

Supplemental Digital Content, Table 4A. Risk of Bias Assessmnt for Case Control Studies Utilizing the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (NOS)

Study	<u>SELECTION</u>				<u>COMPARABILITY</u>	<u>EXPOSURE</u>			Total Score
	Adequacy of Case Definition	Representativeness of Cases	Selection of Controls	Definition of Controls	Comparability of Cases and Controls on Basis of Design or Analysis	Ascertainment of Exposure	Same Ascertainment Method for Cases & Controls	Non-Response Rate	
Amor-Dorado J 2005	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	7
Ballesteros F 2012	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	8
Ballesteros F 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	8
Cadoni G 2006	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Cadoni G 2006	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Cadoni G 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Capaccio P 2005	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Capaccio P 2005	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Capaccio P 2007	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Castiglione A 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Chen K 2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Chien C 2017	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Chien CY 2012	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Chien CY 2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Cho SH 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Fatini C 2005	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Furuta T 2011	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Fusconi M 2011	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	8
Gorur K 2005	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	8
Gross M 2006	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Hamidi A 2019	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Hiramatsu M 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Kitoh R 2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Kitoh R 2017	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	6
Koide Y 2018	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Lan MY 2011	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Lee EJ 2010	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9

Supplemental Digital Content, Table 4A. Risk of Bias Assessment for Case Control Studies Utilizing the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (NOS)

Lin X 2016	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Liu H 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Marcucci R 2005	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Mosnier I 2011	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Nam S 2006	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Nam S 2011	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Nishio N 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Nishio N 2013	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Patscheke JH 2001	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Rudack C 2004	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Rudack C 2006	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Seker Yildiz K 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Teranishi M 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Teranishi M 2013	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Tian G 2018	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Tripodi A 2014	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Uchida Y 2010	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Uchida Y 2011	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Uchida Y 2013	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Um JY 2010	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Um JY 2011	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	8
Um JY 2013	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Weiss D 2014	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yang CH 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yang CH 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yazdani N 2015	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yazdani N 2018	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yeo SW 2000	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yeo SW 2001	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Yildiz Z 2008	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Zhu WY 2019	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9

Supplemental Digital Content, Table 4B. Risk of Bias Assessment for Cross-Sectional Studies and Case Reports Utilizing the Joanna Briggs Institute Appraisal Methodology.

Study	Design	Qs #1	Qs #2	Qs #3	Qs #4	Qs #5	Qs #6	Qs #7	Qs #8
Capaccio 2009	Cross-sectional	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bravenman 2009	Case report	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
Kokotas 2008	Case report	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
Varga 2019	Case report	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
Zou 2016	Case report	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y

JBI Checklist for Cross-Sectional Studies

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were confounding factors identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

JBI Checklist for Case Reports

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were patient’s demographic characteristics clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Was the patient’s history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E, Sfetcu R, Currie M, Qureshi R, Mattis P, Lisy K, Mu P-F. Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk . In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer’s Manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017. Available from <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>

Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E, Sears K, Sfetcu R, Currie M, Qureshi R, Mattis P, Lisy K, Mu P-F. Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk . In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer’s Manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017. Available from <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>