1874-2106/19



REVIEW ARTICLE

Role of a Dentist in the Diagnosis of Child Abuse and Neglect: A Literature and Narrative Review

Maria Melo^{1,2}, Fadi Ata-Ali^{1,3,*}, Teresa Cobo³, José Diago¹, María Teresa Chofré-Lorente¹, Leticia Bagán¹, Cristina Sanchez-Recio⁴ and Javier Ata-Ali^{1,5}

¹Unit of Master's Degree in Advanced Orthodontics, Department of Dentistry, Faculty of Health Sciences, European University of Valencia. Valencia, Spain

²Valencia University Medical and Dental School, University of Valencia Valencia, Spain

³Department of Surgery and Medical-Surgical Specialities, Area of Orthodontics, University Medical and Dental School. University of Oviedo, Instituto Asturiano de Odontologia, Oviedo, Spain

⁴Private Practive in Oral Surgery. Hospital de Manises, Valencia, Spain

^sPublic Dental Health Service. Conselleria de Sanitat Universal i Salut Pública, Generalitat Valenciana, Valencia, Spain

Abstract:

Background:

Child Abuse (CA) is defined as any physical or psychological harm inflicted upon children. The most commonly affected anatomical region in these cases is the orofacial complex, thereby placing dentists in a dominant position for detecting CA. The statistical figures referred to CA are high, and many cases go unreported.

Objective:

To determine the level of knowledge, the aptitudes and capacity of dentists in reporting cases of CA; the barriers facing the reporting of cases; and the key clinical characteristics for the detection of CA.

Methodology:

A search was made of the PubMed (MEDLINE), ScienceDirect, LILACS and SciELO databases for articles published up until March 2019, involving analytical observational and descriptive studies relevant to the objectives of our study. All articles were independently reviewed by two authors.

Results:

Injuries caused by CA are largely located in the orofacial region – the most prevalent being caries, burns and fractures. The most frequently identified risk factor is behavioral alterations on the part of the parents or caregivers. The reviewed studies reflect a discrepancy between suspected and reported cases of CA.

Conclusion:

Although dentists are able to detect injuries, there is a great lack of knowledge about how to report cases of CA to the authorities. It is interesting to establish guidelines for the detection and reporting of suspicious cases. Improved training in forensic and legal dentistry is needed, together with the establishment of detection and reporting protocols. The clinical signs detected in the case of CA and neglect include untreated caries, poor oral hygiene, traumatisms, burns, lacerations and biting. The recognition of such signs and correct case history compilation are essential for the detection of CA.

Keywords: Dental neglect, Dentists, Maltreatment, Diagnosis, Child abuse, Child neglect, Child protection.

Article History	Received: June 01, 2019	Revised: July 19, 2019	Accepted: August 09, 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

Child Abuse (CA) is complicated to define. In effect, the definition changes in different studies according to the context

involved, since there is a lack of agreement in the scientific community that prevents homogenization of the different definitions. The definition of Child Neglect (CN) was done by

Greenbaum *et al.* as the failure of the primary caregivers to meet the child's basic intellectual, physical, or emotional needs [1], though no precise indication is given as to what the parents or caregivers have to do (or not do), or for how long, to cause immediate or potential harm [2]. The Expanded Hierarchical Classification System (EHCS) is the most widely used tool and classifies child abuse into four broad categories: sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect and emotional abuse [3]. There are high comorbidity levels among these four categories [4].

It has been found that approximately 50-80% of all documented cases of CA involve the head and neck region (traumatisms of the mouth, head and face), thereby placing dental professionals in a dominant position for detecting and diagnosing the physical and emotional manifestations of CA and reporting it to the competent authorities [5 - 12]. Unfortunately, according to Kaur *et al.* [5], 55% of the surveyed dentists did not have the capacity to interpret suspect cases and identify signs of abuse, due to a lack of training in the field and of knowledge about how to report such cases to the authorities. Child abuse thus constitutes a largely unknown and little reported social problem that affects all countries and social spheres [13].

The literature shows a discrepancy between suspected cases of CA and actually reported cases [14 - 15], thus indicating that although dentists are capable of recognizing and suspecting cases of CA, there is a lack of knowledge about how to proceed in such cases. This contradiction between suspicion and reporting shows the adequate management of children suffering CA to remain deficient. In order to address this problem, it is necessary to establish whether the theoretical knowledge of dentists is correct and sufficient to diagnose and report CA. Thus, the purpose of this study was to review the current literature in order to assess current perceptions, knowledge and attitudes among dental professionals in relation to CA; the barriers facing the reporting of cases; and the key clinical characteristics for the detection of CA.

2. METHODOLOGY

The PubMed (MEDLINE) database of the United States National Library of Medicine, ScienceDirect, LILACS and Sci-ELO were used to conduct a literature search of articles published up until March 2019. The search terms "dental neglect", "dentistry", "maltreatment", "diagnosis", "child abuse" and "child neglect" were used in different combinations. No restrictions were placed on the year or language of publication. The search was completed with a review of the references of the selected articles to identify additional studies not found in the initial literature search. All articles selected from the electronic and manual searches were independently assessed by the first and second authors of the present study, based on the established inclusion criteria.

Chosen full-text articles were required to meet the follo-

E-mail: losataali@hotmail.com

wing criteria: descriptive (cross-sectional) or analytical observational (retrospective and prospective) studies pertinent to the objectives of the present study, and with a clear definition of CA or CN. All studies involving health or non-health professionals other than dentists were excluded (Table 1).

3. RESULTS

The main physical injuries and psychological signs found were the presence of caries [16 - 25] and increased dental plaque and gingival inflammation scores [20], reflecting the close relationship between abuse and/or neglect and poor oral hygiene and health [18, 19, 21]. Burns [7, 25 - 27] and bone and dental fractures [19, 23, 25, 28, 29], as well as bacterial and viral infections [30, 23], fractures, lacerations, malocclusions [16] due to traumatisms [31], biting or contusions were also reported [7, 27, 29, 32]. Children suffering CA also presented psychological disorders such as anxiety, depression or stress [33 - 35]. The most frequent risk factor for abuse was behavioral alterations in the form of depression, personality alterations, anxiety, stress or social isolation [36, 37]. A low socioeconomic level and alcohol and drug abuse were also associated with an increased risk of abuse [38], in the same way as monoparental families or criminality [6, 39, 40].

The suspicion and reporting of cases were seen to vary among the different studies [9, 13, 14, 41 - 55]. The main barrier faced during the reporting of abuse was an uncertain diagnosis [41, 45, 50, 54], followed by concern about the consequences which reporting may have for the child [41, 48, 51, 54], and a lack of knowledge of how to proceed in reporting CA [13, 45, 54] (Table 2). While no international standards or protocols are available, reporting to the authorities or the police was the most commonly used option among the surveyed dental professionals [25, 43, 45].

Table 1. Strategy inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Key words	Dental neglect, Dentistry, Maltreatment, Diagnosis, Child abuse, Child neglect
Inclusion criteria	 Pertinent to the objectives Cross-sectional studies Retrospective and prospective studies Questionnaire, interview, survey studies Clear definition of CA or CN
Exclusion criteria	 Expert opinions Clinical cases Professionals other than dentists

CA: Child Abuse CN: Child Neglect

4. DISCUSSION

The present study was carried out to determine whether dentists are able to detect cases of CA based on a series of clinical data and proceed as required in confirmed cases of abuse. The percentage of reported cases was low in comparison with the number of suspected cases. Child abuse is difficult to address, for although the prevalence and incidence of CA are high, the exact number of cases is not known and there are no established diagnostic and reporting protocols for such situations. Despite the great relevance of the problem, CA has been seen to involve much uncertainty in the different studies published in the dental care setting [14, 42, 46].

^{*} Address correspondence to this author at the Unit of Master's Degree in Advanced Orthodontics, Department of Dentistry, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universidad Europea de Valencia. C/General Elio, 2. 46010-Valencia, Spain and Department of Surgery and Medical-Surgical Specialities, Area of Orthodontics, University Medical and Dental School. University of Oviedo, Instituto Asturiano de Odontologia, Oviedo, Spain; Tel: +0034985966014;

Table 2. Main findings of the studies included in the literature review.

[55] abuse/reglect in the 5 years before the study. CA. 71% had never seen a case of child abuse in neglect. 14% is a consider to lack of an advective history. (% due to a lack of nonexpatible more negative than you of constitue consequence in the of history at to constitue consequence in the of history at to constitue consequence in the of history at to constitue consequence in the of history at the consequence of the child. 28% of those surveyed suspected some CA. 1999 [41] John et al., 1999 [41] 28% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. 11 Kilpatrick et al., 1999 [51] 58% of the poduric donutities suspected some CA. 14 Love et al., 2001 [42] 81% of those surveyed suspected some CA. 11 Love et al., 2001 [42] 81% of those surveyed suspected some CA. 11 Cairns et al., 2005 [53] 29% of the dentists suspected some CA. 11 Domas et al., 2006 [44] 21% of those surveyed suspected some CA. 11 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 21% of those surveyed suspected some CA. 11 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 11% or out of every three of those surveyed suspected some CA. 11 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 11% or out of every three of those surveyed suspected some CA. 114 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 11% or out of every three of those surveyed suspected some CA. 114 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 11% or out of every three of those surveyed suspected some CA. 114 Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 11% or out of every three of those surveyed suspected some CA. 114 Thomas et al., 2006 [45] 15% of tho dent	Author, year/Type of Study	Main Results and Country	Why did they not report?
1 CA. concern about the consequences for the child, 26% due to pati- Australia Kilpatrick et al., 1999 [51] S8% of the pediatric dentists suspected some case of abuse, versus 24% of the general dentists. 75-80% did not report due to patient confidentiality reasons; and did not do so because of concern about the consequences for the did not do so because of concern about the consequences for the social and the consequences for the dentists. Caims et al., 2005 [53] 29% of the dentists suspected some CA. I Only 8% of the suspicions were reported, 11% were concerned a a negative impact on their practice; 34% faret family violen towards the child, 31% faret violence directed against them; 48% fared lingation. Thomas et al., 2007 [49] 16% suspected cases of CA. I NA Harris et al., 2009 [9] Two out of every three of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. Utild Kingdom NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [9] Two out of every three of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. Utild Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% out of far of violence to the child; 28% out of far of violence and sums then; 10% out of far of family violence against then; 10% out of far of family violence ag	[55] I	abuse/neglect in the 5 years before the study. USA	report due to lack of an adequate history; 6% due to a lack of knowledge about the problem of child abuse and neglect and of the role of the healthcare professional in reporting it; 3% out of concern that reporting may have more negative than positive consequences; 1% because of the impact it could have on their clinical practice; 1% due to a lack of time; and 1% because they did not believe the case would be investigated.
II case of abuse, versus 24% of the general Australia did not do so because of concern about the consequences for the Australia Love et al., 2001 [42] 81% of those surveyed suspected some CA. NA Cairns et al., 2005 [53] 29% of the dentists suspected some CA. Only 8% of the suspicions were reported; 11% were concerned a a negative impact on their practice; 14% Seared family violence Scotland Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 21% of those surveyed suspected some CA. NA Manea et al., 2007 [49] 16% suspected cases of CA. NA Harris et al., 2009 [9] Two out of every three of those surveyed NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [95] 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA. NA United Kingdom 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA. NA United Kingdom 11% of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. NA Uldum et al., 2010 [54] 13% of the dentists suspected cases of CA. 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a like of anothis. Uldum et al., 2011 [46] 62% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. 80% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a like adverted index/seg of the procedures; 66% out of far of the impact on their practice. NA 12 % of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. 80% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a like of indignosi	_	CA.	concern about the consequences for the child; 26% due to patient confidentiality reasons; and 18% out of fear of litigation.
II USA Caims et al., 2005 [53] 29% of the dentists suspected some CA. In the curse of their professional life. Scotland Only 8% of the suspicions were reported; 11% were concerned a a negative impact on their practice; 34% feared family violen towards the child; 31% feared violence directed against them; i 48% feared ligation. Thomas et al., 2006 [44] 21% of those surveyed suspected some CA. I NA Manea et al., 2007 [49] 16% suspected cases of CA. United Kingdom NA Harris et al., 2009 [45] Two out of every three of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. United Kingdom NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [45] 15% of those surveyed suspected some case of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. United Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a la procedures; 66% out of fear of violence to the child; 28% out of of lifigation; 26% out of fear of family violence against then; i 10% out of fear are of family violence against then; i 10% out of fear are of family violence against then; i 10% out of fear are the indignosis. Other reasons fear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedure reporting; and concern about the consequences for CA. Brazil Azevedo et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil Al% failed to report because of concern about the consequences of the subuse/neglect in the last 5 months. Dordan In 37% of those surveyed suspected asso of CA. Brazil Al% failed to report because of concern about the consequence the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Al-Dabaan et al., 2013 [50] </td <td></td> <td>case of abuse, versus 24% of the general dentists.</td> <td>75-80% did not report due to patient confidentiality reasons; 43-38% did not do so because of concern about the consequences for the child.</td>		case of abuse, versus 24% of the general dentists.	75-80% did not report due to patient confidentiality reasons; 43-38% did not do so because of concern about the consequences for the child.
I the course of their professional life. Scotland a negative impact on their practice; 34% feared family violence towards the child; 31% feared violence directed against them; i 48% feared litigation. Thomas et al., 2007 [49] 21% of those surveyed suspected some CA. I NA Manea et al., 2007 [49] 16% suspected cases of CA. I NA Harris et al., 2009 [45] Two out of every three of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. United Kingdom NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [45] 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA in the last 6 months. United Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a le procedures; 66% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% of the dentists suspected some case of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmark Tornavoi et al., 2011 [46] 62% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil 80% did not report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Harris et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil A3% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to re			NA
I USA Mane et al., 2007 [49] 16% suspected cases of CA. Italy NA Harris et al., 2009 [9] Two out of every thre of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. United Kingdom NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [45] 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA in the last 6 months. United Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a la procedures; 66% out of fear of twolence against them; a 10% out of fear of the child; 28% out of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmark Uldum et al., 2010 [54] 13.9% of those surveyed did not consider themselves qualified to diagnose cases of CA. Brazil NA Azevedo et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil NA Sonbol et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil A3% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Harris et al., 2013 [50] 37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland Only 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were du lack of diagnostic certainty. Scotland Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands 54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.0 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack		the course of their professional life.	Only 8% of the suspicions were reported; 11% were concerned about a negative impact on their practice; 34% feared family violence towards the child; 31% feared violence directed against them; and 48% feared litigation.
1 Italy Harris et al., 2009 [9] II Two out of every three of those surveyed suspected some case of CA. United Kingdom NA Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [45] I 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA in the last 6 months. United Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a le procedures; 66% out of fear of violence to the child; 28% out of of litigation; 26% out of fear of the impact on their practice. Uldum et al., 2010 [54] II 13.9% of the dentists suspected some case of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmark 80% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis: 0ther reasons fear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedur reporting; and concern about the consequences for the child in event of intervention by the authorities. Tornavoi et al., 2012 [47] II 62% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil NA Sonbol et al., 2012 [48] II 49.6% suspected cases of CA. Brazil 43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know to to report. Harris et al., 2013 [50] II 37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland Only 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were du lack of diagnostic certainty. Saudi Arabia Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] II 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] II 39% of those surveyed suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA			NA
II suspected some case of CA. United Kingdom Al-Habsi et al., 2009 [45] 15% of those surveyed suspected some CA in the last 6 months. United Kingdom 86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a la procedures; 66% out of fear of family violence against them; a 10% out of fear of the impact on their practice. Uldum et al., 2010 [54] 13.9% of the dentists suspected some case of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmark 80% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis. Other reasons fear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedur reporting; and concern about the consequences for the child in event of intervention by the authorities. Tornavoi et al., 2011 [46] 62% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil NA Azevedo et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil 43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Harris et al., 2013 [50] 37% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil 43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Al-Dabaan et al., 2013 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Databaan et al., 2015 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Males showed grea		-	NA
Iin the last 6 months. United Kingdomprocedures; 66% out of fear of violence to the child; 28% out of of litigation; 26% out of fear of family violence against them; 10% out of fear of family violence against them; 10% out of fear of family violence against them; 10% out of fear of the impact on their practice.Uldum et al., 2010 [54] II13.9% of the dentists suspected some case of child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmark80% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis. Other reasons fear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedur reporting; and concern about the consequences for the child event of intervention by the authorities.Tornavoi et al., 2011 [46] I62% of those surveyed did not consider themselves qualified to diagnose cases of CA. BrazilNAAzevedo et al., 2012 [47] II14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report.Harris et al., 2013 [50] II37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report.Al-Dabaan et al., 2013 [50] II24% of the general dentists suspected CAses Swoti Arabia19.7% did not wish to get involved. CA, Saudi ArabiaVan Dam et al., 2015 [52] II24% of those surveyed suspected CAses The Netherlands54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty. Sould and trabiaAl-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] II39% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. The Net		suspected some case of CA.	NA
IIchild abuse/neglect in the last 6 months. Denmarkfear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedur reporting; and concern about the consequences for the child in event of intervention by the authorities.Tornavoi et al., 2011 [46] I62% of those surveyed did not consider themselves qualified to diagnose cases of CA. BrazilNAAzevedo et al., 2012 [47] II14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. BrazilNASonbol et al., 2012 [48] II49.6% suspected cases of CA. Jordan43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report.Harris et al., 2013 [50] II37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report.Al-Dabaan et al., 2014 [14] II59% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Saudi Arabia19.7% did not wish to get involved.Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] II24% of the general dentists suspected cases of CA. Males showed greater suspicion than I54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lackAl-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] II39% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Males showed greater suspicion than formale ubirts dark the last primetron54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack		in the last 6 months.	86% did not report due to an uncertain diagnosis; 68% due to a lack or procedures; 66% out of fear of violence to the child; 28% out of fear of litigation; 26% out of fear of family violence against them; and 10% out of fear of the impact on their practice.
I themselves qualified to diagnose cases of CA. Brazil Arevedo et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil NA Azevedo et al., 2012 [47] 14.3% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Brazil 43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Sonbol et al., 2012 [48] 49.6% suspected cases of CA. Jordan 43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know v to report. Harris et al., 2013 [50] 37% of those surveyed suspected cases of I Only 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were du lack of diagnostic certainty. Al-Dabaan et al., 2014 [14] 59% of those surveyed suspected cases of I 19.7% did not wish to get involved. Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Males showed greater suspicion than formelou luicited Area for function than formelou luicit		child abuse/neglect in the last 6 months.	fear of violence to the child; a lack of knowledge of the procedures for reporting; and concern about the consequences for the child in the
IICA. BrazilSonbol et al., 2012 [48] II49.6% suspected cases of CA. Jordan43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know w to report.Harris et al., 2013 [50] I37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. ScotlandOnly 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were du lack of diagnostic certainty.Al-Dabaan et al., 2014 [14] II59% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Saudi Arabia19.7% did not wish to get involved.Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] I24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack	_	themselves qualified to diagnose cases of CA.	NA
II Jordan the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know w to report. Harris et al., 2013 [50] 37% of those surveyed suspected abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland Only 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were du lack of diagnostic certainty. Al-Dabaan et al., 2014 [14] 59% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Saudi Arabia 019.7% did not wish to get involved. Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of Litic d Arabia Famiretae 54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.00 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack		CA.	NA
I abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients. Scotland lack of diagnostic certainty. Al-Dabaan et al., 2014 [14] II 59% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Saudi Arabia 19.7% did not wish to get involved. Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] I 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] II 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of cA. Males showed greater suspicion than formulae United Arabia 54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.0 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack			43% failed to report because of concern about the consequences for the child; 41% did not have a clear diagnosis and did not know where to report.
II CA. Saudi Arabia Van Dam et al., 2015 [52] 24% of the general dentists suspected CA in the last year. The Netherlands NA Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of II 54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack	_	abuse/neglect of their pediatric patients.	Only 11% referred a case. Of the unreported cases, 74% were due to a lack of diagnostic certainty.
I the last year. The Netherlands Al-Hajeri et al., 2018 [13] II 39% of those surveyed suspected cases of CA. Males showed greater suspicion than formulae United Arab Emirates 54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6 because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of the case of the c		CA. Saudi Arabia	
II CA. Males showed greater suspicion than because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack	Van Dam <i>et al.</i> , 2015 [52] I	the last year. The Netherlands	
knowledge of how or where to report.		CA. Males showed greater suspicion than	54.9% did not report due to a lack of diagnostic certainty; 59.6% because of possible family violence; and 60.2% out of a lack of knowledge of how or where to report.

I: Questionnaire, Interview, Survey II: Cross-sectional CA: Child Abuse NA: Not Available

The injuries associated with abuse are largely located in the orofacial region [28, 56]. As a result, dentists play a very important role in diagnosing CA [16, 44, 45]. The capacity of dental professionals to suspect and diagnose CA is a crucial issue [13, 56]. The results of the different studies reflect an important discrepancy between professionals that suspect CA and those that effectively report cases of abuse to the competent authorities.

Few dentists have received pre or postgraduate training or have learned about the subject in the course of their professional life [5, 14, 15, 44], even though knowledge of forensic dentistry is also essential in other settings [57, 58]. Three studies [9, 42, 44] have respectively found that 43%, 73% and 85% of all dentists had received training in CA during their graduate years. In contrast, other authors have reported that most dentists (91%) have never received training in CA [49]. This discrepancy may be attributable to the different training or educational plans found in different countries. In this regard, the United Kingdom and the United States provide more training in this field than Brazil or Greece, according to Rodrigues et al. [59]. There is an important discrepancy between studies that consider dentists to have sufficient knowledge and capacity to detect cases of CA [9, 14, 44, 47, 55] and those that consider knowledge and preparation to be insufficient [6, 43, 46]. According to different authors [43, 60], approximately 50% of those surveyed considered themselves to be in a key position for detecting CA, but almost 78% were not prepared to report the detected cases. Despite this difference, and regardless of whether the professionals considered themselves capable of detecting abuse or not, the great majority agreed on the importance of their role as dentists in clinical practice were aware of the legal importance of reporting and acknowledged the crucial relevance of training in this field [25, 41, 43, 45]. Increased knowledge has been observed in professionals specialized in pediatric dentistry [51] versus general dentists. The former are more informed about when and where to report CA, but are unaware of their legal responsibility if they fail to report cases of abuse [44].

Important discrepancies have been found in the reviewed literature. Dentists have different attitudes and positions with respect to the handling and reporting of cases of abuse: some prefer to inform the police or call telephone help services for cases of abuse, while others prefer to talk with the parents or caregivers or contact the authorities. In turn, others prefer to consult cases of this kind with colleagues or other specialists before deciding any measures or to contact social services, lawyers, or the reference hospital of the child. Lastly, some dentists decide not to report cases of abuse. The most common practice is reporting to the police or pertinent authorities, followed by consultation with other specialists [25, 41 - 43, 45]. A minority prefer to talk with parents or caregivers [14, 52]. However, according to Manea et al. [49] and Sfikas et al. [61], among other investigators, a large proportion of those surveyed claimed that they would report cases of abuse to the authorities, but had no clear idea of what authorities should be contacted. Uncertainty regarding which authorities to inform about cases of abuse is conditioned to the country involved, since mandatory reporting to the social services is in force in some countries, while others require reporting to childhood protection services or have no specific protocol for such situations [62]. In a study carried out in Australia, only 24% of the responders knew that they are not legally required to report child abuse in Victoria. However, 74% of them knew that they could be called to testify in juvenile court [41]. No common standards or protocols apply to all, and here again, a multi-disciplinary setting could play a key role, together with adequate training in how to proceed in such situations.

As has been mentioned, there is a discrepancy between the number of suspected cases of CA and the proportion of cases that are actually reported. A number of studies have found the reporting rates to be very low in comparison with the percentages of suspected cases: 18% versus 34% [15], 12% versus 59% [48] or 10% versus 59% [14]. This discrepancy may be due to a number of factors, including the existence of different barriers that complicate the task of dentists in this scenario [13], particularly diagnostic uncertainty or doubts; concern about the consequences of reporting for the child; fear of offending the parents or caregivers; a lack of clear and simple protocols; scant training in CA; and the possible consequences of reporting for their clinical practice [63]. The most frequently cited barriers are diagnostic uncertainty or doubts [42, 43, 46] and concern about the consequences of reporting for the child [6, 14, 48]. Improved training and preparation of the professionals are therefore needed in relation to the detection and reporting of abuse, as well as more legal information about this subject. Dentists must be aware of the legality of their actions and of the existence of legal support of the reporting of cases [9, 41, 42, 61, 64]. In the study published by Laud et al., 21% of the participants were formally trained on the topic during undergraduate education and 12% during graduate education [43]. However, these percentages increased in the study carried out by Harris et al. [9], where 26% of the respondents reported that child protection had been included as a class during undergraduate education. In turn, in the study of Sonbol et al. [48], 34% of those surveyed reported having formal training to recognize and report child abuse, and 42% presented qualification on the topic. Al Habsi et al. found 80% of the respondents to consider this topic to be extremely important for their work, and 79% of the sample expressed a wish to learn more about the issue [45]. All dentists must report suspected child abuse or neglect. The procedure can include an immediate report to the police or pertinent authorities orally by telephone or through electronically. Within 48 hours, a written report form should be completed.

The main physical and psychological consequences of abuse were found to be the presence of caries, poor oral hygiene, bruises, burns, bacterial and viral infections, fractures, lacerations, malocclusions due to traumatisms, biting and psychological alterations such as anxiety, depression or stress. With regard to oral health and the presence of caries, Duda *et al.* [16] found the number of treated caries and the number of primary teeth lost by victims of CA to be significantly greater than in the group of children without abuse. Children suffering neglect have poorer oral health and a higher prevalence of caries [16, 18, 21, 22, 43]. Dental traumatisms and fractures are among the most common clinical findings (59.7%), with the upper incisors being the most frequently affected teeth [65]. Long-evolving caries and abscesses are indicative of neglect [22 - 24,

32], while infections and sexually transmitted diseases such as syphilis, condylomas and palatal petechiae are indicative of sexual abuse [66, 67]. With regard to burns, those caused by flame or fire are the most prevalent in CA, as evidenced by Andronicus et al. [26]. Maguire et al. [27] likewise studied burns in CA and found the most frequent presentation to consist of symmetrical lesions with regular margins and of the same depth. In the case of biting, the intercanine distance is typically greater than 3 mm, with an ovoid shape and central ecchymosis [68]. On the other hand, Chapman et al. [36] documented the prevalence of psychological and depressive disorders in children exposed to abuse. A number of studies [12, 32] coincide that the most important element in the detection of these clinical manifestations is to take into account the aforementioned characteristics, together with discrepancies between the clinical data and the story told; suspicious behavior on the part of the parents; the behavior of the child with emotional problems [34, 35]; and the presence of bilateral injuries in different stages of healing or with a specific pattern indicative of abuse [22]. Victims of CA are scantly cooperative in the dental clinic [20], and are at an increased risk of suffering emotional and psychological disorders [33, 35] in both childhood and adult life. With this data, it is interesting to develop universal guidelines for dentists where they can systematically review the signs that can be found. Thus, the presence of caries, dental trauma, bitemarks, perioral and intraoral injuries as abrasions, lacerations and burns, infections (gonorrhea or syphilis) and diseases with an inconsistent history are indicators of child abuse or neglect.

Most of the reviewed studies coincide in the need for collaboration between physicians and dentists and underscore the important role of the professional in preserving the safety of the child. Improved preparation is required for the diagnosis of these signs, with greater training of dentists in forensic dentistry. The discrepant findings of the different studies reflect the lack of standardized and homogeneous protocols for the diagnosis of CA among dentists.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that dentists effectively suspect cases of CA in their clinical practice, but few report such cases. This important discrepancy between the number of suspected cases and the cases actually reported is due to the existence of a series of barriers that complicate the task of the dental professional - thus underscoring the need to improve training in this setting, since cases of CA may persist over time if adequate measures are not taken. The clinical signs of CA or neglect identified in the present study include burns, untreated caries, lacerations, biting, traumatisms, dental avulsions, bruises and psychological and behavioral disorders. Careful compilation of the case history is essential. Likewise, standardized guidelines and strategies are needed to help dentists detect cases of CA, as well as multidisciplinary work with other health professionals in both the public and the private settings. The definition of reporting protocols and improved training in CA are crucial for reducing morbiditymortality among these children.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Declared none.

REFERENCES

- Greenbaum J, Dubowitz H, Lutzker JR, Johnson KD, Orn K, Kenniston J. Practice guidelines: Challenges in the evaluation of child neglect. Elmhurst, IL: Am Prof Soc Abuse Child 2008.
- [2] Dubowitz H, Pitts SC, Litrownik AJ, Cox CE, Runyan D, Black MM. Defining child neglect based on child protective services data. Child Abuse Negl 2005; 29(5): 493-511.
 - [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2003.09.024] [PMID: 15970322]
- [3] Lau AS, Leeb RT, English D, et al. What's in a name? A comparison of methods for classifying predominant type of maltreatment. Child Abuse Negl 2005; 29(5): 533-51.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2003.05.005] [PMID: 15970324]
 [4] Higgins DJ, McCabe MP. Multi-type maltreatment and the long-term
- adjustment of adults. Child Abuse Rev 2000; 9: 6-18. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0852(200001/02)9:1<6::AID-C AR579>3.0.CO:2-W]
- [5] Kaur H, Chaudhary S, Choudhary N, Manuja N, Chaitra TR, Amit SA. Child abuse: Cross-sectional survey of general dentists. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res 2016; 6(2): 118-23.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jobcr.2015.08.002] [PMID: 27195209]
 [6] Garrocho-Rangel A, Márquez-Preciado R, Olguín-Vivar AI, Ruiz-
- [6] Gartocho-Kanger A, Marquez-ricetado K, Orguni-Vivar A, Ruiz-Rodríguez S, Pozos-Guillén A. Dentist attitudes and responsibilities concerning child sexual abuse. A review and a case report. J Clin Exp Dent 2015; 7(3): e428-34.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.4317/jced.52301] [PMID: 26330943]
 [7] Kellogg N. Oral and dental aspects of child abuse and neglect. Pediatrics 2005; 116(6): 1565-8.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/peds.2005-2315] [PMID: 16322187]
- [8] Harris JC, Elcock C, Sidebotham PD, Welbury RR. Safeguarding children in dentistry: 2. Do paediatric dentists neglect child dental neglect? Br Dent J 2009; 206(9): 465-70. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2009.356] [PMID: 19424243]
- [9] Harris JC, Elcock C, Sidebotham PD, Welbury RR. Safeguarding children in dentistry: 1. Child protection training, experience and practice of dental professionals with an interest in paediatric dentistry. Br Dent J 2009; 206(8): 409-14.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2009.307] [PMID: 19396200]
 Park CM, Welbury R. Current and historical involvement of dentistry in child protection and a glimpse of the future. Oral Dis 2016; 22(7):
- 605-8. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/odi.12485] [PMID: 27027280] [11] Hinchliffe J. Forensic odontology, part 5. Child abuse issues. Br Dent
- J 2011; 210(9): 423-8. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2011.332] [PMID: 21566612]
- [12] Murali P, Prabhakar M. Mantle of forensics in child sexual abuse. J Forensic Dent Sci 2018; 10(2): 71-4. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/jfo.jfds_17_18] [PMID: 30745780]
- [13] Al Hajeri H, Al Halabi M, Kowash M, Khamis AH, Welbury R, Hussein I. Assessment of the knowledge of United Arab Emirates dentists of Child Maltreatment, protection and safeguarding. Eur J Paediatr Dent 2018; 19(2): 105-18. [PMID: 29790774]
- [14] Al-Dabaan R, Newton JT, Asimakopoulou K. Knowledge, attitudes, and experience of dentists living in Saudi Arabia toward child abuse and neglect. Saudi Dent J 2014; 26(3): 79-87. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sdentj.2014.03.008] [PMID: 25057227]
- [15] Chadwick BL, Davies J, Bhatia SK, Rooney C, McCusker N. Child protection: Training and experiences of dental therapists. Br Dent J

2009; 207(3): E6.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2009.666] [PMID: 19629144]

[16] Duda JG, Biss SP, Bertoli FM, et al. Oral health status in victims of child abuse: A case-control study. Int J Paediatr Dent 2017; 27(3): 210-6.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ipd.12254] [PMID: 27434332]

- [17] Valencia-Rojas N, Lawrence HP, Goodman D. Prevalence of early childhood caries in a population of children with history of maltreatment. J Public Health Dent 2008; 68(2): 94-101.
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1 11 1/j.1752 -7 325.2 007. 000 77.x] [PMID: 18248339]
- [18] Greene PE, Chisick MC, Aaron GR. A comparison of oral health status and need for dental care between abused/neglected children and nonabused/non-neglected children. Pediatr Dent 1994; 16(1): 41-5. IPMID: 80159411
- [19] Kenney JP. Domestic violence: A complex health care issue for dentistry today. Forensic Sci Int 2006; 159(Suppl. 1): S121-5. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2006.02.025] [PMID: 16545531]
- [20] Montecchi PP, Di Trani M, Sarzi Amadè D, Bufacchi C, Montecchi F, Polimeni A. The dentist's role in recognizing childhood abuses: study on the dental health of children victims of abuse and witnesses to violence. Eur J Paediatr Dent 2009; 10(4): 185-7. [PMID: 20073544]
- [21] Hartung B, Schaper J, Fischer K, Ritz-Timme S. Care for children with dental neglect: Identification of problems and approaches to solving them. Int J Legal Med 2019; 133(2): 641-50. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00414-018-1938-x] [PMID: 30232545]
- [22] Jenkins GW, Bresnen D, Jenkins E, Muller N. Dental Abscess in Pediatric Patients: A Marker of Neglect. Pediatr Emerg Care 2018; 34(11): 774-7.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PEC.00000000001611] [PMID: 302118 38]

- [23] Kairys S. Oral and dental aspects of child abuse and neglect. Pediatrics 1999; 104(2 Pt 1): 348-50.
 [PMID: 10429025]
- [24] Sillevis Smitt H, de Leeuw J, de Vries T. Association Between Severe Dental Caries and Child Abuse and Neglect. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2017; 75(11): 2304-6.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joms.2017.05.004] [PMID: 28586637]

- [25] Lincoln HS, Lincoln MJ. Role of the odontologist in the investigation of domestic violence, neglect of the vulnerable, and institutional violence and torture. Forensic Sci Int 2010; 201(1-3): 68-73. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.03.027] [PMID: 20417041]
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1010/j.toischit.2010.05.027] [PMID: 2041/041]
 [26] Andronicus M, Oates RK, Peat J, Spalding S, Martin H. Non-accidental burns in children. Burns 1998; 24(6): 552-8.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0305-4179(98)00062-X] [PMID: 97760 94]
- [27] Maguire S, Moynihan S, Mann M, Potokar T, Kemp AM. A systematic review of the features that indicate intentional scalds in children. Burns 2008; 34(8): 1072-81. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2008.02.011] [PMID: 18538478]
- [28] Le BT, Dierks EJ, Ueeck BA, Homer LD, Potter BF. Maxillofacial
- injuries associated with domestic violence. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2001; 59(11): 1277-83. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/joms.2001.27490] [PMID: 11688025]
- [29] Garbin CA, Guimarães e Queiroz AP, Rovida TA, Garbin AJ. Occurrence of traumatic dental injury in cases of domestic violence. Braz Dent J 2012; 23(1): 72-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/ S0103-64 4020 12000100013] [PMID: 22460319]
- [30] Kui LL, Xiu HZ, Ning LY. Condyloma acuminatum and human papilloma virus infection in the oral mucosa of children. Pediatr Dent 2003; 25(2): 149-53. [PMID: 12723841]
- [31] da Fonseca MA, Feigal RJ, ten Bensel RW. Dental aspects of 1248 cases of child maltreatment on file at a major county hospital. Pediatr Dent 1992; 14(3): 152-7.
 [PMID: 1528783]
- [32] Sarkar R, Ozanne-Smith J, Bassed R. Systematic review of the patterns of orofacial injuries in physically abused children and adolescents. Trauma Violence Abuse 2019; 10: 1524838019827617. [Epub ahead of print]

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1524838019827617] [PMID: 30852989]

[33] González-Chica DA, Licinio J, Musker M, et al. Bullying and sexual abuse and their association with harmful behaviours, antidepressant use and health-related quality of life in adulthood: A population-based study in South Australia. BMC Public Health 2019; 19(1): 26. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-6367-8] [PMID: 30616538]

- [34] Warren AS, Goldsmith KA, Rimes KA. Childhood gender-typed behavior and emotional or peer problems: A prospective birth-cohort study. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 2019; 60(8): 888-96. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13051] [PMID: 30907437]
- [35] Jessee SA. Behavioral indicators of child maltreatment. ASDC J Dent Child 1999; 66(1): 17-22.
- [36] Chapman DP, Whitfield CL, Felitti VJ, Dube SR, Edwards VJ, Anda RF. Adverse childhood experiences and the risk of depressive disorders in adulthood. J Affect Disord 2004; 82(2): 217-25. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2003.12.013] [PMID: 15488250]
- [37] Dubowitz H, Bennett S. Physical abuse and neglect of children. Lancet 2007; 369(9576): 1891-9.
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60856-3] [PMID: 17544
- [38] Marco M, Gracia E, López-Quílez A, Freisthler B. Child maltreatment and alcohol outlets in Spain: Does the country drinking culture

matters? Child Abuse Negl 2019; 91: 23-30. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.02.010] [PMID: 30818249]

- [39] Atiqul Haque M, Janson S, Moniruzzaman S, et al. Children's exposure to physical abuse from a child perspective: A populationbased study in rural Bangladesh. PLoS One 2019; 14(2): e0212428. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212428] [PMID: 30779784]
- [40] Nwabuzor Ogbonnaya I, Keeney AJ, Villodas MT. The role of cooccurring intimate partner violence, alcohol use, drug use, and depressive symptoms on disciplinary practices of mothers involved with child welfare. Child Abuse Negl 2019; 90: 76-87. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.02.002] [PMID: 30769190]
- [41] John V, Messer LB, Arora R, *et al.* Child abuse and dentistry: A study of knowledge and attitudes among dentists in Victoria, Australia. Aust Dent J 1999; 44(4): 259-67.
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1834-7819.1999.tb00230.x] [PMID: 1068 7235]
- [42] Love C, Gerbert B, Caspers N, Bronstone A, Perry D, Bird W. Dentists' attitudes and behaviors regarding domestic violence. The need for an effective response. J Am Dent Assoc 2001; 132(1): 85-93. [http://dx.doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.2001.0032] [PMID: 111944 05]
- [43] Laud A, Gizani S, Maragkou S, Welbury R, Papagiannoulis L. Child protection training, experience, and personal views of dentists in the prefecture of Attica, Greece. Int J Paediatr Dent 2013; 23(1): 64-71. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-263X.2012.01225.x] [PMID: 2242 9739]
- [44] Thomas JE, Straffon L, Inglehart MR. Knowledge and professional experiences concerning child abuse: An analysis of provider and student responses. Pediatr Dent 2006; 28(5): 438-44. [PMID: 17036710]
- [45] Al-Habsi SA, Roberts GJ, Attari N, Parekh S. A survey of attitudes, knowledge and practice of dentists in London towards child protectionAre children receiving dental treatment at the Eastman Dental Hospital likely to be on the child protection register? Br Dent J 2009; 206(4): E7..
- [46] Tornavoi D, Galo R, Silva R. Conhecimento de profissionais de odontología sobre violencia doméstica. Rev Sul Bras Odontol 2011; 8: 54-9.
- [47] Azevedo MS, Goettems ML, Brito A, et al. Child maltreatment: a survey of dentists in southern Brazil. Braz Oral Res 2012; 26(1): 5-11.
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1806-83242012000100002] [PMID: 2234 4331]
- [48] Sonbol HN, Abu-Ghazaleh S, Rajab LD, Baqain ZH, Saman R, Al-Bitar ZB. Knowledge, educational experiences and attitudes towards child abuse amongst Jordanian dentists. Eur J Dent Educ 2012; 16(1): e158-65.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0579.2011.00691.x] [PMID: 22251 340]

[49] Manea S, Favero GA, Stellini E, Romoli L, Mazzucato M, Facchin P. Dentists' perceptions, attitudes, knowledge, and experience about child abuse and neglect in northeast Italy. J Clin Pediatr Dent 2007; 32(1): 19-25.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.17796/jcpd.32.1.f920721252jx3614] [PMID: 18 274465]

[50] Harris CM, Welbury R, Cairns AM. The Scottish dental practitioner's role in managing child abuse and neglect. Br Dent J 2013; 214(9): E24.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2013.435] [PMID: 23660928]

[51] Kilpatrick NM, Scott J, Robinson S. Child protection: A survey of experience and knowledge within the dental profession of New South

Wales, Australia. Int J Paediatr Dent 1999; 9(3): 153-9. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-263x.1999.00130.x] [PMID: 10815 5711

- [52] van Dam BA, van der Sanden WJ, Bruers JJ. Recognizing and reporting domestic violence: attitudes, experiences and behavior of Dutch dentists. BMC Oral Health 2015; 15: 159. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12903-015-0141-4] [PMID: 26667115]
- Cairns AM, Mok JYQ, Welbury RR. The dental practitioner and child [53] protection in Scotland. Br Dent J 2005; 199(8): 517-20.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.4812809] [PMID: 16244627] [54] Uldum B, Christensen HN, Welbury R, Poulsen S. Danish dentists' and dental hygienists' knowledge of and experience with suspicion of child abuse or neglect. Int J Paediatr Dent 2010; 20(5): 361-5. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-263X.2010.01070.x] [PMID: 2064 24641
- [55] Ramos-Gomez F, Rothman D, Blain S. Knowledge and attitudes among California dental care providers regarding child abuse and neglect. J Am Dent Assoc 1998; 129(3): 340-8.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.1998.0208] [PMID: 9529809] [56] Paglia L. Child abuse: Awareness is the first step to action. Eur J Paediatr Dent 2018; 19(2): 89.
- [PMID: 29790771] Ata-Ali J, Ata-Ali F. Forensic dentistry in human identification: A [57] review of the literature. J Clin Exp Dent 2014: 6(2): e162-7.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.4317/jced.51387] [PMID: 24790717] [58] Melo M, Ata-Ali J. Accuracy of the estimation of dental age in comparison with chronological age in a Spanish sample of 2641 living subjects using the Demirjian and Nolla methods. Forensic Sci Int 2017: 270: 276.e1-7.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.10.001] [PMID: 28029496] [59] Rodrigues JLSA, Lima APB, Nagata JY, et al. Domestic violence against children detected and managed in the routine of dentistry - A systematic review. J Forensic Leg Med 2016; 43: 34-41.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2016.07.006] [PMID: 27441984]

- [60] Crespo M, Andrade D, Alves AL, Magalhães T. O papel do médico dentista no diagnóstico e sinalização do abuso de crianças. Acta Med Port 2011; 24(Suppl. 4): 939-48. [PMID: 22863503]
- [61] Sfikas PM. Does the dentist have an ethical duty to report child abuse? J Am Dent Assoc 1996; 127(4): 521-3.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.1996.0249] [PMID: 8655876] [62] Mouden LD, Bross DC. Legal issues affecting dentistry's role in preventing child abuse and neglect. J Am Dent Assoc 1995; 126(8): 1173-80.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.1995.0339] [PMID: 7560576] Kvist T, Wickström A, Miglis I, Dahllöf G. The dilemma of reporting

[63] suspicions of child maltreatment in pediatric dentistry. Eur J Oral Sci 2014: 122(5): 332-8. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eos.12143] [PMID: 25039643]

- [64] Cukovic-Bagic I, Welbury RR, Flander GB, Hatibovic-Kofman S, Nuzzolese E. Child protection: Legal and ethical obligation regarding the report of child abuse in four different countries. J Forensic Odontostomatol 2013; 31(1): 15-21. [PMID: 24776437]
- Jackson A. Let the record speak: Medicolegal documentation in cases [65] of child maltreatment. Clin Pediatr Emerg Med 2006; 7: 181-5. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpem.2006.05.001]
- Mathur S, Chopra R. Combating child abuse: The role of a dentist. [66] Oral Health Prev Dent 2013; 11(3): 243-50.

[PMID: 23534033]

- American academy of pediatric dentistry council on clinical cffairs. [67] Guideline on oral and dental aspects of child abuse and neglect. Pediatr Dent 2005-2006; 27: 64-7.
- [68] Golden GS. Bite-Mark and Pattern Injury Analysis: A Brief Status Overview. J Calif Dent Assoc 2015; 43(6): 309-14. [PMID: 26126346]

© 2019 Melo et al.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC-BY 4.0), a copy of which is available at: (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode). This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.