Supplementary online content

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Baseline characteristics of the study population

Table S2. Demographics of DoCs patients received DBS treatment

Table S3. Characteristics of DBS patients according to 1 year outcome

Table S4. Emergence from unconsciousness at 1 year in DBS patients with different diagnosis

Supplementary Figure

Fig S1. Flowchart of the study participants.

Fig S2. Hosmer–Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test of the nomogram

	All patients	DBS group	Control group	Р
variable	(N = 365)	(N = 37)	(N = 328)	value
Age, y, median (IQR)	49.0 (35.0-58.0)	45.0 (35.0-58.0)	49.0 (35.0-58.0)	0.431
Sex (%)				0.349
Male	253 (69.3)	23 (62.2)	230 (70.1)	
Female	112 (30.7)	14 (37.8)	98 (29.9)	
Pathogeny (%)				0.080
Anoxia	65 (17.8)	10 (27.0)	55 (16.8)	
Stroke	164 (44.9)	19 (51.4)	145 (44.2)	
Trauma	136 (37.3)	8 (21.6)	128 (39.0)	
Duration at admission (%)				<0.00 1
3-5 months	65 (17.8)	25 (67.6)	40 (12.2)	
6-11 months	57 (15.6)	8 (21.6)	49 (14.9)	
≥ 12 months	243 (66.6)	4 (10.8)	239 (72.9)	
State of consciousness (%)				0.856
MCS	123 (33.7)	13 (35.1)	110 (33.5)	
VS/UWS	242 (66 3)	24 (64 9)	218 (66 5)	

T 11 01	D 1'	1	C (1	. 1	1.1
Table S1.	Baseline	characteristics	of the	study pc	pulation

Abbreviations: DBS, deep brain stimulation; MCS, minimally consciousness state; VS/UWS, vegetative state/unresponsive wakefulness syndrome.

*P < 0.05, significant difference

Table S2	Demographics	of DoCs	natients	received DBS	treatment
10010 00	Bonnographiloo	0. 0000	pationito	10001100 000	though thomas and the second

Variables	State of consciousness			
variables	MCS (N = 13)	VS/UWS (N = 24)	value	
Age, y, median (IQR)	35.0 (26.0 - 48.5)	49.5 (41.0 - 59.8)	0.002	
Sex (%)			0.288	
Male	10 (76.9)	13 (54.2)		
Female	3 (23.1)	11 (45.8)		
Pathogeny (%)			0.025	
Anoxia	3 (23.1)	7 (29.2)		
Stroke	4 (30.8)	15 (62.5)		
Trauma	6 (46.2)	2 (8.3)		
Duration at admission (%)			0.002	
3-5	4 (30.8)	21 (87.5)		
6-11	6 (46.2)	2 (8.3)		
≥12	3 (23.1)	1 (4.2)		
Recommendation creteria (%)			0.098	
Weakly recommended	5 (38.5)	16 (66.7)		
Highly recommended	8 (61.5)	8 (33.3)		

DoCs, disorders of consciousness; DBS, deep brain stimulation; MCS, minimally consciousness state; VS/UWS, vegetative state/unresponsive wakefulness state *P < 0.05, significant difference

Variables (%)	In	- P value	
	Positive (N = 12)	Unchanged or death $(N = 25)$	i valuo
Age, y, mean ± SD	33.9 ± 12.9	50.3 ± 10.3	<0.001
Sex (%)			0.265
Male	9 (75.0)	14 (56.0)	
Female	3 (25.0)	11 (44.0)	
State of consciousness (%)			<0.001
MCS	10 (83.3)	3 (12.0)	
VS/UWS	2 (16.7)	22 (88.0)	
Pathogeny (%)			0.010
Anoxia	1 (8.3)	9 (36.0)	
Stroke	5 (41.7)	14 (56.0)	
Trauma	6 (50.0)	2 (8.0)	
Duration (%)			0.286
3-5	6 (50.0)	19 (76.0)	
6-11	4 (33.3)	4 (16.0)	
≥12	2 (16.7)	2 (8.0)	
Recommendation criteria (%)			0.012
Weakly recommended	3 (25.0)	18 (72.0)	
Highly recommended	9 (75.0)	7 (28.0)	

Table S3. Characteristics of DBS patients according to 1 year outcome

DBS, deep brain stimulation; MCS, minimally consciousness state; VS/UWS, vegetative state/unresponsive wakefulness state.

*P < 0.05, significant difference

	MCS (N =	VS/UWS (N =	240	Р
Diagnosis	13)	13) 24)		value
GOS (%)				
1	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)		
2	2 (15.4)	20 (83.3)	20.0	<0.001
3	5 (38.5))	3 (12.5)	20.0	
4	3 (23.1)	0 (0.0)		
5	3 (23.1)	0 (0.0)		
Emergence from unconsciousness				
(%)			15.7	-0.001
Emergence	11 (84.6)	3 (12.5)	1	<0.001
Nonemergence	2 (15.4)	21 (87.5)		

Table S4.	. Emergence from unconsciousnes	s at 1 y	ear in	DBS patients w	ith different
diagnosis					

DBS, deep brain stimulation; MCS, minimally consciousness state; VS/UWS, vegetative state/unresponsive wakefulness state; GOS, glascow outcome scale..

*P < 0.05, significant different.



Fig S1. Flowchart of the study participants. DoCs, disorders of consciousness; DBS, deep brain stimulation.



Fig S2. Hosmer–Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test of the nomogram