

Table 1: Socio-demographic differences between cases and control:

	Control (n =41)	Case (n=44)	P-value
Age in years	37.56 ± 11.3	41.44 ± 13.8	= 0.156*
Sex			
• Male	17 (41.5%)	22 (48.9%)	= 0.490**
• Female	24 (58.5%)	22 (51.1%)	
Residence			
• Urban	37 (90.2%)	10 (22.2%)	< 0.001**
• Rural	4 (9.8%)	34 (77.8%)	
Occupation			
• Unemployed	1 (2.4%)	22 (51.1%)	< 0.001**
• Employed	40 (97.6%)	22 (48.9%)	
Marital Status			
• Unmarried	4 (9.8%)	9 (20%)	= 0.185**
• Married	37 (90.2%)	35 (80%)	

*T-test was used to compare the mean differences between cases and controls

**Chi-square test was used to compare the proportions among groups

Table 2: Clinical Characteristics of the studied group of vitiligo patients:

Variable	Category	n = 44
Onset	• Gradual	44 (100%)
Course	• Progressive	44 (100%)
Duration	• Mean ± SD	5.65 ± 5.4
	• Median (Range)	4 years (8 months – 23 years)
Lesion Site	• Hands	25 (55.6%)
	• Lower Limb	22 (48.9%)
	• Face	17 (40%)
	• Trunk	15 (33.3%)
	• Arm/Forearm	12 (26.7%)
Previous Treatment	• No	8 (17.8%)
	• Topical	23 (53.3%)
	• NB-UVB	1 (2.2%)
	• Both	12 (26.7%)
Improvement	• Yes	23 (51.1%)
Family History	• Positive	9 (20%)
Comorbidity	• DM/HTN/RA	5 (11.1%)

Table 3: Anthropometric measurements, Total RRs, RRs categories and S.NGAL between vitiligo cases and controls:

	Control (n =41)	Case (n=44)	P-value
Weight/kg	74.85 ± 9.8	74.01 ± 11.1	= 0.701*
Height/cm	167.20 ± 5.2	169.13 ± 7.3	= 0.164*
BMI	26.72 ± 3.1	25.81 ± 3.5	= 0.210*
SBP (mmHg)	109.27 ± 8.1	108.44 ± 8.2	= 0.643*
DBP (mmHg)	72.68 ± 5.9	74.67 ± 5.1	= 0.100*
hs-CRP	1.97 ± 0.5	1.26 ± 0.3	= 0.254*
TC	170.02 ± 6.9	163.84 ± 6.1	= 0.502*
HDL-C	48.85 ± 2.9	43.36 ± 1.5	= 0.102*
RRs Score			
• Mean ± SD	1.11 ± 0.9	2.28 ± 3.3	= 0.204***
• Median (Range)	0.9 (0.2 – 3)	1 (0.2 – 13.6)	
RRs Categories			
• Low	41 (100%)	36 (82.2%)	
• Medium	0 (0%)	5 (11.1%)	= 0.008**
• High	0 (0%)	3 (6.7%)	
S. NGAL Level			
• Mean ± SD	280.85 ± 108.2	256.51 ± 123.7	= 0.136***
• Median (Range)	276 (122 – 783)	246 (104 – 775)	

P value< 0.05 was significant

***T-test was used to compare the mean differences between cases and controls**

****Chi-square test was used to compare the proportions among groups**

*****Mann Whitney U test was used to compare the median differences between cases and controls**

(BMI=body mass index, SBP=systolic blood pressure, DBP=diastolic blood pressure, hs-CRP=high sensitivity C-reactive protein, TC =total cholesterol), HDL-C high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, RRS= Reynolds Risk Score, NGAL= Neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin)

Table 4: Dermatological Examination Results of the studied Cases:

Variable	Category	n = 44
General Free	• Hair	43 (97.8%)
	• Nail	44 (100%)
	• MM	44 (100%)
Fitzpatrick Skin Phototype	• III	8 (17.8%)
	• IV	36 (82.2%)
Vitiligo Lesion Examination	• Head and Neck	20 (46.7%)
	• UL	24 (53.3%)
	• Hand	30 (66.7%)
	• LL/Groin/Buttock	27 (60%)
	• Feet	22 (48.9%)
	• Trunk	14 (31.1%)
Type of Vitiligo	• Vulgaris	36 (80%)
	• Acro-fascial	6 (13.3%)
	• Focal	2 (6.7%)
VASI Score	• Mean \pm SD	5.80 \pm 0.7
	• Median (Range)	4.3 (0.5 – 21.7)

VASI= Vitiligo Area Scoring Index

Table 5: Correlation between serum NGAL and RRs categories:

	NGAL serum Level (ng/ml)		P-value*	P-value**
	Mean \pm SD	Median (Range)		
RRs Risk Categories				
• Low (I)	250.08 \pm 130.2	235 (104 – 775)	= 0.558	I vs II=0.293
• Medium (II)	313.40 \pm 99.5	343 (180 – 410)		II vs III=0.432
• High (III)	241.01 \pm 50.5	242 (190 - 291)		I vs III=0.904

*One-way ANOVA Test was used to compare the mean difference among cases

*Post-hoc test with Bonferroni correction was used for pairwise comparison

RRs Reynolds Risk Score

RRS= Reynolds Risk Score, NGAL= Neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin