

**QualSyst Scores for Quantitative Papers**

Author Date	QualSyst Criteria (Quantitative)														Score (%)
	Question/ Objective sufficiently described	Study design evident and appropriate	Method of subject/ comparison group selection or source of information/ input variable described and appropriate	Subject characteristic sufficiently described	If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	Outcomes and (if applicable) exposure measures well defined and robust to measurement/ misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Sample size appropriate	Analytic methods described/ justified and appropriate	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results	Controlled for confounding	Results reported in sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by the results	
Akard et al. (2015)	2	2	2	2	2	0	N/A	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	81
Ameringer et al. (2015)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	91
Baggott et al. (2012)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	94
Beale et al. (2007)	2	2	2	2	0	0	N/A	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	81
Berg et al. (2014)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	77
Blaauwbroek et al. (2012)	2	2	2	2	0	0	N/A	2	1	2	1	0	2	2	64
Burns et al. (2009)	2	2	2	2	2	0	N/A	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	73

Multimedia Appendix 4

Author Date	QualSyst Criteria (Quantitative)														Score (%)
	Question/ Objective sufficiently described	Study design evident and appropriate	Method of subject/ comparison group selection or source of information/ input variable described and appropriate	Subject characteristic sufficiently described	If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	Outcomes and (if applicable) exposure measures well defined and robust to measurement/ misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Sample size appropriate	Analytic methods described/ justified and appropriate	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results	Controlled for confounding	Results reported in sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by the results	
Emmons et al. (2013)	2	2	2	2	2	0	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	92
Gilliam et al. (2011)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	0	2	0	0	2	2	73
Hardy et al. (2011)	2	1	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	50
Hooke et al. (2016)	2	2	2	2	0	0	N/A	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	68
Huang et al. (2014)	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	79
Jibb et al. (2017)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	82
Jones et al. (2010)	2	2	2	2	1	0	N/A	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	69
Kato et al. (2008)	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	100

Multimedia Appendix 4

Author Date	QualSyst Criteria (Quantitative)														Score (%)
	Question/ Objective sufficiently described	Study design evident and appropriate	Method of subject/ comparison group selection or source of information/ input variable described and appropriate	Subject characteristic sufficiently described	If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	Outcomes and (if applicable) exposure measures well defined and robust to measurement/ misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Sample size appropriate	Analytic methods described/ justified and appropriate	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results	Controlled for confounding	Results reported in sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by the results	
Kesler et al. (2011)	1	1	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	77
Knijnenburg et al. (2012)	2	1	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	60
McLaughlin et al. (2012)	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	0	N/A	2	2	85
Mendoza (2017)	1	2	2	2	0	0	N/A	2	2	2	0	0	2	1	62
Rabin et al. (2011)	2	2	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	46
Rodgers et al. (2014)	2	2	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	43
Sabel et al. (2016)	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	96
Seitz et al. (2014a)	2	2	2	2	1	0	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	85

Multimedia Appendix 4

Author Date	QualSyst Criteria (Quantitative)														Score (%)
	Question/ Objective sufficiently described	Study design evident and appropriate	Method of subject/ comparison group selection or source of information/ input variable described and appropriate	Subject characteristic sufficiently described	If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	Outcomes and (if applicable) exposure measures well defined and robust to measurement/ misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Sample size appropriate	Analytic methods described/ justified and appropriate	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results	Controlled for confounding	Results reported in sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by the results	
Seitz et al. (2014b)	2	2	2	2	1	0	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	85
Stinson et al. (2015b)	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	100
Valle et al. (2013)	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	68
Valle et al. (2015a)	2	2	2	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	58
Wiklander et al. (2017)	2	2	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	1	0	2	2	80
Wint et al. (2002)	2	2	1	2	0	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	2	0	1	2	71
Wu et al. (2011)	2	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	0	N/A	1	2	73

Note. Criteria were scored either 2,1 or 0 (2=yes, 1=partial, 0=no) or if the criteria was not applicable to the paper it was scored N/A. To make them comparative, overall scores are presented as a %.