Supplementary

Soft drink consumption associated with depression symptoms among the general population: Consistent and robust evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis

Supplementary Files

Supplementary Table 1	Prisma checklist
Supplementary Table 2	Database search strategy
Supplementary Table 3	Newcastle-Ottawa scale for risk of bias assessment of cross-sectional studies included in the meta-analysis
Supplementary Table 4	Newcastle-Ottawa scale for risk of bias assessment of cohort studies included in the meta-analysis
Supplementary Table 5	Meta regression
Supplementary Table 6	Cohen's Kappa
Supplementary Figure 1	Leave-one-out analysis

Supplementary 1: PRISMA checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 3-4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page 4-5
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 4
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary Table 1
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 4
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 5
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 5
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 5-6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Page 6
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Page 6
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 6
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Page 6
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Page 6
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Page 6
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 6
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Page 6

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Page 5
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Page 7-9, Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Page 14, Figure 3
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Page 5-14, table1
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Page 11-13, figure2, 3, table2
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Page 11-13, figure2, 3, table2
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Suplymentary table 5
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Suplymentary table 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Page 14, Figure 3
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Suplymentary table 3,4
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Page 14-18
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page 14-18
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Page 14-18
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page 14-18
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	CRD42024506955
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Not applicable
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Not applicable
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Pgae 18
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 18
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Not applicable
Certainty ...ment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	-

Source: *Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal. Pmed 1000097*
For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Supplementary Table 2: Database search strategy

Table S1. Database search strategy

Database	Search strategy	Number of studies
Pubmed	(((Sweetened OR carbonated OR soft) AND (beverage OR beverages OR drink OR drinks) OR (carbonated beverages) OR (Soda) AND (Depressive symptom OR depressive symptoms OR emotional depression OR emotional depressions OR depression symptom OR depression symptoms)	1,255
Scopus	(((Sweetened OR Carbonated OR Soft) AND (Beverage OR Beverages OR Drink OR Drinks)) OR Carbonated beverages OR Soda OR Soft drinks OR Soft drink) AND (Depressive symptom OR Depressive symptoms OR Emotional depression OR Emotional depressions OR Depression symptom OR Depression symptoms)	8
Cochrane Library	(((Sweetened OR Carbonated OR Soft) AND (Beverage OR Beverages OR Drink OR Drinks)) OR Carbonated beverages OR Soda OR Soft drinks OR Soft drink) AND (Depressive symptom OR Depressive symptoms OR Emotional depression OR Emotional depressions OR Depression symptom OR Depression symptoms)	64
MedRxiv	(((Sweetened OR carbonated OR soft) AND (beverage OR beverages OR drink OR drinks) OR (carbonated beverages) OR (Soda))) AND (Depressive symptom OR depressive symptoms OR emotional depression OR emotional depressions OR depression symptom OR depression symptoms)	89
Epistemonikos	(((Sweetened OR carbonated OR soft) AND (beverage OR beverages OR drink OR drinks) OR (carbonated beverages) OR (Soda))) AND (Depressive symptom OR depressive symptoms OR emotional depression OR emotional depressions OR depression symptom OR depression symptoms)	15
Total		**1,431**

Supplementary Table 3 Newcastle-Ottawa scale for risk of bias assessment of cross-sectional studies included in the meta-analysis

No.	Studíe	Selection				Comparability (2)	Outcome		Total (Max = 8)
		Representativeness of the sample (1)	Sample size (1)	Non-respondents (1)	Ascertainment of the exposure (disease) (1)		Assessment of the outcome (1)	Statistical test (1)	
1	Lazarevich I, et, al. (2017)	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	7
2	Yu B, et al. (2015)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
3	Shi Z, et, al. (2010)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
4	Knüppel, A, et, al. (2017)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
5	Pérez-Ara MÁ, et, al. (2020)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
6	Kim J, et,al. (2021)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
7	Ruiz-Cabello P, et, al. (2016)	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	7
8	Ra JS (2022)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
9	Liu J, et, al. (2022)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8
10	Li P, et, al. (2023)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8

Supplementary Table 4. Newcastle-Ottawa scale for risk of bias assessment of cohort studies included in the meta-analysis

No.	Studíe	Selection				Comparability (2)	Outcome			Total (max = 9)
		Representativeness of exposed cohort (1)	Selection of non-exposed (1)	Ascertainment of exposure (1)	Outcome not present at start (1)		Assessment of the outcome (1)	Adequate follow-up length (1)	Adequacy of follow-up (1)	
1	Kashino I, et, al. (2021)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
2	Castro A, et,al. (2023)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
3	Guo X, et,al. (2014)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
4	Park SK, et, al. (2023)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
5	Sanchez-Villegas A, et al. (2017)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	9

Supplementary Table 5: Meta regression

Heterogeneity	Coefficients	Std.Err	p-value
Study design (Cross-sectional study)	0.13	0.17	*0.51*
Type drink (SSBs + SSCBs)	0.44	0.13	***0.03***
Type drink (SSCBs)	0.23	0.22	*0.35*
Year (Above 2020)	-0.14	0.25	*0.60*
Year (Below 2015)	0.12	0.24	*0.63*
Country (The America)	-0.07	0.22	*0.76*
Country (Western Pacific region)	0.18	0.24	*0.49*
Exposure (Other)	0.08	0.14	*0.59*
Smoking	-0.28	0.22	*0.28*
BMI	0.23	0.22	*0.37*

Supplementary Table 6: Cohen's Kappa

Phase of review	Reviewer agreement table	Cohen's K	Cohen's Kappa	Interpretation
Screeing phase	2×2 contingency table	0.67	95.0	Substantial agreement
Quality assessment phase	2×2 contingency table	0.73	90.4	Substantial agreement

Supplementary Figure 1: Leave-one-out analysis