

# Parent's Views on Access to Dental Care and the Interim Canadian Dental Benefit

Anil Menon<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Vivianne Cruz de Jesus<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Jorma I. Virtanen<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Robert J. Schroth<sup>1,2,4#</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Dentistry, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>4</sup> Shared Health Inc., Winnipeg, MB, Canada

\* These two authors contributed equally to this work.

# Corresponding author: Dr. Robert J Schroth, [Robert.Schroth@umanitoba.ca](mailto:Robert.Schroth@umanitoba.ca)

## Knowledge Transfer Statement:

Findings from this study highlight the significant concern among parents regarding dental care affordability in Canada, reinforcing the necessity of programs like the Interim Canada Dental Benefit (CDB) and Canadian Dental Care Plan. High rates of support suggest a positive public reception of the CDB, which is crucial for policy intervention's success. Concern about accessing dental services, despite the availability of the insurance, indicates ongoing barriers to dental care, suggesting areas for future policy refinements.

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Introduction: This study investigated parents' perspectives on access to oral health care and the  
3 Interim Canada Dental Benefit (CDB). In the context of Canada's national health insurance,  
4 which historically excluded dental care, the introduction of the Interim CDB in October 2022  
5 represented a paradigm shift towards enhancing dental care accessibility for children under 12  
6 years of age from lower-income families.

7 Methods: This study analyzed aggregate and de-identified data from the comprehensive online  
8 survey conducted by The Strategic Counsel for Health Canada, involving 2,203 parents from  
9 across Canada. The survey was administered in March of 2023. Paired/overlap t-test for means  
10 and paired/overlap z-test for percentages were performed, with statistical significance at  $p \leq$   
11 0.05.

12 Results: The majority of participants expressed concerns regarding the costs (90.9%) and  
13 accessibility (80.9%) of dental care, indicated that regular dental visits for children is important  
14 (97.2%), and would take their children more frequently to dental appointments if had extra  
15 money (79.9%). Some of the barriers preventing regular dental visits for children included costs  
16 of service and transportation and lack of insurance. The majority of parents showed support for  
17 the Interim CDB (87%), with the greatest support coming from the provinces of Manitoba and  
18 Saskatchewan (90.4%).

19 Conclusion: This research underscores the imperative for ongoing evaluation and policy  
20 refinement to ensure the CDCP effectively addresses the nuanced needs of Canadian families,  
21 fostering a more inclusive and accessible dental care system. Parents' concerns regarding dental

- 22 care and their support for the Interim CDB signal a clear mandate for improving program
- 23 outreach and accessibility through the Canadian Dental Care Plan (CDCP).
- 24 **Key-words:** insurance, dental; child; health policy; public health dentistry, access to care;
- 25 universal health care

## 26 **Introduction**

27           Canada's national health insurance (Medicare) did not historically include dental care,  
28 given the country's history of privileging equal access to health care. The limited public funding  
29 in Canada covers the cost of dental care for certain groups of people. The federal government  
30 funds dental care services to specific groups, including state-recognized Indigenous populations  
31 (registered First Nations and Inuit) and the country's Armed Forces (Farmer et al. 2022).  
32 Meanwhile, provincial governments finance dental care for low-income children, social welfare  
33 recipients, individuals with disabilities, and those with craniofacial disorders (Canadian  
34 Academy of Health Sciences 2014). Moreover, municipalities often share the cost of providing  
35 care for low-income children and social welfare recipients with the provinces. In addition, low-  
36 income seniors receive independent care from municipalities. Despite these government  
37 investments, access to oral health care in Canada continues to be a significant challenge  
38 (Canadian Academy of Health Sciences 2014; Schroth et al. 2024). As Canada progresses in its  
39 efforts to enhance oral health policies, international perspectives are helpful. Free dental care for  
40 children is offered in some countries, such as the United Kingdom and the Nordic countries.  
41 Australia's public dental program provides free or low-cost services to eligible adults and  
42 children, with a focus on those with healthcare cards or pensions. Unfortunately, similar to  
43 Canada, access to services can be limited due to availability and long wait times, which  
44 underscores a common challenge faced by public dental health systems across the globe.

45           Access to care is a complex issue that includes affordability, availability, accessibility,  
46 acceptability, awareness, and accommodation (Saurman 2016). The introduction of the Interim  
47 Canada Dental Benefit (CDB) and, more recently, the Canadian Dental Care Plan (CDCP)  
48 represent a significant stride towards achieving equitable dental care in Canada. These initiatives

49 are designed to break down financial barriers (i.e. address the affordability dimension), thereby  
50 enhancing the accessibility of dental services for lower-income families. They also signify a shift  
51 towards a more inclusive healthcare system. The feedback from the community, particularly  
52 from parents and children, provides invaluable insights into the effectiveness of these programs,  
53 thereby identifying areas for further enhancement.

54 In October 2022, the Canadian government launched the CDB for children < 12 years of  
55 age from families with annual incomes < \$90,000 without private dental insurance (Canada  
56 Revenue Agency 2022; Department of Finance Canada 2022; Government of Canada 2022;  
57 Rabson 2023; Rollason 2023). The “cost of living relief for dental care and rental housing bill”  
58 provides financial support up to \$650 for each child if the family’s adjusted net income is <  
59 \$70,000, while \$390 is provided if the adjusted net income is between \$70,000 and \$79,999, and  
60 \$260 if it is between \$80,000 and \$89,999 (Canada Revenue Agency 2022; Department of  
61 Finance Canada 2022; Government of Canada 2022). The Interim CDB is a precursor to the  
62 Canadian Dental Care Plan (CDCP). The Interim CDB will sunset June 30, 2024, while the  
63 CDCP is scheduled to commence by mid-2024, providing coverage for uninsured Canadians  
64 with annual family income < \$90,000 (Nadeau 2023).

65 To receive the Interim CDB, families must have a child or children < 12 years of age at  
66 the time of application, no private dental insurance, and an adjusted family net income of <  
67 \$90,000 per year. Additionally, families must have filed a 2022 tax return with the Canada  
68 Revenue Agency (CRA) and incurred out-of-pocket dental care expenses for their child between  
69 October 1, 2022, and June 30, 2024 (Nadeau 2023).

70 Research shows that multiple factors influence children's use of dental services. These  
71 include their parents' dental care utilization, level of education and socioeconomic status,

72 income, employment status, access to dental care, dental insurance, behavioural beliefs,  
73 perceived power, subjective norms, and parental preventative practices (Badri et al. 2014; Isong  
74 et al. 2010; Nagdev et al. 2023). Furthermore, studies have shown that racial and ethnic  
75 disparities in dental care utilization are significantly reduced when a child has a parent who uses  
76 oral health care and has access to childcare and continuous insurance coverage (Guarnizo-  
77 Herreno and Wehby 2012).

78 The purpose of this study was to investigate the perspectives of parents of children under  
79 12 years old on dental care accessibility challenges and the Interim CDB in anticipation of the  
80 CDCP.

## 81 **Methods**

82 This cross-sectional study analyzed data arising from the public opinion research online  
83 survey undertaken by The Strategic Counsel on behalf of Health Canada's Oral Health Branch in  
84 2023 (Health Canada 2023). A 15-minute online survey was completed by 2,203 parents of  
85 children < 12 years of age with an annual household income < \$90,000 Canadian. All  
86 participants were over 18 years of age.

87 Quotas were applied to the base sample ( $n = 2,000$ ) to ensure broad representation from  
88 all regions of Canada and a more significant proportion (70%) of Canadian parents with no  
89 access to private dental care insurance, as this is one of the requirements for eligibility for the  
90 Interim CDB (Health Canada 2023). Two additional 'sample boosts' ( $n = 100$  each) were carried  
91 out to ensure good representation from those residing in remote areas (those located over 350  
92 kilometres from the nearest dental professional and/or without year-round road access) and those  
93 who identify as being a member of an ethnic minority community (Table 1). Inclusion of parents  
94 from rural and remote areas, as well as ethnic minorities, was purposeful to obtain the

95 experiences of often under-researched demographics, contributing to a more inclusive  
96 understanding of dental care accessibility.

97 A telephone recruit-to-online approach was used to reach those residing in remote  
98 communities who met the eligibility criteria. A weighting scheme was applied aiming to align the  
99 sample size with the distribution of the Canadian population by region, based on the Census  
100 2021 from Statistics Canada. Prior to the launch of the survey, on March 2, 2023, the Strategic  
101 Counsel conducted a pre-test with 32 respondents (11 in French and 21 in English) (Health  
102 Canada 2023).

103 The survey was administered from March 3<sup>rd</sup> until March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and the detailed  
104 methodology used for sample design can be found in the Canada Dental Benefit Baseline Survey  
105 Final Report (HC POR —22-32).(Health Canada 2023) Data from this study were accessed from  
106 the Government of Canada’s “Library and Archives Canada collection”  
107 <https://epe.bac-lac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/health/2023/126-22-e/index.html>.

108 Institutional ethics approval was not required as this study utilized aggregate and  
109 anonymized data that did not contain personal identifiers. Specific variables that were evaluated  
110 in this study included demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g., age, gender,  
111 education, and employment), attitudes towards dental care, access to and use of dental services,  
112 barriers to accessing dental care for children, and awareness and views on the Interim CDB. The  
113 analysis were done by province/region and by place of residence (urban: a city or large town or  
114 rural: outside a city or a large town). The place of residence was determined based on the postal  
115 code or it was self-reported by those who preferred not to provide a postal code. Values less than  
116 five were suppressed for confidentiality purposes. Paired/overlap t-test for means and  
117 paired/overlap z-test for percentages were performed, with statistical significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

118

## 119 **Results**

### 120 *Characteristics of the participants*

121 The majority of participants were between 25-44 years old (78%), female (62.1%), married or in  
122 common-law relationships (77.8%), employed (74.6%), lacked private dental insurance (67.8%),  
123 had university (47.5%) or trades/college (30.1%) education level, lived in urban centres (81.2%),  
124 and were from Ontario (37.7%) (Table 1). There was a wide distribution of household income  
125 levels, with nearly 45% earning \$60,000 or more. The distribution of income levels showed  
126 some regional variation, with the Atlantic region having a higher proportion of participants  
127 earning under \$40,000. The ethnic backgrounds of participants was diverse, with the largest  
128 group being Western European (25.8%), while another 13.2% identified as Canadian Indigenous.

### 129 *View and concern about affordability of and access to dental care*

130 The majority of the participants (90.9%) were very or somewhat concerned about the  
131 affordability of dental care in Canada, with regional responses ranging from 88% in Atlantic  
132 Canada to 93.3% in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. There was no difference in responses between  
133 urban and rural dwellers. Further, 80.9% were very or somewhat concerned about accessing the  
134 services of a dentist or oral health care professional (Table 2), with regional responses ranging  
135 from 73.9% in Atlantic Canada to 83.9% in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Interestingly, those  
136 living in urban areas were more likely to report concerns about accessing services of a dentist or  
137 oral health care professional than those from rural areas (82.3% vs. 74.2%).

138 Almost all participants (97.2%) indicated that regular dental visits for children is  
139 important, with similar responses across regions and between urban and rural dwellers (Table 3).



140 When asked, a majority of participants reported they would schedule more regular dental care  
141 appointments for their children (79.9%) or themselves (82.1%) if they had a bit of extra money.  
142 However, there were some regional variations for scheduling more regular dental care  
143 appointments for children (ranging from 69.9% in Atlantic Canada to 85.6% in Manitoba and  
144 Saskatchewan) and parents (ranging from 73.4% in Atlantic Canada to 83.5% in Manitoba and  
145 Saskatchewan). Overall, 58.7% of respondents indicated that they only schedule dental care  
146 appointments for their children when absolutely necessary, with regional variations (ranging  
147 from 49.5% in Atlantic Canada to 72.0% in Manitoba and Saskatchewan), and urban and rural  
148 differences (60.2% vs. 51.1%). Additionally, 94.7% of the participants strongly or somewhat  
149 agreed that, ideally, they would like their children and themselves to receive regular dental care  
150 (Table 3).

#### 151 *Access to dental services for children*

152 Overall, 51.3% of the participants reported having access to a dentist or oral health  
153 professional for their whole family and 18.5% having access only for their children (Table 4).  
154 The Atlantic region had the highest proportion of respondents (59.9%) reporting they had access  
155 to dental services for the whole family, while Manitoba and Saskatchewan had the lowest  
156 proportion of residents reporting access to dental services for the entire family (47.3%).  
157 Surprisingly, more participants in rural regions reported having access to dental services for the  
158 whole family than those from urban areas (58.1% vs. 49.7%).

159 Furthermore, 45.1% of participants reported taking their child to a dental office or oral  
160 health professional within the past 6 months prior to the survey (Table 4), with results ranging  
161 from 51.7% in Atlantic Canada to 35.8% in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. There was no  
162 significant difference between urban and rural respondents. Overall, 66.7% reported that their

163 child last visited an oral health care professional within the last year or less, with results ranging  
164 from 77.9% in Atlantic Canada to 56.0% in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. More parents from  
165 rural regions (25.5%) reported their child last visited an oral health care provided within the past  
166 year compared to urban regions (20.7%). However, 11.1% of the parents reported that they had  
167 never taken their child/children to an oral health care professional. This proportion was highest in  
168 Manitoba/Saskatchewan (15.4%), followed by Alberta (14.2%), Ontario (12.3%), and in rural  
169 regions (14.4%). Only 34.8% of respondents reported having the costs of dental services for  
170 children covered by an insurance or government program, with many having to pay for these  
171 services out of pocket. More than half of the parents from Quebec (52.3%) and Alberta (51.9%)  
172 reported paying in cash or debit for their child's dental services. British Columbia (24.6%),  
173 Manitoba and Saskatchewan (23.6%), and urban dwellers (23.6%) had the highest proportion of  
174 parents taking their children to free dental clinics.

175 Overall, 31.8% of the respondents took their children to see a dentist or other oral health  
176 care professional every 6 months, and the most common reasons for taking their child to visit an  
177 oral health care professional were regular routine cleanings, preventive dental exams and urgent  
178 dental needs (Table 4). When asked about the barriers preventing parents from taking their child  
179 to see an oral health care professional on a regular basis, participants selected the cost of the  
180 service (41%), lack of insurance (28%), cost of transportation (25%), cannot miss school or  
181 work (19%), anxiety or fear (17%), among others (Figure 1).

#### 182 *Awareness of and support for the Interim CDB*

183 Six in ten parents reported hearing about the Interim CDB, but only 22.4% were well  
184 informed about the program. Manitoba/Saskatchewan (37.8%) and Atlantic Canada (37.5%) had  
185 the highest proportion of people unaware about the Interim CDB. Interestingly, there were higher

186 proportion of parents aware about the program in rural areas (67.9%) compared to urban areas  
187 (63.3%). At the same time, parents from rural areas were less likely to apply for the CDB than  
188 parents from urban areas. More than 70% of the respondents from British Columbia/North had  
189 applied or were planning to apply for the program. Atlantic Canada had the lowest proportion of  
190 participants (54.5%) who had applied or were planning to apply for the program (Table 5). Over  
191 60% of the participants without access to dental insurance had heard about the program, and  
192 more than 70% were planning to apply or had applied already (Table 5). The majority of parents  
193 (87%) showed support for the interim CDB program with the greatest support for the interim  
194 CDB coming from Manitoba and Saskatchewan (90.4%).

## 195 **Discussion**

196 This study identified that many Canadian parents report challenges in accessing oral health care  
197 for their children under 12 years of age. Specifically, we identified that parents reported concerns  
198 about the affordability of dental care, have concerns about accessing services of an oral health  
199 professional, only schedule dental appointments for their children when necessary, indicate that  
200 they do not have access to an oral health professional, and have to pay for their children's dental  
201 treatment out of pocket. Additionally, parents identified numerous barriers to care, including the  
202 cost of services, transportation issues, lack of insurance, absence from work or school, anxiety or  
203 fear, inconvenient location of the dental clinic, or lack of access to an oral health care  
204 professional. Many of these access-to-care issues appear to be more pronounced in some  
205 provinces/regions. Further, respondents clearly expressed tremendous support for the interim  
206 CDB policy developed by the federal government as a precursor to the CDCP.

207 Our analysis revealed substantial concerns regarding the affordability and accessibility of  
208 dental care, with over 90% of participants expressing some level of concern. As 32.2% of the

209 participants had private dental insurance, this demonstrates that some people with dental  
210 coverage may still experience cost-related barriers, including being underinsured. Additionally,  
211 they may be sympathetic to the affordability of oral health care as they may have other family or  
212 friends who are uninsured or under-insured and face challenges in accessing oral health care. A  
213 recent study analyzing data from the 2017-2018 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS)  
214 reported that some people living in Ontario, despite having private dental insurance, still face  
215 financial barriers to access dental care (Abdelrehim and Singhal 2024). Similarly, data from the  
216 2022 CCHS showed that 16% of Canadian adults with private insurance and 47.4% of those  
217 uninsured reported avoidance of dental care because of the cost (Moharrami et al. 2024).

218 Notably, our analysis underscored a strong consensus on the importance of regular dental  
219 visits for children, with 97% of respondents acknowledging its significance. This is consistent  
220 with the literature, emphasizing the critical role of early dental care in long-term oral health  
221 outcomes (American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry Pediatric Oral Health Research and Policy  
222 Center 2014). Studies have shown that regular dental check-ups in childhood can significantly  
223 reduce the incidence of oral diseases (Khan et al. 2023), underlining the public health  
224 implications of our findings showing that some parents in Canada only take their children to see  
225 an oral health care professional when required (e.g., cavity) or when there is an emergency (e.g.,  
226 pain or infection). This reactive approach to dental health can lead to increased long-term health  
227 issues and costs. Programs like the CDB and CDCP could play a pivotal role in shifting public  
228 attitudes towards more preventive care approaches, ultimately aiming to reduce the frequency  
229 and severity of emergency dental conditions.

230 Access to oral health care can be influenced by place of residence, with increasing oral  
231 health disparities seen in children from rural regions (Schroth et al. 2016). We are unable to

232 explain why rural dwelling participants reported better access to care in this study. However, the  
233 findings of our study are not fully generalizable to all rural populations as this study's sample  
234 really did not include participants living in very remote parts of Canada, where access to oral  
235 health care is extremely limited, because many of these communities do not have reliable  
236 internet service that was needed to complete the online survey. Contrary to common perceptions,  
237 as in our study, rural areas sometimes report better access and more frequent dental visits for  
238 children than urban areas. This phenomenon may be attributed to targeted rural health initiatives  
239 or the lesser competition for dental services in these areas (Sulo et al. 2022). Such findings  
240 suggest that rural dental service provision might benefit from unique models of care tailored to  
241 their less dense populations.

242           The Canadian Federal Budget 2024 announced the government's intent to include more  
243 health care professionals working in rural and remote communities (e.g., dentists and dental  
244 hygienists) in the Canada Student Loan Forgiveness Program, which is currently only available  
245 for doctors and nurses (Government of Canada 2024). Loan repayment programs in the U.S.  
246 have been shown to have an important influence on healthcare providers' choice on where to  
247 practice and on their retention in rural communities (Renner et al. 2010). Providing incentives for  
248 new graduates to work in under-served communities could help address the current distribution  
249 of oral health care providers in Canada and increase access to care in oral health professional  
250 shortage areas. Proposals such as mobile dental clinics and enhancements to public  
251 transportation could provide more consistent and widespread access to dental care facilities,  
252 particularly benefiting those in underserved rural areas (Partido et al. 2021; Patel et al. 2023;  
253 Pourat et al. 2020). These measures could alleviate some of the geographical and physical

254 barriers currently hindering consistent dental care access, ensuring that all children and families  
255 receive more readily preventative and routine dental services.

256 Significant disparities in access to dental care were also observed between regions in  
257 Canada, with Manitoba and Saskatchewan reporting poorer access and a higher reliance on  
258 urgent or emergency dental services when compared to other provinces. In Manitoba and  
259 Saskatchewan, there are notable discrepancies in dental care accessibility, highlighted by the  
260 higher rates of only seeking care when necessary and a significant portion of children not visiting  
261 a dental professional. This reflects broader challenges in access observed in these regions,  
262 particularly in rural and remote areas. Despite these challenges, substantial public support for the  
263 CDB in these provinces indicates a strong community recognition of the substantial gaps in the  
264 existing dental care system, and this is demonstrated by their higher and above national rates of  
265 children receiving the Interim CDB (Schroth et al. 2024).

266 While there is a clear demand for better dental care, organized dentistry in Manitoba has  
267 shown resistance to the CDCP. At the beginning of 2024, 44% of the licensed members of the  
268 Manitoba Dental Association participated in a survey, and the results showed that the majority  
269 (89%) of respondents are unlikely or very unlikely to participate as a provider in the CDCP  
270 (Manitoba Dental Association 2024). This shows that while the public reports strong support for  
271 public funding of oral health care policy for the uninsured and underinsured, there is a major  
272 discrepancy between the public's support for and dentists' opposition to the CDCP. Given the  
273 existing access issues, this significant opposition suggests a complex interaction between  
274 healthcare policy and professional practice norms. This scenario underscores the need for  
275 innovative solutions to bridge these gaps.

276           The introduction of the Interim CDB marked a significant milestone in addressing the  
277 affordability and accessibility challenges that have long plagued the Canadian dental care  
278 system. However, while our study sheds light on the high levels of concern among parents  
279 regarding dental care costs and access, it is imperative to contextualize these findings within the  
280 broader spectrum of dental care challenges faced nationally. The CDB and, more recently, the  
281 CDCP are designed primarily to mitigate financial barriers to dental care. However, these  
282 programs may not adequately address other crucial barriers, such as lack of awareness,  
283 accessibility challenges, and cultural appropriateness of services (Hopcraft 2024). These gaps  
284 highlight the need for comprehensive strategies that go beyond cost reduction, ensuring inclusive  
285 access to dental care across diverse communities. Such an approach enriches the discussion and  
286 underscores the transformative potential of these programs in mitigating these long-standing  
287 barriers.

288           The high rate of awareness (64%) and intended application (67%) for the Interim CDB  
289 among the participants reflects a proactive stance toward utilizing available resources for dental  
290 care. This is indicative of a broader trend observed in recent research, where public health  
291 initiatives are increasingly recognized and used by the community, suggesting a positive shift  
292 towards more informed health behaviour and resource utilization (Zheng et al. 2024). However,  
293 these results also indicate the need for improved communication and outreach efforts to ensure  
294 all eligible families are informed and can access these supports as more than one-third appeared  
295 unaware of the interim CDB.

### 296 *Limitations*

297           This study is not without limitations. As data from an online survey was utilized, it is  
298 expected that only people with access to the internet and a computer or mobile device and with

299 basic literacy skills to navigate the internet were surveyed. The online survey methodology might  
300 have introduced some selection bias, potentially excluding non-internet users who might face  
301 different or additional barriers and those living in more rural and remote regions of the country  
302 where internet service may be extremely limited. Furthermore, only people willing to participate  
303 in a survey were included, and their attitudes and behaviours may differ from those respondents  
304 who refused or were unable or unwilling to complete the survey (Health Canada 2023). The  
305 sampling format may have had an impact on the findings in rural and urban areas. Consequently,  
306 this cohort may not be representative of the entire target Canadian population. Furthermore, the  
307 cross-sectional design limits the ability to ascertain causality between perceived barriers and  
308 actual utilization of the CDB and the use of aggregated data did not allow further analyses of  
309 associations. The exploration of parental perceptions towards the Interim CDB could greatly  
310 benefit from a more diversified methodological framework, possibly incorporating qualitative  
311 components to capture a more nuanced understanding of these perceptions.

312           Continuous community feedback and robust data analysis should guide the evolution of  
313 these initiatives moving forward. This approach will ensure that the dental care system in Canada  
314 becomes more inclusive and responsive to the needs of its population, paving the way toward  
315 eliminating oral health disparities across the country.

## 316 **Conclusion**

317 This study has substantiated the presence of significant barriers to dental care access in Canada  
318 among parents of children under 12 years of age. The responses identified concerns with  
319 affordability of dental care and accessing services of an oral health care professional and lack of  
320 access to dental services, with many parents only scheduling dental appointments for their  
321 children when absolutely necessary and agreeing that if they had extra money, they would



322 schedule more regular dental appointments for their children. Barriers to accessing oral health  
323 care include cost of services and transportation to the dental office, lack of insurance, and others.  
324 The widespread support across Canada for the Interim CDB reflects a strong public consensus on  
325 the need for more affordable dental care options.

326 **Acknowledgements**

327 Funding for this research was made possible from Dr. Schroth's Canadian Institutes of Health  
328 Research Applied Public Health Chair in Public Health Approaches to Improve Access to Oral  
329 Health Care and Oral Health Status for Young Children in Canada.

330 **Conflicts of Interest**

331 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest to report.

## 332 References

- 333 Abdelrehim M, Singhal S. 2024. Is private insurance enough to address barriers to accessing dental care?  
334 Findings from a canadian population-based study. *BMC Oral Health*. 24(1):503.
- 335 American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry Pediatric Oral Health Research and Policy Center. 2014. Early  
336 preventive dental visits. [accessed 24/04/2024].  
337 [https://www.aapd.org/assets/1/7/Early\\_Preventive\\_Dental\\_Visits\\_Tech\\_Brief\\_2014.pdf](https://www.aapd.org/assets/1/7/Early_Preventive_Dental_Visits_Tech_Brief_2014.pdf).
- 338 Badri P, Saltaji H, Flores-Mir C, Amin M. 2014. Factors affecting children's adherence to regular dental  
339 attendance: A systematic review. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 145(8):817-828.
- 340 Canada Revenue Agency. 2022. Canada dental benefit. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- 341 Canadian Academy of Health Sciences. 2014. Improving access to oral health care for vulnerable people  
342 living in canada. Ottawa: Canadian Academy of Health Sciences. [accessed 18/04/2024].  
343 [https://cahs-acss.ca/wp-](https://cahs-acss.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Access_to_Oral_Care_FINAL_REPORT_EN.pdf)  
344 [content/uploads/2015/07/Access to Oral Care FINAL REPORT EN.pdf](https://cahs-acss.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Access_to_Oral_Care_FINAL_REPORT_EN.pdf).
- 345 Department of Finance Canada. 2022. Making dental care more affordable: The canada dental benefit.  
346 Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- 347 Farmer J, Singhal S, Ghoneim A, Proaño D, Moharrami M, Kaura K, McIntyre J, Quiñonez C. 2022.  
348 Environmental scan of publicly financed dental care in canada: 2022 update. Toronto, ON: Dental  
349 Public Health, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Toronto. [accessed 2024/04/24].  
350 [https://caphd.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Canada-Dental-environmentalscan-UofT-](https://caphd.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Canada-Dental-environmentalscan-UofT-20221017.pdf)  
351 [20221017.pdf](https://caphd.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Canada-Dental-environmentalscan-UofT-20221017.pdf).
- 352 Government of Canada. 2022. Government bill (house of commons) c-31 - royal assent - an act  
353 respecting cost of living relief measures related to dental care and rental housing. Ottawa, ON:  
354 Parliament of Canada.
- 355 Government of Canada. 2024. Budget 2024: Fairness for every generation.
- 356 Guarnizo-Herreno CC, Wehby GL. 2012. Explaining racial/ethnic disparities in children's dental health: A  
357 decomposition analysis. *Am J Public Health*. 102(5):859-866.
- 358 Health Canada. 2023. Canada dental benefit baseline survey. Final report. Ottawa: Health Canada. No.  
359 HC POR - 22-32. [accessed 14/03/2024]. [https://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgs-](https://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsctpsgc/por-ef/health/2023/126-22-e/report.pdf)  
360 [tpsgc/por-ef/health/2023/126-22-e/report.pdf](https://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsctpsgc/por-ef/health/2023/126-22-e/report.pdf).
- 361 Hopcraft M. 2024. Commentary on the senate select committee into the provision of and access to  
362 dental services in australia: An opportunity for reform. *Australian Dental Journal*.
- 363 Isong IA, Zuckerman KE, Rao SR, Kuhlthau KA, Winickoff JP, Perrin JM. 2010. Association between  
364 parents' and children's use of oral health services. *Pediatrics*. 125(3):502-508.
- 365 Khan SY, Schroth RJ, Cruz de Jesus V, Lee VHK, Rothney J, Dong CS, Javed F, Yerec K, Bertone M, El Azrak  
366 M et al. 2023. A systematic review of caries risk in children <6 years of age. *Int J Paediatr Dent*.
- 367 Manitoba Dental Association. 2024. Canadian dental care plan pulse survey. *Manitoba Dental Association*  
368 *Bulletin*. p. 18-19.
- 369 Moharrami M, Sano Y, Murphy K, Hu X, Clarke J, McLeish S, Fortin Y. 2024. Assessing the role of dental  
370 insurance in oral health care disparities in canadian adults. *Health Rep*. 35(4):3-14.
- 371 Nadeau M. 2023. Helping create health smiles across canada. Learn more about the canada dental  
372 benefit and the upcoming canadian dental care plan. *CDA Essentials*. 10(5):2.
- 373 Nagdev P, Iyer MR, Naik S, Khanagar SB, Awawdeh M, Al Kheraif AA, Anil S, Alsarani MM, Vellappally S,  
374 Alsadon O. 2023. Andersen health care utilization model: A survey on factors affecting the  
375 utilization of dental health services among school children. *PLOS ONE*. 18(6):e0286945.
- 376 Partido BB, Bean C, Chartier EA, Sprinkle E. 2021. Outcome evaluation of the dental health outreach  
377 mobile experience (home) coach program. *J Dent Educ*. 85(1):37-43.

- 378 Patel, Long, Durey, Naoum, Kruger, Slack S. 2023. The kimberley dental team: A volunteer-based model  
379 of care serving remote aboriginal communities. *Rural and Remote Health*.
- 380 Pourat N, Chen X, Spetz J. 2020. The relationship between portable school-based oral health  
381 prevention services and subsequent oral health treatment. *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*.  
382 80(4):278-287.
- 383 Rabson M. 2023 March 29, 2023. 'Transformative investments'. Winnipeg Free Press.A1.
- 384 Renner D, Westfall J, Wilroy LA, Ginde A. 2010. The influence of loan repayment on rural healthcare  
385 provider recruitment and retention in colorado. *Rural and Remote Health*.
- 386 Rollason K. 2023 March 29, 2023. Manitoba advocates beam about national dental plan news. Winnipeg  
387 Free Press.A3.
- 388 Saurman E. 2016. Improving access: Modifying penchansky and thomas's theory of access. *J Health Serv*  
389 *Res Policy*. 21(1):36-39.
- 390 Schroth RJ, Cruz de Jesus V, Menon A, Olatosi OO, Lee VHK, Yerex K, Hai-Santiago K, Demaré D. 2024. An  
391 investigation of data from the first year of the interim canada dental benefit for children &12  
392 years of age. *Frontiers in Oral Health*. 4.
- 393 Schroth RJ, Quinonez C, Shwart L, Wagar B. 2016. Treating early childhood caries under general  
394 anesthesia: A national review of canadian data. *J Can Dent Assoc*. 82:g20.
- 395 Sulo G, Nasir EF, Toftesund AL, Mustafa M, Astrom AN, Berggreen E. 2022. Regional variations in caries  
396 experience, predictors, and follow-up among children and adolescents in western norway. *Acta*  
397 *Odontol Scand*. 80(4):289-294.
- 398 Zheng FM, Yan IG, Sun IG, Duangthip D, Lo ECM, Chu CH. 2024. Early childhood caries and dental public  
399 health programmes in hong kong. *Int Dent J*. 74(1):35-41.

400

**TABLES**

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the participants.

	<b>Total (A)</b>	<b>Atlantic (B)</b>	<b>Quebec (C)</b>	<b>Ontario (D)</b>	<b>Manitoba/ Saskatchew an (E)</b>	<b>Alberta (F)</b>	<b>British Columbia/ North (G)</b>	<b>URBAN (H)</b>	<b>RURAL (I)</b>
<b>Age of parents</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
18-24	51 (2.3%) <sup>H</sup>	5 (2.8%)	11 (2.2%)	15 (1.8%)	-	11 (4.3%)	6 (2.0%)	34 (1.9%)	18 (4.5%) <sup>A</sup> H
25-34	699 (31.8%) <sup>E</sup>	52 (30.6%)	163 (34.1%) <sup>E</sup>	259 (31.3%) <sup>E</sup>	39 (22.2%)	99 (37.6%) <sup>AE</sup>	86 (30.5%) <sup>E</sup>	570 (31.9%)	121 (30.9%)
35-44	1,032 (46.9%)	81 (47.6%)	221 (46.1%)	388 (46.9%)	87 (49.5%)	111 (42.1%)	143 (50.7%) <sup>F</sup>	839 (46.9%)	180 (45.8%)
45-54	360 (16.4%)	25 (14.8%)	76 (15.8%)	139 (16.7%)	38 (21.9%) <sup>AF</sup>	38 (14.6%)	44 (15.4%)	299 (16.7%)	61 (15.6%)
55-64	45 (2.1%) <sup>F</sup>	7 (4.2%) <sup>F</sup>	7 (1.4%)	19 (2.3%) <sup>F</sup>	6 (3.6%) <sup>F</sup>	-	-	34 (1.9%)	12 (3%)
65 or older	13 (0.6%)	-	-	8 (1%)	-	-	-	12 (0.7%)	-
<b>Gender</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Male	829 (37.7%) <sup>IC</sup>	58 (33.8%)	150 (31.3%)	327 (39.5%) <sup>C</sup>	77 (44.2%) <sup>BC</sup>	108 (41%) <sup>C</sup>	109 (38.4%) <sup>C</sup>	716 (40%) <sup>AI</sup>	108 (27.6%)
Female	1,367 (62.1%) <sup>H</sup>	112 (66.2%) <sup>E</sup>	330 (68.7%) <sup>ADE</sup> FG	500 (60.4%)	98 (55.8%)	154 (58.3%)	172 (60.9%)	1,068 (59.7%)	283 (72.1%) AH
Other or prefer not to answer	5 (0.2%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Education</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
High school or less	489 (22.2%) <sup>H</sup>	43 (25%)	124 (25.9%) <sup>AG</sup>	179 (21.5%)	37 (21.4%)	54 (20.6%)	51 (18.1%)	354 (19.8%)	131 (33.4%) AH
Trades/College	663 (30.1%) <sup>HG</sup>	61 (35.7%) <sup>G</sup>	180 (37.5%) <sup>ADE</sup> FG	240 (29%) <sup>G</sup>	47 (26.8%)	76 (28.7%) <sup>G</sup>	60 (21.2%)	500 (28%)	158 (40.1%) AH

University	1,046 (47.5%) <sup>IBC</sup>	67 (39.2%)	174 (36.3%)	409 (49.3%) <sup>B</sup>	91 (51.8%) <sup>BC</sup>	134 (50.6%) <sup>BC</sup>	172 (60.6%) <sup>ABC</sup> DF	932 (52.1%) <sup>AI</sup>	103 (26.2%)
<b>Employment</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Employed (Full-time, Part-time, Self-employed)	1,642 (74.6%) <sup>I</sup>	120 (70.7%)	368 (76.8%)	601 (72.5%)	128 (73.2%)	197 (74.8%)	227 (80.1%) <sup>ABD</sup>	1,371 (76.7%) <sup>AI</sup>	257 (65.6%)
<i>Working full-time (30 or more hours per week)</i>	1299 (59%) <sup>ID</sup>	104 (61.2%)	305 (63.5%) <sup>AD</sup>	452 (54.5%)	104 (59.5%)	161 (61.2%)	172 (60.9%)	1,097 (61.4%) <sup>AI</sup>	192 (48.9%)
<i>Working part-time (less than 30 hours per week)</i>	205 (9.3%) <sup>BC</sup>	9 (5.1%)	35 (7.2%)	100 (12.1%) <sup>ABC</sup> EF	12 (6.7%)	19 (7.1%)	31 (10.9%) <sup>B</sup>	170 (9.5%)	32 (8.2%)
<i>Self-employed</i>	138 (6.3%)	7 (4.3%)	29 (6%)	49 (6%)	12 (6.9%)	17 (6.4%)	23 (8.3%)	104 (5.8%)	34 (8.5%)
Unemployed (looking for work)	161 (7.3%) <sup>C</sup>	12 (7.2%)	24 (5%)	76 (9.2%) <sup>ACF</sup>	14 (8%)	15 (5.7%)	19 (6.9%)	129 (7.2%)	31 (8%)
Not employed/not in workforce	348 (15.8%) <sup>HG</sup>	33 (19.2%) <sup>G</sup>	73 (15.2%)	132 (15.9%)	31 (17.4%)	47 (17.8%) <sup>G</sup>	33 (11.6%)	253 (14.2%)	89 (22.6%) AH
Other	31 (1.4%) <sup>H</sup>	5 (2.9%)	13 (2.6%) <sup>AF</sup>	10 (1.2%)	-	-	-	17 (0.9%)	14 (3.6%) <sup>A</sup> H
<b>Household income*</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Under \$20,000	169 (7.7%) <sup>HCG</sup>	18 (10.5%) <sup>CG</sup>	26 (5.4%)	79 (9.5%) <sup>ACG</sup>	18 (10.1%) <sup>CG</sup>	18 (6.7%)	11 (3.8%)	122 (6.8%)	44 (11.1%) AH
\$20,000 to \$29,999	200 (9.1%) <sup>HE</sup>	15 (8.8%)	51 (10.6%) <sup>E</sup>	75 (9.1%) <sup>E</sup>	9 (5%)	23 (8.6%)	27 (9.6%) <sup>E</sup>	150 (8.4%)	46 (11.7%)
\$30,000 to \$39,999	212 (9.6%)	16 (9.6%)	53 (11%)	76 (9.2%)	17 (9.5%)	22 (8.5%)	27 (9.6%)	175 (9.8%)	36 (9.2%)
\$40,000 to \$49,999	278 (12.6%)	21 (12.2%)	63 (13%)	116 (13.9%)	21 (12.2%)	27 (10.4%)	30 (10.6%)	225 (12.6%)	52 (13.2%)
\$50,000 to \$59,999	356 (16.2%)	27 (16%)	83 (17.2%)	133 (16%)	23 (13.4%)	43 (16.3%)	47 (16.5%)	290 (16.2%)	64 (16.3%)
\$60,000 to \$69,999	396 (18%) <sup>ID</sup>	31 (18.4%)	89 (18.6%)	125 (15.1%)	38 (21.5%) <sup>D</sup>	50 (18.8%)	63 (22.3%) <sup>D</sup>	335 (18.8%) <sup>AI</sup>	55 (14%)

\$70,000 to \$79,999	349 (15.9%)	25 (14.9%)	69 (14.4%)	132 (15.9%)	32 (18.4%)	40 (15.3%)	50 (17.8%)	289 (16.2%)	58 (14.8%)
\$80,000 to \$89,999	242 (11%)	16 (9.7%)	46 (9.6%)	93 (11.2%)	18 (10.1%)	41 (15.4%) <sup>A</sup> CG	28 (9.9%)	202 (11.3%)	38 (9.6%)
<b>Marital status</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Never married	304 (13.8%) <sup>G</sup>	34 (19.8%) <sup>AEF</sup> G	84 (17.4%) <sup>AEF</sup> G	113 (13.7%)	17 (9.9%)	29 (11%)	27 (9.6%)	248 (13.9%)	55 (14%)
Married/Common law	1,712 (77.8%) <sup>C</sup>	127 (74.4%)	351 (73.2%)	643 (77.5%)	145 (83.1%) <sup>ABC</sup>	216 (81.9%) <sup>C</sup>	230 (81.1%) <sup>C</sup>	1,404 (78.5%)	291 (74%)
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	175 (8%) <sup>H</sup>	10 (5.8%)	41 (8.6%)	71 (8.5%)	11 (6.5%)	18 (6.7%)	24 (8.6%)	127 (7.1%)	45 (11.5%) AH
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prefer not to answer	7 (0.3%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 (0.3%)	-
<b>Age of children</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Under age 12	2,201 (100%)	170 (100%)	480 (100%)	829 (100%)	175 (100%)	264 (100%)	283 (100%)	1,787 (100%)	392 (100%)
12-17 years of age	399 (18.1%) <sup>BG</sup>	19 (11.4%)	105 (21.8%) <sup>ABE</sup> G	162 (19.5%) <sup>BG</sup>	27 (15.3%)	50 (18.9%) <sup>B</sup>	37 (13%)	312 (17.5%)	82 (21%)
18 years of age or older	90 (4.1%) <sup>H</sup>	9 (5.5%)	25 (5.2%) <sup>F</sup>	32 (3.9%)	7 (3.8%)	7 (2.5%)	10 (3.4%)	61 (3.4%)	27 (7%) <sup>AH</sup>
<b>Private dental insurance**</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Yes	708 (32.2%) <sup>HG</sup>	73 (42.7%) <sup>ACD</sup> FG	152 (31.7%) <sup>G</sup>	272 (32.8%) <sup>G</sup>	63 (35.8%) <sup>G</sup>	79 (29.8%)	70 (24.7%)	549 (30.7%)	143 (36.5%) AH
No	1,493 (67.8%) <sup>IB</sup>	97 (57.3%)	328 (68.3%) <sup>B</sup>	557 (67.2%) <sup>B</sup>	112 (64.2%)	185 (70.2%) <sup>B</sup>	213 (75.3%) <sup>ABC</sup> DE	1,238 (69.3%) <sup>AI</sup>	249 (63.5%)
<b>Ethnicity(ies)</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392

Western European (UK, Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, etc.)	567 (25.8%) <sup>H</sup>	39 (22.9%)	128 (26.6%)	202 (24.3%)	50 (28.4%)	63 (23.8%)	86 (30.4%)	440 (24.6%)	126 (32.1%) <sup>AH</sup>
Eastern European (Poland, Hungary, Romania, Ukraine, Russia, etc.)	153 (7%) <sup>CD</sup>	13 (7.6%) <sup>C</sup>	9 (1.8%)	46 (5.6%) <sup>C</sup>	23 (13.4%) <sup>ACD</sup>	32 (12.1%) <sup>A</sup> CD	30 (10.6%) <sup>ACD</sup>	123 (6.9%)	30 (7.6%)
Canadian Indigenous (First Nations, Métis, Inuit (Inuk), etc.)	291 (13.2%) <sup>C</sup>	31 (18.3%) <sup>C</sup>	43 (9%)	106 (12.8%) <sup>C</sup>	29 (16.4%) <sup>C</sup>	40 (15.2%) <sup>C</sup>	42 (14.7%) <sup>C</sup>	236 (13.2%)	54 (13.8%)
NET ETHNIC (African, Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, East Asian, South/Central/Latin American, and West Indian) <sup>§</sup>	786 (35.7%) <sup>IBC</sup>	35 (20.6%)	92 (19.3%)	372 (44.8%) <sup>ABC</sup> F	70 (39.8%) <sup>BC</sup>	99 (37.5%) <sup>BC</sup>	118 (41.5%) <sup>ABC</sup>	717 (40.1%) <sup>AI</sup>	47 (12%)
Other <sup>§§</sup>	275 (12.5%) <sup>HD</sup> EG	33 (19.6%) <sup>ADE</sup> FG	117 (24.5%) <sup>ADE</sup> FG	79 (9.6%) <sup>G</sup>	10 (5.8%)	28 (10.7%) <sup>E</sup> G	7 (2.4%)	189 (10.6%)	86 (21.9%) <sup>AH</sup>
Don't know	127 (5.8%) <sup>HDEG</sup>	14 (8%) <sup>EG</sup>	54 (11.2%) <sup>ADE</sup> FG	37 (4.5%)	-	10 (3.9%)	9 (3.1%)	84 (4.7%)	43 (11%) <sup>AH</sup>
Prefer not to answer	90 (4.1%) <sup>HDEF</sup>	9 (5.6%) <sup>F</sup>	42 (8.8%) <sup>ADEFG</sup>	22 (2.6%)	-	-	9 (3.1%)	62 (3.5%)	27 (6.9%) <sup>A</sup> H

Note: Comparison Groups: ABCDEFG/AHI; Paired/overlap T-test for means, paired/overlap Z-test for percentages. Uppercase letters indicate significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

\* Last year's total household income, before taxes, for the respondent and their spouse/common-law partner; not including any income received via universal childcare benefit.

\*\* Private insurance for the respondent and their family, either through an employer, pension plan, or individual benefits plan; not including any coverage received from any provincial or federal dental plans.

§ NET ETHNIC: detailed information can be provided upon request.

§§ Other includes Canadian (general), White/Caucasian, Mixed (general), Quebecois, North American, and None.



**Table 2.** Level of concern about affordability of dental care in Canada and accessing the services of a dentist or oral health care professional (e.g., dental assistant, dental hygienist, dental surgeon, etc.), by region.

	Total (A)	Atlantic (B)	Quebec (C)	Ontario (D)	Manitoba/ Saskatchewan (E)	Alberta (F)	British Columbia/ North (G)	URBAN (H)	RURAL (I)
<b>Affordability of dental care</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
VERY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	2,000 (90.9%) <sup>C</sup>	157 (92.3%)	422 (88%)	759 (91.6%) <sup>C</sup>	163 (93.3%) <sup>C</sup>	235 (88.9%)	263 (93.1%) <sup>C</sup>	1,623 (90.8%)	357 (91%)
<i>Very concerned</i>	1,339 (60.8%)	99 (58.4%)	283 (58.9%)	512 (61.8%)	96 (55%)	169 (64%) <sup>E</sup>	179 (63.3%)	1,090 (61%)	234 (59.6%)
<i>Somewhat concerned</i>	661 (30%) <sup>F</sup>	58 (33.9%) <sup>F</sup>	139 (29.1%)	247 (29.8%)	67 (38.2%) <sup>ACDF</sup>	66 (24.8%)	84 (29.8%)	533 (29.8%)	123 (31.4%)
NOT THAT/NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	201 (9.1%)	13 (7.7%)	58 (12%) <sup>ADEG</sup>	70 (8.4%)	12 (6.7%)	29 (11.1%)	20 (6.9%)	165 (9.2%)	35 (9%)
<i>Not that concerned</i>	165 (7.5%)	13 (7.4%)	49 (10.2%) <sup>AEG</sup>	59 (7.1%)	9 (4.9%)	21 (7.9%)	15 (5.2%)	131 (7.3%)	33 (8.4%)
<i>Not concerned at all</i>	36 (1.6%) <sup>B</sup>	-	9 (1.8%) <sup>B</sup>	11 (1.3%)	-	9 (3.2%) <sup>B</sup>	5 (1.7%)	34 (1.9%) <sup>I</sup>	-
<b>Accessing the services of a dentist or oral health care professional</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
VERY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	1,781 (80.9%) <sup>IB</sup>	126 (73.9%)	378 (78.7%)	679 (81.9%) <sup>B</sup>	147 (83.9%) <sup>B</sup>	218 (82.6%) <sup>B</sup>	234 (82.5%) <sup>B</sup>	1,470 (82.3%) <sup>AI</sup>	291 (74.2%)
<i>Very concerned</i>	1,001 (45.5%)	68 (40%)	200 (41.7%)	388 (46.8%)	87 (49.7%)	121 (45.9%)	137 (48.3%)	823 (46.1%)	162 (41.3%)
<i>Somewhat concerned</i>	780 (35.4%)	58 (33.9%)	178 (37.1%)	291 (35.1%)	60 (34.1%)	97 (36.7%)	97 (34.3%)	647 (36.2%)	129 (32.9%)
NOT THAT/NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	420 (19.1%) <sup>H</sup>	44 (26.1%) <sup>ADEFG</sup>	102 (21.3%)	150 (18.1%)	28 (16.1%)	46 (17.4%)	49 (17.5%)	317 (17.7%)	101 (25.8%) <sup>AH</sup>
<i>Not that concerned</i>	334 (15.2%) <sup>H</sup>	34 (19.7%) <sup>E</sup>	88 (18.3%) <sup>AE</sup>	117 (14.1%)	21 (12.1%)	38 (14.2%)	38 (13.4%)	248 (13.9%)	86 (21.9%) <sup>AH</sup>
<i>Not concerned at all</i>	86 (3.9%)	11 (6.4%)	14 (3%)	34 (4%)	7 (4%)	8 (3.2%)	12 (4.1%)	70 (3.9%)	15 (3.9%)

Note: Comparison Groups: ABCDEFG/AHI; Paired/overlap T-test for means, paired/overlap Z-test for percentages. Uppercase letters indicate significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

**Table 3.** Views on dental care for children.

	Total (A)	Atlantic (B)	Quebec (C)	Ontario (D)	Manitoba / Saskatchewan (E)	Alberta (F)	British Columbia/ North (G)	URBAN (H)	RURAL (I)
<b>Importance of regular dental visits for children</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
IMPORTANT	2,140 (97.2%)	164 (96.7%)	466 (97%)	809 (97.6%)	172 (98.4%)	255 (96.4%)	273 (96.6%)	1,741 (97.4%)	379 (96.6%)
<i>Very important</i>	1,637 (74.4%) <sup>F</sup>	134 (79%) <sup>F</sup>	352 (73.3%)	637 (76.8%) <sup>AF</sup>	124 (70.9%)	181 (68.6%)	208 (73.6%)	1,325 (74.1%)	295 (75.3%)
<i>Somewhat important</i>	503 (22.9%)	30 (17.8%)	114 (23.7%)	173 (20.8%)	48 (27.5%) <sup>B</sup>	74 (27.9%) <sup>ABD</sup>	65 (23%)	416 (23.3%)	83 (21.3%)
NOT IMPORTANT	52 (2.4%)	6 (3.3%)	13 (2.8%)	14 (1.6%)	-	7 (2.5%)	10 (3.4%)	37 (2.1%)	13 (3.4%)
<i>Not that important</i>	40 (1.8%) <sup>D</sup>	6 (3.3%)	12 (2.4%)	9 (1.1%)	-	5 (1.8%)	7 (2.4%)	29 (1.6%)	10 (2.6%)
<i>Not important at all</i>	11 (0.5%)	-	-	5 (0.6%)	-	-	-	8 (0.5%)	-
NOT SURE	10 (0.4%)	-	-	6 (0.7%)	-	-	-	10 (0.5%)	-
<b>Strong or some agreement with the following statements</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
If I had a bit of extra money, I would schedule more regular dental care appointments for my children	1,759 (79.9%) <sup>BC</sup>	119 (69.9%)	364 (75.8%)	671 (81%) <sup>BC</sup>	150 (85.6%) <sup>ABC</sup>	217 (82.2%) <sup>BC</sup>	238 (84.3%) <sup>ABC</sup>	1,435 (80.3%)	304 (77.5%)
If I had a bit of extra money, I would schedule more regular dental care appointments for myself	1,807 (82.1%) <sup>B</sup>	125 (73.4%)	387 (80.6%)	699 (84.3%) <sup>AB</sup>	146 (83.5%) <sup>B</sup>	217 (82.2%) <sup>B</sup>	234 (82.5%) <sup>B</sup>	1,472 (82.4%)	314 (80.1%)
I only schedule dental care appointments for my children when absolutely necessary	1,291 (58.7%) <sup>BC</sup>	84 (49.5%)	247 (51.5%)	481 (58.1%) <sup>BC</sup>	126 (72%) <sup>ABCD</sup>	166 (63%) <sup>BC</sup>	186 (65.8%) <sup>ABCD</sup>	1,077 (60.2%) <sup>AI</sup>	200 (51.1%)
Ideally, I would like my children and me to receive regular dental care	2,084 (94.7%)	163 (96%)	458 (95.4%)	780 (94.1%)	171 (98%) <sup>ADFG</sup>	249 (94.3%)	263 (92.8%)	1,686 (94.3%)	377 (96.1%)

Note: Comparison Groups: ABCDEFG/AHI; Paired/overlap T-test for means, paired/overlap Z-test for percentages. Uppercase letters indicate significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

**Table 4.** Access to and use of dental services for children oral health care, by region.

	TOTAL (A)	Atlantic (B)	Quebec (C)	Ontario (D)	Manitoba/ Saskatchewan (E)	Alberta (F)	British Columbia/ North (G)	URBAN (H)	RURAL (I)
<b>Currently has access to dental services</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
Yes, only for myself	291 (13.2%) <sup>B</sup>	9 (5.5%)	54 (11.2%) <sup>B</sup>	115 (13.9%) <sup>B</sup>	32 (18.1%) <sup>BC</sup>	32 (12.1%) <sup>B</sup>	49 (17.5%) <sup>ABC</sup>	248 (13.9%)	42 (10.6%)
Yes, only for my child/children	408 (18.5%)	32 (18.7%)	105 (21.8%) <sup>A</sup>	146 (17.6%)	28 (15.8%)	49 (18.5%)	48 (17.1%)	341 (19.1%)	65 (16.6%)
Yes, for the whole family	1,130 (51.3%) <sup>H</sup>	102 (59.9%) <sup>ADEFG</sup>	254 (52.9%)	417 (50.3%)	83 (47.3%)	132 (49.9%)	142 (50.3%)	888 (49.7%)	228 (58.1%) <sup>AH</sup>
No	372 (16.9%) <sup>C</sup>	27 (15.8%)	67 (14%)	150 (18.1%)	33 (18.9%)	51 (19.5%)	43 (15.1%)	310 (17.4%)	58 (14.7%)
<b>Child's last visit to an oral health care professional</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392
In the past 6 months	993 (45.1%) <sup>E</sup>	88 (51.7%) <sup>EF</sup>	222 (46.3%) <sup>E</sup>	388 (46.8%) <sup>E</sup>	63 (35.8%)	108 (40.9%)	125 (44.1%)	814 (45.6%)	169 (43%)
In the past year	474 (21.6%) <sup>H</sup>	45 (26.2%) <sup>G</sup>	126 (26.3%) <sup>ADFG</sup>	165 (19.9%)	35 (20.2%)	53 (20%)	51 (17.9%)	369 (20.7%)	100 (25.5%) <sup>AH</sup>
1 year to less than 2 years ago	268 (12.2%) <sup>C</sup>	17 (9.8%)	43 (9.1%)	98 (11.8%)	28 (16.2%) <sup>C</sup>	38 (14.3%) <sup>C</sup>	45 (15.8%) <sup>BC</sup>	227 (12.7%)	39 (9.8%)
2 years to less than 3 years ago	110 (5%)	6 (3.7%)	19 (4%)	36 (4.3%)	15 (8.7%) <sup>BCD</sup>	17 (6.4%)	17 (5.9%)	92 (5.1%)	18 (4.6%)
3 years to less than 4 years ago	57 (2.6%) <sup>IBF</sup>	-	11 (2.2%) <sup>B</sup>	22 (2.6%) <sup>BF</sup>	-	-	19 (6.8%) <sup>ABCDEF</sup>	55 (3.1%) <sup>I</sup>	-
4 years to less than 5 years ago	5 (0.2%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Five or more years ago	13 (0.6%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (0.7%)	-

Never	243 (11.1%) <sup>HBG</sup>	11 (6.7%)	50 (10.4%) <sup>G</sup>	102 (12.3%) <sup>BG</sup>	27 (15.4%) <sup>BG</sup>	37 (14.2%) <sup>BG</sup>	15 (5.5%)	184 (10.3%)	56 (14.4%) <sup>AH</sup>
I can't recall	37 (1.7%)	-	7 (1.4%)	14 (1.7%)	-	6 (2.1%)	7 (2.4%)	31 (1.7%)	6 (1.4%)
<b>Payment for dental services for children*</b>	<i>n = 1,958</i>	<i>n = 159</i>	<i>n = 430</i>	<i>n = 727</i>	<i>n = 148</i>	<i>n = 227</i>	<i>n = 268</i>	<i>n = 1,604</i>	<i>n = 336</i>
I go to a free dental clinic	422 (21.6%) <sup>I</sup>	32 (19.9%)	79 (18.3%)	172 (23.6%) <sup>CF</sup>	34 (23.3%)	40 (17.5%)	66 (24.6%) <sup>CF</sup>	379 (23.6%) <sup>AI</sup>	42 (12.5%)
I pay in cash (or debit)	917 (46.8%) <sup>D</sup>	74 (46.5%)	225 (52.3%) <sup>AD</sup>	297 (40.8%)	71 (47.6%)	118 (51.9%) <sup>D</sup>	133 (49.6%) <sup>D</sup>	758 (47.3%)	151 (44.8%)
I pay using a credit card	861 (44%) <sup>B</sup>	54 (33.8%)	200 (46.5%) <sup>B</sup>	303 (41.7%)	74 (50.2%) <sup>BD</sup>	110 (48.6%) <sup>B</sup>	119 (44.6%) <sup>B</sup>	719 (44.9%)	134 (40%)
The dentist office offers a payment plan	373 (19.1%)	24 (15%)	79 (18.3%)	128 (17.6%)	33 (22.1%)	56 (24.8%) <sup>AB</sup> D	53 (19.9%)	320 (19.9%) <sup>A</sup>	53 (15.6%)
Costs are covered (e.g., through private dental insurance, social assistance, disability assistance program, etc.)	681 (34.8%) <sup>C</sup>	70 (44.1%) <sup>ACEFG</sup>	120 (27.9%)	278 (38.2%) <sup>AC</sup>	50 (33.6%)	76 (33.5%)	87 (32.6%)	544 (34%)	129 (38.4%)
Other <sup>1</sup>	17 (0.9%)	6 (3.5%) <sup>AF</sup>	-	6 (0.8%)	-	-	-	15 (0.9%)	-
No Answer	243	11	50	102	27	37	15	184	56
<b>Frequency of visiting dental services for children*</b>	<i>n = 1,958</i>	<i>n = 159</i>	<i>n = 430</i>	<i>n = 727</i>	<i>n = 148</i>	<i>n = 227</i>	<i>n = 268</i>	<i>n = 1,604</i>	<i>n = 336</i>
More often than once every 3 months	127 (6.5%) <sup>E</sup>	10 (6.3%)	27 (6.3%)	48 (6.7%)	5 (3.3%)	21 (9.1%) <sup>E</sup>	16 (6.1%)	113 (7%) <sup>AI</sup>	14 (4.2%)
About every 3 months	308 (15.8%) <sup>C</sup>	23 (14.5%)	46 (10.7%)	118 (16.3%) <sup>C</sup>	35 (23.6%) <sup>ABCD</sup>	37 (16.2%) <sup>C</sup>	49 (18.5%) <sup>C</sup>	258 (16.1%)	49 (14.7%)
About every 6 months	622 (31.8%) <sup>C</sup>	64 (40.2%) <sup>ACE</sup>	113 (26.2%)	240 (33.1%) <sup>C</sup>	41 (27.7%)	76 (33.5%) <sup>C</sup>	88 (33%)	509 (31.8%)	102 (30.4%)
About every 9 months	211 (10.8%) <sup>BF</sup>	6 (3.7%)	50 (11.6%) <sup>BF</sup>	88 (12%) <sup>BF</sup>	20 (13.4%) <sup>BF</sup>	14 (6.3%)	34 (12.6%) <sup>BF</sup>	181 (11.3%)	29 (8.7%)

About every 12 months	416 (21.2%) <sup>HG</sup>	35 (22.4%) <sup>G</sup>	142 (33.1%) <sup>ABDE</sup> FG	142 (19.6%) <sup>G</sup>	28 (18.8%) <sup>G</sup>	39 (17.4%) <sup>G</sup>	28 (10.5%)	315 (19.7%)	97 (29%) <sup>AH</sup>
Less often than once a year	113 (5.8%)	7 (4.5%)	26 (6%)	39 (5.4%)	11 (7.5%)	19 (8.4%) <sup>G</sup>	11 (4%)	95 (5.9%)	18 (5.4%)
Only when required (e.g., cavity)	118 (6%) <sup>D</sup>	10 (6.2%)	21 (4.9%)	33 (4.6%)	7 (4.4%)	16 (7.1%)	31 (11.6%) <sup>ABCD</sup> E	100 (6.2%)	16 (4.7%)
Only when there is an emergency (e.g., accident, severe pain)	28 (1.4%) <sup>C</sup>	-	-	9 (1.3%)	-	5 (2.1%)	9 (3.3%) <sup>ACE</sup>	24 (1.5%)	-
Never	10 (0.5%)	-	-	6 (0.8%)	-	-	-	6 (0.4%)	-
Other <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Answer	243	11	50	102	27	37	15	184	56
<b>Reasons for taking the child to visit the oral health care professional <sup>§</sup></b>	<i>n</i> = 2,047	<i>n</i> = 157	<i>n</i> = 457	<i>n</i> = 781	<i>n</i> = 167	<i>n</i> = 243	<i>n</i> = 243	<i>n</i> = 1,659	<i>n</i> = 369
For regular routine cleanings with a hygienist	1,564 (76.4%)	125 (79.6%)	365 (80%) <sup>AEF</sup>	595 (76.2%)	119 (71.7%)	175 (72.1%)	185 (76.1%)	1,256 (75.7%)	293 (79.5%)
For preventive dental care exams	1,335 (65.2%) <sup>D</sup>	112 (71.3%) <sup>D</sup>	321 (70.3%) <sup>AD</sup>	478 (61.2%)	107 (64.4%)	161 (66.1%)	156 (64.1%)	1,089 (65.6%)	236 (64%)
For urgent dental needs	1,053 (51.4%) <sup>D</sup>	79 (50.3%)	250 (54.7%) <sup>D</sup>	372 (47.7%)	92 (54.9%)	139 (57.2%) <sup>A</sup> D	121 (49.8%)	858 (51.7%)	190 (51.5%)
Other <sup>3</sup>	22 (1.1%)	-	10 (2.1%) <sup>F</sup>	9 (1.2%)	-	-	-	17 (1.1%)	5 (1.4%)
None of the above	40 (1.9%)	-	8 (1.7%)	19 (2.4%)	-	5 (1.9%)	-	33 (2%)	7 (1.9%)
No Answer	154	13	23	48	8	21	40	128	24

Note: Comparison Groups: ABCDEFG/AHI; Paired/overlap T-test for means, paired/overlap Z-test for percentages. Uppercase letters indicate significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

\*Excludes those who responded "never" at Child's last visit to an oral health care professional.

<sup>§</sup> Excludes those who responded "only when required/emergency" at Frequency of visiting dental services for children.

<sup>1</sup> Other includes "I pay out of pocket for extra fees that aren't covered/partial coverage", "I go to another country (where it's cheaper)", and others.

<sup>2</sup> Other includes "Cost issues/only when I can afford it" and others.

<sup>3</sup> Other includes "Orthodontist/braces/Invisalign", "Crowns/fillings", "When child is old enough/child is too young", and others.

**Table 5.** Awareness about the Interim Canada Dental Benefit and number of applicants.


	Total (A)	Atlantic (B)	Quebec (C)	Ontario (D)	Manitoba / Saskatchewan (E)	Alberta (F)	British Columbia/ North (G)	URBAN (H)	RURAL (I)	Access to dental Insurance	
										YES (J)	NO (K)
<b>Heard about the Interim CDB?</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392	<i>n</i> = 708	<i>n</i> = 1,493
NO	787 (35.7%) <sup>C</sup>	64 (37.5%)	151 (31.5%)	301 (36.4%)	66 (37.8%)	99 (37.4%)	106 (37.4%)	656 (36.7%) <sup>A</sup>	126 (32.1%)	198 (28%)	588 (39.4%) <sup>AJ</sup>
YES	1,414 (64.3%) <sup>H</sup>	106 (62.5%)	329 (68.5%) <sup>A</sup>	528 (63.6%)	109 (62.2%)	165 (62.6%)	177 (62.6%)	1,132 (63.3%)	266 (67.9%)	510 (72%) <sup>AK</sup>	905 (60.6%)
<i>Yes, I have heard of it, but don't know much about the program</i>	922 (41.9%) <sup>HG</sup>	72 (42.6%)	213 (44.3%) <sup>G</sup>	347 (41.8%)	80 (45.5%) <sup>G</sup>	109 (41.2%)	102 (36%)	724 (40.5%)	186 (47.4%) <sup>AH</sup>	378 (53.4%) <sup>AK</sup>	544 (36.5%)
<i>Yes, I have heard of it and am well informed about the program</i>	492 (22.4%) <sup>E</sup>	34 (19.9%)	116 (24.2%) <sup>E</sup>	181 (21.8%)	29 (16.6%)	56 (21.3%)	76 (26.7%) <sup>E</sup>	408 (22.8%)	80 (20.5%)	132 (18.6%)	360 (24.1%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<b>Applied or planning to apply for the Interim CDB?</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392	<i>n</i> = 708	<i>n</i> = 1,493
NO, I have not applied and do not plan to	487 (22.1%) <sup>D</sup>	48 (28.5%) <sup>ADG</sup>	116 (24.2%) <sup>D</sup>	159 (19.2%)	45 (25.6%)	63 (23.8%)	55 (19.6%)	384 (21.5%)	97 (24.7%)	287 (40.5%) <sup>AK</sup>	200 (13.4%)
Not sure	246 (11.2%) <sup>HG</sup>	29 (17%) <sup>ADG</sup>	55 (11.4%) <sup>G</sup>	94 (11.3%) <sup>G</sup>	19 (10.8%)	29 (11%)	20 (7.2%)	178 (10%)	66 (16.8%) <sup>AH</sup>	117 (16.5%) <sup>AK</sup>	129 (8.6%)
YES	1,468 (66.7%) <sup>IB</sup>	93 (54.5%)	309 (64.3%) <sup>B</sup>	576 (69.5%) <sup>AB</sup>	111 (63.6%)	172 (65.2%) <sup>B</sup>	207 (73.3%) <sup>ABCEF</sup>	1,225 (68.5%) <sup>AI</sup>	230 (58.5%)	304 (43%)	1,164 (77.9%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<i>Yes, I have applied</i>	400 (18.2%) <sup>IBF</sup>	21 (12.3%)	92 (19.2%) <sup>BF</sup>	150 (18.1%) <sup>B</sup>	32 (18.3%)	36 (13.5%)	70 (24.6%) <sup>ABDF</sup>	345 (19.3%) <sup>AI</sup>	52 (13.4%)	59 (8.3%)	342 (22.9%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<i>Yes, I am planning to apply</i>	1,068 (48.5%)	72 (42.2%)	216 (45.1%)	426 (51.4%) <sup>ABC</sup>	79 (45.3%)	136 (51.7%) <sup>B</sup>	138 (48.7%)	880 (49.2%)	177 (45.2%)	246 (34.7%)	822 (55.1%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<b>Support for the Interim CDB</b>	<i>n</i> = 2,201	<i>n</i> = 170	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 829	<i>n</i> = 175	<i>n</i> = 264	<i>n</i> = 283	<i>n</i> = 1,787	<i>n</i> = 392	<i>n</i> = 708	<i>n</i> = 1,493

SUPPORT	1,915 (87%)	145 (85.2%)	416 (86.8%)	726 (87.6%)	158 (90.4%) <sup>F</sup>	223 (84.4%)	247 (87.3%)	1556 (87.1%)	340 (86.6%)	595 (84%)	1,321 (88.5%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<i>Strongly support</i>	1,404 (63.8%) <sup>F</sup>	119 (70%) <sup>F</sup>	311 (64.7%) <sup>F</sup>	541 (65.2%) <sup>F</sup>	107 (61.1%)	151 (57.3%)	175 (61.9%)	1,136 (63.5%)	253 (64.4%)	425 (60.1%)	979 (65.5%) <sup>AJ</sup>
<i>Somewhat support</i>	512 (23.2%) <sup>B</sup>	26 (15.2%)	106 (22%) <sup>B</sup>	185 (22.4%) <sup>B</sup>	51 (29.3%) <sup>B</sup>	72 (27.1%) <sup>B</sup>	72 (25.4%) <sup>B</sup>	421 (23.5%)	87 (22.2%)	169 (23.9%)	342 (22.9%)
OPPOSE	59 (2.7%)	-	13 (2.6%)	18 (2.1%)	5 (3%)	9 (3.3%)	13 (4.5%)	50 (2.8%)	9 (2.3%)	30 (4.2%) <sup>AK</sup>	29 (2%)
<i>Somewhat oppose</i>	41 (1.9%)	-	8 (1.6%)	12 (1.4%)	-	-	11 (3.8%) <sup>D</sup>	36 (2%)	5 (1.3%)	22 (3.1%) <sup>AK</sup>	19 (1.3%)
<i>Strongly oppose</i>	18 (0.8%)	-	5 (1%)	6 (0.7%)	-	5 (1.8%)	-	14 (0.8%)	-	8 (1.1%)	10 (0.7%)
Neither support nor oppose	196 (8.9%) <sup>E</sup>	19 (11.3%) <sup>E</sup>	44 (9.2%)	76 (9.2%)	10 (5.6%)	28 (10.6%) <sup>E</sup>	18 (6.5%)	156 (8.7%)	38 (9.6%)	75 (10.6%)	121 (8.1%)
Don't know	30 (1.4%)	-	7 (1.4%)	9 (1.1%)	-	5 (1.8%)	5 (1.7%)	25 (1.4%)	5 (1.4%)	8 (1.2%)	22 (1.5%)

Note: Comparison Groups: ABCDEFG/AHI/AJK; Paired/overlap T-test for means, paired/overlap Z-test for percentages. Uppercase letters indicate significance at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

**Figure 1.** Barriers to accessing dental care for children.

## WHAT PREVENTS PARENTS FROM TAKING THEIR CHILD/CHILDREN TO A DENTAL OFFICE OR ORAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL ON A REGULAR BASIS



\* Values for "Other": Total = 3%, Atlantic = 1%, Quebec = 4%, Ontario = 4%, Manitoba/Saskatchewan = 3%, Alberta = 2%, British Columbia/North = 2%.

Note: The participants may have selected more than one barrier. The percentage represents the proportion of the total number of respondents from each region that selected that barrier.