**Popularity And Prevalence Of Gas Exchange Data Processing Methods: A Semi-Automated Scoping Review**

**Supplemental Methods**

*Text Analysis & Screening*

We principally employed two machine learning (ML) models using a random forest classifier through the Python sklearn package [1]. One model predicted if the article was original peer-reviewed research vs. a review, meta-analysis, case study, protocol registration, etc. The other predicted if the subjects were human or non-human.

We initially built the training data for these models while manually reading articles to construct our regular expressions (RegExs). We then used the models to predict the eligibility of the remaining unread articles. Given that our electronic search primarily obtained articles that matched our search criteria, a relatively small fraction of the unread articles were predicted to be ineligible. We manually verified the eligibility for this small number of articles. Our classifiers also calculated an eligibility probability. We also manually reviewed articles predicted eligible within ~15% of the decision boundary.

We then iteratively rebuilt our classifiers with more data from the manual eligibility verification and from other ineligible articles found incidentally while reading their full text for context when charting our data items. Through rebuilding larger models, we discovered additional ineligible articles missed by previous classifier iterations.

Both models were assessed using repeated stratified 5-fold cross-validation as our training data favored eligible articles. The original peer-reviewed research model contained 1,505 samples while the human model 1,919. The mean accuracy for the original research and human models were 83.9% and 93.4%, respectively.
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