Supplemental Table 1 Quality assessment of animal studies according to SYRCLE's risk of bias tool

Stu	Sequ	Baseli	Baseli	Baseli	Alloc	Ran	Ident	Blin	Rand	Blin	Inco	Sele	Other	Oth	Oth	Oth	Oth
dy	ence	ne	ne	ne	ation	do	ical	ding	om	ding	mple	ctive	bias -	er	er	er	er
(yea	gene	charact	charact	charact	conce	m	hous	of	outco	of	te	outc	contam	bias	Bia	bia	Bias
r)	ratio	eristics	eristics	eristics	almen	hou	ing	care	me	outc	outco	ome	ination	-	s -	s -	-
	n	- sex	- age	-	t	sing	cond	giver	asses	ome	me	repo	/	infl	unit	des	Ne
				weight			ition	s	smen	asse	data	rtin	poolin	uenc	s of	ign	w
							s		t	ssor		g	g drugs	e of	ana	-	ani
										s				fun	lysi	spe	mal
														ders	s	cifi	s
															erro	c	add
															rs	risk	ed
																	for
																	dro
																	pou
																	ts

Che	Uncl	Low	Low	Unclea	Uncle	Unc	Uncl	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Low	Low	Lo	Lo	Low
n	ear	risk	risk	r risk	ar risk	lear	ear	ear	ar	ear	ar	ear	risk	risk	w	w	risk
(201	risk					risk	risk	risk	risk	risk	risk	risk			risk	risk	
4)																	
Che	Uncl	Low	Low	Unclea	Uncle	Unc	Uncl	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Low	Low	Lo	Lo	Low
n	ear	risk	risk	r risk	ar risk	lear	ear	ear	ar	ear	ar	ear	risk	risk	w	w	risk
(201	risk					risk	risk	risk	risk	risk	risk	risk			risk	risk	
5)																	
Gou	Uncl	Low	Low	Unclea	Uncle	Unc	Low	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Low	Uncl	Low	Low	Lo	Lo	Low
pil	ear	risk	risk	r risk	ar risk	lear	risk	ear	ar	ear	risk	ear	risk	risk	w	w	risk
(201	risk					risk		risk	risk	risk		risk			risk	risk	
6)																	
На	Uncl	Low	Unclea	Unclea	Uncle	Unc	Low	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Uncle	Uncl	Low	Low	Lo	Lo	Low
wm	ear	risk	r risk	r risk	ar risk	lear	risk	ear	ar	ear	ar	ear	risk	risk	w	w	risk
an	risk					risk		risk	risk	risk	risk	risk			risk	risk	

(201									
3)									

The SYRCLE score determined the risk of bias in Sequence generation, baseline characteristics, allocation concealment, random housing, identical housing conditions, blinding of caregivers, random outcome assessment/blinding of outcome assessor, and incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other biases.

Supplemental Table 2 Quality appraisal for case-control studies according to the Newcastle-Ottawa tool

Study	Is the case	Representativeness	Selection	Definition	Comparability of	Ascertainment	The same	Non-
(year)	definition	of the cases	of	of Controls	cases and	of exposure	method of	Response
	adequate?		Controls		controls based on		ascertainment	rate
					the design or		for cases and	
					analysis		controls	
Chang	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear
(2017)								risk
Pour	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear
(2011)								risk

Supplemental Table 3 Quality appraisal of registry studies using the Wylde' tool

Study (year)	Inclusion of	Representativeness	Percentage follow-up	Minimization of potential				
	consecutive	(multicentre denotes	(>80% denotes	confounding (multivariable				
	patients	adequate)	adequate)	analysis denotes adequate)				
Chowdhurry (2017)	N/R	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate				
Best (2015	N/R	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate				

Supplemental Table 4 Quality assessment of case series using the Moga tool

Study (year)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	SUM
Alpantaki (2011)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	13
Soden (2000)	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	10