

Supplementary Table S1

Comparison of responders and all registered dentists. Total number of sampled or registered dentists and number of dentists who responded to each item are given. There was no statistically significant difference between groups ($p > 0.05$, Chi-square/Mann-Whitney).

	Responders (n=821)	Registered* (n=2346)
Demographic data		
Gender (male/female)	63% / 37% (n=789)	63% / 37%
Year of birth	1964 (1956/1973) (n=803)	1964 (1955/1973)
Dental license since	1992 (1984/2000) ^a (n=803)	1993 (1985/2001)
Clinical setting		
Practice size	(n=795)	
Single practitioner	41%	42%
Two practitioners	37%	unknown
>2 practitioners	22%	unknown
Practice location	(n=793)	
city (>100,000 inhabitants)	33%	
town	54%	unknown
rural	12%	

* data from Zahnärztekammer Schleswig-Holstein, 1.7.2012

Supplementary Table S2

Results of comparative sensitivity analysis between responders and previous non-responders for items. No statistical difference between groups was detected ($p > 0.05$, Chi-square).

Item battery	Item	p (Chi-square)
1	Hardness	0.92
	Moisture	0.49
	Colour	0.47
2	Metal bur	0.33
	Ceramic bur	0.50
	Polymeric bur	0.64
	Hand excavator	0.95
4	Calcium hydroxide suspension	0.50
	Calcium hydroxide cement	0.94
	Base	0.24
	No Liner or base	0.49
3	Direct capping	0.97
	Root canal treatment	0.28
	Stepwise excavation	0.61
	One-step incomplete	0.98
5	Success Indirect capping	0.06
	Success Incomplete excavation	0.06
	Success direct capping	0.26
	Success root canal treatment	0.66
6	Complete, since caries might progress	0.09
	Complete, since caries might harm pulp	0.53
	Incomplete, since sealed caries arrests	0.86
	Incomplete to avoid pulpal exposure	0.14
8	Invasive to facilitate restoration longevity	0.88
	Less invasive accepting re-treatment	0.33
	Legal regulations	0.57
7	Renew restoration	0.67
	Monitor restoration	0.51