Supplemental Appendix 1: Data extraction form – assessment of web-based information on e-cigarettes

Who extract data?	Name: _____ _____
Search engine, web site # :	□ Google, No.:_____ □ Baidu, No: _____
Access date: **Web site link:**	Access date:_____ http://
Who runs the Web site?	□ Government/public/university □ Health institution □ E-cig industry/commercial □ Information services company □ Charity/not-for-profit NGO □ Other: _____ □ Unclear
Organization or company name:	
What types of information? (Multiple choices allowed)	□ Health education □ News □ Advertisement □ Consumer feedback □ Other: _____ □ Unclear
Content coverage?	What are e-cigs: □ Yes; □ No; □Unclear E-cigs' harms: □ Yes; □ No; □Unclear E-cigs for quitting: □ Yes; □ No; □Unclear E-cig regulation: □ Yes; □ No; □Unclear Other: _____
For advertisement websites: **Types of e-cigarettes:**	□ Cigalike –closed system □ eGo - open system □ Mod –APVs □ Heat not burn product □ Unclear/other: _____
Main messages and claims from the website:	
Smoking cessation claims:	□ Help quit □ Not help quit □ Unclear/other: _____
Health claims:	□ Healthier than tobacco cigarettes □ More harmful than tobacco cigarettes □ Unclear/other: _____
Social claims: (Multiple choices allowed)	□ Less expensive than tobacco cigarettes □ Cleaner than tobacco cigarettes □ More socially acceptable than tobacco cigarettes □ Unclear/other: _____
Age claims:	□ Not for children/young people □ No age claims □ Unclear/other: _____
Any other notes/commentary:	
Modified QUEST criteria/scores (range 0-28) Reference for QUEST tool: Robillard JM, Jun JH, Lai JA, Feng TL. The QUEST for quality online health information: validation of a short quantitative tool. BMC medical informatics and decision making 2018; 18(1): 87.	

Authorship: **(Score x1):**_____	0- No indication of authorship or username 1- All other indications of authorship 2- Author's name and qualification clearly stated
Attribution (a): **(Score x3):**_____	0- No sources 1- Mention of expert source, research findings (though with insufficient information to identify the specific studies), links to various sites, advocacy body, or other 2- Reference to at least one identifiable scientific study, regardless of format (e.g., information in text, reference list) 3- Reference to mainly identifiable scientific studies, regardless of format (in >50% of claims)
Attribution (b): **(Score x1):**_____	For all articles scoring 2 or 3 on Attribution (a): Type of study 0- Not applicable; or in vitro, animal models, editorials 1- Single journal article (year: _____) 2- Multiple journal articles (most recent year: _____) 3- Systematic reviews of research studies (year:_____)
Conflict of interest: **(Score x 3):**_____	0- High risk of conflict of interest 1- Unclear 2- Unbiased information
Currency: **(Score x 1):**_____	Web site update date (month/year): _____ 0- No date present 1- Article is dated but 1 years or older 2- Article is dated within the last 1 years
Tone (includes title): **(Score x 3):**_____	0- Fully supported (authors fully and unequivocally support the claims, strong vocabulary, no discussion of limitations) 1- Mainly supported (authors mainly support their claims but with more cautious vocabulary such as "can reduce your risk" or "may help prevent", no discussion of limitations) 2- Balanced/cautious support (authors' claims are balanced by caution, includes statements of limitations and/or contrasting findings)
Total score:_____	Any notes/Commentary: