Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen Date: 16/04/2023

Author: Elysha Kolitz	Year: 2021			Record	Number	
		Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable	
• Were there clear criteria for in series?	nclusion in the case	X				
Was the condition measured i way for all participants include				X		
 Were valid methods used for i condition for all participants ir series? 				X		
• Did the case series have conse participants?	ecutive inclusion of			X		
 Did the case series have comp participants? 	lete inclusion of			X		
 Was there clear reporting of the participants in the study? 	he demographics of the	X				
 Was there clear reporting of control participants? 	linical information of the	X				
• Were the outcomes or follow clearly reported?	up results of cases	X				
 Was there clear reporting of the site(s)/clinic(s) demographic in 		X				
Was statistical analysis approp	oriate?				X	
Overall appraisal: Include $f X$ Exclude \Box Seek further info \Box Comments (Including reason for exclusion)						



Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen

Author: Klaus F. Helm Year 1991 Record Number Yes Unclear Not Nο applicable 1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case 2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable X way for all participants included in the case series? \Box 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case X series? 4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of X participants? 5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of X participants? 6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of X the participants in the study? 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of X the participants? 8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases X clearly reported? 9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting X site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? 10. Was statistical analysis appropriate? Include X Exclude \square Seek further info \square Overall appraisal: Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Date 16/04/2023



© Joanna Briggs Institute 2017

Critical Appraisal Checklist 3 for Case Series

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Vers	Date	e 16/04/20	23			
Author: Yvonne Nguyen Year 2018		Record	d Number			
	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable		
1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?	X					
2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?			X			
3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?	X					
4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	X					
5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	X					
6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?		X				
7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	X					
8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	X					
9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?		X				
10. Was statistical analysis appropriate?				X		
Overall appraisal: Include X Exclude Seek further info Comments (Including reason for exclusion)						



© Joanna Briggs Institute 2017

Critical Appraisal Checklist 3 for Case Series

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Vers	traelen	Date	16/04/2023	3
Author: HopeK. Haefner Year 1999		Record	Number_	
	Yes	No	Unclear a	Not ipplicable
1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?		X		
2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?		X		
3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?	X			
4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?			X	
5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?			X	
6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?		X		
7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	X			
8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	X			
9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?		X		
10. Was statistical analysis appropriate?				X
Overall appraisal: Include X Exclude Seek Comments (Including reason for exclusion)	(further	info [

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen Date: 16/04/2023							
Author: Katharine L. Dalziel	Year: 1995		Record Number				
	Yes	. No	Unclear	Not applicable			
 Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the c series? 	ase	X					
Was the condition measured in a standard, re way for all participants included in the case se			X				
 Were valid methods used for identification of condition for all participants included in the caseries? 							
 Did the case series have consecutive inclusion participants? 	of		X				
 Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? 	f 🗆		X				
 Was there clear reporting of the demographic participants in the study? 	xs of the X						
 Was there clear reporting of clinical informati participants? 	on of the	X					
 Were the outcomes or follow up results of casclearly reported? 	ses X						
 Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? 		X					
Was statistical analysis appropriate?				X			
Overall appraisal: Include X Exclude	Seek furt	ther info					
Comments (Including reason for exclusion)							

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen Date: 16/04/2023						
Author: Andreas R. Günthert	Year: 2007			Record I	Number	
		Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable	
 Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the series? 	e case	X				
Was the condition measured in a standard, way for all participants included in the case				X		
 Were valid methods used for identification condition for all participants included in the series? 				X		
 Did the case series have consecutive inclusi participants? 	on of			X		
 Did the case series have complete inclusion participants? 	of			X		
 Was there clear reporting of the demograp participants in the study? 	hics of the	X				
 Was there clear reporting of clinical inform participants? 	ation of the	X				
 Were the outcomes or follow up results of clearly reported? 	cases	X				
 Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? 	5		X			
Was statistical analysis appropriate?				X		
Overall appraisal: Include X Exclude Seek further info Comments (Including reason for exclusion)						

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen Date: 16/04/2023 Author: D. Trokoudes Year: 2019 Record Number Yes No Unclear Not applicable • Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case X series? • Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable X way for all participants included in the case series? • Were valid methods used for identification of the X condition for all participants included in the case series? • Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of X participants? • Did the case series have complete inclusion of X participants? • Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? • Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? • Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported? • Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? Was statistical analysis appropriate?

Exclude Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Include X

Overall appraisal:

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR **CASE CONTROL STUDIES**

Reviewer: Britt Debaene, Sander Vandeweege and Hans Verstraelen			elen	Date: 16/04/2023		
Author: C.A. Higgins		Year: 2012		Record Number		
		Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable	
1.	Were the groups comparable other than presence of disease in cases or the abserdisease in controls?		X			
2.	Were cases and controls matched appropriately?					
3.	Were the same criteria used for identific of cases and controls?	ation		X		
4.	Was exposure measured in a standard, vand reliable way?	valid X				
5.	Was exposure measured in the same wa cases and controls?	y for X				
6.	Were confounding factors identified?	X				
7.	Were strategies to deal with confoundin factors stated?	g X				
8.	Were outcomes assessed in a standard, and reliable way for cases and controls?					
9.	Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?	g			X	
10.	. Was appropriate statistical analysis used	l? X				
Overall a	ppraisal: Include X Exclude	Seek fur	ther info			
Commen	its (Including reason for exclusion)					