Supplemental Table 1. Patient-level characteristics of patients with a cracked tooth treated at baseline, overall and according to whether or not internal cracks were also present

Demographic characteristic	(N=435)		Internal cracks YES (=389)	
	N^1	Col%[2]	N	Row %[3]
Gender				
Female	266	61%	244	92%
Male	169	39%	145	86%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.9*	
cluster adjusted p[4]			*0.048*	
Race[5]-ethnicity				
White	365	85%	325	89%
Black	25	6%	22	88%
Asian	6	1%	6	100%
Hispanic	27	6%	25	93%
Other	4	1%	4	100%
cluster adjusted p			*non-estimable*	
Age (years)				
< 35	31	7%	27	87%
35 - 44	85	20%	77	91%
45 - 54	121	28%	114	94%
55 - 64	138	32%	117	85%
65 and older	60	14%	54	90%
cluster adjusted p			*0.5*	
Dental insurance				
None	66	15%	57	86%
Any	369	85%	332	90%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.31*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.5*	
Education				
<= High school	48	11%	44	92%
Some college/Associate	118	27%	105	89%
Bachelor	156	36%	142	91%
Graduate degree	110	25%	95	86%
cluster adjusted p			*0.3*	
Clench, grind, or press on teeth				
No	142	33%	128	90%
Yes	293	67%	261	89%
cluster adjusted OR			*0.9*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.8*	
Region				
Western	72	17%	66	92%
Midwest	88	20%	81	92%
Southwest	70	16%	63	90%
South Central	88	20%	79	90%
South Atlantic	48	11%	37	77%
Northeast	69	16%	63	91%
cluster adjusted p			*0.4*	

South Atlantic	48	11%	37	77%
All other regions	387	89%	352	91%
cluster adjusted OR			0.3	
cluster adjusted p			0.04	
Any symptoms/pain[6]				
No	137	31%	116	85%
Yes	298	69%	273	92%
cluster adjusted OR			2.0	
cluster adjusted p			0.03	
Cold pain				
No	205	47%	180	88%
Yes	230	53%	209	91%
cluster adjusted OR			1.5	
cluster adjusted p			0.2	
Biting pain				
No	272	63%	235	86%
Yes	163	37%	154	94%
cluster adjusted OR			2.6	
cluster adjusted p			0.002	
Spontaneous pain				
No	322	74%	286	89%
Yes	113	26%	103	91%
cluster adjusted OR			1.2	
cluster adjusted p			0.6	

[1]Column Ns not summing to column total N above due to missing data

[2]Column percentages not summing to 100 due to rounding.

[3]Percent symptomatic within level of demographic characteristic.

[4]Significance of differences in proportions with an internal crack, adjusted only for clustering of patients within practitioner using generalized estimating equations.

[5]Race groups are all non-Hispanic

[6]Can have more than 1 type of pain

Supplemental Table 2. Tooth-level characteristics of patients with a cracked tooth treated at baseline, overall and according to whether or not internal cracks were also present

			Internal cracks YES (=389)	
		(N=435)		
Tooth-level characteristic[1]	N^1	Col%[2]	N	Row %[3]
Molar	368	85%	329	89%
Premolar	67	15%	60	90%
cluster adjusted OR[5]				1.0
cluster adjusted p[5]				0.97
Mandibular	233	54%	208	89%
Maxillary	202	46%	181	90%
cluster adjusted OR				1.0
cluster adjusted p				0.92
2 or more restorations present	73	17%	65	89%
0 or 1 restoration present	362	83%	324	90%
cluster adjusted OR				0.9
cluster adjusted p				0.82
2 or more external cracks	286	66%	254	89%
1 external crack	149	34%	135	91%
cluster adjusted OR				0.9
cluster adjusted p				0.7
In occlusion w/opposing tooth	427	98%	382	89%
Not in occlusion w/opposing tooth	8	2%	7	88%
cluster adjusted OR				1.2
cluster adjusted p				0.8
Wear facet through enamel	113	26%	98	87%
No wear facet through enamel	322	74%	291	90%
cluster adjusted OR				0.7
cluster adjusted p				0.2
Exposed roots	68	16%	61	90%
No exposed roots	367	84%	328	89%
cluster adjusted OR				1.0
cluster adjusted p				0.96
Caries present	155	36%	131	85%
No caries present	280	64%	258	92%
cluster adjusted OR				0.50

cluster adjusted p				*0.04*
NCCL present	30	7%	27	90%
No NCCL present	405	93%	362	89%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.1*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.85*	
Natural or restored opposing tooth	385	89%	342	89%
Not natural or restored opposing tooth	50	11%	47	94%
cluster adjusted OR			*0.4*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.06*	
Evidence of crack(s) on radiograph	21	5%	20	95%
No evidence of crack(s) on radiograph	414	95%	369	89%
cluster adjusted OR			*3.7*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.2*	

[1]NCCL: Non-carious cervical lesion

[2]Column Ns not summing to column total N above due to missing data

[3]Column percents not summing to 100 due to rounding.

[4]Percent symptomatic within level of tooth characteristic.

[5]Significance of differences in proportions with an internal crack, adjusted only for clustering of patients within practitioner using generalized estimating equations.

Supplemental Table 3. Crack-level characteristics of patients with a cracked tooth treated at baseline overall and according to whether or not internal cracks were also present

External crack-level characteristics	N[1]	Col%[2]	Internal cracks YES (=389) N	Row %[3]
	(N=435)			
At least 1 crack stained	360	83%	323	90%
No cracks were stained	75	17%	66	88%
cluster adjusted OR[4]			1.3	
cluster adjusted p[4]			0.6	
At least 1 crack detectable with explorer	316	73%	283	90%
No cracks were detectable with explorer	119	27%	106	89%
cluster adjusted OR			1.1	
cluster adjusted p			0.8	
At least 1 crack blocked transilluminated light	297	68%	270	91%
No cracks blocked transilluminated light	138	32%	119	86%
cluster adjusted OR			1.8	
cluster adjusted p			0.08	
At least 1 crack connected with a restoration	325	75%	297	91%
No cracks connected with a restoration	110	25%	92	84%
cluster adjusted OR			2.2	
cluster adjusted p			0.04	
At least 1 crack connected with another crack	28	6%	26	93%
No cracks connected with another crack	407	94%	363	89%
cluster adjusted OR			1.6	
cluster adjusted p			0.4	
At least 1 crack extended to root	37	9%	34	92%
No cracks extended to root	398	91%	355	89%
cluster adjusted OR			1.5	
cluster adjusted p			0.5	
At least 1 crack in horizontal direction	156	36%	142	91%
No cracks in horizontal direction	279	64%	247	89%
cluster adjusted OR			1.3	
cluster adjusted p			0.5	
At least 1 crack in vertical direction	407	94%	364	89%
No cracks in vertical direction	28	6%	25	89%
cluster adjusted OR			1.1	
cluster adjusted p			0.9	

At least 1 crack in oblique direction	30	7%	29	97%
No cracks in oblique direction	405	93%	360	89%
cluster adjusted OR			*3.1*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.08*	
Cracks are in more than 1 direction	74	17%	69	93%
All cracks in same direction	361	83%	320	89%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.8*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.2*	

Surfaces involved

At least 1 crack involved mesial	233	54%	208	89%
No crack involved mesial	202	46%	181	90%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.0*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.9*	
At least 1 crack involved occlusal	222	51%	206	93%
No crack involved occlusal	213	49%	183	86%
cluster adjusted OR			*2.3*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.02*	
At least 1 crack involved distal	238	55%	217	91%
No crack involved distal	197	45%	172	87%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.6*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.14*	
At least 1 crack involved facial	177	41%	158	89%
No crack involved facial	258	59%	231	90%
cluster adjusted OR			*1.0*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.9*	
At least 1 crack involved lingual	225	52%	208	92%
No crack involved lingual	210	48%	181	86%
cluster adjusted OR			*2.0*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.07*	
At least 1 crack involved more than 1 surface	183	42%	170	93%
No crack involved more than 1 surface	252	58%	219	87%
cluster adjusted OR			*2.2*	
cluster adjusted p			*0.03*	

[1]Column Ns not summing to column total N above due to missing data

[2]Column percents not summing to 100 due to rounding.

[3]Percent symptomatic within level of crack characteristic.

[4]Significance of differences in proportions with an internal crack, adjusted only for clustering of patients within practitioner using generalized estimating equations.