

The International Journal of Prosthodontics

Bridging the Gap Between Science and Clinical Practice

Official Journal of:
European Association for Osseointegration
International College of Prosthodontists
German Society for Prosthodontics and Dental Materials Science
Italian Academy of Prosthetic Dentistry


EAO
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR OSSEointegration

ICP International College
of Prosthodontists

2022/1

Volume 35
Issue 1 • January/February 2022

Editor-in-Chief:
Inna Sailer

 QUINTESSENCE PUBLISHING

The International Journal of Prosthodontics

Bridging the Gap Between Science and Clinical Practice

ISSN 0893-2174 (print)
ISSN 1942-4426 (online)

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Irena Sailer, Prof Dr Med Dent
Geneva, Switzerland

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Nikos Mattheos, DDS, MASc, PhD
Hong Kong, China

Daniel Thoma, Prof Dr Med Dent
Zurich, Switzerland

Clark Stanford, DDS, PhD
Chicago, Illinois, USA

SECTION EDITORS

Clinical Research

Markus Blatz, DMD, PhD, Dr Med Dent Habil
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

Stefan Wolfart, Prof Dr Med Dent
Aachen, Germany

Reviews

Luca Cordaro, MD, DDS, PhD
Rome, Italy

Anja Zembic, PD Dr Med Dent, PhD
Zurich, Switzerland

Fundamental Research

Petra Gierthmühlen, DDS, PhD
Düsseldorf, Germany

Ann Wennerberg, DDS, PhD
Gothenburg, Sweden

Yu Zhang, MS, PhD
New York, New York, USA

Digital Dental Technologies

Wael Att, DDS, Dr Med Dent, PhD
Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Vincent Fehmer, MDT
Geneva, Switzerland

Marta Revilla-León, DDS, MSD, PHD
Seattle, Washington, USA

Clinical Concepts, Inspired

Helena Francisco, DDS, MSc, PhD
Lisbon, Portugal

Iva Milinkovic, MSc, PhD
Belgrade, Serbia

ABSTRACT EDITOR

Steven Sadowsky, DDS
San Francisco, California, USA

STATISTICAL ADVISOR

Philippe Mojon, Dr Med Dent
Geneva, Switzerland

Board of Reviewers

Tomas Albrektsson, MD, PhD, OD hc, RCPSC
Limor Avivi-Arber, DMD, MSc, PhD, Dip Prosth
Michael Bergler, MDT

Estevam Bonfante, DDS, MS, PhD
Lawrence Brecht, DDS

Stephen Chu, DMD, MSD, CDT
Lyndon Cooper, DDS, PhD

Anthony Dawson, BDS, MSD

Anthony Dickinson, BDS, MSD

James Dudley, BDS, MHS, DCLinDent(Pros)

Joke Duyck, DDS, PhD

Carlo Ercoli, DDS

Jonathan Ferencz, DDS

Yoav Finer, DMD, PhD

Luigi Gallo, PhD, MEng

Klaus Gotfredsen, DDS, PhD

Stefano Gracis, DMD, MSD

David Gratton, DDS, MS

Ingrid Grunert, Prof Dr Med, Dr Med Dent

Jan-Frederik Güth, Prof Dr Med Dent

Adam Hamilton, BDS, DCD

Jung-Suk Han, DDS, MS, PhD

Arndt Happe, PD Dr Med Dent

Jenni Hjerpe, DDS, PhD

Alexis Ioannidis, Dr Med Dent

Xinquan Jiang, DDS, PhD

Asbjørn Jøstad, DDS, Dr Odont

Ronald Jung, Prof Dr Med Dent, PhD

Matthias Kern, Prof Dr Med Dent Habil

Kenneth Kurtz, DDS

Christel Larsson, DDS, PhD

Danielle Layton, BDS, MSc, MSc, DPhil

Dominic Leung, BDS, MSc

Feng Liu, DDS, MS

Kenneth Malament, DDS, MScD

Francesco Mangano, DDS, PhD

William Martin, DMD, MS

Jukka Matinlinna, BSc, MSc, PhD

Konstantinos Michalakos, DDS, MSc, PhD

Eitan Mijiritsky, DMD, Dipl (Prosth)

Michael Moscovitch, DDS

Sven Mühlemann, Dr Med Dent

Frauke Müller, Prof Dr Med Dent

Nadja Nanni, Dr Med Dent

Timo Närhi, DDS, PhD

Rade Paravina, DDS, MS, PhD

Edmond Pow, BDS, MSc, PhD

Harold Preiskel, MDS, MSc

Marta Revilla-León, DDS, MSD

Giovanni Rocca, DMD, PD, PhD

Martin Schimmel, Prof Dr Med Dent, MAS

Marc Schmitter, Prof Dr Med Dent

Nelson Silva, DDS, MSc, PhD

Adam Siu, BDS, MDS(Pros)

Ami Smidt, DMD, MSc, BMedSc

Benedikt Spies, PD Dr Med Dent, PhD

Murali Srinivasan, Prof Dr Med Dent, BDS, MDS, MBA, MAS

Bogna Stawarczyk, Prof Dr Dipl-Ing (FH), MS

Malin Strasding, Dr Med Dent

Esam Tashkandi, BDS, MS, PhD

Thomas Taylor, DDS, MSD

Daniel Thoma, PD Dr Med Dent

Pekka Vallittu, Professor, DDS, PhD

Paul Van Zyl, BChD, MChD

Stefan Vandeweghe, DDS, PhD

Per Vult von Steyern, Professor, Dr Odont, PhD, DDS

Terry Walton, BDS, MSc, MS, DDC

Hans-Peter Weber, DMD, Dr Med Dent

Daniel Wismeijer, DDS, PhD

Philip Yeung, BDS, MSc, Cert(Pros)

Cristina Zarauz, DDS, MSc

Publisher

Christian W. Haase

Publisher Emeritus

H. W. Haase

Executive Vice President

William G. Hartman

Director, Journal Publications

Lori A. Bateman

Managing Editor

Hallie Koontz

Editorial Assistant

Kristen Henningson

Production

Nicole McMillan

Subscription Manager

Michelle Hartman

Advertising/subscription information:

Quintessence Publishing Co, Inc, 411 N Raddant Road,
Batavia, Illinois 60510, Telephone (630) 736-3600
Toll-free (800) 621-0387, Fax: (630) 736-3633

Advertising email: tgoldman@quintbook.com

Subscription email: mhartman@quintbook.com

Web site: www.quintpub.com

Subscription rates (includes online version):

Regular rate for North America is \$218 per year; institutional rate is \$590 (Canadian subscribers add applicable GST). International rate (outside North America) is \$258; \$630 institutional. International subscribers add \$40 to international rate for air mail. Student rate \$128 per year (\$168 international); verification should accompany order. Single issue \$40. Subscription may begin at any time. Please allow 6 weeks for any change of address notification to be processed. Claims for missing issues will be serviced only within 6 months of publication date. Otherwise, single copy price will be charged on missing issues.

Copyright © 2022 by Quintessence Publishing Co, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information and retrieval system, without permission of the publisher through the Copyright Clearance Center. Single photocopies of single articles may be made for personal use as allowed by national copyright laws. Please contact the Copyright Clearance Center for permission requests and to pay fees: Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 (www.copyright.com). The journal's ID number (ISSN) is 0893-2174.

The views expressed herein are those of the authors. Information included herein is not professional advice and is not intended to replace the judgment of a practitioner with respect to particular patients, procedures, or practices. To the extent permissible under applicable laws, Quintessence Publishing Company disclaims responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a result of any actual or alleged libelous statements, infringement of intellectual property or other proprietary or privacy rights, or from use or operation of any ideas, instructions, procedures, products, or methods contained in the material therein. The publisher and editors assume no responsibility for unsolicited manuscripts.

Advertising Policy: All advertising appearing in The International Journal of Prosthodontics must be approved by the editorial staff. The publication of an advertisement does not constitute on the part of the Journal or publisher a guaranty or endorsement of the quality or value of the advertised products or services or of any of the representations or the claims made by the advertisers.

Manuscript submission:

www.manuscriptmanager.net/ijp

The International Journal of Prosthodontics is abstracted and/or indexed in MEDLINE/PubMed, Current Contents/Clinical Medicine, and Science Citation Index Expanded.

The International Journal of Prosthodontics is published bimonthly by Quintessence Publishing Co, Inc, 411 N Raddant Road, Batavia, Illinois 60510. Printed in the United States.

Postmaster: Send address changes to Quintessence Publishing Co, Inc, 411 N Raddant Road, Batavia, Illinois, 60510.

Official Journal of:

European Association for Osseointegration
International College of Prosthodontists

German Society for Prosthodontics and
Dental Materials Science

Italian Academy of Prosthetic Dentistry

ISSUE'S ARTICLES

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.2022.1.e PAGES 5, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
Sailer, Irena

Editorial: New Section—EAO Position Papers

 Full text  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

Order subscription

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.2022.1.bio PAGES 6, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Introducing Our New Associate Editors

 Full text  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

Order subscription

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.8013 PAGES 7-16, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
Pjetursson, Bjarni Elvar / Fehmer, Vincent / Sailer, Irena

EAO Position Paper: Material Selection for Implant-Supported Restorations

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

Order subscription

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7485 PAGES 17-26, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
Carneiro, Dominique Ellen / Ransolin, Emily / Savi Sanson, Mariane Aparecida / Mestriner-Junior, Wilson / Campanha, Nara Hellen / Sánchez-Ayala, Alfonso

Sensitivity and Specificity of Capsules Containing Fuchsin-Based Beads for the Evaluation of Masticatory Performance

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

Order subscription

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7562 PAGES 27-36, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
Floriani, Franciele / Sabatini, Gabriela Panca / Oliveira Dos Santos, Tarla Thaynara / Philippi, Analucia Gebler / Gonzaga, Luiz Henrique / Mezzomo, Luís André

Digital and Analog Analysis of Occlusion in Conventional and Implant-Retained Complete Dentures: Preliminary Results of a Prospective Clinical Trial

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

Order subscription

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7334 PAGES 37-44, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Lee, Jae-Hyun / Lee, Su Young / Han, Kyungdo / Han, Jung-Suk

Removable Dental Prosthesis Use and Low Handgrip Strength in Korean Adults: A Nationwide Cross-Sectional Study

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7580 PAGES 45-52, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Yap, Adrian Ujin / Marpaung, Carolina / Rahmadini, Enrita Dian

Self-Reported Symptoms of Temporomandibular Disorders: Relationship with Psychologic Well-Being, Psychologic Distress, and Oral Health–Related Quality of Life

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7402 PAGES 53-61, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Grech, Caitlin / Kassab, Latifah Bedron / Zarb, Mario / Cortes, Arthur RG / Mifsud, David P / Attard, Nikolai J

Patient Reported Outcomes on Different Occlusal Schemes in Complete Denture Wearers

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7063 PAGES 62-67, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Alshehri, Abeer / Alghofaili, Nasser / ALshunaiber, Renad / Alkadi, Lubna

Quality and Readability Assessment of Internet-Based Information on Common Prosthodontic Treatments

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.6815 PAGES 68-73, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Garg, Varun / Judge, Roy B / Abduo, Jaafar / Palamara, Joseph EA

Effect of Aging on the Load-to-Failure of Molar Implant-Supported Monolithic Zirconia Crowns: A Laboratory Study

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.6875 PAGES 74-81, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Grobecker-Karl, Tanja / Kafitz, Lea / Karl, Matthias

Rationale for a novel attachment system for implant-supported overdentures

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7297 PAGES 82-93, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Michelinakis, George / Apostolakis, Dimitrios / Tsagarakis, Andreas / Lampropoulos, Panagiotis

Influence of Different Material Substrates on the Accuracy of Three Intraoral Scanners: A Single-Blinded In Vitro Study

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7623 PAGES 94-108, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Hamilton, Adam / Obermaier, Barbara / Doliveux, Simon / Negreiros, William Matthew / Alnasser, Muhsen / Gallucci, German O

Digitally Fabricated Provisional Implant Restorations Prior to Implant Placement: A Clinical Case Series

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

DOI: 10.11607/ijp.7052 PAGES 109-118, LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Alencar, Cristiane de Melo / Zaniboni, Joissi Ferrari / Silva, Aryvelto Miranda / Ortiz, Mariangela Ivette Guanipa / Lima, Débora Alvez Nunes Leite / de Campos, Edson Alves

Impact of Finishing Protocols on Color Stability of CAD/CAM Ceramics: A Systematic Review

 Full text (no access)  Abstract  Add bookmark  Endnote export  0 Recommendations

Buy single PDF (20,00 €)

[Order subscription](#)

Self-Reported Symptoms of Temporomandibular Disorders: Relationship with Psychologic Well-Being, Psychologic Distress, and Oral Health–Related Quality of Life

Adrian Ujin Yap, BDS, MSc, PhD, Grad Dip Psychotherapy

Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia; Department of Dentistry, Ng Teng Fong General Hospital and Faculty of Dentistry, National University Health System, Singapore; National Dental Research Institute Singapore, National Dental Centre and Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore Health Services, Singapore.

Carolina Marpaung, BDS, MDS, PhD

Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Enrita Dian Rahmadini, BDS, MDS

Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Purpose: To investigate the relationships of self-reported temporomandibular disorder (TMD) symptoms with psychologic well-being (PWB), psychologic distress (PD), and oral health–related quality of life (OHRQoL).

Materials and Methods: The study sample was recruited from a local university using a convenience sampling technique. The Diagnostic Criteria for TMD Symptom Questionnaire (DC/TMD-SQ); Scales of Psychological Well-Being-18 (SPWB-18); Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21); and Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14) were administered electronically to establish TMD symptoms and to assess PWB, PD, and OHRQoL, respectively. Data were analyzed by number/type of TMD symptoms using Kruskal-Wallis/Mann-Whitney *U* tests and Spearman correlation ($\alpha = .05$). **Results:** A total of 602 participants with a mean age of 19.30 ± 1.18 years (84.3% women) were evaluated. Of these, 59.2% reported TMD symptoms, with 10.7% having multiple (≥ 3) features. Pain-related (PT), intra-articular (IT), and combined (CT) TMD symptoms were present in 23.8%, 15.4%, and 20.2% of the cohort, respectively. For both number and type of symptoms, significant differences in SPWB-18 (total/environmental mastery and self-acceptance domains), DASS-21 (total/all domains), and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) scores were observed ($P < .05$). A moderately strong negative correlation was noted between PWB and PD ($r_s = -0.55$). **Conclusion:** Participants with no TMD symptoms had significantly higher PWB than those with two or more TMD symptoms. They also had significantly lower levels of PD and better OHRQoL. Conversely, individuals with PT/CT reported significantly lower PWB compared to those with no symptoms. Moreover, they also had significantly higher levels of PD and poorer OHRQoL than the IT/no symptoms groups. *Int J Prosthodont* 2022;35:45–52. doi: 10.11607/ijp.7580

Temporomandibular disorders (TMDs) are a cluster of medical and dental conditions affecting the temporomandibular joints (TMJs), masticatory muscles, and related structures. Features of TMDs include TMJ/muscle pain, headaches, and TMJ sounds during jaw movement, as well as functional difficulties. They are the most pervasive orofacial pain condition, affecting about 7% of adolescents and 15% of adults.¹ Women appear to be at greater risk for TMDs, especially those from 20 to 40 years of age.² The multifactorial etiology of TMDs has been confirmed to be consistent with the biopsychosocial model of illness.³ Prior studies have largely focused on TMDs and psychologic distress (PD), notably depression, which has been associated with chronic musculoskeletal pain.^{4,5} Moderate to severe levels of depression were observed in 21.4% to 60.1% of TMD patients.⁵ Moreover, TMDs have been linked to poorer oral health–related quality of life (OHRQoL) through depression.⁶ Despite the plethora of literature on PD and OHRQoL, there is a paucity of TMD research relating to psychologic well-being (PWB). PWB has been explored in other chronic

Correspondence to:
Dr Carolina Marpaung
Department of Prosthodontics
Faculty of Dentistry,
Trisakti University
Jl Kyai Tapa no 260,
Jakarta 1140, Indonesia
Email: carolina@trisakti.ac.id

Submitted January 3, 2021;
accepted May 9, 2021.
©2022 by Quintessence
Publishing Co Inc.

diseases, such as rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic fatigue syndrome.^{7–9} Such studies are clinically relevant, considering the health-protective attributes of high PWB.^{10,11}

PWB is more than the absence of disease and/or PD. It is a complex construct concerning optimal experience and functioning.¹² PWB has been conceptualized based on two broad theories. The hedonic model defines well-being in relation to “pleasure attainment and pain avoidance” and centers on happiness. Conversely, the eudaimonic model explains well-being in terms of “meaning and self-realization” and focuses on positive functioning.^{12–14} Ryff’s operationalized measure of eudaimonic well-being, or Scales of Psychological Well-Being (SPWB), encompasses six dimensions of positive functioning: (1) autonomy; (2) environmental mastery; (3) personal growth; (4) positive relations with others; (5) purpose in life; and (6) self-acceptance.^{14,15} The SPWB has been validated and widely used in research across multiple disciplines.^{10,16,17} Based on the SPWB, higher PWB was linked to lower disability and fatigue, but not to pain, in patients with fibromyalgia.⁸ Furthermore, well-being domains were found to be independent of physical symptoms but strongly related to the psychologic components of fatigue and PD in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome.⁹ Until now, no studies have delved into the associations between TMD symptomology based on the contemporary Diagnostic Criteria for TMDs (DC/TMD) standard¹⁸ and PWB, PD, and OHRQoL.

Therefore, the objectives of this study were to examine the self-reported symptoms of TMDs in terms of number and type and their relationships to PWB, PD, and OHRQoL. In addition, the correlations between PWB, PD, and OHRQoL were also established. The null hypotheses were: (1) the number and type of TMD symptoms have no bearing on PWB, depression, anxiety, stress, or OHRQoL; and (2) PWB, PD, and OHRQoL are not correlated.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Approval was attained from the ethics committee of the Trisakti University School of Dentistry, Indonesia (reference no.: 244/S3/KEPK/FKG/2/2019) before commencing the research. The study sample was recruited from a local university in Jakarta using a convenience sampling method. With G*Power Software (version 3.1.9.3),¹⁹ a minimum sample size of $N = 286$ was established a priori, founded on the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney model with an effect size of 0.50, alpha error of 0.05, power of 95%, and allocation ratio of 4, based on earlier work.²⁰ Volunteers aged between 18 and 22 years who were in good general health with no physical impairments or debilitating illness were included in the study. Those with a history of traumatic injuries, psychiatric treatment, or

uncontrolled metabolic, autoimmune, or other systemic conditions were excluded. The study participants were provided information on the study, and informed consent was obtained before administering the survey via Google Forms. The electronic survey was conducted over 2 months and comprised demographic parameters, the DC/TMD Symptom Questionnaire (SQ), the SPWB-18, the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21), and the Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14).^{21–24}

The SQ (<https://ubwp.buffalo.edu/rdc-tmdinternational/>) is necessary for generating DC/TMD Axis I (physical) diagnoses and includes 14 items about TMD pain, headaches, TMJ sounds, and closed and open locking. According to the DC/TMD, common TMD conditions can be classified into pain-related and intra-articular TMDs. Positive responses to the primary questions on pain and/or headaches accompanying TMDs were used to identify the presence of pain-related TMD symptoms. Likewise, positive responses to the key questions on jaw joint noises and closed and open locking of the jaws were utilized to specify the presence of intra-articular TMD symptoms. The participants were subsequently categorized into the following groups:

- Number of TMD symptoms: no TMD symptoms (NT); one TMD symptom (OS); two TMD symptoms (TS); and multiple (ie, three or more) TMD symptoms (MS)
- Type of TMD symptoms: no TMD symptoms (NT); pain-related TMD symptoms (PT); intra-articular TMD symptoms (IT); and combined (ie, both PT and IT) TMD symptoms (CT)

The SPWB-18 (<https://sparqtools.org/mobility-measure/psychological-wellbeing-scale/>) was used to evaluate PWB and comprises 18 items, with 3 questions for each of the 6 subscales of positive functioning. The responses are scored on a 7-point scale, with 1 = strongly agree and 7 = strongly disagree, and some questions are coded in reverse. The domain scores are calculated and totaled to derive the total SPWB score, and higher levels of PWB are indicated by greater total and domain scores.

PD was examined using the DASS-21 (<http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/dass/>), which involves 21 items. Seven questions are dedicated to each emotional state; ie, depression, anxiety, and stress. Responses are scored on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 = did not apply to me at all to 3 = applied to me very much, or most of the time. Scores for each emotional state are calculated and summed to obtain the total DASS score. Greater scores indicate higher levels of psychologic and emotional distress. The OHIP-14 was utilized to determine OHRQoL and contains 14 items with 2 questions for each of the 7 domains: functional limitation, physical pain, psychologic discomfort, psychologic disability, physical disability,

Table 1 Gender Distribution of the Various Groups (N = 605)

| Variables | | Total n (%) | Women n (%) | Men n (%) |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Number of symptoms | None | 247 (40.8) | 206 (83.4) | 41 (16.6) |
| | One | 186 (30.7) | 153 (82.3) | 33 (17.7) |
| | Two | 107 (17.7) | 91 (85.0) | 16 (15.0) |
| | Three or more | 65 (10.7) | 60 (92.3) | 5 (7.7) |
| Type of symptoms | None | 247 (40.8) | 206 (83.4) | 41 (16.6) |
| | Pain-related | 143 (23.8) | 126 (88.1) | 17 (11.9) |
| | Intra-articular | 93 (15.4) | 67 (72.0) | 26 (28.0) |
| | Combined | 122 (20.2) | 111 (91.0) | 11 (9.0) |

All data are reported as n (%).

social disability, and handicap. The questions are scored on a 5-point response scale, with 0 = never to 4 = very often. Domain scores are tallied to derive the total OHIP score. Larger total and domain OHIP-14 scores denote greater impairments to quality of life.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted with the IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows software version 24.0 (IBM) with the significance level set at .05. As the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 data were not normally distributed based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, nonparametric analyses were conducted with Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests. Total and domain scores were compared by number and type of TMD symptoms. Interrelationships between the number of TMD symptoms and the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 scores were performed using Spearman rank-order correlation. Correlation strengths were deemed weak (correlation coefficient [r_s] = 0.1 to 0.3), moderate (r_s = 0.4 to 0.6), or strong (r_s = 0.7 to 0.9) based on the classification by Dancey and Reidy.²⁵

RESULTS

Out of 733 individuals who were approached, 39 met the exclusion criteria, and 89 declined participation (response rate of 87.2%). The mean age of the study cohort (N = 605) was 19.30 ± 1.18 years, and the cohort was comprised of 84.3% women and 15.7% men. The prevalence of TMD symptoms by number and type were as follows (Table 1):

- Number: NT = 40.8%; OS = 30.7%; TS = 17.7%; MS = 10.7%
- Type: NT = 40.8%; PT = 23.8%; IT = 15.4%; CT = 20.2%

For all TMD symptom groups, a greater frequency of women was perceived compared to men.

The mean and median SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 scores by number and type of TMD symptoms are displayed in Tables 2 and 3 with the results of the statistical analyses. For the number of TMD symptoms, significant differences in total SPW and the domains environmental mastery, positive relations with others, and self-acceptance were observed between the various groups. Likewise, significant differences in DASS-21 (total/all domains) and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) were noted. NT participants had significantly higher total SPWB scores than TS and MS participants and showed significantly lower total DASS and depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores, as well as total OHIP scores, when evaluated against their counterparts with TMD symptoms (ie, the OS, TS, and MS groups). For types of TMD symptoms, significant differences in SPWB-18 (total/environmental mastery and self-acceptance domains), DASS-21 (total/all domains), and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) were detected. Individuals with PT and CT symptoms reported significantly lower total SPWB scores compared to those with no symptoms. Moreover, they generally had significantly higher total DASS, depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores, as well as total OHIP scores, than the IT and NT groups.

Table 4 shows the correlations between the number of TMD symptoms, total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores. Correlation coefficients (r_s) ranged from -0.55 to 0.47 . A moderately strong negative correlation was observed between total SPWB and total DASS, while a moderately strong positive association was determined between total OHIP and total DASS. Correlations between the number of TMD symptoms and total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP were weak, as was the association between total SPWB and total OHIP.

DISCUSSION

This study established the relationship of self-reported TMD symptoms with PWB, PD, and OHRQoL and determined the correlations between these variables. As the

Table 2 Mean (SD) and Median (Interquartile Range) Total and Domain SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 Scores Based on Number of TMD Symptoms

| Variables | | No symptoms (NT) | One symptom (OS) | Two symptoms (TS) | Three or more symptoms (MS) | P | Post hoc significant comparisons |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| SPWB-18 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 91.85 (10.68) 93 (85–99) | 89.73 (10.32) 91 (84–96) | 88.43 (10.86) 90 (81–96) | 87.78 (12.15) 90 (80.5–95) | .005 | NT > TS, MS |
| Autonomy | Mean Median | 13.46 (2.73) 13 (12–15) | 13.34 (2.73) 13 (12–15) | 13.04 (2.57) 13 (11–15) | 13.71 (3.05) 14 (12–16) | .346 | – |
| Environmental mastery | Mean Median | 14.68 (2.63) 15 (13–17) | 13.66 (2.66) 14 (12–16) | 13.77 (2.96) 14 (12–16) | 13.78 (2.58) 14 (12–16) | < .001 | NT > OT |
| Personal growth | Mean Median | 17.96 (2.25) 18 (17–20) | 17.95 (2.20) 18 (17–19) | 17.82 (2.36) 18 (16–20) | 17.14 (2.50) 18 (16–19) | .100 | – |
| Positive relations with others | Mean Median | 14.80 (2.95) 15 (13–17) | 14.50 (2.77) 14 (13–17) | 13.87 (3.25) 14 (12–16) | 14.17 (3.53) 14 (11–17) | .043 | NT > TS |
| Purpose in life | Mean Median | 15.30 (2.68) 16 (14–17) | 15.46 (2.61) 16 (14–18) | 15.23 (2.50) 15 (14–17) | 14.91 (2.78) 15 (13–17) | .514 | – |
| Self-acceptance | Mean Median | 15.64 (2.86) 16 (14–18) | 14.38 (3.05) 15 (13–17) | 14.70 (3.25) 15 (13–17) | 14.08 (3.10) 15 (12–16) | < .001 | NT > OS, TS, MS |
| DASS-21 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 14.98 (8.57) 15 (9–20) | 18.68 (8.52) 19 (13–24) | 22.03 (11.02) 21 (14–29) | 22.60 (10.84) 21 (15–31) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| Depression | Mean Median | 3.65 (3.16) 3 (1–5) | 4.45 (3.05) 4 (2–6) | 5.44 (3.92) 4 (3–8) | 5.50 (3.79) 5 (3–7) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| Anxiety | Mean Median | 5.00 (3.07) 7 (3–7) | 6.62 (3.35) 7 (4–9) | 7.70 (3.78) 7 (5–11) | 7.86 (3.92) 6 (5–11) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| Stress | Mean Median | 6.33 (3.59) 6 (4–9) | 7.60 (3.63) 7 (5–10) | 8.89 (4.54) 8 (5–11) | 9.23 (4.46) 9 (6–12) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| OHIP-14 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 7.20 (7.56) 5 (1–10) | 9.18 (7.76) 7 (3–14) | 11.60 (8.23) 11 (5–17) | 15.31 (10.24) 13 (7.5–22) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT MS > OS |
| Functional limitation | Mean Median | 0.66 (1.14) 0 (0–1) | 0.89 (1.28) 0 (0–2) | 0.79 (1.16) 0 (0–1) | 1.14 (1.43) 1 (0–2) | .019 | MS > NT |
| Physical pain | Mean Median | 1.60 (1.50) 2 (0–2) | 1.92 (2.00) 2 (1–3) | 2.22 (1.61) 2 (1–3) | 3.23 (2.04) 3 (2–5) | < .001 | MS, TS > NT MS > TS, OS |
| Psychologic discomfort | Mean Median | 1.34 (1.61) 1 (0–2) | 1.75 (1.92) 1 (0–3) | 2.30 (1.95) 2 (1–4) | 2.91 (2.07) 2.1 (1–4) | < .001 | MS, TS > OS, NT |
| Physical disability | Mean Median | 1.11 (1.44) 1 (0–2) | 1.52 (1.52) 1 (0–2) | 2.00 (1.74) 2 (0–3) | 2.49 (2.11) 2 (1–4) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT MS > OS |
| Psychologic disability | Mean Median | 1.06 (1.42) 0 (0–2) | 1.35 (1.60) 1 (0–2) | 2.06 (1.86) 2 (0–4) | 2.46 (1.90) 2 (1–3) | < .001 | MS, TS > OS, NT |
| Social disability | Mean Median | 0.70 (1.26) 0 (0–1) | 0.72 (1.33) 0 (0–2) | 1.20 (1.56) 1 (0–2) | 1.66 (1.91) 1 (0–3) | < .001 | MS, TS > NT MS > OS |
| Handicap | Mean Median | 0.74 (1.30) 0 (0–1) | 0.85 (1.29) 0 (0–1) | 1.04 (1.41) 0 (0–2) | 1.41 (1.75) 1 (0–2.5) | .003 | MS > NT |

IQR = interquartile range. Results of Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests.

number/type of TMD symptoms influenced PWB, PD, and OHRQoL, and significant correlations were noted between total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores, both null hypotheses were rejected. Young adults were selected for the study sample, as they constitute up to 75% of TMD patients.²⁶ As the response rate was > 80%, the results can represent the study sample.^{27,28} This study is

among the first to explore the connection between TMD and PWB using the Ryff subscales.^{14,15} The instruments that were used for assessing PWB, PD, and OHRQoL are all well-established measures that are widely applied in psychology and quality of life research. Moreover, both the DASS-21 and OHIP-14 have been used in earlier TMD work.^{20,29–31} Besides allowing for comparison

Table 3 Mean (SD) and Median (IQR) Total and Domain SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 Scores Based on Type of TMD Symptoms

| Variables | | No symptoms (NT) | Pain-related (PT) | Intra-articular (IT) | Combined (CT) | P | Post hoc significant comparisons |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|--|
| SPWB-18 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 91.85 (10.68) | 88.77 (11.05) | 89.63 (10.16) | 88.75 (11.13) | .008 | NT > PT, CT |
| | Median | 93 (85–99) | 90 (82–96) | 91 (84–96) | 90 (82–95) | | |
| Autonomy | Mean | 13.46 (2.73) | 13.33 (2.58) | 13.19 (2.70) | 13.39 (2.98) | .930 | – |
| | Median | 13 (12–15) | 13 (12–15) | 13 (12–15) | 13 (11–15) | | |
| Environmental mastery | Mean | 14.68 (2.64) | 13.44 (2.95) | 13.76 (2.58) | 13.99 (2.57) | < .001 | NT > PT, IT |
| | Median | 15 (13–17) | 14 (12–16) | 14 (12–16) | 14 (12–16) | | |
| Personal growth | Mean | 17.96 (2.25) | 17.80 (2.39) | 17.89 (2.12) | 17.64 (2.39) | .736 | – |
| | Median | 18 (17–20) | 18 (17–19) | 18 (17–19) | 18 (16–19) | | |
| Positive relations with others | Mean | 14.80 (2.95) | 14.26 (3.06) | 14.25 (2.65) | 14.24 (3.39) | .139 | – |
| | Median | 15 (13–17) | 15 (12–17) | 14 (13–16) | 14 (12–17) | | |
| Purpose in life | Mean | 15.30 (2.68) | 15.26 (2.74) | 15.73 (2.39) | 14.99 (2.60) | .319 | – |
| | Median | 16 (14–17) | 15 (14–17) | 16 (14–18) | 15 (13.75–17) | | |
| Self-acceptance | Mean | 15.64 (2.86) | 14.67 (3.09) | 14.81 (3.33) | 14.51 (3.01) | .001 | NT > PT, CT |
| | Median | 16 (14–18) | 15 (13–17) | 16 (12.5–17) | 15 (12–17) | | |
| DASS-21 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 14.98 (8.57) | 21.32 (10.16) | 17.41 (8.61) | 21.58 (10.11) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 15 (9–20) | 21 (15–26) | 17 (11.5–23) | 21 (14–28.25) | | |
| Depression | Mean | 3.62 (3.16) | 5.30 (3.71) | 4.16 (2.96) | 5.11 (3.56) | < .001 | PT, CT > NT |
| | Median | 4 (1–5) | 4 (3–7) | 4 (2–6) | 4 (3–7) | | |
| Anxiety | Mean | 5.00 (3.07) | 7.55 (3.76) | 6.09 (3.21) | 7.56 (3.64) | < .001 | PT, CT, IT > NT PT > IT |
| | Median | 5 (3–7) | 7 (5–10) | 6 (3.5–8) | 7 (5–10) | | |
| Stress | Mean | 6.33 (3.59) | 8.47 (4.09) | 7.16 (3.80) | 8.92 (4.24) | < .001 | CT, PT > NT CT > IT |
| | Median | 6 (4–9) | 8 (6–11) | 7 (4–9) | 8 (6–12) | | |
| OHIP-14 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 7.20 (7.56) | 11.75 (8.42) | 6.61 (5.63) | 13.52 (9.65) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 5 (1–10) | 11 (5–17) | 5 (2–10) | 11.5 (6–20) | | |
| Functional limitation | Mean | 0.66 (1.14) | 1.04 (1.39) | 0.62 (0.99) | 0.97 (1.29) | .006 | PT > NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–2) | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–2) | | |
| Physical pain | Mean | 1.60 (1.50) | 2.31 (1.62) | 1.60 (1.38) | 2.66 (1.88) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 2 (0–2) | 2 (1–3) | 2 (0–2) | 2 (1–4) | | |
| Psychologic discomfort | Mean | 1.34 (1.61) | 2.15 (2.08) | 1.39 (1.52) | 2.65 (2.06) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 1 (0–2) | 2 (0–3) | 1 (0–3) | 2 (1–4) | | |
| Physical disability | Mean | 1.11 (1.44) | 2.06 (1.70) | 0.94 (1.12) | 2.26 (1.95) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 1 (0–2) | 2 (1–3) | 1 (0–2) | 2 (1–4) | | |
| Psychologic disability | Mean | 1.06 (1.42) | 1.81 (1.76) | 0.95 (1.28) | 2.33 (1.94) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–2) | 2 (0–3) | 0 (0–2) | 2 (1–4) | | |
| Social disability | Mean | 0.70 (1.26) | 1.27 (1.61) | 0.58 (0.93) | 1.40 (1.73) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 1 (0–3) | 0 (0–1) | 1 (0–2.25) | | |
| Handicap | Mean | 0.74 (1.30) | 1.11 (1.52) | 0.54 (0.83) | 1.25 (1.59) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 1 (0–2) | 0 (0–1) | 1 (0–2) | | |

IQR = interquartile range. Results of Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests.**Table 4** Correlations Between Number of TMD Symptoms, Total SPWB-18, Total DASS-21, and Total OHIP-14 Scores

| Variables | Number of TMD symptoms | Total SPWB-18 | Total DASS-21 |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| No. of TMD symptoms | – | – | – |
| Total SPWB-18 | –0.145** | – | – |
| Total DASS-21 | 0.291** | –0.550** | – |
| Total OHIP-14 | 0.302** | –0.267** | 0.473** |

**Significant according to Spearman correlation ($P < .01$).

with prior TMD research, the generic OHIP-14 was also chosen over a TMD-specific OHRQoL measure, such as the OHIP-TMDs,³² to facilitate evaluation against other oral conditions.

Number of TMD Symptoms

The number of symptoms provided some indication of TMD severity, as MT participants will experience both pain- and function-related TMDs or marked TMJ dysfunction. Individuals without TMD symptoms usually had significantly higher scores for total SPWB, positive relations with others (developing positive relationships, displaying empathy and intimacy toward others), and self-acceptance (having positive self-regard and recognizing one's abilities/limitations) than those with two or more symptoms. This phenomenon may be related to the increased pain/dysfunction as well as PD and impairments to quality of life associated with the presence of more TMD symptoms. To date, only one other study examined the impact of the number of TMD symptoms on PD and OHRQoL based on the DC/TMD-SQ. Tay et al found that participants with differing numbers of symptoms exhibited significant disparities in PD and total OHIP-14 scores.²⁹ The findings of the present study corroborated those of Tay et al, with participants experiencing more TMD symptoms reporting higher depression, anxiety, stress, and total OHIP scores. Although a significant difference in PD was discerned between participants with and without TMD symptoms, total DASS and depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores among the OS, TS, and MS participants were insignificant. Participants with TMD symptoms also had significantly poorer OHRQoL than symptom-free participants. Among individuals with TMD symptoms, significant differences in total and domain OHIP scores were largely between individuals with multiple symptoms and those with one symptom. The largely low responsiveness of the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 to the number of TMD symptoms could be attributed to the nondifferentiation of painful and non-painful TMD symptoms. Painful TMDs, especially when chronic, have been associated with higher levels of PD and lower OHRQoL.^{20,33–35}

Types of TMD Symptoms

Participants with painful TMDs often presented significantly lower total SPWB, environmental mastery (ability to create, choose, and control one's milieu according to personal needs/values), and self-acceptance than those with no TMD symptoms. Deficits in the latter two constructs were also identified in patients with rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic fatigue syndrome.^{7–9} Schleicher et al found that women with fibromyalgia had significantly lower overall PWB than healthy controls; however, they determined that higher PWB was not related to pain, but rather to less fatigue

and disability.⁸ Jackson and MacLeod also hypothesized that PWB was independent of physical symptoms but related to PD in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome.⁹ Moreover, Mangelli et al reported that chronicity of the illness rather than the disease itself affects PWB.⁷ The association between painful TMD symptoms and PWB may therefore be mediated through PD, as well as physical and psychosocial disabilities connected with TMDs.

Participants with painful TMDs had significantly greater total DASS and higher levels of depression, anxiety, and stress when compared to symptom-free participants. Furthermore, those with TMD pain also recounted significantly greater total DASS, anxiety, and stress than their peers with nonpainful intra-articular symptoms. These findings were consistent with recent studies specifying that pain-related TMDs were associated with higher levels of PD when compared to intra-articular TMJ disorders in both patient and community samples.^{20,36} TMD-related pain can originate from the masticatory muscles (myalgia) or the TMJs (arthralgia). While arthralgia is characterized by discrete inflammatory processes mediated via interleukins, tumor necrosis factor- α , and other cytokines, the pathophysiologic mechanisms for myalgia are still not well-defined.^{37,38} Chronic myalgia associated with TMDs has been considered a functional pain syndrome akin to fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, and chronic fatigue syndrome. Central sensitization, which may be predisposed to the autonomic nervous system as well as genetic polymorphisms, was posited to be the common factor uniting the various conditions.³⁷ The latter may also explain the similarities in PWB and PD outcomes when related to earlier studies in patients with fibromyalgia and chronic fatigue syndromes.^{8,9}

Systematic reviews have demonstrated that TMDs, especially painful subtypes, negatively affect OHRQoL, and the lower quality of life was caused by associated physical and psychologic conditions.^{31,35} This was also observed in the present study. Besides the functional limitation domain, participants with TMD pain reported significantly greater impairments in total OHIP and in all OHIP domains than those with painless intra-articular and no TMD symptoms (ie, IT and NT groups). For the functional limitation domain, only the PT group had significantly higher scores than the NT group. Higher domain scores were noted for physical pain/disability and psychologic discomfort/disability, which substantiated the conclusion of Bitiniene et al.³¹

Correlations Between PWB, PD, and OHRQoL

Correlations between the number of TMD symptoms and total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores were weak, with r_s ranging from -0.15 to 0.30 . The duration and type of TMD symptoms may therefore have a greater impact on PWB, PD, and OHRQoL than the number of symptoms. A positive and moderately strong correlation ($r_s = 0.47$) was

present between total OHIP and total DASS, suggesting that the bearing of TMDs on OHRQoL may be more influenced by PD. This finding is in agreement with that of Miettinen et al, who found that TMDs were related to OHRQoL in several ways, including pain intensity, pain-related disability, somatization, and depression.⁶ Furthermore, the level of OHRQoL was determined to vary more across the psychosocial axis than with TMD diagnostic subtypes.³⁹

Although the negative correlation between total SPWB and total OHIP was weak ($r_s = -0.27$), the association between total SPWB and total DASS was moderately strong ($r_s = -0.55$). Given this relationship, it is plausible that interventions focused on promoting positive functioning may help alleviate psychologic symptoms and the impact of chronic illnesses, including TMDs.⁹ Well-being interventions include mindfulness meditation, acceptance and commitment therapy, and compassion-focused therapy, as well as traditional cognitive-behavioral therapy, which fosters self-management and positive self-attitude. Even though mindfulness meditation has been reported to improve quality of life, pain, and depressive symptoms,⁴⁰ well-designed clinical trials are required to establish its efficacy for chronic TMDs.

Study Limitations

Like other observational studies, this study has its limitations. First, the cross-sectional design employed does not permit causal relationships between TMD symptoms, PWB, PD, and OHRQoL to be determined. Nested case-control and case-cohort designs are needed to establish causality.⁴¹ Second, the study is prone to various biases arising from the use of self-reported measures. While sampling and nonresponse biases might be allayed by the high response rate, other types of partialities, including recall, social desirability, and measurement biases, may still occur.⁴² Third, the study sample consisted of young adults and a predominance of women, who may be more vulnerable to psychologic distress.⁴³ Findings might differ in children/adolescents as well as in matured adults and if more men were involved. Last, clinical and radiographic examinations were not performed to confirm the self-reported TMD symptoms. Additionally, participants with muscle and/or joint pain who may exhibit varied PWB, PD, and OHRQoL impairments were not distinguished. Future studies could incorporate the duration of symptoms, older and more male participants, and TMD patients verified using the DC/TMD protocol. The latter must be carried out before definitive deductions can be made.

CONCLUSIONS

The relationships between self-reported TMD symptoms and PWB, PD, and OHRQoL were established together

with correlations among the latter variables. Symptom-free participants had significantly higher PWB than those with two and multiple TMD symptoms. They also reported significantly lower levels of PD and experienced better OHRQoL. In contrast, individuals with TMD pain had significantly more deficits in PWB compared to those who were symptom-free. In addition, they also had greater PD and poorer OHRQoL than their peers with nonpainful intra-articular and/or no TMD symptoms. While a moderately strong negative association was confirmed between total SPWB and total DASS, a moderately strong positive correlation was noted between total OHIP and total DASS. As the decline in PWB and OHRQoL associated with TMDs may be mediated via PD, well-being interventions targeted at alleviating psychologic symptoms may lessen the impact of pain-related TMDs and improve quality of life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University for their support and Ni Luh Widya, Ariel Jason, Nadhira Shabila, and Novey Riyanti for their assistance in data collection. No funding was received for this study. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. List T, Jensen RH. Temporomandibular disorders: Old ideas and new concepts. *Cephalalgia* 2017;37:692–704.
2. Bueno CH, Pereira DD, Pattussi MP, Grossi PK, Grossi ML. Gender differences in temporomandibular disorders in adult populational studies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Oral Rehabil* 2018;45:720–729.
3. Slade GD, Fillingim RB, Sanders AE, et al. Summary of findings from the OPPERA prospective cohort study of incidence of first-onset temporomandibular disorder: Implications and future directions. *J Pain* 2013;14(12 suppl):T116–T124.
4. Andersen LN, Kohberg M, Juul-Kristensen B, Herborg LG, Søgaard K, Roessler KK. Psychosocial aspects of everyday life with chronic musculoskeletal pain: A systematic review. *Scand J Pain* 2014;5:131–148.
5. De La Torre Canales G, Câmara-Souza MB, Muñoz Lora VRM, et al. Prevalence of psychosocial impairment in temporomandibular disorder patients: A systematic review. *J Oral Rehabil* 2018;45:881–889.
6. Miettinen O, Lahti S, Sipilä K. Psychosocial aspects of temporomandibular disorders and oral health-related quality-of-life. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2012;70:331–336.
7. Mangelli L, Gribbin N, Büchi S, Allard S, Sensky T. Psychological well-being in rheumatoid arthritis: Relationship to 'disease' variables and affective disturbance. *Psychother Psychosom* 2002;71:112–116.
8. Schleicher H, Alonso C, Shirtcliff EA, Muller D, Loevinger BL, Coe CL. In the face of pain: The relationship between psychological well-being and disability in women with fibromyalgia. *Psychother Psychosom* 2005;74:231–239.
9. Jackson H, MacLeod AK. Well-being in chronic fatigue syndrome: Relationship to symptoms and psychological distress. *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2017;24:859–869.
10. Ryff CD. Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom* 2014;83:10–28.
11. Yoo J, Ryff CD. Longitudinal profiles of psychological well-being and health: Findings from Japan. *Front Psychol* 2019;10:2746.
12. Ryan RM, Deci EL. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2001;52:141–166.

13. Diener E, Suh EM, Lucas RE, Smith HL. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychol Bull* 1999;125:276–302.
14. Ryff CD. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1989;57:1069–1081.
15. Ryff CD, Keyes CL. The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1995;69:719–727.
16. Liu Q, Shono M, Kitamura T. Psychological well-being, depression, and anxiety in Japanese university students. *Depress Anxiety* 2009;26:e99–e105.
17. Saajanaho M, Kokko K, Pynnönen K, et al. The Scales of Psychological Well-Being—A validation, usability and test-retest study among community-dwelling older people in Finland. *Aging Ment Health* 2021;25:913–922.
18. Schiffman E, Ohrbach R, Truelove E, et al. Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders (DC/TMD) for clinical and research applications: Recommendations of the International RDC/TMD Consortium Network and Orofacial Pain Special Interest Group. *J Oral Facial Pain Headache* 2014;28:6–27.
19. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods* 2007;39:175–191.
20. Cao Y, Yap AU, Lei J, Zhang MJ, Fu KY. Subtypes of acute and chronic temporomandibular disorders: Their relation to psychological and sleep impairments. *Oral Dis* 2021;27:1498–1506.
21. International Network for Orofacial Pain and Related Methodology (INFORM), Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders Symptom Questionnaire: <https://ubwp.buffalo.edu/rdc-tmdinternational/tmd-assessment/diagnosis/dc-tmd/>. Accessed 4 January, 2022.
22. Stanford University, Scales of Psychological Well-being: <https://sparq-tools.org/mobility-measure/psychological-wellbeing-scale/>. Accessed 15/06/2019.
23. Psychology Foundation of Australia. Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales (DASS). University of New South Wales, Updated 26 July 2018. <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Groups/Dass/>. Accessed 16 November 2021.
24. Slade GD. Derivation and validation of a short-form oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 1997;25:284–290.
25. Dancy CP, Reidy J. Statistics Without Maths for Psychology, ed 7. London: Pearson, 2017.
26. Yap AU, Cao Y, Zhang MJ, Lei J, Fu KY. Age-related differences in diagnostic categories, psychological states and oral health-related quality of life of adult temporomandibular disorder patients. *J Oral Rehabil* 2021;48:361–368.
27. Fincham JE. Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the Journal. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2008;72:43.
28. Cheung KL, Ten Klooster PM, Smit C, de Vries H, Pieterse ME. The impact of non-response bias due to sampling in public health studies: A comparison of voluntary versus mandatory recruitment in a Dutch national survey on adolescent health. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17:276.
29. Tay KJ, Yap AU, Wong JCM, Tan KBC, Allen PF. Associations between symptoms of temporomandibular disorders, quality of life and psychological states in Asian military personnel. *J Oral Rehabil* 2019;46:330–339.
30. Yap AU, Natsu VP. Inter-relationships between pain-related temporomandibular disorders, somatic and psychological symptoms in Asian youths. *J Oral Rehabil* 2020;47:1077–1083.
31. Bitiniene D, Zamaliauskiene R, Kubilius R, Leketas M, Gailius T, Smirnovaite K. Quality of life in patients with temporomandibular disorders. A systematic review. *Stomatologija* 2018;20:3–9.
32. Durham J, Steele JG, Wassell RW, et al. Creating a patient-based condition-specific outcome measure for Temporomandibular Disorders (TMDs): Oral Health Impact Profile for TMDs (OHIP-TMDs). *J Oral Rehabil* 2011;38:871–883.
33. Kim HK, Kim ME. Phenotyping 1488 patients with painful temporomandibular disorders and its relevance to subjective sleep quality: A key step for stratified medicine. *Cranio* 2021;39:491–501.
34. Maísa Soares G, Rizzatti-Barbosa CM. Chronicity factors of temporomandibular disorders: A critical review of the literature. *Braz Oral Res* 2015;29:S1806–83242015000100300.
35. Dahlström L, Carlsson GE. Temporomandibular disorders and oral health-related quality of life. A systematic review. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2010;68:80–85.
36. Jivani HM, Tripathi S, Shanker R, Singh BP, Agrawal KK, Singhal R. A study to determine the prevalence of temporomandibular disorders in a young adult population and its association with psychological and functional occlusal parameters. *J Prosthodont* 2019;28:e445–e449.
37. Furquim BD, Flamengui LM, Conti PC. TMD and chronic pain: A current view. *Dental Press J Orthod* 2015;20:127–133.
38. Svensson P, Graven-Nielsen T. Craniofacial muscle pain: Review of mechanisms and clinical manifestations. *J Orofac Pain* 2001;15:117–145.
39. John MT, Reissmann DR, Schierz O, Wassell RW. Oral health-related quality of life in patients with temporomandibular disorders. *J Orofac Pain* 2007;21:46–54.
40. Hilton L, Hempel S, Ewing BA, et al. Mindfulness meditation for chronic pain: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Behav Med* 2017;51:199–213.
41. Karvanen J. Study design in causal models. *Scand J Stat* 2015;42:361–377.
42. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: Definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2016;9:211–217.
43. Kuehner C. Why is depression more common among women than among men? *Lancet Psychiatry* 2017;4:146–158.

Literature Abstract

Mental Foramen and Anterior Loop Anatomic Characteristics: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Cross-sectional Imaging Studies

The present study aimed to review the epidemiologic, topographic, and morphometric aspects of the mental foramen (MF) and anterior loop (AL) on cone beam computed tomographic imaging studies. An International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO)–registered systematic review (CRD42018112991) was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. Two reviewers independently performed data extraction from observational studies evaluating MF and AL that were available on seven electronic databases. MedCalc software was used to perform a meta-analysis with a 95% confidence level. Of 1,545 articles, 66 met the inclusion criteria, totaling 14,233 patients from 5 continents, with a total of 6,655 females and 5,884 males (some studies did not report sex), with an age range between 8 and 89 years. The most prevalent shapes of MF were oval (48.72%) and circular (44.36%), and the most frequent horizontal positions were between premolars (43.66%) and in line with the long axis of the second premolar (43.12%). Based on the articles that assessed AL, the mean prevalence was 43.18%, with most studies reporting bilateral localization as the most prevalent. This finding suggests that, for most individuals, a distance of 5 mm mesially to the MF renders invasive procedures less prone to complications that could result in AL damage.

Barbosa DAF, Mesquita LR, Borges MMC, et al. *J Endod* 2021;47:1829.e1–1843.e1. **References:** 78. **Reprints:** Daniel AF Barbosa, danielodontologia@gmail.com —Ray Scott, USA

Self-Reported Symptoms of Temporomandibular Disorders: Relationship with Psychologic Well-Being, Psychologic Distress, and Oral Health-Related Quality of Life

by Caroline Damayanti Marpaung

Submission date: 13-Sep-2022 03:25PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1898708248

File name: IJP_2022.pdf (149.21K)

Word count: 7008

Character count: 35106

Self-Reported Symptoms of Temporomandibular Disorders: Relationship with Psychologic Well-Being, Psychologic Distress, and Oral Health–Related Quality of Life

Adrian Ujin Yap, BDS, MSc, PhD, Grad Dip Psychotherapy

Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia; Department of Dentistry, Ng Teng Fong General Hospital and Faculty of Dentistry, National University Health System, Singapore; National Dental Research Institute Singapore, National Dental Centre and Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore Health Services, Singapore.

Carolina Marpaung, BDS, MDS, PhD

Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Enrita Dian Rahmadini, BDS, MDS

Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Purpose: To investigate the relationships of self-reported temporomandibular disorder (TMD) symptoms with psychologic well-being (PWB), psychologic distress (PD), and oral health–related quality of life (OHRQoL). **Materials and Methods:** The study sample was recruited from a local university using a convenience sampling technique. The Diagnostic Criteria for TMD Symptom Questionnaire (DC/TMD-SQ); Scales of Psychological Well-Being-18 (SPWB-18); Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21); and Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14) were administered electronically to establish TMD symptoms and to assess PWB, PD, and OHRQoL, respectively. Data were analyzed by number/type of TMD symptoms using Kruskal-Wallis/Mann-Whitney *U* tests and Spearman correlation ($\alpha = .05$). **Results:** A total of 602 participants with a mean age of 19.30 ± 1.18 years (84.3% women) were evaluated. Of these, 59.2% reported TMD symptoms, with 10.7% having multiple (≥ 3) features. Pain-related (PT), intra-articular (IT), and combined (CT) TMD symptoms were present in 23.8%, 15.4%, and 20.2% of the cohort, respectively. For both number and type of symptoms, significant differences in SPWB-18 (total/environmental mastery and self-acceptance domains), DASS-21 (total/all domains), and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) scores were observed ($P < .05$). A moderately strong negative correlation was noted between PWB and PD ($r_s = -0.55$). **Conclusion:** Participants with no TMD symptoms had significantly higher PWB than those with two or more TMD symptoms. They also had significantly lower levels of PD and better OHRQoL. Conversely, individuals with PT/CT reported significantly lower PWB compared to those with no symptoms. Moreover, they also had significantly higher levels of PD and poorer OHRQoL than the IT/no symptoms groups. *Int J Prosthodont* 2022;35:45–52. doi: 10.11607/ijp.7580

Temporomandibular disorders (TMDs) are a cluster of medical and dental conditions affecting the temporomandibular joints (TMJs), masticatory muscles, and related structures. Features of TMDs include TMJ/muscle pain, headaches, and TMJ sounds during jaw movement, as well as functional difficulties. They are the most pervasive orofacial pain condition, affecting about 7% of adolescents and 15% of adults.¹ Women appear to be at greater risk for TMDs, especially those from 20 to 40 years of age.² The multifactorial etiology of TMDs has been confirmed to be consistent with the biopsychosocial model of illness.³ Prior studies have largely focused on TMDs and psychologic distress (PD), notably depression, which has been associated with chronic musculoskeletal pain.^{4,5} Moderate to severe levels of depression were observed in 21.4% to 60.1% of TMD patients.⁵ Moreover, TMDs have been linked to poorer oral health–related quality of life (OHRQoL) through depression.⁶ Despite the plethora of literature on PD and OHRQoL, there is a paucity of TMD research relating to psychologic well-being (PWB). PWB has been explored in other chronic

Correspondence to:
Dr Carolina Marpaung
Department of Prosthodontics
Faculty of Dentistry,
Trisakti University
Jl Kyai Tapa no 260,
Jakarta 1140, Indonesia
Email: carolina@trisakti.ac.id

Submitted January 3, 2021;
accepted May 9, 2021.
©2022 by Quintessence
Publishing Co Inc.

diseases, such as rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic fatigue syndrome.⁷⁻⁹ Such studies are clinically relevant, considering the health-protective attributes of high PWB.^{10,11}

PWB is more than the absence of disease and/or PD. It is a complex construct concerning optimal experience and functioning.¹² PWB has been conceptualized based on two broad theories. The hedonic model defines well-being in relation to “pleasure attainment and pain avoidance” and centers on happiness. Conversely, the eudaimonic model explains well-being in terms of “meaning and self-realization” and focuses on positive functioning.¹²⁻¹⁴ Ryff’s operationalized measure of eudaimonic well-being, or Scales of Psychological Well-Being (SPWB), encompasses six dimensions of positive functioning: (1) autonomy; (2) environmental mastery; (3) personal growth; (4) positive relations with others; (5) purpose in life; and (6) self-acceptance.^{14,15} The SPWB has been validated and widely used in research across multiple disciplines.^{10,16,17} Based on the SPWB, higher PWB was linked to lower disability and fatigue, but not to pain, in patients with fibromyalgia.⁸ Furthermore, well-being domains were found to be independent of physical symptoms but strongly related to the psychologic components of fatigue and PD in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome.⁹ Until now, no studies have delved into the associations between TMD symptomatology based on the contemporary Diagnostic Criteria for TMDs (DC/TMD) standard¹⁸ and PWB, PD, and OHRQoL.

Therefore, the objectives of this study were to examine the self-reported symptoms of TMDs in terms of number and type and their relationships to PWB, PD, and OHRQoL. In addition, the correlations between PWB, PD, and OHRQoL were also established. The null hypotheses were: (1) the number and type of TMD symptoms have no bearing on PWB, depression, anxiety, stress, or OHRQoL; and (2) PWB, PD, and OHRQoL are not correlated.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Approval was attained from the ethics committee of the Trisakti University School of Dentistry, Indonesia (reference no.: 244/S3/KEPK/FKG/2/2019) before commencing the research. The study sample was recruited from a local university in Jakarta using a convenience sampling method. With G*Power Software (version 3.1.9.3),¹⁹ a minimum sample size of $N = 286$ was established a priori, founded on the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney model with an effect size of 0.50, alpha error of 0.05, power of 95%, and allocation ratio of 4, based on earlier work.²⁰ Volunteers aged between 18 and 22 years who were in good general health with no physical impairments or debilitating illness were included in the study. Those with a history of traumatic injuries, psychiatric treatment, or

uncontrolled metabolic, autoimmune, or other systemic conditions were excluded. The study participants were provided information on the study, and informed consent was obtained before administering the survey via Google Forms. The electronic survey was conducted over 2 months and comprised demographic parameters, the DC/TMD Symptom Questionnaire (SQ), the SPWB-18, the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21), and the Oral Health Impact Profile-14 (OHIP-14).²¹⁻²⁴

The SQ (<https://ubwp.buffalo.edu/rdc-tmdinternational/>) is necessary for generating DC/TMD Axis I (physical) diagnoses and includes 14 items about TMD pain, headaches, TMJ sounds, and closed and open locking. According to the DC/TMD, common TMD conditions can be classified into pain-related and intra-articular TMDs. Positive responses to the primary questions on pain and/or headaches accompanying TMDs were used to identify the presence of pain-related TMD symptoms. Likewise, positive responses to the key questions on jaw joint noises and closed and open locking of the jaws were utilized to specify the presence of intra-articular TMD symptoms. The participants were subsequently categorized into the following groups:

- Number of TMD symptoms: no TMD symptoms (NT); one TMD symptom (OS); two TMD symptoms (TS); and multiple (ie, three or more) TMD symptoms (MS)
- Type of TMD symptoms: no TMD symptoms (NT); pain-related TMD symptoms (PT); intra-articular TMD symptoms (IT); and combined (ie, both PT and IT) TMD symptoms (CT)

The SPWB-18 (<https://sparqtools.org/mobility-measure/psychological-wellbeing-scale/>) was used to evaluate PWB and comprises 18 items, with 3 questions for each of the 6 subscales of positive functioning. The responses are scored on a 7-point scale, with 1 = strongly agree and 7 = strongly disagree, and some questions are coded in reverse. The domain scores are calculated and totaled to derive the total SPWB score, and higher levels of PWB are indicated by greater total and domain scores.

PD was examined using the DASS-21 (<http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/dass/>), which involves 21 items. Seven questions are dedicated to each emotional state; ie, depression, anxiety, and stress. Responses are scored on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 = did not apply to me at all to 3 = applied to me very much, or most of the time. Scores for each emotional state are calculated and summed to obtain the total DASS score. Greater scores indicate higher levels of psychologic and emotional distress. The OHIP-14 was utilized to determine OHRQoL and contains 14 items with 2 questions for each of the 7 domains: functional limitation, physical pain, psychologic discomfort, psychologic disability, physical disability,

**Table 1** Gender Distribution of the Various Groups (N = 605)

| Variables | | Total n (%) | Women n (%) | Men n (%) |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Number of symptoms | None | 247 (40.8) | 206 (83.4) | 41 (16.6) |
| | One | 186 (30.7) | 153 (82.3) | 33 (17.7) |
| | Two | 107 (17.7) | 91 (85.0) | 16 (15.0) |
| | Three or more | 65 (10.7) | 60 (92.3) | 5 (7.7) |
| Type of symptoms | None | 247 (40.8) | 206 (83.4) | 41 (16.6) |
| | Pain-related | 143 (23.8) | 126 (88.1) | 17 (11.9) |
| | Intra-articular | 93 (15.4) | 67 (72.0) | 26 (28.0) |
| | Combined | 122 (20.2) | 111 (91.0) | 11 (9.0) |

All data are reported as n (%).

social disability, and handicap. The questions are scored on a 5-point response scale, with 0 = never to 4 = very often. Domain scores are tallied to derive the total OHIP score. Larger total and domain OHIP-14 scores denote greater impairments to quality of life.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted with the IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows software version 24.0 (IBM) with the significance level set at .05. As the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 data were not normally distributed based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, nonparametric analyses were conducted with Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests. Total and domain scores were compared by number and type of TMD symptoms. Interrelationships between the number of TMD symptoms and the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 scores were performed using Spearman rank-order correlation. Correlation strengths were deemed weak (correlation coefficient [r_s] = 0.1 to 0.3), moderate (r_s = 0.4 to 0.6), or strong (r_s = 0.7 to 0.9) based on the classification by Dancy and Reidy.²⁵

RESULTS

Out of 733 individuals who were approached, 39 met the exclusion criteria, and 89 declined participation (response rate of 87.2%). The mean age of the study cohort (N = 605) was 19.30 ± 1.18 years, and the cohort was comprised of 84.3% women and 15.7% men. The prevalence of TMD symptoms by number and type were as follows (Table 1):

- Number: NT = 40.8%; OS = 30.7%; TS = 17.7%; MS = 10.7%
- Type: NT = 40.8%; PT = 23.8%; IT = 15.4%; CT = 20.2%

For all TMD symptom groups, a greater frequency of women was perceived compared to men.

The mean and median SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 scores by number and type of TMD symptoms are displayed in Tables 2 and 3 with the results of the statistical analyses. For the number of TMD symptoms, significant differences in total SPWB and the domains environmental mastery, positive relations with others, and self-acceptance were observed between the various groups. Likewise, significant differences in DASS-21 (total/all domains) and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) were noted. NT participants had significantly higher total SPWB scores than TS and MS participants and showed significantly lower total DASS and depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores, as well as total OHIP scores, when evaluated against their counterparts with TMD symptoms (ie, the OS, TS, and MS groups). For types of TMD symptoms, significant differences in SPWB-18 (total/environmental mastery and self-acceptance domains), DASS-21 (total/all domains), and OHIP-14 (total/all domains) were detected. Individuals with PT and CT symptoms reported significantly lower total SPWB scores compared to those with no symptoms. Moreover, they generally had significantly higher total DASS, depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores, as well as total OHIP scores, than the IT and NT groups.

Table 4 shows the correlations between the number of TMD symptoms, total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores. Correlation coefficients (r_s) ranged from -0.55 to 0.47. A moderately strong negative correlation was observed between total SPWB and total DASS, while a moderately strong positive association was determined between total OHIP and total DASS. Correlations between the number of TMD symptoms and total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP were weak, as was the association between total SPWB and total OHIP.

DISCUSSION

This study established the relationship of self-reported TMD symptoms with PWB, PD, and OHRQoL and determined the correlations between these variables. As the

Table 2 Mean (SD) and Median (Interquartile Range) Total and Domain SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 Scores Based on Number of TMD Symptoms

| Variables | | No symptoms (NT) | One symptom (OS) | Two symptoms (TS) | Three or more symptoms (MS) | P | Post hoc significant comparisons |
|--------------------------------|--------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| SPWB-18 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 91.85 (10.68) | 89.73 (10.32) | 88.43 (10.86) | 87.78 (12.15) | .005 | NT > TS, MS |
| | Median | 93 (85–99) | 91 (84–96) | 90 (81–96) | 90 (80.5–95) | | |
| Autonomy | Mean | 13.46 (2.73) | 13.34 (2.73) | 13.04 (2.57) | 13.71 (3.05) | .346 | – |
| | Median | 13 (12–15) | 13 (12–15) | 13 (11–15) | 14 (12–16) | | |
| Environmental mastery | Mean | 14.68 (2.63) | 13.66 (2.66) | 13.77 (2.96) | 13.78 (2.58) | < .001 | NT > OT |
| | Median | 15 (13–17) | 14 (12–16) | 14 (12–16) | 14 (12–16) | | |
| Personal growth | Mean | 17.96 (2.25) | 17.95 (2.20) | 17.82 (2.36) | 17.14 (2.50) | .100 | – |
| | Median | 18 (17–20) | 18 (17–19) | 18 (16–20) | 18 (16–19) | | |
| Positive relations with others | Mean | 14.80 (2.95) | 14.50 (2.77) | 13.87 (3.25) | 14.17 (3.53) | .043 | NT > TS |
| | Median | 15 (13–17) | 14 (13–17) | 14 (12–16) | 14 (11–17) | | |
| Purpose in life | Mean | 15.30 (2.68) | 15.46 (2.61) | 15.23 (2.50) | 14.91 (2.78) | .514 | – |
| | Median | 16 (14–17) | 16 (14–18) | 15 (14–17) | 15 (13–17) | | |
| Self-acceptance | Mean | 15.64 (2.86) | 14.38 (3.05) | 14.70 (3.25) | 14.08 (3.10) | < .001 | NT > OS, TS, MS |
| | Median | 16 (14–18) | 15 (13–17) | 15 (13–17) | 15 (12–16) | | |
| DASS-21 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 14.98 (8.57) | 18.68 (8.52) | 22.03 (11.02) | 22.60 (10.84) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| | Median | 15 (9–20) | 19 (13–24) | 21 (14–29) | 21 (15–31) | | |
| Depression | Mean | 3.65 (3.16) | 4.45 (3.05) | 5.44 (3.92) | 5.50 (3.79) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| | Median | 3 (1–5) | 4 (2–6) | 4 (3–8) | 5 (3–7) | | |
| Anxiety | Mean | 5.00 (3.07) | 6.62 (3.35) | 7.70 (3.78) | 7.86 (3.92) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| | Median | 7 (3–7) | 7 (4–9) | 7 (5–11) | 6 (5–11) | | |
| Stress | Mean | 6.33 (3.59) | 7.60 (3.63) | 8.89 (4.54) | 9.23 (4.46) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT |
| | Median | 6 (4–9) | 7 (5–10) | 8 (5–11) | 9 (6–12) | | |
| OHIP-14 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean | 7.20 (7.56) | 9.18 (7.76) | 11.60 (8.23) | 15.31 (10.24) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT MS > OS |
| | Median | 5 (1–10) | 7 (3–14) | 11 (5–17) | 13 (7.5–22) | | |
| Functional limitation | Mean | 0.66 (1.14) | 0.89 (1.28) | 0.79 (1.16) | 1.14 (1.43) | .019 | MS > NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–2) | 0 (0–1) | 1 (0–2) | | |
| Physical pain | Mean | 1.60 (1.50) | 1.92 (2.00) | 2.22 (1.61) | 3.23 (2.04) | < .001 | MS, TS > NT MS > TS, OS |
| | Median | 2 (0–2) | 2 (1–3) | 2 (1–3) | 3 (2–5) | | |
| Psychologic discomfort | Mean | 1.34 (1.61) | 1.75 (1.92) | 2.30 (1.95) | 2.91 (2.07) | < .001 | MS, TS > OS, NT |
| | Median | 1 (0–2) | 1 (0–3) | 2 (1–4) | 2.1 (1–4) | | |
| Physical disability | Mean | 1.11 (1.44) | 1.52 (1.52) | 2.00 (1.74) | 2.49 (2.11) | < .001 | MS, TS, OS > NT MS > OS |
| | Median | 1 (0–2) | 1 (0–2) | 2 (0–3) | 2 (1–4) | | |
| Psychologic disability | Mean | 1.06 (1.42) | 1.35 (1.60) | 2.06 (1.86) | 2.46 (1.90) | < .001 | MS, TS > OS, NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–2) | 1 (0–2) | 2 (0–4) | 2 (1–3) | | |
| Social disability | Mean | 0.70 (1.26) | 0.72 (1.33) | 1.20 (1.56) | 1.66 (1.91) | < .001 | MS, TS > NT MS > OS |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–2) | 1 (0–2) | 1 (0–3) | | |
| Handicap | Mean | 0.74 (1.30) | 0.85 (1.29) | 1.04 (1.41) | 1.41 (1.75) | .003 | MS > NT |
| | Median | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–1) | 0 (0–2) | 1 (0–2.5) | | |

IQR = interquartile range. Results of Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests.

number/type of TMD symptoms influenced PWB, PD, and OHRQoL, and significant correlations were noted between total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores, both null hypotheses were rejected. Young adults were selected for the study sample, as they constitute up to 75% of TMD patients.²⁶ As the response rate was > 80%, the results can represent the study sample.^{27,28} This study is

among the first to explore the connection between TMD and PWB using the Ryff subscales.^{14,15} The instruments that were used for assessing PWB, PD, and OHRQoL are all well-established measures that are widely applied in psychology and quality of life research. Moreover, both the DASS-21 and OHIP-14 have been used in earlier TMD work.^{20,29–31} Besides allowing for comparison



Table 3 Mean (SD) and Median (IQR) Total and Domain SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 Scores Based on Type of TMD Symptoms

| Variables | | No symptoms (NT) | Pain-related (PT) | Intra-articular (IT) | Combined (CT) | P | Post hoc significant comparisons |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| SPWB-18 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 91.85 (10.68) 93 (85–99) | 88.77 (11.05) 90 (82–96) | 89.63 (10.16) 91 (84–96) | 88.75 (11.13) 90 (82–95) | .008 | NT > PT, CT |
| Autonomy | Mean Median | 13.46 (2.73) 13 (12–15) | 13.33 (2.58) 13 (12–15) | 13.19 (2.70) 13 (12–15) | 13.39 (2.98) 13 (11–15) | .930 | – |
| Environmental mastery | Mean Median | 14.68 (2.64) 15 (13–17) | 13.44 (2.95) 14 (12–16) | 13.76 (2.58) 14 (12–16) | 13.99 (2.57) 14 (12–16) | < .001 | NT > PT, IT |
| Personal growth | Mean Median | 17.96 (2.25) 18 (17–20) | 17.80 (2.39) 18 (17–19) | 17.89 (2.12) 18 (17–19) | 17.64 (2.39) 18 (16–19) | .736 | – |
| Positive relations with others | Mean Median | 14.80 (2.95) 15 (13–17) | 14.26 (3.06) 15 (12–17) | 14.25 (2.65) 14 (13–16) | 14.24 (3.39) 14 (12–17) | .139 | – |
| Purpose in life | Mean Median | 15.30 (2.68) 16 (14–17) | 15.26 (2.74) 15 (14–17) | 15.73 (2.39) 16 (14–18) | 14.99 (2.60) 15 (13.75–17) | .319 | – |
| Self-acceptance | Mean Median | 15.64 (2.86) 16 (14–18) | 14.67 (3.09) 15 (13–17) | 14.81 (3.33) 16 (12.5–17) | 14.51 (3.01) 15 (12–17) | .001 | NT > PT, CT |
| DASS-21 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 14.98 (8.57) 15 (9–20) | 21.32 (10.16) 21 (15–26) | 17.41 (8.61) 17 (11.5–23) | 21.58 (10.11) 21 (14–28.25) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Depression | Mean Median | 3.62 (3.16) 4 (1–5) | 5.30 (3.71) 4 (3–7) | 4.16 (2.96) 4 (2–6) | 5.11 (3.56) 4 (3–7) | < .001 | PT, CT > NT |
| Anxiety | Mean Median | 5.00 (3.07) 5 (3–7) | 7.55 (3.76) 7 (5–10) | 6.09 (3.21) 6 (3.5–8) | 7.56 (3.64) 7 (5–10) | < .001 | PT, CT, IT > NT PT > IT |
| Stress | Mean Median | 6.33 (3.59) 6 (4–9) | 8.47 (4.09) 8 (6–11) | 7.16 (3.80) 7 (4–9) | 8.92 (4.24) 8 (6–12) | < .001 | CT, PT > NT CT > IT |
| OHIP-14 | | | | | | | |
| Total | Mean Median | 7.20 (7.56) 5 (1–10) | 11.75 (8.42) 11 (5–17) | 6.61 (5.63) 5 (2–10) | 13.52 (9.65) 11.5 (6–20) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Functional limitation | Mean Median | 0.66 (1.14) 0 (0–1) | 1.04 (1.39) 0 (0–2) | 0.62 (0.99) 0 (0–1) | 0.97 (1.29) 0 (0–2) | .006 | PT > NT |
| Physical pain | Mean Median | 1.60 (1.50) 2 (0–2) | 2.31 (1.62) 2 (1–3) | 1.60 (1.38) 2 (0–2) | 2.66 (1.88) 2 (1–4) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Psychologic discomfort | Mean Median | 1.34 (1.61) 1 (0–2) | 2.15 (2.08) 2 (0–3) | 1.39 (1.52) 1 (0–3) | 2.65 (2.06) 2 (1–4) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Physical disability | Mean Median | 1.11 (1.44) 1 (0–2) | 2.06 (1.70) 2 (1–3) | 0.94 (1.12) 1 (0–2) | 2.26 (1.95) 2 (1–4) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Psychologic disability | Mean Median | 1.06 (1.42) 0 (0–2) | 1.81 (1.76) 2 (0–3) | 0.95 (1.28) 0 (0–2) | 2.33 (1.94) 2 (1–4) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Social disability | Mean Median | 0.70 (1.26) 0 (0–1) | 1.27 (1.61) 1 (0–3) | 0.58 (0.93) 0 (0–1) | 1.40 (1.73) 1 (0–2.25) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |
| Handicap | Mean Median | 0.74 (1.30) 0 (0–1) | 1.11 (1.52) 1 (0–2) | 0.54 (0.83) 0 (0–1) | 1.25 (1.59) 1 (0–2) | < .001 | CT, PT > IT, NT |

IQR = interquartile range. Results of Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests.

Table 4 Correlations Between Number of TMD Symptoms, Total SPWB-18, Total DASS-21, and Total OHIP-14 Scores

| Variables | Number of TMD symptoms | Total SPWB-18 | Total DASS-21 |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| No. of TMD symptoms | – | – | – |
| Total SPWB-18 | –0.145** | – | – |
| Total DASS-21 | 0.291** | –0.550** | – |
| Total OHIP-14 | 0.302** | –0.267** | 0.473** |

**Significant according to Spearman correlation ($P < .01$).



with prior TMD research, the generic OHIP-14 was also chosen over a TMD-specific OHRQoL measure, such as the OHIP-TMDs,³² to facilitate evaluation against other oral conditions.

Number of TMD Symptoms

The number of symptoms provided some indication of TMD severity, as MT participants will experience both pain- and function-related TMDs or marked TMJ dysfunction. Individuals without TMD symptoms usually had significantly higher scores for total SPWB, positive relations with others (developing positive relationships, displaying empathy and intimacy toward others), and self-acceptance (having positive self-regard and recognizing one's abilities/limitations) than those with two or more symptoms. This phenomenon may be related to the increased pain/dysfunction as well as PD and impairments to quality of life associated with the presence of more TMD symptoms. To date, only one other study examined the impact of the number of TMD symptoms on PD and OHRQoL based on the DC/TMD-SQ. Tay et al found that participants with differing numbers of symptoms exhibited significant disparities in PD and total OHIP-14 scores.²⁹ The findings of the present study corroborated those of Tay et al, with participants experiencing more TMD symptoms reporting higher depression, anxiety, stress, and total OHIP scores. Although a significant difference in PD was discerned between participants with and without TMD symptoms, total DASS and depression, anxiety, and stress domain scores among the OS, TS, and MS participants were insignificant. Participants with TMD symptoms also had significantly poorer OHRQoL than symptom-free participants. Among individuals with TMD symptoms, significant differences in total and domain OHIP scores were largely between individuals with multiple symptoms and those with one symptom. The largely low responsiveness of the SPWB-18, DASS-21, and OHIP-14 to the number of TMD symptoms could be attributed to the nondifferentiation of painful and non-painful TMD symptoms. Painful TMDs, especially when chronic, have been associated with higher levels of PD and lower OHRQoL.^{20,33–35}

Types of TMD Symptoms

Participants with painful TMDs often presented significantly lower total SPWB, environmental mastery (ability to create, choose, and control one's milieu according to personal needs/values), and self-acceptance than those with no TMD symptoms. Deficits in the latter two constructs were also identified in patients with rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic fatigue syndrome.^{7–9} Schleicher et al found that women with fibromyalgia had significantly lower overall PWB than healthy controls; however, they determined that higher PWB was not related to pain, but rather to less fatigue

and disability.⁸ Jackson and MacLeod also hypothesized that PWB was independent of physical symptoms but related to PD in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome.⁹ Moreover, Mangelli et al reported that chronicity of the illness rather than the disease itself affects PWB.⁷ The association between painful TMD symptoms and PWB may therefore be mediated through PD, as well as physical and psychosocial disabilities connected with TMDs.

Participants with painful TMDs had significantly greater total DASS and higher levels of depression, anxiety, and stress when compared to symptom-free participants. Furthermore, those with TMD pain also recounted significantly greater total DASS, anxiety, and stress than their peers with nonpainful intra-articular symptoms. These findings were consistent with recent studies specifying that pain-related TMDs were associated with higher levels of PD when compared to intra-articular TMJ disorders in both patient and community samples.^{20,36} TMD-related pain can originate from the masticatory muscles (myalgia) or the TMJs (arthralgia). While arthralgia is characterized by discrete inflammatory processes mediated via interleukins, tumor necrosis factor- α , and other cytokines, the pathophysiologic mechanisms for myalgia are still not well-defined.^{37,38} Chronic myalgia associated with TMDs has been considered a functional pain syndrome akin to fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, and chronic fatigue syndrome. Central sensitization, which may be predisposed to the autonomic nervous system as well as genetic polymorphisms, was posited to be the common factor uniting the various conditions.³⁷ The latter may also explain the similarities in PWB and PD outcomes when related to earlier studies in patients with fibromyalgia and chronic fatigue syndromes.^{8,9}

Systematic reviews have demonstrated that TMDs, especially painful subtypes, negatively affect OHRQoL, and the lower quality of life was caused by associated physical and psychologic conditions.^{31,35} This was also observed in the present study. Besides the functional limitation domain, participants with TMD pain reported significantly greater impairments in total OHIP and in all OHIP domains than those with painless intra-articular and no TMD symptoms (ie, IT and NT groups). For the functional limitation domain, only the PT group had significantly higher scores than the NT group. Higher domain scores were noted for physical pain/disability and psychologic discomfort/disability, which substantiated the conclusion of Bitiniene et al.³¹

Correlations Between PWB, PD, and OHRQoL

Correlations between the number of TMD symptoms and total SPWB, DASS, and OHIP scores were weak, with r_s ranging from -0.15 to 0.30 . The duration and type of TMD symptoms may therefore have a greater impact on PWB, PD, and OHRQoL than the number of symptoms. A positive and moderately strong correlation ($r_s = 0.47$) was



present between total OHIP and total DASS, suggesting that the bearing of TMDs on OHRQoL may be more influenced by PD. This finding is in agreement with that of Miettinen et al, who found that TMDs were related to OHRQoL in several ways, including pain intensity, pain-related disability, somatization, and depression.⁶ Furthermore, the level of OHRQoL was determined to vary more across the psychosocial axis than with TMD diagnostic subtypes.³⁹

Although the negative correlation between total SPWB and total OHIP was weak ($r_s = -0.27$), the association between total SPWB and total DASS was moderately strong ($r_s = -0.55$). Given this relationship, it is plausible that interventions focused on promoting positive functioning may help alleviate psychologic symptoms and the impact of chronic illnesses, including TMDs.⁹ Well-being interventions include mindfulness meditation, acceptance and commitment therapy, and compassion-focused therapy, as well as traditional cognitive-behavioral therapy, which fosters self-management and positive self-attitude. Even though mindfulness meditation has been reported to improve quality of life, pain, and depressive symptoms,⁴⁰ well-designed clinical trials are required to establish its efficacy for chronic TMDs.

Study Limitations

Like other observational studies, this study has its limitations. First, the cross-sectional design employed does not permit causal relationships between TMD symptoms, PWB, PD, and OHRQoL to be determined. Nested case-control and case-cohort designs are needed to establish causality.⁴¹ Second, the study is prone to various biases arising from the use of self-reported measures. While sampling and nonresponse biases might be allayed by the high response rate, other types of partialities, including recall, social desirability, and measurement biases, may still occur.⁴² Third, the study sample consisted of young adults and a predominance of women, who may be more vulnerable to psychologic distress.⁴³ Findings might differ in children/adolescents as well as in matured adults and if more men were involved. Last, clinical and radiographic examinations were not performed to confirm the self-reported TMD symptoms. Additionally, participants with muscle and/or joint pain who may exhibit varied PWB, PD, and OHRQoL impairments were not distinguished. Future studies could incorporate the duration of symptoms, older and more male participants, and TMD patients verified using the DC/TMD protocol. The latter must be carried out before definitive deductions can be made.

CONCLUSIONS

The relationships between self-reported TMD symptoms and PWB, PD, and OHRQoL were established together

with correlations among the latter variables. Symptom-free participants had significantly higher PWB than those with two and multiple TMD symptoms. They also reported significantly lower levels of PD and experienced better OHRQoL. In contrast, individuals with TMD pain had significantly more deficits in PWB compared to those who were symptom-free. In addition, they also had greater PD and poorer OHRQoL than their peers with nonpainful intra-articular and/or no TMD symptoms. While a moderately strong negative association was confirmed between total SPWB and total DASS, a moderately strong positive correlation was noted between total OHIP and total DASS. As the decline in PWB and OHRQoL associated with TMDs may be mediated via PD, well-being interventions targeted at alleviating psychologic symptoms may lessen the impact of pain-related TMDs and improve quality of life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Faculty of Dentistry, Trisakti University for their support and Ni Luh Widya, Ariel Jason, Nadhira Shabila, and Novey Riyanti for their assistance in data collection. No funding was received for this study. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. List T, Jensen RH. Temporomandibular disorders: Old ideas and new concepts. *Cephalalgia* 2017;37:692–704.
2. Bueno CH, Pereira DD, Pattussi MP, Grossi PK, Grossi ML. Gender differences in temporomandibular disorders in adult populational studies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Oral Rehabil* 2018;45:720–729.
3. Slade GD, Fillingim RB, Sanders AE, et al. Summary of findings from the OPPERA prospective cohort study of incidence of first-onset temporomandibular disorder: Implications and future directions. *J Pain* 2013;14(12 suppl):T116–T124.
4. Andersen LN, Kohberg M, Juul-Kristensen B, Herborg LG, Søgaard K, Roessler KK. Psychosocial aspects of everyday life with chronic musculoskeletal pain: A systematic review. *Scand J Pain* 2014;5:131–148.
5. De La Torre Canales G, Câmara-Souza MB, Muñoz Lora VRM, et al. Prevalence of psychosocial impairment in temporomandibular disorder patients: A systematic review. *J Oral Rehabil* 2018;45:881–889.
6. Miettinen O, Lahti S, Sipilä K. Psychosocial aspects of temporomandibular disorders and oral health-related quality-of-life. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2012;70:331–336.
7. Mangelli L, Gribbin N, Büchi S, Allard S, Sensky T. Psychological well-being in rheumatoid arthritis: Relationship to 'disease' variables and affective disturbance. *Psychother Psychosom* 2002;71:112–116.
8. Schleicher H, Alonso C, Shirtcliff EA, Muller D, Loevinger BL, Coe CL. In the face of pain: The relationship between psychological well-being and disability in women with fibromyalgia. *Psychother Psychosom* 2005;74:231–239.
9. Jackson H, MacLeod AK. Well-being in chronic fatigue syndrome: Relationship to symptoms and psychological distress. *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2017;24:859–869.
10. Ryff CD. Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom* 2014;83:10–28.
11. Yoo J, Ryff CD. Longitudinal profiles of psychological well-being and health: Findings from Japan. *Front Psychol* 2019;10:2746.
12. Ryan RM, Deci EL. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2001;52:141–166.



Clinical Research

13. Diener E, Suh EM, Lucas RE, Smith HL. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychol Bull* 1999;125:276–302.
14. Ryff CD. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1989;57:1069–1081.
15. Ryff CD, Keyes CL. The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1995;69:719–727.
16. Liu Q, Shono M, Kitamura T. Psychological well-being, depression, and anxiety in Japanese university students. *Depress Anxiety* 2009;26:e99–e105.
17. Saajanaho M, Kokko K, Pynnönen K, et al. The Scales of Psychological Well-Being—A validation, usability and test-retest study among community-dwelling older people in Finland. *Aging Ment Health* 2021;25:913–922.
18. Schiffman E, Ohrbach R, Truelove E, et al. Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders (DC/TMD) for clinical and research applications: Recommendations of the International RDC/TMD Consortium Network and Orofacial Pain Special Interest Group. *J Oral Facial Pain Headache* 2014;28:6–27.
19. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods* 2007;39:175–191.
20. Cao Y, Yap AU, Lei J, Zhang MJ, Fu KY. Subtypes of acute and chronic temporomandibular disorders: Their relation to psychological and sleep impairments. *Oral Dis* 2021;27:1498–1506.
21. International Network for Orofacial Pain and Related Methodology (INFORM). Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders Symptom Questionnaire: <https://ubwp.buffalo.edu/rdc-tmdinternational/tmd-assessmentdiagnosis/dc-tmd/>. Accessed 4 January, 2022.
22. Stanford University. Scales of Psychological Well-being: <https://sparq-tools.org/mobility-measure/psychological-wellbeing-scale/>. Accessed 15/06/2019.
23. Psychology Foundation of Australia. Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales (DASS). University of New South Wales, Updated 26 July 2018. <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Groups/Dass/>. Accessed 16 November 2021.
24. Slade GD. Derivation and validation of a short-form oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 1997;25:284–290.
25. Dancy CP, Reidy J. Statistics Without Maths for Psychology, ed 7. London: Pearson, 2017.
26. Yap AU, Cao Y, Zhang MJ, Lei J, Fu KY. Age-related differences in diagnostic categories, psychological states and oral health-related quality of life of adult temporomandibular disorder patients. *J Oral Rehabil* 2021;48:361–368.
27. Fincham JE. Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the Journal. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2008;72:43.
28. Cheung KL, Ten Klooster PM, Smit C, de Vries H, Pieterse ME. The impact of non-response bias due to sampling in public health studies: A comparison of voluntary versus mandatory recruitment in a Dutch national survey on adolescent health. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17:276.
29. Tay KJ, Yap AU, Wong JCM, Tan KBC, Allen PF. Associations between symptoms of temporomandibular disorders, quality of life and psychological states in Asian military personnel. *J Oral Rehabil* 2019;46:330–339.
30. Yap AU, Natsu VP. Inter-relationships between pain-related temporomandibular disorders, somatic and psychological symptoms in Asian youths. *J Oral Rehabil* 2020;47:1077–1083.
31. Bitiniene D, Zamaliauskiene R, Kubilius R, Leketas M, Gailius T, Smirnovaite K. Quality of life in patients with temporomandibular disorders. A systematic review. *Stomatologija* 2018;20:3–9.
32. Durham J, Steele JG, Wassell RW, et al. Creating a patient-based condition-specific outcome measure for Temporomandibular Disorders (TMDs): Oral Health Impact Profile for TMDs (OHIP-TMDs). *J Oral Rehabil* 2011;38:871–883.
33. Kim HK, Kim ME. Phenotyping 1488 patients with painful temporomandibular disorders and its relevance to subjective sleep quality: A key step for stratified medicine. *Cranio* 2021;39:491–501.
34. Maísa Soares G, Rizzatti-Barbosa CM. Chronicity factors of temporomandibular disorders: A critical review of the literature. *Braz Oral Res* 2015;29:S1806–83242015000100300.
35. Dahlström L, Carlsson GE. Temporomandibular disorders and oral health-related quality of life. A systematic review. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2010;68:80–85.
36. Jivnani HM, Tripathi S, Shanker R, Singh BP, Agrawal KK, Singhal R. A study to determine the prevalence of temporomandibular disorders in a young adult population and its association with psychological and functional occlusal parameters. *J Prosthodont* 2019;28:e445–e449.
37. Furquim BD, Flamengui LM, Conti PC. TMD and chronic pain: A current view. *Dental Press J Orthod* 2015;20:127–133.
38. Svensson P, Graven-Nielsen T. Craniofacial muscle pain: Review of mechanisms and clinical manifestations. *J Orofac Pain* 2001;15:117–145.
39. John MT, Reissmann DR, Schierz O, Wassell RW. Oral health-related quality of life in patients with temporomandibular disorders. *J Orofac Pain* 2007;21:46–54.
40. Hilton L, Hempel S, Ewing BA, et al. Mindfulness meditation for chronic pain: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Behav Med* 2017;51:199–213.
41. Karvanen J. Study design in causal models. *Scand J Stat* 2015;42:361–377.
42. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: Definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2016;9:211–217.
43. Kuehner C. Why is depression more common among women than among men? *Lancet Psychiatry* 2017;4:146–158.

Literature Abstract

Mental Foramen and Anterior Loop Anatomic Characteristics: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Cross-sectional Imaging Studies

The present study aimed to review the epidemiologic, topographic, and morphometric aspects of the mental foramen (MF) and anterior loop (AL) on cone beam computed tomographic imaging studies. An International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO)–registered systematic review (CRD42018112991) was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. Two reviewers independently performed data extraction from observational studies evaluating MF and AL that were available on seven electronic databases. MedCalc software was used to perform a meta-analysis with a 95% confidence level. Of 1,545 articles, 66 met the inclusion criteria, totaling 14,233 patients from 5 continents, with a total of 6,655 females and 5,884 males (some studies did not report sex), with an age range between 8 and 89 years. The most prevalent shapes of MF were oval (48.72%) and circular (44.36%), and the most frequent horizontal positions were between premolars (43.66%) and in line with the long axis of the second premolar (43.12%). Based on the articles that assessed AL, the mean prevalence was 43.18%, with most studies reporting bilateral localization as the most prevalent. This finding suggests that, for most individuals, a distance of 5 mm mesially to the MF renders invasive procedures less prone to complications that could result in AL damage.

Barbosa DAF, Mesquita LR, Borges MMC, et al. *J Endod* 2021;47:1829.e1–1843.e1. **References:** 78. **Reprints:** Daniel AF Barbosa, danielodontologia@gmail.com —Ray Scott, USA

Self-Reported Symptoms of Temporomandibular Disorders: Relationship with Psychologic Well-Being, Psychologic Distress, and Oral Health–Related Quality of Life

ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%
SIMILARITY INDEX

12%
INTERNET SOURCES

3%
PUBLICATIONS

4%
STUDENT PAPERS


MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)


10%
★ www.pubfacts.com
Internet Source


Exclude quotes On
Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 2%

International Journal of Prosthodontics

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>COUNTRY</p> <p>United States</p> <p>Universities and research institutions in United States</p> | <p>SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY</p> <p>Dentistry</p> <p>Oral Surgery</p> <p>Medicine</p> <p>Medicine (miscellaneous)</p> <div>  <p>Journal Cover Letter Templates</p> <p>American Journal Experts Open ></p> </div> | <p>PUBLISHER</p> <p>Quintessence Publishing Company</p> | <p>H-INDEX</p> <p>99</p> |
| <p>PUBLICATION TYPE</p> <p>Journals</p> | <p>ISSN</p> <p>08932174, 11399791</p> | <p>COVERAGE</p> <p>1988-2021</p> | <p>INFORMATION</p> <p>Homepage</p> <p>How to publish in</p> |





← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="https://www.scimagojr.com" data-bbox="309 522 447 536">
```

SCImago Graphica

Explore, visually communicate and make sense of data with our **new data visualization tool.**

