

Appendix 1 Search strategy

PubMed (Medline) - searched 17 August 2023

(coronary artery bypass[Title/Abstract]) AND ((robot[Title/Abstract]) OR (robotic[Title/Abstract]) OR (robot assisted[Title/Abstract]) OR (RA-MIDCAB[Title/Abstract]) OR (TECAB[Title/Abstract]) OR (totally endoscopic[Title/Abstract]))

Embase - searched 18 August 2023

1. *coronary artery bypass graft/
2. *heart muscle revascularization/
3. *robotics/ or *robot assisted surgery/
4. robot* assisted midcab.mp.
5. tecab.mp.
6. totally endoscopic.mp.
7. 1 or 2
8. 3 or 4 or 5 or 6
9. 7 and 8
10. limit 9 to (full text and human and English language)

Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) - searched 18 August 2023

- #1 MeSH descriptor: [Coronary Artery Bypass] explode all trees
- #2 MeSH descriptor: [Robotic Surgical Procedures] explode all trees
- #3 midcab
- #4 tecab
- #5 #1 and (#2 or #3 or #4)

Appendix 2 Quality assessment using the modified Canadian National Institute of Health Economics (CNIHE) quality appraisal checklist for case series																					
Author, year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Total	Quality
Lo, 2023	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15	Moderate
Jonsson, 2023	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	16	High
Torregrossa, 2022	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	14.5	Moderate
Gofus, 2022	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15	Moderate
Piperata, 2022	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	13.5	Moderate
Varrone, 2022	0.5	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	13	Moderate
Cheng, 2021	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	15	Moderate
Patrick, 2021	1	0	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	11	Low
Wu, 2019	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	16.5	High
Giambruno, 2018	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	0	11	Low
Pasrija, 2018	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	14.5	Moderate
Roubelakis, 2017	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	14	Moderate
Sabashnikov, 2014	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	14.5	Moderate
Bayramoglu, 2014	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14.5	Moderate
Fujita, 2014	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	1	12	Moderate
Ishikawa, 2014	1	0	0	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	0	11	Low
Leyvi, 2014	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	15.5	Moderate
Turner, 2006	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	11.5	Moderate
Derose, 2005	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	High
Falk, 2000	1	0	0	0	0.5	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	10.5	Low
Balkhy, 2022	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	14	Moderate
Balkhy, 2020	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	16.5	High
Stastny, 2018	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	16	High
Zaouter, 2015	1	0	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	11	Low
Dhawan, 2012	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	13	Moderate
Jegaden, 2011	0.5	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	12	Moderate
Srivastava, 2010	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	14.5	Moderate
de Cannière, 2007	1	0	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	15	Moderate
Mishra, 2006	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	11.5	Moderate
Argenziano, 2006	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	17	High
Al-Mulla, 2022	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	13.5	Moderate
Cerny, 2021	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	1	11	Low
Yokoyama, 2021	0.5	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0.5	11.5	Moderate
Whellan, 2016	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0	12.5	Moderate

Appendix 2 (continued)

Appendix 2 (continued)

Author, year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Total	Quality
Cavallaro, 2015	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0	12.5	Moderate
Casula, 2014	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	13	Moderate
Currie, 2012	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	14	Moderate
Folliguet, 2010	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	High
Mishra 2007	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	10.5	Low

Modified Canadian National Institute of Health Economics (CNIHE) quality appraisal checklist

- Q1. Was the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly stated?
- Q2. Was the study conducted prospectively?
- Q3. Were the cases collected in more than one centre?
- Q4. Were patients recruited consecutively?
- Q5. Were the characteristics of the patients included in the study described?
- Q6. Were the eligibility criteria (i.e., inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?
- Q7. Did patients enter the study at a similar point in the disease?
- Q8. Was the intervention of interest clearly described?
- Q9. Were additional interventions (co-interventions) clearly described?
- Q10. Were relevant outcome measures established a priori?
- Q11. Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/subjective methods?
- Q12. Were the relevant outcome measures made before and after the intervention?
- Q13. Were the statistical tests used to assess the relevant outcomes appropriate?
- Q14. Was follow-up long enough for important events and outcomes to occur?
- Q15. Were losses to follow-up reported?
- Q16. Did the study provided estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevant outcomes?
- Q17. Were the adverse events reported?
- Q18. Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?
- Q19. Were both competing interests and sources of support for the study reported?