Appendix 1

Table 1. Search query for each of the databases included

DATABASE	SEARCH QUERY	TOTAL RECORDS
Medline (PubMed)	(((((((((((((tobacco smoke pollution) OR (secondhand smoke)) OR (environmental tobacco smoke)) OR (environment smoking)) OR (tobacco products)) OR (household smoking)) OR (passive smoking)) OR (pregnancy smoking)) OR (smoke free law)) OR (smoke free legislation)) OR (smoking ban)) OR (occupational smoking)) OR (outdoor smoking)) AND (portugal[Title/Abstract]).	158
Web of Science	((((((((((((ALL=(tobacco smoke pollution)) OR ALL=(secondhand smoke)) OR ALL=(environmental tobacco smoke)) OR ALL=(environment smoking)) OR ALL=(tobacco products)) OR ALL=(passive smoking)) OR ALL=(pregnancy smoking)) OR ALL=(smoke free law)) OR ALL=(smoke free legislation)) OR ALL=(smoking ban)) OR ALL=(occupational smoking)) OR ALL=(outdoor smoking)) AND AB=(portugal).	188
Embase	(tobacco smoke pollution or secondhand smoke or environmental tobacco smoke or environment smoking or tobacco products or passive smoking or pregnancy smoking or smoke free law or smoke free legislation or smoke ban or occupational smoking or outdoor smoking).af. and portugal.ab. 1 tobacco smoke pollution.af. 476 2 (tobacco smoke pollution or secondhand smoke).af. 3843 3 (tobacco smoke pollution or secondhand smoke or environmental tobacco smoke or environment smoking or tobacco products or passive smoking).af 26829 4 (tobacco smoke pollution or secondhand smoke or environmental tobacco smoke or environment smoking or tobacco products or passive smoking or pregnancy smoking or smoke free law or smoke free legislation or smoke ban or occupational smoking or outdoor smoking).af. and portugal.ab. 49	49

Table 2. Modified Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (items)

SECTION 1: SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE (max 3*)**	
Representativeness of the sample	
a) Truly representative of the average in the target population (all subjects or random sampling)	*
b) Somewhat representative of the average in the target population (non-random sampling)	*
c) Recruitment based on harmonized protocols	*
d) No description of the sampling strategy or recruitment	
Renspondents vs. Non-respondents	
a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents characteristics is established, and the response rate is satisfactory	*
b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and nonrespondents is unsatisfactory	
c) No description of the response rate or the characteristics of the respondents and the nonrespondents	
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT OF THE EXPOSURE (max. 2)**	
Ascertainment of the exposure	
a) Validated measurement tool: biomarker of exposure or face-to-face interview (exhaustive questionnaire) by trained staff	*
b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described	
c) No description of the measurement tool	
Characterization of the exposure	
a) The study considers frequency and/or intensity of the exposure	*
b) The study does not consider frequency and/or intensity of the exposure	
SECTION 3: OUTCOME (max. 3*)**	
Stratification of the prevalence	
a) The study stratifies the results by gender, age groups and settings (or at least by two of them)	**
a) The study stratifies the results by gender or age groups or settings	*
c) They study does not stratify the results by age groups and settings	
Statistical test	
a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and appropriate	*
b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete.	
Assessment of potential biases/limitations	
a) The study assesses the possibility of biases and limitations arising from the design and selection of the sample	*
b) The study does not assess the possibility of biases and limitations arising from the design and selection of the sample	

APÊNDICE

Table 3. Quality of the 13 studies included in the systematic review (Modified Newcastle-Ottawa scale)

Author, (Publication year)	Sample representativeness	Respondents/ non-respondents	Exposure ascertainment	Characterization of the exposure	Data stratification	Statistical test	Biases/ limitations	Total score	Quality
Areias et al (2009)	*	*	*			*		2	Low
Constant et al (2011)	*	*	*	*		*	*	5	High
Pereira et al (2013)	*		*	*	*	*	*	4	Moderate
Paradela et al (2013)	*		*	*	*	*	*	6	High
Lupsa et al (2011)	*		*	*	*	*	*	5	High
Vitória et al (2015)	*	*	*	*		*	*	6	Moderate
Vitória et al (2017)	*	*	*			*	*	4	Moderate
Mlinaric et al (2019)	*				*	*	*	4	Moderate
Precioso et al (2019)	*		*	*	*	*	*	6	High
Precioso et al (2019)	*		*			*	*	4	Moderate
Alves et al (2020)	*				*	*	*	4	Moderate
Madureira et al (2020)	*		*		*	*	*	4	Moderate
Henderson et al (2021)	*			*	*	*	*	5	High