SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Annex 1

The search terms used were as follows:

- #1'anaphylaxis'/exp OR anaphylaxis OR anaphylactic OR anaphylactoid OR 'acute systemic allergic reaction' OR 'acute systemic allergic reactions' OR 'acute allergic reaction*' OR 'systemic allergic reaction*' OR 'severe allergic reaction*' OR 'life threatening allergic reaction'
- #2'incidence'/exp OR incidence OR 'prevalence'/exp OR prevalence OR epidemiolog* OR 'cross sectional stud*' OR 'cohort analy*' OR 'longitudinal stud*' OR 'prospective stud*' OR 'retrospective stud*' OR 'cohort stud*' OR morbidit* OR regist*
- #3'mortality'/exp OR mortality OR 'fatal* death' OR (fatal* AND ('death'/exp OR death)) OR die
- #4 #1 AND #2 AND #3

Modified from Umasunthar T, Leonardi-Bee J, Turner PJ, Hodes M, Gore C, Warner JO, et al. Incidence of food anaphylaxis in people with food allergy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Exp Allergy. 2015 Nov;45(11):1621-36.

We performed the search in the PubMed/MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Web of Science databases. The search syntax was used first in the EMBASE database, although it also ran well in the other 2 databases (PubMed/MEDLINE and WOS).

doi: 10.18176/jiaci.0693

Annex 2

External validity
1. Was the study's target population a close representation of the national population in relation to relevant variables?
2. Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?
3. Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR was a census undertaken?
4. Was the likelihood of nonresponse bias minimal?

Internal validity
5. Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to a proxy)?
6. Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?
7. Was the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest shown to have validity and reliability?
8. Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?
9. Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?
10. Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate?
11. Summary item on the overall risk of study bias

Risk of bias:
Low risk of bias: 8 or more "✓" answers; Moderate risk of bias: 6 to 7 "✓" answers; High risk of bias: 5 or fewer "✓" answers.

Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. J Clin Epidemiol. 2012 Sep;65(9):934-9.

doi: 10.18176/jiaci.0693