

Table e5. Sustained progression in either VFT or EDSS by treatment group with comparison to progression in either EDSS, HCVA or LCVA progression alone.

Patients with either VFT or				
EDSS progression (%)				
	Placebo	Natalizumab ^a	HR	
Level of contrast	(n=315)	(n=627)	(95% CI) ^b	<i>P</i> value
EDSS or 7-letter HCVA progression	91 (28.9)	125 (19.9)	0.66 (0.50, 0.86)	0.002
EDSS or 7-letter LCVA (2.5%) progression	143 (45.5)	210 (33.5)	0.68 (0.55, 0.84)	0.0003
EDSS	84 (27.0)	104 (17.0)	0.58 (0.43, 0.77)	<0.001
7-Letter HCVA	20 (6.4)	25 (4.0)	0.58 (0.32, 1.01)	0.073
7-letter LCVA	89 (28.3)	126 (20.1)	0.65 (0.50, 0.86)	0.002

The composite measure for EDSS and HCVA shows a significant treatment effect whereas the HCVA measure alone does not. The composite measure for EDSS and LCVA shows a slightly smaller treatment effect than either EDSS or LCVA alone. This confirms that LCVA captures more impairment when added to the EDSS.

^aFrom Kaplan-Meier analysis.

^bFrom a Cox proportional hazards model, adjusted for baseline VFT, EDSS, and age.

CI: confidence interval; EDSS: Expanded Disability Status Scale; HCVA: high-contrast visual acuity; HR: hazard ratio; LCVA: low-contrast visual acuity; VFT: visual function testing.