

Table S1. Availability of tooth-type observations.

Tooth type	Potential n	Unavailable n	Analyzed n	Unavailable rate, %
Maxillary central incisors (U1)	61	0	61	0.0
Maxillary canines (U3)	61	0	61	0.0
Maxillary first premolars (U4)	61	3	58	4.9
Mandibular second premolars (L5)	61	4	57	6.6
Maxillary first molars (U6)	61	3	58	4.9
Mandibular first molars (L6)	61	4	57	6.6
Total	366	14	352	3.8

Table S2. Detailed mixed-effects model results.**A. Fixed effects**

Effect	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Tooth type	F(4.495, 252.6) = 5.658	0.0001
Sex	F(1, 59) = 0.3168	0.5757
Tooth type × sex	F(4.495, 252.6) = 0.2906	0.9025

B. Random effects

Random effect	SD	Variance
Participant	0.2085	0.04348
Residual	0.3867	0.1496

C. Matching effectiveness

Statistic	Value
Chi-square, df	28.72, 1
P value	<0.0001
Significant matching	Yes

D. Model-estimated means (least-squares means)

Tooth type	Male	Female	Row mean
U1	5.424	5.436	5.430
U3	5.449	5.574	5.511
U4	5.563	5.581	5.572
L5	5.500	5.536	5.518
U6	5.713	5.783	5.748
L6	5.711	5.678	5.695
Column mean	5.560	5.598	5.579

Table S3. Tukey-adjusted pairwise comparisons among tooth types.

Comparison	Mean difference	95% CI of difference	Significant	Adjusted p-value
U1 vs U3	-0.088	-0.308 to 0.132	No	0.8451
U1 vs U4	-0.138	-0.332 to 0.056	No	0.3004
U1 vs L5	-0.071	-0.308 to 0.165	No	0.9475
U1 vs U6	-0.323	-0.542 to -0.104	Yes	0.0008
U1 vs L6	-0.260	-0.470 to -0.049	Yes	0.0076
U3 vs U4	-0.047	-0.241 to 0.147	No	0.9791
U3 vs L5	-0.025	-0.260 to 0.209	No	0.9995
U3 vs U6	-0.240	-0.446 to -0.033	Yes	0.0142
U3 vs L6	-0.170	-0.394 to 0.055	No	0.2411
U4 vs L5	0.081	-0.097 to 0.259	No	0.7610
U4 vs U6	-0.187	-0.386 to 0.012	No	0.0762
U4 vs L6	-0.133	-0.329 to 0.064	No	0.3594
L5 vs U6	-0.241	-0.474 to -0.008	Yes	0.0387
L5 vs L6	-0.184	-0.436 to 0.069	No	0.2779
U6 vs L6	0.043	-0.150 to 0.236	No	0.9854