

Supplemental Table S1. Levels of serum bile acid in patients with non-truncating BSEP following 72 weeks of maralixbat treatment compared with baseline

BA Hydrop hobicity	BA species	Nonresponders			Responders		
		Baseline conc. (μ M; n=8)	Week 72 conc. (μ M; n=6)	p-val ue ^a	Baseline conc. (μ M; n=11)	Week 72 conc. (μ M; n=9)	p-value ^a
Hydrop hilic	TCA	36.80 ± 19.87	60.48 ± 29.46	NS	48.38 ± 35.60	29.07 ± 49.14	NS
	TUDCA	14.63 ± 6.88	22.26 ± 15.07	NS	10.16 ± 8.25	6.70 ± 15.32	NS
	TCDC A	16.15 ± 10.30	34.62 ± 32.67	NS	18.14 ± 14.03	17.27 ± 32.10	NS
	GCA	144.64 ± 59.79	154.33 ± 41.41	NS	134.47 ± 82.70	64.06 ± 71.16	0.06
	GUDCA A	108.72 ± 38.62	140.63 ± 83.33	NS	63.80 ± 57.55	28.19 ± 27.91	0.09
	GCDC A	81.87 ± 42.15	119.62 ± 57.63	NS	71.29 ± 47.69	49.15 ± 45.59	NS
	CA	0.08 ± 0.05	0.08 ± 0.04	NS	0.08 ± 0.04	0.06 ± 0.00	NS
	UDCA	2.13 ± 2.18	2.74 ± 2.46	NS	2.20 ± 3.18	1.17 ± 2.11	NS
	CDCA	0.06 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.02	NS	0.06 ± 0.00	0.13 ± 0.09	0.06
	TOTAL	405.09 ± 134.96	534.83 ± 155.37	NS	348.58 ± 183.29	195.79 ± 202.11	0.098
Hydrop hobic	TDCA	0.05 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.02	NS	0.62 ± 1.21	0.12 ± 0.17	NS
	TLCA	0.05 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.01	NS	0.05 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	NS
	GDCA	0.06 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.03	NS	1.34 ± 3.02	0.23 ± 0.36	NS
	GLCA	0.06 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.02	NS	0.06 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.00	NS
	DCA	0.06 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.02	NS	0.07 ± 0.02	0.13 ± 0.18	NS
	LCA	0.06 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.02	NS	0.06 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.00	NS
	TOTAL	0.35 ± 0.00	0.41 ± 0.10	NS	2.20 ± 4.19	0.65 ± 0.49	NS

^ap < 0.10 was considered to be statistically significant given dataset limitations

BA, bile acid; BSEP, bile salt export pump; CA, cholic acid; CDCA, chenodeoxycholic acid;

DCA, deoxycholic acid; LCA, lithocholic acid; GCA, glycine-conjugated cholic acid;

GCDCA, glycochenodeoxycholic acid; GDCA, glycodeoxycholic acid;

GLCA, glycolithocholic acid; GUDCA, glycoursoodeoxycholic acid; NS, non-significant;

TCA, taurine-conjugated cholic acid; TCDCA, taurochenoxycholic acid;

TDCA, taurodeoxycholic acid; TLCA, taurolithocholic acid; TUDCA, taurooursodeoxycholic acid; UDCA,

ursodeoxycholic acid

Data are mean ± standard deviation. The two-tailed Student's t-test was used to compare groups.

Supplemental Table S2. Total BA as biomarker – model optimization

Fix effect	Random effect	AIC	BIC	Random effect residual variance
1 + Week + Age + Gender + Predictor_baseline +Total_BA	1 + Week Subject_ID	203.1	231.0	0.1279
1 + Week + Gender + Predictor_baseline +Total_BA	1 + Week Subject_ID	200.3	225.4	0.1278
1 + Week + Age + Predictor_baseline +Total_BA	1 + Week Subject_ID	200.1	225.3	0.1279
1 + Week + Age + Gender + Total_BA	1 + Week Subject_ID	201.1	226.3	0.1278

Supplemental Table S3. Likelihood-ratio test for reduced model excluding age, gender, and pre-dose baseline vs. full model

LMM model	npar	AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	Chisq	Df	Pr(>Chisq)
`ItchRO Weekly Average Score` ~ 1 + Week + Total_BA + (1 + Week Subject_ID)	7	197.81	217.38	-91.905	183.81			
`ItchRO Weekly Average Score` ~ 1 + Week + Age + Predictor_baseline + Gender + Total_BA + (1 + Week Subject_ID)	10	202.06	230.02	-91.030	182.06	1.751	3	0.6257

Supplemental Table S4. Summary of linear mixed model (LMM) of pruritus ItchRO score ~ UDCA (%)

Predictors	ItchRO_score		
	Estimates	CI	p-value
(Intercept)	1.79	1.46 – 2.12	< 0.001
Week	-0.01	-0.01 – -0.00	0.001
UDCA	-0.03	-0.05 – -0.01	0.002

Random Effects	
σ^2	0.14
τ_{00} Patient_id	0.47
τ_{11} Patient_id.Week	0.00
Q_{01} Patient_id	-0.13
ICC	0.80
N Patient_id	19

Observations	121
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.139 / 0.828

*Significant p-values, i.e. at 0.05 level, are highlighted in bold.

Supplemental Table S5. Summary of linear mixed model (LMM) of pruritus ItchRO score ~ GCA (%)

Predictors	ItchRO_score		
	Estimates	CI	p-value
(Intercept)	0.97	0.54 – 1.40	< 0.001
Week	-0.01	-0.01 – -0.00	0.006
GCA	0.02	0.01 – 0.03	< 0.001

Random Effects	
σ^2	0.12
T00 Patient_id	0.45
T11 Patient_id.Week	0.00
Q01 Patient_id	-0.33
ICC	0.81
N Patient_id	19

Observations	121
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.229 / 0.853

*Significant p-values, i.e. at 0.05 level, are highlighted in bold.

Supplemental Table S6. Summary of linear mixed model (LMM) of pruritus ItchRO score ~ TCA (%)

Predictors		ItchRO_score	
	Estimates	CI	p-value
(Intercept)	1.32	0.93 – 1.71	<0.001
Week	-0.01	-0.02 – -0.00	<0.001
TCA	0.04	0.02 – 0.06	<0.001

Random Effects	
σ^2	0.14
τ_{00} Patient_id	0.44
τ_{11} Patient_id.Week	0.00
η_{01} Patient_id	-0.37
ICC	0.76
N Patient_id	19

Observations	121
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.226 / 0.815

*Significant p-values, i.e. at 0.05 level, are highlighted in bold.

Supplemental Table S7. Summary of general linear mixed model (GLMM) of pruritus responder class ~ GCA (%)

Pruritus responder			
Predictors	Odds Ratios	CI	p-value
(Intercept)	0.00	0.00 – 973.31	0.274
Week	0.93	0.74 – 1.16	0.527
GCA	0.88	0.58 – 1.33	0.548

Random Effects	
σ^2	3.29
T00 Patient_id	375.26
T11 Patient_id.Week	24.83
Q01 Patient_id	-0.84
ICC	1.00
N Patient_id	19

Observations	121
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.000 / 1.000

Supplemental Table S8. Summary of general linear mixed model (GLMM) of pruritus responder class ~ ratio of total cholic acids/total chenodeoxycholic acids

Pruritus_responding			
Predictors	Odds Ratios	CI	p-value
(Intercept)	0.00	0.00 – 0.75	0.044
Week	0.94	0.75 – 1.17	0.564
Total CA/CDCA ratio	0.22	0.01 – 8.12	0.411

Random Effects	
σ^2	3.29
T00 Patient_id	429.46
T11 Patient_id.Week	27.69
Q01 Patient_id	-0.85
ICC	1.00
N Patient_id	19

Observations	121
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.000 / 1.000

*Significant p-values, i.e. at 0.05 level, are highlighted in bold.