Supplementary Table 2. Quality assessment using Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for cohort studies

Study	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Quality power
	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the nonexposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders	Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts	
Cha et al. [15] (2022)	★	-	★	★	★	★	★	-	Good
Cho et al. [16] (2012)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Choi et al. [17] (2020)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Choi et al. [18] (2021)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Chung et al. [19] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Hong et al. [20] (2016)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Hong et al. [21] (2020)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Hwang et al. [23] (2018)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Hwang et al. [24] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Im et al. [26] (2020)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Im et al. [27] (2021)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Im et al. [28] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Jang et al. [29] (2016)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Jang et al. [30] (2020)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Jang et al. [31] (2021)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Jee et al. [32] (2020)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Jeon et al. [33] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Jeong et al. [34] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Jeong et al. [35] (2020)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Jung et al. [36] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [37] (2012)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [38] (2013)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [39] (2017)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Kim et al. [40] (2019)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Kim et al. [41] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [42] (2020)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Kim et al. [43] (2020)	★	-	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [44] (2020)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [45] (2020)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [46] (2021)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Kim et al. [47] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [48] (2022)	★	-	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Kim et al. [49] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Ko et al. [50] (2018)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Ko et al. [51] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Ko et al. [52] (2020)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Lee et al. [53] (2012)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [54] (2013)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [55] (2017)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [56] (2018)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [57] (2021)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [58] (2021)	★	-	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Lee et al. [59] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Oh et al. [60] (2017)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Oh et al. [61] (2019)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Park et al. [62] (2012)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good

(*Continued on the next page*)

Supplementary Table 2. (Continued)

Study	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Quality power
	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the nonexposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders	Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts	
Park et al. [63] (2012)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Park et al. [64] (2015)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Park et al. [65] (2020)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Ryoo et al. [66] (2015)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Ryoo et al. [67] (2019)	★	-	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Song et al. [68] (2012)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Song et al. [69] (2021)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Suh et al. [70] (2013)	★	★	★	★	-	★	★	★	Poor
Um et al. [71] (2018)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Wang et al. [72] (2021)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good
Yeo et al. [73] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
Yoo et al. [74] (2020)	★	-	★	★	★	★	★	★	Good
You et al. [75] (2022)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	Good

Each article was rated based on selection (maximum, four stars), comparability (maximum, two stars), and outcome (maximum, three stars).