

1. Introduction: Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?
2. Methods: Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population or ecological (e.g. census tracts) base so that it closely represented the target/reference population or ecological context under investigation?
3. Methods: Was SEP measured with more than 1 single indicator?
4. Methods: Were SEP-variables adequately described or do the authors refer to other paper(s) where the variables are adequately described? Note: Indicate 'partly' if more SEP-indicators were measured, of which some are adequately described/referred to description, and some were not.
5. Methods: Were environmental variables adequately described or do the authors refer to other paper(s) where the variables are adequately described? Note: Indicate 'partly' if more environmental indicators were measured, of which some are adequately described/referred to description, and some were not.
6. Methods: Were the SEP- and environmental exposures measured within the same year (or one year before/after)? Note: Indicate 'partly' if more SEP-indicators were measured, of which some were measured within the same year or one year before/after, and some were not.
7. Methods: Was SEP analysed at individual level? Note: Indicate 'partly' if more SEP-indicators were measured, from which some were measured on individual level and some on a larger level.
8. Methods: Was missing data handling adequately described? E.g. Did the authors indicate that missing data was removed, or missing data was imputed, or something else?
9. Methods: Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?
10. Results: Were the basic data adequately described? E.g. Is their descriptives table understandable, is basic information on participants described, e.t.c.
11. Results: If appropriate, was information about non-responders described? Note: For ecological studies, this can be answered with 'not relevant'. Papers that use secondary data should also provide information about non-responders. Indicate 'no' if no information on non-response was provided.
12. Discussion: Were the limitations of the study discussed?
13. Other: Were funding sources and conflicts of interest disclosed? Note: Indicate 'partly' if either only the conflicts of interest or the funding source is disclosed.
14. Other: Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?

Question

- 1. Introduction: Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?
- 2. Methods: Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population or ecological (e.g. census tracts) base so that it closely represented the target/reference population or
- 3. Methods: Was SEP measured with more than 1 single indicator?
- 4. Methods: Were SEP-variables adequately described or do the authors refer to other paper(s) where the variables are adequately described?
- 5. Methods: Were environmental variables adequately described or do the authors refer to other paper(s) where the variables are adequately described?
- 6. Methods: Were the SEP- and environmental exposures measured within the same year (or one year before/after)?
- 7. Methods: Was SEP analysed at individual level?
- 8. Methods: Was missing data handling adequately described?
- 9. Methods: Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?
- 10. Results: Were the basic data adequately described?
- 11. Results: If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?
- 12. Discussion: Were the limitations of the study discussed?
- 13. Other: Were funding sources and conflicts of interest disclosed?
- 14. Other: Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?

Answer	Points	Relevant t	Overall quality
0	0	#DIV/0!	

- Options
- yes
 - partly
 - no/notstated
 - not relevant