Supplemental Table. 1 The Quality Assessment Base on Newcastle – Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS).

| | NOS score items for cohort study | | Author and year | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|-----------------|--------|---------|------------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|--------|--------|
| | | | Katsarava, | Bigal, | Ashina, | Seferoğlu, | Lipton, | Özge, | Lipton, | Reed, | Martin, | Scher, | Scher, |
| | | | 2004 | 2008 | 2012 | 2012 | 2013 | 2013 | 2015 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Selection | Representativeness of the exposed cohort | a) truly representative of the average (describe) in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average in the community * c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers d) no description of the derivation of the cohort | | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * |
| | 2) Selection of the non exposed cohort | the cohort a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort ★ b) drawn from a different source c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | 3) Ascertainment of | a) secure record (eg surgical | | | | | | | * | | | | * |
| | exposure | records) * b) structured interview * c) written self report d) no description | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | |
| | 4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study | . • | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Supplemental Table. 1 (Continued) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------|------------|------------|---|------|---|---|------|----------|------|---|
| Comparability | 1) Comparability of | a) study controls for (select | | * | * | | * | | | * | * | * | |
| | cohorts on the basis of | the most important factor) * | | 7 * | A * | | APK. | | | APA. | ₩ | Apr. | |
| | the design or analysis | b) study controls for any additional | * | * | * | | * | | * | * | * | * | * |
| | | factor * | ~ | <i>T</i> | ~ | | ~ | | ~ | ~ | | ~ | |
| Outcome | 1) Assessment of | a) independent blind assessment * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | outcome | b) record linkage ** | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | | c) self report | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | d) no description | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2) Was follow-up long | a) yes (select an adequate follow up | * * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| | enough for outcomes | period for outcome of interest) * | | ~ | ~ | 7 | • | • | • | ~ | • | ~ | ~ |
| | to occur | b) no | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3) Adequacy of follow | a) complete follow up - all subjects | | | * | * | | | * | | * | | |
| | up of cohorts | accounted for * | * | | • | · | | | · | | · | | * |
| | | b) 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | d) no statement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total score | | | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 |