

sTable 1. Comparison of ipsilateral vs contralateral plaque characteristics in 155 patients who had bilateral plaques

	Ipsilateral plaque (n=155)	Contralateral plaque (n=155)	P value
Plaque morphology			
PB (mean \pm SD)	79.41 \pm 8.33	70.52 \pm 14.52	< 0.001
RI (mean \pm SD)	1.03 \pm 0.14	1.01 \pm 0.10	0.161
%LRNC (mean \pm SD)	22.97 \pm 11.43	19.42 \pm 9.75	< 0.001
Stenosis (mean \pm SD)	68.97 \pm 15.55	51.16 \pm 19.89	< 0.001
Plaque composition			
FCR (n, %)	77 (49.7)	74 (47.7)	0.788
DPS (n, %)	88 (56.8)	82 (52.9)	0.504
IPH (n, %)	14 (9.0)	9 (5.8)	0.359
Complicated plaque (n, %)	90 (58.1)	82 (52.9)	0.350

Paired t test was used for continuous variables, and McNemar test for categorical variables. Abbreviations: PB = plaque burden; RI = remodeling index; LRNC = lipid-rich necrotic core; FCR = fibrous cap rupture; DPS = discontinuity of plaque surface; IPH = intraplaque hemorrhage; SD = standard deviation. P value = comparison of plaque causing any stenosis ipsilateral vs contralateral to stroke.

sTable 2. Logistic regression analysis for an index ischemic stroke in 155 patients who had bilateral plaques

	Model 1		Model 2	
	OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
PB (per 10% increase)	2.664 (1.853-3.828)	< 0.001	0.501 (0.259-0.966)	0.039
RI (per 0.1 increase)	1.091 (0.826-1.440)	0.541	2.207 (1.416-3.439)	< 0.001
%LRNC (per 10% increase)	1.044 (1.003-1.086)	0.036	1.048 (1.000-1.098)	0.052
Complicated plaque	0.770 (0.371-1.597)	0.483	1.456(0.559-3.789)	0.442

Conditional logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate independent predictors for an index ischemic stroke based on the comparison of plaques ipsilateral vs contralateral to stroke. Model 1 = based on the comparison of plaques ipsilateral vs contralateral to stroke in 155 patients; Model 2 = additionally adjusted luminal stenosis; PB = plaque burden; RI = remodeling index; LRNC = lipid-rich necrotic core; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.