

Table S1 Search queries		
Databases	PICO	Queries
PubMed and Cochrane Library	1. Disease; colonic polyp	(“Colonic Polyps”[Mesh] OR “colonic polyp”[tiab] OR “colon polyp”[tiab] OR “colorectal polyp”[tiab] OR “colorectal adenoma”[tiab]))
	2. Intervention	(“Helicobacter pylori”[Mesh] OR “Helicobacter pylori”[tiab])
Embase	1. Disease; colonic polyp	(‘colon polyp’/exp OR ‘colonic polyp’:ti,ab OR ‘colonic polyps’:ti,ab OR ‘colorectal polyp’:ti,ab OR ‘colorectal adenoma’:ti,ab)
	2. Intervention	(‘helicobacter pylori’/exp OR ‘helicobacter pylori’:ti,ab)
PICO, population, intervention, comparison, outcome.		

Table S2 Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment										
Study	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Total score	Quality power
	Adequate definition of case	Representativeness of case	Selection of control	Definition of control	Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis	Ascertainment of exposure	Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls	Non response rate		
Abbass 2011 (2)	★	★			★★	★	★		★★★★★ [6]	Fair
Akalin 2019 (19)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [9]	Good
Aydin 1999 (20)	★	★			★	★		★	★★★★★ [5]	Fair
Bae 2009 (21)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Breuer-Katschinsk 1999 (23)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Brim 2014 (24)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
ChangxiChen 2019 (25)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Dong 2019 (26)	★	★			★	★			★★★★★ [4]	Poor
Fujimori 2005 (28)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Georgopoulos 2006 (29)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Hong 2012 (30)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Hu 2017 (32)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Huang 2019 (33)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [9]	Good
Inoue 2011 (34)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [9]	Good
Kim 2017 (36)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Kumar 2018 (37)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Liou 2006 (39)	★	★	★		★	★			★★★★★ [5]	Poor
Meucci 1997 (40)	★		★	★	★★	★			★★★★★★ [6]	Poor
Mizuno 2005 (41)	★	★			★	★		★	★★★★★ [5]	Fair
Mohamed 2020 (42)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Nam 2013 (44)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Nam 2017 (43)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Patel 2014 (45)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Ren 2021 (46)	★	★		★	★★	★	★		★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Selgrad 2014 (47)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Siddheshwar 2001 (50)	★	★			★★	★	★		★★★★★★ [6]	Fair
Sonnenberg 2013 (51)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Sonnenberg 2020 (6)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Teimoorian 2018 (52)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Tongtawee 2016 (53)	★	★		★	★★	★		★	★★★★★★★ [7]	Good
Yan 2017 (54)	★	★		★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [8]	Good
Zuniga 2015 (56)	★	★	★	★	★★	★	★	★	★★★★★★★★★ [9]	Good

A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item except for comparability. A maximum of two stars can be awarded for comparability. Good quality, 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome domain. Fair quality, 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome domain. Poor quality, 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome domain.