

**Supplementary File 1. Risk of bias assessments for included studies**

<b>Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Case Reports – Criteria</b>
1. Were 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. Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?
6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?
7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?
8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?
<b>Responses Options:</b> Yes, No, Unclear, Not Applicable (NA)
<b>Quality Rating:</b> Poor 0 – 2; Fair 3 – 5; Good 6 – 8

<b>Study</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Kashihara_1987	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Sano_1988	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Zager_1991	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Good
Matsumoto_1996	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Terao_2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Perrini_2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good
Tatsui_2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Suzuki_2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Good
Thorat_2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Kono_2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Moon_2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good
Zis_2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Zelman_2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Kobets_2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Good
Vanikieti_2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Nishimoto_2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Good

<b>Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Case Series – Criteria</b>
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 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 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?
<b>Responses Options:</b> Yes, No, Unclear, Not Applicable (NA)
<b>Quality Rating:</b> Poor 0 – 3; Fair 4 – 7; Good 8 – 10

<b>Study</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Linskey_1990	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Fair
Date_1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Good
Hahn_2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Good
Kikkawa_2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Fair