

Supplementary Online Content

Ji-Xu A, Liakos W, Merleev A, Brügger MC, Nelson CA. Assessing the discriminatory ability of diagnostic criteria for ulcerative pyoderma gangrenosum and its mimickers. *JAMA Dermatol*. Published online January 18, 2023. doi:10.1001/jamadermatol.2022.5978

eMethods.

eTable. Published Diagnostic Criteria for Pyoderma Gangrenosum

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

eMethods

Searches were conducted on MEDLINE from January 2000–April 2022. Search terms used for PG cases were “pyoderma gangrenosum” and “pyoderma gangrenosa”. PG cases were included if the age of the patient was >18 years, clinicopathological data was consistent with diagnosis, and the diagnosis was ulcerative PG (in any anatomical region). Cases were excluded if they were previously used to develop diagnostic criteria or if they described atypical (i.e. non-ulcerative) PG. The search term used for PG mimickers was “ulcer”. PG mimicker cases were included if the age of the patient was >18 years, clinicopathological data was consistent with diagnosis, and the diagnosis was a known PG mimicker as previously described in Weenig *et al.*¹: vascular occlusive or venous disease, primary infection, cancer, drug-induced or exogenous tissue injury or vasculitis. Two independent reviewers screened abstracts and articles for inclusion and assigned diagnostic criteria scores to cases. Any disagreements during screening or scoring were resolved by an independent board-certified dermatologist. Authors were contacted for missing data. Statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.1.2 (R Core Team). Discrimination and calibration statistics were first calculated by including cases with complete data only. Results were then validated with imputed case data to explore potential biases due to systemic missingness. Missing data were accounted for using the multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE) framework, under both missing completely at random (MCAR) and missing at random (MAR) assumptions. A two-sided p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

eTable 1. Published Diagnostic Criteria for Pyoderma Gangrenosum

Su criteria (2004)	Delphi consensus criteria (2018)	PARACELsus score (2019)
Requires 2/2 major criteria and 2/4 minor criteria	Requires 1/1 major criterion and 4/8 minor criteria	PG highly likely if ≥ 10 points
Major criteria	Major criterion	Major criteria (three points each)
Rapid progression of a painful, necrolytic cutaneous ulcer with an irregular, violaceous, and undermined border	Biopsy with neutrophilic infiltrate	Progressive course of disease (<6 weeks for development of ulcer)
Exclusion of other causes of cutaneous ulceration		Absence of relevant differential diagnoses Reddish-violaceous wound border
Minor criteria	Minor criteria	Minor criteria (two points each)
Pathergy or cribriform scarring	Exclusion of infection	Amelioration with immunosuppressant
Systemic disease associated with PG	Pathergy	Characteristically bizarre ulcer shape
Histopathologic findings	History of IBD or inflammatory arthritis	Extreme pain (>4/10 on VAS)
Treatment response (rapid response to systemic steroid treatment)	Papule, pustule, or vesicle ulcerating within 4 days of appearing	Localized pathergy phenomenon
	Peripheral erythema, undermining border, and tenderness at ulceration site	Additional criteria (one point each)
	Multiple ulcerations (at least one occurring on an anterior lower leg)	Suppurative inflammation in histopathology
	Cribriform or “wrinkled paper” scarring	Undermined wound border
	Decrease in ulcer size within 1 month of immunosuppressive medication	Associated systemic disease

PG, pyoderma gangrenosum; VAS, visual analog scale; IBD, inflammatory bowel disease.