Original Article Association of rheumatoid arthritis and the prevalence of metabolic syndrome: an update meta-analysis

Honghao Duan, Lisong Heng, Lin Xiao, Xiangxiang Sun, Shuxin Yao, Hui Li, Guanghui Zhao, Hao Guo, Jianbing Ma

Department of Knee Surgery, Hong-Hui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University College of Medicine, Eastern Youyi Road no. 555, Xi'an 710054, Shanxi, China

Received March 5, 2016; Accepted August 13, 2016; Epub September 15, 2016; Published September 30, 2016

Abstract: The aim of the study is to evaluate the association between rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and the risk of metabolic syndrome (MetS). Studies were retrieved in PubMed, Embase and Springer link databases based on predefined searching strategy and inclusion criteria. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was utilized to assess the quality of the studies. Odds Ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (Cls) were utilized to calculate the pooled results. Subgroup analyses were conducted to discuss whether geographic region, study type and sex composition could affect the result. Funnel plot was used to determine the potential publication bias. Seventeen studies containing 3251 RA patients and 5536 healthy controls were identified. As a result, RA patients achieved a higher prevalence of MetS than healthy controls, with the diagnostic criterion of NCEP-ATP III (OR = 1.38, 95% Cl: 1.04 to 1.83, P = 0.02), but not with WHO or IDF criterion (P > 0.05). In studies that MetS was diagnosed by NCEP-ATP III criterion, subgroup analysis indicated that there was no significant association between MetS and RA, neither in study type subgroup, nor in region subgroup (P > 0.05). With regard to sex composition, the significant association was detected in male & female group (OR = 1.45, 95% Cl: 1.01 to 2.07, P = 0.04), but not female group (P > 0.05). High prevalence of MetS is diagnosed with NCEP-ATP III criterion. However, more prospective studies with larger sample size are required to confirm these results.

Keywords: Rheumatoid arthritis, metabolic syndrome, meta-analysis

Introduction

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is known as a frequent autoimmune disease that mainly influences joints [1]. Although substantial improvements have achieved for RA management, mortality caused by this disease is increasing [2]. In addition, RA is an inflammation-related disorder, and RA-related diseases and heart diseases are reported to share several common features involving inflammation [3]. Numerous studies have found that RA is tightly related to cardiovascular disease (CVD) [4]. The epidemiological data indicates that CVD is the predominant factor for about a half of RArelated deaths [5]. Metabolic syndrome (MetS) is a combination of factors such as obesity, hypertension and dyslipidaemia, which are implied to be associated with additional cardiovascular (CV) mortality [6]. Two major hallmarks of MetS are insulin resistance and hyperinsulinemia, and patients suffered with this syndrome are apt to develop CVD [7]. Due to the close relationship between MetS and CVD, emerging researches have been conducted to explore the potential correlation between RA and MetS; however, conflicting results are presented and prevalence of MetS in RA patients is different in different studies [8-10]. Moreover, insufficient statistical power exists in each individual study due to small sample size. Thus, a previous study using meta-analysis evaluated whether RA patients were more likely to develop MetS or not [11]. As a result, they concluded that prevalence of MetS in RA patients were higher than in non-RA patients. However, only 12 studies involving 6686 participants (2283 cases and 4403 controls) were identified in that meta-analysis and substantial heterogeneity was observed. Although subgroup-analysis



Figure 1. Procedure of study selection.

stratified by geographic region and different diagnostic criteria of MetS was concerned, study type was not considered. Additionally, all the participants in their four cross-sectional studies were female, which might cause deviations to some extent.

Therefore, we updated this meta-analysis by including more eligible studies. Moreover, study quality was assessed using a more strict system, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS). After eligible studies were screened out, we first pooled the results according to the diagnostic criteria of MetS. Then subgroup analyses stratified by region, study type and sex composition were conducted. The study aimed to provide a more acute and reliable association between RA and the occurrence of MetS.

Materials and methods

Literature search

Literature retrieval was performed in databases such as PubMed, Embase and Springer up to January 25th 2016. The searching strategies were "metabolic syndrome" OR "MetS" AND "rheumatoid arthritis" OR "RA". Manual bibliographic search was also carried out for more eligible studies.

Study selection criteria

The studies were included if: (1) The studies were observational studies; (2) The experimental group in the study was RA patients diag-

nosed by American College of Rheumatology classification, while the control group was healthy individuals; (3) The studies investigated the association between RA and occurrence of MetS; (4) The studies provided odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of relevant outcomes, or there were sufficient data to calculate them. On the other hand, reviews, letters or comments were excluded. If multiple studies were published basing on the same dataset or same population, only the most recent publication with complete data was included.

Data extraction and quality assessment

According to the aforementioned criteria, two authors independently completed literature search and selected eligible studies. Then based on a predefined standardized form, they independently extracted required data information from each study, such as first author information, publication year, study location, study type, sample sizes in experimental and control groups, age, sex composition and the case numbers of MetS. When there were disagreements, a discussion with a third investigator was needed to reach a consensus.

Quality of studies was evaluated using a 9-star system by NOS [12], which included a total of 8 items. A study was considered as low-, moderate- or high-quality if it achieved a score of 0-3, 4-6 or 7-9 stars, respectively.

Statistical analysis

The heterogeneity among studies was examined via Cochrane's Q-statistic and I² statistic [13]. If P < 0.05 and/or I² > 50%, which indicates a significance, then a random-effects model is used. Otherwise, if $P \ge 0.05$ and/or I² $\le 50\%$, a fixed-effects model is selected to calculate the pooled results [14]. Subgroup analyses were performed, stratified by study region, study type and sex composition, to evaluate whether these factors could influence results of this meta-analysis. Funnel plot was utilized to determine potential publication bias. The

Study	Year	Area	Age (ys), RA/CG	Study period (ys)	Sex	Study design	Number of RA/CG	Number of MetS- NCEP (RA/CG)	Number of MetS- WHO (RA/CG)	Number of MetS- IDF (RA/CG)
Abourazzak	2014	Morocco	49±11.5/51±13	8	M&F	CS	179/149	52/8	NA	55/16
Bilecik	2014	Turkey	52/51	NA	F	CC	100/100	27/28	NA	33/44
Chung	2008	USA	54/52	5.5	M&F	CC	154/85	54/19	55/8	NA
Crowson	2011	USA	58.8±12.8/63.9±9.2	7	M&F	CS	232/1241	76/316	NA	NA
Cunha	2012	Brazil	56.8±12.3/44.5±8.3	10.86	M&F	CC	283/226	111/44	NA	NA
Dao	2010	Viet Nam	56.3/55.7	1.75	F	CS	105/105	34/19	20/13	43/24
Karakoc	2012	Turkey	49.76±11.15/47.05±9.75	7.6	M&F	CC	54/52	NA	NA	23/5
Karimi	2011	Iran	48.3±14.6/42.2±9.9	8	F	CC	92/96	25/34	18/21	NA
Karvounaris	2006	Greece	63±11/63±11	9.52	M&F	CS	200/400	88/164	NA	NA
Lee	2013	Korea	50.6±11.3/48.3±11.3	3.5	F	CS	84/109	16/17	NA	NA
МОК	2011	Hong Kong	53.3±12.0/52.9±12.0	5.3	M&F	CC	699/1398	137/278	NA	NA
Ormseth	2013	USA	54/53	NA	M&F	CC	162/89	58/18	NA	NA
Parra-Salcedo	2015	Mexico	38.1±12.8/38.0±12.4	NA	M&F	CS	160/160	24/43	NA	18/42
Rostom	2013	Morocco	49±12/48.5±13	7.8	M&F	CC	120/100	39/18	24/14	58/23
Sahebari	2011	Iran	45.5±13/45.6±12	5.5	M&F	CC	120/500	54/269	NA	37/171
Salinas	2013	Argentina	55.5±13.2/57.3±13.1	8	M&F	CS	409/624	NA	NA	145/253
Santos	2010	Portugal	49.2±13.7/47.7±13.4	7.6	F	CC	98/102	25/16	NA	NA

Table 1	. Characteristics	of 17	included studies
---------	-------------------	-------	------------------

Year, year of publication; ys, years; RA, rheumatoid arthritis group; CG, control group; CS, cross-sectional; CC, Case-control; M, male; F, female; NA, not available.

Study	Selection	Comparability	Exposure	Total score					
Abourazzak	☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	7					
Bilecik	***	☆☆	☆☆☆	8					
Chung	☆☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆☆	9					
Crowson	***	☆☆	**	7					
Cunha	***	☆☆	☆☆☆	8					
Dao	***	☆☆	**	7					
Karakoc	☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	6					
Karimi	***	☆☆	**	7					
Karvounaris	***	☆☆	**	7					
Lee	☆☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆☆	9					
MOK	☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	7					
Ormseth	☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	7					
Parra-Salcedo	☆☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	7					
Rostom	***	☆☆	**	7					
Sahebari	☆☆	☆☆	☆☆	6					
Salinas	☆☆	☆☆	☆☆☆	7					
Santos	***	**	☆☆☆	8					

Table 2. Methodological quality of included studies included in the meta-analysis

software RevMan 5.2 (Cochrane Collaboration, http://ims.cochrane.org/revman) was used to calculate the statistical significance.

Results

Eligible studies

Based on the aforementioned search strategy, a total of 3251 articles were retrieved via a preliminary selection, including 1312 articles in Embase database, 655 articles in PubMed database and 1284 articles in Springer link database. Then there remained 2282 articles after eliminating duplicated articles. Next, via title browsing, 2245 articles that did not meet our inclusion criteria were excluded. Thereafter, 37 articles were remained after abstract reading, among which 15 articles were further excluded due to 9 were reviews and 6 did not involve the correlation of RA and MetS. After full text reading, 5 of the 22 remaining studies were excluded. No additional studies were included by manual search. Thus, a set of 17 eligible articles were included in the meta-analysis [8-10, 15-28]. Flow chart of the study selection is shown in Figure 1.

Study characteristics

As presented in **Table 1**, totally, the included 17 studies consisted of 3251 RA patients in exper-

imental group and 5536 healthy individuals in control group. The studies were published mainly from 2006 to 2015, and were primarily conducted in regions such as Europe, Asia, America and Africa. Age and sex composition of participants at study baseline had no significant differences. There are three main diagnostic criteria of MetS, including the National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel III (NCEP-ATP III), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Diabetes Federation (IDF). According to the quality assessment results, all the studies achieved scores \geq 6 stars, indicating a good quality of the included studies (Table 2).

Study outcomes

A total of 15 studies applied the diagnostic criterion of NCEP-ATP III [8, 9, 15-17, 19-28]. As shown in **Figure 2**, heterogeneity among the 15 studies

was statistically significant ($l^2 = 80\%$, P < 0.05). Therefore, the random-effects model was used. The pooled result indicated that risk of MetS diagnosed by NCEP-ATP III was significantly higher in RA patients than that in control group (OR = 1.38, 95% Cl: 1.04 to 1.83, P = 0.02, **Figure 2A**).

Only 4 studies [15, 22, 25, 26] have reported the prevalence of MetSin RA patients with the WHO criterion. Likewise, a random-effects model was applied due to substantial heterogeneity across these studies ($I^2 = 74\%$, P = 0.009), and the pooled results indicated there was no significant relationship between RA and prevalence of MetS (OR = 1.83, 95% CI: 0.88 to 3.80, P = 0.11, Figure 2B).

There were 8 studies reported MetS risk according to the IDF criterion [8-10, 15, 18, 20, 25, 28]. Due to substantial heterogeneity was observed among the studies ($I^2 = 90\%$, P < 0.05), the random-effects model was selected. As a result, RA was not significantly related to MetS risk with this criterion (OR = 1.44, 95% CI: 0.81 to 2.55, P = 0.22, Figure 2C).

Subgroup analyses

In studies diagnosed by the NCEP-ATP III criterion, subgroup analyses stratified by study region, type and sex were performed.

Rheumatoid arthritis and metabolic syndrome

	Experim		Contr			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events				-	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Abourazzak 2014	52	179	8	149	5.3%	7.22 [3.30, 15.77]	· · ·
Bilecik 2014	27	100	28	100	6.3%	0.95 [0.51, 1.77]	
Chung 2008	54	154	19	85	6.3%	1.88 [1.02, 3.45]	
Crowson 2011	76	232	316	1241	8.2%	1.43 [1.05, 1.93]	-
Cunha 2012	111	283	44	226	7.6%	2.67 [1.78, 4.01]	· · · ·
Dao 2010	34	105	19	105	6.1%	2.17 [1.14, 4.12]	
Karimi 2011	25	92	34	96	6.3%	0.68 [0.37, 1.27]	
Karvounaris 2006	88	200	164	400	7.9%	1.13 [0.80, 1.59]	- <u>+</u>
Lee 2013	16	84	17	109	5.5%	1.27 [0.60, 2.70]	_ _
Mok 2011	137	699	278	1398	8.5%	0.98 [0.78, 1.23]	+
Ormseth 2013	58	162	18	89	6.3%	2.20 [1.20, 4.04]	— -
Parra-Salcedo 2015	24	160	43	160	6.7%	0.48 [0.28, 0.84]	_
Rostom 2013	24	120	14	100	5.7%	1.54 [0.75, 3.16]	+
Sahebari 2011	54	120	269	500	7.6%	0.70 [0.47, 1.05]	
Santos 2010	25	98	16	102	5.8%	1.84 [0.91, 3.71]	<u>+</u>
Total (95% CI)		2788		4860	100.0%	1.38 [1.04, 1.83]	•
Total events	805		1287				•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		= 71 18		P < 0 0	0001)· I² =	- 80%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Test for overall effect:	,	,	,	0.0	0001), 1 -		0.05 0.2 1 5
rest for overall effect.	2 - 2.20 (1	- 0.02)				Fa	avours experimental Favours control
	Experim	ontal	Contr	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
	Experim	entai	00110			Ouus Natio	Ouus Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events				Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Chung 2008					Weight 24.1%		
	Events	Total	Events	Total		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Chung 2008	Events 55	Total 154	Events 8	Total 85	24.1%	M-H. Random, 95% Cl 5.35 [2.40, 11.89]	
Chung 2008 Dao 2010	Events 55 20	<u>Total</u> 154 105	Events 8 13	Total 85 105	24.1% 24.8%	M-H. Random, 95% Cl 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55]	
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011	Events 55 20 18	Total 154 105 92	Events 8 13 21	Total 85 105 96 100	24.1% 24.8% 25.7%	M-H. Random. 95% Cl 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76]	
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013	Events 55 20 18	Total 154 105 92 120	Events 8 13 21	Total 85 105 96 100	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4%	<u>M-H. Random. 95% CI</u> 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16]	
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI)	Events 55 20 18 24 117	Total 154 105 92 120 471	Events 8 13 21 14 56	Total 85 105 96 100 386	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0%	M-H, Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80]	M-H. Random. 95% Cl
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² :	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55,	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P	Total 85 105 96 100 386	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80]	M-H. Random. 95% Cl
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² :	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, 2 = 0.11)	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P	Total 85 105 96 100 386 9 = 0.00	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² : Z = 1.62 (P	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, ? = 0.11) ental	<u>Events</u> 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr	Total 85 105 96 100 386 9 = 0.00	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); I ² = 74	M-H, Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] %	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² : Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, ? = 0.11) ental Total	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events	Total 85 105 96 100 386 9 = 0.00 rol Total	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u>	M-H. Random, 95% Cl 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abourazzak 2014	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, = 0.11) ental Total 120	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16	Total 85 105 96 100 386 P = 0.00 rol Total 149	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</u> 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</u> 3.69 [2.01, 6.77]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abourazzak 2014	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, = 0.11) ental Total 11,00	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44	Total 85 105 96 100 386 P = 0.00 Total 149 100	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.7%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, > = 0.11) ental 179 100 105	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24	Total 85 105 96 100 386 ? = 0.00 rol Total 149 100 105	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.7% 12.5%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, P = 0.11) ental 179 100 105 54	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5	Total 85 105 96 100 386 ? = 0.00 rol Total 149 100 105 52	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.7% 12.5% 9.7%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012 Parra-Salcedo 2015	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23 18	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, P = 0.11) ental Total 179 100 105 54 160	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5 42	Total 85 105 96 100 386 P = 0.00 Total 149 100 105 52 160	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.5% 9.7% 12.5%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30] 0.36 [0.19, 0.65]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012 Parra-Salcedo 2015 Rostom 2013	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23 18 58	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, > = 0.11) ental Total 179 100 105 54 160 120	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5 42 23	Total 85 105 96 100 386 9 = 0.00 rol Total 149 105 52 160 100	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.6%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 3.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30] 0.36 [0.19, 0.65] 3.13 [1.74, 5.64]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012 Parra-Salcedo 2015	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23 18	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, P = 0.11) ental Total 179 100 105 54 160	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5 42	Total 85 105 96 100 386 P = 0.00 Total 149 100 105 52 160	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.5% 9.7% 12.5%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30] 0.36 [0.19, 0.65]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012 Parra-Salcedo 2015 Rostom 2013 Sahebari 2011	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23 18 58 37	Total 154 105 92 120 471 = 11.55, = 0.11) ental 179 100 105 54 160 120 120	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5 42 23 171	Total 85 105 96 100 386 = 0.00 rol Total 149 100 105 52 160 100 500 624	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 <u>Weight</u> 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5%	M-H, Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30] 0.36 [0.19, 0.65] 3.13 [1.74, 5.64] 0.86 [0.56, 1.32]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 Odds Ratio
Chung 2008 Dao 2010 Karimi 2011 Rostom 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abourazzak 2014 Bilecik 2014 Dao 2010 Karakoc 2012 Parra-Salcedo 2015 Rostom 2013 Sahebari 2011 Salinas 2013	Events 55 20 18 24 117 0.41; Chi ² Z = 1.62 (P Experim Events 55 33 43 23 18 58 37	$\begin{array}{r} {\rm Total} \\ 154 \\ 105 \\ 92 \\ 120 \\ 471 \\ = 11.55, \\ 2 = 0.11 \\ \\ \hline {\rm ental} \\ \hline {\rm Total} \\ 179 \\ 100 \\ 105 \\ 54 \\ 160 \\ 120 \\ 409 \\ \end{array}$	Events 8 13 21 14 56 df = 3 (P Contr Events 16 44 24 5 42 23 171	Total 85 105 96 100 386 = 0.00 rol Total 149 100 105 52 160 100 500 624	24.1% 24.8% 25.7% 25.4% 100.0% 9); l ² = 74 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.5% 12.6% 13.6% 13.4%	M-H. Random, 95% CI 5.35 [2.40, 11.89] 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 0.87 [0.43, 1.76] 1.54 [0.75, 3.16] 1.83 [0.88, 3.80] % Fa Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 3.69 [2.01, 6.77] 0.63 [0.35, 1.11] 2.34 [1.29, 4.26] 6.97 [2.40, 20.30] 0.36 [0.19, 0.65] 3.13 [1.74, 5.64] 0.86 [0.56, 1.32] 0.81 [0.62, 1.04]	M-H. Random, 95% Cl M-H. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 Odds Ratio

Figure 2. Forest plot of association between metabolic syndrome and rheumatoid arthritis according to different diagnostic criteria. A: With NCEP-ATP III criterion; B: With WHO criterion; C: With IDF criteria.

When stratified by study type, it indicated that cross-sectional studies and case-control studies had significant heterogeneity ($l^2 > 50\%$, P < 0.05), and the pooled ORs were 1.51 (95% CI: 0.88 to 2.57) and 1.32 (95% CI: 0.93 to 1.87), respectively, both without statistical significance (P > 0.05, **Figure 3**).

When stratified by study region, RA was not significantly associated with MetS risk in any region (P > 0.05, Figure 4).

With regard to sex, the significant association was detected in male & female group (OR = 1.45, 95% CI: 1.01 to 2.07, P = 0.04), but not in female group (OR = 1.25, 95% CI: 0.81 to 1.93, P = 0.30) (Figure 5).

Publication bias

The funnel plot showed that the scatter distribution was symmetrical, suggesting a lack of obvious publication bias of the included studies (**Figure 6**).

Int J Clin Exp Med 2016;9(9):17334-17344

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 Cross-sectiona	l study						
Abourazzak 2014	52	179	8	149	5.3%	7.22 [3.30, 15.77]	
Crowson 2011	76	232	316	1241	8.2%	1.43 [1.05, 1.93]	
Dao 2010	34	105	19	105	6.1%	2.17 [1.14, 4.12]	
Karvounaris 2006	88	200	164	400	7.9%	1.13 [0.80, 1.59]	- -
ee 2013	16	84	17	109	5.5%	1.27 [0.60, 2.70]	
Parra-Salcedo 2015	24	160	43	160	6.7%	0.48 [0.28, 0.84]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		960		2164	39.7%	1.51 [0.88, 2.57]	◆
Total events	290		567				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.36; Chi ²	= 34.26,	df = 5 (P	< 0.00	001); l ² = 8	85%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.50 (F	e = 0.13)	,		,.		
2.1.2 Case-control st	udy						
Bilecik 2014	27	100	28	100	6.3%	0.95 [0.51, 1.77]	
Chung 2008	54	154	19	85	6.3%	1.88 [1.02, 3.45]	
Cunha 2012	111	283	44	226	7.6%	2.67 [1.78, 4.01]	
Karimi 2011	25	92	34	96	6.3%	0.68 [0.37, 1.27]	
Mok 2011	137	699	278	1398	8.5%	0.98 [0.78, 1.23]	+
Ormseth 2013	58	162	18	89	6.3%	2.20 [1.20, 4.04]	— -
Rostom 2013	24	120	14	100	5.7%	1.54 [0.75, 3.16]	+
Sahebari 2011	54	120	269	500	7.6%	0.70 [0.47, 1.05]	
Santos 2010	25	98	16	102	5.8%	1.84 [0.91, 3.71]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1828		2696	60.3%	1.32 [0.93, 1.87]	◆
Total events	515		720				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		= 36.20.		< 0.00	01); l² = 78	8%	
Test for overall effect:		,	(,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Fotal (95% CI)		2788		4860	100.0%	1.38 [1.04, 1.83]	•
Total events	805	2100	1287	4000	100.0 /0	1.50 [1.04, 1.05]	-
		- 71 10			0001\.12 -	900/	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	,		,	- < 0.0	0001); 1- =	00%	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for overall effect:		,			0) 12 - 00/	Fa	avours experimental Favours control
Fest for subgroup diffe	erences: Ch	$11^{\circ} = 0.16$). dt = 1 (l	P < 0.6	9). I ² = 0%	•	

Figure 3. Subgroup analysis of study type.

Discussions

This meta-analysis included 17 articles, involving a total of 8787 participants (3251 RA patients and 5536 healthy individuals). Interestingly, we found that RA patients had a pronounced higher prevalence of MetS than healthy controls, only applying the diagnostic criteria of NCEP-ATP III, instead of using the WHO or IDF criteria.

CVD is considered as the major reason for death in RA patients, and MetS is a clustering of risk factors of CVD [6, 29]. Inflammation is one major hallmark of RA, and accumulating evidence demonstrates that many pro-inflammatory cytokines, such as IL-1, IL6 and TNF- α , are involved in progression of RA [30, 31]. In fact, MetS is associated with subclinical inflammation [32], and metabolic inflammation plays important roles in CVD [33]. Therefore, it is understandable that RA patients achieved a higher incidence of MetS, in comparison with the healthy control. Furthermore, emerging evi-

dence supports the concept that the accumulated adipose tissue macrophage exerts significant function during the process of metabolic inflammation [34, 35]. A study further confirms that alteration of adipokine could contribute to the promotion of obesity-related metabolic disorders and CVD [36]. These suggest adipose tissue might be an important linkage between RA and MetS.

At present, three standards are widely used for diagnosis of MetS, including the WHO, NCEP-ATP III and IDF criteria [37-39]. However, different criteria might generate different results. Reportedly, prevalence of MetS varies depending on different diagnostic criteria, and it is commonly higher based on IDF than NCEP-ATP III [40]. Another study indicates a comparable incidence of MetS using NCEP-ATP III with using IDF criteria among children and adolescents, but a higher prevalence using modified WHO criterion than the other two criteria [38]. Although IDF and NCEP-ATP III are often used for the diagnosis of MetS or for comparison,

Rheumatoid arthritis and metabolic syndrome

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.2.1 Asian							
Dao 2010	34	105	19	105	6.1%	2.17 [1.14, 4.12]	
Karimi 2011	25	92	34	96	6.3%	0.68 [0.37, 1.27]	
Lee 2013	16	84	17	109	5.5%	1.27 [0.60, 2.70]	
Mok 2011	137	699	278	1398	8.5%	0.98 [0.78, 1.23]	
Sahebari 2011	54	120	269	500	7.6%	0.70 [0.47, 1.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1100		2208	34.0%	1.00 [0.71, 1.41]	•
Total events	266		617				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.09: Chi ²	= 10.25.	df = 4 (P	= 0.04): l ² = 61%		
Test for overall effect:					,,		
2.2.2 America							
Chung 2008	54	154	19	85	6.3%	1.88 [1.02, 3.45]	— <u> </u>
Crowson 2011	54 76	232		85 1241	6.3% 8.2%	1.43 [1.05, 1.93]	
			44				
Cunha 2012	111	283		226	7.6%	2.67 [1.78, 4.01]	
Ormseth 2013	58	162	18	89	6.3%	2.20 [1.20, 4.04]	
Parra-Salcedo 2015	24	160 991	43	160 1801	6.7%	0.48 [0.28, 0.84]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	202	991	440	1001	35.1%	1.51 [0.88, 2.57]	
Total events	323	05.00	440		04) 12 - 0	40/	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	,	,		< 0.00	01); 1- = 84	+70	
2.2.3 Africa							
Abourazzak 2014	52	179	8	149	5.3%	7.22 [3.30, 15.77]	
Rostom 2013	24	120	14	100	5.7%	1.54 [0.75, 3.16]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		299		249	11.0%	3.30 [0.72, 15.23]	
Total events	76		22				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.07; Chi ²	= 8.27, c	f = 1 (P =	= 0.004); I² = 88%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.53 (F	P = 0.13)					
2.2.4 Europe							
Bilecik 2014	27	100	28	100	6.3%	0.95 [0.51, 1.77]	+
Karvounaris 2006	88	200	164	400	7.9%	1.13 [0.80, 1.59]	
Santos 2010	25	98	16	102	5.8%	1.84 [0.91, 3.71]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	20	398	.5	602	20.0%	1.18 [0.89, 1.57]	•
Fotal events	140		208				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		= 2.07 c		= 0.36)	$ ^2 = 3\%$		
Test for overall effect:	,	,	•	0.00),			
Total (95% CI)		2788		4860	100.0%	1.38 [1.04, 1.83]	•
Total events	805	2.00	1287				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		= 71 19		P < 0 0	0001) 12 -	80%	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Test for overall effect:				- 0.0			0.05 0.2 1 5 20
Test for subgroup diffe		,		D = 0 3	3) ² - 12	8%	avours experimental Favours control

Figure 4. Subgroup analysis of geographic region.

NCEP-ATP III is more frequently used. In our study, a total of 14 studies applied the NCEP-ATP III diagnostic criterion. Based on the previous meta-analysis, RA was associated with the prevalence of MetS, only with the NCEP-ATP III criterion, but not with IDF or WHO criteria [11], which is consisted with our findings. This prompts us that NCEP-ATP III might be more appropriate for MetS diagnosis to investigate its association with RA.

As our results indicated, substantial heterogeneities were presented. To further investigate the potential causative factors, we performed subgroup analysis stratified by region, study type and sex composition for studies using NCEP-ATP III as the diagnostic criterion for MetS. Unexpected, we did not detect any significant difference on MetS prevalence between RA patients and healthy controls, when stratified by region (P > 0.05). This might be explained by an almost equal distribution of articles in Asian, America, Europe and Africa. Considering only 2-5 studies were included in each subgroup of geographic regions, we could not conclude whether region is a confounder factor for substantial heterogeneity, but just suggest that more studies in relevant countries are required. Cross-sectional study might be insensitive when determine the directionality between

Rheumatoid arthritis and metabolic syndrome

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H. Random, 95% CI
2.3.1 F							
Bilecik 2014	27	100	28	100	6.3%	0.95 [0.51, 1.77]	_ _
Dao 2010	34	105	19	105	6.1%	2.17 [1.14, 4.12]	
Karimi 2011	25	92	34	96	6.3%	0.68 [0.37, 1.27]	
Lee 2013	16	84	17	109	5.5%	1.27 [0.60, 2.70]	
Santos 2010	25	98	16	102	5.8%	1.84 [0.91, 3.71]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		479		512	29.9%	1.25 [0.81, 1.93]	-
Total events	127		114				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.13; Chi ²	= 8.41, d	lf = 4 (P =	= 0.08);	l² = 52%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.03 (F	P = 0.30)					
2.3.2 M&F							
Abourazzak 2014	52	179	8	149	5.3%	7.22 [3.30, 15.77]	
Chung 2008	54	154	19	85	6.3%	1.88 [1.02, 3.45]	
Crowson 2011	76	232	316	1241	8.2%	1.43 [1.05, 1.93]	
Cunha 2012	111	283	44	226	7.6%	2.67 [1.78, 4.01]	
Karvounaris 2006	88	200	164	400	7.9%	1.13 [0.80, 1.59]	
Mok 2011	137	699	278	1398	8.5%	0.98 [0.78, 1.23]	+
Ormseth 2013	58	162	18	89	6.3%	2.20 [1.20, 4.04]	
Parra-Salcedo 2015	24	160	43	160	6.7%	0.48 [0.28, 0.84]	_ - -
Rostom 2013	24	120	14	100	5.7%	1.54 [0.75, 3.16]	
Sahebari 2011	54	120	269	500	7.6%	0.70 [0.47, 1.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2309		4348	70.1%	1.45 [1.01, 2.07]	◆
Total events	678		1173				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.27; Chi ²	= 62.79,	df = 9 (P	< 0.00	001); l² = i	86%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.02 (F	P = 0.04)					
Total (95% CI)		2788		4860	100.0%	1.38 [1.04, 1.83]	◆
Total events	805		1287				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		= 71.18.		P < 0.0	0001); l² =	* 80%	
Test for overall effect:			,		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup diffe				P = 0.6	2) $l^2 = 0\%$, Fa	avours experimental Favours control

Figure 5. Subgroup analysis of sex composition.



Figure 6. Funnel plot of all the included studies.

MetS and related diseases [41]. Our findings that RA was not associated with prevalence of MetS in neither cross-sectional studies, nor case-control studies, suggesting study type

was not a causative factor for heterogeneity. With regard to sex composition, although Zhang's meta-analysis did not consider this factor for subgroup analysis, they implied it might influence the overall result [11]. We did not confirm this hypothesis but found that in female subgroup, RA was not pronouncedly related to the prevalence of MetS (P > 0.05). Due to the limited research data, the male subgroup could not be extracted separately, we failed to estimate whether male patients with RA were more likely to develop MetS or not.

Despite the fact that 17 eligible studies were all with larger sample size and high quality, there are several limitations in the meta-analysis. First, all the included studies were observation-

al studies, and there lacked prospective studies. Although several confounding factors were adjusted, the correlation between RA and MetS risk could still be affected by certain unadjusted confounding factors. Second, significant heterogeneity existed across studies, which might cause some bias of the result. Fortunately, we have conducted subgroup analyses to recognize potential resources of heterogeneity. Third, treatment of RA could influence the components of MetS; however, neither of the included studies mentioned the related issue. Thus, we did not take this factor into consideration, which might affect the accuracy of MetS diagnosis. Therefore, more high-quality prospective studies are necessary to verify the result that RA patients had higher prevalence of MetS than healthy individuals.

In conclusion, high prevalence of MetS is significantly associated with RA, especially when using the NCEP-ATP III diagnostic criterion. Prevalence of MetS might be used as an indicator for RA progression. However, more prospective studies with larger sample size are required to confirm these results.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Jianbing Ma, Department of Knee Surgery, Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University Health Science Center, Eastern Youyi Road no. 555, Xi'an 710054, Shaanxi, China. Tel: +8613609251167; Fax: +8602987894724; E-mail: majbing@163.com

References

- McInnes IB and Schett G. The pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. New Engl J Med 2011; 365: 2205-2219.
- [2] Myasoedova E, Davis III JM, Crowson CS and Gabriel SE. Epidemiology of rheumatoid arthritis: rheumatoid arthritis and mortality. Curr Rheumatol Rep 2010; 12: 379-385.
- [3] Crowson CS, Liao KP, Davis JM, Solomon DH, Matteson EL, Knutson KL, Hlatky MA and Gabriel SE. Rheumatoid arthritis and cardiovascular disease. Am Heart J 2013; 166: 622-628, e621.
- [4] Villarino MR, Sala ER, Latorre FG, Garcia MY, Ferrer MM, Pascual ÈV, Bernabeu EV, Dangond CV, Espí GA and Sancho JA. AB0372 Physical Exercise has no Influence on Markers of Sub-

clinical Cardiovascular Disease in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 2015; 74: 1018-1018.

- [5] Goshayeshi L, Saber H, Sahebari M, Rezaieyazdi Z, Rafatpanah H, Esmaily H and Goshayeshi L. Association between metabolic syndrome, BMI, and serum vitamin D concentrations in rheumatoid arthritis. Clin Rheumatol 2012; 31: 1197-1203.
- [6] Gremese E and Ferraccioli G. The metabolic syndrome: the crossroads between rheumatoid arthritis and cardiovascular risk. Autoimmun Rev 2011; 10: 582-589.
- [7] Ruderman NB, Carling D, Prentki M and Cacicedo JM. AMPK, insulin resistance, and the metabolic syndrome. J Clin Invest 2013; 123: 2764.
- [8] Bilecik NA, Tuna S, Samanci N, Balci N and Akbas H. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in women with rheumatoid arthritis and effective factors. Int J Clin Exp Med 2014; 7: 2258-2265.
- [9] Abourazzak FE, Mansouri S, Najdi A, Tahiri L, Nejjari C and Harzy T. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with rheumatoid arthritis in Morocco: a cross-sectional study of 179 cases. Clin Rheumatol 2014; 33: 1549-1555.
- [10] Salinas MJ, Bertoli AM, Lema L, Saucedo C, Rosa J, Quintana R, Bellomio V, Aguero S, Spindler W, Tamborenea N, Schimid M, Ceccato F, Sala JP, Paira S, Spindler A, Soriano ER, Estel BA, Caeiro F, Alvarellos A and Saurit V. Prevalence and correlates of metabolic syndrome in patients with rheumatoid arthritis in Argentina. J Clin Rheumatol 2013; 19: 439-443.
- [11] Zhang J, Fu L, Shi J, Chen X, Li Y, Ma B and Zhang Y. The risk of metabolic syndrome in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a meta-analysis of observational studies. PLoS One 2013; 8: e78151.
- [12] Wells G, Shea B, Oj connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M and Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2011. URL: http://www. ohri. ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford. asp 2011.
- [13] Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ and Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003; 327: 557-560.
- [14] Liu YJ, Zhan J, Liu XL, Wang Y, Ji J and He QQ. Dietary flavonoids intake and risk of type 2 diabetes: A meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. Clin Nutr 2014; 33: 59-63.
- [15] Rostom S, Mengat M, Lahlou R, Hari A, Bahiri R and Hajjaj-Hassouni N. Metabolic syndrome in rheumatoid arthritis: case control study. BMC Musculoskelet Dis 2013; 14: 147.
- [16] Ormseth MJ, Lipson A, Alexopoulos N, Hartlage GR, Oeser AM, Bian A, Gebretsadik T, Shintani

A, Raggi P and Stein CM. Association of epicardial adipose tissue with cardiometabolic risk and metabolic syndrome in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthrit Care Res (Hoboken) 2013; 65: 1410-1415.

- [17] Lee SG, Kim JM, Lee SH, Kim KH, Kim JH, Yi JW, Jung WJ, Park YE, Park SH, Lee JW, Baek SH, Lee JH and Kim GT. Is the frequency of metabolic syndrome higher in South Korean women with rheumatoid arthritis than in healthy subjects? Korean J Intern Med 2013; 28: 206-215.
- [18] Karakoc M, Batmaz I, Sariyildiz MA, Tahtasiz M, Cevik R, Tekbas E, Yildiz I and Celepkolu T. The relationship of metabolic syndrome with disease activity and the functional status in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. J Clin Med Res 2012; 4: 279-285.
- [19] da Cunha VR, Brenol CV, Brenol JC, Fuchs SC, Arlindo EM, Melo IM, Machado CA, de Castro Chaves H Jr and Xavier RM. Metabolic syndrome prevalence is increased in rheumatoid arthritis patients and is associated with disease activity. Scand J Rheumatol 2012; 41: 186-191.
- [20] Sahebari M, Goshayeshi L, Mirfeizi Z, Rezaieyazdi Z, Hatef MR, Ghayour-Mobarhan M, Akhlaghi S, Sahebkar A and Ferns GA. Investigation of the association between metabolic syndrome and disease activity in rheumatoid arthritis. ScientificWorldJournal 2011; 11: 1195-1205.
- [21] Mok CC, Ko GT, Ho LY, Yu KL, Chan PT and To CH. Prevalence of atherosclerotic risk factors and the metabolic syndrome in patients with chronic inflammatory arthritis. Arthrit Care Res (Hoboken) 2011; 63: 195-202.
- [22] Karimi M, Mazloomzadeh S, Kafan S and Amirmoghadami H. The frequency of metabolic syndrome in women with rheumatoid arthritis and in controls. Int J Rheum Dis 2011; 14: 248-254.
- [23] Crowson CS, Myasoedova E, Davis JM 3rd, Matteson EL, Roger VL, Therneau TM, Fitz-Gibbon P, Rodeheffer RJ and Gabriel SE. Increased prevalence of metabolic syndrome associated with rheumatoid arthritis in patients without clinical cardiovascular disease. J Rheumatol 2011; 38: 29-35.
- [24] Santos MJ, Vinagre F, Silva JJ, Gil V and Fonseca JE. Cardiovascular risk profile in systemic lupus erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis: a comparative study of female patients. Acta Reumatol Port 2010; 35: 325-332.
- [25] Dao HH, Do QT and Sakamoto J. Increased frequency of metabolic syndrome among Vietnamese women with early rheumatoid arthritis: a cross-sectional study. Arthritis Res Ther 2010; 12: R218.

- [26] Chung CP, Oeser A, Solus JF, Avalos I, Gebretsadik T, Shintani A, Raggi P, Sokka T, Pincus T and Stein CM. Prevalence of the metabolic syndrome is increased in rheumatoid arthritis and is associated with coronary atherosclerosis. Atherosclerosis 2008; 196: 756-763.
- [27] Karvounaris SA, Sidiropoulos PI, Papadakis JA, Spanakis EK, Bertsias GK, Kritikos HD, Ganotakis ES and Boumpas DT. Metabolic syndrome is common among middle-to-older aged Mediterranean patients with rheumatoid arthritis and correlates with disease activity: a retrospective, cross-sectional, controlled, study. Ann Rheum Dis 2007; 66: 28-33.
- [28] Parra-Salcedo F, Contreras-Yáñez I, Elías-López D, Aguilar-Salinas CA and Pascual-Ramos V. Prevalence, incidence and characteristics of the metabolic syndrome (MetS) in a cohort of Mexican Mestizo early rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with conventional disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs: the complex relationship between MetS and disease activity. Arthritis Res Ther 2015; 17: 34.
- [29] Rocha VM and Pippa MGB. Evaluation of Risk Factors for Cardiovascular Disease in Rheumatoid Arthritis. Arterioscl Throm Vas 2015; 35: A631-A631.
- [30] Van Halm V, Nielen M, Nurmohamed M, Van Schaardenburg D, Reesink H, Voskuyl A, Twisk J, van de Stadt R, de Koning M and Habibuw M. Lipids and inflammation: serial measurements of the lipid profile of blood donors who later developed rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 2007; 66: 184-188.
- [31] Libby P. Role of inflammation in atherosclerosis associated with rheumatoid arthritis. Am J Med 2008; 121: S21-S31.
- [32] Conen D, Rexrode KM, Creager MA, Ridker PM and Pradhan AD. Metabolic Syndrome, Inflammation, and Risk of Symptomatic Peripheral Artery Disease in Women A Prospective Study. Circulation 2009; 120: 1041-1047.
- [33] Romeo GR, Lee J and Shoelson SE. Metabolic syndrome, insulin resistance, and roles of inflammation-mechanisms and therapeutic targets. Arterioscl Throm Vas 2012; 32: 1771-1776.
- [34] Chawla A, Nguyen KD and Goh YS. Macrophage-mediated inflammation in metabolic disease. Nat Rev Immunol 2011; 11: 738-749.
- [35] Lolmède K, Duffaut C, Zakaroff-Girard A and Bouloumié A. Immune cells in adipose tissue: key players in metabolic disorders. Diabetes Metab 2011; 37: 283-290.
- [36] Maury E and Brichard S. Adipokine dysregulation, adipose tissue inflammation and metabolic syndrome. Mol Cell Endocrino 2010; 314: 1-16.

- [37] Chei CL, Yamagishi K, Tanigawa T, Kitamura A, Imano H, Kiyama M, Sato S and Iso H. Metabolic syndrome and the risk of ischemic heart disease and stroke among middle-aged Japanese. Hypertens Res 2008; 31: 1887-1894.
- [38] Cizmecioglu P, Etiler N, Hamzaoglu O and Hatun S. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in schoolchildren and adolescents in Turkey: a population-based study. J Pediatr Endocr Met 2009; 22: 703-714.
- [39] Mujica V, Leiva E, Icaza G, Diaz N, Arredondo M, Moore-Carrasco R, Orrego R, Vásquez M and Palomo I. Evaluation of metabolic syndrome in adults of Talca city, Chile. Nutr J 2008; 7: 14.
- [40] Bener A, Zirie M, Musallam M, Khader YS and Al-Hamaq AO. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome according to Adult Treatment Panel III and International Diabetes Federation criteria: a population-based study. Metab Syndr Relat D 2009; 7: 221-230.
- [41] Gisondi P, Tessari G, Conti A, Piaserico S, Schianchi S, Peserico A, Giannetti A and Girolomoni G. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with psoriasis: a hospital-based case. Brit J Dermatol 2007; 1: 68-73.