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Summary

• Schools as a political battleground for healthy food policy in NZ

• One school in the poorest part of South Auckland makes a change
  – Anecdotal benefits reported
  – Is there objective evidence of benefit?

• What effect does the policy have on the oral health of students?
School policies & nutrition

- 2008 National Administration Guidelines
- “… where food and beverages are sold on schools’ premises, … only healthy options [are to be made] … available.”
Change in Govt. policy

- 2009 NAG changed.
- Selling healthy options removed, but...

“...promote healthy food and nutrition for all students.”
Yendarra primary school
To be the BEST we can
at YENDARRA we value...
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"To be the BEST we can we row our oars together!"
What did Yendarra school do?

- In 2006
Promoting healthy foods

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83glvF5v3ak
- Community engagement
- New water fountains
- Fruit/milk in schools; healthy canteen
- Photos of students with healthy lunches promoted
- Giving away drink bottles
Inspiring results

- Fewer behavioural issues
- Less dental caries
- Large sizes of uniform stopped selling
- New water fountains
- Weight loss
- Improved learning and classroom behaviour
Does a school nutrition policy influence the incidence of dental caries?

THE STUDY
Community oral health service

- Publicly funded dental service
- All children invited to participate
- Ideally seen yearly for review
Community dental data

- Cross sectional study (2007 to 2014)
- Age 8 to 11 years
- Yendarra vs 8 other surrounding schools
  - (state funded and decile 1)
- Outcome
  - First visit dmft + DMFT (total caries)
- Exposure
  - Age (at visit), sex, ethnicity
Results

- 3,813 kids
- 428 Yendarra, 3385 surrounding schools
### Kids by school...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other Primary Schools (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>Yendarra (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>Total (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,765 (52.1)</td>
<td>220 (51.4)</td>
<td>1,985 (52.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>9.10 (0.82)</td>
<td>9.14 (0.80)</td>
<td>9.10 (0.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>2,528 (74.7)</td>
<td>337 (78.7)</td>
<td>2,865 (75.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>721 (21.3)</td>
<td>77 (18.0)</td>
<td>798 (20.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>136 (4.0)</td>
<td>14 (3.3)</td>
<td>150 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparing oral health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Health Status</th>
<th>Other Primary Schools (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>Yendarra (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>Total (col. % or sd)</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary teeth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>1.03 (1.57)</td>
<td>0.91 (1.48)</td>
<td>1.02 (1.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>1.61 (1.97)</td>
<td>1.44 (1.91)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dmf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>2.91 (2.76)</td>
<td>2.50 (2.61)</td>
<td>2.87 (2.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent teeth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>0.55 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.50 (1.15)</td>
<td>0.55 (1.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total caries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.47 (2.99)</td>
<td>3.00 (2.84)</td>
<td>3.41 (2.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of total caries

Total caries (sum of dmft & DMFT)
Regression model (regplot)

* Centred at mean value (age = 9.1 years; Year = 2010.5)
Sensitivity analysis

• Include younger children:
  – much the same results.
Limitations

- Cross-sectional: cause and effect impossible to distinguish
  - Perhaps health conscious parents select Yendarra vs other schools??
- Selection bias: ~20% non-participation
- Measurement error possible
  - Likely to reduce size of benefit.
Conclusion

• Policy reduces dental decay on average 1 tooth per 2 students.
• 16 carious teeth / year prevented.
Conclusions

• If carried out in other schools
  – 48 carious teeth / year prevented.
  – Extend to other schools

• Nutrition policies are important!
  – Particularly sugar
  – ↓ dental caries
  – ↓ obesity
  – ↓ health inequality
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