Dental expenditure, Progressivity and Horizontal inequality in Chinese adults—Based on the 4th National Oral Health Epidemiology Survey
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Abstract
Background: The financial burden of oral diseases is getting more important. The aim of this study was to describe the dental expenditure, analyze its progressivity and horizontal inequality under the general health finance and insurance system, and identify the key social determinants of this inequality for Chinese adults. Methods: A secondary analysis used the data of 13,464 adults from the 4th National Oral Health Epidemiological Survey (NOHES) in China was undertook. The dental expenditure in the past year divided into out-of-pocket and health insurance payments was collected. Horizontal inequality index and Kakwani index were used to analyze the horizontal inequality and progressivity, respectively. Decomposition of concentration index was made to explore the associated socioeconomic determinants. Results: Mean dental expenditure per capita of Chinese adults was $20.55 (95% CI: 18.83,22.26) and for those who used dental service in the past year, the number was $100.95(95%CI: 93.22,108.68). More than 90% of the expenditure was out-of-pocket. Horizontal inequality indices and Kakwani indices were both negative and that indicated inequalities were in favor of the rich. The socioeconomic factors including income, urban or rural area and educational attainment were the main contributors to the inequality of dental expenditure. Conclusion: Dental expenditure for Chinese adults was not too much under a pretty low utilization. The payments of dental expenditure were regressive. People with the most oral health need didn’t meet appropriate dental services. Socioeconomic characteristic including household income, area and education was the main determinant while oral hygiene practice and oral health status were the main individual determinants for the inequality of dental expenditure.

Background
The financial burden of oral diseases is getting more important. World Health Organization (WHO) reported the treatment of oral diseases was the 4th expensive in most industrial countries [1]. In the latest research of global burden of disease, oral diseases affect the lives of 3.5 billion people worldwide and become a global public challenge [2, 3]. An up-to-date economic estimation claimed that direct treatment costs due to dental diseases worldwide were estimated at 298 billion US dollar (USD) yearly, corresponding to an average of 4.6% of global health expenditure [4]. Another
study demonstrated that severe teeth loss was found to imply 67% of global productivity losses due to dental diseases, followed by severe periodontitis (21%) and untreated caries (12%)[5].

Significant inequalities exist in oral health. Oral health status, utilization of services and expenditures usually distribute unbalanced among populations. Low socioeconomic status is associated with severe caries and the utilization of dental services[6, 7]. Social and demographic factors affect the use of dental services, both directly and through insurance participation[8]. Income inequality has the potential effect in both functional and social dimensions of oral health[9]. Dentistry is often unavailable, unaffordable, and inappropriate for particularly the rural poor in low- or middle-income countries[10].

From 2009, Chinese government deepened the reform of medical health care system and the basic medical health insurance structure covered 90% people completed[11]. However, most people are unprotected against oral diseases and over 85% of dental expenditure are out-of-pocket payment[12]. The current situation needs to be updated and associated determinants should be analyzed to improve the situation.

In the previous NOHES in China, the income-related inequality in oral health was not concerned[13].

The 4th NOHES conducted in 2015-2016 firstly surveyed this project with a view to providing information for future development of oral health related policies.

This study used the 4th NOHES data and census data was assisted for secondary analysis, aiming to describe the dental expenditure, analyze its progressivity and horizontal inequality and identify the key social determinants for Chinese adults such as income or health insurance.

Methods
Due to technical limitations, the Methods section is available as a download in the Supplementary Files.

Results
In the Figure1, the total dental expenditure per capita was $20.55(95%CI: 18.83,22.26) for all participants and $100.95(95%CI: 93.22,108.68) for those who used dental service in the past year. More than 90% of dental expenditure were paid out-of-pocket. Dental expenditure per capita
accounted for approximately 4.08% of the total medical expenses per capita. 96.9% of the 13464 participants were enrolled in the basic health insurance, only 2.2% participants didn’t register in any insurance. However, 77.8% of 2740 who used dental service in the past year reported they paid out-of-pocket for dental service but among these participants, only 2.6% were not enrolled in a medical health insurance.

The household income quintile bar charts showed in Figure 2 showed the trends of dental expenditure, need and service utilization as income level rise. For horizontal analysis, dental utilization increased and dental need decreased as the household income level increased. The quintile with highest prevalence of bad self-reported oral health obtained the less dental utilization. At the same time, the quintile with relatively the better oral healthuired more dental utilization. The proportion of dental expenditure in household income declined as household income level raised. For the poorest quintile in those who used dental service in the past year, such proportion was more than 7% but for the richest this number was less than 1%.

The analysis result showed in Table 1 also demonstrated great inequality in dental expenditure. And the concentration curves showed in Figure 3 were corresponding with such result. Both the Kakwani indices and Horizontal inequality indices were negative and statistically significant. Medical care was in favor of the rich but medical need was concentrated in the poor. However, the distribution of self-reported oral health trended to be more balanced. Out-of-pocket payment and health insurance payment benefit the rich, but the former are more concentrated among the rich. Figure 3 displayed the distribution of total dental expenditures in both all participants and those who used dental service in the past year were similar to the out-of-pocket payment. The difference was that the inequality appeared to be expanding among population who used dental services.

Discussion
The result from two decomposition models showed high consistency and reliability. Socio-economic level directly contributed to the inequality of oral medical expenditure. The major contribution from household income, area and education may indicate the social class determined the inequality of dental expenditure. Individual factors of teeth brushing habit contributed 7.18%. It indicated good
oral hygiene concentrated in the rich. In the three basic medical insurance, the contribution of UEBMI was definite and the other two didn’t contributed a lot. It didn’t mean that health insurance played a role in promoting equality. On the contrary, basic health insurance gave little impact on expenditure and can’t share the patients’ financial risk. The policy of comprehensively deepening medical reform in China has been implemented continuously. We cautiously think about that policy such as increasing the reimbursement ratio of basic medical insurance may not be effective for the equality of dental expenses because the treatment-oriented utilization model remained unchanged. The redistribution of medical expenditure through health insurance needs taking into account socioeconomic factors such as household income, urban or rural area.

Limitation
For the first time, this study used national epidemiological survey data to conduct an equality analysis of health financing for oral diseases. Recall bias and report bias are unavoidable in such cross-sectional surveys. In this study, only the question of the expenditure in the past year was answered by looking back to minimize recall bias. Besides, logically dental expenditure was made from dental utilization, the results of a full sample analysis may be diluted. Thus, one sample with all participants and the other with only those who used dental service in the past year were modeled and analyzed, respectively. Fortunately, the consistent results of the two models can reflect the reliability of the research method.

Based on the limitations of the survey data, the household income was used in this study to represent the ATP. In future research, variables such as wealth deposits and non-food expenditures and income may comprehensively reflect the ATP.

Conclusion
Dental expenditure for Chinese adults was not too much under a pretty low utilization. The payments of dental expenditure were regressive. People with the most oral health need didn’t meet appropriate dental services. Socioeconomic characteristic including household income, area and education was the main determinant while oral hygiene practice and oral health status were the main individual determinants for the inequality of dental expenditure.
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Tables
Table 1 Shares of dental expenditure and dental utilization and need for all participants.
### Quintiles

| Quintiles   | Household income | Vertical inequality items |
|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|
|             |                  | Total dental expenditure | Out-of-pocket payment | Health insurance payment | Dental utilization in the past year | Bad self-reported oral health |
| Poorest     | 3.18%            | 10.99%                    | 11.09%                  | 9.93%                     | 14.50%                              |
| 2nd         | 4.42%            | 12.59%                    | 13.03%                  | 7.86%                     | 18.73%                              |
| Middle      | 11.78%           | 18.45%                    | 18.92%                  | 13.41%                    | 17.93%                              |
| 4th         | 24.16%           | 23.53%                    | 23.62%                  | 22.65%                    | 22.42%                              |
| Richest     | 56.46%           | 34.44%                    | 33.35%                  | 46.15%                    | 26.38%                              |
| Concentration index/Gini coefficient (standard error) | 0.4974 (0.0039) | 0.1952 (0.0309) | 0.1820 (0.0325) | 0.3376 (0.0621) | 0.1215 (0.0128) |
| (p value)   | (<0.001)         | (<0.001)                  | (<0.001)                | (<0.001)                  | (<0.001)                            |
| Kakwani index/Horizontal inequality index (standard error) | / (0.0310) | -0.3022 (0.0327) | -0.3154 (0.0621) | / | / |
| (p value)   | / (<0.001)       | / (<0.001)                | / (0.0100)              | / | / |

Legend: All participants are sorted by household income from poor to rich and evenly divided into five groups. The proportion of interested variables of each group against whole participants are recorded. Household income here is the ranking and reference variable refer to the ability to pay.

Table 2
| Variables         | Model 1 Elasticities | Concentration indices | Contributions | Percentage of contributions | Model 2 Elasticities | Concentration indices |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Household income  | 0.0798               | 0.4975                | 0.0397        | 20.33                      | 0.0739               | 0.4757                |
| Region            | -0.0613              | -0.0356               | 0.0022        | 1.12                       | -0.0436              | -0.0347               |
| Area-Urban        | -0.2844              | -0.0554               | 0.0158        | 8.07                       | -0.3350              | -0.0441               |
| Education         | 0.1520               | 0.1138                | 0.0173        | 8.86                       | 0.1911               | 0.0919                |
| UEBMI              | 0.0171               | 0.2668                | 0.0045        | 2.33                       | 0.0557               | 0.1945                |
| URBMI             | -0.0059              | 0.0520                | -0.0003       | -0.16                      | -0.0016              | -0.0071               |
| NRCMS             | -0.0031              | -0.1825               | 0.0006        | 0.29                       | 0.0215               | -0.2233               |
| Other insurance   | 0.0172               | 0.3166                | 0.0054        | 2.79                       | 0.0142               | 0.2540                |
| Age groups        | 0.1023               | -0.0466               | -0.0048       | -2.44                      | 0.1118               | -0.0373               |
| Gender-Female     | 0.0198               | -0.0125               | -0.0002       | -0.13                      | 0.0005               | -0.0171               |
| Nationality-Han   | -0.0058              | -0.0688               | 0.0004        | 0.21                       | -0.0050              | -0.2011               |
| Teeth brushing    | 0.0939               | 0.1494                | 0.0140        | 7.18                       | 0.1019               | 0.0995                |
| habit-twice daily |                      |                       |               |                             |                      |                       |
| Self-reported oral| 0.1238               | -0.0176               | -0.0022       | -1.11                      | 0.2386               | -0.0187               |
| health            |                      |                       |               |                             |                      |                       |
| DMFT              | 0.3064               | -0.0737               | -0.0226       | -11.56                     | 0.3849               | -0.0520               |
| Dental utilization| 0.9606               | 0.1216                | 0.1168        | 59.81                      | -                    | -                     |
| Residual          | 0.0086               |                       |               | 4.43                       | -                    | -                     |
| Total             | 0.1952               | 100.00                |               |                             | -                    | -                     |

Legend: Model 1 enrolled all participants and model 2 enrolled those who used dental services in the past year.

UEBMI indicated urban employee basic medical insurance; URBMI indicated urban resident basic medical insurance; NRCMS indicated new rural cooperated medical care; other insurance included government medical insurance and private commercial insurance; they were binary variables in the decomposition and the reference was didn’t covered by such insurance.

Nouns after “-” for variables indicated the references for binary variables.

Figures
Figure 1

Distribution of different types of health insurance. Comparison between participation of health insurance in all participants (n=13464) and whether participants who used dental service in the past year (n=2740) benefit from these insurance in the last dentist visit. Other insurance includes government insurance and private insurance and they are not conflict to the basic medical health insurance system.
Dental expenditure, dental care and dental needs in different household income groups.

(A) Different distributions of dental care and needs in household income groups from poor to rich. The utilization of dental service in the past year indicated the dental care, the DMFT and the bad self-reported oral health indicated evaluated and subjective dental needs, respectively. (B) Different payment routes as percentage of household income for all participants—averaged by household income quintile. (C) Different payment routes as percentage of household income for those who used dental services in the past year—averaged by household income quintile.
Figure 3

Concentration curves and Lorenz curve for dental expenditure, dental care and dental needs. (A) Concentration curves for DMFT, bad self-reported oral health and dental services utilization in the past year for all participants. (B) Concentration curves for different payment routes and Lorenz curve for household income in all participants. (C) Concentration curves for different payment routes and Lorenz curve for household income in those who used dental services in the past year.
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