PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Pages 1-2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 2
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page 2
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 2
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Pages 2-3
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 3
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 3
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 2
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 2
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary file- word
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Supplementary file- word
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Pages 2-3
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 2
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Supplementary file- word
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	No meta- analysis was performed
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Supplementary file- word
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary file- word
Reporting bias	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Supplementary

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			file- word
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Supplementary file- word
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Page 3
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Page 3
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Page 3
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Supplementary file- word
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Pages 4-5, Tables
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Pages 2-5 and supplementary results
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	No meta- analysis
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Supplementary file- word
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Pages 2- 5 and Supplementary file- word
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Supplementary file- word
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Supplementary file- word
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Pages 5-7
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page 7
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	7
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page 7
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	PROSPERO 2024 CRD42024626060
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	-
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	-
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 7

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 7
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Tables, flow diagram and pages 2-3

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. This work is licensed under CC BY 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Supplementary- Submission jcm-3373513 (Prisma checklist)

- We are attaching the Prisma checklist, and for the corresponding sections mentioned below, we provide detailed instructions in this document.

According to bias (11, 14, 18, 20, 21): Each study we chose to include was evaluated based on the CARE Guidelines (for Case Reports) to minimize the risk of bias. An additional tool we used was The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal tools to help us reach more reliable conclusions and reduce the risk of bias. Since the studies we present are case reports or case series, only the aforementioned tools were used.

Both tools were used for each study by K.Z. and I.S. separately in order to examine what each author reported, and then C.C. re-evaluated the results to ensure there were no discrepancies or disagreements between the authors' findings.

12) Effect measures: In this systematic review, we present the parameters studied in the specific studies, such as the level of pain, and report the data we have collected for all the studies (as shown in the tables). For each parameter, we have specified the number of studies in which it is mentioned. Not all

parameters are reported by all the studies, as they are case reports or case series. In the tables and within the text, we present in detail the parameters that were evaluated in each study.

13) (c,d,e,f): As presented in the tables, K.Z and I.S compiled all the final studies as derived from the flow diagram and described the results based on the parameters mentioned in the subsets of cases. No meta- analysis was performed.

C.C. ultimately evaluated all the results to draw reliable conclusions based on the parameters studied in the cases, aiming to identify common points across as many cases as possible.

15) Certainty assessment and Certainty of evidence: Due to the rarity of our study and the lack of sufficient data apart from case reports or case series, which have a level of evidence 4, we were always cautious about the results of each study we included.