

New Practical Aspects of Sweet Syndrome

**Journal:** *American Journal of Clinical Dermatology*

**Authors:** Tejas P. Joshi, Sarah K. Friske, David A. Hsiou, Madeleine Duvic

**Corresponding Author:** Tejas P. Joshi

**Corresponding Author Affiliation:** School of Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine

**E-mail:** tejas.joshi@bcm.edu

**Declarations:**

**Funding Sources:** John R Stanton Fellowship; Blanche Bender Professorship for Cancer Research; MD Anderson Core Grant P30 CA16672

**Conflicts of Interest:** Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Supplementary Table 1** Naranjo adverse drug reaction probability scale [3]

Question	Yes	No	Do not know
1. Are there previous <i>conclusive</i> reports on this reaction?	+1	0	0
2. Did the adverse event occur after the drug was administered?	+2	-1	0
3. Did the adverse reaction improve when the drug was discontinued or a <i>specific</i> antagonist was administered?	+1	0	0
4. Did the adverse reaction reappear when the drug was readministered?	+2	-1	0
5. Are there alternative causes (other than the drug) that could have on their own caused the reaction?	-1	+2	0
6. Did the reaction reappear when a placebo was given?	-1	+1	0
7. Was the drug detected in the blood (or other fluids) in concentrations known to be toxic?	+1	0	0
8. Was the reaction more severe when the dose was increased or less severe when the dose was decreased?	+1	0	0
9. Did the patient have a similar reaction to the same or similar drug in <i>any</i> previous exposure?	+1	0	0
10. Was the adverse event confirmed by any objective evidence?	+1	0	0

**Supplementary Table 2** Tool for evaluating the methodological quality of case reports and case series, as proposed by Murad and colleagues [4]

Domains	Leading Explanatory Questions	Points
Selection	1. Does the patient(s) represent(s) the whole experience of the investigator (center) or is the selection method unclear to the extent that other patients with similar presentation may not have been reported?	1 point
Ascertainment	2. Was the exposure adequately ascertained?	1 point
	3. Was the outcome adequately ascertained?	1 point
Causality	4. Were other alternative causes that may explain the observation ruled out?	1 point
	5. Was there a challenge/rechallenge phenomenon?	1 point
	6. Was there a dose–response effect?	1 point
	7. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur?	1 point
Reporting	8. Is the case(s) described with sufficient details to allow other investigators to replicate the research or to allow practitioners to make inferences related to their own practice?	1 point