Supplementary tables

Table S1: Overview of search terms

Exposure	**Outcome**	**Type of publication**
AND	AND	
High(-)intensity sweetener(s)	Body weight	Narrative review
High(-)potency sweetener(s)	Obesity	Systematic review
Intense sweetener(s)	Overweight	Mini-review
Artificial sweetener(s)	Adiposity	Review
Low(-)calorie sweetener(s)		Commentary
Low(-)caloric sweetener(s)		Opinion
Low(-)energy sweetener(s)		Perspective
Non-caloric sweetener(s)		Meta-analysis
No(-)calorie sweetener(s)		Meta-analyses
Non-nutritive sweetener(s)		Consensus statement(s)
Sugar(-)free sweetener(s)		Consensus report
Sugar(-)free product(s)		Position statement(s)
Reduced(-)sugar sweetener(s)		Position report
Reduced(-)sugar product(s)		Scientific statement(s)
Sweetening agent(s)		Scientific report
Sugar replacer		

Table S2: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria	**Exclusion criteria**
The effect or association of LES (primarily intense sweeteners) with BW regulation	Publications reviewing lower-energy sugars, polyols or other food ingredients
The publication has to include an assessment of evidence on the relationship between LES and BW as a significant component	Publications which incidentally refer to LES and BW relationships, without reviewing the evidence
The publication has to include LES in general and not specific types of LES	Publication focused on one specific LES or one specific category of LES
The publication has to be either a narrative or systematic review or position or consensus statement	All primary studies; animal studies as well as human studies (observational or intervention), letters to editors, brief commentaries, conference abstracts or summaries
	Publications focused on pregnancy and fetal outcomes
The publication has to be published in a refereed journal	
An English version of the full publication has to be assessible	
Full text has to be accessible	Publications with data not electronically accessible from the database

BW: body weight, LES: low-energy sweetener

Table S3: Article characteristics and subsequent operationalization

Characteristic	**Operationalization**
Article ID	Self-assigned unique ID, consecutive
First author surname	Text (used for matching)
Title	Text (used for matching)
Publication year	Year (used for matching)
Study outcome – Reviews Author's conclusion BW	Effect or association relative to control or no/lower exposure: 0 = Decrease/more beneficial 1 = Neutral (no directional effect or association) 2 = Increase/less beneficial 3 = No conclusion directly relevant to the LES-body weight relationship 4 = Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion (author's view) 5 = We are unable to draw a conclusion from the paper
Study outcome – Reviews Statistical significance (only reviews including meta-analysis) BW	0 = Significant effect - decreasing 1 = Not statistically significant effect 2 = Significant effect - increasing
Study outcome – Primary studies Main message BW	Effect or association relative to control or no/lower exposure: 0 = Decrease/more beneficial 1 = Neutral (no directional effect or association) 2 = Increase/less beneficial 3 = No conclusion directly relevant to the LES-BW relationship 4 = Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion (author's view) 5 = We are unable to draw a conclusion from the paper
Article type - Review	0 = Narrative review 1 = Systematic review with meta-analysis 2 = Systematic review without meta-analysis

BW: body weight, LES: low-energy sweeteners

Table S3: Article characteristics and subsequent operationalization, *continued*

Article type – Primary studies	0 = Randomized controlled trial 1 = Observational study 2 = Animal and/or in vitro study 3 = Other 4 = Systematic review (systematic search) with meta-analysis 5 = Systematic review (systematic search) without meta-analysis 6 = Narrative review
Population Only human studies	0 = Adults 1 = Children 2 = Both or not specific
Sample size, only primary studies	Number
Number of authors	Number
Journal impact factor, current	Number
Journal impact factor, last five years	Number
Funding source, only reviews	0 = Non-profit organization 1 = For profit organization 2 = Both profit and non-profit 3 = Not stated/Stated as no funding received
Affiliation of the corresponding author, only reviews	0 = University 1 = Government 2 = Non-profit organization 3 = Industry 4 = Other
Affiliation of the first author, only reviews	0 = University 1 = Government 2 = Non-profit organization 3 = Industry 4 = Other
Number of relevant cited studies, only reviews	Number
Number of review authors publications in the section concerning BW, only reviews	Number
Years since cited paper was published	Number

BW: body weight, LES: low-energy sweeteners

Adjusted odds ratios for the likelihood of being cited

Table S4: Adjusted odds ratios for the likelihood of being cited (from multivariate analyses of 183 cited articles in 51 evidence assessment units from 33 reviews)

	Adjusted OR (CI), NOAU	*p*	Adjusted OR (CI), JFC	*p*	Adjusted OR (CI), YESI	*p*
Main message of cited articles						
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	1 (ref)		1 (ref)		1 (ref)	
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	1.72 (1.00-2.98)	0.05	1.63 (0.94-2.82)	0.08	1.64 (0.93-2.88)	0.09
Decrease/more beneficial	1.39 (0.81-2.40)	0.23	1.26 (0.72-2.21)	0.42	1.31 (0.76-2.27)	0.33
We are unable to draw a conclusion from the article	1.25 (0.49-2.82)	0.61	1.14 (0.45-2.55)	0.76	1.11 (0.43-2.50)	0.81
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	1.19 (0.60-2.27)	0.61	1.11 (0.56-2.11)	0.76	1.05 (0.53-2.03)	0.88
Increase/less beneficial	1.17 (0.72-1.95)	0.53	1.16 (0.71-1.94)	0.56	1.11 (0.67-1.87)	0.69
Cited article type						
Systematic review with meta-analysis	1 (ref)		1 (ref)		1 (ref)	
Systematic review without meta-analysis	0.97 (0.40-2.22)	0.95	0.83 (0.35-1.87)	0.66	0.86 (0.36-1.92)	0.72
Randomized controlled trial	0.85 (0.50-1.52)	0.58	0.79 (0.45-1.42)	0.41	0.85 (0.48-1.56)	0.59
Observational study	0.69 (0.40-1.23)	0.19	0.62 (0.36-1.12)	0.10	0.67 (0.39-1.19)	0.15
Animal	0.67 (0.29-1.47)	0.33	0.66 (0.28-1.45)	0.31	0.64 (0.28-1.40)	0.28
Narrative review	0.45 (0.18-1.03)	0.07	0.40 (0.16-0.90)	0.03	0.39 (0.16-0.87)	0.03
Other	0.27 (0.00-3.39)	0.50	-	-	0.22 (0.00-2.68)	0.44
Cited article population						
Adults	1 (ref)		1 (ref)		1 (ref)	
Children	2.28 (1.61-3.24)	<0.001	2.20 (1.54-3.15)	<0.001	2.27 (1.59-3.26)	<0.001
Both	1.05 (0.63-1.70)	0.83	1.04 (0.62-1.69)	0.88	1.00 (0.59-1.65)	0.99
Sample size	1.00 (0.83-1.21)	0.96	0.96 (0.80-1.16)	0.68	1.00 (0.82-1.21)	0.97
Number of authors	-	-	1.04 (0.99-1.09)	0.10	1.05 (1.00-1.10)	0.06
Journal impact factor	1.14 (0.99-1.30)	0.06	-	-	1.15 (1.00-1.31)	0.04
Journal impact factor, last five years	1.12 (0.97-1.28)	0.12	-	-	1.13 (0.98-1.30)	0.08
Years since cited article was published	1.00 (0.98-1.02)	0.83	1.00 (0.98-1.02)	0.93	-	-

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, JFC; Current journal impact factor, LES; low-energy sweetener, NOAU; Number of authors, OR; Odds ratios, *p*; p-value, ref; reference variable, YESI; Years since cited study was published. Logistic mixed-effects regression adjusted for number of authors, journal impact factor and years since cited study was published, respectively.

Post hoc analysis

Table S5: Subgroup analysis for evidence assessment units (n= 11) showing a beneficial effect or association of LES on BW (n=65 articles cited)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	16 (25)	1 (ref)	
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	8 (12)	1.23 (0.61-2.40)	0.56
Increase/less beneficial	9 (14)	1.06 (0.53-2.07)	0.86
Decrease/more beneficial	18 (28)	1.02 (0.58-1.80)	0.93
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	11 (17)	0.90 (0.46-1.73)	0.76
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	2 (3)	0.55 (0.09-2.04)	0.44
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	8 (12)	1 (ref)	
Systematic review without meta-analysis	4 (6)	1.62 (0.66-3.90)	0.28
Randomized controlled trial	23 (35)	0.91 (0.49-1.80)	0.79
Observational study	19 (29)	0.82 (0.42-1.64)	0.56
Narrative review	8 (12)	0.70 (0.29-1.60)	0.40
Other	1 (2)	0.49 (0.03-2.84)	0.51
Animal	1 (2)	0.49 (0.03-2.84)	0.51
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	23 (35)	1 (ref)	
Children	22 (34)	1.38 (0.85-2.26)	0.19
Both	18 (28)	1.07 (0.62-1.82)	0.81
Sample size[3,4]	42 (65)	0.92 (0.68-1.22)	0.56
Number of authors	64 (98)	1.01 (0.95-1.07)	0.86
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	63 (97)	1.01 (0.84-1.20)	0.9
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	63 (97)	1.01 (0.84-1.20)	0.92
Years since cited article was published	65 (100)	0.97 (0.94-1.00)	0.09

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S6: Subgroup analysis for evidence assessment units (n=7) showing a neutral effect or association of LES on BW (n=48 articles cited)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	19 (40)	1 (ref)	
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	3 (6)	1.67 (1.07-2.54)	**0.03**
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	2 (4)	1.45 (0.84-2.43)	0.17
Increase/less beneficial	9 (19)	1.25 (0.92-1.70)	0.15
Decrease/more beneficial	11 (23)	1.08 (0.80-1.45)	0.60
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	4 (8)	0.89 (0.56-1.38)	0.61
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	8 (17)	1 (ref)	
Observational study	22 (46)	1.45 (1.06-2.02)	**0.03**
Randomized controlled trial	18 (38)	1.13 (0.81-1.60)	0.48
Animal	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-
Systematic review without meta-analysis	-	-	-
Narrative review	-	-	-
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	26 (54)	1 (ref)	
Children	16 (33)	1.12 (0.88-1.44)	0.36
Both	6 (13)	0.81 (0.55-1.18)	0.29
Sample size[3,4]	4 (8)	1.09 (0.96-1.23)	0.18
Number of authors	48 (100)	0.97 (0.93-1.00)	0.06
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	46 (96)	1.03 (0.94-1.13)	0.47
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	48 (100)	1.02 (0.93-1.12)	0.64
Years since cited article was published	48 (100)	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.78

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression. The analysis is additionally adjusted for overdispersion.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S7: Subgroup analysis for evidence assessment units (n=7) showing an adverse effect or association of LES on BW (n=63 articles cited)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	9 (14)	1 (ref)	
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	6 (10)	1.29 (0.62-2.65)	0.49
Increase/less beneficial	35 (56)	1.09 (0.65-1.90)	0.75
Decrease/more beneficial	6 (10)	0.95 (0.43-2.01)	0.89
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	6 (10)	0.79 (0.35-1.72)	0.56
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	1 (2)	0.79 (0.11-3.33)	0.78
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	4 (6)	1 (ref)	
Animal	12 (19)	1.43 (0.72-3.15)	0.34
Observational study	33 (52)	1.34 (0.72-2.85)	0.40
Randomized controlled trial	6 (10)	1.17 (0.52-2.77)	0.71
Systematic review without meta-analysis	2 (3)	1.00 (0.29-2.98)	1.00
Narrative review	6 (10)	1.00 (0.43-2.41)	1.00
Other	-	-	-
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	19 (30)	1 (ref)	
Both	9 (14)	0.87 (0.53-1.39)	0.57
Children	22 (35)	0.80 (0.55-1.15)	0.24
Sample size[3,4]	39 (62)	1.14 (0.91-1.44)	0.25
Number of authors	63 (100)	1.04 (1.00-1.09)	0.07
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	63 (100)	1.13 (0.97-1.30)	0.12
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	63 (100)	1.13 (0.97-1.32)	0.12
Years since cited article was published	63 (100)	1.00 (0.96-1.04)	0.92

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression. The analysis is additionally adjusted for overdispersion.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S8: Subgroup analysis for evidence assessment units (n=26) concluding insufficient evidence to draw a conclusion about the effect of LES on BW (n=126 articles cited)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	29 (23)	1 (ref)	
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	12 (10)	1.45 (0.96-2.15)	0.07
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	15 (12)	0.89 (0.58-1.35)	0.60
Increase/less beneficial	36 (29)	0.88 (0.63-1.22)	0.45
Decrease/more beneficial	28 (22)	0.80 (0.56-1.14)	0.22
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	4 (3)	0.65 (0.27-1.37)	0.30
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	12 (10)	1 (ref)	
Systematic review without meta-analysis	6 (5)	1.97 (1.12-3.45)	**0.02**
Observational study	53 (42)	1.03 (0.69-1.59)	0.89
Randomized controlled trial	42 (33)	0.82 (0.54-1.29)	0.38
Animal	3 (2)	0.78 (0.29-1.83)	0.60
Narrative review	8 (6)	0.73 (0.37-1.37)	0.34
Other	-	-	-
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	66 (52)	1 (ref)	
Children	39 (31)	1.84 (1.43-2.37)	**<0.001**
Both	16 (13)	0.83 (0.53-1.25)	0.38
Sample size[3,4]	96 (76)	1.10 (0.98-1.25)	0.11
Number of authors	125 (99)	1.00 (0.97-1.04)	0.92
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	124 (98)	1.10 (1.00-1.20)	**0.049**
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	123 (98)	1.10 (0.99-1.21)	0.06
Years since cited article was published	126 (100)	1.00 (0.99-1.02)	0.77

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S9: Subgroup analysis for articles cited (n=112) in narrative reviews (n=26 evidence assessment units)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	20 (18)	1 (ref)	
Decrease/more beneficial	21 (19)	1.13 (0.75-1.70)	0.57
Increase/less beneficial	38 (34)	1.10 (0.76-1.59)	0.63
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	17 (15)	0.76 (0.47-1.21)	0.25
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	12 (11)	0.73 (0.42-1.22)	0.24
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	3 (3)	0.54 (0.16-1.39)	0.26
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	13 (12)	1 (ref)	
Randomized controlled trial	20 (18)	1.00 (0.64-1.58)	0.99
Animal	13 (12)	0.84 (0.50-1.41)	0.52
Observational study	48 (43)	0.81 (0.55-1.23)	0.31
Narrative review	14 (13)	0.64 (0.37-1.09)	0.10
Systematic review without meta-analysis	3 (3)	0.47 (1.14-1.22)	0.16
Other	-	-	-
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	41 (37)	1 (ref)	
Children	31 (28)	1.24 (0.90-1.70)	0.18
Both	25 (22)	0.93 (0.64-1.32)	0.68
Sample size[3,4]	69 (62)	0.87 (0.74-1.00)	0.06
Number of authors	112 (100)	1.03 (0.99-1.06)	0.16
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	109 (97)	1.06 (0.95-1.18)	0.26
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	111 (99)	1.04 (0.93-1.16)	0.47
Years since cited article was published	112 (100)	1.01 (0.99-1.03)	0.22

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S10: Subgroup analysis for articles cited (n=56) in systematic reviews with meta-analysis (n=11 evidence assessment units)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	21 (38)	1 (ref)	
Decrease/more beneficial	13 (23)	1.50 (0.85-2.64)	0.16
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	3 (5)	1.43 (0.50-3.56)	0.46
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	3 (5)	1.15 (0.37-2.99)	0.79
Increase/less beneficial	15 (27)	1.10 (0.61-1.95)	0.75
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	1 (2)	0.65 (0.03-3.55)	0.68
Cited article type			
Randomized controlled trial	29 (52)	1 (ref)	
Observational study	27 (48)	0.94 (0.60-1.45)	0.77
Animal	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-
Systematic review with meta-analysis	-	-	-
Systematic review without meta-analysis	-	-	-
Narrative review	-	-	-
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	34 (61)	1 (ref)	
Children	22 (39)	0.86 (0.54-1.34)	0.50
Both	-	-	-
Sample size[3,4]	56 (100)	0.97 (0.78-1.20)	0.81
Number of authors	56 (100)	0.95 (0.88-1.04)	0.27
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	56 (100)	1.11 (0.92-1.31)	0.26
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	56 (100)	1.11 (0.91-1.33)	0.28
Years since cited article was published	56 (100)	1.01 (0.99-1.03)	0.39

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S11: Subgroup analysis for articles cited (n=116) in systematic reviews without meta-analysis (n=14 evidence assessment units)

	n (%)[1]	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	29 (25)	1 (ref)	
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	13 (11)	1.19 (0.71-1.94)	0.51
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	11 (9)	1.13 (0.65-1.92)	0.65
Decrease/more beneficial	28 (24)	1.06 (0.71-1.61)	0.77
Increase/less beneficial	28 (24)	1.02 (0.67-1.54)	0.93
Unable to draw a conclusion from the article	4 (3)	0.52 (0.15-1.35)	0.23
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	11 (9)	1 (ref)	
Systematic review without meta-analysis	8 (7)	0.92 (0.48-1.74)	0.80
Observational study	49 (42)	0.67 (0.43-1.08)	0.09
Randomized controlled trial	39 (34)	0.61 (0.38-1.00)	**0.04**
Narrative review	4 (3)	0.54 (0.19-1.30)	0.20
Animal	1 (1)	0.35 (0.02-1.85)	0.32
Other	1 (1)	0.35 (0.02-1.85)	0.32
Cited article population[2]			
Adults	62 (53)	1 (ref)	
Both	14 (12)	1.86 (1.20-2.82)	**0.004**
Children	36 (31)	1.66 (1.20-2.29)	**0.002**
Sample size[3,4]	88 (76)	1.03 (0.88-1.20)	0.74
Number of authors	114 (98)	1.02 (0.98-1.07)	0.33
Journal impact factor, current (2018)[5]	113 (97)	1.06 (0.95-1.19)	0.29
Journal impact factor, last five years[5]	112 (97)	1.06 (0.94-1.19)	0.33
Years since cited article was published	116 (100)	1.00 (0.98-1.01)	0.69

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Cited articles can potentially be cited in all evidence assessment units. The aggregated number for subgroups is therefore higher than the total number of cited articles.

[2]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[3]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[4]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[5]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.

Table S12: Subgroup analysis of articles cited 5 or more times (n=45) across all evidence assessment units (n = 51)

	n (%)	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Main message of cited articles			
Neutral (no directional effect or association)	15 (33)	1 (ref)	
Evidence is insufficient to draw a conclusion	2 (4)	1.39 (0.79-2.34)	0.23
Increase/less beneficial	11 (24)	1.27 (0.94-1.71)	0.12
Decrease/more beneficial	16 (36)	1.25 (0.95-1.64)	0.11
No conclusion directly relevant to the LES- BW relationship	1 (2)	0.66 (0.23-1.55)	0.39
We are unable to draw a conclusion from the paper	-	-	-
Cited article type			
Systematic review with meta-analysis	6 (13)	1 (ref)	
Observational study	22 (49)	1.15 (0.81-1.65)	0.45
Randomized controlled trial	17 (38)	1.10 (0.77-1.60)	0.62
Animal	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-
Systematic review without meta-analysis	-	-	-
Narrative review	-	-	-
Cited article population[1]			
Adults	19 (42)	1 (ref)	
Children	20 (44)	1.04 (0.82-1.31)	0.77
Both	6 (13)	0.91 (0.63-1.29)	0.59
Sample size[2,3]	39 (87)	1.06 (0.94-1.20)	0.31
Number of authors	45 (100)	0.98 (0.94-1.01)	0.24
Journal impact factor[4]	45 (100)	1.13 (1.04-1.22)	**0.003**
Journal impact factor, last five years[4]	45 (100)	1.13 (1.03-1.22)	0.006
Years since cited article was published	45 (100)	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.88

BW; body weight, CI; 95% confidence interval, LES; low-energy sweetener, n; sample size, OR; Odds ratio, ref; reference variable. Logistic mixed-effects regression.

[1]Data on population was only extracted for articles considering human subjects.

[2]Data on sample size was only extracted for primary evidence (i.e. not for reviews).

[3]Sample size was base 10 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 10-fold change in study population.

[4]Journal impact factor was base 2 log-transformed, so odds ratio is the change per 2-fold change in journal impact factor.