

**Supplementary Table 1.** Risk of bias of each individual non-randomised study according to the ROBINS-I Cochrane Collaboration tool

Study/Criterion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Overall
Published as full papers									
Haussen et al. (2016) <sup>17</sup>	/	+	-	/	-	+	++	/	High
Rebello et al. (2017) <sup>16</sup>	-	++	-	++	+	+	++	+	Mild
Chen et al. (2018) <sup>21</sup>	-	+	-	++	+	+	++	+	Mild
Sarraj et al. (2019) <sup>19</sup>	-	++	-	++	+	+	++	+	Mild
Gilgen et al. (2015) <sup>6</sup>	+	+	-	++	+	+	++	-	Mild
Panni et al. (2019) <sup>18</sup>	+	+	-	++	+	+	++	+	Mild
Gautheron et al. (2018) <sup>15</sup>	/	+	+	/	+	+	++	/	Mild
Yoshimoto et al. (2020) <sup>20</sup>	/	+	+	/	+	+	++	/	Mild
Kerleroux et al. (2020) <sup>3</sup>	/	+	+	/	+	+	++	/	Mild
Published as abstracts									
None									

Criteria used for the Cochrane "Tool to Assess Risk of Bias in Cohort Studies"

1. Was selection of exposed and non-exposed cohorts drawn from the same population?
  2. Can we be confident in the assessment of exposure?
  3. Can we be confident that the outcome of interest was not present at start of study?
  4. Did the study match exposed and unexposed for all variables that are associated with the outcome of interest or did the statistical analysis adjust for these prognostic variables?
  5. Can we be confident in the assessment of the presence or absence of prognostic factors?
  6. Can we be confident in the assessment of outcome?
  7. Was the follow-up of cohorts adequate?
  8. Were co-interventions similar between groups?
- Definitely yes (low risk of bias) ++; probably yes +; probably no -; definitely no (high risk of bias); not assessable /.