Kuch A, Procyk G, Borowiec K, et al. The role of MicroRNAs in arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy: A systematic review. Pol Heart J. 2024.

Table S1. PRISMA 2020 checklist

Section and Topic	**Item #**	**Checklist item**	**Location where item is reported**
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review	Title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge	Introduction
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses	MicroRNAs as novel biomarkers
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses	Methods

Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted	Methods
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used	Methods
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process	Methods
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process	Methods
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect	Methods
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information	Methods
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process	Methods
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results	N/A
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5))	N/A

	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses	N/A
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression)	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases)	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome	N/A
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram	Methods and Figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics	Tables 1–3
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study	Supplementary material, *Table S2*

Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots	Tables 1–3
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies	N/A
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence	Discussion
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review	Discussion
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used	Limitations of the study
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research	Conclusions
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered	“Other information” section

	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared	"Other information" section
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review	"Other information" section
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors	"Other information" section
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review	"Other information" section

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021; 372: n71, doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Table S2. Quality assessment of the included studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomized case-control studies

Study	SELECTION				COMPARABILITY	EXPOSURE			Converting the NOS to AHRQ standards
	1) Is the case definitio	2) Representativeness of the cases	3) Selectio	4) Definitio	1) Comparability of cases and controls on the	1) Ascertainme	2) Same method of ascertainme	3) Non-Response rate	

	n adequate ?		n of Controls	n of Controls	basis of the design or analysis	nt of exposure	nt for cases and controls		
Mazurek et al. 2017	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆		Good quality
Rainer et al. 2018	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆☆	☆	☆		Good quality
Calore et al. 2019	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆ ☆	☆	☆		Good quality
Khudiakov et al. 2019	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆	☆	☆	Poor quality
Zhang et al. 2016	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆	☆	☆	Poor quality
Sommariva et al. 2017	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆☆	☆	☆	☆	Good quality
Yamada et al. 2018	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆☆	☆	☆	☆	Good quality
Bueno Marinas et al. 2020	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆	☆	☆	Poor quality
Khudiakov et al. 2021	☆	☆				☆	☆	☆	Poor quality

Sacchetto et al. 2021	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆☆	☆	☆	☆	Good quality
Bonet et al. 2024	☆	☆	☆			☆	☆	☆	Poor quality
Lu et al. 2022	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆	☆	☆	Poor quality
Li et al. 2024	☆	☆	☆			☆	☆	☆	Poor quality

Abbreviations: NOS, Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale, AHRQ, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality