

Appendix Table A1. Demographic Information of Included Articles

Study	Year	Surgery Performed	Position	Study Design	Mean Follow-Up (Range, MOs)	No. of Comparison Groups	MINORS Criteria
Voos et al. ⁶³	2010	Arthroscopic Bankart Repair	BC	Case Series	32.4 (24-49)	1	10
Sommaire et al. ⁵⁹	2012	Arthroscopic Bankart Repair	NR	Case Series	44.4 (36-54)	1	13
Hardy et al. ²⁵	2012	Arthroscopic Bankart Repair	NR	Case Series	68.0 (32-100)	1	13
Park et al. ^{45,46}	2012	Arthroscopic Remplissage	NR	Case Series	18.0 (8.8-27.2)	1	7
Franceschi et al. ²⁰	2012	Arthroscopic Remplissage & Arthroscopic Bankart	LD	Comparative Cohort	25.4 (NR) 24.8 (NR)	2	18
Moon et al. ³⁸	2015	Open Latarjet	BC	Case Series	25.9 (20-32)	1	14
Nakagawa et al. ³⁹	2015	Arthroscopic Bankart	NR	Comparative Cohort	24.0 (NR)	4	18
Khater et al. ³¹	2015	Open Congruent Arc Latarjet	NR	Case Series	28.0 (24-35)	1	16
Garcia et al. ²¹	2015	Arthroscopic Remplissage & Arthroscopic Bankart		Comparative Cohort	31.6 (24.1-39.9) 40.7 (26.3-51.1)	2	17
Yang et al. ⁶⁹	2016	Open Modified Latarjet	BC	Comparative Cohort	42 (24-240)	2	17

Shaha et al. ⁵⁴	2016	Bankart Repair	Both	Comparative Cohort	48.3 (23.5-58)	2	18
Cho et al. ^{9,10}	2016	Arthroscopic Remplissage & Open Latarjet & Arthroscopic Bankart	BC	Comparative Cohort	24.7 (19-31) 30.4 (19-48) 22.9 (11-39)	3	16
Ko et al. ³³	2016	Arthroscopic Remplissage & Arthroscopic Bankart	LD	Comparative Cohort	66 (24-180)	2	18

BC: Beach Chair

LD: Lateral Decubitus

MINORS: Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies

Appendix Table A2. Glenoid and Humeral Bone Loss Measurements of Included Articles

Study	Year	Mean Age (SD)	N	Bone Loss Modality	Hill-Sachs Size Calculation	Reported HSD Size (%) & Engagement (%)
Voos et al. ⁶³	2010	32.6 (NR)	73 M: 61 F: 12	Arthroscopy GBL: None	Dimensions measured during arthroscopy	Volume only (mm ³): 558.0 ± 501.9 Engagement: NR
Sommaire et al. ⁵⁹	2012	27.5 (10.5)	77 M: 54 F: 23	Radiograph GBL: None	Charousset 2010	10.3 ± 8.3 Engagement: NR
Hardy et al. ²⁵	2012	29.0 (NR)	59 M: NR F: NR	Radiograph GBL: None	Charousset 2010	16.2 ± 7.8 Engagement: NR
Park et al. ^{45,46}	2012	25.3 (7.2)	11 M: NR F: NR	MRI GBL: None	Largest dimensions measured during MRI	Volume only (mm ³): 334.3 ± 220.2 Engagement: NR
Franceschi et al. ²¹	2012	NR	50 M: 36 F: 14	3D-CT GBL: bare area method	Charousset 2010	30.6 ± 15.5 30.1 ± 13.3 Engagement: All patients via dynamic arthroscopy
Moon et al. ³⁸	2015	24.5 (9)	44 M: 41 F: 3	3D-CT GBL: surface area method	NR	Depth Only (mm): 6.4 ± 2.4 Engagement: All patients via dynamic arthroscopy
Nakagawa et al. ³⁹	2015	22.5 (NR)	103 M: NR F: NR	3D-CT GBL: bare area method	Ozaki 2011	33.0% ± 21.1% Engagement: NR
Khater et al. ³¹	2015	26.8 (NR)	73 M: NR F: NR	MRI 3D-CT GBL: ratio method	Porcellini 2011	26% ± 6% Engagement: NR
Garcia et al. ²²	2015	24.4 (NR) 26.0 (NR)	10 14 M: 18 F: 6	MRI GBL: NR	Largest dimensions measured during MRI	Volume only (mm ³): 283.8 ± 192.6 310.2 ± 240.5 Engagement: All patients via glenoid track

Yang et al. ⁶⁹	2016	22.3 (6.8) 26.5 (8.9)	40 12 M: 41 F: 11	3D-CT GBL: bare area method	Cho 2011	40.3% ± 15.5% 27.9% ± 13.0% Engagement: NR
Shaha et al. ⁵⁴	2016	25.8 (NR) 26.8 (NR)	27 30 M: 54 F: 3	MRI 3D-CT GBL: bare area method	Di Giacomo 2014	HSD: NR Engagement: 14% via glenoid track
Cho et al. ^{9,10}	2016	24.8 (9) 27.8 (7.9) 26.1 (7)	37 35 35 M: 100 F: 7	3D-CT GBL: NR	NR	Depth Only (mm): 6.8 ± 1.7 6.4 ± 2.4 6.0 ± 1.5 Engagement: All patients via dynamic arthroscopy
Ko et al. ³³	2016	29.4 (4.5) 29.2 (4.8)	24 24 M: 37 F: 11	3D-CT GBL: NR	Largest dimensions measured during 3D-CT	Volume only (mm ³): 439.9 ± 59.4 440.6 ± 57.2 Engagement: All patients via NR method

HSD: Hill-Sachs Defect

GBL: Glenoid Bone Loss

NR: Not Reported

M: Male

F: Female

3D-CT: Three-dimensional Computed Tomography Reconstruction

MRI: Magnetic Resonance Imaging