Supplementary Materials

Search Strategy

PubMed and Scopus' search strategy: (“Pregnant Women”[Title/Abstract]) OR (pregnancy[Title/Abstract] OR Pregnant Women[Title/Abstract] OR Pregnancy[Title/Abstract] OR pregnancy OR Prenatal Care[Title/Abstract] OR Maternal Health[Title/Abstract]) AND (Diet[Title/Abstract] OR dietary[Title/Abstract]) AND (Microbiota[Title/Abstract] OR microbiome OR Gastrointestinal Microbiome[Title/Abstract] OR "Gut Flora" OR "Gut Bacteria" OR "Intestinal Bacteria") AND (Maternal outcomes OR maternal health OR "pregnancy outcomes" OR "Pregnancy Complications"[Title/Abstract]).

Embase's search strategy: ('diet'/exp OR 'diet' OR 'dietary intake'/exp OR 'dietary intake')AND('microflora'/exp OR microflora OR 'microbiome'/exp OR 'microbiome' OR 'intestine flora'/exp OR 'intestine flora') AND ('pregnant woman'/exp OR 'pregnant woman' OR 'pregnancy'/exp OR pregnancy OR 'prenatal care'/exp OR 'prenatal care' OR 'perinatal period'/exp OR 'perinatal period') AND ('maternal outcome'/exp OR 'maternal outcome' OR 'maternal welfare'/exp OR 'maternal welfare' OR 'pregnancy outcome'/exp OR 'pregnancy outcome' OR 'pregnancy complication'/exp OR 'pregnancy complication' OR 'pregnancy disorder'/exp OR 'pregnancy disorder' OR 'adverse pregnancy outcome'/exp OR 'adverse pregnancy outcome' OR 'perinatal outcome'/exp OR 'perinatal outcome').

Table 3 - ROB2 bias assessment

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall
Urwin, 2014						
Sugino, 2022						

Green: Low risk. Blue: Unclear . Yellow: Some concerns for bias. Red: High risk.

Supplementary material 2: domains for the ROB2 assessment:

D1: Bias arising from the randomization process

D2: Bias due to deviation from intended intervention

D3: Bias due to missing outcome data

D4: Bias in measurement of the outcomes

D5: Bias in selection of the reported results

CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection

1) Is the case definition adequate?

a) yes, with independent validation ✷

b) yes, eg record linkage or based on self reports

c) no description

2) Representativeness of the cases

a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases ✷

b) potential for selection biases or not stated

3) Selection of Controls

a) community controls ✷

b) hospital controls

c) no description

4) Definition of Controls

a) no history of disease (endpoint) ✷

b) no description of source

Comparability

1) Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis

a) study controls for _____ (Select the most important factor.) ✷

b) study controls for any additional factor ✷ (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Exposure

1) Ascertainment of exposure

a) secure record (eg surgical records) ✷

b) structured interview where blind to case/control status ✷

c) interview not blinded to case/control status

d) written self report or medical record only

e) no description

2) Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls

a) yes ✷

b) no

3) Non-Response rate

a) same rate for both groups ✷

b) non respondents described

c) rate different and no designation

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE
COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability

Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

a) truly representative of the average _____ (describe) in the community ✷

b) somewhat representative of the average _____ in the community ✷

c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers

d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort ✷

b) drawn from a different source

c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure

a) secure record (eg surgical records) ✷

b) structured interview ✷

c) written self report

d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

a) yes ✷

b) no

Comparability

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

a) study controls for _____ (select the most important factor) ✷

b) study controls for any additional factor ✷ (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

a) independent blind assessment ✷
b) record linkage ✷
c) self report
d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur

a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) ✷
b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for ✷
b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > ____ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) ✷
c) follow up rate < ____% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
d) no statement

REFERENCES - APA 7

1. Wells, G., Shea, B., O'Connell, D., Peterson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., Tugwell, P. (2013) The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp