



Public Health  
England

# **Dental public health epidemiology programme**

## **Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013**

A report on the prevalence and severity  
of dental decay

## About Public Health England

Public Health England exists to protect and improve the nation's health and wellbeing, and reduce health inequalities. It does this through advocacy, partnerships, world-class science, knowledge and intelligence, and the delivery of specialist public health services. PHE is an operationally autonomous executive agency of the Department of Health.

Public Health England  
133-155 Waterloo Road  
Wellington House  
London SE1 8UG  
Tel: 020 7654 8000  
[www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe)  
Twitter: [@PHE\\_uk](https://twitter.com/PHE_uk)  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland](https://www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland)

For queries relating to this document, please contact: [Nick.Kendall@PHE.gov.uk](mailto:Nick.Kendall@PHE.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v2.0. To view this licence, visit OGL or email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk). Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Published September 2014

PHE publications gateway number: 2014302

# Contents

About Public Health England	2
Contents	3
Executive summary	4
Introduction	5
Section 1 Methodology	6
Section 2 Results	7
Participation in the survey	7
Prevalence of dental decay at age three	11
Severity of dental decay at age three	11
Correlation of decay prevalence and severity with deprivation	12
Severity of decay among children with caries experience at age three	14
Prevalence of extraction experience at age three	15
Prevalence of early childhood caries	16
Children with sepsis at the time of the examination	17
Comparisons with survey results of five-year-old children	17
Section 3 Implications of results	18
Variation and inequality	18
Changes in levels of decay between the ages of three and five-years-old	19
Putting this information to use	19
Section 4 References	20
Section 5 Supplementary tables	
Appendix 1 Summary results by upper-tier local authority	22
Appendix 2 Summary results by lower-tier local authority	27

## Executive summary

This report presents summarised results from the Public Health England (PHE) dental public health epidemiology programme (DPHEP) survey of three-year-old children, 2013.<sup>i</sup> Estimates for disease prevalence and severity are reported at national, regional, PHE centre and upper and lower-tier local authority level. Data provides key information to identify suitable life stages for targeting activities to address the dental indicator (tooth decay in children aged five) included in the public health outcomes framework (PHOF).

No national survey has previously been undertaken for this age group.

Overall, of the three-year-old children in England whose parents gave consent for their participation in this survey 12% had experienced dental decay. On average, these children had 3.08 teeth that were decayed, missing or filled (at age three most children have all 20 primary teeth). The average number of decayed, missing or filled teeth (d<sub>3</sub>mft) in the whole sample (including the 88% who were decay free) was 0.36.

At the government regional level, the results revealed wide variation in the prevalence and severity of dental decay but the trend did not match that of five year olds where the areas with poorer oral health tended to be in the north. The four regions with highest severity were East Midlands, North West, London and Yorkshire and the Humber. At lower-tier local authority level there was also wide variation with the highest prevalence of caries experience affecting 34% of children in Leicester and below 2% in many other areas. Severity ranged from below 0.1 d<sub>3</sub>mft in 27 lower tier local authorities to greater than 1.0 d<sub>3</sub>mft in four local authorities. Further analysis is required to investigate associations with a range of factors that could be impacting on these estimates.

Summary results can be found in appendix 1 and appendix 2 of this report. Full tables of results are available at [www.nwph.net/dentalhealth](http://www.nwph.net/dentalhealth)

Local authorities are now responsible for improving health and reducing inequalities, including oral health.<sup>1</sup> This report provides baseline and benchmarking data that can be used in joint strategic needs assessments and to plan and commission oral health improvement interventions. PHE produced 'Local authorities improving oral health: commissioning better oral health for children and young people: an evidence-informed toolkit for local authorities' in June 2014,<sup>2</sup> which provides guidance regarding commissioning evidence-informed oral health improvement interventions.

---

<sup>i</sup> Survey data were collected during the 2012-13 school year but are referred to here as 2013. The North West region data were collected during the 2010-11 school year but amalgamated with the data from the rest of England.

## Introduction

This report presents summarised results of the oral health of three-year-old children surveyed in the school year 2012-13. This is the first national dental survey of this age group in England.

Since 1985 standardised and coordinated surveys of child dental health have been conducted across the UK which have provided robust, comparable information for use at local, regional and national levels. In England these surveys are now part of the Public Health England (PHE) dental public health epidemiology programme, supported by the dental public health epidemiology team (DPHET) and the knowledge and intelligence team North West (KIT NW). The surveys follow UK wide standards set down by the British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry (BASCD). This survey took place during the reorganisation of the NHS and fieldwork teams were commissioned by primary care trusts (PCTs) to undertake the fieldwork according to a national protocol. From 1 April 2013 the responsibility for commissioning dental public health functions transferred to local authorities<sup>1</sup> as set out in Statutory Instrument 3094 (2012).<sup>3</sup>

Information produced from nationally coordinated surveys of child dental health is used by commissioners when conducting oral health needs assessments at a local level and forms an important component of the commissioning cycle when planning and evaluating local services and health improvement interventions.

The survey reported here provides information on the prevalence and severity of dental decay (caries) in three-year-old children attending nurseries, both private and state funded, nursery classes attached to schools and playgroups. It has not been possible to include children who do not attend such sites and the possibility for bias from this is acknowledged but cannot be measured. The survey also provides relevant information relating to the dental indicator (tooth decay in children aged five) in the public health outcomes framework (PHOF).<sup>4</sup>

## Section 1. Methodology

The survey was undertaken during the 2012-13 school year. The sampling frame was children attending state or privately funded nurseries, nursery classes attached to schools and playgroups who were aged three years at the time of the survey. Sampling took into account the varying levels of provision of each of these in each local authority.

Data was collected by trained and calibrated examiners employed by NHS Trusts providing community dental services. The training and calibration of examiners was carried out using the methodology described by Pine et al.<sup>5</sup> BASCD criteria for clinical examination described by Pitts et al.<sup>6</sup> were employed. This involves visual-only examination for missing teeth (mt), filled teeth (ft) and teeth with obvious dentinal decay (d<sub>3</sub>t). The subscript <sub>3</sub> indicates this level of detection, which is widely accepted in the literature, acknowledging that it provides an underestimate of the true prevalence and severity of disease. The presence and absence of plaque and oral sepsis were also recorded.

An adjustment was made to allow accurate calculation of severity and prevalence for this younger age group, for whom it cannot be assumed that missing incisors had been naturally shed (exfoliated), as is the case for five-year-olds. Where such teeth were missing, most would have been extracted because of caries, so it is important to include these teeth when calculating severity and prevalence. Examiners were therefore required to record missing incisors in two ways – one which recorded the most likely true fate of missing incisors and a second which aligned with the convention applied for examining five-year-olds and therefore made for fairer comparison with the older age group.

The survey was conducted according to a standard protocol which gave details of the sampling methodology based on that described by Pine et al.<sup>7</sup> The primary sampling unit was local authorities. Random samples were drawn for each local authority in England using a method that ensured the sample mirrored the proportions of children attending each type of childcare institution within each local authority.

The protocol also required that positive consent was obtained before the survey from the child's parent or from someone with the competence to give consent on behalf of the child. Requests for consent for sampled children were sent to parents and followed by a second request where no response was made to the first.

Data was collected using the 'Dental SurveyPlus 2' computer program. Electronic files of the raw, anonymised data were sent from fieldwork teams to regional coordinators and on to the PHE DPHET via a secure web portal. Data cleaning, quality checks and initial analyses were undertaken before the data was linked via the child's home postcode to look-up tables for geographic allocation and for scores from the index of multiple deprivation 2010 (IMD 2010).

The DPHET and the KIT NW worked jointly on the analyses, result collation, report compilation and quality assurance.

Population weighting<sup>ii</sup> was used to calculate estimates of a range of measures of oral health for each local authority. The postcode of residence for each record was used to assign a deprivation score which has been adjusted for the 2011<sup>8</sup> census. These were then used to allow weighting of the sample data to more closely match the actual distribution of deprivation quintiles<sup>iii</sup> in the source population.

Confidence limits were calculated and are presented as errors bars on charts in this report and in the tables available from [www.nwph.net/dentalhealth](http://www.nwph.net/dentalhealth). The 95% confidence limits are the lower and upper levels of a range of values, around the estimate, within which we can say we are 95% confident that the true value lies. Larger sample sizes result in smaller confidence interval ranges, thus values are more likely to be true. When comparing results, if the lower and upper confidence intervals of sample estimates do not overlap, then it can be assumed there is a significant difference between the estimates.

## Section 2. Results

Headline results are presented here along with an indication of the range of results and some high-level illustrations. Full tables and charts of results at lower and upper-tier local authorities, PHE centre, regional and national levels are available at [www.nwph.net/dentalhealth](http://www.nwph.net/dentalhealth)

Reports with further analyses and interactive maps will be made available in due course from the same site.

### Participation in the survey

In total, 145 upper-tier local authorities out of 152 took part in the survey providing reliable estimates for 288 lower-tier local authorities out of 326.

Simple non-response to the request for consent was the most common reason for non-consent, despite two requests and childcare sites actively seeking returned forms. Only 8% of children

---

<sup>ii</sup> The sampling methodology used for this survey was child care site based and therefore not truly representative of the population of three-year-old children by index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintile. Thus, the sample was treated as a stratified random sample, that is children were selected randomly from each IMD quintile, but the sampling probability varied between IMD quintiles. For this reason, IMD-weighted estimates were produced to provide more robust estimates of overall prevalence.

<sup>iii</sup> Deprivation quintiles divide populations into fifths according to the IMD, and are used to identify the range of deprived and affluent sections of the population.

with consent declined to take part on the day of examination. Absenteeism accounted for a further loss of 9% of consented children.

A total of 53,640 clinical examinations were linked to geographical areas and included in the final analysis which represented 8% of the population of this age cohort and 97% of those children examined.


The proportion of children who participated in the survey varied at regional and upper and lower-tier local authority level and this probably reflects the provision of child care in different areas which impacts upon the ability to access children. Across the regions, representation varied from 5% in Yorkshire and the Humber and in London to 14% in the North West. At upper-tier local authority level coverage varied from less than 1% in West Sussex to 46% in Rutland.

### Prevalence of dental decay at age three

In England, 12% of three-year-old children had experience of obvious dental decay (caries), having one or more teeth that were decayed to dentinal level, extracted or filled because of caries (%d<sub>3</sub>mft>0). The remaining 88% were free from visually obvious dental decay. Across the regions, estimates ranged from 8% in the East of England to 16% in the East Midlands (figures 1 and 2).




**Figure 1: Percentage of three-year-old children with decay experience ( $d_3mft > 0$ ) in England by government region, 2013.**



Error bars represent 95% confidence limits

**Figure 2: Percentage of three-year-old children with decay experience ( $d_{3mft} > 0$ ) in England by government region, 2013.**




At the upper-tier local authority level there were wider variations, ranging from South Gloucestershire where only 2% had experience of dentinal decay to Leicester where 34% were affected.

### Severity of dental decay at age three

In England, the average number of teeth per child affected by decay (decayed, missing or filled teeth ( $d_3mft$ )) was 0.36. At the regional level this ranged from 0.24 in the East of England to 0.47 in the North West (figure 3).

The number of teeth with obvious, untreated dentinal decay ( $d_3t$ ) made up 89% of the  $d_3mft$  index in this age group so there is little reason to look at the components of the index in more detail.


**Figure 3: Average number of dentinally decayed, missing (due to decay) and filled teeth ( $d_3mft$ ) among three-year-old children in England by government region, 2013**



Error bars represent 95% confidence limits

There was wide variation in mean  $d_3mft$  across upper-tier local authorities, ranging from 0.03 in South Gloucestershire to 1.17 in Slough (figure 4).

**Figure 4: Average number of dentinally decayed, missing (due to decay) and filled teeth (d<sub>3</sub>mft) among three-year-old children in England by upper-tier local authorities, 2013**




Variation was also evident at the lower-tier local authority level and the severity of decay has some correlation with deprivation (figures 5 and 6).


### Correlation of decay prevalence and severity with deprivation

The association of high levels of decay with high levels of deprivation have been widely described. For example, in the most recent survey of five-year-olds in England, the correlation was shown to be good, with 44% of the variation in decay levels in local authorities being explained by differences in deprivation.<sup>9</sup> Deprivation is measured using the index of multiple deprivation.<sup>8</sup> A similar analysis using the current survey data shows a far weaker association with greater scatter and only 19% of the prevalence and 25% of the severity being explained by deprivation (figures 5 and 6).

**Figure 5: Correlation between proportion of three-year-old children with caries experience and index of multiple deprivation (IMD 2010) score. Lower-tier local authorities in England, 2013**



**Figure 6: Correlation between number of dentinally decayed, missing (due to decay) and filled teeth (d<sub>3</sub>mft) among three-year-old children and index of multiple deprivation (IMD 2010) score. Lower-tier local authorities in England, 2013**




### Severity of decay among children with caries experience at age three

It is helpful to look more closely at those children who had experience of decay, separately from those with none. In 2013, all of the decay identified occurred in 12% of those surveyed. Calculation of the average number of decayed, missing or filled teeth in this group with decay (referred to as  $d_{3mft}>0$ ) allows us to understand more about the extent of disease in the mouths of children who were affected.

Among the children with decay experience, the average number of decayed, missing (due to decay) or filled teeth was 3.08 (most children have all 20 primary teeth present by age three). Figure 7 shows the England average and far less variation across the regions than for the average  $d_{3mft}$  calculated for all children.

**Figure 7: Average number of dentinally decayed, missing (due to decay) and filled teeth ( $d_{3mft}$ ) among three-year-old children with decay experience ( $d_{3mft}>0$ ). England by government region, 2013**



Error bars represent 95% confidence limits

At upper-tier local authority level the variation of severity among affected children was greater, ranging from 2.09  $d_{3mft}$  in Leicestershire to 4.75 in Bristol (only valid estimates included).


At lower-tier local authority level the variation was wider with an average  $d_{3mft}$  for this sub-group with valid estimates ranging from 1.61 in Blaby to 4.75 in Bristol.

### Prevalence of extraction experience (children with teeth extracted due to dental decay) at age three

The proportion of three-year-old children, who have had one or more teeth extracted on one or more occasions, across England, was less than 1% (figure 8). At upper-tier level the variation was small and ranged from zero in many areas to 3% in Herefordshire county. The range at lower tier level was greater with little relationship between caries prevalence and the likelihood of having had an extraction experience. For example, Leicester had the highest prevalence of disease experience at 34%, the joint third poorest severity with an average  $d_{3mft}$  of 1.06 but had the seventh lowest proportion of children who had experienced extractions.

It should be noted that the vast majority of these extractions would have required admission to hospital for such young children.

**Figure 8: Percentage of three-year-old children with caries experience who have had one or more teeth extracted due to dental decay ( $mt > 0$ ) in England by region, 2013**



Error bars represent 95% confidence limits

## Prevalence of early childhood caries


For the first time data was collected that allowed for investigation into a specific type of caries called early childhood caries (ECC). This is an aggressive form of decay that affects upper incisors and can be rapid and extensive in attack. It is associated with long term bottle use with sugar-sweetened drinks, especially when these are given overnight for long periods of the day. The definition of ECC used here is:

Caries affecting any surface of one or more upper primary incisors, regardless of the caries status of any other teeth.<sup>10</sup>

Overall the prevalence of ECC was 4% (figure 9) and varied by region, but at upper-tier level there was a far wider range from less than 1% in eight local authorities to 16% in Hillingdon.

At lower-tier local authority the range was greater with 33 local authorities having less than 1% of their three-year olds with ECC, in contrast nine local authorities had 10% or more affected.

**Figure 9: Percentage of three-year-old children with early childhood caries in England by government region, 2013**



Error bars represent 95% confidence limits



## Children with sepsis at the time of the examination

Among three-year olds, virtually all sepsis will be the result of the dental decay process rather than originating from gum problems. Sepsis was defined in the protocol as the presence of a dental abscess or sinus recorded by visual examination of the soft tissues. Across England 0.4% of three-year-old children showed signs of sepsis and, as expected, the level was generally higher in those areas where there were higher levels of decay. For example, the highest levels occurred in the East Midlands region (0.6%) and the lowest in the South West, South East and North East (0.2%).

Between lower-tier local authorities the range ran from less than 1% in 89 authorities to over 3% in Bradford.


## Comparisons with survey results of five-year-old children

It is of value to investigate the relationship between caries levels found among three-year-olds and that among five-year olds for each lower-tier local authority. Data from the most recent survey of five-year olds has been used to do this.<sup>9</sup> While the analysis does not constitute a longitudinal survey as different children appear in the two samples, it can give indications as to the change in disease levels between the two ages and show the age at which interventions may be most beneficial in areas where caries levels are high.

For this purpose the same convention was used with regard to missing incisors for both age groups, ie, that missing incisors are all assumed to have exfoliated. Therefore, figures for three-year olds vary slightly from those quoted in the rest of the report.

Overall, the strength of association between caries prevalence at age three and age five at lower-tier local authority level was moderate ( $R^2=0.48$ ) (figure 10). It is to be expected that there would be some association as dentinal carious lesions do not resolve, so if they are measured at age three they will also be present at age five. However, there is a fair degree of scatter that shows there are localities where this relationship is weak and suggest the need for investigation.

**Figure 10: Correlation between caries prevalence at age three and at age five for lower-tier local authorities in England, 2013**



## Section 3. Implications of results

### Variation and inequality

For the first time, this report is able to show the wide variation in the levels of dental decay experienced by three-year-old children living in different parts of the country. The cause of dental decay is well understood and is related to the frequent exposure of teeth to fermentable carbohydrates, most commonly through eating and drinking sugary snacks and drinks.<sup>11</sup> In this young age group the impact of infant feeding and weaning is of particular note. High frequency consumption of sugar-containing food and drink is also a contributory factor to other issues of public health concern in children – for example, childhood obesity.

The variation in dental decay reported at the local authority (lower-tier level) has some correlation with the index of multiple deprivation, with the highest levels of disease tending to be seen in the most deprived areas. However, there were several examples of local authorities with relatively high IMD 2010 score but where the prevalence of caries experience was low; Hartlepool (IMD 2010 38.43, prevalence 5%), Stoke on Trent (38.53, 7%) and Sandwell (40.32,

10%). In contrast there were examples of relatively affluent lower-tier local authorities where caries prevalence was high: Blaby (9.62, 25%), Charnwood (16.34, 29%) and Hillingdon (19.86, 25%). While the two out of the three former situations can be explained by the presence of natural or artificial water fluoridation it is difficult to explain the situation of the latter three. Other factors should be considered as the reason, such as cultural behavioural norms.

Results show that a very large proportion of three-year-old children had no decay and that there was greater polarisation of caries in this age group than has been typically seen among five-year olds.

### Changes in levels of decay between the ages of three and five

The association between caries prevalence at age three and the same measure at age five is to be expected but does not explain all the variation in disease at age five. It is therefore likely to be useful for each local authority to seek advice about the patterns of decay and stages when this occurs for their own population. What seems clear, however, is that caries experience is already apparent in many children by the age of three.

### Putting this information to use

Data from this survey can be used to give background information when approaching the PHOF dental indicator (4.2 tooth decay in children aged five).

Where general caries levels at age three are high, it is clear that interventions need to be targeted at younger age groups in an effort to reduce caries levels at age five.

For local authorities where the specific problem of ECC is widely prevalent interventions should be developed that tackle specific problems related to feeding practices, essential action would be to stop the prolonged use of feeding bottles that contain sugar sweetened beverages. Substitution with water or unsweetened milk and use of free flow trainer cups and beakers instead feeding bottles from the age of one are required to prevent further attack. Support for parents is required to bring these changes about. Guidance is provided in 'Delivering better oral health: an evidence based toolkit for prevention'<sup>12</sup> and 'Local authorities improving oral health: commissioning better oral health for children and young people, an evidence-informed toolkit for local authorities'.<sup>2</sup>

Where caries levels increase sharply between the ages of three and five years, interventions need to tackle the causes of caries during this later stage of the life course. Such interventions would seek to reduce the frequency of sugar consumption in food and drinks as well as increasing the availability of fluoride in a choice of vehicles.

Locally these data can also be used in oral health needs assessments, and in contributions to Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs). Commissioning or providing dental public health programmes, which are the responsibility of local authorities, should be commissioned following strategic planning. Advice is available from consultants in dental public health at PHE centres regarding planning and commissioning tailored oral health improvement programmes. There is good evidence that, in addition to place based generic health improvement activities, which will address some of the common risk factors for dental decay, strategies to increase the exposure to fluoride are effective.<sup>13</sup> The PHE guidance 'Local authorities improving oral health: commissioning better oral health for children and young people, an evidence-informed toolkit for local authorities'<sup>2</sup> provides a range of tools to assist with selection of suitable interventions to improve oral health.

Local authorities may also wish to seek dental public health advice from PHE centres with regard to commissioning of specific surveys or larger samples using this methodology to evaluate their interventions and gain more detailed information about the oral health of their populations.

## Section 4. References

1. The Stationery Office (2006). Health & Social Care Act 2012. Available at [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/7/enacted](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/7/enacted)
2. Public Health England (2014). Local authorities improving oral health: commissioning better oral health for children and young people. An evidence-informed toolkit for local authorities. [www.gov.uk/government/publications/improving-oral-health-an-evidence-informed-toolkit-for-local-authorities](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/improving-oral-health-an-evidence-informed-toolkit-for-local-authorities)
3. Statutory Instrument 2012 No 3094. National Health Service, England Social Care Fund, England Public Health, England. The NHS Bodies and Local Authorities (Partnership Arrangements, Care Trusts, Public Health and Local Health watch) Regulations 2012. Available at : <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/3094/part/4/made>
4. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-lives-healthy-people-improving-outcomes-and-supporting-transparency>
5. Pine, C. M., Pitts, N.B. and Nugent, Z.J. (1997a). British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry (BASCD) guidance on the statistical aspects of training and calibration of examiners for surveys of child dental health. A BASCD co-ordinated dental epidemiology programme quality standard. Community Dental Health **14** (Supplement 1):18-29.

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

6. Pitts, N.B., Evans, D.J. and Pine, C.M. (1997) British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry (BASCD) diagnostic criteria for caries prevalence surveys – 1996/97. *Community Dental Health* **14** (Supplement 1): 6-9.
7. Pine, C.M., Pitts, N.B. and Nugent, Z.J. (1997b) British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry (BASCD) guidance on sampling for surveys of child dental health. A BASCD coordinated dental epidemiology programme quality standard. *Community Dental Health* **14** (Supplement 1):10-17.
8. Office for National Statistics (2013). Ward population estimates, mid – 2011(Census based). Statistical bulletin. Available at: [www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778\\_311891.pdf](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_311891.pdf)
9. Public Health England National dental epidemiology programme: oral health survey of five-year-old children 2012. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay. [www.nwph.net/dentalhealth/](http://www.nwph.net/dentalhealth/)
10. Davies GM, Blinkhorn FA and Duxbury JT (2001). Caries among 3-year-olds in Greater Manchester. *British Dental Journal* **190**: 381-384
11. Rugg-Gunn, A. J. (1992). British Society of Paediatric Dentistry policy document sugars and the dental health of children. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* **2**: 177-180
12. Public Health England (2014). Delivering better oral health: an evidence based toolkit for prevention. Third edition. [www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-better-oral-health-an-evidence-based-toolkit-for-prevention](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-better-oral-health-an-evidence-based-toolkit-for-prevention)
13. Kay E, Locker, D. A systematic review of the effectiveness of health promotion aimed at improving oral health. (2002) The University of York Centre for reviews and dissemination, NHS national institute for health research, England.

## Section 5. Supplementary tables

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 1. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, upper tier local authority (LA)

Region	Upper Tier LA Code	Upper Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft (% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
Eng	Eng	England	8.1	0.36	11.7	3.08	3.9	0.35	0.37	11.5	12.0	3.01	3.15	3.7	4.1
East Midlands	00FK	Derby	4.0	0.73	13.5	5.41	4.4	0.20	1.26	7.2	19.7	2.68	8.14	0.5	8.4
	17	Derbyshire	13.3	0.28	9.2	3.05	2.4	0.21	0.35	7.5	10.9	2.52	3.58	1.5	3.3
	00FN	Leicester	7.6	1.06	34.0	3.12	11.3	0.82	1.30	29.2	38.8	2.57	3.67	8.1	14.5
	31	Leicestershire	16.0	0.39	18.6	2.09	2.6	0.33	0.45	16.3	20.8	1.89	2.29	1.7	3.5
	32	Lincolnshire	0.0												
	34	Northamptonshire	10.5	0.39	11.9	3.25	3.2	0.29	0.49	9.9	14.0	2.69	3.81	2.1	4.4
	00FY	Nottingham	6.5	0.50	16.6	3.05	4.2	0.30	0.70	12.0	21.1	2.18	3.92	1.6	6.7
	37	Nottinghamshire (data for Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield & Rushcliffe ONLY)	8.2	0.35	12.9	2.67	2.7	0.22	0.48	10.3	15.5	1.88	3.46	1.3	4.1
	00FP	Rutland	46.4	0.33	14.9	2.22	1.8	0.14	0.52	8.3	21.5	1.60	2.84	0.0	3.9
East of England	00KB	Bedford	10.0	0.37	10.8	3.40	5.6	0.15	0.59	6.5	15.2	1.92	4.88	2.3	8.9
	12	Cambridgeshire	14.4	0.16	4.8	3.38	2.1	0.11	0.21	3.5	6.0	2.67	4.09	1.2	2.9
	00KC	Central Bedfordshire	6.1	0.13	6.2	2.09	1.9	0.03	0.23	2.9	9.6	1.86	2.32	0.0	3.8
	22	Essex (data for Basildon, Braintree, Brentwood, Castle Point, Chelmsford, Colchester, Epping Forest, Harlow, Maldon, Rochford & Uttlesford ONLY)	7.7	0.17	6.3	2.65	1.8	0.13	0.21	4.9	7.6	2.25	3.05	1.0	2.5
	26	Hertfordshire	7.1	0.30	11.6	2.61	2.9	0.23	0.37	9.6	13.7	2.24	2.98	1.9	3.9
	00KA	Luton	6.3	0.79	21.8	3.62	10.4	0.47	1.11	16.2	27.5	2.50	4.74	6.2	14.7
	33	Norfolk	12.5	0.27	9.9	2.77	0.7	0.20	0.34	8.2	11.6	2.24	3.30	0.2	1.2
	00JA	Peterborough	4.8	0.44	10.2	4.27	5.0	0.11	0.77	4.8	15.6	1.91	6.63	1.0	9.0
	00KF	Southend-on-Sea	9.9	0.22	5.6	4.01	3.8	0.06	0.38	2.6	8.5	2.31	5.71	1.4	6.3
	42	Suffolk	14.9	0.20	6.9	2.94	1.6	0.14	0.26	5.4	8.3	2.32	3.56	0.9	2.3
00KG	Thurrock	2.6	0.15	7.3	2.09	0.0	0.01	0.29	1.3	13.4	2.09	2.09	0.0	0.0	
London	00AB	Barking and Dagenham	6.4	0.45	18.0	2.49	6.2	0.30	0.60	13.1	22.9	2.01	2.97	3.2	9.2
	00AC	Barnet	3.8	0.58	16.2	3.55	6.1	0.34	0.82	11.1	21.3	2.50	4.60	2.8	9.5
	00AD	Bexley	0.0												
	00AE	Brent	3.2	0.83	20.3	4.10	9.4	0.50	1.16	13.5	27.1	3.22	4.98	4.5	14.4
	00AF	Bromley	5.3	0.31	8.0	3.89	4.6	0.11	0.51	4.5	11.5	1.97	5.81	1.9	7.3
	00AG	Camden	6.4	0.33	12.5	2.64	2.2	0.15	0.51	7.1	18.0	1.85	3.43	0.0	4.5
	00AA	City of London	2.2												
	00AH	Croydon	3.5	0.41	12.8	3.25	4.9	0.20	0.62	8.1	17.4	2.07	4.43	1.9	7.9
	00AJ	Ealing	4.6	0.41	16.8	2.47	6.0	0.26	0.56	12.0	21.7	1.90	3.04	3.0	9.1
	00AK	Enfield	4.3	0.66	18.4	3.58	5.1	0.42	0.90	13.2	23.7	2.72	4.44	2.1	8.1
	00AL	Greenwich	0.0												
	00AM	Hackney	5.0	0.49	12.9	3.79	5.2	0.21	0.77	8.0	17.9	2.39	5.19	1.8	8.5
	00AN	Hammersmith and Fulham	8.2	0.27	7.6	3.54	3.6	0.11	0.43	4.0	11.3	2.19	4.89	1.0	6.1
	00AP	Haringey	5.1	0.32	10.6	2.99	3.9	0.09	0.55	5.6	15.6	1.36	4.62	0.7	7.0
	00AQ	Harrow	5.9	0.82	18.3	4.47	9.5	0.46	1.18	12.5	24.0	3.08	5.86	5.2	13.7
	00AR	Havering	6.9	0.36	12.5	2.85	4.5	0.19	0.53	8.0	16.9	1.89	3.81	1.7	7.3

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 1. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, upper tier local authority (LA)

Region	Upper Tier LA Code	Upper Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft (% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
London	00AS	Hillingdon	5.8	0.91	25.3	3.59	16.1	0.63	1.19	19.6	31.0	2.83	4.35	11.2	21.0
	00AT	Hounslow	2.5	0.67	17.0	3.94	6.4	0.25	1.09	9.6	24.3	2.23	5.65	1.5	11.4
	00AU	Islington	0.0												
	00AW	Kensington and Chelsea	7.4	0.44	15.0	2.92	7.4	0.20	0.68	8.3	21.7	1.78	4.06	2.6	12.2
	00AX	Kingston upon Thames	9.8	0.09	6.1	1.42	0.0	0.04	0.14	3.0	9.2	1.08	1.76	0.0	0.0
	00AY	Lambeth	4.6	0.19	10.2	1.86	0.6	0.07	0.31	5.7	14.7	0.97	2.75	0.0	1.6
	00AZ	Lewisham	4.7	0.14	9.0	1.56	1.8	0.07	0.21	5.0	13.0	1.17	1.95	0.1	3.6
	00BA	Merton	8.7	0.45	13.7	3.24	6.2	0.27	0.63	9.5	17.9	2.29	4.19	3.2	9.1
	00BB	Newham	3.8	0.95	23.1	4.09	14.0	0.61	1.29	17.0	29.3	3.12	5.06	8.9	19.0
	00BC	Redbridge	3.3	0.21	9.3	2.23	2.0	0.09	0.33	4.7	13.9	1.47	2.99	0.0	4.2
	00BD	Richmond upon Thames	7.7	0.12	9.8	1.19	0.5	0.07	0.17	5.8	13.8	0.97	1.41	0.0	1.4
	00BE	Southwark	5.6	0.33	10.7	3.13	2.1	0.12	0.54	6.4	14.9	1.59	4.67	0.1	4.2
	00BF	Sutton	8.7	0.10	5.8	1.80	1.5	0.04	0.16	2.8	8.8	1.38	2.22	0.0	3.0
	00BG	Tower Hamlets	5.0	0.55	17.3	3.17	9.1	0.32	0.78	11.9	22.8	2.26	4.08	5.0	13.2
	00BH	Waltham Forest	0.0					0.00	0.25						
00BJ	Wandsworth	7.2	0.22	8.3	2.69	0.8	0.08	0.36	4.8	11.8	1.66	3.72	0.0	1.9	
00BK	Westminster	3.0	0.59	16.0	3.68	10.3	0.17	1.01	7.2	24.7	2.50	4.86	3.0	17.7	
North East	00EJ	County Durham	4.0	0.21	6.3	3.30	1.5	0.08	0.34	3.2	9.4	1.90	4.70	0.0	3.0
	00EH	Darlington	15.5	0.28	6.2	4.50	3.2	0.10	0.46	3.0	9.3	3.32	5.68	0.7	5.6
	00CH	Gateshead	9.2	0.37	13.7	2.73	3.0	0.18	0.56	9.2	18.3	1.74	3.72	0.6	5.3
	00EB	Hartlepool	18.2	0.12	4.7	2.54	1.3	0.03	0.21	1.8	7.5	1.58	3.50	0.0	2.8
	00EC	Middlesbrough	14.2	0.53	17.3	3.08	8.1	0.34	0.72	12.8	21.7	2.27	3.89	4.8	11.4
	00CJ	Newcastle upon Tyne	6.9	0.26	11.0	2.41	3.5	0.14	0.38	6.8	15.1	1.79	3.03	1.0	6.0
	00CK	North Tyneside	8.4	0.16	4.0	4.03	1.5	0.02	0.30	1.3	6.8	2.05	6.01	0.0	3.2
	00EM	Northumberland	7.0	0.28	9.7	2.90	4.6	0.13	0.43	5.7	13.6	1.91	3.89	1.9	7.4
	00EE	Redcar and Cleveland	14.0	0.45	17.3	2.61	5.0	0.26	0.64	12.1	22.5	1.82	3.40	1.9	8.0
	00CL	South Tyneside	12.3	0.17	5.1	3.25	1.3	0.06	0.28	2.2	8.0	1.97	4.53	0.0	2.8
	00EF	Stockton-on-Tees	8.5	0.23	7.3	3.18	2.2	0.07	0.39	3.5	11.2	1.81	4.55	0.1	4.4
00CM	Sunderland	6.3	0.54	18.4	2.94	7.4	0.34	0.74	13.0	23.8	2.25	3.63	3.8	11.0	
North West (data collected 2011)	00EX	Blackburn with Darwen	15.9	0.79	20.6	3.81	9.1	0.57	1.01	16.5	24.8	3.12	4.50	6.1	12.0
	00EY	Blackpool	13.9	0.63	16.9	3.74	8.1	0.38	0.88	12.2	21.6	2.67	4.81	4.6	11.5
	00BL	Bolton	13.0	0.76	17.8	4.25	9.1	0.57	0.95	14.6	21.1	3.52	4.98	6.6	11.6
	00BM	Bury	8.7	0.61	18.4	3.29	5.3	0.39	0.83	13.2	23.7	2.50	4.08	2.3	8.3
	00EQ	Cheshire East	1.5	0.11	11.2	1.00	0.0	0.00	0.24	1.0	21.4	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
	00EW	Cheshire West and Chester	21.1	0.22	7.9	2.73	1.5	0.14	0.30	5.9	9.9	1.95	3.51	0.6	2.4
	16	Cumbria	25.6	0.40	12.0	3.34	4.5	0.32	0.48	10.2	13.8	2.87	3.81	3.3	5.7
	00ET	Halton	33.8	0.25	10.3	2.45	2.6	0.16	0.34	7.7	13.0	1.90	3.00	1.2	3.9
	00BX	Knowsley	18.2	0.31	10.5	2.92	4.4	0.18	0.44	7.1	14.0	2.22	3.62	2.0	6.7
	30	Lancashire (data for Burnley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale & Wyre ONLY)	10.8	0.53	15.6	3.41	4.8	0.45	0.61	13.8	17.4	3.08	3.74	3.8	5.8
	00BY	Liverpool	17.9	0.36	11.0	3.26	2.9	0.27	0.45	8.9	13.0	2.68	3.84	1.8	4.0
00BN	Manchester	6.3	1.06	25.6	4.15	12.6	0.84	1.28	21.6	29.7	3.58	4.72	9.5	15.7	

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 1. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, upper tier local authority (LA)

Region	Upper Tier LA Code	Upper Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft (% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
North West (data collected 2011)	00BP	Oldham	15.3	1.08	30.4	3.55	13.8	0.87	1.29	26.4	34.3	3.04	4.06	10.8	16.8
	00BQ	Rochdale	3.2	0.55	18.9	2.89	5.9	0.28	0.82	10.9	26.9	2.12	3.66	1.2	10.6
	00BR	Salford	7.2	0.70	24.8	2.81	5.8	0.48	0.92	19.1	30.5	2.22	3.40	2.6	9.0
	00CA	Sefton	20.9	0.25	10.2	2.46	4.0	0.17	0.33	7.8	12.6	1.94	2.98	2.4	5.5
	00BZ	St Helens	26.3	0.29	10.2	2.85	2.9	0.19	0.39	7.6	12.9	2.18	3.52	1.5	4.4
	00BS	Stockport	6.8	0.42	15.4	2.75	6.2	0.25	0.59	10.7	20.1	1.99	3.51	3.0	9.5
	00BT	Tameside	17.6	0.55	16.8	3.29	5.1	0.40	0.70	13.6	20.0	2.67	3.91	3.2	7.1
	00BU	Trafford	13.8	0.23	9.2	2.53	2.0	0.14	0.32	6.5	11.8	1.89	3.17	0.7	3.4
	00EU	Warrington	31.6	0.35	10.5	3.34	3.8	0.26	0.44	8.4	12.6	2.79	3.89	2.5	5.1
	00BW	Wigan	5.7	0.16	8.5	1.90	2.0	0.06	0.26	4.7	12.2	1.22	2.58	0.1	4.0
00CB	Wirral	22.3	0.39	13.4	2.87	4.8	0.30	0.48	11.1	15.8	2.43	3.31	3.3	6.3	
South East	00MA	Bracknell Forest	11.0	0.34	11.4	3.00	5.7	0.16	0.52	6.7	16.2	1.91	4.09	2.3	9.1
	00ML	Brighton and Hove	2.3	0.44	14.4	3.03	6.8	0.05	0.83	4.0	24.8	2.34	3.72	0.0	13.7
	11	Buckinghamshire	12.2	0.28	8.3	3.43	3.4	0.19	0.37	6.4	10.2	2.67	4.19	2.1	4.6
	21	East Sussex	0.0												
	24	Hampshire (data for Basingstoke & Dean, East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Hart, Havant, New Forest, Test Valley & Winchester ONLY)	9.4	0.12	4.6	2.55	1.4	0.09	0.15	3.5	5.7	2.09	3.01	0.8	2.1
	00MW	Isle of Wight	18.6	0.43	13.5	3.19	3.1	0.22	0.64	9.0	18.0	2.12	4.26	0.9	5.3
	29	Kent	6.6	0.18	6.3	2.88	1.6	0.13	0.23	5.0	7.7	2.39	3.37	0.9	2.3
	00LC	Medway	5.2	0.15	6.1	2.38	0.4	0.03	0.27	2.6	9.6	1.01	3.75	0.0	1.3
	00MG	Milton Keynes	4.9	0.25	7.8	3.17	2.6	0.09	0.41	4.0	11.6	1.53	4.81	0.3	4.9
	38	Oxfordshire	14.3	0.28	10.3	2.67	2.4	0.22	0.34	8.6	12.1	2.26	3.08	1.5	3.3
	00MR	Portsmouth	7.5	0.18	8.7	2.04	1.5	0.08	0.28	4.9	12.5	1.22	2.86	0.0	3.2
	00MC	Reading	13.1	0.74	17.4	4.24	10.6	0.49	0.99	13.2	21.6	3.25	5.23	7.2	14.0
	00MD	Slough	8.7	1.17	25.7	4.54	13.9	0.81	1.53	19.8	31.5	3.63	5.45	9.3	18.5
	00MS	Southampton	14.9	0.40	10.5	3.83	7.0	0.25	0.55	7.7	13.4	2.80	4.86	4.6	9.4
	43	Surrey	3.5	0.11	5.1	2.17	1.6	0.06	0.16	3.2	7.0	1.65	2.69	0.5	2.6
00MB	West Berkshire	9.9	0.21	7.4	2.89	3.5	0.08	0.34	3.9	11.0	1.63	4.15	1.2	5.8	
45	West Sussex (data for Arun, Chichester & Worthing ONLY)	0.5	0.32	12.4	2.61	3.5	0.03	0.61	4.6	20.3	0.92	4.30	0.0	8.2	
00ME	Windsor and Maidenhead	10.7	0.20	8.2	2.48	1.9	0.08	0.32	4.5	12.0	1.76	3.20	0.1	3.8	
00MF	Wokingham	9.3	0.22	5.4	4.03	0.9	0.03	0.41	2.3	8.6	1.20	6.86	0.0	2.1	
South West	00HA	Bath and North East Somerset	0.0												
	00HN	Bournemouth	9.1	0.34	12.2	2.81	5.5	0.19	0.49	7.5	16.8	2.09	3.53	2.5	8.5
	00HB	Bristol, City of	3.7	0.73	15.3	4.75	5.7	0.43	1.03	11.1	19.5	3.49	6.01	2.8	8.6
	00HE	Cornwall	3.5	0.29	10.7	2.74	1.7	0.16	0.42	6.6	14.8	2.02	3.46	0.4	2.9
	18	Devon (data for East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon, North Devon, South Hams, Teignbridge & Torridge ONLY)	20.1	0.22	8.6	2.56	1.9	0.17	0.27	7.2	10.0	2.18	2.94	1.2	2.6
19	Dorset	28.0	0.26	9.9	2.61	3.6	0.20	0.32	8.1	11.6	2.18	3.04	2.5	4.8	



Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 1. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, upper tier local authority (LA)

Region	Upper Tier LA Code	Upper Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft (% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
South West	23	Gloucestershire	11.7	0.31	12.6	2.50	2.6	0.23	0.39	10.3	14.9	2.07	2.93	1.5	3.7
	00HF	Isles of Scilly <sup>1</sup>	42.1	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0
	00HC	North Somerset	8.5	0.31	11.1	2.78	2.9	0.18	0.44	6.4	15.7	2.05	3.51	0.9	4.9
	00HG	Plymouth	6.4	0.19	6.0	3.07	1.7	0.06	0.32	2.7	9.4	2.34	3.80	0.0	3.6
	00HP	Poole	13.2	0.41	12.4	3.31	3.7	0.21	0.61	8.0	16.8	2.17	4.45	1.2	6.3
	40	Somerset	10.4	0.33	9.9	3.32	3.2	0.22	0.44	7.5	12.3	2.47	4.17	1.8	4.6
	00HD	South Gloucestershire	6.0	0.03	1.9	1.82	0.0	0.00	0.07	0.0	3.8	1.82	1.82	0.0	0.0
	00HX	Swindon	5.8	0.18	7.9	2.21	1.3	0.01	0.35	3.8	12.1	0.45	3.97	0.0	3.0
	00HH	Torbay	16.0	0.58	13.1	4.40	5.1	0.30	0.86	8.5	17.7	2.90	5.90	2.2	8.1
00HY	Wiltshire	3.3	0.35	13.5	2.62	3.2	0.20	0.50	8.7	18.3	2.04	3.20	0.6	5.7	
West Midlands	00CN	Birmingham	3.9	0.33	12.5	2.66	3.6	0.22	0.44	9.9	15.2	2.06	3.26	2.0	5.2
	00CQ	Coventry	2.9	0.46	14.4	3.17	6.6	0.19	0.73	8.4	20.4	1.81	4.53	2.4	10.8
	00CR	Dudley	2.8	0.18	10.1	1.81	2.1	0.05	0.31	4.8	15.5	1.05	2.57	0.0	5.0
	00GA	Herefordshire, County of	9.2	0.71	22.3	3.18	5.6	0.45	0.97	16.5	28.2	2.37	3.99	2.3	8.8
	00CS	Sandwell	4.2	0.21	10.1	2.08	3.8	0.10	0.32	5.9	14.2	1.41	2.75	1.0	6.7
	00GG	Shropshire	6.2	0.24	7.5	3.15	0.4	0.08	0.40	3.7	11.3	1.79	4.51	0.0	1.1
	00CT	Solihull	6.8	0.26	14.0	1.85	0.6	0.09	0.43	7.1	21.0	0.92	2.78	0.0	1.6
	41	Staffordshire	6.8	0.14	4.0	3.48	1.2	0.06	0.22	2.5	5.6	2.10	4.86	0.3	2.2
	00GL	Stoke-on-Trent	9.0	0.27	7.2	3.77	3.7	0.14	0.40	4.3	10.1	2.81	4.73	1.5	5.8
	00GF	Telford and Wrekin	9.8	0.22	6.8	3.30	3.7	0.09	0.35	3.5	10.1	2.39	4.21	1.2	6.2
	00CU	Walsall	5.1	0.23	12.7	1.81	3.3	0.12	0.34	7.9	17.5	1.23	2.39	0.7	5.8
	44	Warwickshire	11.9	0.19	5.8	3.25	2.1	0.12	0.26	4.1	7.4	2.39	4.11	1.1	3.1
	00CW	Wolverhampton	5.0	0.31	15.1	2.06	2.2	0.17	0.45	9.9	20.3	1.47	2.65	0.1	4.3
	47	Worcestershire	8.5	0.30	10.3	2.95	4.3	0.20	0.40	7.8	12.8	2.29	3.61	2.6	6.0
Yorkshire and the Humber	00CC	Barnsley	7.7	0.44	11.8	3.72	6.6	0.20	0.68	7.4	16.2	2.13	5.31	3.1	10.0
	00CX	Bradford	2.1	0.58	17.1	3.42	7.2	0.31	0.85	11.4	22.8	2.27	4.57	3.3	11.0
	00CY	Calderdale	5.3	0.42	12.1	3.49	5.6	0.18	0.66	6.7	17.4	2.22	4.76	2.0	9.1
	00CE	Doncaster	5.2	0.31	8.6	3.67	3.3	0.10	0.52	4.4	12.7	1.90	5.44	0.7	5.9
	00FB	East Riding of Yorkshire	1.9	0.16	4.0	3.93	2.8	0.00	0.38	0.2	7.8	1.04	8.90	0.0	6.3
	00FA	Kingston upon Hull, City of	1.9	0.30	14.2	2.10	1.1	0.12	0.48	6.4	21.9	1.51	2.69	0.0	3.3
	00CZ	Kirklees	3.3	0.60	15.3	3.89	6.2	0.35	0.85	10.0	20.6	2.78	5.00	3.3	9.1
	00DA	Leeds	2.0	0.49	19.4	2.51	7.5	0.30	0.68	13.7	25.0	1.94	3.08	3.7	11.3
	00FC	North East Lincolnshire	8.7	0.37	15.0	2.49	5.7	0.15	0.59	8.4	21.7	1.66	3.32	1.2	10.2
	00FD	North Lincolnshire	6.0	0.15	8.1	1.92	2.6	0.04	0.26	3.3	12.8	1.10	2.74	0.0	5.4
	36	North Yorkshire	19.2	0.22	8.8	2.49	2.5	0.17	0.27	7.2	10.4	2.11	2.87	1.6	3.4
	00CF	Rotherham	6.0	0.46	11.6	3.98	6.2	0.21	0.71	6.9	16.3	2.65	5.31	2.6	9.8
	00CG	Sheffield	2.9	0.23	8.4	2.70	1.8	0.09	0.37	4.4	12.4	1.78	3.62	0.0	3.7
	00DB	Wakefield	2.5	0.51	19.8	2.59	7.2	0.23	0.79	12.1	27.5	1.58	3.60	2.2	12.2
	00FF	York	7.2	0.21	6.9	3.00	1.8	0.03	0.39	3.0	10.8	0.93	5.07	0.0	3.8

<sup>1</sup>Isles of Scilly figures have been reported because 100% of the sample and 42% of the population have been examined.

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 1. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, upper tier local authority (LA)

Region	Region Code	Region Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d <sub>3</sub> mft (% d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
Regions	E	East Midlands	9.1	0.45	15.8	2.85	3.9	0.40	0.50	14.8	16.9	2.64	3.06	3.3	4.5
	G	East of England	9.5	0.24	8.2	2.93	2.3	0.21	0.27	7.6	8.9	2.71	3.15	1.9	2.6
	H	London	4.7	0.42	13.6	3.11	5.3	0.38	0.46	12.7	14.6	2.92	3.30	4.7	5.9
	A	North East	8.7	0.30	10.1	2.96	3.5	0.26	0.34	8.9	11.2	2.67	3.25	2.8	4.2
	B	North West	14.1	0.47	14.3	3.30	5.1	0.44	0.50	13.7	14.9	3.17	3.43	4.7	5.5
	J	South East	7.2	0.27	8.6	3.16	3.1	0.24	0.30	8.0	9.2	2.95	3.37	2.8	3.5
	K	South West	10.1	0.31	10.5	2.94	3.0	0.28	0.34	9.7	11.2	2.74	3.14	2.6	3.5
	F	West Midlands	6.2	0.28	10.1	2.77	3.0	0.25	0.31	9.2	11.0	2.54	3.00	2.5	3.6
	D	Yorkshire and The Humber	5.1	0.39	12.6	3.09	4.8	0.34	0.44	11.4	13.8	2.81	3.37	4.0	5.5
<b>Eng</b>	<b>Eng</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>

All or part LA did not partake in survey  
 Number examined too small (<30) for robust estimate  
 Based on fewer than 30 volunteers



DRAFT

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
Eng	Eng	England	8.1	0.36	11.7	3.08	3.9	0.35	0.37	11.5	12.0	3.01	3.15	3.7	4.1
East Midlands	17UB	Amber Valley	11.2	0.18	3.80	4.63	1.9	0.01	0.35	0.53	7.07	4.03	5.23	0.2	4.1
	37UB	Ashfield	2.9	0.14	5.21	2.67	2.2	0.07	0.35	0.47	10.89	0.60	5.94	1.9	6.2
	37UC	Bassetlaw	0.0												
	31UB	Blaby	16.6	0.40	25.14	1.61	0.6	0.28	0.52	18.85	31.43	1.33	1.89	0.6	1.7
	17UC	Bolsover	13.9	0.38	11.12	3.41	5.5	0.18	0.58	5.67	16.57	2.85	3.97	1.7	9.2
	32UB	Boston	0.0												
	37UD	Broxtowe	17.1	0.27	11.62	2.37	2.4	0.13	0.41	7.21	16.03	1.53	3.21	0.3	4.5
	31UC	Charnwood	9.2	0.65	29.30	2.23	3.3	0.47	0.83	22.27	36.33	1.87	2.59	0.9	5.7
	17UD	Chesterfield	7.9	0.27	9.14	2.90	2.4	0.07	0.47	3.08	15.20	1.91	3.89	0.9	5.6
	34UB	Corby	18.4	0.59	15.35	3.86	4.8	0.29	0.89	9.83	20.87	2.42	5.30	1.5	8.1
	34UC	Daventry	17.4	0.44	13.86	3.19	4.7	0.20	0.68	8.52	19.20	1.90	4.48	1.4	8.0
	00FK	Derby	4.0	0.73	13.45	5.41	4.4	0.20	1.26	7.20	19.70	2.68	8.14	0.5	8.4
	17UF	Derbyshire Dales	15.9	0.29	10.87	2.65	2.0	0.06	0.52	4.67	17.07	1.98	3.32	0.8	4.9
	32UC	East Lindsey	0.0												
	34UD	East Northamptonshire	11.3	0.32	8.52	3.72	1.9	0.04	0.60	3.45	13.59	2.97	4.47	0.7	4.5
	17UG	Erewash	10.2	0.67	19.71	3.41	5.3	0.33	1.01	13.23	26.19	1.97	4.85	1.5	9.1
	37UE	Gedling	13.0	0.52	20.09	2.61	3.0	0.26	0.78	14.05	26.13	1.59	3.63	0.5	5.4
	31UD	Harborough	21.1	0.21	13.16	1.60	3.0	0.13	0.29	8.50	17.82	1.39	1.81	0.6	5.3
	17UH	High Peak	29.2	0.20	8.44	2.37	1.0	0.09	0.31	5.03	11.85	1.46	3.28	0.1	2.1
	31UE	Hinckley and Bosworth	9.8	0.48	17.31	2.76	2.6	0.25	0.71	10.41	24.21	1.97	3.55	0.4	5.6
	34UE	Kettering	11.6	0.10	6.30	1.56	0.0	0.03	0.17	2.76	9.84	0.92	2.20	0.0	0.0
	00FN	Leicester	7.6	1.06	33.96	3.12	11.3	0.82	1.30	29.16	38.76	2.57	3.67	8.1	14.5
	32UD	Lincoln	0.0												
	37UF	Mansfield	9.4	0.31	10.11	3.08	3.6	0.06	0.56	4.46	15.76	1.49	4.67	0.1	7.1
	31UG	Melton	31.8	0.31	14.49	2.11	2.2	0.17	0.45	9.44	19.54	1.52	2.70	0.1	4.3
	37UG	Newark and Sherwood	0.0												
	17UJ	North East Derbyshire	9.7	0.02	1.91	1.00	0.0	0.01	0.05	0.67	4.49	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
	32UE	North Kesteven	0.0												
	31UH	North West Leicestershire	18.3	0.35	14.52	2.39	3.9	0.19	0.51	9.60	19.44	1.70	3.08	1.3	6.6
	34UF	Northampton	5.6	0.50	11.69	4.28	5.0	0.21	0.79	6.82	16.56	2.67	5.89	1.7	8.4
	00FY	Nottingham	6.5	0.50	16.56	3.05	4.2	0.30	0.70	12.00	21.12	2.18	3.92	1.6	6.7
	31UJ	Oadby and Wigston	19.4	0.29	13.23	2.15	0.9	0.11	0.47	7.16	19.30	1.16	3.14	0.8	2.6
	37UJ	Rushcliffe	14.3	0.25	14.48	1.73	1.1	0.14	0.36	9.48	19.48	1.22	2.24	0.4	2.7
00FP	Rutland	46.4	0.33	14.90	2.22	1.8	0.14	0.52	8.26	21.54	1.60	2.84	0.3	3.9	
17UK	South Derbyshire	11.9	0.12	6.71	1.76	1.3	0.02	0.22	2.52	10.90	1.44	2.08	0.4	2.9	
32UF	South Holland	0.0													
32UG	South Kesteven	0.0													
34UG	South Northamptonshire	13.9	0.12	6.21	1.99	0.5	0.02	0.22	2.18	10.24	1.06	2.92	0.4	1.3	
34UH	Wellingborough	6.5	0.71	28.40	2.50	4.6	0.29	1.13	16.90	39.90	1.46	3.54	0.6	9.8	
32UH	West Lindsey	0.0													
East of England	42UB	Babergh	22.5	0.11	4.47	2.35	1.7	0.02	0.20	1.59	7.35	0.96	3.74	0.2	3.6
	22UB	Basildon	4.5	0.16	4.70	3.49	0.0	0.02	0.30	1.23	8.17	1.54	5.44	0.0	0.0
	00KB	Bedford	10.0	0.37	10.83	3.40	5.6	0.15	0.59	6.50	15.16	1.92	4.88	2.3	8.9
	22UC	Braintree	5.3	0.18	7.48	2.36	2.0	0.03	0.33	2.48	12.48	1.08	3.64	0.7	4.6

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
East of England	33UB	Breckland	13.0	0.21	9.31	2.29	0.0	0.08	0.34	5.22	13.40	1.43	3.15	0.0	0.0
	22UD	Brentwood	5.9	0.12	8.81	1.36	0.0	0.00	0.24	1.02	16.60	1.36	1.36	0.0	0.0
	33UC	Broadland	15.6	0.11	6.52	1.67	0.0	0.05	0.17	2.94	10.10	1.28	2.06	0.0	0.0
	26UB	Broxbourne	7.0	0.35	15.92	2.19	2.0	0.13	0.57	8.10	23.74	1.47	2.91	0.6	4.6
	12UB	Cambridge	13.8	0.25	5.95	4.16	4.5	0.07	0.43	2.65	9.25	2.95	5.37	1.6	7.4
	22UE	Castle Point	18.7	0.11	5.65	1.89	2.2	0.03	0.19	1.89	9.41	1.15	2.63	0.2	4.6
	00KC	Central Bedfordshire	6.1	0.13	6.23	2.09	1.9	0.03	0.23	2.91	9.55	1.86	2.32	0.0	3.8
	22UF	Chelmsford	6.6	0.18	5.51	3.28	0.9	0.03	0.33	1.58	9.44	2.09	4.47	0.7	2.5
	22UG	Colchester	3.3	0.11	7.91	1.33	2.4	0.03	0.19	2.13	13.69	1.11	1.55	0.9	5.7
	26UC	Dacorum	2.9	0.24	6.69	3.64	3.3	0.03	0.51	0.44	13.82	1.12	6.16	0.1	6.5
	12UC	East Cambridgeshire	16.0	0.06	3.04	2.07	1.3	0.00	0.12	0.22	5.86	1.11	3.03	0.6	3.3
	26UD	East Hertfordshire	9.1	0.31	9.90	3.15	1.8	0.09	0.53	5.33	14.47	1.61	4.69	0.2	3.8
	22UH	Epping Forest	8.4	0.19	6.07	3.10	0.8	0.02	0.36	2.06	10.08	1.42	4.78	0.7	2.2
	12UD	Fenland	23.5	0.21	7.55	2.76	2.0	0.08	0.34	4.17	10.93	1.57	3.95	0.2	3.9
	42UC	Forest Heath	20.4	0.32	8.64	3.73	3.2	0.11	0.53	4.39	12.89	2.32	5.14	0.5	5.8
	33UD	Great Yarmouth	5.4	0.41	6.67	6.21	0.0	0.16	0.98	0.49	12.85	1.17	13.59	0.0	0.0
	22UJ	Harlow	15.6	0.16	6.32	2.55	3.1	0.06	0.26	3.09	9.55	1.71	3.39	0.8	5.3
	26UE	Hertsmere	6.0	0.27	6.99	3.91	3.2	0.07	0.47	3.17	10.81	3.91	3.91	0.3	6.7
	12UE	Huntingdonshire	11.9	0.17	4.90	3.53	2.3	0.05	0.29	2.12	7.68	1.86	5.20	0.4	4.2
	42UD	Ipswich	11.0	0.20	8.51	2.29	1.9	0.08	0.32	4.56	12.46	1.31	3.27	0.0	3.8
	33UE	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	7.5	0.19	5.25	3.67	1.6	0.01	0.37	1.49	9.01	1.74	5.60	0.6	3.8
	00KA	Luton	6.3	0.79	21.84	3.62	10.4	0.47	1.11	16.17	27.51	2.50	4.74	6.2	14.7
	22UK	Maldon	7.5	0.17	4.74	3.62	3.0	0.03	0.37	0.48	9.96	2.88	4.36	1.1	7.0
	42UE	Mid Suffolk	18.3	0.21	7.11	2.98	1.6	0.03	0.39	3.51	10.71	0.88	5.08	0.2	3.4
	26UF	North Hertfordshire	7.0	0.31	13.34	2.34	2.1	0.09	0.53	7.90	18.78	0.94	3.74	0.2	4.5
	33UF	North Norfolk	23.0	0.22	11.60	1.90	0.7	0.09	0.35	6.83	16.37	1.04	2.76	0.6	2.0
	33UG	Norwich	12.4	0.62	16.34	3.78	1.6	0.35	0.89	10.96	21.72	1.63	4.93	0.0	3.1
	00JA	Peterborough	4.8	0.44	10.19	4.27	5.0	0.11	0.77	4.80	15.58	1.91	6.63	1.0	9.0
	22UL	Rochford	19.6	0.10	4.49	2.20	0.9	0.01	0.19	1.17	7.81	0.88	3.52	0.9	2.7
	12UG	South Cambridgeshire	11.9	0.12	3.02	4.13	0.9	0.02	0.22	0.81	5.23	2.17	6.09	0.3	2.1
	33UH	South Norfolk	13.8	0.16	9.92	1.61	0.0	0.09	0.23	5.78	14.06	1.30	1.92	0.0	0.0
	00KF	Southend-on-Sea	9.9	0.22	5.58	4.01	3.8	0.06	0.38	2.64	8.52	2.31	5.71	1.4	6.3
	26UG	St Albans	7.0	0.16	8.56	1.88	1.0	0.06	0.26	4.14	12.98	1.09	2.67	0.4	2.4
	42UF	St Edmundsbury	17.4	0.18	5.27	3.34	0.8	0.05	0.31	2.36	8.18	1.45	5.23	0.3	1.8
	26UH	Stevenage	2.9	0.67	16.97	3.94	3.1	0.05	1.29	6.69	27.25	0.94	6.94	2.6	8.7
	42UG	Suffolk Coastal	15.9	0.19	6.38	3.05	1.6	0.06	0.32	3.05	9.71	1.66	4.44	0.2	3.4
	22UN	Tendring	0.0												
	26UJ	Three Rivers	11.6	0.24	11.10	2.15	3.6	0.10	0.38	5.63	16.57	1.55	2.75	0.4	6.7
	00KG	Thurrock	2.6	0.15	7.31	2.09	0.0	0.01	0.29	1.26	13.36	2.09	2.09	0.0	0.0
	22UQ	Uttlesford	14.0	0.25	6.44	3.86	2.2	0.05	0.45	2.13	10.75	2.26	5.46	0.3	4.8
26UK	Watford	11.3	0.28	9.78	2.84	2.9	0.11	0.45	4.96	14.60	1.87	3.81	0.4	5.4	
42UH	Waveney	5.5	0.08	5.44	1.45	0.0	0.01	0.15	0.98	9.90	1.00	1.90	0.0	0.0	
26UL	Welwyn Hatfield	8.1	0.25	14.37	1.77	3.6	0.11	0.39	7.49	21.25	1.22	2.32	0.0	7.2	
London	00AB	Barking and Dagenham	6.4	0.45	18.01	2.49	6.2	0.30	0.60	13.12	22.90	2.01	2.97	3.2	9.2
	00AC	Barnet	3.8	0.58	16.21	3.55	6.1	0.34	0.82	11.12	21.30	2.50	4.60	2.8	9.5
	00AD	Bexley	0.0												

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
London	00AE	Brent	3.2	0.83	20.30	4.10	9.4	0.50	1.16	13.51	27.09	3.22	4.98	4.5	14.4
	00AF	Bromley	5.3	0.31	8.00	3.89	4.6	0.11	0.51	4.51	11.49	1.97	5.81	1.9	7.3
	00AG	Camden	6.4	0.33	12.53	2.64	2.2	0.15	0.51	7.08	17.98	1.85	3.43	0.2	4.5
	00AA	City of London	2.2												
	00AH	Croydon	3.5	0.41	12.75	3.25	4.9	0.20	0.62	8.13	17.37	2.07	4.43	1.9	7.9
	00AJ	Ealing	4.6	0.41	16.83	2.47	6.0	0.26	0.56	11.98	21.68	1.90	3.04	3.0	9.1
	00AK	Enfield	4.3	0.66	18.43	3.58	5.1	0.42	0.90	13.18	23.68	2.72	4.44	2.1	8.1
	00AL	Greenwich	0.0												
	00AM	Hackney	5.0	0.49	12.93	3.79	5.2	0.21	0.77	7.96	17.90	2.39	5.19	1.8	8.5
	00AN	Hammersmith and Fulham	8.2	0.27	7.64	3.54	3.6	0.11	0.43	4.00	11.28	2.19	4.89	1.0	6.1
	00AP	Haringey	5.1	0.32	10.61	2.99	3.9	0.09	0.55	5.62	15.60	1.36	4.62	0.7	7.0
	00AQ	Harrow	5.9	0.82	18.29	4.47	9.5	0.46	1.18	12.54	24.04	3.08	5.86	5.2	13.7
	00AR	Havering	6.9	0.36	12.46	2.85	4.5	0.19	0.53	7.99	16.93	1.89	3.81	1.7	7.3
	00AS	Hillingdon	5.8	0.91	25.28	3.59	16.1	0.63	1.19	19.57	30.99	2.83	4.35	11.2	21.0
	00AT	Hounslow	2.5	0.67	16.95	3.94	6.4	0.25	1.09	9.63	24.27	2.23	5.65	1.5	11.4
	00AU	Islington	0.0												
	00AW	Kensington and Chelsea	7.4	0.44	15.00	2.92	7.4	0.20	0.68	8.26	21.74	1.78	4.06	2.6	12.2
	00AX	Kingston upon Thames	9.8	0.09	6.10	1.42	0.0	0.04	0.14	3.02	9.18	1.08	1.76	0.0	0.0
	00AY	Lambeth	4.6	0.19	10.21	1.86	0.6	0.07	0.31	5.74	14.68	0.97	2.75	0.5	1.6
	00AZ	Lewisham	4.7	0.14	8.98	1.56	1.8	0.07	0.21	5.01	12.95	1.17	1.95	0.1	3.6
	00BA	Merton	8.7	0.45	13.72	3.24	6.2	0.27	0.63	9.54	17.90	2.29	4.19	3.2	9.1
	00BB	Newham	3.8	0.95	23.12	4.09	14.0	0.61	1.29	16.96	29.28	3.12	5.06	8.9	19.0
	00BC	Redbridge	3.3	0.21	9.27	2.23	2.0	0.09	0.33	4.68	13.86	1.47	2.99	0.2	4.2
00BD	Richmond upon Thames	7.7	0.12	9.78	1.19	0.5	0.07	0.17	5.78	13.78	0.97	1.41	0.5	1.4	
00BE	Southwark	5.6	0.33	10.65	3.13	2.1	0.12	0.54	6.42	14.88	1.59	4.67	0.1	4.2	
00BF	Sutton	8.7	0.10	5.81	1.80	1.5	0.04	0.16	2.82	8.80	1.38	2.22	0.0	3.0	
00BG	Tower Hamlets	5.0	0.55	17.34	3.17	9.1	0.32	0.78	11.87	22.81	2.26	4.08	5.0	13.2	
00BH	Waltham Forest	0.0													
00BJ	Wandsworth	7.2	0.22	8.28	2.69	0.8	0.08	0.36	4.78	11.78	1.66	3.72	0.3	1.9	
00BK	Westminster	3.0	0.59	15.98	3.68	10.3	0.17	1.01	7.23	24.73	2.50	4.86	3.0	17.7	
North East	00EJ	County Durham	4.0	0.21	6.30	3.30	1.5	0.08	0.34	3.22	9.38	1.90	4.70	0.0	3.0
	00EH	Darlington	15.5	0.28	6.18	4.50	3.2	0.10	0.46	3.04	9.32	3.32	5.68	0.7	5.6
	00CH	Gateshead	9.2	0.37	13.74	2.73	3.0	0.18	0.56	9.21	18.27	1.74	3.72	0.6	5.3
	00EB	Hartlepool	18.2	0.12	4.66	2.54	1.3	0.03	0.21	1.84	7.48	1.58	3.50	0.2	2.8
	00EC	Middlesbrough	14.2	0.53	17.26	3.08	8.1	0.34	0.72	12.81	21.71	2.27	3.89	4.8	11.4
	00CJ	Newcastle upon Tyne	6.9	0.26	10.95	2.41	3.5	0.14	0.38	6.84	15.06	1.79	3.03	1.0	6.0
	00CK	North Tyneside	8.4	0.16	4.02	4.03	1.5	0.02	0.30	1.26	6.78	2.05	6.01	0.2	3.2
	00EM	Northumberland	7.0	0.28	9.66	2.90	4.6	0.13	0.43	5.73	13.59	1.91	3.89	1.9	7.4
	00EE	Redcar and Cleveland	14.0	0.45	17.31	2.61	5.0	0.26	0.64	12.08	22.54	1.82	3.40	1.9	8.0
	00CL	South Tyneside	12.3	0.17	5.09	3.25	1.3	0.06	0.28	2.18	8.00	1.97	4.53	0.1	2.8
	00EF	Stockton-on-Tees	8.5	0.23	7.34	3.18	2.2	0.07	0.39	3.51	11.17	1.81	4.55	0.1	4.4
	00CM	Sunderland	6.3	0.54	18.41	2.94	7.4	0.34	0.74	12.98	23.84	2.25	3.63	3.8	11.0

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
North West (data collected 2011)	16UB	Allerdale	22.7	0.46	11.59	3.95	4.8	0.22	0.70	7.28	15.90	2.43	5.47	1.9	7.7
	16UC	Barrow-in-Furness	35.1	0.39	11.90	3.26	3.6	0.21	0.57	7.81	15.99	2.18	4.34	1.2	5.9
	00EX	Blackburn with Darwen	15.9	0.79	20.64	3.81	9.1	0.57	1.01	16.47	24.81	3.12	4.50	6.1	12.0
	00EY	Blackpool	13.9	0.63	16.89	3.74	8.1	0.38	0.88	12.20	21.58	2.67	4.81	4.6	11.5
	00BL	Bolton	13.0	0.76	17.84	4.25	9.1	0.57	0.95	14.57	21.11	3.52	4.98	6.6	11.6
	30UD	Burnley	14.0	0.72	18.81	3.82	1.8	0.41	1.03	12.89	24.73	2.71	4.93	0.2	3.9
	00BM	Bury	8.7	0.61	18.41	3.29	5.3	0.39	0.83	13.16	23.66	2.50	4.08	2.3	8.3
	16UD	Carlisle	17.4	0.67	15.28	4.39	9.0	0.38	0.96	10.47	20.09	3.13	5.65	5.1	12.9
	00EQ	Cheshire East	1.5	0.11	11.17	1.00	0.0	0.02	0.24	0.99	21.35	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
	00EW	Cheshire West and Chester	21.1	0.22	7.91	2.73	1.5	0.14	0.30	5.91	9.91	1.95	3.51	0.6	2.4
	30UE	Chorley	0.0												
	16UE	Copeland	18.4	0.23	11.47	1.98	4.5	0.12	0.34	6.26	16.68	1.67	2.29	1.1	7.9
	16UF	Eden	34.9	0.25	9.04	2.75	2.8	0.09	0.41	4.67	13.41	1.54	3.96	0.4	5.3
	30UF	Fylde	7.9	0.12	6.73	1.84	1.9	0.02	0.22	1.35	12.11	1.04	2.64	0.6	4.4
	00ET	Halton	33.8	0.25	10.34	2.45	2.6	0.16	0.34	7.73	12.95	1.90	3.00	1.2	3.9
	30UG	Hyndburn	10.0	0.85	17.23	4.94	8.2	0.34	1.36	9.13	25.33	3.17	6.71	1.9	14.6
	00BX	Knowsley	18.2	0.31	10.54	2.92	4.4	0.18	0.44	7.09	13.99	2.22	3.62	2.0	6.7
	30UH	Lancaster	22.8	0.39	10.32	3.81	4.9	0.23	0.55	7.14	13.50	2.92	4.70	2.7	7.1
	00BY	Liverpool	17.9	0.36	10.95	3.26	2.9	0.27	0.45	8.91	12.99	2.68	3.84	1.8	4.0
	00BN	Manchester	6.3	1.06	25.61	4.15	12.6	0.84	1.28	21.57	29.65	3.58	4.72	9.5	15.7
	00BP	Oldham	15.3	1.08	30.37	3.55	13.8	0.87	1.29	26.43	34.31	3.04	4.06	10.8	16.8
	30UJ	Pendle	15.6	0.78	20.26	3.86	9.0	0.53	1.03	15.23	25.29	3.07	4.65	5.3	12.6
	30UK	Preston	9.8	0.70	19.89	3.53	5.7	0.42	0.98	14.17	25.61	2.57	4.49	2.3	9.0
	30UL	Ribble Valley	11.3	0.08	2.96	2.77	0.0	0.05	0.21	1.20	7.12	2.77	2.77	0.0	0.0
	00BQ	Rochdale	3.2	0.55	18.91	2.89	5.9	0.28	0.82	10.94	26.88	2.12	3.66	1.2	10.6
	30UM	Rossendale	18.3	0.46	17.71	2.58	3.3	0.28	0.64	11.88	23.54	2.09	3.07	0.5	6.1
	00BR	Salford	7.2	0.70	24.82	2.81	5.8	0.48	0.92	19.12	30.52	2.22	3.40	2.6	9.0
	00CA	Sefton	20.9	0.25	10.17	2.46	4.0	0.17	0.33	7.75	12.59	1.94	2.98	2.4	5.5
	16UG	South Lakeland	32.1	0.27	10.27	2.60	1.8	0.16	0.38	6.78	13.76	2.01	3.19	0.4	3.2
	30UN	South Ribble	0.0												
	00BZ	St. Helens	26.3	0.29	10.24	2.85	2.9	0.19	0.39	7.63	12.85	2.18	3.52	1.5	4.4
	00BS	Stockport	6.8	0.42	15.38	2.75	6.2	0.25	0.59	10.70	20.06	1.99	3.51	3.0	9.5
	00BT	Tameside	17.6	0.55	16.77	3.29	5.1	0.40	0.70	13.55	19.99	2.67	3.91	3.2	7.1
00BU	Trafford	13.8	0.23	9.18	2.53	2.0	0.14	0.32	6.53	11.83	1.89	3.17	0.7	3.4	
00EU	Warrington	31.6	0.35	10.48	3.34	3.8	0.26	0.44	8.41	12.55	2.79	3.89	2.5	5.1	
30UP	West Lancashire	0.0													
00BW	Wigan	5.7	0.16	8.45	1.90	2.0	0.06	0.26	4.67	12.23	1.22	2.58	0.1	4.0	
00CB	Wirral	22.3	0.39	13.44	2.87	4.8	0.30	0.48	11.13	15.75	2.43	3.31	3.3	6.3	
30UQ	Wyre	18.8	0.42	14.53	2.91	4.7	0.24	0.60	8.91	20.15	2.45	3.37	1.5	8.0	
South East	45UB	Adur	0.0												
	45UC	Arun	1.0												
	29UB	Ashford	4.4	0.24	8.61	2.75	3.1	0.01	0.49	1.93	15.29	0.97	4.53	1.1	7.3
	11UB	Aylesbury Vale	8.7	0.43	13.26	3.23	4.9	0.23	0.63	8.56	17.96	2.15	4.31	2.1	7.7
	24UB	Basingstoke and Deane	4.1	0.28	8.02	3.48	4.5	0.05	0.51	2.56	13.48	1.63	5.33	0.3	8.8
	00MA	Bracknell Forest	11.0	0.34	11.42	3.00	5.7	0.16	0.52	6.66	16.18	1.91	4.09	2.3	9.1
00ML	Brighton and Hove	2.3	0.44	14.40	3.03	6.8	0.05	0.83	3.99	24.81	2.34	3.72	0.2	13.7	

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
South East	29UC	Canterbury	2.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0
	38UB	Cherwell	13.9	0.27	9.89	2.69	1.2	0.16	0.38	6.34	13.44	2.03	3.35	0.0	2.4
	45UD	Chichester	0.5												
	11UC	Chiltern	15.3	0.44	10.06	4.40	4.5	0.19	0.69	5.78	14.34	3.19	5.61	1.7	7.4
	45UE	Crawley	0.0												
	29UD	Dartford	8.9	0.08	5.26	1.55	0.0	0.01	0.15	1.49	9.03	0.78	2.32	0.0	0.0
	29UE	Dover	5.6	0.15	1.90	8.00	1.0	0.08	0.38	0.61	4.41	0.16	15.84	0.9	2.8
	24UC	East Hampshire	2.8	0.12	5.78	2.00	0.0	0.02	0.26	0.39	11.95	0.87	3.13	0.0	0.0
	21UC	Eastbourne	0.0												
	24UD	Eastleigh	20.5	0.07	2.99	2.22	0.6	0.02	0.12	1.15	4.83	1.38	3.06	0.2	1.4
	43UB	Elmbridge	1.7	0.12	6.60	1.83	0.6	0.02	0.26	1.23	14.43	1.83	1.83	0.5	1.6
	43UC	Epsom and Ewell	5.4	0.11	6.17	1.73	0.0	0.01	0.23	0.27	12.61	1.73	1.73	0.0	0.0
	24UE	Fareham	13.9	0.20	5.97	3.34	1.2	0.04	0.36	2.32	9.62	1.18	5.50	0.4	2.7
	24UF	Gosport	16.4	0.05	1.98	2.59	0.9	0.02	0.12	0.26	4.22	2.59	2.59	0.8	2.5
	29UG	Gravesham	5.6	0.52	12.87	4.08	8.4	0.08	1.12	4.17	21.57	3.69	4.47	0.9	15.9
	43UD	Guildford	1.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0
	24UG	Hart	1.7												
	21UD	Hastings	0.0												
	24UH	Havant	9.7	0.13	5.06	2.48	0.8	0.02	0.24	1.42	8.70	1.52	3.44	0.7	2.3
	45UF	Horsham	0.0												
	00MW	Isle of Wight	18.6	0.43	13.47	3.19	3.1	0.22	0.64	8.98	17.96	2.12	4.26	0.9	5.3
	21UF	Lewes	0.0												
	29UH	Maidstone	7.9	0.15	5.72	2.69	2.2	0.02	0.28	2.04	9.40	1.96	3.42	0.1	4.4
	00LC	Medway	5.2	0.15	6.11	2.38	0.4	0.03	0.27	2.62	9.60	1.01	3.75	0.4	1.3
	45UG	Mid Sussex	0.0												
	00MG	Milton Keynes	4.9	0.25	7.80	3.17	2.6	0.09	0.41	4.03	11.57	1.53	4.81	0.3	4.9
	43UE	Mole Valley	3.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0
	24UJ	New Forest	12.5	0.08	4.96	1.56	2.4	0.03	0.13	2.11	7.81	1.19	1.93	0.4	4.4
	38UC	Oxford	10.7	0.34	10.69	3.20	5.5	0.16	0.52	6.14	15.24	2.26	4.14	1.9	9.2
	00MR	Portsmouth	7.5	0.18	8.70	2.04	1.5	0.08	0.28	4.88	12.52	1.22	2.86	0.2	3.2
	00MC	Reading	13.1	0.74	17.38	4.24	10.6	0.49	0.99	13.18	21.58	3.25	5.23	7.2	14.0
	43UF	Reigate and Banstead	3.7	0.04	2.67	1.49	1.3	0.02	0.10	0.96	6.30	1.49	1.49	1.2	3.8
	21UG	Rother	0.0												
	43UG	Runnymede	6.5	0.07	5.76	1.22	3.8	0.01	0.13	0.84	10.68	0.79	1.65	0.6	7.1
	24UL	Rushmoor	0.0												
	29UK	Sevenoaks	9.2	0.06	2.90	2.05	0.0	0.00	0.12	0.04	5.76	2.05	2.05	0.0	0.0
	29UL	Shepway	9.9	0.38	11.67	3.28	3.4	0.13	0.63	6.41	16.93	2.08	4.48	0.0	6.9
	00MD	Slough	8.7	1.17	25.65	4.54	13.9	0.81	1.53	19.81	31.49	3.63	5.45	9.3	18.5
	11UE	South Bucks	20.5	0.08	1.82	4.57	1.3	0.03	0.19	0.23	3.87	4.57	4.57	0.5	3.0
	38UD	South Oxfordshire	17.1	0.42	15.32	2.73	4.7	0.14	0.70	10.67	19.97	1.18	4.28	1.7	7.7
00MS	Southampton	14.9	0.40	10.51	3.83	7.0	0.25	0.55	7.65	13.37	2.80	4.86	4.6	9.4	
43UH	Spelthorne	1.7													
43UJ	Surrey Heath	3.4	0.24	9.15	2.61	3.7	0.08	0.56	0.88	19.18	1.03	4.19	3.3	10.7	
29UM	Swale	4.8	0.04	1.37	3.17	0.0	0.03	0.11	0.52	3.26	3.17	3.17	0.0	0.0	
43UK	Tandridge	9.9	0.12	7.55	1.65	1.1	0.02	0.22	2.29	12.81	1.06	2.24	1.1	3.3	
24UN	Test Valley	14.0	0.11	4.05	2.81	2.1	0.00	0.22	1.30	6.80	2.38	3.24	0.1	4.1	
29UN	Thanet	9.7	0.31	9.17	3.36	1.3	0.14	0.48	4.48	13.86	2.65	4.07	0.5	3.0	

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
South East	29UP	Tonbridge and Malling	4.3	0.06	3.70	1.52	1.0	0.00	0.12	0.57	7.97	1.52	1.52	0.9	2.8
	29UQ	Tunbridge Wells	6.2	0.05	1.83	2.50	0.0	0.02	0.12	0.65	4.31	0.44	5.44	0.0	0.0
	38UE	Vale of White Horse	14.7	0.21	6.37	3.27	1.9	0.07	0.35	3.12	9.62	1.68	4.86	0.1	3.7
	43UL	Waverley	1.8												
	21UH	Wealden	0.0												
	00MB	West Berkshire	9.9	0.21	7.42	2.89	3.5	0.08	0.34	3.87	10.97	1.63	4.15	1.2	5.8
	38UF	West Oxfordshire	15.9	0.18	9.14	2.00	1.4	0.08	0.28	5.11	13.17	1.48	2.52	0.2	2.9
	24UP	Winchester	8.6	0.07	4.16	1.74	0.8	0.00	0.14	0.60	7.72	1.01	2.47	0.7	2.3
	00ME	Windsor and Maidenhead	10.7	0.20	8.24	2.48	1.9	0.08	0.32	4.51	11.97	1.76	3.20	0.1	3.8
	43UM	Woking	3.1	0.14	6.24	2.21	0.0	0.01	0.29	0.05	12.53	2.21	2.21	0.0	0.0
	00MF	Wokingham	9.3	0.22	5.44	4.03	0.9	0.03	0.41	2.32	8.56	1.20	6.86	0.3	2.1
45UH	Worthing	1.1													
11UF	Wycombe	11.3	0.20	8.34	2.45	2.6	0.08	0.32	4.70	11.98	1.49	3.41	0.5	4.7	
South West	00HA	Bath and North East Somerset	0.0												
	00HN	Bournemouth	9.1	0.34	12.18	2.81	5.5	0.19	0.49	7.54	16.82	2.09	3.53	2.5	8.5
	00HB	Bristol, City of	3.7	0.73	15.29	4.75	5.7	0.43	1.03	11.11	19.47	3.49	6.01	2.8	8.6
	23UB	Cheltenham	10.4	0.24	10.63	2.27	2.8	0.10	0.38	6.06	15.20	1.41	3.13	0.4	5.2
	19UC	Christchurch	37.2	0.25	11.65	2.18	4.7	0.08	0.42	6.47	16.83	1.05	3.31	1.2	8.1
	00HE	Cornwall	3.5	0.29	10.71	2.74	1.7	0.16	0.42	6.63	14.79	2.02	3.46	0.4	2.9
	23UC	Cotswold	14.4	0.16	11.54	1.41	1.8	0.07	0.25	5.65	17.43	1.03	1.79	0.6	4.1
	18UB	East Devon	17.4	0.13	3.83	3.44	0.4	0.03	0.23	1.40	6.26	2.03	4.85	0.4	1.3
	19UD	East Dorset	23.8	0.13	6.07	2.14	0.4	0.05	0.21	2.76	9.38	1.29	2.99	0.4	1.3
	18UC	Exeter	15.5	0.12	5.87	2.07	0.3	0.05	0.19	2.69	9.05	1.39	2.75	0.3	0.9
	23UD	Forest of Dean	15.5	0.49	17.87	2.76	3.0	0.17	0.81	10.47	25.27	1.32	4.20	0.5	6.4
	23UE	Gloucester	10.3	0.62	19.28	3.20	1.8	0.30	0.94	13.11	25.45	1.93	4.47	0.3	4.0
	00HF	Isles of Scilly <sup>1</sup>	42.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0
	40UB	Mendip	2.0												
	18UD	Mid Devon	27.4	0.21	5.74	3.64	1.2	0.08	0.34	2.87	8.61	2.20	5.08	0.1	2.6
	18UE	North Devon	22.9	0.31	13.19	2.33	3.7	0.16	0.46	8.79	17.59	1.50	3.16	1.4	6.0
	19UE	North Dorset	18.7	0.42	14.62	2.84	5.6	0.20	0.64	8.85	20.39	1.81	3.87	1.8	9.4
	00HC	North Somerset	8.5	0.31	11.07	2.78	2.9	0.18	0.44	6.40	15.74	2.05	3.51	0.9	4.9
	00HG	Plymouth	6.4	0.19	6.04	3.07	1.7	0.06	0.32	2.69	9.39	2.34	3.80	0.2	3.6
	00HP	Poole	13.2	0.41	12.43	3.31	3.7	0.21	0.61	8.02	16.84	2.17	4.45	1.2	6.3
	19UG	Purbeck	40.9	0.26	10.04	2.60	3.4	0.09	0.43	5.64	14.44	1.33	3.87	0.7	6.1
	40UC	Sedgemoor	11.9	0.40	9.97	4.03	4.6	0.07	0.73	5.04	14.90	3.07	4.99	1.0	8.3
	00HD	South Gloucestershire	6.0	0.03	1.90	1.82	0.0	0.01	0.07	0.05	3.75	1.82	1.82	0.0	0.0
	18UG	South Hams	27.6	0.18	7.48	2.35	1.9	0.07	0.29	3.92	11.04	1.39	3.31	0.1	3.7
	40UD	South Somerset	10.7	0.38	9.91	3.79	3.5	0.17	0.59	5.76	14.06	2.22	5.36	0.9	6.0
	23UF	Stroud	10.0	0.26	9.16	2.86	3.7	0.08	0.44	3.83	14.49	1.83	3.89	0.5	7.0
	00HX	Swindon	5.8	0.18	7.94	2.21	1.3	0.01	0.35	3.78	12.10	0.45	3.97	0.5	3.0

<sup>1</sup>Isles of Scilly figures have been reported because 100% of the sample and 42% of the population have been examined.



Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95 % Confidence Limits								
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)	
South West	40UE	Taunton Deane	12.6	0.28	11.79	2.36	0.4	0.12	0.44	6.39	17.19	1.49	3.23	0.4	1.3	
	18UH	Teignbridge	18.5	0.23	7.68	3.06	2.6	0.08	0.38	3.95	11.41	1.65	4.47	0.3	4.8	
	23UG	Tewkesbury	12.5	0.11	3.86	2.86	1.7	0.00	0.22	0.61	7.11	1.90	3.82	0.5	3.9	
	00HH	Torbay	16.0	0.58	13.12	4.40	5.1	0.30	0.86	8.50	17.74	2.90	5.90	2.2	8.1	
	18UK	Torridge	30.6	0.31	15.31	2.00	2.5	0.18	0.44	10.37	20.25	1.42	2.58	0.3	4.7	
	18UL	West Devon	0.0													
	19UH	West Dorset	29.8	0.22	6.46	3.42	3.2	0.08	0.36	3.52	9.40	1.91	4.93	1.1	5.3	
	40UF	West Somerset	25.6	0.28	9.98	2.85	6.1	0.07	0.49	3.40	16.56	1.71	3.99	0.9	11.2	
	19UJ	Weymouth and Portland	26.9	0.30	12.85	2.36	5.0	0.14	0.46	7.74	17.96	1.71	3.01	1.5	8.5	
	00HY	Wiltshire	3.3	0.35	13.49	2.62	3.2	0.20	0.50	8.69	18.29	2.04	3.20	0.6	5.7	
West Midlands	00CN	Birmingham	3.9	0.33	12.51	2.66	3.6	0.22	0.44	9.86	15.16	2.06	3.26	2.0	5.2	
	47UB	Bromsgrove	8.4	0.09	4.49	2.00	1.7	0.01	0.19	0.74	8.24	0.37	3.63	0.6	4.0	
	41UB	Cannock Chase	1.9													
	00CQ	Coventry	2.9	0.46	14.44	3.17	6.6	0.19	0.73	8.44	20.44	1.81	4.53	2.4	10.8	
	00CR	Dudley	2.8	0.18	10.14	1.81	2.1	0.05	0.31	4.76	15.52	1.05	2.57	0.7	5.0	
	41UC	East Staffordshire	4.5	0.34	11.36	3.03	1.5	0.04	0.64	4.13	18.59	1.15	4.91	1.3	4.3	
	00GA	Herefordshire, County of	9.2	0.71	22.33	3.18	5.6	0.45	0.97	16.51	28.15	2.37	3.99	2.3	8.8	
	41UD	Lichfield	2.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	
	47UC	Malvern Hills	9.9	0.22	10.03	2.16	5.1	0.00	0.44	2.82	17.24	0.84	3.48	0.6	10.9	
	41UE	Newcastle-under-Lyme	14.6	0.15	2.24	6.68	1.3	0.04	0.34	0.04	4.44	6.68	6.68	0.5	3.0	
	44UB	North Warwickshire	20.0	0.13	4.10	3.25	0.8	0.01	0.27	0.66	7.54	1.45	5.05	0.8	2.5	
	44UC	Nuneaton and Bedworth	9.7	0.13	4.90	2.67	0.5	0.03	0.23	1.62	8.18	1.57	3.77	0.5	1.5	
	47UD	Redditch	9.8	0.35	12.05	2.88	2.0	0.11	0.59	5.88	18.22	1.56	4.20	0.7	4.6	
	44UD	Rugby	14.4	0.31	8.63	3.54	5.7	0.13	0.49	4.57	12.69	2.37	4.71	2.5	8.9	
	00CS	Sandwell	4.2	0.21	10.06	2.08	3.8	0.10	0.32	5.93	14.19	1.41	2.75	1.0	6.7	
	00GG	Shropshire	6.2	0.24	7.48	3.15	0.4	0.08	0.40	3.69	11.27	0.79	4.51	0.4	1.1	
	00CT	Solihull	6.8	0.26	14.03	1.85	0.6	0.09	0.43	7.05	21.01	0.92	2.78	0.5	1.6	
	41UF	South Staffordshire	4.3	0.02	2.30	1.00	0.0	0.02	0.06	2.04	6.64	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0	
	41UG	Stafford	3.5	0.25	9.03	2.76	7.6	0.05	0.55	0.47	17.59	2.46	3.06	0.5	15.8	
	41UH	Staffordshire Moorlands	19.8	0.15	4.78	3.18	0.7	0.01	0.31	1.59	7.97	0.48	5.88	0.6	2.1	
	00GL	Stoke-on-Trent	9.0	0.27	7.17	3.77	3.7	0.14	0.40	4.28	10.06	2.81	4.73	1.5	5.8	
	44UE	Stratford-on-Avon	11.6	0.26	7.40	3.53	1.8	0.03	0.49	2.99	11.81	1.41	5.65	0.5	4.1	
	41UK	Tamworth	4.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	
	00GF	Telford and Wrekin	9.8	0.22	6.80	3.30	3.7	0.09	0.35	3.53	10.07	2.39	4.21	1.2	6.2	
	00CU	Walsall	5.1	0.23	12.70	1.81	3.3	0.12	0.34	7.94	17.46	1.23	2.39	0.7	5.8	
	44UF	Warwick	8.9	0.04	2.93	1.45	0.8	0.00	0.08	0.10	5.76	1.45	1.45	0.8	2.5	
	00CW	Wolverhampton	5.0	0.31	15.12	2.06	2.2	0.17	0.45	9.90	20.34	1.47	2.65	0.1	4.3	
	47UE	Worcester	8.9	0.49	12.25	4.04	7.4	0.13	0.85	6.11	18.39	1.91	6.17	2.5	12.3	
	47UF	Wychavon	7.8	0.25	9.34	2.64	3.8	0.07	0.43	3.45	15.23	2.03	3.25	0.2	7.5	
	47UG	Wyre Forest	6.7	0.36	12.18	2.95	5.5	0.12	0.60	5.36	19.00	1.83	4.07	0.3	10.7	
Yorkshire and the Humber	00CC	Barnsley	7.7	0.44	11.81	3.72	6.6	0.20	0.68	7.44	16.18	2.13	5.31	3.1	10.0	
	00CX	Bradford	2.1	0.58	17.11	3.42	7.2	0.31	0.85	11.41	22.81	2.27	4.57	3.3	11.0	
	00CY	Calderdale	5.3	0.42	12.06	3.49	5.6	0.18	0.66	6.73	17.39	2.22	4.76	2.0	9.1	
	36UB	Craven	35.9	0.28	9.87	2.83	2.8	0.12	0.44	5.57	14.17	1.66	4.00	0.3	5.3	
	00CE	Doncaster	5.2	0.31	8.56	3.67	3.3	0.10	0.52	4.42	12.70	1.90	5.44	0.7	5.9	

Oral health survey of three-year-old children 2013. A report on the prevalence and severity of dental decay.

Appendix 2. Dental Public Health Epidemiology Programme for England, Oral Health Survey of three-year-old children 2013, lower tier local authority (LA)

Region	Lower Tier LA Code	Lower Tier LA Name	% of population examined	Weighted Measures				95% Confidence Limits							
				Mean d3mft including incisors	% d3mft > 0 including incisors	Mean d3mft (% d3mft > 0) including incisors	% with early childhood caries (ECC)	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft including incisors	Lower % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Upper % d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 including incisors	Lower d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Upper d <sub>3</sub> mft > 0 (mean) including incisors	Lower % with early childhood caries (ECC)	Upper % with early childhood caries (ECC)
Yorkshire and the Humber	00FB	East Riding of Yorkshire	1.9	0.16	3.95	3.93	2.8	0.06	0.38	0.15	7.75	1.04	8.90	0.7	6.3
	36UC	Hambleton	26.8	0.22	8.45	2.57	3.5	0.10	0.34	4.86	12.04	1.65	3.49	1.1	5.9
	36UD	Harrogate	12.8	0.26	8.76	2.99	3.1	0.10	0.42	5.06	12.46	1.70	4.28	0.8	5.3
	00FA	Kingston upon Hull, City of	1.9	0.30	14.15	2.10	1.1	0.12	0.48	6.42	21.88	1.51	2.69	1.1	3.3
	00CZ	Kirklees	3.3	0.60	15.30	3.89	6.2	0.35	0.85	10.00	20.60	2.78	5.00	3.3	9.1
	00DA	Leeds	2.0	0.49	19.36	2.51	7.5	0.30	0.68	13.72	25.00	1.94	3.08	3.7	11.3
	00FC	North East Lincolnshire	8.7	0.37	15.04	2.49	5.7	0.15	0.59	8.41	21.67	1.66	3.32	1.2	10.2
	00FD	North Lincolnshire	6.0	0.15	8.07	1.92	2.6	0.04	0.26	3.31	12.83	1.10	2.74	0.3	5.4
	36UE	Richmondshire	24.6	0.20	5.49	3.69	2.8	0.02	0.38	1.77	9.21	1.86	5.52	0.1	5.6
	00CF	Rotherham	6.0	0.46	11.64	3.98	6.2	0.21	0.71	6.94	16.34	2.65	5.31	2.6	9.8
	36UF	Ryedale	19.3	0.18	9.88	1.80	2.2	0.05	0.31	3.69	16.07	1.15	2.45	0.8	5.2
	36UG	Scarborough	13.3	0.13	6.73	1.91	0.0	0.04	0.22	2.70	10.76	1.37	2.45	0.0	0.0
	36UH	Selby	18.8	0.19	9.06	2.12	1.4	0.09	0.29	5.13	12.99	1.44	2.80	0.2	3.0
	00CG	Sheffield	2.9	0.23	8.40	2.70	1.8	0.09	0.37	4.43	12.37	1.78	3.62	0.2	3.7
	00DB	Wakefield	2.5	0.51	19.79	2.59	7.2	0.23	0.79	12.13	27.45	1.58	3.60	2.2	12.2
00FF	York	7.2	0.21	6.92	3.00	1.8	0.03	0.39	3.02	10.82	0.93	5.07	0.2	3.8	
Regions	E	East Midlands	9.1	0.45	15.8	2.85	3.9	0.40	0.50	14.8	16.9	2.64	3.06	3.3	4.5
	G	East of England	9.5	0.24	8.2	2.93	2.3	0.21	0.27	7.6	8.9	2.71	3.15	1.9	2.6
	H	London	4.7	0.42	13.6	3.11	5.3	0.38	0.46	12.7	14.6	2.92	3.30	4.7	5.9
	A	North East	8.7	0.30	10.1	2.96	3.5	0.26	0.34	8.9	11.2	2.67	3.25	2.8	4.2
	B	North West	14.1	0.47	14.3	3.30	5.1	0.44	0.50	13.7	14.9	3.17	3.43	4.7	5.5
	J	South East	7.2	0.27	8.6	3.16	3.1	0.24	0.30	8.0	9.2	2.95	3.37	2.8	3.5
	K	South West	10.1	0.31	10.5	2.94	3.0	0.28	0.34	9.7	11.2	2.74	3.14	2.6	3.5
	F	West Midlands	6.2	0.28	10.1	2.77	3.0	0.25	0.31	9.2	11.0	2.54	3.00	2.5	3.6
D	Yorkshire and The Humber	5.1	0.39	12.6	3.09	4.8	0.34	0.44	11.4	13.8	2.81	3.37	4.0	5.5	
<b>Eng</b>	<b>Eng</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>