

Cost components of school-based oral health-promoting programs: a systematic review protocol

Bárbara da Silva Mourthé Matoso¹, Viviane Elisângela Gomes¹, Wagner Marcenes², Kênya Valéria Micaela de Souza Noronha³, Camilla Aparecida Silva de Oliveira Lima¹, Raquel Conceição Ferreira¹.

¹ Faculdade de Odontologia, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

² Affordable Health Initiative, London, United Kingdom

³ Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

Corresponding author

E-mail: vivianegomes@ufmg.br (VEG)

BSMM, VEG, WM, KVMSN, CASOL, RCF, and EFF contributed to the conceptualization of the study. BSMM, VEG, WM, KVMSN, CASOL, and RCF contributed to defining the methodology of the study. BSMM, VEG, CASOL, and RCF contributed to writing the original draft. BSMM, VEG, WM, KVMSN, CASOL, and RCF contributed to writing, reviewing, and editing the final version of the manuscript.

1 Abstract

2

3 **Introduction**

4 Oral health-promoting school programs play a crucial role in achieving universal
5 coverage of oral health care by addressing oral diseases and promoting the well-being and
6 quality of life of children and adolescents. However, a lack of studies has evaluated the
7 costs associated with implementing these programs, which hinders decision-makers in
8 adopting them on a large scale. This review aims to assess the cost components involved
9 in school-based oral health-promoting programs.

10 **Methods**

11 This review will include studies that have conducted either partial or full economic
12 evaluations, focusing on describing the cost components of oral health-promoting
13 programs implemented in primary schools involving students aged 6 to 14. A systematic
14 search was conducted across multiple databases: MEDLINE, The Cochrane Library, the
15 Virtual Health Library, the NHS Economic Evaluation Database, Web of Science,
16 Scopus, and EMBASE. Additionally, gray literature was searched using the Health
17 Technology Assessment Database. Two independent reviewers will screen the titles and
18 abstracts, followed by a full-text review based on predefined inclusion criteria. Data
19 extraction and critical appraisal evaluation will also be carried out independently by two
20 reviewers. In case of disagreements, the reviewer team will resolve them through
21 discussion.

22 **Discussion**

23 The systematic review resulting from this protocol aims to provide evidence regarding
24 the cost components and necessary resources for implementing and maintaining oral
25 health-promoting school programs. This information can assist decision-makers in
26 adopting these programs on a larger scale and effectively addressing oral diseases among
27 children and adolescents.

28

29 **Protocol registration:** CRD42022363743.

30

31 **Key words:** Systematic review; costs and cost analysis; dental economics; oral health;
32 health promotion; school dentistry.

33

34

35 **Introduction**

36 Oral diseases are prevalent noncommunicable diseases worldwide, affecting
37 approximately 3.5 billion individuals. If left untreated, these diseases can cause pain and
38 suffering, impacting human health and well-being. To address this problem, important
39 decisions, and actions have been taken, such as the historic resolution on oral health at
40 the World Health Assembly, in 2021, the development and adoption of the Global
41 Strategy on Oral Health, and the Global Oral Health Action Plan. These initiatives aim to
42 achieve universal coverage of oral health services by 2030 [1].

43

44 School-based oral health-promoting programs play a crucial role in combating oral
45 diseases and achieving universal coverage of oral health care. Globally, more than 90%
46 of children in the primary school age group are enrolled in school, spending a significant
47 portion of their time there [2]. Furthermore, schools can serve as the only and primary
48 access point for oral health services for children and adolescents, making oral health
49 programs implemented in schools valuable for health promotion and equality [3,4].

50

51 Oral health promotion can be effectively integrated into the school curriculum and
52 activities, serving as a foundation for developing Health Promoting Schools (HPS) [5].
53 HPS is recognized as a strategic approach for promoting positive development and
54 healthy behaviors among students [2]. Integrating oral health promotion activities into
55 schools benefits the participating children and extends to their siblings, parents, and the
56 community, as they gain new knowledge and adopt healthier behaviors [6].

57 However, there is a lack of studies evaluating the costs, cost components, and necessary
58 resources associated with these school-based oral health-promoting programs, hindering
59 the decision-making process for large-scale adoption of such programs [7,8]. Cost
60 analyses, although scarce in this context, are essential for implementing evidence-based
61 practices [9] and supporting decision-making [10]. Therefore, conducting precise and
62 detailed cost studies to assess the resources needed for implementing and maintaining
63 school-based oral health-promoting programs is necessary.

64 This systematic review aims to address this knowledge gap and is being conducted as part
65 of the planning for assessing the implementation costs of oral health care proposed by the
66 Affordable Health Initiative model of the Health Promoting School program
67 (<https://www.affordablehealthinitiative.com/resources-dental-health-care>). The

68 Affordable Health Initiative (AHI) is a Charitable Incorporated Organization in the

69 United Kingdom that offers a simple, scalable, and sustainable operational model for the
70 World Health Organization's HPS initiative. The AHI HPS model recognizes and
71 addresses the socio-economic and socio-psychological barriers to a healthy lifestyle,
72 focusing efforts on hygiene, diet, physical activities, tobacco and drug use, and alcohol
73 consumption, all of which are associated with several health outcomes [11].

74

75 **Review question**

76 What are the cost components of school-based oral health-promoting programs?

77

78 **Methods**

79 This protocol follows the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
80 Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocol (PRISMA-P) [12] S1 file. The protocol has been
81 registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42022363743).

82

83 **Eligibility criteria**

84 The research question and eligibility criteria were developed using the PICOS acronym
85 (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Study type).

86

87 **Population**

88 This review includes studies involving students aged 6 to 14 years. Studies focusing on
89 students under 5 and over 14 years of age will be excluded. The emphasis on elementary
90 school is due to its widespread coverage among children and adolescents worldwide, as
91 well as its alignment with the target population of the HPS initiative and the AHI HPS
92 model. In Brazil, elementary education lasts 9 years and caters to students between 6 and
93 14 years old [13].

94

95 **Intervention and comparator**

96 The review will consider studies that evaluated school-based oral health-promoting
97 programs without any applicable comparator. We considered oral health-promoting
98 school programs as the interventions aligned with the HPS initiative, aiming to create a
99 school environment conducive to oral health, reduce risk factors for oral diseases, and
100 improve knowledge and attitudes related to oral health [5].

101

102 Studies focusing on discontinued dental procedures within school-based oral health-
103 promoting programs will be excluded (e.g., topical application of 4% NAF-PO₄).

104

105 **Context**

106 This review focuses on assessing costs related to school-based oral health-promoting
107 programs in primary schools. Studies conducted in colleges, universities, kindergartens,
108 or nursery schools will be excluded. The primary school level is the main focus due to its
109 extensive coverage among children and adolescents globally, representing the target
110 population for the HPS initiative.

111

112 **Outcomes**

113 This review will include studies that evaluated the costs of school-based oral health-
114 promoting programs, with a specific requirement for a detailed breakdown or
115 disaggregation of costs, w, including a description of different cost components
116 considered based on the analytical perspective and time horizon adopted.

117

118 **Study types**

119 This review will include both partial or full economic evaluations that provide cost
120 estimations along with descriptions of cost components. Model-based evaluations will be
121 excluded unless they exclusively utilize empirical data (primary data on resource
122 consumption and health outcome).

123

124 There will be no restrictions on language, location, or publication date. Studies will be
125 excluded if they are letters, brief commentaries, reviews, and conference abstracts.
126 Articles unaccessed or without full text available will also be excluded.

127 Additionally, articles without accessible full texts or unavailability of full texts will be
128 excluded.

129

130 **Search strategy**

131 The search strategy was developed, refined, and piloted with the collaboration of an
132 experienced librarian. The exact search terms used in all databases are described in S2
133 file.

134

135 **Information sources**

136 The search will be carried out in MEDLINE (via Pubmed), The Cochrane Library, Virtual
137 Health Library, Economic Evaluation Database (via NHS CRD), Web of Science,
138 Scopus, and EMBASE (via CAPES Portal). Grey literature will be searched in the Health
139 Technology Assessment Database (via NHS CRD). Additionally, a manual search will be
140 conducted on the references of the included articles to identify additional eligible studies.

141

142 **Study selection**

143 Identified citations will be imported into EndNote® Web to remove duplicates. The
144 remaining documents will be screened by independent reviewers using the Rayyan®
145 blinding tool. Two blinded reviewers will assess the titles and abstracts against the
146 inclusion criteria in the first round. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion,
147 involving a third reviewer if necessary. The second round will involve the same process,
148 this time accessing the full text. A PRISMA flowchart [14] will be presented to illustrate
149 the study selection process.

150

151 **Assessment of methodological quality**

152 Methodological quality and risk of bias in the included studies will be assessed using the
153 quality assessment tool proposed by Andrade and colleagues [15] (S3). This tool is
154 deemed appropriate for both full and partial economic evaluations. Two independent
155 reviewers will complete the checklists, and disagreements will be resolved by a third
156 reviewer. Study authors will be contacted to request missing or additional data, if
157 necessary.

158

159 Regardless of methodological quality, all studies will undergo data extraction and
160 synthesis. The results of the quality assessments will be presented in a tabular format, and
161 the implications of study quality on the comprehensiveness and results of the systematic
162 review will be discussed.

163

164 **Data collection**

165 Two independent researchers will collect data using an adapted version of JBI Data
166 Extraction Form for Economic Evaluation (S4). Disagreements will be resolved by a third
167 researcher. Data extraction will comprise general and clinical data such as author,
168 location, intervention, comparator, population, study design, data source, clinical
169 outcome, and economic data (time horizon, analytical perspective, data source, data

170 collection method, cost components, currency, adjustments and discounts, treatment of
171 uncertainty, cost results and, whenever possible, the author's conclusions regarding
172 factors that promote or impede the cost and effects of the intervention).

173

174 **Data synthesis**

175 The extracted data will be presented through narrative synthesis to address the objective
176 and question of the review, providing a summary of findings and comparing results
177 among studies, including the critical appraisal. Disaggregated presentation of results will
178 be preferred. Relevant information such as analytical perspective, cost components,
179 minimum and maximum value per cost component, and estimation method will be
180 presented. Different currencies will be converted to USD using the same reference year.

181

182 **Discussion**

183 The systematic review, derived from the proposed protocol, aims to generate evidence on
184 the cost components and required resources for the implementation and sustenance of
185 school-based oral health-promoting programs. It emphasizes the significance of oral
186 health interventions as a foundational element for successfully implementing the Health
187 Promoting School (HPS) initiative in educational institutions. This evidence can
188 potentially guide decision-makers in adopting the AHI HPS model on a broader scale in
189 various countries and regions where its implementation has taken place. Ultimately, this
190 widespread adoption can lead to improved access to primary oral healthcare for a larger
191 number of children and adolescents, thereby enhancing their oral health outcomes.

192

193 **Acknowledgments**

194

195 The authors would like to thank Dr. Fernanda Gomes Almeida, librarian at Universidade
196 Federal de Minas Gerais, for her contribution, and pay posthumous tribute to Prof.
197 Efigênia Ferreira e Ferreira, who integrated the review team and led the conceptualization
198 of the study.

199

200 **References**

201

- 202 1. WHO. Global oral health status report. Vol. 57, Dental Abstracts. 2022.
- 203 2. World Health Organization. Making every school a health-promoting school:

- 204 global standards and indicators for health-promoting schools and systems.
- 205 3. Tomazoni F, Vettore M V., Baker SR, Ardenghi TM. Can a School-Based
206 Intervention Improve the Oral Health-Related Quality of Life of Brazilian
207 Children? *JDR Clin Transl Res* [Internet]. 2019;4(3):229–38. Available from:
208 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2380084418816984>
- 209 4. Khoshnevisan MH, Pakkhesal M, Pooyan M, Nejad GG. School-based oral
210 health promotion: a thorough review. *J Dent Sch* |. 2017;35(4):143–9.
- 211 5. World Health Organization. WHO Information Series on School Health. Educ
212 Dev Center, Inc. 2003;1–65.
- 213 6. Macnab AJ. Children’s Oral Health: The Opportunity for Improvement Using the
214 WHO Health Promoting School Model. *Adv Public Heal*. 2015;2015:1–6.
- 215 7. Amilani U, Carter HE, Senanayake S, Hettiarachchi RM, McPhail SM, Kularatna
216 S. A scoping review of cost-effectiveness analyses of school-based interventions
217 for caries. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 2020;48(5):357–63.
- 218 8. Arora A, Kumbargere Nagraj S, Khattri S, Ismail NM, Eachempati P. School
219 dental screening programmes for oral health. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*.
220 2022;2022(7).
- 221 9. Bowser DM, Henry BF, McCollister KE. Cost analysis in implementation studies
222 of evidence-based practices for mental health and substance use disorders: a
223 systematic review. *Implement Sci*. 2021;16(1):1–15.
- 224 10. Hettiarachchi RM, Kularatna S, Downes MJ, Byrnes J, Kroon J, Lalloo R, et al.
225 The cost-effectiveness of oral health interventions: A systematic review of cost-
226 utility analyses. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 2018;46(2):118–24.
- 227 11. Affordable Health Initiative AHI. May 3 2023. [cited 2023 May 27]. Available
228 from: <https://www.affordablehealthinitiative.com>.
- 229 12. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al.
230 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols
231 (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* [Internet].
232 2015;349(January):1–25. Available from:
233 <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647>
- 234 13. BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Base Nacional Curricular Comum. 2017.
235 [cited 2023 May 27]. Available from:
236 http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_-versaofinal_site.pdf.
237
- 238 14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et
239 al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic
240 reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372.
- 241 15. Andrade M V., Noronha K, Diniz BPC, Guedes G, Carvalho LR, Silva VA, et al.
242 The economic burden of malaria: a systematic review. *Malar J* [Internet].
243 2022;21(1):1–10. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-022-04303-6>
- 244

245 **Supporting information**

246 S1 Checklist. PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-
247 Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: Recommended items to address in a systematic
248 review protocol.

249

250 S2 File. Search terms and strategy.

251

252 S3 File. Quality assessment form.

253

254 S4 File. Data extraction form.

255