

Correspondence

Certification of maxillofacial disability and impairment

Dental professionals are included in the medical board of health institutions in India to give expert opinion on evaluation and procedure for certification of maxillofacial disability and impairment. The Extraordinary Gazette of India had issued guidelines for the purpose of assessing the extent of specified disability in a person under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (49 of 2016) as annexure II on 5 January 2018, but had omitted maxillofacial disability and impairment in the reported guidelines.¹ We attempt to detail maxillofacial disability and impairment that should be added in the revised guidelines of Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (49 of 2016). The maxillofacial disability and impairment may be measured in terms of loss of motion, loss of muscle strength and loss of coordination.²

The McBride method introduced by the American orthopedic surgeon McBride in 1936 is still used for evaluation and certification of maxillofacial disability and impairment in India.³ Evaluation of facial impairment and tooth loss is graduated as per the McBride method (Table I).³ Tooth loss is graduated for natural as well as artificial teeth and the maximum percentage admissible under the McBride method is 15%.

Conflict of interest. None declared

REFERENCES

- 1 The Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii) Section 56 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (49 of 2016). Available at

TABLE I. McBride method for certification of maxillofacial disability and impairment³

Maxillofacial disability and impairment	Impairment whole percentage
<i>Evaluation criteria for impairment of face</i>	
I. Fracture of the jaws including disfigurement	
A. Maxilla united with malocclusion	8
B. Mandibular: malocclusion	8
C. Condylod process: painful occlusion	8
II. Ankylosis temporomandibular joint (motion limited 1/4 to 1/2 inch)	10
III. Loss of all teeth replaceable with prosthesis	15
IV. Loss of tongue: one-third	5
V. Loss of ear auricle	5
VI. Nose injury interfering with breathing	7
<i>Evaluation criteria of tooth loss</i>	
I. Tooth loss	
A. Anterior teeth (incisor)	0.3
B. Canine	0.45
C. Premolar	0.45
D. Molar	0.9
II. Implant crown	
A. Anterior teeth (incisor)	0.06
B. Canine	0.09
C. Premolar	0.09
D. Molar	0.18
III. Denture	
A. Pontic site	0.06–0.18
B. Removable denture site	0.09–0.27
C. Full denture	0.15–0.45
IV. Complete tooth loss	15

www.swavlambancard.gov.in/public/files/ProceduresGuidelines.pdf (accessed on 8 Jul 2022).

- 2 Shah N, Palan S, Mahajan A, Shah P, Shah R, Kumar P. Why and how maxillofacial disability and impairment due to trauma should be quantified for compensation: A need for nationwide guidelines. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg* 2014;**13**:425–30.
- 3 Ahn YW, Jang SM, Jeong SH, Jeon HM, Kim KH, Ok SM. A study on disability and impairment of dental disorders in Korea. *J Oral Med Pain* 2018;**43**:70–6.

Thorakkal Shamim
Dentistry
Government General Hospital
Manjeri, Kacheripadi
Kerala
India
shamu3duad@gmail.com

[To cite: Shamim T. Certification of maxillofacial disability and impairment [Correspondence]. *Natl Med J India* 2023;**36**:67. DOI: 10.25259/NMJI_600_22]

Narrative approaches to reviews

Garg *et al.* have used a narrative review to summarize the effect of non-operative therapies in the management of low back pain.¹ The results of the review have to be approached with caution for the following reasons. Narrative reviews or literature reviews are criticized for being neither systematic nor transparent in their approach to the synthesis of the literature.² Although the authors claim to have conducted a literature review, the search terms, databases and duration of the literature research have not been reported. The review must make sure that all or the majority of the pertinent research on the subject has been identified and included after clearly outlining its objectives. Along with parameters linked to variability, such as critical analysis of the articles included in the initial reviews, the quality and consistency of the evidence must be addressed.³

The next major drawback is that the authors have not defined the clinical question for which the review was done, which is a prerequisite for Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE).⁴ The outcomes and comparator agents have not been specifically reported for many of the reviewed interventions. It is also not clear how the authors graded the quality of evidence using GRADE as the effect size for each outcome in absolute terms was not provided.⁵ Though this may be partially explained in terms of diverse characteristics of the studies considered, the authors could have considered alternative synthesis of results such as summary statistics of intervention effect estimates, vote counting based on direction of effect, and combining p values, and could have presented the results as a synthesis without meta-analysis.⁶

The results of some of the studied interventions have not been stated clearly. For example, the section on education does not specifically mention the outcomes and the comparator agent that were considered to determine if patient education was successful. Further, certain recommendations are based on old references (e.g. section on exercises). A recent meta-analysis has concluded that pilates, McKenzie therapy and functional restoration were more effective than other types of exercise treatment for reducing pain intensity and functional limitations.⁷ The results of a network meta-analysis had concluded that the pilates, resistance and stabilization/motor control, and resistance

and aerobic exercises are effective against true control only for pain, physical function and mental health, respectively.⁸ It may therefore be ensured that reviews adhere to preferred reporting items that help in the decision-making process.

Conflicts of interest. None declared

REFERENCES

- Garg B, George J, Mehta N. Non-operative treatment in low back pain: A review of current evidence and treatment recommendations. *Natl Med J India* 2022;**35**:19–27.
- Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Britten N, et al. *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews: Final report*. Swindon:ESRC Methods Programme; 2006.
- Saunders M, Rojon C. On the attributes of a critical literature review. *Coaching* 2011;**4**:156–62.
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;**64**:395–400.
- Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;**64**:383–94.
- McKenzie J, Brennan S. Synthesizing and presenting findings using other methods. In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al. (eds). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ:John Wiley & Sons; 2019:321–48.
- Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Stewart SA, Bagg MK, Stanojevic S, et al. Some types of exercise are more effective than others in people with chronic low back pain: A network meta-analysis. *J Physiother* 2021;**67**:252–62.
- Owen PJ, Miller CT, Mundell NL, Verswijveren SJJM, Tagliaferri SD, Brisby H, et al. Which specific modes of exercise training are most effective for treating low back pain? Network meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;**54**:1279–87.

G. Shankar Ganesh
Department of Physiotherapy
Composite Regional Centre for Skill Development,
Rehabilitation, and Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities
Mohaan Road
Lucknow
Uttar Pradesh
India
shankarpt@rediffmail.com

[To cite: Shankar Ganesh G. Narrative approaches to reviews [Correspondence]. *Natl Med J India* 2023;**36**:67–8. DOI: 10.25259/NMJI_735_22]

Reply to letter: Narrative approaches to reviews

We thank the authors for their interest in our recently published review article on non-operative therapies in low back pain.¹ As they have rightly pointed out, our study was a narrative review and is subject to limitations of the same. We agree that some of the literature may not have been covered in our review. Also, since our review was not a systematic one, many components of a systematic review such as a systematic search of the available databases, analysis of risks of bias of individual studies, assessment of heterogeneity among studies, etc.

were not addressed. However, as mentioned in our review, whenever possible we used data from high-quality systematic reviews. Our review was primarily aimed to summarize the evidence provided in various systematic reviews each of which had adhered to all the guidelines of systemic reviews. The author also mentions about the lack of definition for using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), as well as lack of definition for various outcome measures, comparator agents, and effect sizes. Defining outcome measures, interventions, effect sizes, etc. are relevant while conducting a review of individual trials. However, we had reported the findings as well as GRADE recommendations provided by multiple reviews. For example, for understanding the effect of education on low back pain we used the findings from Engers et al.² and Wood and Hendrick.³ Both these studies were high-quality reviews (not individual trials), which had summarized the findings of multiple studies, and our findings and recommendations were based on these studies. The aim of our review was not to summarize the evidence of different trials, rather summarize the findings of other systematic reviews. Therefore, synthesizing information from individual trials was not necessary when the included reviews have already evaluated in detail the individual topics/interventions. Finally, the authors point out that some of our references were old. We had tried to include the latest references at the time of preparation of the manuscript, and we agree that some studies may have been published after the preparation of the review. The study on pilates was a comprehensive Cochrane review by Yamato et al.,⁴ published in 2015, which is still the latest evidence available on Cochrane on pilates for back pain. However, we do recognize that new studies have been published regarding the topic and are likely to be published in the future. Therefore, periodic future reviews are required to include the updated evidence. Despite multiple limitations of our review, we do believe that our narrative review provides readers a summary of the findings and recommendations of various systematic reviews on interventions in back pain, and is helpful in guiding treatment decisions.

Conflicts of interest. None declared

REFERENCES

- Garg B, George J, Mehta N. Non-operative treatment for low back pain: A review of evidence and recommendations. *Natl Med J India* 2022;**35**:19–27.
- Engers A, Jellema P, Wensing M, van der Windt DA, Grol R, van Tulder MW. Individual patient education for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;**2008**:CD004057.
- Wood L, Hendrick PA. A systematic review and meta-analysis of pain neuroscience education for chronic low back pain: Short-and long-term outcomes of pain and disability. *Eur J Pain* 2019;**23**:234–49.
- Yamato TP, Maher CG, Saragiotto BT, Hancock MJ, Ostelo RW, Cabral CM, et al. Pilates for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;**2015**:CD010265.

Bhavuk Garg, Jaiben George, Nishank Mehta
Department of Orthopaedics
All India Institute of Medical Sciences
New Delhi
India
drbhavukgarg@gmail.com

[To cite: Garg B, George J, Mehta N. Reply to letter: Narrative approaches to reviews [Correspondence]. *Natl Med J India* 2023;**36**:68. DOI: 10.25259/NMJI_920_22]