A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association between poor oral health and substance abuse

Hooman Baghaie¹ BSc

Steve Kisely^{2,3} MD PhD FRANZCP FRCPsych FAFPHM FFPH FACHAM

Malcolm Forbes^{2,4} MBBS

Emily Sawyer⁵

Dan J Siskind^{2,3} MBBS MPH PhD FRANZCP

¹ School of Dentistry, The University of Queensland, Herston, Queensland, Australia.

² School of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Woolloongabba, Queensland, Australia

³ Metro South Addiction and Mental Health Service, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

⁴ School of Medicine, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁵ James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland, Australia

Word Count: 4690

Correspondence: Dr. Hooman Baghaie

School of Dentistry

The University of Queensland

288 Herston Road, Herston QLD

Phone: +61 (07) 3365 8022

Fax: +61 (07) 3365 8199

Email: h.baghaie@uq.net.au

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/add.13754](https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13754)

Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding: The authors have none to disclose. This project was supported by the University of Queensland Winter Research program.

Author Manuscript

ABSTRACT

Background and aims: Substance use disorders are commonly associated with comorbid physical illness. There are less data on dental disease in these conditions, in spite of high rates of dry mouth (xerostomia) as well as the associated indirect or life-style effects such as poverty and lack of access to care. We compared the oral health of people with substance use disorders (SUDs) with non-using controls.

Method: A systematic search for studies from the last 35 years of the oral health of people reporting SUDs. We used MEDLINE, PsycInfo, OVID, Google Scholar, EMBASE and article bibliographies. Results were compared with the general population. Oral health was assessed in terms of dental caries and periodontal disease using the following standardized measures: the mean number of decayed, missing and filled teeth (DMFT) or surfaces (DMFS), and probing pocket depth. Non-carious tooth loss was assessed clinically.

Results: We identified 28 studies that had sufficient data for a meta-analysis, comprising 4086 SU patients and 28031 controls. People with SUD had significantly higher mean scores for DMFT (mean difference=5.15, 95% CI=2.61-7.69 and DMFS (mean difference=17.83, 95% CI=6.85-28.8). They had more decayed teeth, but fewer restorations, indicating reduced access to dental care. Patients with SUD also exhibited greater tooth loss, non-carious tooth loss and destructive periodontal disease compared to controls.

Conclusion: Patients with substance use disorders have greater and more severe dental caries and periodontal disease than the general population, but are less likely to have received dental care.

Key words: substance use; addiction; oral health; edentulism; dental decay; caries; periodontitis; dental wear

MOOSE = meta-analyses of observational studies in epidemiology

SU = Substance Use

SUD = Substance Use Disorder

DMFT = decayed, missing and filled teeth

DMFS = decayed, missing and filled surfaces

DT = decayed teeth

FT = filled teeth

MT = missing teeth

DSM = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders

ICD = International Classification of Diseases

INTRODUCTION

Globally, it is estimated that 246 million, or one in 20 people between the ages of 15 and 64 years, used substances in 2013 alone(1). Approximately 10% have drug dependence or substance use disorders (SUDs)(1). While the more serious side effects of drug-use like HIV/AIDs, Hepatitis C and overdose has received some exposure in the literature, oral diseases are less commonly identified as consequences of SUDs. These include dental decay, periodontal disease, dental wear and oral cancers. The precise dental consequences vary by substance and route of administration. For instance, cannabis use is associated with significant xerostomia (2, 3), increased caries (4) and possibly increased oral cancers (5). People who use amphetamines present with accelerated tooth wear as a result of associated bruxism, in addition to advanced caries, severe xerostomia and an overall dental status that is significantly poor for their age (6, 7). Opioid users tend to present with the consequences of personal neglect and environmental risk factors such as poverty and increased consumption of sweetened foods. These include dental decay, increased periodontal disease and poor oral

hygiene and care (8). The preference for sweet foods in people who use opiates is thought to be due to activation of the mu-opiate receptor leading to changes in glucose intake and glycaemic control. Importantly, this also applies to people on methadone maintenance and this may be aggravated by the use of methadone preparations that have a high sugar content (9).

Cocaine can be applied to the gums, snorted, smoked or injected intravenously. From a dental perspective, patients using cocaine may present with oro-nasal defects, periodontal disease, and increased dental attrition from bruxism (10, 11).

The reality is that these substances are rarely used alone (3). A large majority of patients report using two or more of illicit substances (12-18).

Similarly, substance use is routinely combined with smoking and alcohol consumption, both of which have negative effects on the oral cavity (19).

The impact of SUD on oral health can be attributed to direct physiological effects such as xerostomia, an increased urge for snacking, sympathetic activation and the associated dental clenching or grinding, as well as chemical dental erosion from applying cocaine to teeth. The indirect effects and life-styles associated with SU include a lack of priority of oral health, and poor oral hygiene. Furthermore, issues regarding to the access of dental care can also contribute to oral diseases (3, 17). This is compounded by neglected oral hygiene, malnutrition, high sugar diets and sporadic dental

appointment patterns. Dental care is further compromised by these patients' tolerance to analgesics.

We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on the prevalence and extent of dental decay and periodontal disease among substance users in comparison to controls without substance use disorders.

METHOD

The review was registered with PROSPERO an international database of prospectively registered systematic reviews in health and social care based in the United Kingdom (CRD42015029874). We followed recommendations for the reporting of meta-analyses of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE), including background, search strategy, methods, results, discussion and conclusions, as well as the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA).

Oral health outcomes

The two main outcomes of the present study were tooth decay and periodontal disease. We also assessed for the presence of dental wear clinically. Tooth decay is the result of demineralisation and cavitation of teeth via acids produced by fermentation of sugars by bacteria (20). It is assessed by two indexes frequently used in epidemiological studies: the number of decayed, missing and filled teeth (DMFT) and/or the number of decayed, missing and filled surfaces (DMFS). The unit of measurement in the DMFT

score is each tooth, while that of the DMFS is the dental surface. Anterior teeth have four surfaces while posterior ones have five. The maximum possible DMFT is therefore 32 (although wisdom teeth are often excluded making the maximum 28), while the maximum DMFS is 148 (or 128 if wisdom teeth are excluded)(20). By contrast, non-carious tooth loss (NCTL) is not associated with bacteria. This term combines dental attrition (tooth wear from tooth on tooth contact e.g. grinding), abrasion (tooth wear from non-tooth on tooth contact e.g. toothbrush or hair pins) and erosion (tooth wear from non-bacterial acids e.g. acidic foods and carbonated drinks). Non-carious tooth loss is measured by S&K index where by a value between 0-5 is assigned based on progressive extent of loss of tooth structure (21). Periodontal disease is a chronic inflammatory disease of the supporting structures of the teeth. It starts as gingivitis (reversible destruction limited to the gingiva) and leads to the periodontitis (irreversible destruction of the gingiva, bone and periodontal ligaments that hold teeth in place). Severity is commonly measured with a manual probe to assess pocket probing depth (PPD) or clinical attachment level (CAL)(22). In general, a PPD of more than 3 mm, or CAL of more than 2 mm, is the threshold for periodontitis (23) although other authors suggest that the PPD threshold should be 4 mm (24). A PPD of 7mm, for instance, indicates that the tooth has lost 4mm of bone in that region. Similarly a CAL of In general, once more than 4-5mm of bone around a tooth is lost, the tooth becomes progressively mobile until it falls out. During

assessment, a PPD of 4-5mm is assigned as a 'shallow' pocket while 'deep' pockets are 6mm or greater (25).

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included cross-sectional or cohort studies that reported the oral health of patients with substance use disorders. Substances used included Amphetamine, Cocaine, Inhalants, Marijuana, Opioids, Phencyclidine and Heroin products. The oral health outcomes were experience of dental caries, NCTF and periodontitis, and we therefore excluded studies of less severe dental outcomes such as poor oral hygiene. We also excluded studies focusing on purely alcohol or tobacco abuse.

Search strategy

We searched Medline, PsycInfo, OVID, Google Scholar and EMBASE from January 1981 until October 2016 using the following text, MeSH or Entree terms as appropriate: Substance-Related Disorders, Amphetamine-Related Disorders, Cocaine-Related Disorders, Inhalant Abuse, Marijuana Abuse, Opioid-Related Disorders, Phencyclidine Abuse, Psychoses, Substance-Induced, Substance Abuse, Morphine Dependence, Heroin Dependence, Oral Health, Dental Health Survey, Dental Care, Edentulous Mouth, Edentulous Jaw, Dental Caries, Toothloss, Periodontitis, Periodontal Disease, Non-carious Tooth Loss, Dental Erosion, Dental Wear. Other descriptive words associated with the above MeSH terms were also used as

key terms. A sample of search terms are included in supplementary on-line appendix. We searched for further publications by scrutinizing the reference lists of initial studies identified and other relevant review papers. Two reviewers (HB and MF) independently assessed abstracts, extracted and checked the data for accuracy. ES assessed the quality of the included studies and SK provided content expertise and acted as supervisor to HB.

For inclusion in the meta-analysis, studies had to have data on suitable controls, either collected by the study authors themselves (internal controls) or from a survey of a similar community and age group, conducted within 10 years of the index study (external controls). External controls were either identified by the study authors or, where absent, we searched for a survey of the general population that met our inclusion criteria as above. This protocol has been used in a number of similar reviews (26, 27). We included all outcomes for which there were at least two studies for one of the substance use categories.

Study quality

The quality of the studies was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS)(28). This assesses the quality of non-randomized studies in meta-analyses in three areas: the selection of the study groups; the comparability of the groups; and the ascertainment of outcome.

Statistical analysis

Review Manager Version 5.3 was used for the main analysis. We calculated the mean differences for continuous data as studies used the same scale for each outcome (e.g. DMFT, DMFS, DT, FT, MT). We calculated odds ratios for NCTL and periodontitis (prevalence of periodontitis, prevalence of shallow and deep pockets). Studies that only presented measures of association without raw numbers were included in the meta-analysis using WinPepi version 11.34 (29) or Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (CMA) (30).

We assessed heterogeneity by using the I-squared statistic. A random effects model was employed due to significant heterogeneity in the majority of our analyses. In addition, where possible, we investigated heterogeneity by performing analyses both with and without outlying studies as part of a sensitivity analysis. Sensitivity analysis was also attempted for studies with internal versus external controls; samples from prison versus the community; route of administration and duration of substance use. In the case of studies with internal controls, we investigated the effect of restricting analyses to those that assessed for comparability of substance users and controls in terms of socio-demographic differences, and the use of tobacco or alcohol.

Where there were a sufficient number of studies ($n > 10$), we tested for publication bias using the both the fail-safe N statistic and funnel plot asymmetry. The fail-safe N statistic is the number of non-significant studies

that would be necessary to reduce the odds ratio or effect size to a negligible value. In tests for a skewed funnel plot, low P values suggest publication bias.

RESULTS

Study inclusion and characteristics

A total of 6101 citations resulted from the electronic search. Of these, 5,989 were excluded based on title. The abstracts of the remaining 112 potentially relevant papers were read and a further 52 were excluded as they had a different primary focus. All remaining studies were obtained and scrutinized. Another six studies were discovered from the bibliographies of the full texts, making a total of 60 full-texts. Of those, 32 were excluded for the following reasons: no suitable controls (n=10); insufficient data (n=7); not an outcome of interest (n=8); use of only alcohol and/or tobacco (n=6); follow up of an included study (n=1). This left 28 studies that could be included in the meta-analysis (Figure 1).

Table 1 gives details of these 28 papers. Nine were from Europe, eight from USA. The remainders were from China (n=2), India (n=2), Australia (n=2), Iran (n=1), Argentina (n=1), Brazil (n=1), New Zealand (n=1) and Saudi Arabia (n=1). The most commonly used substance in these studies was heroin and methamphetamines. Participants' ages ranged from 13 to 79 years.

Study quality was variable. One study (31) did not indicate the substances used by subjects, and a further 15 did not give details of the duration of use (Table 1). Similarly, the recency of use was not clear in all studies, particularly in the case of incarcerated samples, although one study was restricted to newly arrived prisoners (12). Another study divided participants in a rehabilitation programme into lifetime use, and use within 30 days (32). While most studies used participant questionnaires and interviews to diagnose substance use, six studies (4, 15, 33-36) failed to outline how they made the diagnosis (Table 1). Similarly, only two study (37, 38) mentioned use of DSM or ICD diagnostic criteria. Twelve of the studies described their subjects as 'addicts' or 'dependent on substances' (4, 13, 14, 16, 32-35, 37, 39-41), however none described the differentiation of dependence from substance use. In terms of group comparability, only 19 out of the 28 studies had internal controls (Table1) including one study in which the controls were non-users and mild users of cannabis (42). Of these, three studies considered the impact of alcohol as a potential confounder and found no differences in alcohol use between substance users and non-users (12, 19, 43). In terms of tobacco use, one study found no differences in smoking between substance users and non-users (19). Another two stratified substance users by smoking status (43) or alcohol use (44). Fifteen studies checked that SUD cases and controls had similar socio-demographic characteristics such as gender, education and socio-economic status and/or

used multivariate analyses to adjust for these, as well as tobacco +/- alcohol use (4, 12, 16, 19, 32, 33, 36-38, 42-47). Five studies considered differences between cases and controls in brushing, flossing or previous dental care (12, 19, 37, 43, 44) and two adjusted for these in multivariate analyses (37, 43).

In terms of assessing outcome, ascertainment of dental status in most studies was by trained dental examiners using some, or all, of the Decayed, Missing and Filled classification. Periodontal disease was generally measured by pocket probing depth (PPD) or clinical attachment loss (CAL). However, dental examinations in one study were done by a general medical practitioner (16) and in another two by senior dental students (40, 48). Two studies used radiographic aids to confirm the results of dental examinations (12, 31).

Data for meta-analyses were available for 4086 SUD patients and 28031 controls. Data on gender was available for 2921 SU cases, of which 2141 (73.2%) were males. Nineteen studies had data on control groups collected by the authors themselves with similar characteristics to the SUD cases (Table 1). There were 2199 SUD cases and 2964 controls in these studies. Six studies used community surveys of a similar age group and country as external controls (Table 1), of which two used propensity score matching to ensure that SUD cases and controls were as alike as possible in age and gender (32, 45). For the remaining three studies, we found comparison dental survey data from the same nation and age group collected within 10 years of the study (Table 2). Data on gender were only available for

13977 controls but, where available, 66% were male (n=9289) (Table 1 and 2). Males predominated in the data derived from both the studies and the community surveys, albeit to differing degrees. Most studies (n=5) with internal controls had a greater percentage (15-17%) of males in their SUD group compared to the control group. The opposite was true for five studies with males making a greater portion of the controls (11-51%). Out of the remaining studies that reported gender, all had similar distributions (Table 1). Participants were either from correctional institutions (n=267), rehabilitation centres (n=1779), the community (n=1796) or a combination of these (n=244) (Table 1).

Substances Used

A majority of the papers (n=18) reported the use of a combination of two or more substances by their participants with amphetamine-like drugs such as methamphetamine and methylenedioxymethamphetamine being the most commonly used substances (Table 1). Other substances included heroin, opioids, cannabis, cocaine, benzodiazepines, barbiturates, solvents, petrol and methadone (Table 1). Six studies (4, 32, 44, 45, 48, 49) reported use of methamphetamine alone, two studies (42, 46) reported cannabis use alone, one study (34) looked at heroin users on a methadone program and another (33) reported the use of heroin alone (Table 1). The heroin users and those on the methadone program were combined for analysis. While studies of benzodiazepines and methadone were of pharmaceutical products, and

those of cannabis, methamphetamine, methylenedioxy-methamphetamine, cocaine and heroin of non-pharmaceutical products, the source of others such as opioids was less clear given that categories were based on self-report. Of the thirteen studies that reported on the duration of substance use, the range was between one and 32 years (Table 1). In the following paragraphs, we have presented the results of caries and NCTL by type of substance use. In the case of periodontal disease we combined all the studies as there was less differentiation between SUD types.

Opiate Users

Two studies reported on the prevalence of dental caries. Opiate users had greater decay experience when compared to controls in terms of DMFT scores (Figure 2). They also had a greater mean number of decayed teeth (3.5) and fewer restored teeth (Figure 2). The latter finding may be indicative of unmet needs. There was one study that reported an increased prevalence of shallow periodontal pockets compared to controls (Figure 4).

Amphetamine Users

Four studies reported on the prevalence of dental caries. In two studies, patients who reported solely using amphetamine-like drugs also demonstrated an increased experience of caries compared to controls in terms of decayed and missing teeth, as well as overall DMFT and DMFS scores (Figure 2). In one study, they were significantly more likely to have lost

all their teeth (edentulism) (Table 1) (32). There was no difference in the number of filled teeth (Figure 2). It was possible to combine data from two other studies on the presence of caries as a dichotomous variable (45, 48) and, again, amphetamine use was associated with increased decay (OR=4.41; 95% CI: 2.53 – 7.69; $p<0.001$).

Three further studies assessed the presence of NCTL as noted on dental examination (19, 39, 47). When the results were combined amphetamine users were almost 6 times as likely to have NCTL (95% CI: 1.68 – 20.62; $p=0.006$).

Mixed Substance Users

Seven studies reported increased DMFT scores compared to controls (Figure 3). This was further illustrated in their DMFS values (Figure 3). The SED group had an average of 3.5 more decayed teeth compared to controls, but in contrast had fewer restorations (Figure 3), again possibly suggesting a greater level of unmet needs. Lastly, the mixed substance users had approximately 3.5 less teeth compared to their controls (Figure 3), although they were no more likely to be completely edentulous in the one study where it was reported(31).

Periodontal disease

There were eight studies that reported on one or more aspects of periodontal disease with data that could be incorporated into a meta-analysis.

Adjusted results from one further study on marijuana (42) that could not be added to the main meta-analysis were included in subsequent sensitivity analyses using WinPepi software (see below). With the exception of one study that reported on heroin use (34), and one on marijuana users (46), all the others were of mixed substance use. We therefore analysed all the studies together. There were eight studies that reported the presence of overall periodontal disease and another four gave results for deep pockets. In both cases, substance users had higher rates of periodontitis (Figure 4).

Heterogeneity

Aside from studies of amphetamine use (Figure 2), all the comparisons showed evidence of heterogeneity (Figures 2 and 3).

Sensitivity Analyses

In terms of decay, there were insufficient studies to undertake any further sensitivity analyses for outcomes as measured by DMFS and FT but it was possible for the DMFT, DT and MT results. Excluding the prison based studies or only including studies with similar gender ratios did not affect the results. Two studies reported that longer duration of use was associated with poorer oral health (16, 44). Others analysed the effect of age and found that older users with presumably longer histories had absolute worse dental outcomes (15, 32, 44). Similarly only including the results from studies that categorized their subjects as 'addicts' or 'substance dependents' (13, 14, 16,

32-35, 37, 39, 40) increased the overall dental caries experience across all dental measurements. One of these studies also compared oral and non-oral use of methamphetamines after adjusting for duration of use, comorbid substance use and sociodemographic factors. Oral use was associated with significantly greater dental decay (44). Another found that intravenous use had still worse dental outcomes (32).

There was little difference in the results when we only included studies that reported on internal controls where it was possible to take into account variables such as socio-demographic factors, alcohol/tobacco use, past dental care and access, or tooth brushing and flossing. For instance, in the case of mixed substance use, participants who were using had more missing teeth (MD= 3.23, 95% CI=0.14 to 6.31, p=0.04) and higher DMFT scores (MD= 5.01, 95% CI=1.36 to 8.65, p=0.007). Missing teeth scores were the only measure of dental decay where it was possible to do undertake sensitivity analyses of only including results adjusted for sociodemographic factors and/or alcohol and tobacco use. Two studies of methamphetamine were included (12, 32) and users had significantly more missing teeth (OR 2.4; 95% CI: 2.15 - 2.70; p < 0.00001). In terms of other decay experience, oral use of methamphetamine was associated with increased DMFT scores on multivariate analyses in one study (44), while in another use was only associated with increased numbers of decayed teeth in non-Caucasians (12). In a third study, opiate use was an independent predictor of dental decay (16).

The results of a study of mixed drug users gave more equivocal results (OR 2.03; 95%CI: 0.98 – 4.23; $p=0.056$) (37).

In term of periodontal disease, we were able to combine the results of five studies that adjusted for smoking and/or socio-demographic factors (37, 38, 42, 43, 46) (Supplementary on-line Figure 1). In this case, substance use remained independently associated with periodontal disease (OR 1.76; 95%CI: 1.47 - 2.21). In contrast to the main results for periodontal disease, there was no evidence of heterogeneity ($I^2 = 9\%$) (Supplementary on-line Figure 1).

Finally, sensitivity analyses of the effect of omitting each study in turn made little difference to the results except for two studies. Omission of an outlier study (41) in the comparison of all measures of decay in opiate use reduced the I^2 value to 0% without changing the effect associated with opiates (e.g. the result for DMFT was MD=3.33, 95% CI= 2.67 to 3.99, $p<0.001$). Similarly, in the case of DMFS scores in mixed substance users (Figure 2), the omission of another outlier study(14) reduced the I^2 value to a non-significant value of 30% without effecting the outcome (MD=11.59, 95% CI= 7.74 to 15.45, $p<0.001$).

Publication Bias

We were unable to test for publication bias, as there were insufficient studies for any of the outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The use of drugs is increasing by approximately three million new users each year (1). While the global use of amphetamine, cocaine and ecstasy are estimated to have decreased in the past decade, the use of opioids and cannabis is continually on the rise (1).

This meta-analysis has highlighted the increased dental diseases in substance users compared to non-users. Substance users suffer from greater dental decay experience and are more likely to have periodontitis.

Interestingly, users had greater number of decayed teeth, but they also had a fewer number of restorations, suggesting reduced access to dental services.

Most of the studies included a wide range of substance use disorders. Studies that considered only one were restricted to methamphetamines and opiates. Although “methamphetamine mouth” has been the focus of attention, we did not find that users of this substance had worse dental outcomes than controls when compared to other substances on the limited number of available studies. This echoes findings from a study that directly compared people who used methamphetamine to other substance users and highlights the importance of comparisons with controls (50). Although excessive tooth wear is accepted as one of the sequelae of substance use, we only found three studies that assessed this outcome and all were of amphetamine-like drugs.

Our findings mirror those of increased dental decay in people with severe mental illness and affective disorders when compared to the general population. They are also consistent with greater periodontal disease in people with alcohol use disorders. Oral health has significant consequences on quality of life. Apart from localised effects on function and self-esteem of conditions such as “meth-mouth”, there are systemic implications such as an association between dental disease and ageing, as well as chronic such as coronary heart disease, stroke, diabetes and respiratory disease (51, 52). This is partly through common risk factors such as tobacco or alcohol, but also because of intermittent bacteraemia, chronic inflammation and secondary pro-inflammatory cytokines and immune complexes that lead to an inflammatory responses in distal organs (52).

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the present study. There was considerable variation in the outcomes measured and how they were reported. Some studies had no comparison groups. However, we were able to find suitable community controls for three of these. Although care was taken to find community controls from the same country (where possible from same state), same age group, similar gender distribution and similar publication date; comparisons between community controls and users should be interpreted with great caution. Similarly, while we were able to include a total

of 16 studies in this review, only nine could be used for DMFT, nine for DT and fewer for all other dental outcomes.

Study quality was not optimal. Most studies (12, 15, 31, 32, 35, 36, 42-49) did not describe the duration of substance use and one study (31) failed to report the actual substances that were used. Most studies relied on self-reported substance use (via completing surveys or divulging the information during interviews). While some studies referred to their subjects as 'addicts' or 'substance dependents' none revealed how this diagnosis was made. Similarly none attempted to compare the difference in dental status of substance users and those dependents on substances. Some studies also did not have internal controls and, although we took into account age and secular trends in oral health when selecting external controls, we were unable to take into account other factors such as economic status, education level or access to dental care. Similarly, there were gender differences between the control and SU group in most studies. However, a sensitivity analysis of only including studies with a similar gender mix in both cases and controls did not alter the results. Furthermore, there was a lack of blinding of dental examiners to the substance use history of the patients in all of the studies. Although the use of radiographs allows for better detection of dental caries, radiographic assessment was only used in two of the 28 studies (12, 31). In addition, there were considerable variations in how periodontitis was defined and reported, reflecting lack of consensus diagnosis definition and reporting.

Many of the studies did not consider the effects of potential confounders such as alcohol and tobacco use, or sociodemographic differences between users and non-users and our main meta-analyses were unadjusted for these factors. However, some studies established that there was no difference between cases and controls in terms of alcohol use, and several used statistical methods to adjust for a range of lifestyle and socio-demographic variables. Furthermore, in sensitivity analyses restricted to results adjusted for socio-demographic factors and/or alcohol and tobacco use, substance use remained an independent predictor of worse dental health. This was confirmed in results of other studies where it was not possible to combine adjusted data in a meta-analysis. A smaller proportion of studies considered differences between cases and controls in brushing, flossing or previous dental care, and only two adjusted for these in multivariate analyses. We do acknowledge that it is difficult to account for the effect of influences on dental health that may disproportionately affect people with substance use disorders such as dento-alveolar trauma from accidents or assaults.

Lastly, some of our results showed heterogeneity. This was primarily for studies of opiate or mixed drug use. Those restricted to amphetamines did not show significant heterogeneity. We tried to minimize the effects of heterogeneity in several ways. Firstly, we explored heterogeneity through sensitivity analyses of the effect of omitting each study in turn. The removal of

two outlier studies (14, 41) meant that heterogeneity was no longer present in our analyses of dental decay. In addition, results were no longer heterogeneous when analyses of were restricted to studies that adjusted periodontal outcomes for smoking and/or socio-demographic factors. Finally, we used a random-effects model to incorporate heterogeneity into our analyses.

Implications

For non-dental practitioners

Clinicians who provide care for individuals with substance use disorders should screen for oral diseases and arrange for such patients to receive dental care. A simple way for non-dental practitioners to screen for dental diseases is to enquire about the presence of either oral pain or loosening of teeth, as well as inspect the oral cavity for brown or black dental discolouration. In addition, physicians should consider the use of sugar-free preparations when prescribing methadone. They should warn patients of the associated craving for sweet foods and the xerostomic effects psychotropic medication which combine to cause further dental disease. Finally, further research is indicated into the prevalence and extent of dental wear among this cohort given the low numbers of studies we found for this outcome.

For dental practitioners

More than a third of dentists do not enquire about substance use among new patients, even though more than three quarters believe that their practice includes patients who are engaged in substance misuse (7). Lack of experience with this sensitive topic may be one barrier to screening for substance abuse (7). This is an important issue to address as dentists may be the first clinician to suspect substance use when they see clinical signs of advanced dental or periodontal disease that are inconsistent with the age of the patient. Substance use should therefore be a part of a standard history in the same way as patients are asked about allergies, medications, smoking and alcohol consumption. Consideration should also be given to issues around treatment and consent when patients are intoxicated, as well as the reduced efficacy of opioid analgesics in these patients. On a related issue, dentists should also be aware that they may be the target of opioid seeking behaviour (7, 53). Finally, our findings suggest the need for a prison dental service as people with substance use may find themselves in the criminal justice system.

For researchers

Given the limitations of the existing literature, more studies are indicated that include controls from similar settings and adjust for potential confounders such as differences between groups in terms of socio-demographic variables, lifestyle and duration of substance use. Ideally oral

health assessments should be made by trained dental personnel blinded to the presence of a substance use diagnosis and confirmed by radiography.

Similarly care should be taken to ensure when selecting indexes to measure dental and periodontal diseases.

Conclusion.

People with substance abuse disorders have increased rates of both dental caries and periodontal disease. These problems should receive greater attention and there are simple steps that both dental and non-dental personnel can take to improve this population's oral health.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

None.

REFERENCES:

1. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. World Drug Report 2015. United Nations Publication. 2016.
2. Darling MR, Arendorf TM. Effects of cannabis smoking on oral soft tissues. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 1993;21(2):78-81.
3. Joshi S, Ashley M. Cannabis: A joint problem for patients and the dental profession. Br Dent J. 2016;220(11):597-601.
4. Di Cugno F, Perec CJ, Tocci AA. Salivary secretion and dental caries experience in drug addicts. Archives of oral biology. 1981;26(5):363-7.

5. Zhang ZF, Morgenstern H, Spitz MR, Tashkin DP, Yu GP, Marshall JR, et al. Marijuana use and increased risk of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers*. 1999;8(12):1071-8.
6. Hamamoto DT, Rhodus NL. Methamphetamine abuse and dentistry. *Oral Dis*. 2009;15(1):27-37.
7. Parish CL, Pereyra MR, Pollack HA, Cardenas G, Castellon PC, Abel SN, et al. Screening for substance misuse in the dental care setting: findings from a nationally representative survey of dentists. *Addiction*. 2015;110(9):1516-23.
8. Mitsas A, Ferguson MM. Impact of Opioid Use on Dentistry. *Aust Dent J*. 2002;47(2):94-8.
9. Mysels DJ, Sullivan MA. The relationship between opioid and sugar intake: review of evidence and clinical applications. *Journal of opioid management*. 2010;6(6).
10. Blanksma CJ, Brand HS. Cocaine abuse: orofacial manifestations and implications for dental treatment. *Int Dent J*. 2005;55(6):365-9.
11. Driscoll SE. A pattern of erosive carious lesions from cocaine use. *J of Massachusetts Dental Society*. 2003;52(3):12-4.
12. Boyer EM, Thompson N, Hill T, Zimmerman MB. The Relationship between Methamphetamine Use and Dental Caries and Missing Teeth. *Journal of dental hygiene : JDH / American Dental Hygienists' Association*. 2015;89(2):119-31.
13. Kayal RA, Elias WY, Alharthi KJ, Demyati AK, Mandurah JM. Illicit drug abuse affects periodontal health status. *Saudi Med J*. 2014;35(7):724-8.
14. Mateos-Moreno MV, Del-Rio-Highsmith J, Rioboo-Garcia R, Sola-Ruiz ME, Celemin-Vinuela A. Dental profile of a community of recovering drug addicts: Biomedical aspects. Retrospective cohort study. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal*. 2013;18(4):e671-9.
15. Molendijk B, Ter Horst G, Kasbergen M, Truin GJ, Mulder J. Dental health in Dutch drug addicts. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 1996;24(2):117-9.
16. Reece AS. Dentition of addiction in Queensland: poor dental status and major contributing drugs. *Aust Dent J*. 2007;52(2):144-9.
17. Kiemer L, Holmes R. Under the Influence: Informing Oral Health Care Providers About Substance Abuse. *J Evid-Based Dent Pr*. 2014;14:127-+.
18. Rooban T, Rao A, Joshua E, Ranganathan K. Dental and oral health status in drug abusers in Chennai, India: A cross-sectional study. *J Oral Maxillofac Pathol* 2008;12(1).
19. Ravenel MC, Salinas CF, Marlow NM, Slate EH, Evans ZP, Miller PM. Methamphetamine abuse and oral health: a pilot study of "meth mouth". *Quintessence Int*. 2012;43(3):229-37.
20. Do LG, Roberts-Thomson KF. Dental caries experience in the Australian adult population. *Aust Dent J*. 2007;52(3):249-51.

21. Smith BG, Knight JK. A comparison of patterns of tooth wear with aetiological factors. *Br Dent J.* 1984;157(1):16-9.
22. Solis AC, Marques AH, Pannuti CM, Lotufo RF, Lotufo-Neto F. Evaluation of periodontitis in hospital outpatients with major depressive disorder. *J Periodontal Res.* 2014;49(1):77-84.
23. Savage A, Eaton KA, Moles DR, Needleman I. A systematic review of definitions of periodontitis and methods that have been used to identify this disease. *Journal of clinical periodontology.* 2009;36(6):458-67.
24. Tezal M, Uribe S. A lack of consensus in the measurement methods for and definition of periodontitis. *Journal of the American Dental Association (1939).* 2011;142(6):666-7.
25. Albandar JM. Epidemiology and risk factors of periodontal diseases. *Dent Clin North Am.* 2005;49(3):517-32, v-vi.
26. Kisely S, Baghaie H, Lalloo R, Johnson NW. Association between poor oral health and eating disorders: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brit J Psychiat.* 2015;207(4):299-305.
27. Kisely S, Baghaie H, Lalloo R, Siskind D, Johnson NW. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Association Between Poor Oral Health and Severe Mental Illness. *Psychosom Med.* 2015;77(1):83-92.
28. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. Newcastle-Ottawa Schale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis. 2000.
29. Abramson JH. WINPEPI updated: computer programs for epidemiologists, and their teaching potential. *Epidemiol Perspect Innov.* 2011;8(1):1.
30. Borenstein M, Hedges, L., Higgins, J. and Rothstein, H. . Comprehensive Meta-Analysis, Version 2. Englewood: NJ: Biostat; 2005.
31. Gibson G, Rosenheck R, Tullner JB, Grimes RM, Seibyl CL, Rivera-Torres A, et al. A national survey of the oral health status of homeless veterans. *J Public Health Dent.* 2003;63(1):30-7.
32. Shetty V, Mooney LJ, Zigler CM, Belin TR, Murphy D, Rawson R. The relationship between methamphetamine use and increased dental disease. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2010;141(3):307-18.
33. Becart A, Hedouin V, Martin-Bouyer L, Revuelta E, Gosset D. The oral health status of drug addicts. A prison survey in Lille, France. *J Forensic Odontostomatology.* 1997;15(2):27-9.
34. Ma H, Shi XC, Hu DY, Li X. The poor oral health status of former heroin users treated with methadone in a Chinese city. *Med Sci Monit.* 2012;18(4):PH51-5.
35. Scheutz F. Dental health in a group of drug addicts attending an addiction-clinic. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 1984;12(1):23-8.
36. Silvestre FJ, Bagan JV, Del Olmo JA, Gimeno V. [Oral status of drug addicted patients. Study of 66 cases]. *Actual Odontostomatol (Paris).* 1990;44(170):299-306.

37. Gupta T, Shah N, Mathur VP, Dhawan A. Oral health status of a group of illicit drug users in Delhi, India. *Community Dent Health*. 2012;29(1):49-54.
38. Antoniazzi RP, Zanatta FB, Rosing CK, Feldens CA. Association Among Periodontitis and the Use of Crack Cocaine and Other Illicit Drugs. *Journal of periodontology*. 2016;87(12):1396-405.
39. Milosevic A, Agrawal N, Redfearn P, Mair L. The occurrence of toothwear in users of Ecstasy (3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine). *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 1999;27(4):283-7.
40. Pourhashemi SJ, Ghane M, Shekarchizadeh H, Jafari A. Oral health determinants among female addicts in Iran. *Contemporary clinical dentistry*. 2015;6(3):375-80.
41. Brotrka N, Katunaric M, Filipovic I, Verzak Z. Caries prevalence in heroin addicts. *Acta Clin Croat*. 2013;52(4):436-43.
42. Shariff JA, Ahluwalia KP, Papapanou PN. Relationship Between Frequent Recreational Cannabis (Marijuana and Hashish) Use and Periodontitis in Adults in the United States: Nhanes 2011-12. *J Perio*. 2016;1-12.
43. Jamieson LM, Gunthorpe W, Cairney SJ, Sayers SM, Roberts-Thomson KF, Slade GD. Substance use and periodontal disease among Australian Aboriginal young adults. *Addiction*. 2010;105(4):719-26.
44. Brown RE, Morisky DE, Silverstein SJ. Meth mouth severity in response to drug-use patterns and dental access in methamphetamine users. *J Calif Dent Assoc*. 2013;41(6):421-8.
45. Shetty V, Harrell L, Clague J, Murphy DA, Dye BA, Belin TR. Methamphetamine Users Have Increased Dental Disease: A Propensity Score Analysis. *J Dent Res*. 2016;95(7):814-21.
46. Thomson WM, Poulton R, Broadbent JM, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Beck JD, et al. Cannabis smoking and periodontal disease among young adults. *JAMA-J Am Med Assoc*. 2008;299(5):525-31.
47. Nixon PJ, Youngson CC, Beese A. Tooth surface loss: does recreational drug use contribute? *Clin Oral Investig*. 2002;6(2):128-30.
48. Morio KA, Marshall TA, Qian F, Morgan TA. Comparing diet, oral hygiene and caries status of adult methamphetamine users and nonusers: a pilot study. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2008;139(2):171-6.
49. Rommel N, Rohleder NH, Wagenpfeil S, Hartel-Petri R, Jacob F, Wolff KD, et al. The impact of the new scene drug "crystal meth" on oral health: a case-control study. *Clin Oral Investig*. 2016;20(3):469-75.
50. Cretzmeyer M, Walker J, Hall JA, Arndt S. Methamphetamine use and dental disease: results of a pilot study. *J Dent for Children (Chicago, Ill)*. 2007;74(2).
51. Chapple IL. The impact of oral disease upon systemic health-Symposium overview. *J Dent*. 2009;37(8):S568-71.
52. Scannapieco FA. Systemic effects of periodontal diseases. *Dent clin Nth Am*. 2005;49(3):533-50.

53. Ashrafioun L, Edwards PC, Bohnert AS, Ilgen MA. Nonmedical use of pain medications in dental patients. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 2014;40(4):312-6.
54. Du M, Bedi R, Guo L, Champion J, Fan M, Holt R. Oral health status of heroin users in a rehabilitation centre in Hubei province, China. *Community Dent Health*. 2001;18(2):94-8.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: details of included studies.

Author Manuscript

Author	Year	Country	Setting	N	Gender (Male)	Age, yrs mean (range)	Control	Substance Used	Duration of SU	Route of Use	SU Assessment (DSM or ICD)	Dental Assessment	Dental decay	Decay Score	Periodontal status (protocol)	Periodontal Cutoff	% Periodontal disease	Wear
Antioniazzi(38)	2016	Brazil	Rehab	SU: 106 Control: 106	74.5% (SU) 74.5% (Control)	25 (SU) 22.5 (Control) (13-46)	Internal	Crack Cocaine (100%) Cannabis (79.2%) Cocaine (87.7%) Solvents (34%)	5.0 (mean)	Smoking	S (ICD)	Clinical X8	-	-	% periodontitis deep pockets (6 site per tooth)	≥ 2 sites with PPD > 3 mm CAL ≥6mm	43.4 64.2	-
Becart (33)	1997	France	Prison	SU: 47 Control: 46	66% (SU) 83% (Control)	25 (16-35)	Internal	Heroin	4.3 (mean)	-	-	Clinical X8	DMFT DT FT MT	13 6.8 3.3 2.9	-	-	-	-
Boyer (12)	2015	USA	Prison	SU: 95 Control: 79	79% (SU) 94% (Control)	30 (17-53)	Internal	Methamphetamine, marijuana, cocaine, heroin	-	-	S	Clinical and Radiographic I8	DT MT	7.8 4.7	-	-	-	-
Brown (44)	2013	USA	Prison	SU: 59 Control: 40	80% (SU) 80% (Control)	33 (18-63)	Internal	Methamphetamine	-	Oral (78%) IV/IN (22%)	S	Clinical X8	DMFT DT FT MT	15 8.8 3.4 3.1	-	-	-	-
Di Cugno (4)	1981	Argentina	Rehab	SU: 198 Control: 50	100% (SU) 100% (Control)	21	Internal	Amphetamine	1+	-	-	Clinical ?8	DMFT DMFT	13.7 15	-	-	-	-
Du (54)	2000	China	Rehab	SU: 123	77% (SU)	(35-44)	External	Heroin, others	2+ (76%)	Oral/ Smoking	I	Clinical ?8	DMFT DT	5.4 4.7	% participants	PPD 4-5mm	45	-

Oral Health and Substance Use

								(2%)		(72%) IV/IN (28%)			FT MT	0.02 0.6	nts with shallow pockets Deep pockets (CPITN)	PPD ≥ 6mm	10	
Gibson (31)	2003	USA	Veterans in Rehab	SU: 339 Control: 6259*	100% (SU) 100% (Control)	44 (24- 79)	External	-	-	-	I	Clinical and Radiogra phic ?8	DMFT DT FT MT % Edentulis m	16 3.2 5.1 7.6 7.4%	Mild, moderat e, severe periodont itis #^	Subjectiv e#	-	-
Gupta (37)	2010	India	Rehab	SU: 126 Control: 126	99% (SU) 99% (Control)	36 (18- 66)	Internal	Opioids, Cannabi s,	12 (mean)	-	S (using DSM IV)	Clinical I8	DMFT DT FT MT	3.5 2.5 0.01 0.98	% participa nts with shallow pockets Deep pockets (Mod CPI)	PPD 4- 5mm PPD ≥ 6mm	43 12	-
Jamieso n (43)	2009	Australia	Communi ty	SU: 169 Control: 256	48% (SU)	18 (16- 20)	Internal	Cannabi s, petrol sniffing	-	-	S	Clinical ?8	-	-	% Periodon titis (CAL/PP D from MB and B of each tooth)	2x PPD ≥ 5 mm	32	-
Kayal (13)	2014	Saudi Arabia	Rehab	SU: 57	100% (SU)	(20-40 = 74%)	External	Cannabi s, Ampheta mine, Heroin, Cocaine	5+ (81%)	Oral (67%) IV/IN (39%)	S	Clinical X8	-	-	% Periodon titis (6 site per tooth)	^	100	-
Ma (34)	2012	China	Rehab	SU: 216	71% (SU)	35 (20- 59)	External	Methadone program	1-32	-	-	Clinical M8	MT#	-	% participa nts with shallow	PPD 4- 5mm PPD ≥	38 4	-

															pockets Deep pockets (CPI)	6mm		
Mateos- Moreno (14)	2013	Spain	Rehab	SU: 64 Control: 34	79% (SU) 94% (Control)	(30-56)	Internal	Heroin, Cocaine Methado ne Benzodia zepine, cannabis	6-30	-	I	Clinical ?8	DMFT DT FT MT DMFS	23 10 0.7 12 91	% Periodon titis ^	^	87	-
Milosewv ic (39)	1999	United Kingdom	Communi ty	SU: 30 Control: 28	-	-	Internal	Ecstasy, ampheta mines, cocaine, ketamine , LSD, magic mushroo ms, cannabis	-	-	S	Clinical ?8	-	-	-	-	-	S&K 0.63
Morio(48)	2008	USA	Communi ty	SU: 18 Control: 18	76% (Overall)	31	Internal	Methamp hetamine	-	-	S	Clinical \$?8	% anterior, premolar and molar teeth with decay	61 61 86	-	-	-	-
Molendij k (15)	1997	Nether lands	Mixed	SU: 121 Control: 1532*	76% (SU)	30.5 (20- 40)	External	Heroin, Cocaine	-	-	-	Clinical ?8	DMFS	49	-	-	-	-
Nixon(47)	2002	United Kingdom	Communi ty	SU: 13 Control: 13	62% (SU) 62% (Control)	20 (18- 23)	Internal	Ampheta mine, Ecstasy	-	Oral	S	Clinical ?8	-	-	-	-	-	S&K1.4
Pourhas hemi (40)	2015	Iran	Rehab (32%) & communi ty (68%)	SU: 95	0% (SU)	38	External	Opiates, methamp hetamine	11.6 (mean)	Smoking (79%) IN (14%) Oral	I	Clinical\$?8	DMFT DT FT MT	20 8.2 0.8 11	% participa nts with s hallow	PPD 4- 5mm PPD ≥	48 -	-

										(20%) IV (11%)					pockets Deep pockets# (CPI)	6mm		
Protrka(4 1)	2013	Croatia	Rehab	SU:100 Control: 100	53% (overall)	35.15	Internal	Heroin Methado ne Cannabi s Hashish	5+	-	S	Clinical I8	DMFT DT FT MT DMFS	18.78 12.57 4.59 1.6 5.32	-	-	-	-
Ravenel (19)	2012	US	Rehab and Commu nity	SU: 28 Control: 16	50% (SU) 39% (Control)	30 (19- 45)	Internal	Metham phetami ne, cocaine	7.2 (mean)	Smoking (100%) IN (15%) Oral (8%) IV (13%)	S	Clinical ?8	DMFS	29	-	-	-	Brux-ism 31%
Reece (16)	2007	Australia	Commu nity	SU: 233 Control: 47	77% (SU) 59% (Control)	31 (19- 45)	Internal	Cannabi s, Heroin, Morphin e, Methado ne, Amphet amine	7.27 8.97 1.19 1.21 1.89 (mean)	-	S	Clinical \$\$?8	MT	4	-	-	-	-
Rommel (49)	2015	Germany	Rehab	SU: 100 Control: 100	79% (SU) 94% (Control)	-	Internal	Crystal Metham phetami ne	-	-	I	Clinical X8	DMFT DT DMFS	12 3.4 33	PSI##	PPD >3.5 mm	2.75	-
Rooban (18)	2008	India	Rehab	SU: 100 Control: 100	79% (SU) 94% (Control)	33 (18- 48)	Internal	Heroin, cocaine, morphin e, benzodi	8 (mean)		I	Clinical X8	DMFT	4.8	% Periodo ntitis ^	^	7%	-

Scheutz (35)	1984	Denmark	Community	SU: 134	66% (SU)	25 (18-37)	External	azepine, cannabis Opiates	-	IV (100%)	-	Clinical ?8	DMFT	18.3	% Periodontitis (MB of 6 preselected teeth)#	Nil: mean attachment loss figures given	Up to 40%	-
Shariff (42)	2016	USA	Community	Total: 1938	50% (Combined)	(30-59)	Internal but included both rare & non- users	Cannabis	-	-	S	Clinical X8	-	-	Mean number sites with PPD ≥4mm, ≥6mm, and ≥8mm (6 site per tooth)	PPD ≥4mm, ≥6mm, and ≥8mm	29.2 24.8 24.5	-
Shetty (32)	2010	USA	Rehab	SU: 250 Control: 7630	38% (SU)	36.5	External	Methamphetamine	-	Smoking (64%) IN (14%) IV (21%)	S, I	Clinical X8	% Edentulism Missing teeth	13%	-	-	-	-
Shetty(4 5)	2016	USA	Community	Su: 552 Control: 2755	-	44.4	External	Methamphetamine	-	Smoking (64%)	S	Clinical X8	Mean difference of DMFT	2.04	-	-	-	-
Silvestre (36)	1990	Spain	Prison Addiction Services Source of control unclear	SU: 66 Control: 30	98% (SU) 47% (Control)	SU: 24.6 Control 26.3	Internal	Heroin, cocaine, morphine, benzodiazepine, cannabis,	-	-	-	Clinical X8	DMFT	12.3	-	-	-	-

Thomson (46) @	2008	New Zealand	Community	SU: 182 Control: 293	51.1 (SU)	SU: 32 Control: 32	Internal	barbiturates Hallucinogens Cannabis	-	-	S	Clinical X8	-	-	% Participants with shallow pockets Deep pockets (2 quadrant s, MB, B and DL measured)	CAL ≥3mm CAL ≥5mm	51% 25%	-
----------------	------	-------------	-----------	-------------------------	-----------	-----------------------	----------	---	---	---	---	-------------	---	---	---	----------------------	------------	---

SU, Substance User; DMFT/S, decayed, filled and missing teeth/surfaces; DT, Decayed Teeth; FT, Filled Teeth; MT, Missing Teeth; F, female; M, male; S, Survey; I, Interview; PSI, Periodontal Screening Index

* From external control

Data not used due to lack of controls

Data not used as not able to compare with other studies

^ Undefined

\$ Senior dental student; \$\$ General Medical Practitioner

& Only part of database used

@ Same cohort was followed up 6 years later in Merier 2016(43)

X8 third molars excluded in assessment (i.e. DMFT out of 28 and DMFS out of 128)

I8 third molars included in assessment (i.e. DMFT out of 32 and DMFS out of 148)

?8 not clear if third molars were included or excluded

M8 if third molars are present, they're included, if missing excluded

S&K: Smith and Knight Classification(54)

Table 2: Description of control samples derived from community surveys

Author	Year	Country	Study name	N	Mean Age/ Range	Male (%)
Hong-Ying	2002	China	The Second National Survey of Oral Health Status in Children and Adults in China	1420	35-44	-
Hessari	2007	Iran	Oral Health among 35- to 44-Year-Old Iranians	2786	35-44	0*
Hossain	2013	Saudi Arabia	Prevalence of Periodontal Diseases among Patients Attending the Outpatient Department at the College of Dentistry, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia	2739	32	86

* To reflect the 100% female sample of SU study

Figure 1: Number of papers yielded by search strategy

Figure 2: Dental decay in opiate and amphetamine users

Figure 3: Dental decay in mixed substance users

Author Manuscript

Figure 4: Periodontitis

Author Ma

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Baghaie, H;Kisely, S;Forbes, M;Sawyer, E;Siskind, DJ

Title:

A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association between poor oral health and substance abuse

Date:

2017-05-01

Citation:

Baghaie, H., Kisely, S., Forbes, M., Sawyer, E. & Siskind, D. J. (2017). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association between poor oral health and substance abuse. ADDICTION, 112 (5), pp.765-779. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13754>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/292655>