

Table S2. Quality assessment of reviewed studies based on NHLBI

Reference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total ¹
Lee et al., 2013	+	+	NR	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	NA	+	fair
Lee et al., 2017	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	NA	+	fair
Lu et al., 2019	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	NR	NA	+	fair
Reading et al., 2019	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	NR	NA	+	poor
Saqlain et al., 2019	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	NA	+	fair
Seong et al., 2019	+	+	NR	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	NR	NA	+	fair
Shehadeh-Sheeny et al., 2013	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	NA	+	fair
Song & Park, 2020	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	NR	NA	+	fair
Wannasirikul et al., 2016	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	NA	+	fair

Notes and abbreviations: ¹Total scores were calculated based on the single scores and a critical appraisal of the methodological quality of each study in accordance with the NHLBI.

NR: Not relevant, NA/NR: Not available/not reported.

Criteria: 1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?; 2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?; 3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?; 4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?; 5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?; 6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?; 7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?; 8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?; 9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?; 10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?; 11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?; 12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?; 13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?; 14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?.

The NHLBI can be found in: National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies. 2014. Available from: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-pro/guidelines/in-develop/cardiovascular-risk-reduction/tools/cohort>.