Table S2 Logistic regression analysis of the urine levels of CRAMP, EF-1α, and stathmin, as well as chitinase activity

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	LL37	.218	.123	3.126	1	.077	1.244
	Stathmin	.060	.073	.688	1	.407	1.062
	EF	.371	.268	1.916	1	.166	1.449
	chitinase	.007	.002	11.585	1	.001	1.007
	Constant	-1.195	.428	7.797	1	.005	.303
Step 2[a]	LL37	.255	.122	4.331	1	.037	1.290
	EF	.410	.272	2.281	1	.131	1.507
	chitinase	.007	.002	11.488	1	.001	1.007
	Constant	-1.054	.397	7.034	1	.008	.349
Step 3[a]	LL37	.326	.118	7.630	1	.006	1.385
	chitinase	.008	.002	12.182	1	.000	1.008
	Constant	-.675	.303	4.958	1	.026	.509

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: LL37, Stathmin, EF, chitinase.

The data show the logistic regression analysis of the urine levels of CRAMP, EF-1α, and stathmin, as well as the level of chitinase activity in urine of healthy individuals compared to IgAN patients (unaffected, IgAN I–II and IgAN III+). Statistical parameters: B: regression coefficient; SE: standard error; Wald: Wald Chi-square; df: degree of freedom; Sig.: significance; Exp(B): odds ratio. The analysis revealed that a combination of CRAMP(LL37) expression and chitinase activity had the highest statistical power to discriminate the three cohorts when using following combination score=0.326×CRAMP(LL37)+0.008×chitinase