Supplementary Table 1.
Risk of bias assessments

	Selection					Outcome		
First Author	Representative of sample	Sample size	Non-respondents	Ascertainment of the surveillance tool	Comparability*	Assessment of outcome	Statistical test	Total star
Kato (2009)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Rathman (2011)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Gallagher (2011)	*	*	*	**	-	*	*	7
Shojaei (2011)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Daryasari (2012)	-	-	*	**	-	*	*	5
Peters-Klimm (2012)	*	*	*	**	-	*	*	7
Momeni (2013)	-	-	*	**	-	*	*	5
Vidán (2014)	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	8
Alizadeh (2014)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Kamrani (2014)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Hu (2015)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Uchmanowicz (2015)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Graven (2015)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Linn (2016)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Hamzehpour (2016)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Uchmanowicz (2017)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Masterson Creber (2017)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Giezeman (2017)	*	-	-	**	-	*	*	5
Lee (2018)	*	*	*	**	-	*	*	7
de Sousa (2018)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Mlynarska (2018)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Asadi (2019)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Jaafar (2019)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Kessing (2016)	*	*	*	**	-	*	*	7
Liljeroos (2020)	*	-	-	**	-	*	*	5
Kolasa (2021)	*	-	*	**	*	*	*	7
Pobrotyn (2021)	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	8
Ryou (2021)	*	-	*	**	*	*	*	7
Sedlar (2021)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6
Calero-Molina (2022)	*	*	*	**	-	*	*	7
Yoshinaga (2022)	*	-	*	**	-	*	*	6

Studies are rated from 0–10 star, with those studies rating 0–3 star (poor quality), 4–6 star (fair quality), 7–10 star (good/high quality).

They refer to number of stars the study take from that criterion. https://cdn-links.lww.com/permalink/ejgh/a/ejgh_31_9_2019_07_18_nguyen_15743_sdc1.pdf