|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Supplemental Table 1. Assessment of methodological quality of cohort studies using NOS** | | | | | | | | |
| Author  [Year] | Haroutiunian (2009) | Herrero (2014) | Huang (2017) | Mink  (2011) | Spriet (2007) | Vélez Díaz- Pallarés (2011) | Wen  (2017) | Wu (2016) |
| Selection | | | | | | | | |
| Representativeness of the exposed cohort | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Selection of the nonexposed cohort | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* |
| Ascertainment of exposure | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Outcome of interest was not present at the start of the study | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |
| Comparability | | | | | | | | |
| Comparability of cohorts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment of outcome | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Was follow-up sufficiently long for outcomes to occur? | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |
| Total stars | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 |