

Supplemental Table 2 Quality Ratings

<b>Cohort Study</b>													
Items	Buys, 2019* [48]	Garcia-Diaz, 2017 [34]	Gibson, 2017 [35]	Kurasawa, 2016 [37]	Low, 2016 [38]	Chew, 2015 [33]	Thongsai, 2015 [42]	Parker, 2012 [40]	Bowser, 2009 [32]	Masuda, 2006 [39]	Ando, 2005 [31]	Rosen, 2003 [41]	Karter, 2004 [36]
1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4. Were confounding factors identified?	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or the moment of exposure)?	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
10. Were reasons to address incomplete follow up utilized?	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Total Score	8	9	8	6	7	10	4	11	5	9	6	8	11
Level of Quality	0.73	0.82	0.73	0.55	0.64	0.91	0.36	1.0	0.45	0.82	0.55	0.73	1.0
<b>Cross-Sectional Study</b>													
Items									Khoza, 1995 [44]	Belgrave, 1994 [43]			
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?									0	0			
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?									1	1			
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?									0	1			
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?									0	0			
5. Were confounding factors identified?									0	0			
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?									0	0			
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?									0	0			
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?									0	1			
Total Score									1	3			
Level of Quality									0.13	0.38			

Supplemental Table 2 (Continued)

Case Control Study			
Items	Simmon, 2007 [47]		
1. Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or absence of disease in controls?	0		
2. Were cases and controls matched appropriately?	1		
3. Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?	1		
4. Was exposure measured in a standard, valid, and reliable way?	0		
5. Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?	1		
6. Were confounding factors identified?	1		
7. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors identified?	1		
8. Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?	0		
9. Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?	1		
10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	1		
Total Score	7		
Level of Quality	0.7		
Qualitative Study			
Items	Buy, 2019 * [48]	Heydarabadi, 2017 [45]	Wong, 2005 [46]
1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	1	0	0
2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	1	1	1
3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	1	1	1
4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	1	1	1
5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	1	1	1
6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	0	0	0
7. Is the influence of the research on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	0	0	0
8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	0	1	0
9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	1	1	1
10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	1	1	1
Total Score	7	7	6
Level of Quality	0.7	0.7	0.6

\*Mixed methods study

