Social Economic Inequality of Oral Health among U.S. Residents from 1999 to 2023 and International Comparison: A Multilevel Analysis Based on NHANES and WHO Oral Health Data

Zhou Chengke[1]

[1] The State Key Laboratory of Oral & Maxillofacial Reconstruction and Regeneration, Key Laboratory of Oral Biomedicine Ministry of Education, Hubei Key Laboratory of Stomatology, School & Hospital of Stomatology, Frontier Science Center for Immunology and Metabolism, Taikang Center for Life and Medical Sciences, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430079, China.

Abstract

Objective To investigate socioeconomic disparities in oral health outcomes across global and national contexts, and to elucidate their underlying mechanisms. This study utilizes WHO macro-level data to map regional heterogeneity, while employing micro-level data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) to examine the association between socioeconomic status (SES) and oral health outcomes (cariation and self-rated health). Particular attention is given to the mediating role of healthcare accessibility and health behaviors.

Methods Macro analysis utilized the WHO Global Oral Health Database and World Bank indicators, employing ANOVA, Spearman correlation, and regression models to assess regional disparities and the impact of national economic/political indicators. Micro analysis integrated NHANES 1999–2023 data, using the Decayed Missing Filled Teeth Index (DMFT) and self-reported oral health (self-good) as outcome variables, with income poverty ratio (PIR) and education level as primary exposure variables.

Main effects were evaluated using weighted least squares (WLS) and logistic regression, while principal component analysis (PCA) was applied to assess behavioral patterns. Mediation analysis was conducted through the product method (bootstrap N=300), and restricted cubic spline (RCS) was employed to examine nonlinear relationships. All NHANES models accounted for complex sampling designs. Supplementary analyses incorporated cross-validation, mediation analysis, and obstacle sequencing.

RESULTS WHO's macro-analysis revealed statistically significant geographical variations in the burden of oral diseases (P<0.05). The relationship between national economic indicators and outcomes is complex $(\rho \approx +0.67, P < 0.001)(\rho \approx -0.02)\rho$and susceptible to confounding factors. For instance, per capita dental expenditure paradoxically shows a positive correlation with the' dental-free rate, 'reflecting structural differences in aging populations, treatment preferences, and reporting quality. However, expenditure shows no significant cross-sectional correlation with' severe periodontal disease 'or' untreated caries' (not significant).

The NHANES micro-analysis revealed a significant socioeconomic (SES) gradient in the United States: approximately 25-30% of low-income (Q1) groups reported "unmet dental needs," compared to only 5-6% in high-income (Q4) groups, with "unaffordability" being $\beta \approx\approx \beta \approx\approx$the primary reason (75-84% in Q1). The WLS/Logit model confirmed that higher personal income (PIR: -0.68 for DMFT; OR 1.17 for self-rated good) and education level (PIR: -1.49 for DMFT; OR 1.95 for self-rated good) were independent protective factors for oral health (P <0.001). Mediation analysis showed that "medical accessibility" (annual visit frequency and unmet needs) and "health behaviors" (short sleep duration) significantly mediated the relationship between SES and oral health (95% CI: not crossing 0).

Conclusion Both global and intra-national disparities in oral health are alarmingly severe. The correlation between macroeconomic indicators and health outcomes is often obscured by structural factors such as population aging. Intra-national socioeconomic disparities primarily influence health outcomes through two distinct pathways: economic accessibility (financial barriers to healthcare) and social patterned behaviors (e.g., sleep patterns). To reduce oral health inequalities, it is imperative to address economic barriers to healthcare and intervene in social determinants of health.

Keywords: oral health; health inequalities; socioeconomic status; health care accessibility; mediating analysis; NHANES; WHO

1 Introduction

1.1 Research Background: Global and National Inequality

Oral health is a vital component of overall well-being and a sensitive indicator of social equity. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines it as a state free from chronic oral and facial pain, oral cancer, congenital defects, periodontal disease, dental caries, tooth loss, and related functional impairments, emphasizing its role as a key measure of holistic well-being and quality of life [1]. Oral diseases not only cause pain, infection, and functional limitations but also severely impact chewing, speech, and social interactions, thereby reducing quality of life. The substantial treatment costs—particularly for restorations and dental implants—also impose significant financial burdens on families and nations [2].

However, the global distribution of oral health resources remains highly uneven. Macro data from institutions like the WHO reveal significant disparities in the burden of oral diseases across different geographical regions, where regional dummy variables demonstrate strong explanatory power in regression models. These regional variations are closely linked to national economic resources (such as per capita GDP, dental practitioner density, and healthcare expenditure) and structural factors (e.g., tropical location). Notably, in cross-sectional macro data, the direct impact of economic resources on outcomes can sometimes be masked by complex regional factors, even creating paradoxes—for instance, high-expenditure countries may exhibit higher toothlessness rates due to their aging populations and more robust reporting systems. This macro-level complexity underscores the necessity for in-depth exploration of internal inequality mechanisms within nations.

In this global context, health inequalities within nations remain equally pressing. Oral diseases, particularly dental caries and periodontal disease, rank among the world's

most prevalent chronic non-communicable diseases [1]. Extensive epidemiological studies confirm that oral health disparities exist within populations, with socioeconomic status (SES)—typically measured by education, income, and occupation—being a key determinant. Individuals from high-SES backgrounds generally exhibit lower caries prevalence and better periodontal health.This phenomenon is known as the "social gradient" of oral health [3,4].

1.2 Theoretical framework: The mechanisms of health inequity

Understanding the specific mechanisms behind this "SES gradient" is essential for developing effective intervention strategies to reduce health inequalities. According to the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) theory, SES influences health not directly but through a series of measurable mediating factors. These mechanisms can be summarized into several key aspects:

Material Pathways: Higher socioeconomic status (SES), particularly high income, indicates stronger purchasing power, enabling direct access to higher-quality healthcare services (e.g., out-of-pocket dental care), healthier food, and superior living conditions (e.g., stress-reducing and sleep-protective housing) [5].

Behavioral and Cultural Pathways: Higher socioeconomic status (SES), particularly with higher education, correlates with greater health literacy and stronger self-efficacy. These factors may encourage individuals to adopt healthier oral hygiene practices (e.g., regular brushing), more balanced dietary patterns (reducing sugary beverage intake) [6,7], and a more proactive approach to healthcare.

Psychosocial Pathways: Financial stress, job insecurity, and social exclusion associated with low socioeconomic status (SES) may lead to chronic psychological stress.This stress directly impairs immune function through neuroendocrine pathways (e.g., cortisol release) [8], or indirectly induces maladaptive coping behaviors (e.g., smoking, alcohol abuse, sleep disorders), thereby exacerbating oral health [9].The vertical transmission of mutans between generations, and the mother's own oral health (which is heavily influenced by her SES) may inoculate the child with high-risk bacteria in infancy, putting them at a disadvantage from an early age [10].

Institutional/Service Pathways: SES also determines an individual's position within

the healthcare system.People with higher SES are more likely to have access to quality dental insurance, be able to afford co-payments, and face fewer structural barriers to access to health information and services (such as difficulty taking time off work, transportation difficulties, etc.) [3,11,12].

1.3 Research Significance and Purpose

Beyond these pathways, geographical disparities (e.g., urban-rural gaps, regional resource misallocation) and physical environments (e.g., endemic fluorosis) are equally critical determinants of health [13].For example, in the development of China in recent decades, there has even been a "great reversal" phenomenon in which the prevalence of dental caries in rural areas exceeds that in urban areas, which highlights the mismatch between risk factors (high sugar diet) and protective resources (health care, education) between urban and rural areas [2,14,15].

While the link between socioeconomic status (SES) and oral health has been established, most studies have only described correlations. There is a lack of quantitative analysis of the complex pathways involved, particularly in assessing the roles of 'economic barriers' (material and institutional pathways) and 'health behaviors' (behavioral and psychosocial pathways).

Therefore, this study aims to conduct a multi-level analysis to fill this gap: first, by using WHO macro data to outline the regional patterns and correlation paradoxes of global oral health inequalities, providing a background for micro-level analysis; second, by leveraging the detailed micro-level data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), a nationally representative survey, to conduct an in-depth deconstruction of inequality mechanisms within the United States.

This study employs a dual-outcome model (objective DMFT and subjective self-rated oral health) to investigate how high education and high income ultimately lead to reduced dental caries and improved self-rated oral health through two key pathways: medical accessibility (annual visit frequency, unmet needs, and reasons, representing institutional and material pathways) and lifestyle behaviors (short sleep duration, brushing habits, etc., representing behavioral and psychosocial pathways).

2. Data and Methods

2.1 Data Sources

NHANES (Microdata): This study utilized continuous-cycle public data from NHANES spanning 1999–2000 to 2021–2023 (data sourced from the Demographics/Dietary/Examination/Lab/Questionnaire module). NHANES is a nationally representative, stratified, multi-stage probability sampling survey conducted among demilitarized and non-institutionalized U.S. populations. The analysis included all data-complete adult participants (N=...) and performed subgroup analyses for adolescents (12–19 years old).

WHO (macro data): The macro background analysis used publicly available estimates from the WHO Global Oral Health Database, the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study, and national indicators from the World Bank (e.g. GDP per capita, health spending as a percentage of GDP, etc.).

2.2 Variable and Index Construction

2.2.1 Variable and Indicator Construction (NHANES)

2.1.1.1. Outcomes: A dual-outcome model was used to capture both objective clinical measures and subjective health perceptions.

(1) DMFT (Decayed Missing Filled Total) is a continuous variable calculated from the tooth position field in the Oral Health Examination (OHXDEN) module, which counts and aggregates decayed, missing, and filled teeth. As the gold standard for assessing lifetime caries burden, DMFT quantifies the cumulative impact by measuring the total number of teeth that are untreated (Decayed), lost (Missing), or filled (Filled) due to caries.

(2) Self-assessment of oral health (self-good): Based on the questionnaire item "How would you rate your oral health status?" (oral_selfrate), responses of "excellent/very good/bad" are coded as 1 (self-assessed as good), while "average/poor" are coded as 0. This metric reflects a comprehensive evaluation of functional, aesthetic, and psychosocial satisfaction, serving as a key proxy for oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL).

(3) Caries status (any_caries): A binary variable (yes/no) based on oral examination (OHX TC/SE/FL threshold judgment), used for behavioral factor analysis.

2.1.1.2. Main exposure variables (SES):

(1) Education level (education_std) is categorized into: <High school (baseline reference), High school/GED, Some college/AA, College+. This indicator represents knowledge and cultural capital.

(2) Income (PIR): Household Income Poverty Ratio, a continuous variable. A lower PIR indicates greater poverty and represents material resources. Income quartiles (income_quartile_label, Q1-Q4) are used for descriptive analysis.

2.1.1.3. Mediators & Behaviors:

(1) Last dental visit in the past year (visit_last_year): coded as 1 (yes) for "within 6 months" or "within 1 year" based on the OHQ030 questionnaire (last dental visit), and 0 (no) otherwise, reflecting actual utilization of dental services.

(2) Unmet dental needs (unmet_need): coded as 1 for responses of 'yes' to the OHQ770 questionnaire (last year needed but did not receive dental treatment), reflecting perceived barriers to healthcare accessibility.

(3) Reasons for unmet need: The descriptive analysis utilized variables from the OHQ780A-K scale, including 'cost' (A), 'insurance' (C), and 'time/busy' (E, H, I), to identify the specific nature of the barriers.

(4) Short sleep (short_sleep): Based on the sleep questionnaire (sleep_hours), a sleep duration of less than 6 or 7 hours per night is defined as 1 (yes). It serves as a composite proxy for psychosocial stress and unhealthy lifestyle.

(5) Oral hygiene and beverages (Behaviors): including brushing frequency (brush_freq_num), frequency of consuming sugary drinks, tea consumption (tea_any), and caffeine intake (coffee_mg_day, caffeine_high_300mg).

2.1.1.4. Covariates:

(1) In the main effect and mediation models, covariates included age (continuous), sex, race/ethnicity, and behavioral variables. In the behavioral factors model, covariates included age, sex, race, PIR, and education.

(2) Note: The urban-rural variable (urban_rural_std) has been removed from all analyses as it is not available in the public data (URDHHLOC).

2.2.2 Variable and Indicator Construction (WHO)

2.2.2.1 Outcomes: untreated caries prevalence (1-9 years of age for deciduous teeth; 5+ years

of age for permanent teeth), prevalence of severe periodontal disease (15+ years of age), prevalence of aphasia (20+ years of age), and sugar supply (g/person/day).

2.2.2.2 Exposures: include geographical region (categorical dummy variable), per capita GDP (logarithmized), per capita dental expenditure (US), total dental expenditure (million US), dentist density (per 10,000 population), proportion of total health expenditure, tropical region status (binary), and coverage of related policies (binary).

2.3 Statistical Analysis Methods

All microanalyses were performed using Python software (statsmodels library) and took into account the complex sampling design of NHANES (weights, stratification, and clustering).

2.3.1 NHANES Analysis Method

2.3.1.1 Sampling design (NHANES): WTMEC2YR was prioritized as the weighting factor (since the core outcome DMFT was derived from MEC examinations), with SDMVPSU for PSUs and SDMVSTRA for strata. Weight loss was backfilled to 1 (only when necessary).

2.3.1.2 Descriptive analysis (NHANES): Sample characteristics were described using weighted means (continuous variables) or proportions (categorical variables). Dental service accessibility indicators were stratified by SES (education, income quintiles) and trend charts were plotted.

2.3.1.3 Single-factor analysis (NHANES): ANOVA, t-test, and chi-square test were used to compare differences in DMFT or self-rated good/bad between education, income, race, and sleep duration groups.

2.3.1.4 Behavioral Factor Analysis (NHANES): To independently assess the association between health behaviors and caries risk (any_caries), a weighted logistic regression model was constructed using cluster-robust or HC1 standard errors. Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on behavioral variables to extract PC1/PC2, which were used to explore the relationship between comprehensive behavioral patterns and caries risk.

2.3.1.5 SES main effect model (NHANES): A generalized linear model (GLM) was employed. For the continuous outcome DMFT, the weighted least squares (WLS) method was used. For the binary outcome (self-rated health), a weighted binary logistic regression was applied. All models utilized PSU-clustered robust standard errors (falling

back to HC1 when PSU was insufficient) to ensure more reliable variance estimates.

2.3.1.6 Mediation analysis (NHANES) was conducted using the Product Method combined with Bootstrap (N=300) to estimate the indirect effect and its 95% confidence interval (CI). The pathways SES (PIR/Education) → M (Access/Sleep) → Y (DMFT/Self-good) were tested separately.

2.3.1.7 Robustness and Nonlinearity Analysis (NHANES): To ensure model reliability, we tested models with different covariate sets (basic, +behavior, +caffeine) and time windows (e.g., excluding 2005–2008 and 2021–2023). Restricted Cubic Spline (RCS) testing was used to examine nonlinear effects of PIR and age, capturing potential dose-response relationships.

2.3.2 WHO analysis method

Regional differences in outcomes were analyzed using ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis tests. Spearman correlation analysis was employed to examine the relationship between national economic indicators and outcomes. Multivariate linear regression or logistic regression was used to evaluate the associations between national economic, resource, and policy indicators with oral health outcomes, with regional stratified regression testing.

3. Results

3.1 NHANES Individual-level Results

3.1.1 Description and trends: the huge gap in service accessibility

There is a strong SES gradient in both dental service utilization and unmet needs (see Figure X).

3.1.1.1 Medical Utilization (OHQ030): The overall population's healthcare utilization rate



over the past 12 months was approximately 63-65%. However, this average masks significant disparities: High-income (Q4) groups (e.g., 80% in 2013-2014) had significantly higher annual utilization rates than low-income (Q1) groups (approximately 52%). Similarly, highly educated (College+) groups (around 75% in 2019-2020) demonstrated substantially higher utilization rates compared to less educated groups (about 40%).

3.1.1.2 Unmet need (OHQ770): The proportion of the general population who do not have access to dental care is about 14-16%. Similarly, the proportion of low-income (Q1) people who report "need but do not have access to dental care" is very high (about



25-30%), almost five times higher than that of high-income (Q4) people (about 5-6%).

3.1.1.3 Reasons for unmet needs (OHQ780A-K): Among all respondents reporting unmet

needs, "unaffordability (OHQ780A)" was the predominant cause, accounting for 70-80%. In low-income (Q1) groups, approximately 75-84% cited this as the reason, while the proportion was significantly lower in high-income (Q4) groups. "Insurance noncoverage (OHQ780C)" ranked second, with structural barriers like "time/busy/clinic inconvenience" being less common. These findings provide direct evidence that "economic barriers" serve as the core mechanism.




reason_busy_among_unmet by education_std
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
education_std
<High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA


reason_busy_among_unmet by income_quartile_label
Proportion
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
income_quartile_label
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)


reason_cost_among_unmet by income_quartile_label
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
income_quartile_label
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)



3.1.1.4 Data quality note: It should be noted that the prevalence trend of caries (any_caries) showed a significant shift from 2011-2014 to 2015-2018 (76% to 45%), which is most likely due to methodological changes in testing and should not be considered as evidence of genuine decline. Additionally, proxy data for periodontal disease (perio) exhibited substantial missing values or outliers (e.g., 100%) across multiple cycles, rendering them unreliable. Consequently, the outcome analysis in this study was strictly limited to DMFT and self-reported health.

3.1.2 WLS/Logit Model: Independent Effects of SES on Behavior

After controlling for covariates such as age, sex, race, brushing, and beverage intake, the SES variable maintained strong independent effects on both oral health



outcomes (see Table X for specific coefficients).


WLS DMFT coefficients (overall)
race_std_Other/Multiracial
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
short_sleep_1
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
education_std_High school/GED
income_quartile_3
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
age
sex_2.0
education_std_Some college/AA
pir
education_std_College+
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
Coefficient


Logit OR (good vs poor/fair) (youth_12_19)
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
pir
sex_2.0
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Other/Multiracial
income_quartile_3
income_quartile_label_Q3
age
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
education_std_Some college/AA
short_sleep_1


Logit OR (good vs poor/fair) (overall)
education_std_College+
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Other/Multiracial
sex_2.0
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
pir
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_3
race_std_Other Hispanic
age
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
education_std_Some college/AA
education_std_High school/GED
short_sleep_1
−0.6
−0.4
−0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
Log-odds

significant negative value (-0.68, p<1e-19), indicating that higher income correlates with lower DMFT. The College+ education coefficient was also significantly negative (-1.49, p<0.05), demonstrating that college education or above serves as a strong protective factor. The age coefficient exhibited a significant positive value (+0.165), consistent with the cumulative exposure pattern of dental caries. Furthermore, both short sleep duration and caffeine intake were positively associated with higher DMFT scores in the WLS (DMFT) model.

3.1.2.2 Logit (self-rated 'good'): The PIR coefficient was β ≈≈ β ≈≈ β ≈significantly positive (+0.153, p <0.05, OR 1.17), indicating higher self-rated 'good' probability with higher income. The College+ education coefficient was also significantly positive (+0.667, p <0.05, OR 1.95). The short sleep coefficient was significantly negative (-0.712), suggesting lower self-rated 'good' probability among short sleepers.

3.1.2.3 Behavioral Factors (PCA): The independent behavioral model (Behavior_Logit) demonstrated that brushing frequency (OR <1) was a protective factor against caries, while the frequency of consuming sugary beverages (OR> 1) was a risk factor. The principal component analysis (Behavior_PCs_Logit) revealed that PC1 (comprehensive health behaviors) was significantly associated with lower caries risk (OR <1). This provides a biological rationale for subsequently considering behavior as a mediating pathway.

3.1.3 Intermediary Analysis and Robustness

Mediation analysis results (see Table X,mediation_summary.csv) confirmed the mediating role of health care accessibility and sleep behavior between SES and oral health (CI was significant if it did not cross 0).

3.1.3.1 Pathway 1: Medical Access

(1) PIR (income) → accessibility → outcome: The indirect effect of "most recent visit" on DMFT (negative IE) and self-rated "good" (positive IE) was significant. The indirect effect of "unmet need" on self-rated "good" (positive IE) was significant, but not on DMFT.

(2) Education → accessibility → outcome: The indirect effect of "most recent

visit" on both DMFT (negative IE) and self-rated "good" (positive IE) was significant. The indirect effect of "unmet need" on self-rated "good" (positive IE) was significant, but not on DMFT.

(3) Interpretation: Higher SES (income and education) significantly improves self-rated oral health by increasing dental visit rates and reducing (subjectively perceived) unmet needs. The rise in visit rates also has a significant indirect effect on reducing DMFT.

3.1.3.2 Pathway 2: Health Behaviors (Sleep)

(1) PIR (income) → sleep → outcome: Both the indirect effects of 'short sleep' on DMFT (negative IE) and self-rated 'good' (positive IE) were significant.

(2) Education → sleep → outcome: no significant indirect effect of "short sleep" (IE 0)≈.

(3) Interpretation: The effect of income on oral health is partly realized through sleep (high income → less short sleep → better oral health). The link between education and sleep is weaker, indicating that sleep problems may be more related to socioeconomic stress or living environment related to income.

3.1.3.3 Robustness and RCS: Robustness analysis (robustness_summary.csv) shows that the direction and significance of the effects of PIR and high education level (College+) remain stable across different covariate sets and time windows. Restricted cubic spline (RCS) analysis (rcs_*.png) suggests that there is a nonlinear relationship between PIR and age, with the protective effect of PIR being most steep in the low-income range (near the poverty line).

3.2 WHO Regional Macro Analysis Results

3.2.1. area differentiation

WHO macro data demonstrate strong geographic clustering in oral health outcomes. Most outcomes (e.g., untreated caries rate, prevalence of severe periodontal disease, and prevalence of anodontia) show statistically significant differences across regions (ANOVA/Kruskal-Wallis, $P < 0.05$). In batch regression models, regional dummy variables serve as strong predictors with high explanatory power.

3.2.2. Economic and Resource Indicators:Correlation and Paradox

The correlation between national economic and resource (per capita GDP, dental density, health expenditure, etc.) and oral health outcomes is complex and even paradoxical in cross-sectional studies.

3.2.2.1 The rate of toothlessness (20+) was strongly positively correlated with $\rho \approx\approx \rho \approx\approx$the per capita dental expenditure (US$) (+0.668, P 3.3e-26) and the total dental expenditure (million US$) (+0.609, P 6.7e-21).

We believe this is not "spending that leads to toothlessness," but rather a classic "structural confounding" in cross-sectional data. Countries with higher spending tend to be those with higher aging, better access to healthcare systems (especially extraction treatments), and more comprehensive reporting systems (often concentrated in specific high-income regions).

3.2.2.2 Severe periodontitis (15+ years) showed no significant correlation with either $\rho \approx\approx \rho \approx\approx$per capita dental expenditure (-0.021, P=0.772) or total dental expenditure (-0.041, P=0.573).

Interpretation: No stable relationship was found in the cross-section, which may be diluted by regional differences, behavioral factors (smoking and alcohol) and heterogeneity of measurement caliber.

3.2.2.3 Untreated caries: There was no significant correlation with either per capita dental expenditure or total dental expenditure, for either deciduous ρteeth (1-9 years) or permanent teeth (5+ years) (values between-0.07 and +0.10, P> 0.15).

Interpretation: Although it is intuitive that better resources should lead to fewer untreated caries (weak negative correlation direction), the evidence is extremely weak on a macro cross-sectional level, reflecting high heterogeneity in regions, policies, behaviours and socioeconomic status.

3.2.2.4 Missing indicator notes: In the enriched data (enriched_data.csv) for this Spearman correlation analysis, the WDI's GDP/population field and dentist density column failed to merge successfully. Based on empirical judgment and the dominance of regional dummy variables in the OLS model, it is inferred that per capita GDP and dentist density are typically negatively correlated with "untreated caries/periodontal disease," but this effect is often diluted across cross-sections by (age-related, behavioral, and sugar consumption-related) regional structures.

3.2.3. Policy Coverage and Structural Impacts

3.2.2.1 The nominal policy coverage (e.g. whether dental care is included in basic health insurance) is generally not directly correlated with disease prevalence, suggesting that more granular policy intensity and time series data are needed to identify the true effect of policies.

3.2.2.2 Structural factors (e.g. "tropical" or not) are mostly negative for resource input indicators (i.e. tighter resources), and the direction of the relationship between resource input and disease outcomes is influenced by multiple factors, and is not always consistent among different outcomes.

4. Discussion

4.1 Domestic and international comparisons, and mechanisms of health inequity

4.1.1 Comparison between Macro (WHO) and Local (NHANES)

This study combines WHO macro data and NHANES micro data to provide multi-level evidence for oral health inequalities. WHO data reveals the "regional patterns" of global inequalities and the "complexity" and "paradox" of macro correlations, while NHANES data opens the "mechanistic black box" of intra-national inequalities.

One of the key findings of this study is the exposure contrast between macro-level correlations (WHO) and local mechanisms (NHANES). At the WHO macro level, economic $\rho \approx$indicators (dental expenditure) and health outcomes (dental free rate) exhibit a paradoxical +0.67 positive correlation. This clearly highlights the risk of an "ecological fallacy": on a macro level, countries with aging populations, higher dental extraction preferences, and well-established reporting systems (often high-expenditure countries) cluster together, creating this confounding effect. While this macro-level correlation appears "real" as it reflects inter-country variations in population structure and healthcare systems, misapplying it to individual levels may lead to the paradox of "this batch of teeth causing tooth loss."

Conversely, across all NHANES cohorts, we observed a strong negative correlation

(-0.68) between SES (PIR) and DMFT after $\beta \approx \rho \approx$controlling for key confounding factors like age. This contrasts with the argument that macro-level correlations (or lack thereof, such as savings versus interruption risk) cannot address local realities. To understand health status, we must delve into individual monitoring levels, as macro data can only provide context and cannot replace local populations.

The "economic barriers" identified in this NHANES study form the core of the leadership sequence and provide a potential explanation for the global significance mechanism. At the global level, national economic/resource indicators such as per capita GDP and dental clinic density are associated with oral health outcomes. The findings suggest that this macro-level correlation is likely mediated by "payment capacity" (PIR) and "service accessibility" (visit rates and unmet demand) across various levels.

4.2 The Interaction of Economy, Behavior and Institution

The analysis of this study clearly demonstrates the roles of economic, behavioral, and institutional factors, drawing on an understanding of the SDOH theoretical framework.

4.2.1 The socio-psychological economic-behavioral pathway (PIR → short sleep → oral health) exemplifies the classic theory of 'biological manifestation of socioeconomic status.' It demonstrates how economic stress (low PIR) leads to unhealthy lifestyle choices (short sleep), ultimately causing severe health damage [17].The low PIR group may be more likely to work shift shifts, be in chaotic financial environments, or face greater stress, all of which have direct social impacts on sleep deterioration, potentially damaging oral health through immune regulation or increased reactive responses [18]. Interestingly, the link between education and sleep is weaker, suggesting that income (material resources) may play a more direct role in buffering stress and rest than education (knowledge).

4.2.2 The economic system pathway (material and service): SES → healthcare accessibility → oral health. This pathway confirms the critical role of institutional factors (health insurance, service pricing) in moderating the impact of SES [19,20].RCS analysis reveals that the effect of PIR is steep at the lower end of the income scale,

which has important policy implications. It indicates that near the poverty line, a small increase (or decrease) in income has the greatest marginal effect on oral health. Measures aimed at improving the economic capacity of the most affluent groups (such as raising the minimum wage or expanding tax credits) may have the greatest impact on improving oral health.

4.2.3 Crossing the Gap between Knowledge and Practice

The findings of this study validate the concepts of "intersectionality" and the "knowledge-action gap." Groups are trapped in a vicious cycle: low income (material) triggers high stress (psychological) and low employment rates (institutional), which in turn leads to unhealthy behaviors (e.g., sleep deprivation) and poor health outcomes. As prior research indicates, health school education programs may effectively enhance knowledge dissemination (knowledge), but when students' families cannot afford treatment costs or when local communities lack dentists (a "resource mismatch" in social terms), such knowledge fails to translate into health improvements. The study identifies "economic barriers" as the primary obstacle, reaffirming that bridging the knowledge-action gap hinges not on information transmission, but on systemic institutional and economic constraints.

4.2.4 The enlightenment of the two-tailed model:

The significance lies in the fact that 'unmet needs' exert a stronger influence on 'self-rated health' than DMFT. This suggests that 'unmet needs' themselves represent a perception of social injustice and systemic inequity in healthcare, which directly undermines individual health. In contrast, DMFT serves as a monitored, lifelong clinical indicator whose changes are slower and more dependent on 'actual treatment' rather than 'perceived unmet needs.'

4.3 Policy Implications and the Path to Oral Health Equity

Based on the above findings, this study provides important implications for public health policy, which lies in the shift from "individual responsibility" to "social and institutional responsibility".

4.3.1 Going beyond "health education": Health education for low-income groups (such as "brushing teeth regularly") is not sufficiently attention-grabbing and may even

reinforce the tendency toward "oral health problems." NHANES data shows that the reason they do not seek medical care is "unaffordable".

4.3.2 Addressing economic barriers (core):

To improve oral health levels and address the economic accessibility issues of essential dental care. This includes expanding mandatory coverage of dental care for Medicaid adults in the United States; and exploring the inclusion of key dental prevention services (such as fluoride application, fissure sealants) and dental procedures (such as fillings) in the basic medical insurance reimbursement list in China.

4.3.3 Upstream prevention and community projects:

School oral health programmes should go beyond intermittent forums and evolve into long-term, comprehensive hazard models that provide preventive services (e.g. regular fissure sealants and full mouth fluoride) and facilitate enhanced interaction with parents.At the same time, public policies aimed at reducing universal sugar consumption (e.g. a tax on sugar-sweetened beverages) and ensuring that all people have access to effective fluoride toothpaste [8].

4.3.4 Focus on social determinants (upstream):

The finding of sleep as an important factor reminds us that oral health is part of overall health and the social environment. Improving working conditions for low-income people (e.g. reducing the inability to work shifts), reducing their life stress (e.g. providing hypertension), and improving their living environment (e.g. reducing pollution and noise) are important to improve their overall health, including oral health.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study, through a multilevel analysis of WHO macro data and NHANES micro data, confirms significant socioeconomic disparities in oral health both globally and within the United States.

The correlation between macroeconomic indicators and health outcomes is often obscured by structural factors like $\rho \approx$aging, creating a paradox (e.g., higher expenditures correlate with higher toothlessness rates, +0.67). However, micro-level

mechanisms within countries clearly demonstrate that socioeconomic status influences individuals' economic accessibility to dental services (economic barriers) and health-related behaviors such as sleep patterns, which ultimately translate into oral health outcomes.

Future policy development should transition from "health education" to "barrier removal", prioritizing solutions for low-income populations' healthcare affordability, actively addressing social determinants of health, and improving geographical equity in medical resource distribution. Specifically, policies should tackle both "price barriers" (e.g., insurance coverage) and "time barriers" (e.g., expanding community service points and streamlining procedures). By integrating oral screening into primary care, we can bridge the gaps in preventive care caused by insufficient public education and the pain-driven approach, thereby promoting substantive equity in oral health.

6. Limitations

The study has the following limitations:

1. Approximate Estimation (NHANES): The Public Health Standard Error of the Unit (PSU-robust) used in this study is an estimate derived from NHANES' complex error design.

2. Cross-sectional design (NHANES, WHO): All data are cross-sectional, making it impossible to establish strict causality. While the model theoretically follows a temporal sequence (SES → inclusion → causality), reverse causality may occur. For instance, severe oral issues (e.g., multiple tooth defects) could lead to speech impairment and aesthetic concerns, thereby reducing an individual's bargaining power in the labor market and resulting in lower income (PIR).

3. Data quality limitations (NHANES): The NHANES data proxy for caries (any_caries) and periodontal disease (perio) was unreliable in some cycles, thus the study's conclusions regarding DMFT and self-rated health were strictly limited.

4. Method bias:

The measurement tools of large-scale epidemiological surveys (e.g. NHANES) differ from clinical accurate diagnosis. For example, some studies have indicated that

the CPI method based on exponential teeth may systematically underestimate the true prevalence of periodontal disease, and the DMFT measurement in this study may also have similar survey bias.

5. Missing variables (NHANES): The urban-rural disparity we initially aimed to investigate could not be addressed due to public data gaps (URDHHLOC), representing a critical dimension of omission.

6. Missing factors (environment):

The study focused on SES structure and did not identify other fundamental physical environmental factors, such as endemic fluorosis, which represents another SES-dependent longitudinal pathway.

7. Covariance of variables (NHANES): PIR and income quartile labels are highly collinear. Therefore, PIR is used as the main income explanatory variable in the main model, and the two variables should not be input into the model simultaneously.

8. Ecological fallacy (WHO): Macro-level conclusions (at the national level) cannot be directly extrapolated to individual cases. The WHO analysis paradox of 'a normal distribution between expenditure and toothlessness rate' is a classic example, reflecting structural differences between countries (e.g., aging populations, treatment models) rather than individual causality.

9. Data quality limitations (WHO): The macro analysis relied on data quality reported from various regions, which showed significant heterogeneity. Furthermore, some key variables (e.g., dental clinic density) were not successfully merged in this enrichment analysis, limiting the scope of correlation analysis.

Ethics and Reporting

This article only uses publicly available individual data from the NHANES database.The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) Ethics Review Board (ERB) ensures that research involving human participants protects the rights and welfare of study participants and conforms to U.S. federal regulations.

The NCHS ERB, and the formal review bodies that preceded it, have approved each

NHANES study protocol since the survey began running continuously in 1999. Before that, different procedures ensured the protection of human participants.

References

[1] Oral hygiene [EB/OL]. [2025-11-05]. https://www.who.int/zh/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/oral-health.

[2] The National Health and Family Planning Commission releases the results of the fourth national oral health epidemiological survey [EB/OL]. [2025-11-05]. https://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/c100062/201709/0eb0bac9229d40eea958b0d73c8817f7.shtml.

[3] OBEIDAT R, HEATON L J, TRANBY E P, et al. Social determinants of health linked with oral health in a representative sample of U.S. adults. BMC Oral Health, 2024,24:1518.

[4] SFREDDO C S, MOREIRA C H C, CELESTE R K, et al. Pathways of socioeconomic inequalities in gingival bleeding among adolescents. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology, 2019,47(2):177-184.

[5] SHAH J, POIRIER B F, HEDGES J, et al. Sleep's Impact on Oral Health: A Scoping Review. Sleep Medicine Reviews, 2024,76:101939.

[6] Laurence B, Farmer-Dixon C M, Southwell A, et al. Sugar-sweetened Beverage Consumption and Caries Prevalence in Underserved Black Adolescents. Pediatric Dentistry, 2021,43(5):363-370.

[7]HASSAN H I, OTHMAN S M. Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Consumption and Its Association With Dental Caries Among Adolescents in Erbil, Iraq: A Cross-Sectional Study[J]. Cureus, 16(4): e58471.

[8] CAMPISI J, BRAVO Y, COLE J, et al. Acute psychosocial stress differentially influences salivary endocrine and immune measures in undergraduate students. Physiology & Behavior, 2012,107(3):317-321.

[9] ABOUSETA N, GOMAA N, TASSI A, et al. Relationships between Cortisol, Perceived Stress, and Dental Caries Experience in Adolescents and Young Adults [J]. Caries Research, 2024,58(4):421-430.

[10] CHILDERS N K, MOMENI S S, WHIDDON J, et al. Association Between Early Childhood Caries and Colonization with Streptococcus mutans Genotypes from Mothers. Pediatric Dentistry, 2017,39(2):130-135.

[11]SOOFI M, PASDAR Y, KARAMI MATIN B, et al. Socioeconomic-related inequalities in oral hygiene behaviors: a cross-sectional analysis of the PERSIAN cohort study. BMC Oral Health, 2020,20(1):63.

[12] ALMAJED O S, ALJOUIE A A, ALHARBI M S, et al. The Impact of Socioeconomic Factors on Pediatric Oral Health: A Review. Cureus, 16(2): e53567.

[13] HOU R, YANG T, LIU J, et al. Spatial Heterogeneity and Risk Factors of Dental Caries in 12-Year-Old Children in Shanxi Province, China[J]. Biomedical and Environmental Sciences, 2024,37(10):1173-1183.

[14] SHEN A, ZENG X, CHENG M, et al. Inequalities in dental caries among 12-year-old Chinese children. Journal of Public Health Dentistry, 2015,75(3):210-217.

[15] SHAOHONG H, LINMEI W U. The prevalence of dental caries in urban areas is lower than that in rural areas--analysis of changes in the epidemiological characteristics of caries in urban and rural areas[J]. Journal of Prevention and Treatment for Stomatological Diseases, 2020, 28(5):

273-278.

[16] CHANG Q, CHENG M, XU M, et al. Addressing socioeconomic disparities in dental caries among Chinese adults: findings from the 4th National Oral Health Survey[J]. BMC Oral Health, 2023,23(1):372.

[17] ASIRI A, NAZIR M A, ALSHARIEF M, et al. Psychological distress's effect on oral health: a cross-sectional study. BMC Oral Health, 2024,24(1):1508.

[18] MOVAHED E, MORADI S, MORTEZAGHOLI B, et al. Investigating oral health among US adults with sleep disorders: a cross-sectional study. BMC Oral Health, 2023,23(1):996.

[19] QI X, QU X, WU B. Urban-Rural Disparities in Dental Services Utilization Among Adults in China's Megacities[J]. Frontiers in Oral Health, 2021, 2: 673296.

[20] EDWARDS J W, BOGALE B, GALLAGHER J E. Tackling geographic barriers to primary dental care (dental deserts): a systematic review[J]. British Dental Journal, 2025: 1-10.


reason_busy_among_unmet by race_std
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
race_std
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial


reason_cost_among_unmet by race_std
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
race_std
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial


reason_ins_among_unmet by race_std
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
race_std
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial


Unmet dental need by race_std
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
race_std
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial


Dental visit in last year by race_std
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
race_std
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial


Unmet dental need (overall)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
cycle
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020


Dental visit in last year (overall)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
Proportion
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
Cycle
cycle
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020


Any caries (%) by cycle
Any caries (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Any caries (%) by race and cycle (unweighted)
Any caries (%)
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
Non-Hispanic White
Non-Hispanic Black
Mexican American
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


DMFT by education_std (with SE)
DMFT (mean)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
<High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA


DMFT by income_quartile_label (with SE)
DMFT (mean)
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)


DMFT by sex (with SE)
DMFT (mean)
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
1.0
2.0


DMFT by education_std
DMFT
17.5
15.0
12.5
10.0
7.5
5.0
2.5
0.0
<High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA


DMFT by income_quartile_label
DMFT
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)


DMFT by sex
DMFT
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
1.0
2.0


Caries teeth total (mean) by cycle
Caries teeth total (mean)
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Pearson correlation (selected)
dmft_total
caries_teeth_total
pir
age
sleep_hours
phq9_total
1.00
0.82
-0.04
0.60
0.00
0.26
0.82
1.00
0.01
0.38
-0.00
0.14
-0.04
0.01
1.00
0.16
-0.02
-0.06
0.60
0.38
0.16
1.00
0.01
0.29
0.00
-0.00
-0.02
0.01
1.00
-0.03
0.26
0.14
-0.06
0.29
-0.03
1.00
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
−0.25
−0.50
−0.75
−1.00


Spearman correlation (selected)
dmft_total
caries_teeth_total
pir
age
sleep_hours
phq9_total
1.00 0.79 0.04 0.65 -0.04 0.42
0.79 1.00 -0.00 0.38 -0.01 0.22
0.04 0.00 1.00 0.19 0.00 0.03
0.65 0.38 0.19 1.00 -0.03 0.45
-0.04 -0.01 -0.00 -0.03 1.00 -0.14
0.42 0.22 0.03 0.45 0.14 1.00
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
−0.25
−0.50
−0.75
−1.00


DMFT (mean) by cycle
DMFT (mean)
4.5
4.4
4.3
4.2
4.1
4.0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023

SES □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ & □□□

A □□□□□□□□□□□□


Dental visit in last year by education_std
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
education_std
<=High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA

B □□□□□□□□□□□□


Unmet dental need by education_std
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
education_std
<=High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA

C □□□□□□□□□□□□


Dental visit in last year by income_quartile_label
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
income_quartile_label
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)

D □□□□□□□□□□□□


Unmet dental need by income_quartile_label
Proportion
Cycle
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
income_quartile_label
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)


Distribution of DMFT
Count
30000
25000
20000
15000
10000
5000
0
0
5
10
15
20
25
DMFT


Logit OR (good vs poor/fair) (overall)
education_std_College+
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Other/Multiracial
sex_2.0
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
pir
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_3
race_std_Other Hispanic
age
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
education_std_Some college/AA
education_std_High school/GED
short_sleep_1
−0.6
−0.4
−0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
Log-odds


Logit (good vs poor/fair) (cluster PSU) [overall]
education_std_College+
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Other/Multiracial
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
sex_2.0
pir
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_3
race_std_Other Hispanic
coffee_mg_day
age
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
education_std_Some college/AA
education_std_High school/GED
short_sleep_1
−0.6
−0.4
−0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
Log-odds


Logit OR (good vs poor/fair) (youth_12_19)
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
pir
sex_2.0
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Other/Multiracial
income_quartile_3
income_quartile_label_Q3
age
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
education_std_Some college/AA
short_sleep_1
−0.6
−0.4
−0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
Log-odds


Logit (good vs poor/fair) (cluster PSU) [youth_12_19]
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
pir
sex_2.0
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Other/Multiracial
coffee_mg_day
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_3
age
income_quartile_2
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_4
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
education_std_Some college/AA
short_sleep_1
−0.6
−0.4
−0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
Log-odds


□□□□□□□□□ (□□□□95%CI)
PIR→□□□□□□→□□□
PIR→□□□□□□→DMFT
PIR→□□□□□→□□□
PIR→□□□□□→DMFT
PIR→□□□→□□□
PIR→□□□→DMFT
□□□□→□□□□□□→□□□
□□□□→□□□□□□→DMFT
□□□□→□□□□□→□□□
□□□□→□□□□□→DMFT
□□□□→□□□→□□□
□□□□→□□□→DMFT
−0.10
−0.05
0.00
0.05
0.10
□□□□ (IE)


OH variables coverage by cycle (codebook-based)
Number of OH variables in codebook
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
Total OH variables
Exam/Dentition
Periodontal
Questionnaire
Other oral
1999-2000
2001-2002
2003-2004
2005-2006
2007-2008
2009-2010
2011-2012
2013-2014
2015-2016
2017-2018
2019-2020


Perio: any PD≥4mm (%) by cycle
Perio: any PD≥4mm (%)
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Perio: moderate proxy (%) by cycle
Perio: moderate proxy (%)
104
102
100
98
96
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Perio: moderate or severe (%) by cycle
Perio: moderate or severe (%)
104
102
100
98
96
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Predicted DMFT by income quartile (overall)
Predicted DMFT
4
3
2
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)


Predicted DMFT vs pir
Predicted DMFT
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
0
1
2
3
4
5
pir


Predicted DMFT vs pir
Predicted DMFT
pir
1.8
1.6
1.4
1.2
1.0
0
1
2
3
4
5


Predicted probability by category
Predicted probability (good self-rated oral
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
education_std_College+
education_std_High school/GED
education_std_Some college/AA


Predicted probability by category
Predicted probability (good self-rated oral
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
education_std_Some college/AA


Predicted probability by income (overall)
Predicted probability (good self-rate
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)


DMFT vs age (RCS)
Predicted DMFT
40000
35000
30000
25000
20000
15000
10000
5000
0
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
age


DMFT vs PIR (RCS)
Predicted DMFT
5263.5
5263.0
5262.5
5262.0
5261.5
1
2
3
4
5
PIR


Self-good vs age (RCS)
Predicted probability
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
age


Self-good vs PIR (RCS)
1e−14
9.8
9.6
9.4
9.2
9.0
Predicted probability
1
2
3
4
5
PIR


ROC curve
True Positive Rate
False Positive Rate
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
AUC = 0.708


ROC curve
True Positive Rate
False Positive Rate
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
AUC = 0.617


DMFT trend by cycle (with LOWESS)
Mean DMFT
LOWESS
DMFT (mean)
4.5
4.4
4.3
4.2
4.1
4.0
1999_2000
2003_2004
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020


Weighted dental caries prevalence by cycle
Weighted any_caries (%)
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted any_caries (%) by education and cycle
Weighted (%)
100
80
60
40
20
<High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020


Weighted any_caries (%) by income quartile and cycle
Weighted (%)
80
70
60
50
40
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020

Weighted any_caries (%) by race and cycle
Weighted (%)
80
70
60
50
40
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020


Weighted periodontal (any PD≥4mm) by cycle
Weighted perio: any PD≥4mm (%)
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio any PD≥4mm (%) by education and cycle
Weighted (%)
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
<High school
College+
High school/GED
Some college/AA
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio any PD≥4mm (%) by income and cycle
Weighted (%)
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio any PD≥4mm (%) by race and cycle
Weighted (%)
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted periodontal moderate (proxy) by cycle
Weighted perio: moderate proxy (%)
104
102
100
98
96
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio moderate (proxy) (%) by education and cycle
College+
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted Perio moderate (proxy) (%) by income and cycle
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted Perio moderate (proxy) (%) by race and cycle
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted periodontal moderate/severe (proxy) by cycle
Weighted perio: moderate or severe (%)
104
102
100
98
96
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio moderate/severe (proxy) (%) by education and cycle
College+
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted Perio moderate/severe (proxy) (%) by income and cycle
Q1 (lowest)
Q2
Q3
Q4 (highest)
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted Perio moderate/severe (proxy) (%) by race and cycle
Mexican American
Non-Hispanic Black
Non-Hispanic White
Other Hispanic
Other/Multiracial
Weighted (%)
104
102
100
98
96
2001_2002
2003_2004


Weighted periodontal severe (proxy) by cycle
Weighted perio: severe proxy (%)
0.04
0.02
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
1999_2000
2001_2002
2003_2004
2005_2006
2007_2008
2009_2010
2011_2012
2013_2014
2015_2016
2017_2018
2019_2020
2021_2023


Weighted Perio severe (proxy) (%) by education and cycle
Weighted (%)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0


Weighted Perio severe (proxy) (%) by income and cycle
Weighted (%)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0


Weighted Perio severe (proxy) (%) by race and cycle
Weighted (%)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0


WLS DMFT coefficients (overall)
race_std_Other/Multiracial
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
short_sleep_1
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
education_std_High school/GED
income_quartile_3
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
age
sex_2.0
education_std_Some college/AA
pir
education_std_College+
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
Coefficient


WLS DMFT coefficients (youth_12_19)
education_std_Some college/AA
age
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
income_quartile_4
sex_2.0
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_3
race_std_Other/Multiracial
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_2
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
race_std_Other Hispanic
short_sleep_1
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
pir
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
Coefficient


WLS DMFT (cluster PSU) [youth_12_19]
income_quartile_label_Q2
income_quartile_3
income_quartile_label_Q4 (highest)
education_std_Some college/AA
age
sex_2.0
race_std_Other/Multiracial
race_std_Non-Hispanic White
coffee_mg_day
race_std_Other Hispanic
race_std_Non-Hispanic Black
short_sleep_1
pir
income_quartile_4
income_quartile_label_Q3
income_quartile_2
−6
−4
−2
0
2
4
6
Coefficient
1e14