

Supplementary Table S3 A Results of the methodological quality assessment based on The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case control studies

Author/year	Were the groups comparable in ways other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls?	Were cases and controls matched appropriately?	Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?	Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?	Was exposure measured the same way for cases and controls?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?	Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?	Was an appropriate statistical analysis used?	Overall appraisal
Aikaterini A et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	I
Anyfanti P et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Arida A et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Bazzichi L et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	I
Cypiene A et al	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Holmes M et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Ilter A et al	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	I
Mäki-Petäjä KM et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I

Y:Yes; N: No; U:Unclear; NA: Not apply; I: included. The level of evidence was IV using Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine 2011 Levels of Evidence Question (OCEBM) (Is this diagnostic or monitoring test accurate?).

Supplementary Table S3 B Results of the methodological quality assessment based on The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Cross Sectional studies.

Author/year	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Overall appraisal
Beyazal MS et al	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	I
Pieringer H et al	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Turkyilmaz A et al	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Wallberg-Jonsson S et al	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	I

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear; NA: Not apply; I: Included. The level of evidence was II using Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine 2011 Levels of Evidence Question (OCEBM) (Is this diagnostic or monitoring test accurate?)