Table S1 Primary and secondary outcome changes in young adult university students (n=106) who completed the Eating Advice To Students (EATS) brief web-based nutrition intervention pilot RCT from baseline to 3 months

Outcome	Mean change from baseline to 3-months (95%CI)				Mean difference between groups (95% CI)	Group*Time p-value	Effect size
	Intervention (n=42 or 50)	p-value	Control (n=50 or 54)	p-value			
Diet quality (ARFS) [a]	-0.3 (-2.4, 1.7)	0.750	1.1 (-0.8, 2.9)	0.269	-1.4 (-4.2, 1.4)	0.326	-0.16
Fruit (ARFS sub-scale score) [a]	0.1 (-0.6, 0.8)	0.731	-0.1 (-0.7, 0.5)	0.705	0.2 (-0.7, 1.2)	0.611	0.09
Fruit (grams/day) [a]	-4.8 (-53.3, 43.7)	0.846	4.7 (-39.8, 49.1)	0.837	-9.4 (-75.2, 56.3)	0.778	-0.05
Fruit (grams/day) (adjusted model) [a, b]	20.9 (-14.6, 56.4)	0.248	4.7 (-27.5, 36.8)	0.777	16.3 (-31.6, 64.2)	0.505	0.11
% energy from fruit	0.2 (-1.4, 1.8)	0.812	0.2 (-1.3, 1.6)	0.827	0.03 (-2.1, 2.2)	0.978	0.01
Vegetable (ARFS sub-scale score) [a]	-0.2 (-1.3, 1.0)	0.744	0.8 (-0.2, 1.8)	0.135	-1.0 (-2.5, 0.6)	0.211	-0.22
Vegetable (grams/day) [a]	17.4 (-21.3, 56.1)	0.378	-10.7 (-46.1, 24.8)	0.556	28.1 (-24.4, 80.6)	0.294	0.18
% energy from vegetables [a]	0.3 (-0.9, 1.4)	0.650	0.4 (-0.7, 1.4)	0.497	-0.1 (-1.6, 1.4)	0.900	-0.02
% energy from discretionary foods [a]	-3.0 (-5.8 -0.2)	**0.033**	1.6 (-0.9, 4.2)	0.212	-4.6 (-8.4, -0.9)	**0.016**	-0.37
QLESQ total score [a]	0.2 (-1.8, 2.1)	0.870	-0.2 (-2.0, 1.7)	0.859	0.3 (-2.3, 3.0)	0.810	0.05
WHO-5 score [a]	0.1 (-0.9, 1.2)	0.797	-0.6 (-1.6, 0.5)	0.272	0.7 (-0.8, 2.2)	0.343	0.17
Below categorical variables presented as odds ratio [c]							
Breakfast (frequency consumed) [a]	1.3 (0.3, 5.8)	0.734	7.1 (1.6, 31.4)	**0.010**	0.2 (0.02, 1.5)	0.109	-0.41
Alcohol (quantity consumed) [d]	1.5 (0.6, 3.7)	0.430	2.7 (1.1, 6.6)	**0.035**	0.5 (0.2, 2.0)	0.357	0.30

Outcome	Intervention	p-value	Control	p-value	Mean difference between groups (95% CI)	Group*Time p-value	Effect size (Cohen's d)
Fruit self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	0.8 (0.3, 1.9)	0.605	0.3 (0.1, 0.6)	**0.002**	3.1 (0.9, 10.6)	0.065	0.27
Vegetables self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	1.1 (0.5, 2.4)	0.846	0.7 (0.3, 1.6)	0.435	1.5 (0.5, 4.4)	0.501	0.09
Takeaway foods self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	0.6 (0.2, 1.3)	0.191	0.6 (0.3, 1.2)	0.163	1.0 (0.3, 3.0)	0.974	0.00
EDNP snack foods self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	0.7 (0.3, 1.5)	0.341	1.3 (0.6, 2.7)	0.541	0.5 (0.2, 1.6)	0.267	-0.15
Sugar sweetened drinks self-efficacy (confidence score) [d, e]	0.5 (0.2, 1.5)	0.233	0.7 (0.3, 1.7)	0.449	0.7 (0.2, 2.8)	0.670	-0.07
Alcohol self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	0.1 (0.04, 0.5)	**0.002**	0.9 (0.3, 2.6)	0.855	0.2 (0.03, 0.8)	**0.023**	-0.45
Breakfast self-efficacy (confidence score) [d]	0.5 (0.2, 1.4)	0.187	1.0 (0.4, 2.5)	0.937	0.5 (0.1, 2.1)	0.364	-0.16

ARFS, Australian Recommended Food Score; EDNP, Energy-Dense Nutrient Poor; QLESQ, Quality of Life, Enjoyment & Satisfaction Questionnaire; WHO-5, World Health Organization-Five Well-being Index. [a] n=42 for intervention group and n=50 for control group (i.e. those who completed the Australian Eating Survey Food Frequency Questionnaire at follow up) [b] Adjusted model with n=1 intervention participant removed from analysis due to outlier (1278 grams/day at baseline and 218 grams/day at follow-up). [c] Categorical variables are presented as OR of moving up a category (i.e. desirable direction), with the exception of alcohol intake which is odds of moving down a category. [d] n=50 for intervention group and n=54 for control group (i.e. those who completed the other survey questions at follow up) [e] Proportional odds assumption not met for this model, however alternative modelling did not change the result or interpretation

Table S2 Primary and secondary outcome changes in young adult university students (n=78) who reported plausible energy intake at baseline in the Eating Advice To Students (EATS) brief web-based nutrition intervention pilot RCT from baseline to 3 months

Outcome	Mean change from baseline to 3-months (95%CI)				Mean difference between groups (95% CI)	Group*Time p-value	Effect size (Cohen's d)
	Intervention (n=39)	p-value	Control (n=39)	p-value			
Diet quality (ARFS)	0.6 (-1.7, 3.0)	0.587	0.2 (-1.9, 2.3)	0.843	0.4 (-2.7, 3.6)	0.791	0.05
Fruit (ARFS sub-scale score)	0.4 (-0.4, 1.1)	0.373	-0.1 (-0.8, 0.6)	0.765	0.5 (-0.6, 1.5)	0.392	0.18
Fruit (grams/day)	12.7 (-33.4, 58.8)	0.589	10.0 (-32.5, 52.5)	0.646	2.8 (-60.0, 65.5)	0.931	0.02
% energy from fruit	0.9 (-0.7, 2.5)	0.289	1.1 (-0.4, 2.7)	0.139	-0.3 (-2.5, 2.0)	0.818	-0.06

Vegetable (ARFS sub-scale score)	0.2 (-1.1, 1.6)	0.745	0.3 (-1.0, 1.5)	0.662	-0.1 (-1.9, 1.8)	0.954	-0.01
Vegetable (grams/day)	14.2 (-33.3, 61.9)	0.556	-30.0 (-74.1, 14.1)	0.182	44.3 (-20.5, 109.2)	0.180	0.28
% energy from vegetables	0.5 (-0.7, 1.8)	0.399	-0.1 (-1.2, 1.1)	0.915	0.6 (-1.1, 2.3)	0.489	0.13
% energy from discretionary foods	-4.1 (-7.8, -0.5)	**0.027**	1.6 (-1.8, 5.0)	0.347	-5.7 (-10.7, -0.8)	**0.024**	-0.45
Below categorical variables presented as odds ratio [b]							
Breakfast (frequency consumed)	1.1 (0.1, 10.0)	0.914	4.5 (0.8, 25.6)	0.091	0.3 (0.02, 4.2)	0.334	-0.33

ARFS, Australian Recommended Food Score. Plausible energy reporters were identified from baseline energy intake using the Goldberg cutoffs [1], with basal metabolic rate calculated using the Schofield equation [2] and a physical activity level of 1.55 used for all participants. Participants with an energy intake: basal metabolic rate <0.97 were classified as under-reporters and those with energy intake: basal metabolic rate >2.48 as over-reporters. There was no significant difference in the number of plausible reporters between groups (intervention n=39, control n=39).

References

1. Black, A.E. Critical evaluation of energy intake using the goldberg cut-off for energy intake:Basal metabolic rate. A practical guide to its calculation, use and limitations. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* **2000**, *24*, 1119-1130.
2. Schofield, W.N. Predicting basal metabolic rate, new standards and review of previous work. *Hum Nutr Clin Nutr* **1985**, *39 Suppl 1*, 5-41.