

Table S2. Quality scores of the studies included in the meta-analysis, assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa scale.

		Selection				Comparability ^a	Outcome			Overall quality
Author	Year	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that the outcome of interest was not present at the start of the study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Assessment of the outcome	Was follow-up enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts	
Dinc	2009	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Matijevic	2016	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	7
Fernandez	2003	*	*	*	*	0	*	0	*	6
Armstrong	2017	*	*	*	*	0	0	*	*	6
Bhandari	2016	*	*	0	*	**	*	*	*	8
Screnci	2012	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Debiazi Zomer	2021	*	*	*	*		0	*	*	6
Grano	202	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	7

	0									
Szubert	2020	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	7
Abdulrazeq	2019	*	*	0	*	**	*	*	*	8
Jordens	2014	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	7
Katz	2011	*	*	*	*	0	0	*	*	6
Saleh	2019	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	7
Thornley	2009	*	*	0	*	**	*	*	*	8
Palten	2010	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Pandey	2016	*	*	0	*	**	0	*	*	7
Mayfield	2023	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	6
Tuteja	2015	*	*	*	*	0	0	*	*	6
Walker	2012	*	*	0	*	0	*	*	*	6

Newcastle-Ottawa scale for assessment of quality of included studies - cohort studies (each asterisk represents if individual criterion within the subsection was fulfilled). ^a Comparability of cohorts: for the most important factors: age, education level, and occupation