

that subjects reporting poor oral or general health, dissatisfied with their oral health, having oral health problems, feeling the need to undergo dental treatment and those dissatisfied with the appearance of their teeth or denture were most likely to have low GOHAI scores.

Discriminant validity was evaluated by comparing the GOHAI scores with the objectively assessed clinical parameters. It was hypothesized that lesser the number of missing teeth, decayed teeth, mobile teeth, gingival recession, and cervical abrasion better will be the GOHAI score. Modest correlation was also expected between the GOHAI score and the number of restored teeth, crowned teeth and OHI-S score.

Exploratory factor analysis was done to examine the factor structure and internal reliability. To determine the adequacy of the strength of factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Barlett's test of sphericity was done. Using principal component analysis, the factors were extracted using Eigenvalue technique. After factor extraction, rotation was done by varimax orthogonal rotation and rotated component matrix derived.

Results

Participants characteristics and responses to general oral health assessment index-Tml

Mean ADD-GOHAI was 52.7 (6.8, range 22–60, median 54). Mean SC-GOHAI was 2 (2.4, range 0–11, median 1). The mean age of the study population was 31 years (11.6). It was seen that among the 265 subjects 64% (169/265) were men, and 36% (96/265) were women. Almost 63% (167/265) of the study population was aged less than 30 years. Observation of the brushing habits showed that 68% (179/265) of the participants brushed at least once daily (only two respondents reported that they brushed few times in a week and all the subjects had the habit of brushing their teeth at different frequencies hence for test of significance only two groups were considered refer Table 2). Among those recruited 14.3% (38/265) of them smoked and 61.5% (163/265) had visited dentist before. Only 8% (22/265) subjects reported replacing their teeth with dentures and among them 17 of them had replaced with FPD and 5 with RPD [Table 2].

The mean, standard deviation and median of the 12 items in the GOHAI scale are given in Table 3. Among the items analyzed it was seen that negative scores (always, fairly often and sometimes) were more commonly reported for Q2-24.2% (64/265), Q7-29.4% (78/265) and "Q9-30.9% (82/265). The mean values ranged from 3.8 to 4.2 [Table 3]. Responses like seldom or never (less impact) were more frequently reported for items such as Q3-92.8% (246/265), Q4-94.4% (250/265), Q8-92.8% (246/265) and Q11-90.9% (241/265). The mean values ranged from 4.7 to 4.8 [Table 3].

Validity

Face and content validity of the translated version was established by administering the Tamil questionnaire to 60 volunteers prior to test-retest procedure. Interview session along with the authors and professional translators' ensued and necessary changes were made.

The construct validity was supported as hypothesized for the following variables in this population. OHRQOL decreased with increasing age, with subjects aged more than 50 years reporting poorer OHRQOL and more number of negative responses. Statistically significant difference was seen in both the mean ADD and SC-GOHAI scores between age groups ($P < 0.01$, $P = 0.03$ respectively). Unemployed and retired respondents perceived poorer OHRQOL. Mean ADD-GOHAI score showed a statistically significant difference within the group based on their occupation ($P = 0.01$). Subjects who replaced missing teeth with RPDs reported more number of negative responses (i.e. mean higher SC-GOHAI) and statistically significant difference was seen when comparing with those wearing FPDs ($P = 0.01$) [Table 2]. Contrary to the hypothesis, it was observed that participants who had never visited a dentist reported better OHRQOL and statistically significant difference was seen in both the mean ADD and SC-GOHAI scores based on their history of visit ($P < 0.01$, $P = 0.01$ respectively). No significant difference was seen in OHRQOL between those wearing denture and those not wearing denture ($P = 0.30$) [Table 2].

The results for concurrent validity were in agreement with the hypothesis, and statistical significance was seen ($P < 0.001$ to 0.02) [Table 4]. Analysis of discriminant validity showed that lower mean ADD-GOHAI score was seen in patients with more number of missing teeth, decayed teeth, gingival recession, mobility due to periodontal disease, crowned teeth and filled teeth [Table 5]. Patients with poor oral hygiene status and those diagnosed with localized or generalized periodontitis had lower ADD-GOHAI scores. Statistically significant difference was seen in the mean GOHAI scores (both ADD-GOHAI, SC-GOHAI) for clinical parameters like number of teeth present, decayed teeth, gingival recession, mobility and between patients diagnosed with generalized periodontitis and gingivitis ($P < 0.001$ to 0.04). With respect to number of filled teeth statistical significant difference was seen only for mean SC-GOHAI score ($P = 0.04$) [Table 5].

Factor analysis

Principal component analysis was used for factor extraction. Only factors with eigenvalues > 1 were extracted (Kaisers criteria) which resulted in extraction of the first four factors. It was seen that the first factor accounted for 35% (35/100) variance, second 14.2% (14.2/100) variance, third 8.7% (8.7/100) variance, and fourth 8.3% (8.3/100) variance. All the four factors together accounted for 66.4% (7.9/12) variance.

Table 2: Construct validity and descriptive statistics of the variables assessed in the study

Variable	n (%)	Mean ADD-GOHA1 (SD)	Statistical test P	Mean SC-GOHA1 (SD)	Statistical test P
Age					
≤30	167 (63)	53.1 (6.2)	ANOVA	1.83 (2.3)	ANOVA
31-50	72 (27)	53.2 (6.2)	F=6.0	1.96 (2.3)	F=3.4
>50	26 (9.8)	48.4 (9.5)	P<0.01	3.15 (2.9)	P=0.03
Gender					
Male	169 (63.8)	53.0 (6.1)	T-test	1.91 (2.3)	T-test
Female	96 (36.2)	52.2 (7.7)	F=0.9 P=0.33	2.16 (2.4)	F=0.8 P=0.41
Education					
School education (complete/incomplete)	104 (39.2)	51.6 (7.7)	ANOVA	2.2 (2.4)	ANOVA
Degree/diploma	122 (46)	53.3 (6.3)	F=1.8	1.8 (2.4)	F=0.5
Postgraduation	34 (12.8)	53.5 (4.5)	P=0.13	1.9 (2.1)	P=0.61
Uneducated	5 (1.9)	56.2 (4.4)		1.2 (1.6)	
Occupation					
Employed	172 (64.9)	53.1 (6.1)	ANOVA	1.8 (2.2)	ANOVA
Unemployed	43 (16.2)	50.6 (9.0)	F=3.4	2.5 (2.8)	F=1.6
Student	41 (15.5)	54.1 (5.9)	P=0.01	1.6 (2.6)	P=0.17
Retired	9 (3.4)	48.4 (6.7)		3.1 (1.6)	
Income					
≤10,000	95 (35.8)	51.7 (7.0)	ANOVA	2.3 (2.4)	ANOVA
10,001-20,000	66 (24.9)	53.8 (5.3)	F=2.1	1.6 (2.2)	F=1.7
≥20,000	26 (9.8)	54.8 (5.0)	P=0.09	1.3 (1.4)	P=0.15
No income	78 (29.4)	52.3 (7.7)		2.0 (2.7)	
Frequency of brushing					
Once	179 (67.9)	52.4 (7.1)	T-test	2.0 (2.4)	ANOVA
Twice/more than twice	83 (30.9)	53.5 (5.6)	F=1.1 P=0.23	1.8 (2.2)	F=0.6 P=0.50
Smoking					
No	227 (85.7)	52.5 (6.8)	T-test	2.08 (2.4)	T-test
Yes	38 (14.3)	54.0 (5.9)	F=1.2 P=0.20	1.50 (1.9)	F=1.3 P=0.16
Chewable tobacco					
No	248 (93.6)	52.8 (6.7)	T-test	1.9 (2.3)	T-test
Yes	17 (6.4)	51.7 (7.7)	F=0.6 P=0.54	2.1 (2.9)	F=0.2 P=0.83
Visit to dentist					
No	102 (38.5)	54.2 (5.9)	T-test	1.5 (2.2)	T-test
Yes	163 (61.5)	51.8 (7.0)	F=2.8 P<0.01	2.2 (2.4)	F=2.3 P=0.01
Wearing denture					
No	243 (91.7)	52.8 (6.7)	T-test	1.9 (2.3)	T-test
Yes	22 (8.3)	51.0 (7.4)	F=1.1 P=0.23	2.5 (2.3)	F=1.0 P=0.30
Type of denture					
Fixed denture	17 (77.3)	52.7 (6.7)	T-test	1.8 (2.00)	T-test
Removable denture	5 (22.7)	45.6 (7.7)	F=2.0 P=0.05	4.8 (2.2)	F=2.8 P=0.01

GOHA1: General oral health assessment index, SD: Standard deviation, ADD-GOHA1: Additive general oral health assessment index, SC-GOHA1: Simple count general oral health assessment index

Following factor extraction, factor rotation was done and rotated component matrix derived [Table 6]. Varimax orthogonal rotation with Kaiser normalization was used. It was seen that Q6, Q7, Q9, and Q10 clustered under first factor; Q1, Q2, and Q5 clustered under second factor; Q3, Q4, and Q11 clustered under third factor and Q8, Q12 clustered under fourth factor. Based on the clustering of items, we can label the first factor as psychosocial effect

of oral health, second factor as physical effect affecting primarily eating ability, third factor as physical effect affecting speaking, swallowing, and also psychosocial effect of uncomfortable eating in front of others and fourth factor encompasses pain or discomfort due to dental problems. It was seen that the communalities for all variables were above 0.50 hence we did not exclude any variables on the basis of low communalities.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the GOHAI scale and the frequency distribution of the responses for each item

Items	Mean=52.7			Variance=46.0 n (%)		SD=6.7 n (%)	Number of items=12 n (%)	
	Mean	SD	Median	Always	Fairly often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Q1	4.4	0.9	5	8 (3.0)	4 (1.5)	26 (9.8)	41 (15.5)	186 (70.2)
Q2	4.2	1.0	5	11 (4.2)	8 (3.0)	45 (17.0)	51 (19.2)	150 (56.6)
Q3	4.7	0.5	5	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	18 (6.8)	26 (9.8)	220 (83.0)
Q4	4.8	0.6	5	3 (1.1)	0 (0)	12 (4.5)	11 (4.2)	239 (90.2)
Q5	4.4	1.0	5	11 (4.2)	3 (1.1)	30 (11.3)	34 (12.8)	187 (70.6)
Q6	4.4	1.0	5	11 (4.2)	10 (3.8)	23 (8.7)	36 (13.6)	185 (69.8)
Q7	3.9	1.3	4	26 (9.8)	13 (4.9)	39 (14.7)	61 (23.0)	126 (47.5)
Q8	4.6	0.6	5	1 (0.4)	3 (1.1)	15 (5.7)	42 (15.8)	204 (77.0)
Q9	3.8	1.2	4	20 (7.5)	21 (7.9)	41 (15.5)	82 (30.9)	101 (38.1)
Q10	4.2	1.0	5	8 (3.0)	14 (5.3)	33 (12.5)	54 (20.4)	156 (58.9)
Q11	4.6	0.8	5	7 (2.6)	1 (0.4)	16 (6.0)	25 (9.4)	216 (81.5)
Q12	4.2	0.9	4	6 (2.3)	11 (4.2)	33 (12.5)	86 (32.5)	129 (48.7)

GOHAI: General oral health assessment index, SD: Standard deviation

Table 4: Concurrent validity of GOHAI scores

Variable	n (%)	Mean ADD-GOHAI (SD)	Statistical test P	Mean SC-GOHAI (SD)	Statistical test P
Self-perceived oral health					
Excellent	20 (7.5)	55.8 (4.9)	ANOVA F=16.4 P<0.001	1.4 (0.8)	ANOVA F=10.6 P<0.001
Good	102 (38.5)	54.8 (6.2)		2.2 (1.4)	
Fair	129 (48.7)	51.5 (6.0)		2.3 (2.3)	
Poor	14 (5.3)	43.9 (9.3)		2.7 (4.5)	
Self-perceived general health					
Excellent	53 (20)	54.3 (5.8)	ANOVA F=5.8 P<0.01	1.5 (1.9)	ANOVA F=5.9 P<0.01
Good	142 (53.6)	53.5 (6.1)		1.6 (2.2)	
Fair	67 (25.3)	49.9 (7.8)		3.0 (2.7)	
Poor	3 (1.1)	50.67 (10.06)		3.00 (3.00)	
Satisfaction with oral health					
No	121 (45.7)	50.2 (7.3)	T-test F=5.6 P<0.001	2.7 (2.5)	T-test F=5.0 P<0.001
Yes	144 (54.3)	54.8 (5.4)		1.3 (2.0)	
Self-reported bad breath					
No	175 (66)	53.9 (6.0)	T-test F=3.7 P<0.001	1.6 (2.1)	T-test F=3.1 P<0.01
Yes	90 (34)	50.4 (7.5)		2.6 (2.7)	
Self-reported bleeding gums					
No	171 (64.5)	53.7 (6.3)	T-test F=3.3 P<0.01	1.7 (2.2)	T-test F=2.6 P=0.01
Yes	94 (35.5)	50.8 (7.1)		2.5 (2.6)	
Burning mouth					
No	245 (92.5)	53.0 (6.5)	T-test F=2.8 P<0.01	1.9 (2.3)	T-test F=1.9 P=0.05
Yes	20 (7.5)	48.6 (8.7)		3.0 (2.6)	
Perceived need for dental treatment					
No	35 (13.2)	56.0 (5.3)	T-test F=3.1 P<0.01	1.1 (2.1)	T-test F=2.2 P=0.02
Yes	230 (86.8)	52.2 (6.8)		2.1 (2.4)	
Self-reported TMJ discomfort					
No	238 (89.8)	53.1 (6.8)	T-test F=2.9 P<0.01	1.8 (2.3)	T-test F=2.7 P<0.001
Yes	27 (10.2)	49.1 (5.3)		3.1 (2.1)	
Self-reported esthetic satisfaction					
No	151 (57.0)	54.6 (5.5)	T-test F=5.1 P<0.001	1.4 (2.0)	T-test F=4.5 P<0.001
Yes	114 (43.0)	50.2 (7.4)		2.7 (2.6)	

GOHAI: General oral health assessment index, SD: Standard deviation, TMJ: Temporomandibular joint, ADD-GOHAI: Additive general oral health assessment index, SC-GOHAI: Simple count general oral health assessment index

Table 5: Discriminant validity for GOHAI scores

Variable	n (%)	Mean ADD-GOHAI (SD)	Statistical test P	Mean SC-GOHAI (SD)	Statistical test P
Number of teeth present					
1-19	4 (1.5)	35.5 (9.9)	ANOVA	6.7 (3.3)	ANOVA
20-28	72 (27.2)	52.9 (6.2)	F=14.4	1.9 (2.1)	F=8.4
29-32	189 (71.3)	53.0 (6.4)	P<0.001	1.9 (2.3)	P<0.001
Number of missing teeth					
Nil/0	120 (45.5)	53.5 (6.3)	ANOVA	1.7 (2.3)	ANOVA
1-4	113 (42.8)	52.5 (6.6)	F=2.6	2.1 (2.3)	F=1.4
≥5	31 (11.7)	50.4 (8.2)	P=0.07	2.5 (2.5)	P=0.24
Number of decayed teeth					
Nil/0	93 (35.2)	54 (5.4)	T-test	1.5 (2.0)	T-test
≥1	171 (64.8)	52 (7.3)	F=2.4 P=0.01	2.2 (2.5)	F=2.2 P=0.02
Number of restored teeth					
Nil/0	209 (78.9)	53.1 (6.5)	T-test	1.8 (2.3)	T-test
≥1	56 (21.1)	51.2 (7.3)	F=1.8 P=0.06	2.5 (2.5)	F=2.03 P=0.04
Number of teeth with gingival recession					
Nil/0	173 (65.5)	53.3 (6.5)	T-test	1.7 (2.2)	T-test
≥1	91 (34.5)	51.4 (7.0)	F=2.2 P=0.02	2.5 (2.5)	F=2.6 P=0.01
Number of teeth with mobility					
Nil/0	244 (92.1)	53.2 (6.2)	T-test	1.8 (2.2)	T-test
≥1	21 (7.9)	47.2 (9.8)	F=2.7 P=0.01	3.9 (3.2)	F=2.9 P<0.01
Number of teeth with cervical abrasion					
Nil/0	236 (89.4)	52.9 (6.7)	T-test	1.9 (2.4)	T-test
≥1	28 (10.6)	51.4 (6.9)	F=1.0 P=0.28	2.1 (2.1)	F=0.4 P=0.65
Number of crowned teeth					
Nil/0	241 (90.9)	52.8 (6.7)	T-test	1.9 (2.3)	T-test
≥1	24 (9.1)	51.8 (7.4)	F=0.6 P=0.51	2.2 (2.5)	F=0.6 P=0.52
OHI-S total score					
0-1.2	27 (10.2)	54.5 (5.2)	ANOVA	1.5 (2.1)	ANOVA
1.3-3	151 (57)	52.7 (7.0)	F=1.1	2.0 (2.4)	F=0.4
3.1-6	87 (32.8)	52.2 (6.7)	P=0.30	2.1 (2.3)	P=0.61
Diagnosis					
GCP	25 (9.4)	48.8 (8.5)	ANOVA	3.1 (2.7)	ANOVA
LCP	80 (30.2)	52.0 (6.4)	F=6.4	2.2 (2.3)	F=4.8
Gingivitis	160 (60.4)	53.7 (6.3)	P<0.01	1.6 (2.2)	P<0.01

GOHAI: General oral health assessment index, SD: Standard deviation, OHI-S: Simplified oral hygiene index, GCP: Generalized chronic periodontitis, LCP: Localized chronic periodontitis, ADD-GOHAI: Additive general oral health assessment index, SC-GOHAI: Simple count general oral health assessment index

Reliability

GOHAI-Tml was administered to 60 subjects twice within a period of 1-week. Among the 60 subjects, 30 subjects were of lower educational level (incomplete or completed school education, uneducated but able to read Tamil), and the other 30 were of higher educational level (degree/diploma/postgraduation). The Spearman rank correlation ranged from 0.8 to 0.9, $P < 0.001$ for all the 12 items between visits for the 60 samples. Cronbach alpha was 0.9, indicating excellent and high internal consistency. There was high correlation between ADD-GOHAI and SC-GOHAI between visit 0.9 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.9 ($P < 0.001$), respectively (statistics not shown in table).

Reliability analysis among the 30 subjects who were less educated showed that Spearman rank correlation between visits ranged from 0.8 to 1.00, $P < 0.001$ for all the 12 items and Cronbach alpha was 0.8, indicating good internal consistency. The ADD-GOHAI and SC-GOHAI showed a very high correlation between visits 0.9 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.9 ($P < 0.001$) respectively (statistic not shown in table).

Reliability analysis among the subjects of higher education showed that Spearman rank correlation between visits ranged from 0.7 to 0.9, $P < 0.001$ for all the 12 items and Cronbach alpha was 0.9, indicating excellent internal consistency. The ADD-GOHAI and SC-GOHAI showed a very high

Table 6: Rotated component matrix

Items	Component				Communalities	
	1	2	3	4	Initial	Extracted
Q1	0.04	0.8	0.09	0.1	1.000	0.7
Q2	0.14	0.8	0.1	0.2	1.000	0.8
Q3	-0.02	0.1	0.6	0.2	1.000	0.5
Q4	0.1	0.05	0.8	-0.02	1.000	0.6
Q5	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.1	1.000	0.7
Q6	0.7	0.02	0.2	-0.002	1.000	0.6
Q7	0.7	0.2	-0.05	-0.1	1.000	0.5
Q8	0.07	0.1	0.08	0.7	1.000	0.6
Q9	0.7	0.2	0.07	0.2	1.000	0.7
Q10	0.7	0.02	0.1	0.1	1.000	0.6
Q11	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.1	1.000	0.6
Q12	0.07	0.1	0.1	0.7	1.000	0.5

Extraction method: Principal component analysis

correlation between visits 0.9 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.7 ($P < 0.001$), respectively (statistic not shown in table).

The Cronbach alpha for 265 samples was 0.8 suggesting good internal consistency. The inter-item correlation between the 12 items in the questionnaire was positive. The strength of correlation between few items such as “Q6 and Q1, Q3, Q8” and “Q7 and Q3, Q8, Q12” was poor and ranged from 0.01 to 0.09. Item scale correlation ranged from 0.3 to 0.7 ($P < 0.001$). Corrected item-scale correlation ranged from 0.3 to 0.6 and items 3, 4, 7, 8, and 12 showed an acceptable but weak positive relationship with total score (acceptable corrected item-total correlation (r) 0.3–0.7, Ferketich 1991).^[21] The removal of these items did not significantly affect Cronbach alpha, hence we considered retaining these items. The item scale statistics showed that deletion of items 2, 5, and 9 would result in a slightly lower Cronbach alpha value and in turn affect the reliability of the scale.

Split half reliability was evaluated, the scale was divided into two equal parts (q1–q6 one half, q7–q12 other half) consisting of 6 items each and Cronbach alpha was determined, the correlation between the halves was 0.6 and Spearman brown coefficient was 0.7. Guttman split half coefficient was found to be 0.7 (statistic not shown in table).

Discussion

Tamil is the language of Tamilians all over the world, and it has been granted classical status. Modern Tamil language is described as diglossic, meaning that it exhibits a division between the colloquial spoken form of the language and the written language used for formal purposes. Spoken Tamil has evolved significantly over years, the colloquial versions are so varied that differences exist within the state due to its rich cultural, religious, social and geographical diversity. The translated version was drafted keeping in mind all such difference so that it will be acceptable and understandable to all. In order to evaluate the effect of oral health on the QOL

in this population and due to unavailability of a validated Tamil OHQOL questionnaire for research purpose we aimed to develop GOHAI-Tml version. The present study is the first to adapt this scale for evaluating the OHRQOL among the Tamil speaking population.

The current study established the psychometric properties of GOHAI-Tml version. It was found to be reliable and valid. The positively phrased items (Q3, Q5, Q7) were negatively rephrased in this Tamil version similar to the Maltese, Chinese, and Romanian translation of the questionnaire.^[9,18,22] The translated Tamil version was highly consistent irrespective of the educational status of the respondents. The Cronbach alpha for internal consistency was found to be higher than the other translated versions like Hindi 0.79, Spanish 0.77, Persian 0.78, Portuguese 0.76, Malay 0.79, and Romanian 0.63.^[8,13,15,17,20,22] Deletion of any of the items did not seem to increase the Cronbach alpha value hence retaining all the items is justifiable for the GOHAI-Tml version.

The item scale correlation ranged from 0.3 to 0.7; it was evident that the items trouble swallowing, trouble speaking the way you wanted, use of medications to relieve pain or discomfort and teeth or gums sensitive to hot cold or sweet had a weaker but acceptable correlation with the ADD-GOHAI score. Similar to this study the French, Malay, Persian translations showed lower item scale rating for the Q3, the likely reason for such a finding in this study could be probably due to dominance of younger individuals, the item was originally included in the scale to measure the oral impact in people with xerostomia.^[10,13,17] The Inter-item correlation showed a very weak relationship between items such as limiting the kind of food, trouble swallowing, limit contact with people, pleased with look of teeth, medicines to relieve pain and sensitive to hot or cold food.

Test-retest Spearman rank correlations between visits were very strong ($P < 0.001$) indicating high reliability. Mean ADD-GOHAI was higher when compared with that of other versions indicating comparatively minimal impact on QOL due to oral health status. The summative GOHAI score was similar to the German version (mean ADD-GOHAI score 53).^[14]

The means of the individual items in the scale ranged from 3.8 to 4.7, people felt more impact on satisfaction with look of teeth/denture and worrying about teeth/gums/dentures than the other items in the scale. Based on the higher percentage of negative responses to individual items, it can be concluded that major impact was on biting or chewing, satisfaction with appearance of teeth and worrying about teeth, gums or dentures. The least impact was on speaking (5.6%), followed by swallowing (7.2%) and uncomfortable eating in front of others (9%).

Concurrent and discriminant validity was established as hypothesized. Our study showed good correlation between

GOHAI score and clinical parameters and self-reported oral health problems. It was surprisingly observed that subjects who had never visited a dentist had reported better OHRQOL, indicating that irrespective of the clinical status self-perception of one's own health plays an important role in seeking professional help.

Factor extraction using principle component analysis resulted in extraction of four factors with eigenvalue more than 1 accounting for 66.4% of variance, this was in contrast to the original factor structure of the index as proposed by Atchison and Dolan and the translated Arabic, Spanish and Malay GOHAI versions.^[4,8,11,17] The Portuguese version showed three distinct factors and the Swedish version indicated two-factor solutions.^[15,16] In the GOHAI-Tml version, the fourth factor was formed by clustering of items that were least affected due to oral health problems (Q3, Q4, and Q11) and these items also showed a weak positive correlation with total score of the scale.

Limitations of the study are convenience sampling, cross-sectional design, and the subjects were recruited from clinical setting, hence the study subject may not be representative of the population, moreover the study sample were predominantly of younger age hence impact on OHRQOL identified in this research work could be more expressive of that age group, hence furthermore scientific work with subjects from diverse age group should be carried out. Very few subjects were wearing denture in this sample hence supplementary studies with more denture users is needed to elicit the impact on QOL. Additional studies are needed to evaluate whether GOHAI-Tml can be used as an effective tool to monitor dental treatment outcomes.

Conclusion

Within the limitations of the study, it can be concluded that GOHAI-Tml has shown acceptable psychometric properties, so it could be used as an efficient tool in identifying the impact of oral health on QOL among the Tamil speaking population.

Acknowledgement

The research project was self-funded by the author and co-authors.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

- DHHS. Oral Health in America: A Report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institute of Health; 2000. p. 7.
- Locker D. Measuring oral health: A conceptual framework. *Community Dent Health* 1988;5:3-18.
- Inglehart MR, Bagramian RA. Oral Health-related Quality of Life. Illinois: Quintessence Publishing Co., Inc.; 2002.
- Atchison KA, Dolan TA. Development of the geriatric oral health assessment index. *J Dent Educ* 1990;54:680-7.
- Strauss RP, Hunt RJ. Understanding the value of teeth to older adults: Influences on the quality of life. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1993;124:105-10.
- Slade GD, Spencer AJ. Development and evaluation of the oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Health* 1994;11:3-11.
- Leao A, Sheiham A. The development of a socio-dental measure of dental impacts on daily living. *Community Dent Health* 1996;13:22-6.
- Sánchez-García S, Heredia-Ponce E, Juárez-Cedillo T, Gallegos-Carrillo K, Espinel-Bermúdez C, de la Fuente-Hernández J, *et al.* Psychometric properties of the general oral health assessment index (GOHAI) and dental status of an elderly Mexican population. *J Public Health Dent* 2010;70:300-7.
- Wong MC, Liu JK, Lo EC. Translation and validation of the Chinese version of GOHAI. *J Public Health Dent* 2002;62:78-83.
- Tubert-Jeannin S, Riordan PJ, Morel-Papernot A, Porcheray S, Saby-Collet S. Validation of an oral health quality of life index (GOHAI) in France. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2003;31:275-84.
- Atieh MA. Arabic version of the geriatric oral health assessment index. *Gerodontology* 2008;25:34-41.
- Daradkeh S, Khader YS. Translation and validation of the Arabic version of the geriatric oral health assessment index (GOHAI). *J Oral Sci* 2008;50:453-9.
- Motallebnejad M, Mottaghi K, Mehdizade S, Alaedini F, Bijani A. Reliability and validity of the Persian version of the general oral health assessment index (GOHAI). *Caspian J Dent Res* 2012-2013;1:8-17.
- Hassel AJ, Rolko C, Koke U, Leisen J, Rammelsberg P. A German version of the GOHAI. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2008;36:34-42.
- Carvalho C, Manso AC, Escoval A, Salvado F, Nunes C. Translation and validation of the Portuguese version of the geriatric oral health assessment index (GOHAI). *Rev Port Saude Publica* 2013;31:166-72.
- Hägglin C, Berggren U, Lundgren J. A Swedish version of the GOHAI index. Psychometric properties and validation. *Swed Dent J* 2005;29:113-24.
- Othman WN, Muttalib KA, Bakri R, Doss JG, Jaafar N, Salleh NC, *et al.* Validation of the geriatric oral health assessment index (GOHAI) in the Malay language. *J Public Health Dent* 2006;66:199-204.
- Santucci D, Camilleri L, Kobayashi Y, Attard N. Development of a Maltese version of oral health-associated questionnaires: OHIP-14, GOHAI, and the denture satisfaction questionnaire. *Int J Prosthodont* 2014;27:44-9.
- Naito M, Suzukamo Y, Nakayama T, Hamajima N, Fukuhara S. Linguistic adaptation and validation of

- the general oral health assessment index (GOHAI) in an elderly Japanese population. *J Public Health Dent* 2006;66:273-5.
20. Mathur VP, Jain V, Pillai RS, Kalra S. Translation and validation of Hindi version of geriatric oral health assessment index. *Gerodontology* 2013;11:16.
 21. Ferketich S. Focus on psychometrics. Aspects of item analysis. *Res Nurs Health* 1991;14:165-8.
 22. Murariu A, Hanganu C, Bobu L. Evaluation of the reliability of the geriatric oral health assessment index (GOHAI) in institutionalized elderly in Romania: A pilot study. *OHDMBSC* 2010;9:11-5.