

2001 6

가

가

가 ,

.....	
1 1
2 4
2.1 4
2.2 5
2.3 9
3 11
3.1 11
3.2 13
3.3 17
3.4 19
3.5 21
4 26
5 35
..... 37	
【 】 40
1. 41
2. 42
..... 43	

Table 1. Number of workers studied	5
Table 2. Prevalence rate of dental erosion between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid	11
Table 3. Number of eroded teeth in subjects exposed to acid and in the group not exposed to acid	12
Table 4. Number of eroded teeth weighed in subjects exposed to acid and in group not exposed	12
Table 5. Prevalence and severity of dental erosion in the upper teeth	13
Table 6. Prevalence and severity of dental erosion in the lower teeth	14
Table 7. Prevalence of dental erosion between the anterior and the posterior teeth in the group exposed to acid	15
Table 8. Prevalence of dental erosion between the anterior and the posterior teeth in the group not exposed to acid	15
Table 9. Prevalence of dental erosion between the upper and lower the teeth in the group exposed to acid	16
Table 10. Prevalence of dental erosion between the upper and the lower teeth in the group not exposed to acid	16
Table 11. Prevalence rate of dental erosion in factories	17
Table 12. Mean of number of eroded teeth in factories	18
Table 13. Weighted mean index of weighed eroded teeth in factories	18

Table 14. Prevalence rate of dental erosion by industrial type	19
Table 15. Mean of number of eroded teeth by industrial type	19
Table 16. Weighted mean index of weighed eroded teeth by industrial type	20
Table 17. Results of bivariate analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid	21
Table 18. Results of multivariate logistic regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid	22
Table 19. Results of multivariate logistic regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables	23
Table 20. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis using eroded teeth and other variables	23
Table 21. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables	24
Table22.Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis using weighted eroded teeth and other variables	24
Table 23. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis of weighted eroded teeth index between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables	25

4

1

866

가

1. 1 가 25.5%, 2 가 2.9%, 3
 가 4.5%, 4 가 1.4%, 5 가 0.4%
 34.7% . 1.44±2.59, 가 2.28±5.62

2. 가
 (P<0.05).
 (P<0.05)

3. , 가
 (P<0.01).

4. 가 (P<0.01).
5. : 3.478, : 1.328, : 0.728 .
6. : 0.988, : 0.297, : 1.293 가 : 1.833, : 0.673, : 1.417 .
7. : 1.961, 40 : 4.316, 가 5-10 : 1.743, 20 : 0.480, : 0.751 .
8. : 0.728, 40 : 0.977, 5-10 : 1.212 가 : 0.816, : 1.873, 40 : 1.426, : 1.461 .

: , , , ,

(Rugg-Gunn

1993).

(Malcolm, and Paul 1961). Cate 1968

, 555 2

(Skogedal et al. 1977; Remijn et al. 1982)

(Petersen, and Gormsen

1991)가 . Tuominen

, ,

(Tuominen, and Tuominen 1992). Shingo

가 3

(Shingo et al. 1999).

1982

, (, 1988),

(, 1994)

(1994; 1994).

가

,

,

가

가

가

가

가

2000

6

1

2

,

,

3

가

가

가

2

2.1

가

가 가

가

3

1

가

1

487

379

(Table 1).

2000 3 , 4 , 8 , 9

12

Table 1. Number of workers studied

	Factory		Total
	Galvanizing	Battery	
Exposure group	329(38.0)	158(18.2)	487(56.2)
Non-exposure group	379(43.8)	0(0.0)	379(43.8)

* unit: number of workers(%)

2.2

1

가

가 가

가

가

가

가

가

가

Cate
(Etching)

1

5

1)

• 0 -

: 가

0

• 1 -

: 가

• 2 -

:

,

가

2

• 3 -

:

,

,

3

• 4 -

:

,

가

,

가

,

,

4

• 5 -
 : 가
 5 .

2)

- -
 : , ,
- - ,
 : , , ,
- -
 : , , , ,
- - , 가 , ,
 : , , ,
- -
 : , ,
- -
 : , , ,

- -
:
- -
:
- 1 -

stepwise

(odds ratio)

가

3

3.1

1)

1 가 25.5%, 2 2.9%, 3 4.5%, 4 1.4% 5 가 0.4% .
 1 가 11.3%, 2 1.6%, 3 0.3% 4 가 0.3%
 . 1 34.7%
 13.5%

(Table 2).

Table 2. Prevalence rate of dental erosion between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid

	Grade of dental erosion						P value**
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Exposed	318 (65.3)	124 (25.5)	14 (2.9)	22 (4.5)	7 (1.4)	2 (0.4)	0.000
Not exposed	328 (86.5)	43 (11.3)	6 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)		
Total	646 (74.6)	167 (19.3)	20 (2.3)	23 (2.7)	8 (0.9)	2 (0.2)	

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P<0.01 by Chi-square test, comparison between exposed and not exposed group to acid

3.2

1)

1 가 0.2%, 1 2 0.2%,
 3 0.2%, 4 0.2%, 1 0.6%, 2 0.8%, 3 0.4%, 4 0.2%,
 1 7.2%, 2 1.8%, 3 1.4%, 4 0.4%, 1 22.0%, 2
 1.4%, 3 3.3%, 4 0.2%, 5 0.2% .
 1 가 23.6%, 2 1.8%, 3 2.9%, 5 0.4%,
 1 10.1%, 2 1.0%, 3 2.1%, 4 0.2%, 5 0.4%, 1
 1.0%, 2 0.4%, 3 1.0%, 4 0.2%, 1 3 0.2%, 2 1
 0.2%, 3 0.2%, 1 1 3 0.2% (Table 5).

Table 5. Prevalence and severity of dental erosion in the upper teeth

Tooth No	Grade of dental erosion					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
17	448(92.0)					
16	427(87.7)	1(0.2)				
15	443(91.0)					
14	462(94.9)		1(0.2)	1(0.2)	1(0.2)	
13	449(92.2)	3(0.6)	4(0.8)	2(0.4)	1(0.2)	
12	398(81.7)	35(7.2)	9(1.8)	7(1.4)	2(0.4)	
11	305(62.6)	107(22.0)	7(1.4)	16(3.3)	1(0.2)	1(0.2)
21	299(61.4)	115(23.6)	9(1.8)	14(2.9)		1(0.2)
22	381(78.2)	49(10.1)	5(1.0)	10(2.1)	1(0.2)	2(0.4)
23	448(92.0)	5(1.0)	2(0.4)	5(1.0)	1(0.2)	
24	463(95.1)			1(0.2)		
25	438(89.9)	1(0.2)		1(0.2)		
26	415(89.9)	1(0.2)		1(0.2)		
27	447(91.8)					

* unit: number of workers(%)

2 2 가 0.2%, 3 0.4%, 1
 1 0.2%, 2 0.4%, 3 0.6%, 4 0.2%, 1 1.0%, 2 1.6%, 3
 1.4%, 4 0.3%, 1 7.4%, 2 0.8%, 3 1.6%, 4 0.8%,
 1 10.5%, 2 0.4%, 3 1.8%, 4 0.8% .
 1 가 0.2%, 2 0.4%, 3 2.3%, 4 0.8%,
 1 5.5%, 2 0.2%, 3 2.1%, 4 0.6%, 1 0.4%, 2
 1.2%, 3 1.8%, 1 3 0.6%, 4 0.2%, 2 3 0.2%,
 1 2 가 0.2% (Table 6).

Table 6. Prevalence and severity of dental erosion in the lower teeth

Tooth No	Grade of dental erosion					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
37	405(83.2)					
36	385(79.1)					
35	438(89.9)					
34	457(93.8)					
33	451(92.6)					
32	423(86.9)					
31	406(83.4)					
41	409(84.0)					
42	436(89.5)					
43	458(94.0)					
44	465(95.5)					
45	431(88.5)					
46	387(79.5)					
47	401(82.3)					

* unit: number of workers(%)

2)

(1)

(Table 7).

(Table 8).

(2)

(Table 9, Table 10).

Table 7. Prevalence of dental erosion between the anterior and the posterior teeth in the group exposed to acid

		Anterior teeth		P value**
		without	with	
Posterior teeth	without	318(65.3)	154(31.6)	0.000
	with	3(0.6)	12(2.5)	
Total		321(65.9)	166(34.1)	

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P<0.01 by Chi-square test, comparison between anterior and posterior teeth in the group exposed to acid

Table 8. Prevalence of dental erosion between the anterior and the posterior teeth in the group not exposed to acid.

		Anterior teeth		P value**
		without	with	
Posterior teeth	without	328(86.5)	47(12.4)	0.083
	with	2(0.5)	2(0.5)	
Total		330(87.1)	49(12.9)	

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P>0.05 by Chi-square test, comparison between anterior and posterior teeth in the group not exposed to acid

Table 9. Prevalence of dental erosion between the upper and the lower teeth in the group exposed to acid

		Upper teeth		P value**
		without	with	
Lower teeth	without	318(65.3)	89(18.3)	0.000
	with	14(2.9)	66(13.6)	
Total		332(68.2)	155(31.8)	

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P<0.01 by Chi-square test, comparison between upper and lower teeth in the group exposed to acid

Table 10. Prevalence of dental erosion between the upper and the lower teeth in the group not exposed to acid

		Upper teeth		P value**
		without	with	
Lower teeth	without	328(86.5)	35(9.2)	0.000
	with	4(1.1)	12(3.2)	
Total		332(87.6)	47(12.4)	

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P<0.01 by Chi-square test, comparison between upper and lower teeth in the group not exposed to acid

3.3

1)

() 33.7%, () 21.8%, () 62.8%, () 75%, () 28.6% Chi-square

(Table 11).

Table 11. Prevalence rate of dental erosion in factories

Factory	Grade of dental erosion					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
	218(66.3)	88(26.7)	7(2.1)	13(4.0)	3(0.9)	
	43(78.2)	5(9.1)	2(3.6)	3(5.5)		2(3.6)
	16(37.2)	21(48.8)	2(3.6)	2(4.7)	2(4.7)	
	1(25.0)	1(25.0)	1(25.0)		1(25.0)	
	40(71.4)	9(16.1)	2(3.6)	4(7.1)	1(1.8)	
Total	318(65.3)	124(25.5)	14(2.9)	22(4.5)	7(1.4)	2(0.4)

*unit : number of workers(%)

*P<0.01 by Chi-square test, comparison among factories

2)

가 6.00, 3.19, 가 1.38,
1.22, 가 1.13 .
가 Duncan 가
가 (Table 12).

Table 12. Mean of number of eroded teeth in factories

Factory	N	Eroded teeth	
		Mean	SD
	329	1.22	2.24
	55	1.38	3.28
	43	3.19	3.33
	4	6.00	4.97
	56	1.13	2.21
Total	487	1.44	2.59

*P<0.01 by ANOVA test, comparison among factories

3) 가

가 가 11.25, 5.00, 가
 3.24, 가 1.89 1.73
 Duncan 가
 (Table 13).

Table 13. Weighted mean index of weighed eroded teeth in factories

Factory	N	Eroded teeth (weighted)	
		Mean	SD
	329	1.73	4.02
	55	3.24	9.53
	43	5.00	8.17
	4	11.25	11.59
	56	1.89	4.51
Total	487	2.28	5.62

*P<0.01 by ANOVA test, comparison among factories

3.4

1)

36.7%

33.7%

Chi-square

(Table 14).

Table 14. Prevalence rate of dental erosion by industrial type

Factory	Grade of dental erosion					
	0 (n=318)	1 (n=124)	2 (n=14)	3 (n=22)	4 (n=7)	5 (n=2)
Galvanizing	218(66.3)	88(26.7)	7(2.1)	13(4.0)	3(0.9)	
Battery	100(63.3)	36(22.8)	7(4.4)	9(5.7)	4(2.5)	2(1.3)
Total	318(65.3)	124(25.5)	14(2.9)	22(4.5)	7(1.4)	2(0.4)

*unit : number of workers(%)

**P>0.05 by Chi-square test, comparison between two industrial types

2)

1.90

1.22

(Table 15).

Table 15. Mean of number of eroded teeth by industrial type

Factory	N	Mean±SD
Galvanizing	329	1.22±2.24
Battery	158	1.90±3.17
Total	487	1.44±2.59

*P<0.01 by t-test, comparison between galvanizing and battery factories

3) 가

가 3.44
1.73 (Table 16).

Table 16. Weighted mean index of weighed eroded teeth by industrial type

Factory	N	Mean±SD
Galvanizing	329	1.73±4.02
Battery	158	3.44±7.86
Total	487	2.28±5.62

*P<0.01 by t-test, comparison between galvanizing and battery factories

3.5

1)

			38
	35		
	가 10.5		
가		11.9%	7.1%
		7.8%, 59.5%, 88.5%	
	3.6%, 49.3%, 80.9%		

(Table 17).

Chi-square

가

Table 17. Results of bivariate analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid

	Exposed (n=487)	Not exposed (n=379)	P
Age	38.12±8.38	35.22±7.57*	0.000
Years of service	10.50±6.92	6.94±5.74	0.000
Brittle teeth	11.9%	7.1%	0.049
Discoloration of gum	3.6%	7.8%	0.023
Tooth brushing method(rolling)	49.3%	59.5%	0.017
mask	80.9%	88.5%	0.004

* Mean±SD

2)

1 가 가 가
 가 3.48 ,
 가 1.33 가 .
 가 가 0.73 가 (Table 18).

Table 18. Results of multivariate logistic regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid

Variables	Odds ratio	95% CI*	P value
Acid (exposed)	3.48	2.25- 5.37	0.0001
Years of service	1.33	1.13- 1.56	0.0007
Tooth brushing frequency (rolling method)	0.73	0.56- 0.95	0.0183

* 95% confidence intervals for odds ratio

가

가 4.32 3.48 .
 가 5- 10 가 1.96
 40 1.74 20 0.48 (Table 19).

Table 19. Results of multivariate logistic regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables

Variables	Odds ratio	95% CI*	P value
Acid (exposed)	4.32	2.79-6.69	0.0001
Years of service (5- 10year)	1.96	1.27-3.04	0.0026
Age(<30year)	0.48	0.27-0.85	0.0121
Age(40-49year)	1.74	1.12-2.70	0.0130
Tooth brushing frequency(rolling method)	0.75	0.58-0.98	0.0340

* 95% confidence intervals for odds ratio

3)

가 가
 가 0.30, 가 가 1.29
 가 0.99,
 (Table 20).

Table 20. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis using eroded teeth and other variables

Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	P value	R- square
Acid(exposed)	0.99	0.28	0.0005	
Brittle teeth	1.29	0.39	0.0010	10.3%
Age(per 10year)	0.30	0.14	0.0409	

0.98, 40 0.82, 5-10
 0.73, 가 1.21 가 가
 (Table 21).

Table 21. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables

Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	P value	R-square
Acid(exposed)	0.98	0.20	0.0001	
Brittle teeth	1.21	0.38	0.0018	
Age(40-49year)	0.82	0.27	0.0028	29.5%
Years of service (5-10year)	0.73	0.27	0.0074	

4) 가

가

1.83, 가 가 0.67, 가
 1.42 가 가 가 (Table 22).

Table 22. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis using weighted eroded teeth and other variables

Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	P value	R-square
Acid(exposed)	1.83	0.37	0.0001	
Age(per 10year)	0.67	0.21	0.0013	7.0%
Brittle teeth	1.42	0.61	0.0201	

가
 가 1.46 가 1.87, 40 1.43,
 가 가

(Table 23).

Table 23. Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis of weighted eroded teeth index between the group exposed to acid and the group not exposed to acid after age and years of service are changed using dummy variables

Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	P value	R- square
Acid(exposed)	1.87	0.28	0.0001	
Age(40-49year)	1.43	0.40	0.0004	16.8%
Brittle teeth	1.46	0.60	0.0149	

4

가

1992 2000

1 2

3

가

3

1 가 25.5%, 2 2.9%, 3 4.5%, 4 14.6%, 5 가 0.4%

1 34.7%

Cate 555

1 14.6% 2

11.2% . 3 4.1% , 4

1.8% . 5 1

31.7% (Cate 1968).

1 가 2 가 .

A

34.9% (, 1988).

가

1994

25.2%

가 1 2 가

. Cate 1 가

, Malcolm Paul 1

2

3 가 1

2

3 10% 3

4 3 가

5%

가

가

1.44

Peterson Gormsen 1990 가 0.4-4.1mg/m³
 1.3
 1.25
 1-1.5
 가 0.42
 가 가
 가 가
 가 2.28 0.49
 가

(Malcolm, and Paul 1961; 1982).

(Eccles, and Jenkins
 1974; Eccles 1982; Jones, and Cleaton-Jones 1989).

((Lussi 1996).

(Goto et al. 1996)

(2000)

가

가

가

가

, , ,

가 6.00,

3.19,

가 138,

1.22,

가 1.13

가

Duncan

가

가

가

가 11.25,

5.00,

가 3.24,

가 1.89,

1.73

Duncan

가

1mg/m³

1995-2000

0.21±0.35m g/m³, 0.15±0.30m g/m³, 0.42±0.88m g/m³, 가
가 0.10±0.13m g/m³ . 가 0.12±0.10m g/m³,

가
가

가
가 가 . Cate

가

. 1998

(1998).

가

36.7%

33.7%

1.90

1.22

. 가

가 .
가 가

가 0.99, 10 가 0.30, 가
가 1.29 . 가

가 0.67, 가 1.83, 10
가 가 1.42 가

가 가 .
가

(Dummy
variable)

가

가 4.32 3.48 .
가 5-10 가 1.96
40 1.74 20 0.48
. 가 가

가

Tuominen

가

가

(Tuominen, and Tuominen

1992).

가

가

가

가

20

96%

3.48

Goto

3.0

3

가

5

, 가

4

1

866

1. 1 가 25.5%, 2 가 2.9%, 3
가 4.5%, 4 가 1.4%, 5 가 0.4%
34.7% . 1.44±2.59, 가 2.28±5.62

2. 가
(P<0.05).
(P<0.05)

3. , 가
(P<0.01).

4. 가 (P<0.01).

5. : 3.478, : 1.328,
: 0.728 .

6. : 0.988, : 0.297, :
1.293 가 : 1.833, : 0.673,
: 1.417 .

7. : 4.316, 가 5-10
: 1.961, 40 : 1.743, 20 : 0.480,
: 0.751 .

8. : 0.977, 5-10
: 0.728, 40 : 0.816, :
1.212 가 : 1.873, 40 : 1.426,
: 1.461 .

. 1998. " " .
. 7(1): 55-64.

, . 1994. " " .
. 18(1): 303-337.

. 2000. " " .
24(3): 309-318.

. 1994. " " .
. 3(1): 1-9.

. 1992. 17 . 92-9.
, , , , . 1994. " " .
. 32(3): 368-377.

. 1994. " " . 3(1): 41-55.

, , , . 1982. " (acid) " .
. 15(1): 83-87.

, . 1988. " " .
. 41(1): 69-75.

, . 2000. . p 2-5,

- Cate H.J. ten Bruggen. 1968. "Dental erosion in Industry". *Bri J Ind Med*. 25 : 249-266.
- Chikte U.M.E., and A.M. Josie-Perez. 1999. "Industrial dental erosion: a cross-sectional, comparative study". *SA DJ*. 54(11): 531-536.
- Eccles J.D., and W.G. Jenkins. 1974. "Dental erosion and diet". *J of Dentistry*. 2(4): 153-159.
- Eccles J.D. 1982. "Tooth surface loss from abrasion, attrition and erosion". *Dental Update*. 373-381.
- Goto H., M. Kosaka, T. Ueda, M. Yoshida, and I. Hara. 1996. "Association between dental erosion and exposure to acids in a chemical factory". **Sangyo Eiseigaku Zasshi**. 38(4): 165-171.
- Jones RR., and P. Cleaton-Jones. 1989. "Depth and areas of dental erosions and dental caries in bulimic women". *J Dent Res*. 68: 1275-1278.
- Lussi A. 1996. "Dental erosion clinical diagnosis and case history taking". *Eur J Oral Sci*. 104: 191-198.
- Malcolm D., and E. Paul. 1961. "Erosion of teeth due to sulphuric acid in the battery industry". *Bri J Ind Med*. 18: 63-69.
- Petersen P.E., and C. Gormsen. 1991. "Oral conditions among German battery workers". *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 19: 104-106.
- Remijn B., P. Koster, D. Houthuijs, J. Boleij, H. Willems, B Brunekreef, K Biersteker, and C. van Loveren. 1982. "Zinc chloride, Zinc oxide, Hydrochloric acid Exposure and Dental erosion in a zinc galvanizing plant in the Netherlands". *Ann. Occup. Hyg*. 25(3): 299-307.

- Rugg-Gunn A.J. 1993. *Nutrition and Dental health*. Oxford Medical Publications. p 290-303.
- Schour I., and B.G. Sarnat. 1942. "Oral manifestations of occupational origin". *JAMA* . 120: 1197-1207.
- Shingo F., N. KoiChi, S. Toshiaki, M. Masashi, and Y. Eiji. 1999. "Prevalence of dental erosion caused by sulfuric acid fumes in a smelter in Japan". *San Ei Shi*. 41: 88-94.
- Skogedal O., J. Silness, T. Tangerud, O. Laegrid, and O. Gilhuus-Moe. 1977. "Pilot study on dental erosion in a Norwegian electrolytic zinc factory". *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 5: 248.
- Tuominen M., and R. Tuominen. 1992. "Tooth surface loss and associate factors among factory workers in Finland and Tanzania". *Community Dental Health*. 9: 143-150.

【 】

2.

:

:

1.

7	6	5	4	3	2	1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

--	--

2.

1 :

2 :

3 :

4 : 2

5 :

cf)

7 : 가

8 : 가 가

9 : 가

ABSTRACT

Dental Erosion Prevalence and Risk Factors in Galvanizing and Battery manufacture Factory Workers

Choong-Ho Choi, D.D.S., M.P.H.

Dept. of Dental Science, Graduate School,
Yonsei University

(Directed by Associate Professor Ho-Keun Kwon D.D.S., M.P.H., Ph.D.)

The object of this study was to investigate the prevalence rate of dental erosion and the associated factors for the purpose of providing the basic data to occupational dental health program. It was examined 866 workers in 1 galvanizing and 4 battery manufacture factories at March 22th-24, April 11th-12th, 17th-18th, 23th, August 6th, September 4th-7th, 2000. The prevalence rate of dental erosion, the mean number of tooth eroded and eroded teeth(weighted) were calculated. It was compare with type of industry, factories and location. For the associated factors, logistic regression and multiple regression was performed.

The results were as follows;

1. The prevalence rate of dental erosion were Grade 1(25.5%), Grade 2(2.9%), Grade 3(4.5%), Grade 4(1.4%), Grade 5(0.4%) and total(34.7%) in exposed workers to acid. Eroded teeth were 1.44 ± 2.59 and eroded teeth(weighted) were 2.28 ± 5.62 .
2. The dental erosion is more higher in anterior and upper teeth than posterior and lower teeth in exposed workers to acid($P < 0.05$). The dental erosion is more higher in upper than lower in non-exposed workers($P < 0.05$).

3. In exposed workers to acid, there were significant differences in the prevalence of dental erosion, eroded teeth and eroded teeth(weighted) among factories($P < 0.01$).
4. In exposed workers to acid, there were significant differences in the eroded teeth and eroded teeth(weighted) between two industries($P < 0.01$).
5. The risk factors to the prevalence of dental erosion were acid(odds ratio: 3.478), service year(odds ratio: 1.328) and frequency of tooth brushing by rolling method(odds ratio: 0.728).
6. The risk factors to the eroded teeth were acid(B: 0.988), age(B: 0.297) and brittle teeth(B: 1.293) and to the eroded teeth(weighted) were acid(B: 1.833), age(B: 0.673) and brittle teeth(B: 1.417).
7. When age and service year were changed dummy variables, the risk factors to the prevalence of dental erosion were acid(odds ratio: 4.316), service year(5- 10year)(odds ratio: 1.328), age(40-49year)(odds ratio: 1.743), age(<30)(odds ratio: 0.480) and frequency of tooth brushing(odds ratio: 0.751).
8. When age and service year were changed dummy variables, the risk factors to the eroded teeth were acid(B: 0.977), service year(5- 10year)(B: 0.728), age(40-49year)(B: 0.816) and brittle teeth(B: 1.212) and to the eroded teeth(weighted) were acid(B: 1.873), age(40-49year)(B: 1.426) and brittle teeth(B: 1.461).

According to the results, environment of working place, age and service year and discomfort of workers like a brittle teeth will be considered in the preventive program of industrial dental erosion. And the continuing studies of the effect of acid and the risk factors are necessary.

Key words : dental erosion, prevalence, eroded teeth, risk factor.