

<b>The Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS tool, 2016) Part 1</b>							
Study	Asefa et al., 2015	Bacchieri et al., 2010	Bamberger and Cohen, 2015	Boufous and Williamson, 2006	Chu, 2014	Karakus et al., 2015	Sam et al., 2018
Introduction							
1. Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Methods							
2. Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Was the sample size justified?	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
4. Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
5. Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES

population under investigation?							
7. Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
8. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
9. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/ measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
10. Is it clear what was used to determined statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (eg, p values, CIs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Results							
12. Were the basic data adequately described?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

13. Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
14. If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?	NO	NO	YES	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE	NO
15. Were the results internally consistent?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
16. Were the results for the analyses described in the methods, presented?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

<b>The Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS tool, 2016) Part 2</b>							
Study	Smailović et al., 2019	Thiese et al., 2015	Thygerson et al., 2011	Chen et al., 2020	Konlan et al., 2020	French and Gumus, 2021	Mitchell et al., 2014
Introduction							
1. Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Methods							
2. Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Was the sample size justified?	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
4. Was the target/reference	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)							
5. Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
8. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
9. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

10. Is it clear what was used to determined statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (eg, p values, CIs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
Results							
12. Were the basic data adequately described?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
14. If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?	NOT APPROPRIATE	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE
15. Were the results internally consistent?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
16. Were the results for the analyses described in the methods, presented?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

<b>The Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS tool, 2016) Part 3</b>							
Study	Poku et al.,2020	Brodie et al., 2009	Holizki et al., 2015	Lambrechts et al., 2019	Rudisill et al., 2019	Yuan, 2021	Li et al.,2020
Introduction							
1. Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Methods							
2. Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Was the sample size justified?	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
4. Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
5. Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
6. Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO

8. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
9. Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/ measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
10. Is it clear what was used to determined statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (eg, p values, CIs)	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Results							
12. Were the basic data adequately described?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
14. If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE	YES	NO	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE
15. Were the results internally consistent?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

16. Were the results for the analyses described in the methods, presented?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

<b>The Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS tool, 2016) Part 4</b>									
Study	<b>Liu &amp; Fan, 2020</b>	<b>Papali a et al., 2012</b>	<b>Bourdeau et al., 2021</b>	<b>McNeilly et al., 2010</b>	<b>Qi et al., 2013</b>	<b>Gates et al., 2013</b>	<b>Wadsworth et al., 2006</b>	<b>Khoshakhlagh et al., 2019</b>	<b>Reguly et al., 2014</b>
Introduction									
1. Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Methods									
2. Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Was the sample size justified?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
4. Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES





correctly using instruments/ measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?									
10. Is it clear what was used to determined statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (eg, p values, CIs)	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Results									
12. Were the basic data adequately described?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
14. If appropriate, was information about non-	NOT APPROPRIATE	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE	NOT APPROPRIATE	YES	NOT APPROPRIATE	NO	NO	NOT APPROPRIATE

[illegible]