



Hindawi Publishing Corporation

International Journal of Dentistry

International Journal of Dentistry  
Volume 2009 (2009), Article ID 945074, 6 pages  
doi:10.1155/2009/945074

### Research Article

## Trends in Finnish Public Orthodontic Care from the Professionals' Perspective

Ilpo Pietilä,<sup>1</sup> Terttu Pietilä,<sup>1</sup> Juha Varrela,<sup>2</sup> Pertti Pirttiniemi,<sup>3</sup> and F...

<sup>1</sup>Oral Health Services, Health Centre of Pori, P.O. Box 33, 28601 Pori, Finland

<sup>2</sup>Departments of Oral Development and Orthodontics and Public Health, Institute of Dentistry, University of Turku, 20520 Turku, Finland

<sup>3</sup>Department of Oral Development and Orthodontics, Institute of Dentistry, University of Turku, 20520 Turku, Finland

Received 18 July 2008; Accepted 1 December 2008

Academic Editor: W. Murray Thomson

Copyright © 2009 Ilpo Pietilä et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### Abstract

The study maps out orthodontic care in Finnish municipal health centres. The previous ten years reported by chief dental officers, and assessed the availability of orthodontic services. The data were collected by questionnaires in all health centres in Finland. Of all 0 - 18-year-olds, 11% were receiving orthodontic treatment (the health centres). The most frequently used appliances were fixed appliances. Economic resources and the lack of orthodontic expertise were decreasing the volume of services. The orthodontists mentioned the guidelines as the most important aspects that should be improved. They suggested increasing the number of specialist orthodontists and the number of health centres providing orthodontic services.

### 1. Introduction

In Finnish health centres, orthodontic treatment is an important part of dental care, all of which are free of charge up to the age of 18 years. In the early 1990s, the number of adolescents to the health centres was connected with orthodontic treatment.

depression later in the 1990s, most health centres had to restrict public dental health care was gradually changing, and today, dental services. Despite this development, it is generally accepted as endangered. Each municipal health centre can decide on the extent of the access to orthodontic treatment varies considerably [2, 3].

In countries with publicly funded orthodontic services, dentists provide orthodontic treatment [4, 5]. The access to orthodontic treatment is influenced by the number of orthodontists for assessment and the sufficiency of services. It is also influenced by the thoroughness of examination, the consistency of the perceived efficacy of treatment. Different guidelines have been developed to assess treatment need, but they do not seem to have much impact on the actual treatment. In Finland, the most frequently applied method in the assessment of orthodontic treatment need is from Grainger's TPI-index [8] by Heikinheimo [9] that is used in most health centres. It represents the most severe malocclusions or craniofacial malocclusions. The most frequently applied cut-off level entitling to treatment is 7. However, it varies between grades 2 and 8 according to the resources of the health centre.

The availability of services is greatly influenced by the distribution of specialists in the country, the majority of specialists live in the largest cities or densely populated areas, this may lead either to restrictions in access to specialist services or to services given by general dentists [10]. In Finland, the availability of specialist orthodontic services varies between health centres in the country. In most health centres, the role of specialist orthodontists is limited, but general dentists commonly provide treatment at least in all centres.

When public orthodontic care of children and adolescents is evaluated, it is important to evaluate orthodontic services as such and the perspective of the entire dental service. This study examines orthodontic care in Finnish municipal health centres and its development during the past ten years as viewed by the local chief dental officers working in the health centres.

## 2. Methods

In April 2002, two different semistructured questionnaires were sent to all health centres in Finland. A questionnaire was sent to all local chief dental officers and a questionnaire was based on an earlier questionnaire, which mapped the orthodontic care in 1992 [2], and it inquired about the number of personnel involved in orthodontic care, the number of orthodontic patients and visits, the use of removal appliances, orthodontic care in the previous ten years, and the chief dental officer's opinion on what research is needed. A follow-up letter was sent to the chief dental officers.

Another different questionnaire was sent to all 146 specialist orthodontists in Finland in 2001, regardless of their type of employment. The names and addresses of the specialists were obtained from the files of the Finnish Dental Society. The answers received concerning the main indications for starting treatment in children at each developmental stage and the choice of appliances have been analyzed in a previous study [11].

The present study includes only the answers of those respondents who were specialist orthodontists or consultant orthodontists, or who provided community dental services, because they possessed real facts about activities in health centres. They were asked to evaluate, in open questions, orthodontic services and orthodontic treatment, to report recent changes in their treatment practices, to give suggestions for further research, and to suggest orthodontic issues needing further research.



Seventy-four percent of chief dental officers reported major changes in the previous five years. In thirty-four health centres, major changes in orthodontic services (Table 4). Most of these changes concerned orthodontic services. The number of orthodontists had increased in twenty-seven and decreased in seven.

**Table 4:** Changes in the volume of orthodontic services by local chief dental officers ( $N = 34$ ).

### 3.2. Specialist Orthodontists' Views on Orthodontic Care in

The specialist orthodontists proposed that specialists should not give up general dentistry, but rather focus on treatment planning, consultation, and difficult treatment. Forty-five percent of respondents preferred a 50/50 division between specialists and general dentists; thirty-three (47%) preferred a 70/30 division, mainly by delegating simpler treatments to them: treatment with face mask, and removable appliances. Seventeen respondents (24%) preferred a 90/10 division, with specialists handling difficult treatments and the number of treatments started by general dentists.

Only one specialist orthodontist wanted to decrease delegation to general dentists. The most common suggestion for increasing delegation by devolving routine tasks more often. The most common suggestions (51% of respondents answering this question), re-education and motivation (42%), bonding of brackets (15%), and orthodontic treatment.

Eighty-one percent of specialist orthodontists had made some changes in their practice in the preceding ten years. The most frequent changes concerned the adoption of an eruption guidance appliance was most common. Other changes in the timing of treatment (54%), with the majority (71%) of respondents delegating orthodontic tasks to general dentists.

When the specialist orthodontists were asked to name those features of good quality, 55% listed the population-based system in the orthodontic care, 20% listed the professional skills of specialists, and 20% listed the professional skills in the orthodontic care.

When assessing public orthodontic care as a whole, the orthodontists mentioned improvement suggestions were an increase in specialist orthodontic services, access to orthodontic treatment and unsatisfactory routines in orthodontic care. The most common improvement suggestion was an increase in specialist orthodontic services.

**Table 5:** Aspects in need of improvement and suggestions for improvement by specialist orthodontists (percentage of respondents).

Both respondent groups stressed the need for research on treatment methods. The need for research on treatment efficacy of treatment methods was similarly mentioned by both groups. The need for research on treatment effectiveness was especially emphasized by the orthodontists (Table 6).

**Table 6:** Suggestions for subjects for further research (percentage of respondents in parenthesis).

## 4. Discussion

There was a wide variation in the extent of orthodontic services in different health centres. Access and delivery of treatment also seemed to be the main

cooperating with health centres. The economic depression in the 1990s led to a reduction of orthodontic services, and more health centres had increased the

The earlier survey on public orthodontic care of children and adolescents made it possible to evaluate the changes in services during the ten-year period. The need generally increased, but the 20-fold differences among health centres remained. The guidance appliance, was introduced during the period. The eruptive use of removable plates and functional appliances in the early treatment. The use of auxiliaries had increased, and delegation was widely accepted by the

The information on orthodontic treatment delivery in health centres was incomplete. In nonresponding health centres were smaller ones, which obviously led to incomplete data. Because this evaluation concentrated on public services provided in health centres include only the views of the orthodontists working in or cooperating with

The methods of measuring the volume of orthodontic treatment varied between the countries and comparisons [3, 12, 13]. According to Chestnutt et al. [12], the volume of orthodontic treatment in Britain between 1993 and 2003. Correspondingly, we found that the percentage of children receiving orthodontic treatment had increased from 7.6% in 1992 to

The average share of orthodontic visits of all dental visits of children and adolescents in 1992 [2] to 30% in this study. An explanation for the increase in the share of orthodontic visits of general dental visits [14]. Furthermore, in 1998, the National Institute of Health published a report recommending longer oral examination intervals. The large variation among health centres in the share of orthodontic visits led to this change.

Most of the changes in providing orthodontic services were related to the increase in the number of orthodontists was reported more often in larger health centres. To organize specialist services seem to differ between small and large health centres. In this study, the availability of health centres' own orthodontic expertise was limited. Health centres employing their own salaried specialist had increased the share of orthodontic services regardless of their size, have an equal responsibility to organize treatment. It may be one reason why the percentage of health centres purchasing orthodontic services increased from 1992 to 34% in 2001.

According to the respondents in the present study, the weakened economic conditions led to a reduction for reducing children's orthodontic services. The effects of economic conditions have been evaluated in Denmark and in Sweden [16, 17]. According to the respondents, orthodontic services cannot be defended by a decreasing need for orthodontic treatment seems to lead to an increased consumption of resources. Economic restraints seemed to decrease the number of treatments provided. The need for demanding good compliance [18].

It has been suggested that the costs of orthodontic services could be reduced by delegation of tasks to dental auxiliaries [19]. The delegation of tasks to dental auxiliaries in Nordic countries, but is applied most widely in Denmark and Sweden. The delegation is supported by the systematic training of orthodontic assistants [20]. In Finland, the delegation of orthodontic tasks to auxiliaries had increased from 28% to 61% in 2001. This may be largely accepted among Finnish orthodontists. They were concerned about the delegation of treatments to general dentists with the premise that the planning of

The orthodontists were concerned about the great variation in the

them suggested that national guidelines should be established to r has also been suggested earlier as a good tool for reducing vari Guidelines on the screening of malocclusions and the assessment access to and volume of treatment. Furthermore, the inefficient r treatments, which were also mentioned, could be improved by nati

## 5. Conclusions

---

National guidelines and delegation of orthodontic tasks were su variation among the health centres. The retirement of orthodon orthodontists' suggestion to increase the number of specialist orthodontic services should be established without further delay b personnel working in orthodontic teams. Furthermore, develop treatment process might increase both the uniformity and effective

## Acknowledgment

---

The study was supported by the Finnish Office for Health Care Tecf

## References

---

1. T. Pietilä, *Orthodontic care in Finnish health centres*, Doctor
2. T. Pietilä, I. Pietilä, E. Widström, J. Varrela, and P. Alanen, *children and adolescents in Finland*," *Community Dentistry* 155, 1997.
3. S. Järvinen and E. Widström, "Hampaiston oikomishoito ter *Hammaslääkärilehti*, vol. 14, no. 17, pp. 910 - 915, 2007.
4. W. C. Shaw, M. J. Gabe, and B. M. Jones, "The expectation Louis, Missouri," *British Journal of Orthodontics*, vol. 6, no.
5. K. Bergström, *Orthodontic care in Sweden*, Doctoral Thesis,
6. W. C. Shaw, K. D. O'Brien, and S. Richmond, "Quality conti *orthodontic treatment*," *British Dental Journal*, vol. 170, no
7. K. O'Brien, J. Wright, F. Conboy, et al., "The effect of ortho *trial*," *British Dental Journal*, vol. 188, no. 7, pp. 392 - 397,
8. R. M. Grainger, *Orthodontic Treatment Priority Index*, Public 25, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, USA,
9. K. Heikinheimo, *Need of orthodontic treatment and prevalen children*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Turku, Turku, Finlanc
10. K. Bergström and A. Halling, "Orthodontic care provided by Swedish counties with different orthodontic specialist resour 35 - 50, 1996.
11. I. Pietilä, T. Pietilä, P. Pirttiniemi, J. Varrela, and P. Alanen, *of orthodontic treatment in Finnish public oral health care*," pp. 46 - 51, 2008.

12. I. G. Chestnutt, D. J. Burden, J. G. Steele, N. B. Pitts, N. M. condition of children in the United Kingdom, 2003," *British* 2006.
13. SBU: Bettavvikelser och tandreglering i ett hälsoperspektiv. beredning för medicinsk utvärdering; Mölnlycke, 2005.
14. A. Nordblad, L. Suominen-Taipale, J. Rasilainen, and T. Karl 1970-luvulta vuoteen 2000. STAKES, Raportteja 278, Helsin
15. A. Eerola, H. Hausen, S. Lahti, and E. Widström, Eds., Tutki terveydenhuollossa. STAKES, Raportteja 225, Helsinki, 1998
16. D. Mavreas and B. Melsen, "Financial consequences of redu orthodontic service. A decision analysis problem," *British Jc* 1995.
17. S. Linder-Aronson, K. Bjerrehorn, and C. M. Forsberg, "Obj treatment in Stockholm County," *Swedish Dental Journal*, v
18. E. Josefsson and A. Halling, "Influence of economic restrain quality of orthodontic care," *Swedish Dental Journal*, vol. 2
19. P. Utriainen, H. Sintonen, and E. Widström, "Terveyskesku: 1991," *Hallinnon Tutkimus*, vol. 12, pp. 235 - 240, 1993.
20. A. Stenvik and T. Torbjørnsen, "Vem gör vad inom ortodon 2007.
21. M. Mäkelä, "Do general practitioners need guidelines?," *Sc* no. 1, pp. 2 - 3, 1996.
22. K. O'Brien, J. L. McComb, N. Fox, D. Bearn, and J. Wright, ' inappropriately?," *British Dental Journal*, vol. 181, no. 4, pp