

ABSTRACT

Background: Down Syndrome (DS) is the most common chromosomal disorder, affecting 1/700 live births¹. With life expectancy averaging 60 years, it is crucial for healthcare professionals to address the needs of this growing population². Common craniofacial features include maxillary hyperplasia, hypodontia, and malocclusions, which can affect functions like speech, chewing, and breathing³. These challenges make individuals with DS more likely to require significant dental treatment including specialty treatment⁴. However, despite the benefits of comprehensive dental treatment for patients with DS, there is insufficient understanding of the need and feasibility for specialty treatment, thus leading to inadequate referrals to specialists. DS patients who received orthodontic and prosthodontic referrals at Boston Methods: Children's Hospital (BCH) from 2003 to 2023 were reviewed. Patient demographics, medical and dental history, including specialty treatment details, referral, consultation, and treatment duration, were obtained and analyzed. **Results:** Ninety-nine DS patients referred for orthodontic consultation were reviewed. The sample had an even sex distribution with 43.4% >10 years of age at referral. The most common orthodontic issues were maxillary arch crowding (44.4%), crossbites (25.3%), and tooth impaction (16.2%). Among referred, 38.4% proceeded, with 76.3% of them completing treatment. The most frequent reasons for not starting treatment included being lost to follow-up (42.6%) or inadequate cooperation (21.3%). Most of fifteen DS patients with prosthodontic referral were female (73.7%) and >15 years of age (46.7%). Frequent prosthodontic concerns were congenitally missing teeth (73%), peg laterals (13.3%), and acquired tooth loss (13.3%). Forty percents initiated and completed the treatment, including implant-supported prostheses (50.0%), crowns (16.6%), dentures (50.0%), and fixed partial dentures (33.3%). **Conclusions:** Forty percent of DS patients who were referred for specialty treatment proceeded and completed the treatment, indicating the potential for successful dental outcomes when treatment is initiated and supported appropriately. The main barrier to starting treatment was due to loss of follow-up rather than inadequate cooperation, suggesting that ongoing support and monitoring may be key to improving treatment adherence.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

- Patient charts at the Boston Children's Hospital (BCH) Dental Clinic from 2003 to 2023 were screened with the following inclusion criteria: 1) medical diagnosis of DS, 2) \geq 6 years of age, 3) initial comprehensive or periodic evaluation performed including orthodontic or prosthodontic assessment, 4) at least one additional appointment at the BCH Dental Clinic.
- Patient radiographs, clinical notes, and billing codes were reviewed.
- Patient demographic characteristics were documented.
- Referral, consult, treatment start, and completion dates were noted.
- Barriers to overall treatment success were recorded.

Dental Treatment in Down Syndrome Patients: Prevalence, Barriers, and Interventions

Noel Kim¹ and Aram Kim², DMD, MS, FACP ¹Harvard School of Dental Medicine; ²Boston Children's Hospital

44.4

RESULTS

Orthodontic Patients

Our study identified 99 patients with DS who had received orthodontic referral and the demographics (Table 1) and referral reasons (Figure 1) are shown below.

VariableCategoryn (%)PatientsTotal Number99 (100)Sex DistributionMale52 (52.5)Female47 (47.5)Age at Referral<10 years28 (28.3)>10 years43 (43.4)Unknown28 (28.3)Missing TeethYes55 (55.6)No44 (44.4)Orthodontic ParameterClass IClass II24 (24.2)Class III42 (42.4)Crowding77 (77.8)Openbite36 (36.4)Decepbite25 (25.3)Crossbite59 (59.6)	Table 1: Orthodontic Patient Demographics			Figure 1: Orthodontic
Patients Total Number 99 (100) Sex Distribution Male 52 (52.5) Female 47 (47.5) Age at Referral <10 years 28 (28.3) >10 years 43 (43.4) Unknown 28 (28.3) Missing Teeth Yes 55 (55.6) No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I 33 (33.3) Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Variable	Category	n (%)	Referral Reason (%)
Sex Distribution Male 52 (52.5) Female 47 (47.5) Age at Referral ≤10 years 28 (28.3) >10 years 43 (43.4) Unknown 28 (28.3) Missing Teeth Yes No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Patients	Total Number	99 (100)	
Female 47 (47.5) Age at Referral ≤10 years 28 (28.3) >10 years 43 (43.4) Unknown 28 (28.3) Missing Teeth Yes No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Sex Distribution	Male	52 (52.5)	
Age at Referral ≤ 10 years 28 (28.3) >10 years 43 (43.4)Unknown 28 (28.3)Missing TeethYesYes 55 (55.6)No 44 (44.4)Orthodontic ParameterClass IClass II 24 (24.2)Class III 42 (42.4)Crowding 77 (77.8)Openbite 36 (36.4)Decepbite 25 (25.3)Crossbite 59 (59.6)		Female	47 (47.5)	3.0
>10 years 43 (43.4) Unknown 28 (28.3) Missing Teeth Yes No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Age at Referral	≤10 years	28 (28.3)	11.1
Unknown 28 (28.3) Missing Teeth Yes 55 (55.6) No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I 33 (33.3) Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)		>10 years	43 (43.4)	
Missing Teeth Yes 55 (55.6) 16.2 No 44 (44.4) 16.2 16.2 Orthodontic Parameter Class I 33 (33.3) 16.2 Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) 25.3 25.3 Openbite 36 (36.4) Crowding Crossbite Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite Crossbite		Unknown	28 (28.3)	
No 44 (44.4) Orthodontic Parameter Class I 33 (33.3) Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Missing Teeth	Yes	55 (55.6)	16.2
Orthodontic ParameterClass I33 (33.3)Class II24 (24.2)Class III42 (42.4)Crowding77 (77.8)Openbite36 (36.4)Decepbite25 (25.3)Crossbite59 (59.6)		No	44 (44.4)	
Class II 24 (24.2) Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)	Orthodontic Parameter	ClassI	33 (33.3)	
Class III 42 (42.4) Crowding 77 (77.8) Openbite 36 (36.4) Decepbite 25 (25.3) Crossbite 59 (59.6)		Class II	24 (24.2)	
Crowding77 (77.8)25.3Openbite36 (36.4)CrowdingDecepbite25 (25.3)CrossbiteCrossbite59 (59.6)Impacted Tooth		Class III	42 (42.4)	
Openbite36 (36.4)Decepbite25 (25.3)Crossbite59 (59.6)		Crowding	77 (77.8)	25.3
Decepbite25 (25.3)CrossbiteCrossbite59 (59.6)Impacted Tooth		Openbite	36 (36.4)	Crowding
Crossbite 59 (59.6)		Deeepbite	25 (25.3)	Crossbite
		Crossbite	59 (59.6)	Impacted Teeth
Impacted Teeth 47 (47.5)		Impacted Teeth	47 (47.5)	■ OSA
Number of Medical Conditions ≤1 9 (9.1)	Number of Medical Conditions	≤1	9 (9.1)	
2 or 3 15 (15.2)		2 or 3	15 (15.2)	
>3 75 (75.7)		>3	75 (75.7)	

Of referred patients, 61.6% initiated treatment with the reasons for 38.4% of patients not initiating treatment seen below (Figure 2).



Among the patients who initiated the treatment, 76.3% successfully completed their orthodontic treatment.

Prosthodontic Patients

Our study identified 15 patients with DS who had received prosthodontic referral and the demographics (Table 2) and referral reasons (Figure 4) are shown below.

Table 2: Prosthodontic Patient Demographics

Variable	Category	n (%)
Patients	Total Number	15 (100)
Sex Distribution	Male	4 (26.7)
	Female	11 (73.3)
Age at Referral	≤ 10 years	0 (0.0)
	≤ 15 years	3 (20)
	>15 years	7 (46.7)
	Unknown	5 (33.3)
Missing Teeth	Yes	4 (26.7)
	No	11 (73.3)
Number of Medical Conditons	≤1	3 (20)
	2 or 3	7 (46.7)
	>3	5 (33 3)





Of referred patients, 40% of patients initiated treatment with the reasons for 60% of patients not initiating treatment seen below (Figure 5).



All patients who initiated treatment successfully completed treatment with the treatment types shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Type of Completed Prosthodontic Treatment (%)





DISCUSSION

Despite the belief that those with DS may not tolerate certain dental treatments due to factors such as hearing loss, anxiety, or difficulty with utilizing appliances, it is clear from the present study that such individuals are able to successfully complete specialty treatment.⁵ Moreover, technological advancements in materials and the overall warmness and patience of those with DS have the potential to further facilitate treatment.⁶ Because it is increasingly clear that comprehensive dental care and appropriate specialty interventions could significantly improve oral function, aesthetics, and overall quality of life for these individuals, further efforts must be made to target those with DS for early comprehensive dental treatment.

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS

- 1. DS patients often need specialty care due to their characteristic craniofacial and dental development.
- 2. Completion of orthodontic and prosthodontic treatment are feasible with DS patients with education and support.
- 3. General dentists should consider making specialty referrals to orthodontics and prosthodontics early on to support these growing populations.

REFERENCES

- 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023, June 28). Data and statistics on Down Syndrome. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/birthdefects/downsyndrome/data.html#print
- 2. Ijezie OA, Healy J, Davies P, Balaguer-Ballester E, Heaslip V (2023) Quality of life in adults with Down syndrome: A mixed methods systematic review. PLOS ONE 18(5) e0280014. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280014
- 3. Scalioni FAR, Carrada CF, Tavares MC, Abreu LG, Ribeiro RA, Paiva SM. Oral health characteristics in children and adolescents with Down syndrome. Spec Care Dentist 2023; 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/scd.12883
- 4. Kaczorowska N, Kaczorowski K, Laskowska J, Mikulewicz M. Down syndrome as a cause of abnormalities in the craniofacial region: A systematic literature review. Adv Clin Exp Med. 2019 Nov;28(11):1587-1592. https://doi.org/10.17219/acem/112785
- 5. Mubayrik AB. The Dental Needs and Treatment of Patients with Down Syndrome Am. 2016 Jul;60(3):613-26. North Clin https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cden.2016.02.003
- 6. Desai SS. Down syndrome: a review of the literature. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 1997 Sep;84(3):279-85. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1079-<u>2104(97)90343-7</u>