

## Supplementary File 3

First author	Year	n Intracranial Hematoma	n Intracranial Abscess	1	2	3	4	5	6a	6b	7	8	9	10
<b>Amorim</b>	2010	2	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Arseni</b>	1970	6	-	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT
<b>Elshanawany</b>	2020	6	-	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	No	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Gago</b>	2019	2	-	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Kale</b>	2015	2	-	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Lim</b>	2016	11	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>McDougall</b>	2015	2	-	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	No	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Moradi</b>	2012	2	-	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	No	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Newrick</b>	1982	2	-	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Pavlin</b>	1979	2	-	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Pitkanen</b>	2013	-	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	CT	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Vilaca</b>	2015	2	-	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Welch</b>	1959	2	-	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT
<b>Wynn</b>	2015	38	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes

Supplementary File Table 3. Critical appraisal of a case study checklist, adapted from The Pocket Guide to Critical Appraisal by Crombie. n: number of patients with complication reported. CT: cannot tell. 1. Did the study address a clearly focused question / issue? 2. Is the research method (study design) appropriate for answering the research question? 3. Are both the setting and the subjects representative with regard to the population to which the findings will be referred? 4. Is the researcher's perspective clearly described and taken into account? 5. Are the methods for collecting data clearly described? 6a. Are the methods for analyzing the data likely to be valid and reliable? 6b. Are quality control measures used? 7. Was the analysis repeated by more than one researcher to ensure reliability? 8. Are the results credible, and if so, are they relevant for practice? 9. Are the conclusions drawn justified by the results? 10. Are the findings of the study transferable to other settings?