

Summary of baseline inter-examiner reliability results

- 1) total number of teeth per subject
 - a) 82 subjects assessed, 81 pairings (99%) were in agreement
 - b) the 1 disagreement occurred regarding an implant vs. natural tooth call
- 2) tooth-specific tooth counts (i.e., "present", "retained root fragment", "missing without fixed replacement", "missing with fixed replacement" calls)
 - a) 32 teeth x 82 subjects = 2,624 possible pairings
 - b) 98% of the pairings were in agreement (2,574/2,624)
 - c) 48 of the 50 pairs (96%) in disagreement were due to disagreement over tooth position, not tooth presence. One disagreement was a "present" vs. "retained root" disagreement, and the other was a "missing with fixed replacement" vs. "present" disagreement.
- 3) number of retained root fragments per subject
 - a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth
 - b) 22 of the 1,686 teeth were called a "retained root" by at least one examiner; these roots were included in the "number of remaining teeth"
 - c) 21 of these 22 calls (95%) were in agreement
- 4) number of fixed prosthetic pontics or cantilevers per subject
 - a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth
 - b) 36 "missing with fixed replacement" calls were made by at least one examiner; these prosthetic teeth were not included in the "number of remaining teeth"
 - c) 35 of these 36 calls (97%) were in agreement
- 5) number of bulk restoration fractures per subject
 - a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth
 - b) 19 teeth were called as having a bulk fracture by at least one examiner (14 subjects)
 - c) For subjects with at least one call, both examiners agreed on the number of calls only 6 times (43% agreement). That is, overall, examiners agreed on the number of bulk fractures on 74 of the 82 subjects (90%).
 - d) coefficient of colligation, $Y=0.91$; $\kappa=0.62$
- 6) number of cusp/incisal edge fractures per subject
 - a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth
 - b) 26 teeth were called as having a cusp or incisal edge fracture by at least one examiner (19 subjects).
 - c) For subjects with at least one call, both examiners agreed on the number of calls only 7 times (37% agreement). That is, overall, examiners agreed on the

number of cusp fractures on 70 of the 82 subjects
(85%).

d) coefficient of colligation, $Y=0.89$; $kappa=0.60$

7) number of root defects per subject

a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth

b) 34 teeth were called as having a root defect by at least one examiner (12 subjects).

c) For subjects with at least one call, both examiners agreed on the number of calls only 3 times (25% agreement). That is, overall, examiners agreed on the number of root defects on 72 of the 82 subjects (88%).

d) coefficient of colligation, $Y=0.84$; $kappa=0.48$

8) number of mobile teeth per subject

a) 82 subjects assessed, who had 1,686 teeth

b) 54 teeth were called as having one or more mobile teeth by at least one examiner (18 subjects).

c) For subjects with at least one call, both examiners agreed on the number of calls only 3 times (17% agreement). That is, overall, examiners agreed on the number of mobile teeth on 67 of the 82 subjects (82%).

d) coefficient of colligation, $Y=0.88$; $kappa=0.60$

Summary of inter-examiner agreement for coronal and root caries assessment

Pairing	# subj.	# pairs of teeth	CORONAL % agreement	ROOT % agreement	CORONAL kappa	CORONAL coeff. Y	ROOT kappa	ROOT coeff. Y
Overall	82	1,686	96%	97%	0.89	0.91	0.62*	0.82
Mean (S.D.)	8 (4)	75 (41)	96% (2%)	97% (2%)				

* surface-specific root agreement:

lingual kappa=0.72; Y=0.90
 mesial kappa=0.63; Y=0.86
 buccal kappa=0.59; Y=0.76
 distal kappa=0.57; Y=0.81

1=DWL; 2=TAD; 3=DEA; 4=GHG; 5=UF; 6=MLR

Summary of inter-examiner reliability results for periodontal attachment loss, ranked by percent agreement +/- 1 mm

Pairing	# subj.	# pairs of teeth	# (%) pairs +/- 1 mm	# (%) pairs +/- 2mm
Overall	81	642	535 (83%)	622 (97%)
Mean (S.D.)	7.4 (4.1)	58.4 (37.8)	83% (7%)	97% (2%)

Overall Intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.75

Mean (S.D.) attachment loss in teeth assessed was 3.9 mm (1.9 mm)

1=DWL; 2=DEA; 3=GHG; 4=UF; 5=TAD; 6=MLR