**Appendix Table 1.** Quality assessment for included studies using a modified\* Downs and Black checklist23

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors, year | Study design | Reporting (Maximum 11) | External validity (Maximum 3) | Bias (Maximum 7) | Confounding (Maximum 6) | Power (Maximum 1) |
| Pell et al., 201529   | Before-after study without control | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dalal, et al.,201631  | Cross-sectional | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Kelly et al., 201633  | Cross-sectional | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| O’Leary, et al., 201618  | Non-randomized trial | 7 | 1  | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Kelly et al., 201738 | Repeated cross-sectional | 4  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

\*Higher scores reflect less bias. The power assessment was modified from a 0-5 to a 0-1 scale, where the item was scored “1” if a power calculation or sample size calculation was present and “0” if there was no power/sample size calculation or an explanation of the appropriateness of the number of subjects.
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