Predictive models for ocular chronic graft-*versus*-host disease diagnosis and disease activity in transplant clinical practice

Lauren M. Curtis,[1] Manuel B. Datiles III,[2] Seth M. Steinberg,[3] Sandra A. Mitchell,[4] Rachel J. Bishop,[2] Edward W. Cowen,[5] Jacqueline Mays,[6] John M. McCarty,[7] Zoya Kuzmina,[1] Filip Pirsl,[1] Daniel H. Fowler,[1] Ronald E. Gress[1] and Steven Z. Pavletic[1]

[1]Experimental Transplantation and Immunology Branch, National Cancer institute (NCI), National Institutes of Health (NIH), Bethesda, MD; [2]National Eye Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD; [3]Biostatistics and Data Management Section, NCI, NIH, Rockville, MD; [4]Outcomes Research Branch, Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences, NCI, NIH, Rockville, MD; [5]Dermatology Branch, NCI, NIH, Bethesda, MD; [6]National Institutes of Dental and Craniofacial Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD; and [7]Bone Marrow Transplant Program, Massey Cancer Center, Virginia Commonwealth University Medical Center, Richmond, VA, USA

Supplemental data:

#1: Supplemental Table #1: Univariate analysis evaluating any association between diagnosis of ocular cGVHD and three types of GHVD prophylaxis at time of transplant

Type of GVHD prophylaxis	Patients	Ocular cGVHD present (n,%)	Ocular cGVHD absent (n,%)	*p*
Cyclosporine -based	Cyclosporine-based GVHD prophylaxis n=83	57 (69)	26 (31)	0.14
	Non-cyclosporine based prophylaxis n=121	95 (79)	26 (21)	
Tacrolimus -based	Tacrolimus-based GVHD prophylaxis n=80	63 (79)	17 (21)	0.32
	Non-tacrolimus based GVHD prophylaxis n=124	89 (72)	35 (28)	
T-cell depletion (ATG, ex-vivo T-cell depletion, alemtuzumab)	T-cell depleting GVHD prophylaxis n=33	25 (76)	8 (24)	1.00
	Non-T-cell depleting GVHD prophylaxis n=171	127 (74)	44 (26)	

Note: 6 (3%) patients with missing GVHD prophylaxis data.