

Knowledge Attitude and Practice Regarding Use of Dental Clinical Photography among Undergraduate Dental Students

Dr. K. Aravind Kumar^{1*}, Dr. K. V. N. R. Pratap², Dr. T. Madhavi Padma³, Dr. V. SivaKalyan⁴, Dr. V. Srujan Kumar⁵, Dr. Harsha Mudigonda⁶

¹Student, 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.

⁶III Year Post Graduate, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India.

Research Article

*Corresponding Author: K. Aravind Kumar, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College,

Khammam, India.

E-mail: rvnkumark64@gmail.com

Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.B

ABSTRACT

Dental clinical photography plays a crucial role in clinical documentation, patient education, and academic presentations. However, there may be differences in the knowledge, usage, and accessibility of photography equipment among dental students at various stages of their education. This study aims to compare the practices, knowledge, and challenges of dental clinical photography between intern and postgraduate dental students. The study highlights the gap in knowledge and experience between dental interns and postgraduates regarding dental clinical photography. Postgraduate students were found to be more proficient and frequent users of clinical photography, likely due to their advanced clinical experience and greater exposure to specialized equipment. The findings suggest that there is a need for enhanced educational interventions in clinical photography for dental interns to improve their skills and access to appropriate tools, ultimately benefiting patient care and clinical documentation.

Aim: To assess Knowledge attitude and practice regarding use of dental clinical photography among undergraduate dental students.

Objectives

To assess the knowledge attitude and practice regarding the use of dental clinical photography among undergraduate dental students based on gender.

To assess the knowledge attitude and practice regarding the use of dental clinical photography among undergraduate dental students based on year of study.

Method: A cross-sectional survey was conducted among 250 dental students, comprising 87 males (34.8%) and 163 females (65.2%), including 36 third-year BDS students, 77 fourth-year BDS students, and 123 interns. The survey included 12 questions exploring awareness, and perceptions, of dental clinical



photography for clinical Curriculum. Responses were analyzed based on gender and year of study using chisquare tests to identify statistically significant differences.

Keywords: Dental Clinical Photography, Dental Records, DSLR Camera, Photographs.

Introduction

Photography has been utilized in dentistry for a considerable period of time and is being used for various reasons in dentistry. Photographs are used to supervise the progress of various treatments and also to track the transition after the procedure. In the same way as radiography, study casts, and other investigations and testing are regarded as diagnostic tools, dental photography is considered at par. Photographs are predominantly used for recording various lesions pre and post-treatment. Other places where photographs are utilized are in providing proof in MLCs; supporting disease detection and in the implementation procedures. Serving as a tool for dental education and guidance for staff and students. Assisting in guiding the patient and inspiring them. Instruction to patients, laboratories, other physicians, and insurance providers. Serving as a tool for a tutor for case discussion. Photographs also help in distant consultation from specialists who live across the globe, specifically for cases such as premalignant ones.

Methodology

 a) Study design and area: A crosssectional study was carried out at the tertiary care teaching hospital Khammam.

- **b) Study Population:** The health care students including those of IV year and Interns who responded to the offline paper print questionnaire survey.
- c) Study Instrument: A self-administered questionnaire was designed based on knowledge attitude and awareness of the advanced technology and had a total of 12 questions. Each participant has to fill in their demographic data like Name, age, and year of study. Participants had to select one option from the answers provided against questions the questions were based on knowledge attitude and awareness 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 were willing to participate.
- **g) Exclusion Criteria:** students who are not willing to participate.
- h) Statistical Analysis: Data from the filled questionnaire was collected in a tabular form in an Excel worksheet and evaluated for analysis. The analysis was performed by SSPS version 29.

Result Table: 1

	Ge	nder		1	2	Total
1	Year of Study	1	Count	11	11	22
	2		% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	25.3%
			Count	38	0	38
			% of Total	43.7%	0.0%	43.7%
		3	Count	13	0	13
			% of Total	14.9%	0.0%	14.9%

		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	16.1%
	Total		Count	62	25	87
			% of Total	71.3%	28.7%	100.0%
2	Year of Study	1	Count	2	12	14
			% of Total	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%
		2	Count	37	2	39
			% of Total	22.7%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	60	50	110
			% of Total	36.8%	30.7%	67.5%
	Total	•	Count	99	64	163
			% of Total	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
3	Year of Study	1	Count	13	23	36
			% of Total	5.2%	9.2%	14.4%
		2	Count	75	2	77
			% of Total	30.0%	0.8%	30.8%
		3	Count	73	50	123
			% of Total	29.2%	20.0%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%
	Total		Count	161	89	250
			% of Total	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%

Table: 2

	Gender			1	2	3	4	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	22	0	0	0	22
			% of Total	25.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.3%
		2	Count	0	14	13	11	38
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	14.9%	12.6%	43.7%
		3	Count	0	0	13	0	13
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	14	0	0	0	14
			% of Total	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	36	14	26	11	87
			% of Total	41.4%	16.1%	29.9%	12.6%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	14	0		14
			% of Total	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%		8.6%
		2	Count	14	25	0		39
			% of Total	8.6%	15.3%	0.0%		23.9%
		3	Count	61	37	12		110

Knowledge Attitude and Practice Regarding Use of Dental Clinical Photography K. Aravind Kumar et al.

			% of Total	37.4%	22.7%	7.4%		67.5%
	Total		Count	75	76	12		163
			% of Total	46.0%	46.6%	7.4%		100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	22	14	0	0	36
			% of Total	8.8%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.4%
		2	Count	14	39	13	11	77
			% of Total	5.6%	15.6%	5.2%	4.4%	30.8%
		3	Count	61	37	25	0	123
			% of Total	24.4%	14.8%	10.0%	0.0%	49.2%
		4	Count	14	0	0	0	14
			% of Total	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
	Total		Count	111	90	38	11	250
			% of Total	44.4%	36.0%	15.2%	4.4%	100.0%

Table: 3

	Gender			1	2	3	4	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	11	0	0	22
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.3%
		2	Count	11	11	16	0	38
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	18.4%	0.0%	43.7%
		3	Count	0	0	2	11	13
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	12.6%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	0	14	0	14
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	22	22	32	11	87
			% of Total	25.3%	25.3%	36.8%	12.6%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	0	2	12	14
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%
		2	Count	0	25	12	2	39
			% of Total	0.0%	15.3%	7.4%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	49	12	36	13	110
			% of Total	30.1%	7.4%	22.1%	8.0%	67.5%
	Total		Count	49	37	50	27	163
			% of Total	30.1%	22.7%	30.7%	16.6%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	11	2	12	36
			% of Total	4.4%	4.4%	0.8%	4.8%	14.4%
		2	Count	11	36	28	2	77
			% of Total	4.4%	14.4%	11.2%	0.8%	30.8%
		3	Count	49	12	38	24	123
			% of Total	19.6%	4.8%	15.2%	9.6%	49.2%

Knowledge Attitude and Practice Regarding Use of Dental Clinical Photography K. Aravind Kumar et al.

	4	Count	0	0	14	0	14
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
Total		Count	71	59	82	38	250
		% of Total	28.4%	23.6%	32.8%	15.2%	100.0%

Table: 4

	Gender			1	2	3	4	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	11	0		22
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	0.0%		25.3%
		2	Count	11	11	16		38
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	18.4%		43.7%
		3	Count	0	11	2		13
			% of Total	0.0%	12.6%	2.3%		14.9%
		4	Count	14	0	0		14
			% of Total	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%		16.1%
	Total		Count	36	33	18		87
			% of Total	41.4%	37.9%	20.7%		100.0%
2		1	Count	12	0	2	0	14
			% of Total	7.4%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	8.6%
		2	Count	25	0	0	14	39
			% of Total	15.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	23.9%
		3	Count	25	23	26	36	110
			% of Total	15.3%	14.1%	16.0%	22.1%	67.5%
	Total		Count	62	23	28	50	163
			% of Total	38.0%	14.1%	17.2%	30.7%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	23	11	2	0	36
			% of Total	9.2%	4.4%	0.8%	0.0%	14.4%
		2	Count	36	11	16	14	77
			% of Total	14.4%	4.4%	6.4%	5.6%	30.8%
		3	Count	25	34	28	36	123
			% of Total	10.0%	13.6%	11.2%	14.4%	49.2%
		4	Count	14	0	0	0	14
			% of Total	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
	Total		Count	98	56	46	50	250
			% of Total	39.2%	22.4%	18.4%	20.0%	100.0%

Table: 5

	Gen	der		1	2	3	4	5
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	0	0	11	22
			% of Total	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.6%	25.3%
		2	Count	0	14	13	11	38
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	14.9%	12.6%	43.7%
		3	Count	2	11	0	0	13
			% of Total	2.3%	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	0	14	0	14
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	13	25	27	22	87
			% of Total	14.9%	28.7%	31.0%	25.3%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	2		12	14
			% of Total	0.0%	1.2%		7.4%	8.6%
		2	Count	0	0		39	39
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%		23.9%	23.9%
		3	Count	51	11		48	110
			% of Total	31.3%	6.7%		29.4%	67.5%
	Total		Count	51	13		99	163
			% of Total	31.3%	8.0%		60.7%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	2	0	23	36
			% of Total	4.4%	0.8%	0.0%	9.2%	14.4%
		2	Count	0	14	13	50	77
			% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	5.2%	20.0%	30.8%
		3	Count	53	22	0	48	123
			% of Total	21.2%	8.8%	0.0%	19.2%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	0	14	0	14
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
	Total	'otal		64	38	27	121	250
			% of Total	25.6%	15.2%	10.8%	48.4%	100.0%

Table: 6

	Gender			1	2	3	4	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY 1		Count	11	0	11	0	22
			% of Total	12.6%	0.0%	12.6%	0.0%	25.3%
	2		Count	0	14	13	11	38
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	14.9%	12.6%	43.7%
		3	Count	0	11	2	0	13
			% of Total	0.0%	12.6%	2.3%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	0	14	0	14

			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	11	25	40	11	87
			% of Total	12.6%	28.7%	46.0%	12.6%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	14	0	0	0	14
			% of Total	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
		2	Count	12	12	13	2	39
			% of Total	7.4%	7.4%	8.0%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	12	23	39	36	110
			% of Total	7.4%	14.1%	23.9%	22.1%	67.5%
	Total	•	Count	38	35	52	38	163
			% of Total	23.3%	21.5%	31.9%	23.3%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	UDY 1	Count	25	0	11	0	36
			% of Total	10.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	14.4%
		2	Count	12	26	26	13	77
			% of Total	4.8%	10.4%	10.4%	5.2%	30.8%
		3	Count	12	34	41	36	123
			% of Total	4.8%	13.6%	16.4%	14.4%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	0	14	0	14
			% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
	Total		Count	49	60	92	49	250
			% of Total	19.6%	24.0%	36.8%	19.6%	100.0%

Table: 7

	Gen	der		1	2	3	4	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	11	0	11	22
			% of Total	0.0%	12.6%	0.0%	12.6%	25.3%
		2	Count	11	11	16	0	38
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	18.4%	0.0%	43.7%
		3	Count	0	13	0	0	13
			% of Total	0.0%	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	14	0	0	14
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	11	49	16	11	87
			% of Total	12.6%	56.3%	18.4%	12.6%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	12	2	0	0	14
			% of Total	7.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
		2	Count	13	12	12	2	39
			% of Total	8.0%	7.4%	7.4%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	25	12	11	62	110
			% of Total	15.3%	7.4%	6.7%	38.0%	67.5%
	Total		Count	50	26	23	64	163
			% of Total	30.7%	16.0%	14.1%	39.3%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	12	13	0	11	36

Knowledge Attitude and Practice Regarding Use of Dental Clinical Photography K. Aravind Kumar et al.

		% of Total	4.8%	5.2%	0.0%	4.4%	14.4%
	2	Count	24	23	28	2	77
		% of Total	9.6%	9.2%	11.2%	0.8%	30.8%
	3	Count	25	25	11	62	123
		% of Total	10.0%	10.0%	4.4%	24.8%	49.2%
	4	Count	0	14	0	0	14
		% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Total		Count	61	75	39	75	250
		% of Total	24.4%	30.0%	15.6%	30.0%	100.0%

Table: 8

	Gender	r		1	2	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	11	22
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	25.3%
		2	Count	36	2	38
			% of Total	41.4%	2.3%	43.7%
		3	Count	13	0	13
			% of Total	14.9%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	14	0	14
			% of Total	16.1%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	74	13	87
			% of Total	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	8.6%	8.6%
		2	Count	37	2	39
			% of Total	22.7%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	47	63	110
			% of Total	28.8%	38.7%	67.5%
	Total		Count	84	79	163
			% of Total	51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	25	36
			% of Total	4.4%	10.0%	14.4%
		2	Count	73	4	77
			% of Total	29.2%	1.6%	30.8%
		3	Count	60	63	123
			% of Total	24.0%	25.2%	49.2%
		4	Count	14	0	14
			% of Total	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
	Total		Count	158	92	250
			% of Total	63.2%	36.8%	100.0%

Table: 9

	Gend		1	2	Total	
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	22	0	22
			% of Total	25.3%	0.0%	25.3%
		2	Count	14	24	38
			% of Total	16.1%	27.6%	43.7%
		3	Count	11	2	13
			% of Total	12.6%	2.3%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	16.1%
	Total		Count	47	40	87
			% of Total	54.0%	46.0%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	12	2	14
			% of Total	7.4%	1.2%	8.6%
		2	Count	37	2	39
			% of Total	22.7%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	47	63	110
			% of Total	28.8%	38.7%	67.5%
	Total		Count	96	67	163
			% of Total	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	34	2	36
			% of Total	13.6%	0.8%	14.4%
		2	Count	51	26	77
			% of Total	20.4%	10.4%	30.8%
		3	Count	58	65	123
			% of Total	23.2%	26.0%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%
	Total	Total		143	107	250
			% of Total	57.2%	42.8%	100.0%

Table: 10

	Gender		1	2	Total	
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	0	22	22
			% of Total	0.0%	25.3%	25.3%
		2	Count	0	38	38
			% of Total	0.0%	43.7%	43.7%
		3	Count	13	0	13
			% of Total	14.9%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	16.1%
	Total		Count	13	74	87
			% of Total	14.9%	85.1%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	2	12	14

			% of Total	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%
		2	Count	24	15	39
			% of Total	14.7%	9.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	39	71	110
			% of Total	23.9%	43.6%	67.5%
	Total	*	Count	65	98	163
			% of Total	39.9%	60.1%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	2	34	36
			% of Total	0.8%	13.6%	14.4%
		2	Count	24	53	77
			% of Total	9.6%	21.2%	30.8%
		3	Count	52	71	123
			% of Total	20.8%	28.4%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%
	Total		Count	78	172	250
			% of Total	31.2%	68.8%	100.0%

Table: 11

	Gender			1	2	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	22	0	22
			% of Total	25.3%	0.0%	25.3%
		2	Count	22	16	38
			% of Total	25.3%	18.4%	43.7%
		3	Count	13	0	13
			% of Total	14.9%	0.0%	14.9%
		4	Count	14	0	14
			% of Total	16.1%	0.0%	16.1%
	Total		Count	71	16	87
			% of Total	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	12	2	14
			% of Total	7.4%	1.2%	8.6%
		2	Count	37	2	39
			% of Total	22.7%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	73	37	110
			% of Total	44.8%	22.7%	67.5%
	Total		Count	122	41	163
			% of Total	74.8%	25.2%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	34	2	36
			% of Total	13.6%	0.8%	14.4%

	2	Count	59	18	77
		% of Total	23.6%	7.2%	30.8%
	3	Count	86	37	123
		% of Total	34.4%	14.8%	49.2%
	4	Count	14	0	14
		% of Total	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
Total		Count	193	57	250
		% of Total	77.2%	22.8%	100.0%

Table: 12

	Gender			1	2	Total
1	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	11	11	22
			% of Total	12.6%	12.6%	25.3%
		2	Count	38	0	38
			% of Total	43.7%	0.0%	43.7%
		3	Count	11	2	13
			% of Total	12.6%	2.3%	14.9%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	16.1%	16.1%
	Total		Count	60	27	87
			% of Total	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
2	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	2	12	14
			% of Total	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%
		2	Count	37	2	39
			% of Total	22.7%	1.2%	23.9%
		3	Count	72	38	110
			% of Total	44.2%	23.3%	67.5%
	Total		Count	111	52	163
			% of Total	68.1%	31.9%	100.0%
Total	YEAR OF STUDY	1	Count	13	23	36
			% of Total	5.2%	9.2%	14.4%
		2	Count	75	2	77
			% of Total	30.0%	0.8%	30.8%
		3	Count	83	40	123
			% of Total	33.2%	16.0%	49.2%
		4	Count	0	14	14
			% of Total	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%
	Total		Count	171	79	250
			% of Total	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%

Discussion

Our study had a near-equal spread of participants between both genders and a vast difference in education levels, with excellent response rates from dental interns. While having a slight female predilection, the majority (78.4%) of participants were interns, while the minority (21.6%) were in a postgraduate course, which is in accordance with previously conducted studies by Alghulikah K et al. and Shaikh T et al.,

The importance of recording the cases for marketing purposes was marked seen in our study as 78.6% of the study population agreed to it while only a smaller number of the participants believed in the importance of dental records for treatment purposes. 80% of the cohort stated that the cost of the accessories was the particular reason they were not documenting cases since most participants could not afford the price of a DSLR camera.

According to our study, the majority of the participants (73.2%) obtained permission from the patient before taking photographs, and 59.2% ensure patient confidentiality by covering their eyes. This finding suggests that dentists are becoming more conscious about protecting patient privacy, which is an improvement compared to a previous study conducted by Hoda LA et al.16 in 2020 and is consistent with the results of a similar study by Rozan K A et al.17 in 2021.

Conclusion

The comparative study reveals that while thirdyear, and final-year, intern students recognize the importance of clinical photography in dentistry, their application and expertise levels differ significantly. Interns, third year, and final year, on the other hand, show enthusiasm but lack the technical proficiency and theoretical understanding required for optimal use.

References

- D Mladenović L Mladenović S Mladenović Importance of digital dental photography in the practice of dentistry Sci J Fac Med Niš20102727584; https://publisher.medfak.ni.ac.rs/AFMN
 - 1/2010/2-
 - 2010/4%20Dragan%20Mladenovic.pdf
- Gouse, S., Karnam, S., Girish, H. C., & Murgod, S. (2018). Forensic photography: Prospect through the lens. Journal of Forensic Dental Sciences, 10(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfo.jfds.2.16
- 3. Çifter, M. (2017). A Qualitative Analysis of Dental Photography in Orthodontics: The Patient's Perspective. BioMed Research International, 2018(1), 5418592. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/5418592
- 4. Wander, P. (2016). Clinical Dental Photography in Orthodontic Practice. Primary Dental Journal. https://doi.org/10.1308/2050168168202 09488
- Kalpana, D; Rao, Sanjana J; Joseph, Joel Koshy; Kurapati, Sampath Kumara Raju. Digital Dental Photography. Indian Journal of Dental Research 29(4):p 507-512, Jul-Aug 2018. | doi: https://doi.org/10.4103/ijdr.IJDR 396 17

How to cite this Article: K. Aravind Kumar, K. V. N. R. Pratap, T. Madhavi Padma, V. SivaKalyan, V. Srujan Kumar, Harsha Mudigonda; *Knowledge Attitude and Practice Regarding Use of Dental Clinical Photography among Undergraduate Dental Students;* Int. J. Drug Res. Dental Sci., 2024; 6(4): 10-21, doi: https://doi.org/10.36437/ijdrd.2024.6.4.B

Source of Support: Nil, Conflict of Interest: Nil.

Received: 24-11-2024 Revised: 14-1-2025 Accepted: 20-1-2025