

Arthritis

Bibliographic reference	Atzeni et al. (2008)
Study type	Case series
Study quality	<p>The Joanna Briggs Institute Prevalence Critical Appraisal Tool (http://ijhpm.com/article_2870_607.html)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the sample representative of the target population? YES 2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way? NO – Unclear if consecutive sample recruited 3. Was the sample size adequate? YES 4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? YES 5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? YES 6. Were objective, standard criteria used for the measurement of the condition? YES 7. Was the condition measured reliably? YES 8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis? YES 9. Are all important confounding factors/subgroups/differences identified and accounted for? YES 10. Were subpopulations identified using objective criteria? NA <p>Overall risk of bias = MODERATE</p>
Country	Italy
Number of patients	N=20 patients with active rheumatoid arthritis N=50 healthy controls
Study population	<p>Inclusion: patients with active rheumatoid arthritis fulfilling ACR classification criteria for RA and who were being treated with adalimumab and methotrexate (13 also had corticosteroids and 14 NSAIDs)</p> <p>Mean age: 58.5 years (range 28 to 80); 17 women, 3 men; Mean disease duration: 8.6 ± 12.3 years</p>
Control	None
Length of follow-up	Patients tested at baseline and after 6 months of treatment for arthritis
Details of coeliac testing	Anti-tTG (ELISA: Phadia, Freiburg, Germany) – IgA and IgG CD confirmed on biopsy
Results	1 patient (5%) had positive tTG IgA and biopsy-confirmation (both at baseline and at follow-up; anti-tTG IgG was negative for all patients)

Appendix D: Evidence Tables

	(however, anti-tTG IgG levels were elevated during treatment and higher in the study group than among healthy controls both at baseline [p=0.028] and 6 months of treatment [p=0.001])
Source of funding	Not reported
Conflicts of interest	Not reported
Comments	

Definitions of abbreviations are given at the end of this document.

Bibliographic reference	Coacciloli et al. (2010)
Study type	Cross-sectional survey
Study quality	<p>The Joanna Briggs Institute Prevalence Critical Appraisal Tool (http://ijhpm.com/article_2870_607.html)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the sample representative of the target population? YES 2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way? NO – Unclear is consecutive sample recruited 3. Was the sample size adequate? YES 4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? YES 5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? YES 6. Were objective, standard criteria used for the measurement of the condition? YES 7. Was the condition measured reliably? YES 8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis? YES 9. Are all important confounding factors/subgroups/differences identified and accounted for? YES 10. Were subpopulations identified using objective criteria? NA <p>Overall risk of bias = MODERATE</p>
Country	Italy
Number of patients	N=93 patients with rheumatoid or psoriatic arthritis or psoriasis
Study population	<p>Inclusion: patients undergoing treatment under physicians and dermatologists at the Santa Maria Hospital in Terni since July 2006 until October 2008 with rheumatoid or psoriatic arthritis or psoriasis (all were on DMARD therapy)</p> <p>Median age: 55 years (range 8-84) 53 males, 40 females</p> <p>N=15 had rheumatoid arthritis: 6 males with mean age 59 years (32-76); 9 females with age 53 years (42-69)</p>

Appendix D: Evidence Tables

	N=27 had psoriatic arthritis: 13 males with mean age 58 years (43-73); 14 females with age 57 years (25-81) N=51 had psoriasis: 34 males with mean age 56 years (28-80); 17 females with age 52 years (8-72)
Control	None
Length of follow-up	n/a
Details of coeliac testing	EMA (substrate of monkey oesophagus: Biosystems, SA, Barcelona, Spain) and anti-tTG IgA (ELISA: Diamedix Co. subsidiary of IVAX Diagnostics Inc, Miami, FL, USA) and serum Ig Those positive had biopsy
Results	Biopsy-confirmed CD: 0% with RA 0% with psoriatic arthritis were positive 5.9% (3/51) with psoriasis
Source of funding	Not reported
Conflicts of interest	Paper reports that none were declared
Comments	

Definitions of abbreviations are given at the end of this document.

Bibliographic reference	Francis et al. (2002)
Study type	Cross-sectional survey
Study quality	The Joanna Briggs Institute Prevalence Critical Appraisal Tool (http://ijhpm.com/article_2870_607.html) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the sample representative of the target population? YES 2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way? NO – Unclear is consecutive sample recruited 3. Was the sample size adequate? YES 4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? YES 5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? YES 6. Were objective, standard criteria used for the measurement of the condition? YES 7. Was the condition measured reliably? YES 8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis? YES 9. Are all important confounding factors/subgroups/differences identified and accounted for? YES 10. Were subpopulations identified using objective criteria? NA Overall risk of bias = MODERATE
Country	UK

Appendix D: Evidence Tables

Number of patients	N=160 adults with rheumatoid arthritis
Study population	Inclusion: consecutive patients with rheumatoid arthritis attending the rheumatology outpatients, mean age 61yrs (range 20 to 84yrs), N=107 (67%) female, mean disease duration 12yrs
Control	
Results	N=1 with CD, which had been previously diagnosed, prevalence of CD in RA 0 (95% CI; 0 to 24%)
Source of funding	Rheumatology Fund, Lincoln County Hospital, Postgraduate Medical federation, Lincoln
Conflicts of interest	
Comments	

Definitions of abbreviations are given at the end of this document.