Supplementary Table 2. Quality Appraisal of the Cross-Sectional Studies Included in this Review (n = 19)

Studies	Appraisal Questions															
	Q1: Were	Q2: Were	Q3: Was	Q4: Were	Q5: Were	Q6: Were	Q7: Were	Q8: Was								
	the criteria	the study	the	objective,	confounding	strategies to	the	appropriate								
	for inclusion in the sample	subjects and the setting described	exposure measured in a valid and reliable	standard criteria used for measurement	factors identified?	deal with confounding factors stated?	outcomes measured in a valid and	statistical analysis used?								
									clearly	in detail?	way?	of the			reliable	
									defined?			condition?			way?	
									Willard-	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Grace et al.,															
	2013															
Rabatin et al.,	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•								
2016																
Simonetti et	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
al., 2017																
Edwards et	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
al., 2017																
Blechter et	•	•	•	•	?	•	•	•								
al., 2017																
Spinelli et al.,	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
2016																
Helfrich et	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
al., 2014																
Olayiwola et	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
al., 2018																
Linzer et al.,	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
2009																

Robertson et al., 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•	?	•
Babbott et al., 2014	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Edwards et al., 2018	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Yoon et al., 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Williams et al., 2007	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Kim et al., 2018	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Zubatsky et al., 2018	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Sun et al., 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Whitebird et al., 2017	•	•	•	•	?	0	•	•
Helfrich et al., 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Note. • = Yes; ° = No; ? = Unclear; N/A = Not Applicable; Q = Question;