

Table S6. Accuracy of analysis and interpretation of the effect of policy change on treatment and clinical outcome, as well as accuracy of overall conclusions, in each of the 10 data-to-paper “Treatment Policy” research papers (Supplementary Manuscripts C1-10).

Paper	Analysis and statistics		Results interpretation		Conclusions
	treat- ment	clinical outcome	treat- ment	clinical outcome	
C1	✓	✓	? [d]	✓	✓
C2	✓ [a]	✓	✓ [a]	✗ [e]	✗
C3	✓ [b]	✓	✓	✓	✓
C4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C9	✓	✓ [c]	✓	✓	✓
C10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

✓, ✗, ? : correct / incorrect / borderline

a: By correcting for confounding factors, found a barely significant association of a variable (PPV) with policy change, which was not reported in the original study.

b: Data analysis of treatment change also tested for a change in variables that should not be accounted as treatment (like Breastfeeding).

c: Final analysis is correct, but reviewing the run conversation shows wrong intermediate attempts.

d: While 3 treatment variables were associated with policy change, the results section reported 2 of those as insignificant.

e: Citing p-value of a model's "intercept" as if it was the p-value for the effect of the policy change on an outcome variable.