

Appendix 2a. Quality assessment of studies included in meta-analyses of the systematic literature review.

ADA Quality Checklist Criteria	Al-Naimi 2004	Biston 1996	Bo 2017	Gibbs 2014	Gil-Lozano 2015	Holmback 2002	Holmback 2003	Leung 2017	Owens 1996	Van Cauter 1992
1. Was the research question clearly stated?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Was the selection of study subjects/patients free from bias?	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
3. Were the study groups comparable?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. Was the method of handling withdrawals described?	x	x	x	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
5. Was blinding used to prevent introduction to bias?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Were intervention/therapeutic regimens/exposure factor or procedure and any comparisons described in detail? Were intervening factors described?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
7. Were outcomes clearly defined and the measurements valid and reliable?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Was the statistical analysis appropriate for the study design and type of outcome indicators?	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9. Were conclusions supported by results with biases and limitations also taken into consideration?	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓
10. Is bias due to the study's findings or sponsorship unlikely?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quality Rating	Neutral	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Neutral	Neutral

Grey indicates validity items that must be satisfied for a positive quality rating.

Quality rating based on Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly American Dietetic Association) guidelines (2003a).

Appendix 2b. Quality assessment of studies included in qualitative synthesis and excluded in the systematic literature review.

ADA Quality Checklist Criteria	Aparicio 1974	Lund 2001	Morris 2015	Morris 2016	King 1993	Van Gent 1979	Terpstra 1979
1. Was the research question clearly stated?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Was the selection of study subjects/patients free from bias?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3. Were the study groups comparable?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. Was the method of handling withdrawals described?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
5. Was blinding used to prevent introduction to bias?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Were intervention/therapeutic regimens/exposure factor or procedure and any comparisons described in detail? Were intervening factors described?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x
7. Were outcomes clearly defined and the measurements valid and reliable?	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x	x
8. Was the statistical analysis appropriate for the study design and type of outcome indicators?	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x
9. Were conclusions supported by results with biases and limitations also taken into consideration?	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x
10. Is bias due to the study's findings or sponsorship unlikely?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quality Rating	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Negative	Negative

Grey indicates validity items that must be satisfied for a positive quality rating.

Quality rating based on Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly American Dietetic Association) guidelines (2003a).