

Appendix S1

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethical statement

This study was accepted by the ethics committee of region Zealand (project number SJ-191, SJ-113, SJ-114) in Denmark. Written informed consent was obtained from all study participants.

Study design

A cross-sectional study of the association of HS (referred to as the exposure) and renal function (referred to as the outcome) was conducted. We investigated 2 different HS-groups; (i) An HS group identified in the general population (referred to as the population HS group); (ii) An HS group identified in a hospital (referred to as the hospital HS group).

Exposure. The population HS group was identified in The Danish General Suburban Population Study (GESUS), which was initiated in January 2010, and enrolled participants until October 10 2013. It was a cross-sectional study of the adult Danish general suburban population in Næstved Municipality (70 km south of Copenhagen) (12). All citizens aged 30+ and a random selection of those aged 20–30 years were invited. The population HS diagnosis was based on a questionnaire where the diagnosis of HS was made if participants reported (i) boils within the previous 6 months as well as (ii) a minimum of 2 boils (in 5 possible locations: axilla, groin, genital areas, mamma, other e.g. perianal, neck, abdomen). The validation of the population HS diagnosis was discussed in a separate paper showing a sensitivity of 90%, and a specificity of 97% (7). The overall participation rate in GESUS was 49%. Further details about GESUS can be found in Bergholdt et al. (12).

The hospital HS group was recruited from the outpatient clinic at the Department of Dermatology at Roskilde Hospital in Denmark (serving the region of Zealand which includes Næstved). Inclusion criteria were the WHO International Classification of Diseases (ICD) code, edition 10 (ICD-10) of HS (L73.2), and undergoing either systemic or laser treatment for HS indicating moderate/severe disease. The diagnosis of the hospital-based HS group was verified by physical examination by a physician from the Department of Dermatology. The hospital-based HS group underwent the same examination and filled out the same questionnaire as the population HS group. The participation rate for the invited hospital HS group was 34%. The distribution of age and sex did not differ between participants and non-participants (data not shown).

Both the hospital- and population-based HS group were compared to a control group (referred to as the non-HS group) defined as participants from GESUS without HS.

Outcome. Creatinine ($\mu\text{mol/l}$) levels were measured in non-fasting venous blood samples of all participants. Renal function was assessed by estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate (eGFR) using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation in $\text{ml/min per } 1.73 \text{ m}^2$ body surface. The eGFR-CKD-EPI equation is based on information of sex,

ethnicity, creatinine and age (13). The Danish civil registration number provided information on sex and age. Ethnicity was self-reported. A detailed description of methods in GESUS has previously been published (12).

We reported eGFR levels according to Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) stages using the accepted CKD-classification; however, not containing information of proteinuria as we did not perform urine analysis: CKD1: $\text{eGFR} \geq 90 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$, CKD2 (mild): $\text{eGFR } 60\text{--}89 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$, CKD3 (moderate): $\text{eGFR } 30\text{--}59 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$, CKD4 (severe): $\text{eGFR } 15\text{--}29 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$, and CKD5 (kidney failure): $\text{eGFR} < 15 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$.

Statistical analyses

Estimated GFR. The outcome eGFR was continuous, and a mean for the HS group and the non-HS group was computed, respectively, as well as the mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). We performed 3 statistical models: 1) an unadjusted (crude) MD (95% CI) and 2) an age, sex and smoking-status adjusted MD (95% CI) using linear regression (General Linear Model: GLM procedure/Dunnett-Hsu method), and 3) a full model adjusted for age, sex, smoking-status, body mass index (BMI), hypertension and diabetes. The third model was made to accommodate the possible confounders of BMI, hypertension, and diabetes; all known to potentially influence renal function. The tests were two-sided with a significance level at 0.05. All analyses were performed using SAS 9.3.

We also made stratified analyses of eGFR levels according to the CKD Classification. We performed Fischer's exact test with Monte Carlo estimation to find a *p*-value for the differences in CKD stages when comparing the HS group and the non-HS group.

HS Severity. The definition of severity of HS for the population HS group was based on self-reported information on number of boils/locations of boils, and subsequent scarring, and was inspired by the Hurley score (13). Mild HS: minimum 2 boils and no subsequent scarring, moderate HS: minimum 2 boils and subsequent scarring, and severe HS: minimum 2 boils in minimum 2 locations and subsequent scarring. The severity of HS for the hospital HS group was assessed by the Sartorius score based on physical examination (13). Furthermore, we explored the severity of HS as number of boils. Subgroup analysis of eGFR was performed according to the 3 HS severity degrees, and a one-way ANOVA was used to detect a potential association between the 3 degrees of HS severity and eGFR. Linear regression was used to detect a possible association between eGFR and number of boils as well as Sartorius score, respectively.

Background factors and possible confounders. Age and sex was identified via the Danish Civil Registration Number. Smoking was self-reported. The possible confounders of BMI (measured height and weight and subsequently calculated from the formula of $\text{weight/height} \times \text{height}$), hypertension (measured blood pressure $\geq 140/90$ or self-reported antihypertensive drugs), and diabetes (defined by non-fasting blood glucose/HbA1c above threshold or self-reported diabetes) were identified.

Table SIII. Mean differences (MD) for estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)

	Hospital HS group vs. Population non-HS group	Population HS group vs. Population non-HS group
Unadjusted MD for eGFR (95%CI), ml/min/1.73 m ²	17.61 (11.10–24.13) <i>p</i> <0.001*	6.42 (4.63–8.22) <i>p</i> <0.001*
Age-sex-smoking adjusted MD for eGFR (95%CI), ml/min/1.73 m ²	6.22 (0.92–11.52) <i>p</i> =0.0172*	–0.40 (–1.87–1.06) <i>p</i> =0.7866
Age-sex-smoking-BMI-hypertension-diabetes adjusted MD for eGFR (95%CI), ml/min/1.73 m ²	6.81 (1.27–12.35) <i>p</i> =0.0119*	1.53 (–0.35–3.41) <i>p</i> =0.1322

Table SII. Mean values for estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) and creatinine in the hospital HS group, population HS group, and population non-HS group and unadjusted eGFR levels according to CKD stages (p-value < 0.001).

	Hospital HS group n=32	Population HS group n=430	Population non-HS group n=20,780
Mean values for eGFR and creatinine			
eGFR (unadjusted), ml/min/1.73m ² , mean ± SD (range)	104.79 ± 14.39 (71.92–127.52)	93.60 ± 16.66 (10.64–149.55)	87.17 ± 16.46 (5.45–141.22)
eGFR (age-sex-smoking adjusted), ml/min/1.73m ² , mean (95%CI)	94.63 (89.99–99.27)	88.00 (86.72–89.29)	88.41 (88.10–88.71)
eGFR (age-sex-smoking-BMI-hypertension-diabetes adjusted), ml/min/1.73 m ² , mean (95% CI)	95.53 (90.66–100.40)	90.25 (88.55–91.96)	88.72 (88.10–89.34)
Creatinine, umol/l) mean (95% CI)	64.2 (60.1–68.3)	73.2 (71.1–75.3)	76.5 (76.2–76.8)
Unadjusted eGFR levels			
eGFR ≥ 90 ml/min/1.73 m ²	84.38%	63.64%	46.57%
eGFR 60–89 ml/min/1.73 m ²	15.63%	32.87%	47.52%
eGFR 30–59 ml/min/1.73 m ²	0%	3.03%	5.68%
eGFR 15–29 ml/min/1.73 m ²	0%	0.23%	0.18%
eGFR < 15 ml/min/1.73 m ²	0%	0.23%	0.05%

Table SI. Background factors and characteristics in hospital hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) subjects, population HS subjects, and population non-HS subjects

	Hospital HS group <i>n</i> = 32	Population HS group <i>n</i> = 430	Population non-HS group <i>n</i> = 20,780
Age, years, mean (range)	42 (22–64)	48 (22–78)	56 (20–96)
Sex, Female vs. Male % (<i>n</i>)	78 vs. 22	68 vs. 32	54 vs. 46
Smoking status, % (<i>n</i>)			
Present smoker	55	41	18
Past smoker	42	36	40
Never smoked	3	23	42
Ethnicity, Caucasian, % (<i>n</i>)	97	97	99
CRP, mg/l, median (range)	5.1 (0.2–119.0)	2.2 (0.1–38.0)	1.3 (0.1–194.0)
HS severity distribution, %			
Mild	12.5	50	Not applicable
Moderate	15.5	28.5	Not applicable
Severe	72	21.5	Not applicable
Sartorius score, median (range)	29 (5–176)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Number of boils, median (range)	12 (1–171)	3 (2–106)	Not applicable
BMI, kg/m ² , mean (range)	31.3 (21.5–46.5)	28.8 (17.6 – 47.8)	26.7 (14.2 – 57.5)
Diabetes, %	12.5	8	6
Hypertension, %	56	49	61

REFERENCES

- Miller IM, Jemec G. Maturation of an idea: a historical perspective on the association of psoriasis with the metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular disease. *Arch Dermatol* 2012; 148: 112.
- Miller IM, Skaaby T, Ellervik C, Jemec GB. Quantifying cardiovascular disease risk factors in patients with psoriasis: a meta-analysis. *Br J Dermatol* 2013; 169: 1180–1187.
- Miller IM, Ellervik C, Yazdanyar S, Jemec GB. Meta-analysis of psoriasis, cardiovascular disease, and associated risk factors. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2013; 69: 1014–1024.
- Dervisoglu E, Akturk AS, Yildiz K, Kiran R, Yilmaz A. The spectrum of renal abnormalities in patients with psoriasis. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2012; 44: 509–514.
- Jemec GB. Clinical practice. Hidradenitis suppurativa. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 366: 158–164.
- Fimmel S, Zouboulis CC. Comorbidities of hidradenitis suppurativa (acne inversa). *Dermatoendocrinol* 2010; 2: 9–16.
- Vinding GR, Miller IM, Zarchi K, Ibler KS, Ellervik C, Jemec GB. The prevalence of inverse recurrent suppuration: a population-based study of possible hidradenitis suppurativa. *Br J Dermatol* 2014; 170: 884–889.
- Sabat R, Chanwangpong A, Schneider-Burrus S, Metternich D, Kokolakis G, Kurek A, et al. Increased prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with acne inversa. *PloS One* 2012; 7: e31810.
- Gold DA, Reeder VJ, Mahan MG, Hamzavi IH. The prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with hidradenitis suppurativa. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2014; 70: 699–703.
- Miller IM, Ellervik C, Vinding GR, Zarchi K, Ibler KS, Knudsen KM et al. Association of metabolic syndrome and Hidradenitis Suppurativa. *JAMA Dermatology*. 2014; 150: 1273–1280.
- Danby FW, Jemec GB, Marsch WC, von Laffert M. Preliminary findings suggest hidradenitis suppurativa may be due to defective follicular support. *Br J Dermatol* 2013; 168: 1034–1039.
- Bergholdt HK, Bathum L, Kvetny J, Rasmussen DB, Moldow B, Hoeg T, et al. Study design, participation and characteristics of the Danish General Suburban Population Study. *Dan Med J* 2013; 60: A4693.
- Redal-Baigori B, Rasmussen K, Heaf JG. The use of absolute values improves performance of estimation formulae: a retrospective cross sectional study. *BMC Nephrology* 2013; 14: 271.
- Sartorius K, Lapins J, Emtestam L, Jemec GB. Suggestions for uniform outcome variables when reporting treatment effects in hidradenitis suppurativa. *Br J Dermatol* 2003; 149: 211–213.
- Singh AK, Kari JA. Metabolic syndrome and chronic kidney disease. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 2013; 22: 198–203.
- Thomas G, Sehgal AR, Kashyap SR, Srinivas TR, Kirwan JP, Navaneethan SD. Metabolic syndrome and kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2011; 6: 2364–2373.
- Kurella M, Lo JC, Chertow GM. Metabolic syndrome and the risk for chronic kidney disease among nondiabetic adults. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2005; 16: 2134–2140.
- Yoon YS, Park HS, Yun KE, Kim SB. Obesity and metabolic syndrome-related chronic kidney disease in nondiabetic, nonhypertensive adults. *Metabolism* 2009; 58: 1737–1742.
- Okada R, Yasuda Y, Tsushita K, Wakai K, Hamajima N, Matsuo S. Glomerular hyperfiltration in prediabetes and prehypertension. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2012; 27: 1821–1825.
- Brenner BM, Lawler EV, Mackenzie HS. The hyperfiltration theory: a paradigm shift in nephrology. *Kidney Int* 1996; 49: 1774–1777.
- Cases A, Coll E. Dyslipidemia and the progression of renal disease in chronic renal failure patients. *Kidney Int Suppl* 2005; S87–S93.
- Gluba A, Mikhailidis DP, Lip GY, Hannam S, Rysz J, Banach M. Metabolic syndrome and renal disease. *Int J Cardiol* 2013; 164: 141–150.
- Carrero JJ, Stenvinkel P. Persistent inflammation as a catalyst for other risk factors in chronic kidney disease: a hypothesis proposal. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009; 4 Suppl 1: S49–S55.
- Kasiske BL, Crosson JT. Renal disease in patients with massive obesity. *Arch Int Med* 1986; 146: 1105–1109.
- Ribstein J, du Cailar G, Mimran A. Combined renal effects of overweight and hypertension. *Hypertension* 1995; 26: 610–615.
- Locatelli F, Pozzoni P, Del Vecchio L. Renal manifestations in the metabolic syndrome. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2006; 17: S81–S85.
- Markham T, Watson A, Rogers S. Adverse effects with long-term cyclosporin for severe psoriasis. *Clin Exp Dermatol* 2002; 27: 111–114.
- Maza A, Montaudié H, Sbidian E, Gallini A, Aractingi S, Aubin F, et al. Oral cyclosporin in psoriasis: a systematic review on treatment modalities, risk of kidney toxicity and evidence for use in non-plaque psoriasis. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2011; 25 Suppl 2: 19–27.
- De Vriese AS, Robbrecht DL, Vanholder RC, Vogelaers DP, Lameire NH. Rifampicin-associated acute renal failure: pathophysiologic, immunologic, and clinical features. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1998; 31: 108–115.
- Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ. The metabolic syndrome. *Lancet* 2005; 365: 1415–1428.
- Miyamoto T, Carrero JJ, Stenvinkel P. Inflammation as a risk factor and target for therapy in chronic kidney disease. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 2011; 20: 662–668.
- Shikata K, Makino H. Microinflammation in the pathogenesis of diabetic nephropathy. *J Diabetes Investig* 2013; 4: 142–149.
- Anders HJ, Muruve DA. The inflammasomes in kidney disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2011; 22: 1007–1018.
- Tintut Y, Patel J, Parhami F, Demer LL. Tumor necrosis factor- α promotes in vitro calcification of vascular cells via the cAMP pathway. *Circulation* 2000; 102: 2636–2642.
- Metcalfe W. How does early chronic kidney disease progress? A background paper prepared for the UK Consensus Conference on early chronic kidney disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2007; 22 Suppl 9: ix26–30.
- Oh DJ, Kim HR, Lee MK, Woo YS. Profile of human β -defensins 1, 2 and proinflammatory cytokines (TNF- α , IL-6) in patients with chronic kidney diseases. *Kidney Blood Press Res* 2013; 37: 602–610.
- Helal I, Fick-Brosnahan GM, Reed-Gitomer B, Schrier RW. Glomerular hyperfiltration: definitions, mechanisms and clinical implications. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2012; 8: 293–300.
- Cox HJ, Bhandari S, Rigby AS, Kilpatrick ES. Mortality at low and high estimated glomerular filtration rate values: a ‘U’ shaped curve. *Nephron Clin Pract* 2008; 110: c67–72.
- Eriksen BO, Løchen ML, Arntzen KA, Bertelsen G, Eilertsen BA, von Hanno T, et al. Subclinical cardiovascular disease is associated with a high glomerular filtration rate in the nondiabetic general population. *Kidney Int* 2014; 86: 146–153.
- Park M, Yoon E, Lim YH, Kim H, Choi J, Yoon HJ. Renal hyperfiltration as a novel marker of all-cause mortality. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2015; 26: 1426–1433.

Table SIV. Subgroup analysis of estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) according to hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) severity (p-value = 0.0419)

	HS severity		
	Mild (n=218; Population n=214 Hospital n=4)	Moderate (n=128; Population n=123 Hospital n=5)	Severe (n=116; Population n=93 Hospital n=23)
eGFR (95%CI), ml/min/1.73 m ²	93.19 (90.97–95.42)	93.30 (90.41–96.20)	97.75 (94.71–100.79)