

## **Public oral health screening leads to regular dental visits: the LIFE Study**

Yudai Tamada<sup>1,2</sup>, Taro Kusama<sup>1,3</sup>, Megumi Maeda<sup>4</sup>, Fumiko Murata<sup>4</sup>,  
Ken Osaka<sup>1</sup>, Haruhisa Fukuda<sup>4</sup>, and Kenji Takeuchi<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>

### **Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> Department of International and Community Oral Health, Tohoku University Graduate School of Dentistry, Miyagi, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Aichi, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Division of Statistics and Data Science, Liaison Center for Innovative Dentistry, Tohoku University Graduate School of Dentistry, Miyagi, Japan

<sup>4</sup> Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Kyushu University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Fukuoka, Japan

**Running Title:** Oral health screening and dental visits

**Keywords:** Dental check-up; Dental screening; Individual screening; Dental care utilization.

### **\*Correspondence:**

Kenji Takeuchi

Department of International and Community Oral Health,

Tohoku University Graduate School of Dentistry,

4-1, Seiryō-machi, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Miyagi, 980-8575, Japan.

Tel: +81-22-717-7639, E-mail: kenji.takeuchi.c4@tohoku.ac.jp

### **Itemized List:**

Word Count for Abstract: 243/300 Words

Word Count for Text: 3,002 Words (from Introduction through Discussion)

Number of References: 30

Number of Tables: 2, Number of Figures: 3

Number of Supplemental Tables: 2, Number of Supplemental Figures: 3

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background:** Although periodontal disease screening has been implemented as a public oral  
3 health screening program in Japan, it remains unclear whether screening encourages regular  
4 dental visits. This study aimed to test the hypothesis that periodontal disease screening leads to  
5 subsequent regular dental visits among adults using a difference-in-differences (DID) approach.

6 **Methods:** This study used healthcare claims data of municipality residents who underwent  
7 periodontal disease screening in 2017 or 2018. For each screening recipient, four individuals  
8 of the same age and sex were extracted from those who did not undergo screening as controls.  
9 In the DID analysis, we assessed the change in the prevalence of dentist visits at least once  
10 every 180 days after screening.

11 **Results:** A total of 4,270 participants were included in the analysis. The prevalence of visiting  
12 dentists was consistent before screening among the participants who underwent screening  
13 (181–360 days before, 62.4%; 1–180 days before, 60.3%). While the prevalence was also  
14 consistent in those who did not undergo screening throughout the study period (approximately  
15 45%), the prevalence in those who underwent screening sharply increased after undergoing the  
16 screening (1–180 days after, 81.1%) and then declined (181–360 days after, 67.8%). DID  
17 analysis indicated that the prevalence increased by 12.1% owing to screening. In addition, the  
18 age-subgroup DID estimates were higher in the younger population (aged 20–35 years, 17.4%;  
19 40–55 years, 11.5%; 60 years, 11.0%).

20 **Conclusion:** Periodontal disease screening increased subsequent dental visits, especially in  
21 younger populations.

## 22 INTRODUCTION

23 Oral diseases are among the most prevalent health conditions that impose tremendous health  
24 and economic burdens<sup>1</sup>. Periodontal disease, a representative oral disease, is a known risk  
25 factor for various systemic diseases, including dementia<sup>2</sup>, cardiovascular diseases<sup>3</sup>, and  
26 pulmonary diseases<sup>4,5</sup>, through sharing a common inflammatory pathway<sup>6</sup>. Regular dental  
27 visits contribute to the early detection of oral diseases, and continuous preventive care by dental  
28 professionals is effective in maintaining and improving oral health. Previous studies reported  
29 that preventive dental visits reduce future non-preventive dental care<sup>7</sup> and dental  
30 expenditures<sup>7,8</sup>. This suggests that health policy should prioritize frequent dental visits to  
31 improve people's health.

32 Various public oral health screening programs have been implemented in Japan.  
33 Periodontal disease screening is one of them, and it is primarily aimed at middle-aged and  
34 young older populations, where at least 40% of dentate adults aged  $\geq 40$  years experience  
35 periodontal disease<sup>9</sup>. Screening was initially introduced in 1995 and is now conducted for  
36 adults aged 40, 50, 60, and 70 years as part of a health promotion project. Eligible people can  
37 undergo screening free of charge or at a low cost (depending on their residential municipality)<sup>10</sup>.  
38 During screening, people will be examined for their oral status, such as the condition of present  
39 teeth, tooth loss, and periodontal tissue, by the procedure set out<sup>11</sup>. Based on the examined  
40 results, they will receive oral hygiene education, such as the importance of regular dental visits  
41 and advice on improving their oral status. Many companies have private workplace oral health  
42 promotion aimed at a similar age group as those included in the periodontal disease screening  
43 program. Such programs, which consist of oral examinations and tailored oral health  
44 instructions, have previously been reported to increase the frequency of dental visits<sup>12,13</sup>.  
45 Although the purpose and content of periodontal diseases are similar, it is still unknown  
46 whether periodontal disease screening can also contribute to an increase in subsequent dental

47 visits. Therefore, this study aimed to test the hypothesis that screening for periodontal disease  
48 leads to subsequent regular dental visits among adults. Using the difference-in-differences  
49 (DID) approach, we assessed changes in the prevalence of regular dental visits after periodontal  
50 disease screening.

51 **METHODS**

52 **Study Population and Setting**

53 This study was based on data from the Longevity Improvement & Fair Evidence (LIFE)  
54 Study<sup>14</sup>, a longitudinal community-based database project that collected various health-related  
55 data, such as administrative healthcare claims and oral health screenings data, from municipal  
56 governments. In the LIFE Study, a unique research ID was assigned to each resident by data  
57 managers, and each data can be linked at the individual level. Details of the LIFE Study, such  
58 as the data collection procedures and database construction, are available<sup>14</sup>. In this study, we  
59 used data on periodontal disease screening conducted in fiscal years 2017 or 2018 and  
60 healthcare claims of the National Health Insurance<sup>15,16</sup> enrollees collected from a municipality  
61 with a residential population of approximately 700,000.

62 In the municipality, periodontal disease screening is conducted for adults aged 20, 25,  
63 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, and 70 years from June to November in designated dental clinics  
64 as individual screenings free of charge. The municipality also had other oral health screening  
65 programs (i.e., oral healthcare screening), annually conducted for those aged  $\geq 65$  years  
66 throughout the year. Because those aged 65 or 70 years could undergo oral healthcare and  
67 periodontal disease screening within a year, we excluded them from our analytical sample to  
68 assess the effect of only periodontal disease screening. Additionally, those who underwent  
69 periodontal disease screening more than twice a year or those aged out of eligibility for the  
70 screening were excluded from the analysis. Furthermore, we restricted our analytic sample to  
71 those who had continuous health insurance enrollment for the 360 days preceding and  
72 following periodontal disease screening. We assessed the enrollment in the following two  
73 ways: First, in our primary analysis, eligible participants who visited a medical institution were  
74 regarded as having health insurance enrollment for 180 days since the visit date (when  $\geq 181$   
75 days had passed since the last visit date, they were regarded as being disenrolled from health

76 insurance at 180 days since the previous visit date). Second, in our secondary analysis, although  
77 the data existed only for those aged  $\geq 40$  years, we ascertained the participants' health insurance  
78 enrollment period using the health insurance register collected from the municipality.

79

## 80 **Outcome Assessment**

81 The primary outcome was the prevalence of participants who visited dentists at least once every  
82 180 days for 360 days before or after undergoing periodontal disease screening (181–360 days  
83 before; 1–180 days before; 1–180 days after; and 181–360 days after undergoing screening).  
84 Dental visits were identified based on dental claims. The interval between regular dental visits  
85 (180 days) was determined because general dental practitioners traditionally recommend  
86 visiting a dental clinic at least once every 180 days to maintain oral health<sup>17</sup>. In the sensitivity  
87 analysis, to account for other treatment or maintenance strategies<sup>18</sup>, we assessed the prevalence  
88 of visiting dentists at least once every 90 days before or after undergoing screening (271–360  
89 days before; 181–270 days before; 91–180 days before; 1–90 days before; 1–90 days after; 91–  
90 180 days after; 181–270 days after; 271–360 days after undergoing screening).

91 Furthermore, to investigate the details of dental visits after undergoing the screening,  
92 for example, periodontal maintenance and caries treatment, we assessed the prevalence of the  
93 following seven dental procedures at least once in 1–180 or 181–360 days after undergoing the  
94 screening: cavity fillings, pulpectomies, dental calculus removals, periodontal surgeries, tooth  
95 extractions, dental bridges, and dentures. The procedures were identified using the original  
96 Japanese procedure codes in the dental claims data according to the definitions in previous  
97 studies<sup>19,20</sup> (Supplemental Table 1).

98

## 99 **Exposure Assessment**

100 The exposure in this study involved screening for periodontal disease. For each participant who  
101 underwent screening, four participants of the same age and sex were sequentially selected from  
102 those who did not undergo screening (1:4 age and sex matching was conducted) in a non-  
103 replicative manner.

104

### 105 **Statistical Analysis**

106 First, for demographic characteristics, we assessed the participants' age, sex, and screening  
107 month by fiscal year when they underwent periodontal disease screening. Second, we evaluated  
108 descriptively whether the prevalence of visiting dentists at least once in 180 days increased  
109 after periodontal disease screening (for participants who did not undergo screening, the  
110 matched date was regarded as the index date). We then examined the changes in the prevalence  
111 of visiting dentists 180 days before and after undergoing screening using the DID approach<sup>21,22</sup>  
112 after statistically verifying the parallel trend assumption. The DID analysis allowed for a  
113 counterfactual assessment of what happened to the intervention group (those who underwent  
114 screening) after the intervention (undergoing screening) by referring to the time course of the  
115 control group (those who did not undergo screening). Practically, we included an interaction  
116 term between the indicator of whether the participants experienced the screening and the period  
117 after undergoing the screening in a linear probability model, and the coefficient was the DID  
118 estimate, which can be interpreted as the percentage change due to undergoing the screening.  
119 The 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the DID estimates were obtained using wild cluster  
120 bootstrapping with 1,000 replications. As an additional analysis, we descriptively assessed  
121 whether the prevalence of visiting dentists within 90 days of screening increased. Furthermore,  
122 as an age-subgroup analysis, we evaluated the transitions in the prevalence of visiting dentists  
123 by age group (20–35/40–55/60 years). Third, we restricted the analytic sample to those who  
124 had not visited dentists 360 days before the screening and assessed the transition of the

125 prevalence of visiting dentists in 180 days in the total population and the age groups (aged 20–  
126 35/40–55/60 years). Fourth, we assessed the participants' dental procedures at least once in 1–  
127 180 days or 181–360 days after screening.

128 As a sensitivity analysis, we conducted the same analysis as the main analysis among  
129 participants whose continuous health insurance enrollment was ascertained from the health  
130 insurance register. All analyses were conducted using Stata (version 17.0; Stata Corp., College  
131 Station, TX, USA). This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational  
132 Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines.

133

#### 134 **Ethical Considerations**

135 This study was approved by the Kyushu University Institutional Review Board for Clinical  
136 Research (approval number: 22114-02) and the Ethics Committee of Tohoku University  
137 Graduate School of Dentistry (approval number: 23835). Data usage approval was obtained  
138 from the municipality's Personal Information Protection Review Board.



139 **RESULTS**

140 Table 1 shows the characteristics of the analytical sample according to the fiscal year in which  
141 the participants underwent periodontal disease screening. Of 854 participants who underwent  
142 screening (427 in the fiscal year 2017 and 427 in the fiscal year 2018), 3,416 participants were  
143 matched with those who did not undergo screening. Among the participants, 64.8% were  
144 female, 11.6% were 20–35, 64.4% were 40–55, and 24.0% were 60 years old. In addition, the  
145 participants underwent screening most frequently in November (21.2%), followed by June  
146 (21.0%).

147 Figure 1 presents the prevalence of visiting dentists at least once in 180 and 360 days  
148 before and after undergoing screening. In the total population, the prevalence before screening  
149 was almost consistent throughout the 360 days in both participants who underwent screening  
150 (181–360 days before, 62.4%; 1–180 days before, 60.3%) and those who did not (181–360  
151 days before, 43.5%; 1–180 days before, 43.5%) (parallel trend test,  $P = 0.305$ ). The prevalence  
152 was also almost consistent after undergoing screening in those who did not (1–180 days after,  
153 44.1%; 181–360 days after, 45.0%). In contrast, in those who underwent screening, the  
154 prevalence sharply increased after screening (1–180 days after, 81.1%) and then declined (181–  
155 360 days after, 67.8%) but remained higher than before screening. The DID analysis indicated  
156 that the prevalence was increased by 12.1% (95% CI, 9.0–15.0) by undergoing the screening  
157 (Table 2). In an additional analysis that assessed the prevalence of visiting dentists at least once  
158 in 90 days during the 360 days before and after undergoing the screening, a similar trend was  
159 observed: the prevalence sharply increased after the screening and then declined (Supplemental  
160 Figure 1).

161 By age group, the increase in the prevalence of visiting dentists at least once in 180  
162 days was sharper in those aged 20–35 years (from 56.6% in 1–180 days before to 84.8% in 1–  
163 180 days after) than in those aged 40–55 years (from 61.3% in 1–180 days before to 81.3% in

164 1–180 days after) or 60 years (from 59.5% in 1–180 days before to 79.0% in 1–180 days after)  
165 (Figure 1). In the age group DID analysis, the corresponding percent changes were 17.4% (95%  
166 CI, 8.0–27.1) in those aged 20–35 years, 11.5% (95% CI, 7.4–15.9) in those aged 40–55 years,  
167 and 11.0% (95% CI, 4.7–16.9) in those aged 60 years (Table 2).

168 Figure 2 shows the prevalence of visiting dentists at least once every 180 days for 360  
169 days after screening among those who had not visited dentists for 360 days before undergoing  
170 screening. In the total population, 69.6% of the participants visited dentists 1–180 days after  
171 screening. In addition, the prevalence was higher in the younger population (aged 20–35 years,  
172 77.3%; aged 40–55 years, 73.1%; and 60 years, 58.2%). In all age groups, the prevalence at  
173 181–360 days after screening declined from that at 1–180 days after screening (total population,  
174 41.5%; age 20–35 years, 40.9%; age 40–55 years, 41.5%; age 60 years, 41.8%).

175 Figure 3 shows the prevalence of each dental procedure that the participants who  
176 underwent screening received at least once in 1–180 or 181–360 days after the screening. In  
177 the total population, while the prevalence of patients who received cavity fillings declined from  
178 1–180 days after screening (49.8%) to 181–360 days after screening (40.4%), the prevalence  
179 of patients who received dental calculus removal increased from 1–180 days after screening  
180 (69.3%) to 181–360 days after screening (71.7%) undergoing the screening. On the other hand,  
181 among the participants who had not visited a dentist 360 days before undergoing screening, the  
182 prevalence of those who received cavity fillings 1–180 days after screening (66.0%) was higher  
183 than that in the total population, but it was almost halved 181–360 days after screening (32.6%).

184 In the secondary analysis, which ascertained the participants' continuous health  
185 insurance enrollment using the health insurance register, the characteristics of the analytical  
186 samples were similar to those of the primary analysis (Supplemental Table 2). In addition, we  
187 observed similar trends in the prevalence of dental visits 180 days during 360 days before and  
188 after periodontal disease screening (Supplemental Figure 2). In the total population, the

189 prevalence was 51.0% at 181–360 days before screening and 52.5% at 1–180 days before  
190 screening among those who underwent screening; it increased to 74.8% at 1–180 days and  
191 declined to 58.3% at 181–360 days after screening. In contrast, the prevalence in those who  
192 did not undergo screening was almost consistent throughout the study period (181–360 days  
193 before screening, 30.7%; 1–180 days before screening, 29.4%; 1–180 days after screening,  
194 31.4%; 181–360 days after screening, 31.1%). In the analysis of those who had not visited  
195 dentists for 360 days before undergoing the screening, the prevalence at 1–180 days after  
196 screening was higher in the younger population (aged 40–55 years, 62.8%; aged 60 years,  
197 54.9%) (Supplemental Figure 3).

198 **DISCUSSION**

199 This study found that periodontal disease screening was associated with an increase in  
200 subsequent regular dental visits, including those who did not regularly visit dentists before  
201 screening. The increase in the frequency of regular dental visits after screening was more  
202 significant in the younger population.

203         Concerning the details of dental visits after undergoing the screening, this study  
204 revealed that nearly half of the participants had cavity fillings 1–180 days after the screening.  
205 The prevalence of those who received cavity fillings declined 181–360 days after screening. In  
206 contrast, the prevalence of dental calculus removal increased from 1–180 days to 181–360 days  
207 after screening. These results suggest that visits to the dentist for the treatment of caries noted  
208 during periodontal disease screening may have contributed to the increase in the prevalence of  
209 visits to the dentist on days 1–180 after screening. On the other hand, the prevalence of  
210 participants who underwent dental calculus removal was higher in 181–360 days than in 1–180  
211 days after screening, but this cannot be simply interpreted as representing an increase in the  
212 prevalence of preventive dental visits. As the prevalence of visiting dentists declined from days  
213 1–180 to days 181–360 after screening, it is possible that some people visited dentists for dental  
214 caries treatment and did not return after the treatment, which may have increased the prevalence  
215 of preventive dental visits. People who have experienced dental caries are known to be at a  
216 higher risk of developing it again<sup>23</sup>, so dental professionals should not only recommend dental  
217 visits during periodontal disease screening but also provide thorough oral hygiene education  
218 so that they can continue regular preventive dental visits after treatment.

219         In Japan, “universal dental health checks” are expected to be conducted in the next  
220 few years<sup>10</sup>. It is still unclear whether it will be an oral health screening program that provides  
221 annual individual screenings for the entire population, such as an expansion of periodontal  
222 disease screening, or an oral health campaign that promotes dental visits at least once a year.

223 If “universal dental health checks” would be an oral health screening program, because this  
224 study assessed the effectiveness of periodontal disease screening in late adolescent young older  
225 adults, we believe our findings may have important implications for developing the program.  
226 First, those who did not undergo periodontal disease screening were less likely to visit a dentist  
227 routinely than those who did. This suggests that, in developing “universal dental health checks”,  
228 a focused approach for those indifferent to their health (those in the pre-contemplation  
229 stage<sup>24,25</sup>) needs to be incorporated. Second, this study observed an increase in the prevalence  
230 of dental visits after screening, which declined over time. Based on the findings, “universal  
231 dental health checks” are expected to include a system that effectively promotes continuous  
232 dental visits. Further research is needed and incentives should be provided to those with  
233 continuous dental visits for preventive purposes.

234 This study has some limitations. First, given the low prevalence of people who  
235 underwent periodontal disease screening among the eligible people (around 5%)<sup>26</sup>, our study  
236 participants who underwent screening might have systemically higher health literacy than in  
237 those who did not. People with higher health literacy are more likely to follow  
238 recommendations from health professionals<sup>27</sup>; hence, it is possible that our study participants  
239 who underwent the screening were more likely to visit dentists regularly according to the  
240 advice received from the screening than those who did not. In this case, our estimates of the  
241 changes in the prevalence of visiting dentists may have been overestimated. Second, our study  
242 participants were restricted to the National Health Insurance enrollees, a public insurance  
243 scheme for those not employed. Enrollees included self-employed or part-time workers,  
244 retirees, and their dependents. Considering that full-time workers have to work for state-related  
245 reasons for not visiting dentists<sup>28,29</sup>, such as they cannot spare enough time on weekdays,  
246 caution is needed when generalizing our results to other populations<sup>30</sup>. Third, this study was  
247 based on municipal data. Although periodontal disease screening has been implemented in

248 many municipalities and is carried out by the procedure set out<sup>11</sup>, there are some variations in  
249 its characteristics, such as eligible age, advertising method, and fees to undertake it. Hence,  
250 further studies using data from multiple municipalities are required to assess the  
251 generalizability of the results.

252 In conclusion, this study showed that screening for periodontal disease leads to  
253 subsequent regular dental visits among adults. In particular, younger individuals were more  
254 likely to visit a dentist after screening. We believe that our findings provide important insights  
255 for designing efficient oral health programs in the future.

256 **Appendix**

257 Supplementary material can be found in the online version of the journal.

258

259 **Acknowledgments**

260 We are grateful to the other investigators, staff, and participants of the LIFE Study for their  
261 valuable contributions. YT was supported by Nagoya University CIBoG WISE Program from  
262 MEXT.

263

264 **Funding**

265 This study was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific (22H03299) from Japan Society for  
266 the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI, Health Labour Sciences Research Grant  
267 (23FA1022) from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan, and a JST FOREST  
268 Program Grant (JPMJFR205J) by the Japan Science and Technology Agency. The funders had  
269 no role in the study design, data analysis, data interpretation, manuscript preparation, or  
270 decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The views and opinions expressed in this  
271 article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of  
272 the respective funding organizations.

273

274 **Conflict of Interest**

275 None declared.

276

277 **ORCID IDs**

278 Yudai Tamada <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6868-4195>

279 Taro Kusama <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8683-4484>

280 Kenji Takeuchi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8769-8955>

281

282 **Author Contribution**

283 YT, TK, MM, FM, HF, and KT conceived and designed the study. YT, MM, FM, and HF  
284 collected and checked data. YT analyzed the data. YT and KT wrote the first draft of the  
285 manuscript. KO, HF, and KT supervised and administrated the study. HF and KT acquired  
286 funding. All authors reviewed the manuscript, interpreted the data, and approved the final  
287 version of the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet  
288 authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

289

290 **Data Availability Statement**

291 All data used in this study are not publicly available due to ethical or legal restrictions. For  
292 inquiries about the datasets used in this study, please contact the principal investigator of the  
293 LIFE Study, Dr. Haruhisa Fukuda, upon reasonable request. Codes used to generate the results  
294 in the manuscript may be available from the first author (tamada.yudai97@gmail.com) upon  
295 reasonable request.



## REFERENCES

1. Peres MA, Macpherson LMD, Weyant RJ, et al. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. *Lancet* 2019; 394: 249–260.
2. Asher S, Stephen R, Mäntylä P, et al. Periodontal health, cognitive decline, and dementia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2022; 70: 2695–2709.
3. Dhadse P, Gattani D, Mishra R. The link between periodontal disease and cardiovascular disease: How far we have come in last two decades ? *J Indian Soc Periodontol* 2010; 14: 148–154.
4. Takeuchi K, Matsumoto K, Furuta M, et al. Periodontal status and lung function decline in the community: the Hisayama study. *Sci Rep* 2018; 8: 13354.
5. Takeuchi K, Matsumoto K, Furuta M, et al. Periodontitis is associated with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *J Dent Res* 2019; 98: 534–540.
6. Hajishengallis G, Chavakis T. Local and systemic mechanisms linking periodontal disease and inflammatory comorbidities. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2021; 21: 426–440.
7. Taylor HL, Sen B, Holmes AM, et al. Does preventive dental care reduce nonpreventive dental visits and expenditures among Medicaid-enrolled adults? *Health Serv Res* 2022; 57: 1295–1302.
8. Pourat N, Choi MK, Chen X. Evidence of effectiveness of preventive dental care in reducing dental treatment use and related expenditures. *J Public Health Dent* 2018; 78: 203–213.
9. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Report on the Survey of Dental Diseases 2022, <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10804000/001112405.pdf> (accessed August 31, 2023).
10. Dewake N, Yoshinari N. Historic changes and current status of periodontal disease screenings, and specific considerations for universal dental health checks. *Journal of Japanese Society of Periodontology* 2022; 64: 129–135.

11. Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare of Japan. Periodontal disease screening manual 2015, <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/file/06-Seisakujouhou-10900000-Kenkoukyoku/manual2015.pdf> (accessed March 22, 2023).
12. Ide R, Mizoue T, Tsukiyama Y, et al. Evaluation of oral health promotion in the workplace: the effects on dental care costs and frequency of dental visits. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2001; 29: 213–219.
13. Mochida Y, Fuchida S, Yamamoto T. Association between participation in the short version of a workplace oral health promotion program and medical and dental care expenditures in Japanese workers: a longitudinal study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*; 19. Epub ahead of print March 7, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19053143.
14. Fukuda H, Ishiguro C, Ono R, et al. The Longevity Improvement & Fair Evidence (LIFE) Study: overview of the study design and baseline participant profile. *J Epidemiol*. Epub ahead of print June 24, 2022. DOI: 10.2188/jea.JE20210513.
15. Sakamoto H, Rahman M, Nomura S, et al. Japan health system review. *Health Syst Transit*; 8, <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/259941> (2018).
16. Fukuda H, Maeda M, Murata F, et al. Anti-dementia drug persistence following donepezil initiation among Alzheimer's disease patients in Japan: LIFE Study. *J Alzheimers Dis*. Epub ahead of print October 1, 2022. DOI: 10.3233/JAD-220200.
17. Fee PA, Riley P, Worthington HV, et al. Recall intervals for oral health in primary care patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020; 10: CD004346.
18. Giannobile WV, Braun TM, Caplis AK, et al. Patient stratification for preventive care in dentistry. *J Dent Res* 2013; 92: 694–701.
19. Taira K, Mori T, Ishimaru M, et al. Regional inequality in dental care utilization in Japan: an ecological study using the national database of health insurance claims. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac* 2021; 12: 100170.

20. Ono S, Ishimaru M, Ida Y, et al. Validity of diagnoses and procedures in Japanese dental claims data. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021; 21: 1116.
21. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing difference in difference studies: Best practices for public health policy research. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2018; 39: 453–469.
22. de Vocht F, Katikireddi SV, McQuire C, et al. Conceptualising natural and quasi experiments in public health. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2021; 21: 32.
23. Askar H, Krois J, Göstemeyer G, et al. Secondary caries: what is it, and how it can be controlled, detected, and managed? *Clin Oral Investig* 2020; 24: 1869–1876.
24. Prochaska JO, Velicer WF. The transtheoretical model of health behavior change. *Am J Health Promot* 1997; 12: 38–48.
25. Shimazaki T, Okoshi H, Yamauchi T, et al. The process of behavioral change in individuals who are uninterested in health: a qualitative study based on professional health knowledge. *Environ Health Prev Med* 2022; 27: 32–32.
26. Yatabe N, Furuta M, Takeuchi K, et al. Periodic and regional differences in estimated consultation rate for periodontal disease screening in Japan. *J Dent Hlth* 2018; 68: 92–100.
27. Chen X, Hay JL, Waters EA, et al. Health literacy and use and trust in health information. *J Health Commun* 2018; 23: 724–734.
28. Harada Y, Nagata T, Nagata M, et al. Association between overtime work hours and preventive dental visits among Japanese workers. *BMC Public Health* 2021; 21: 87.
29. Choi JW, Choi Y, Lee T-H, et al. Employment status and unmet dental care needs in South Korea: a population-based panel study. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9: e022436.
30. Degtiar I, Rose S. A review of generalizability and transportability. *Annu Rev Stat Appl*. Epub ahead of print March 7, 2023. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-042522-103837.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of analytic sample according to fiscal year when participants underwent periodontal disease screening.

|                 | Overall<br>(n = 4,270) |      | Fiscal year 2017  |      |   |      | Fiscal year 2018  |      |   |      |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|
|                 |                        |      | Participants who underwent periodontal disease screening<br>(n = 427) |      | Participants who did not undergo periodontal disease screening<br>(n = 1,708) |      | Participants who underwent periodontal disease screening<br>(n = 427) |      | Participants who did not undergo periodontal disease screening<br>(n = 1,708) |      |
|                 |                        |      | n   | %    | n   | %    | n   | %    | n   | %    |
| Sex             |                        |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |
| Male            | 1,505                  | 35.3 | 146   | 34.2 | 584   | 34.2 | 155   | 36.3 | 620   | 36.3 |
| Female          | 2,765                  | 64.8 | 281   | 65.8 | 1,124   | 65.8 | 272   | 63.7 | 1,088   | 63.7 |
| Age, years      |                        |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |
| 20              | 65                     | 1.5  | 7   | 1.6  | 28  | 1.6  | 6   | 1.4  | 24  | 1.4  |
| 25              | 60                     | 1.4  | 2   | 0.5  | 8   | 0.5  | 10  | 2.3  | 40  | 2.3  |
| 30              | 120                    | 2.8  | 11  | 2.6  | 44  | 2.6  | 13  | 3.0  | 52  | 3.0  |
| 35              | 250                    | 5.9  | 20  | 4.7  | 80  | 4.7  | 30  | 7.0  | 120   | 7.0  |
| 40              | 360                    | 8.4  | 43  | 10.1 | 172   | 10.1 | 29  | 6.8  | 116   | 6.8  |
| 45              | 490                    | 11.5 | 45  | 10.5 | 180   | 10.5 | 53  | 12.4 | 212   | 12.4 |
| 50              | 1,115                  | 26.1 | 121   | 28.3 | 484   | 28.3 | 102   | 23.9 | 408   | 23.9 |
| 55              | 785                    | 18.4 | 79  | 18.5 | 316   | 18.5 | 78  | 18.3 | 312   | 18.3 |
| 60              | 1,025                  | 24.0 | 99  | 23.2 | 396   | 23.2 | 106   | 24.8 | 424   | 24.8 |
| Screening month |                        |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |   |      |
| June            | 179                    | 21.0 | 84  | 19.7 | —   | —    | 95  | 22.3 | —   | —    |
| July            | 164                    | 19.2 | 82  | 19.2 | —   | —    | 82  | 19.2 | —   | —    |
| August          | 118                    | 13.8 | 60  | 14.1 | —   | —    | 58  | 13.6 | —   | —    |
| September       | 101                    | 11.8 | 54  | 12.7 | —   | —    | 47  | 11.0 | —   | —    |
| October         | 111                    | 13.0 | 52  | 12.2 | —   | —    | 59  | 13.8 | —   | —    |
| November        | 181                    | 21.2 | 95  | 22.3 | —   | —    | 86  | 20.1 | —   | —    |

Notes: In this analytical sample, participants' continuous health insurance enrollment was ascertained based on their healthcare utilization patterns (those who visited a medical institution were regarded as having health insurance enrollment for 180 days since the visit date).

**Table 2.** Percent change in regular dental visits after undergoing periodontal disease screening.

| <b>Analytic sample</b>       | <b>DID estimates, % (95% CI*)</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Total population (n = 4,270) | 12.1% (9.0–15.0)                  |
| Aged 20–35 years (n = 495)   | 17.4% (8.0–27.1)                  |
| Aged 40–55 years (n = 2,750) | 11.5% (7.4–15.9)                  |
| Aged 60 years (n = 1,025)    | 11.0% (4.7–16.9)                  |


Abbreviations: DID = difference-in-differences; CI = confidence interval.

Notes: In this analysis, participants' continuous health insurance enrollment was ascertained based on their healthcare utilization patterns (those who visited a medical institution were regarded to have the health insurance enrollment for 180 days since the visit date).

\* Obtained by wild cluster bootstrapping with 1,000 replications.


## Figure Legends

**Figure 1.** Prevalence of participants who visited dentists in 180 days during 360 days before and after undergoing periodontal disease screening in (A) total population, (B) aged 20–35 years, (C) 40–55 years, and (D) aged 60 years.



Notes: In this analytical sample, participants' continuous health insurance enrollment was ascertained based on their healthcare utilization patterns (those who visited a medical institution were regarded as having health insurance enrollment for 180 days since the visit date).


**Figure 2.** Prevalence of participants who visited dentists in 180 days during 360 days of undergoing periodontal disease screening in (A) total population, (B) aged 20–35 years, (C) 40–55 years, and (D) aged 60 years among those who had not visited dentists in 360 days before undergoing this screening.



Notes: In this analytical sample, participants’ continuous health insurance enrollment was ascertained based on their healthcare utilization patterns (those who visited a medical institution were regarded as having health insurance enrollment for 180 days since the visit date).

**Figure 3.** Prevalence of each dental procedure received in 1–180 days and 181–360 days after undergoing periodontal disease screening in (A) total population and (B) participants who had not visited dentists in 360 days before undergoing this screening.

**(A) Total population**



**(B) Participants who had not visited dental clinics in 360 days before undergoing periodontal disease screening**

