

Supplementary Table 1. ROBINS-I risk of bias analyses of SCS studies

Study	Confounding	Selection	Classification	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing data	Measurement of outcomes	Selection of reported results
Barolat et al. ¹⁹ (1986)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Katz et al. ²⁰ (1991)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Serious	Moderate
Herman et al. ²¹ (2002)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Carhart et al. ²² (2004)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Jilge et al. ²³ (2004)	Moderate	No information	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Minassian et al. ²⁴ (2004)	Moderate	No information	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Ganley et al. ²⁵ (2005)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
DiMarco et al. ²⁶ (2006)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Huang et al. ²⁷ (2006)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
DiMarco et al. ^{67,68} (2009)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Harkema et al. ²⁸ (2011)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Moshonkina et al. ²⁹ (2012)	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Serious	Low	Serious	Moderate
Hofstoetter et al. ³⁰ (2013)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Angeli et al. ⁷ (2014)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Moderate
Hofstoetter et al. ³¹ (2014)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Sayenko et al. ³² (2014)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Bedi et al. ³³ (2015)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Gerasimenko et al. ³⁴ (2015)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Hofstoetter et al. ³⁵ (2015)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Rejc et al. ³⁶ (2015)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Bedi et al. ³⁷ (2016)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Lu et al. ³⁸ (2016)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Minassian et al. ³⁹ (2016)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Gad et al. ⁴⁰ (2017)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Grahn et al. ⁴¹ (2017)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Rejc et al. ⁴² (2017)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Rejc et al. ⁴³ (2017)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Angeli et al. ⁴⁴ (2018)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Aslan et al. ⁴⁵ (2018)	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
DiMarco et al. ⁴⁶ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Formento et al. ⁴⁷ (2018)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Low
Freyvert et al. ⁶⁹ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low
Gad et al. ⁷⁰ (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Gill et al. ⁴⁸ (2018)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Harkema et al. ⁷¹ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Harkema et al. ⁷² (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Herrity et al. ⁴⁹ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Inanici et al. ⁷³ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Niu et al. ⁷⁴ (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low

(Continued)

Supplementary Table 1. ROBINS-I risk of bias analyses of SCS studies (continued)

Study	Confounding	Selection	Classification	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing data	Measurement of outcomes	Selection of reported results
Phillips et al. ⁵⁰ (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Powell et al. ⁵¹ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Moderate
Rath et al. ⁵² (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Wagner et al. ² (2018)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Walter et al. ⁵³ (2018)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
West et al. ⁵⁴ (2018)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate
Calvert et al. ⁷⁵ (2019)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Cheng et al. ⁵⁵ (2019)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Low	Serious	Moderate
Darrow et al. ⁷⁶ (2019)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Knikou et al. ⁵⁶ (2019)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Nightingale et al. ⁵⁷ (2019)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Sayenko et al. ⁷⁷ (2019)	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Terson de Paleville et al. ⁵⁸ (2019)	Moderate	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Alam et al. ⁷⁸ (2020)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
DiMarco et al. ⁵⁹ (2020)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Gad et al. ⁶⁰ (2020)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Gill et al. ⁷⁹ (2020)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Gorgey et al. ⁸⁰ (2020)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Moderate
Peña Pino et al. ⁸¹ (2020)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Wiesener et al. ⁶¹ (2020)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Wu et al. ⁸² (2020)	Moderate	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Beck et al. ⁶² (2021)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Serious	Moderate
Calvert et al. ⁶³ (2021)	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low
DiMarco et al. ⁸³ (2021)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Estes et al. ⁸⁴ (2021)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Herrity et al. ⁸⁵ (2021)	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Low
Ibáñez et al. ⁶⁴ (2021)	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Inanici et al. ⁸⁶ (2021)	Serious	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low
Linde et al. ⁸⁷ (2021)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Mesbah et al. ⁶⁵ (2021)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Squair et al. ⁶⁶ (2021)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low
Smith et al. ⁸⁸ (2022)	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Serious	Low

ROBINS-I, Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions; SCS, spinal cord stimulation.