**Supplementary Table 4.** Quality measure of included studies inspired by the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement's checklist

| Checklist | Haussen et al. (2016)[17] | Rebello et al. (2017)[16] | Chen et al. (2018)[21] | Sarraj et al. (2019)[19] | Gilgen et al. (2015)[6] | Panni et al. (2019)[18] | Gautheron et al. (2018)[15] | Yoshimoto et al. (2020)[20] | Kerleroux et al. (2019) | Berkhemer et al. (2015)[9] (MR CLEAN) | Bracard et al. (2016)[10] (THRACE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Title and abstract | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Intro. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2) Background/rationale | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3) Objectives | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Methods | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4) Study design | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5) Setting | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6) Participants | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 7) Variables | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 8) Data sources/ measurement | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 9) Bias | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 10) Study size | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11) Quantitatives variables | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 12) Statistical methods | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Results | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Participants | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 14) Descriptive data | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 15) Outcome data | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 16) Main results | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * |
| 17) Other analyses | | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18) Key results | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 19) Limitations | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * |
| 20) Interpretation | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| 21) Generalizability | | | * | | * | | | | | | |
| 22) Funding | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Additional items | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23) Prospective study design | | | | | | | | | | * | * |
| 24) Lost to follow-up and excluded patients ≤10% | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | | * | * |
| 25) No selection of specific groups | * | | * | | * | | | * | | | * |
| 26) Blinding in outcome evaluation | | | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 27) Informed consent | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 28) Consecutive recruitment | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Total (of 28) | 24 | 23 | 25 | 24 | 26 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 |

The scores were then defined as follow: 0–10, inadequate data to assess; 10–14, poor; 15–19, acceptable; 20–28, good. The score was built by assessing in each report the STROBE criteria (0–22), adding one point for each of the following items when positive: prospective study design (item 23), lost to follow-up and excluded patients less than 10% (item 24), no selection of specific groups (item 25), blinding in outcome evaluation (item 26), informed consent (item 27) and consecutive recruitment (item 28).