**Supplementary File 4.** Quality assessment of included cross-sectional studies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | Author, year(ref.) | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Mohamed  et al.2018(7) | | Elevli et al.2018(14) | AbdulWahab  et al.2018(15) | Uysalol  et al.2014(17) | Razi et al.2011(37) | Urushidate  et al.2010(25) | Rubin et al.2004(41) | Ford et al.2004(28) | Omland et al.2002(43) |
| 1. | Define the source of information (survey, record review); | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2. | List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3. | Indicate time period used for identifying patients; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. | Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-based; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5. | Evaluators of subjective components of study were not masked to other aspects of the status of the participants; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 6. | Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measurements); | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7. | Explain any patient exclusions from analysis; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 8. | Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled; | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. | If applicable, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. | Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection; | 0 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. | Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained; | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Overall quality score | 9 | | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7 |

The quality of studies was assessed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (ARHQ) methodology checklist.

1= “Yes”, 0= “No” or “Unclear”. The full score for the scale is 11 points.