

Table S1: Newcastle–Ottawa Scale for Critical Appraisal of Cross-Sectional Studies

Source	Study design	Selection			Ascertainment of exposure	Comparability	Outcome		Total score
		Representativeness of the sample	Sample size	Non-respondents		Based on design and analysis	Assessment of outcome	Statistical test	
Biousee et al., 1998	Cross-sectional	+1 (b)	+1 (a)	0 (c)	+2 (a)	+2 (a)	+2 (b)	0 (b)	8/10
Kerty, 1998	Cross-sectional	+1 (b)	+1 (a)	0 (c)	+2 (a)	0 (b)	+2 (b)	0 (b)	6/10

Representativeness of the sample: a) Truly representative of the average in the target population. b) Somewhat representative of the average in the target population; c) Selected group of users d) No description of the sampling strategy; Sample size: a) Justified and satisfactory. b) Not justified; Non-respondents: a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents characteristics is established, and the response rate is satisfactory. b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and non-respondents is unsatisfactory. c) No description of the response rate or the characteristics of the responders and the non-responders; Ascertainment of the exposure: a) Validated measurement tool. b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described. c) No description of the measurement tool; Comparability: 1) The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled. a) The study controls for the most important factor (select one). b) The study control for any additional factor; Outcome: 1) Assessment of the outcome: a) Independent blind assessment; b) Record linkage; c) Self report; d) No description. 2) Statistical test: a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and appropriate, and the measurement of the association is presented, including confidence intervals and the probability level (p value); b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete.

Table S2: Quality assessment of the included case series using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Series

[illegible]

Table S3: Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Reports

Source	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Were the study subjects and setting described 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?
Rivkin et al., 1990	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable
Tsai et al., 1997	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable
Archer et al., 1998	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable
Babovic et al., 2005	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Not applicable
Koch et al., 2005	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	Not applicable
Kawabe et al., 2009	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Not applicable
Lysandropoulos et al., 2010	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Not applicable
Anders et al. 2014	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable
Jah et al., 2019	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable
Zheng et al., 2020	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Not applicable
Lains et al., 2021	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	Not applicable

