**Supporting Table 3. NOS quality assessment scale.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study, year** | **Representativeness: 0,1** | **Present outcome**  **at the beginning**  **of study: 0, 1** | **Sample size: 0, 1** | **Diagnostic**  **tool: 0, 1, 2** | **Comparability**  **of study**  **population: 0, 2** | | **Outcome**  **assessment:**  **0, 1** | **Statistical**  **test: 0, 1** | **Total** | **Quality of evidence****a** |
| Bazerbachi et al. (2020) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | high |
| Guedes et al. (2019) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |
| Genco et al. (2018) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | high |
| Raftopoulos et al. (2017) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |
| Folini et al. (2014) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | fair |
| Takihata et al. (2014) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |
| Tai et al. (2013) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |
| Nikolic et al. (2011) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |
| Sekino et al. (2011) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | fair |
| Stimac et al. (2011) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | high |
| Forlano et al. (2010) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | high |
| Donadio et al. (2009) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | high |
| Ricci et al. (2008) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | fair |

aQuality assessment of the selected studies was assessed using the modified NOS [studies with a score of 7-9 were high quality (low risk of bias); those with a score of 4-6 were fair quality (moderate risk of bias); and those with a score of 1-3 stars were low quality (high risk of bias)].