

Journal of Global Oral Health



Research Article

The use of pediatric behavior management techniques among Syrian dentists - A cross-sectional study

Ekram Alsibai¹, Mawia Karkoutly¹, Elian Gattas Abu Samra², MHD Bashier Almonakel¹, Nada Bshara¹

Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Damascus University, Department of Fixed Prosthodontics, Qasyoun Private University, Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic.



*Corresponding author: Mawia Karkoutly, Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, Damascus University, Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic.

mawiamaherkarkoutly@ hotmail.com

Received: 23 February 2023 Accepted: 12 July 2023 EPub Ahead of Print: 29 November 2023 Published: 27 December 2023

DOI 10.25259/JGOH_11_2023

Quick Response Code:



ABSTRACT

Objectives: The aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the attitude toward several behavior management techniques among Syrian pediatric dentists (PDs), general dental practitioners (GDPs), and other dental specialists (ODSs). Dental fear and anxiety are highly prevalent among schoolchildren and pre-school children. Behavior management techniques can be either pharmacological or non-pharmacological. Distraction is a non-pharmacological behavior management technique, which is safe, economical, and effective. Materials and Methods: A self-designed questionnaire was distributed through social networks. Syrian GDPs, PDs, and ODSs participated in the online questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of four sections and required responses regarding participants' demographic characteristics, work setting, the use of several behavior management techniques, and attitude toward tablet distraction use. Pearson's Chi-square test was performed at 5% for statistical analysis using SPSS version 23.0. Result: A total of 642 participants responded. Most of the participants reported using tell-show-do (63.08%) and positive reinforcement (65.58%) techniques. Less than half of the participants (45.79%) used virtual reality (VR) eyeglasses for distraction. PDs used cartoons and storytelling techniques significantly more than GDPs and ODSs, with P = 0.023 and P < 0.001, respectively. However, most of the participants never used touch screen video games (74.45%) or joystick video games (92.21%) for distraction. Half of the questionnaire participants (52.34%) were unsure about using a tablet device for distraction. Conclusion: This study concluded that tell-show-do, positive reinforcement techniques, and VR eyeglasses were used the most. However, the vast majority of the participants never used video games for distraction. A good proportion of the study participants were hesitant about using a tablet device as a means of distraction.

Keywords: Dental anxiety, Dental fear, Distraction, Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION

Dental anxiety is an unpleasant emotional state before dental treatment, while dental fear is an emotional response to certain stimuli during dental procedures. Dentists must be aware that managing pain is different from managing fear and anxiety.[1] Dental fear and anxiety (DFA) are highly prevalent among schoolchildren and pre-school children globally.^[2] In addition, DFA can cause oral health deterioration due to dental treatment postponement or avoidance. [3] Moreover, DFA is affected by decayed, missing, and filled permanent teeth (DMFT) scores and self-perceived oral health. [4] However, dental anxiety was not related to personality traits. [5] Reducing fear and anxiety are the cornerstone of successful pediatric practice. Distraction is a non-pharmacological behavior

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, transform, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms. ©2023 Published by Scientific Scholar on behalf of Journal of Global Oral Health

management technique for diverting a child's attention away from unpleasant dental stimuli. [6] According to McCaul and Malott, [7] the human capacity to pay attention is limited and one should focus on the painful stimuli to perceive pain. Distractors can be either active or passive according to the sensory modalities involved (visual, aural, or kinesthetic).[8,9] Passive distraction demands the child to remain calm while the dental assistant is actively distracting him, for example, by watching cartoons or listening to stories. Active distraction requires more of a child's engagement in certain activities during dental treatment, such as singing songs or playing video games.^[10] Distraction appears to be an economical, safe, and effective strategy.[11] An early attempt at distraction was using a ceiling or a wall-mounted television screen.^[12] Recently, however, many pediatric hospitals have utilized tablets as a distraction tool for anxiety management instead of pharmacological sedation or physical restraint, [13] which is more preferred in children. [14]

Pharmacological behavior management techniques involve the use of various medications to manage anxiety, pain, and discomfort during dental procedures. Sedation is the use of medication to help patients relax and manage anxiety. Sedation can be administered in various ways. Nitrous oxide, is a mild sedative that is commonly used to alleviate anxiety. General anesthesia is used rarely in dentistry and is typically reserved for patients who need extensive dental work or who have severe anxiety or medical issues. It involves the administration of medication that puts the patient to sleep during the procedure. [6] Pharmacological techniques are used by 93% of the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry (AAPD) members.^[15] However, parental acceptance of pharmacological behavior management techniques was not as high as nonpharmacological techniques. [16] There is a dearth of data in the literature regarding Syrian dentists' views on different behavior management techniques in pediatric dental practice. Hence, the aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the attitude toward several behavior guidance techniques among Syrian pediatric dentists (PDs), general dental practitioners (GDPs), and other dental specialists (ODSs).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethical approval was provided by the institutional review board of Damascus University (N 529/2022) on October 24, 2022. Participants were Syrian PDs, GDPs, and ODSs and the participation was optional and anonymous. An online Arabic self-designed questionnaire was created using Google Forms software survey in November 2022. It was designed based on similar validated questionnaires.[17,18] The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section included data regarding the demographic characteristics of participants including sex, age, years of experience, type of practice, and working hours per day. The second section covered participants' work settings. The third section addressed participants' use of several behavior management techniques. The last section addressed participants' attitude toward tablet distraction use.

The inclusion criteria for the responses were (1) respondents who were members of the Damascus dental syndicate and (2) respondents who were GDPs, PDs, or ODSs. The exclusion criteria were questionnaires with missing answers. Descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) were performed using MS Excel (Microsoft Excel, Microsoft Crop, WA, USA). For comparison of results between study groups, Pearson's Chi-square test was performed. The significant level for alpha was set at 0.05 (P < 0.05). Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS software v.23 (IBM Corp., Armonk, USA).

RESULTS

A total of 642 participants completed the online questionnaire, and the overall response rate was 23.91% (642/2684). Table 1 shows participants' experience and practice. More than half of the participants (52.80%) were male (GDPs: 64.16%, PDs: 33.71%, and ODSs: 40.41%). Most of the participants (64.49%) had fewer than 5 years of experience (GDPs: 73.89%, PDs: 59.55%, and ODSs: 49.22%). About half of the participants (55.14%) worked in a private clinic (GDPs: 58.33%, PDs: 43.82%, and ODSs: 49.22%). Approximately half of the participants (51.25%) worked more than 5 h/day (GDPs: 49.44%, PDs: 44.94%, and ODSs: 57.51%).

As shown in Table 2, there were statistically significant differences in the participants' responses regarding the work setting (P < 0.001). About half of GDPs (55.56%) and ODSs (63.73%) sometimes provided dental care for children. More than half of PDs (65.17%) and ODSs (56.48%) would ask a dental assistant for help, while less than a half of GDPs (44.44%) would do. Almost two-thirds of PDs (60.67%) had a dental chair-mounted tablet, while more than half of GDPs (67.22%) and ODSs (55.44%) had not. Most of the participants reported using tell-show-do (GDPs: 58.06%, PDs: 87.64%, and ODSs: 61.14%) and positive reinforcement (GDPs: 61.39%, PDs: 88.76%, and ODSs: 62.69%) techniques, with a significant difference to GDPs (P < 0.001). Distraction techniques were divided into five basic categories: storytelling, virtual reality (VR) eyeglasses, watching cartoons, touch screen video games, and joystick video games. The use of different distraction techniques differed among participants with VR eyeglasses being the most distraction technique used (GDPs: 43.89%, PDs: 59.55%, and ODSs: 43.01%), with a significant difference to ODSs (P = 0.023). About a third of GDPs (36.39%) and ODSs (27.98%) used the storytelling technique, while half of PDs (51.69%) did, with a significant difference to ODSs (P = 0.002). More than half of PDs (59.55%) used cartoons as a distraction technique. However, almost two-thirds of GDPs (61.11%) and ODSs (70.47%) did not, with a significant difference to ODSs (P < 0.001). Interestingly, most of the participants never used

Characteristics	Total <i>n</i> (%)	GDPs n (%)	PDs n (%)	ODSs n (%
Sex	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)
Male	339 (52.80)	231 (64.16)	30 (33.71)	78 (40.41)
Female	303 (47.20)	129 (35.84)	59 (66.29)	115 (59.59
Age	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)
<25	377 (58.72)	240 (66.67)	47 (52.81)	90 (46.63
25-30	123 (19.16)	50 (13.89)	20 (22.47)	53 (27.46
>30	142 (22.12)	70 (19.44)	22 (24.72)	50 (25.91
Years of experience	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100
<5	414 (64.49)	266 (73.89)	53 (59.55)	95 (49.22
5-10	100 (15.58)	34 (9.44)	17 (19.10)	49 (25.39
>10	128 (19.94)	60 (16.67)	19 (21.35)	49 (25.39
Type of practice	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100
Private clinic	354 (55.14)	210 (58.33)	39 (43.82)	105 (54.40
Non-government organization	160 (24.92)	68 (18.89)	34 (38.20)	58 (30.05
Government organization	128 (19.94)	82 (22.78)	16 (17.98)	30 (15.54
Working hours per day	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100
<5	169 (26.32)	87 (24.17)	35 (39.33)	47 (24.35
5	144 (22.43)	95 (26.39)	14 (15.73)	35 (18.13
>5	329 (51.25)	178 (49.44)	40 (44.94)	111 (57.5

otal n (%) 642 (100) 73 (42.52)	GDPs n (%) 360 (100)	PDs n (%) 89 (100)	ODSs n (%)	P-value
` /	` /	89 (100)	103 (100)	
25 (50.62) 44 (6.85) 642 (100) 27 (50.93) 87 (29.13) 28 (19.94) 642 (100)	142 (39.44) 200 (55.56) 18 (5.00) 360 (100) 160 (44.44) 110 (30.56) 90 (25.00) 360 (100) 118 (32.78)	86 (96.63) 2 (2.25) 1 (1.12) 89 (100) 58 (65.17) 23 (25.84) 8 (8.99) 89 (100) 54 (60.67)	193 (100) 45 (23.32) 123 (63.73) 25 (12.95) 193 (100) 109 (56.48) 54 (27.98) 30 (15.54) 193 (100) 86 (44.56)	<0.001* <0.001* <0.001*
	25 (50.62) 44 (6.85) 642 (100) 27 (50.93) 87 (29.13) 28 (19.94) 642 (100) 58 (40.19) 84 (59.81)	44 (6.85) 18 (5.00) 642 (100) 360 (100) 27 (50.93) 160 (44.44) 87 (29.13) 110 (30.56) 28 (19.94) 90 (25.00) 642 (100) 360 (100) 58 (40.19) 118 (32.78)	44 (6.85) 18 (5.00) 1 (1.12) 642 (100) 360 (100) 89 (100) 27 (50.93) 160 (44.44) 58 (65.17) 87 (29.13) 110 (30.56) 23 (25.84) 28 (19.94) 90 (25.00) 8 (8.99) 642 (100) 360 (100) 89 (100) 58 (40.19) 118 (32.78) 54 (60.67)	44 (6.85) 18 (5.00) 1 (1.12) 25 (12.95) 542 (100) 360 (100) 89 (100) 193 (100) 27 (50.93) 160 (44.44) 58 (65.17) 109 (56.48) 87 (29.13) 110 (30.56) 23 (25.84) 54 (27.98) 28 (19.94) 90 (25.00) 8 (8.99) 30 (15.54) 542 (100) 360 (100) 89 (100) 193 (100) 58 (40.19) 118 (32.78) 54 (60.67) 86 (44.56)

GDPs: General dental practitioners, PDs: Pediatric dentists, ODSs: Other dental specialists. *P<0.05: Significant difference based on Pearson's Chi-square test, n: Sample size

touchscreen video games (GDPs: 76.11%, PDs: 59.55%, and ODSs: 78.24%), and joystick video games (GDPs: 92.50%, PDs: 89.89%, and ODSs: 92.75%) as distraction techniques [Table 3].

Attitude toward tablet distraction use is presented in Table 4. Regarding the participants' views on using an electronic tablet to manage dental anxiety, about a third of the participants disagreed (GDPs: 30.56%, PDs: 25.84%, and ODSs: 31.09%). However, almost half of them were unsure (GDPs: 52.78%, PDs: 48.31%, and ODSs: 53.37%). About half of PDs (42.70%) thought that using a tablet would improve child patients' experience. However, more than half of GDPs (54.17%) and ODSs (56.99%) thought that they would not, with a significant difference to GDPs (P < 0.001).

Approximately a quarter of PDs (23.60%) considered that using a tablet had made their work less stressful, while most of the participants reported that they had not tried it (GDPs: 67.50%, PDs: 58.43%, and ODSs: 72.54%).

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the attitude toward several basic behavior management techniques among Syrian GDPs, PDs, and ODSs. An online questionnaire was used due to its affordability, accuracy, and accessibility to both researchers and participants. The results of this questionnaire showed that tell-show-do and

positive reinforcement techniques were used by most of the participants. This result is not surprising as those techniques are simple, economical, and can be used with the majority of pediatric patients who are able to communicate.^[15] This current finding is consistent with a previous result reported in several questionnaires.[17,19,20] Distraction is a nonpharmacological basic behavior management technique that is safe, effective, and economical. In addition, it is used by 96% of AAPD members.^[15] VR eyeglasses were used by most of the study participants. A similar result was reported in Nigeria.[18] A possible explanation of this finding is that VR eyeglasses could achieve superior distraction due to their interactive, immersive, and multisensory nature.[21] Moreover, VR eyeglasses block the visual field of a child to mask some irritating stimuli as well.[22] In addition, Nordgård and Låg[23] reported that VR eyeglasses positively affected procedural pain and anxiety in pediatrics. Furthermore, VR eveglasses could effectively decrease anxiety before the dental appointment.^[24] More than half of PDs preferred cartoons as a distraction technique using a tablet, this result is not surprising as most of PDs had a dental chair-mounted tablet. Al-Halabi et al., [25] found that watching cartoons on a tablet device was more effective in relieving DFA compared to AV eyeglasses. This could be because AV eyeglasses were difficult to wear and blocked the dentist's vision while performing the dental treatment. Storytelling as a distraction technique was more preferred by PDs over GDPs and ODSs. This could be due to the PDs' higher exposure to children. Even though audio distraction was less effective compared to audiovisual distraction, [26,27] storytelling was the most effective audio distraction technique.^[28] However, children can be just captivated at the beginning of the story, which makes it effective only at the start of the dental procedure. [29] It should be noted that, there were significant differences in ODSs in the usage of the three previous distraction techniques, as a result of ODSs being more occupied with their field of specialty and less exposed to children. Although active distraction surpasses passive distraction in terms of controlling fear and anxiety,[14,30-32] the overwhelming majority of the participants never used video games. However, due to the fact that passive distraction techniques are more time-saving, more costeffective for dentists, and less demanding for children. [33]

Question	Total n (%)	GDPs n (%)	PDs n (%)	ODSs n (%)	P-value
1. Tell-show-do	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	<0.001*
Always	405 (63.08)	209 (58.06)	78 (87.64)	118 (61.14)	
Sometimes	135 (21.03)	86 (23.89)	11 (12.36)	38 (19.69)	
Never	102 (15.89)	65 (18.06)	0 (0.00)	37 (19.17)	
2. Positive reinforcement	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	< 0.001
Always	421 (65.58)	221 (61.39)	79 (88.76)	121 (62.69)	
Sometimes	129 (20.09)	82 (22.78)	9 (10.11)	38 (19.69)	
Never	92 (14.33)	57 (15.83)	1 (1.12)	34 (17.62)	
3. Storytelling	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.002*
Always	231 (35.98)	131 (36.39)	46 (51.69)	54 (27.98)	
Sometimes	236 (36.76)	128 (35.56)	29 (32.58)	79 (40.93)	
Never	175 (27.26)	101 (28.06)	14 (15.73)	60 (31.09)	
4. Virtual reality eyeglasses	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.023*
Always	294 (45.79)	158 (43.89)	53 (59.55)	83 (43.01)	
Sometimes	215 (33.49)	120 (33.33)	28 (31.46)	67 (34.72)	
Never	133 (20.72)	82 (22.78)	8 (8.99)	43 (22.28)	
5. Watching cartoons using a tablet	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	< 0.001
Always	200 (31.15)	106 (29.44)	53 (59.55)	41 (21.24)	
Sometimes	63 (9.81)	34 (9.44)	13 (14.61)	16 (8.29)	
Never	379 (59.03)	220 (61.11)	23 (25.84)	136 (70.47)	
6. Touchscreen video games using a tablet	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.004*
Always	113 (17.60)	58 (16.11)	22 (24.72)	33 (17.10)	
Sometimes	51 (7.94)	28 (7.78)	14 (15.73)	9 (4.66)	
Never	478 (74.45)	274 (76.11)	53 (59.55)	151 (78.24)	
7. Joystick video games using a tablet	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.875
Always	29 (4.52)	15 (4.17)	6 (6.74)	8 (4.15)	
Sometimes	21 (3.27)	12 (3.33)	3 (3.37)	6 (3.11)	
Never	592 (92.21)	333 (92.50)	80 (89.89)	179 (92.75)	

GDPs: General dental practitioners, PDs: Pediatric dentists, ODSs: Other dental specialists. *P<0.05: Significant difference based on Pearson's Chi-Square test, n: Sample size

Table 4. I articipants attitude toward tablet distraction use.					
Question	Total <i>n</i> (%)	GDPs n (%)	PDs n (%)	ODSs n (%)	P-value
1. Do you agree with using a tablet as a	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.284
distraction tool to manage dental anxiety?					
Agree	113 (17.60)	60 (16.67)	23 (25.84)	30 (15.54)	
Disagree	193 (30.06)	110 (30.56)	23 (25.84)	60 (31.09)	
Unsure	336 (52.34)	190 (52.78)	43 (48.31)	103 (53.37)	
2. Do you think that using a tablet will	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	<0.001*
improve a child's patient experience?					
Yes	150 (23.36)	72 (20.00)	38 (42.70)	40 (20.73)	
No	321 (50.00)	195 (54.17)	16 (17.98)	110 (56.99)	
Maybe	171 (26.64)	93 (25.83)	35 (39.33)	43 (22.28)	
3. Do you feel that using a tablet made your	642 (100)	360 (100)	89 (100)	193 (100)	0.180
work less stressful?					
Yes	112 (17.45)	65 (18.06)	21 (23.60)	26 (13.47)	
No	95 (14.80)	52 (14.44)	16 (17.98)	27 (13.99)	
Did not try	435 (67.76)	243 (67.50)	52 (58.43)	140 (72.54)	

GDPs: General dental practitioners, PDs Pediatric dentists, ODSs: Other dental specialists. * P<0.05: Significant difference based on Pearson's Chi-square test, n: Sample size

Surprisingly, most of the participants were hesitant about using a tablet device as a means of distraction. A possible explanation for this result is that most of the study participants had fewer than 5 years of practice and needed further training concerning different distraction tools. However, tablet devices have proven to be practical, userfriendly, and effective for pediatric behavior management.[34] A good proportion of PDs believed that using a tablet would improve a child's patient experience compared to GDPs and ODSs, which could be due to PDs' higher exposure to children and mastering several distraction techniques. This study had some limitations. First, it was a self-administered questionnaire which led to a low response rate and sampling bias. Second, most of the questionnaire participants had fewer than 5 years of practice. Therefore, the findings of this study should be generalized with caution.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the present questionnaire highlighted the use of a variety of basic behavior management techniques among Syrian GDPs, PDs, and ODSs. Tell-show-do, positive reinforcement techniques, and VR eyeglasses were used by most of the study participants. Storytelling and cartoon display were preferred by PDs. However, most of the participants never used video games for distraction. Most of the questionnaire participants were hesitant about using a tablet device as a means of distraction.

Declaration of patient consent

Patient's consent is not required as there are no patients in this study.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Armfield JM, Heaton LJ. Management of fear and anxiety in the dental clinic: A review. Aust Dent J 2013;58:390-407
- Grisolia BM, Dos Santos AP, Dhyppolito IM, Buchanan H, Hill K, Oliveira BH. Prevalence of dental anxiety in children and adolescents globally: A systematic review with metaanalyses. Int J Paediatr Dent 2021;31:168-83.
- Beaudette JR, Fritz PC, Sullivan PJ, Ward WE. Oral health, nutritional choices, and dental fear and anxiety. Dent J (Basel) 2017;5:8.
- 4. Fernandes EC, Tôrres AC, de Oliveira da Nóbrega FJ, Santos PB. Predictors of dental anxiety in children: Self-perception and parental factors. Cumhuriyet Dent J 2020;23:291-9.
- Saheer PA, Marriette TM, Alappat AT, Majid SA, Hafiz H, Jamal F, et al. Association of dental anxiety with personality traits among Al Azhar arts students in Thodupuzha, Kerala. J Global Oral Health 2018;1:25-30.
- Affairs Clinical Committee-Behavior Management Subcommittee, American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Guideline on behavior guidance for the pediatric dental patient. Pediatr Dent 2015;37:57-70.
- McCaul KD, Malott JM. Distraction and coping with pain. Psychol Bull 1984;95:516-33.
- Birnie KA, Noel M, Parker JA, Chambers CT, Uman LS, Kisely SR, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of distraction and hypnosis for needle-related pain and distress in children and adolescents. J Pediatr Psychol 2014;39:

- 783-808.
- Wismeijer AA, Vingerhoets AJ. The use of virtual reality and audiovisual eyeglass systems as adjunct analgesic techniques: A review of the literature. Ann Behav Med 2005;30:268-78.
- 10. Weiss KE, Dahlquist LM, Wohlheiter K. The effects of interactive and passive distraction on cold pressor pain in preschool-aged children. J Pediatr Psychol 2011;36:816-26.
- 11. Singh H, Rehman R, Kadtane S, Dalai DR, Jain CD. Techniques for the behaviors management in pediatric dentistry. Int J Sci Study 2014;2:270.
- 12. Baghdadi ZD. Evaluation of audio analgesia for restorative care in children treated using electronic dental anesthesia. J Clin Pediatr Dent 2000;25:9-12.
- 13. McQueen A, Cress C, Tothy A. Using a tablet computer during pediatric procedures: A case series and review of the "apps". Pediatr Emerg Care 2012;28:712-4.
- 14. Attar RH, Baghdadi ZD. Comparative efficacy of active and passive distraction during restorative treatment in children using an iPad versus audiovisual eyeglasses: A randomised controlled trial. Eur Arch Paediatr Dent 2015;16:1-8.
- 15. American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry. Behavior guidance for the pediatric dental patient. In: The Reference Manual of Pediatric Dentistry. Chicago, Illinois: American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry; 2022. p. 321-39.
- 16. Acharya S. Parental acceptance of various behaviour management techniques used in pediatric dentistry: A pilot study in Odisha, India. Pesqui Bras Odontopediatria Clin Integr 2017;17:e3758.
- 17. Nazzal H, El Shahawy OI, Al-Jundi S, Hussein I, Tahmassebi JF. The use of behaviour management techniques amongst paediatric dentists working in the Arabian region: A cross-sectional survey study. Eur Arch Paediatr Dent 2021;22:375-85.
- 18. Orhue OK, Omorogbe OS, Osayande E. Awareness and disposition towards the clinical use of distraction virtual reality among selected dental healthcare workers in Benin City, Nigeria. Niger J Dent Sci 2020;3:50-6.
- 19. Adair SM, Waller JL, Schafer TE, Rockman RA. A survey of members of the American academy of pediatric dentistry on their use of behavior management techniques. Pediatr Dent 2004;26:159-66.
- 20. Felebman O, Baamer R, Bukhari Z, Baghlaf K, Aldajani M, Sijini O. Variation in the use of basic behavioral management techniques in general and pediatric dental practice: A crosssectional study. J Adv Oral Res 2022;13:225-33.
- 21. Slifer KJ. A Clinician's Guide to Helping Children Cope and Cooperate with Medical Care: An Applied Behavioral Approach. United States: JHU Press; 2013.
- 22. Koticha P, Katge F, Shetty S, Patil DP. Effectiveness of virtual reality eyeglasses as a distraction aid to reduce anxiety among 6-10-year-old children undergoing dental extraction procedure. Int J Clin Pediatr Dent 2019;12:297-302.
- 23. Nordgård R, Låg T. The effects of virtual reality on procedural

- pain and anxiety in pediatrics: A systematic review and metaanalysis. Front Virtual Real 2021;2:297.
- 24. Al-Nerabieah Z, Alhalabi MN, Owayda A, Alsabek L, Bshara N, Kouchaji C. Effectiveness of using virtual reality eyeglasses in the waiting room on preoperative anxiety: A randomized controlled trial. Perioper Care Oper Room Manag 2020;21:100129.
- 25. Al-Halabi MN, Bshara N, AlNerabieah Z. Effectiveness of audio visual distraction using virtual reality eyeglasses versus tablet device in child behavioral management during inferior alveolar nerve block. Anaesth Pain Intensive Care 2018;22:55-61.
- 26. Kaur R, Jindal R, Dua R, Mahajan S, Sethi K, Garg S. Comparative evaluation of the effectiveness of audio and audiovisual distraction aids in the management of anxious pediatric dental patients. J Indian Soc Pedod Prev Dent 2015;33:192-203.
- 27. Prabhakar AR, Marwah N, Raju OS. A comparison between audio and audiovisual distraction techniques in managing anxious pediatric dental patients. J Indian Soc Pedod Prev Dent 2007;25:177-82.
- 28. Navit S, Johri N, Khan SA, Singh RK, Chadha D, Navit P, et al. Effectiveness and comparison of various audio distraction aids in management of anxious dental paediatric patients. J Clin Diagn Res 2015;9:C05-9.
- 29. Muñoz N, Álvarez IM, Cárdenas JM. Efficacy of the contingent distraction technique with auditory material on the behavior of patients between 4 and 6 years of age. CES Odontol 1998;11:13-20.
- 30. Peretz B, Gluck GM. Assessing an active distracting technique for local anesthetic injection in pediatric dental patients: Repeated deep breathing and blowing out air. J Clin Pediatr Dent 1999;24:5-8.
- 31. Dahlquist LM, McKenna KD, Jones KK, Dillinger L, Weiss KE, Ackerman CS. Active and passive distraction using a head-mounted display helmet: Effects on cold pressor pain in children. Health Psychol 2007;26:794-801.
- 32. MacLaren JE, Cohen LL. A comparison of distraction strategies for venipuncture distress in children. J Pediatr Psychol 2005;30:387-96.
- 33. Alsibai E, Bshara N, Alzoubi H, Alsabek L. Assessing an active distracting technique during primary mandibular molar pulpotomy (randomized controlled trial). Clin Exp Dent Res 2023;9:283-9.
- 34. Kumprasert P, Prapansilp W, Rirattanapong P. Video games, audiovisual, and conventional distractions for pediatric dental patients: A crossover randomized controlled clinical trial. Mahidol Dent J 2021;41:225-34.

How to cite this article: Alsibai E, Karkoutly M, Abu Samra EG, Almonakel MH, Bshara N. The use of pediatric behavior management techniques among Syrian dentists - A cross-sectional study. J Global Oral Health 2023;6:91-6.