

Supplementary Table 1. Newcastle-Ottawa scale quality assessment

Author (year)	Study type	S1	S2	S3	S4	C1A	C1B	O1	O2	O3	Total
Naef et al. (2021) [20]	PC	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	5/9
Meyers et al. (2020) [21]	PC	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3/9
Lester et al. (2020) [22]	PC	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/9
Tang et al. (2020) [23]	PC	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6/9
Metzger et al. (2019) [24]	PC	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	5/9
Lee et al. (2019) [25]	PC	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5/9
Fumis et al. (2019) [26]	PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8/9
Oliveira et al. (2018) [27]	PC	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7/9
Beesley et al. (2018) [28]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	7/9
Petrinec et al. (2017)[29]	PC	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4/9
Matt et al. (2017) [30]	PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
McPeake et al. (2016) [31]	PC	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/9

Hartog et al. (2015) [32]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	UC	7/9
de Miranda et al. (2011) [33]	PC	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6/9
Pillai et al. (2010) [34]	PC	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5/9
Anderson et al. (2008) [35]	PC	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5/9
Meyers et al. (2020) [36]	PC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2/9
Kentish-Barnes et al. (2017) [37]	RCT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Warren et al. (2016) [38]	PC	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	5/9
Downey et al. (2015) [39]	RCT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Davydow et al. (2013) [40]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	8/9
Choi et al. (2013) [41]	PC	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	4/9
Gries et al. (2010) [42]	RCT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Douglas et al. (2010) [43]	PC	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6/9
Van Pelt et al. (2010) [44]	PC	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	4/9

Zimmerli et al. (2014) [57]	CS	1	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	N/A	9/10
Sundararajan et al. (2014) [58]	PC	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5/9
Dithole et al. (2013) [59]	PC	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	5/9
Azoulay et al. (2005) [60]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	7/9
Jones et al. (2004) [61]	RCT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kentish-Barnes et al. (2018) [62]	PC	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5/9
Vallet et al. (2019) [63]	PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	UC	7/9
Myhren et al. (2010) [64]	CS	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	N/A	9/10
Siegel et al. (2008) [65]	CS	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	N/A	4/10
Azoulay (2022) [66]	PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Fu et al. (2021) [67]	CS	0	1	1	2	0	1	2	1	N/A	8/10
Heesakkers et al. (2022) [68]	PC	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6/9
Milton et al. (2021) [69]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	7/9

McPeake et al. (2022) [70]	PC	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	7/9
----------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Legend: N/A: not available; S1: Selection: Representativeness of the exposed cohort; S2: Selection of the non-exposed cohort; S3: Ascertainment of exposure; S4: Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study; C1A: Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders: the study controls for gender of a relative; C1B: Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders: the study controls for other factors; O1: Assessment of outcome; O2: Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur; O3: Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts. The quality of a study was assessed by converting Newcastle-Ottawa scale to AHRQ standard (good, fair and poor): Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain; Fair quality: 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain; Poor quality: 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain