## Quality assessment rubric for quasi-experimental studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well-described source population?</th>
<th>Representative eligible population?</th>
<th>Representative participants?</th>
<th>Selection bias minimized during allocation?</th>
<th>Acceptably low contamination?</th>
<th>Adjusted for confounders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Potential confounders are discussed and/or dismissed due to explicit justification. Other likely confounders were considered and adjusted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Some confounders were controlled for, but other likely confounders were not adjusted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information on one of the above population characteristics.</td>
<td>Missing information on two or more of the above population characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliable outcome measures?</th>
<th>Similar follow-up times in all arms?</th>
<th>Meaningful follow-up time?</th>
<th>Sufficiently powered?</th>
<th>Considered multiple explanatory variables?</th>
<th>Reported precision of effect sizes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Precision of intervention effects provided for all specified outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Precision of intervention effects provided for some specified outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table**

S4 Table. Quality assessment rubric for quasi-experimental studies.

- **Well-defined outcomes presented with inter- or intra-rater reliability scores (if applicable).** Multiple data collection strategies used to gather evidence (e.g. self-reported and enumerator observations).
- **Represented outcomes by mean or by other reliable and valid measures.**
- **Assessed whether the findings are generalizable.**
- **Accurately measured differences in outcome measures.**
- **Collecting data at different time points.**
- **Provided power calculations demonstrate that the study is sufficiently powered for the outcome(s) of interest.**
- **Multiple explanatory variables were considered in the analyses. Alternatively, justification for not including other explanatory variables was provided.**
- **Precision of intervention effects provided for all specified outcomes.**
- **Precision of intervention effects provided for some specified outcomes.**

- **Recruit is well-described, but eligible population does not appear to be representative of source population.**
- **Inclusion and exclusion criteria are not explicitly provided and the selection of participants is not well-described. Insufficient information to assess representativeness.**
- **Comparison group received intervention and it was likely to cause bias.**
- **No mention of adjusting for any confounders and no discussion/justification supporting this decision.**

- **Meaningful follow-up time?**
- **Sufficiently powered?**
- **Considered multiple explanatory variables?**
- **Reported precision of effect sizes?**

- **Well-defined outcomes presented with inter- or intra-rater reliability scores (if applicable).** Multiple data collection strategies used to gather evidence (e.g. self-reported and enumerator observations).
- **Represented outcomes by mean or by other reliable and valid measures.**
- **Assessed whether the findings are generalizable.**
- **Accurately measured differences in outcome measures.**
- **Collecting data at different time points.**
- **Provided power calculations demonstrate that the study is sufficiently powered for the outcome(s) of interest.**
- **Multiple explanatory variables were considered in the analyses. Alternatively, justification for not including other explanatory variables was provided.**
- **Precision of intervention effects provided for all specified outcomes.**
- **Precision of intervention effects provided for some specified outcomes.**

- **Recruit is well-described, but eligible population does not appear to be representative of source population.**
- **Inclusion and exclusion criteria are not explicitly provided and the selection of participants is not well-described. Insufficient information to assess representativeness.**
- **Comparison group received intervention and it was likely to cause bias.**
- **No mention of adjusting for any confounders and no discussion/justification supporting this decision.**

- **Meaningful follow-up time?**
- **Sufficiently powered?**
- **Considered multiple explanatory variables?**
- **Reported precision of effect sizes?**
| - | Outcomes were not defined. | - | No | - | Less than 6 months. | - | No power calculations provided. | - | Multiple explanatory variables were not considered in the analyses. | - | Precision of intervention effects not provided. |