

Supplemental Table 2c. ROBIS Rating

Item	Li 2013 ⁽¹⁾	Shin 2013 ⁽²⁾	Rong 2013 ⁽³⁾	Bechthold 2017 ⁽⁴⁾	Xu 2018 ⁽⁵⁾	Alexander 2016 ⁽⁶⁾	Djousse 2016 ⁽⁷⁾	Tamez 2016 ⁽⁸⁾	Wallin 2016 ⁽⁹⁾	Khawaja 2017 ⁽¹⁰⁾	Tian 2017 ⁽¹¹⁾	Schwinghabckl 2017 ⁽¹²⁾	Schwinghabckl 2017 ⁽¹³⁾	Rouhani 2017 ⁽¹⁴⁾	Zhang 2018 ⁽¹⁵⁾	Schlesinger 2019 ⁽¹⁶⁾	Geiker 2018 ⁽¹⁷⁾	Park 2018 ⁽¹⁸⁾	Mente 2009 ⁽¹⁹⁾	Kerley 2018 ⁽²⁰⁾	Kerley 2018 ⁽²¹⁾	Richard 2017 ⁽²²⁾	Tran 2014 ⁽²³⁾	
	META-ANALYSIS																SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS							
DOMAIN 1: STUDY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA																								
1.1 Did the review adhere to pre-defined objectives and eligibility criteria?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1.2 Were the eligibility criteria appropriate for the review question?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PN	PN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1.3 Were eligibility criteria unambiguous?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	N	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PN	PN	Y	PN	PN	Y	PN	
1.4 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on study characteristics appropriate (e.g. date, sample size, study quality, outcomes measured)?	PY	PY	Y	Y	PY	Y	NI	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	NI	NI	PN	PY	PY	Y	PY	PN
1.5 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on sources of information appropriate (e.g. publication status or format, language, availability of data)?	PN	N	Y	PY	NI	N	N (English)	PY	NI	N	NI	N	PY	PY	NI	N	NI	NI	N	N	N	Y	N	
Concerns regarding specification of study eligibility criteria (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	UNCLEAR	UNCLEAR	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	
DOMAIN 2: IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF STUDIES																								
2.1 Did the search include an appropriate range of databases/electronic sources for published and unpublished reports?	PN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NI	Y	PN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.2 Were all relevant databases additional to database searching used to identify relevant reports?	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
2.3 Were the terms and structure of the search strategy likely to retrieve as many eligible studies as possible?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PN	Y	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PN	NI	PN	PY	PY	PY	PY	
2.4 Were restrictions based on date, publication format, or language appropriate?	PY	N	PY	PY	NI	N	N	PY	PY	N	NI	N	PY	PY	PY	PY	NI	NI	N	N	N	N	N	
2.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in selection of studies?	NI	Y	N	NI	NI	Y	NI	PY	Y	NI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NI	NI	Y	N	N	Y	NI	
Concerns regarding methods used to identify and/or select studies (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	UNCLEAR	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	UNCLEAR	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	UNCLEAR	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
DOMAIN 3: DATA COLLECTION AND STUDY APPRAISAL																								
3.1 Were efforts made to minimise error in data collection?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NI	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
3.2 Were sufficient study characteristics available for both review authors and readers to be able to interpret the results?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	PY	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
3.3 Were all relevant study results collected for use in the synthesis?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	NI	PY	NI	NI	PY	PY	
3.4 Was risk of bias (or methodological quality) formally assessed using appropriate criteria?	N	PY	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
3.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in risk of bias assessment?	N	NI	Y	NI	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	NI	NI	Y	NI	NI	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	
Concerns regarding the methods used to collect data and appraise studies (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
DOMAIN 4: SYNTHESIS AND FINDINGS																								
4.1 Did the synthesis include all studies that it should?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4.2 Were all pre-defined analyses reported or departures explained?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4.3 Was the synthesis appropriate given the nature and similarity in the research questions, study designs and outcomes across included studies?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4.4 Was between-study variation (heterogeneity) minimal or addressed in the synthesis?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4.5 Were the findings robust, e.g. as demonstrated through funnel plot or sensitivity analyses?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4.6 Were biases in primary studies minimal or addressed in the synthesis?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	PY	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Concerns regarding the synthesis and findings (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SUMMARY																								
1. Risk of bias in review (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH
2. Risk of bias in included studies (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	UNCLEAR	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	UNCLEAR	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
3. Risk of bias in data collection and study appraisal (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	UNCLEAR	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH
4. Risk of bias in synthesis and findings (LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR)	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

1. Li Y, Zhou C, Zhou X *et al.* (2013) Egg consumption and risk of cardiovascular diseases and diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Atherosclerosis* 229, 524-30.
2. Shin JY, Jun P, Nakamura Y *et al.* (2013) Egg consumption in relation to risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 98, 146-59.
3. Rong Y, Chen L, Zhu T *et al.* (2013) Egg consumption and risk of coronary heart disease and stroke: dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* 346, e8539.
4. Bechthold A, Boeing H, Schwedhelm C *et al.* (2017) Food groups and risk of coronary heart disease, stroke and heart failure: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*, 1-20.
5. Xu L, Lam TH, Jiang CQ *et al.* (2018) Egg consumption and the risk of cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality: Guangzhou Biobank Cohort Study and meta-analyses. *Eur J Nutr*.
6. Alexander DD, Miller PE, Vargas AJ *et al.* (2016) Meta-analysis of Egg Consumption and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease and Stroke. *J Am Coll Nutr* 35, 704-16.
7. Djousse L, Khawaja OA, Gaziano JM. (2016) Egg consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Am J Clin Nutr* 103, 474-80.
8. Tamez M, Virtanen JK, Lajous M. (2016) Egg consumption and risk of incident type 2 diabetes: a dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Br J Nutr* 115, 2212-8.
9. Wallin A, Forouhi G, Wolk A *et al.* (2016) Egg consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes: a prospective study and dose-response meta-analysis. *Diabetologia* 59, 1204-13.
10. Khawaja O, Singh H, Lun F *et al.* (2017) Egg Consumption and Incidence of Heart Failure: A Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Front Nutr* 4, 10.
11. Tian S, Xu Q, Jiang R *et al.* (2017) Dietary Protein Consumption and the Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *Nutrients* 9.
12. Schwedhelm L, Heimann G, Campbell AM *et al.* (2017) Food groups and risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Eur J Epidemiol* 32, 363-75.
13. Schwinghabckl P, Schwedhelm C, Geyffert G *et al.* (2017) Food Groups and Risk of Hyperglycemia: A Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of Prospective Studies. *Adv Nutr* 8, 793-803.
14. Rouhani MI, Resaliyi S, Farahmand N, Salehi Atashkenasi M *et al.* (2010) Effects of Egg Consumption on Blood Lipids: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. *J Am Coll Nutr* 37, 99-110.
15. Zhang Y, Zhang DZ. (2018) Red meat, poultry, and egg consumption with the risk of hypertension: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *J Hum Hypertens*.
16. Schlesinger S, Neuenschwander M, Schwedhelm C *et al.* (2019) Food Groups and Risk of Overweight, Obesity, and Weight Gain: A Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of Prospective Studies. *Adv Nutr* 10, 205-18.
17. Geiker NRW, Larsen ML, Dyerberg J *et al.* (2018) Egg consumption, cardiovascular diseases and type 2 diabetes. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 72, 44-56.
18. Park SJ, Jung JH, Choi SW *et al.* (2018) Association between Egg Consumption and Metabolic Disease. *Korean J Food Sci Anim Resour* 38, 209-23.
19. Mente A, de Koning L, Shannon HS *et al.* (2009) A systematic review of the evidence supporting a causal link between dietary factors and coronary heart disease. *Arch Intern Med* 169, 659-69.
20. Kerley CP. (2018) Dietary patterns and components to prevent and treat heart failure: a comprehensive review of human studies. *Nutr Rev*, 1-27.
21. Kerley CP. (2018) A Review of Plant-based Diets to Prevent and Treat Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev* 4, 54-61.
22. Richard C, Cristall L, Fleming E *et al.* (2017) Impact of Egg Consumption on Cardiovascular Risk Factors in Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes and at Risk for Developing Diabetes: A Systematic Review of Randomized Nutritional Intervention Studies. *Can J Diabetes* 41, 453-63.
23. Tran NL, Barraj LM, Heilman JM *et al.* (2014) Egg consumption and cardiovascular disease among diabetic individuals: a systematic review of the literature. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 7, 121-37.