Title:

Real-world evidence of clinical outcomes of the use of the adalimumab biosimilar SB5 in rheumatic and digestive IMIDs: 12-month data from the PERFUSE study

Authors:

- Bruno Fautrel,
- Yoram Bouhnik,
- Carine Salliot,
- Franck Carbonnel,
- Mathurin Fumery,
- Christophe Bernardeau,
- Yves Maugars,
- Mathurin Flamant
- Fabienne Coury,
- * Ben Braithwaite,
- Janet Addison,
- On behalf of the PERFUSE investigators.

* Corresponding Author:

Ben Braithwaite, Sanoïa e-Health Services, Gémenos, France, 0000-0002-7378-1034

email address: <u>bbraithwaite@sanoia.com</u>

Supplementary Table S8: STROBE cohort checklist.

	Item No	Recommendation	Manuscript Mapping
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a	"Real-world evidence of clinical
		commonly used term in the title or the abstract	outcomes of the long-term use"
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and	Provided.
		balanced summary of what was done and what	
		was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale	Done – 1. Introduction
		for the investigation being reported	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any	Done – 1. Introduction (Final
		prespecified hypotheses	paragraph)
			Expanded upon in 2.1. Study
			Design
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in	Done – 2.1. Study Design
		the paper	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant	Done – 2.1. Study Design
		dates, including periods of recruitment,	2.2. Data Collection
		exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources	Done – 2.1. Study Design
		and methods of selection of participants.	2.2. Data Collection
		Describe methods of follow-up	
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria	Done for SNDS Matching – 2.2.2.
		and number of exposed and unexposed	SB5 Treatment Persistence
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures,	Done – 2.2. Data Collection
		predictors, potential confounders, and effect	
		modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if	
		applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of	Done – 2.2. Data Collection
measurement		data and details of methods of assessment	
		(measurement). Describe comparability of	
		assessment methods if there is more than one	
		group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
		sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
			This is an observational study, and
			the sample was also limited by
			recruitment capacity and time
			constraints.
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
		handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe	
		which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
		those used to control for confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

		subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
		(<i>d</i>) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
			Dong 2.2 Statistical Analysis
		(<i>e</i>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Done – 2.3. Statistical Analysis
Results	10.1		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage	Done – 3.1. and Fig. 1
		of study—eg numbers potentially eligible,	
		examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible,	
		included in the study, completing follow-up,	
		and analysed	Dana 21 and Fig 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each	Done – 3.1. and Fig. 1
		stage	Dana Eig 1
	14*	(c) Consider use of a flow diagram(a) Give characteristics of study participants	Done – Fig. 1 Done – 3.1. and Tables 1 & 2
Descriptive data	14.		Done -5.1 and Tables 1 & 2
		(eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential	
		confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with	Done – Data Density is reported
		missing data for each variable of interest	for each analysis performed
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and	Done – Persistence Analysis
		total amount)	presented in 3.3.
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary	Done – Persistence Analysis
Juitoine uala	10	measures over time	presented in 3.3.
Main results	16	(<i>a</i>) Give unadjusted estimates and, if	Done – All results are reported as
iviani results	10	applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and	appropriate for type and density of
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval).	data.
		Make clear which confounders were adjusted	
		for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when	Done – All results are reported as
		continuous variables were categorized	appropriate for type and density of data.
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of	Multivariate Analysis presents
		relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful	odds ratios as is appropriate for
		time period	this type of data.
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of	Done – All results are reported as
e uner unimpeer	- /	subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity	appropriate for type and density of
		analyses	data for subgroup analyses also.
Discussion		•	
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study	Done – Key results are
		objectives	summarised in the opening
			paragraph.
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into	Done – Both methodological and
		account sources of potential bias or	data-related limitations are
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and	discussed with regard to available
		magnitude of any potential bias	literature.
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results	Done – Results are discussed with
		considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity	regard to available literature.
		of analyses, results from similar studies, and	
		3	

		other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity)	Done – Results are discussed with
		of the study results	regard to available literature.
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the	Done – Declarations Section
		funders for the present study and, if applicable,	completed.
		for the original study on which the present	
		article is based	

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at http://www.strobe-statement.org.