Supplemental tables

Supplemental Table 1

Comparison of geometric parameters between plaques with LRNC and without LRNC.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | LRNC absent  n=64 | LRNC present  n=100 | Univariable analysis[[1]](#footnote-1)  (B; 95% CI) | p value | Multivariable analysis[[2]](#footnote-2)  (B; 95% CI) | p value |
| Wall area (cm2) | 0.46 (0.39; 0.55) | 0.51 (0.41; 0.65) | 0.077 (0.022; 0.131) | 0.006 | NA[[3]](#footnote-3) | NA |
| Maximal wall thickness (mm) | 3.1 (2.5;4.2) | 3.9 (3.0;4.9) | 0.686 (0.274; 1.098) | 0.001 | 0.279 (-0.022; 0.580) | 0.069 |
| Total vessel area (cm2) | 0.71 (0.63;0.83) | 0.72 (0.60; 0.88) | 0.036 (-0.032; 0.105) | 0.294 | -0.044 (-0.082; -0.005) | 0.026 |
| Plaque burden (%) | 65 (58; 74) | 71 (63;82) | 6.185 (2.787; 9.583) | <0.001 | 3.977 (0.886; 7.068) | 0.012 |
| Lumen area (cm2) | 0.22 (0.18; 0.33) | 0.19 (0.14; 0.26) | -0.040 (-0.078; -0.003) | 0.037 | -0.044 (-0.082; -0.005) | 0.026 |
| Remodeling ratio | 1.8 (1.6; 2.2) | 2.0 (1.7; 2.3) | 0.059 (-0.114: 0.231) | 0.503 | -0.081 (-0.226;0.064) | 0.274 |

Supplemental Table 2

Comparison of geometric parameters between plaques with thin-or-ruptured FC and without thin-or-ruptured FC.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TRFC[[4]](#footnote-4) absent  n=101 | TRFC present  n=55 | Univariable analysis[[5]](#footnote-5)  (B; 95% CI) | *p* value | Multivariable analysis[[6]](#footnote-6)  (B; 95% CI) | *p* value |
| Wall area (cm2) | 0.47 (0.39; 0.56) | 0.54 (0.45; 0.69) | 0.108 (0.053;0.164) | <0.001 | NA[[7]](#footnote-7) | NA |
| Maximal wall thickness (mm) | 3.3 2.6; 4.2) | 4.3 (3.2; 5.4) | 1.029 (0.611;1.447) | <0.001 | 0.470 (0.151; 0.788) | 0.004 |
| Total vessel area (cm2) | 0.70 (0.6; 0.83) | 0.70 (0.60; 0.93) | 0.054 (-0.17;0.125) | 0.137 | -0.062 (-0.103; -0.21) | 0.003 |
| Plaque burden (%) | 66 (61; 73) | 78 (67; 83) | 8.158 (4.691;11.624) | <0.001 | 5.238 (1.956; 8.520) | 0.002 |
| Lumen area (cm2) | 0.22 (0.17; 0.31) | 0.16 (0.13; 0.24) | -0.054 (-0.093; -0.015) | 0.07 | -0.062 (-0.103; -0.21) | 0.003 |
| Remodeling ratio | 1.9 (1.6; 2.3) | 2.0 (1.7; 2.5) | 0.147 (-0.035; 0.328) | 0.112 | -0.055 (-0.21; 0.102) | 0.492 |

Supplemental Table 3

Comparison of geometric parameters between plaques with LRNC and without LRNC. A subgroup analysis on plaques in which no IPH was present.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Only LRNC absent  n=64 | LRNC present  n=43 | Univariable analysis[[8]](#footnote-8)  (B; 95% CI) | p value | Multivariable analysis[[9]](#footnote-9)  (B; 95% CI) | p value |
| Wall area (cm2) | 0.46 (0.39- 0.55) | 0.46 (0.38- 0.55) | 0.002 (-0.045; 0.049) | 0.944 | NA[[10]](#footnote-10) | NA[[11]](#footnote-11) |
| Maximal wall thickness (mm) | 3.1 (2.5  4.2) | 3.4 (2.8- 4.3) | 0.216 (-0.198; 0.630) | 0.304 | 0.208 (-0.143; 0.559) | 0.243 |
| Total vessel area (cm2) | 0.71 (0.63- 0.83) | 0.69 (0.57-0.79) | -0.023 (-0.096; 0.050) | 0.538 | -0.025 (-0.071; 0.022) | 0.291 |
| Plaque burden (%) | 65 (58- 74) | 67 (62- 77) | 2.575 (-1.382; 6.533) | 0.200 | 2.525 (-1.190; 6.241) | 0.181 |
| Lumen area (cm2) | 0.22 (0.18-0.33) | 0.20 (0.15-0.28) | -0.025 (-0.072; 0.023) | 0.305 | -0.025 (-0.071; 0.022) | 0.290 |
| Remodeling ratio | 1.8 (1.6-  2.2 | 2.0 (1.6-2.1) | -0.081 (-0.277; 0.12) | 0.417 | -0.084 (-0.261; 0.093) | 0.349 |

1. Univariable analysis: IPH presence. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Multivariable analysis: IPH presence and wall area. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Not applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. THIN-OR-RUPTURED FIBROUS CAP; MISSING N=8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Univariable analysis: IPH presence. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Multivariable analysis: IPH presence and wall area. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Not applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Univariable analysis: Only LRNC presence. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Multivariable analysis: Only LRNC presence and wall area. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Not applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Not applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-11)