

	Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described	Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	Were diagnostics tests or assessment methods and the result clearly described?	Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described	Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?
Hernandez et al. (2022)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ajmera et al. (2022)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Supplemental Figure 1. Risk of Bias for Case Report Studies

Judgement :
 + = Yes
 - = No
 ? = Unclear

	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Overall
	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of a study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Assessment of outcome	Follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	
Adler et al.(2022)	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	Good quality

Supplemental Figure 2. Risk of Bias for Retrospective observational study

	Sequence generation	Baseline Characteristics	Allocation concealment	Random housing	Performance Blinding	Random outcome assessment	Detection blinding	Incomplete outcome data	Selective outcome reporting	Other sources of bias
Smith et al. (2011)	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	+	-
Jordan et al. (2009)	?	+	?	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Warner et al. (2022)	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Huggins et al. (2009)	-	?	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Sergeev et al. (2016)	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Berhanu et al. (2015)	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Russo et al. (2020)	-	+	-	+	-	?	?	+	+	+
Sergeev et al. (2017)	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-

Judgement :
 + = Yes
 - = No
 ? = Unclear

Supplemental Figure 3. Risk of Bias for In Vivo Studies

	Sample size calculation	Sample with similar dimension	Control group	Standardization of procedures	Statistical analysis carried out	Other risk of bias
Smith et al. (2009)	-	+	+	+	-	+

Judgement :
 + = Yes
 - = No
 ? = Unclear

Figure 4. Risk of Bias for In Vitro Study

	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Were the study subjects and the setting describes in detail?	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?
O'Laughlin et al. (2022)	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+

Judgement :
 + = Yes
 - = No
 ? = Unclear

Supplemental Figure 5. Risk of Bias for Cross-Sectional Study

	Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?	Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in	Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in	Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?	Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic	Was statistical analysis appropriate?
Matias et al. (2022)	-	+	+	?	?	+	+	+	+	-
Paastula et al. (2022)	?	+	+	?	?	+	+	+	+	-

Figure 6. Risk of Bias for Case Series Studies

Judgement :
 + = Yes
 - = No
 ? = Unclear