

APPENDIX 1 - SCANDINAVIAN RESULTS

Table 6. Number of Practitioner-Investigators in Each Occlusal and Proximal Primary Restorative Threshold Combination for the Low Risk Scenario, Scandinavians Only

Occlusal Low Risk (OLR)						
	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Proximal Low Risk (PLR)	n	n	n	n	n	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
2	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
3	0	2	5	14	2	23 (55%)
4	0	1	6	8	4	19 (45%)
5	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Totals	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	11 (26%)	22 (52%)	6 (14%)	42

Table 7. Number of Practitioner-Investigators in Each Occlusal and Proximal Primary Restorative Threshold Combination for the High Risk Scenario, Scandinavians Only

Occlusal High Risk (OHR)						
	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Proximal High Risk (PHR)	n	n	n	n	n	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
2	0	1	2	3	0	6 (14%)
3	1	6	9	16	3	35 (81%)
4	0	0	0	2	0	2 (5%)
5	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Totals	1 (2%)	7 (16%)	11 (26%)	21 (49%)	3 (7%)	43

Table 8. Number of Practitioner-Investigators in Each Existing Restoration Repair and Replace Combination, Scandinavians Only

Number of Repairs (n)					
Number of Replacements (n)	0	1	2	3	Totals
0	11	10	10	4	35 (61%)
1	4	10	3	0	17 (30%)
2	0	3	0	0	3 (5%)
3	2	0	0	0	2 (4%)
Totals	17 (30%)	23 (40%)	13 (23%)	4 (7%)	57

Table 9. Number of Repairs Recommended by Primary Restorative Thresholds in Occlusal and Proximal Caries, Scandinavians Only

	OLR	OHR	PLR	PHR
Number of repairs recommended	Occlusal low risk*	Occlusal high risk*	Proximal low risk*	Proximal high risk*
0†	3.88 <sup>ac</sup> ±0.72	3.59 <sup>bef</sup> ±0.80	3.58 <sup>cef</sup> ±0.51	3.08 <sup>df</sup> ±0.29
1†	3.55 <sup>ag</sup> ±0.83	3.27 <sup>bgh</sup> ±0.98	3.37 <sup>egh</sup> ±0.50	2.84 <sup>dh</sup> ±0.50
2†	3.58 <sup>ai</sup> ±0.79	3.23 <sup>bi</sup> ±1.01	3.42 <sup>ci</sup> ±0.51	2.82 <sup>di</sup> ±0.40
3†	3.75 <sup>aj</sup> ±0.96	3.67 <sup>bj</sup> ±1.15	3.33 <sup>cj</sup> ±0.58	3.00 <sup>dj</sup> ±0.00
Difference in column means between those who recommended no repairs and those who recommended 3 repairs	-0.13	0.08	-0.25	-0.08

mean threshold±sd

\*Means in a column with the same superscript are not significantly different, p<0.05

†Means in a row with the same superscript are not significantly different, p<0.05

Table 9a. Number of Practitioner-Investigators Choosing Repair, Scandinavians Only

	OLR	OHR	PLR	PHR
Number of repairs recommended	Occlusal low risk n (%)	Occlusal high risk n (%)	Proximal low risk n (%)	Proximal high risk n (%)
0	16 (31%)	17 (31%)	12 (26%)	12 (27%)
1	20 (38%)	22 (40%)	19 (41%)	19 (42%)
2	12 (23%)	13 (24%)	12 (26%)	11 (24%)
3	4 (8%)	3 (5%)	3 (7%)	3 (7%)
totals	52	55	46	45

Table 10. Number of Replacements Recommended by Primary Restorative Thresholds in Occlusal and Proximal Caries, Scandinavians Only

	OLR	OHR	PLR	PHR
Number of replacements recommended	Occlusal low risk*	Occlusal high risk*	Proximal low risk*	Proximal high risk*
0†	3.76 <sup>af</sup> ±0.75	3.42 <sup>bf</sup> ±0.83	3.43 <sup>cf</sup> ±0.50	2.86 <sup>de</sup> ±0.35
1†	3.60 <sup>ag</sup> ±0.83	3.41 <sup>bg</sup> ±1.00	3.47 <sup>cg</sup> ±0.52	3.07 <sup>dg</sup> ±0.46
2†	3.00 <sup>ah</sup> ±1.41	3.00 <sup>bh</sup> ±1.73	3.00 <sup>ch</sup> ±0.00	2.00 <sup>eh</sup> ±0.00
3†	3.50 <sup>ai</sup> ±0.71	3.00 <sup>bi</sup> ±1.41	0	0
Difference in column means between those who recommended no replacements and those who recommended 3 or 2 replacements	-0.26	-0.42	-0.43	-0.86

mean threshold±sd

\*Means in a column with the same superscript are not significantly different, p<0.05

†Means in a row with the same superscript are not significantly different, p<0.05

Table 10a. Number of Practitioner-Investigators Choosing Replacement, Scandinavians Only

	OLR	OHR	PLR	PHR
Number of replacements recommended	Occlusal low risk n (%)	Occlusal high risk n (%)	Proximal low risk n (%)	Proximal high risk n (%)
0	33 (63%)	33 (60%)	30 (65%)	29 (64%)
1	15 (29%)	17 (31%)	15 (33%)	15 (33%)
2	2 (4%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
3	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Totals	52	55	46	45

Table 6 reports the low-risk patient scenario and Table 7 reports the high-risk scenario. In the low-carries risk scenario, the pair of choices most frequently selected was 4 for occlusal and 3 for proximal by 14 practitioner-investigators. The most frequent choices were 4 for occlusal and 3 for proximal by 16 practitioner-investigators for the high-risk scenario.

Not shown in the tables, when the 1-5 ordinal scales were treated as ratio scales, the mean threshold and standard deviation for restoration of the occlusal low-risk patient was  $3.67 \pm 0.79$ ; for the high-risk patient it was  $3.38 \pm 0.93$ . The values for restoration of proximal caries for the low-risk patient were  $3.43 \pm 0.50$ ; for the high-risk patient it was  $2.91 \pm 0.42$ . The mean thresholds for restoration of occlusal and proximal caries in both the low- and high-risk patient scenarios were at a later stage for the Scandinavians.

For the low-risk scenario there was not a statistically significant correlation, Spearman's rho = 0.04;  $p=0.80$ , between the occlusal and proximal thresholds for restorative intervention that are shown in Table 6. For the high-risk responses in Table 7, a statistically significant correlation also was not found between the occlusal and proximal thresholds, Spearman's rho = 0.12;  $p=0.46$ .

In Table 8 the most frequent combination chosen by 11 (19%) dentists was to repair no restorations and to replace none. There were three combinations that were the next most frequent choice: 1) repair one restoration and replace no restorations; 2) repair two restoration and replace no restorations; and 3) repair one restoration and replace one restoration. All were chosen by 10 (18%) of the practitioner-investigators. The combination that had the fewest number of practitioner-investigators was no repairs and two replacements at 0. The decisions were not equally likely ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

The repair results for the Scandinavians are more like the replacement results for the US, in that the means generally decrease as the number or repairs increase (0-3), Table 9. This is especially

true for the data in replacement groups 0-2 if repair group 3 is discounted due to the small number of practitioner-investigators, Table 9a.

For the replacement results in Table 10 there are no clear trends when examining the means for 0-3 replacements due to the small number of practitioner-investigators in the 2 and 3 replacement groups, Table 10a. The data does show that 60% of the Scandinavian practitioner-investigators choose not to replace any of the restorations, whereas only 22% of the US practitioner-investigators choose not to replace any of the restorations. That is, about three times as many Scandinavians, by percent, elected no replacement restorative treatment as compared to the US practitioner-investigators.