







Supplementary Material (Tables)

Supplementary Table 1. The risk of bias assessment of the included studies

THE REVISED COCHRANE RISK-OF-BIAS TOOL FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS IN THE META-ANALYSIS									
Author, year	Bias arising from the randomization process	Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Bias due to missing data	Bias in measurement of outcomes	Bias in selection of the reported result	low/moderate/serious/critical			
Healey et al, 2012	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low			
Martin et al, 2015	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low			
NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE COHORT STUDIES									
Study	Selection				Comparability of the cohort	Outcome			Total score
	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Outcome not present at baseline		Assessment of outcome	Enough follow up duration	Adequate follow-up	
Benezet Mazuecos et al, 2018	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Li <i>et al</i> , 2019	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Park <i>et al</i> , 2021	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Study	Selection				Comparability of Cases and Controls	Outcome			Total score
	Adequate Case Definition	Representativeness of the Cases	Selection of Controls	Defenition of Controls		Ascertainment of Exposure	Same Method Of Ascertainment for Cases and Controls	Non-response rate	
Gonzalez et al, 2014	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Witt et al, 2015	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	-	8
Nishinarita <i>et al</i> , 2019	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	-	8

Each asterisk represents one star in the Newcastle-Ottawa Scaling System. The maximum stars are 2 for comparability and 1 are for all other categories. Each star counts towards the total score. Score of 5 to 6 considered as moderate quality and 7 to 9 as high quality.
 - Not available or unable to extract.