#### **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL**

### **Supplemental Material Contents**

#### Methods

Subgroup Analyses1	
Results	
Supplemental Table 1. Reduction in UP/C From Baseline to Week 8 by Dose Group (Efficacy Evaluable Set)	3
Supplemental Table 2. MMRM Analysis of UP/C at Baseline and Week 8, All Doses (Full Analysis Set)	Ļ
Supplemental Table 3. Proportion of Patients Who Achieved FPRE at Week 8 (Efficacy Evaluable Set)5	5
Supplemental Table 4. Changes in Select Laboratory and Safety Parameters During the Double-blind Period (Safety Evaluable Set)6	>
Supplemental Table 5. Diuretic Use During the Double-blind Period (Full Analysis Set)	,
Supplemental Table 6. Change in Diuretic Treatment During the Double-blind Period (Full Analysis Set)	3
Supplemental Table 7. Changes in UP/C for Patient Subgroups (Efficacy Evaluable Set) 9	)

### **METHODS**

#### Subgroup Analyses

Prespecified analyses were performed on patient subgroups of the efficacy evaluable set population stratified by age (>18 vs ≤18 years), baseline UP/C (≥3.5 vs <3.5 g/g), sex, and baseline severity of kidney disease (eGFR: >90, >60–90, >45–60, and 30–45 mL/min/1.73m²). Analyses of subgroups based on race and blood pressure were also performed. The treatment group geometric least squares mean percent change from baseline in UP/C was calculated for both treatment groups within each patient subgroup. Analysis of covariance models for change in natural log UP/C included baseline UP/C as a covariate and effects for treatment, cohort, prognostic factor, and treatment by prognostic factor interaction. Descriptive statistics and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for each subgroup.

RESULTS
Supplemental Table 1. Reduction in UP/C From Baseline to Week 8 by Dose Group (Efficacy Evaluable Set)

	UP/C Ratio, I Week 0	Median (Range)	UP/C Ratio, N Week 8	Median (Range)	% Reduction I (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	From Baseline	
Sparsentan Dose Cohort	Irbesartan (n=32)	Sparsentan (n=64)	Irbesartan (n=32)	Sparsentan (n=64)	Irbesartan (n=32)	Sparsentan (n=64)	<i>P</i> Value
All doses	3.27 (0.88, 10.73) [n=32]	3.62 (0.43, 18.66) [n=64]	2.41 (0.43, 10.19) [n=32]	1.98 (0.12, 14.47) [n=64]	-18.5 (-34.6, 1.7) [n=32]	-44.8 (-52.7, -35.7) [n=64]	0.006
400 and 800 mg	2.97 (0.88, 10.73) [n=25]	3.53 (0.43, 18.66) [n=51]	2.39 (0.43, 10.19) [n=25]	1.90 (0.12, 14.47) [n=51]	-19.0 (-38.0, 5.9) [n=25]	-47.4 (-56.3, -36.9) [n=51]	0.011
200 mg	4.86 (0.98, 8.03) [n=7]	3.71 (1.50, 10.15) [n=13]	3.64 (1.45, 6.69) [n=7]	2.06 (0.59, 14.38) [n=13]	-15.0 (-41.8, 24.2) [n=7]	-33.1 (-49.3, -11.6) [n=13]	0.298
400 mg	2.85 (1.10, 10.73) [n=17]	3.71 (1.25, 18.66) [n=21]	2.38 (0.43, 10.19) [n=17]	1.73 (0.28, 12.34) [n=21]	-28.1 (-47.5, -1.6) [n=17]	-52.7 (-64.3, -37.2) [n=21]	0.056
800 mg	3.30 (0.88, 9.76) [n=8]	3.23 (0.43, 14.68) [n=30]	3.02 (1.11, 8.37) [n=8]	2.09 (0.12, 14.47) [n=30]	-9.3 (-45.3, 50.3) [n=8]	-41.3 (-54.4, -24.4) [n=30]	0.127

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Geometric least squares mean percent change from baseline.

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; UP/C, urinary protein-to-creatinine ratio.

P values from analysis of covariance.

## Supplemental Table 2. MMRM Analysis of UP/C at Baseline and Week 8, All Doses (Full Analysis Set)

		UP/C Ratio, Med Week 8	dian (Range)	Comparison of the Baseline (We 0) Adjusted Week 8 UP/C Values Between Sparsentan and Irbesartan (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	
Irbesartan (n=36)	Sparsentan (n=73)	Irbesartan (n=36)	Sparsentan (n=73)	Sparsentan (n=73) vs Irbesartan (n=36)	<i>P</i> Value
3.12 (0.88, 10.73) [n=36]	3.61 (0.43, 18.66) [n=72]	2.41 (0.43, 10.19) [n=32]	1.94 (0.12, 14.47) [n=66]	0.69 (0.52, 0.91)	0.010

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>A mixed model repeated measures (MMRM) analysis using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) with the natural log(UP/C) at Week 0 and Week 8 as the dependent variable, treatment, cohort, visit, and treatment-by-visit interaction as fixed effects, and subject as a random effect was conducted in this analysis. The ratio for the difference from Week 8 to Week 0 is generated by exp[LSmean of natural log(UP/C) at Week 8 - LSmean of natural log(UP/C) at Week 0 for Sparsentan – LSmean of natural log(UP/C) at Week 0 for Irbesartan]. 95% CI of ratio and P value are derived from the contrast of the treatments and visits within the MMRM model.

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; UP/C, urinary protein-to-creatinine ratio.

## Supplemental Table 3. Proportion of Patients Who Achieved FPRE at Week 8 (Efficacy Evaluable Set)

	Patients, n/N (%)				
Dose Cohort	Irbesartan (n=32)	Sparsentan (n=64)	<i>P</i> Value <sup>a</sup>		
All doses	3/32 (9.4)	18/64 (28.1)	0.040		
400 mg and 800 mg	3/25 (12.0)	16/51 (31.4)	0.092		
200 mg	0/7 (0)	2/13 (15.4)	0.521		
400 mg	3/17 (17.7)	8/21 (38.1)	0.282		
800 mg	0/8 (0)	8/30 (26.7)	0.164		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Discrete outcomes were compared using a Fisher exact test.

Abbreviation: FPRE, focal segmental glomerular sclerosis (FSGS) partial remission endpoint; n/N, number achieving endpoint / number assessed.

## Supplemental Table 4. Changes in Select Laboratory and Safety Parameters During the Double-blind Period (Safety Evaluable Set)

	Irbesartan (n=36)		Sparsentan, All D (n=73)	oses
Parameter	Baseline	Week 8	Baseline	Week 8
Body weight, kg	82.1 (22.1)	81.6 (22.4)	81.4 (22.4)	81.1 (22.8)
Serum albumin, g/dL	3.54 (0.72)	3.61 (0.58)	3.56 (0.71)	3.6 (0.72)
Serum creatinine, mg/dL	1.22 (0.56)	1.22 (0.58)	1.19 (0.53)	1.25 (0.59)
Serum potassium, mmol/L	4.23 (0.44)	4.47 (0.36)	4.13 (0.37)	4.43 (0.43)
Hemoglobin, g/dL	12.9 (2.1)	12.7 (2.1)	13.3 (1.9)	12.3 (2.0)
Hematocrit, %	39.4 (5.9)	39.0 (5.4)	40.2 (5.6)	37.3 (6.0)
ALT, U/L	24.3 (13.9)	23.1 (10.9)	24.2 (15.1)	20.8 (12.2)
AST, U/L	26.1 (14.7)	24.5 (10.2)	23.9 (11.7)	22.1 (11.1)
NT-proBNP, pg/mL <sup>a</sup>	202.3 (408.3)	125.4 (116.5)	139.1 (128.9)	146.1 (285.1)

Data presented as mean (standard deviation) and analyzed using descriptive statistics.

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro–B-type natriuretic peptide.

 $<sup>^{</sup>a}$ Based on the efficacy analysis set; sparsentan (n = 64) and irbesartan (n = 32).

## Supplemental Table 5. Diuretic Use During the Double-blind Period (Full Analysis Set)

	Patients, n (%)			
Diuretic	Irbesartan (n=36)	Sparsentan, All Doses (n=73)		
Thiazide	6 (16.7)	5 (6.8)		
Hydrochlorothiazide	4 (11.1)	3 (4.1)		
Chlorthalidone	0	1 (1.4)		
Metolazone	2 (5.6)	1 (1.4)		
Loop	8 (22.2)	26 (35.6)		
Furosemide	8 (22.2)	25 (34.2)		
Bumetanide	0	1 (1.4)		

Data analyzed using descriptive statistics.

## Supplemental Table 6. Change in Diuretic Treatment During the Double-blind Period (Full Analysis Set)

	Patients, n (%)			
Diuretic	Irbesartan (n=36)	Sparsentan, All Doses (n=73)		
All diuretics				
New or increased	4 (11.1)	8 (11.0)		
Reduced	1 (2.8)	1 (1.4)		
Thiazide <sup>a</sup>				
New or increased	3 (8.3)	1 (1.4)		
Reduced	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)		
Furosemide <sup>b</sup>				
New or increased	1 (2.8)	7 (9.6)		
Reduced	1 (2.8)	0 (0.0)		

Data analyzed using descriptive statistics.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Thiazides included hydrochlorothiazide, chlorthalidone, and metolazone.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>No other loop diuretics change during the double-blind period.

## Supplemental Table 7. Changes in UP/C for Patient Subgroups (Efficacy Evaluable Set)

# Geometric LS Mean % Change From Baseline to Week 8 (95% CI)

Subgroup	Patients, n Irbesartan/ Sparsentan	Irbesartan (n=32)	Sparsentan, All Doses (n=64)	Interaction <i>P</i> Value
Age				0.921
>18 y	24/52	-12.1 ( <del>-</del> 30.6, 11.5)	-40.7 (-49.3, -30.6) <sup>a</sup>	
≤18 y	8/12	<b>-41.1</b> ( <b>-72.4</b> , 25.5)	-62.9 (-78.2, -36.9) <sup>a</sup>	
Sex				0.556
Male	18/37	-20.0 (-39.5, 5.8)	-41.1 (-51.3, -28.6) <sup>a</sup>	
Female	14/27	-8.0 (-37.6, 35.6)	-50.1 (-61.8, -34.7) <sup>a</sup>	
Race				0.477
White	23/51	-21.1 (-39.6, 3.1)	-43.3 (-52.6, -32.1) <sup>a</sup>	
Black/African American	6/6	-26.6 (-74.8, 113.9)	-56.3 ( <del>-</del> 85.2, 29.1)	
Other	3/7	35.7 (-24.8, 144.7)	-49.7 (-62.9, -31.8) <sup>a</sup>	
Baseline UP/C				0.207
≥3.5 g/g	14/33	-29.3 (-46.9, -5.9) <sup>a</sup>	-39.7 (-50.0, -27.2) <sup>a</sup>	
<3.5 g/g	18/31	-10.8 (-36.4, 25.2)	-46.0 (-58.3, -30.0) <sup>a</sup>	
Baseline eGFR <sup>b</sup>				0.624
>90 mL/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>	6/16	-14.6 ( <del>-</del> 59.0, 78.1)	-57.7 (-72.4, -35.0) <sup>a</sup>	
>60-90 mL/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>	11/18	-42.0 (-61.1, -13.6) <sup>a</sup>	-37.2 (-52.7, -16.7) <sup>a</sup>	
>45-60 mL/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>	7/12	-4.0 ( <del>-45.4, 68.9)</del>	-42.5 (-62.7, -11.3) <sup>a</sup>	
30-45 mL/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>	6/16	21.5 (–30.5, 112.4)	-39.1 (-54.8, -18.1) <sup>a</sup>	

Baseline BP				0.981
Hypertensive	8/27	-4.4 (-42.7, 59.6)	-46.6 (-62.0, -25.0) <sup>a</sup>	
Normotensive	24/37	-21.3 ( <del>-</del> 38.8, 1.1)	-48.1 (-57.5, -36.6) <sup>a</sup>	

Data reported as mean change (95% CI). For the interaction *P* value, an analysis of covariance model was fitted for the natural log of change from baseline in UP/C with the natural log of baseline UP/C as covariate and effects for treatment, cohort, prognostic factor, and treatment by prognostic factor interaction.

aP<0.05.

Abbreviations: BP, blood pressure; CI, confidence interval; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; LS, least squares; UP/C, urine protein-to-creatinine ratio.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>n=92.