

Reviewers: Adisu Tafari Shama and Dufera Rikitu Terefa, Date: 15-20/3/2023													
JBI critical appraisal checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies													
Record no.	Author (year)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Total score	%	Overall appraisal	Reason for exclusion
2.	Abebe (2017)	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	3	37.5	Include	
3.	Ayele (2021)	2	1	3	3	3	2	1	1	3	37.5	Exclude	Difference in Population
4.	Ayele (2022)	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	5	62.5	Exclude	Difference in Population
6.	Endalamaw (2021)	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	6	75	Include	
7.	Gebretsadik (2021)	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	50	Include	
8.	Hailu (2020)	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	5	62.5	Include	
11.	Kibret (2022)	1	1	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	37.5	Include	
12.	Kumie (2020)	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	6	75	Include	
14.	Memirie (2018)	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	4	50	Include	
15.	Schwartz (2020)	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	25	Exclude	Outcome of interest not reported
16.	Schwartz (2021)	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	25	Exclude	Outcome of interest not reported
18.	Solomon (2019)	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	1	5	62.5	Include	
19	Tefera B (2016)	2	1	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	37.5	Include	
21	Tesfaw (2018)	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	5	62.5	Exclude	No outcome of interest reported
24.	Woldu (2017)	1	2	1	3	2	2	3	1	3	37.5	Include	
Q1.	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?												
Q2.	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?												
Q3.	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?												
Q4.	Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?												

Q5.	Were confounding factors identified?
Q6.	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
Q7.	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?
Q8.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

JBI critical appraisal checklist for Case-control studies															
Record no.	Author (year)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Total score	%	Overall appraisal	Reason for exclusion
5.	Duche (2021)	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	1	6	60	Include	
9.	Hassen (2021)	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	7	70	include	
10.	Hassen (2022)	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	6	60	include	
13.	Mekonen (2021)	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	7	70	include	
17.	Shalamo (2022)	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	6	60	include	
23.	Tolessa (2021)	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	8	80	include	
1.	Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls?														
2.	Were cases and controls matched appropriately?														
3.	Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?														
4.	Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?														
5.	Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?														
6.	Were confounding factors identified?														
7.	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?														
8.	Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?														
9.	Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?														
10.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?														

JBI critical appraisal checklist for Cohort studies

Record no.	Author (year)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Total score	%	Overall appraisal	Reason for exclusion
20	Tekle (2019)	4	4	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	3	27	exclude	Outcome of interest not reported
1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? 2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? 3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? 4. Were confounding factors identified? 5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? 6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? 7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? 8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? 9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? 10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? 11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?																

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR STUDIES REPORTING PREVALENCE DATA															
Record no.	Author (year)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Total score	%	Overall appraisal	Reason for exclusion	
1	Abate (2016)	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	33	exclude	The outcome of interest is not shown in this study. Besides, Sample size, sampling techniques and analysis methods were not clearly described.	
22	Timotewos (2018)	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	5	77	Include		
1.		Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?													
2.		Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?													
3.		Was the sample size adequate?													

4.

Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?

5.

Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?

6.

Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?

7.

Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?

8.

Was there appropriate statistical analysis?

9.

Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?
- 1-Yes

2- No

3-Unclear

4-Not applicable