

Assessment of Knowledge about Nocebo Effect in Dentistry among Undergraduate Dental Students in Khammam

Dr. R. Ramani^{1*}, Dr. K. V. N. R. Pratap², Dr. T. Madhavi Padma³, Dr. V. Srujan⁴, Dr. Surbith Singh⁵, Dr. Nithin⁶

^{1,6}Student, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

²Professor and HOD, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

³Professor, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

⁴Reader, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

⁵Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

ABSTRACT

Background: "NOCEBO EFFECT" identified in 1961 by 'WALTER P. KENNEDY'. The term derives from Latin word 'Nocere' means to harm. Nocebo word describes a situation where negative outcome occurs due to a belief that intervention will cause harm.

Nothing but treatment that may cause harmful side-effects or worsening of symptoms because of patient's belief they may occur.

Aim: To Assess knowledge about nocebo effect in dentistry among dental students.

Objective: To determine knowledge about nocebo effect among students based on year of study. To determine assess knowledge about nocebo effect among students based on gender.

Method: A cross sectional study was conducted among dental students (I, II, III, IV, Interns) in a tertiary care teaching hospital Khammam using a web based tool called forms pro a semi structural online questionnaire was designed and distributed to students in order to fill, Descriptive studies and chi square test were calculated using SPSS version 29.

Result: A Total of 206 students took part with females (70.38%) and males (29.12%) age of participants range from 19 to 25yrs. In this study males have more knowledge than females.

Conclusion: The study result suggest the assess knowledge about nocebo effect in dentistry among dental students is adequate.

Keywords: Knowledge, Dentistry, Nocebo Effect, Negative expectations, Psychological Influence, Students, Symptoms.

Address of Corresponding Author

R. Ramani; Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

E-mail: ramagiriramani@gmail.com

Crossref Doi: <https://doi.org/10.36437/irmhs.2025.8.2.A>

Introduction

NOCEBO EFFECT' which means a petrified feeling which a person go through which scatter's a negative opinion in the dental field, this results affects the vital treatment of a patient and it makes to ignore the needful treatments of patients and lends a way to" ALARM OF DISEASES" this results in a drop of the Dental treatments and Boosten the Dental fears; in the people which effects the dentistry.

Methodology

A) Study design and area: A cross-sectional study was carried out at the tertiary care teaching hospital Khammam.

B) Study population: The health care students including those of I, II, III, and IV years and interns who responded to the online questionnaire sent through social media

C) Study Instrument: A self-administered questionnaire was designed based on knowledge attitude and practice had a total of 15 questions

and through online forms pro link. Each participant has to fill in their demographic data like Name, age, and year of study. Participants has to select one option from the answers provided against questions the questions were based on knowledge attitude and practice regarding anaphylaxis among dental students

D) Pilot study: A pilot study was conducted on a group of students to assess the validity and reliability of the study

E) Sampling method: The sampling method used is a convenience method

F) Inclusion criteria: The students who were interested in the study and who are willing to participate

G) Exclusion criteria: students who are not willing to participate are excluded

H) Organizing the study: The purpose of the study was explained in a short note which was sent along with a link via social media participants were asked to select one option from the answers provided against the questions

I) Statistical analysis: Data from the filled questionnaire was conducted in a tabular form in an Excel worksheet and evaluated for analysis. The analysis was performed by SPSS version 29.

Result

A total of 206 students took part with females (70.38%) and males (29.12%) age of participants range from 19 to 25yrs. In this study, males have more knowledge than females.

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	206	18	24	22.17	1.095
Valid N (listwise)	206				

Q1. Crosstab

Gender				1Qsn				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	3	10	2	1	16
			% of Total	5.0%	16.7%	3.3%	1.7%	26.7%
		2	Count	1	6	0	0	7
			% of Total	1.7%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	5	4	3	0	12
			% of Total	8.3%	6.7%	5.0%	0.0%	20.0%
		4	Count	6	5	0	0	11
			% of Total	10.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%
		5	Count	7	5	2	0	14
			% of Total	11.7%	8.3%	3.3%	0.0%	23.3%
Total		Count	22	30	7	1	60	
		% of Total	36.7%	50.0%	11.7%	1.7%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	18	10	5	3	36
			% of Total	12.4%	6.9%	3.4%	2.1%	24.8%
		2	Count	1	7	0	0	8
			% of Total	0.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%
		3	Count	17	9	6	3	35
			% of Total	11.7%	6.2%	4.1%	2.1%	24.1%
		4	Count	3	3	4	2	12
			% of Total	2.1%	2.1%	2.8%	1.4%	8.3%

		5	Count	24	12	16	2	54
			% of Total	16.6%	8.3%	11.0%	1.4%	37.2%
	Total		Count	63	41	31	10	145
			% of Total	43.4%	28.3%	21.4%	6.9%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	21	20	7	4	52
			% of Total	10.2%	9.8%	3.4%	2.0%	25.4%
		2	Count	2	13	0	0	15
			% of Total	1.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%
		3	Count	22	13	9	3	47
			% of Total	10.7%	6.3%	4.4%	1.5%	22.9%
		4	Count	9	8	4	2	23
			% of Total	4.4%	3.9%	2.0%	1.0%	11.2%
		5	Count	31	17	18	2	68
			% of Total	15.1%	8.3%	8.8%	1.0%	33.2%
Total		Count	85	71	38	11	205	
		% of Total	41.5%	34.6%	18.5%	5.4%	100.0%	

Q2

Gender				2Qsn			Total
				2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	7	6	3	16
			% of Total	11.7%	10.0%	5.0%	26.7%
		2	Count	2	4	1	7
			% of Total	3.3%	6.7%	1.7%	11.7%
		3	Count	3	4	5	12
			% of Total	5.0%	6.7%	8.3%	20.0%
		4	Count	6	4	1	11
			% of Total	10.0%	6.7%	1.7%	18.3%
		5	Count	3	6	5	14
			% of Total	5.0%	10.0%	8.3%	23.3%
Total		Count	21	24	15	60	
		% of Total	35.0%	40.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	5	10	21	36
			% of Total	3.4%	6.9%	14.5%	24.8%
		2	Count	1	3	4	8
			% of Total	0.7%	2.1%	2.8%	5.5%
		3	Count	5	11	19	35
			% of Total	3.4%	7.6%	13.1%	24.1%
		4	Count	1	6	5	12
			% of Total	0.7%	4.1%	3.4%	8.3%
		5	Count	5	15	34	54
			% of Total	3.4%	10.3%	23.4%	37.2%
Total		Count	17	45	83	145	
		% of Total	11.7%	31.0%	57.2%	100.0%	
Total	Year of study	1	Count	12	16	24	52
			% of Total	5.9%	7.8%	11.7%	25.4%
		2	Count	3	7	5	15

		% of Total	1.5%	3.4%	2.4%	7.3%
	3	Count	8	15	24	47
		% of Total	3.9%	7.3%	11.7%	22.9%
	4	Count	7	10	6	23
		% of Total	3.4%	4.9%	2.9%	11.2%
	5	Count	8	21	39	68
		% of Total	3.9%	10.2%	19.0%	33.2%
Total		Count	38	69	98	205
		% of Total	18.5%	33.7%	47.8%	100.0%

Q3

Gender				3Qsn				Total
				0	1	2	3	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	10	3	3	16
			% of Total	0.0%	16.4%	4.9%	4.9%	26.2%
		2	Count	0	4	3	0	7
			% of Total	0.0%	6.6%	4.9%	0.0%	11.5%
		3	Count	0	4	5	3	12
			% of Total	0.0%	6.6%	8.2%	4.9%	19.7%
		4	Count	0	5	5	1	11
			% of Total	0.0%	8.2%	8.2%	1.6%	18.0%
		5	Count	1	7	4	3	15
			% of Total	1.6%	11.5%	6.6%	4.9%	24.6%
Total			Count	1	30	20	10	61
			% of Total	1.6%	49.2%	32.8%	16.4%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count		11	7	18	36
			% of Total		7.6%	4.8%	12.4%	24.8%
		2	Count		2	4	2	8
			% of Total		1.4%	2.8%	1.4%	5.5%
		3	Count		7	14	14	35
			% of Total		4.8%	9.7%	9.7%	24.1%
		4	Count		7	1	4	12
			% of Total		4.8%	0.7%	2.8%	8.3%
		5	Count		18	12	24	54
			% of Total		12.4%	8.3%	16.6%	37.2%
Total			Count	45	38	62	145	
			% of Total	31.0%	26.2%	42.8%	100.0%	
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	21	10	21	52
			% of Total	0.0%	10.2%	4.9%	10.2%	25.2%
		2	Count	0	6	7	2	15
			% of Total	0.0%	2.9%	3.4%	1.0%	7.3%
		3	Count	0	11	19	17	47
			% of Total	0.0%	5.3%	9.2%	8.3%	22.8%
		4	Count	0	12	6	5	23
			% of Total	0.0%	5.8%	2.9%	2.4%	11.2%

		5	Count	1	25	16	27	69
			% of Total	0.5%	12.1%	7.8%	13.1%	33.5%
	Total		Count	1	75	58	72	206
			% of Total	0.5%	36.4%	28.2%	35.0%	100.0%

Q4

Gender				4Qsn			Total
				1	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	3	3	10	16
			% of Total	5.0%	5.0%	16.7%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	0	7	7
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	11.7%
		3	Count	6	1	5	12
			% of Total	10.0%	1.7%	8.3%	20.0%
		4	Count	1	1	9	11
			% of Total	1.7%	1.7%	15.0%	18.3%
		5	Count	3	6	5	14
			% of Total	5.0%	10.0%	8.3%	23.3%
Total		Count	13	11	36	60	
		% of Total	21.7%	18.3%	60.0%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	18	8	10	36
			% of Total	12.4%	5.5%	6.9%	24.8%
		2	Count	1	1	6	8
			% of Total	0.7%	0.7%	4.1%	5.5%
		3	Count	20	3	12	35
			% of Total	13.8%	2.1%	8.3%	24.1%
		4	Count	5	5	2	12
			% of Total	3.4%	3.4%	1.4%	8.3%
		5	Count	26	12	16	54
			% of Total	17.9%	8.3%	11.0%	37.2%
Total		Count	70	29	46	145	
		% of Total	48.3%	20.0%	31.7%	100.0%	
Total	Year of study	1	Count	21	11	20	52
			% of Total	10.2%	5.4%	9.8%	25.4%
		2	Count	1	1	13	15
			% of Total	0.5%	0.5%	6.3%	7.3%
		3	Count	26	4	17	47
			% of Total	12.7%	2.0%	8.3%	22.9%
		4	Count	6	6	11	23
			% of Total	2.9%	2.9%	5.4%	11.2%
		5	Count	29	18	21	68
			% of Total	14.1%	8.8%	10.2%	33.2%
Total		Count	83	40	82	205	
		% of Total	40.5%	19.5%	40.0%	100.0%	

Q5

Gender				2Qsn			Total		
				1	3	4			
1	Year of study	1	Count	1	4	11	16		
			% of Total	1.7%	6.7%	18.3%	26.7%		
		2	Count	1	0	6	7		
			% of Total	1.7%	0.0%	10.0%	11.7%		
		3	Count	1	3	8	12		
			% of Total	1.7%	5.0%	13.3%	20.0%		
		4	Count	4	1	6	11		
			% of Total	6.7%	1.7%	10.0%	18.3%		
		5	Count	5	9	0	14		
			% of Total	8.3%	15.0%	0.0%	23.3%		
		Total			Count	12	17	31	60
					% of Total	20.0%	28.3%	51.7%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	5	19	12	36		
			% of Total	3.4%	13.1%	8.3%	24.8%		
		2	Count	3	2	3	8		
			% of Total	2.1%	1.4%	2.1%	5.5%		
		3	Count	4	14	17	35		
			% of Total	2.8%	9.7%	11.7%	24.1%		
		4	Count	1	9	2	12		
			% of Total	0.7%	6.2%	1.4%	8.3%		
		5	Count	16	31	7	54		
			% of Total	11.0%	21.4%	4.8%	37.2%		
		Total			Count	29	75	41	145
					% of Total	20.0%	51.7%	28.3%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	6	23	23	52		
			% of Total	2.9%	11.2%	11.2%	25.4%		
		2	Count	4	2	9	15		
			% of Total	2.0%	1.0%	4.4%	7.3%		
		3	Count	5	17	25	47		
			% of Total	2.4%	8.3%	12.2%	22.9%		
		4	Count	5	10	8	23		
			% of Total	2.4%	4.9%	3.9%	11.2%		
		5	Count	21	40	7	68		
			% of Total	10.2%	19.5%	3.4%	33.2%		
		Total			Count	41	92	72	205
					% of Total	20.0%	44.9%	35.1%	100.0%

Q6

Gender				6Qsn			Total
				1	2	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	2	2	12	16
			% of Total	3.3%	3.3%	20.0%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	1	6	7
			% of Total	0.0%	1.7%	10.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	3	1	8	12
			% of Total	5.0%	1.7%	13.3%	20.0%

		4	Count	0	5	6	11	
			% of Total	0.0%	8.3%	10.0%	18.3%	
		5	Count	6	8	0	14	
			% of Total	10.0%	13.3%	0.0%	23.3%	
Total		Count	11	17	32	60		
		% of Total	18.3%	28.3%	53.3%	100.0%		
2	Year of study	1	Count	11	8	17	36	
			% of Total	7.6%	5.5%	11.7%	24.8%	
		2	Count	1	4	3	8	
			% of Total	0.7%	2.8%	2.1%	5.5%	
		3	Count	6	7	22	35	
			% of Total	4.1%	4.8%	15.2%	24.1%	
		4	Count	7	2	3	12	
			% of Total	4.8%	1.4%	2.1%	8.3%	
		5	Count	25	20	9	54	
			% of Total	17.2%	13.8%	6.2%	37.2%	
		Total		Count	50	41	54	145
				% of Total	34.5%	28.3%	37.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	13	10	29	52	
			% of Total	6.3%	4.9%	14.1%	25.4%	
		2	Count	1	5	9	15	
			% of Total	0.5%	2.4%	4.4%	7.3%	
		3	Count	9	8	30	47	
			% of Total	4.4%	3.9%	14.6%	22.9%	
		4	Count	7	7	9	23	
			% of Total	3.4%	3.4%	4.4%	11.2%	
		5	Count	31	28	9	68	
			% of Total	15.1%	13.7%	4.4%	33.2%	
		Total		Count	61	58	86	205
				% of Total	29.8%	28.3%	42.0%	100.0%

Q7

Gender			7Qsn		Total		
			2	4			
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	16	16	
			% of Total	0.0%	26.7%	26.7%	
		2	Count	0	7	7	
			% of Total	0.0%	11.7%	11.7%	
		3	Count	0	12	12	
			% of Total	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	
		4	Count	0	11	11	
			% of Total	0.0%	18.3%	18.3%	
		5	Count	1	13	14	
			% of Total	1.7%	21.7%	23.3%	
		Total		Count	1	59	60
				% of Total	1.7%	98.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	0	36	36	
			% of Total	0.0%	24.8%	24.8%	

		2	Count	1	7	8	
			% of Total	0.7%	4.8%	5.5%	
		3	Count	0	35	35	
			% of Total	0.0%	24.1%	24.1%	
		4	Count	0	12	12	
			% of Total	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	
		5	Count	3	51	54	
			% of Total	2.1%	35.2%	37.2%	
		Total		Count	4	141	145
				% of Total	2.8%	97.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	52	52	
			% of Total	0.0%	25.4%	25.4%	
		2	Count	1	14	15	
			% of Total	0.5%	6.8%	7.3%	
		3	Count	0	47	47	
			% of Total	0.0%	22.9%	22.9%	
		4	Count	0	23	23	
			% of Total	0.0%	11.2%	11.2%	
		5	Count	4	64	68	
			% of Total	2.0%	31.2%	33.2%	
Total		Count	5	200	205		
		% of Total	2.4%	97.6%	100.0%		

Q8

Gender				8Qsn			Total
				1	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	10	1	5	16
			% of Total	16.7%	1.7%	8.3%	26.7%
		2	Count	7	0	0	7
			% of Total	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	5	2	5	12
			% of Total	8.3%	3.3%	8.3%	20.0%
		4	Count	6	0	5	11
			% of Total	10.0%	0.0%	8.3%	18.3%
		5	Count	3	0	11	14
			% of Total	5.0%	0.0%	18.3%	23.3%
Total		Count	31	3	26	60	
		% of Total	51.7%	5.0%	43.3%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	10	3	23	36
			% of Total	6.9%	2.1%	15.9%	24.8%
		2	Count	7	0	1	8
			% of Total	4.8%	0.0%	0.7%	5.5%
		3	Count	11	6	18	35
			% of Total	7.6%	4.1%	12.4%	24.1%
		4	Count	2	0	10	12
			% of Total				

			% of Total	1.4%	0.0%	6.9%	8.3%
		5	Count	15	2	37	54
			% of Total	10.3%	1.4%	25.5%	37.2%
	Total		Count	45	11	89	145
			% of Total	31.0%	7.6%	61.4%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	20	4	28	52
			% of Total	9.8%	2.0%	13.7%	25.4%
		2	Count	14	0	1	15
			% of Total	6.8%	0.0%	0.5%	7.3%
		3	Count	16	8	23	47
			% of Total	7.8%	3.9%	11.2%	22.9%
		4	Count	8	0	15	23
			% of Total	3.9%	0.0%	7.3%	11.2%
		5	Count	18	2	48	68
			% of Total	8.8%	1.0%	23.4%	33.2%
Total		Count	76	14	115	205	
		% of Total	37.1%	6.8%	56.1%	100.0%	

Q9

Gender				9Qsn				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	3	6	2	5	16
			% of Total	5.0%	10.0%	3.3%	8.3%	26.7%
		2	Count	1	3	0	3	7
			% of Total	1.7%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	3	1	4	4	12
			% of Total	5.0%	1.7%	6.7%	6.7%	20.0%
		4	Count	3	1	5	2	11
			% of Total	5.0%	1.7%	8.3%	3.3%	18.3%
		5	Count	3	5	3	3	14
			% of Total	5.0%	8.3%	5.0%	5.0%	23.3%
Total		Count	13	16	14	17	60	
		% of Total	21.7%	26.7%	23.3%	28.3%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	5	10	15	6	36
			% of Total	3.4%	6.9%	10.3%	4.1%	24.8%
		2	Count	4	1	0	3	8
			% of Total	2.8%	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	5.5%
		3	Count	6	7	13	9	35
			% of Total	4.1%	4.8%	9.0%	6.2%	24.1%
		4	Count	1	3	2	6	12
			% of Total	0.7%	2.1%	1.4%	4.1%	8.3%
		5	Count	12	13	16	13	54
			% of Total	8.3%	9.0%	11.0%	9.0%	37.2%

Total			Count	28	34	46	37	145
			% of Total	19.3%	23.4%	31.7%	25.5%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	8	16	17	11	52
			% of Total	3.9%	7.8%	8.3%	5.4%	25.4%
		2	Count	5	4	0	6	15
			% of Total	2.4%	2.0%	0.0%	2.9%	7.3%
		3	Count	9	8	17	13	47
			% of Total	4.4%	3.9%	8.3%	6.3%	22.9%
		4	Count	4	4	7	8	23
			% of Total	2.0%	2.0%	3.4%	3.9%	11.2%
		5	Count	15	18	19	16	68
			% of Total	7.3%	8.8%	9.3%	7.8%	33.2%
Total			Count	41	50	60	54	205
			% of Total	20.0%	24.4%	29.3%	26.3%	100.0%

Q10

Gender				10Qsn		Total
				3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	4	12	16
			% of Total	6.7%	20.0%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	7	7
			% of Total	0.0%	11.7%	11.7%
		3	Count	1	11	12
			% of Total	1.7%	18.3%	20.0%
		4	Count	0	11	11
			% of Total	0.0%	18.3%	18.3%
		5	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	23.3%	23.3%
Total			Count	5	55	60
			% of Total	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count		36	36
			% of Total		24.8%	24.8%
		2	Count		8	8
			% of Total		5.5%	5.5%
		3	Count		35	35
			% of Total		24.1%	24.1%
		4	Count		12	12
			% of Total		8.3%	8.3%
		5	Count		54	54
			% of Total		37.2%	37.2%
Total			Count		145	145
			% of Total		100.0%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	4	48	52

		2	% of Total	2.0%	23.4%	25.4%		
			Count	0	15	15		
		3	% of Total	0.0%	7.3%	7.3%		
			Count	1	46	47		
		4	% of Total	0.5%	22.4%	22.9%		
			Count	0	23	23		
		5	Count	0	68	68		
			% of Total	0.0%	33.2%	33.2%		
		Total			Count	5	200	205
		Total			% of Total	2.4%	97.6%	100.0%

Gender				11Qsn				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	7	7	2	16
			% of Total	0.0%	11.7%	11.7%	3.3%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	7	0	0	7
			% of Total	0.0%	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	0	6	5	1	12
			% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	8.3%	1.7%	20.0%
		4	Count	3	6	1	1	11
			% of Total	5.0%	10.0%	1.7%	1.7%	18.3%
		5	Count	1	8	4	1	14
			% of Total	1.7%	13.3%	6.7%	1.7%	23.3%
Total			Count	4	34	17	5	60
Total			% of Total	6.7%	56.7%	28.3%	8.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	5	13	13	5	36
			% of Total	3.4%	9.0%	9.0%	3.4%	24.8%
		2	Count	0	4	1	3	8
			% of Total	0.0%	2.8%	0.7%	2.1%	5.5%
		3	Count	5	17	12	1	35
			% of Total	3.4%	11.7%	8.3%	0.7%	24.1%
		4	Count	1	3	7	1	12
			% of Total	0.7%	2.1%	4.8%	0.7%	8.3%
		5	Count	10	16	16	12	54
			% of Total	6.9%	11.0%	11.0%	8.3%	37.2%
Total			Count	21	53	49	22	145
Total			% of Total	14.5%	36.6%	33.8%	15.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	5	20	20	7	52
			% of Total	2.4%	9.8%	9.8%	3.4%	25.4%
		2	Count	0	11	1	3	15
			% of Total	0.0%	5.4%	0.5%	1.5%	7.3%
3	Count	5	23	17	2	47		
	% of Total	2.4%	11.2%	8.3%	1.0%	22.9%		

	4	Count	4	9	8	2	23
		% of Total	2.0%	4.4%	3.9%	1.0%	11.2%
	5	Count	11	24	20	13	68
		% of Total	5.4%	11.7%	9.8%	6.3%	33.2%
	Total		Count	25	87	66	27
		% of Total	12.2%	42.4%	32.2%	13.2%	100.0%

Q12

Gender			12Qsn					Total			
			0	1	2	3	4				
1	Year of study	1	Count	0	1	8	4	3	16		
			% of Total	0.0%	1.6%	13.1%	6.6%	4.9%	26.2%		
		2	Count	0	0	0	3	4	7		
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	6.6%	11.5%		
		3	Count	0	2	4	2	4	12		
			% of Total	0.0%	3.3%	6.6%	3.3%	6.6%	19.7%		
		4	Count	0	0	3	7	1	11		
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	11.5%	1.6%	18.0%		
		5	Count	1	4	3	5	2	15		
			% of Total	1.6%	6.6%	4.9%	8.2%	3.3%	24.6%		
		Total		Count	1	7	18	21	14	61	
				% of Total	1.6%	11.5%	29.5%	34.4%	23.0%	100.0%	
		2	Year of study	1	Count		5	12	18	1	36
					% of Total		3.4%	8.3%	12.4%	0.7%	24.8%
2	Count				0	4	2	2	8		
	% of Total				0.0%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	5.5%		
3	Count				3	12	10	10	35		
	% of Total				2.1%	8.3%	6.9%	6.9%	24.1%		
4	Count				4	3	5	0	12		
	% of Total				2.8%	2.1%	3.4%	0.0%	8.3%		
5	Count				10	20	19	5	54		
	% of Total				6.9%	13.8%	13.1%	3.4%	37.2%		
Total				Count		22	51	54	18	145	

			% of Total		15.2%	35.2%	37.2%	12.4%	100.0%	
Total	Year of study	1	Count	0	6	20	22	4	52	
			% of Total	0.0%	2.9%	9.7%	10.7%	1.9%	25.2%	
		2	Count	0	0	4	5	6	15	
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	2.4%	2.9%	7.3%	
		3	Count	0	5	16	12	14	47	
			% of Total	0.0%	2.4%	7.8%	5.8%	6.8%	22.8%	
		4	Count	0	4	6	12	1	23	
			% of Total	0.0%	1.9%	2.9%	5.8%	0.5%	11.2%	
		5	Count	1	14	23	24	7	69	
			% of Total	0.5%	6.8%	11.2%	11.7%	3.4%	33.5%	
		Total		Count	1	29	69	75	32	206
				% of Total	0.5%	14.1%	33.5%	36.4%	15.5%	100.0%

Q13

Gender			13Qsn				Total			
			1	2	3	4				
1	Year of study	1	Count	4	0	3	9	16		
			% of Total	6.7%	0.0%	5.0%	15.0%	26.7%		
		2	Count	0	0	4	3	7		
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	5.0%	11.7%		
		3	Count	5	0	4	3	12		
			% of Total	8.3%	0.0%	6.7%	5.0%	20.0%		
		4	Count	2	0	1	8	11		
			% of Total	3.3%	0.0%	1.7%	13.3%	18.3%		
		5	Count	1	2	4	7	14		
			% of Total	1.7%	3.3%	6.7%	11.7%	23.3%		
		Total		Count	12	2	16	30	60	
				% of Total	20.0%	3.3%	26.7%	50.0%	100.0%	
		2	Year of study	1	Count	15	4	4	13	36
					% of Total	10.3%	2.8%	2.8%	9.0%	24.8%
2	Count			1	0	5	2	8		
	% of Total			0.7%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	5.5%		
3	Count			9	2	11	13	35		
	% of Total			6.2%	1.4%	7.6%	9.0%	24.1%		
4	Count			5	3	0	4	12		
	% of Total			3.4%	2.1%	0.0%	2.8%	8.3%		
5	Count			15	8	14	17	54		

			% of Total	10.3%	5.5%	9.7%	11.7%	37.2%
	Total		Count	45	17	34	49	145
			% of Total	31.0%	11.7%	23.4%	33.8%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	19	4	7	22	52
			% of Total	9.3%	2.0%	3.4%	10.7%	25.4%
		2	Count	1	0	9	5	15
			% of Total	0.5%	0.0%	4.4%	2.4%	7.3%
		3	Count	14	2	15	16	47
			% of Total	6.8%	1.0%	7.3%	7.8%	22.9%
		4	Count	7	3	1	12	23
			% of Total	3.4%	1.5%	0.5%	5.9%	11.2%
	5	Count	16	10	18	24	68	
		% of Total	7.8%	4.9%	8.8%	11.7%	33.2%	
	Total		Count	57	19	50	79	205
			% of Total	27.8%	9.3%	24.4%	38.5%	100.0%

Q14

Gender				14Qsn				Total
				1	2	3	4	
1	Year of study	1	Count	1	4	1	10	16
			% of Total	1.7%	6.7%	1.7%	16.7%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	6	0	1	7
			% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	1.7%	11.7%
		3	Count	3	3	0	6	12
			% of Total	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	10.0%	20.0%
		4	Count	2	4	0	5	11
			% of Total	3.3%	6.7%	0.0%	8.3%	18.3%
	5	Count	4	5	1	4	14	
		% of Total	6.7%	8.3%	1.7%	6.7%	23.3%	
	Total		Count	10	22	2	26	60
			% of Total	16.7%	36.7%	3.3%	43.3%	100.0%
2	Year of study	1	Count	7	8	6	15	36
			% of Total	4.8%	5.5%	4.1%	10.3%	24.8%
		2	Count	2	4	1	1	8
			% of Total	1.4%	2.8%	0.7%	0.7%	5.5%
		3	Count	6	14	5	10	35
			% of Total	4.1%	9.7%	3.4%	6.9%	24.1%
		4	Count	6	1	0	5	12
			% of Total	4.1%	0.7%	0.0%	3.4%	8.3%
	5	Count	7	15	9	23	54	
		% of Total	4.8%	10.3%	6.2%	15.9%	37.2%	
	Total		Count	28	42	21	54	145
			% of Total	19.3%	29.0%	14.5%	37.2%	100.0%
Total	Year of study	1	Count	8	12	7	25	52

		2	% of Total	3.9%	5.9%	3.4%	12.2%	25.4%
			Count	2	10	1	2	15
		3	% of Total	1.0%	4.9%	0.5%	1.0%	7.3%
			Count	9	17	5	16	47
		4	% of Total	4.4%	8.3%	2.4%	7.8%	22.9%
			Count	8	5	0	10	23
		5	% of Total	3.9%	2.4%	0.0%	4.9%	11.2%
			Count	11	20	10	27	68
		Total	% of Total	5.4%	9.8%	4.9%	13.2%	33.2%
			Count	38	64	23	80	205
		% of Total	18.5%	31.2%	11.2%	39.0%	100.0%	

Q15

Gender			12Qsn				Total	
			1	2	3	4		
1	Year of study	1	Count	1	7	6	2	16
			% of Total	1.7%	11.7%	10.0%	3.3%	26.7%
		2	Count	0	0	7	0	7
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	0.0%	11.7%
		3	Count	0	2	7	3	12
			% of Total	0.0%	3.3%	11.7%	5.0%	20.0%
		4	Count	0	3	6	2	11
			% of Total	0.0%	5.0%	10.0%	3.3%	18.3%
		5	Count	2	3	7	2	14
			% of Total	3.3%	5.0%	11.7%	3.3%	23.3%
Total		Count	3	15	33	9	60	
		% of Total	5.0%	25.0%	55.0%	15.0%	100.0%	
2	Year of study	1	Count	3	4	18	11	36
			% of Total	2.1%	2.8%	12.4%	7.6%	24.8%
		2	Count	0	1	6	1	8
			% of Total	0.0%	0.7%	4.1%	0.7%	5.5%
		3	Count	3	5	14	13	35
			% of Total	2.1%	3.4%	9.7%	9.0%	24.1%
		4	Count	0	4	4	4	12
			% of Total	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	8.3%
		5	Count	14	8	24	8	54
			% of Total	9.7%	5.5%	16.6%	5.5%	37.2%
Total		Count	20	22	66	37	145	
		% of Total	13.8%	15.2%	45.5%	25.5%	100.0%	
Total	Year of study	1	Count	4	11	24	13	52
			% of Total	2.0%	5.4%	11.7%	6.3%	25.4%
		2	Count	0	1	13	1	15
			% of Total	0.0%	0.5%	6.3%	0.5%	7.3%

		3	Count	3	7	21	16	47
			% of Total	1.5%	3.4%	10.2%	7.8%	22.9%
		4	Count	0	7	10	6	23
			% of Total	0.0%	3.4%	4.9%	2.9%	11.2%
		5	Count	16	11	31	10	68
			% of Total	7.8%	5.4%	15.1%	4.9%	33.2%
Total			Count	23	37	99	46	205
			% of Total	11.2%	18.0%	48.3%	22.4%	100.0%

Discussion

NOCEBO EFFECT' a patient can express it when he underwent dental treatment or fallacious words heard from a person which makes the patient to reject the treatment to treat this phenomenon and detach negative expectations of patients for example - if a patient comes with gingivitis and explains u the bleeding through gums continuously which threaten me the dentist should answer oh got it's not that petrified what u think it indicates that u have to clean ur gums with regular check-ups and maintain good oral health and brushing twice a day must, avoid adverse habits like frequent consumption of alcohol and cigarettes by avoiding all this and maintaining of good oral health it relives ur gums. The way of treating and explaining the cause to patients is very important which play's a vast role in dentistry neutralize the Nocebo effect among the public and avoiding giving new roots of future expectations which may lend way to the Nocebo effect' and don't give the extent of information, therapeutic connection is key between dentist and patient which is a sign of trust and drop of Nocebo effect 'most of the people are with transmittable information which threatens the dental field.

Conclusion

To combat this' Nocebo effect ' informed consent; must before undergoing any dental treatments the patient approval of treatment must informing everything about what treatment outcomes may come this can subside the "NOCEBO EFFECT ".

References

1. Amanzio, M., Pollo, A., Maggi, G., and Benedetti, F. (2001). Response variability

to analgesics: a role for non-specific activation of endogenous opioids. Pain 90, 205–215. doi:

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959\(00\)00486-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959(00)00486-3)

2. Arnon, Z. (ed.) (2016). "The importance of therapeutic rapport," in *The Principles of Positive Suggestive Communication in the Field of Medicine*. (New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers), 15–20.
3. Afilalo, M., Etropolski, M. S., Kuperwasser, B., Kelly, K., Okamoto, A., Van Hove, I., et al. (2010). Efficacy and safety of tapentadol extended release compared with oxycodone controlled release for the management of moderate to severe chronic pain related to osteoarthritis of the knee: a randomized, double-blind, placebo- and active controlled phase III study. *Clin. Drug Investig.* 30, 489–505. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2165/11533440-000000000-00000>
4. Barber, T. X. (1978). Hypnosis, suggestions, and psychosomatic phenomena: a new look from the standpoint of recent experimental studies. *Am. J. Clin. Hypn.* 21, 13–27. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00029157.1978.10403953>
5. Benedetti, F. (2008). Mechanisms of placebo and placebo-related effects across diseases and treatments. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 48, 33–60. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.48.113006.094711>
6. Benedetti, F. (2013). Placebo and the new physiology of the doctor-patient

- relationship. *Physiol. Rev.* 93, 1207–1246. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00043.2012>
7. Cheek, D. B. (1962). Importance of recognizing that surgical patients behave as though hypnotized. *Am. J. Clin. Hypn.* 4, 227–236. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00029157.1962.10401905>
 8. Chooi, C. S., White, A. M., Tan, S. G., Dowling, K., and Cyna, A. M. (2013). Pain vs. comfort scores, after Caesarean section: a randomized trial. *Br. J. Anaesth.* 110, 780–787. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aes517>
 9. Cohen, S. (2014). The nocebo effect of informed consent. *Bioethics* 28, 147–154. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8519.2012.01983.x>
 10. Colloca, L. (2017). Tell me the truth and I will not be harmed: informed consents and nocebo effects. *Am. J. Bioeth.* 17, 46–48. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2017.1314057>
 11. Colloca, L., Sigauco, M., and Benedetti, F. (2018). The role of learning in nocebo and placebo effects. *Pain* 136, 211–218. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2008.02.006>
 12. Daniels, A. M., and Sallie, R. (1981). Headache, lumbar puncture, and expectation. *Lancet* 1:1003. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(81\)91771-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(81)91771-2)
 13. Defechereux, T., Degauque, C., Fumal, I., Faymonville, M. E., Joris, J., Hamoir, E., et al. (2000). Hypnosedation, a new method of anesthesia for cervical endocrine surgery. Prospective randomized study. *Ann. Chir.* 125, 539–546. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3944\(00\)00238-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3944(00)00238-8)
 14. Dworkin, S. F., Chen, A. C., LeResche, L., and Clark, D. W. (1983). Cognitive reversal of expected nitrous oxide analgesia for acute pain. *Anesth. Analg.* 62, 1073–1077. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1213/00000539-198312000-00005>
 15. Ebell, H. (2017). Hypnotherapeutic communication: core element of a “resonance based medicine.” *Z. Hyp. Hypnother.* 12, 173–202.
 16. Evers, A. W. M., Colloca, L., Blease, C., Annoni, M., Atlas, L. Y., Benedetti, F., et al. (2018). Implications of placebo and nocebo effects for clinical practice: expert consensus. *Psychother. Psychosom.* 87, 204–210. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000490354>
 17. Faasse, K., Gamble, G., Cundy, T., and Petri, K. J. (2012). Impact of television coverage on the number and type of symptoms reported during a health scare: a retrospective pre-post observational study. *BMJ Open* 2:e001607. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001607>
 18. Faasse, K., and Petrie, K. J. (2013). The nocebo effect: patient expectations and medication side effects. *Postgrad. Med. J.* 89, 540–546. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2012-131730>
 19. Wampold, B. E. (2015). How important are the common factors in psychotherapy? An update. *World Psychiatry* 14, 270–277. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20238>
 20. Wampold, B. E. (2015). How important are the common factors in psychotherapy? An update. *World Psychiatry* 14, 270–277. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20238>
 21. Wilhelm, M., Rief, W., and Doering, B. K. (2018). Decreasing the burden of side effects through positive message framing: an experimental proof-of concept study. *Int. J. Behav. Med.* 25, 381–389. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-018-9726-z>
 22. Wilkinson, S., Dodgson, G., and Meares, K. (2017). Predictive processing and the varieties of psychological trauma. *Front.*

- Psychol. 8:1840. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01840>
23. Wolf, S. (1949). Studies on nausea; effects of ipecac and other emetics on the human stomach and duodenum. *Gastroenterol* 12, 212–218.
24. Zech, N., Seemann, M., Grzesiek, M., Breu, A., Seyfried, T. F., and Hansen, E. (2019). Nocebo effects on muscular performance – an experimental study about clinical situations. *Front. Pharmacol.* 4:e00208. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/prp2.208>
25. Zech, N., Seemann, M., and Hansen, E. (2014). Nocebo effects and negative suggestions in anesthesia. *Anaesthesist* 63, 816–824. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00101-014-2386-8>
26. Zech, N., Seemann, M., Graf, B. M., and Hansen, E. (2015a). Nocebo effects with the informed consent. *Anästhesiol. Intensivmed. Notfallmed. Schmerzther.* 50, 64–69. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-100081>
27. Zech, N., Seemann, M., Lange, M., Schlaier, J., Janzen, A., and Hansen, E. (2018). Deep brain stimulation surgery without sedation. *Stereotact. Funct. Neurosurg.* 5, 1–9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000494803>
28. Zech, N., Seemann, M., Signer-Fischer, S., and Hansen, E. (2015b). Communication with children: practical hints and tools for the anesthesiology routine. *Anaesthesist* 64, 197–207. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00101-015-0001-2>

How to cite this Article: R. Ramani, K. V. N. R. Pratap, T. Madhavi Padma, V. Srujan, Surbith Singh, Nithin; *Assessment of Knowledge about Nocebo Effect in Dentistry among Undergraduate Dental Students in Khammam*; *Int. Res. Med. Health Sci.*, 2025; (8-2): 1-18; doi: <https://doi.org/10.36437/irmhs.2025.8.2.A>

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.

Received: 16-01-2025; **Revision:** 18-03-2025; **Accepted:** 24-03-2025