

School-based caries prevention and the impact on acute and chronic student absenteeism

Ryan Richard Ruff^{1,2}, Rami Habib¹, Tamarinda Barry-Godin¹, Richard Niederman¹

1. *Department of Epidemiology & Health Promotion, New York University College of Dentistry*
2. *New York University College of Global Public Health*

Correspondence to:
Ryan Richard Ruff, PhD, MPH
NYU College of Dentistry
433 First Avenue, Room 712
New York, NY, 10010
Tel: 212-998-9663
E-mail: ryan.ruff@nyu.edu

Running title: CariedAway Education

Total number of pages, figures, and supplementary tables: 11

Submitted to: medRxiv

Date: 13 November, 2022

Keywords: oral health; caries prevention; education; academic performance; absenteeism

Abstract word count: 301

Manuscript word count: 2141

Figures: 0

Tables: 4

Corresponding author: Ryan Richard Ruff, ryan.ruff@nyu.edu

Abstract

Background: Poor oral health is negatively associated with absenteeism, being attributed to millions of lost school days per year. The role of school-based dental programs that address oral health inequities on student attendance has not yet been explored.

Methods: CariedAway was a longitudinal, cluster-randomized, non-inferiority trial of preventive medicines for dental caries used in a school-based program. To explore the potential impact of caries prevention on attendance, we extracted data on average school absenteeism and the proportion of chronically absent students from publicly-available datasets maintained by the New York City Department of Education for years before, during, and after program onset. Data were obtained for all CariedAway schools as well as a group of untreated comparator schools. Total absences and the proportion of chronically absent students were modeled using multilevel mixed effects linear and two-limit tobit regression, respectively. Multiple model specifications were considered, including exposures to time-varying treatments across multiple years. Models also included a group of untreated comparator schools.

Results: In years in which treatment was provided through a school-based comprehensive caries prevention program, schools recorded approximately 944 fewer absences than in non-treatment years (95% CI = -1739, -149). Averaged across all study years, schools receiving either treatment had 1500 fewer absences than comparator schools, but this was not statistically significant. In contrast, chronic absenteeism was found to significantly decrease in later years of the program (B = -.037, 95% CI = -.062, -.011). Removing data for years affected by COVID-19 eliminated the significant reduction in total absences during treatment years, yet still showed a marginally significant interaction for chronic absenteeism.

Discussion: Though originally designed to mitigate access barriers to critical oral healthcare, early integration of school-based dental programs may positively impact school attendance. However, concerns over the reliability of attendance records due to the closing of school facilities resulting from COVID-19 may mask the true effect.

Introduction

Dental caries is the most prevalent noncommunicative disease in the world and disproportionately affects children from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as those from low-income and/or minority families [1]. Children with poor oral health face numerous barriers to academic success including missed school days, lower test performance, difficulty paying attention, or impacts on functional and/or psychological behavior [2, 3]. In 2019, a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies in children aged 5-18 years concluded that poor oral health was associated with a significant increase in the risk of absenteeism and poor achievement [4]. In contrast, Medicaid children who receive comprehensive screening services early in life may demonstrate higher academic performance [5].

Despite the potential health and cognitive benefits of early childhood dental care, high-risk children often have lower dental service utilization rates [6-8]. Historical data from the US Department of Health and Human Services indicates that over 75% of children with Medicaid fail to receive required dental services, and one in four children do not see a dentist at all [9]. Partially to address this unmet need, multiple federal agencies including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommend school-based dental programs, which can provide a range of effective preventive and/or therapeutic services and increase access to essential oral healthcare [10], improve oral health-related quality of life [11], and reduce the burden of disease [12, 13]. While utilization of general school-based health centers (e.g., medical, mental, dental, and vision services) may positively impact student attendance [14], the existing evidence is limited [15].

CariedAway is a pragmatic cluster-randomized trial of treatments for dental caries provided through a school-based program [16]. Conducted in predominantly low-income minority urban students, secondary objectives of the *CariedAway* trial were to assess the effects of school-based oral health programs on educational performance.

Methods

Design and Participants

CariedAway is a longitudinal, cluster-randomized, non-inferiority pragmatic trial of minimally-invasive interventions for dental caries implemented in schools. The study received ethical approval from the New York University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board (#17-00578) and is registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov (#NCT03442309, 22/09/2018). A trial protocol was previously published [16]. Participant recruitment followed a two-stage process. First, any school with a student population consisting of at least 50% Hispanic/Latino or black race/ethnicity and at least 80% receiving free and reduced lunch was eligible for inclusion. Second, schools were randomized to treatments and any child in enrolled schools who provided parental informed consent, child assent, and spoke English was enrolled.

Interventions

Schools were block-randomized using a random number generator to one of two experimental conditions: a “simple” experimental treatment consisting of fluoride varnish (5% NaF, Colgate PreviDent) applied to all teeth and a 38% silver diamine fluoride solution (Elevate Oral Care Advantage Arrest, 2.24 F-ion mg/dose) applied to any asymptomatic cavitated lesions and on all pits and fissures of bicuspid and molars, and a “complex” active comparator which included the same fluoride varnish application, glass ionomer sealants (GC Fuji IX) placed on all pits and fissures of bicuspid and molars, and atraumatic restorations on any frank asymptomatic cavitations.

Comparator schools

For this analysis, a subset of schools which did not receive either simple or complex treatment assignment was included. This group consisted of schools that were enrolled in Stage 1 of the CariedAway recruitment process but did not proceed to stage two. These schools serve as non-randomized counterfactuals, in that they meet all study inclusion criteria, are found in the same geographic area, but have not received any treatment.

Data Sources and Outcomes

Attendance rates for each included school were obtained for the 2016 through 2021 school years from the New York City Department of Education. Student attendance is attributed to the school the student attended at the time. If a student changed schools, attendance data was

attributed to multiple schools. Data were extracted for total days present, total days absent, overall average school attendance, and the proportion of children classified as chronically absent. Chronic absenteeism was defined by the New York State Department of Education as any student with a total attendance of 90% or less across all school days (minimum enrollment threshold of ten days).

Statistical Analysis

Data were ordered sequentially by school and year of study. Descriptive statistics for outcomes and select independent variables were produced overall and by treatment group. Absenteeism was modeled using mixed effects linear regression, and the proportion of chronically absent students using two-limit mixed effects tobit regression. Our first model (Model 1) was a single-group analysis defined as $y_t = b_0 + b_1t_t + b_2x_t + b_3x_t t_t$, where t is the overall time since the start of the *CariedAway* trial, x is a dummy variable indicating onset of the intervention (e.g., signifying a change from non-intervention period to an intervention period and vice-versa), and $x t$ their interaction. Multiple treatment onsets were possible. Subsequent models introduced an additional parameter, z , representing the treatment type provided in each school (Model 2), and a series of treatment-specific interaction terms including the treatment-time interaction, treatment-intervention onset, and a three-level interaction between treatment, time, and intervention-onset, defined as $y_t = b_0 + b_1t_t + b_2x_t + b_3x_t t_t + b_4z + b_5z t_t + b_6z x_t + b_7z x_t t_t$ (Model 3). Models were first run in schools receiving either simple or complex treatment (Models 1a, 2a, and 3a) and then inclusive of comparator schools, which did not receive treatment, by modifying the dummy indicator for treatment as ‘any treatment’ versus ‘no treatment’ (Models 1b, 2b, and 3b). Schools were included as random intercepts. As a final analysis, we excluded the 2019-2020 school year, which was partially conducted virtually due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and may bias results.

Results

When restricted to schools that received treatment in the *CariedAway* trial, our data included 193 yearly observations across 39 schools. When adding comparator schools, results reflect 52 schools and 258 yearly observations. The yearly recorded days absent and proportion of students chronically absent is shown in Table 1.

Results for total days absent (Table 2) and chronic absenteeism (Table 3) combine models for simple versus complex schools (Model 1a, Model 2a, Model 3a) and any treatment versus no treatment schools (Model 1b, Model 2b, Model 3b). For total days absent, there was a consistent reduction in school absence in years in which treatment was provided ('x' indicator) as well as an increased effect when treatment was provided in later school years ('xt' indicator). For example, Model 2b with all schools included shows a predicted reduction of 883 (95% CI = -1697, -70) missed school days in years in which treatment was provided with an additional reduction of 1437 days (95% CI = -2219, -655) if treatment was provided in later years. Including all schools and relevant predictors (Model 3b), there was an additional non-significant overall reduction in missed school days in schools that ever received treatment versus schools that did not (B=-1505, 95% CI = -3699, 690), but this gap significantly reduced over time (B=556, 95% CI = 221-890). Indicators for the treatment/treatment time and treatment/treatment time/overall time variables were perfectly collinear as comparator schools never received treatment and were therefore removed from the final model.

For the proportion of enrolled schoolchildren who are chronically absent, single-group models (Table 3, Model 1a and 1b) indicate that there is a significant yearly increase of approximately 1% in the proportion of chronically absent students each year, and a significant 3% decrease for the interaction between school year and if the school received treatment that year. Multi-group models with and without comparator schools show a non-significant reduction in chronic absenteeism for simple versus complex treatment (Model 2a) and any treatment versus no treatment (Model 2b). Overall model results (Model 3b, inclusive of comparator schools) suggests that there is an approximate 3.5% decrease in chronic absenteeism when treatment was provided in later years. There was a marginally significant (p=.054) decrease of 7% in schools receiving treatment compared to control schools, but this effect reduces by 1% over time.

Results when excluding data from the 2019-2020 school year removed the effect of treatment in a given year. There was an overall reduction in days absent comparing treated schools to untreated schools, but this effect was not statistically significant (Table 4, Models 1 & 2. Similar

results were found for chronically absent students, with a non-significant reduction in the chronically absent population in treated schools (Table 4, Models 3 & 4).

Discussion

In addition to school absences resulting from dental pain or infection, acute or unplanned dental care contributes over thirty million hours of missed school per year [17]. Although school-based dental programs were developed to treat and prevent oral diseases in children who lack access to traditional dental care [18], their early integration may likewise improve educational performance. The *CariedAway* project provided both comprehensive dental screening/examinations and treatment services for untreated dental caries, supporting preliminary analyses of early school-based dental interventions on academic outcomes.

Prior research suggests that the utilization of school-based health centers positively affects classroom attendance and seat time, reflecting the complex role of child health on education [19, 20]. Our findings indicate that school-based dental care may reduce student absenteeism, but the changes in school operations due to COVID-19 could bias results. Inclusive of all years, there was an average reduction of 940 missed school days in years that treatment was provided. There were also no differences in absenteeism when comparing schools receiving simple or complex prevention. For this latter finding, prior data from *CariedAway* indicated that the clinical effectiveness of simple prevention was non-inferior to that of complex prevention, with near identical rates of disease prevention over time [12]. As both treatments in the *CariedAway* project had similar impact, non-differential effects on secondary outcomes, such as absenteeism, may be expected.

Many schools participating in the *CariedAway* program received treatment during the 2019-2020 school year; as a result, the effect of treatment in a given year may be biased due to the impact of COVID-19. Schools in New York City closed educational facilities and transitioned to remote learning on 15 March 2020, and the final third of the school year was conducted virtually. On the one hand, attendance and achievement may decrease when transitioning to remote instruction, with low-income areas being particularly affected [21]. Indeed, publicly-accessible data from 1,500 schools in New York City indicated that schools with heavy Black and

Hispanic populations were much more likely to report poor attendance during remote instruction [22]. On the other, the administrative confusion associated with such an unprecedented transition to remote learning may have resulted in inaccurate or unreliable reporting, and there was a noticeable drop city-wide in absenteeism during this initial period.

We first attempted to explore this potential bias by including schools enrolled in *CariedAway*, but not treated, in our analysis. Compared to these schools, treated schools did record an additional reduction of approximately 1,500 missed school days, but this effect was not statistically significant. However, this indicator reflects average attendance throughout all years of the program, inclusive of years care was not provided in treatment schools. Additionally, some schools received care in multiple years, including years not affected by remote learning policies. We then further restricted our data to excluded attendance records for the 2019-2020 school year. In so doing, we found that the previously estimated reduction in absences was removed. However, there remained a consistent, non-significant reduction in overall absences and when comparing treated to untreated schools.

In contrast to accumulated absences, data reporting for the proportion of students who were chronically absent may be more robust to the effects of remote instruction, particularly as this transition occurred in the last quarter of the academic year. While treatment onset did not have an immediate impact on this outcome (e.g., reductions in the same year in which treatment was provided), there was a significant interaction for subsequent years and treated schools showed a marginally significant reduction compared to untreated ones. When removing the 2019-2020 school year, we similarly found a non-significant reduction in the chronically absent population in treated schools. Recently, the 2022 Mayor's Management Report documented a rise in city-wide chronic absenteeism, citing continued disruptions due to COVID-19 variants and a re-transition to in-person instruction [23]. As *CariedAway* prioritized schools with predominantly low-income, minority student populations, our findings could suggest a potential positive pathway to improved attendance via those students who are chronically absent.

In spite of concerns regarding the effects of COVID-19 and the shifts in educational instruction, our analysis suggest that school-based comprehensive dental programs could potentially have a positive effect on attendance and chronic absenteeism. Indeed, the overall participation rate across all schools enrolled and treated in *CariedAway* was approximately 30%. As a result, the true impact on school-level absenteeism may be further masked by children who elected not to participate. Further study using student-level data may show the potential pathways to affecting attendance, such as analysis stratified by baseline decay in children or exploring the post-treatment longitudinal effects, such as attendance trajectories for children from early grades through primary school graduation.

Author Contributions

RRR and RN conceived of the study, obtained funding, and were the Principal Investigators of the *CariedAway* trial. RRR performed all statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript. RH collected educational data. TBG directed the *CariedAway* program and collected clinical data. All authors critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Funding

Research reported in this publication was funded through a Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) Award (PCS-1609-36824). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the funding organization, New York University, or the NYU College of Dentistry.

References

1. Bernabe, E., et al., *Global, Regional, and National Levels and Trends in Burden of Oral Conditions from 1990 to 2017: A Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden of Disease 2017 Study*. J Dent Res, 2020. **99**(4): p. 362-373.
2. Jackson, S.L., et al., *Impact of poor oral health on children's school attendance and performance*. Am J Public Health, 2011. **101**(10): p. 1900-6.
3. Mathur, V.P. and J.K. Dhillon, *Dental Caries: A Disease Which Needs Attention*. Indian J Pediatr, 2018. **85**(3): p. 202-206.
4. Ruff, R.R., et al., *Oral health, academic performance, and school absenteeism in children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. J Am Dent Assoc, 2019. **150**(2): p. 111-121 e4.
5. Wehby, G.L., *Oral Health and Academic Achievement of Children in Low-Income Families*. J Dent Res, 2022: p. 220345221089602.
6. Treadwell, H.M., *The Nation's Oral Health Inequities: Who Cares*. Am J Public Health, 2017. **107**(S1): p. S5.
7. Griffin, S.O., et al., *Vital Signs: Dental Sealant Use and Untreated Tooth Decay Among U.S. School-Aged Children*. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2016. **65**(41): p. 1141-1145.
8. Dye, B.A., X. Li, and G. Thornton-Evans, *Oral health disparities as determined by selected healthy people 2020 oral health objectives for the United States, 2009-2010*. NCHS Data Brief, 2012(104): p. 1-8.
9. Murrin, S., *Most children with Medicaid in four states are not receiving required dental services*. 2016, Department of Health and Human Services: Washington, DC.
10. Gooch, B.F., et al., *Preventing Dental Caries Through School-Based Sealant Programs*. The Journal of the American Dental Association, 2009. **140**(11): p. 1356-1365.
11. Ruff, R.R., et al., *Silver diamine fluoride, atraumatic restorations, and oral health-related quality of life in children aged 5-13 years: results from the CariedAway school-based cluster randomized trial*. BMC Oral Health, 2022. **22**(1): p. 125.
12. Ruff, R.R., T. Barry-Godin, and R. Niederman, *Non-inferiority of essential medicines for caries arrest and prevention in a school-based program: Results from the CariedAway pragmatic clinical trial*. medRxiv, 2022.
13. Ruff, R.R., T. Barry-Godin, and R. Niederman, *Non-inferiority of silver diamine fluoride for caries prevention when applied by nurses compared to dental hygienists: Results from the CariedAway school-based clinical trial*. medRxiv, 2022.
14. Knopf, J.A., et al., *School-Based Health Centers to Advance Health Equity: A Community Guide Systematic Review*. Am J Prev Med, 2016. **51**(1): p. 114-26.
15. Arenson, M., et al., *The Evidence on School-Based Health Centers: A Review*. Glob Pediatr Health, 2019. **6**: p. 2333794X19828745.
16. Ruff, R.R. and R. Niederman, *Silver diamine fluoride versus therapeutic sealants for the arrest and prevention of dental caries in low-income minority children: study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial*. Trials, 2018. **19**(1): p. 523.
17. Naavaal, S. and U. Kelekar, *School Hours Lost Due to Acute/Unplanned Dental Care*. Health Behavior and Policy Review, 2018. **5**(2): p. 66-73.
18. Starr, J.R., et al., *Longitudinal caries prevalence in a comprehensive, multicomponent, school-based prevention program*. J Am Dent Assoc, 2021. **152**(3): p. 224-233 e11.

19. Walker, S.C., et al., *Impact of School-Based Health Center use on academic outcomes*. J Adolesc Health, 2010. **46**(3): p. 251-7.
20. Van Cura, M., *The relationship between school-based health centers, rates of early dismissal from school, and loss of seat time*. J Sch Health, 2010. **80**(8): p. 371-7.
21. Dorn, E., et al., *COVID-19 and student learning in the United States: The hurt could last a lifetime*. 2020, McKnsey & Company.
22. *Schools with High Black and Hispanic Populations Had Low Student Engagement during Pandemic, City Data Shows*. 2020, New York City Council: New York, NY.
23. Foo, J., et al., *Mayor's Management Report*. 2022, Mayor's Office of Operations: New York, NY.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for absenteeism and chronically absent students, by year

Year	Simple				Complex				No treatment			
	Days Missed		Chronically absent		Days Missed		Chronically absent		Days Missed		Chronically absent	
	Mean	SD	%	SD	Mean	SD	%	SD	Mean	SD	%	SD
2016-2017	7600.53	3966.18	33.99	5.64	7200.33	3326.4	31.81	12.82	8221.85	3287.16	36.92	8.97
2017-2018	8360.41	4735.45	36.64	5.74	7373.76	3122.62	33.15	12.18	8275.77	3278.24	40.59	8.04
2018-2019	7988.44	4533.4	39.01	10.02	7276.1	3043.91	33.86	13.2	7995.85	2965.69	40.28	7.73
2019-2020	4718.72	2300.48	34.03	7.42	4352.48	1767.06	31.81	11.38	4606.54	1773.5	35.52	9.22
2020-2021	7660.28	3677.6	36.71	12.53	7933.95	3859.62	37.61	14.74	8089.39	3616.8	39.1	15.13

Table 2: Model results for total school absences

VARIABLES	(1) Model 1a	(1) Model 1b	(2) Model 2a	(2) Model 2b	(3) Model 3	(3) Model 3b
t	137.8 (-33.08 - 308.8)	-25.20 (-180.8 - 130.4)	138.0 (-32.91 - 308.9)	-24.75 (-180.5 - 131.0)	63.23 (-198.3 - 324.8)	-418.3*** (-699.7 - -136.9)
x	-945.2** (-1,698 - -192.0)	-879.9** (-1,692 - -67.34)	-946.0** (-1,699 - -192.8)	-883.5** (-1,697 - -69.68)	-1,037** (-2,064 - -10.51)	-943.9** (-1,739 - -149.1)
xt	-1,607*** (-2,337 - -877.9)	-1,437*** (-2,219 - -654.7)	-1,609*** (-2,339 - -879.7)	-1,437*** (-2,219 - -655.1)	-1,135** (-2,060 - -210.1)	-1,608*** (-2,378 - -837.9)
z			-534.2 (-2,554 - 1,486)	154.7 (-1,802 - 2,111)	-745.2 (-2,984 - 1,493)	-1,505 (-3,699 - 689.6)
zt					125.4 (-217.4 - 468.1)	555.6*** (221.4 - 889.9)
zx					4,129 (-1,535 - 9,792)	
zxt					-1,232 (-2,724 - 259.0)	
Constant	7,238*** (6,120 - 8,355)	7,632*** (6,676 - 8,587)	7,526*** (5,968 - 9,084)	7,515*** (5,759 - 9,271)	7,650*** (5,998 - 9,302)	8,744*** (6,844 - 10,645)
Observations	193	258	193	258	193	258
Schools	39	52	39	52	39	52

ci in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

t = school year; x = time varying (treatment year); z = treatment

Model 1: time only, no comparators

Model 1b: time only, no comparators

Model 2a: multi-group, simple vs complex

Model 2b: multi-group, with comparators (simple + complex vs no treatment)

Model 3a: full model, simple vs complex

Model 3b: full model, with comparators (higher interactions removed)

Table 3: Model results for the proportion of chronically absent students

VARIABLES	(1) Model 1a	(1) Model 1b	(2) Model 2	(2) Model 2b	(3) Model 3	(3) Model 3b
t	0.0114*** (0.00542 - 0.0174)	0.00766*** (0.00254 - 0.0128)	0.0114*** (0.00543 - 0.0174)	0.00757*** (0.00245 - 0.0127)	0.00625 (-0.00296 - 0.0155)	-0.00184 (-0.0112 - 0.00751)
x	0.00200 (-0.0244 - 0.0284)	0.00268 (-0.0240 - 0.0294)	0.00194 (-0.0245 - 0.0283)	0.00343 (-0.0233 - 0.0302)	0.00846 (-0.0277 - 0.0446)	0.00200 (-0.0244 - 0.0284)
xt	-0.0369*** (-0.0624 - -0.0113)	-0.0329** (-0.0586 - -0.00723)	-0.0370*** (-0.0626 - -0.0114)	-0.0328** (-0.0585 - -0.00715)	-0.0328** (-0.0654 - -0.00026)	-0.0369*** (-0.0624 - -0.0113)
z			-0.0283 (-0.0900 - 0.0334)	-0.0285 (-0.0890 - 0.0319)	-0.0498 (-0.120 - 0.0205)	-0.0681* (-0.137 - 0.00108)
zt					0.00885 (-0.00322 - 0.0209)	0.0133** (0.00216 - 0.0244)
zx					0.00758 (-0.192 - 0.207)	
zxt					-0.00643 (-0.0589 - 0.0461)	
Constant	0.322*** (0.287 - 0.358)	0.340*** (0.310 - 0.370)	0.338*** (0.289 - 0.386)	0.361*** (0.307 - 0.416)	0.350*** (0.298 - 0.402)	0.391*** (0.331 - 0.451)
Observations	193	258	193	258	193	258
Schools	39	52	39	52	39	52

ci in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: Model results for absences (Models 1 and 2) and chronically absent students (Models 3 and 4), excluding remote learning years

VARIABLES	(1) Model 1	(2) Model 2	(3) Model 3	(4) Model 4
t	58.01 (-56.19 - 172.2)	68.75 (-48.15 - 185.7)	0.00795*** (0.00244 - 0.0135)	0.00912*** (0.00353 - 0.0147)
x	32.45 (-597.1 - 662.0)	127.3 (-541.6 - 796.3)	-0.00631 (-0.0365 - 0.0238)	0.00431 (-0.0275 - 0.0362)
z	-550.7 (-2,703 - 1,601)	-545.0 (-2,695 - 1,605)	-0.0363 (-0.0983 - 0.0256)	-0.0357 (-0.0975 - 0.0261)
xt		-277.8 (-949.1 - 393.5)		-0.0305* (-0.0625 - 0.00142)
Constant	7,977*** (6,086 - 9,868)	7,946*** (6,055 - 9,837)	0.369*** (0.313 - 0.425)	0.366*** (0.310 - 0.422)
Observations	206	206	206	206
Schools	52	52	52	52

ci in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1