

Supplementary Table 2. Risk of bias assessment criteria for included case reports (JBI critical appraisal checklist)

Study ID	1. Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?	2. Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	3. Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	4. Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	5. Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	Overall appraisal: include exclude seek further info
Tanaka et al., ¹¹ 1980	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Grabel et al., ¹³ 1989	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Hamada et al., ¹⁴ 1994	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Kawaguchi et al., ¹⁵ 1996	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Kawai et al., ¹⁶ 1997	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Miyake et al., ¹⁷ 2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Lee et al., ¹⁸ 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Kuroda et al., ¹⁹ 2001	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Wong et al., ²⁰ 2003	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Ali et al., ¹⁰ 2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Koebbe and Horowitz, ²¹ 2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Baik et al., ²² 2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Gandhi et al., ²³ 2008	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Choulakian et al., ²⁴ 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Park et al., ²⁵ 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Leung et al., ²⁶ 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Yang et al., ²⁷ 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Yu et al., ²⁸ 2010	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Arai et al., ⁹ 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Lévêque et al., ²⁹ 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Xu et al., ³⁰ 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Ni et al., ³¹ 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Hayashi et al., ³² 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Chalouhi et al., ³³ 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Okawa et al., ⁶ 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
He et al., ³⁵ 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Yuan et al., ³⁶ 2013	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Hwang et al., ³⁷ 2014	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Daou et al., ³⁸ 2015	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Kim et al., ⁴⁰ 2017	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Study ID	1. Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?	2. Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	3. Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	4. Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	5. Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	Overall appraisal: include exclude seek further info
Kim et al., ⁷ 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Include
Yamada et al., ⁸ 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Tokairin et al., ⁴² 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Zhao et al., ⁴³ 2020	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Larson et al., ⁴⁴ 2020	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Goto et al., ⁴⁵ 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Byeon et al., ⁴⁶ 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Fu et al., ⁴⁷ 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Okamura et al., ³⁴ 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Kusakabe et al., ⁴⁸ 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Lee et al., ⁴⁹ 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Ding et al., ⁵⁰ 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
Ando et al., ⁵¹ 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include

Reviewers: ZF, CF. Date: August 13, 2024. The case report was considered as good quality and included in this systematic review if it satisfied at least 5 appraisal items out of 8. Two independent reviewers (ZF and CF) conducted the risk of bias assessment without any disagreement.