

Supplementary Information

Title: The reporting of study limitations and hedging in articles with and without causal diagrams

Taísa Rodrigues Cortes^{*1}, Ismael Henrique Silveira², Michael Maia Schlussek³, Guilherme Loureiro Werneck^{1,4} and Claudio José Struchiner^{1,5}.

1. Institute of Social Medicine, State University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
2. Institute of Collective Health, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil.
3. UK EQUATOR Centre, Centre for Statistics in Medicine, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK.
4. Institute for Public Health Studies, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
5. School of Applied Mathematics, Getúlio Vargas Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

File S1 Details of the search strategies

Table S1 Hedge terms and context rules

File S2 Causal models

Figure S1 Study limitations and potential biases reported by the authors.

Table S2 Sensitivity analysis

File S3 Examples of the reporting of study limitations for each bias category

Table S2 Sensitivity analysis

Linear regression model	DAG	Non-DAG	Diference* (95% CI)
Frequency of terms for study limitations	6.73	4.77	1.82 (0.82, 2.81)
Hedging per 10 sentences	8.0	7.5	0.44 (-0.04, 0.92)
High uncertainty hedging per 100 words	0.03	0.03	-

Conditional logistic regression model	OR** (95% CI)	OR*** (95% CI)
Acknowledged of ≥ 4 study limitations	1.86 (1.11, 3.13)	1.76 (1.04, 3.01)
Quantitative assessment of bias	3.83 (2.03, 7.24)	4.08 (1.97, 8.48)

* Multiple linear regression models ajusted by journal impact factor, year of publication, research category, number of coauthors and native language of the first author.

** Model ajusted by journal and issue (as a strata).

*** Model ajusted by journal, issue, number of coauthors and native language of the first author.