

1 **Peripheral blood DNA methylation signatures predict response to**
2 **vedolizumab and ustekinumab in adult patients with Crohn's**
3 **disease: The EPIC-CD study**

4 Vincent W. Joustra^{1*}, Andrew Y.F. Li Yim^{2,3*}, Peter Henneman^{3*}, Ishtu Hageman^{1,2}, Tristan de
5 Waard⁴, Evgeni Levin⁴, Alexandra J. Noble⁵, Thomas P. Chapman^{5,6}, Femke Mol², Sarah
6 van Zon¹, Donghyeok Lee⁴, Colleen G.C. McGregor⁵, Alex T. Adams⁵, Jack J. Satsangi^{5**},
7 Wouter J. de Jonge^{2,7**}, Geert R. D'Haens^{1**}; EPIC-CD Consortium.

8 **EPIC-CD Consortium:** Hans Paulich, Inge van Welsen, Rishand Ramkisoen, Yara Abeling, Marloes
9 Zwart, Nicole Berkers, Caroline Verseijden, Anje te Velde, Nicola Radcliffe, Aisling Quinn, Beatriz
10 Camesella Perez, Tom Thomas, Rahul Ravindran, James Chivenga, Simon Travis.

11
12 ¹Amsterdam UMC - University of Amsterdam, Department of Gastroenterology & Hepatology, Amsterdam, The
13 Netherlands.

14 ²Amsterdam UMC - University of Amsterdam, Tytgat Institute for Liver and Intestinal Research, Amsterdam, The
15 Netherlands.

16 ³Amsterdam UMC - University of Amsterdam, Genome Diagnostics Laboratory, Department of Human Genetics,
17 Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

18 ⁴Horaizon BV, Delft, The Netherlands.

19 ⁵Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, John Radcliffe Hospital, Translational Gastroenterology Unit
20 & NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, Oxford, United Kingdom.

21 ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, St Richard's and Worthing Hospitals, University Hospitals Sussex NHS
22 Foundation Trust, West Sussex, UK

23 ⁷University of Bonn, Department of Surgery, Germany.

24

25 * These authors share first authorship

26 ** The 3 last authors are shared senior authors

27 *Address for correspondence:* Prof. Geert D'Haens PhD, Amsterdam University Medical Centers, Department of
28 Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Room C2-208, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

29 *Email:* g.dhaens@amsterdamumc.nl

30

31 *Funding:* This project was supported by a grant from the Helmsley Foundation [2019-1179]

32 Short title: DNA methylation predicts response to biologicals in CD

33 Acknowledgement: Floris de Voogd for his assistance in evaluation of ultrasound images.


34 Conflicts of interest: The AmsterdamUMC has a patent pending for the vedolizumab and ustekinumab response
35 prediction models presented in this manuscript. ALY received honoraria from Janssen, Johnson & Johnson,

36 DeciBio and was employed by GSK. WJ received honoraria from Janssen, Johnson & Johnson and is a

37 cofounder of AlBiomics BV. GD received speaker fees from Janssen, Johnson & Johnson. EL is a cofounder of

38 Horaizon BV and AlBiomics BV. The remaining authors disclose no conflicts. TC received honoraria from Janssen
39 and Takeda. The remaining authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

40 Graphical abstract



41

42

43

44

45 **Abstract**

46 Biological therapeutics are now widely used in Crohn's disease (CD), with evidence of
47 efficacy from randomized trials and real-world experience. Primary non-response is a
48 common, poorly understood problem. We assessed blood methylation as a predictor of
49 response to vedolizumab (VDZ, anti-a4b7 integrin) or ustekinumab (USTE, anti-IL-12/23p40).
50 We report a two-center, prospective cohort study in which we profiled the peripheral blood
51 DNA methylome of 184 adult male and female CD patients prior to and during treatment with
52 VDZ or USTE in a discovery (n=126) and an external validation cohort (n=58). We defined
53 epigenetic biomarkers that were stable over time and associated with combined clinical and
54 endoscopic response to VDZ or USTE with an area under curve (AUC) of 0.87 and 0.89,
55 respectively. We validated these models in an external cohort yielding an AUC of 0.75 for
56 both VDZ and USTE. These data will now be prospectively tested in a multicenter
57 randomized clinical trial.

58

59 Introduction

60 Crohn's disease (CD) is an incurable, chronic, relapsing inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)
61 caused by a complex interplay between the environment, gut microbiome, and a
62 dysregulated immune system in genetically susceptible patients^{1,2}. Accessibility to high-
63 throughput "omics" technology has enhanced our understanding of the underlying molecular
64 pathogenesis of CD leading to the development of several monoclonal antibodies or
65 biologicals that target specific inflammatory pathways in an effort to suppress the
66 inflammation and to induce and or maintain a state of clinical and endoscopic remission³.
67 Currently, the repertoire of approved biologicals in CD includes anti-TNF antibodies
68 (infliximab (IFX) and adalimumab (ADA)), the anti- $\alpha_4\beta_7$ integrin antibody vedolizumab (VDZ)
69 and the anti-IL12/23p40 antibody ustekinumab (USTE). More recently, specific IL23p19
70 antibodies and JAK inhibitors have also been approved for clinical use⁴⁻⁶. Despite the
71 established efficacy of these biological treatments to induce corticosteroid-free *clinical*
72 *remission* in up to 65% of CD patients, sustained *endoscopic remission* is observed in not
73 more than a third of patients after 1 year of treatment⁷⁻⁹. This creates a clinical challenge
74 since therapeutic guidelines suggest to use endoscopic remission as a target. An
75 increasingly common clinical scenario is the choice between VDZ or USTE as second-line
76 treatment for patients who have not responded to anti-TNF therapies.

77 To date, treatment selection has been based on a trial-and-error approach. Given the limited
78 efficacy, many patients are therefore treated with insufficiently effective treatment, which is
79 associated with an increased risk of complications (stenosis, fistula, abscesses, nutritional
80 deficiencies) and surgery. The development of strategies that allow selection of treatment
81 based on the likelihood of response is an important unmet need. Although various efforts
82 using clinical¹⁰, transcriptomic¹¹⁻¹³, proteomic¹⁴ or microbial^{15,16} technologies have been
83 investigated and reported, no predictive biomarkers have made their way to clinical
84 application¹⁷⁻¹⁹.

85 DNA methylation is one of the most studied epigenetic features characterized by the covalent
86 binding of methyl groups to nucleotides, most often a cytosine in a cytosine-phosphate-
87 guanine (CpG) sequence in humans²⁰. DNA methylation is believed to play an essential role
88 in the regulation of gene expression, thereby determining cellular phenotype and behavior
89 without altering the DNA sequence itself^{21,22}. Within the context of IBD, DNA methylation has
90 gained particular interest due to its dynamic interaction with the environment and suggested
91 epigenetic-microbial crosstalk²³⁻²⁵. A number of recent studies demonstrated differential DNA
92 methylation profiles associated with the presence of CD and/or specific CD-phenotypes^{26,27} in

93 peripheral blood leukocytes (PBL)²⁸⁻³⁰, intestinal mucosa³¹ and specific cell-types thereof^{32,33}.
94 Most studies proposed a potential role of the DNA methylome in diagnostics and prediction
95 of treatment response.

96 In the current study we performed an epigenome-wide association study (EWAS) in which
97 we identified and validated prognostic DNA methylation signatures in peripheral blood of
98 adult CD patients associated with objective therapeutic response to VDZ and USTE. We
99 subsequently interrogated whether these signatures were stable over time and assessed the
100 influence of common confounding variables. We further performed additional validation
101 analyses of the model against patients with previous non-response to one or both drugs.
102 Finally, we investigated the association of the identified DNA methylation biomarkers with
103 gene expression through transcriptomic analyses.

104

105 **Results**

106 **Study population**

107 We prospectively recruited a discovery cohort of 126 adult patients at the IBD Center of
108 Amsterdam University Medical Centers (Amsterdam UMC), Amsterdam, Netherlands. All
109 patients had active symptomatic and endoscopic CD and were scheduled to start VDZ (N =
110 64) or USTE (N = 62). Evidence for active disease was documented with a validated clinical
111 score (Harvey Bradshaw Index (HBI), median 8 (interquartile range (IQR) 4-12)), biochemical
112 tests (serum C-reactive protein (CRP), median 6.1 mg/L (IQR 2.2-14.8) and fecal calprotectin
113 (FCP), median 903 µg/g (IQR 278-1816)) and also endoscopic signs of inflammation
114 measured with the simple endoscopic score for CD (SES-CD), median 9 (IQR 6-15). In
115 addition, an external validation cohort of 58 adult CD patients starting VDZ (N = 25) or USTE
116 (N = 33) biological therapy were recruited at the John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, United
117 Kingdom. Peripheral blood leukocyte (PBL) samples were obtained prior to treatment
118 initiation and upon response assessment at a median of 27 (IQR 20-33) weeks into
119 treatment, when patients were classified as responder (R) or non-responder (NR). A detailed
120 overview of all the clinical characteristics across the different cohorts and treatments can be
121 found in the methods section as well as in **Table 1**.

122 **Blood DNA methylation profiling predicts response to vedolizumab and** 123 **ustekinumab**

124 To identify prognostic biomarkers of VDZ and USTE response, we performed supervised
125 machine learning through stability selected gradient boosting^{34,35} on blood samples obtained
126 shortly before the start of treatment (**Fig. 1a**). The model was trained on the discovery cohort
127 acquired in Amsterdam and subsequently validated in the validation cohort acquired in
128 Oxford. We were able to generate response-predicting models with an area under the curve
129 (AUC) of 0.87 with a standard deviation of 0.06 and 0.89 with a standard deviation of 0.08 for
130 VDZ and USTE, respectively, when testing against the discovery cohort (**Fig. 1b**). The
131 models comprised 25 and 68 differentially methylated CpGs for VDZ and USTE, respectively
132 (**Fig. 1c, Supplementary Fig. 1-2 and Supplementary Tables 1-2**). Validating our models
133 against the independent validation cohort yielded an AUC of 0.75 for both VDZ and USTE
134 (**Fig. 1b**), indicating reproducible response-associated differences in DNA methylation prior
135 to the start of treatment.

136 While the discrepancy between discovery and validation performances is expected as part of
137 machine learning, we hypothesized that the differences were partially due to differences in

138 response assessments. During the COVID-19 pandemic, endoscopic assessments were
139 scheduled less frequently resulting in the validation cohort consisting of patient samples in
140 whom response was defined on both strict (combined clinical-, biochemical- and endoscopic
141 evaluation) or modified criteria (combined clinical- and biochemical evaluation). We therefore
142 investigated whether a difference in performance could be observed between both methods
143 of evaluation. This stratification indicated that accuracy was optimized by using the strictly
144 defined combination of clinical- and endoscopic endpoints for both VDZ ($AUC_{\text{strict}} = 0.83$
145 versus $AUC_{\text{modified}} = 0.66$) and USTE ($AUC_{\text{strict}} = 0.83$ versus $AUC_{\text{modified}} = 0.72$)
146 (**Supplementary Fig. 3a**). Application of the strict criteria yielded performances similar to the
147 discovery dataset thereby confirming that our model is likely more capable at predicting
148 response as defined using combined clinical-, biochemical- and endoscopic evaluations.

149 In addition, we were interested whether the performance of our models was affected by prior
150 exposure to anti-TNF medication. We observed a better performance of our models among
151 anti-TNF naïve compared to anti-TNF exposed patients for both VDZ ($AUC_{\text{non-exposed}} = 0.85$
152 versus $AUC_{\text{exposed}} = 0.66$) and USTE ($AUC_{\text{non-exposed}} = 0.97$ versus $AUC_{\text{exposed}} = 0.63$)
153 (**Supplementary Fig. 3b**).

154 Focusing on the practical implications in a clinical setting, we calculated a sensitivity of 0.769
155 and a specificity of 0.67 for VDZ and both a sensitivity and specificity of 0.73 for USTE
156 (**Table 2**). Next, we computed the likelihood ratio of response and the post-test probability of
157 response to aid clinicians in accurately predicting response following a positive test outcome.
158 From Lowenberg *et al.*⁷, we note that 50 of the 110 VDZ-treated CD patients presented with
159 endoscopic response at week 52 indicating a pre-test probability of response of 0.45. At the
160 calculated sensitivity of 0.77 and a specificity of 0.67, the likelihood ratio of response is 2.31,
161 thereby making the post-test probability of response 0.65 for VDZ. Similarly, for USTE, prior
162 research showed that 75 of the 179 USTE-treated CD patients presented with endoscopic
163 response at week 52⁸, indicating a pre-test probability of response of 0.42. At the calculated
164 sensitivity and specificity of 0.73 the likelihood ratio is 2.67 and the post-test probability of
165 response is 0.66. Taken together, the probability that a patient would actually respond to
166 VDZ or USTE when classified as responder is 0.20 and 0.24 higher than the current standard
167 of care.

168 **Methylation status of predictor CpGs remains stable over time**

169 As baseline samples were acquired pre-treatment, we sought to understand whether the
170 initiation of treatment affected the methylation status of the predictor CpGs. To this end, we
171 compared samples obtained at the time of response assessment (T2) with samples obtained

172 pre-treatment (T1). We could not identify any statistically significant differences in DNA
173 methylation levels for any of the predictor CpGs (**Fig. 2a**). Indeed, comparing the differences
174 over time suggested that the mean difference between R and NR was similar both pre-
175 treatment and at response assessment (**Fig. 2b**). Furthermore, a two-way, mixed,
176 consistency intra-class correlation (ICC) analysis indicated highly-stable DNA methylation
177 over time with 24 out of 25 VDZ and 62 out of 68 USTE predictor CpGs presenting ICC
178 values ≥ 0.75 (**Fig. 2c, Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2**). This observation was corroborated by
179 interrogating our previous longitudinal consistency analysis of peripheral blood DNA
180 methylation from 46 adult IBD patients collected at 2 time points with a median of 7 years
181 (range, 2-9 years) in between³⁶. Here, we observed that the majority (16 out of 25 VDZ and
182 52 out of 68 USTE) of the predictor CpGs presented “good” ($0.75 \leq \text{ICC} < 0.9$) to “excellent”
183 ($0.9 \geq \text{ICC}$) stability³⁷ over a median span of 7 years (**Fig. 2c**). As a final validation, we
184 utilized the prognostic model to predict response to therapy of the samples obtained at
185 response assessment, where we obtained better performances compared to the pre-
186 treatment samples ($\text{AUC}_{\text{VDZ}} = 0.97$; $\text{AUC}_{\text{USTE}} = 1.00$) (**Fig. 2d**). Altogether, our observations
187 suggest that response-associated differences in DNA methylation detected prior to treatment
188 remain stable during treatment.

189 **Patients who previously experienced treatment failure to multiple** 190 **biological treatments are classified correctly**

191 Having established that the prognostic response prediction models for both drugs perform
192 well both pre- and into treatment, we explored the performance of our model in a further
193 independent cohort of 33 adult CD patients from whom blood had been collected after
194 sequential treatment with anti-TNF, VDZ, and/or USTE. Treatment failure was determined
195 with endoscopy in 28 (82%), MRI in 2 (6%), or the need for surgical resection in 4 (12%),
196 combined with biochemical biomarkers such as CRP in 12 (35%) and/or FCP in 16 (47%)
197 and clinical parameters in 32 (94%) patients. In this cohort, a relatively large proportion of
198 patients had extensive disease location (67.6%), perianal disease (52.9%), and/or IBD-
199 related surgery (70.6%) in the past (**Supplementary Table 3**).

200 Both VDZ and USTE response prediction models accurately predicted NR, with 24 out of 27
201 (88.9%) VDZ-NR patients and 24 out of 26 (92.3%) USTE-NR patients correctly identified.
202 Focusing specifically on the patients with previous non-response to both VDZ and USTE the
203 models correctly classified 16 out of 19 (84%) as NR. Notably, 12 of out of these 19 patients
204 (75%) were anti-TNF experienced.

205 **Assessment of potential confounding variables**

206 Through multiple linear regression analyses we observed that 22 of the 25 (88%) VDZ
207 response-associated CpGs and 38 of the 68 (55%) USTE response-associated CpGs (**Fig.**
208 **3a** and **Supplementary Fig. 1-2**) presented statistically significant differences. The large
209 discrepancy between the linear regression analyses and the USTE response-associated
210 CpGs indicates that a more complex non-linear relationship exists among the response-
211 associated predictor CpGs and underscores that statistical p-values may not equal biologic
212 or functional relevance and/or importance at an individual level. As it has been established
213 that the peripheral blood DNA methylome is associated with certain phenotypic
214 characteristics such as sex, age, smoking status, as well as the underlying cellular
215 composition³⁸⁻⁴¹, we investigated whether any of these variables confounded our results. In
216 doing so with linear regression analysis, we observed that 12 out of 22 (55%) and 30 out of
217 38 (79%) markers remained significantly associated with response for VDZ and USTE,
218 respectively (**Fig. 3a**). In terms of effect size, the mean percentage methylation difference
219 between R and NR of the predictor CpGs on average decreased by 15% and increased by
220 5% in VDZ and USTE, respectively (**Fig. 3b**). To understand whether the confounding
221 variables are capable of predicting response, we constructed a prediction model solely based
222 on the confounding variables using the discovery cohort and tested this on the validation
223 cohort. The confounder model yielded an AUC of 0.57 and 0.65 for VDZ and USTE,
224 respectively, against the validation cohort indicating worse performance than the prediction
225 model based on CpGs only (**Fig. 3c**). Our results indicate that while there appears to be a
226 significant association with sex, age, smoker status and blood cell distribution, the CpG-only
227 prediction model outperforms a confounder-only model.

228 We next investigated whether the predictor CpGs were significantly associated with severity
229 of systemic and intestinal inflammation at baseline measured using CRP and FCP, as was
230 previously reported by Sominen *et al.*⁴². For VDZ, 5 predictor CpGs significantly associated
231 with CRP whereas only a single CpG was associated with FCP (**Supplementary Fig. 4**). For
232 USTE, we observed 9 predictor CpGs associated with CRP and 2 predictor CpGs with FCP
233 (**Supplementary Fig. 4**). In all cases, mean differences in methylation were smaller than
234 0.5%. These observations suggest that the majority of the identified predictor CpGs are
235 independent of inflammatory status at onset of therapy.

236 **RFPL2 presents concordant response-associated differential methylation** 237 **and expression**

238 To understand the functional relevance of the predictor CpGs, we annotated the them to their
239 respective genes based on whether they were located in either a gene promoter or enhancer

240 resulting in the annotation of 20 VDZ response-associated predictor CpGs to 16 unique
241 genes (**Supplementary Table 1**) and 43 USTE response-associated predictor CpGs to 46
242 genes (**Supplementary Table 2**). We performed transcriptomic analyses on a subset of
243 samples from the discovery cohort (VDZ; $N_{T1}=10_R10_{NR}$, $N_{T2}=10_R8_{NR}$ and USTE; $N_{T1}=14_R11_{NR}$,
244 $N_{T2}=10_R9_{NR}$). Comparing R with NR identified pretreatment differences for predictor CpG-
245 associated genes *TULP4* ($p\text{-value}_{T1} = 4.38E-02$) and *RFPL2* ($p\text{-value}_{T1} = 4.72E-02$) for VDZ
246 (**Fig. 4a, b** and **Supplementary Table 4**), with *RFPL2* presenting a significant inverse
247 correlation between DNA methylation and gene expression (Pearson $r = -0.65$; $p\text{-value} =$
248 $1.39E-03$) (**Fig. 4c**). For USTE, we observed significant differences in the expression of
249 predictor CpG-associated genes *MRC1* ($p\text{-value}_{T1} = 4.25E-04$) and *TMEM191B* ($p\text{-value}_{T1} =$
250 $7.31E-03$) (**Fig. 4a** and **d** and **Supplementary Table 5**) with *TMEM191B* presenting a
251 significant positive correlation between DNA methylation and gene expression (Pearson $r =$
252 0.57 ; $p\text{-value} = 3.11E-03$) (**Fig. 4e**). We next investigated whether predictor CpG-associated
253 genes presented differential expression after the start of treatment by comparing R with NR
254 at response assessment. VDZ predictor CpG-associated genes *MCM2* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} = 2.40E-$
255 03) and *RFPL2* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} = 3.88E-03$) were differentially expressed at response assessment
256 (**Fig. 4a, f** and **Supplementary Table 4**) with *RFPL2*, once again, presenting a significant
257 inverse correlation between DNA methylation and expression (Pearson $r = -0.55$; $p\text{-value} =$
258 0.017) (**Fig. 4g**). For USTE, predictor CpG-associated genes *POTEF* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} = 1.47E-02$),
259 *HDAC4* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} = 2.18E-02$), *PARP4* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} = 3.49E-02$) and *MARK3* ($p\text{-value}_{T2} =$
260 $2.87E-02$) presented differential expression at response assessment (**Fig. 4a, h** and
261 **Supplementary Table 5**), but did not show any significant correlation with DNA methylation.
262 Taken together, our results show that some of the response predictor CpG-associated genes
263 present differential expression either pretreatment and/or during response assessment, with
264 VDZ- and USTE- response-associated genes *RFPL2* and *TMEM191B*, respectively,
265 presenting a significant correlation between DNA methylation and gene expression.
266 Nonetheless, we acknowledge that most predictor CpG-associated genes present no
267 response-associated differential expression.

268

269 Discussion

270 Although the introduction of biologicals has transformed the care of patients with CD, the
271 current clinical practice of treatment selection remains suboptimal. Nonetheless, a large body
272 of real-world evidence studies suggests there could be a place for a more individualized
273 approach^{43,44}. Therefore, in parallel with ongoing drug development, predictive biomarkers
274 that allow for selection of successful medical therapy would represent a major step forward in
275 clinical care.

276 Here, we conducted a longitudinal case-control study where we identified methylation
277 signatures composed of 25 and 68 markers associated with combined endoscopic,
278 biochemical and clinical response to VDZ and USTE, respectively, in a cohort of adult CD
279 patients in whom treatment response was assessed with stringent criteria. We were able to
280 build models with significant predictive performance at an AUC > 0.85 for both models. The
281 models demonstrated similar performance in an independent, external validation with an
282 AUC of 0.75 for both models.

283 Recent real-world data and (post-hoc) findings from both the GEMINI and UNITI trials
284 indicate superior response to both VDZ and USTE in anti-TNF naïve patients⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹. In our
285 discovery cohorts, 77% of VDZ and 98% of the USTE-treated patients were previously
286 exposed to anti-TNF medication. Stratifying the patients in the validation cohort by previous
287 anti-TNF exposure showed that both models performed noticeably better in anti-TNF naïve
288 rather than exposed patients. However, the number of patients included in both subset
289 comparisons are relatively small and further exploration using larger groups patients are
290 needed. Furthermore, we demonstrate the ability of our models to effectively identify patients
291 with previous non-response to both VDZ and USTE treatment. This holds true for both anti-
292 TNF naïve and experienced patients, providing significant importance for clinical practice, as
293 the precise prediction of non-response to both drugs offers clinicians the opportunity to make
294 informed decisions. For anti-TNF experienced patients, this could mean a direct switch
295 towards newer modes-of-action (i.e. JAK-inhibitors).

296 While this study is the first to demonstrate the utility of DNA methylation profiling in whole
297 blood for objective response to VDZ and USTE in CD patients, previous analyses from two
298 separate studies explored its application to predict anti-TNF response in both CD and UC
299 patients^{50,51}. In the first study, the authors sought to identify an anti-TNF response-associated
300 profile combining integrated methylation and gene expression data from samples taken
301 before and 2 weeks into treatment using a primary endpoint of clinical remission at week
302 14⁵⁰. The observations were made using a mixed cohort of 37 IBD (18 CD, 19 UC) patients

303 and validated against a publicly available gene expression data of 20 CD patients. In the
304 second study, the authors did not show replication of these observations using methylation
305 data of 385 patients, as part of the previously published PANTS study^{51,52}. In this study, bio-
306 naïve patients with active CD started treatment with adalimumab or infliximab. Interestingly,
307 the authors report 323 differentially methylated positions annotated to 210 genes identified at
308 baseline that were significantly associated with serum drug concentrations at week 14. This
309 profile could potentially be of interest to identify patients in need of intensified anti-TNF drug
310 monitoring or dosing. The methodological differences and lack of endoscopic data in the
311 previous experiments preclude direct comparison with our study in which outcome
312 assessments were more stringent.

313 Through two separate stability analyses, we demonstrated both short- and long-term hyper
314 stability of the majority of our identified CpG markers indicating their independence of
315 treatment as well as the resultant difference in inflammation. The latter is further evidenced
316 by the lack of correlation between the methylation status of the predictor CpGs and both
317 baseline CRP and FCP, therapy switch or even CD-related surgery⁵³ suggesting that the
318 CpGs are response-predictors but do not directly mediate inflammation. Nonetheless,
319 confounder analysis indicated potential confounding for some of the predictor CpGs for age,
320 sex, smoking status and the blood cell distribution. We observed however that prediction
321 modeling using the confounders only performed significantly worse than the CpG model,
322 indicating that confounders do not contribute substantially to the predictive performance.

323 We note that the predictor CpGs annotate to genes associated with MHC class I (*HLA-C*)
324 and cell migration (*TSPEAR*, *NID2*)^{54,55} for VDZ and macrophage function (*RHOJ*, *MARK3*
325 and *PCGF3*)⁵⁶⁻⁶¹ and polarization (*PKNOX1* and *MRC1*)⁶²⁻⁶⁴, histone remodeling and Th17-
326 differentiation (*HDAC4*)⁶⁵⁻⁶⁹ and TGF- β signaling (*SMAD1* and *EBF3*)⁷⁰⁻⁷⁷ for USTE.
327 Integrating DNA methylation with their transcriptomic data indicates that VDZ-response-
328 associated *RFPL2*, which encodes an E3 ubiquitin ligase^{78,79}, and USTE-response-
329 associated *TMEM191B*, which encodes a transmembrane protein, present concordant
330 differential methylation and expression. However, their exact role in either IBD and/or
331 response to therapy remains unknown to date. Accordingly, beyond the utility of the predictor
332 CpGs in classifying response to therapy, identifying their role in the pathogenesis and
333 etiology of non-response remains challenging at present and hence a subject for future
334 studies.

335 Our study derives its main strength from the sampling and endpoint assessment strategy. In
336 addition, patients with anti-drug antibodies or without a measurable serum drug
337 concentration and those that stopped treatment due to adverse events were excluded prior to

338 the selection of this cohort. Non-responders therefore reflect a more homogenous group of
339 true biological (i.e. pharmacodynamic) non-response rather than failure due to
340 pharmacokinetics or intolerance. Second, the relatively small sample size was justified by
341 performing a sample size estimation based on prior pilot experiments in combination with
342 previous studies on statistical power in EWAS⁸⁰. Lastly, besides stability of the observed
343 methylation differences during induction- and maintenance treatment, our markers
344 demonstrated stable differences between R and NR over time, which was further
345 corroborated when interrogating our 7-year longitudinal DNA methylation survey. This time-
346 independent behavior of the predictor CpGs indicates that exposure over time and change in
347 inflammatory parameters does not affect the response-associated behavior of the CpGs,
348 suggesting that the CpGs are very stable, which in turn increases its utility in clinical practice.

349 There are however some limitations to this study. First, a post-hoc power analysis of the
350 mean effect size difference between responders and non-responders indicated a mean
351 absolute difference of 9.9% and 7.6% for VDZ and USTE, respectively. At the collected
352 samples sizes, this would translate to a statistical power of approximately 98.4% and 64.3%
353 for VDZ and USTE, respectively⁸⁰. Despite the lower power for USTE, we note that the model
354 remained performant in predicting response in the external cohort. Second, in the external
355 cohort response assessment was less stringent in approximately 70% of the patients due to
356 the COVID-19 pandemic during which we encountered a notable reduction in the access to
357 non-essential endoscopies, particularly in the UK⁸¹. Nonetheless, the modified response
358 criteria are a reflection of clinical parameters that physicians commonly use in daily practice.
359 This pragmatic approach enhances the overall generalizability of our results to a much larger
360 IBD population. Notably, the analysis where we included the available endoscopic outcomes
361 in the subset of UK patients for whom these data were available, enhanced the performance
362 to an AUC of 0.83 for both the VDZ and USTE models, reinforcing the validity of both models
363 in identifying objective responders to these biological therapies. While we acknowledge this
364 limitation, we believe that our comprehensive approach provides valuable insights into the
365 predictive capabilities of the models under diverse clinical scenarios. Third, while we
366 purposely used PBL samples as these are minimally invasive and easily obtained during
367 daily clinical practice, PBL represents a mixed cellular population. Therefore, the specific cell
368 types responsible for the observed predictive signal remain unidentified⁸². It should be noted
369 however that after correcting for the blood cell distribution, several predictor CpGs remained
370 statistically significant, indicating independence of cellular composition. Third, the majority of
371 the predictor CpG loci identified are situated within gene introns, complicating the biological
372 interpretation of our findings. Although the identified predictor CpGs collectively serve as a
373 strong predictor of response, we acknowledge that the underlying biology behind this

374 observation is more complicated than merely the inverse correlation between DNA
375 methylation and gene expression. Lastly, while strict removal of most catalogued and
376 predicted genetic variant-binding probes, we acknowledge that there is still a possibility that
377 underlying genetic differences could have influenced our outcome⁸³. Nonetheless both
378 models performed effectively in both the discovery- (Dutch) and the validation (UK) cohorts.

379 In summary, our findings pave the way towards personalized medicine for CD. Several US
380 and European studies report a significant reduction in pharmaco-economic burden of CD if
381 clinical and endoscopic remission can be achieved with adequate treatment compared to the
382 cost of treatment of IBD patients on suboptimal medication⁸⁴⁻⁸⁸. In the absence of a predictive
383 biomarker panel, current endoscopic response rates at week 52 have been reported around
384 45% in VDZ and 42% in USTE treated CD patients^{7,8}. Taken together, our biomarker panels
385 could potentially increase these proportions by approximately 20% for VDZ and 24% for
386 USTE, thereby significantly impacting healthcare costs and disease burden in these patients.
387 We acknowledge that clinical validation of our findings in a randomized prospective trial,
388 comparing our method of pre-treatment selection with current clinical practice, is needed to
389 firmly demonstrate both clinical and economic benefit⁸⁹. To this end, the Omicrohn trial as
390 part of the ongoing Horizon Europe funded METHYLOMIC project has been launched and is
391 currently underway⁹⁰.

392

393 **Online Methods**

394 **Study population and design**

395 We prospectively recruited adult male and female CD patients that presented with a
396 combination of clinical, biochemical and endoscopic disease activity at ileo-colonoscopy and
397 were scheduled to start VDZ or USTE treatment within 1 year after the last endoscopy at the
398 Amsterdam University Medical Centers, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands
399 (discovery cohort) and the John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, United Kingdom (validation
400 cohort). All patients were naïve to the biological of interest.

401 Patients were treated according to standard-of-care protocols, which for VDZ meant that
402 patients were given 300 mg infusions at week 0, 2 and 6 followed by infusions at an 8 week
403 interval. For USTE, standard-of-care involved patients receiving a single intravenous infusion
404 (6 mg/kg rounded to 260 mg, 390 mg or 520 mg) at week 0 and subsequent 90 mg
405 subcutaneous injections at an 8 week interval. For both VDZ and USTE, interval
406 intensification every 6 or 4 weeks with an additional week 10 infusion for VDZ or extra
407 intravenous boost infusion for USTE at the treating physicians' discretion. To ensure
408 assessment of mechanistic and not pharmacokinetic failures of each biological treatment,
409 only patients with measurable serum concentrations without anti-drug antibodies at response
410 assessment were used for methylation analyses.

411 The project was approved by the medical ethics committee of the Academic Medical Hospital
412 (METC NL57944.018.16 and NL53989.018.15) and written informed consent was obtained
413 from all subjects prior to sampling, as well as by the National Health Service Research Ethics
414 committee. (REC reference: 21/PR/0010 Protocol number: 14833 IRAS project ID: 266041).
415 UK patients were recruited and consented under the ethics of the Translational
416 Gastrointestinal Unit biobank IBD cohort ethics (09/H1204/30) and GI cohort ethics
417 (16/YH/0247 and 21/YH/0206). The quality of the collected data and study procedures were
418 assessed by an independent monitor.

419 **Vedolizumab discovery and validation cohort characteristics**

420 The VDZ discovery cohort consisted of 64 patients ($N_R = 36$, $N_{NR} = 28$) of which 49 (77%) had
421 previously been exposed to anti-TNF treatment and 9 (14%) to USTE. Response was
422 defined on endoscopic as well as clinical/biochemical criteria in this group (see section
423 "Definitions of response"). In 62 (97%) patients, a follow-up endoscopy was performed. The
424 remaining 2 patients were classified as non-responders as a result of urgent surgical

425 intervention due to worsening of disease without CD-associated complications, such as
426 stenosis or perforating disease. R and NR presented overall comparable clinical
427 characteristics, with no significant differences in age, sex and smoking behavior. Importantly,
428 serum VDZ concentrations at T2 were not significantly different between R and NR (median
429 15 (IQR 7.7-20.5) versus median 14 (IQR 3.6-27.5), p-value = 0.77) although more NR
430 patients received an additional VDZ infusion at week 10 (35.7% vs 13.9%, p-value = 0.04).
431 Notably, patients in the NR group had more frequently been exposed to anti-TNF treatment
432 (89.3% vs 66.7%, p-value = 0.03) and/or USTE (25% vs 5.6%, p-value = 0.03) compared to
433 R group. Thirteen of the 15 R patients received VDZ as first-line biologic, had a shorter
434 disease duration, lower rates of previous surgery and perianal disease as well as a higher
435 percentage of B1 phenotype compared to anti-TNF experienced patients.

436 The VDZ validation cohort consisted of 25 additional patients ($N_R = 14$ and $N_{NR} = 11$) from
437 Oxford with a median 9 (IQR 3-15) year disease duration. Seventeen (68%) did not undergo
438 a follow-up colonoscopy to assess endoscopic response due to restrictions during the
439 COVID-19 pandemic and therefore were assessed using the modified definition of response,
440 which was defined as a combination of clinical and biochemical parameters (see “Definitions
441 of response” below). Out of these 25 patients, 13 (52%) were biological naïve, 12 (48%)
442 were anti-TNF-experienced and 7 (28%) were previously treated with USTE, which was
443 enriched among the NR group (54.5% vs 7.1%, p-value = 0.01). All other clinical
444 characteristics were comparable in R and NR, including age, sex, and smoking behavior. As
445 in the VDZ discovery cohort, the majority (69%) of biological naïve patients were responders
446 to VDZ.

447 **Ustekinumab discovery and validation cohort characteristics**

448 The USTE discovery cohort consisted of 62 patients ($N_R=30$, $N_{NR}=32$) of which 60 (98%)
449 were previously exposed to anti-TNF and 26 (42%) to VDZ. A follow-up endoscopy was
450 performed in 58 (94%) patients. The remaining 4 were evaluated with serial intestinal
451 ultrasound using validated criteria assessed by an expert IBD ultrasonographer. Clinical
452 characteristics did not significantly differ between R and NR, although the R population
453 consisted of more female patients (R = 80%, NR = 56.3%, p-value = 0.05). No significant
454 differences in treatment intensification (21.9% vs 6.7%, p-value = 0.08), extra intravenous
455 boost infusions (p-value = 0.26) or serum USTE concentrations at T2 between R and NR
456 were observed (median 3.0 (IQR 1.8-5.5) versus median 4.8 (IQR 2.1-8.6), p-value = 0.31).

457 The USTE validation cohort consisted of 33 patients ($N_R=22$ and $N_{NR}=11$), with a median
458 disease duration of 11 (IQR 3-20) years. Twenty-five (76%) did not undergo follow-up

459 colonoscopy as a result of pandemic-related restrictions on non-essential endoscopy and
460 therefore were assessed using the modified definition of response. Of the 33 included
461 patients, 9 were biological naïve (52%), 21 (63.6%) were anti-TNF-experienced and 5
462 (15.2%) were previously treated with VDZ. Responders presented a significantly longer
463 disease duration compared to non-responders (median 15 vs 5 years, $p=0.05$). No significant
464 differences in age, sex, and smoking behavior were observed.

465 **Sample collection and storage protocols**

466 In all patients, whole peripheral blood leukocyte (PBL) samples were collected for
467 measurement of epigenome-wide DNA methylation prior to the start of VDZ/USTE, before
468 the baseline endoscopy or the first infusion (time point 1) and after an interval of 6-9 months
469 into treatment (time point 2) using 4.0-6.0mL BD ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA)
470 vacutainer tubes. For the Amsterdam discovery cohort, samples were subsequently
471 aliquoted into 1.10mL micronic tubes before storing at -80°C until further handling. The
472 Oxford validation samples were directly frozen at -80°C in preparation for later extraction. At
473 both time points, additional PBL samples were stored for the purpose of targeted gene
474 expression analyses from a subset of the Amsterdam discovery patients using 2.0-mL
475 PAXgene Blood RNA tubes and were frozen at -20°C for 24 h before storing at -80°C until
476 further handling.

477 **Definitions of response**

478 At response assessment, patients were classified as responders (R) or non-responders (NR)
479 based on a strict combination of endoscopic, biochemical and clinical criteria: $\geq 50\%$
480 reduction in the endoscopic SES-CD score, corticosteroid-free clinical remission (≥ 3 point
481 drop⁹¹ in HBI or $\text{HBI} \leq 4$ and no systemic steroids) and/or biochemical response (CRP
482 reduction $\geq 50\%$ or $\text{CRP} \leq 5$ mg/L and FCP reduction $\geq 50\%$ or $\text{FCP} \leq 250$ $\mu\text{g/g}$). Modified
483 response was defined as a combination of corticosteroid-free clinical- ($\text{HBI} \leq 4$) and
484 biochemical ($\text{CRP} \leq 5$ mg/L and/or $\text{FCP} \leq 250$ $\mu\text{g/g}$) remission between week 26-52 without
485 treatment change through week 52.

486 **DNA isolation and in vitro DNA methylation analysis**

487 For the Amsterdam discovery cohorts, genomic DNA was extracted using the QIAasympphony.
488 We next assessed the quantity of DNA using the FLUOstar OMEGA and quality of the high-
489 molecular weight DNA on a 0.8% agarose gel. Following these steps, 750ng of DNA per
490 sample was randomized per plate, to limit batch effects, after which genomic DNA was

491 bisulfite converted using the Zymo EZ DNA Methylation kit and analyzed on the Illumina
492 HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array. Aforementioned work was performed at the Core
493 Facility Genomics, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

494 For the Oxford validation cohorts, genomic DNA was extracted using the Qiagen Puregene
495 Blood Core Kit C at the Oxford Translational Gastroenterology Unit, University of Oxford.
496 DNA samples were assessed for quality using the NanoDrop spectrometer (NanoDrop 1000,
497 Thermo Scientific). A total of 750ng of DNA per sample was randomized per plate, to limit
498 batch effects, after which genomic DNA was bisulfite converted using the Zymo EZ DNA
499 Methylation kit and analyzed on the Illumina HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array at
500 UCL Genomics, University College London, London, United Kingdom.

501 **Raw methylation data pre-processing**

502 DNA methylation data processing was orchestrated in Snakemake (v7.14.1)⁹². Raw
503 methylation data was imported into the R statistical environment (v4.3.1) using the
504 Bioconductor minfi^{93,94} package (v1.44). Quality control was performed using shinyMethyl
505 (v1.38.0)⁹⁵ for probe level quality control, ewastools (v1.7.2)⁹⁶ to ensure paired samples were
506 correctly labeled, and the Horvath clock⁹⁷ to ensure a proper match with the metadata. One
507 patient sample from the VDZ and one patient sample from the USTE discovery cohort were
508 removed due to a discrepancy in the predicted sex with the annotated sex. Raw signals were
509 normalized using functional normalization⁹⁸. Probes were annotated to their gene of interest
510 using the provided Illumina annotations, which were further enhanced with enhancer data as
511 obtained using the publicly accessible promoter-capture Hi-C data⁹⁹. We subsequently
512 calculated the methylation signal in the form of percentage methylation. Technical artefacts
513 as a result of batch, plate and plate position were removed using ComBat (v0.9.7)¹⁰⁰ as
514 implemented in the sva (v3.50.0)¹⁰¹ package, a tool for removing known batch effects in
515 microarray data using the parametric empirical Bayes framework, using the default
516 parameters. Probes hybridizing to allosomes were removed to identify sex-independent
517 differences. Moreover, probes hybridizing to known and tentative genetic variants were
518 removed to identify true methylation signals. Known genetic variants were identified based
519 on their presence in dbSNP (v137), whereas tentative genetic variants were based on the
520 methylation signal displaying a tri- or bimodal distribution, a hallmark of genetic variants
521 underlying DNA methylation¹⁰², as determined using gaphunter¹⁰³ set to a threshold of 0.25.
522 The eventual number of CpGs used for training the prediction models were 806,308 and
523 808,815 for VDZ and USTE, respectively. For the validation of the prediction models, raw
524 methylation data from the validation cohort was pre-processed together with the discovery
525 cohort using functional normalization and ComBat to mitigate batch effects introduced by the

526 different experimental setup. From the combined dataset, the predictor CpGs were extracted
527 and the prediction model was recalibrated against the discovery dataset where after
528 predictions were made on the validation dataset.

529 **Machine learning models: stability selected gradient boosting analyses**

530 The machine learning modeling was divided into two steps, namely feature selection and
531 validation (**Fig. 1a**). Feature selection was performed on the discovery cohort, collected at
532 the AmsterdamUMC, whereas validation was performed on the validation cohort, collected at
533 the John Radcliffe Hospital. During the feature selection procedure, the model was at no
534 point exposed to the validation cohort. To identify baseline epigenetic markers associated
535 with response/non-response to treatment, we implemented a rigorous supervised machine
536 learning approach using stability selected gradient boosting^{34,35,104} combined with covered
537 information disentanglement (CID)¹⁰⁵. Gradient boosting is an algorithm for supervised
538 learning, which operates through stepwise improvement of weak learners thereby minimizing
539 the overall prediction error against the observed data. We opted for gradient boosting as it
540 captures linear, non-linear and interaction effects better than traditional linear regression
541 approaches¹⁰⁴. CID, in conjunction with stability selected gradient boosting, represents an
542 approach for feature selection that assigns permutation-based feature importance that, unlike
543 other methods for assigning feature importance, is unbiased by multicollinearity¹⁰⁵.

544 We first removed CpGs with low variance and then applied univariate feature selection using
545 a F-test. Stability selection was subsequently employed to identify reliable biomarkers by
546 splitting randomly the discovery data into an 80% training data and a 20% test data using
547 stratified shuffle split and repeating this process 100 times to mitigate overfitting¹⁰⁶. During
548 each split, we computed the CID for each CpG by randomly permuting it 100 times and
549 calculating the mean feature importance and assessing the average effect of permutation on
550 the model's performance (i.e., predicted versus true outcome)¹⁰⁵. After all 100 iterations, the
551 mean feature importance per iteration was averaged and compared against a randomly
552 generated noise variable that was included throughout the entire modeling process where
553 CpGs with an aggregated feature importance ranked above a random variable were termed
554 predictor CpGs and retained for future analyses.

555 Having determined the predictor CpGs, we subsequently validated the predictive
556 performance internally and externally. Internal validation was performed by extracting the
557 predictor CpGs, training an ensemble of 100 gradient boost models on the 80% discovery
558 training data and utilizing all models to predict against the withheld 20% discovery test data.
559 External validation was performed using a similar approach where the discovery and

560 validation cohort were merged, the predictor CpGs extracted, and an ensemble of 100
561 models trained on the discovery cohort. The resultant models were then requested to predict
562 the response in the external validation cohort. In both cases, the output of each model
563 yielded a prediction score on a scale of 0 to 1 per sample. The prediction scores were
564 aggregated by calculating the mean prediction score per sample, representing the final,
565 ensembled, output of the model. This final prediction score was used to calculate the
566 receiver operator characteristic (ROC) to assess performance. The resultant prediction
567 scores were subsequently converted into classes by freezing the model at the Youden index,
568 thereby balancing the true positive rate relative to the false positive rate. Analyses were not
569 conducted separately for males and females as the cohorts would become too small.
570 Aforementioned analyses were performed in Python (v3.10) (<https://www.python.org>), with
571 packages scikit-learn and xgboost for the model development.

572 **In silico DNA methylation analysis**

573 Differential methylation analyses were performed in R using limma¹⁰⁷ (v3.46) and eBayes¹⁰⁸.
574 Separate analyses were run either regressing against the slide and slide position only, or in
575 combination with common confounding variables: age, sex, smoking behavior and the
576 estimated blood cell distribution^{109,110}. The blood cell distribution was estimated using the
577 method described by Houseman *et al.*¹⁰⁹ and implemented by Salas *et al.*¹¹⁰ for the Illumina
578 HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array, where methylation profiles of the current data are
579 compared against a reference methylation profiles of cell-sorted neutrophils, B cells,
580 monocytes, NK cells, CD4+ T cells and CD8+ T cells, enabling the inference of the cellular
581 composition. Intra-class correlation analyses were performed by conducting a two-way,
582 mixed, consistency analysis comparing samples obtained during response assessment with
583 samples obtained pretreatment using irr (v0.84.1). Statistical significance was defined as a
584 false discovery rate-adjusted p-value < 0.05. Visualizations were generated using ggplot2¹¹¹
585 (v3.3.5).

586 **RNA expression and data processing**

587 Transcriptomic analyses was conducted through RNA sequencing, wherein mRNA was
588 extracted utilizing the QIAasympyony system, converted into cDNA and sequenced in a
589 paired-end format on the Illumina NovaSeq6000 at the Amsterdam UMC Core Facility
590 Genomics, generating a dataset comprising 40 million 150 bp-reads. Following that, *in silico*
591 data processing was orchestrated in Snakemake where read quality was assessed using
592 FastQC (v0.11.8) and summarized using MultiQC (v1.0)^{92,112}. Raw reads were aligned to the
593 human genome (GRCh38) using the STAR aligner (v2.7.0), with annotations provided by the
594 Ensembl v95 annotation. Post-alignment processing was done in SAMtools (v1.9), followed

595 by read counting using the featureCounts function from the Subread package (v1.6.3)¹¹³⁻¹¹⁵.
596 Differential expression analysis (DE) analysis, was carried out within the R statistical
597 environment (v4.3) using the Bioconductor package DESeq2 (v1.38.3). We specifically
598 focused on genes associated with the predictor CpG loci based on the latter's location in
599 either promoter or enhancer regions. Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) were identified
600 based on their significant differences, defined as those with a Benjamini–Hochberg-adjusted
601 p-value <0.05. Visualization of the results was accomplished using ggplot2 (v3.4.0)¹¹⁶.

602 **Sample size estimation**

603 We based our sample size on an initial pilot experiment and the calculations performed by
604 Tsai and Bell⁸⁰ where we maintained a nominal p-value threshold of 0.05. A pilot experiment
605 using a subset of VDZ treated patients (7 R and 5 NR) indicated on average that the most
606 differentially methylated CpGs presented a mean difference in percentage methylation of
607 10% when comparing R with NR. We subsequently consulted the power calculations
608 reported by Tsai and Bell⁸⁰, who conducted a case-control epigenome wide simulation study.
609 Assuming an approximately equal number of cases and controls and a mean difference in
610 percentage methylation of at least 10% at a nominal p-value threshold of 0.05, a statistical
611 power of at least 80% would be achieved if we included 40 patients (20 R and 20 NR) per
612 drug. To further eliminate the possibility of being underpowered, we aimed to collect at least
613 60 patients for the discovery cohort per drug, which would be supplemented by at least 20
614 patients for the validation cohort.

615 **Statistical analysis of clinical variables**

616 Baseline characteristics of all included patients were summarized using descriptive statistics.
617 Categorical variables are presented as percentages and continuous variables as median
618 annotated with the interquartile range (IQR). Differences in distribution between responders,
619 non-responders and the different cohorts were assessed using a chi-square test (categorical
620 variables) or Mann-Whitney U (continuous variables). Two-tailed probabilities were used with
621 a p-value ≤0.05 were considered statistically significant. Analyses of clinical data were
622 performed in IBM SPSS statistics (v26). To estimate the probability of a patient responding to
623 either VDZ or USTE after being predicted to be a responder, we calculated the post-test
624 probability using the following formulas:

$$625 \quad (1) \text{ pre test odds} = \frac{\text{pre test probability}}{1 - \text{pre test probability}}$$

$$626 \quad (2) \text{ likelihood ratio} = \frac{\text{sensitivity}}{1 - \text{specificity}}$$

627 $(3) \text{ post test odds} = \text{likelihood ratio} * \text{pre test odds}$
628 $(4) \text{ post test probability} = \frac{\text{post test odds}}{\text{post test odds} + 1}$

629 The pre-test probabilities were obtained from the largest VDZ⁷, and USTE⁸ treatment-
630 response studies to date. The sensitivity and specificity were calculated by determining the
631 number of true positives, true negatives, false positives and false negatives when predicting
632 response in the validation cohort.

633 **Data availability**

634 The raw DNA methylation- (.idat) and gene expression (.fastq.gz) data alongside the de-
635 identified patient metadata as reported on in this study have been published under controlled
636 access for research purposes at the European Genome-phenome Archive (EGA). The DNA
637 methylation data for the VDZ discovery cohort can be found under accession ID:
638 EGAD00010002651. The DNA methylation data for the VDZ validation cohort can be found
639 under accession ID: EGAD00010002652. The DNA methylation data for the USTE discovery
640 cohort can be found under accession ID: EGAD00010002649. The DNA methylation data for
641 the USTE validation cohort can be found under accession ID: EGAD00010002650. The
642 RNA-sequencing data for the VDZ discovery cohort can be found under accession ID:
643 EGAD50000000385. The RNA-sequencing data for the USTE discovery cohort can be found
644 under accession ID: EGAD50000000386.

645 **Code availability**

646 All Snakemake, bash calls and R scripts have been made available on GitHub and can be
647 found at https://github.com/ND91/HGPRJ0000008_EPICCD_multi_drug.git. The machine
648 learning modeling was performed using proprietary algorithms founded on the same
649 statistical principles as those of gradient boosting, permutation importance, and covered
650 information disentanglement. The code for these techniques is openly available at
651 <https://xgboost.ai> and <https://github.com/JBPereira/CID> or <https://scikit-learn.org/stable>.

2 Tables

3 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics discovery- and validation cohorts.** Values in bold are significant, percentages shown are valid percentages. ADA: adalimumab. VDZ:
4 vedolizumab. USTE: ustekinumab. R: responder. NR: non-responder, SD: standard deviation. IQR: interquartile range, CRP: C-reactive protein. FCP: Fecal calprotectin. HBI:
5 Harvey Bradshaw Index. SES-CD: simple endoscopic disease activity score, Immunomodulator: azathioprine, mercaptopurine, thioguanine, methotrexate. Anti-TNF:
6 infliximab, adalimumab or golimumab.

	Amsterdam (discovery)			Oxford (validation)			Amsterdam (discovery)			Oxford (validation)		
	VDZ R (n=36)	VDZ NR (n=28)	P-val	VDZ R (n=14)	VDZ NR (n=11)	P-val	USTE R (n=30)	USTE NR (n=32)	P-val	USTE R (n=22)	USTE NR (n=11)	P-val
Sex, n (%), female	17 (47.2)	18 (64.3)	0.17	6 (42.9)	3 (27.3)	0.42	24 (80)	18 (56.3)	0.05	13 (59.1)	5 (45.5)	0.63
Age, years, median (IQR)	36 (25-52)	28 (32-56)	0.98	41 (21-65)	42 (24-70)	0.56	38 (29-56)	35 (23-45)	0.80	43 (35-55)	30 (24-52)	0.25
Disease duration, years, median (IQR)	12 (3-19)	9 (4-20)	0.80	12 (2-15)	8 (3-17)	0.41	12 (7-23)	10 (5-21)	0.81	15 (6-24)	5 (2-12)	0.05
Ethnic background, n (%), White European	29 (80.6)	19 (67.9)	0.24	13 (92.9)	9 (81.8)	0.80	25 (83.3)	22 (68.8)	0.18	21 (95.5)	7 (87.5)	0.10
CRP, mg/L, median (IQR)^a	3.9 (2.0-11.7)	6.2 (3.2-19.2)	0.26	5.2 (1.4-11.6)	5.2 (1.3-23.4)	0.97	5.7 (1.8-19.2)	7.8 (3.4-19.1)	0.45	6.1 (1.6-18.0)	4.8 (2.3-10.9)	0.30
FCP, ug/g, median (IQR)^b	1003 (412-1802)	1322 (389-2654)	0.79	-	-	-	809 (180-1599)	729 (221-2347)	0.69	-	-	-
Total baseline HBI, mean (±SD) or median (IQR)^c	7.4 (±4.2)	9.3 (±4.9)	0.11	3 (1-8)	4 (1-8)	0.53	8.4 (±5.3)	8.2 (±5.9)	0.90	6 (4-9)	4 (2-8)	0.69
Total baseline SES-CD, median (IQR)	8 (6-12)	10 (5-13)	0.27	7 (6-12)	7 (6-22)	0.92	10 (6-17)	9 (6-14)	0.62	8 (5-16)	8 (3-19)	0.73
Endoscopic evaluation at follow-up	36 (100)	26 (93)	0.19	4 (29)	4 (36)	1.00	29 (97)	29 (91)	0.61	6 (27)	2 (18)	0.69
Disease location, n (%)			0.50			0.21			0.78			0.43
- Ileal disease (L1)	13 (36.1)	8 (28.6)		3 (21)	2 (18)		6 (20.0)	6 (18.8)		7 (32)	5 (46)	
- Colonic disease (L2)	9 (25.0)	5 (17.9)		2 (14)	5 (45)		7 (23.3)	10 (31.3)		8 (36)	2 (18)	
- Ileocolonic disease (L3)	14 (38.9)	15 (53.6)		9 (64)	4 (36)		17 (56.7)	16 (50.0)		6 (27)	3 (27)	
- Upper GI involvement (L4)	1 (2.8)	2 (7.1)	0.41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (9)	0.13
Disease behavior, n (%)			0.60			0.53			0.39			0.06

- Non stricturing non-penetrating (B1)	16 (44.4)	9 (32.1)		9 (82)	10 (91)		10 (33.3)	12 (37.5)		15 (68)	5 (46)	
- Stricturing (B2)	10 (27.8)	10 (35.7)		2 (18)	1 (9)		11 (36.7)	15 (46.9)		5 (23)	2 (18)	
- Penetrating (B3)	10 (27.8)	9 (32.1)		-	-		9 (30.0)	5 (15.6)		-	3 (27)	
- Perianal disease (p)	8 (22.2)	11 (39.3)	0.14	1 (7)	2 (18)	0.48	10 (33.3)	12 (37.5)	0.73	6 (27)	3 (27)	0.88
Previous IBD related surgery, n (%)	14 (38.9)	16 (57.1)	0.15	4 (28.6)	4 (36.4)	0.88	23 (76.7)	21 (65.6)	0.34	11 (50)	7 (63)	0.29
Concomitant medication, n (%)												
- Immunomodulators	2 (5.6)	2 (7.1)	0.80	-	2	-	1 (3.3)	-	0.23	1	-	-
- Prednisone taper scheme	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 (23.3)	4 (12.5)	0.26	-	-	-
Previous treatment exposure, n (%)												
- Immunomodulators	28 (77.8)	24 (85.7)	0.42	13 (92.9)	8 (72.7)	0.17	29 (96.7)	32 (100)	0.23	17 (77.3)	5 (45.5)	0.07
- Anti-TNFs	24 (66.7)	25 (89.3)	0.03	5 (35.7)	7 (63.9)	0.25	30 (100)	31 (96.9)	0.25	14 (63.6)	7 (63.3)	1.00
- Vedolizumab	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (40.0)	14 (43.8)	0.77	2 (9.1)	3 (27.3)	0.15
- Ustekinumab	2 (5.6)	7 (25.0)	0.03	1 (7.1)	6 (54.5)	0.01	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smoking, n (%)^d												
- Active	6 (17.1)	2 (7.1)	0.22	3 (21.4)	1 (9.1)	0.30	6 (20)	5 (15.6)	0.65	5 (22.7)	1 (9.1)	0.24

8 **Table 2.** Predictive performance metrics of the prognostic biomarkers on the discovery cohort acquired at the AmsterdamUMC (n=126) and the validation cohort acquired at
9 the John Radcliffe Hospital (n=58). TP = True positives. TN = True negatives. FP = False positives. FN = False negatives. AUC = Area under the receiver operator
0 characteristic curve. VDZ: vedolizumab. USTE: ustekinumab.

	VDZ discovery	VDZ validation	USTE discovery	USTE validation
TP	33	10	27	16
TN	22	8	29	8
FP	4	4	2	3
FN	3	3	2	6
AUC	0.87	0.75	0.89	0.75
Recall	0.92	0.77	0.93	0.73
Precision	0.89	0.71	0.93	0.84
F1-score	0.90	0.74	0.93	0.78

1
2

663 Legends

664 Figures

665 **Fig. 1: Predictive model using stability selected gradient boosting for response to therapy.** **a)** An overview
666 of the feature selection and supervised machine learning approach for predicting response to VDZ and USTE as
667 used in the current study. Int. train: Internal training set. Int. test: Internal test set. ROC: Receiver operator
668 characteristic. **b)** Receiver operating characteristics plots showing the mean area under the curve (AUC)
669 performance of the discovery (n=126) and validation (n=58) cohorts. **c)** Left: radar plots presenting the
670 standardized difference in methylation between R (purple) and NR (green) for the top 15 predictor CpGs. Right:
671 Aggregated feature importance of the top 15 predictor CpGs.

672 **Fig. 2: Longitudinal stability analyses.** **a)** Volcano plot representing the differential methylation analyses when
673 comparing into treatment (T2) with pretreatment (T1) where grey dots represent CpG loci located on the Illumina
674 HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array and black dots represent response-associated predictor CpGs. X-axis
675 represents mean difference in percentage methylation, Y-axis represents the statistical significance as depicted
676 in $-\log_{10}(\text{p-value})$ with a dashed line at $\text{p-value} = 0.05$. **b)** Scatterplot showing the correlation of differential DNA
677 methylation between R and NR pretreatment (T1) and into treatment (T2). Grey dots represent CpG loci located
678 on the Illumina HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array and black dots represent response-associated predictor
679 CpGs. **c)** Boxplot of the two-way, consistency, intra-class correlation (ICC) coefficients of the predictor CpGs
680 calculated when comparing pretreatment and into treatment as well as the ICC coefficients of the predictor CpGs
681 obtained from a previous study on long-term stability of DNA methylation in IBD patients⁵³. The vertical dashed
682 grey lines represent classification boundaries introduced by Koo and Li³⁷, with blocks representing poor ($\text{ICC} <$
683 0.5), moderate ($0.5 \leq \text{ICC} < 0.75$), good ($0.75 \leq \text{ICC} < 0.9$), and excellent ($0.9 \geq \text{ICC}$). **d)** Receiver operating
684 characteristic plots representing the predictive performance into treatment (T2; black) and pre-treatment (T1;
685 grey) as reference.

686 **Fig. 3: Analyses of potential confounding variables.** **a)** Volcano plot representing the change in response-
687 associated differential methylation when correcting for the potential confounding variables age, sex, and
688 estimated cellular composition (black) or not (grey). X-axis represents mean difference in percentage
689 methylation, Y-axis represents the statistical significance as depicted in $-\log_{10}(\text{p-value})$. The dotted line
690 represents a threshold set at $\text{p} = 0.05$. **b)** Boxplot of the change in effect size after correcting for the confounding
691 variables as calculated by $(\beta_{\text{corrected}} - \beta_{\text{uncorrected}}) / \beta_{\text{uncorrected}}$. **c)** Receiver operator characteristic curve comparing
692 the response-prediction model for the CpG model (grey) with the confounder model (blue).

693 **Fig. 4: Integrative analyses of predictor CpG-associated genes.** **a)** Scatterplot showing the effect size (Wald
694 statistic) of the response-associated difference in pretreatment (T1; X-axis) and into treatment (T2; Y-axis). Grey
695 dots represent all genes measured, black dots represent non-differentially expressed predictor CpG-associated
696 genes, red, blue and purple dots represent predictor associated genes that are differentially expressed at T1, T2,
697 or T1 and T2, respectively. **b)** Boxplot of the T1 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ for VDZ response predictor CpG-associated
698 genes *TULP4* and *RFPL2* stratified by response. **c)** Scatterplot of the T1 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ of *RFPL2* (X-axis)
699 relative to the percentage DNA methylation (Y-axis) for the predictor CpG cg12906381 annotated with the
700 Pearson correlation coefficient and the associated p-value. **d)** Boxplot of the T1 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ for USTE
701 response predictor CpG-associated genes *MRC1* and *TMEM191B* stratified by response. **e)** Scatterplot of the T1
702 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ of *TMEM191B* (X-axis) relative to the percentage DNA methylation (Y-axis) for the predictor

703 CpG cg13982436 annotated with the Pearson correlation coefficient and the associated p-value. **f)** Boxplot of the
704 T2 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ for VDZ response predictor CpG-associated genes *MCM2* and *RFPL2* stratified by response.
705 **g)** Scatterplot of the T2 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ of *RFPL2* (X-axis) relative to the percentage DNA methylation (Y-axis)
706 for the predictor CpG cg12906381 annotated with the Pearson correlation coefficient and the associated p-value.
707 **h)** Boxplot of the T2 $\log_2(\text{expression})$ for USTE response predictor CpG-associated genes *POTEF*, *HDAC4*,
708 *PARP4* and *MARK3* stratified by response.

709 **Supplementary Tables**

710 **Supplementary Table 1:** Differential methylation summary statistics of the VDZ-response predictor CpGs.
711 Columns represent the Illumina CpG identifier, the associated HGNC gene symbol, the chromosome, the location
712 on the chromosome (build: hg19), the mean difference in percentage methylation between responders and non-
713 responders, the nominal p-value associated with the mean difference, the intra-class correlation coefficient
714 between pretreatment and during response assessment.

715 **Supplementary Table 2:** Differential methylation summary statistics of the USTE-response predictor CpGs.
716 Columns represent the Illumina CpG identifier, the mean difference in percentage methylation between
717 responders and non-responders, the nominal p-value associated with the mean difference, the genomic
718 coordinates on the human genome (build: hg19), the annotated gene name.

719 **Supplementary Table 3:** Clinical characteristics multi-biological failure cohort.

720 **Supplementary Table 4:** Differential expression summary statistics of the VDZ-response predictor CpGs-
721 associated genes. Columns represent the Ensembl gene ID, the HGNC gene name, the mean difference in
722 $\log_2(\text{fold change})$ between responders and non-responders and the nominal p-value associated with the mean
723 difference.

724 **Supplementary Table 5:** Differential expression summary statistics of the USTE-response predictor CpGs-
725 associated genes. Columns represent the Ensembl gene ID, the HGNC gene name, the mean difference in
726 $\log_2(\text{fold change})$ between responders and non-responders and the nominal p-value associated with the mean
727 difference.

728 **Supplementary Figures**

729 **Supplementary Fig. 1:** Longitudinal differential methylation of vedolizumab response-associated predictor CpGs.
730 Individual boxplots and temporal stability of the 25 VDZ-associated predictor CpGs over time. Top: jitterplot
731 visualization with samples obtained from the same donor connected by a dotted line annotated with the two-way
732 consistency intra-class correlation coefficient and the 95% confidence intervals. Bottom: boxplot visualization
733 grouped by response and stratified by timepoint. Annotations include nominal p-value as determined through
734 response-associated differential methylation analyses for samples obtained pretreatment (T1) or during response
735 assessment (T2). Green and red represent responders (R) and non-responders (NR), respectively.

736 **Supplementary Fig. 2:** Longitudinal differential methylation of ustekinumab response-associated predictor
737 CpGs. Individual boxplots and temporal stability of the 68 USTE-associated predictor CpGs over time. Top:
738 jitterplot visualization with samples obtained from the same donor connected by a dotted line annotated with the
739 two-way consistency intra-class correlation coefficient and the 95% confidence intervals. Bottom: boxplot
740 visualization grouped by response and stratified by timepoint. Annotations include nominal p-value as determined
741 through response-associated differential methylation analyses for samples obtained pretreatment (T1) or during
742 response assessment (T2). Green and red represent responders (R) and non-responders (NR), respectively.

743 **Supplementary Fig. 3:** Stratified prediction analyses. Receiver operating characteristics plots showing the mean
744 area under the curve (AUC) performance of the validation cohort patients that were a) assessed using either the
745 strict (NVDZ = 8, NUSTE = 8; blue) or modified (NVDZ =17, NUSTE = 25; pink) response criteria, and b) either
746 anti-TNF exposed (NVDZ = 12, NUSTE = 21; black) or non-exposed (NVDZ = 13, NUSTE = 12; yellow) for VDZ
747 (left) and USTE (right).

748 **Supplementary Fig. 4:** Analyses of markers of IBD-associated inflammation. Volcano plot representing the
749 differential methylation analyses regressing against a) C-reactive protein (CRP) and b) fecal calprotectin (FCP)
750 pretreatment (T1) for VDZ (left) and USTE (right). Grey dots represent all CpG loci located on the Illumina
751 HumanMethylation EPIC BeadChip array and black dots represent response-associated predictor CpGs. X-axis
752 represents mean difference in percentage methylation, Y-axis represents the statistical significance as depicted
753 in $-\log_{10}(\text{p-value})$. CpGs with a nominal p-value < 0.05 are annotated.

754

755 References

- 756 1. de Souza, H.S. & Fiocchi, C. Immunopathogenesis of IBD: current state of the art.
757 *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* **13**, 13-27 (2016).
- 758 2. Liu, J.Z., *et al.* Association analyses identify 38 susceptibility loci for inflammatory
759 bowel disease and highlight shared genetic risk across populations. *Nat Genet* **47**,
760 979-986 (2015).
- 761 3. Alsoud, D., Vermeire, S. & Verstockt, B. Biomarker discovery for personalized
762 therapy selection in inflammatory bowel diseases: Challenges and promises. *Curr*
763 *Res Pharmacol Drug Discov* **3**, 100089 (2022).
- 764 4. Juillerat, P., Grueber, M.M., Ruetsch, R., Santi, G., Vuillemoz, M. & Michetti, P.
765 Positioning biologics in the treatment of IBD: A practical guide - Which mechanism of
766 action for whom? *Curr Res Pharmacol Drug Discov* **3**, 100104 (2022).
- 767 5. Loftus, E.V., Jr., *et al.* Upadacitinib Induction and Maintenance Therapy for Crohn's
768 Disease. *N Engl J Med* **388**, 1966-1980 (2023).
- 769 6. D'Haens, G., *et al.* Risankizumab as induction therapy for Crohn's disease: results
770 from the phase 3 ADVANCE and MOTIVATE induction trials. *Lancet* **399**, 2015-2030
771 (2022).
- 772 7. Lowenberg, M., *et al.* Vedolizumab Induces Endoscopic and Histologic Remission in
773 Patients With Crohn's Disease. *Gastroenterology* **157**, 997-1006 e1006 (2019).
- 774 8. Sands, B.E., *et al.* Ustekinumab versus adalimumab for induction and maintenance
775 therapy in biologic-naive patients with moderately to severely active Crohn's disease:
776 a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, parallel-group, phase 3b trial. *Lancet* **399**,
777 2200-2211 (2022).
- 778 9. Colombel, J.F., *et al.* Infliximab, azathioprine, or combination therapy for Crohn's
779 disease. *N Engl J Med* **362**, 1383-1395 (2010).
- 780 10. Dulai, P.S., *et al.* Development and Validation of Clinical Scoring Tool to Predict
781 Outcomes of Treatment With Vedolizumab in Patients With Ulcerative Colitis. *Clin*
782 *Gastroenterol Hepatol* **18**, 2952-2961 e2958 (2020).
- 783 11. Verstockt, B., *et al.* Expression Levels of 4 Genes in Colon Tissue Might Be Used to
784 Predict Which Patients Will Enter Endoscopic Remission After Vedolizumab Therapy
785 for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* **18**, 1142-1151 e1110
786 (2020).
- 787 12. Verstockt, B., *et al.* Low TREM1 expression in whole blood predicts anti-TNF
788 response in inflammatory bowel disease. *EBioMedicine* **40**, 733-742 (2019).
- 789 13. Verstockt, B., *et al.* DOP70 An integrated multi-omics biomarker predicting
790 endoscopic response in ustekinumab treated patients with Crohn's disease. *Journal*
791 *of Crohn's and Colitis* **13**, S072-S073 (2019).
- 792 14. Soendergaard, C., Seidelin, J.B., Steenholdt, C. & Nielsen, O.H. Putative biomarkers
793 of vedolizumab resistance and underlying inflammatory pathways involved in IBD.
794 *BMJ Open Gastroenterol* **5**, e000208 (2018).
- 795 15. Ananthakrishnan, A.N., *et al.* Gut Microbiome Function Predicts Response to Anti-
796 integrin Biologic Therapy in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases. *Cell Host Microbe* **21**,
797 603-610 e603 (2017).
- 798 16. Lee, J.W.J., *et al.* Multi-omics reveal microbial determinants impacting responses to
799 biologic therapies in inflammatory bowel disease. *Cell Host Microbe* **29**, 1294-1304
800 e1294 (2021).
- 801 17. Stevens, T.W., *et al.* Systematic review: predictive biomarkers of therapeutic
802 response in inflammatory bowel disease-personalised medicine in its infancy. *Aliment*
803 *Pharmacol Ther* **48**, 1213-1231 (2018).
- 804 18. Gisbert, J.P. & Chaparro, M. Predictors of Primary Response to Biologic Treatment
805 [Anti-TNF, Vedolizumab, and Ustekinumab] in Patients With Inflammatory Bowel
806 Disease: From Basic Science to Clinical Practice. *J Crohns Colitis* **14**, 694-709
807 (2020).






- 808 19. Zilbauer, M. & Heuschkel, R. Disease Prognostic Biomarkers in Inflammatory Bowel
809 Diseases-A Reality Check. *J Crohns Colitis* **16**, 162-165 (2022).
- 810 20. Bird, A. DNA methylation patterns and epigenetic memory. *Genes Dev* **16**, 6-21
811 (2002).
- 812 21. Kaluscha, S., *et al.* Evidence that direct inhibition of transcription factor binding is the
813 prevailing mode of gene and repeat repression by DNA methylation. *Nat Genet* **54**,
814 1895-1906 (2022).
- 815 22. de Mendoza, A., *et al.* Large-scale manipulation of promoter DNA methylation
816 reveals context-specific transcriptional responses and stability. *Genome Biol* **23**, 163
817 (2022).
- 818 23. Hornschuh, M., Wirthgen, E., Wolfien, M., Singh, K.P., Wolkenhauer, O. & Dabritz, J.
819 The role of epigenetic modifications for the pathogenesis of Crohn's disease. *Clin*
820 *Epigenetics* **13**, 108 (2021).
- 821 24. Peery, R.C., Pammi, M., Claud, E. & Shen, L. Epigenome - A mediator for host-
822 microbiome crosstalk. *Semin Perinatol* **45**, 151455 (2021).
- 823 25. Qin, Y. & Wade, P.A. Crosstalk between the microbiome and epigenome: messages
824 from bugs. *J Biochem* **163**, 105-112 (2018).
- 825 26. Li, Y., *et al.* Intestinal mucosa-derived DNA methylation signatures in the penetrating
826 intestinal mucosal lesions of Crohn's disease. *Sci Rep* **11**, 9771 (2021).
- 827 27. Sadler, T., *et al.* Genome-wide analysis of DNA methylation and gene expression
828 defines molecular characteristics of Crohn's disease-associated fibrosis. *Clin*
829 *Epigenetics* **8**, 30 (2016).
- 830 28. Adams, A.T., *et al.* Two-stage Genome-wide Methylation Profiling in Childhood-onset
831 Crohn's Disease Implicates Epigenetic Alterations at the VMP1/MIR21 and HLA
832 Loci. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* **20**, 1784--1793 (2014).
- 833 29. Ventham, N.T., *et al.* Integrative epigenome-wide analysis demonstrates that DNA
834 methylation may mediate genetic risk in inflammatory bowel disease. *Nature*
835 *Communications* **7**, 13507 (2016).
- 836 30. Li Yim, A.Y.F., *et al.* Peripheral blood methylation profiling of female Crohn's disease
837 patients. *Clin Epigenetics* **8**, 65 (2016).
- 838 31. Howell, K.J., *et al.* DNA Methylation and Transcription Patterns in Intestinal Epithelial
839 Cells From Pediatric Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Diseases Differentiate
840 Disease Subtypes and Associate With Outcome. *Gastroenterology* **154**, 585--598
841 (2018).
- 842 32. Gasparetto, M., *et al.* Transcription and DNA Methylation Patterns of Blood-Derived
843 CD8(+) T Cells Are Associated With Age and Inflammatory Bowel Disease But Do
844 Not Predict Prognosis. *Gastroenterology* (2020).
- 845 33. Li Yim, A.Y.F., *et al.* Whole-Genome DNA Methylation Profiling of CD14+ Monocytes
846 Reveals Disease Status and Activity Differences in Crohn's Disease Patients. *J Clin*
847 *Med* **9**(2020).
- 848 34. Meinshausen, N. & Bühlmann, P. Stability Selection *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
849 *Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **72**, 417/473 (2010).
- 850 35. Chen, T. & Guestrin, C. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. . in
851 *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge*
852 *Discovery and Data Mining* 785–794 (New York, 2016).
- 853 36. Joustra V., L.Y.A. Long-term temporal stability of peripheral blood DNA methylation
854 alterations in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. (BioRxiv, 2022).
- 855 37. Koo, T.K. & Li, M.Y. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation
856 Coefficients for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med* **15**, 155-163 (2016).
- 857 38. Tsai, P.C., *et al.* Smoking induces coordinated DNA methylation and gene
858 expression changes in adipose tissue with consequences for metabolic health. *Clin*
859 *Epigenetics* **10**, 126 (2018).
- 860 39. Houseman, E.A., Kelsey, K.T., Wiencke, J.K. & Marsit, C.J. Cell-composition effects
861 in the analysis of DNA methylation array data: a mathematical perspective. *BMC*
862 *Bioinformatics* **16**, 95 (2015).





- 863 40. Solomon, O., *et al.* Meta-analysis of epigenome-wide association studies in
864 newborns and children show widespread sex differences in blood DNA methylation.
865 *Mutat Res-Rev Mutat* **789**(2022).
- 866 41. Dobbs, K.R., *et al.* Age-related differences in monocyte DNA methylation and
867 immune function in healthy Kenyan adults and children. *Immun Ageing* **18**, 11 (2021).
- 868 42. Sominen, H.K., *et al.* Blood-Derived DNA Methylation Signatures of Crohn Disease
869 and Severity of Intestinal Inflammation. *Gastroenterology* (2019).
- 870 43. Kappelman, M.D., *et al.* Real-World Evidence Comparing Vedolizumab and
871 Ustekinumab in Antitumor Necrosis Factor-Experienced Patients With Crohn's
872 Disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* **118**, 674-684 (2023).
- 873 44. Torres, J., *et al.* ECCO Guidelines on Therapeutics in Crohn's Disease: Medical
874 Treatment. *J Crohns Colitis* **14**, 4-22 (2020).
- 875 45. Siegel, C., *et al.* P714 Mucosal healing in CD with vedolizumab versus other
876 biologics: endoscopic outcomes during long-term routine care in a multinational
877 observational study. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis* **17**, i844-i844 (2023).
- 878 46. Danese, S., *et al.* Treat to target versus standard of care for patients with Crohn's
879 disease treated with ustekinumab (STARDUST): an open-label, multicentre,
880 randomised phase 3b trial. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **7**, 294-306 (2022).
- 881 47. Feagan, B.G., *et al.* Rapid Response to Vedolizumab Therapy in Biologic-Naive
882 Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Diseases. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* **17**, 130-138
883 e137 (2019).
- 884 48. Sandborn, W.J., *et al.* Long-term efficacy and safety of ustekinumab for Crohn's
885 disease through the second year of therapy. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* **48**, 65-77
886 (2018).
- 887 49. Feagan, B.G., *et al.* Ustekinumab as Induction and Maintenance Therapy for Crohn's
888 Disease. *N Engl J Med* **375**, 1946-1960 (2016).
- 889 50. Mishra, N., *et al.* Longitudinal multi-omics analysis identifies early blood-based
890 predictors of anti-TNF therapy response in inflammatory bowel disease. *Genome*
891 *Med* **14**, 110 (2022).
- 892 51. Lin, S., *et al.* Whole blood DNA methylation changes are associated with anti-TNF
893 drug concentration in patients with Crohn's disease. *J Crohns Colitis* (2023).
- 894 52. Kennedy, N.A., *et al.* Predictors of anti-TNF treatment failure in anti-TNF-naive
895 patients with active luminal Crohn's disease: a prospective, multicentre, cohort study.
896 *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **4**, 341-353 (2019).
- 897 53. Joustra, V., *et al.* Long-term Temporal Stability of Peripheral Blood DNA Methylation
898 Profiles in Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease. *Cell Mol Gastroenterol Hepatol*
899 **15**, 869-885 (2023).
- 900 54. Ido, H., *et al.* Molecular dissection of the alpha-dystroglycan- and integrin-binding
901 sites within the globular domain of human laminin-10. *J Biol Chem* **279**, 10946-10954
902 (2004).
- 903 55. Ulazzi, L., *et al.* Nidogen 1 and 2 gene promoters are aberrantly methylated in human
904 gastrointestinal cancer. *Mol Cancer* **6**, 17 (2007).
- 905 56. Yuan, L., *et al.* RhoJ is an endothelial cell-restricted Rho GTPase that mediates
906 vascular morphogenesis and is regulated by the transcription factor ERG. *Blood* **118**,
907 1145-1153 (2011).
- 908 57. Park, S.Y., *et al.* RhoA/ROCK-dependent pathway is required for TLR2-mediated IL-
909 23 production in human synovial macrophages: Suppression by cilostazol. *Biochem*
910 *Pharmacol* **86**, 1320-1327 (2013).
- 911 58. Zeng, R.J., Zhuo, Z.W., Luo, Y.J., Sha, W.H. & Chen, H. Rho GTPase signaling in
912 rheumatic diseases. *Iscience* **25**(2022).
- 913 59. Sandi, M.J., *et al.* MARK3-mediated phosphorylation of ARHGEF2 couples
914 microtubules to the actin cytoskeleton to establish cell polarity. *Sci Signal* **10**(2017).
- 915 60. Hu, Y.J., *et al.* PCGF3 promotes the proliferation and migration of non-small cell lung
916 cancer cells via the PI3K/AKT signaling pathway. *Exp Cell Res* **400**(2021).


- 917 61. Zhuang, G.Q., *et al.* A Novel Regulator of Macrophage Activation miR-223 in
918 Obesity-Associated Adipose Tissue Inflammation. *Circulation* **125**, 2892-+ (2012).
- 919 62. Jiao, P., *et al.* miR-223: An Effective Regulator of Immune Cell Differentiation and
920 Inflammation. *Int J Biol Sci* **17**, 2308-2322 (2021).
- 921 63. Wright, P.B., *et al.* The mannose receptor (CD206) identifies a population of colonic
922 macrophages in health and inflammatory bowel disease. *Sci Rep* **11**, 19616 (2021).
- 923 64. Koelink, P.J., *et al.* Anti-TNF therapy in IBD exerts its therapeutic effect through
924 macrophage IL-10 signalling. *Gut* **69**, 1053-1063 (2020).
- 925 65. Lu, W., *et al.* The microRNA miR-22 inhibits the histone deacetylase HDAC4 to
926 promote T(H)17 cell-dependent emphysema. *Nat Immunol* **16**, 1185-1194 (2015).
- 927 66. Glauben, R., Sonnenberg, E., Wetzel, M., Mascagni, P. & Siegmund, B. Histone
928 Deacetylase Inhibitors Modulate Interleukin 6-dependent CD4(+) T Cell Polarization
929 in Vitro and in Vivo. *J Biol Chem* **289**, 6142-6151 (2014).
- 930 67. Brusselle, G.G. & Bracke, K.R. MicroRNA miR-22 drives T(H)17 responses in
931 emphysema. *Nat Immunol* **16**, 1109-1110 (2015).
- 932 68. Dou, B., Ma, F.Z., Jiang, Z.Y. & Zhao, L. Blood HDAC4 Variation Links With Disease
933 Activity and Response to Tumor Necrosis Factor Inhibitor and Regulates CD4+T Cell
934 Differentiation in Ankylosing Spondylitis. *Front Med-Lausanne* **9**(2022).
- 935 69. Brusselle, G.G. & Bracke, K.R. MicroRNA miR-22 drives T(H)17 responses in
936 emphysema. *Nat Immunol* **16**, 1109-1110 (2015).
- 937 70. Browning, L.M., *et al.* TGF-beta-mediated enhancement of TH17 cell generation is
938 inhibited by bone morphogenetic protein receptor 1alpha signaling. *Sci Signal*
939 **11**(2018).
- 940 71. Kuczma, M. & Kraj, P. Bone Morphogenetic Protein Signaling Regulates
941 Development and Activation of CD4(+) T Cells. *Vitam Horm* **99**, 171-193 (2015).
- 942 72. Lu, L., *et al.* Synergistic effect of TGF-beta superfamily members on the induction of
943 Foxp3(+) Treg. *Eur J Immunol* **40**, 142-152 (2010).
- 944 73. Park, S.H., *et al.* Hypermethylation of EBF3 and IRX1 genes in synovial fibroblasts of
945 patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Mol Cells* **35**, 298-304 (2013).
- 946 74. Stockinger, B. & Veldhoen, M. Differentiation and function of Th17 T cells. *Curr Opin*
947 *Immunol* **19**, 281-286 (2007).
- 948 75. Lyakh, L., Trinchieri, G., Provezza, L., Carra, G. & Gerosa, F. Regulation of
949 interleukin-12/interleukin-23 production and the T-helper 17 response in humans.
950 *Immunol Rev* **226**, 112-131 (2008).
- 951 76. Zhao, L., Ghetie, D., Jiang, Z. & Chu, C.-Q. How Can We Manipulate the IL-23/IL-17
952 Axis? *Current Treatment Options in Rheumatology* **1**, 182-196 (2015).
- 953 77. Morishima, N., Mizoguchi, I., Takeda, K., Mizuguchi, J. & Yoshimoto, T. TGF-beta is
954 necessary for induction of IL-23R and Th17 differentiation by IL-6 and IL-23. *Biochem*
955 *Bioph Res Co* **386**, 105-110 (2009).
- 956 78. Rajkovic, A., Lee, J.H., Yan, C. & Matzuk, M.M. The ret finger protein-like 4 gene,
957 Rfpl4, encodes a putative E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase expressed in adult germ cells.
958 *Mech Dev* **112**, 173-177 (2002).
- 959 79. Huang, C. Roles of E3 ubiquitin ligases in cell adhesion and migration. *Cell Adh Migr*
960 **4**, 10-18 (2010).
- 961 80. Tsai, P.C. & Bell, J.T. Power and sample size estimation for epigenome-wide
962 association scans to detect differential DNA methylation. *Int J Epidemiol* **44**, 1429-
963 1441 (2015).
- 964 81. Rees, C. & Penman, I. Has the COVID-19 pandemic changed endoscopy in the UK
965 forever? *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **8**, 6-8 (2023).
- 966 82. Lappalainen, T. & Grealis, J.M. Associating cellular epigenetic models with human
967 phenotypes. *Nat Rev Genet* **18**, 441-451 (2017).
- 968 83. Villicana, S., *et al.* Genetic impacts on DNA methylation help elucidate regulatory
969 genomic processes. *Genome Biol* **24**, 176 (2023).

- 970 84. Yu, A.P., Cabanilla, L.A., Wu, E.Q., Mulani, P.M. & Chao, J. The costs of Crohn's
971 disease in the United States and other Western countries: a systematic review. *Curr*
972 *Med Res Opin* **24**, 319-328 (2008).
- 973 85. Mehta, F. Report: economic implications of inflammatory bowel disease and its
974 management. *Am J Manag Care* **22**, s51-60 (2016).
- 975 86. Jackson, B., Con, D., Ma, R., Gorelik, A., Liew, D. & De Cruz, P. Health care costs
976 associated with Australian tertiary inflammatory bowel disease care. *Scand J*
977 *Gastroenterol* **52**, 851-856 (2017).
- 978 87. Ghosh, N. & Premchand, P. A UK cost of care model for inflammatory bowel disease.
979 *Frontline Gastroenterol* **6**, 169-174 (2015).
- 980 88. Rubin, D.T., Mody, R., Davis, K.L. & Wang, C.C. Real-world assessment of therapy
981 changes, suboptimal treatment and associated costs in patients with ulcerative colitis
982 or Crohn's disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* **39**, 1143-1155 (2014).
- 983 89. Noor, N.M., *et al.* A biomarker-stratified comparison of top-down versus accelerated
984 step-up treatment strategies for patients with newly diagnosed Crohn's disease
985 (PROFILE): a multicentre, open-label randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*
986 *Gastroenterol Hepatol* **9**, 415-427 (2024).
- 987 90. DNA methylation markers to predict treatment success of biologicals in Crohn's
988 disease.
- 989 91. Vermeire, S., Schreiber, S., Sandborn, W.J., Dubois, C. & Rutgeerts, P. Correlation
990 between the Crohn's disease activity and Harvey-Bradshaw indices in assessing
991 Crohn's disease severity. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* **8**, 357-363 (2010).
- 992 92. Molder, F., *et al.* Sustainable data analysis with Snakemake. *F1000Res* **10**, 33
993 (2021).
- 994 93. Aryee, M.J., *et al.* Minfi: a flexible and comprehensive Bioconductor package for the
995 analysis of Infinium DNA methylation microarrays. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1363-1369
996 (2014).
- 997 94. Fortin, J.P., Triche, T.J., Jr. & Hansen, K.D. Preprocessing, normalization and
998 integration of the Illumina HumanMethylationEPIC array with minfi. *Bioinformatics* **33**,
999 558-560 (2017).
- 1000 95. Fortin, J.P., Fertig, E. & Hansen, K. shinyMethyl: interactive quality control of Illumina
1001 450k DNA methylation arrays in R. *F1000Res* **3**, 175 (2014).
- 1002 96. Heiss, J.A. & Just, A.C. Identifying mislabeled and contaminated DNA methylation
1003 microarray data: an extended quality control toolset with examples from GEO. *Clin*
1004 *Epigenetics* **10**, 73 (2018).
- 1005 97. Horvath, S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. *Genome Biol* **14**,
1006 R115 (2013).
- 1007 98. Fortin, J.P., *et al.* Functional normalization of 450k methylation array data improves
1008 replication in large cancer studies. *Genome Biol* **15**, 503 (2014).
- 1009 99. Javierre, B.M., *et al.* Lineage-Specific Genome Architecture Links Enhancers and
1010 Non-coding Disease Variants to Target Gene Promoters. *Cell* **167**, 1369-1384 e1319
1011 (2016).
- 1012 100. Johnson, W.E., Li, C. & Rabinovic, A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray
1013 expression data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics* **8**, 118-127 (2007).
- 1014 101. Leek, J.T., Johnson, W.E., Parker, H.S., Jaffe, A.E. & Storey, J.D. The sva package
1015 for removing batch effects and other unwanted variation in high-throughput
1016 experiments. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 882-883 (2012).
- 1017 102. Daca-Roszak, P., *et al.* Impact of SNPs on methylation readouts by Illumina Infinium
1018 HumanMethylation450 BeadChip Array: implications for comparative population
1019 studies. *BMC Genomics* **16**, 1003 (2015).
- 1020 103. Andrews, S.V., Ladd-Acosta, C., Feinberg, A.P., Hansen, K.D. & Fallin, M.D. "Gap
1021 hunting" to characterize clustered probe signals in Illumina methylation array data.
1022 *Epigenetics Chromatin* **9**, 56 (2016).
- 1023 104. Friedman, J.H. Greedy Function Approximation: A Gradient Boosting Machine. *The*
1024 *Annals of Statistics* **29**, 1189-1232 (2001).

- 1025 105. J., P., E., S., A., Z. & E., L. Covered Information Disentanglement: Model
1026 Transparency via Unbiased Permutation Importance. in *The Thirty-Sixth AAAI*
1027 *Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-22)* (2022).
- 1028 106. Demsar, J. & Zupan, B. Hands-on training about overfitting. *PLoS Comput Biol* **17**,
1029 e1008671 (2021).
- 1030 107. Ritchie, M.E., *et al.* limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-
1031 sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Res* **43**, e47 (2015).
- 1032 108. Smyth, G.K. Linear models and empirical bayes methods for assessing differential
1033 expression in microarray experiments. *Stat Appl Genet Mol Biol* **3**, Article3 (2004).
- 1034 109. Houseman, E.A., *et al.* DNA methylation arrays as surrogate measures of cell
1035 mixture distribution. *BMC Bioinformatics* **13**, 86 (2012).
- 1036 110. Salas, L.A., *et al.* An optimized library for reference-based deconvolution of whole-
1037 blood biospecimens assayed using the Illumina HumanMethylationEPIC BeadArray.
1038 *Genome Biol* **19**, 64 (2018).
- 1039 111. Wickham, H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*, (Springer-Verlag New
1040 York, 2016).
- 1041 112. Ewels, P., Magnusson, M., Lundin, S. & Kaller, M. MultiQC: summarize analysis
1042 results for multiple tools and samples in a single report. *Bioinformatics* **32**, 3047-3048
1043 (2016).
- 1044 113. Dobin, A., *et al.* STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 15-21
1045 (2013).
- 1046 114. Li, H., *et al.* The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**,
1047 2078-2079 (2009).
- 1048 115. Liao, Y., Smyth, G.K. & Shi, W. featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program
1049 for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 923-930
1050 (2014).
- 1051 116. H, W. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis* [Internet]. *New York, NY:*
1052 *Springer-Verlag New York* (2009).
- 1053







● Uncorrected ● Corrected

