

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### Appendix

For quantitative assessment of the Erector Spinalis Muscles, we performed the analysis on a single-slice axial chest CT image at the level of the lower margin of the 12<sup>th</sup> thoracic vertebra, as described in the article cited above [Tanimura K, et al Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2016;13(3):334-41]. We measured both CT-measured erector spinae muscle area and density. From the initial sample of 370 patients, we were able to obtain this radiological information in 336 patients (37 patients could not be used). In this analysis (Table 1), both ESM area and density were associated with all-cause mortality, as previously described. In the multivariable analysis (Table 2), ESM area was associated with mortality, along with age and the BODE index.

Table 1.

| Univariable analysis exploring factors that predict survival |                       |         |
|--|-----------------------|---------|
| Variables  | HR (95% IC)           | p value |
| Age* (for each year)   | 1.08 (1.05 – 1.10)    | <0.001  |
| Pack-year (for each pack-year)                               | 1 (0.99 – 1.01)       | 0.097   |
| BSA  | 1.12 (0.32 – 3.89)    | 0.857   |
| BMI (body mass index)  | 1.00 (0.96 – 1.04)    | 0.99    |
| Gender (male as reference)                                   | 0.62 (0.35 – 1.08)    | 0.09    |
| Current Smoker (yes vs. no)                                  | 1.69 (0.23 – 12.43)   | 0.61    |
| FEV1%* (for each %)  | 0.98 (0.97 – 0.99)    | <0.001  |
| MMRC* (for each point)                                       | 1.30 (1.09 – 1.54)    | 0.003   |
| 6MWD* (for each m)   | 0.995 (0.994 – 0.997) | <0.001  |
| Exacerbations  | 1.73 (0.98 – 3.05)    | 0.056   |
| BODE* (for each point)                                       | 1.19 (1.09 – 1.31)    | <0.001  |
| ESM area* (for each cm <sup>2</sup> )                        | 0.96 (0.93 – 0.99)    | 0.014   |
| ESM index (for each cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> )        | 0.89 (0.78 – 1.01)    | 0.079   |
| ESM density* (for each HU)                                   | 0.98 (0.97 – 0.99)    | 0.007   |

Table 2.

| Multivariable analysis exploring factors that predict mortality |                    |         |
|---|--------------------|---------|
| Variables   | HR (95% IC)        | p value |
| Age* (for each year)  | 1.07 (1.03 – 1.11) | 0.001   |
| Gender (male as reference)                                      | 1.65 (0.83 – 3.27) | 0.152   |
| Pack-year (for each pack-year)                                  | 1.00 (0.99 – 1.01) | 0.399   |
| BMI   | 1.02 (0.97 – 1.07) | 0.480   |
| BODE* (for each point)  | 1.11 (1.01 – 1.24) | 0.041   |
| ESM area* (for each cm <sup>2</sup> )                           | 0.95 (0.91 – 0.99) | 0.006   |
| ESM density (for each HU)                                       | 0.99 (0.98 – 1.01) | 0.558   |

Having confirmed the previous findings of Tanimura and coworkers, we then explored the important issue of whether information from analysis of the psoas muscles differed from that of the ES. This we completed in the 220 patients where both muscles could be analyzed and we obtained the results shown in Table 3:

Table 3.

| Multivariable analysis exploring factors that predict mortality |                    |         |
|---|--------------------|---------|
| Variables   | HR (95% IC)        | p value |
| Age* (for each year)  | 1.07 (1.03 – 1.11) | 0.001   |
| Gender (male as reference)                                      | 1.81 (0.70 – 4.69) | 0.224   |
| Pack-year (for each pack-year)                                  | 1.00 (0.99 – 1.01) | 0.414   |
| BMI   | 1.02 (0.95 – 1.09) | 0.558   |
| BODE (for each point)   | 1.05 (0.91 – 1.21) | 0.533   |
| ESM area (for each cm <sup>2</sup> )                            | 0.96 (0.91 – 1.02) | 0.151   |
| ESM density (for each HU)                                       | 1.03 (0.99 – 1.06) | 0.071   |
| Psoas density* (for each HU)                                    | 0.95 (0.92 – 0.99) | 0.005   |

As you can see, CT-assessed PsD was independently associated with mortality, whereas ESM area or density was not.