	Hori- kawa et al. 2001	et al.	Osawa et.al.2003	Ditch- burn et al. 2006		Gaspard et.al.2009	Treakle et.al.2009	McGovern et al. 2010	Uneke et.al 2010	Winner- Well et.al2011	Banu et al. 2012 et al. 2012	Mor- gan et.al. 2012	Munoz- Prize et.al.2012	Roghmann Williams et.al. 2015 et al. 2015	Abu Ra- wan & Ahmad. 2017	et.al.	Batis- ta et al. 2019	Jacksor	1Kanwa r et al. 2019
<ol> <li>Representativeness of the sample:</li> <li>a) Truly representative of the average</li> </ol>																			*
in the target population. * (all subjects																			
or random sampling) b) Somewhat representative of the		*		*															
average in the target population. *	*		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		
(non-random sampling)																			
c) Selected group of users.																			
d) No description of the sampling																			
strategy.																			
<ol> <li>Sample size:</li> <li>a) Justified and satisfactory. *</li> </ol>																			
b) Not justified.			*			*	*	*	*	*		*	*	* *	*	*	*	*	
3) Non-respondents:																			
a) Comparability between respond-																			
ents and non-respondents' character- istics is established, and the response																			
rate is satisfactory. *																			
b) The response rate is unsatisfactory,																			
or the comparability between re-										*		*	*		*				
spondents and non-respondents is																			
unsatisfactory.																			
c) No description of the response rate																			
or the characteristics of the respond-																			
ers and the non-responders. 4)Ascertainment of the exposure (risk																			
factor):																			
a) Validated measurement tool. **																			
b) Non-validated measurement tool,																			
but the tool is available or described.*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	* *	*	*	* *	*	*	*	*	*
c) No description of the measurement tool .																			
5)Comparability: (Maximum 2 stars)																			

 Table S1. Newcastle - Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (adapted for cross sectional studies).

<ol> <li>The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confound- ing factors are controlled.</li> <li>a) The study controls for the most important factor (select one). *</li> <li>b) The study control for any addi- tional factor. *</li> </ol>	* *	*	* *	*	*	*	* *	*	*	*	*	* *	* *	*	* *	* *	*	*	*	*	* *
<ul> <li>6)Outcome: (Maximum 3 stars)</li> <li>1) Assessment of the outcome:</li> <li>a) Independent blind assessment. **</li> <li>b) Record linkage. **</li> <li>c) Self report. *</li> <li>d) No description.</li> <li>2) Statistical test:</li> <li>a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and ap-</li> </ul>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

propriate, and the measurement of the association is presented, including

b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete.

Table S2. Risk-of-bias for each included randomized controlled trial.

(+) Low risk of bias; (?) unclear risk of bias; (-) high risk of bias

	Randomization process	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported result	Overall
Burden et al. (2011)	+	•	+	•	+	+
Anderson et al. (2017)	+	•	+	+	+	+

Risk-of-bias graph: judgement by review authors in each risk of bias category presented as percentage of all included studies

