**Supplementary appendix**

Table S3. NOS scoring records for quality assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **NOS scoring for included cohort studies** |
| **Study, Year** | **Selection** | **Comparability** | **Outcome** | **Total scores** | **Quality Grade** |
| Representative-ness of the exposed cohort | Selection of the non- exposed cohort | Ascertainment of exposure | Demonstration of outcome | Assessment of outcome | Follow-up long enough for outcomes | Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts |
| Andreassen, 2014 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Boixeda*,* 2014 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Grolimund*,* 2014 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Poor |
| Huerta*,* 2013 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Good |
| Husebø, 2018 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Jeong*,* 2010 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Kim*,* 2016 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Good |
| Lieberman*,* 2002 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | Good |
| Lu*,* 2016 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Myint*,* 2011 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Pizzini*,* 2017 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | Good |
| Saleh*,* 2015 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Sharafkhane*,* 2017 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | Poor |
| Shin*,* 2016 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Good |
| Shin*,* 2019 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | Good |
| Søgaard*,* 2016 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Good |
| Steer*,* 2012 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Poor |
| **NOS scoring for included case-control study** |
| **Study, Year** | **Selection** | **Comparability** | **Exposure** | **Total score** | **Quality Grade** |
| Cases definition | Cases representativeness | Controls selection | Outcome of mortality | Assessment of exposure | Same method to determineexposure | No response rate |
| Yu, 2018 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Poor |

NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa Scale.