

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE

Supplementary File 1: Risk of bias assessments for included studies.**Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Case Reports – Criteria**

1. Were the patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?
2. Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?
3. Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?
4. Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?
5. Were the intervention (s) or treatment procedure (s) clearly described?
6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?
7. Were adverse events (harm) or unanticipated events identified and described?
8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?
9. Responses Options: Yes, No, Unclear, Not Applicable (NA)

Quality Rating: Poor 0–2; Fair 3–5; Good 6–9

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Rating
Kang – 2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
Sgreccia <i>et al.</i> – 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Bhatti <i>et al.</i> – 2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 7
Kraus <i>et al.</i> – 2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Kurokawa <i>et al.</i> – 2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
Martinez-Perez <i>et al.</i> – 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Morishita <i>et al.</i> – 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 9
Parr <i>et al.</i> – 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
De San Pedro – 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Sobol <i>et al.</i> – 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Suzuki <i>et al.</i> – 2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 7
Yi <i>et al.</i> – 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Lylyk <i>et al.</i> – 1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 9
Kobets <i>et al.</i> – 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
Gelener and Akpınar – 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 8
Zelman <i>et al.</i> – 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Tsuboi <i>et al.</i> – 1992	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 7
Takahashi <i>et al.</i> – 2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Collins <i>et al.</i> – 1992	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 8
Tummala <i>et al.</i> – 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
Nathal <i>et al.</i> – 1992	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Murakami <i>et al.</i> – 2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Kerns <i>et al.</i> – 1979	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 7
Fujita <i>et al.</i> – 2002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Maroon <i>et al.</i> – 1978	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Miyazawa <i>et al.</i> – 2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 7
Tajima <i>et al.</i> – 1993	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 8
Sarwar – 1977	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Kurokawa <i>et al.</i> – 1999	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 7
Nathal <i>et al.</i> – 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8

Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Case Series – Criteria

1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?
2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?
3. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?
4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?
5. Did the case series have a complete inclusion of participants?
6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?
7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?
8. Were the outcomes or follow-up results of cases clearly reported?
9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site (s)/clinic (s) demographic information?
10. Was statistical analysis appropriate?

Responses Options: Yes, No, Unclear, Not Applicable (NA)

Quality Rating: Poor 0–3; Fair 4–7; Good 8–10

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rating
Koskela <i>et al.</i> – 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Kameda-Smith <i>et al.</i> – 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Bartleson <i>et al.</i> – 1986	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Fair - 7
Hassan and Hamimi – 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Santillan <i>et al.</i> – 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 8
Brigui <i>et al.</i> – 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair - 7
Burkhardt <i>et al.</i> – 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 9
Signorelli <i>et al.</i> – 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Weber <i>et al.</i> – 2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Zhang <i>et al.</i> – 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Fair - 7
Lehto <i>et al.</i> – 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8
Koskela <i>et al.</i> – 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 9
Rodríguez-Catarino – 2003	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
KONO <i>et al.</i> – 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Good - 9
Menghini <i>et al.</i> – 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Fair - 7
Kyriakides <i>et al.</i> – 1989	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good - 8
Moon <i>et al.</i> – 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Fair - 7
Kassis <i>et al.</i> – 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Fair - 7
Hall <i>et al.</i> – 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good - 8
Brown <i>et al.</i> – 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Fair - 7
Matano <i>et al.</i> – 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Fair - 7
Boulouis <i>et al.</i> – 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good - 8