

Additional file 1. ROSES for Systematic Map Reports. Version 1.0

November 2017
Neal R Haddaway, Biljana Macura, Paul Whaley, and Andrew Pullin

Column descriptions

Section/sub-section - The sections or sub-sections listed below correspond to sections in CEE systematic review and map protocols and final reports: please see the relevant text under these subheadings for information within a specific review.

Topic - the section or sub-section is further broken down for the purposes of clarity.

Description/Further explanation - Details of what is needed in each section or sub-section are provided, along with practical advice and links to relevant guidance.

Checklist/Meta-data - Checklist items MUST be completed. Meta-data items correspond to information that should be reported as data or short descriptions that will be used to populate the Summary Record and Flow Diagram. Any meta-data items where stages were not performed (e.g. grey literature searching), this should be stated (e.g. 'Not performed').

Author response - authors should select or write a response for meta-data, or select 'yes' or 'no' for checklist items. Further details may be provided in Comments (see below).

Comments - authors may supplement their response with a brief comment.

Please cite as: Haddaway NR, Macura B, Whaley P, and Pullin AS. 2017. ROSES for Systematic Map Reports. Version 1.0. DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.5897299.

Item number	Section/sub-section	Topic	Description	Further explanation	Checklist/meta-data	Author response	Comments
1	Title	Title	The title must indicate that it is a systematic map, and should indicate if it is an update/amendment; e.g. "...A systematic map update."	The title should normally be the same or very similar to the review question.	Meta-data	Effects of public policy interventions for environmentally sustainable food consumption: a systematic map of available evidence	
2	Type of review	Type of review	Select one of the following types of review: systematic map, systematic map update, systematic map amendment	See CEE Guidance on systematic mapping [1], and on amendments and updates [2]	Meta-data	Systematic map	
3	Authors' contacts	Authors' contacts	The full names, institutional addresses and email addresses for all authors must be provided. The abstract of the manuscript must not exceed 500 words and must be structured into separate sections: Background, the context and purpose of the review, including the review question; Methods, how the review was performed (specifically mention search strategy, inclusion criteria, critical appraisal (optional), meta-data extraction and coding, and narrative synthesis); Results, the main findings, including results of search and assessment of evidence base; Conclusions, brief summary and potential implications for policy/management and research. Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Reviews must indicate why this study was necessary and what it aims to contribute to the field.		Checklist	Yes	
4	Abstract	Structured summary	The actual role of stakeholders throughout the review process (e.g. in the formulation of the question) must be described and explained (using a broad definition of 'stakeholder', including e.g. researchers, funders and other decision-makers; see [3])	A theory of change and/or conceptual model should be presented that links the intervention or exposure to the outcome.	Checklist	Yes	
5	Background	Background			Checklist	Yes	
6	Stakeholder engagement	Stakeholder engagement			Checklist	Yes	
7	Objective of the review	Objective	Describe the primary question and secondary questions (when applicable).	The primary question is the main question of the review. The secondary questions are usually linked to sources of heterogeneity (effect modifiers).	Checklist	Yes Population: Private and public food consumption in any geographic or economic setting. Intervention: Public policy interventions with the explicit aim to achieve more environmentally sustainable food consumption patterns (implemented by national or sub-national governments or suggested). This includes policy interventions aimed at achieving change in consumption of e.g., meat, plant-based foods, deforestation-prone foods, or certified products. The intervention should have the end goal to directly or indirectly influence consumer choice towards more sustainable foods. Outcome: Anticipated or actual change in any type of environmental impacts of food production, or proves thereof including e.g., change in meat consumption, plant-based foods, consumption of deforestation prone foods or certified products. Studies that measure and/or discuss health outcomes only will not be included, although the interventions included in such studies, e.g., reduced overconsumption or consumption of red meat, might lead to environmental gains. Studies that do not explicitly measure environmental outcomes (directly or indirectly) will not be included.	
8	Methods	Definition of the question components	Provide reference to the question key elements, e.g. population(s), intervention(s)/exposure(s), comparator(s), and outcome(s).	For other question types see [4,5]	Meta-data		
9		Protocol	Provide citation, DOI or open-access link to published protocol. Describe any ways in which the final methods of the review deviate from those set out in the protocol along with a justification.	The protocol should be peer-reviewed and publicly available online (open access).	Meta-data	https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-022-00271-1	
10		Deviations from protocol	Detail the search strategy used, including: database names accessed, dates of searching, institutional subscriptions (or date ranges subscribed for each database), search options (e.g. "topic words" or "full text" search facility), efforts to source grey literature, other sources of evidence (e.g. hand searching, calls for evidence/submission of evidence by stakeholders).		Checklist	Yes	
11	Searches	Search strategy			Checklist	Yes Web of Science: Topic: (((food or meal* or diet or eating) NEAR/2 (purchas* or select* or choice* or reduc* or choose or decision or consum* or intake or behav* or habit*)) or "product select*" or "food products" or menu or "food environment" or "dietary pattern*" or catering or ((beverage* or grocery or groceries or fish or seafood or beef or meat or dairy or milk or vegetable* or legume* or "meat alternative" or "organic food" or "local food") NEAR/2 (consum* or choice* or choose or select* or market or demand* OR reduc*)) AND (policy or policies or legislat* or law* or ((label* or labi* or certifi*) NEAR/2 (food or ecol* or sustainab* or carbon or climate)) or ecolabi* or ecolabel* or eco-labi* or eco-label* or eco-certifi* or guideline* or guidance or incenti* or intervent* or nudg* or subdi* or stimu* or persua* or "voluntary agreement*" or roundtable* or forc* or innovat* or directive* or regulation or regulations or education or ((plate* or serving-size or "serving size") NEAR/1 ration*) or ((carbon or consum* or output or environmental) NEAR/2 (tax* or information or standard* or ban* or prohibit* or limit* or sanction*)) or "green criteria" or "green public procurement" or "public procurement") AND ("climate change" or "climatic change" or "global warming" or "greenhouse gases" or ghg or "greenhouse effect" or "greenhouse gas" or "carbon emission*" or "carbon footprint" or "water footprint" or "land use" or "biodiver*loss" or ecosystem or overfishing or pollution or "over fishing" or deforest* or reduction* NEAR/2 emission*) or (environment* NEAR/2 (impact* or consequence* or assess* or evaluat* or indicator* or mitigat*)) or "plant based food" or "plant-based food" or "planetary health diet" or plant-forward or "pro-environmental" or "local food" or "seasonal food" or "eat less" or overconsumption or overeating or flexitarian or vegan or vegetarian or pescetarian or "meat reduction" or "beef reduction" or (sustainab* NEAR/2 (consum* or diet* or food or fisher*))]]	
12		Search string	Provide Boolean-style full search string and state the platform for which the string is formatted (e.g. Web of Science format)		Meta-data		
13		Languages - bibliographic databases	List languages used in bibliographic database searches		Meta-data		
14		Languages – grey literature	List languages used in organisational website searches and web-based search engines		Meta-data	English, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish	
15		Bibliographic databases	Provide the number of bibliographic databases searched		Meta-data		5
16		Web-based search engines	Provide the number of web-based search engines searched		Meta-data		1
17		Organisational websites	Provide the number of organisational websites searched		Meta-data		28
18		Estimating comprehensiveness of the search	Describe the process by which the comprehensiveness of the search strategy was assessed (i.e. list of benchmark articles)		Checklist	Yes	
19		Search update	Describe any update to searches undertaken during the conduct of the review	Compulsory (if update performed). A search update is good practice if original searches were performed more than two years prior to review completion.	Checklist	No	
20		Article screening and study inclusion criteria	Describe the methodology for screening articles/studies for relevance. Methods for consistency of screening decisions (at title, abstract, and full texts levels) checking must be described.		Checklist	Yes	
21		Inclusion criteria	Describe the inclusion criteria used to assess relevance of identified articles/studies. These must be broken down into the question key elements (e.g. relevant subject(s), intervention(s)/exposure(s), comparator(s), outcome(s), study design(s)) and any other restrictions (e.g. date ranges or languages).		Checklist	Yes	
22	Critical appraisal	Critical appraisal strategy	Describe here the method used for critical appraisal of study validity (including assessment of individual studies and the evidence base as a whole). Describe how repeatability of critical appraisal of study validity was tested.	Optional	Checklist	No	
23		Critical appraisal used in synthesis	Describe how the information from critical appraisal was used in synthesis.	Compulsory if critical appraisal performed	Checklist	n/a	
24	Meta-data extraction and coding strategy	Meta-data extraction and coding strategy	Describe the method for meta-data extraction and coding for studies, providing lists of variables that will be extracted as meta-data and those that will be coded. Describe how repeatability of meta-data/data extraction and coding was tested.		Checklist	Yes	
25		Approaches to missing data	Describe any process for obtaining and confirming missing or unclear information or data from authors.		Checklist	Yes	
26	Data synthesis and presentation	Narrative synthesis strategy	Describe methods used for narratively synthesising the evidence base in the form of descriptive statistics, tables (including SM database) and figures.		Checklist	No	
27		Knowledge gap and cluster identification strategy	Describe the methods used to identify and/or prioritise key knowledge gaps (unrepresented or underrepresented subtopics that warrant further primary research) and knowledge clusters (well-represented subtopics that are amenable to full synthesis via systematic review).		Checklist	Yes	
28		Demonstrating procedural independence	Describe the role of systematic reviewers (who have also authored articles to be considered within the review) in decisions regarding inclusion or critical appraisal of their own work.	Reviewers who have authored articles to be considered within the review should be prevented from unduly influencing inclusion decisions, for example by delegating tasks appropriately.	Checklist	Yes	
29		Results (review findings)	Describe the review process including the volume of evidence identified from all sources and retained through each stage of the review. Must also display the number of articles/studies included at all stages of the review in a flow diagram, including the number of articles/studies excluded at each stage.		Checklist	Yes	
30		Number of search results	Provide the number of search results from bibliographic databases (including updates if conducted) prior to duplicate removal.	This number should not include web-based search engine or organisational website searches; this will help assessment of the efficiency of the primary search string.	Meta-data		27819
31		Number of search results after duplicate removal	Provide the total number of search results from bibliographic database searches following duplicate removal.	This number should not include web-based search engine or organisational website searches; this will help assessment of the efficiency of the primary search string.	Meta-data		19254
32		Full text screening excludes	Additional file containing list of and reasons for full text exclusions.		Checklist	Yes	
33		Title screening results	Provide the number of articles retained following title screening.	Optional if screening titles and abstracts together	Meta-data	NA	
34		Abstract screening results	Provide the number of articles retained following abstract screening.	Optional if screening titles and abstracts together	Meta-data	NA	
35		Title and abstract screening results	Provide the number of articles retained following title and abstract screening.	Optional if screening titles and abstracts separately	Meta-data		1605
36		Retrieval results	Provide the number of articles retrieved at full text.		Meta-data		1545
37		Unobtainable articles	Additional file containing list of unobtainable articles.		Checklist	Yes	
38		Full text screening results	Provide the number of articles retained following full text screening. Results of consistency checking at all stages (screening, meta-data extraction and coding, critical appraisal) must be provided. Provide the number of titles, abstracts and full texts screened and checked for consistency by two or more reviewers as a fraction of the total (e.g. Title: 2000/20000; Abstract: 500/5000; Full text: 10/100).		Meta-data		227
39		Consistency checking: screening			Checklist	Yes	Title/Abstract: 474/19254; Full text: 110/1545; Meta-data extraction 20/227

			Describe the body of evidence identified using figures and tables, avoiding vote-counting (tallying of studies based on results; direction or significance). Each must be presented with descriptive information (meta-data). Describe the validity of individual studies and the evidence base as a whole (if critical appraisal conducted).		
40		Narrative synthesis		Checklist	Yes
41		Systematic map database	Additional file containing meta-data and coding for included studies.	Checklist	Yes
42		Limitations of the review	Discuss possible limitations in the methods used.	Checklist	Yes
43		Limitations of the evidence base	Discuss possible limitations in the evidence base. Describe knowledge gaps (unrepresented or underrepresented subtopics that warrant further primary research) and knowledge clusters (well-represented subtopics that are amenable to full synthesis via systematic review)	Checklist	Yes
44	Conclusions	Knowledge gaps and clusters	Summarise the state of the evidence base and discuss the way in which the identified evidence may inform policy/practice decision making in relation to the review/map question.	Checklist	Yes
45		Implications for policy/management	Discussions must not include practical environmental management recommendations or advocacy.	Checklist	Yes
46		Implications for research	Discuss the way in which the identified evidence may inform research including options for increasing the reliability of study design that could improve future research.	Checklist	Yes
47	Declarations	Competing interests	Describe of any financial or non-financial competing interests that the review authors may have.	Checklist	Yes

References

[1] James, K.L., Randall, N.P. and Haddaway, N.R., 2016. A methodology for systematic mapping in environmental sciences. *Environmental Evidence*, 5(1), p.7.

[2] Bayliss, H.R., Haddaway, N.R., Eales, J., Frampton, G.K. and James, K.L., 2016. Updating and amending systematic reviews and systematic maps in environmental management. *Environmental Evidence*, 5(1), p.20.

[3] Haddaway, N.R., Kohl, C., da Silva, N.R., Schiemann, J., Spök, A., Stewart, R., Sweet, J.B. and Wilhelm, R., 2017. A framework for stakeholder engagement during systematic reviews and maps in environmental management. *Environmental Evidence* , 6(1), p.11.

[4] Collaboration for Environmental Evidence. 2018. Guidelines and Standards for Evidence synthesis in Environmental Management. Version 5.0. www.environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors.

[5] Leeds Institute of Health Sciences. https://medhealth.leeds.ac.uk/info/639/information_specialists/1500/search_concept_tools. Accessed 12/11/2017.