



Table S1. Quality of appraisal of the included studies assessed with the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale–Cross-sectional studies [36] (n=10).

	Selection Domain			Comparability Domain		Outcome Domain		Score (0-10)*
	Sample representativeness	Sample size	Non-response rate	Exposure definition	Adjustment of the outcome	Assessment of the outcome	Statistical test	
Arace et al. [58]	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Bacaro et al. [59]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Cellini et al. [60]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Liang et al. [61]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Mariani Wigley et al. [63]	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
Matiz et al. [64]	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	6
Oliva et al.[65]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Picca et al. [66]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Scaini et al.[68]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Scrimin et al.[69]	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
Average Domain		4.2			0.9	2		7.1

* 9–10 =Very Good; 7–8 =Good; 5–6 =Satisfactory; 0– 4 = Unsatisfactory. This scale has been adapted from the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for cohort studies and the adapted Newcastle–Ottawa scale created for cross-sectional studies.

Table S2. Quality of appraisal of the included studies assessed with the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale–Longitudinal studies [35] (n=3).

	Selection Domain				Comparability Domain	Outcome Domain			Score (0-9)*
	Representativeness of exposed cohort	Selection of non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Outcome of interest at start of study	Adjustment of the outcome	Assessment of the outcome	Follow-up length	Adequacy of follow up	
Lionetti et al. <i>Study 1</i> [62]	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Lionetti et al. <i>Study 2</i> [62]	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Provenzi et al [67]	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Average Domain		2			1	2			5

* 9–10 =Very Good; 7–8 =Good; 5–6 =Satisfactory; 0– 4 = Unsatisfactory. This scale has been adapted from the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for cohort studies and the adapted Newcastle–Ottawa scale created for cross-sectional studies.