

Additional Table 2: Quality assessment scores for qualitative studies. Yes- 2, Partial- 1, No- 0, Not applicable-NA

	Question/ objective	Study design	Context	Theoretical framework	Sampling	Data collection	Data analysis	Verification procedure	Conclusions	Reflexivity
Batnitzky <i>et al.</i> (2008) ⁽¹⁶⁾	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	0
Boatema <i>et al.</i> (2018) ⁽¹⁷⁾	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	0
Brown <i>et al.</i> (2015) ⁽¹⁸⁾	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0
*Charlton <i>et al.</i> (2014) ⁽⁵⁹⁾	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	2	0
Craveriro <i>et al.</i> (2016) ⁽¹⁹⁾	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	0
Draper <i>et al.</i> (2016) ⁽²⁰⁾	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Legwegoh <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽²²⁾ , (2016) ⁽²²⁾	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	1	0
*Pradeilles (2015) ⁽⁶⁰⁾	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Rguibi and Behalsen, 2006 ⁽²³⁾	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	0
Sedibe <i>et al.</i> (2014) ⁽²⁴⁾ ; Voorend <i>et al.</i> (2013) ⁽²⁵⁾	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0

*mixed methods study- scored here for qualitative component. Quality appraisal was conducted using using a validated quality assessment tool⁽¹³⁾.

Additional Table 3: Quality assessment scores for quantitative studies. Yes- 2, Partial- 1, No- 0, Not applicable-NA.

	Question/ objective	Study design	Subject selection	Subject characteristics	Random allocation	Investigator blinding	Subject blinding	Outcome measure	Sample size	Data analysis	Estimate of variance	Control for confounding	Result reporting	Conclusions
Agbozo <i>et al.</i> (2018) ⁽²⁶⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	0	0	2	1
Amenyah <i>et al.</i> (2016) ⁽²⁷⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
Aounalla-Sikhiri <i>et al.</i> (2011) ⁽²⁸⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Becquey <i>et al.</i> (2010) ⁽²⁹⁾	2	2	2	1	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
*Charlton <i>et al.</i> (2004) ⁽⁵⁹⁾	2	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	2	2
Cisse-Egbuonye <i>et al.</i> (2017) ⁽³⁰⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Codjoe <i>et al.</i> (2016) ⁽³¹⁾	2	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
El Ansari <i>et al.</i> (2015) ⁽³²⁾	2	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Feeley <i>et al.</i> (2013) ⁽³³⁾	1	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
Fokeena <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽³⁴⁾	2	2	1	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	2	2	0	2	2
Glozah <i>et al.</i> (2015) ⁽³⁵⁾	2	1	1	2	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Gitau <i>et al.</i> (2014) ⁽³⁶⁾	2	2	2	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	2	0	0	2	1
Hattingh <i>et al.</i> 2006 ⁽³⁷⁾ ; 2011 ⁽³⁸⁾ ; 2014 ⁽³⁹⁾	1	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	1	N/A	2	2
Jafri <i>et al.</i> (2013) ⁽⁴⁰⁾	2	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
Kiboi <i>et al.</i> (2017) ⁽⁴¹⁾	1	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Landais <i>et al.</i> 2012 ⁽⁴²⁾ ; (2015) ⁽⁴³⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
Lopez <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽⁴⁴⁾	2	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	0	0	2	0
Mayen <i>et al.</i> (2016) ⁽⁴⁵⁾	1	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	1	0	2	0
Mbochi <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽⁴⁶⁾	2	1	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	1	0	1	2
Mogre <i>et al.</i> (2013) ⁽⁴⁷⁾	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	0	N/A	2	2
Njelekela <i>et al.</i> (2011) ⁽⁴⁸⁾	1	2	2	1	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	1	0	2	1
Onyiririuka <i>et al.</i> (2013) ⁽⁴⁹⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	0	2	2
Peltzer <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽⁵⁰⁾	2	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	0	0	2	2
*Pradeilles (2015) ⁽⁶⁰⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Savy <i>et al.</i> (2008) ⁽⁵¹⁾	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2

Sodjinou <i>et al.</i> 2008 ⁽⁵²⁾ ; 2009 ⁽⁵³⁾	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Soualem <i>et al.</i> (2012) ⁽⁵⁴⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	0	2	1
Steyn <i>et al.</i> (2011) ⁽⁵⁵⁾	2	2	2	1	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Van Zyl <i>et al.</i> (2010) ⁽⁵⁶⁾	2	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	N/A	0	2	2
Waswa, 2011 ⁽⁵⁷⁾	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
Zeba <i>et al.</i> (2014) ⁽⁵⁸⁾	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	1	2	2

*mixed methods study- scored here for quantitative component. Quality appraisal was conducted using a validated quality assessment tool⁽¹³⁾.