

Patient's Satisfaction with the Use of Fixed Partial Denture.

Kamal Nayan¹, Lalima Kumari²

¹Lecturer, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Hazaribagh College of Dental Sciences and Hospital, Hazaribagh.

²Lecturer, Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Patna Dental College and Hospital, Patna-4.

Received: February 2019

Accepted: February 2019

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher. Annals of International Medical and Dental Research (AIMDR) is an Official Publication of "Society for Health Care & Research Development". It is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: The dental literature quotes around 7000 articles related to fixed partial dentures. However, only some of them are associated with patients' perceptions of outcomes and their satisfaction level with FPD treatment. The present study was conducted with the aim to evaluate the patient satisfaction using fixed partial denture. **Methods:** Questions regarding masticatory efficiency, esthetics, speech, the comfort and the maintenance of oral hygiene and the ease of cleaning were noted. All the data thus obtained was arranged in a tabulated form and analyzed using SPSS software. Data was expressed as percentage of the total value. **Results:** The present study enrolled 200 subjects with the mean age of 37.72±4.89 years. There were 128 (64%) subjects who were wearing FPD for 0-3 years, 34 subjects (17%) wore FPD for 4-7 years and there were 38 subjects who were wearing FPD for more than 10 years. There were 0.25% subjects who were not satisfied with the mastication and comfort and esthetic and maintenance respectively. **Conclusion:** The results of the present study illustrated that the fixed partial prosthesis are very satisfying amongst the patients.

Keywords: Esthetics, speech, satisfaction, prosthesis.

INTRODUCTION

Fixed partial dentures have been the management of choice for replacing the missing teeth since past years. The dental literature quotes around 7000 articles related to fixed partial dentures. However, only some of them are associated with patients' perceptions of outcomes and their satisfaction level with FPD treatment. Edentulous conditions and dental disorders have affected the patients adversely. Subjects with the dental conditions are affected by a changed self-image.^[1] Few people expect them to be socially less competent and less intellectual.^[2] Dentofacial issues have certain effects on subject's satisfaction regarding esthetics, performance, and function.^[3-5] The prosthodontic literature is has many studies on subject satisfaction amongst complete denture wearers, but with very less consensus on the factors alter it.^[6,7] There have been numerous reports on the patient's satisfaction with implant-based prostheses amongst edentulous subjects have been equivocal.^[8] Studies in the past on satisfaction amongst the partial denture subjects have primarily engrossed on the subjects managed with removable partial

dentures,^[9] although there are few studies on subject groups managed by a diversity of prosthodontic methods.^[10,11] The general conclusion in these studies is that patient satisfaction is a complicated and multidimensional spectacle,^[12] much of that is still unclear. The present study was conducted with the aim to evaluate the patient satisfaction using fixed partial denture.

MATERIALS & METHODS

The present observational study was conducted in the department of prosthodontics. The study enrolled all the patients who reported to the department for fixed partial denture and consented to participate in the study. The study was approved by the institutional ethical board and all the subjects were informed about the study and a consent was obtained from them in their vernacular language. These subjects were administered a pretested close ended questionnaire to evaluate their perception about the clinical outcome of their FPD. Questions regarding masticatory efficiency, esthetics, speech, the comfort and the maintenance of oral hygiene and the ease of cleaning were noted. The questionnaire assessed the perception of patient and their attitude regarding the fixed partial denture. A total of 200 subjects were made to fill the questionnaire. The duration of their FPD usage was also recorded in the study. All the data thus obtained was arranged in a tabulated form

Name & Address of Corresponding Author

Dr. Lalima Kumari
Lecturer,
Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics,
Patna Dental College and Hospital,
Patna-4.

and analyzed using SPSS software. Data was expressed as percentage of the total value.

RESULTS

The present study enrolled 200 subjects with the mean age of 37.72+/-4.89 years.

[Table 1] illustrates the satisfaction of subjects using fixed partial denture. There were 128 (64%) subjects who were wearing FPD for 0-3 years, 34 subjects (17%) wore FPD for 4-7 years and there were 38 subjects who were wearing FPD for more than 10 years. There were 90% (n=180) subjects who were satisfied with the function of FPD and rest 10% were not satisfied with the function of FPD. There were 80% (n=160) subjects who were esthetically satisfied and 20% were not satisfied with the esthetics.

[Figure 1] illustrates the reason for un-satisfaction amongst the subjects. There were 0.25% subjects who were not satisfied with the mastication and comfort and esthetic and maintenance respectively. There were 5% subjects who were not satisfied with the speech and maintenance and esthetic and mastication respectively. There were 10% subjects who were not satisfied with the comfort, maintenance and mastication respectively. There were 50% subjects who were not satisfied with the esthetics.

Table 1: Satisfaction of the patients.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Duration (Years)		
0-3	128	64
4-7	34	17
>10	38	19
Satisfaction with function		
Yes	180	90
No	20	10
Satisfaction with esthetics		
Yes	160	80
No	40	20




Figure 1: Reasons for unsatisfied treatment

DISCUSSION

While assessment of the efficacy of fixed prosthesis treatment, Anderson in the year 1998 illustrated that it is crucial to regard both the dentist's as well as the subject's are satisfied.^[18] Studies to investigate subject's satisfaction were performed in different nations, like Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, Croatia, and Singapore,^[10,13-17] all found that subject's satisfaction with FPD was very high. Whereas, important satisfaction like patient satisfaction are clearly underrated in the present literature, mainly for implant prosthesis.^[18] As per a recent study established that implant based prosthesis positively influence the subject's life's quality, the amount of satisfaction, and their ability to maintain oral hygiene.^[19] In the present study, there were 128 (64%) subjects who were wearing FPD for 0-3 years, 34 subjects (17%) wore FPD for 4-7 years and there were 38 subjects who were wearing FPD for more than 10 years. There were 90% (n=180) subjects who were satisfied with the function of FPD and rest 10% were not satisfied with the function of FPD. There were 80% (n=160) subjects who were esthetically satisfied and 20% were not satisfied with the esthetics. There were 0.25% subjects who were not satisfied with the mastication and comfort and esthetic and maintenance respectively. There were 5% subjects who were not satisfied with the speech and maintenance and esthetic and mastication respectively. There were 10% subjects who were not satisfied with the comfort, maintenance and mastication respectively. There were 50% subjects who were not satisfied with the esthetics. The high incidence of females amongst the studied sample suggested that females in Sudan were more anxious about getting their missing teeth replaced. This outcome feels into pact with the past studies where females were more crucial about their facial appearance.^[19,20] The clinical outcome evaluations by dentists do not essentially signify the patients' judgment that encompassed both functional and psychosocial adaption.^[21] Concerns of subjects are primarily associated with function, comfort, and esthetics, specially for implant based fixed prosthesis.^[22,23] In an investigation by Wismeijer et al. on satisfaction of patient on implant, it was seen that there was no significant enhancement in speech that was more tuff to explain.^[24] It is the duty of the clinician to inform the patients that future care is needed for the maintenance of the restoration and the rest of the teeth.^[25]

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study illustrated that the fixed partial prosthesis are very satisfying amongst the patients. Majority of them were satisfied with the esthetics and functional aspect of the fixed partial prosthesis. If the clinicians illustrate the post

treatment instructions properly then patient satisfaction is not an issue of concern.

REFERENCES

1. Fiske J, Davis DM, Frances C, Gelbier S. The emotional effects of tooth loss in edentulous people. *Br Dent J* 1998;184:90-3.
2. Newton JT, Prabhu N, Robinson PG. The impact of dental appearance on the appraisal of personal characteristics. *Int J Prosthodont* 2003;16:429-34.
3. Nikias MK, Sollecito WA, Fink R. An empirical approach to developing multidimensional oral status profiles. *J Public Health Dent* 1978;38:148-58.
4. Leao A, Sheiham A. Relation between clinical dental status and subjective impacts on daily living. *J Dent Res* 1995;74:1408-13.
5. Slade GD, Spencer AJ. Social impact of oral conditions among older adults. *Aust Dent J* 1994;39:358-64.
6. Elias AC, Sheiham A. The relationship between satisfaction with mouth and number and position of teeth. *J Oral Rehabil* 1998;25:649-61.
7. Yoshida M, Sato Y, Akagawa Y, Hiasa K. Correlation between quality of life and denture satisfaction in elderly complete denture wearers. *Int J Prosthodont* 2001;14:77-80.
8. Feine JS, Dufresne E, Boudrias P, Lund JP. Outcome assessment of implant-supported prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent* 1998;79:575-9.
9. Frank RP, Brudvik JS, Leroux B, Milgrom P, Hawkins N. Relationship between the standards of removable partial denture construction, clinical acceptability, and patient satisfaction. *J Prosthet Dent* 2000;83:521-7.
10. Hakestam U, Söderfeldt B, Rydén O, GlantzE, GlantzPO. Dimensions of satisfaction among prosthodontic patients. *Eur J Prosthodont Restor Dent* 1997;5:111-7.
11. Fromentin O, Boy-Lefèvre ML. Quality of prosthetic care: Patients' level of expectation attitude and satisfaction. *Eur J Prosthodont Restor Dent* 2001;9:123-9.
12. Sondell K, Söderfeldt B, Palmqvist S. Dentist-patient communication and patient satisfaction in prosthetic dentistry. *Int J Prosthodont* 2002;15:28-37.
13. Oates AJ, Fitzgerald M, Alexander G. Patient decision-making in relation to extensive restorative dental treatment. Part I: Characteristics of patients. *Br Dent J* 1995;178:449-53.
14. Näpänkangas R, Salonen MA, Raustia AM. A 10-year follow-up study of fixed metal ceramic prosthodontics. *J Oral Rehabil* 1997;24:713-7.
15. Creugers NH, De Kanter RJ. Patients' satisfaction in two long-term clinical studies on resin-bonded bridges. *J Oral Rehabil* 2000;27:602-7.
16. Stipetic J, Celebic A, Jerolimov V, Vinter I, Kraljevic S, Rajic Z. The patient's and the therapist's evaluation of bridges of different materials and age. *Coll Antropol* 2000;24 Suppl 1:25-9.
17. Tan K, Li AZ, Chan ES. Patient satisfaction with fixed partial dentures: A 5-year retrospective study. *Singapore Dent J* 2005;27:23-9.
18. den Hartog L, Slater JJ, Vissink A, Meijer HJ, Raghoebar GM. Treatment outcome of immediate, early and conventional single-tooth implants in the aesthetic zone: A systematic review to survival, bone level, soft-tissue, aesthetics and patient satisfaction. *J Clin Periodontol* 2008;35:1073-86.
19. Goiato MC, Torcato LB, Dos Santos DM, Moreno A, Antenucci RM, de Carvalho Dekon SF. Quality of life and satisfaction of patients wearing implant-supported fixed partial denture: A cross-sectional survey of patients from Araçatuba city, Brazil. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2015;26:701-8.
20. Xiaoxian Meng, Gilbert GH, Duncan RP, Heft MW. Satisfaction with dental appearance among diverse groups of dentate adults. *J Aging Health* 2007;19:778-91.
21. Ring L, Höfer S, Heuston F, Harris D, O'Boyle CA. Response shift masks the treatment impact on patient reported outcomes (PROs): The example of individual quality of life in edentulous patients. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005;3:55.
22. Cibirka RM, Razzoog M, Lang BR. Critical evaluation of patient responses to dental implant therapy. *J Prosthet Dent* 1997;78:574-81.
23. Stellingsma K, Bouma J, Stegenga B, Meijer HJ, Raghoebar GM. Satisfaction and psychosocial aspects of patients with an extremely resorbed mandible treated with implant-retained overdentures. A prospective, comparative study. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2003;14:166-72.
24. Wismeijer D, Tawse-Smith A, Payne AG. Multicentre prospective evaluation of implant-assisted mandibular bilateral distal extension removable partial dentures: Patient satisfaction. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2013;24:20-7.
25. Balshi TJ, MingledorffEB. Maintenance procedures for patients after complete fixed prosthodontics. *JProsthet Dent* 1977;37:420-31.

How to cite this article: Nayan K, Kumari L. Patient's Satisfaction with the Use of Fixed Partial Denture. *Ann. Int. Med. Den. Res.* 2019; 5(2):DE20-DE22.

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared