

Supplementary File 1: Assessment of the certainty of evidence for the three meta-analyses

Certainty assessment							Nº of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Individuals in settlements	[comparação]	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Dental caries												
4	non-randomised studies	very serious ^a	very serious ^b	very serious ^c	very serious ^d	publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect ^e	427/504 (84.7%)		not estimable		⊕○○○ Very low ^{a,b,c,d,e}	
Dental pain												
3	non-randomised studies	very serious ^a	very serious ^b	very serious ^c	very serious ^d	publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect ^e	439/105 (43.7%)		not estimable		⊕○○○ Very low ^{a,b,c,d,e}	
Negative perception of oral health												
3	non-randomised studies	very serious ^a	very serious ^b	very serious ^c	very serious ^d	publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect ^e	625/996 (62.8%)		not estimable		⊕○○○ Very low ^{a,b,c,d,e}	

CI: confidence interval

Explanations

a. Risk of bias.; b. Statistical heterogeneity is high.; c. Different settlements and countries assessed.; d. Large confidence interval.; e. Possibility of non-publication of results