# Is there a link between the molecular basis of juvenile idiopathic arthritis and autoimmune diseases? Supplementary material

**Ignacio Ventura, Gemma Clara Meira-Blanco, María Ester Legidos-García, Marcelino Pérez-Bermejo and María Teresa Murillo-Llorente**

**Table S1.** Studies appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist for case control studies

| | Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? | Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? | Were confounding factors identified? | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Score out of 8 (100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shin et al., 2021 [28] | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | 7 (87.5%) |
| Morelle et al., 2021 [29] | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | U | Y | Y | 6 (75%) |
| Wang et al., 2021 [30] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 8 (100%) |
| Tappeiner et al., 2018 [31] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 8 (100%) |
| Ganeya et al., 2020 [35] | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 7 (87.5%) |
| Rumsey et al., 2021 [36] | Y | U | Y | Y | U | Y | N | Y | 5 (62.5%) |

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear; NA: Not applicable

**Table S2.** Studies appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies

| | Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls? | Were cases and controls matched appropriately ? | Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls? | Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way? | Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls? | Were confounding factors identified? | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls? | Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful? | Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Score out of 10 (100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Harms et al., 2020 [24] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | 9 (90%) |
| Kostik et al., 2021 [25] | Y | Y | U | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 8 (80%) |
| Angeles et al., 2021 [26] | Y | Y | Y | U | U | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | 7 (70%) |

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear; NA: Not applicable

**Table S3.** Studies appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist for cohort studies

| | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | Were confounding factors identified? | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? | Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Score out of 11 (100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Van Straalen et al., 2021 [27] | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | N | 8 (72.7%) |
| Lerkvaleekul et al., 2022 [32] | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | N | U | Y | 8 (72.7%) |
| Räisänen et al., 2021 [33] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 11 (100%) |
| Parida et al., 2021 [34] | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | U | U | Y | 8 (72.7%) |

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear; NA: Not applicable