

REFLECT FORM MODIFICATIONS

Modifications to the REFLECT statement items when translating them into the form of questions for the comprehensive reporting assessment form included:

- Item 3 (eligibility and setting/location) has three components; however, the reviewer was not asked whether the owner/manager eligibility was reported, as prior experience suggested studies would not report this, and therefore this question would always be no. It was considered preferable to focus on the more critical factors. The reviewer was required to specify both whether the study unit eligibility was reported and whether the setting was described. For reviewers to consider the setting to have been adequately described, the investigators had to provide some information about the housing (e.g., pen size, type of flooring). It was not sufficient for investigators to say, for example, "a 1500-sow farm". A yes response indicates both items are reported.
- For item 5, the reviewers scored this a "Yes" if both objectives and hypothesis were reported in the methods and materials.
- Item 4-B is only relevant for challenge studies, and this item includes four separate aspects of reporting. It was assessed if the authors described: organism growth details, route of administration and dose of the organism or if a seeder pig model was used.
- For item 6, a primary outcome was considered to have been reported if the investigators used the term "primary" or "main" or if the outcome was used in the calculation of the sample size.
- Reviewers were only required to answer items 8,9, and 10 if the investigators described the allocation as random (not pseudorandom or systematic randomization).

- For item 8, investigators were considered to have reported the method used to generate the truly random allocation sequence if they use the term computer-generated, "flipping a coin", or "generated by a statistician". A statement that the sequence was random was not sufficient.
- For item 10, if the answer was no then the reviewers were required to specify which of the required three pieces of information was missing (i.e., who generated the allocation sequence, who enrolled the study units, and who assigned the study units to the intervention groups).
- For Item 11 the reviewer was required to separately specify whether blinding occurred in the people administering the interventions, the caregivers (these had to be identified by the investigators using the terms "caretakers" or "caregivers"), the outcome assessors and the data analysts. If blinding was reported for at least one of these options, the reviewers answered as a "Yes".
- For item 16, the reviewers scored this a "Yes" if the numbers were reported for at least one of the outcomes reported in the methods and materials.
- Reviewers were only required to answer item 18 if the investigators described that the study had 2 or more arms. Multiplicity was assessed for the primary outcome and including p-value adjustment methods included Tukey's test, Duncan's new multiple range test, Fisher's least significant difference, and the Bonferroni method.