**Supplementary data-Table S2.docx**: Quality assessment of studies according to the Newcastle-Ottawa-Scale procedure based on three categories: selection, compatibility and outcome.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| Author, Year  (Reference number) | **Selection** | | | | | **Comparability** | | **Outcome** | | **Total**  **(on 10 stars)** | |
| Representativeness  of the sample  (1 star) | | Sample size  (1 star) | Non-respondents  (1 star) | Ascertainment  of the exposure  (2 stars) | Controls for the most important factor  (1 star) | Controls for any additional  factor (1star) | Assessment of the outcome  (2 stars) | Statistical  test  (1 star) |  | |
| Leon et al. 2009 ([31](#_ENREF_6)) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Diaz et al. 2015 (32) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Ortiz et al. 2014 (27) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Freire et al.2014 (4) | \* | | \* | 0 | \*\* | \* | 0 | \*\* | \* | 8 | |
| World Bank Group 2007 (26) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Waldrop et al. 2016 (30) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Handal et al. 2007 (33) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| So et al. 2017 (34) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Arsenaul et al. 2017 (35) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Robalino et al. 2017 (12) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Ramos et al. 2015 (37) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Oleas et al. 2014 (36) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Casapulla et al 2017 (39) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Cambizaca et al 2016 (28) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Garrido et al. 2016 (29) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Yepez et al. 2018 (40) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Castro et al. 2003 (38) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Orces et al. 2017 (11) | \* | | \* | 0 | \*\* | 0 | 0 | \*\* | \* | 7 | |
| Sempertegui et al. 2011 (43) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Hanna et al. 2011 (46) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Torres et al. 2013(44) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Campoverde et al. 2014 (42) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| Salazar et al. 2016 (45) | \* | | \* | 0 | \* | 0 | 0 | \* | \* | 5 | |
| This table summarizes assessment of the quality of studies included using the NOS score. This score allocates stars for each and every items.  \*Equals one star or one point. \*\*Stands for two stars or two points. NOS, Newcastle Ottawa Scale. | | | | | | | | | | |