

eTable 1
ROBINS-I assessment of risk of bias in included studies*

Author, year, country	Bias due to confounding [†]	Bias in selection of participants	Bias in classification of interventions	Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Bias due to missing data [‡]	Bias in measurement of outcomes	Bias in selection of the reported result [§]	Overall
Chen et al. 2008 ⁴⁸ Taiwan	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S
Kim et al. 2014 ⁴⁵ South Korea	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S
Maekawa et al. 2013 ⁴⁶ Japan	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S
Sakamoto et al. 2014 ⁴⁷ Japan	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S
Shin et al. 2013 ⁴⁹ South Korea	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S
Siao et al. 2015 ⁵⁰ Taiwan	S	L	L	L	L	L	M	S

Risk of bias: L = low risk; M = moderate risk; S = serious risk.

Risk of bias summary: Review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study. Based on the ROBINS-I tool all studies were deemed at overall serious risk of bias because they included at least one category with serious risk of bias.

* All studies were deemed to have an overall serious risk of bias, which could also be considered critical, with confounding being the primary source of bias.

[†] Risk of bias from confounding was considered serious when confounding was not inherently controlled and when the possibility of residual (and unmeasured) confounders remained after adjusting for measured covariates, but could also be considered critical as the criteria to judge bias within the ROBINS-I tool are essentially subjective.

[‡] The majority of studies did not report on missing data, but could also be considered unknown.

[§] All studies were at moderate risk for selective outcome reporting since none provided a pre-registered protocol.