**Triangulation Study**

The triangulation study had two stages: the first examining concordance between the literature synthesis and expert consensus and the second reconciling differences.

1. **Concordance between the literature synthesis and expert consensus studies**:
	1. The results of multilevel modelling showed that there was significant agreement between the results of the literature synthesis and the proportion of experts (i) agreeing that a link was present or (ii) agreeing that a link was absent.
	2. Direct comparison of links found in the two studies identified 37 links (p<.05 in literature study and ≥80% experts rated the link to be present) and 460 non-links (p>.05 *or* no data in literature study, and ≥80% of experts rated the link to be absent).
2. **Reconciliation of inks that were marginal or inconsistent between the literature synthesis and expert consensus studies**:

A new group of 16 experts participated in a 3-round consensus exercise to reconcile 179 links that remained inconclusive. Inconclusive links were: those that met the criterion for a link in either the literature or the expert study, but not in the other; and those that nearly met the criterion for a link in either study (.05 < p < .10 in the literature study) and/or (link agreed by 70-80% of experts).

This resulted in agreement by ≥80% of these experts on a further 55 links and 5 non-links. There was no resolution for 119 links.

**Conclusion:** across all stages, 92 (37 + 55) BCT-MoA links and 465 (460 + 5) non-links were identified. Links covered 51 of 93 BCTs and 22 of 26 MoAs. Evidence was inconclusive or absent for a large number of possible links.