

Quality Appraisal	Altahawi (2020)	Ang (2021)	Baker (2020)	Barnes (2015)	Battista (2018)	Boden (2019)	Bradberry (2018)	Bureau (2022)	Chalian (2021)	Fick (2021)	Jacobson (2016)	Kirschner (2021)	Koh (2013)	Lavallee (2021)	Martin (2019)	Nakagawa (2023)	Rupe (2023)	Seng (2016)	Stover (2019)	Wahezi (2023)
1. Was the selection of patients for inclusion in the study unbiased?																				
2. Was there significant attrition rate of study participants?																				
3. Was there clear description of methodology and techniques in the study?																				
4. Was there unbiased and accurate assessment of outcomes and complications?																				
5. Were potential confounding variables identified and mitigated using acceptable statistical techniques?																				
6. Was duration of follow-up reasonable for investigated outcomes?																				
7. Was population included in the study described adequately?																				
8. Was the included participant group similar to the population at large that is affected by the condition studied?																				
9. Were inclusion and exclusion criteria clearly defined?																				
10. Was the funding source and role of funder clearly defined in the study? Were there any conflicts of interest identified or easily apparent?																				
Score	8	9	9	9	5	8	6	10	8	9	8	9	10	9	8	9	9	10	7	7

Appendix 2. Quality appraisal and risk of bias assessment. Each included study was assessed and scored using the using specific criteria set forth by National Institute for Health Research and National Health Service Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Questions 1 through 6 assess internal validity of each study, and questions 7 through 10 assess external validity. A blue oval signifies “yes” to the question. An orange oval signifies “no” to the question. Of note, question 2, when answered in the affirmative, is indicative of increased risk of bias, and thus counts against the total score. The total score, out of a total of 10, is listed at the bottom. A higher score indicates a higher level of evidence and decreased risk of bias.