

Table A5. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEC-list.

Author(s)	Is the study population clearly described?	Are competing alternatives clearly described?	Is a well-defined research question posed in answerable form?	Is the economic study design appropriate to the stated objective?	Is the chosen time horizon appropriate to include relevant costs and consequences?
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unverifiable
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unverifiable
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unverifiable
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Keefe, 1994	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Birch, 1990	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Doessel, 1985	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Niessen and Douglass,	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not reported	Yes
Dowell, 1976	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not reported	Yes
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Table A5. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEC-list.

Author(s)	Is the actual perspective chosen appropriate?	Are all important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?	Are all costs measured appropriately in physical units?	Are costs valued appropriately?	Are all important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Yes	No	Unverifiable	Yes
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Not applicable
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	No
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	Yes	No	Unverifiable	Yes
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Yes	Yes	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Yes	Yes	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
O'Keefe, 1994	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	No
Birch, 1990	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	No
Doessel, 1985	No	No	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
Niessen and Douglass,	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	No
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
Dowell, 1976	Yes	No	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable
Nelson and Swint, 1976	No	No	No	Unverifiable	Not applicable

Table A5. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEC-list.

Author(s)	Are all outcomes measured appropriately?	Are outcomes valued appropriately?	Is an incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	No	Yes
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Keefe, 1994	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Birch, 1990	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Doessel, 1985	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
Niessen and Douglass,	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dowell, 1976	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No

Table A5. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEC-list.

Author(s)	Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?	Does the study discuss the generalizability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups	Does the article indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?	Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Yes	No	Yes	No
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	Yes	No	No
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Yes	Yes	No	No
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Yes	No	No	No
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Yes	Yes	No	No
O'Keefe, 1994	Yes	No	No	No
Birch, 1990	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Doessel, 1985	Yes	No	No	No
Niessen and Douglass,	Yes	No	No	No
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Yes	No	No	No
Dowell, 1976	Yes	No	No	No
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Yes	No	No	No

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Title	Abstract	Background & objectives	Health economic analysis plan	Target population and subgroups
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Title.	Scientific summary, xxxiii-xxxvi.	Scientific summary, xxxiii-xxxvi.	Not reported.	Methods, p.27-29.
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Not reported	Abstract, p.1.	Background section, p.2.	Not reported.	Forecasting the health benefits of fluoridation, p.2 - 3.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Not reported.	Abstract, p. 224.	Introduction, last paragraph, p. 2225.	Not reported.	Study data and methods, p.2225.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Title	Abstract	Background & objectives	Health economic analysis plan	Target population and subgroups
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Title.	Abstract, p.38.	Introduction, p.38.	Not reported.	Methods, p.38-39.
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Not reported.	Abstract, p.523.	Background and problem section, p.524.	Not reported.	Table 2, p.527.
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Title.	Abstract, p.369.	Introduction, p.370.	Not reported.	Effect of fluoridation on dental caries section, p.370 and epidemiology of caries, p.371.
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Title.	Abstract, p.51.	Introduction, p.52.	Not reported.	Intervention and comparator section, p.52.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Title	Abstract	Background & objectives	Health economic analysis plan	Target population and subgroups
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Not reported.	Abstract, p.37.	Introduction, p.37.	Not reported.	Economic model section, p.38.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Not reported.	Abstract, p.1.	Introduction, p.2.	Not reported.	Methods, p.3.
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Title.	Abstract, p.170.	Introduction, p.170.	Not reported.	Data and assumptions, demography and averted decay, p.171.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Title	Abstract	Background & objectives	Health economic analysis plan	Target population and subgroups
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Title.	Abstract, p.78.	Introduction, p.78.	Not reported.	Methods section, first assumption, p.79 and obtaining parameter estimates section, p.79.
O'Keefe, 1994	Title.	No Abstract.	Introduction and background, p.33-34.	Not reported.	Methodology, assumptions, p.34-35.
Birch, 1990	Title.	Abstract, p.3 - limited detail.	Introduction, p.3.	Not reported.	Methods, p.3-4.
Doessel, 1985	Title.	Abstract, p.19 - limited detail.	Introduction, p. 19.	Not reported.	Methods, p.20.
Niessen and Douglass,	Title.	Abstract, p. 156.	Introduction, p.156.	Not reported.	Methods, p.157-158.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Title	Abstract	Background & objectives	Health economic analysis plan	Target population and subgroups
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Title.	Abstract, p.343.	Introduction, p. 343.	Not reported.	Financial benefits section, p.343.
Dowell, 1976	Not reported.	Not reported.	Introduction, p.103	Not reported.	Methods, p.104.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Title.	No abstract.	Need for CBA section, first paragraph. p.88.	Not reported.	Background, p.89.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Setting and location	Comparators	Study perspective	Time horizon	Discount rate
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Abstract p.vii and methods p.27.	Approach section, p.41.	Approach section, p.41.	Health economic evaluation methods, p.41.	Health economic evaluation methods, p.41.
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Background, p.2.	Background, p.2.	Reported in original report - introduction and context - medical and public health perspective p.2), not justified.	Forecasting the health benefits of fluoridation, p.2.	Averted cost assumptions, p.3.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Study data and methods, p.2225.	Developing the estimates section, p.2225.	Study data and methods section, p.2225.	Study data and methods, p.2225.	Study data and methods, p.2225.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Setting and location	Comparators	Study perspective	Time horizon	Discount rate
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Abstract and methods, p.38.	Methods, p.38	Method section, p.38, not justified.	Data analysis section, p.39-40, not justified	Data analysis section, p.39.
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Background and problem section, p.524.	Background and problem section, p.523-524.	Results, logic model for the intervention, p.529 and conclusion, p.531.	Estimation methods, p.525-526, not justified.	Investment costs, p.525.
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Fluoridation coverage section, p.370.	Fluoridation coverage section, p.370.	Abstract, p.369.	Abstract, p.369 and cost-effectiveness modelling section, p.372.	Cost-effectiveness modelling section, p.372.
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Intervention and comparator section, p.52.	Analysis section, p.53, risk type intervention model compares cost and benefits of two ageing cohorts of newborns up to the age of 100 years, with and without CWF.	Not reported.	Timeframe is unclear - Analysis section, p.53.	Abstract, p.51 and sensitivity analysis, p.54, not justified

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Setting and location	Comparators	Study perspective	Time horizon	Discount rate
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Introduction, p.37.	Methods, p.38.	Methods, p.38, not justified	Averted costs section, p.38.	Cost of a carious surface section, p.41.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Introduction, p.2.	Methods, p.3.	Methods, p.3.	Costs associated with CWFPS section, p.3.	Methods, p.3, not justified
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Data and assumptions, p.171.	Abstract, p.170 - not clearly defined in the methods section.	Incorrectly reported study perspective - Economic methodology, p.170.	Data and assumptions section, first assumption, p.171.	Economic methodology, p.171.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Setting and location	Comparators	Study perspective	Time horizon	Discount rate
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Introduction, p.78.	Methods, p.78.	Introduction, p.78.	Methods, p.78.	Methods, p.79.
O'Keefe, 1994	Methodology, p.34.	Methodology section, p.34.	Methodology section, p.34.	Methodology section, p.34-35.	Methodology section, p.35, not justified
Birch, 1990	Introduction, p.3.	Introduction, p.3.	Not reported.	Methods section, assumption 2, p.4.	Results section, p.6, not justified
Doessel, 1985	Methods, p.19.	Methods, p.19.	Incorrectly reported study perspective - Introduction section, p. 19.	Methods, p.19.	Results, p20-21.
Niessen and Douglass,	Benefit-cost analysis section, p.157.	Methods, p.158.	Not reported.	Introduction section, p.156 and methods section, p.158.	Methods section, p.158, not justified

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Setting and location	Comparators	Study perspective	Time horizon	Discount rate
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Financial benefits section, p.344.	Financial benefits section, p.343.	Not reported.	Financial costs section p.344.	Cost-benefit characteristics section, p.345.
Dowell, 1976	Methods, p.103.	Methods, p.104-105.	Not reported.	Methods, p.105.	Methods, p.105.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Background, p.89.	Introduction, p.88.	Incorrectly reported study perspective, need for CBA section, p.89.	Programme costs section, p.89.	Time valuation of costs and benefits section, p.94.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Choice of health outcomes	Measurement of effectiveness/outcomes	Measurement and valuation of outcomes	Estimating resources and costs
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Approach section, p.41 QALYS gained.	Quality-adjusted life years section, p.41.	Derived QALYs using the CHU9D questionnaire and utility weights informed by previous research p.42- 43.	CWF costs and treatment savings, p.41-42.
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Forecasting the health benefits of fluoridation, p.2 - 3, dmft/DMFT prevented dmft/DMFT and QALYs gained.	Forecasting health benefits of fluoridation section, p.2-3, applied an age-specific effect of CWF to the disaggregated dmfs/DMFS outcomes from NZOHS to estimate the decay experience of the population with exposure to CWF.	Calculating quality-adjusted life years section (p.4) using own value judgements, authors assigned different QoL scores to health states as defined by levels of decay.	CWF costs and treatment savings, p.2 - 4.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Developing the estimates, steps 1-3, p.2226.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Choice of health outcomes	Measurement of effectiveness/outcomes	Measurement and valuation of outcomes	Estimating resources and costs
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Methods section, p.38, dmft/DMFT prevented.	Data collection section (p.39) - difference in mean dmft/DMFT outcomes between those with and without CWF NZOHS.	Not applicable	CWF costs and treatment savings - p. 38-40, insufficient detail provided.
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs, p.525.
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Modelling input parameters table, p.373 dmft/DMFT prevented and population health impact section, p.371, DALYs averted.	Effect of fluoridation on dental caries section, p.370.	Population health impact section, p.372, decay outcome information, time spent with caries symptoms and a disability weight (informed by previous research) to symptomatic caries	CWF costs and treatment savings, p.371, insufficient detail provided.
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Calculation of DALYs averted, p.53.	Analysis section, p.53, method not adequately described - author used an "odds ratio" informed by previous research that indicated that children in non-fluoridated Brisbane were 1.8 times likely to have caries experience.	Sources of data for modelling, p.52, calculation of disability adjusted life years section, p.53, method not adequately described	CWF costs and treatment savings, p.53, insufficient detail provided.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Choice of health outcomes	Measurement of effectiveness/outcomes	Measurement and valuation of outcomes	Estimating resources and costs
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs, p.38 - insufficient detail provided.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Costs associated with CWFPs section, p.3 - insufficient detail provided.
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Economic methodology, p.170, DFS prevented.	Data and Assumptions section, p.171, estimates of averted decay in younger cohort and an assumed reduction in DFS for older cohort.	Not applicable	CWF costs and treatment savings - data and assumptions section, p.171 - 173

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Choice of health outcomes	Measurement of effectiveness/outcomes	Measurement and valuation of outcomes	Estimating resources and costs
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs - p.81-82 - insufficient detail provided.
O'Keefe, 1994	Methodology section, p.36, dmfs/DMFS prevented and QATYs gained.	Methodology section, p.36 - dental health outcome data and utility values informed by expert opinion.	Methodology section, p.36 - dental health outcome data and utility values informed by expert opinion	CWF costs and treatment savings - p.35-36, insufficient detail provided.
Birch, 1990	Methods section, p.3, dmft/DMFT prevented.	Methods section, p.3, annual reduction in decay estimated using the difference in dmft/DMFT between population with and without lifetime exposure to CWF.	Not applicable	CWF costs - results section, Table 6 (p.7), insufficient detail provided.
Doessel, 1985	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs, p.19-20 - insufficient detail provided.
Niessen and Douglass,	Methods section, p.158, number of carious surfaces prevented.	Methods section, p.158 and Table 1, p.159, an assumed rate of decay without CWF.	Not applicable	CWF costs and treatment savings, p.158 -p.159 and Appendix A (p.164-165), insufficient detail provided.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Choice of health outcomes	Measurement of effectiveness/outcomes	Measurement and valuation of outcomes	Estimating resources and costs
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF Cost, financial costs section p.344 - insufficient detail provided.
Dowell, 1976	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs - not reported.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	CWF costs, p.89 - insufficient detail provided.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Currency, price date, and conversion	Rationale and description of model	Analytics and assumptions	Characterising heterogeneity	Characterising distributional effects
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Base year and methods use to convert costs to base year and per capita CWF costs, p.41-42, treatment types and total costs p.67-68 and p.75-76.	Study's own model, described in the methods section p.41-46.	Bootstrapping to determine the ICER and generate CEACs in relation to possible values of the cost-effectiveness threshold, methods section, p.44. Inclusion of missing data in sensitivity analysis, methods section, p.46.	Appendix 4 - p171-184.	Appendix 4 - p171-184
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Averted costs assumptions, p3-4. Appendix - averted decay - supplementary tables A-E.	Study's own model - Methods section, p.3-5, provides an overview of the non-technical data relating to the model and tables 5-12, p.27-39 in original report.	Methods section, p.3-5, provides an overview of the non-technical data relating to the model and tables 5-12, p.27-39 in original report.	Discussion section, p.6 and original report, p.51-55 + Table 2 p.6	Discussion section, p.6 and original report, p.51-55
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Study data and methods section, p.2225, developing the estimates, step 3 and 4, p.2226	Markov model, analysis section, p.2226 and online appendix, analysis section p.23-24.	Developing the estimates - p.2225 -2226 and online Appendix, p.2 - 23.	Exhibit 1, p.2228.	Policy implications p.2230.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Currency, price date, and conversion	Rationale and description of model	Analytics and assumptions	Characterising heterogeneity	Characterising distributional effects
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Data collection and data analysis, p.38-39.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Limited detail -data collection and data analysis section, p. 38-39.	Table 3, p.41.	Not reported
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Methodology section, p.525 - 529, base year of study and methods used to adjust prices.	Study's own model.	Methodology section, p.525 -529.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Cost of public water supply fluoridation section, p.371.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Cost-effectiveness modelling, p.371-372 and table 1 p.373.	Epidemiology of caries, p.372, CWF provision cost, p.371 and table 1, p.373.	Not reported
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Costs of fluoridation and dental treatment section, p.53.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Analyses section, p.53, limited detail.	Not reported	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Currency, price date, and conversion	Rationale and description of model	Analytics and assumptions	Characterising heterogeneity	Characterising distributional effects
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	The economic model, base year, p.38. Programme cost parameters section - year of price and a mean per capita CWF cost reported - limited detail.	Study's own model.	Methods section, programme cost parameters, p.38 -39. Effectiveness CWF, p.39, annual caries increment p.39-40 and cost of a carious surface, p.40-41- limited detail.	Table 2 p.42.	Not reported.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Costs associated with CWFs, p.3, overview of year of price information, method applied to adjust costs and per capita aggregate annual CWF cost as per community size served reported in Appendix - Table 2.	Study's own model.	Methods section, p.2-6 and analysis section, p.6- 7.	Results section, p.7.	Not reported.
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Dates of the estimated resource quantities not reported unit costs and currency - cost savings from averted decay (p.171-172) and costs of fluoridation (p.172-173) and Table 1 (p.172). Currency and year of conversion, economic methodology section, p.171.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Data and assumptions section, p.171-173.	Data and assumptions section, estimates of averted decay, p.171.	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Currency, price date, and conversion	Rationale and description of model	Analytics and assumptions	Characterising heterogeneity	Characterising distributional effects
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Methods section, base year, assumption 9, p. 79. CWF cost methods, p.81-82.	Study's own model.	Methods section, assumptions, p.79 and obtaining parameter estimates, p.79 -82.	Table 3 & 4, p.81-82.	Not reported.
O'Keefe, 1994	CWF costs and treatment savings - p.35-36.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Methods section, p.35- 37, limited detail.	Not reported	Not reported
Birch, 1990	Not reported.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Methods and results sections, tables 2-7, p.3-7.	Results section, tables 6-7, p.7	Underlying oral morbidity - Methods and results sections, tables 2-7, p.3-7.
Doessel, 1985	Methods section, p.20, no information provided on the estimated resource quantities, unit costs and how costs were converted to the year of	Study's own model.	Methods section, p.20 and equation 2, p.19-20- limited detail.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Niessen and Douglass,	Methods section, p.158, insufficient detail provided.	Study's own model - insufficient detail provided.	Methods section, p.157- 161, limited detail.	Not reported	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Currency, price date, and conversion	Rationale and description of model	Analytics and assumptions	Characterising heterogeneity	Characterising distributional effects
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Cost-benefit characteristics part A, p.345 base year of study, year of prices and method applied to deflate prices.	Study's own model.	Cost-benefit characteristics, p.345 and discussion section, assumptions, p.345 - limited detail.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Dowell, 1976	Base year of study currency, mean per capita treatment costs and CWF costs, p.103 - limited detail.	Study's own model.	Methods section, tables II - XI, p.103-106, limited detail.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Programme costs section, p.89 - 90 year of prices, and aggregate annual cost of CWF cost components - limited detail.	Study's own model.	Programme benefits, p.89-92, limited detail.	Not reported.	Not reported.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Characterising uncertainty	Engagement with patients and others	Study parameters	Summary of main results	Effect of uncertainty
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Probabilistic sensitivity analyses, p. 46.	Not reported.	Health economics results section, p.65-83.	Health economics results section, p.65-83	Health economics results section, p.65-83
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	One-way sensitivity analysis. results section, p.5 and table 4, p.6.	Not reported.	Methods section, p.3-5, provides an overview of the non-technical data relating to the model and tables 5-12, p.27-39 in original report.	Results section and tables 1-3, p.5-6	Results section, table 4, p.6
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Probabilistic sensitivity analysis, p.2226 and online Appendix, p.23-24.	Not reported.	Online Appendix, study data and methods section, table 1 , p.3.	Results, p.2227-2228.	Results, p.2227-2228.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Characterising uncertainty	Engagement with patients and others	Study parameters	Summary of main results	Effect of uncertainty
Fyfe <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Univariate and multivariate sensitivity analyses, p.40.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Results section, table 3, p.41	Results section, table 4, p.41
Tchouaket <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Univariate and bivariate sensitivity analyses, p.529.	Not reported.	Methodology section, p.524-529.	Results, tables 4 + 5, p.530.	Results, tables 4 + 5, p.530.
Cobiac and Vos, 2012	Probabilistic sensitivity analysis, p.370-372.	Not reported.	Table 1, p.373.	Results section, p.372 and table 2, p.374	Results section, p.372 and table 2, p.374
Ciketic <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Probabilistic sensitivity analysis, p.54.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Results section, p.53-54	Results section, table 2 p.55

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Characterising uncertainty	Engagement with patients and others	Study parameters	Summary of main results	Effect of uncertainty
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Univariate sensitivity analysis, p.41.	Not reported.	Estimation of parameters, p. 38-41.	Results, p.41-42.	Results, p.41-42.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Probabilistic sensitivity analysis, p.6-7.	Not reported.	Assumptions outlined within methods, p2-7.	Results, p.7.	Results and figure, p.7.
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Univariate analysis, p.173-175.	Not reported.	Assumptions outlined within methods section, p.170-173.	Results section, table 3, p.174	Results section, tables 4-6 and figure 3 (p.174 - 176)

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Characterising uncertainty	Engagement with patients and others	Study parameters	Summary of main results	Effect of uncertainty
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Univariate, multivariate sensitivity analyses and threshold analyses, p.82.	Not reported.	Assumptions outlined within methods, p78-82.	Results and table 4, p.82.	Results and figures 1 and 2, p.82-83.
O'Keefe, 1994	Bivariate and multivariate sensitivity analyses, p.37.	Not reported.	Assumptions outlined within methods section, p.34-36.	Results section, table 1 p.36-37	Results section, table 2, p.36-37
Birch, 1990	One-way sensitivity analysis, p.6 - no formal mention of a sensitivity analysis, but study considered alternative discount rates.	Not reported.	Methods and results sections Tables 2-7, p.3-7.	Results section, tables 5-7, p.7	Results section, table 7, p.7
Doessel, 1985	Multivariate sensitivity analysis, methods section, p.21.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Results, p.20-21 and tables 1 -2.	Results, p.20-21 and tables 1 -2.
Niessen and Douglass,	One-way sensitivity analysis, discussion section, p.163	Not reported.	Assumptions outlined within methods section, p.157-159.	Results section, p.159-161 and table 5 p.161	Results section, table 6, p. 163

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Characterising uncertainty	Engagement with patients and others	Study parameters	Summary of main results	Effect of uncertainty
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Univariate sensitivity analysis, p.343-344.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Results, p.345 and tables 2-3 p.346-347.	Results, p.345 and tables 2-3 p.346-347.
Dowell, 1976	Not reported.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Methods, tables ix-xi, p.105-106.	Not reported.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Not reported.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Decision, table 5, p.94.	Not reported.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Effect of engagement with patients and others	Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	Source of funding	Conflicts of interest
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Not reported.	Discussion, p.85.	Funding, p.viii.	Declared competing interests of authors, p.i.
Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Not reported.	Discussion, p.5-6.	Funding, p.7.	Competing interests, p.7.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Not reported.	Discussion and policy implications, p.2229 - 2230.	Footnote, p.2230.	Not reported.

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Effect of engagement with patients and others	Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	Source of funding	Conflicts of interest
<i>Fyfe et al., 2015</i>	Not reported.	Discussion, p.42-43.	Not reported.	Competing interests, p.43.
<i>Tchouaket et al., 2013</i>	Not reported.	Discussion and conclusion, p.530-531.	Acknowledgements, p.352.	Conflict of interest, p.352.
<i>Cobiac and Vos, 2012</i>	Not reported.	Discussion, p.372-374.	Funding, p.375.	Competing interests, p.375.
<i>Ciketic et al., 2010</i>	Not reported.	Discussion, p.54.	Not reported.	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Effect of engagement with patients and others	Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	Source of funding	Conflicts of interest
Campain <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Not reported.	Discussion, p.42-43.	Acknowledgements, p.43.	Not reported.
O'Connell <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Not reported.	Discussion, p.7-8.	Acknowledgments, p.8.	Footnote all pages.
Wright <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Not reported.	Discussion, p.175-177.	Acknowledgements, p.177.	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Effect of engagement with patients and others	Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	Source of funding	Conflicts of interest
Griffin <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Not reported.	Discussion, p.82-84.	Not reported.	Not reported.
O'Keefe, 1994	Not reported.	Discussion, p.37-38.	Not reported.	Not reported
Birch, 1990	Not reported.	Discussion, p.8-9.	Not reported.	Not reported
Doessel, 1985	Not reported.	Discussion, p.21-22.	Acknowledgments, p.22.	Not reported.
Niessen and Douglass,	Not reported.	Discussion, p.161-164.	Not reported.	Not reported

Table A6. An overview of the performance of each study in terms of the criterion outlined in the CHEERS statement.

Author	Effect of engagement with patients and others	Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	Source of funding	Conflicts of interest
Carr <i>et al.</i> , 1980	Not reported.	Discussion, p.345 and 348.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Dowell, 1976	Not reported.	Discussion and conclusion, p.106.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Nelson and Swint, 1976	Not reported.	Summary and conclusion, p.95.	Not reported.	Not reported.