

**Note to readers with disabilities:** *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to [508 standards](#) due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact [ehp508@niehs.nih.gov](mailto:ehp508@niehs.nih.gov). Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

### **Supplemental Material**

#### **Associations between Exposure to Organochlorine Chemicals and Endometriosis: A Systematic Review of Experimental Studies and Integration of Epidemiological Evidence**

Komodo Matta, Meriem Koual, Stéphane Ploteau, Xavier Coumoul, Karine Audouze, Bruno Le Bizec, Jean-Philippe Antignac, and German Cano-Sancho

#### **Table of Contents**

##### **Section 1: Tables**

**Table S1.** Search string for PUBMED.

**Table S2.** List of all organochlorine chemicals identified as Persistent Organic Pollutants listed in the Stockholm Convention (UNEP 2017).

**Table S3.** Data extraction items.

**Table S4.** Summary of confidence rating procedure (OHAT, 2015).

**Table S5.** Determination of initial confidence rating based on confidence features of study design.

**Table S6.** Translation of confidence rating into level of evidence.

**Table S7.** Inventory of chemicals studied in *in vivo* and *in vitro* studies and the number of experiments studying each chemical.

**Table S8.** Inventory of cell types of *in vitro* studies and the number of experiments using each cell type.

##### **Section 2: Figures**

###### **2.1 Methods: Data Extraction Process Examples**

**Figure S1.** Example of general study data form in HAWC.

**Figure S2.** Example of animal bioassay (*in vivo*) experiment(s) form in HAWC.

**Figure S3.** Example of animal bioassay (*in vivo*) experiment data form in HAWC.

**Figure S4.** Example of animal bioassay (*in vivo*) group data form in HAWC.

**Figure S5.** Example of dose-response endpoint visualisation in HAWC.

## 2.2 Methods: Hazard Identification

**Figure S6.** Hazard Identification Scheme.

**Figure S7.** Risk of Bias Assessment of individual studies on all primary endpoints. Ratings are illustrated by percentage (out of 25 total studies; n = 16 for *in vivo* studies, n = 9 for *in vitro* studies). Interactive figure with additional information and justifications in HAWC Figure S7.

**Figure S8.** Risk of bias (RoB) heatmap for TCDD on *in vivo* onset. Key elements are marked by \*. Tiers 1-3 are tiered rankings as determined by responses to the RoB questions. Tier 1 (T1) study responses are mostly “definitely low” and “probably low”. Tier 3 (T3) responses are mostly “not reported” or “probably high” or “definitely high”. Interactive figure with additional information and justifications in HAWC Figure S8.

**Figure S9.** Risk of bias (Rob) heatmap for TCDD on *in vivo* lesion growth. Key elements are marked by \*. Tiers 1-2 are tiered rankings as determined by responses to the RoB questions. Tier 1 (T1) study responses are mostly “definitely low” and “probably low”. Tier 2 (T2) responses are mostly “probably low” with some “not reported”. Interactive figure with additional information and justifications in HAWC Figure S9.

**Figure S10.** Risk of bias (RoB) heatmap for TCDD on *in vitro* migration/invasion. Key elements are marked by \*. Tiers 2-3 are tiered rankings as determined by responses to the RoB questions. Tier 2 (T2) responses are mostly “probably low” with some “not reported”. Tier 3 (T3) responses are mostly “not reported” or “probably high” or “definitely high”. Interactive figure with additional information and justifications in HAWC Figure S10.

**Figure S11.** Risk of bias (RoB) heatmap for TCDD on *in vitro* viability/proliferation. Key elements are marked by \*. Tiers 1-2 are tiered rankings as determined by responses to the RoB questions. Tier 1 (T1) study responses are mostly “definitely low” and “probably low”. Tier 2 (T2) responses are mostly “probably low” with some “not reported”. Interactive figure with additional information and justifications in HAWC Figure S11.

**Figure S12.** Tested doses of TCDD (pg/g TEQ/TCDD) in *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies plotted to compare with measured internal doses from human epidemiological studies.

## **Section 3: Risk of bias**

### **Risk of Bias Response Criteria**

### **References**