

1 **Online supplement**

2 **Effects of intranasal cellulose powder on asthma control in children with mild-to-**
3 **moderate persistent allergic rhinitis: A single-center, randomized, placebo-controlled**
4 **trial**

5 Xi Chen ^{1,3#}, Wei-jie Guan ^{1#}, Shixue Sun ², Pei-yan Zheng ¹, Li-hong Sun ¹, De-hui Chen ¹, Dandan
6 Wang ², Chang Chen ², Bao-qing Sun ^{1*}, Xiaohua Douglas Zhang ^{2*}

7 1 State Key Laboratory of Respiratory Disease, National Clinical Research Center for Respiratory
8 Disease, First Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou Institute of
9 Respiratory Diseases, Guangzhou, China

10 2 Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau, Taipa, Macau (SX Sun MS, DD Wang MD, C
11 Chen, Prof XH Douglas Zhang PhD)

12 3 Department of clinical laboratory, Guangzhou Panyu Central Hospital

13

14 **# These authors contributed equally.**

15

16 *** Correspondence 1:** Bao-qing Sun, State Key Laboratory of Respiratory Disease, National Clinical
17 Research Center for Respiratory Disease, Guangzhou Institute of Respiratory Diseases, First
18 Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou,
19 510120, China. Tel: +86-20-83062865, Fax: +86-20-83062729, E-mail: sunbaoqing@vip.163.com;

20 *** Correspondence 2:** Xiaohua Douglas Zhang, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau,
21 Macau, China. Tel: +853-88224813, E-mail: douglaszhang@umac.mo

22

23 **Table S1. Changes in VAS scores in the three groups throughout the study**

	Changes	Treatment A Mean (95%CI)	Treatment B Mean (95%CI)	Treatment C Mean (95%CI)	P value
VAS for symptoms	-	-	-	-	-
Sneezing	2w-0w	-1.53(-2.20, -0.86)	-0.44(-1.26, 0.38)	-0.25(-1.04, 0.54)	0.002
	4w-0w	-1.34(-2.26, -0.42)	-0.24(-1.11, 0.62)	-0.48(-1.44, 0.49)	0.028

	8w-0w	-1.27(-2.10, -0.44)	-0.51(-1.13, 0.10)	-0.32(-1.25, 0.61)	0.063
Nasal discharge	2w-0w	-0.68(-1.53, 0.16)	-0.76(-1.59, 0.08)	-0.45(-1.12, 0.22)	0.750‡
	4w-0w	-0.84(-1.57, -0.12)	-0.76(-1.69, 0.18)	-0.57(-1.50, 0.36)	0.816‡
	8w-0w	-0.70(-1.55, 0.15)	-1.10(-1.81, -0.39)	-1.20(-2.16, -0.23)	0.408
Nasal congestion	2w-0w	-0.61(-1.13, -0.08)	-0.73(-1.56, 0.10)	-0.65(-1.50, 0.20)	0.937‡
	4w-0w	-0.66(-1.31, -0.01)	-0.78(-1.76, 0.20)	-0.69(-1.55, 0.17)	0.948‡
	8w-0w	-0.97(-1.78, -0.17)	-0.80(-1.68, 0.07)	-0.54(-1.53, 0.46)	0.608
Nasal itching	2w-0w	-1.03(-1.88, -0.18)	-1.63(-2.56, -0.71)	0.08(-0.46, 0.61)	0.000‡
	4w-0w	-1.29(-2.10, -0.48)	-1.80(-2.73, -0.88)	-0.29(-1.12, 0.54)	0.000‡
	8w-0w	-1.46(-2.23, -0.69)	-2.05(-3.01, -1.08)	-0.34(-1.26, 0.57)	0.000
Ocular itching	2w-0w	-0.55(-1.25, 0.15)	-0.54(-1.41, 0.34)	-0.50(-1.20, 0.20)	0.989
	4w-0w	-0.84(-1.60, -0.09)	-0.85(-1.42, -0.29)	-0.69(-1.40, 0.02)	0.828‡
	8w-0w	-0.76(-1.52, 0.00)	-0.85(-1.64, -0.06)	-0.83(-1.44, -0.22)	0.949
Total	2w-0w	-4.39(-6.71, -2.08)	-4.08(-7.17, -0.99)	-1.77(-4.06, 0.51)	0.116
	4w-0w	-5.73(-7.59, -3.14)	-4.42(-7.57, -1.28)	-2.71(-5.71, 0.28)	0.140
	8w-0w	-5.16(-7.69, -2.63)	-5.30(-8.03, -2.57)	-3.22(-6.00, -0.44)	0.240
C-ACT score	2w-0w	3.55(2.29, 4.82)	4.37(3.29, 5.44)	4.25(2.67, 5.83)	0.367
	4w-0w	4.13(2.88, 5.38)	5.71(4.38, 7.04)	4.81(3.49, 6.13)	0.028‡
	8w-0w	5.11(3.76, 6.46)	6.05(4.76, 7.34)	4.85(3.58, 6.13)	0.059‡
FEV₁predicted%	2w-0w	7.46(3.18, 11.75)	7.46(4.37, 10.55)	7.43(2.92, 11.94)	1.000
	4w-0w	6.11(1.09, 11.12)	6.39(2.97, 9.99)	3.67(-2.62, 9.96)	0.592
	8w-0w	7.30(1.44, 13.17)	5.00(1.11, 8.88)	3.51(-2.67, 9.68)	0.511
FEV₁/FVC (%)	2w-0w	1.66(-1.02, 4.35)	3.34(1.49, 5.19)	2.01(-0.21, 4.23)	0.363
	4w-0w	1.15(-1.54, 3.85)	4.21(1.35, 7.07)	0.03(-3.14, 3.19)	0.032
	8w-0w	1.19(-1.37, 3.76)	1.35(-1.04, 3.74)	0.06(-3.07, 3.19)	0.691
PEF (L/min)	2w-0w	24.5(11.9, 37.1)	24.8(11.45, 38.1)	23.8(11.1, 36.4)	0.992
	4w-0w	27.2(12.0, 42.5)	27.3(18.7, 38.9)	21.6(9.2, 34.0)	0.746
	8w-0w	27.2(2.6, 51.7)	23.37(6.64, 40.09)	27.4(17.8, 37.0)	0.926‡
FeNO (ppb)	4w-0w	-16.3(-25.6, -6.99)	-6.68(-16.37, 3.00)	-6.60(-15.64, 2.45)	0.079
	8w-0w	-11.2(-19.7, -2.69)	-6.93(-16.83, 2.98)	-3.63(-12.91, 5.64)	0.292

Note: FeNO was not measured at week 2 per protocol and therefore was not included in the comparison.

* P value was derived from two-way ANCOVA for comparing treatments A, B and C. Statistical significance at significant level of 0.05 is bold face displayed. 95%CI denotes the 95% confidence interval based on one-sample t-test for paired difference between a week and week 0. “8w”, “4w”, “2w” and “0w” represent the value at weeks 8, 4, 2 and 0, respectively. ‡ indicates that there is a significant interaction between treatment and baseline and thus the labeled p-value for the overall treatment effect is not reliable.

Table S2: The asthma control level in week 8

		Week 8		
		Poorly controlled	Not well-controlled	Well-controlled
Group A	Poorly controlled	2	0	5
	Not well-controlled	0	0	12
	Well-controlled	0	0	19
Group B	Poorly controlled	0	0	7
	Not well-controlled	0	1	15

Group C	Well-controlled	0	1	17
	Poorly controlled	1	3	8
	Not well-controlled	0	2	10
	Well-controlled	0	1	17
	Total	3	8	110

All data were expressed as number.

poorly controlled= (C-ACT: 5~15); not well-controlled= (C-ACT: 16~20); not well-controlled= (C-ACT: 16~20)

Figure legends

Figure S1: A diagram demonstrating C-ACT score

Figure S2: The appearance, powder transmission system, and usage of the study products in groups B and C

Figure S3: Subgroup analysis based on sensitization.

Each panel demonstrates the relationship between the change of an efficacy endpoint at Week 8 and

62 baseline at Week 0 for each treatment level.

63

64 ***Figure S4: Subgroup analysis based on total IgE***

65 Each panel demonstrates the relationship between the change of an efficacy endpoint at Week 8 and

66 baseline at Week 0 for each treatment level.