

Supplementary Table S6 Linear model–based comparison of retinal sublayer thickness 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, μ m	0.99	(0.988 to 0.992)	< 0.001	0.001	0.995	(0.993 to 0.998)	< 0.001	0.003
GCL-IPL, μ m	0.995	(0.993 to 0.996)	< 0.001	0.001	0.997	(0.996 to 0.999)	0.013	0.026
INL, μ m	0.995	(0.991 to 0.999)	0.017	0.019	0.997	(0.992 to 1.001)	0.147	0.235
ISOS-RPE, μ m	0.987	(0.985 to 0.989)	< 0.001	0.001	0.994	(0.991 to 0.996)	< 0.001	0.003
ELM-ISOS, μ m	0.98	(0.973 to 0.986)	< 0.001	0.001	0.997	(0.990 to 1.005)	0.497	0.568
RPE, μ m	1.004	(1.001 to 1.007)	0.023	0.019	1.001	(0.997 to 1.004)	0.702	0.702
Macular Thickness, μ m	0.995	(0.994 to 0.996)	< 0.001	0.001	0.998	(0.997 to 0.999)	< 0.001	0.003
Macular volume, mm^3	0.682	(0.585 to 0.795)	< 0.001	0.001	0.889	(0.738 to 1.071)	0.216	0.247

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.