SUPPLEMENT A.

Papers graded ‘C’ and excluded, with reason for ‘C’/exclusion


**Reason:** Long recall period


**Reason:** Long recall period


**Reason:** Intervention diet not clearly defined, fish intake not reported in sufficient detail


**Reason:** Source population not well defined. Fish intake not reported in sufficient detail


**Reason:** Endpoints are intermediate


**Reason:** The study is focused on dietary cholesterol, and not on fish intake


**Reason:** Weak on inclusion and ascertainment of confounding factors


**Reason:** Fish intake not reported in sufficient detail


**Reason:** Several weaknesses, particularly fish intake not reported in sufficient detail, and weak on inclusion and ascertainment of confounding factors


**Reason:** Weak on inclusion and ascertainment of confounding factors


**Reason:** Response rate not reported/not acceptable, and dietary pattern nor relevant for the Norwegian population


**Reason:** Study design not suited to test the research hypothesis


**Reason:** Study design not suited to test the research hypothesis, response rate not reported/acceptable, weak on defining confounding factors, by chance findings not considered.


**Reason:** Wrong study design (cross-sectional)


**Reason:** Research question not clearly formulated, study design not suited to test the research hypothesis, fish intake not well described, and confounding factors not well reported and handled


**Reason:** Unclear aim, multiple hypotheses. Fish included primarily as a source of iodine. Unclear whether confounding factors were taken into account


**Reason:** Study design not suited to test the research hypothesis

**Reason:** High drop-out


**Reason:** Fish consumption only divided into consumers/non-consumers


**Reason:** Fish consumption only continuous variable


**Reason:** Study design not suited to test the research hypothesis, source population not clearly defined, response rate not reported/not acceptable, fish intake not described in sufficient detail, weak confounder description/handling


**Reason:** Fish intake not relevant for the Norwegian diet. Weak in the description of methods such as period of data collection and case status


**Reason:** Lack of proper statistics, study population was stratified in a particular manner but the methodology to correct for this was not available


**Reason:** Research question not well defined, outcome not well described, inclusion/exclusion criteria not well defined


**Reason:** Fish consumption only divided into consumers/non-consumers


**Reason:** The study design is not suited to test the research hypothesis, and confounders were not adequately handled

Reason: The primary exposure was cord blood mercury, fish intake was assessed and taken into account, but no associations between fish intake and outcomes were reported


Reason: Confounding factors could not be identified, and no adjustments are performed


Reason: The research question is not well defined


Reason: Exposure is not adequately described


Reason: The study population is not suited to contribute generalizable evidence on the health effects of fish consumption since those exposed to fish were highly exposed to an environmental toxicant


Reason: Lacking information on the FFQ related to fish exposure. Recall bias uncertain


Reason: The modelling is not well described


Reason: Pilot study. Unclear if conditional log regression has been used. Possible selection bias, and fish intake dichotomized


Reason: Period of recruitment not well defined, case status not clearly ascertained, criteria for inclusion/exclusion not well described, recall bias not considered, and confounders not adequately handled

Reason: Mechanistic study


Reason: Research question not clearly formulated, insufficient number of outcomes/cases (small study population)


Reason: Several weaknesses, low quality method for diet registration, no total energy adjustment, and no BMI reported. Selection criteria unclear


Reason: Analyses is performed on group-level and cannot be included


Reason: The study design is not suited to test the research hypothesis (cross-sectional for adults, retrospective for children)


Reason: Confounders not well ascertained or considered


Reason: Recall bias is not considered, cases are not only incident cases (also prevalence)


Reason: The study design is not suited to test the research hypothesis

Lv Y., Kraus V.B., Gao X., Yin Z., Zhou J., Mao C., Duan J., Zeng Y., Brasher M.S., Shi W., Shi X. (2019) Higher dietary diversity scores and protein-rich food consumption were associated with lower risk of all-cause mortality in the oldest old.

Reason: Fish intake is only categorized as consumers/non-consumers

**Reason:** Have only included self-caught fish. Several confounders relevant for the outcome has not been ascertained (e.g., folate status). Low number of study participants to study this particular outcome


**Reason:** Fish intake is not relevant for Norwegian diet. Cross-sectional design.


**Reason:** Low responser rate (17%) and a population that is not representative. No power calculation, low power due to low sample size


**Reason:** The study design is not suited to answer the research question. Questionable sampling, no response rate reported, high attrition, no power calculation, small sample, unclear statistics


**Reason:** Fish intake not well described, unclear objective and unclear statistics


**Reason:** Low response rate. Very small study sample, unclear statistics


**Reason:** Selection bias, low number of cases


**Reason:** Analyses is of low quality, important confounders missing

**Reason:** Analyses is of low quality, important confounders missing


**Reason:** Fish intake is only described as consumers/non-consumers

Park Y. (2010) Intakes of vegetables and related nutrients such as vitamin B complex, potassium, and calcium, are negatively correlated with risk of stroke in Korea 4:303-10.

**Reason:** Study focusing on vegetables and nutrients, not fish


**Reason:** Fish intake is only described as consumers/non-consumers


**Reason:** The study design is not suitable to answer the research question. Two population samples are used, one had a population with high prevalence of depression, while the other was cross-sectional


**Reason:** Fish intake not described in sufficient detail, only oily fish assessed


**Reason:** Fish intake not described in sufficient detail, only oily fish assessed


**Reason:** Fish intake not described in sufficient detail


**Reason:** Time period of baseline examinations not clearly identified, several other weaknesses

Reason: Recall bias, dietary assessment (5Y after pregnancy)


Reason: No dietary assessment at baseline, no reported response rate, no reported compliance, small sample size


Reason: Fish intake not reported in sufficient detail


Reason: Fish intake is dichotomized (high/low) and continuous. Cannot be used for our purpose


Reason: The study was based on a prospective follow up of participants in a cohort, but the data regarding fish consumption and HSCL-25 were collected cross-sectionally


Reason: Important confounders are not ascertained


Reason: Fish intake is not linked to the outcome


Reason: Fish intake and outcome is not examined in the same group of study participants


Reason: Assessment of fish intake and outcome was assessed at the same time point in pregnancy (week 32).

Reason: Important confounders are missing, FFq not validated, only fatty fish included


Reason: Exposure groups are based on the age at fish introduction, not fish intake amounts


Reason: Intermediate endpoint


Reason: The diet is reported by relatives after cases’ deaths


Reason: Important confounders not ascertained. Analyses unadjusted, only p-values