

Supplementary Table S5 Comparison of retinal sublayer thickness results across the entire progression of T2D (adjusted for additional covariates)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]	<i>p</i>	FDR- <i>p</i>	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]	<i>p</i>	FDR- <i>p</i>
RNFL, μm	0.967	(0.960 to 0.974)	< 0.001	0.001	0.982	(0.972 to 0.992)	< 0.001	0.003
GCL-IPL, μm	0.986	(0.980 to 0.992)	< 0.001	0.001	0.995	(0.988 to 1.003)	0.262	0.419
INL, μm	0.985	(0.971 to 1.000)	0.050	0.050	0.991	(0.972 to 1.011)	0.378	0.438
ISOS-RPE, μm	0.960	(0.952 to 0.968)	< 0.001	0.001	0.980	(0.970 to 0.991)	< 0.001	0.003
ELM-ISOS, μm	0.917	(0.894 to 0.940)	< 0.001	0.001	0.972	(0.942 to 1.005)	0.095	0.190
RPE, μm	1.021	(1.010 to 1.034)	< 0.001	0.001	1.007	(0.992 to 1.022)	0.383	0.438
Macular Thickness, μm	0.983	(0.981 to 0.986)	< 0.001	0.001	0.993	(0.990 to 0.996)	< 0.001	0.003
Macular volume, mm^3	0.682	(0.581 to 0.800)	< 0.001	0.001	0.928	(0.763 to 1.129)	0.451	0.451

Model 1 was adjusted for age and gender.

Model 2 was adjusted for age, gender, education level, ethnicity, smoking status, drinking status, health status, physical activity level, townsend index, BMI, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, blood calcium, blood uric acid, spherical equivalent, PRS, dietary composition score, OCT quality score.

FDR-P: False Discovery Rate-adjusted *p*-value calculated using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure.