National Survey of Children’s Health
The National Survey of Children’s Health was conducted in 2003, 2007, 2012, and most recently in 2016. The National Center for Health Statistics (part of the Center for Disease Control) performs the survey and reported the results. The 2016 survey sampled about 100,000 parents in the United States, averaging about 2,000 respondents per state. First, the survey conducted random digit dialing to identify households with one or more children under the age of 18. Then, within each household, the parent answered questions about a single, randomly selected child. The survey addresses topics such as parent-child interactions, neighborhood safety, and experiences in the classroom. This report concerns a single portion of the study: oral health among Nevada children.

Data Summary
In Nevada, the survey asked 746 parents to rate their child’s oral health. Over three-quarters of parents responded excellent or very good, about 17 percent answered good, and 6 percent chose fair or poor (Figure 1). The data shows inequality across racial, socioeconomic, and family lines. Non-Hispanic whites were 13 percent more likely to have excellent or very good teeth compared to Hispanics, and 5 percent more likely compared to the other racial or ethnic groups (Figure 2). The proportion of children with excellent or very good teeth is greater among higher income households (Figure 3), insured households (Figure 5), and households where the primary language is English (Figure 6). Age also matters. Parents reported very good or excellent health 15 percent more frequently for children ages 1-5 than for children in other age groups (Figure 4). Finally, the data shows a gap between family types. Married parents reported the highest rate of excellent or very good health for their child, followed by single mothers and unmarried parents (Figure 7).
Figure 2

Condition of Child’s Teeth by Race/Ethnicity

Hispanic
- Excellent or very good: 70.8%
- Good: 20.0%
- Fair or poor: 9.2%
Sample Size: 191

White, Non-Hispanic
- Excellent or very good: 84.0%
- Good: 11.8%
- Fair or poor: 4.3%
Sample Size: 378

Other, Non-Hispanic
- Excellent or very good: 78.9%
- Good: 16.7%
- Fair or poor: 4.4%
Sample Size: 150
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Figure 3
Oral Health By Family’s Income as a Percent of Federal Poverty Line

- 400% +: Excellent or good 25%, Good 75%
- 200-399%: Excellent or good 30%, Good 70%
- 100-199%: Excellent or good 35%, Good 65%
- 0-99%: Excellent or good 40%, Good 60%

Figure 4
Oral Health by Age of Child

- 1-5: Excellent or very good 79.5%, Good 15.7%, Fair or poor 4.8%
- 6-11: Excellent or very good 64.3%, Good 25.2%, Fair or poor 10.5%
- 12-17: Excellent or very good 59%, Good 37%, Fair or poor 4%

Figure 5
Oral Health by Health Insurance

- Fair or poor: Not insured 48%, Insured 52%
- Good: Insured 74%, Not insured 26%
- Excellent or very good: Insured 96%, Not insured 4%

Figure 6
Oral Health by Primary Language

- Excellent or very good: English 79.5%, Other 20.5%
- Good: English 64.3%, Other 35.7%
- Fair or poor: English 15.7%, Other 84.3%
Figure 7
Oral Health by Family

- **Two Parents, Currently Married**
  - Excellent or very good: 79.3%
  - Good: 14.8%
  - Fair or poor: 5.9%
- **Two Parents, Not Currently Married**
  - Excellent or very good: 69.0%
  - Good: 18.6%
  - Fair or poor: 12.3%
- **Single Mother**
  - Excellent or very good: 71.9%
  - Good: 24.5%
  - Fair or poor: 3.6%
- **Other Family Type**
  - Excellent or very good: 73.8%
  - Good: 22.1%
  - Fair or poor: 4.1%
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