

S2 Table. Application of the quality assessment tool NOS to the studies included in the meta-analysis

Items	Subgroups	Details	No 1	No 2	No 3	No 4	No 5	No 6	No 7	No 8	No 9	No 10	No 11	No 12	No 13	No 14	No 15	No 16	No 17	No 18	No 19	No 20	No 21	No 22	No 23	No 24	No 25	No 26	No 27	No 28	No 29	No 30				
			Camps, 2005	Camps, 2011	Castib, 1998	Chen, 2010	Dobryzcka, 2011	Eiel, 2015	El Messaoudi, 2016	Gautschi, 2007	Haidao, 2016	Han, 2016	Hara, 2017	Jamrozka, 2017	Kim, 2015	Kimura, 2004	Kingham, 2016	Kimjoo, 2015	Laethem, 2017	Nygaard, 2014	Nygaard, 2014	Ramirez, 2001	Sommad, 2015	Stagh, 2015	Spindler, 2014	Spindler, 2015	Taberner, 2015	Takai, 2015	Tjonnvoll, 2016	Wang, 2010	Xu, 2014	Yamada, 1998				
Selection	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort	a) truly representative of the average _____ (describe) in the community *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
		b) random representativeness of the average _____ in the community *																																		
	2) Selection of the non exposed cohort	a) no description of the derivation of the cohort																																		
		b) drawn from a different source																																		
3) Ascertainment of exposure	a) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort																																			
	a) secure record (eg surgical records) *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
	b) structured interview *																																			
	c) written self report																																			
4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	a) no description																																			
	a) yes *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Comparability	1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	a) no																																		
		b) study controls for _____ (select the most important factor) *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Outcome	1) Assessment of outcome	a) independent blind assessment *																																		
		b) record linkage *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
	2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	a) self report																																		
		a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) *																																		
3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	a) no																																			
	b) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *																																			
	c) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost -> _____ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost *																																			
	c) follow up rate < _____ % (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost																																			
Assessment	Total	a) no statement																																		
		* Selection (max of 4 stars)	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		
		** Comparability (max of 3 stars)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
		* Outcome (max of 3 stars)	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability