

**Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of Different Models for Discrimination of Fractional Flow Reserve Derived from Computed Tomographic Angiography  $\leq 0.80$**

Variables	Sen.	Spec.	Acc.	AUC
1	0.82 (0.59–0.94)	0.66 (0.55–0.76)	0.69 (0.59–0.78)	0.74 (0.62–0.87)
2	0.82 (0.59–0.94)	0.69 (0.58–0.78)	0.71 (0.61–0.79)	0.76 (0.63–0.88)
3	0.88 (0.66–0.97)	0.79 (0.69–0.87)	0.81 (0.72–0.88)	0.84 (0.73–0.94)
1 + 2	0.82 (0.59–0.94)	0.69 (0.58–0.78)	0.71 (0.61–0.79)	0.85 (0.77–0.94)
1 + 3	0.88 (0.66–0.97)	0.79 (0.69–0.87)	0.81 (0.72–0.88)	0.90 (0.83–0.96)
2 + 3	0.88 (0.66–0.97)	0.79 (0.69–0.87)	0.81 (0.72–0.88)	0.87 (0.78–0.96)
1 + 2 + 3	0.88 (0.66–0.97)	0.82 (0.72–0.89)	0.83 (0.74–0.89)	0.92 (0.86–0.98)

Model 1: variable 1, take-off level (above pulmonary valve); Model 2: variable 2, intramural course (present); Model 3: variable 3, proximal vessel morphology (slit-like); Model 4: variables 1 + 2; Model 5: variables 1 + 3; Model 6: variables 2 + 3; Model 7: variables 1 + 2 + 3. Acc. = accuracy, AUC = area under curve, Sen. = sensitivity, Spec. = specificity