

Supplemental Table 1. Critical Appraisal of the included studies

Design	Authors	Demographic characteristics	Patient's history	Clinical presentation	Diagnostics and assessment	Intervention or treatment procedures	Post-intervention clinical condition	Adverse events identified?	Provision of takeaway lessons	Number of criteria met (quality) n/8		
Case Reports (Level of evidence: 5)												
Case Report	Adhikari (2014) ⁷²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Ahuja (2014) ⁵²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Alaoui (2012) ⁶³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Barbosa (2019) ⁵⁶	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Brouwer (2014) ⁶⁴	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Chang (2018) ²²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Erenel (2019) ⁶⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Fois (2017) ³⁸	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Inal (2015) ²³	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	7		
Case Report	Islam (2017) ⁵⁰	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Jacquemyn (2021) ⁵¹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	John (2018) ⁶⁶	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Kaushal (2015) ²⁴	x	✓	✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓	5		
Case Report	Kimko (2020) ⁴⁴	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Lahbabi (2014) ⁶⁷	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Laniado-Laborin (2017) ⁷⁸	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	5		
Case Report	Lee (2015) ⁴⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Lin (2018) ⁷³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Lu (2013) ³⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Loughenbury (2009) ²⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Masukume (2013) ⁶⁸	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Muin (2015) ⁷⁴	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Rajput (2021) ⁴⁷	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	6		
Case Report	Raznatovska (2021) ⁵⁷	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	5		
Case Report	Sagar (2016) ²⁶	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Sharma (2018) ⁸⁰	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7		
Case Report	Shi (2021) ⁵⁸	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Shital (2018) ⁶⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Stuart (2009) ²⁷	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Report	Yeh (2019) ²⁸	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	7		
Case Report	Zhu (2021) ⁵⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8		
Case Series (Level of evidence: 5)		Clear criteria for inclusion?	Condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	Valid methods for identification of condition included?	Consecutive inclusion of participants?	Complete inclusion of participants?	Clear reporting of demographics?	Clear reporting of clinical information?	Outcomes or follow up results clearly reported?	Clear reporting of presenting sites/clinics demographic information?	Statistical analysis appropriate?	Number of criteria met (quality) n/10
Case Series	Acquah (2021) ⁸³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	9
Case Series	Badve (2011) ⁵⁹	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x	6
Case Series	Bishara (2015) ⁶¹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	9
Case Series	Du (2021) ⁴⁰	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10
Case Series	Li (2019) ⁴⁸	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10
Case Series	Modi (2021) ⁷⁶	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10
Case Series	Palacios (2009) ¹⁹	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	9
Case Series	Peng (2011) ⁴⁶	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10
Case Series	Rathod (2017) ²⁴	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x	5
Case Series	Suresh (2015) ⁸¹	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	8
Case Series	Tabarsi (2011) ⁷⁷	✓	✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Case Series	Toro (2011) ⁴⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	9

Case Series	Ye (2019) ⁵⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	9
Case-control (Level of evidence: 3)		Groups comparable?	Cases and controls appropriately matched?	Same criteria for identification of cases and controls?	Exposure measured in a standard, reliable, and valid way?	Exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?	Confounding factors stated?	Strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Outcomes assessed in a standard, reliable, and valid way for cases and controls?	Exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?	Appropriate statistical analysis?		Number of criteria met (quality) n/10
Case-control	Asuquo (2012) ¹⁸	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x		7
Case-control	Chopra (2017) ⁵¹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓		9
Case-control	Lin (2010) ²⁰	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		9
Cohort Study (Level of evidence: 3)		Groups similar and recruited from the same population?	Exposures measured similarly to exposed and unexposed groups?	Exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Confounding factors identified?	Strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Groups free of outcome(s) at start of study?	Outcomes measured in valid and reliable way?	Follow up time sufficiently long enough for outcome(s) to occur?	Follow up complete? Reasons for loss to follow up described?	Were strategies to address incomplete follow up used?	Appropriate statistical analysis?	Number of criteria met (quality) n/11
Retrospective Cohort Study	Ahmadzia (2020) ⁵⁷	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Ali (2011) ²¹	✓			x	x	✓	✓	✓			x	4
Retrospective Cohort Study	Ali (2021) ³¹			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	6
Retrospective Cohort Study	Baluku (2021) ⁸²			✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓			✓	5
Prospective Cohort Study	Bekker (2016) ³⁰	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Dennis (2018) ⁷¹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	El-Messidi (2016) ⁴³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Fernandez (2018) ⁷⁰	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	LaCourse (2016) ³²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Loveday (2020) ³³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	10
Retrospective Cohort Study	Mokhele (2021) ⁴²	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Rendell (2016) ⁷⁹	x	x	✓	x	x	✓	✓	x			✓	3
Prospective Cohort Study	Salazar-Austin (2007) ³⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	8
Retrospective Cohort Study	Sade (2020) ³⁴	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	Sun (2021) ⁹⁷	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	9
Retrospective Cohort Study	van der Walt (2020) ⁶²			✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	6
Retrospective Cohort Study	Yadav (2019) ⁵⁶	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	8
Other (Level of evidence: 3)		Groups similar and recruited from the same population?	Exposures measured similarly to exposed and unexposed groups?	Exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Confounding factors identified?	Strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Groups free of outcome(s) at start of study?	Outcomes measured in valid and reliable way?	Follow up time sufficiently long enough for outcome(s) to occur?	Follow up complete? Reasons for loss to follow up described?	Were strategies to address incomplete follow up used?	Appropriate statistical analysis?	Number of criteria met (quality) n/11
Secondary Data Analysis	Rickman (2020) ⁸⁵	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	9
Secondary Data Analysis	van de Water (2020) ⁴⁴	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	8
Project Improvement (Level of evidence: 5)		Cause and effect?	Participants in each comparison group similar?	Participants received similar treatment?	Control group?	Multiple measurements of outcome pre and post intervention?	Follow up complete?	Outcomes in comparison groups measured the same way?	Outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Appropriate statistical analysis used?			Number of criteria met (quality) n/9
Project Improvement	Cornish (2020) ⁶⁰	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓			7

***Blank cells denote not applicable