Assessed for eligibility (unknown)
Dentists chose patients with matched carious lesions who they felt would return for follow-ups. They were not specifically asked to enrol sequential patients.

Enrolment

Excluded (unknown)
Not meeting inclusion criteria (unknown)

Refused to participate (retrospectively gathered data indicated this to be around 13%)

Randomisation
Split mouth design.
Computer generated randomization at distant site accessed by phone call.
Treatments randomised by sequence and side of mouth for intervention or control

Allocated to intervention (n=132)
Received allocated intervention (n=128)
Did not receive allocated intervention (n=4)
Reasons:
couldn’t get crown to fit tooth (n=3)
patient unable to cope with procedure (n=1)
Analysed (n=132)

Allocated to control (n=132)
Received allocated control (n=129)
Did not receive allocated control (n=3)
Reasons:
unable to cope with procedure (n=3)
Analysed (n=132)

Allocation

Analysis of acceptability of treatments

Analysis of treatment outcomes

Lost to follow-up (n=8)
Reasons:
Moved away (n=3)
Failed to return (n=5)
Discontinued intervention (n=0)
Analysed (n=124)
Excluded from analysis (n=0)

Lost to follow-up (n=8)
Reasons:
Moved away (n=3)
Failed to return (n=5)
Discontinued intervention (n=0)
Analysed (n=124)
Excluded from analysis (n=0)

2 yr follow-up

Figure 2 CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) diagram showing the flow of participants through each stage of the randomized trial.