

Table S1. Cross-table of PAR improvement categories at T1 and T2 compared to T0.

		T0-T2			
		Greatly improved	Improved	Worse or no difference	Total
T0-T1	Greatly improved	51	20	1	72
	Improved	0	11	2	13
	Worse or no difference	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	31	3	85

Table S2. Prognostic factors for T1-T2 changes in overjet, overbite, arch width and length.

[illegible]

Table S3. Prognostic factors for changes in PAR (T2-T1) and for LI grade at T2.

	Prognostic factor	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
PAR (T2-T1)	Lower fixed retainer at T2	-11.10	2.31	-4.80	0.000	-15.74	-6.56
	Non-extraction treatment	5.97	1.63	3.66	0.001	2.70	9.24
	Essix retainer at T1	5.38	1.36	-3.97	0.000	-8.11	-2.66
	<p>- The presence of a lower fixed retainer at T2 correlates with 11.1 units decrease in difference in PAR score from T1 to T2, compared to no lower fixed retainer at T2.</p> <p>- A non-extraction treatment correlates with 6.0 units increase in difference in PAR score from T1 to T2 compared to an extraction treatment.</p> <p>- An upper Essix retainer at T1 correlates with 5.4 units decrease in difference in PAR score from T1 to T2 compared to an upper Begg retainer.</p>						
	Prognostic factor	Odds ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
LII grade at T2	LII at T1	0.08	0.06	-3.33	0.001	0.02	0.35
	Lower fixed retainer at T2	732.95	1603.18	3.02	0.003	10.07	53321.82
	<p>- A 1-mm increment in LII index at T1 correlates with a change of 0.08 in the odds of being in a better LII grade at T2.</p> <p>- The presence of a lower fixed retainer at T2 correlates with a change of 733 in the odds of being in a better LII grade at T2.</p>						

PAR; Peer Assessment Rating Index, LI; Little's Irregularity Index.

Significance level: p-value<0.0033 (Bonferroni correction for 15 outcomes modelled).