Supplemental Table 3: Risk of bias assessment for the included studies

Study	Selection				Comparability[e]	Outcome		
	Representativeness of the exposure (intervention) cohort[a]	Selection of the nonexposed cohort[b]	Ascertainment of exposure[c]	Incident disease[d]		Assessment of outcome[f]	Length of follow up[g]	Adequacy of Follow up[h]
Amin 2007 (30)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Pattanittum 2008 (31)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Bastek 2010	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A
Miyazaki 2014 (22)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

a. A, truly representative of the average population of interest; B, somewhat representative of the average population of interest; C, selected group; D, no description of the derivation of the cohort.

b. A, drawn from the same source as the intervention cohort (concurrent controls); B, drawn from a different source (historical controls); C, no description of the derivation of the nonexposed cohort.

c. A, secure record (e.g., hospital records); B, structured interview; C, written self-report; D, no description.

d. Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at the start of the study: A, yes; B, no.

e. Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis: A, study controls for the most important factor; B, study controls for any additional factor; C, not carried out or not reported.

f. A, independent blind assessment; B, record linkage; C, self-report; D, no description.

g. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur? A, yes; B, no.

h. A, complete follow-up; all subjects were accounted for. B, Subjects lost to follow-up were unlikely to introduce bias because small numbers were lost; >90% had follow-up, or description was provided of those lost. C, follow-up rate <90%, and there was no description of those lost. D, no statement.