	Study ID	Representation	Sampling	Random selection	Non- response bias	Data collection	Case definition	Reliability & validity	Method of data collection	Prevalence period	Numerator & denominator	Summary assessment
1	Tsegabrhan et al	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	6
2	Tegegne et al	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
3	Bifftu et al	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	6
4	Tegegne et al	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	6
5	Bifftu et al	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
6	Tilahune et al	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
7	Kiko	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
8	Adewuya et al	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
9	Ayanda et al	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
10	Owolabi et al	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
11	Mosaku et al	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	8
12	Ogunrin et al	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	7
13	Sezibera et al	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
14	Mutabazi	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
15	Saadalla et al	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	9
16	Veneviv et al	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	9

Yes=0, No=1

The overall risk of bias scored based on the number of high risk of bias per study: 8–10: 'low risk of bias', 5–7: 'moderate risk' and 0–4: 'high risk'.

Risk of bias assessment tool: Yes (low risk); No (high risk)

1. Representation: Was the study population a close representation of the national population?

2. Sampling: Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?

3. Random selection: Was some form of random selection used to select the sample OR was a census undertaken?

4. Non-response bias: Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?

5. Data collection: Were data collected directly from the subjects?

6. Case definition: Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?

7. Reliability and validity of study tool: Was the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest show to have reliability and validity?

8. Data collection: Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?

9. Prevalence period: Was the length of the prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?

10. Numerators and denominators: Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate?