

3. *Results*3.1. *Demographics*

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic details of the 100 subjects included in the study. The mean age of the subjects was 21 years, with a range from 18 to 24 years. There were 50 males and 50 females.

3.2. *Findings* The findings are summarized below. The first section describes the relationship between the number of caries and the number of restorations. The second section describes the relationship between the number of caries and the number of fillings. The third section describes the relationship between the number of caries and the number of composite resin restorations.

3.2.1. *Number of caries vs. number of restorations* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of restorations ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.2.2. *Number of caries vs. number of fillings* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of fillings ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.2.3. *Number of caries vs. number of composite resin restorations* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of composite resin restorations ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.2.4. *Number of caries vs. number of class II inlays* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of class II inlays ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3. *Conclusions*3.3.1. *Number of caries vs. number of restorations*3.3.2. *Number of caries vs. number of fillings*

3.3.3. *Number of caries vs. number of composite resin restorations* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of composite resin restorations ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3.4. *Number of caries vs. number of class II inlays* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of class II inlays ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3.5. *Number of caries vs. number of class V inlays* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of class V inlays ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3.6. *Number of caries vs. number of class II inlays vs. number of class V inlays* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of class II inlays ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3.7. *Number of caries vs. number of class II inlays vs. number of class V inlays vs. number of composite resin restorations* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of composite resin restorations ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).

3.3.8. *Number of caries vs. number of class II inlays vs. number of class V inlays vs. number of class II inlays vs. number of composite resin restorations* There was no significant difference between the number of caries and the number of composite resin restorations ($P = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $n = 100$, $df = 98$, $95\% CI = -0.05$ to 4.05).