Supplementary Table S1 Ovid Medline search strategy to identify nutrition interventions in vending machines in the University setting

#	Searches	Results
1	Food Dispensers, Automatic/	328
2	(vending machine* or "point of choice").mp	684
3	((food or drink* or snack*) adj5 (vending or dispens*)).mp.	599
4	1 or 2 or 3	1015
5	Universities/ or (universit* or college*).mp.	457139
6	((higher education or educational or tertiary or undergraduate* or postgraduate* or graduate*) adj5 (campus* or staff* or student* or setting* or population or institution*)).mp.	57467
7	5 or 6	498134
8	4 and 7	95
9	limit 8 to english language	60

Explanation of search terms:

- The forward slash symbol (/) means that the term is a valid controlled vocabulary term which has been searched in the Subject Headings field of the database.
- 'mp' searches several fields at once: mp search looks in the Title, Original Title, Abstract, Subject Heading, Name of Substance, and Registry Word fields
- 'adj5' searches for both terms within five words of each other in either order.



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #	
TITLE				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1	
ABSTRACT				
Structured summary 2		Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.		
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	1-2	
Objectives 4		Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).		
METHODS				
Protocol and registration 5 Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be access registration information including registration number.		Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	2	
Eligibility criteria 6 Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristic language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.		Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	2	
Information sources 7		Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.		
Search 8 Present full electronic search strategy for at le repeated.		Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary Table S1	
Study selection	dy selection 9 State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable included in the meta-analysis).		2-3	
Data collection process	ta collection process 10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.		3	
Data items	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions simplifications made.		3	
Risk of bias in individual studies	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3	

Summary measures	ummary measures 13 State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).		3
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I²) for each meta-analysis.	NA

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	topic # Checklist item		Reported on page #	
Risk of bias across studies	k of bias across studies 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).			
Additional analyses	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.			
RESULTS				
Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.				
Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.				
Risk of bias within studies	k of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).		13	
Results of individual studies	sults of individual studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.		7-12	
Synthesis of results	ynthesis of results 21 Present the main results of the review. If meta-analyses are done, include for each, confidence intervals and measures of consistency		3-6	
Risk of bias across studies	sk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).		NA	
Additional analysis	Iditional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).		NA	
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	nmary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).		13-14	
Limitations	ations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).		14-15	
Conclusions	onclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.		15	

FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	15

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Page 2 of 2