

Table S1. Type of outcomes evaluated in the studies

Author	Patient centrality and acceptability	Accessibility Timely care	Efficiency and equity	Safety	Effectiveness
Lumala 2017 ¹³	—	yes	—	—	yes
Mgaya 2017 ¹⁴	—	yes	—	—	yes
Kayiga 2016 ¹⁵	—	—	—	—	yes
Mohd Azri 2015 ¹⁶	—	—	—	—	yes
Gebrehiwot 2014 ¹⁷	—	yes	—	—	yes
Baltag 2012 ¹⁸	yes	—	—	—	yes
Kidanto 2012 ¹⁹	—	yes	—	—	yes
Sukhanberdiyev 2011 ²⁰ Hodorogea 2010 ²¹	yes	yes	—	—	yes
Van den Akker 2011 ²²	—	yes	—	—	yes
Bailey 2010 ²³	—	yes	—	—	yes
Van den Akker 2009 ²⁴	—	yes	—	—	yes
Hunyinbo 2008 ²⁵	—	yes	—	—	yes
Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁶	—	yes	—	—	yes

Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁷	—	yes	—	—	yes
Weeks 2005 ²⁸	—	yes	—	—	yes
Wagaarachchi 2001 ²⁹	—	yes	—	—	yes

Table S2. Risk of bias

Author	Study design	Risk of bias criteria for RCTs, CCTs, CBAs, UCBA					Additive risk of bias criteria for ITS		
		<i>Random sequence generation</i>	<i>Allocation concealment</i>	<i>Blinding</i>	<i>Incomplete outcome data</i>	<i>Selective reporting</i>	<i>Intervention independent of other changes?</i>	<i>Shape of the intervention effect prespecified?</i>	<i>Intervention unlikely to affect data collection?</i>
Lumala 2017 ¹³	ITS	high	high	high	low	unclear	high	low	high
Mgaya 2017 ¹⁴	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Kayiga 2016 ¹⁵	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Mohd Azri 2015 ¹⁶	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Gebrehiwot 2014 ¹⁷	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Baltag 2012 ¹⁸	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Kidanto 2012 ¹⁹	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Sukhanberdiyev 2011 ²⁰ Hodorogea 2010 ²¹	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Van den Akker 2011 ²²	ITS	high	high	high	low	unclear	high	low	high
Bailey 2010 ²³	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Van den Akker 2009 ²⁴	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-

Hunyinbo 2008 ²⁵	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁶	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁷	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Weeks 2005 ²⁸	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-
Wagaarachchi 2001 ²⁹	NCBA	high	high	high	low	unclear	-	-	-

Table S3. World bank classification of country income

Author	Country	WB classification *
Lumala 2017 ¹³	Uganda	L
Mgaya 2017 ¹⁴	Tanzania	L
Kayiga 2016 ¹⁵	Uganda	L
Mohd Azri 2015 ¹⁶	Malaysia	UM
Gebrehiwot 2014 ¹⁷	Ethiopia	L
Baltag 2012 ¹⁸	Moldova	LM
Kidanto 2012 ¹⁹	Tanzania	L
Sukhanberdiyev 2011 ²⁰ Hodorogea 2010 ²¹	Kazakhstan	UM
Van den Akker 2011 ²²	Malawi	L
Bailey 2010 ²³	Vietnam	L §§
Van den Akker 2009 ²⁴	Malawi	L
Hunyinbo 2008 ²⁵	Nigeria	L §§
Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁶	Malawi	L
Kongnyuy 2008 ²⁷	Malawi	L
Weeks 2005 ²⁸	Uganda	L
Wagaarachchi 2001 ²⁹	Ghana and Jamaica	L §§

§ L=Low income; LM=Lower middle income; UM=Upper middle income

§§ Ghana, Jamaica, Nigeria and Vietnam were classified as low income countries during the time of the study, while they were upgraded to lower middle income in 2010, 2007 2008, and 2009 respectively.

