Table S1. Quality assessment of articles included in this Review. The final quality rating was based on the number of “No” answers to the 10 quality criteria as well as the number of unclear (Ucl) answers to the sub-questions within these criteria (data not shown).

| Rating:          | Andersen 2008 | Bathla 2016 | Haas 2014 | Rajagopalan 2000 | Reddy 2016 | Nair 2014 | Vinodkumar 2009 | Vinodkumar 2009_1 | Vinodkumar 2007 | Wegmuller 2006 | Nair 2014 | Assey-Berko 2017 |
|------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|
| Strong           | Yes           | Yes         | Yes       | Yes               | Yes        | Yes        | Yes             | Yes               | Yes             | Yes           | Yes       | Yes               |
| Moderate         | Yes           | Yes         | Yes       | Yes               | Yes        | Yes        | Yes             | Yes               | Yes             | Yes           | Yes       | Yes               |
| Weak             | Yes           | Yes         | Yes       | Yes               | Yes        | Yes        | Yes             | Yes               | Yes             | Yes           | Yes       | Yes               |
| Overall Quality Rating | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

1. Would implementing the studied intervention or procedure (if found successful) result in improved outcomes for the patients/critics/population group?

2. Did the authors study an outcome or topic that the patients/critics/population group would care about?

3. Is the focus of the intervention or procedure or topic of study a common issue of concern to dietetics practice?

4. Is the intervention or procedure feasible?

5. Was the selection of study subjects/patients free from bias?

6. Were study groups comparable?

7. Was blinding used to prevent introduction of bias?

8. Was the method of handling withdrawals described?

9. Were intervention/therapeutic regimens/exposure factor or procedure and any comparison(s) described in detail?

10. Were outcomes clearly defined and the measurements valid and reliable?

11. Was the statistical analysis appropriate for the study design and type of outcome indicators?

12. Are conclusions supported by results with biases and limitations taken into consideration?

13. Is bias due to study’s funding or sponsorship unlikely?