

## Supplementary Information

### Protein-saliva interactions: a systematic review

*Frances Brown<sup>a</sup>, Alan R. Mackie<sup>a†</sup>, Qi He<sup>b</sup>, Alison Branch<sup>b</sup> and Anwesha Sarkar<sup>a\*</sup>*

<sup>a</sup> Food Colloids and Bioprocessing Group, School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup> Mondelēz International, Reading, United Kingdom

Corresponding authors:

E-mail address: [A.Sarkar@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:A.Sarkar@leeds.ac.uk) (\*A. Sarkar). [A.R.Mackie@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:A.R.Mackie@leeds.ac.uk) (†A. R. Mackie).

**Supplementary Table S1.** Assessment of risk per included study.

Reporting quality			Only applicable if using human saliva					Performance Bias			Selection bias		Detection Bias		Total					
Reference	Disclosed protein origin and type used (2)	Disclosed (Model) Saliva origin and type used (2)	Disclosed protein processing method (2)	Reported how many saliva donors (2)	Reported age range and sex (2)	Reported health status of donors (and how they were deemed healthy) (2)	Reported if saliva was stimulated or unstimulated (2)	Reported how saliva was stimulated (2)	Reported temperature (2)	Reported ratio of mixture between saliva and protein (2)	Reported the makes of apparatus used for methodology (2)	Kept the food system/delivery of the protein the same in all conditions except for 1 variable (2)	Blinded sensory panel to the true objectives of the study (2)	Used the same methods for the control and exposure (2)	Reported the number of replicates (2)	RQ	PB	SB	DB	Total
Ahmad, et al. (2020) <sup>44</sup>	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ahmad, et al. (2020) <sup>55</sup>	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	83%	100%	100%	96%
Andrewes, et al. (2011) <sup>45</sup>	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	NA	2	2	81%	67%	100%	100%	87%
Beecher, et al. (2008) <sup>46</sup>	2	NA	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	64%	83%	100%	50%	74%
Biegler, et al. (2016) <sup>61</sup>	2	2	NA	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	57%	83%	50%	100%	73%
Campbell, et al (2017) <sup>68</sup>	2	NA	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	NA	2	0	NA	2	2	79%	75%	0%	100%	63%
Çelebioğlu, et al. (2015) <sup>52</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	83%	100%	100%	96%

Çelebioğlu, et al. (2016) <sup>51</sup>	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	83%	100%	100%	96%
Çelebioğlu, et al. (2017) <sup>53</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	NA	2	0	100%	100%	100%	50%	88%
Childs, et al. (2010) <sup>65</sup>	0	NA	2	2	1	0	NA	NA	1	NA	2	0	2	2	2	50%	50%	50%	100%	63%
Dresselhuus, et al. (2008) <sup>73</sup>	2	NA	NA	2	0	1	2	NA	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	70%	67%	100%	100%	84%
Fuhrman, et al. (2019) <sup>66</sup>	2	NA	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	43%	100%	50%	100%	73%
Hsein, et al. (2015) <sup>47</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	83%	100%	100%	96%
Hu, et al. (2019) <sup>72</sup>	2	0	NA	2	2	1	NA	2	1	2	2	0	NA	2	2	75%	#### ##	#### ##	100%	90%
Kelly, et al. (2010) <sup>48</sup>	2	NA	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	93%	83%	100%	100%	94%
Koukoura, et al. (2019) <sup>59</sup>	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	83%	100%	100%	96%
Lee, et al. (2008) <sup>49</sup>	2	NA	2	2	1	0	NA	NA	1	NA	2	2	2	2	0	70%	75%	100%	50%	74%
Morell, et al. (2015) <sup>64</sup>	2	2	2	2	2	0	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	83%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Morell, et al. (2017) <sup>63</sup>	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	81%	100%	100%	100%	95%
Ritzoulis, et al. (2012) <sup>58</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	50%	100%	100%	88%
Sano, et al. (2005) <sup>38</sup>	2	NA	2	2	2	1	NA	NA	0	NA	2	2	2	2	2	90%	50%	100%	100%	85%
Sarkar, et al. (2009) <sup>56</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	NA	2	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Silletti, et al. (2010) <sup>41</sup>	2	NA	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	NA	2	0	50%	50%	100%	50%	63%

Silletti, E., et al. (2007) <sup>1</sup>	2	NA	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	64 %	83%	100 %	100 %	87%
Silletti, E., et al. (2007) <sup>60</sup>	2	NA	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	NA	2	2	93 %	83%	100 %	100 %	94%
Silletti, et al. (2008) <sup>57</sup>	2	NA	2	NA	0	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	NA	2	2	86 %	83%	0%	100 %	67%
Vardhana bhuti, et al. (2010) <sup>54</sup>	2	NA	2	2	2	0	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	80 %	83%	100 %	100 %	91%
Vardhana bhuti, et al. (2011) <sup>36</sup>	2	NA	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	2	2	71 %	50%	75%	100 %	74%
Vingerhods, et al. (2009) <sup>42</sup>	2	NA	2	0	0	0	NA	NA	1	NA	2	2	2	2	2	40 %	75%	100 %	100 %	79%
Vingerhods, et al. (2005) <sup>37</sup>	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	NA	2	0	81 %	83%	100 %	50 %	79%
Wang, et al. (2016) <sup>50</sup>	0	NA	0	2	0	0	NA	NA	0	NA	2	0	1	2	2	20 %	50%	25%	100 %	49%
Withers, et al. (2013) <sup>40</sup>	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	NA	2	0	100 %	83%	100 %	50 %	83%
Ye, et al. (2011) <sup>43</sup>	2	NA	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	86 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	96%

Yes= 2, No= 0, Ambiguous/ indirect =1, NA did not count towards scores,

DB: Detection bias, PB: Performance Bias, RQ: Reporting quality ,SB: Selection Bias,