Supplementary Table 1: Comparison of patients with teleangiectacias and patients without teleangiectacias for determinants for immunosuppressive medication, vascular complications and gastrointestinal interventions

1 0				
	Teleangiectacias	Teleangiectacias	P value	
	absent, n=93	present, n= 133		
	(41%)	(59%)		
mRSS, mean (SD)	6.2 (10)	4.7 (6)	ns	
Interstitial lung disease, n (%)	48 (52%)	65 (49%)	ns	
Diffuse cutaneous SSc, n (%)	35 (38%)	38 (29%)	ns	
Disease duration, years; mean (SD)	4.7 (6.4)	8.3 (8.4)	0.001	
Additional pulmonary function test	19 (20%)	14 (11%)	0.038	
indicated within 12 months after care				
pathway, n (%)				
Calcinosis, n (%)	6 (7%)	33 (25%)	< 0.001	
Digital Ulcers, n (%)	21 (23%)	22 (17%)	ns	
Estimated SPAP by cardiac ultrasound > 35	18 (26%)	38 (34%)	ns	
mmHg, n (%)*				
Discussion of patient's case in	5 (5%)	18 (14%)	0.049	
multidisciplinary PAH meeting, n (%)				
Additional cardiac ultrasound indicated	1 (1%)	7 (5%)	0.09	
within 12 months after care pathway, n (%)				
Start of medication for peripheral vascular	18 (19%)	40 (30%)	0.069	
complications, n (%)				
Referral to gastro-enterologist, including	14 (15%)	21 (16%)	ns	
requests for specific additional				
investigations				
Start of proton pump inhibitor or laxantia	13 (14%)	16 (12%)	ns	
mRSS = modified Rodnan Skin score, SPAP = systolic arterial pulmonary pressure; PAH =				

mRSS = modified Rodnan Skin score, SPAP = systolic arterial pulmonary pressure; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; * available in n = 182

Translation of questionnaire

Organisation

1.	 Did you get sufficient information on the health care program beforehand? Yes, sufficient No, not sufficient. No opinion.
	In case you were not adequately informed, which aspects did you not know of beforehand?
2.	Did you get sufficient information specific medical diagnostic tests beforehand, including cardiac ultrasound, pulmonary function test etc? O Yes, sufficient O No, not sufficient. O No opinion.
	In case you were not adequately informed, which aspects did you not know of beforehand?
3.	Was the care pathway in line with your health care needs, as evaluated by the questionnaire? O Yes O No. O No opinion.
	Remarks:
4.	What was your opinion about the time schedule during the 2 days? Output Insufficient. No opinion.
	Remarks:
5.	Did the physician make an appointment with you to discuss the results? O Yes No

Health care

	iii cai c	1.1.19			1 6 1 7 11 7
				r opinio	on on a scale from 1 to 5, with $5 =$
	atisfactory, and				1.0
6.	Were you sati		way you was v	velcome	
	Very unsatisfi	_	2	4	very satisfied
	1	2	3	4	5
	Remark:				
	What should l	be changed?			
7.	Were you sati Very unsatisfi	sfied about the	heath care pro	viders?	very satisfied
	1	2	3	4	5
	Remark:				
	What should l	be changed?			
8. 9.	Very unsatisfi			-	very satisfied
	1	2	3	4	5
	Remark:				
	What should l	be changed?			
10	. Were you sat		e specific knov	wledge (on systemic sclerosis of the health
	Very unsatisfi	ied			very satisfied
	1	2	3	4	5
	Remark:				
	Is there a spec	cific area where	there is lack o	f knowl	edge?
11	. Were you sati Rheumatolog Very unsatisfi	gist	:		very satisfied
	1	2	3	4	5

Remark:			
What should be changed?			
Specialized nurse Very unsatisfied 1 2	3	4	very satisfied 5
Remark:			
What should be changed?			
If applicable: Physical therapist Very unsatisfied 1 2	3	4	very satisfied 5
Remark:			
What should be changed?			
Occupational therapist Very unsatisfied 1 2 Remark:	3	4	very satisfied 5
Remark:			
What should be changed?			
Social worker Very unsatisfied 1 2 Remark:	3	4	very satisfied 5
What should be changed?			

How would you grade the care pathway in general, including organisation, health care providers and food and drinks, and if applicable your stay in the hospital?

Very unsatisfactory highly satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What should be changed?

12. Do you have any other remarks or suggestions?