

1 **Preventive dental visits and health literacy in patients with diabetes: a nationwide**
2 **cross-sectional study**

3

4 Kyoko Saito, RD, MPH^{1, 2}, Yuki Kawai, MD, PhD, MPH^{1, 3}, Hirono Ishikawa, PhD¹,

5 Takahiro Tabuchi, MD, PhD⁴, Keisuke Kuwahara, PhD^{1, 5, 6}

6 1 Teikyo University Graduate School of Public Health, Tokyo, Japan

7 2 Kato Clinic of Internal Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

8 3 Department of Medical Science and Cardiorenal Medicine, Yokohama City University

9 Graduate School of Medicine, Yokohama, Japan

10 4 Cancer Control Center, Osaka International Cancer Institute, Osaka, Japan

11 5 Department of Public Health, Yokohama City University School of Medicine

12 6 Department of Health Data Science, Graduate School of Data Science, Yokohama City

13 University

14

15 *Corresponding to Dr Keisuke Kuwahara

16 Department of Public Health, Yokohama City University School of Medicine

17 3-9 Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa, Japan

18 TEL: +81-45-787-2610

19 FAX : +81-45-787-2609

20 kkuwahara@yokohama-cu.ac.jp

22 **Abstract**

23 **Aim:** This cross-sectional study examined the association between health literacy and
24 preventive dental visits in patients with diabetes.

25 **Methods:** We used cross-sectional data from the Japan COVID-19 and Society Internet
26 Survey (JACSIS), a web-based nationwide survey. The participants were 1,441 patients
27 reporting to have diabetes in 2020. Health literacy was measured using the validated scales
28 for health literacy. Preventive dental visits in the past 12 months were self-reported. We
29 estimated the multivariable-adjusted prevalence ratio (PR) for preventive dental visits.

30 **Results:** Over 50% of the patients had preventive dental visits in the past 12 months, and
31 approximately one-third had high health literacy. Compared with the low health literacy
32 group, the high health literacy group was more likely to engage in preventive dental visits
33 (the multivariable-adjusted PR associated with high health literacy: 1.12 [95% confidence
34 interval: 1.01 to 1.23]). Similar results were obtained when health literacy was treated as a
35 continuous variable.

36 **Conclusions:** The present data from the JACSIS showed that health literacy was positively
37 associated with preventive dental visits among patients with diabetes.

38

39 **Keywords:** diabetes, health literacy, preventive dental visit, cross-sectional study, Japan

40

41 **1. Introduction**

42 Diabetes is a growing social and public health issue globally (1) including Japan (2). Recent
43 statistics estimated that 537 million people worldwide (1) and 10 million in Japan (2) have
44 diabetes. In patients, poor oral health, as indicated by periodontal disease, has been associated
45 with an increased risk of diabetic complications, including cardiovascular complications,
46 retinopathy, end-stage renal disease, and even deaths (3). Therefore, the development of
47 effective strategies to prevent periodontal disease is needed for patients with diabetes.

48 Both self-care and professional care are important for the prevention of periodontal
49 diseases (4). Therefore, regular dental visits are recommended for patients, particularly those
50 with diabetes (4). For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (5)
51 recommend getting a dental examinations at least once a year for patients with diabetes. The
52 American Diabetes Association (6) also recommends comprehensive dental and periodontal
53 examination for initial care management. However, the rate of dental visits among patients
54 with diabetes remains low (e.g., 43% in Japan (7) and 61% in the US (8)), which are lower
55 than those of patients without diabetes (8). This suggests an urgent need to identify
56 modifiable factors that may promote dental visits among patients with diabetes.

57 Recently, health literacy has gained much attention in promoting behavioral changes (9).
58 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), health literacy is defined as cognitive
59 and social skills that determine the motivation and ability of individuals to gain access to,

60 understand and use information in ways that promote and maintain good health'. Based on
61 this definition, Nutbeam (10) proposed a health literacy model that includes three levels and
62 assumes both individual and population benefits at each level: (i) functional/basic literacy, (ii)
63 communicative/interactive literacy, and (iii) critical literacy.

64 The existing literature has shown that among patients with diabetes, health literacy is
65 associated with self-care behaviors for diabetes (11), glycemic control (12) and retinopathy
66 (13). Thus, health literacy may be associated with dental visits in patients with diabetes. To
67 date, only one cross-sectional study has examined this association (14). Furthermore,
68 although a preventive approach is important in dentistry (4; 5; 15), the previous study (14)
69 did not distinguish preventive dental visits from traditional curative approaches. In addition,
70 validity of measuring health literacy was unclear in that study (14). Therefore, we examined
71 the association between health literacy and preventive dental visits using a validated
72 questionnaire for health literacy among patients with diabetes in Japan.

73

74 **2. Methods**

75 *2.1. Study design and data source*

76 This cross-sectional study analyzed the baseline data of the Japan “COVID-19 and Society”
77 Internet Survey (JACSIS), a web-based, self-reported questionnaire survey (16; 17). A total
78 of 224,389 panelists aged 15 to 79 years from an internet research agency in Japan (Rakuten

79 Insight, Inc.) were selected from approximately 2.2 million panelists, and asked about their
80 willingness to participate in the survey. Eligible participants were selected using random
81 sampling stratified by age, sex, and prefecture to represent the Japanese demographic
82 composition. Questionnaires were distributed from August 25, 2020 to September 30, 2020;
83 28,000 respondents aged 15-79 years participated in this survey.

84 *2.2.Participants*

85 Of the 28,000 participants, we sequentially excluded 2,518 participants who provided invalid
86 responses or met other exclusion criteria as with previous studies (17; 18); first, we excluded
87 1,955 participants providing invalid responses, using a dummy item stating: “Please choose
88 the second option from the bottom.” We then excluded 422 participants who provided
89 artificial or unnatural responses, defined as the use of recreational substances and
90 medications, including sleeping pills, legal opioids, illegal opioids, organic solvents, designer
91 drug, cannabis, cocaine. Lastly, we excluded 141 participants having all listed chronic
92 diseases, including cancer, ischemic heart disease, stroke, diabetes, asthma, mental disorders,
93 and so on. We additionally excluded one participant who reported an implausible body height
94 (<100 cm). Of the remaining 25,481 participants (12,808 women and 12,673 men) aged
95 15-79 years (mean 48.8 years), we extracted the data of 1,441 participants aged 40-79 years
96 who reported currently having diabetes. We restricted the participants to those aged 40 years
97 or older because measurement of blood glucose levels and hemoglobin A1c levels are

98 mandatory in this age group in the annual health checkups (19). We expected that the validity
99 of self-reports on diabetes in this group would be better than that in younger groups. For
100 sensitivity analyses, we additionally included 258 adults who reported to have diabetes in the
101 past but not at the time of the study. As diabetes is not a curable disease, we expected that the
102 participant characteristics would be somewhat different between those who reported having
103 diabetes currently and those who had diabetes in the past but not currently.

104 *2.3.Measurement of health literacy*

105 Health literacy was measured using the Communicative and Critical Health Literacy (CCHL)
106 scale which has been validated in Japanese (20). This scale measures communicative and
107 critical health literacy, and comprised three items for communicative health literacy (items
108 i–iii) and two items for critical health literacy (items iv–v). These items asked whether the
109 participant were able to (i) collect health-related information from various sources, (ii) extract
110 the information he wanted, (iii) understand and communicate the obtained information, (iv)
111 consider the credibility of the information and (v) make decisions based on the information,
112 specifically in the context of health-related issues (20). Each item is assessed using a
113 five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). We then
114 calculated the total health literacy score by summing the score of each of the five responses
115 divided by five, yielding scores of 1-5, where higher scores indicate greater health literacy.
116 We reclassified the participants scoring less than 4 points as those with “low health literacy,”

117 and participants scoring 4-5 points as those with “high health literacy” (20).

118 *2.4.Measurement of past one years’ preventive dental visits*

119 To measure preventive dental visits, respondents were asked, “In the past year, have you
120 visited a dental clinic?” Dental visits included periodic checkups, dental cleaning, and tartar
121 removal, but excluded visits for the treatment of cavities. Response options were “Yes” or
122 “No.” The questionnaire on preventive dental visits was similar to those used in previous
123 studies (21-23).

124 *2.5.Other Covariates*

125 The participants reported their socio-demographic factors such as age, sex, educational
126 attainment, marital status, living arrangements, employment status, and annual household
127 income in the past year (17) as well as health-related data, such as personal history of
128 diseases, self-rated health, and body weight and height. History of diabetes was reported
129 through four response options: none, having diabetes in the past but not currently, having
130 diabetes currently with receiving treatment, having diabetes currently without treatment. In
131 Japan, self-reported diabetes has been validated by using a similar question (24). Self-rated
132 health was measured using 5-point scale (25; 26) and participants were classified into two
133 groups: good (1-3 points) and poor (4-5 points) (25; 26). Body mass index (BMI; kg/m^2) was
134 calculated using body weight and height. BMI was reclassified as underweight ($<18.5 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$),
135 normal weight (18.5 to $<25.0 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$), and overweight ($\geq 25.0 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$).

136 *2.6.Ethics statement*

137 As described previously (17), the present study was conducted in accordance with the ethical
138 standards of the 1975 Declaration of Helsinki, as revised in 2013. Written informed consent
139 was obtained from all participants before they responded to the online questionnaire. The
140 study protocol, including the informed consent procedure, was approved by the ethics
141 committees of the Osaka International Cancer Institute (no. 20084) and Teikyo University (no.
142 20-148-3). The Internet Survey Agency complies with the Act on the Protection of Personal
143 Information in Japan. The data were anonymized; thus, the researchers did not have access to
144 information that could identify individual participants. The participants were provided a
145 credit point as an incentive for participation in this study.

146 *2.7.Statistical analysis*

147 Participant characteristics according to preventive dental visits are shown as numbers (%).
148 We used Poisson regression to estimate multivariable-adjusted prevalence ratios (PRs) and
149 the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of preventive dental visits based on health literacy. We
150 adjusted for age (years, continuous), sex, education attained (junior high school, high school,
151 vocational school/technical college/junior college, university or higher, and others), marital
152 status (married, unmarried, divorced, and widowed), living arrangement (living alone and
153 living with someone), working status (currently working, unemployed or students, and
154 retired), annual household income in 2019 (<3 million yen, 3 to <5 million yen, 5 to <7

155 million yen, ≥ 7 million yen, unclear, and do not want to answer), self-rated health status
156 (good and poor), and BMI (<18.5 , 18.5 to <25.0 , and ≥ 25.0 kg/m²). Health literacy was
157 treated as a dichotomous variable (low and high) and as a continuous variable. We also
158 performed two sensitivity analyses. First, we conducted a stratified analysis by age (<65
159 years and ≥ 65 years) as older adults would have more dental or periodontal problems. Second,
160 we conducted the sensitivity analyses by changing the definition of having diabetes as having
161 diabetes currently or in the past. All analyses were performed using R4.1.3. or Stata 18.0.
162 Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ (two-sided).

163

164 **3. Results**

165 Of the 1,441 participants who reported currently having diabetes, more than half had gone for
166 preventive dental visits ($n = 773$, 53.6%). The average scores of health literacy was 3.5
167 (standard deviation: 0.7); approximately one in three patients ($n = 508$, 35.3%) had high
168 health literacy. Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants according to the number
169 of preventive dental visits. Those who had preventive dental visits were slightly older,
170 married or living with someone, likely to have a higher education and higher income, and not
171 engaged in any work. They were also likely to report good self-rated health status and tended
172 to have normal weight.

173 Table 2 shows the relationship between preventive dental visits and health literacy.

174 Participants with high health literacy were more likely to have had a preventive dental visit as
175 compared to those with low health literacy; crude PR of preventive dental visit was 1.18
176 (95% CI: 1.08 to 1.30) for high health literacy group compared with low health literacy
177 group. This relationship was slightly attenuated, but remained significant after additional
178 adjustment for several covariates (aPR=1.12, 95% CI: 1.01, 1.23). A 1-point increase in
179 health literacy was also significantly associated with preventive dental visits (aPR = 1.09).
180 Analysis stratified by age groups showed similar point estimates, although some results were
181 not statistically significant. As shown in Supplementary Tables 1, after enrolling 258
182 participants who reported having diabetes in the past but not currently, the associations were
183 slightly weakened and some results became non-significant.

184

185 **4. Discussion**

186 4.1. Discussion

187 In this cross-sectional study, health literacy was positively associated with preventive dental
188 visits among patients with diabetes in Japan. The sensitivity analyses supported the main
189 results. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the relationship
190 between health literacy and preventive dental visits in patients with diabetes.

191 Although there is no directly comparable study, our findings of significant and positive
192 associations between health literacy and preventive dental visits are in line with at

193 cross-sectional study by Rafferty et al (14). This study showed that individuals with low
194 health literacy had lower adjusted odds ratios for dental visits; however, it did not distinguish
195 between dental visits for preventive and treatment purposes, neither did it use any validated
196 scales to assess health literacy. The present study using validated scales for health,
197 underscores the importance of health literacy for patients with diabetes in promoting dental
198 visits for preventive purposes.

199 4.2. Strengths and limitations

200 The strengths of this study include the large-scale sample of more than 1,000 patients
201 with diabetes, use of a validated health literacy scale, and adjustment for many potential
202 confounders. However, the results of this study should be interpreted in light of the following
203 limitations. First, because of its cross-sectional design, it was not possible to confirm
204 causality. Second, because we did not use objective measurements of glycemic conditions,
205 patients with undiagnosed diabetes were not included in our analyses. Third, the validity of
206 self-reported preventive dental visits was unclear, though previous studies have used similar
207 self-reported questionnaires on dental visits (27; 28). Fourth, since the participants were
208 recruited through an online survey, they were more likely to have better health literacy than
209 the general populations. However, the CCHL scores in our study were not significantly
210 different from those in previous studies (29), in which participants were recruited via mails.
211 Fifth, although we adjusted for many potential confounders, unmeasured confounding factors

212 including access to medical care may have affected the results. Finally, all participants were
213 Japanese patients with diabetes. Therefore, caution should be exercised when generalizing the
214 present findings to populations from other countries.

215 4.3.Conclusion

216 We found that health literacy was significantly associated with preventive dental visits
217 among patients with diabetes in Japan. Healthcare professionals in diabetes care should
218 consider patients' health literacy levels to promote preventive dental visits. Further research is
219 needed to confirm the present results using a longitudinal design and to determine whether
220 health literacy education can promote preventive dental visits and prevent serious
221 complications among patients with diabetes.

222

223 **Acknowledgement**

224 The authors are thankful to those who involved in JACSIS.

225

226 **Funding**

227 The conduct of JACSIS 2020 was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers:
228 JP17H03589, JP19K10671, JP19K10446, JP19K19439, JP18H03107, JP18H03062,
229 JP21H04856, JP20H03919, Research Support Program to Apply the Wisdom of the
230 University to tackle COV19 Related Emergency Problems, University of Tsukuba, and

231 Health Labor Sciences Research Grant (grant numbers: 19FA1005, 19FG2001).

232

233 **Data Availability**

234 The data used in the present are not deposited in a public repository due to the containing of

235 personally identifiable or potentially sensitive information. In accordance with the ethical

236 guidelines' regulations in Japan, dissemination of the data is restricted by the Research Ethics

237 Committee of the Osaka International Cancer Institute. Any inquiries regarding the data use

238 should go to Dr Takahiro Tabuchi, tabuchitak@gmail.com. More details of data availability

239 can be found on the website of JACSIS (<https://jacsis-study.jp/howtouse/>).

References

1. International Diabetes Federation. *IDF Diabetes Atlas, 10th edn*. Brussels: International Diabetes Federation, 2021
2. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. *The National Health and Nutrition Survey in Japan, 2016*. Tokyo: Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
3. Casanova L, Hughes FJ, Preshaw PM. Diabetes and periodontal disease: a two-way relationship. *Br Dent J* 2014;217:433-437
4. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Department of Health and Human Service. Healthy People 2030: Oral Conditions. Available from <https://health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/browse-objectives/oral-conditions>. Accessed 01-24 2024
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. How to Promote Oral Health for People With Diabetes, Available from <https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/professional-info/health-care-pro/diabetes-oral-health.html>. Accessed 01-24 2024
6. American Diabetes Association. Oral Health. Available from <https://diabetes.org/health-wellness/keeping-your-mouth-healthy>. Accessed 01-24 2024
7. Inagaki K, Kikuchi T, Noguchi T, Mitani A, Naruse K, Matsubara T, Kawanami M, Negishi J, Furuichi Y, Nemoto E, Yamada S, Yoshie H, Tabeta K, Tomita S, Saito A, Katagiri

- S, Izumi Y, Nitta H, Iwata T, Numabe Y, Yamamoto M, Yoshinari N, Fujita T, Kurihara H, Nishimura F, Nagata T, Yumoto H, Naito T, Noguchi K, Ito K, Murakami S, Nishimura R, Tajima N. A large-scale observational study to investigate the current status of diabetic complications and their prevention in Japan (JDCP study 6): baseline dental and oral findings. *Diabetol Int* 2021;12:52-61
8. Luo H, Bell RA, Wright W, Wu Q, Wu B. Trends in annual dental visits among US dentate adults with and without self-reported diabetes and prediabetes, 2004-2014. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2018;149:460-469
9. Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, Doyle G, Pelikan J, Slonska Z, Brand H, European H-ECHLP. Health literacy and public health: a systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:80
10. Nutbeam D. Promoting health and preventing disease: an international perspective on youth health promotion. *J Adolesc Health* 1997;20:396-402
11. Ong-Artborirak P, Seangpraw K, Boonyathee S, Auttama N, Winaiprasert P. Health literacy, self-efficacy, self-care behaviors, and glycemic control among older adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a cross-sectional study in Thai communities. *BMC Geriatr* 2023;23:297
12. Alvarez PM, Young LA, Mitchell M, Blakeney TG, Buse JB, Vu MB, Weaver MA, Rees J, Grimm K, Donahue KE. Health Literacy, Glycemic Control, and Physician-Advised Glucose Self-Monitoring Use in Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2018;31:344-347

13. Schillinger D, Grumbach K, Piette J, Wang F, Osmond D, Daher C, Palacios J, Sullivan GD, Bindman AB. Association of health literacy with diabetes outcomes. *JAMA* 2002;288:475-482
14. Rafferty AP, Winterbauer NL, Luo H, Bell RA, Little NRG. Diabetes Self-Care and Clinical Care Among Adults With Low Health Literacy. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2021;27:144-153
15. World Health Organization. Oral health. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/oral-health> [accessed 2024-01-24].
16. Matsuyama Y, Aida J, Takeuchi K, Koyama S, Tabuchi T. Dental Pain and Worsened Socioeconomic Conditions Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Dent Res* 2021;100:591-598
17. Kuwahara K, Kato M, Ishikawa H, Shinozaki T, Tabuchi T. Association between watching wide show as a reliable COVID-19 information source and preventive behaviors: A nationwide survey in Japan. *PLOS ONE* 2023;18:e0284371
18. Miyawaki A, Tabuchi T, Tomata Y, Tsugawa Y. Association between participation in the government subsidy programme for domestic travel and symptoms indicative of COVID-19 infection in Japan: cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e049069
19. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. *"Specific Health Checkups and Specific Health Guidance"*. (in Japanese) Available from <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000161103.html>. Accessed 1-24 2024

20. Ishikawa H, Nomura K, Sato M, Yano E. Developing a measure of communicative and critical health literacy: a pilot study of Japanese office workers. *Health Promot Int* 2008;23:269-274
21. Foiles Sifuentes AM, Castaneda-Avila MA, Lapane KL. The relationship of aging, complete tooth loss, and having a dental visit in the last 12 months. *Clin Exp Dent Res* 2020;6:550-557
22. Spinler K, Aarabi G, Walther C, Valdez R, Heydecke G, Buczak-Stec E, König HH, Hajek A. Determinants of dental treatment avoidance: findings from a nationally representative study. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2021;33:1337-1343
23. Zhang Y, Leveille SG, Shi L, Camhi SM. Disparities in Preventive Oral Health Care and Periodontal Health Among Adults With Diabetes. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2021;18:E47
24. Goto A, Morita A, Goto M, Sasaki S, Miyachi M, Aiba N, Kato M, Terauchi Y, Noda M, Watanabe S, Saku Cohort Study G. Validity of diabetes self-reports in the Saku diabetes study. *J Epidemiol* 2013;23:295-300
25. Kawachi I, Kennedy BP, Glass R. Social capital and self-rated health: a contextual analysis. *Am J Public Health* 1999;89:1187-1193
26. Sugisawa H, Harada K, Sugihara Y, Yanagisawa S, Shinmei M. Socioeconomic status and self-rated health of Japanese people, based on age, cohort, and period. *Popul Health Metr* 2016;14:27

27. Sakalauskiene Z, Maciulskiene V, Vehkalahti MM, Kubilius R, Murtomaa H. Characteristics of dental attendance among Lithuanian middle-aged university employees. *Medicina (Kaunas)* 2009;45:312-319
28. Kosteniuk J, D'Arcy C. Dental service use and its correlates in a dentate population: an analysis of the Saskatchewan population health and dynamics survey, 1999-2000. *J Can Dent Assoc* 2006;72:731
29. Kimura N, Kobayashi T. [Association of health literacy with hypertension, diabetes, and dyslipidemia: A cross-sectional survey of a regional Japanese community]. *Nihon Koshu Eisei Zasshi* 2020;67:871-880

Table 1. Participant characteristics according to preventive dental visits among 1,441 diabetic patients

	Preventive dental visits	
	No	Yes
N	668	773
Sex		
Male	495 (74.1)	583 (75.4)
Female	173 (25.9)	190 (24.6)
Age, years	62.0±10.5	64.9±10.3
Education		
Junior high school	48 (7.2)	38 (4.9)
High school	256 (38.3)	251 (32.5)
Vocational school, technical college, or junior college	93 (13.9)	103 (13.3)
University or higher	270 (40.4)	379 (49.0)
Others	0 (0)	2 (0.2)
Marital status		
Not married (unmarried, divorce, widowed)	211 (31.6)	176 (22.8)
Married	457 (68.4)	597 (77.2)
Living arrangement		

Living alone	127 (19.0)	119 (15.4)
Living with someone	541 (81.0)	654 (84.6)
Working status		
Currently working	375 (56.1)	384 (49.7)
Unemployed or students	235 (35.2)	284 (36.7)
Retired	58 (8.7)	105 (13.6)
Annual household income last year		
<3 million yen	155 (23.2)	161 (20.8)
3 million to <5 million yen	139 (20.8)	198 (25.6)
5 to <7 million yen	96 (14.4)	102 (13.2)
≥7 million yen	142 (21.3)	180 (23.3)
Unclear or do not want to answer	136 (20.4)	132 (17.1)
Self-rated health		
Poor	210 (31.4)	190 (24.6)
Good	458 (69.6)	583 (75.4)
Body mass index		
<18.5 kg/m ²	23 (3.4)	26 (3.4)
18.5 to <25.0 kg/m ²	336 (50.3)	440 (55.9)
≥25.0 kg/m ²	309 (46.3)	307 (39.7)

Health literacy, scores	3.4 ± 0.7	3.5 ± 0.7
-------------------------	-----------	-----------

Data are shown as n (%) or mean ± standard deviation).

Table 2. Prevalence ratios and 95% confidence intervals of preventive dental visits by health literacy among diabetic patients

	N	Events	Unadjusted model		Adjusted model*	
			PR (95% CI)	P value	PR (95% CI)	P value
All participants						
Low (<4 points)	933	470 (50.4)	Reference		Reference	
High (≥ 4 points)	508	303 (59.7)	1.18 (1.08 to 1.30)	0.001	1.12 (1.01 to 1.23)	0.027
1 point increase (continuous)			1.13 (1.05 to 1.22)	0.001	1.09 (1.01 to 1.17)	0.028
Aged <65 years						
Low (<4 points)	357	183 (42.5)	Reference		Reference	
High (≥ 4 points)	304	121 (52.6)	1.24 (1.05 to 1.46)	0.011	1.19 (1.01 to 1.41)	0.043
1 point increase (continuous)			1.11 (0.99 to 1.25)	0.085	1.07 (0.95 to 1.20)	0.29
Aged ≥65 years						

Low (<4 points)	502	287 (57.2)	Reference		Reference	
High (\geq 4 points)	278	182 (65.5)	1.15 (1.02 to 1.28)	0.02	1.09 (0.97 to 1.22)	0.15
1 point increase (continuous) [†]			1.14 (1.04 to 1.24)	0.006	1.10 (1.00 to 1.21)	0.045

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; PR, prevalence ratio.

* Adjusted for sex, age, education, marital status, living arrangement, working status, annual household income, self-rated health, and body-mass index.