

Title: The association between food insecurity and academic performance among higher education students: A systematic review.

Journal: Current Nutrition Reports

Table S1 Quality assessment of included studies (*N*=47) in a systematic review on the association between food insecurity and academic performance.

First Author’s Initials, Year, Country	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8	Question 9	Question 10	Question 1 1	Overall Rating ^c
Cross-sectional studies ^a												
ANSS, 2021&2022 Malaysia	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
AT, 2025, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
AA, 2024, Jordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
BM, 2023, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
BNA, 2024, Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
BN, 2023, Australia	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good

CK, 2019, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
CC, 2022, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
CM, 2020, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
DR, 2021, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
EZA, 2019, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
FNF,2023, Malaysia	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
FK, 2025, Canada	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
FL, 2019, Canada	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
GME, 2023, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
HR, 2019, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
HR, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
HRH, 2024, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
HC, 2025, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
HC, 2023, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
HM, 2021, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good

HA, 2020, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
IE, 2024, Nigeria	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
KR, 2024, Saudi Arabia	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
MC, 2022, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
MM, 2015, USA,	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
MS, 2020, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
MH, 2024, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
MLM, 2016, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
MEM, 2025, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
ONM, 2017, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
PLM, 2014, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
PSD, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
PE, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
RBM, 2024, Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
RRA, 2021, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good

SS, 2024, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
TJJ, 2022, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
TK, 2024, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
UM, 2023, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
VI, 2023, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
VWI, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
WR, 2019, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
WR, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
ZB, 2025, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good
ZVA, 2021, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair
Longitudinal studies ^b												
First Author's Initials, Year, Country	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8	Question 9	Question 10	Question 11	Overall Rating
RIG, 2018, USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

^aThe following 8 questions were used for the cross-sectional studies:

Question 1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? Question 2: Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? Question 3: Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? Question 4: Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? (Not applicable in this review) Question 5: Were confounding factors identified? Question 6: Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Question 7: Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Question 8: Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

^bThe following 11 questions were used for the longitudinal study: Question 1: Were the two groups similar & recruited from the same population? Question 2: Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? Question 3: Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? Question 4: Were confounding factors identified? Question 5: Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Question 6: Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study or at the moment of exposure? (This question was not applicable in this review). Question 7: Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Question 8: Was the follow up time reported and sufficient enough for outcomes to occur? Question 9: Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? Question 10: Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? Question 11: Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

^cOverall rating: To rate the quality of the evidence as good, fair, or poor for each study, we used the following criteria: good (all 'yes' or 'not applicable' ratings), fair (1 to 2 'no' or 'unclear ratings'), and poor (3 or more 'no' or 'unclear' ratings) as adapted from (Shi et al., 2021)

^dUnclear: if authors were not explicit on the item

^eN/A: Not applicable