|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **Table S3**. Supplementary Material the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale quality assessment of the included studies (details). Cohort Star Template | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **Study1** | **Selection of cohorts** | | | | | **Comparability of cohorts** | **Outcome** | | | **Power2** |  |
| Representativeness of the exposed cohort | Selection of the non exposed cohort | | Ascertainment of exposure | Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at  start of study | Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design  or analysis | Assessment of outcome | Was follow up long enough for outcomes to occur | Adequacy of follow up of cohorts |  |  |
| Byles et al.  (2016) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Good quality3 |  |
| Dinh et al. (2022) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Hallerod et al. (2023) |  | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Haapanen et al. (2022) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Kalousova & Mendes (2014) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Kang & Kim (2014) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Lallukka et al. (2023) | ☆ |  | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Fair quality |  |
| Manty et al. (2018) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Good quality |  |
| Manty et al. (2016) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Good quality |  |
| Nie et al. (2019) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Okamoto et al. (2018) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Good quality |  |
| Pedron et al. (2020) | ☆ | ☆ | | ☆ | ☆ | ☆☆ | ☆ | ☆ |  | Good quality |  |
| Sato et al. (2023) | ☆ | ☆ | | ☆ | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |
| Stenholm et al. (2014) |  | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Fair quality |  |
| Stevens et al. (2021) |  | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Fair quality |  |
| van den Bogaard & Henkens (2018) |  | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ | ☆ | Fair quality |  |
| Wu et al. (2016) | ☆ | ☆ | | ☆ | ☆ | ☆☆ | ☆ | ☆ | ☆ | Good quality |  |
| Xue et al. (2017) | ☆ | ☆ | | ☆ | ☆ | ☆☆ | ☆ | ☆ |  | Good quality |  |
| Yuan et al. (2021) | ☆ | ☆ | |  | ☆ | ☆☆ |  | ☆ |  | Poor Quality |  |

Note.

1 To reduce the risk of bias, each article was assessed by an independent judge, and no discrepancies were found between both reviewers.

2Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain; Fair quality: 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain; Poor quality: 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain

3Low risk of bias = *Good and fair quality* // High risk of bias: *Poor quality*

*From:*  Wells, G., Shea, B., O’Connell, D., Peterson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., & Tugwell, P. (2014). Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale cohort studies. University of Ottawa.