**Supplementary Table 1.** The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for risk of bias assessment of cohort studies included in the meta-analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Selection | | | | Comparability | Outcome | | | Quality  score |
| Representativeness  of Exposed Cohort | Selection of  Nonexposed | Ascertainment  of Exposure | Outcome Not  Present at Start | Assessment of Outcome | Adequate Follow- Up Length | Adequacy of  Follow-Up |
| Watanabe et al. [62] | ☆ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ☆ | ★ | 6 |
| Bjarnison et al. [9] | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | 9 |
| Dogan et al. [17] | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ☆ | ★ | ★ | 7 |
| Gumina et al. [24] | ☆ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ☆ | ☆ | 5 |
| İncesoy et al. [28] | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | 8 |
| Jeong et al. [31] | ☆ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | ★ | 7 |
| Longo et al. [40] | ☆ | ★ | ★ | ☆ | ★ | ☆ | ★ | ★ | 5 |
| Spiegl et al. [58] | ☆ | ★ | ★ | ☆ | ☆ | ☆ | ★ | ★ | 4 |

★ = score of 1; ★★ = score of 2; ☆ = score of 0.

**Supplementary Table 2.** Methodological quality of the included studies, based on the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) assessing the quality of cross-sectional studies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Define the source of information  (survey, record  review) | List inclusion  and exclusion  criteria for  exposed and  unexposed  subjects (cases and controls)  or refer to  previous  publications | Indicate time  period used for  identifying  patients | Indicate  whether or  not participants  were consecutive  if not  population-based | Indicate if  evaluators of  subjective  components of  study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants | Describe any  assessments  undertaken for  quality assurance  purposes  (such as, test/retest  of primary  outcome  measurements) | Explain any  patient  exclusions  from analysis | Describe how  confounding  was assessed  and/or  controlled | If applicable,  explain how  missing data  were handled  in the analysis | Summarize  patient  response  rates and  completeness  of data  collection | Clarify  what  follow-up,  if any, was  expected  and the  percentage  of patients  for which  incomplete data or follow-up  was obtained | Quality  score |
| Haveri et al [27] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | No | 8 |
| Jeong et al. [29] | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | NA | 6 |
| Kim et al. [34] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | NA | 7 |
| Lee et al. [37] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | No | 6 |
| Mehta et al. [41] | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | No | 6 |
| Shinagawa et al. [56] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | No | 8 |
| Abate et al. [1] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | NA | 7 |
| Applegate et al. [4] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | NA | NA | 7 |
| Atala et al. [5] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | No | 8 |
| Blonna et al. [10] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | No | Yes | 8 |
| Cunningham et al. [16] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | NA | 7 |
| Figueiredo et al. [20] | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | No | 6 |
| Motta et al. [44] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | No | Yes | 9 |
| Mohamed et al [43] | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | No | 6 |
| Park et al. [48] | Yes | Yes | No | NA | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 6 |
| Passaretti et al. [49] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | No | 8 |
| Yamamoto et al. [64] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 8 |
| van Kampen et al. [61] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | NA | 9 |

NA = unclear.