

Table 1s. Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Tool

JOANNA BRIGGS INSTITUTE CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL FOR CASE CONTROL STUDIES												
Yes = 2 Unclear = 1 No = 0 NA												
Study	1. Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls?	2. Were cases and controls matched appropriately?	3. Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?	4. Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?	5. Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?	6. Were confounding factors identified?	7. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	8. Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?	9. Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?	10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	TOTAL	%
Brown 2008	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	1	12	60 %
Chen 2017	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Cho 2015	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Cohen 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Kabbabe 2010	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	16	80%
Kilian 2007	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	16	80%
Ha 2014	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Kim 2010	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	12	60%
Lho 2013	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Lubis 2013	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Raykha 2014	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	12	60%
Xu 2012	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Xu 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
Cher 2018	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	100%
JOANNA BRIGGS INSTITUTE CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL FOR CASE SERIES STUDIES												
Yes = 2 Unclear = 1 No = 0 NA												
Study	1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?	2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?	3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?	4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?	7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?	10. Was statistical analysis appropriate?	TOTAL	%
Uththoff 2007	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	18	90%