Supplemental 1. JBI critical appraisal for included studies. * represents questions which recorded disagreement on first review between two authors

Analytical Cross-sectional studies (answers: Yes, No, Unclear, Not Applicable (NA))

Reference	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?			
46	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
36	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
39	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear*	Yes*	Unclear*	Yes	Yes*			
37	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
32	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
58	Yes	Yes	Unclear*	No	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes			
38	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	No*	Yes	No*			
Cohort stud	dies								-		
Reference	Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were the groups/partic ipants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?
47	NA*	NA*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes
7	No*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Unclear*	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No*
8	No	Yes*	Yes*	No	No	No	Yes*	Yes*	Unclear*	No*	Yes*
51	Yes*	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
40	Yes*	Yes	Yes	NA*	NA*	Unclear*	Yes	Unclear*	Unclear*	NA*	Yes
14	NA	NA	NA*	Yes	Unclear*	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes
41	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
48	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	No
56	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Unclear*	Unclear*	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes
29	Yes	NA*	Yes*	Yes*	No*	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No*
53	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes
44	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*
52	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
49	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	Unclear*	No*	NA*	Unclear*	NA*	Yes*
57	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes

54	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	Unclear*	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Case-Conti											
Reference	Were the groups comparable 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 in 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 appropriate statistical analysis used?	
30	Yes	NA*	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Unclear*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	-
31	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	Yes	-
42	No	Unclear*	No*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Unclear*	Yes*	1
43	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear*	Yes	Yes	Yes	
45	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
34	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*	NA*	Yes	
33	Unclear*	NA*	NA*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	No*	NA*	Unclear*	Yes	
Quasi-expe	rimental studie				-	-			-	-	
Reference	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/car e, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	Was there a control group? Yes	Were there multiple measurement s of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/ exposure?	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Unclear*	Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? Yes	Was appropriate statistical analysis used? Yes		
60	Yes*	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Economic e	evaluation									-	
Reference	Is there a well-defined question?	Is there comprehensi ve description of alternatives?	Are all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative identified?	Has clinical effectiveness been established?	Are costs and outcomes measured accurately?	Are costs and outcomes valued credibly?	Are costs and outcomes adjusted for differential timing?	Is there an incremental analysis of costs and consequence s?	Were sensitivity analyses conducted to investigate uncertainty in estimates of cost or	Do study results include all issues of concern to users?	Are the results generalizable to the setting of interest in the review?

									consequence s?		
61	Yes	No*	Yes	Unclear*	Yes*	Yes	Unclear	Yes*	Unclear*	No*	Yes
Prevalence	studies					-					
Reference	Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	Was the sample size adequate?	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately ?		
55	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*		
35	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA*]	
15	Yes	Yes*	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	
50	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	1	