



Oochit, K. K., Wong, Y. Y., Mihuna, A., Oliwa, A. and Kontorinis, G. (2022) IgG4 related sclerosing disease of the temporal bone: a systematic review. *Otology and Neurotology*, 43(8), pp. 856-863. (doi: [10.1097/MAO.00000000000003614](https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.00000000000003614))

Supplemental material

There may be differences between this version and the published version.
You are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/271183/>

Deposited on 18 May 2022

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Supplement Table 1: JBI Methodological Quality Assessment: Risk of Bias for Case Reports¹

Case Reports	Reviewer (1= KO, 2=YW)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Overall status
Masterson et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Schiffenbauer et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Moss et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Bittencourt et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Nishijima et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Wang et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Cain et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Liu et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Li et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Wick et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include

Vuncannon et al.	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Chowsilpa et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	
Cheng et al.	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	

The JBI Risk of Bias checklist for Case Reports¹ has 8 domains listed 1-8 on the Row 1 in Table 1. Detailed description of each domains¹ is summarized below. Each of the domains are filled as either Yes, No, Unclear (UC) or Not Applicable (N/A). An arbitrary of number of more than 2 No/ Unclear domains was decided among authors to have high concerns for bias and studies with ≤2 No/Unclear was deemed appropriate among authors for inclusion in the review due to overall low risk of bias.

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 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?

Answers: Yes, No, Unclear (UC) or Not Applicable (N/A)

Supplement Table 2: JBI Methodological Quality Assessment: Risk of Bias Tool for Case Series²

Case Series	Reviewer (1= KO, 2=YW)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Overall
Detiger et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	N/A	
Deshpande et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	
Melenotte et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	
Marinelli et al.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Include
	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

The JBI Risk of Bias checklist for Case Series² has 10 domains listed 1-10 on the Row 1 in Table 2. Detailed description of each domains² is summarized below. Each of the domains are filled as either Yes, No, Unclear (UC) or Not Applicable (N/A). An arbitrary of number of more than 2 No/ Unclear domains was decided among authors to have some concerns for bias and studies with ≤ 2 No/Unclear was deemed appropriate among authors for inclusion in the review due to overall low risk of bias.

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?

Answers: Yes, No, Unclear (UC) or Not Applicable (N/A)

References:

1. Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E. CHECKLIST FOR CASE REPORTS. JBI [Internet]. 2020;Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk. Available from: <https://synthesismanual.jbi.global>
2. Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E, Sears K. Checklist for Case Series. Joanna Briggs Inst [Internet]. 2017;Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk. Available from: <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>