

Table SI. [Systematic evaluation or meta-analysis evaluation results]

Inclusion		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨	⑩	⑪	⑫		⑬		⑭	⑮	⑯	
of literature																				
Mahar et al.(2014)	PD	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	meta-analysis conducted	No	meta-analysis conducted	No	Yes	No	meta-analysis conducted	Yes
Castillo et (2018)	B al.	Yes	Partical yes	Yes	Partical yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	meta-analysis conducted	No	meta-analysis conducted	Yes	Yes	No	meta-analysis conducted	Yes
Lee al.(2024)	JS et	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Partial Yes	No	

- ① Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?
- ② Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?
- ③ Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?
- ④ Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?
- ⑤ Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?

- ⑥ Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?
- ⑦ Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?
- ⑧ Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?
- ⑨ Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?
- ⑩ Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?
- ⑪ If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?
- ⑫ If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?
- ⑬ Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?
- ⑭ Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?
- ⑮ If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?
- ⑯ Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

Table SII. [Results of the evaluation of the quality of expert consensus]

Expert consensus	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥
Brüggen MC et al.(2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
White KD et al.(2018)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adverse Drug Reaction Research Center, Chinese Society of Dermatology, Chinese Medical Association. (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

① Is the source of the opinion clearly identified? ② Does the source of the viewpoint have standing in the field of expertise? ③ Are the interests of relevant groups the central focus of opinions? ④ Is the stated position the result of the analysis process? Is the viewpoint expressed logically? ⑤ Is there reference to the extant literature? ⑥ Is any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defended?

Reference:

Brüggen MC, Le ST, Walsh S, Toussi A, de Prost N, Ranki A, et al. Supportive care in the acute phase of stevens–johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis: an international, multidisciplinary delphi-based consensus. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2021 Sep;185(3):616–26. doi:10.1111/bjd.19893

White KD, Abe R, Ardern-Jones M, Beachkofsky T, Bouchard C, Carleton B, et al. SJS/TEN 2017: building multidisciplinary networks to drive science and translation. *J Allergy Clin Immunol, Pract*. 2018;6(1):38–69. doi:10.1016/j.jaip.2017.11.023 PubMed PMID: 29310768; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5857362.

The Chinese Medical Association Dermatology and Venereology Branch Drug Adverse Reaction Research Center. Expert consensus on the diagnosis and treatment of Stevens-Johnson syndrome/toxic epidermal necrolysis. *Chinese Journal of Dermatology*. 2021;54(5):376–81.

Mahar PD, Wasiak J, Hii B, Cleland H, Watters DA, Gin D, et al. A systematic review of the management and outcome of toxic epidermal necrolysis treated in burns centres. *Burns*. 2014 Nov;40(7):1245–54. doi:10.1016/j.burns.2014.02.006

Castillo B, Vera N, Ortega-Loayza AG, Seminario-Vidal L. Wound care for Stevens-Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. 2018 Oct 1;79(4):764-767.e1. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2018.03.032

Lee JS, Mallitt K, Fischer G, Saunderson RB. An individual patient data meta-analysis of wound care in patients with toxic epidermal necrolysis. *Australas J Dermatol*. 2024 Mar;65(2):128–42. doi:10.1111/ajd.14193 PubMed PMID: 38063272