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Introduction
Oral health problems in Appalachia are considered severe, with Kentuckians having some of the worst oral health outcome indicators in the nation across all age groups. Kentucky ranks second in the number of completely edentulous older adults, third in adults with any permanent teeth extracted, and sixth in the prevalence of individuals not visiting a dentist or dental clinic within the past year for any reason (1). Though Kentucky has a high rate of water fluoridation (42%), teeth cleanings and dental sealants comparable to the nation’s, it still has a higher rate of caries experience and untreated caries among children. Parents in rural Kentucky report that their children are less likely to have teeth in excellent condition and to have dental insurance than their urban counterparts. These indicators point to a spatially-based disparity between rural and Appalachian Kentucky and the rest of the state. Unfortunately, tabular presentations (alone) of oral health data to policymakers can fail to convey both the relative magnitude and location of disparities. To clearly illustrate these geographic differences in oral health outcomes, we propose the use of a cartographic construction technique called the contiguous bivariate areal cartogram.

We believe that these cartograms provide an immediate visual impact and ease of assessment of spatially-based disparities, and are capable of being readily interpreted by policymakers. The objective of this paper is to illustrate this using data on oral health disparities in Kentucky.

Methods
We created cartograms using ArcGIS v9.2 (ESRI, Redlands, CA) that visualize 2006 population estimates, dental manpower (2007), and an oral health outcome across Kentucky by counties. We calculated dental manpower by county, defined as dentists per 10,000 population, by crossing the physical addresses of dentists in Kentucky and calculating the rate via a point-in-polygon count divided by the respective county population. County areas were then transformed to adjust for population and dental manpower using the Gaute-Newman diffusion algorithm along with a shaded depiction (chroropleth) of an oral health outcome—in our case, the percentage of adults 18 or older with six or more permanent teeth removed because of tooth decay or gum disease. This health outcome was collected from the 2007 Kentucky Institute of Medicine Report. Disparities between rural and Appalachian counties are considered severe, with Kentuckians having some of the worst oral health outcome indicators in the nation across all age groups. Kentucky ranks second in the number of completely edentulous older adults, third in adults with any permanent teeth extracted, and sixth in the prevalence of individuals not visiting a dentist or dental clinic within the past year for any reason (1). Though Kentucky has a high rate of water fluoridation (42%), teeth cleanings and dental sealants comparable to the nation’s, it still has a higher rate of caries experience and untreated caries among children. Parents in rural Kentucky report that their children are less likely to have teeth in excellent condition and to have dental insurance than their urban counterparts. These indicators point to a spatially-based disparity between rural and Appalachian Kentucky and the rest of the state. Unfortunately, tabular presentations (alone) of oral health data to policymakers can fail to convey both the relative magnitude and location of disparities. To clearly illustrate these geographic differences in oral health outcomes, we propose the use of a cartographic construction technique called the contiguous bivariate areal cartogram.

We believe that these cartograms provide an immediate visual impact and ease of assessment of spatially-based disparities, and are capable of being readily interpreted by policymakers. The objective of this paper is to illustrate this using data on oral health disparities in Kentucky.

Results
Trends in the created cartograms lead us to conclude that counties with lower populations (i.e., typically Appalachian and more rural counties) tend to have worse oral health as measured by our oral health outcomes. Figure 1a shows an untransformed typical choropleth map of Kentucky. Figure 1b depicts counties with the highest populations as also having the largest areas. Figure 1c shows a similar trend as Figure 1b in that the counties with the largest areas (i.e., higher rates of dentists per 10,000 population) also have the lowest percentage of adults with 6 or more removed teeth.

Figure 1 points to an area density distortion favoring counties (i.e., a lower percentage of adults with 6 or more teeth removed) with denst populations and higher rates of dentists per 10,000 population. Table 1 enumerates the results in Figure 1 with mean population and dentists per 10,000 population in Appalachian lower than in non-Appalachia and the state and the percentage of adults with 6 or more teeth removed higher in Appalachian than in non-Appalachia and the state.

Table 2 shows that both panels b & c in Figure 1 have higher square areas in the first two classes (11-25% & 26-34%) than panel a and lower square areas in the bottom three classes (34-41%, 42-50%, & 51-65%) than panel a.

Table 1: Sample Descriptives of Transformation Variables: Kentucky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Appalachia</th>
<th>Non-Appalachia</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Population</td>
<td>22,080</td>
<td>45,837</td>
<td>35,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists per 10,000 Population</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percentage of Adults 18 or older with six or more permanent teeth removed because of tooth decay or gum disease</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Total Square Area Comparison of the 3 Map Projections among the Five Oral Health Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Health Classes</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>State Population Caratogram</th>
<th>Dentist/Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health Classes</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Oral Health Classes</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25%</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
<td>5058 (13)</td>
<td>11680 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34%</td>
<td>32 (27)</td>
<td>9064 (22)</td>
<td>9677 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-41%</td>
<td>34 (28)</td>
<td>13033 (32)</td>
<td>9095 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-50%</td>
<td>30 (25)</td>
<td>11209 (25)</td>
<td>6652 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65%</td>
<td>10 (8)</td>
<td>2974 (7)</td>
<td>1371 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120 (100)</td>
<td>40405 (100)</td>
<td>40255 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
The depiction of a distorted Kentucky via cartograms offers more of a truthful and intelligible visualization of the state by oral health status regular choropleth maps and tabular presentations and allows policymakers to better understand the spatial component of oral health disparities within the state. This study provides policy makers with map-to-map and table and shows evidence of oral health disparities and a dental workforce misdistribution (Figure 1c). Mapping health care providers using a GIS has been shown to be a useful tool for assessing provider distribution and availability, and developing programs to attract dentists to underserved areas. Some limitations of our study include artificially abrupt changes in oral health from county boundary to county boundary and the use of county-level choropleth thematic mapping that depicts a synthetic uniformity (ecological fallacy) of the oral health outcome across counties. In addition, the oral health outcome is limited to adults 18 or older with six or more permanent teeth removed because of tooth decay or gum disease. While necessary, this outcome is not sufficient in providing an exhaustive understanding of oral health disparities in Kentucky.
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