# **Association Between Caregiver Opposition to Topical Fluoride and COVID-19 Vaccines**



Sapna J. Saini, DDS<sup>1</sup>, Adam C. Carle, MA, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Anna R. Forsyth, DDS, MSD<sup>1</sup>, Donald L. Chi, DDS, PhD<sup>1,3</sup>

University of Washington School of Dentistry, Department of Pediatric Dentistry<sup>1</sup>, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Department of Pediatrics<sup>2</sup>, University of Washington, Department of Oral Health Sciences<sup>3</sup>

## **BACKGROUND**

**Vaccines** help prevent and reduce transmission and severity of diseases like coronavirus (COVID-19). However, many caregivers are vaccine hesitant or opposed to childhood vaccines. Caregiver hesitancy and opposition to non-COVID-19 childhood immunizations and the COVID-19 vaccine stem from similar beliefs.

- FDA-approved COVID-19 vaccines became available to children and adolescents aged 5 and older in the U.S. during 2021<sup>1,2</sup>
- Currently, 28.4% of 5- to 11-year-old children and 58.9% of 12- to 17year-old adolescents in the U.S. are fully vaccinated against COVID-19<sup>3</sup>
- 87% of children hospitalized from December 2021 February 2022 were not vaccinated for COVID-194

#### Common Reasons Caregivers Report COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy<sup>5</sup>

- Fast rate of vaccine development
- Fear of adverse reactions
- Distrust in its safety and efficacy
- Unknown long-term side effects
- Perception of reduced COVID-19 disease severity in children

Analogous to how vaccines prevent systemic diseases, **topical fluoride** helps prevent dental caries in high-risk children.

- > 13% of caregivers may oppose topical fluoride treatment for their children during healthcare visits<sup>6</sup>
- > Larger proportions of caregivers are likely to be hesitant about topical fluoride (accept fluoride treatment but may have underlying concerns)
- > Some children whose caregivers refuse topical fluoride may have high levels of untreated, preventable dental disease

## **PURPOSE**

Previous work reported a significant association between opposition of topical fluoride and childhood vaccines.<sup>7</sup> There has been no recent investigation in this line of research, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The goals of the current study were to:

- 1. Evaluate whether caregiver opposition to topical fluoride is specifically associated with opposition to COVID-19 vaccines
- 2. Identify other factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine opposition

### **METHODS**

A single-site, observational cross-sectional study was administered at the University of Washington's Center for Pediatric Dentistry (UW CPD) in Seattle, WA.

An 85-item electronic survey was administered via REDCap during patient care visits (dental checkups and treatment) at the UW CPD between 2/1/2021 and 9/30/2021.

The survey included questions on oral health knowledge, beliefs and reasons for opposition to topical fluoride, and beliefs about COVID-19 vaccines.

#### Eligibility criteria:

- > English-speaking caregivers of children aged <18 years
- > Children were patients of record at the UW CPD
- One caregiver per household could participate

#### PREDICTOR VARIABLE

"On a scale of 0 to 10 with '0' being 'not at all opposed' and '10' being 'totally opposed,' how opposed are you to topical fluoride for your children?"

CODED AS YES / NO

#### **OUTCOME VARIABLE**

"On a scale of 0 to 10 with '0' being 'not at all opposed' and '10' being 'totally opposed,' how opposed are you to a COVID-19 vaccine for your child/children?"

CODED AS YES / NO

## **RESULTS**

- > Of 651 respondents, 403 caregivers were included in the final analytical sample
- Caregivers who opposed topical fluoride were **3.13 times** as likely to oppose COVID-19 vaccines for their child (95% CI: 1.87, 5.25; *P*<0.001)
- A **lower education level** (OR=3.47; 95% CI: 1.44, 8.38; *P*<0.006) and **self-reported conservative political** ideology (OR=2.77; 95% CI: 1.26, 6.08; P<0.011) were significantly correlated with COVID-19 vaccine opposition
- > In a bivariate analysis, racial minorities were significantly more likely to be opposed to the COVID-19 vaccine for their children compared to white caregivers (OR=2.71; 95% CI: 1.81, 4.06; *P*<0.001; data not shown)
- Race failed to achieve statistical significance in a logistic regression model with multiple covariates

## **RESULTS CONTINUED**

Variable	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p Value**
Fluoride Varnish Opposition		
Opposed	3.13 (1.87-5.25)	<0.001
Not Opposed*	-	-
<b>Education Level</b>		
High school equivalent or less	3.47 (1.44-8.38)	0.01
More than 4 years*	-	-
Political Ideology		
Very Conservative or Conservative	2.77 (1.26-6.08)	0.01
Moderate	2.03 (1.20-3.44)	0.01
Very Liberal or Liberal*	-	-
* Reference Group	Scap to view	0840

- \*\* Level of significance for *P*-value <0.05
- † Level of significance for *P*-value <0.01
- ‡ Level of significance for P-value < 0.001

Scan to view complete data tables



## CONCLUSIONS

- Caregiver topical fluoride opposition in dental settings is significantly associated with COVID-19 vaccine opposition for their
- Caregiver education level and self-reported political ideology are also significantly associated with COVID-19 vaccine opposition.
- 3. Additional research is needed to develop clinical interventions, including tailored and evidence-based communication strategies and a clinical screening tool for fluoride opposition; this tool could also identify children who are unvaccinated against COVID-19.
- 4. Future research should identify ways to use the common risk factor approach to address topical fluoride and vaccine opposition concurrently for disease prevention and improving the health of children.

## REFERENCES

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. May 10, 2021.

s.Chi DL. Parent Refusal of Topical Fluoride for Their Children: Clinical Strategies and Future Research Priorities to Improve Evidence-Based Pediatric Dental Practice. Dent 7.Carpiano RM, Chi DL. Parents' attitudes towards topical fluoride and vaccines for children: Are these distinct or overlapping phenomena?. Prev Med Rep 2018;10:123-128.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This study was supported by grant funding from the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research (NIDCR), grant number R01DE026741-01A1.