Table 1 - Quality of included studies appraised using the MINORS statement.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) A clearly stated aim | (2) Inclusion of consecutive patients | (3) Prospective collection of data | (4) Endpoints appropriate to the aim of the study | (5) Unbiased assessment of the study endpoint | (6) Follow-up period appropriate to the aim of the study | (7) Loss to follow up less than 5% | (8) Prospective calculation of study size | (9) An adequate control group | (10) Contemporary groups | (11) Baseline equivalence of groups | (12) Adequate statistical analyses | Overall quality score |
| Túlia Ferrer, 2019 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **17/24** |
| Turan,2023 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **15/24** |
| Moghtadaei, 2020 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **16/24** |
| Feeney, 2001 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | **12/16** |
| Badura-Brzoza, 2009 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | - | - | - | - | **13/16** |
| Ramaesh, 2013 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **17/24** |
| Mercurio, 2020 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **18/24** |
| Qi, 2016 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | **17/24** |
| Gong, 2014 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **16/24** |
| Giurea, 2016 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **19/24** |
| Benditz, 2017, Germany | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | **15/24** |
| Singh, 2010 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **15/24** |
| Chao Chen, 2021 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **17/24** |
| Singh,2016 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **15/24** |