Supplementary materials

Specific Boolean strings for each database

PubMed: ("Behcet Syndrome"[MeSH Terms] OR "Behcet's Disease" OR "Behcet Disease" OR "Behcets Syndrome") AND ("Anticoagulants"[MeSH Terms] OR "Anticoagulation Therapy" OR "Anticoagulation" OR "Anticoagulant Treatment" OR "Warfarin" OR "Heparin" OR "Rivaroxaban" OR "Apixaban" OR "Dabigatran" OR "Enoxaparin" OR "Fondaparinux")

Embase: ('behcet syndrome'/exp OR 'behcet syndrome' OR 'behcet disease'/exp OR 'behcet disease' OR 'behcets syndrome'/exp OR 'behcets syndrome') AND ('anticoagulants' OR 'warfarin' OR 'heparin' OR 'rivaroxaban' OR 'apixaban' OR 'dabigatran' OR 'enoxaparin' OR 'fondaparinux')

Scopus: (TITLE-ABS-KEY (behcet AND syndrome' OR 'behcet AND disease' OR 'behcets AND syndrome) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ('anticoagulants' OR 'warfarin' OR 'heparin' OR 'rivaroxaban' OR 'apixaban' OR 'dabigatran' OR 'enoxaparin' OR 'fondaparinux'))

Web of science: (TS=("Behcet Syndrome" OR "Behcet Disease" OR "Behcets Syndrome")) AND TS=("Anticoagulants" OR "Warfarin" OR "Heparin" OR "Rivaroxaban" OR "Apixaban" OR "Dabigatran" OR "Enoxaparin" OR "Fondaparinux")

Supplementary Table S1. Risk of bias assessment in included cohort studies using the Joanna Briggs institute critical appraisal tools.

Author	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
Desbois	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	NA	Yes
Alibaz-Oner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
Akyol	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Emmungil	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Yıldırım	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Unclear	Yes
Ideguchi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Geri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Unclear	Yes
Zeliha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Girgin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ahn	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Alibaz-Oner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes

C1: similarity of groups and recruitment from the same population; C2: exposure measurement and assignment to groups; C3: validity and reliability of exposure measurement; C4: identification of confounding factors; C5: strategies for dealing with confounding factors; C6: freedom of groups/participants from the outcome at the start; C7: Validity and reliability of outcome measurement; C8: reporting and sufficiency of follow-up time; C9: completeness of follow-up and reasons for loss; C10: strategies to address incomplete follow-up; C11: appropriateness of statistical analysis.

Supplementary Table S2. Risk of bias assessment in included case series using the Joanna Briggs institute critical appraisal tools.

Author	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
Saadoun *et al*.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA
Seyahi *et al*.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Li	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes
Eroglu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Roriz	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Zhu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Oumerzouk	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Vautier	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Kehribar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wang	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Demir	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Coşkun	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ozen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Alkaabi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Tohmé	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Desbois	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

C1: were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? C2: was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants? C3: were valid methods used for identification of the condition? C4: did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? C5: did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? C6: was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? C7: was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? C8: were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported? C9: was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? C10: was statistical analysis appropriate?

Supplementary Table S3. Risk of bias assessment in included case-control studies using the Joanna Briggs institute critical appraisal tools.

Author	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
Seyahi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Samaniego	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes

C1: were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls? C2: were cases and controls matched appropriately? C3: were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls? C4: was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way? C5: was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls? C6: were confounding factors identified? C7: were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? C8: were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls? C9: was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful? C10: was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Supplementary Table S4. Risk of bias assessment in included cross-sectional studies using the Joanna Briggs institute critical appraisal tools.

Author	Year	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8
Emmi *et al*.	2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Saadoun *et al*.	2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

C1: were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? C2: were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? C3: was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? C4: were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? C5: were confounding factors identified? C6: were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? C7: were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? C8: was appropriate statistical analysis used?