



Knowledge, Awareness and Practice on Quackery in Dentistry among Dental Students in Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital

Dr. Anjali Maloth^{1*}, Dr. K. V. N. R. Pratap², Dr. T. Madhavi Padma³, Dr. V. Srujan Kumar⁴, Dr. Surbhit Singh⁵, Dr. Bhargavi Latha⁶

¹Student, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

²Professor and HOD, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

³Professor, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

^{4,5}Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

⁶Student, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

[Original Article](#)

***Corresponding Author:** Anjali Maloth, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

E-mail: malothanjali5@gmail.com

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.E>

ABSTRACT

Quackery in dentistry refers to the practice of providing dental care that is either unproven, unsafe, or unethical, often by individuals who lack proper qualifications or expertise. This phenomenon has been a persistent issue, undermining patient trust, leading to harmful outcomes, and contributing to public health risks. The rise of unregulated dental practices, particularly in the form of unauthorized practitioners or misleading advertisements, has exacerbated the problem. Quackery in dentistry can range from offering ineffective or harmful treatments to promoting products that lack scientific validation. Despite regulatory efforts, these practices continue to thrive, often exploiting vulnerable populations. This paper aims to explore the prevalence, impact, and ethical concerns surrounding dental quackery, emphasizing the importance of public awareness, education, and stricter enforcement of dental regulations to mitigate these risks. Prevalence, impact, and ethical concerns surrounding dental quackery, emphasizing the importance of public awareness, education, and stricter enforcement of dental regulations to mitigate these risks.

Aim: To assess the knowledge, awareness, and practice of quackery dentistry.

Objectives: To determine the knowledge, awareness, and practice regarding quackery dentistry among undergraduate dental students based on gender.

To determine knowledge, awareness, and practice regarding quackery dentistry among undergraduate dental students based on year of study.

Method: A cross-sectional study was conducted among undergraduate dental students (I, II, III, IV, Interns) in a tertiary care teaching hospital khammam using a offline paper print was designed and distributed to students in order to fill , Descriptive studies and chi square test were calculated using SPSS version.

Keywords: Awareness, Dental Quackery, Knowledge, Oral Health, Practice.

Introduction

Quackery in dentistry refers to the provision of dental care by unqualified, untrained, or unethical practitioners, often involving the promotion of ineffective or potentially harmful treatments. It is a widespread problem that undermines the quality of care, endangers patient health, and erodes trust in legitimate dental practices. The term "quackery" typically refers to the use of false or exaggerated claims about the efficacy of dental procedures, products, or therapies without scientific validation or proven benefit.

Dental quackery is not only a concern in traditional settings but has grown in prominence with the rise of social media and online platforms, where unlicensed practitioners often advertise their services or products to a broader audience. These practices can lead to serious consequences, such as delayed diagnosis, incorrect treatments, irreversible damage, or even long-term health issues for patients.

The prevalence of dental quackery poses significant challenges for regulatory bodies, which face difficulty in monitoring and controlling the growing number of unlicensed dental practitioners. Additionally, many individuals may be unaware of the dangers posed by such fraudulent practices, often turning to them due to convenience, affordability, or lack of access to qualified dental professionals.

This issue underscores the need for increased public education, stricter regulation, and enhanced oversight to protect patients and ensure that dental care remains safe, evidence-based, and accessible.

The impact of dental quackery can be severe. Untrained practitioners may perform procedures that lead to complications, such as infections, tooth damage, or even life-threatening conditions. Furthermore, the use of unapproved or unsafe products can result in long-term health consequences, including systemic infections or

allergic reactions. For instance, some fraudulent dental products may contain harmful chemicals or substances that damage the teeth or gums.

This issue calls for a multi-pronged approach to education, regulation, and enforcement. Public awareness campaigns, improved access to affordable dental care, and stronger regulatory measures are essential to combat quackery and protect patients. By addressing the root causes of dental quackery and providing proper education to both patients and dental practitioners, the risks associated with unqualified and unsafe dental practices can be significantly reduced.

Methodology

A) Study design and area: A cross-sectional study was carried out at the tertiary care teaching hospital khammam.

B) Study population: The health care students including those of I, II, III, and IV years and interns who responded to the offline paper print questionnaire survey.

C) Study Instrument: A self-administered questionnaire was designed based on knowledge, awareness, and practice and had a total 14 questions and through offline paper print forms pro link. Each participant has to fill in their demographic data like Name, age, and year of study. Participants had to select one option from the answers provided against questions the questions were based on knowledge, awareness, and practice towards quackery dentistry.

D) Pilot study: A pilot study was conducted on a group of students to assess the validity and reliability of the study.

E) Sampling method: The sampling method used is the convenience method.

F) Inclusion criteria: The students who were interested in the study and who are willing to participate.

G) Exclusion criteria: students who are not willing to participate are excluded.

H) Organizing the study: The purpose of the study was explained in a short note which was sent participants were asked to select one option from the answers provided against the questions.

I) Statistical analysis: Data from the filled questionnaire was conducted in a tabular form in an Excel worksheet and evaluated for analysis. The analysis was performed by SPSS version 29.

Results

A total of 300 students took part with females (69.7%) and males (30.3%). Age of participants ranging from 18 - 25 years in this study females have more knowledge regarding quackery

dentistry than males among dental students. Interns have more knowledge followed by IV-year students followed by III year students followed by II and I-year students.

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	300	18	25	21.47	1.835
Valid N (listwise)	300				

Year of study					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	65	6.5	21.7	21.7
	2	64	6.4	21.3	43.0
	3	58	5.8	19.3	62.3
	4	59	5.9	19.7	82.0
	5	54	5.4	18.0	100.0
	Total	300	30.0	100.0	

Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	91	9.1	30.3	30.3
	2	209	20.9	69.7	100.0
	Total	300	30.0	100.0	

Q1

Gender				Q1				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	4	5	4	6	19
			% of Total	4.4%	5.5%	4.4%	6.6%	20.9%
		2	Count	1	3	13	5	22
			% of Total	1.1%	3.3%	14.3%	5.5%	24.2%
		3	Count	2	8	4	4	18
			% of Total	2.2%	8.8%	4.4%	4.4%	19.8%
		4	Count	3	12	0	4	19
			% of Total	3.3%	13.2%	0.0%	4.4%	20.9%
		5	Count	0	1	0	12	13
			% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	13.2%	14.3%
	Total		Count	10	29	21	31	91

			% of Total	11.0%	31.9%	23.1%	34.1%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	12	12	9	13	46
			% of Total	5.7%	5.7%	4.3%	6.2%	22.0%
		2	Count	1	16	14	11	42
			% of Total	0.5%	7.7%	6.7%	5.3%	20.1%
		3	Count	6	16	7	11	40
			% of Total	2.9%	7.7%	3.3%	5.3%	19.1%
		4	Count	17	6	8	9	40
			% of Total	8.1%	2.9%	3.8%	4.3%	19.1%
		5	Count	2	1	0	38	41
			% of Total	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	18.2%	19.6%
	Total		Count	38	51	38	82	209
			% of Total	18.2%	24.4%	18.2%	39.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	16	17	13	19	65
			% of Total	5.3%	5.7%	4.3%	6.3%	21.7%
		2	Count	2	19	27	16	64
			% of Total	0.7%	6.3%	9.0%	5.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	8	24	11	15	58
			% of Total	2.7%	8.0%	3.7%	5.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	20	18	8	13	59
			% of Total	6.7%	6.0%	2.7%	4.3%	19.7%
		5	Count	2	2	0	50	54
			% of Total	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	16.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	48	80	59	113	300
			% of Total	16.0%	26.7%	19.7%	37.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Gender				Q2		Total
				1	2	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	19	19
			% of Total	0.0%	20.9%	20.9%
		2	Count	0	22	22
			% of Total	0.0%	24.2%	24.2%
		3	Count	11	7	18
			% of Total	12.1%	7.7%	19.8%
		4	Count	19	0	19
			% of Total	20.9%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	42	49	91
			% of Total	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	46	46
			% of Total	0.0%	22.0%	22.0%

		2	Count	8	34	42
			% of Total	3.8%	16.3%	20.1%
		3	Count	26	14	40
			% of Total	12.4%	6.7%	19.1%
		4	Count	35	5	40
			% of Total	16.7%	2.4%	19.1%
		5	Count	31	10	41
			% of Total	14.8%	4.8%	19.6%
	Total		Count	100	109	209
			% of Total	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	65	65
			% of Total	0.0%	21.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	8	56	64
			% of Total	2.7%	18.7%	21.3%
		3	Count	37	21	58
			% of Total	12.3%	7.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	54	5	59
			% of Total	18.0%	1.7%	19.7%
		5	Count	43	11	54
			% of Total	14.3%	3.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	142	158	300
			% of Total	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q3

Gender				Q3					Total
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	4	15		19
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	16.5%		20.9%
		2	Count	0	0	14	8		22
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	8.8%		24.2%
		3	Count	1	1	12	4		18
			% of Total	1.1%	1.1%	13.2%	4.4%		19.8%
		4	Count	6	3	1	9		19
			% of Total	6.6%	3.3%	1.1%	9.9%		20.9%
		5	Count	0	0	0	13		13
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%		14.3%
	Total		Count	7	4	31	49		91
			% of Total	7.7%	4.4%	34.1%	53.8%		100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	11	35	0	46
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	16.7%	0.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	0	0	22	20	0	42
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	9.6%	0.0%	20.1%

		3	Count	0	3	21	16	0	40
			% of Total	0.0%	1.4%	10.0%	7.7%	0.0%	19.1%
		4	Count	4	17	0	18	1	40
			% of Total	1.9%	8.1%	0.0%	8.6%	0.5%	19.1%
		5	Count	0	0	0	41	0	41
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.6%	0.0%	19.6%
	Total		Count	4	20	54	130	1	209
			% of Total	1.9%	9.6%	25.8%	62.2%	0.5%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	15	50	0	65
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	16.7%	0.0%	21.7%
		2	Count	0	0	36	28	0	64
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	9.3%	0.0%	21.3%
		3	Count	1	4	33	20	0	58
			% of Total	0.3%	1.3%	11.0%	6.7%	0.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	10	20	1	27	1	59
			% of Total	3.3%	6.7%	0.3%	9.0%	0.3%	19.7%
		5	Count	0	0	0	54	0	54
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%	0.0%	18.0%
	Total		Count	11	24	85	179	1	300
			% of Total	3.7%	8.0%	28.3%	59.7%	0.3%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q4

Gender				Q4					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	4	3	7	0	5	19
			% of Total	4.4%	3.3%	7.7%	0.0%	5.5%	20.9%
		2	Count	6	2	2	1	11	22
			% of Total	6.6%	2.2%	2.2%	1.1%	12.1%	24.2%
		3	Count	0	0	15	1	2	18
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	16.5%	1.1%	2.2%	19.8%
		4	Count	1	1	5	4	8	19
			% of Total	1.1%	1.1%	5.5%	4.4%	8.8%	20.9%
		5	Count	0	1	4	1	7	13
			% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	4.4%	1.1%	7.7%	14.3%
	Total		Count	11	7	33	7	33	91
			% of Total	12.1%	7.7%	36.3%	7.7%	36.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	12	20	3	11	46
			% of Total	0.0%	5.7%	9.6%	1.4%	5.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	2	9	3	6	22	42
			% of Total	1.0%	4.3%	1.4%	2.9%	10.5%	20.1%
		3	Count	0	14	8	11	7	40
			% of Total	0.0%	6.7%	3.8%	5.3%	3.3%	19.1%

		4	Count	2	6	4	0	28	40
			% of Total	1.0%	2.9%	1.9%	0.0%	13.4%	19.1%
		5	Count	2	7	4	4	24	41
			% of Total	1.0%	3.3%	1.9%	1.9%	11.5%	19.6%
	Total		Count	6	48	39	24	92	209
			% of Total	2.9%	23.0%	18.7%	11.5%	44.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	4	15	27	3	16	65
			% of Total	1.3%	5.0%	9.0%	1.0%	5.3%	21.7%
		2	Count	8	11	5	7	33	64
			% of Total	2.7%	3.7%	1.7%	2.3%	11.0%	21.3%
		3	Count	0	14	23	12	9	58
			% of Total	0.0%	4.7%	7.7%	4.0%	3.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	3	7	9	4	36	59
			% of Total	1.0%	2.3%	3.0%	1.3%	12.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	2	8	8	5	31	54
			% of Total	0.7%	2.7%	2.7%	1.7%	10.3%	18.0%
	Total		Count	17	55	72	31	125	300
			% of Total	5.7%	18.3%	24.0%	10.3%	41.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q4

Gender				Q4					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	4	3	7	0	5	19
			% of Total	4.4%	3.3%	7.7%	0.0%	5.5%	20.9%
		2	Count	6	2	2	1	11	22
			% of Total	6.6%	2.2%	2.2%	1.1%	12.1%	24.2%
		3	Count	0	0	15	1	2	18
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	16.5%	1.1%	2.2%	19.8%
		4	Count	1	1	5	4	8	19
			% of Total	1.1%	1.1%	5.5%	4.4%	8.8%	20.9%
		5	Count	0	1	4	1	7	13
			% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	4.4%	1.1%	7.7%	14.3%
	Total		Count	11	7	33	7	33	91
			% of Total	12.1%	7.7%	36.3%	7.7%	36.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	12	20	3	11	46
			% of Total	0.0%	5.7%	9.6%	1.4%	5.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	2	9	3	6	22	42
			% of Total	1.0%	4.3%	1.4%	2.9%	10.5%	20.1%
		3	Count	0	14	8	11	7	40
			% of Total	0.0%	6.7%	3.8%	5.3%	3.3%	19.1%
		4	Count	2	6	4	0	28	40
			% of Total	1.0%	2.9%	1.9%	0.0%	13.4%	19.1%
		5	Count	2	7	4	4	24	41

			% of Total	1.0%	3.3%	1.9%	1.9%	11.5%	19.6%
	Total		Count	6	48	39	24	92	209
			% of Total	2.9%	23.0%	18.7%	11.5%	44.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	4	15	27	3	16	65
			% of Total	1.3%	5.0%	9.0%	1.0%	5.3%	21.7%
		2	Count	8	11	5	7	33	64
			% of Total	2.7%	3.7%	1.7%	2.3%	11.0%	21.3%
		3	Count	0	14	23	12	9	58
			% of Total	0.0%	4.7%	7.7%	4.0%	3.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	3	7	9	4	36	59
			% of Total	1.0%	2.3%	3.0%	1.3%	12.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	2	8	8	5	31	54
			% of Total	0.7%	2.7%	2.7%	1.7%	10.3%	18.0%
	Total		Count	17	55	72	31	125	300
			% of Total	5.7%	18.3%	24.0%	10.3%	41.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q5

Gender				Q5					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	1	2	6	5	5	19
			% of Total	1.1%	2.2%	6.6%	5.5%	5.5%	20.9%
		2	Count	3	2	1	11	5	22
			% of Total	3.3%	2.2%	1.1%	12.1%	5.5%	24.2%
		3	Count	4	4	5	0	5	18
			% of Total	4.4%	4.4%	5.5%	0.0%	5.5%	19.8%
		4	Count	5	0	0	14	0	19
			% of Total	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	0	0	1	0	13
			% of Total	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	14.3%
	Total		Count	25	8	12	31	15	91
			% of Total	27.5%	8.8%	13.2%	34.1%	16.5%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	4	14	8	13	7	46
			% of Total	1.9%	6.7%	3.8%	6.2%	3.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	12	11	7	3	9	42
			% of Total	5.7%	5.3%	3.3%	1.4%	4.3%	20.1%
		3	Count	17	0	13	10	0	40
			% of Total	8.1%	0.0%	6.2%	4.8%	0.0%	19.1%
		4	Count	14	6	2	18	0	40
			% of Total	6.7%	2.9%	1.0%	8.6%	0.0%	19.1%
		5	Count	32	1	0	0	8	41
			% of Total	15.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	19.6%
	Total		Count	79	32	30	44	24	209

			% of Total	37.8%	15.3%	14.4%	21.1%	11.5%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	5	16	14	18	12	65
			% of Total	1.7%	5.3%	4.7%	6.0%	4.0%	21.7%
		2	Count	15	13	8	14	14	64
			% of Total	5.0%	4.3%	2.7%	4.7%	4.7%	21.3%
		3	Count	21	4	18	10	5	58
			% of Total	7.0%	1.3%	6.0%	3.3%	1.7%	19.3%
		4	Count	19	6	2	32	0	59
			% of Total	6.3%	2.0%	0.7%	10.7%	0.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	44	1	0	1	8	54
			% of Total	14.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	2.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	104	40	42	75	39	300
			% of Total	34.7%	13.3%	14.0%	25.0%	13.0%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q6

Gender				Q6		Total
				1	2	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	19	19
			% of Total	0.0%	20.9%	20.9%
		2	Count	0	22	22
			% of Total	0.0%	24.2%	24.2%
		3	Count	13	5	18
			% of Total	14.3%	5.5%	19.8%
		4	Count	0	19	19
			% of Total	0.0%	20.9%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	25	66	91
			% of Total	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	46	46
			% of Total	0.0%	22.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	0	42	42
			% of Total	0.0%	20.1%	20.1%
		3	Count	14	26	40
			% of Total	6.7%	12.4%	19.1%
		4	Count	20	20	40
			% of Total	9.6%	9.6%	19.1%
		5	Count	37	4	41
			% of Total	17.7%	1.9%	19.6%
	Total		Count	71	138	209
			% of Total	34.0%	66.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	65	65
			% of Total	0.0%	21.7%	21.7%

		2	Count	0	64	64
			% of Total	0.0%	21.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	27	31	58
			% of Total	9.0%	10.3%	19.3%
		4	Count	20	39	59
			% of Total	6.7%	13.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	49	5	54
			% of Total	16.3%	1.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	96	204	300
			% of Total	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q7

Gender				Q7				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	0	19	19
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	20.9%
		2	Count	0	0	0	22	22
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.2%	24.2%
		3	Count	0	9	9	0	18
			% of Total	0.0%	9.9%	9.9%	0.0%	19.8%
		4	Count	0	19	0	0	19
			% of Total	0.0%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	0	0	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	12	28	9	42	91
			% of Total	13.2%	30.8%	9.9%	46.2%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	0	46	46
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	0	0	8	34	42
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	16.3%	20.1%
		3	Count	0	21	19	0	40
			% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	9.1%	0.0%	19.1%
		4	Count	3	37	0	0	40
			% of Total	1.4%	17.7%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%
		5	Count	39	2	0	0	41
			% of Total	18.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.6%
	Total		Count	42	60	27	80	209
			% of Total	20.1%	28.7%	12.9%	38.3%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	0	0	65	65
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	0	0	8	56	64
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	18.7%	21.3%

		3	Count	0	30	28	0	58
			% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	9.3%	0.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	3	56	0	0	59
			% of Total	1.0%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	51	2	0	1	54
			% of Total	17.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	18.0%
	Total		Count	54	88	36	122	300
			% of Total	18.0%	29.3%	12.0%	40.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q8

Gender				Q8					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	3	1	1	14	19
			% of Total	0.0%	3.3%	1.1%	1.1%	15.4%	20.9%
		2	Count	0	1	5	2	14	22
			% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	5.5%	2.2%	15.4%	24.2%
		3	Count	5	5	3	1	4	18
			% of Total	5.5%	5.5%	3.3%	1.1%	4.4%	19.8%
		4	Count	3	3	2	2	9	19
			% of Total	3.3%	3.3%	2.2%	2.2%	9.9%	20.9%
		5	Count	4	1	0	0	8	13
			% of Total	4.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	14.3%
	Total		Count	12	13	11	6	49	91
			% of Total	13.2%	14.3%	12.1%	6.6%	53.8%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	2	5	4	1	34	46
			% of Total	1.0%	2.4%	1.9%	0.5%	16.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	2	4	3	0	33	42
			% of Total	1.0%	1.9%	1.4%	0.0%	15.8%	20.1%
		3	Count	11	5	5	7	12	40
			% of Total	5.3%	2.4%	2.4%	3.3%	5.7%	19.1%
		4	Count	11	8	4	5	12	40
			% of Total	5.3%	3.8%	1.9%	2.4%	5.7%	19.1%
		5	Count	3	10	1	0	27	41
			% of Total	1.4%	4.8%	0.5%	0.0%	12.9%	19.6%
	Total		Count	29	32	17	13	118	209
			% of Total	13.9%	15.3%	8.1%	6.2%	56.5%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	2	8	5	2	48	65
			% of Total	0.7%	2.7%	1.7%	0.7%	16.0%	21.7%
		2	Count	2	5	8	2	47	64
			% of Total	0.7%	1.7%	2.7%	0.7%	15.7%	21.3%
		3	Count	16	10	8	8	16	58
			% of Total	5.3%	3.3%	2.7%	2.7%	5.3%	19.3%

		4	Count	14	11	6	7	21	59
			% of Total	4.7%	3.7%	2.0%	2.3%	7.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	7	11	1	0	35	54
			% of Total	2.3%	3.7%	0.3%	0.0%	11.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	41	45	28	19	167	300
			% of Total	13.7%	15.0%	9.3%	6.3%	55.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.037*

Q9

Gender				Q9		Total
				1	2	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	19	19
			% of Total	0.0%	20.9%	20.9%
		2	Count	0	22	22
			% of Total	0.0%	24.2%	24.2%
		3	Count	12	6	18
			% of Total	13.2%	6.6%	19.8%
		4	Count	19	0	19
			% of Total	20.9%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	43	48	91
			% of Total	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	46	46
			% of Total	0.0%	22.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	0	42	42
			% of Total	0.0%	20.1%	20.1%
		3	Count	28	12	40
			% of Total	13.4%	5.7%	19.1%
		4	Count	40	0	40
			% of Total	19.1%	0.0%	19.1%
		5	Count	40	1	41
			% of Total	19.1%	0.5%	19.6%
	Total		Count	108	101	209
			% of Total	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	65	65
			% of Total	0.0%	21.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	0	64	64
			% of Total	0.0%	21.3%	21.3%

		3	Count	40	18	58
			% of Total	13.3%	6.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	59	0	59
			% of Total	19.7%	0.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	52	2	54
			% of Total	17.3%	0.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	151	149	300
			% of Total	50.3%	49.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q10

Gender				Q10				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	8	1	7	3	19
			% of Total	8.8%	1.1%	7.7%	3.3%	20.9%
		2	Count	3	10	1	8	22
			% of Total	3.3%	11.0%	1.1%	8.8%	24.2%
		3	Count	2	5	9	2	18
			% of Total	2.2%	5.5%	9.9%	2.2%	19.8%
		4	Count	14	2	3	0	19
			% of Total	15.4%	2.2%	3.3%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	0	0	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	39	18	20	14	91
			% of Total	42.9%	19.8%	22.0%	15.4%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	14	8	16	8	46
			% of Total	6.7%	3.8%	7.7%	3.8%	22.0%
		2	Count	4	3	12	23	42
			% of Total	1.9%	1.4%	5.7%	11.0%	20.1%
		3	Count	14	4	20	2	40
			% of Total	6.7%	1.9%	9.6%	1.0%	19.1%
		4	Count	11	20	9	0	40
			% of Total	5.3%	9.6%	4.3%	0.0%	19.1%
		5	Count	1	39	1	0	41
			% of Total	0.5%	18.7%	0.5%	0.0%	19.6%
	Total		Count	44	74	58	33	209
			% of Total	21.1%	35.4%	27.8%	15.8%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	22	9	23	11	65
			% of Total	7.3%	3.0%	7.7%	3.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	7	13	13	31	64
			% of Total	2.3%	4.3%	4.3%	10.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	16	9	29	4	58

			% of Total	5.3%	3.0%	9.7%	1.3%	19.3%
		4	Count	25	22	12	0	59
			% of Total	8.3%	7.3%	4.0%	0.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	13	39	1	1	54
			% of Total	4.3%	13.0%	0.3%	0.3%	18.0%
	Total		Count	83	92	78	47	300
			% of Total	27.7%	30.7%	26.0%	15.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q11

Gender				Q11					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	13	3	0	3	19
			% of Total	0.0%	14.3%	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%	20.9%
		2	Count	10	1	7	3	1	22
			% of Total	11.0%	1.1%	7.7%	3.3%	1.1%	24.2%
		3	Count	0	2	11	3	2	18
			% of Total	0.0%	2.2%	12.1%	3.3%	2.2%	19.8%
		4	Count	0	0	6	11	2	19
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	12.1%	2.2%	20.9%
		5	Count	1	7	3	0	2	13
			% of Total	1.1%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	2.2%	14.3%
	Total		Count	11	23	30	17	10	91
			% of Total	12.1%	25.3%	33.0%	18.7%	11.0%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	20	9	6	11	46
			% of Total	0.0%	9.6%	4.3%	2.9%	5.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	26	0	2	8	6	42
			% of Total	12.4%	0.0%	1.0%	3.8%	2.9%	20.1%
		3	Count	7	9	5	12	7	40
			% of Total	3.3%	4.3%	2.4%	5.7%	3.3%	19.1%
		4	Count	1	0	19	13	7	40
			% of Total	0.5%	0.0%	9.1%	6.2%	3.3%	19.1%
		5	Count	6	23	5	0	7	41
			% of Total	2.9%	11.0%	2.4%	0.0%	3.3%	19.6%
	Total		Count	40	52	40	39	38	209
			% of Total	19.1%	24.9%	19.1%	18.7%	18.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	33	12	6	14	65
			% of Total	0.0%	11.0%	4.0%	2.0%	4.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	36	1	9	11	7	64
			% of Total	12.0%	0.3%	3.0%	3.7%	2.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	7	11	16	15	9	58
			% of Total	2.3%	3.7%	5.3%	5.0%	3.0%	19.3%
		4	Count	1	0	25	24	9	59

			% of Total	0.3%	0.0%	8.3%	8.0%	3.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	7	30	8	0	9	54
			% of Total	2.3%	10.0%	2.7%	0.0%	3.0%	18.0%
	Total		Count	51	75	70	56	48	300
			% of Total	17.0%	25.0%	23.3%	18.7%	16.0%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q12

Gender				Q12					Total
				1	2	3	4	5	
1	Year of study	1	Count	3	1	10		5	19
			% of Total	3.3%	1.1%	11.0%		5.5%	20.9%
		2	Count	6	3	9		4	22
			% of Total	6.6%	3.3%	9.9%		4.4%	24.2%
		3	Count	2	0	13		3	18
			% of Total	2.2%	0.0%	14.3%		3.3%	19.8%
		4	Count	0	1	11		7	19
			% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	12.1%		7.7%	20.9%
		5	Count	1	4	4		4	13
			% of Total	1.1%	4.4%	4.4%		4.4%	14.3%
	Total		Count	12	9	47		23	91
			% of Total	13.2%	9.9%	51.6%		25.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	13	4	14	4	11	46
			% of Total	6.2%	1.9%	6.7%	1.9%	5.3%	22.0%
		2	Count	20	1	6	9	6	42
			% of Total	9.6%	0.5%	2.9%	4.3%	2.9%	20.1%
		3	Count	3	4	22	1	10	40
			% of Total	1.4%	1.9%	10.5%	0.5%	4.8%	19.1%
		4	Count	3	9	13	4	11	40
			% of Total	1.4%	4.3%	6.2%	1.9%	5.3%	19.1%
		5	Count	2	8	5	1	25	41
			% of Total	1.0%	3.8%	2.4%	0.5%	12.0%	19.6%
	Total		Count	41	26	60	19	63	209
			% of Total	19.6%	12.4%	28.7%	9.1%	30.1%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	16	5	24	4	16	65
			% of Total	5.3%	1.7%	8.0%	1.3%	5.3%	21.7%
		2	Count	26	4	15	9	10	64
			% of Total	8.7%	1.3%	5.0%	3.0%	3.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	5	4	35	1	13	58

			% of Total	1.7%	1.3%	11.7%	0.3%	4.3%	19.3%
		4	Count	3	10	24	4	18	59
			% of Total	1.0%	3.3%	8.0%	1.3%	6.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	3	12	9	1	29	54
			% of Total	1.0%	4.0%	3.0%	0.3%	9.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	53	35	107	19	86	300
			% of Total	17.7%	11.7%	35.7%	6.3%	28.7%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q13

Gender				Q13		Total
				1	2	
1	Year of study	1	Count	19	0	19
			% of Total	20.9%	0.0%	20.9%
		2	Count	12	10	22
			% of Total	13.2%	11.0%	24.2%
		3	Count	13	5	18
			% of Total	14.3%	5.5%	19.8%
		4	Count	19	0	19
			% of Total	20.9%	0.0%	20.9%
		5	Count	12	1	13
			% of Total	13.2%	1.1%	14.3%
	Total		Count	75	16	91
			% of Total	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	46	0	46
			% of Total	22.0%	0.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	30	12	42
			% of Total	14.4%	5.7%	20.1%
		3	Count	29	11	40
			% of Total	13.9%	5.3%	19.1%
		4	Count	40	0	40
			% of Total	19.1%	0.0%	19.1%
		5	Count	40	1	41
			% of Total	19.1%	0.5%	19.6%
	Total		Count	185	24	209
			% of Total	88.5%	11.5%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	65	0	65
			% of Total	21.7%	0.0%	21.7%
		2	Count	42	22	64
			% of Total	14.0%	7.3%	21.3%
		3	Count	42	16	58
			% of Total	14.0%	5.3%	19.3%

		4	Count	59	0	59
			% of Total	19.7%	0.0%	19.7%
		5	Count	52	2	54
			% of Total	17.3%	0.7%	18.0%
	Total		Count	260	40	300
			% of Total	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%

P-value 0.000*

Q14

Gender				Q14	Total
				2	
1	Year of study	1	Count	19	19
			% of Total	20.9%	20.9%
		2	Count	22	22
			% of Total	24.2%	24.2%
		3	Count	18	18
			% of Total	19.8%	19.8%
		4	Count	19	19
			% of Total	20.9%	20.9%
		5	Count	13	13
			% of Total	14.3%	14.3%
	Total		Count	91	91
			% of Total	100.0%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	46	46
			% of Total	22.0%	22.0%
		2	Count	42	42
			% of Total	20.1%	20.1%
		3	Count	40	40
			% of Total	19.1%	19.1%
		4	Count	40	40
			% of Total	19.1%	19.1%
		5	Count	41	41
			% of Total	19.6%	19.6%
	Total		Count	209	209
			% of Total	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	65	65
			% of Total	21.7%	21.7%
		2	Count	64	64
			% of Total	21.3%	21.3%

		3	Count	58	58
			% of Total	19.3%	19.3%
		4	Count	59	59
			% of Total	19.7%	19.7%
		5	Count	54	54
			% of Total	18.0%	18.0%
	Total		Count	300	300
			% of Total	100.0%	100.0%

P-value 0.004*

Discussion

Dental quackery has become one of the most unethical practices misleading the majority of the world population especially those residing in underdeveloped and developing nations. Even though efforts were made by different researchers and governments in different countries to advertise this act to gain the attention of policymakers and to put a pause to such quackery. The existing literature all over world reveals that the majority of the patients get attracted by dental quacks because of their publicity contrivance claiming a faster, cheaper, and sure cure. Because of a lack of firm action against the quacks, this activity has become pronounced in recent years resulting in complications for innocent people and acting as an obstacle in providing quality dental care.

The present study was undertaken to assess the Knowledge, awareness, and practice among the students about quackery dentistry tertiary care teaching hospital, Khammam. 300 students participated in the study, out of which 69.7% females and 30.3% males were included. The cost of treatment and the location of private practices may be a barrier to dental care for many people in developing countries. The present study found that lack of patient awareness, inadequate regulation, lack of accessibility of dental care, and lack of knowledge about dental quackery were the reasons to use dental quack services.

Conclusion

Dental quackery remains a significant public health concern, posing serious risks to patients' oral and overall health. The proliferation of unqualified practitioners and misleading treatments, often fueled by misinformation and lack of regulation, highlights the need for stronger oversight and education. Combating quackery requires a collaborative approach involving dental professionals, regulatory bodies, and public awareness campaigns to inform individuals about the importance of seeking care from qualified practitioners. Furthermore, it is essential to empower patients to recognize the signs of quackery and make informed decisions about their oral health. By addressing these challenges, the dental community can help ensure that all individuals receive safe, effective, and scientifically supported care, ultimately fostering greater trust in legitimate dental practices.

References

1. Ahuja NK, Parmar R. Demographics & current scenario with respect to dentists, dental institutions & dental practices in India. *Indian Journal of Dental Sciences* 2011;2(3):8-11.
2. Bennadi D, Konekeri V. Quackery in Dentistry. *RJPBCS* 2015;6(2):504-509. [https://www.rjpbcs.com/pdf/2015_6\(2\)/\[78\].pdf](https://www.rjpbcs.com/pdf/2015_6(2)/[78].pdf)
3. Singh G, Garg K, Mehrotra V, Mehrotra A, Singh R. Quackery: Demon's of Indian

- dentistry-A review. University J Dent Scie 2017;3(2):1-3.
4. GoyalS, Kansal G, Deepika. Journal of Dental Peers 2015;1(2):150-157.
 5. Sachdev R, Garg K. Acrylic denture stomatitis of oral cavity: A case report. EJBPS 2018;5(2): 703-705.
 6. Gautam S et al. Assessment of the abused tissue response in patients with faulty prosthesis made by unqualified dental practitioners (quacks). EJPBS 2017; 4(10):601-605.
<https://www.ejbps.com/ejbps/abstract id/3244>

How to cite this Article: Anjali Maloth, K. V. N. R. Pratap, D. T. Madhavi Padma, V. Srujan Kumar, Surbhit Singh, Bhargavi Latha; *Knowledge, Awareness and Practice on Quackery in Dentistry among Dental Students in Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital*; Int. J. Drug Res. Dental Sci., 2024; 6(4): 38-56, doi: <https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.E>

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** Nil.

Received: 4-12-2024 **Revised:** 16-1-2025 **Accepted:** 24-1-2025