Additional File 1 Cohort characteristics, TSP data source, hierarchy of evidence score and quality appraisal for each study.

				Age	NHMRC	Quality appraisal score*															
Reference	Population	TSP data	N			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
		source		(yrs)	score																
Aronsson et	Swedish	telephone	2086 F,	16-65	IV	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	12
al [39]	working adults	interview	1715 M																		
Balague et al	Swiss	self-report	875 F,	7-17	IV	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	9
[60]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	840 M																		
Balague et al	Swiss	self-report	323 F,	12-17	IV	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
[61]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	292 M																		
Balague et al	Swiss	self-report	54 F,	10-16	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10
[59]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	63 M																		
Cude-	Swiss	self-report	68 F,	8-12	IV	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14
Mauroux et	schoolchildren	questionnaire	57 M																		
al [40]																					
Dieck et al	American	self-report	903 F	Not	III-2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
[62]	college	questionnaire		stated																	
	graduates																				
El-Metwally	Finnish	self-report	571 F,	10.8	II	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
et al [41]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	542 M																		
Fairbank et	UK	self-report	219 F,	12-18	IV	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
al [42]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	227 M																		

and subjective

in	terview

Feldman et	Canadian high	self-report	342	13.8	II	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
al [69]	school	questionnaire		(0.1)																	
	students																				
Grimmer et	Australian	subjective	60 F,	13-17	II	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
al [12]	schoolchildren	interview	72 M																		
Hagen et al	Norwegian	self-report	25,922	20-80	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
[43]	adults	questionnaire																			
Harreby et al	Danish	self-report	718 F,	14-15	IV	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
[64]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	671 B																		
Korovessis	Greek	subjective	664 F,	15.0	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10
et al [44]	schoolchildren	interview	588 M	(2.0)																	
Korovessis	Greek	subjective	1816 F,	12.0	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
et al [65]	schoolchildren	interview	1625 M	(1.5)																	
Kujala et al	Finnish	self-report	344 F,	10-16	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
[45]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	354 M																		
Linton et al	Swedish	self-report	1004 F,	35-45	IV	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	8
[47]	adults	questionnaire	910 M																		
Linton et al	Swedish	self-report	500	35-45	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10
[46]	adults	questionnaire																			
Mikkelsson	Finnish	self-report	894 F,	9.8	II	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
et al [66]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	862 M	(0.3)																	

and

11.8

				(0.4)																	
Mogensen et	Danish	subjective	234 F,	12-13	IV	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
al [67]	schoolchildren	interview	205 M																		
Moore et al	American	subjective	287 F,	8-18	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
[48]	schoolchildren	interview	244 M																		
Murphy et al	UK	self-report	32 F,	12.7	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
[49]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	34 F	(0.9)																	
Murphy et al	UK	self-report	336 F,	12.8	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
[50]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	343 M	(0.9)																	
Natvig et al	Norwegian	self-report	1418 F,	20-72	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	10
[68]	adults	questionnaire	1308 M																		
Niemelainen	Finnish males	structured	600 M	49.8	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
et al [13]		interview		(7.7)																	
Park et al	American	self-report	12,812	>19	III-2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	10
[51]	working male	questionnaire		yrs																	
	adults																				
Reigo et al	Swedish	self-report	663 F,	20-59	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	9
[52]	working adults	questionnaire	681 M																		
Salminen et	Finnish	self-report	370	11-17	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
al [53]	schoolchildren	questionnaire																			
Troussier et	French	self-report	471 F,	10-14	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
al [54]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	455 M																		
Tsuritani et	Japanese	subjective	709 F	54.0	IV	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	10

al [55]	female adults	interview		(7.7)																	
Veerapen et	Adults living in	subjective	1420 F,	> 15	IV	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
al [56]	Malaysia	interview	1174 M																		
Wedderkopp	Danish female	subjective	254 F	8-10,	IV	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
et al [57]	schoolchildren	interview	children	14-16																	
			, 165 F																		
			adolesc																		
			ents																		
Wedderkopp	Danish	subjective	419 F,	8-16	IV	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
et al [11]	schoolchildren	interview	387 M																		
Whittfield et	New Zealand	Self-report	70 F,	13.6	IV	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
al [58]	schoolchildren	questionnaire	70 M	(1.3)																	
				and																	
				17.1																	
				(0.6)																	
Proportion of	-		-	-	-	97.0	63.6	100	33.3	6.1	81.8	42.4	33.9	42.4	93.9	90.9	97.0	97.0	93.9	66.7	Mean
studies with																					(SD):
positive																					10.5
score (%)																					(2.0)

<sup>\*</sup> Key to scoring (Law et al. [36]): all items 1 for yes, 0 for no except biases (0 for yes, 1 for no).

<sup>1 =</sup> Was the study purpose stated clearly? 2 = Was relevant background literature reviewed? 3 = Was the design appropriate for the study question? 4 = Were there any biases present (minimum response rate of 80% for sample bias, blinding of investigators when physical measure were taken)? 5 = Was sample size justified? 6 = Was the sample described in detail? (had to include the number of participants by gender, age,

and a description of where the cohort was sampled from) 7 = Was informed consent obtained? (if not described, assume no); 8 = Were the outcome measures reliable? (if all not described, assume no); 10 = Results were reported in terms of statistical significance? 11 = Clinical importance was reported? 12 = Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate? 13 = Conclusions were appropriate given the study methods? 14 = Are there implications for clinical practice given the results of the study (based on the experience of the reviewers)? 15 = Were limitations of the study acknowledged and described by the authors?

M = males, F = females