

1 **Cancer Worry among *BRCA1/2* pathogenic variant carriers choosing surgery**
2 **to prevent tubal/ovarian cancer: course over time and associated factors**

3 Majke H.D. van Bommel¹, Miranda P. Steenbeek¹, Joanna IntHout², Rosella P.M.G. Hermens³,
4 Nicoline Hoogerbrugge⁴, Marline G. Harmsen¹, Helena C. van Doorn⁵, Marian J.E. Mourits⁶, Marc van
5 Beurden⁷, Ronald P. Zweemer⁸, Katja N. Gaarenstroom⁹, Brigitte F.M. Slangen¹⁰, Monique M.A.
6 Brood-van Zanten^{7,11}, M. Caroline Vos¹², Jurgen M. Piek¹³, Luc R.C.W. van Lonkhuijzen¹¹, Mirjam J.A.
7 Apperloo¹⁴, Sjors F.P.J. Coppus¹⁵, Judith B. Prins¹⁶, José A.E. Custers¹⁶, Joanne A. de Hullu¹

8

9 **Corresponding author**

10 Name: Majke van Bommel

11 Affiliation: Radboud university medical center, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Department of
12 Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

13 E-mail address: majke.vanbommel@radboudumc.nl

14

15

16

17 **Online Resource 2. Parameters of the LCGA-models with different number of classes**

No. of classes	BIC	LMR-LRT	BLRT	Entropy	n	Posterior Probabilities	Intercept (95% CI)	Slope linear (95% CI) (per time point)
1	7772.891						14.24 (13.91; 14.56)***	-0.84 (-0.99; 0.69)***
2	7934.789	.0005	.0000	.873	87 (16.6%) 438 (83.4%)	.952 .967	19.33 (17.62; 21.04)*** 13.12 (12.75; 13.5)***	-0.74 (-1.3; 0.17)** -0.89 (-1.04; 0.74)***
3	7768.655	.0022	.0000	.804	296 (56.4%) 33 (6.3%) 196 (37.3%)	.918 .959 .879	12.08 (11.61; 12.56)*** 21.56 (19.99; 23.13)*** 16.2 (15.41; 16.98)***	-0.87 (-1.02; 0.71)*** -0.01 (-0.69; 0.66) -0.91 (-1.23; 0.59)***
4	7711.554	.0052	.0000	.790	225 (42.9%) 24 (4.6%) 60 (11.4%) 216 (41.1%)	.862 .920 .879 .899	14.76 (14.32; 15.21)*** 22.44 (20.56; 24.32)*** 18.89 (17.76; 20.03)*** 11.49 (11.13; 11.86)***	-0.83 (-1.12; 0.54)*** 0.09 (-0.84; 1.02) -1.18 (-2.09; 0.27)* -0.86 (-1.03; 0.7)***
5	7703.974	.1633	.0000	.789	27 (5.1%) 31 (5.9%) 195 (37.1%) 48 (9.1%) 224 (42.7%)	.930 .830 .900 .797 .839	22.17 (20.61; 23.73)*** 20.45 (19.6; 21.31)*** 11.4 (11.03; 11.77)*** 15.91 (14.14; 17.67)*** 14.62 (14.18; 15.07)***	0.16 (-0.66; 0.99) -2.82 (-4; 1.64)*** -0.86 (-1.04; 0.68)*** 0.87 (0.21; 1.52)** -0.97 (-1.3; 0.64)***

18 BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; LMR-LRT, Vuong-Lo-Mendell Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test; BLRT,

19 Bootstrap Likelihood Ratio Test; CI, confidence interval

20 *p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001

21 The three-class model was considered most appropriate because of its fit indices and clinical
 22 interpretability. In the three-class model, compared with the two-class model, the BIC was better,
 23 but the entropy was lower. The posterior probabilities were similar for the two and three-class
 24 model. Compared with the four-class mode,. in the three-class model, the BIC was somewhat higher,
 25 whereas other fit indices were similar. In the four-class model, however, a class was identified
 26 including only 24 (<5%) women, limiting clinical interpretability.