**Table S1: Comparing CAPS total score between hydrocortisone and placebo: Observed cases, Mixed Model Analysis [[1]](#footnote-1) and ANCOVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed cases (unless noted otherwise) | | Mixed Model Analysis  Adjusted marginal means | |  |  |
| Visit | **Hydrocortisone**  (Mean ± SD) | **Placebo**  (Mean ± SD) | **Hydrocortisone** (n=49)  (Mean ± SE) | **Placebo**  (n=45)  (Mean ± SE) | Mixed Model Analysis Difference[[2]](#footnote-2)  (Mean ± SE) | ANCOVA |
| 2 (NOCB) | 40.25 ± 36.50 | 37.69 ± 27.73 | 41.50 ± 0.00 | 41.50 ± 0.00 | Treatment group by visit p=.39  (NOCB adjusted p=.36) | -- |
| 2 | 43.02 ± 25.65 | 41.92 ± 27.31 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 3 | 34.12 ± 24.04 | 31.60 ± 25.77 | 34.14 ± 2.48 | 32.53 ± 2.72 | -1.61 ± 3.68, p=.66 | -- |
| 4 | 26.30 ± 20.32 | 17.82 ± 20.59 | 24.69 ± 3.25 | 22.58 ± 3.51 | -2.11 ± 4.78, p=.66 | -- |
| 5 | 17.37 ± 20.33 | 14.23 ± 19.85 | 17.31 ± 3.45 | 19.10 ± 3.59 | 1.79 ± 4.98, p=.72 | -- |
| 6 | 16.67 ± 17.95 | 16.49 ± 21.01 | 15.37 ± 3.43 | 20.47 ± 3.59 | 5.10 ± 4.96, p=.31  (NOCB adjusted 6.22 ± 5.23, p=.24) | -- |
| 6 LOCF | 16.02 ± 17.53 | 15.98 ± 20.72 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ANCOVA  Change from baseline (visit 6 – visit 2) (ANCOVA)  NOCB (NOCB adjusted for mean change) | | | | -22.90 ± 2.39  (-20.85 ± 2.4) | -25.22 ± 2.29  (-23.42 ± 2.30) | -2.31 ± 3.32, p=.49  -2.57 ± 3.34, p=.44 |

**Table S2: PTSD as per CAPS total score greater than 49**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Hydrocortisone** | **Placebo** |  |
| Visit 2 | Yes=38.6%, n=17  No=61.4%, n=27 | Yes=35%, n=14  No=65%, n=26 |  |
| Visit 2 (NOCB) | Yes=40.9%, n=18  No=59.1%, n=26 | Yes=35.3%, n=18  No=64.7%, n=33 |  |
| Visit 2 (NOCB adjusted for mean decline) | Yes=36.3%, n=16  No=63.7%, n=28 | Yes=35.3%, n=18  No=64.7%, n=33 |  |
| Visit 3 | Yes=40.9%, n=18  No=59.1%, n=30 | Yes=20.9%, n=9  No=79.1%, n=34 |  |
| Visit 4 | Yes=11.6%, n=5  No=89.4%, n=38 | Yes=9%, n=3  No=91%, n=30 |  |
| Visit 5 | Yes=10.5%, n=4  No=89.5%, n=38 | Yes=8.5%, n=3  No=91.5%, n=32 |  |
| Visit 6 | Yes=7.8%, n=4  No=92.2%, n=47 | Yes=8.8%, n=4  No=91.2%, n=41 |  |
| Visit 6 (LOCF) | Yes=11.3%, n=6  No=88.7%, n=47 | Yes=10.6%, n=5  No=89.4%, n=42 |  |
| Visit 6 (LOCF) of those *with* PTSD at visit 2 (NOCB) | Yes=19.0%, n=4  No=81.0%, n=17 | Yes=23.5%, n=4  No=76.5%, n=17 | p=.74 |
| Visit 6 (LOCF) of those *without* PTSD at visit 2 (NOCB) | Yes=3.6%, n=1  No=96.4%, n=27 | Yes=3.6%, n=1  No=96.4%, n=27 |  |

**Table S3: Comparing VAS-A score between hydrocortisone and placebo: Observed cases, Mixed Model Analysis [[3]](#footnote-3) and ANCOVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed cases (unless noted otherwise) | | Mixed Model Analysis  Adjusted marginal means | |  |  |
| Visit | **Hydrocortisone**  (Mean ± SD) | **Placebo**  (Mean ± SD) | **Hydrocortisone** (n=50)  (Mean ± SE) | **Placebo**  (n=45)  (Mean ± SE) | Mixed Model Analysis Difference[[4]](#footnote-4) | ANCOVA |
| 2 (NOCB) | 3.39 ± 3.10 | 3.62 ± 3.08 | -- | -- | Treatment group by visit p=.52 | -- |
| 2 | 3.41 ± 3.05 | 3.54 ± 3.15 | 3.47 ± .00 | 3.47 ± .00 | -- | -- |
| 3 | 2.70 ± 2.88 | 2.55 ± 2.48 | 2.74 ± .334 | 2.51 ± .359 | p=.63 | -- |
| 4 | 2.88 ± 2.79 | 2.10 ± 2.24 | 2.92 ± .295 | 2.05 ± .359 | p=.06 | -- |
| 5 | 2.40 ± 2.75 | 2.18 ± 2.67 | 2.47 ± .382 | 2.32 ± .425 | p=.79 | -- |
| 6 | 1.91 ± 2.73 | 1.61 ± 2.38 | 2.08 ± .366 | 1.60 ±.399 | p=.38 | -- |
| 6 LOCF | 1.98 ± 2.75 | 1.62 ± 2.36 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ANCOVA  Change from baseline (*visit 2 LOCF – visit 6 NOCB*) (ANCOVA); Done opposite direction to make values consistent with other scales where higher score is greater symptom level. | | | -1.34 ± .35 | -1.89 ± .389 |  | .54 ± .523, p=.30 |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Table S4: Comparing VASD score between hydrocortisone and placebo: Observed cases, Mixed Model Analysis and ANCOVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed cases (unless noted otherwise) | | Mixed Model Analysis  Adjusted marginal means | |  |  |
| Visit | **Hydrocortisone**  (Mean ± SD) | **Placebo**  (Mean ± SD) | **Hydrocortisone** (n=50)  (Mean ± SE) | **Placebo**  (n=45)  (Mean ± SE) | Mixed Model Analysis Difference | ANCOVA |
| 2 (NOCB) | 3.04 ± 2.96 | 3.58 ± 2.99 | -- | -- | Treatment group by visit p=.10 | -- |
| 2 | 3.10 ± 2.82 | 3.59 ± 3.10 | 3.31 ± .00 | 3.31 ± .00 |  | -- |
| 3 | 2.27 ± 2.51 | 3.08 ± 2.59 | 2.43 ± .355 | 2.74 ± .380 |  | -- |
| 4 | 3.00 ± 3.01 | 2.24 ± 2.32 | 3.23 ± .337 | 2.04 ± .397 |  | -- |
| 5 | 2.13 ± 2.66 | 1.63 ± 2.12 | 2.40 ± .371 | 1.71 ± .407 |  | -- |
| 6 | 1.62 ± 2.35 | 1.66 ± 2.06 | 2.02 ± .432 | 1.43 ± .470 |  | -- |
| 6 LOCF | 1.70 ± 2.40 | 1.67 ± 2.03 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ANCOVA  Change from baseline (*visit 2 LOCF – visit 6 NOCB*) (ANCOVA); Done opposite direction to make values consistent with other scales where higher score is greater symptom level. | | | 1.34 ± .293 | 1.68 ± .326 |  | 0.34 ± 0.44, p=0.45 |

**Table S5L Comparing MADRS score between hydrocortisone and placebo: Observed cases and ANCOVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Observed cases (unless noted otherwise) | | ANCOVA | |
| Visit | **Hydrocortisone**  (Mean ± SD) | **Placebo**  (Mean ± SD) | (Mean ± SE) | (Mean ± SE) |
| 3 | 8.88 ± 8.03 | 8.23 ± 7.67 |  |  |
| 6 | 5.85 ± 7.73 | 4.44 ± 5.91 |  | -2.03 ± 1.60, p=.21 |
| ANCOVA  Change from baseline (*visit 6 LOCF – visit 2*) (ANCOVA). | | | -2.73 ± 1.032 | -4.76 ± 1.23  n=29 |

Note: Mixed model not done since only 2 visits.

1. MMRM with treatment arm and treatment arm–by-visit interaction as fixed effects, patient nested in treatment as random effect, and Baseline value as covariate. An unstructured covariance matrix was used to model the covariance of within-patient scores. This analyses was performed based on all scores using only the observed cases (OCs) without imputation of missing values with the exception of visit 2 score which included imputed values were missing.  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. MMRM with treatment arm and treatment arm–by-visit interaction as fixed effects, patient nested in treatment as random effect, and Baseline value as covariate. An unstructured covariance matrix was used to model the covariance of within-patient scores. This analyses was performed based on all scores using only the observed cases (OCs) without imputation of missing values with the exception of visit 2 score which included imputed values were missing.  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)