

## CHERRIES Statement—Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys

Item Category	Checklist Item	Explanation
<b>Design</b>		
	Describe survey design	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...A cross-sectional online study has been implemented at the University of Münster in Germany...”
<b>IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval and informed consent process</b>		
	IRB approval	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...Ethical approval has been obtained from the Institutional Review Board...”
	Informed consent	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...Prior to the online survey, all participants gave informed consent...”
	Data protection	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The email included information on the length of completing the survey (20-30 minutes, 172 items on 15 pages), voluntariness, anonymity, data protection, and incentives (e.g. VIP tickets for sporting events)....”
<b>Development and pre-testing</b>		
	Development and testing	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The survey was carried out standardized (i.e. without randomization of items) using the evaluation software EvaSys version 8.0 with adaptive questioning (Electric Paper Evaluationssysteme GmbH, Lueneburg, Germany)...”

<b>Recruitment process and description of the sample having access to the questionnaire</b>		
	Open survey vs closed survey	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: Closed survey, with “Students received an invitation email and were provided with an individual transaction number (TAN).”
	Contact mode	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The resulting 42,630 students were invited by e-mail to take part...”
	Advertising the survey	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The resulting 42,630 students were invited by e-mail to take part...”
<b>Survey administration</b>		
	Web/E-mail	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The resulting 42,630 students were invited by e-mail to take part... The survey was carried out standardized (i.e. without randomization of items) using the evaluation software EvaSys version 8.0 with adaptive questioning...”  Invitation via email providing a link to a website with the online survey (EvaSys), where responses were automatically captured.
	Context	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting
	Mandatory / voluntary	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: Voluntary, “...The email included information on the length of completing the survey..., voluntariness, anonymity, data protection...”

	Incentives	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...Students received an invitation email and were provided with an individual transaction number (TAN). The email included information on the length of completing the survey (20-30 minutes, 172 items on 15 pages), voluntariness, anonymity, data protection, and incentives (e.g. VIP tickets for sporting events).”
	Time/Date	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The health survey was carried out during the summer term 2019...”
	Randomization of items or questionnaires	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “The survey was carried out standardized (i.e. without randomization of items) using the evaluation software EvaSys version 8.0 ...”
	Adaptive questioning	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “The survey was carried out standardized (i.e. without randomization of items) using the evaluation software EvaSys version 8.0 with adaptive questioning...”
	Number of items	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The email included information on the length of completing the survey (20-30 minutes, 172 items on 15 pages) ...”
	Number of screens (pages)	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...The email included information on the length of completing the survey (20-30 minutes, 172 items on 15 pages) ...”
	Completeness check	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...No completeness check was available. However, incomplete surveys were captured as well...”
	Review step	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: YES

<b>Response rates</b>		
	Unique site visitor	In Page 5, under Methods →Study Design and Setting: “...Students received an invitation email and were provided with an individual transaction number (TAN)...”
	View rate (ratio of unique survey visitors/unique site visitors)	Not applicable
	Participation rate (ratio of unique visitors who agreed to participate/unique first survey page visitors)	In Page 7, under Results →Participants and Descriptive Data: “A total of 4,189 students participated in this online survey, resulting in an overall response rate of 10% (range 7.2% to 22.1% among the 21 university departments)...”
	Completion rate (ratio of users who finished the survey/users who agreed to participate)	In Page 7, under Results →Participants and Descriptive Data: “A total of 4,189 students participated in this online survey, resulting in an overall response rate of 10% (range 7.2% to 22.1% among the 21 university departments)...”
<b>Preventing multiple entries from the same individual</b>		
	Cookies used	Not applicable
	IP check	Not applicable
	Log life analysis	Not applicable

	Registration	In Page 5, under Methods → Study Design and Setting: “...Students received an invitation email and were provided with an individual transaction number (TAN)...”
<b>Analysis</b>		
	Handling of incomplete questionnaires	In Page 5, under Measurements → Physical Activity: For example in Physical Activity, “...Missing PA or ST data were considered as completely missing for this case and not considered for statistical analysis (n=80)...”
	Questionnaires submitted with an atypical timestamp	Not applicable
	Statistical correction	In Page 6, under Measurements → Perceived Stress: “...Ipsative mean imputation was used (n=70) when not more than one item of the complete scale was missing. In case of two or more missing items, the subject was not considered for statistical analyses (n=14)...”