



Buckland, N. J., Er, V., Redpath, I., & Beaulieu, K. (2018). Priming food intake with weight control cues: systematic review with a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-018-0698-9>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1186/s12966-018-0698-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-018-0698-9)

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)
PDF-document

University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

Additional file 1: search strategy:

Database: PsycINFO <1806 to January Week 3 2017>

- 1 Prime.mp.
- 2 Priming.mp.
- 3 Primed.mp.
- 4 Exposure.mp.
- 5 Cue\$.mp.
- 6 Reminder.mp.
- 7 Goal activation.mp.
- 8 Images.mp.
- 9 weight loss.mp. or Weight Loss/
10 diet.mp. or Diet/
- 11 Health goals.mp.
- 12 Slim.mp.
- 13 Weight control.mp.
- 14 Energy intake.mp. or Energy Intake/
15 Calori* intake.mp.
- 16 food intake.mp.
- 17 food consumption.mp.
- 18 eating behavio*.mp.
- 19 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (236807)
- 20 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 (32998)

21 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 (31110)

22 19 and 20 and 21 (540)

23 limit 22 to (english language and humans and ("adolescent (13 to 18 years)" or "young adult and adult (19-24 and 19-44)" or "middle age (45 to 64 years)).

Additional file 2. Risk of bias assessment

First author (year)	Sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel ⁱ	Blinding of outcome assessors ⁱⁱ	Incomplete outcome data ⁱⁱⁱ	Selective outcome	Other source of bias ^{iv}
Experimental studies							
Albarracin (2009); Study 1	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Albarracin (2009); Study 2	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Boland (2013); Study 2	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Bourn (2015)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Boyce (2013)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk
Boyce (2014)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk
Brunner (2012); Study 1	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Buckland (2013)	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Buckland (2014)	High risk	High risk ^v	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Buckland (unpublished)	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Harris (2009)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk
Harrison (2006)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Jansen (2002)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Mills (2002); Study 1	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Minas (2016)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk
Papies (2010)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Pelaez-Fernandez (2011)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Seddon & Berry (1996)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Sellahewa (2015)	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Stampfli (2016)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	High risk	High risk	High risk
Stampfli (2017); Study 1	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk
Stein (2016)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk
Strahan (2007); Study 1	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
van Kleef (2011)	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	High risk	High risk	High risk
Versluis (2016); Study 2	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Werle (2017); Pilot study	High risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk

ⁱBased on whether a cover story was used and believed by participants.

ⁱⁱBased on whether the experimenter who assessed food intake was blind to the study aims or condition administered.

ⁱⁱⁱBased on whether the exclusion of participants was specified in the exclusion criteria or exclusions deviated from standard procedures in the research field

^{iv}Based on risk of confounding variables influencing food intake [e.g. used piece count (susceptible to researcher bias), absence of procedures to control for appetite between conditions; social test settings; administering psychometric scales before assessing food intake].

^vNot reported in the paper but this study was conducted by the lead author of the meta-analysis (NB).

Additional file 3. Publication bias funnel plot

