**Supporting Information 2. Adequately reported items of the STROBE checklist**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | | **Criteria to score as adequately reported** |
| **Title and abstract** | | |
| **1a** | Study design | The study design in the abstract or title containing cohort, case-control or cross-sectional was described. |
| **1b** | Abstract | An informative and balanced summary of the paper was provided. |
| **Introduction** | | |
| **2** | Background | Explanation about the specific (scientific) background was given. |
| **3** | Objective / hypotheses | A specific objective or hypothesis was mentioned. |
| **Methods** | | |
| **4** | Study design | The study design was described early in the methods section containing cohort, case-control or cross-sectional. |
| **5** | Setting | The setting, locations and relevant dates including periods of recruitment, data collection, follow-up and exposure were described. |
| **6a** | Participants, selection criteria | Depending on the study design sources and methods of selection of participants or sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection were described. |
| **6b** | Matching criteria | *Not applicable for cross-sectional studies*  Matching criteria and number of exposed / unexposed or number of controls per case were given. |
| **7** | Variables | All outcomes, predictors, potential confounders and effect modifiers were defined. |
| **8** | Data sources / measurement | For each variable of interest sources of data and details of methods of assessments were given. |
| **9** | Bias | The methods to assess risk of bias across the study were described. |
| **10** | Study size | It was explained how study size was created. |
| **11** | Quantitative variables | The method of how quantitative variables were categorized was described. |
| **12a** | Statistical methods | The statistical method(s) to analyse the data were provided. |
| **12b** | Subgroups / interactions | The statistical method(s) to examine subgroups and interactions were provided. |
| **12c** | Missing data | It was explained how missing data were handled. |
| **12d** | Follow-up / matching or sampling strategy | It was described how loss to follow-up was addressed, how matching of cases and controls was addressed or how reporting of analytical methods was done while taking account of sampling strategy, depending on the study design. |
| **12e** | Sensitivity analysis | A sensitivity analysis was described. |
| **Results** | | |
| **13a** | Participants | Numbers of individuals at each stage of the study were provided. |
| **13b** | Non-participation | Reasons for non-participation were provided for each stage. |
| **13c** | Flow diagram | A flow diagram was used. |
| **14a** | Descriptive data | Characteristics of study participants (e.g. demographic, clinical or social) and optionally exposure and potential confounders was given. |
| **14b** | Missing data | Number(s) of participants with missing data for variables of interest were given. |
| **14c** | Follow-up time | *Not applicable for case-control or cross-sectional studies*  Only for cohort studies: follow-up time was described. |
| **15** | Outcome data | Depending on the study design, numbers of outcome events or summary measures (over time of exposure) were described. |
| **16a** | Main results | Unadjusted estimates and their precision were given. |
| **16b** | Category boundaries | Category boundaries were reported when continuous variables were categorized. |
| **16c** | Relative risk into absolute risk | Translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period was reported. |
| **17** | Additional analyses | Sensitivity analyses or other extra analyses were reported. |
| **Discussion** | | |
| **18** | Summary key results | The discussion section started with a summary of the key results with reference to the study objectives. |
| **19** | Limitations | Limitations or potential sources of bias of the current study were described. |
| **20** | Overall interpretation | The overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations and results from similar studies or other relevant evidence were described. |
| **21** | Generalizability | The generalizability of the study results was described. |
| **Other information** | | |
| **22** | Funding and role of funders | Sources of funding and role of the funders of the current study were provided. |

**Legend:**

Based on STROBE checklist (Von Elm 2007) and suggestions in the *Explanation and Elaboration* paper (Vandenbroucke 2007).

Items were scored as either ‘adequately reported’ or ‘inadequately reported’; there was no category ‘partially adequately reported’. If an item was not applicable for that study design, it was scored as ‘not applicable’.