Supplementary Table 1. PICOTS framework for elective labiaplasty and combined aesthetic vulvovaginal procedures

Element	Definition	Application in national guideline
P (population)	Target patient group	Women requesting elective labiaplasty or combined aesthetic vulvovaginal procedures for aesthetic, functional, or psychosocial indications.
I (intervention)	Evaluated surgical procedures	Labiaplasty (including wedge, trim, and de-epithelialization techniques etc.) alone or in combination with clitoral hood reduction, perineoplasty, or vaginoplasty.
C (comparison)	Comparator approach	Conservative management (women who don't seek labiaplasty), or outcomes against established anatomical norms.
O (outcome)	Measured clinical effects	Patient-reported outcome measures, aesthetic satisfaction, relief of functional symptoms, sexual function, and post-operative complication rates.
T (time)	Follow-up duration	No time restrictions applied.
S (study design)	Source of evidence	Systematic reviews and meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, prospective and retrospective cohort studies, and multidisciplinary expert consensus.

Supplementary Table 2. AMSTAR-2 methodological quality assessment table

Item	AMSTAR-2 criterion	Alavi-Arjas et al. (18)	Nahidi et al. (20)	Escandón et al. (16)	Géczi et al. (17)	Aulia et al. (22)	Ortega-Sánchez et al. (23)	Zulfikaroglu and Kurban (19)	Alavi-Arjas et al. (21)
		Body/genital self-image	**Sexual function**	**Safety and outcomes**	**Technique and satisfaction**	**Motivation and psychological**	**Motivational factors**	**Sexual function (FSFI meta)**	**Partner role and decision-making**
A. Research question and inclusion criteria									
1	Does the research question and inclusion criteria incorporate the PICO components?	PY	PY	Y	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
B. Protocol and study design									
★ **2**	**Critical domain** Were the review methods pre-specified? (PROSPERO or protocol registration)	**N**	**N**	**N**	Y	**N**	Y	**N**	**N**
3	Were the included study designs justified?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	PY
C. Literature search methodology									
★ **4**	**Critical domain** Was a comprehensive literature search strategy employed? (≥2 databases, MeSH + free-text)	Y	Y	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
5	Was study selection performed by dual independent reviewers?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	Was data extraction performed by dual independent researchers?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y
★ **7**	**Critical domain** Was a list of excluded studies provided with corresponding justifications?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
8	Were the included studies described in adequate detail?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
D. Risk of bias assessment									
★ **9**	**Critical domain** Was the risk of bias in primary studies assessed using a satisfactory tool?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	PY
10	Were the funding sources of the included primary studies reported?	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**
E. Meta-analysis and statistical methods									
★ **11**	**Critical domain** If meta-analysis was performed, were appropriate statistical methods applied?	Y Y	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	PY
12	Was the potential impact of risk of bias on meta-analytic results assessed?	**N**	*PY*	**N**	**N**	—	—	**N**	**N**
★ **13**	**Critical domain** Was risk of bias accounted for when interpreting and discussing the results?	*PY*	Y	*PY*	*PY*	Y	Y	PY	PY
14	Was observed heterogeneity in results satisfactorily explained?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
F. Publication bias and conflict of interest									
★ **15**	**Critical domain** If quantitative synthesis was performed, was publication bias adequately investigated?	Y	Y	Y	**N**	—	—	PY	PY
16	Were the conflict of interest and funding sources of the review authors reported?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Overall confidence level		**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**	**LOW**
No. of critical domain flaws (N only)		**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**
Risk of bias assessment tool		EPHPP	EPHPP	NOS+ MEROS	MINORS	ROBINS-I	JBI	NOS/ ROBINS-I	EPHPP

Y: Yes, PY: Partial yes, **N:** No, —: Not applicable, ★: Critical domain (7 of 16)

Supplementary Table 3. Risk of bias assessment of included randomized/controlled clinical trials using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool

Study	D1 randomization	D2 deviations	D3 missing data	D4 outcome measurement	D5 Reporting bias	Overall risk
Minikowski et al. (24) Plast Reconstr Surg RCT | n=48	✓ Low	**?** Some concerns	✓ Low	✓ Low	✓ Low	**?** Some concerns
Turini et al. (25) Plast Reconstr Surg CCT | n=24	✕ High	**?** Some concerns	**?** Some concerns	**?** Some concerns	✕ High	✕ High

D1: Bias arising from the randomization process
D2: Bias due to deviations from intended interventions
D3: Bias due to missing outcome data
D4: Bias in measurement of the outcome
D5: Bias in selection of the reported result

Risk of bias judgments
✓ Low-risk of bias
? Some concerns
✕ High-risk of bias.

RCT: Randomized controlled trial, CCT: Controlled clinical trial, FGSIS: Female genital self-image scale, BDD-SS: Body dysmorphic disorder symptom scale

Supplementary Table 4. Risk of bias assessment of included prospective and retrospective studies using ROBINS-I tool

First author, year	D1★ Confounding	D2★ Selection	D3 Classification	D4 Deviations	D5 Missing Data	D6★ Measurement	D7 Reporting	Overall ROBINS-I Judgement
Goodman et al. (26)	−	+	+	+	−	−	+	− Moderate
Sharp et al. (27)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ Low
Veale et al. (28)	+	−	+	+	−	+	+	− Moderate
Jiang et al. (29)	✕	−	−	✕	−	−	−	✕
Dogan et al. (30)	✕	−	−	✕	−	−	−	✕
Nahidi et al. (31)	−	+	+	−	+	+	+	− Moderate
Alavi-Arjas et al. (32)	−	+	+	−	+	+	+	− Moderate
Sharp et al. (33)	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ Low
Veale et al. (34)	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	− Moderate
Veale et al. (35)	−	−	+	+	−	+	+	− Moderate

★ Critical domains.
D1 = Confounding
D2 = Participant selection
D3 = Classification of interventions
D4 = Deviations from intended interventions
D5 = Missing data
D6 = Measurement of outcomes
D7 = Selection of reported result

Judgement
+ Low-risk
− Moderate risk
✕ Serious risk