

Appendix 2. NIH Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies

	Bunnell, S. 1927	Shaffer, J. 1950	Nemithi, C. 1956	Buncke, H. 1972	Holst, H. 1975
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	N	Y	N	N	Y
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3. Were the cases consecutive?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	Y	N (included non digital nerve injuries)	Y	N	N (included non digital nerve injuries)
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Unclear	Y	N	Y	Y
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	N/A	N/A	N	N/A	N/A
9. Were the results well described?	N	Y	N	N	N
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Fair	Fair	Poor (due to lack of detail in results themselves and how they were obtained)	Poor (this is a symposium with some patient results)	Fair

	Poppen, N. 1979	Young, L. 1981	Khuc, T. 1982	Sullivan, D. 1985	Mailander, P. 1988
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	N	Y	N	Y	Y
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
3. Were the cases consecutive?	N	Y	N	N	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N (included non digital nerve repairs)
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Y	N	N	Y	Y
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9. Were the results well described?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Fair (good results set, non consecutive patients and weak objective)	Fair (inadequate follow up period)	Poor (retrospective, non-consecutive series with no clear objective and poorly presented results)	Good	Good (even though non digital nerves were included, there was a results breakdown for digital nerves)

	Altissimi, M. 1991	Pereira, J. 1991	Goldie, B. 1992	Chaise, F. 1993	Chow, S. 1993
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3. Were the cases consecutive?	Y	N	N	Y	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9. Were the results well described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Good	Fair (small sample size, non consecutive)	Fair (good results set, non consecutive patients and weak objective)	Good	Good

	Kallio, P. 1993	Al-Ghazal, S. 1994	Elias, B. 1994	Vertruyen, M. 1994	Efstathopoulos, D. 1995
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	N	N	N	N	N
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	N	Y	N	N	N
3. Were the cases consecutive?	Y	Y	N	N	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Y	N	Y	Y	Unclear
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9. Were the results well described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Fair (weak objective, non-comparable cases but good results set)	Fair (needed longer follow up, some only 8 months)	Poor (due to non consecutive nature of cases and weak objective)	Fair (due to non consecutive nature of cases and weak objective)	Fair (due to weak objective, also some notes-based follow up, unclear when assessment was made)

	Tadjalli, H. 1995	Wang, W. 1996	Segalman, K. 2001	Cheng, A. 2001	Portincasa, A. 2007
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3. Were the cases consecutive?	N	N	N	Y	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	N (included replants)	Y	Y	Y	N (included non digital nerves and variety of injury mechanisms)
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Y	Y	N	Y	N
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A
9. Were the results well described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Fair (included replants and retrospective, 26/150 potential patients included)	Fair (patients without follow up excluded but not stated how many this was)	Fair (high dropout rate)	Good (even though follow up was limited to 6 months)	Poor (due to diverse study group and lack of detail in results)

	Hohendorff, B. 2009	Lohmeyer, J . 2009	Thomas, P. 2015	Fakin, M. 2016	Huber, J. 2017
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3. Were the cases consecutive?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
4. Were the subjects comparable?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5. Was the intervention clearly described?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants?	N	N (huge drop out rate)	Y	Y	Y
7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8. Were the statistical methods well described?	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y
9. Were the results well described?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quality rating (Good, Fair, Poor)	Poor (drop out rate, short follow up, results presentation)	Fair (concerns about drop out rate)	Good (though would have been stronger with more patients, consecutive cases)	Good	Good