

Supplementary material has been published as submitted. It has not been copyedited, or typeset by Acta Dermato-Venereologica

Table SI. Abbreviations and search terms used in the study.

Abbreviation	Full form
DLQI	Dermatology Life Quality Index
EQ-5D	Euro Quality of Life-5 Dimensions
FSFI	Female Sexual Function Index
HRQoL	Health-Related Quality of Life
RosaQoL	Rosacea Quality of Life
SF	Short Form

Searching term:

("rosacea"[MeSH Terms] OR Rosacea[tw] OR "rhinophyma"[MeSH Terms] OR Rhinophyma[tw] OR Phyma[tw] OR phymata[tw] OR phymatous[tw] OR gnathophyma[tw] OR metophyma[tw] OR blepharophyma[tw]) AND ("psychometrics"[MeSH Terms] OR psychometric*[tw] OR "quality of life"[MeSH Terms] OR "quality of life"[tw] OR "life quality"[tw] OR "life qualities"[tw] OR questionnaire[tw] OR qol[tw] OR HRQOL[tw] OR HRQL[tw] OR SF-36[tw] OR Short-form 36[tw] OR SF-12[tw] OR Short form[tw] OR Sickness impact profile[tw] OR DLQI[tw] OR Dermatology Life Questionnaire Index[tw] OR skindex[tw] OR scale[tw] OR inventor*[tw] OR qol[tw])

Table SII. Studies comparing QoL scores in patients with rosacea and healthy controls.		
Study name [year]	Rosacea skin type, n (%)	HRQoL results, mean (SD)
Ozcan 2023	Rosacea group (n = 134)	
	nil	Mean DLQI 6.3 (5.8) Median (IQR) in DLQI: 5 (7)
	Healthy group (n = 124)	
	nil	Mean DLQI 1.3 (1.8) Median (IQR) in DLQI: 1 (2)
Wu 2018	Rosacea group (n = 201)	
	Skin types • Type i~ii: 8 (4) • Type iii~iV: 161 (80.1) • Type V~Vi: 32 (15.9)	Mean DLQI 7.59 (5.72) (vs. healthy group p < 0.001)
	Healthy group (n = 196)	
	Skin types • Type i~ii: 8 (4.1) • Type iii~iV: 148 (75.5) • Type V~Vi: 40 (20.4)	Mean DLQI 1.81 (2.85)
Salamon 2009	Rosacea group (n = 40)	
	• ET: 11 (27.5) • PR: 25 (62.5) • PH: 2 (5) • Ocular: 2 (5)	Mean physical function: 75.87 (18.25) Mean role physical: 60.00 (42.29) Mean bodily pain: 54.75 (24.50) Mean general health: 53.50 (16.69) Mean vitality: 59.06 (20.79) Mean social functioning: 64.06 (23.71) Mean role emotional: 62.00 (43.49) Mean mental health: 68.75 (23.28) Mean overall physical health: 44.69 (11.10) Mean overall mental health: 43.07 (14.40)
	Healthy group (n = 40)	
	nil	Mean physical function: 90.25 (11.69) Mean role physical: 90.00 (24.54) Mean bodily pain: 72.05 (20.02) Mean general health: 61.41 (16.14) Mean vitality: 72.75 (19.68) Mean social functioning: 69.87 (26.89) Mean role emotional: 92.00 (24.10) Mean mental health: 84.35 (22.80) Mean overall physical health: 52.16 (5.99) Mean overall mental health: 52.39 (12.81)
Abbreviations: DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; ET, erythematotelangiectatic; HLQoL, health-related quality of life; RosaQoL, Rosacea-Specific Quality-of-Life Questionnaire; PH, phymatous; PP, papulopustular.		

Table SIII. Studies comparing QoL scores in patients with rosacea with and without treatment.

Study name [year]	Rosacea skin type, n (%)	Rosacea severity, n (%)	HRQoL results
Treatment group vs. non-treatment group			
Sbidian 2016	Treatment group		
	PP: 156 (100) Fitzpatrick skin phototype in intervention group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I: 4 (3.7) • II: 48 (44.4) • III: 40 (37.0) • IV: 10 (9.3) • V: 5 (4.6) • VI: 1 (0.9) 	Number of lesions at baseline, median (range): 17 (8-110)	Median Skindex 39.7 (3.5-84.6) at baseline in intervention group. Change in Skindex -49.4% at fourth month in intervention group.
	Non-treatment group		
	PP: 156 (100) Fitzpatrick skin phototype in placebo group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I: 2 (4.2) • II: 9 (18.8) • III: 23 (47.9) • IV: 11 (22.9) • V: 3 (6.3) • VI: 0 (0) 	Number of lesions at baseline, median (range): 15 (8-65)	Median Skindex 33.2 (6.9-69.0) at baseline in placebo group. Change in Skindex -18.0% at fourth month in placebo group.
Tyring 2016	Treatment group		
	PP: 483 (100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe: 65 (13.5) • Moderate: 418 (86.5) • Mild: 0 (0) • Minimal: 0 (0) • Clear: 0 (0) 	Mean DLQI 5.4 (4.8) at baseline. Mean DLQI change 2.6 at end of treatment (vs. control group p = 0.18). Mean RosaQoL change 6.8 at end of treatment (vs. control group p = 0.67). Mean EQ-5D-5L change 0.006 at end of treatment (vs. control group p = 0.50).
	Non treatment group		
	PP: 478 (100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe: 62 (13.0) • Moderate: 416 (87.0) • Mild: 0 (0) • Minimal: 0 (0) • Clear: 0 (0) 	Mean DLQI 5.4 (4.9) at baseline Mean DLQI change 2.1 at end of treatment. Mean RosaQoL change 6.4 at end of treatment. Mean EQ-5D-5L change 0.007 at end of treatment.
Bribeche 2015	Intervention group		
	PP: 13 (31.2) ET: 30 (69.8)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IGA score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear: 0 (0) • Minimal: 4 (9.3) • Mild: 11 (25.6) • Moderate: 28 (65.1) • Severe: 0 (0) 2. CEA score 	Mean (range) DLQI: 15.8 (4–23) at baseline Mean DLQI: 4.6 at week 16

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 0 (0) • Mild: 5 (11.6) • Moderate: 12 (27.9) • Significant: 26 (60.5) • Severe: 0 (0) 	
	Non treatment group		
	PP: 7 (21.8) ET: 15 (68.2)	1. IGA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear: 0 (0) • Minimal: 1 (4.6) • Mild: 9 (40.9) • Moderate: 12 (54.5) • Severe: 0 (0) 2. CEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 0 (0) • Mild: 3 (13.6) • Moderate: 8 (36.4) • Significant: 11 (50) • Severe: 0 (0) 	Mean + range DLQI 14.6 (5–21) at baseline Mean DLQI 7.9 at week 16
Luger 2015	Treatment group		
	ET: 40 (100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild: 9 (22.5) • Moderate: 24 (60.0) • Severe: 7 (17.5) 	Mean Baseline treatment group RosaQoL in symptom domain: 3.04 ± 0.705 (2.81, 3.27) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change from baseline to Week 4: -0.04 ± 0.506 (-0.20, 0.13)
	Non treatment group		
	ET: 21 (100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild: 3 (14.3) • Moderate: 11 (52.4) • Severe: 7 (33.3) 	Mean baseline control group RosaQoL in symptom domain: 3.04 ± 2(2.71, 3.38) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change from baseline to Week 4: -0.22 ± 0.589 (-0.50, 0.05)
Abbreviations: CEA, Clinician Erythema Assessment; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; ET, erythematotelangiectatic; IGA, Investigator's Global Assessment; QoL, quality of life; RosaQoL, Rosacea-Specific Quality-of-Life Questionnaire; PP, papulopustular.			

Table SIV. Studies comparing QoL scores in patients with rosacea before and after treatment.			
Study name [year]	Rosacea skin type, n (%)	Rosacea severity, n (%)	HRQoL results
Yang 2022	ET: 16 (100)	Mean CEA 2.88 ± 0.62 at baseline Mean CEA 1.00 ± 0.37 at 1 month after treatment	Mean DLQI 22.25 ± 5.25 at baseline Mean DLQI 7.69 ± 2.47 at 1 month after treatment Mean DLQI 7.13 ± 2.16 at 3 months after treatment Mean DLQI 10.56 ± 3.53 at 6 months after treatment ($p < 0.001$)
Wang 2021_a	Phototype: • III: 16 (47.06) • IV: 18 (52.94)	1. CEA: • Mild: 14 (41.18) • Moderate: 18 (52.94) • Severe: 2 (5.88) 2. IGA: • Clear or almost clear: 22 (64.71) • Mild: 3 (8.82) • Moderate: 9 (26.47)	Mean DLQI reduction from 16.70 ± 3.55 to 10.48 ± 2.92 ($P < 0.001$)
Wang 2020	Rosacea type: • ET: 30 (100) Phototype: • III: 22 (73.3) • IV: 8 (26.7)	CEA • Almost clear: 2 (6.7) • Mild: 24 (80.0) • Moderate: 4 (13.3) • Severe: 0 (0.0)	Mean DLQI 17.5 ± 3.8 at baseline Mean DLQI 14.1 ± 3.0 after treatments Difference DLQI between baseline and post treatments: -3.4 ($-4.4, -2.4$) ($p < 0.001$)
Campos 2019	ET: 27 (100)	nil	Mean DLQI 6.15 ± 4.9 at baseline Mean DLQI 3.30 ± 3.5 at first treatment Mean DLQI 1.74 ± 1.6 at second treatment Mean DLQI 1.22 ± 1.2 at third treatment
Friedman 2019	ET + PP: 6 (37.5) ET: 10 (62.5)	Mean CEA 3.03 (1.1) Mean PSA 2.81 (0.93)	Mean DLQI 18.6 ± 1.9 at baseline Mean DLQI 9.6 ± 2.8 at 6 months after treatment ($p < 0.001$)
Baskan 2018	ET: 13 (92.9) PP: 1 (7.1)	RSS • 0 (Clear): 0 (0) • 1 (Minimal): 0 (0) • 2 (Mild): 5 (35.7) • 3 (Mild-moderate): 6 (42.9) • 4 (Moderate): 2 (14.3) • 5 (Moderate-severe): 1 (7.1) • 6 (Severe): 0	Effect of rosacea on life quality, n (%) 1. Pre-treatment • Not at all: 0 (0) • A little: 2 (14.3) • A lot: 11 (78.6) • Very much: 1 (7.1) Mean QoL 1.93 ± 0.48 2. Post treatment • Not at all: 4 (28.6) • A little: 7 (50) • A lot: 3 (21.4) • Very much: 0 (0) Mean QoL 0.93 (0.73) ($p = 0.001$)
van der Linden 2017	PP: 80 (100)	1. IGA: • Mild: 12 (15)	• The median and range at baseline of patients receiving doxycycline: RosaQoL overall 3.38 (2.77–3.95)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate: 21 (26) Severe: 47 (59) <p>2. CEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild: 25 (31) Moderate: 46 (58) Significant: 5 (6) Severe: 4 (5) 	<p>RosaQoL emotion 3.45 (2.66–4.07) RosaQoL function 2.33 (1.67–3.33) RosaQoL symptoms 3.43 (3.14–4.25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The median and range at week 28 of patients receiving doxycycline: RosaQoL overall 2.83 (2.20–3.74) RosaQoL emotion 3.09 (2.16–3.73) RosaQoL function 2.33 (1.67–3.00) RosaQoL symptoms 3.00 (2.57–3.71) Change in RosaQoL: 0.62 (0.19–1.14) The median and range at baseline of patients receiving minocycline: RosaQoL overall 3.36 (3.01–3.85) RosaQoL emotion 3.45 (3.02–3.87) RosaQoL function 2.67 (1.75–3.33) RosaQoL symptoms 3.64 (3.14–4.11) The median and range at week 28 of patients receiving minocycline: RosaQoL overall 2.41 (2.03–2.98) RosaQoL emotion 2.36 (1.84–3.20) RosaQoL function 2.33 (1.67–3.00) RosaQoL symptoms 2.57 (2.14–3.00) Change in RosaQoL: 0.86 (0.51–1.15)
Schaller 2016	PP: 161 (100)	IGA = 4 (severe)	<p>Mean DLQI total scores at baseline were 7.8 and 6.6 for the IVM 1% and MTZ 0.75% groups Change of DLQI at week 16 were -6.0 and -3.8 for the IVM and MTZ group. (p = 0.014) Change of EQ-5D at week 16 were 0.074 and 0.069 for the IVM and MTZ group. (p = 0.032) Change of EQ-5D at week 52 were 0.103 and 0.084 for the IVM and MTZ group. (p = 0.010)</p>
Taieb 2016	PP: 962 (100)	IGA >= 3	<p>1. EQ-5D Mean EQ-5D total scores at baseline were 0.86 and 0.85 for the IVM and MTZ groups Mean EQ-5D total scores at week 16 were 0.94 and 0.91 for the IVM and MTZ groups Mean EQ-5D total scores at week 52 were 0.95 and 0.9 for the IVM and MTZ groups</p> <p>2. Change >= 5 points in DLQI, n (%) Week 16 in IVM group: 201 (42.05) Week 16 in MTZ group: 153 (31.61) Week 52 in IVM group: 173 (36.19) Week 52 in MTZ group: 108 (22.31)</p>
Shim 2013	ET: 20 (100)	nil	<p>Mean DLQI 17.3 in pre-laser treatment Mean DLQI 4.3 in post-laser treatment</p>
Aksoy 2009	Fitzpatrick skin phototype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I: 28 (9.1) II: 143 (46.4) III: 125 (40.6) IV: 12 (3.9) 	Mean RSS 4.0 ± 1.86	<p>Mean DLQI 6.93 ± 5.18 in total population Mean DLQI 4.36 ± 4.82 at post treatment</p>
Menezes 2009	ET: 22 (100)	nil	<p>Mean DLQI 5.6 in pre-treatment group Mean DLQI 1.5 in post-treatment group</p>

Trumbore 2009	PP: 8 (100)	RCS: 4.13 (1.36)	<p>Mean DLQI in total effect at baseline: 2.55 (1.37)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in total effect at 28 days: 1.98 (0.90)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in total effect at 56 days: 1.86 (0.90)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in symptoms effect at baseline: 2.32 (1.19)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in symptoms effect at 28 days: 1.89 (0.89)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in symptoms effect at 56 days: 1.80 (0.90)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in emotions effect at baseline: 3.00 (0.97)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in emotions effect at 28 days: 2.27 (0.85)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in emotions effect at 56 days: 2.07 (0.89)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in functioning effect at baseline: 1.45 (0.93)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in functioning effect at 28 days: 1.17 (0.38)</p> <p>Mean DLQI in functioning effect at 56 days: 1.25 (0.67)</p>
Weissenbacher 2008	PP: 40 (100)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervention group: Mean SSS at baseline: 53.45 Mean SSS at week 4: 48.95 Control group: Mean SSS at baseline: 64.75 Mean SSS at week4: 43.35 (p = 0.48) 	<p>Mean DLQI 5.50 at baseline in intervention group</p> <p>Mean DLQI 3.10 at week 4 in intervention group</p> <p>Mean DLQI 6.70 at baseline in control group</p> <p>Mean DLQI 3.70 at week 4 in control group (p = 0.75)</p>
Fleischer 2005	nil	Mean IGA 3.52 ± 1.28 at baseline	<p>Mean RosaQoL 3.20 ± 0.68 for overall at baseline</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 2.78 ± 0.70 for overall at follow up</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 3.38 ± 0.79 for emotion at baseline</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 2.90 ± 0.83 for emotion at follow up</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 3.12 ± 0.74 for symptom at baseline</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 2.70 ± 0.70 for symptom at follow up</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 2.70 ± 0.96 for function at baseline</p> <p>Mean RosaQoL 2.52 ± 0.91 for function at follow up</p>
Tan 2005	ET: 16 (100)	nil	<p>Mean DLQI 7.8 ± 5.7 in pre-laser treatment</p> <p>Mean DLQI 3.2 ± 1.8 in post 1 laser treatment</p> <p>Mean DLQI 1.9 ± 1.1 in post 2 laser treatment</p>
<p>Abbreviations: CEA, Clinician Erythema Assessment; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; EQ-5D, EuroQol Five-Dimension Scale; EQ-5D-5L, EuroQol Five-Dimension Five-Level Scale; EQ-VAS, EuroQol Visual Analog Scale; ET, erythematotelangiectatic; IGA, Investigator's Global Assessment; PH, phymatous; PP, papulopustular; QoL, quality of life; RCS, Rosacea Clinical Scorecard; RosaQoL, Rosacea-Specific Quality-of-Life Questionnaire; RSS, rosacea severity score; SF-36, 36-Item Short Form Health Survey; SSS, symptom severity scale; VAS, Visual Analog Scale.</p>			

Table SV. Studies reporting only total QoL scores in patients with rosacea.			
Study name [year]	Rosacea skin type, n (%)	Rosacea severity, n (%)	HRQoL results
Augustin 2023	nil	nil	Mean DLQI: 4.3 ± 4.6 EQ-5D VAS > 50: 73.3%
Azrumelashvili 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ET: 28 PP: 93 PH: 4 Ocular: 13 	nil	Mean DLQI: 14.09 ± 3.18 Mean DLQI in ET type: 9.46 Mean DLQI in PP type: 15.1 Mean DLQI in PH type: 15.5 Mean DLQI in ocular type: 16.5
Kulakhli 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ET: 42 (44.68) PP: 50 (53.2) PH: 2 (2.13) Ocular: 27 (28.72) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild: 31 (32.98) Moderate: 52 (55.32) Severe: 11 (11.70) Mean SSS 4.58 ± 3.23	Median DLQI 5 (3–9) Mean RosaQoL 44.88 ± 18.75
Yang 2023	nil	CEA grade 1: 1 (2) grade 2: 5 (12) grade 3: 16 (39) grade 4: 19 (46)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALA-PDT group (n=20): Median (IQR) RosaQoL at baseline: 3.34 (3.06-4.03) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at the end of treatment: 0.48 (0.19-1.22) Minocycline group (n= 21): Median (IQR) RosaQoL at baseline: 3.48 (2.95-3.86) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at the end of treatment: 0.53 (-0.27-1.57)
Huang 2022	nil	nil	Mean DLQI 11.6 ± 7.2 Median DLQI 11 (6–16)
Wang 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ET: 108 PP: 52 	nil	Median DLQI in rosacea without depression group: 10.5 Median DLQI in rosacea with depression group: 15
Wang 2021_b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PP: 58 (100) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEA in HCQ group: Mild: 3 (10.71) Moderate: 15 (53.57) Severe: 10 (35.71) CEA in doxycycline group: Mild: 4 (13.33) Moderate: 19 (63.33) Severe: 7 (23.33) 	HCQ group (n=28): Median (IQR) RosaQoL at baseline: 52 (43, 60.75) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at week 4: 8.00 (-1.75, 13.50) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at week 8: 13.00 (4.25, 18.75) Doxycycline group (n=30): Median (IQR) RosaQoL at baseline: 45.5 (34.5, 59.75) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at week 4: 8.00 (-1.75, 13.50) Median (IQR) change in RosaQoL at week 8: 10.50 (1.75, 19.00)
Yamasaki 2022	nil	1. Erythema severity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild: 28 (21.5) Moderate: 79 (60.8) Severe: 23 (17.7) 2. IGA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate: 114 (87.7) Severe: 16 (12.3) 	Mean DLQI: 3.9 ± 3.6 in total population Mean Skindex-16: 35.4 ± 22.9 in total population EQ-5D-5L <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Level of pain/discomfort, n (%) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> None: 71 (54.6) Slight: 47 (36.2) Moderate: 7 (5.4) Severe: 5 (3.8) Extreme: 0 Level of anxiety/depression, n (%) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> None: 91 (70.0)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Slight: 29 (22.3) c. Moderate: 9 (6.9) d. Severe: 1 (0.8) e. Extreme: 0
Yang 2022	nil	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IGA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost clear: 68 (14.5) • Mild: 159 (33.9) • Moderate: 148 (31.6) • Severe 77 (16.4) • Very severe 17 (3.6) 2. CEA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear: 23 (4.9) • Almost clear: 56 (11.9) • Mild: 220 (46.9) • Moderate: 140 (29.9) • Severe: 30 (6.4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLQI, n (%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear: 24 (5.1) Mild: 66 (14.1) Moderate: 132 (28.1) Severe: 166 (35.4) Very severe: 81 (17.3) • Mean DLQI 12.6 ± 7.7 • RosaQoL, mean ± SD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total 2.34 ± 0.84 Emotion: 2.41 ± 0.99 Symptoms: 2.37 ± 0.82 Function: 2.03 ± 0.89
Acar 2021	Skin type: Type 1: 24 (24) Type 2: 47 (47) Type 3: 29 (29)	nil	Median (range) DLQI: 9 (1-30)
Chen 2021	nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate to severe rate in anxiety patients: 20.0% (95% CI: 17.2-22.9%) • Moderate to severe rate in depression patients: 25.8% (95% CI: 22.8-28.9%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With anxiety: 14.034 ± 7.511 With depression: 13.336 ± 7.497 Without anxiety: 8.048 ± 6.348 Without depression: 8.407 ± 6.791
Yang 2021	nil	IGA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 1: 1 (3.2) • Grade 2: 8 (25.8) • Grade 3: 16 (51.6) • Grade 4: 6 (19.4) • Grade 5: 0 (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median 6 (1.5–9.5) in rosacea group Median SF-36 in physical component score: 54.8 (47.5-57.7) Median SF-36 in mental component score: 46.5 (41-50.3) Median SF-36 in Physical functioning: 95 (92.5-100)
Karabay 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ET: 58 (68.2) • PP: 26 (30.6) • PH: 1 (1.2) • Ocular: 0 (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild: 54 (63.5%) Moderate: 31 (36.47%) Severe: 0 (0%) 	Mean + range DLQI: 2 (0-8)
Wienholtz 2020	nil	nil	DLQI, n (%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-1: 128 (42.7) • 2-5: 105 (35.0) • 6-10: 36 (12.0) • 11-20: 30 (10.0) • 21-30: 1 (0.3) Median DLQI: 2 (1–5)

Baldwin 2019	Fitzpatrick skin phototype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I: 110 (15.5) II: 323 (45.6) III: 205 (29.0) IV: 60 (8.5) V: 9 (1.3) VI: 1 (0.1) 	Severity of erythema <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild: 419 (59.2) Moderate: 235 (32.7) Severe: 54 (7.6) 	Mean DLQI 5.2 ± 6.0
Kubanov 2019	nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mild type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ET: 34 Papular: 30 Severe type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pustulous: 32 Infiltrative-productive: 24 	Mean DLQI 12.5 ± 4.5 (min=5.0, max=19.0) in patients with the presence of Demodex mites (n= 60) Mean DLQI 8.0 ± 3.4 (min=2.0; max=19.0) in patients with no Demodex mites (P<0.05) (n= 60)
Tan 2019	nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe: 30 (4.2) Moderate 191 (26.9) Mild 275 (38.7) Almost clear: 116 (16.3) Clear 98 (13.8) 	Mean DLQI 8.0 ± 7.7 in total population
Williamson 2019	Total: 54 (100) ET: 40 (74.1) PP: 40 (74.1)	Mild: 32 (59.3) Moderate: 13 (24.1) Absent: 9 (16.7)	Mean DLQI 2.35 (2.93)
Harper 2018	ET: 409 (100)	nil	Scores on all SF-36 domains for ETR participants were similar in the mild, moderate, and severe erythema subgroups. (p < 0.01) RosaQoL emotion domain increased with increasing erythema severity. (p = 0.0035)
Williamson 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ET: 98 (80.3) PP: 74 (60.7) PH: 12 (9.8) Ocular: 10 (8.2) Unknown: 5 (4.1) 	Mild: 68 (55.7) Moderate: 22 (18.0) Severe: 2 (1.6)	Mean DLQI 2.7 (3.0) from 120 patients who returned the survey
Zeichner 2018	ET: 409 PP: 191	ET: Mild: 63.6% Moderate: 32.0% PP: Mild: 62.8% Moderate: 30.9%	ET: Mean RosaQoL total 2.3 Mean RosaQoL emotion 2.4 Mean RosaQoL symptom 2.4 Mean RosaQoL function 2.0 PP: Mean RosaQoL total 2.8 Mean RosaQoL emotion 2.9 Mean RosaQoL symptom 2.9 Mean RosaQoL function 2.4
Thomas 2017	nil	VAS: 5.7 (2.1)	Mean Skindex-16 in symptoms effect: 26.9 ± 23.2 Mean Skindex-16 in emotions effect: 66.4 ± 26.8 Mean Skindex-16 in functioning effect: 31.9 ± 24.6

Li 2016	nil	nil	Mean RosaQoL overall 68.5 ± 12.6 Mean RosaQoL emotion 47.4 ± 7.8 Mean RosaQoL function 26.8 ± 2.7 Mean RosaQoL symptoms 36.2 ± 4.0 Mean DLQI 11.2 ± 6.1
Beikert 2013	nil	nil	Mean DLQI 4.3 ± 4.6 (range 0–26)
Böhm 2013	nil	Current somatic symptoms: • moderate: 41% • severe: 18%	Mean DLQI 4.05 ± 4.67 in total population
Langenbruch 2011	nil	nil	Mean DLQI 4.2 ± 4.6 (n=445)
Baldwin 2010	nil	nil	Mean RosaQoL 3.3 at baseline Mean RosaQoL 2.8 at week 12 (p < 0.0001)
Kini 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ET: 34 (25.2) • PP: 47 (34.8) • PH: 54 (40) 	nil	Mean RosaQoL 2.56 ± 0.64 for overall in ET patients Mean RosaQoL 2.61 ± 0.77 for overall in PP patients Mean RosaQoL 2.99 ± 0.62 for overall in PH patients Mean RosaQoL 2.67 ± 0.84 for emotion in ET patients Mean RosaQoL 2.64 ± 0.86 for emotion in PP patients Mean RosaQoL 3.10 ± 0.71 for emotion in PH patients Mean RosaQoL 2.42 ± 0.69 for symptom in ET patients Mean RosaQoL 3.03 ± 0.72 for symptom in PP patients Mean RosaQoL 2.70 ± 0.70 for symptom in PH patients Mean RosaQoL 2.48 ± 0.83 for function in ET patients Mean RosaQoL 2.34 ± 1.02 for function in PP patients Mean RosaQoL 2.50 ± 0.90 for function in PH patients
Hiltscher 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PP: 30 (65.2) • ET: 3 (6.5) • Rhinophyma: 13 (28.2) 	nil	Mean DLQI 7 ± 4.9 in PP patients Mean DLQI 4 ± 2.8 in ET patients Mean DLQI 5.6 ± 3.6 in rhinophyma patients
Abbreviations: CEA, Clinician Erythema Assessment; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; EQ-5D, EuroQol Five-Dimension Scale; EQ-5D-5L, EuroQol Five-Dimension Five-Level Scale; EQ-VAS, EuroQol Visual Analog Scale; ET, erythematotelangiectatic; IGA, Investigator's Global Assessment; PH, phymatous; PP, papulopustular; QoL, quality of life; RCS, Rosacea Clinical Scorecard; RosaQoL, Rosacea-Specific Quality-of-Life Questionnaire; RSS, rosacea severity score; SF-36, 36-Item Short Form Health Survey; SSS, symptom severity scale; VAS, Visual Analog Scale.			

Table SVI. NOS scores of cross-sectional studies with healthy controls

Studies	Selection			Comparability	Outcome		Total quality score	
Author [Year]	Representativeness of the sample	Sample size	Satisfactory response rate	Ascertainment of the rosacea diagnosis	Confounder is controlled	Assessment of outcome: blind or record linkage	Statistical test is clearly defined	
Ozcan 2023	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Wu 2018	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	6
Salamon 2009	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	6

Table SVII. AHRQ scores of cross-sectional studies without healthy controls.

Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Total	ROB
Augustin 2023	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	7	Moderate
Azrumelashvili 2023	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	8	Low
Kulakli 2023	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	8	Low
Yang 2023	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	Moderate
Huang 2022	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	Low
Wang 2022	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	Low
Wang 2021	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	Severe
Yamasaki 2022	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	7	Moderate
Yang 2022	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	8	Low
Acar 2021	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	6	Moderate
Chen 2021	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	Low
Yang 2021	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	Moderate
Karabay 2020	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	7	Moderate
Wienholtz 2020	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	8	Low
Baldwin 2019	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	8	Low
Kubanov 2019	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	Moderate
Tan 2019	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	Low
Williamson 2019	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	Low
Harper J 2018	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	8	Low
Williamson 2018	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	8	Low
Zeichner 2018	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	Moderate
Thomas 2017	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	Severe
van der Linden 2017	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	Low
Li 2016	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	Moderate
Beikert 2013	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	6	Severe
Böhm 2013	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	Severe
Langenbruch 2011	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	Severe
Baldwin 2010	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	Moderate
Kini 2009	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	Severe
Hiltscher 2001	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	Moderate

Q1: Define the source of information.

Q2: List the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants or refer to previous publications.

Q3: Indicate whether the participants are consecutive if not population based and whether they are representative of the average in the community.

Q4: Indicate the time period used for identifying participants.

Q5: Indicate whether the evaluators of subjective study components were blinded to other aspects of the participants.

Q6: Indicate whether the examination method was standard.

Q7: Describe any assessments conducted for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measures).

Q8: Indicate whether the assessments and classification of HRQoL assessment tools are clearly stated and standard?

Q9: If any, explain scenarios in which participants were excluded from the analysis. If no participant is excluded, then 1 point is awarded.

Q10: Describe how confounding variables were assessed and/or controlled for.

Q11: Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection.