Supplementary Table 1 - Deep ulcers vs. superficial ulcers in achieving 50% endoscopic improvement by week 26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Deep, n (%) | Superficial, n (%) | Unadjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value adjusted |
| Ileum | 72 (76.6) | 22 (23.7) | 0.719 (0.214-2.416) | 0.59 | 0.423 (0.070-2.577) | 0.35 |
| Ascending Colon | 49 (60.5) | 32 (39.5) | 0.741 (0.172-3.204) | 0.69 | 0.875 (0.185-4.146) | 0.87 |
| Transverse Colon | 54 (75.0) | 18 (25.0) | 1.562 (0.261-9.343) | 0.63 | 1.605 (0.252-10.221) | 0.62 |
| Descending Colon | 64 (64.6) | 35 (35.4) | 0.355 (0.089-1.258) | 0.11 | 0.370 (0.097-1.417) | 0.37 |
| Rectum | 33 (46.5) | 38 (53.5) | 1.016 (0.304-3.395) | 0.98 | 1.09 (0.316-3.783) | 0.88 |

Supplementary Table 2 - Impact of ulcer size (SES-CD) on achieving absence of ulceration by week 26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Small, n (%) | Medium, n (%) | Large, n (%) | Comparison | Unadjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value adjusted |
| Ileum | 21 (22.3) | 49 (52.1) | 24 (25.6) | Large vs. Not Large | 0.49 (0.18-1.33) | 0.16 | 0.41 (0.14-1.17) | 0.10 |
| Medium or Large vs. Small | 0.34 (0.13-0.93) | 0.04 | 0.30 (0.10-0.88) | 0.03 |
| Ascending Colon | 23 (28.4) | 44 (54.3) | 14 (17.3) | Large vs. Not Large | 1.86 (0.58-5.95) | 0.30 | 3.20 (0.81-12.63) | 0.10 |
| Medium or Large vs. Small | 2.29 (0.82-6.38) | 0.11 | 2.36 (0.79-6.99) | 0.12 |
| Transverse Colon | 8 (11.1) | 38 (52.8) | 26 (36.1) | Large vs. Not Large | 1.06 (0.37-3.07) | 0.91 | 2.07 (0.72-5.91) | 0.18 |
| Medium or Large vs. Small | 0.62 (0.16-2.38) | 0.49 | 0.61 (0.15-2.49) | 0.49 |
| Medium vs. Small | 0.53 (0.12-2.31) | 0.40 | 0.49 (0.10-2.28) | 0.36 |
| Descending Colon | 24 (24.2) | 33 (33.3) | 33 (42.5) | Large vs. Not Large | 0.57 (0.25-1.28) | 0.17 | 0.64 (0.27-1.49) | 0.30 |
| Medium or Large vs. Small | 1.35 (0.54-3.40) | 0.52 | 1.16 (0.44-3.07) | 0.76 |
| Rectum | 9 (12.7) | 16 (22.5) | 46 (64.8) | Large vs. Not Large | 0.29 (0.10-0.82) | 0.02 | 0.27 (0.09-0.78) | 0.02 |
| Medium or Large vs. Small | 0.60 (0.14-2.46) | 0.47 | 0.55 (0.13-2.31) | 0.41 |

Supplementary Table 3– Impact of depth of ulceration (CDEIS) on achieving absence of ulceration by week 26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Deep, n (%) | Superficial, n (%) | Unadjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value adjusted |
| Ileum | 72 (76.6) | 22 (23.7) | 0.50 (0.19-1.31) | 0.16 | 0.44 (0.16-1.22) | 0.44 |
| Ascending Colon | 49 (60.5) | 32 (39.5) | 0.69 (0.28-1.69) | 0.42 | 0.74 (0.28-1.92) | 0.54 |
| Transverse Colon | 54 (75.0) | 18 (25.0) | 1.69 (0.57-5.02) | 0.34 | 2.05 (0.64-6.60) | 0.23 |
| Descending Colon | 64 (64.6) | 35 (35.4) | 0.72 (0.23-2.25) | 0.57 | 0.82 (0.26-2.63) | 0.74 |
| Rectum | 33 (46.5) | 38 (53.5) | 0.41 (0.15-1.06) | 0.07 | 0.44 (0.16-1.22) | 0.11 |

Supplementary Table 4 – Comparison of ileal healing in patients with isolated ileal disease compared to ileocolonic disease for achieving endoscopic remission in the ileum by week 26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comparison | Isolated Ileal Disease | Ileocolonic Disease  | Unadjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value adjusted |
| Isolated Ileal Disease vs. Ileocolonic Disease b | 44 / 94 (46.1%) | 55 / 94 (53.9%) | 0.36 (0.15-0.83) | 0.02 | 0.33 (0.09-1.17) | 0.09 |
| Isolated Ileal Disease Severe (>3) vs. Ileocolonic Disease Severe (>3)b | 39 (88.6%) | 40 (80%) | 0.38 (0.15-0.93) | 0.04 | 0.40 (0.10-1.62) | 0.20 |
| Isolated Ileal Disease Not Severe (2 or 3) vs. Ileocolonic Disease Not Severe (2 or 3)b | 5 (11.4%) | 10 (20%) | 0.44 (0.02-9.03) | 0.60 | 0.33 (0.01-14.52) | 0.56 |

b patients with score 0 or 1 excluded from analysis

Supplementary Table 5 - Impact of severity of ileal inflammation in patients with isolated ileal vs. ileocolonic disease for achieving endoscopic remission in the ileum by week 26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comparison | Moderate  | Severe | Unadjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR (95%CI)  | p-value adjusted |
| Isolated Ileal Disease Severe (>3) vs. Not Severe (2 or 3)b | 5 (11.4%) | 39 (88.6%) | 0.17 (0.02-1.70) | 0.13 | 0.53 (0.02-12.46) | 0.69 |
| Ileocolonic Disease Severe (>3) vs. Not Severe (2 or 3)b | 6 (12%) | 44 (88%) | 1.19 (0.19-7.34) | 0.85 | 0.39 (0.12-12.81) | 0.60 |

b patients with score 0 or 1 excluded from analysis

Supplementary Table 6 - Impact of ileum large ulcer size>2cm vs not large on achieving endoscopic remissiona by week 26, stratified by treatment allocation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Large | Not large | Unadjusted OR | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR | p-value adjusted |
| AZA | 6 | 21 | \*Note: not possible as no one in AZA subgroup had endoscopic healing  |
| IFX | 7 | 26 | 0.143 (0.015-1.360) | 0.09 | 0.117 (0.012-1.161) | 0.067 |
| AZA+IFX  | 11 | 23 | 1.10 (0.260-4.65) | 0.897 | 0.985 (0.219-4.432) | 0.985 |

a endoscopic remission defined as SES-CD = 0

AZA – azathioprine; IFX - infliximab

Supplementary Table 7 - Impact of rectum large ulcer size>2cm vs not large on achieving endoscopic remissiona by week 26, stratified by treatment allocation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Large | Not large | Unadjusted OR | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR | p-value adjusted |
| AZA | 14 | 8 | 0.46 (0.067-3.094) | 0.42 | 0.72 (0.084-6.219) | 0.766 |
| IFX | 18 | 10 | 0.17 (0.030-0.903) | 0.038 | 0.163 (0.029-0.905) | 0.038 |
| AZA+IFX  | 14 | 7 | 0.22 (0.021-2.370) | 0.213 | 0.279 (0.021-3.786) | 0.337 |

a endoscopic remission defined as SES-CD = 0

AZA – azathioprine; IFX - infliximab

Supplementary Table 8 - Deep and large ulcers in ileum compared to superficial or smaller ulcers in achieving endoscopic remissiona by week 26, stratified by treatment allocation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Deep+Large | Not Deep+Large | Unadjusted OR | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR | p-value adjusted |
| AZA | 5 | 22 | 0.361 (0.034-3.788) | 0.396 | \*Not possible |
| IFX | 5 | 28 | 0.370 (0.053-2.601) | 0.318 | \*Not possible |
| AZA+IFX  | 8 | 26 | 0.238 (0.044-1.296) | 0.097 | \*Not possible |

a endoscopic remission defined as SES-CD = 0

\* - adjustment not possible due to small number of cases

AZA – azathioprine; IFX – infliximab

Supplementary Table 9 - Deep and large ulcers in rectum compared to superficial or smaller ulcers in achieving endoscopic remissiona by week 26, stratified by treatment allocation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Deep+Large | Not Deep+Large | Unadjusted OR | p-value unadjusted | Adjusted OR | p-value adjusted |
| AZA | 4 | 18 | 0.128 (0.011-1.542) | 0.106 | 0.245 (0.015-4.047) | 0.326 |
| IFX | 3 | 25 | 0.095 (0.007-1.318) | 0.079 | 0.081 (0.05-1.200) | 0.068 |
| AZA+IFX  | 0 | 21 | \*Not possible due to no cases in this group | \*Not possible due to no cases in this group |

a endoscopic remission defined as SES-CD = 0

AZA – azathioprine; IFX - infliximab