	Critical appraisal tools	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2020 ⁵⁰	American Academy of Pediatrics, 2019 ⁵²	Gonzalvo et al., 2016 ⁵⁵	Berg et al, 2021 ⁵⁶	Sahr et al, 2020 ⁵⁸	Silver et al, 2016 ⁵⁹	Hadland & Chadi, 2020 ⁵³	Graham et al, 2020 ⁴⁸	Graha m et al., 2021 ⁴⁹	Sikka et al., 2021 ⁵⁷	Chadi et al., 2021 ⁵⁴	Health Canada, 2021 ⁶⁰
JBI (CA tool for text and opinion												
1.	Is the source of the opinion clearly identified?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
2.	Does the source of opinion have standing in the field of expertise?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
3.	Are the interests of the relevant population the central focus of the opinion?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
4.	Is the stated position the result of an analytical process, and is there logic in the opinion expressed?	Y	Y	UC	Y			Y				Y	
5.	Is there reference to the extant literature?	Y	N	Ν	Y			Y				Y	
6.	Is any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defended?	Y	Y	N	Y			N				N	
JBI (CA tool for case reports												
1.	Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?					Y	Y						
2.	Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?					Y	Y						
3.	Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?					Y	Y						
4.	Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?					Y	UC						

Appendix 3. Quality assessment	of included studies using J	BI critical annraisal tools
Appendix 5. Quanty assessment	fi menuucu stuures using s	Di ci nicai appi aisai toois

Iterative treatment proceedure(s) Iterative described? 6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described? Y Y 7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described? Y N 8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons? Y Y 18. LOA to I for quasi-experimental study Y Y 1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'takeawa' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar UCC 4. Was there a control group? N 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention of interest? N	5.	Was the intervention(s) or		Y	UC				
clearly described? V Y Y 6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described? Y Y Y 7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described? Y N V 8. Does the case report provide takesway lessons? Y Y Y V 10. Ist clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? V Y Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? UC V V 4. Was there a control group? N N Y 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention of intervest? N N N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of the intervention sin the sin soft N N N	5.			1	00				
6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described? Y Y 7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described? Y N 8. Does the case report provide tatekaway lessons? Y Y JBI CA tool for quasi-experimental study Y Y Y 1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable cornes first)? Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar? UC V 4. Was there a control group? N N 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N N 6. Was follow up comparisons ifter control group? N N N									
clinical condition clearly described?	6			V	V				
described?	0.			1	1				
7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described? Y N 8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons? Y Y BIC A tool for quasi-experimental study Y Y Y 1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'sffect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar UC UC 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar UC Y 4. Was there a control group? N N 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N N									
or unanticipated events	7.		 	Y	N				
identified and described? Image: construction of the construction of the intervention of intervention of the intervention of intervention of the interventing of the interventing of the intervention of the interventing of				-					
8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons? Y Y BIC A tool for quasi-experimental study Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar UC UC 4. Was there a control group? N X 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N X 6. Was follow up complet and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adquately N N									
Iakeaway lessons? Image: Iakeaway lessons? Image: Iakeaway lessons? Image: Iakeaway lessons? JBI CA tool for quasi-experimental study Image: Iakeaway lessons? Image: Iakeaway lessons? Image: Iakeaway lessons? 1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Image: Y Image: Iakeaway lessons? 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Image: Y Image: Iakeaway lessons? 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? Image: Were there multiple Image: Were there multiple 4. Was there a control group? Image: Were there multiple Image: Were there multiple Image: Were there multiple 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of the outcome soft here outfor work of the outcome soft here multiple Image: Were there multiple Image: Were there multiple 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of the outcome soft here multiple Image: Were there multiple Image: Were there multiple	8.		 	Y	Y				
JBI CA tool for quasi-experimental study Image: study of the study what is the study which experimental study of the study which experimental study of the study which experimental study of the study which experimental study and the study of the study and the study of the study and the study and the study of the study and the study of the study and the study of the study of the study and the study of the study of the study and the study of t									
study Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cffect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? UC UC 4. Was there a control group? N Y V 5. Were there differences between groups in terms of the intervention/exposure? N N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of the inferences N N	JBI (
the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Y 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? UC 4. Was there a control group? N 5. Were the remultiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N									
'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Image: Comparison of the comparison of the intervention/exposure? 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? UC 4. Was there a control group? Image: Control group of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Y 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N	1.	Is it clear in the study what is				Y			
confusion about which variable comes first)? Y Image: Comparison of the state of the st									
variable comes first)? Image: comparison of the service of the se									
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Y 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? UC 4. Was there a control group? N 5. Were the multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N									
included in any comparisons similar? Image: Comparison of the system of the intervention/exposure? Image: Comparison of the system of the intervention/exposure? 3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? Image: Comparison of the system of the									
similar? understand	2.					Y			
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? UC UC 4. Was there a control group? N 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? N 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N									
included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? Image: Comparisons of the exposure or intervention of interest? 4. Was there a control group? Image: Comparison of the exposure or intervention of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Comparison of the exposure or intervention of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Comparison of the exposure or intervention of the outcome differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately Image: Comparison of the exposure of the outcome both pre and the outcome both pr									
receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? 4. Was there a control group? 5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately	3.					UC			
treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? N Image: state intervention of interest? 4. Was there a control group? N Image: state intervention of intervention of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Y 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of the intervention of intervention of intervention of intervention of items of the intervention of the intervention of the intervention of items of ite									
exposure or intervention of interest? Image: Constraint of the intervention of group? Image: Constraint of the intervention of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Constraint of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Constraint of the outcome both pre and post the intervention of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the intervent of the outcome both pre and post the outcome both pre and post the outcome both pre and post the outcome bot									
interest? Image: Control group?									
4. Was there a control group? N N Image: Control group in terms of the control measurements of the control measurements of the control measurements of the control measurements of the control measurement in the intervention/exposure? Image: Control measurement in terms of the control measurement in									
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Y Y 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately N N	4					NT			
measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Constraint of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? 6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately Image: Constraint of the outcome both pre and post their follow up adequately									
outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Image: Constraint of the intervention of the in	э.					Y			
the intervention/exposure? Image: Complete and the intervention of the intervent									
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately									
if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately	6					 N			
between groups in terms of their follow up adequately	0.					T.4			
their follow up adequately									
described and analyzed?		described and analyzed?							
7. Were the outcomes of Y	7.					Y	1		
participants included in any									

	comparisons measured in the							
	same way?							
8.	Were outcomes measured in				UC			
	a reliable way?							
9.	Was appropriate statistical				Y			
	analysis used?							
	CA tool for RCTs							
1.	Was true randomization used					Y		
	for assignment of participants							
	to treatment groups?							
2.	Was allocation to treatment					Y		
	groups concealed?							
3.	Were treatment groups					Y		
	similar at the baseline?							
4.	Were participants blind to					Y		
	treatment assignment?							
5.	Were those delivering					Y		
	treatment blind to treatment							
	assignment?							
6.	Were outcomes assessors					Y		
	blind to treatment							
_	assignment?							
7.	Were treatment groups					UC		
	treated identically other than							
0	the intervention of interest?							
8.	Was follow up complete and					Y		
	if not, were differences							
	between groups in terms of							
	their follow up adequately described and analyzed?							
9.	Were participants analyzed in			 		Y		
у.	the groups to which they					1		
	were randomized?							
10.	Were outcomes measured in					Y		
10.	the same way for treatment					I		
	groups?							
11.	Were outcomes measured in					NA		
11.	a reliable way?					INA		
	a reliable way:						1	

12. Was appropriate statistical malysis used? Y 13. Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Y JBI CA tool for case series Image: Charlen the standard reason of the trial? Y JBI CA tool for case series Image: Charlen the standard reason of the trial? Y JBI CA tool for case series Image: Charlen the standard, reliable way for inclusion in the case series? Y 2. Was the condition measured in the case series? Image: Charlen the standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the case series? Image: Charlen the case series? Y 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y Y 5. Did the case reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of participants? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Wer	10	W7					V		
13. Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Y JBI CA tool for case series Image: Case series Image: Case series 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Image: Case series Image: Case series 2. Was the condition measured in astandard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y Image: Case series 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N Y 4. Did the case series have convertive inclusion of participants? Y Y Y 5. Did the case series have comparticipants? Y Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Y Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y Y Y 6. W	12.						Ŷ		
appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: Constant of the conduct and analysis of the trial? JBI CA tool for case series Image: Constant of the inclusion in the case series? Image: Constant of the trial? 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Image: Constant of the trial participants included in the case series? Image: Constant of the trial participants included in the case series? 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: Constant of the trial participants included Image: Constant of the trial participants included 5. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of participants? Image: Constant of the the case series have compete inclusion of the case series of the the case series of the the case series of the the case series of the constant of the participants? Image: Constant of the the case series of the the case series of the the case series of the constant of the the case series of the	10								
deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: CA tool for case series Image: CA tool for case series 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Image: CA tool for case series Image: CA tool for case series 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Image: CA tool for case series Image: CA tool for case series 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: CA tool for case series Image: CA tool for case series 4. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: CA tool for case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: CA tool for case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: CA tool for case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: CA tool for case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: CA tool for case series have complete inclusion of for case series have compl	13.						Y		
RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: Conduct and analysis of the trial? JBI CA tool for case series Image: Conduct analysis of the trial? Image: Conduct analysis of the trial? 1. Were there clear criteria for in the case series? Image: Conduct analysis of the trial? Y 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N Y 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants included in the case series? Y Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants included in the case relies? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y									
randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: constant of the conduct and analysis of the trial? JBICA tool for case series Image: constant of the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: constant of the conduct and analysis of the trial? 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Image: constant of trial constant of the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Image: constant of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: constant of the condition of the condition of the condition of the condition of participants? Image: constant of the condition of the condition of participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: constant of the condition of participants? Image: constant of the condition of participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: constant of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? Image: constant of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: constant of the participants? Image: con									
groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? JBI CA tool for case series Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? JBI CA tool for case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? JBI CA tool for case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Image: conduct and methods used for identification of the condition 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? Image: conduct and analysis of the condition for all participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Ymage: conduct and the case series have complete inclusion of the participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Ymage: conduct and the amage: conduct and the case series have complete inclusion of the participants? Ymage: conduct and the amage: c									
conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? JBL CA tool for case series Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? Image: conduct and analysis of the trial? 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the case series? 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the case series? Image: conduct and analysis of the case series? 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: conduct and									
Itial?									
JBI CA tool for case series Image: Case of the study? Image: Case of the study? 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Image: Case of the study? Y 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N N 4. Did the case series have consective inclusion of participants? Y Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the tudy? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y									
1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Y 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y 6. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y									
inclusion in the case series? Vas the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y	JBI (
2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Y Y 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N N 4. Did the case series? Y Y 5. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y	1.							Y	
in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? N 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y									
all participants included in the case series? N 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants? Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y	2.	Was the condition measured						Y	
the case series? Image: constraint of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: constraint of the condition for all participants included in the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: constraint of the condition for all participants? 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: constraint of the condition for all participants? Image: constraint of the condition for all participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: constraint of the participants? Image: constraint of the participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Image: constraint of the participants? Image: constraint of the participants? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Image: constraint of the participants? Image: constraint of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: constraint of the participants? Image: constraint of the participants?									
3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? N N 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Y Y 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y									
identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants in the study? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: Consecutive inclusion of the participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants?		the case series?							
for all participants included in the case series? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants?	3.	Were valid methods used for						Ν	
in the case series? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 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		identification of the condition							
in the case series? Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants? 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		for all participants included							
consecutive inclusion of participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants?5.Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants?6.Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants in the study?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants in the study?7.Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants?8.Were the outcomes or followImage: Consecutive inclusion of Participants?Image: Consecutive inclusion of Participants?									
participants?Image: Complete inclusion of participants?Y5.Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?Image: Complete inclusion of participants?6.Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?Image: Complete inclusion of the participants?7.Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?Image: Complete inclusion of the participants?8.Were the outcomes or followImage: Complete inclusion of the participants?	4.	Did the case series have						Y	
5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Y Y 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y		consecutive inclusion of							
complete inclusion of participants?complete inclusion of participants?Y6.Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?Y7.Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?Y8.Were the outcomes or followY									
complete inclusion of participants?complete inclusion of participants?Y6.Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?Y7.Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?Y8.Were the outcomes or followY	5.	Did the case series have						Y	
participants? Image: Constraint of the demographics of the participants in the study? Image: Constraint of the participants in the study? Image: Constraint of the participants? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Image: Constraint of the participants? Image: Constraint of the participants? Image: Constraint of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow Image: Constraint of the participants? Image: Constraint of the participants? Image: Constraint of the participants?									
6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Y Y Y 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y Y									
the demographics of the participants in the study? Image: the demographic of the participants in the study? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow	6.							Y	
participants in the study? Image: Constraint of the study? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow									
7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Y Y 8. Were the outcomes or follow Y Y									
clinical information of the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow	7.							Y	
participants? Image: Constraint of the system of the sys									
8. Were the outcomes or follow Y									
	8.							Y	
		up results of cases clearly							
reported?									
9. Was there clear reporting of Y	9.							Y	
the presenting site(s)/clinic(s)									
demographic information?									

10.	Was statistical analysis					NA	
	appropriate?						
JMI	CA tool for qualitative						
resea	arch						
1.	Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?						Y
2.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?						Y
3.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?						Y
4.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?						Y
5.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?						Y
6.	Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?						Ν
7.	Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?						Y
8.	Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?						Y
9.	Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?						UC

10.	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?												Y
Tota	al (obtained score/total score)	6/6	5/6	3/6	6/6	8/8	5/8	5/6	5/9	11/13	8/10	5/6	8/10
Perc	centage (%)	100	83	50	100	100	62	83	55	85	80	83	80

Abbreviations: JBI, Joana Briggs Institute; N, No; NA, Not applicable; UC, Unclear; Y, Yes.