

Table S1: Quality evaluation of the included quantitative studies.

Criteria	Studies							
	Dreyer <i>et al.</i> , 1987 [50]	Addiss <i>et al.</i> , 1995 [30]	Albuquerque <i>et al.</i> , 1995 [32]	Norões <i>et al.</i> , 1996 [34]	Braga <i>et al.</i> , 1997 [33]	Vincent <i>et al.</i> , 1998 [49]	Dreyer <i>et al.</i> , 1999 A [43]	Dreyer <i>et al.</i> , 1999 B [35]
Question/objective sufficiently described?	0	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Study design evident and appropriate?	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement / misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sample size appropriate?	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2
Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Controlled for confounding?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Results reported in sufficient detail?	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Conclusions supported by the results?	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
Maximum points	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Total points	08	16	18	14	16	15	13	15
Summary score (%)	36	73	82	64	73	68	59	68

0 if the response is 'no'; 1 if the response is 'partial'; 2 if the response is 'yes'; followed by N/A if not applicable.

Table S1: Quality evaluation of the included quantitative studies.

Criteria	Studies							
	Dreyer <i>et al.</i> , 2002 [21]	Bonfim <i>et al.</i> , 2003 [36]	Norões <i>et al.</i> , 2003 [25]	Wilson <i>et al.</i> 2004 [66]	Fox <i>et al.</i> 2005 [47]	Dreyer <i>et al.</i> 2006 A [46]	McPherson <i>et al.</i> 2006 [48]	Medeiros <i>et al.</i> 2006 [37]
Question/objective sufficiently described?	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Study design evident and appropriate?	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	2
Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	1
If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement / misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2
Sample size appropriate?	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Controlled for confounding?	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Maximum points	22	22	22	20	20	20	24	22
Total points	16	17	17	17	19	18	12	18
Summary score (%)	73	77	77	85	95	90	50	82

0 if the response is 'no'; 1 if the response is 'partial'; 2 if the response is 'yes'; followed by N/A if not applicable.

Table S1: Quality evaluation of the included quantitative studies.

Criteria	Studies							
	Freitas <i>et al.</i> , 2008 [40]	Aguiar-Santos <i>et al.</i> , 2009 [27]	Norões <i>et al.</i> 2009 [41]	Norões <i>et al.</i> , 2010 [42]	Rocha <i>et al.</i> , 2010 [39]	Netto <i>et al.</i> , 2016 [38]	Santana <i>et al.</i> 2016 [52]	Soares <i>et al.</i> , 2016 [65]
Question/objective sufficiently described?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Study design evident and appropriate?	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement / misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Sample size appropriate?	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	0	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	2	2
Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	0	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	2	1
Controlled for confounding?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0
Results reported in sufficient detail?	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Maximum points	20	16	16	20	22	20	20	28
Total points	11	15	14	20	13	18	18	20
Summary score (%)	55	94	88	100	59	90	90	71

0 if the response is 'no'; 1 if the response is 'partial'; 2 if the response is 'yes'; followed by N/A if not applicable.