for plaque and gingival changes)(*)
   b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts:
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for (*)
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost (subjects lost due to death or discharge from the hospital or unit) (*)
   c) no description of those lost or loss due to other reasons than death or discharge from the hospital/unit.
   d) no statement