**Table S1. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal for case series study**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Checklist questions | Davis et al., 2021 | Estiverne et al., 2021 | Al Bishawi et al., 2022 |
| 1. | Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2. | Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 3. | Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? | Yes | No | No |
| 4. | Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? | No | Yes | No |
| 5. | Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? | No | Yes | No |
| 6. | Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 7. | Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 8. | Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 9. | Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 10. | Was statistical analysis appropriate? | NA | NA | NA |

**Table S2. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal for case report study**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Checklist questions | Sörgel F et al. 2021 | Peyko et al. 2020 | Oktavianto et al.2021 |
| 1. | Were patient’s demographic characteristics clearly described? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2. | Was the patient’s history clearly described and presented as a timeline? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 3. | Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4. | Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described? | Yes | No | No |
| 5. | Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described? | Yes | Yes | No |
| 6. | Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described? | Yes | Yes | No |
| 7. | Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described? | Yes | Yes | Unclear |
| 8. | Does the case report provide takeaway lessons? | Yes | Yes | Unclear |

**Table S3. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal for quality and bias assessment of cross-sectional study**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Checklist Questions | Wang et al. | Van Laar et al. | Pettit et al | Aiswarya et al. | Selvaraj et al. 2022 | Thakare et al. | Selvaraj 2021 | Banerjee et al. |
| 1 | Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| 2 | Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 3 | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unclear | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 5 | Were confounding factors identified? | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Yes | Yes | Unclear |
| 6 | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | No | No | Unclear |
| 7 | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 8 | Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |

**Table S4. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal for quality and bias assessment of cohort study**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Checklist Questions | Ackley et al. | Butt et al. | Meshram et al. | Schieber et al | Seethapathy et al. | Shah et al. | Shakir et al. | Buxeda et al. |
| 1 | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? | No | NA | NA | No | Yes | Yes | NA | NA |
| 2 | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? | Yes | NA | NA | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | NA |
| 3 | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | Were confounding factors identified? | Yes | Unclear | Yes | Unclear | Unclear | Yes | Unclear | Yes |
| 5 | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | No | Unclear | No | Unclear | Unclear | Yes | Unclear | Yes |
| 6 | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 7 | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 8 | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 9 | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 10 | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | No | NA |
| 11 | Was appropriate statistical analysis used | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |