Supplementary File 3: Quality Assessment of included studies

Table 1 Quality assessment of quantitative intervention studies

ID	Author, year	Study design	Selection bias related to participants	Selection bias related to intervention	Performance and detection bias	Attrition bias	Reporting bias	Other bias
39	Rambaud- Althaus 2017*	RCT	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High
120	Palazuelos 2013**	Comparison	High	High	High	Low	NA	Low
2	Abouda 2015**	Before and after	Low	NA	High	Unclear	NA	Low
125	Segal 2015***	Before and after	Low	NA	High	Low	NA	Low
87	Adams 2012***	Evaluation	Low	NA	High	High	NA	High
47	Praveen 2014***	Evaluation	High	NA	High	Low	NA	High
121	Catalani	Evaluation	High	NA	High	Low	NA	High

2014***

* Cochrane Collaboration tool for assessing risk of bias (11).

** risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions (ROBINS-I) (14)

***risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions (ROBINS-I) (14) without selection bias related to the intervention as there was no comparison group

Table 2 Quality assessment of qualitative studies using an adapted version of the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) tool for qualitative studies (15)

ID	Author, year	Study design	Clear statement of aims	Qualitative methodology appropriate	Research design appropriate	Recruitment strategy appropriate	Data collected addressed issue	Relationship between researcher and participants considered
63	Shao 2015	In-depth interviews and focus groups	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear
124	Bessat 2019	In-depth interviews and focus groups	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes
8	Agbo 2012	Semi-structured interviews	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Unclear
126	Oduor 2019	Semi-structured interviews	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear
41	Reynolds 2013	Semi-structured interviews	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear
53	Iqbal 2013	Focus groups	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear
49	Park 2016	Focus groups	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear

1

ID	Author, year	Study design	Clear stateme nt of aims	Research design appropria te	Sampl e size justifie d	Sample frame appropria te	Selection appropria te	Non- responde rs addresse d	Outcomes measured appropriate ly	Statistical significanc e determine d
71	Udezi	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12 7	Anasi	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes
76	Wabe	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	Yes
11 3	Gelayee	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes
74	Usanga	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
10 7	Kamuha bwa	Quantitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes
31	Rusatira	Mixed methods: online survey and interviews	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	No
95	Graham	Mixed methods; observation of consultations with structured questionnaire, focus groups, in-depth interviews	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Νο	Yes	Yes
21	Samiak	Mixed methods; semi qualitative cross-sectional survey	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes

Table 3 Quality assessment of survey studies a critical appraisal tool to assess the quality of cross-sectional studies (AXIS) (16)