

**Supplementary Table S1:** Quality assessment of each study included in the meta-analysis, based on the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) <sup>a</sup>

Study ID	SELECTION			COMPARABILITY		OUTCOME		Total score	
	Representativeness of exposed cohort	Selection of non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Assessment of outcome	Was follow up long enough for outcomes to occur		Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
De Jager et al. 2018 <sup>[17]</sup>	★	★	★	★	★ ★	★	★	★	9
Wang et al. 2013 <sup>[11]</sup>	★	★	★	★	★ ★	★	★	★	9
Yu et al. 2015 <sup>[13]</sup>	★	★	★	★	N/R	★	★	★	7
Park et al. 2015 <sup>[15]</sup>		★	★	★	N/R	★	★	★	6
Dijk et al. 2015 <sup>[12]</sup>	★	★	★	★	★ ★	★	★	★	9
Schmidt et al. 2011 <sup>[14]</sup>	★	★	★	★	N/R	★	★	★	7
Meyer et al. 2014 <sup>[16]</sup>	★	★	★	★	★ ★	★	★	★	9
Li et al. 2012 <sup>[10]</sup>	★	★	★		★ for age	★	★	★	7

<sup>a</sup> A maximum of one star for each item within the ‘Selection’ and ‘Outcome’ categories; A maximum of two stars for ‘Comparability’ category. For ‘Comparability’, one star was awarded if the study controlled for age, another star was awarded if the study controlled for important CHD risk factors; N/R, not reported.