|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| eTable 3. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale of included observational trials | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Selection** |  |  |  | **Comparability** | **Outcome** |  |  | **TOTAL** |
| Study | **Rapresentative**  **ness of the**  **exposed cohort** | **Selection of the non exposed cohort** | **Ascertainment of exposure** | **Demostration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study** | **Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis** | **Assessment of outcome** | **Was follow up long enough for outcomes to occur?** | **Adequacy of follow up of cohorts** | **TOTAL stars, n** |
| Bonsante, 2013 (France) | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | 7 |
| Dang, 2015 (USA) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Guthman, 2015 (Switzerland) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 9 |
| Härtel, 2014 (Germany) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Hoyos, 1999 (Colombia) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | 7 |
| Hunter, 2012 (USA) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Janvier, 2014 (Canada) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Lambæk, 2016 (Denmark) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Li, 2013 (California) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* |  | 7 |
| Luoto, 2010 (Finland) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Patole, 2016 (Australia) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 8 |
| Repa, 2014 (Austria) | \* | \* | \* |  | \*\* | \* | \* |  | 7 |
| Yamashiro, 2010 (Japan) | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |  | 6 |
| Zampieri, 2013 (Japan) | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* |  |  | 5 |
| Each asterisk represents 1 star in the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale system. The maximum number of stars is 2 for comparability and 1 for each of the other categorie. (0-3 stars=poor study quality, 4-6 stars=acceptable study quality, 7-9 stars= good study quality) | | | | | | | | | |