



SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Nutrition Education and Dietetics Infant, Child, and Adolescent Nutrition

Association Between Food and Nutrition Literacy and Nutritional Status: A Systematic Review

Dewi Kholilatur Rohmaniyah Widya Rahmawati Irma Sarita Rahmawati

Universitas Brawijaya, Faculty of Health Science/Department of Nutrition, Puncak Dieng Eksklusif, Kunci, Kalisongo, Dau, Kabupaten Malang, Jawa Timur 65151, Indonesia.
dewikholila@student.ub.ac.id / wrahmawati.fk@ub.ac.id / irma_sr@ub.ac.id

Table S1. Quality Assessment Using JBI Critical Appraisal – Cross sectional

No	Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Score	Quality
1	Ashoori <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
2	Zhixue <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
3	Uzdil <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
4	Yin <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
5	Kocaay & Şanlier (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
6	Ayer & Ergin (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
7	Yurtdas Depboyulu <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
8	Priambudi & Farapti (2023)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias
9	Syafei & Badriyah (2019)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias
10	Taleb & Itani (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
11	El-Ahmady & El-Wakeel (2017)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias
12	Mostafazadeh <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
13	Svendsten <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias
14	Sanlier <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
15	Du <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
16	Papežová <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
17	Mahmudiono <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias
18	Maheri <i>et al.</i> (2022)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7/8 (87.5%)	Low risk of bias
19	Tezol & Mammadova (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7/8 (87.5%)	Low risk of bias
20	Costarelli <i>et al.</i> (2022)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
21	Xia <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
22	Tang <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/8 (100%)	Low risk of bias
23	Boariu <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	6/8 (75%)	Low risk of bias

Table S2. Quality Assessment Using JBI Critical Appraisal – RCT

No	Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Score	Quality
1	Sirajuddin <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	11/13 (84.6%)	Low risk of bias

Table S3. Quality Assessment Using JBI Critical Appraisal – Quasi Experimental Studies

No	Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Score	Quality
1	Sudaryati <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	7/9 (77.7%)	Low risk of bias
2	Bozkurt & Yildiran (2024)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9 (88.8%)	Low risk of bias
3	Hamilton-Reeves <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9/9 (100%)	Low risk of bias

High quality/low risk of bias: 75–100%

Moderate quality/moderate risk of bias: 50–74%

Low quality/high risk of bias: 0–49%