Supplementary Table 3 – Risk of bias assesed using the Joanna Briggs Institute tool for use in Systematic Reviews. The risk of bias was categorized as high, when the study score up to 49% “yes”, moderate when the study scored 50% to 69% “yes”, and low when the study scored more than 70% “yes”.

Cohort Studies

Authors	**Q.1**	**Q.2**	**Q.3**	**Q.4**	**Q.5**	**Q.6**	**Q.7**	**Q.8**	**Q.9**	**Q.10**	**Q.11**	**% yes/risk**
Civantos et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100 % / L
Enomoto et al. 2015	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	81.8%/ L
Farber et al. 2019	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	72.2% / L
Fereydooni et al. 2024	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	72.2%/L
Ramsey et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	81.8%/L

Sullivan et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	81.8%/ L
% Yes	100 %	100 %	80 %	16.6 %	16.6 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	83.3 %	100 %	100 %	

Q.1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? Q.2.Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? Q.3.Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? Q.4.Were confounding factors identified? Q.5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Q.6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? Q.7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Q.8.Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? Q.9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? Q.10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? Q.11.Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Y-Yes; N- No; H- High, M- Moderate; L- Low.

Cross-sectional studies

Authors	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q. 5	Q. 6	Q.7	Q.8	% yes/risk
Mulvey; Smith; Gourin, 2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	71,4%/L
Satheeshkumar et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	71,4%/ L
% Yes	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	0%	0%	100 %	100 %	

Q.1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? Q.2.Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? Q.3.Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? Q.4.Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? Q.5.Were confounding factors identified? Q.6.Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Q.7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Q.8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? Y-Yes; N- No; H- High, M- Moderate; L- Low.

.

Case control study

Author	Q. 1	Q. 2	Q. 3	Q. 4	Q. 5	Q. 6	Q. 7	Q. 8	Q. 9	Q.10	% yes/risk
Saravia et al. 2022	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	60%/ M

Q.1. Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls? Q.2. Were cases and controls matched appropriately? Q.3.Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls? Q.4. Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way? Q.5. Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls? Q.6. Were confounding factors identified? Q.7. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Q.8.Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls? Q.9.Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful? Q.10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Y-Yes; N- No; H- High, M- Moderate; L- Low.

Case series

Authors	**Q.1**	**Q.2**	**Q.3**	**Q.4**	**Q.5**	**Q.6**	**Q.7**	**Q.8**	**Q.9**	**Q.10**	**% yes / risk**
Lin et al. 2020	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	70.0 %/ L

Q.1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series? Q.2.Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Q.3.Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series? Q.4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? Q.5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Q.6.Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Q.7.Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants? Q.8.Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported? Q.9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? Q.10.Was statistical analysis appropriate?

Y-Yes; N- No; H- High, M- Moderate; L- Low, N.A –Not applicable

.