

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

Bárbara da Silva Mourthé Matoso<sup>1</sup>, Viviane Elisângela Gomes<sup>1</sup>, Wagner Marcenes<sup>2</sup>, Kênya Valéria Micaela de Souza Noronha<sup>3</sup>, Camilla Aparecida Silva de Oliveira Lima<sup>1</sup>, Raquel Conceição Ferreira<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Faculdade de Odontologia, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

<sup>2</sup> Affordable Health Initiative, London, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup> Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

Corresponding author

E-mail: [vivianegomes@ufmg.br](mailto: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-PO<sub>4</sub>).

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](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