Validation of Nepalese Oral Health Impact Profile14 and Assessment of Its Impact in Patients with Oral Submucous Fibrosis in Nepal

Rimal J,¹ Shrestha A²

¹Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, ²Department of Public Health Dentistry, B.P. Koirala Institute of Health Science, Dharan, Nepal.

ABSTRACT

Background: Oral Health Impact Profile–14 (OHIP-14) is one of the most internationally used oral health related quality of life (OHRQoL) questionnaire available in various languages. The study was aimed to validate Nepalese version of OHIP-14 and to assess impact of quality of life (QoL) in patients with oral submucous fibrosis (OSF).

Methods: An interventional OHRQoL study was conducted among OSF patients visiting Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan using OHIP-14 after translation and validation process. Following the baseline questionnaire, 74 patients were treated with dexamethasone and hyaluronidase for 6 weeks and followed up for 6 months during which OHIP-14 was again administered.

Results: For concurrent validity, Nepalese OHIP-14 scores were associated with self-perceived oral health status, self-perceived dental treatment need and satisfaction with oral health status. For internal reliability, inter-item correlation coefficient varied from 0.2-0.8. Corrected item-total correlation coefficients were between 0.43-0.80. Cronbach's alpha was 0.90. Commercial tobacco product chewing with arecanut (Gutka[°]) was seen among 45% with median frequency and duration of 7.5(0-20) times/day and 10(0-60) years, respectively. Median OHIP-14 score at baseline 18(0-45), was significantly (p<0.001) different from 6 months' follow-up [5(0-15)]. Impact score at baseline was mainly influenced by age ($r_s=0.32$, p=0.005), frequency of habit ($r_s=0.44$, p<0.001) and duration of habit ($r_s=0.31$, p=0.006).

Conclusions:Nepalese version of OHIP-14 is a valid and, reliable instrument to measure OHRQoL in OSF patients. OHRQoL in OSF patients can be improved after professional treatment regime.

Keywords: Oral submucous fibrosis; oral cancer; oral health; oral potentially malignant disorders; quality of life;

INTRODUCTION

Oral submucous fibrosis (OSF) is a chronic, progressive disease of oral mucosa, characterized by blanching, stiffness, trismus, burning sensation, hypomobility of soft palate, tongue, affecting lamina propria leading to loss of fibroelasticity.^{1,2} Its prevalence is high in Southeast Asia³ and symptoms compromise speaking and eating.⁴ OSF is oral potentially malignant disorder with malignant transformation rate of 3-19%.⁵ It is caused by a masticatory substance, areca nut, fourth most addictive substance,^{6,7} chewed with/without tobacco and is an ancient, socially acceptable habit.⁸

Quality of Life (QoL) research guides health professionals in understanding impact of a disease and treatment⁹ and Oral health Related Quality of Life (OHRQoL) questionnaire incorporates functional, social and psychological impacts of

Correspondence: Dr Jyotsna Rimal, Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, B.P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal. Email: josna21@yahoo.com, Phone: 9842171300. oral diseases.¹⁰ Oral Health Impact Profile 14 is one of the most popular OHRQoL tool. QoL in OSF is severely affected however, has been poorly researched. Hence, it was the purpose of the study to validate Nepalese OHIP-14 and to assess impact of OHRQoL in OSF patients.

METHODS

An interventional OHRQoL study was designed and OHIP-14 was chosen for this study. All the study participants received written information and gave informed consent. The study was approved by the Institutional Ethical Review Board (IERB) of BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences. The participants were patients visiting the department of Oral Medicine and Radiology (OMR) of the institute for the diagnosis and treatment of oral submucous fibrosis from February 2011- February 2012.

Translation and adaptation process of OHIP-14 into Nepali was carried out. The validity of the Nepalese OHIP-14 was checked using the backtranslation technique. The validation process was done in 3 steps namely linguistic and cultural adaptation, pilot testing and the main study. The English version of the questionnaire was translated into Nepali by two individuals who were experts in both the languages. Back translation was done along with linguistic and cultural adaptation by two other individuals who were not a part of the study but were erudite in both the languages. The resultant Nepalese version was produced after the face and content validity results of the pilot study were verified by experts in the use of questionnaires in both languages. Concurrent validity was checked by the association between Nepalese OHIP-14 scores and self-perceived oral health status, self-perceived dental treatment need and satisfaction with oral health status. The questionnaire was pilot tested on 50 individuals. During the pilot study, it took an average of ten minutes to finish the interview and 15 - 20 minutes to complete the proforma. Scheduling for the main study was planned likewise. Participants were also asked about difficulties in understanding items or frequencies. Reliability of the translated version of the OHIP-14 scale was assessed in terms of internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha

which measured the overall correlation between items within the scale. In relation to internal consistency, inter-item and corrected item-total correlation coefficients for the different OHIP scale items were also calculated. For each of the 14 items, patients were asked how often they had experienced the problem in the previous 1 year. Responses were coded as 'very often' (scoring 4), 'fairly often' (3), 'occasionally' (2), 'hardly ever' (1) or 'never' (0).¹¹ The total OHIP-14 score and the subscale scores constituted measures of the 'severity' of adverse impacts caused by OSF. A detailed history was recorded regarding patient's deleterious oral habits in the proforma developed by the department through trained interviewers. Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) for burning sensation in a rating of 0-10 was also recorded. Visual analogue scale is an unidimensional measure of pain intensity which has been widely used in diverse population. It consists of a horizontal line measuring 100 mms denoted by 2 descriptors ie no pain to worst imaginable pain. It is a validated tool available to public freely. Higher score denotes greater pain intensity and vice versa. Inter-incisal mouth opening, cheek flexibility were measured using vernier caliper by a single examiner. Along with these, blanching and fibrotic bands were also recorded on each visit. Staging of OSF was done as described by Kerr et al.¹ Following the self administered baseline questionnaire, 74 patients were enrolled in the study. All patients were given a potent vasodilator, pentoxifylline 400 mg thrice daily for one month along with intralesional dexamethasone 4mg/ml biweekly for the first 2 weeks then in combination with hyaluronidase 1500 IU for the next 4 weeks biweekly for a total period of 6 weeks and followed up for 6 months (2 weeks, 1 month, 3 months and 6 months) during which OHIP-14 was again administered at 6 months to assess the impact.

The data were analyzed using SPSS version 11.5. Continuous data were presented as mean with their Standard deviation. Categorical data were presented as frequencies with percentages. Nonparametric statistics were used for comparison which included Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test (Pairwise comparison) and Kruskal Wallis Test (Groupwise comparison). Correlation carried out using Spearman's rho correlation coefficient. Level of statistical significance was set at p<0.05.

RESULTS

The study population consisting of 52 males and 22 females had a mean age of 36.14±13.52 [median (range) = 35.5(17-74)] years. The psychometric properties of the OHIP-14 in terms of concurrent validity as well as internal reliability were good. For internal reliability, all inter-item correlations (Table 1) were positive and the inter-item correlation coefficient varied from 0.2 to 0.8. The corrected item-total correlation coefficients (Table 2) ranged from 0.43 to 0.80. The Cronbach's alpha of this 14-item scale was 0.90. For concurrent validity the Nepalese OHIP-14 scores were significantly associated with self-perceived oral health status (p<0.001), self-perceived dental treatment need (p<0.001) and satisfaction with oral health status (p<0.001) (Table 3). Commercial tobacco and areca nut product chewing habit (Gutka®) was seen among 44.6% of patients. Other chewing habits were arecanut (4.1%), arecanut with betel leaf

(4.1%), betel quid (5.4%), betel quid with tobacco (16.2%) and betel guid with smoking tobacco (20.3%). Median (range) frequency and duration were 7.5(0-20) times per day and 10(0-60) years, respectively. Median(range) OHIP-14 score at baseline of 18(0-45), was significantly (p<0.001) different from the follow- up at 6 months of 5(0-15) (Table 4). Similarly, median (range) visual analogue scale for burning sensation revealed that baseline score of 4(0-10) was significantly (p<0,001) different from 6-month follow-up score of 0(0-4). VAS and OHIP-14 scores were also significantly different between males and females both before and after treatment of OSF (Table IV). Table 5 displays responses to OHIP-14 items before and after treatment. There was weak positive correlation between OHIP-14 score and age [r_c(72)=0.32, p=0.005], frequency [r_c(68)=0.44, p<0.001] and duration of habit [r_.(68)=0.31, p=0.006]. VAS scores also had weak correlation with age [r_c(72)= 0.27, p<0.001], frequency of habit [r₁(72)=0.13, p>0.05] and duration of habit [r₍₇₂₎=0.18, p>0.05.]

| Table 1. Inter-item corre | Table 1. Inter-item correlation of 14 items of OHIP-14. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Impact item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Trouble pronouncing any words | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sense of taste has worsened | 0.28 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Painful aching in mouth | 0.63 | 0.31 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncomfortable to eat any foods | 0.56 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Felt self conscious | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.72 | 0.39 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Felt tense | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.52 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Diet been unsatisfactory | 0.38 | 0.58 | 0.37 | 0.56 | 0.51 | 0.28 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Had to interrupt meals | 0.51 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 0.30 | 0.64 | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Difficult to relax | 0.61 | 0.25 | 0.58 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Been a bit embarrassed | 0.56 | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.34 | 0.62 | 0.36 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 0.80 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Been a bit irritable with others | 0.37 | 0.26 | 0.37 | 0.28 | 0.36 | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.25 | 0.32 | 0.36 | 1.00 | | | |
| Had difficulty doing usual jobs | 0.52 | 0.29 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 0.48 | 0.25 | 1.00 | | |
| Life in general was less satisfying | 0.42 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.20 | 0.41 | 0.50 | 0.26 | 0.20 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.60 | 0.23 | 1.00 | |
| Been totally unable to function | 0.41 | 0.33 | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.45 | 0.20 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.57 | 0.28 | 1.00 |

| Table 2. Corrected item-total correlation. | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OHIP item | Corrected inter-item total correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted | | | | | |
| Trouble pronouncing any words | 0.71 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Sense of taste has worsened | 0.46 | 0.90 | | | | | |
| Painful aching in mouth | 0.71 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Uncomfortable to eat any foods | 0.53 | 0.90 | | | | | |
| Felt self conscious | 0.80 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Felt tense | 0.43 | 0.91 | | | | | |
| Diet been unsatisfactory | 0.66 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Had to interrupt meals | 0.72 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Difficult to relax | 0.70 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Been a bit embarrassed | 0.73 | 0.89 | | | | | |
| Been a bit irritable with others | 0.44 | 0.90 | | | | | |
| Had difficulty doing usual jobs | 0.54 | 0.90 | | | | | |
| Life in general was less satisfying | 0.53 | 0.90 | | | | | |
| Been totally unable to function | 0.58 | 0.90 | | | | | |

| Table 3. Construct validation of OHIP-14. | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|-------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | n(%) | Mean | Median | P value | | | | |
| | | rank | (range) | | | | | |
| Perceived oral health status | | | | | | | | |
| Good | 10 | 6.5 | 12.5 (0-29) | | | | | |
| Fair | 18 | 28 | 18 (0-33) | <0.001 | | | | |
| Poor | 22 | 59 | 24 (0-45) | | | | | |
| Perceived need for oral | | | | | | | | |
| care | | | | | | | | |
| No | 12 | 6.5 | 18 (0-34) | <0.001 | | | | |
| Yes | 38 | 33.5 | 22 (2-45) | <0.001 | | | | |
| Perceived oral | | | | | | | | |
| satisfaction | | | | | | | | |
| No | 21 | 49 | 24.5(1-45) | <0.001 | | | | |
| Yes | 29 | 12 | 15.5(0-29) | | | | | |

| Table 4. Mean distribution and comparison of OHIP Scale and VAS scores. | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| OHIP Scale Median (Range) | | | | | | |
| | Before After | | | | | |
| OHIP score | 18(0-45) | 5(0-15)* | | | | |
| Male | 18(0-45) | 4.5(0-15)* | | | | |
| Female | 17(1-45) | 6(0-10)* | | | | |
| Visual analogue scale | | | | | | |

Nepalese OHIP-14 in Oral Submucous Fibrosis

| VAS score | 4(0-10) | 0(0-4)* |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| Male | 4(0-10) | 0(0-4)* |
| Female | 6(0-8) | 0(0-3)* |

*p<0.001

| treatment:Incasingly n (%)Hardly everOccasionally n (%)Fairly often often n (%)Fairly often n (%)Fairly often often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly often in (%)Fairly in (%) <t< th=""><th colspan="9">Table 5. Responses to OHIP-14 items before and after</th></t<> | Table 5. Responses to OHIP-14 items before and after | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| n (%) ever n (%) n (%) often n (%) often n (%) often n (%) Functional limitation I I often n (%) often n (%) often n (%) often n (%) Functional limitation I I I I I I Touble pronouncing any words 34 (45.9) 12 (9.5) 56 (8.8) 18 (24.3) 56 (6.8) Sense of tase has worsened I <thi<< th=""><th colspan="10"></th></thi<<> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Image in the set of the set | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| Functional limitation%%%%%%%Trouble pronouncing any words34 (45.9)12 (16.2)5 (6.8) (24.3)18 (24.3)5 (6.8) (24.3)00*57 (77)*7 (9.5)*8 (10.8)* (24.3)2 (2.7)* (10.8)00*00*56 (56.8)16 (15.7)2 (2.7)* (21.6)00* (10.8)00*00*56 (57.7)16 (21.6)2 (2.7)* (21.6)00* (10.8)00* (10.8)00*Physical pain in mouth10 (22 (22.7)*14 (18.9) (21.6)16 (22.7)* (20.7)*13 (21.6)15 (21.6)100 (22.7)*22 (60.8)*7 (9.5)* (10.8)0 (0* (20.7)*0(0* (20.7)*0(0* (20.7)*100 (22.7)*24 (28.7)*10 (13.5)* (11.8)*0 (0* (20.7)*15 (20.3)*15 (20.3)*100 (11.8)*21 (24.4)*8 (11.8)*11 (12.8)*13 (11.6)*15 (20.3)*11 (28.4)*21 (44.6)*31 (11.8)*3 (4.1)* | | n (%) | | n (%) | | | | | | |
| limitationimitationimitableimit | Functional | | n (%) | | n (%) | n (%) | | | | |
| Trouble pronouncing any words 34 (45.9) 12 (16.2) 5 (6.8) (24.3) 18 (24.3) 5 (6.8) 57 (77)* (9.5)* 8 (10.8)* 2 (2.7)* 0 (0)* (56.8) (13.5) (10.8) 3 (10.8) (4.1) Sense of task has worsened 56 16 2 (2.7)* 0 (0)* 0 (0)* (77.7)* (21.6)* 2 0 (0)* 10 12 Physical pain 10 22 14 (18.9) 16 12 Painful aching in moth 12 45 7 (9.5)* 0 (0)* 0(0)* 21 8 17 (23) 13 15 (20.7)* (20.3) foods 11 13 13 15 (20.3)* 0(0)* (20.3)* foods 11 13 13 15 (20.3)* 10 (21.6)* (20.3)* foods 11 13 13 15 (20.3)* 10 (21.6)* (21.6)* foods 11 16.8 12 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trouble pronouncing any words (45.9) (16.2) (24.3) (24.3) (26.3) 57 7 8 (10.8) 2 (2.7) 0 (0)* (77)* (9.5)* 111 (14.9) 8 3 Sense of task has worsened (56.8) (13.5) (10.8) (41.0) has worsened 56 16 2 (2.7)* 0 (0)* (10.8) Physical pain 7 (21.6)* 14 (18.9) 16 12 Physical pain 10 22 14 (18.9) 16 12 Painful aching 12 (27.7) (21.6)* 7 (9.5)* 0 (0)* (10.2)* 10 22 14 (18.9) 13 14 | | 34 | 12 | 5 (6.8) | 18 | 5 | | | | |
| series of tases 57 7 8 (10.8)* 2 (2.7)* 0 (0)* Sense of tases has worsened 42 10 11 (14.9) 8 3 Sense of tases has worsened 56 16 2 (2.7)* 0 (0)* 0 (0)* Physical pain - - 0 (0)* 0 (0)* 0 (0)* Physical pain - - - 10 0 (0)* 0 (0)* Physical pain - - - - - 10 Painful aching in mouth 13.5 (29.7)* 60.08* 0 (0)* (21.6) 10.01* (20.7)* (60.8)* - 0 (0)* (21.3) 15 (23.3) 15 (28.4) (10.8) - - - (21.3) 15 (26.4) 10.8 - 13 15 (23.3) 15 (23.3) 16 (23.3) 10 13.5 (23.3) 16 (23.3) 16 (23.3) 10 17.6 10 16< | | | | - () | | (6.8) | | | | |
| 1/1 $(77)^{\circ}$ $(9.5)^{\circ}$ $(-1)^{\circ}$ $(9.5)^{\circ}$ $(-1)^{\circ}$ <td></td> <td>57</td> <td>7</td> <td>8 (10.8)ª</td> <td>2 (2.7)^a</td> <td>0 (0)^a</td> | | 57 | 7 | 8 (10.8)ª | 2 (2.7) ^a | 0 (0) ^a | | | | |
| Sense of tasts has worsened(56.8)(13.5)(10.0)(10.10)(10.10)150122211011Physical pain102214 (18.9)1612110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*0 (0)*110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*10110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*10110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*10.0*110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*10.0*110022457 (9.5)*0 (0)*10.0*11001245101315110011817 (23)13151101131310 (13.5)*0 (0)*1110113311315111011313131111110113131311< | | (77) ^a | (9.5)ª | | | | | | | |
| has worsened 56 16 2 (2.7) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (75.7) ^a (21.6) ^a - - - Physical pain - - - - - Painful aching (10. 22 14 (18.9) 16 12 (13.5) (29.7) ^a (60.8) ^a - - - (10.00000000000000000000000000000000000 | | | - | 11 (14.9) | - | | | | | |
| 100(75.7)*(21.6)*(21.6)*(21.6)(21.6)(21.6)Painful aching in mouth102214 (18.9)1612(20.7)*(60.8)*(21.6)(21.6)(20.7)*(20.7)*(60.8)*(17.6)(20.3)*Uncomfortable to eat any foods21817 (23)1315(21.4)*(10.8)(17.6)(20.3)*(20.3)*Psychological discomfort313310 (13.5)*0 (0)*0 (0)*Psychological discomfort25813 (17.6)20 (27)8(33.8)(10.8)(10.8)(10.8)(10.8)(10.8)Pelt self conscious25813 (17.6)20 (27)8(111221 (28.4)1810.9*(10.8)Pelt tense111221 (28.4)1816.9*(14.9)(16.2)(14.9)*0 (0)*0 (0)*0 (0)*(14.9)(16.2)(14.9)*10.9*16.9*16.9*Physical disability317 (9.5)12 (16.2)186(14.9)15181 (1.4)*0 (0)*0 (0)*16.9*Interrupt meals2617 (23)*11 (14.9*155Respendencia (35.1)170 (0)*10.9*16.9*Interrupt meals57170 (0)*0 (0)*16.9*Interrupt meals57170 (0)*0 (0)*16.9*Interrupt me | | | | | | | | | | |
| Physical pain Painful aching in mouthInInInInIn102214 (18.9)1612(13.5)(29.7)(60.8)*(10.6)(21.6)(0)*(29.7)*(60.8)*(17.6)(20.3)(17.6)(20.3)Uncomfortable to eat any | has worsened | | - | 2 (2.7)ª | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0)ª | | | | |
| Painful aching in mouth102214 (18.9)1612 (13.5) (29.7) (29.7) $(60.8)^{\circ}$ (21.6) (16.2) $(29.7)^{\circ}$ $(60.8)^{\circ}$ $(7 (9.5)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $(0)^{\circ}$ $(29.7)^{\circ}$ $(60.8)^{\circ}$ $17 (23)$ 13 15 (28.4) (10.8) (17.6) $(20.3)^{\circ}$ $(20.3)^{\circ}$ (28.4) (10.8) (17.6) $(20.3)^{\circ}$ $(17.6)^{\circ}$ (28.4) (10.8) $(17.6)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $(41.9)^{\circ}$ $(44.6)^{\circ}$ $(10.15.5)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ Psychological discomfort (3.8) (10.8) (17.6) $20 (27)$ 8 Felt self (3.8) (10.8) (10.8) (10.8) (10.8) (10.8) Conscious 40 31 $3 (4.1)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $f54.1)^{\circ}$ $(41.9)^{\circ}$ $(41.9)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ (16.2) Felt self (3.8) (10.8) $(21.2)^{\circ}$ (16.2) $(54.1)^{\circ}$ $(41.9)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $felt tense$ (3.8) $7 (9.5)$ $12 (16.2)$ 18 6 $(asbility)$ 55 18 $1 (1.4)^{\circ}$ $0 (0)^{\circ}$ $(0)^{\circ}$ $(asta)$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(24.3)^{\circ}$ $(asta)$ $(26.1)^{\circ}$ $(17 (23)^{\circ})$ $(11 (14.9)^{\circ})$ $15 (6.8)^{\circ}$ $(6.8)^{\circ}$ <td>Physical pain</td> <td>(/5./)ª</td> <td>(Z1.6)^a</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | Physical pain | (/5./)ª | (Z1.6) ^a | | | | | | | |
| Painful aching in mouth(13.5)(29.7)(29.7)(21.6)(21.6)(17.6)(17.6)(20.7)(60.8)(7 (9.5)°0 (0)°(7 (3.6)°(7 (3.6)°(7 (3.6)°Uncomfortable to eat any foods21817 (23.0)(17.6)(20.3)°(11.0)(21.0)10 (13.5)°0 (0)°(20.3)°(11.6)°Psychological discomfort(41.9)°(10 (13.5)°0 (0)°(10.8)°Psychologicat discomfort25813 (17.6)20 (27)8Felt self conscious(33.8)(10.8)20 (27)8(10.8)°Felt self conscious(40.0)313 (4.1)°0 (0)°0 (0)°10(41.9)11221 (28.4)1812Felt self conscious111221 (28.4)1812111221 (28.4)181216.2)16.2)Felt self conscious141221 (28.4)1812111221 (28.4)1816.2)16.2)16.2)Felt self conscious13341 (1.4)°0 (0)°12Felt self conscious13121216.2)16.2)Felt self conscious14122116.2)16.2)Felt self conscious1412212121Felt self disability1311.1.4)°0.00°16.2)16.2)Piet self interrupt meals26 <t< td=""><td></td><td>10</td><td>22</td><td>14 (18 9)</td><td>16</td><td>12</td></t<> | | 10 | 22 | 14 (18 9) | 16 | 12 | | | | |
| in mouth22 (29.7)*45 (60.8)*7 (9.5)* (10.8)0 (0)* (0)*0 (0)* (0)*Uncomfortable to eat any foods21 (28.4)8 (10.8)17 (23)13 (17.6)15 (20.3)31 (33 (41.9)*33 (44.6)*10 (13.5)* (14.8)*0 (0)* (0)*0 (0)* (0)*Psychological discomfort78 (10.8)0 (0)* (16.8)*0 (0)* (16.8)Felt self conscious25 (40, 31) (54.1)*8 (10.8)20 (27) (16.2)8 (10.8)Felt self conscious40 (14.9)*31 (4.1)* (16.2)0 (0)* (24.3)0 (0)* (16.2)Felt tense foldisability11 (14.9)*21 (28.4) (24.3)*18 (16.2)12 (24.3)10 (0)* (16.2)Physical disability31 (74.3)*7 (9.5) (24.3)*12 (16.2) (24.3)*18 (11.4)*6 (24.3)0 (0)* (12.1)Diet been unsatisfactory31 (74.3)*7 (9.5) (24.3)*11 (1.4)* (16.2)0 (0)* (24.3)0 (0)* (12.1)Had to interrupt meals26 (77.3)*12 (16.2) (23.4)*18 (11.4)*15 (20.3)5 (6.8) (16.2)Psychological disability27 (23.4)*11 (14.9)* (0.0)*0 (0)* (0.0)*6 (0.0)*Psychological disability32 (23.4)*12 (16.2) (20.3)*9 (0.0)*9 (0.0)*Psychological disability32 (43.2)12 (16.2) (23.4)*99 (12.2)Difficult to432 <b< td=""><td>Painful aching</td><td>-</td><td></td><td>14 (10.7)</td><td></td><td></td></b<> | Painful aching | - | | 14 (10.7) | | | | | | |
| Uncomfortable to eat any foods218 (28.4)17 (23)1315 (20.3)3133 (41.9)*10 (13.5)* (44.6)*0 (0)*0 (0)*Psychological discomfort0 (0)*0 (0)*Psychological discomfortFelt self conscious258 (10.8)13 (17.6) (10.8)20 (27)8 (10.8)Felt self conscious0 (0)*0 (0)*1112 (54.1)*21 (28.4)18 (16.2)12 (16.2)16.2)Felt tense1112 (14.9)*21 (28.4)18 (16.2)12 (16.2)Physical disabilityDiet been unsatisfactory31 (74.3)*7 (9.5)12 (16.2)18 (24.3)*6 (24.3)Had to interrupt meals26 (74.3)*17 (23) (24.3)*11 (1.4)* (20.3)*0 (0)* (20.3)1Psychological disability26 (77.3*17 (23.3*0 (0)* (20.3)*00Psychological disabilityBifficult to13141516 | _ | | | 7 (9.5)ª | | | | | | |
| Uncomfortable to eat any foods (28.4) (10.8) (17.6) (20.3) 31 33 10 (13.5) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Psychological discomfort (44.6) ^a 10 (13.5) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Psychological discomfort (44.6) ^a 10 (13.5) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Felt self (33.8) (10.8) 20 (27) 8 (33.8) (10.8) 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (54.1) ^a (41.9) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (14.9) (16.2) 21 (28.4) 18 12 (14.9) (16.2) (24.3) (16.2) Felt tense 31 7 (9.5) 12 (16.2) 18 6 (13ability 1 1.1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a (24.3) (8.1) Diet been (41.9) 12 (16.2) 18 6 (17.3) ^a (24.3) ^a (24.3) ^a (24.3) ^a (24.3) ^a (26.3) ^a Had to interrupt 57 17 0 (0) ^a | | (29.7)ª | (60.8)ª | | | . , | | | | |
| (28.4) (10.8) (17.6) (20.3) 10 ead any foods 31 33 $(41.9)^a$ 10 $(13.5)^a$ 0 $(0)^a$ 0 $(0)^a$ $R_{sychologicaldiscomfort(44.6)^a10101010Psychologicaldiscomfort125813 (17.6)20 (27)8Felt selfconscious4031(54.1)^a3 (4.1)^a0 (0)^a0 (0)^aFelt selfconscious4031(54.1)^a3 (4.1)^a0 (0)^a0 (0)^aFelt tense1112(54.1)^a21 (28.4)18(16.2)12(24.3)16.2Felt tense1112(52.7)^a21 (28.4)18(45.9)^a100 (0)^aFelt tense31(52.7)^a7(9.5)12 (16.2)18(24.3)^a100 (0)^aFelt tense31(52.7)^a7(9.5)12 (16.2)18(24.3)^a6101114(24.3)^a0 (0)^a0 (0)^a105518(74.3)^a11 (14.9)^a0 (0)^a6(8.1)^a1011(14.9)^a111115(20.3)^a5518(24.3)^a11 (14.9)^a0 (0)^a1011(74.3)^a17(23.4)^a00010^a1011(14.9)^a11(14.9)^a10(16.2)^a11(16.2)^a$ | Uncomfortable | 21 | 8 | 17 (23) | 13 | 15 | | | | |
| foods313310 (13.5)a0 (0)a0 (0)aPsychological discomfort(44.6)aPsychological discomfort25813 (17.6)20 (27)8Felt self conscious(33.8)(10.8)(10.8)40313 (4.1)a0 (0)a0 (0)a0 (0)a $(54.1)^a$ (41.9)a3 (4.1)a0 (0)a0 (0)aFelt self conscious111221 (28.4)1812 11 1221 (28.4)1816.2)(16.2) 7 (45.9)a-0 (0)a0 (0)a0 (0)a $(52.7)a$ (45.9)a 7 (45.9)a 11 1221 (16.2)186- $(52.7)a$ (45.9)a 11 1221 (16.2)186- 11 1212 (16.2)186- 11 155181 (1.4)a0 (0)a0 (0)a 11 191512 11 1211 (14.9)155 11 170 (0)a0 (0)a0 (0)a 11 1211 (14.9)155 11 1212 (16.2)10 11 15170 (0)a0 (0)a0 (0)a< | | (28.4) | (10.8) | | (17.6) | (20.3) | | | | |
| Psychological discomfort Image: section of the section | - | - | | 10 (13.5)ª | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0)ª | | | | |
| discomfortImage: select one se | | (41.9)ª | (44.6) ^a | | | | | | | |
| Felt self conscious258 (10.8)13 (17.6) (10.8)20 (27) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Felt self conscious (33.8) (10.8) (10.8) (10.8) 40 31 3 (4.1) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (54.1) ^a (41.9) ^a 3 (4.1) ^a 0 (0) ^a 10 (0) ^a (10.8) (41.9) ^a 21 (28.4) 18 12 (14.9) (16.2) (24.3) (16.2) 39 34 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (52.7) ^a (45.9) ^a 10 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (52.7) ^a (45.9) ^a 12 (16.2) 18 6 fisability 31 7 (9.5) 12 (16.2) 18 6 Diet been (41.9) 10 10 00 ^a 60 ^b (14.19) 25.5 18 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 60 ^b usatisfactory 55 18 1 (1.4) ^a 20 ^b 6.8 ^b fitterrupt 57 17 0 (0) ^a 20 ^b 6.8 ^b interrupt 57 17 0 (0) ^a 20 ^b </td <td>disconnort</td> <td>25</td> <td>8</td> <td>13 (17 6)</td> <td>20 (27)</td> <td>8</td> | disconnort | 25 | 8 | 13 (17 6) | 20 (27) | 8 | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Felt self | | - | 13 (17.0) | 20 (27) | - | | | | |
| (54.1)*(41.9)*(41.9)*(41.9)*111221 (28.4)1812(14.9)(16.2)(24.3)(16.2)39341 (1.4)*0 (0)*0 (0)*(52.7)*(45.9)*10 (0)*0 (0)*(52.7)*(45.9)*12 (16.2)186disability7 (9.5)12 (16.2)1860(41.9)12 (16.2)1860(41.9)2617 (23)11 (1.4)*0 (0)*102617 (23)11 (14.9)1551157170 (0)*20.3)*6.8)1157170 (0)*0 (0)*0 (0)*1157170 (0)*0 (0)*0 (0)*1177)*(23)*11 (14.9)155111212 (16.2)999111512 (16.2)12 (16.2)9911141212 (16.2)12 (16.2)12 (12.2)12 (12.2)111314141414141114151414141411141514141414111214141414141114151414141414151414141414141415141414141414 | | | | 3 (4.1)ª | 0 (0)ª | | | | | |
| Felt tense (14.9) (16.2) (24.3) (16.2) 39 34 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (52.7) ^a (45.9) ^a 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Physical disability 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 10 (0) ^a 10 (0) ^a Physical disability 1 7 (9.5) 12 (16.2) 18 6 Diet been unsatisfactory 55 18 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 1000 7(4.3) ^a (24.3) ^a 11 (14.9) 15 5 Had to interrupt meals 26 17 (23) 11 (14.9) 15 5 57 17 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Fsychological disability 57 17 0 (0) ^a 100 ^a 100 ^a Masselitity 32 12 12 (16.2) 9 9 Difficult to (43.2) (16.2) (12.2) (12.2) (12.2) | | (54.1)ª | | | | - (-) | | | | |
| Felt tense 39 34 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (52.7) ^a (45.9) ^a 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Physical disability 45.9) ^a 1 1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a 1 Physical disability 7 9.5 12 (16.2) 18 6 000 ^a (41.9) 7 9.5 12 (16.2) 18 6 000 ^a (41.9) 10 12 (16.2) 18 6 000 ^a (24.3) ^a 11 (14.9) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 16 77 17 0 (0) ^a 10 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 170 ^a (23) ^a 100 ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 100 ^a 10 10 10 ^a 10 ^b 10 ^b 10 ^b 10 ^b 10 10 ^b 10 | | 11 | 12 | 21 (28.4) | 18 | 12 | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c } & 39 & 34 & 1 & (1.4)^{a} & 0 & (0)^{a} & 0 & (0)^{a} \\ (52.7)^{a} & (45.9)^{a} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$ | Felt tense | (14.9) | (16.2) | | (24.3) | | | | | |
| Physical disability Image: sector secto | Tett tense | | - | 1 (1.4)ª | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0)ª | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c } \begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline disability & ic c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | (52.7) ^a | (45.9)ª | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | disability | 31 | 7 (9 5) | 12 (16 2) | 18 | 6 | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Diet been | | . (,, | () | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | unsatisfactory | | 18 | 1 (1.4)ª | | 0 (0) ^a | | | | |
| Had to (35.1) (1) (20.3) (6.8) interrupt 57 17 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Psychological (77) ^a (23) ^a (20.3) 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Psychological (1) (20.3) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) Difficult to (43.2) (16.2) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | | (74.3)ª | (24.3)ª | | | | | | | |
| interrupt meals (35.1) (20.3) (6.8) 57 17 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 77) ^a (23) ^a (23) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a Psychological disability 12 12 12 9 9 Difficult to (43.2) (16.2) (12.2) (12.2) (12.2) | Had to | | 17 (23) | 11 (14.9) | | | | | | |
| meals 57 17 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a 0 (0) ^a (77) ^a (23) ^a (23) ^a (23) ^a (0) ^a | | | | | | | | | | |
| Psychological disability Image: Second system | - | | | 0 (0) ^a | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0) ^a | | | | |
| disability Image: Second system Seco | Baychological | (//) ^a | (23) ^a | | | | | | | |
| 32 12 12 (16.2) 9 9 Difficult to (43.2) (16.2) (12.2) (12.2) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difficult to (43.2) (16.2) (12.2) (12.2) | | 32 | 12 | 12 (16.2) | 9 | 9 | | | | |
| | Difficult to | | | | (12.2) | (12.2) | | | | |
| retax 63 10 0 (0) ^a 1 (1.4) ^a 0 (0) ^a | relax | 63 | 10 | 0 (0) ^a | 1 (1.4)ª | 0 (0) ^a | | | | |
| (85.1) ^a (13.5) ^a | | (85.1) ^a | (13.5) ^a | | | | | | | |

| | 22 | 10 | | F ((0) | - |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | 32 | 19 | 13 (17.6) | 5 (6.8) | 5 |
| Been a bit | (43.2) | (25.7) | | | (6.8) |
| embarrassed | 61 | 12 | 1 (1.4)ª | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0) ^a |
| | (82.4) ^a | (16.2) ^a | | | |
| Social | | | | | |
| disability | | | | | |
| Reen e hit | 39 | 15 | 13 (17.6) | 7 (9.5) | 0 (0) |
| Been a bit irritable with | (52.7) | (20.3) | | | |
| other people | 64 | 10 | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0)ª |
| | (86.5)ª | (13.5) ^a | | | |
| Lind differentia | 40 | 18 | 8 (10.8) | 5 (6.8) | 3 |
| Had difficulty | (54.1) | (24.3) | | | (4.1) |
| doing usual iobs | 59 | 15 | 0 (0)ª | 0 (0) ^a | 0 (0) ^a |
| | (79.7) ^a | (20.3) ^a | | | |
| Handicap | | | | | |
| Life in general | 23 | 20 (27) | 23 (31.1) | 6 (8.1) | 2 |
| Life in general was less | (31.1) | | | | (2.7) |
| satisfying | 58 | 14 | 1 (1.4)ª | 1 (1.4) ^a | 0 (0) ^a |
| satisfying | (78.4) ^a | (18.9) ^a | | | |
| Doon totally | 34 | 10 | 18 (24.3) | 10 | 2 |
| Been totally | (45.9) | (13.5) | | (13.5) | (2.7) |
| unable to function | 47 | 15 | 6 (8.1)ª | 5 (6.8) ^a | 1 |
| Tunction | (63.5)ª | (20.3) ^a | | | (1.4)ª |

DISCUSSION

OHIP-14 is one of the most popular OHRQoL instrument. The cultural and linguistic adaptation is an important aspect of the validation process. The translation in Nepalese was straightforward and there was no difficulty in finding the equivalent words used in the English version of OHIP-14, hence, there was no conceptual or content difference. OHIP-14 has been translated in various other languages like Chinese,¹³ Greek,¹⁴ Persian,¹⁵ Spanish,¹⁶ Sinhalese,¹⁷ Hebrew,¹⁸ Hindi¹⁹ and Sudanese-Arabic.²⁰

The present study is an institutional based research and we as clinicians at times fail to understand the psychological impact any disease can have on an individual. This study is an attempt to understand this domain of quality of life of patients along with function, symptoms, social-psychological disability and handicap. OSF is marked clinically by blanching and stiffening of the oral mucosa leading to limitation in oral opening. The presence of fibrous bands in lips, cheeks and soft palate is a hallmark of the disease. The disease extends over time to include the oropharynx and the upper third of the esophagus¹ severely compromising the quality of life. The study assessed the impact of OSF on QoL pertaining to oral health. The results show that all multi-item oral health specific quality of life measures scored a high internal consistency and validity. In this study it was evident that 94.6% had areca nut habit which strongly supports that areca nut with or without tobacco causes OSF.21 The OSF targeting younger generation is worth taking note of and about 45% of them used commercial preparations as these are easily available sachets at a minimal cost. It has been a well known fact that any form of areca nut guid and tobacco practice can cause OSF.⁶ In the baseline questionnaire, it was found that the most impact was in the psychological domain where patients felt tensed (40.5%) about their oral condition and they were self conscious about the condition (37.8%). This was followed by physical pain where patients felt uncomfortable while eating (37.9%) and painful ache (37.8%). This clearly shows that there is a compromise in their daily activity due to the disease.

There was a normal age distribution ranging from 17-74 years with a mean age (SD) of 36.14 (13.52). However, it is guite important to note that 75.7% of the patients are below 40 years and nearly 40% of study population was under 30 years of age. This age bracket is considered the most productive years of an individual and their productivity is lost due to the compromise in their health. In regards to functional limitation 31.1% had difficulty in pronouncing the words. This could be attributed to the involvement of tongue. There is inability to protrude the tongue due to involvement of floor of the mouth and ventral surface of the tongue. 14.9% individuals had worsened taste sensation and studies have shown that there is altered taste sensation in OSF.^{22, 23} Almost 38% of patients often had pain in their mouth and discomfort in eating daily food which shows that their eating is compromised. This can lead to sequelae of events like deranged metabolism, malnutrition, decreased bone density and starvation, and their consequences in the body as a whole. Almost 40% of them felt that they had psychological discomfort. The food generally relished by rest of the family is no longer enjoyable to them. The quantity of food taken is also less to avoid pain and discomfort and once the diagnosis is known to the patient as oral potentially malignant disorder, this develops tremendous fear of cancer. Patients also reported

their psychological disability with 24.4% not being able to relax and 13.6% being embarrassed. Though social disability accounted for less than 10%, it should not be ignored. This was quite evident in our study showing higher value of Cronbach's alpha. Oral health impact and the visual analog significantly reduced with medical and physical therapy as shown in Table 4. Though the chance of complete cure of OSF cannot be guaranteed, there is significant improvement in quality of life of these patients. When burning sensation reduced, the food generally avoided by patients in the past, was being relished following the treatment. As shown in Table 5, comparison between baseline and 6 months post treatment were made and most of the items had improvements in functional limitation, physical pain-disability, psychological discomfortdisability along with social disability and handicap. The quality of life of these patients seems to have significantly improved following the treatment. This is very encouraging for clinicians in evaluating the treatment outcome of the therapy provided.

There was significant weak positive relationship between OHIP-14 scores and age of patients, frequency of deleterious habit and duration of habit. Moreover, there was weak and almost no association between these factors and VAS scores. Such is expected as oral health related quality of life of OSF patients would be directly influenced by the condition itself and indirectly by other factors. Perhaps a stronger correlation would be observed between OHIP-14 scores and severity of OSF. However, such was not recorded in the present study and may be recommended for future studies. Similar may be suggested for VAS scores and OSF.

The OHRQoL is affected in OSF patients and can be improved after cessation of deleterious areca habit and professional treatment regime. If OSF is treated at an early stage then the degree of malignant transformation can be reduced thereby reducing the cancer burden and improving the overall quality of life.

CONCLUSIONS

Our study revealed that the translated Nepalese version of OHIP met the standard criteria for reliability, validity, and responsiveness hence, can be considered a scientifically valid, reliable oral health related quality of life instrument. However, it needs to be used in larger longitudinal studies to evaluate the sensitivity of Nepalese version of OHIP-14 on other oral diseases in different age groups. OHRQoL has been assessed for the first time for OSF and shows strong evidence that the OHRQoL is severely affected in OSF patients. If oral submucous fibrosis is treated at an early stage then it can reduce the cancer burden and improves the quality of life. It is also recommended to research the relationship between Nepalese version of OHIP and health related quality of life in different oral diseases.

REFERENCES

- Kerr AR, Warnakulasuriya S, Mighell AJ, Dietrich T, Nasser M, Rimal J, et al. A systematic review of medical interventions for oral submucous fibrosis and future research opportunities. Oral Diseases. 2011; 17(1):42– 57
- Borle RM, Borle SM. Management of oral submucous fibrosis: a conservative approach. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1991;49:788-91
- Gupta PC, Mehta FS, Daftary D. Incidence rates of oral cancer and natural history of oral precancerous lesions in a 10 year follow-up study of Indian villages. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol. 1980;8:287-333
- Cox S & Zoellner H. Physiotherapeutic treatment improves oral opening in oral submucous fibrosis. Journal of Oral Pathology & Medicine. 2009;38: 220-226
- Mithani SK, Mydlarz WK, Grumbine FL, Smith IM, Califano JA. Molecular genetics of premalignant oral lesions. Oral Diseases. 2007;13:126–133
- IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Betel-quid and Areca-nut Chewing and Some Areca-nut-derived Nitrosamines IARC Monogr Eval Carcinog Risks Hum. 2004; 85: 123-128
- Gupta PC, Warnakulasuriya S. Global epidemiology of areca nut usage. Addiction Biology. 2002; 7: 77-83.
- 8. Balasimha D, Rajagopal V. Arecanut monograph; Central Plantation Crops Research Institute; Indian Council

of Agricultural Research. 2004; 224-239

- Staquet M J, Hays R D, Fayers P M. Quality of life assessment in clinical trials: methods and practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999
- Gift HC, Redford M. Oral health and the quality of life Clin Geriatr Med. 1992;8(3):673-683
- Slade GD, Nuttall N, Sanders AE, Steele JG, Allen PF, Lahti S. Impacts of oral disorders in the United Kingdom and Australia. Br Dent J. 2005;198:489–93.
- Hawker AG, Mian S, Kendzerska T, French M. Measures of Adult Pain. Arthritis Care and Research. 2011;63(11):240-252
- Xin WN, Ling JQ. Validation of a Chinese version of the oral health impact profile-14. Chinese J Stomatol. 2006; 41:242-245.
- 14. Papagiannopoulou V, Oulis CJ, Papaioannou W, Antonogeorgos G, fantopoulos JY. Validation of a Greek version of the oral health impact profile (OHIP-14) for use among adults. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2012;14;10:7.
- Navabi N, Nakhaee N, Mirzadeh A Validation of a Persian Version of the Oral Health Impact Profile (OHIP-14) Iranian J Publ Health. 2010;39(4):135-139
- Montero-Martín J, Bravo-Pérez M, Albaladejo-Martínez A, Luis Antonio Hernández-Martín LA, Rosel-Gallardo EM. Validation the Oral Health Impact Profile (OHIP-14sp) for adults in Spain. Med Oral Patol Or Oral Cir Bucal. 2009 Jan;14(1):44-50.
- Ekanayake L, Perera I. Validation of a Sinhalese translation of the Oral Health Impact Profile-14 for use with older adults Gerodontology. 2003 Dec;20(2):95-9.

- Kushnir D, Zusman SP, Robinson PG. Validation of a Hebrew version of the Oral Health Impact Profile 14. J Public Health Dent. 2004;64(2):71-5.
- Acharya S. Oral health-related quality of life and its associated factors in an Indian adult population. Oral Health Prev Dent.2008;6(3):175-84.
- 20. Khalifa N, Allen PF, Abu-bakr NH, Abdel-Rahman ME. Psychometric properties and performance of the Oral Health Impact Profile (OHIP-14s-ar) among Sudanese adults. Journal of Oral Science. 2013;55(2):123-132.
- Balaram P, Sridhar H, Rajkumar T, Vaccarella S, Herrero R, Nandakumar A, Ravichandran K, Ramadas K, Sankaranarayanan R, Gajalakshmi V, Munoz N & Franceschi S. Oral cancer in southern India: The influence of smoking, drinking, paan chewing and oral hygiene. Int. J. Cancer. 2002;98: 440–445
- 22. Deeplaxmi R, Sakarde S, Sur J, Singh AP, Jain S, Mujoo S. Altered Taste Perception in Oral Submucous Fibrosis: A Research. J Ind Acad O Med and Radiol. 2012;24(4):288-291
- Chaturvedi VN, Marathe NG. Electrogustometry in oral submucous fibrosis. A study in 50 cases. Indian J Dent Res. 1992;3(3):90-3.