**Supplementary Table 1: Joanna Briggs quality assessment for cohort studies included in the review**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Author (Ref) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | Total score |  |
| **Balabanova (48)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  No | No | Yes | 8/11 |
| **Balabanova (49)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No  | 7/11 |  |
| **Bei (50)** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | 7/11 |
| **Bhering (51)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 9/11 |
| **Blöndal (52)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 10/11 |
| **Chingonzoh (53)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 7/11 |
| **Frank (54)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | 8/11 |
| **Gandhi (56)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | 7/11 |
| **James (57)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | 6/11 |
| **Javaid (58)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 9/11 |  |
| **Kuksa (59)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 10/11 |  |
| **Kvasnovsky (60)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 10/11 |
| **Liu (61)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | 8/11 |  |
| **O’Donnell (62)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 6/11 |  |
| **O’Donnell (63)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 8/11 |  |
| **Olayanju (64)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 9/11 |
| **Pietersen (65)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 8/11 |  |
| **Pietersen (66)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 7/11 |  |
| **Shean (67)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 7/11 |  |
| **Shin (68)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | 7/11 |  |
| **Tang (69)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | 6/11 |  |
| **Te Riele (70)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 8/11 |  |
| **Yuengling (71)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 10/11 |  |
| **Zhang (72)** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 10/11 |  |

1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?
2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?
4. Were confounding factors identified?
5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?
8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?
9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?
10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?
11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

**Supplementary Table 2: Joanna Briggs Quality Assessment for case-control studies included in the review**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Author (Ref) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total Score |
| **Gandhi (55)** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 8/10 |

1. Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls?
2. Were cases and controls matched appropriately?
3. Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?
4. Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?
5. Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?
6. Were confounding factors identified?
7. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
8. Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?
9. Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?
10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?