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eMethods. Search Strategy for Ovid Medline

1. Food/ or exp Food Industry/ or exp Food Habits/

2. exp Beverages/

3. exp Diet/

4. exp Food Habits/ or "nutrition* intervention*".mp.

5. exp Nutrition Policy/

6. exp Nutritive Value/

7. "food industry".mp. or exp Food Industry/

8. (nutrition* and (intervention* or science or studies or values or management or support or treatment)).tw.

9. (diet* and (intervention* or science or studies or values or management or support or treatment)).tw.

10. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9

11. "financial support".mp. or exp Financial Support/

12. "industry sponsored research".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]

13. "Industry funding".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]

14. "Industry payment".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
15. "private funding".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
16. "funding source".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
17. "funding opportunities".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
18. "industry funded".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
19. "reporting bias".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
20. "industry bias".mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
22. "conflict* of interest".tw.
23. "non financial conflict* of interest".tw.
24. "Conflict of Interest"/
25. "industry sponsorship".mp.
26. 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25
27. (review* or "systematic review*" or "content analysis" or "content analyses" or cohort).mp.
[mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]

28. 10 and 26 and 27
### eTable 1. List of Excluded Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams 2007&lt;sup&gt;[1]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not relevant to nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownell 2009&lt;sup&gt;[2]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowdhury 2014&lt;sup&gt;[3]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No industry sponsorship or COI analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galbraith-Emami 2013&lt;sup&gt;[4]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No industry sponsorship or COI analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudzune 2015&lt;sup&gt;[5]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No industry sponsorship or COI analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobson 2005&lt;sup&gt;[6]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James 2002&lt;sup&gt;[7]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katan 2007&lt;sup&gt;[8]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazzerini 2013&lt;sup&gt;[9]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No industry sponsorship or COI analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubans 2013&lt;sup&gt;[10]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Letter not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock 1999&lt;sup&gt;[12]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe 2009&lt;sup&gt;[13]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuckler 2012&lt;sup&gt;[14]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappenden 2015&lt;sup&gt;[15]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commentary not review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eReferences. Excluded Studies

# eTable 2. Coding of Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Definition of Favorable Conclusions in the Review</th>
<th>Reliability Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bes-Rastrollo, 2013</td>
<td>SRs were considered to have a conclusion of a positive association when they concluded that SSB consumption may increase the risk of weight gain or overweight/obesity. By contrast, SRs were considered to have a conclusion of no positive association when they concluded that there was insufficient evidence to assess the risk of SSB consumption on weight gain or obesity, or when they presented contradictory results without stating any definitive conclusion about the association.</td>
<td>Two researchers, blinded to the authors’ financial conflicts of interest and stated sources of funding, independently extracted the conclusions stated in the articles. The agreement between the researchers was 93.3% (Kappa index: 0.86; p,0.001); disagreement was resolved through a third researcher’s assessment, to reach a consensus. Based on these conclusions, we classified the SRs into those that had found a positive association versus those that had not for the relationship between SSB consumption and weight gain or obesity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diels, 2011</td>
<td>Each article was classified based on the following criteria: 1. Favorable – If the co-investigator finds that no statement were made that cast the product in a negative light and, at the same time, the conclusions suggest one or more of the following: (a) Beneficial health effects. (b) Increased nutritional value. (c) Absence of adverse health effects. (d) Equivalence in nutritional value between the GM product and the non-GM reference line, if the GM product was not developed with the aim to increase nutritional value. 2. Unfavorable – If the co-investigator finds that no statements were made that cast the product in a positive light and, at the same time the conclusions suggest one or more of the following: (a) Absence of expected beneficial health effects. (b) Adverse health effects. (c) Lower nutritional value of the GM product when compared to the non-GM reference line.</td>
<td>Two independent co-investigators classified the conclusions of each article as generally “favorable”, “unfavorable” or “neutral”. None of the co-investigators had any prior knowledge of the classification produced by their peers and had access only to the article sections relevant to their task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Equal nutritional value of the GM product, when compared to the non-GM reference line, if the GM product was developed with the aim to increase nutritional value.

3. Neutral – If the co-investigator finds the study is inconclusive or criteria for a favorable or unfavorable classification were not met.

Finally, the two co-investigators exchanged classification data. An article was excluded if no consensus was reached on assigned categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesser, 2007</th>
<th>Article conclusions were classified as “favorable,” “neutral,” or “unfavorable” by two investigators who had no knowledge of financial sponsors. Favorable—if both co-investigators agreed that: (1) the conclusions suggested beneficial health effects or absence of expected adverse health effects, and (2) no statements were made that cast the product in a negative light. Unfavorable—if both co-investigators agreed that: (1) the conclusions suggested adverse health effects or absence of expected beneficial health effects, and (2) no statements were made that cast the product in a positive light. Neutral—if the co-investigators agreed that the conclusions were neither favorable nor unfavorable, or if the co-investigators could not agree on classification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levine, 2003</td>
<td>The articles were reviewed and classified as supportive, neutral, or critical with respect to the use of olestra by criteria defined as follows: Supportive: Emphasizes safety/efficacy; recommends use; criticizes authors questioning safety/efficacy. Neutral: Concludes that there is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massougbodji, 2014</td>
<td>For each review included in the analysis, we extracted the final statement on the association between SSB consumption and obesity/weight gain. These final conclusions were anonymously compiled into a booklet; each page contained the statement with a Likert scale ranging from 0 = no evidence of a causal relation to 5 = strong evidence of a causal relation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugambi, 2013</td>
<td>The authors’ overall study conclusion and conclusions on reported clinical outcomes were evaluated and categorized as: 1. Positive: The author’s conclusion preferred the sponsor’s products over control/placebo. Interpretation of data supported the sponsor’s products over control. 2. Negative: The sponsors’ products were not preferred over control / placebo. Interpretation of data did NOT support the sponsors’ products. 3. Neutral: The author’s conclusion was neutral to the sponsor’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

insufficient information to assess safety/efficacy; makes no recommendations about use; equitably assesses opposing views. Critical: Emphasizes concerns about safety/efficacy; recommends alternatives; criticizes authors emphasizing safety/efficacy. for 2 it was supportive vs neutral, and in the 16 remaining cases, one of the reviewers rated the article either supportive or critical and the other was undecided between the same rating and neutral. All but 4 of these minor discrepancies were resolved by having both raters reread the articles. The articles then were submitted to a third rater (D.H.) who had no prior contact with either the articles or the other raters’ ratings. The articles were sent to this rater with all indications of authors’ affiliations removed. In the undisputed cases, the latter ratings agreed with the original 2 raters in all but 5 cases; in those cases, the original ratings were determinant. In the 4 originally disputed cases, the third rater agreed with one or the other of the original raters, and her ratings were accepted as final.
4. No clear conclusion was offered by author.

**Nkansah, 2009**

The following categories were coded: (xviii) authors’ conclusion (whether the authors recommended Ca supplementation, did not recommend Ca supplementation or had a neutral conclusion).

Articles meeting inclusion criteria were examined individually by three reviewers (study investigators: H.I., T.N. and N.N.) and subsequently coded using a standard instrument. Each reviewer extracted details from the articles independently. After independent review, all three reviewers met to reconcile the results of the coding, and discrepancies were resolved by reviewing the original article and establishing consensus.

**Wilde, 2012**

The article was determined to be favorable if the results suggested beneficial health effects or an absence of expected adverse health effects; the article was determined to be unfavorable if the conclusions suggested adverse health effects; and the paper was determined to be neutral if the conclusions were neither favorable nor unfavorable or null findings of the expected beneficial health effects.

Each article's title and abstract was read by the two article classifiers, who made independent determinations about whether the article was relevant to dairy and obesity, and, if so, whether the findings were favorable, unfavorable, neutral, or undeterminable to the dairy Industry.

After classification, the two article classifiers met to reconcile and corroborate their determinations. For each Principal Investigator–article pair, the reviewers determined whether their independent classifications of relevancy and outcome were unanimous or discrepant. Those articles for which the relevancy was discrepant were revisited and either a consensus or divergence of opinion was established. Relevant articles were reviewed further for outcome. For those in which the outcome was discrepant, the reviewers revisited the abstracts and established either a consensus or a divergence of opinion.