Supplementary material Supplementary Table 1 Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis of shift work in relation to risk of diabetes mellitus

Study	Study design (time period)	Country	Population (age)	Population and occupation	Exposure assessment	Type of shift work	Study outcome and ascertainment	NO of cases	Adjustment for confounders	Quality assessment
Mikuni et al ,1983	Cross-sectional	Japan	2367 men aged mean=38.1	Factory laborers	Shift work was a three shifts	Rotating	Diabetes identified through self- report and confirmed by Japan Diabetes Society 1970 diagnostic criteria	37	No covariate adjustment	2
Kawakami et al, 1999	Prospective cohort (follow up at 8 years)	Japan	2194 men aged 18-60	Workers at a large electrical company	Shift workers engaged in two or three shift work schedules including night shift, with a weekly clockwise rotation	Mixed	Type 2 diabetes identified through self-report and confirmed by WHO criteria	34	Age, education, BMI, smoking, alcohol consumption, leisure time physical activity, family history of diabetes mellitus, job strain, social support, use of technology	8

							Diabetes			
							identified			
							through			
							medical records			
				DI II	Shift workers were		and confirmed			
NT.			2650	Blue-collar	defined as the		by Fasting		BMI, job, drinking,	
Nagaya et	Cross-sectional	Japan	3650 men	workers	subjects with night	Night	serum	176	smoking and	4
al, 2002			aged 30-59	attending annual	work (at least once a		glucose		exercise	
				health check-ups	week)		≥7.00mmol/l			
							or			
							patient under			
							treatment for			
							diabetes			
							Diabetes			
							mortality			
							identified by			
							medical records			
				Workers from			was confirmed			
Karlsson	Retrospective		5442 men	two	The shift workers		by death		Age, duration of	
et al, 2005	cohort	Sweden	aged 10-59	pulp and paper	worked a three-shift	Rotating	certificate	158	employment	7
et al, 2003	conort		ageu 10-39	manufacturing	rota		diagnosis		employment	
				plants			in the primary			
							or			
							contributory			
							cause-of death			
							fields based on			

ICD-6~10
codes or
Diagnosis
Related
Group codes

Diabetes

Morikawa et al, 2005	Prospective cohort (follow up at 8 years)	Japan	2860 men aged 19-49	Blue collar workers in a sash and zipper factory	Rotating two-shift workers did day shifts and evening shifts, and three-shift workers did three-shift continuous (counterclockwise) and three-shift non-continuous	Evening and mixed	identified through health examination and medical records and confirmed based on an HbA1c of ≥ 6.1 or clinical judgment of hospital physicians	87	Age, BMI, family history, health-related behavior(smoking, habitual drinking, lack of physical exercise)	8
-------------------------	---	-------	------------------------	---	---	-------------------	--	----	--	---

Suwazono et al, 2006	Prospective cohort (follow up at 6.69 years)	Japan	5629 men aged day shift mean=35.1(9.9) alternating shift mean=37.4(8.8)	Workers in a Japanese steel company	The alternating shift workers were working according to a four-team/three shift system with clockwise rotation	Rotating	Diabetes identified through medical records and confirmed based on an HbA1c of ≥ 6.1 or clinical judgment of hospital physicians	246	Age, BMI, total serum cholesterol, γ-GTP, uric acid, and absence of habitual exercise, drinking, smoking	8
De Bacquer et al,2009	Prospective cohort (follow up at 6.6years)	Belgium	1529 men aged 35-59 mean=46.54	Nine different companies and public administrations	Shift workers worked in two or three rotating shifts	Rotating	Type 2 diabetes identified through self-reports and confirmed by a modification of the criteria of the International Diabetes Federation	364	Age, waist circumference, diastolic blood pressure and HDL cholesterol at the initial examination	8

self-report consu	sumption,
diagnosis and physi	sical activity
Shift workers were confirmed by level,	el, smoking
supplemental people who had status	, ,
questionnaire;	,
62696 women National	e ,menopausal
Pan et Diabetes Data	us and hormone
cohort (follow United States as at least three Night Group Group	, family history
up at 20 years) nights/month in of dia NHS I criteria(before	liabetes, current
addition to days and aspiri	irin use,
1998)and evenings in that quinti	ntiles of total
Association month) calori	orie, diabetes
Diabetes	tary score,
Association	•
updat 1997(after	lated BMI
categorial (1998)	egory

Type 2 diabetes identified through

diagnostic criteria Age, alcohol

8

Type 2 diabetes

Ika et al, 2013	Cross-sectional	Japan	475 men aged 19-70	Workers at a large manufacturing company	A shift worker was person whose work schedule includes hours day time (8: 00 to 16:45 h) for 5-weekday and night shift (21:15 to 6:00 h) for 5-weekday	Night	Diabetes identified through medical records and confirmed by Japan Diabetes Society diagnostic criteria	21	Age, smoking status, frequency of alcohol consumption, and cohabitation status	7
Eriksson et al, 2013	Prospective cohort (follow up at 8-10 years)	Sweden	5432 men and women aged 35-56	Middle-aged persons from a population-based cohort	Did you do shift work?	Unspecified	Type 2 diabetes identified through self-report and medical checkup and confirmed by WHO criteria	149	Age sex educational level, psychological distress, family history of diabetes, BMI, physical activity, smoking, and civil status,	8

							Diabetes			
					Shift		identified		Gender, age, race,	
Guo et Consortional China		Workers from	work was defined as		through		marital status, tea			
			any work schedule		self-report, use		consumption, life			
	26463 men and		involving unusual or		of		stress, current			
	Cross-sectional	China	women mean=63.6	Tongji-Dongfeng Cohort	irregular working	T 1	hypoglycemic	3197	smoking status,	8
al, 2013		Cillia			hours as opposed to	Irregular	drugs and	3197	passive smoking,	o
					a normal daytime		repeated		current drinking	
					work		measuring		status, physical	
					schedule: 8:00 AM		fasting plasma		activity and	
					to 17:00 PM.		glucose level		BMI	
							≥7.0 mmol/l			

Age presented the range with Mean (SD), Abbreviations: BMI, Body mass index; NHS, Nurses' Health Survey; WHO, World Health Organization; HDL, High-density lipoprotein—cholesterol; GTP, Glutamyl transpeptidase

Supplementary Table 2. Quality assessment of reviewed cohort studies on shift work in relation to diabetes mellitus*

		Se	lection		Comparability		Outcome		
Study	Exposed group represents average in community	The comparison groups from the same source population	comparison groups from the same structured source Ascertain exposure through records or structured interview		There was adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn (comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis)	Ascertain outcome via independent blind assessment or medical records, physicians	Follow-up long enough for outcome to occur (> 5 years)	Loss to follow-up <20%	Overall quality score
Kawakami et al. 1999	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Karlsson et al. 2005	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Morikawa et al. 2005	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Suwazono et al. 2006	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
De Bacquer et al.2009	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Pan et al. 2011	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
Eriksson et al. 2013	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	8

^{*}The study quality was assessed according to the Newcastle Ottawa Quality assessment scale for cohort studies. This scale awards a maximum of 9 points to each study: 4 for selection, 2 for comparability, and 3 for assessment of outcomes (for cohort study). 1 = "Yes", 0 = "No", "Unable to determine" or "Not available".

Supplementary Table 3. Quality assessment of reviewed cross-sectional studies on shift work in relation to diabetes mellitus*

Study	1. Define the source of informati on (survey, record review)	2. List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexpose d subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications	3. Indicate time period used for identifying patients	4. Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-ba sed	5. Indicate if evaluators of subjective compone nts of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participan ts	6. Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measuremen ts)	7. Explain any patient exclusio ns from analysis	8. Describe how confoundi ng was assessed and/or controlled	9. If applicabl e, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis	10.Summari ze patient response rates and completene ss of data collection	11. Clarify what follow-u p, if any, was expected and the percenta ge of patients for which incomple te data or follow-u p was obtained	Overa ll qualit y score
Mikuni et al. 1983	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Nagaya et al. 2002	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Ika et al. 2013	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	7
Guo et al. 2013	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	8

*The study quality was assessed according to the 11 items recommended by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) for cross-sectional studies. 1 point if the item was contemplated in the study, 0 point if the item was not, and unable to determine. 1 = "Yes", 0 = "No", "Unable to determine", or "Not applicable"