

## Online Supplementary Materials

### Study quality assessment criteria information

- **Was the study sample size justified and was this justification adequate?** An example of an adequate justification would be a formal statistical power analysis. An example of a less than adequate justification would be basing sample size on previous studies with no consideration of statistical power.
- **Was the study sample size very small?** (i.e. < 20 participant per group for an experimental study, < 30 participants for observational study).
- **Was the study methodology described in sufficient detail?** Examples of a lack of sufficient detail would be very limited information on where the study took place, how the procedure was implemented, questionnaire item wording and/or response formats not being described in full.
- **Were study results described in sufficient enough detail to support conclusions?** Examples of a lack of sufficient detail would be statistical analyses only being partially reported (e.g. statistics missing for some group comparisons), data for some response options missing or being reported selectively (e.g. only reporting on % of participants strongly agreeing with a statement, but not for other response options), data for one or more groups missing.
- **Are outcome measures appropriate for research question?** For studies examining alcohol consumption behaviour, measures that examine actual behaviour are most appropriate. Measures that examine intended or hypothetical behaviour are less appropriate. For any studies using multi-item questionnaires/scales, appropriate psychometric properties of scales should be reported ideally.
- **Was the study methodology and analysis plan pre-registered?** E.g. on a trials registry or other online database.
- **Potential conflicts of interest?** A lack of a conflicts of interest statement means this is unclear. A funding statement and no information about the role of the funder in the research also makes potential conflicts of interest unclear.
- **For experimental studies examining consumer effects of energy labelling, were randomization methods used (and described) to allocate participants to conditions?** Information on randomization method used (e.g. blocked) should be reported ideally.
- **For experimental studies examining consumer effects of energy labelling, were efforts made to minimize participant awareness of study aims?** If participants are aware of the study aims then this may affect their behaviour or reported hypothetical behaviour (demand characteristics). Efforts made to minimize awareness include a cover story or including consumer behaviour measures related to alcohol among other measures (i.e. making it less obvious what the focal outcome variable is).
- **For experimental studies examining consumer effects of energy labelling, is information provided on: participant awareness of study aims?** Irrespective of whether measures were taken to attempt to minimize participant awareness, how many participants were aware of the study aims? (e.g. % of participants correctly identifying the study aims).

### Meta-analyses

We conducted a meta-analysis of proportions of individuals who i) accurately estimated the number of kcals in alcoholic beverages and ii) who supported energy labelling policies for alcoholic beverages. If raw data (the total number of individuals and the number who accurately estimated kcals / supported the policy) were not available, we estimated the numbers based on percentages provided. If percentages were not granular enough, e.g. did not lead to a whole number, we rounded to the nearest integer. Where studies provided estimates of multiple alcoholic beverages we took the average percentage correct across each beverage to calculate the total number of correct estimations (e.g. Bui et al 2008). We did not include each beverage separately in the analysis as this would violate independence of data points. One study (Annunziata, 2006b) provided percentage accuracy separately across different geographical locations, and as such these were entered separately into the meta-analysis. One study (Nikolaou et al, 2014) provided percentages of support for policy separately for males and females, as such these were entered separately into the meta-analysis. Analyses were conducted using the “metaprop” function from the “meta” package in R (1), with data and R scripts on OSF (<https://osf.io/8gpm5/>). We used a logit transformation, in line with recommendations for meta-analysing proportions (2). Generic Inverse Variance random effects models were used, and heterogeneity was assessed with the  $I^2$  statistic (3). We conducted leave-one-out analysis to examine the stability and identify any influential proportions. We also examined asymmetry around the pooled proportion estimate using the Trim and Fill procedure (4). This method estimates the number of ‘hypothetical’ studies missing (presumed to be due to publication bias) to achieve symmetry of effect sizes around the pooled estimate. The effect size with these imputed studies accounted for is thought to better represent the true effect size, whilst accounting for publication bias. For correct estimates of energy content of alcoholic beverages, the Trim and Fill procedure estimated 5 studies would be necessary for symmetry (see Figure S1 below). Imputing these hypothetical studies reduced the pooled estimate to 15% (95% CI: 10% - 21%). For support for policy, the Trim and Fill procedure estimated that 1 study would be necessary for symmetry (see Figure S2 below). Imputing this study reduced the pooled estimate to 62% (95% CI: 51% - 72%).

- 1) Schwarzer, G., Carpenter, J. R., & Rücker, G. (2015). *Meta-analysis with R* (Vol. 4784). Cham: springer.
- 2) Stijnen, T., Hamza, T. H., & Özdemir, P. (2010). Random effects meta-analysis of event outcome in the framework of the generalized linear mixed model with applications in sparse data. *Statistics in medicine*, 29(29), 3046-3067.
- 3) Higgins, J. P., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327(7414), 557-560.
- 4) Duval, S., & Tweedie, R. (2000). Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*, 56(2), 455-463.

Figure S1. Funnel plot for studies examining % of participants accurate in estimating energy content of alcoholic beverages





Figure S2. Funnel plot for studies examining % of participants supporting energy labelling policy



**Table A1. Study ratings for individual quality criteria**

Study	Sample size justified?	Very small sample size?	Method adequately detail?	Results adequately described?	Outcome measure assessment	Was the study pre-registered?	Potential conflicts of interest?	Randomization used and described?	Participant awareness of study aims?
Annunziata, 2016 (a)	Not reported	No	No	No	Unclear	Not reported	Funded by the International Organisation of Vine and Wine Role of funder not reported No conflicts of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Annunziata, 2016 (b)	Not reported	No	No	No	Appropriate measure	Not reported	Funded by the International Organisation of Vine and Wine Role of funder not reported No conflicts of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Bui, 2008 (Pilot Study)	Not reported	No	No	No	Appropriate measure	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Bui, 2008 (Main Study)	Not reported	No	No	No	Proxy measure of behaviour	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	Not reported	Not reported
Christensen, 2019	Not reported	No	Yes	No	Appropriate measure	Not reported	No conflict of interests reported Funded by the Danish Cancer	N/A	N/A

							Society and philanthropic foundation TrygFonden Role of funder not reported		
Grunert, 2018	Not reported	No	Yes	No	Appropriate measure	Not reported	Funded by the food industry Role of funder not reported No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Kypri, 2007	Not reported	No	Yes	Yes	Appropriate measure	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement. Funded by Australian Health Agency Role of funder not reported	N/A	N/A
Martinez, 2018 Study 1	Not reported	No	Yes	No	Proxy measure of behaviour	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	Randomization used, but method not described	Study made some attempt to blind participants to study aims Participants awareness not reported
Martinez, 2018 Study 2	Not reported	No	Yes	No	Proxy measure of behaviour	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	Randomization used, but method not described	Study made some attempt to blind participants to study aims

									Participants awareness not reported
Maynard, 2018	Yes, formal power analysis	No	Yes	Yes	Appropriate measure	Yes	No conflict of interests reported	Yes	Addressed adequately
Moore, 2010	Not reported	No	No	No	Appropriate measure	Not reported	Research funded by the alcohol industry (Diageo, PLC, a London-based manufacturer of beer, wine, and spirits) Role of funder not reported. No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Nikolaou, 2014	Not Reported	No	No	No	Unclear	Not reported	No conflict of interests reported	N/A	N/A
Pabst, 2019	Not reported	Yes	No	No	Unclear	Not reported	No conflict of interests reported	N/A	N/A
Thomson, 20102	Not reported	No	Yes	Yes	Appropriate measure	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Vecchio, 2018	Yes, based on other study sample sizes	No	No	No	Proxy measure of behaviour	Not reported	No conflict of interests reported	Yes	No attempt made to blind participants to study aims. Participant awareness not reported

GfK, 2014	Not reported	No	No	Yes	Appropriate measures	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
Alcohol Research UK Report (Maynard), 2018  Study 1	Not reported	No	No	No	Appropriate for knowledge of energy content and support for labelling  Proxy measure of consumer behaviour	Not reported	No conflict of interest statement	N/A	N/A
National Institute for Health Innovation (Walker) 2019	Yes, formal power analysis	No	Yes	Yes	Proxy measure of consumer behaviour  Appropriate measures for knowledge of energy content and support for energy labelling	Study methodology pre-registered, analysis strategy not specified	No conflict of interests reported	Yes	No attempt made to blind participants to study aims. Participant awareness not reported