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*Figure S1. Alternate treatment pathways among those with mild psoriasis (panel A) and those with severe psoriasis (panel B).* Treatment consequences that result from testing positive (top), testing negative (middle), and no testing (bottom). Abbreviations: TP = true positive, FP = false positive, TN = true negative, FN = false negative, PsA = psoriatic arthritis, Dx = diagnosis, Tx = treatment, HAQ = health assessment questionnaire.

# Table S1. Model parameters altered in scenario analyses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mild psoriasis | Severe Psoriasis |
| Prevalence | 10.1% (1) | 20.6% (2) |
| Baseline PASI | 3.5 (3) | 12 (assumption) |
| Baseline HAQ | 0 (3) | 0.5 (assumption) |
| Probability of accepting treatment change following positive test | 90% (assumption) | 95% (assumption) |
| Probability of PsO progressing | 3.1% (4) | 0% (assumption) |



# Figure S2. Tornado diagram showing the ten most influential model parameters in one-way sensitivity analyses. Red line represents the base case ICER. Abbreviations: MTX = methotrexate, LEF = leflunomide, HAQ = health assessment questionnaire.
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# Figure S3. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve showing the probability that the biomarker is cost-effective at various willingness-to-pay thresholds.
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