Domain	Criteria	Justification/definition
Choice Design	Choice of attributes and levels grounded in qualitative work with the target population	Attributes and levels should be comprehensible, sensible and relevant to the target population to ensure engagement with the choice task
	No conceptual overlap between attributes	Attributes should be conceptually distinct and vary independently of each other, otherwise effects will not be independent
	Inclusion of an opt-out or status quo option	Choices that force participants to accept an unappealing choice are likely to lead to overestimation of preferences, and do not reflect usual shopping practice
Experimental design	Experimental design optimal or statistically efficient	A D-efficient (or orthogonal) design is used, and a description of how the questionnaire accounted for participant comprehension(eg. through provision of pictoral cues, reducing cognitive fatigue from >16 choice sets) is included
Conduct	Piloting among target population	Validity of choice task design and questionnaire features should be tested with participants from target population and subgroups
	Target population appropriate for choice task design	Preferences of target population should be sufficient to answer research objective
	Sampling frame representative of target population	Sampling frames that exclude part of the target population may lead to bias in preference choice
	Response rate sufficient to minimise bias	>50% = meets criteria, <50% = risk of bias
Analysis	Where calculated, any pooled analysis from different sub-groups appropriate	Pooled analyses from very heterogeneous subgroups may mask marked differences in preferences
	Where relevant, econometric model accounts for correlation of choices	As multiple observations are obtained from each participant, the econometric model should take account of panel nature of data to avoid overestimation of the differences between preferences
	Relative attribute effects compared using a common metric?	Preferences for different attributes cannot be compared directly using parameter estimates due to confounding with the underlying utility scales.
Conflict of Interest	Study not industry or private scheme funded	Trials should not be funded by food industry bodies related to the food products being tested, or by the certification schemes in question under examination