

Review

Occupational Hearing Loss Associated with the Combined Exposure of Solvents and Noise: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Jia Ren ^{1,2}, Hongwei Xie ¹, Yong Hu ¹, Yu Hong ^{2,*}, Hua Zou ^{1,*} and Xiangjing Gao ^{1,*}

Table S1. Quality assessment of the cross-sectional studies.

Criteria	Study																
	[39]	[40]	[41]	[42]	[43]	[44]	[18]	[23]	[45]	[46]	[47]	[27]	[48]	[11]	[49]	[50]	[51]
1. Define the source of information	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects or refer to previous publications	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
3. Indicate time period used for identifying patients	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
4. Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-based	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5. Indicate if evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
7. Explain any patient exclusions from analysis	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
9. If applicable, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
11. Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total scores	6	6	8	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	6	5	5	6	6	4	5

Criteria	Study																
	[39]	[40]	[41]	[42]	[43]	[44]	[18]	[23]	[45]	[46]	[47]	[27]	[48]	[11]	[49]	[50]	[51]
Quality levels	M	M	H	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Note: M=Moderate, H=high.																	

Table S2. Quality assessment of the cohort studies.

Criteria		Study					
		[33]	[34]	[35]	[36]	[37]	[38]
1. Selection	(1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort	1	1	1	1	1	1
	(2) Selection of the non exposed cohort	1	1	1	1	1	1
	(3) Ascertainment of exposure	1	1	1	1	1	1
	(4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	0	0	1	1	0	0
2. Comparability	(1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	1	1	2	1	1	1
	(2) Assessment of outcome	1	1	1	1	1	1
3. Outcome	(1) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	1	1	1	1	1	1
	(2) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total scores		7	7	9	8	7	7
Quality levels		M	M	H	H	M	M

Note: M=Moderate, H=high.