1. Visser 2011		
Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**Low risk**	"Participants were randomly assigned to the micronutrient or placebo groups in computer-generated permuted blocks of 8, generated by an independent epidemiologist."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Treatment allocation was concealed by prepackaging supplements in sequentially numbered packets according to the allocation schedule"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"Active and placebo capsules and tablets for both treatment groups were identical in size, shape, and color. All research team members as well as the laboratory staff involved in the trial were blinded."
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"Active and placebo capsules and tablets for both treatment groups were identical in size, shape, and color. All research team members as well as the laboratory staff involved in the trial were blinded."
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**high risk**	High proportion of loss to follow up was observed in both groups (15.6% in the intervention vs 24.6% in the placebo groups).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	There was no information about selective reporting
Other bias	**low risk**	We were unable to identify any other sources of bias.
2. Pakasi et al., 2010		
Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**Low risk**	"Prior to the study, randomization was done using a computer program, in which a treatment code was given to a subject."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Every district had its random allocation table consisted 60 patients plus additional randomization for another 50 patients"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"All capsules were similar in terms of shape, color and size."
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"All capsules were similar in terms of shape, color and size."

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**low risk**	There was less than 10%(8.9% vs 8.4%) loss to follow-up in placebo and intervention group (zinc plus vitamin A).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	There was no evidence about selective reporting approach
Other bias	**low risk**	We are unable to identify any other sources of bias.

3. Lawson 2010

Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**Low risk**	"Prepared the allocation sequence using random numbers generated in Minitab... using permuted block randomization with four different black sizes"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Treatment group allocation was designated by a lettered code and concealed from the investigators and subjects until data analysis was completed."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"a placebo resembling the intervention group"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"a placebo resembling the intervention group"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**high risk**	There were 24 of 116 in the placebo group, and 27 of 117 in the zinc and vitamin A group lost to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	There was no evidence about selective reporting
Other bias	**low risk**	We didn't identify any other sources of bias.

4. Ginawi 2013

Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**low risk**	Not described. Patients were randomly assigned to receive either placebo or intervention group
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**unclear risk**	Not described.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"Supplement and placebo capsules were indistinguishable in appearance both externally and internally."
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"Supplement and placebo capsules were indistinguishable in appearance both externally and internally."

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**high risk**	"28.6% loss to follow-up (> 10% therefore high risk of bias)."
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	it is unclear regarding selective reporting
Other bias	**Low risk**	We are unable to detect any other source of bias.

5. Armijos 2010

Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**Low risk**	Subjects were randomized to the micronutrient or placebo groups.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Subject codes remained sealed until after completion of data analysis."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"Placebo group subjects received organoleptically identical, Subject codes remained sealed until after data analysis"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"Placebo group subjects received organoleptically identical, Subject codes remained sealed until after data analysis"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**low risk**	the reasons for drop-out were explained sufficiently.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	We could not retrieve the evidence about selective reporting
Other bias	**low risk**	We did not identify any other sources of bias.

6. Karyadi 2002

Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**low risk**	"We used a table with randomly assorted digits to allocate the patients into 2 groups."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**unclear risk**	The trial authors did not describe well.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"Supplement and placebo capsules were indistinguishable in appearance both externally and internally." "The authors, health staff, and patients were unaware of the treatment code until the study was completed"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"Supplement and placebo

		capsules were indistinguishable in appearance both externally and internally.". "The authors, health staff, and patients were unaware of the treatment code until the study was completed"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**high risk**	The trial authors analysed 80/110 (72%) participants.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	This was not reported
Other bias	**low risk**	We did not identify any other sources of bias.
7. Range et al., 2005		
Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Two allocation sequences, using blocks of four, were created using computer-generated random numbers."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**low risk**	"Codes for micronutrient and zinc remained sealed until the completion of data analysis."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**low risk**	"Placebo tablets were identical in color with micronutrient tablets, shape and size to the corresponding white Zn and green MVM tablets"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**low risk**	"Placebo tablets were identical in color, shape and size to the corresponding white Zn and green MVM tablets"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**high risk**	Loss to follow-up: mortality: 9% zinc group versus 14% placebo group
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	no evidence is available
Other bias	**low risk**	We did not identify any other sources of bias.
8. Kumar et al., 2013		
Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**low risk**	" Two allocation sequences, using blocks of four, were created using computer-generated random numbers.."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**low risk**	Loss to follow-up: less than 10%
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	no evidence is available
Other bias	**low risk**	We did not identify any other sources of bias.
9. Singh et al., 2013		
Risk of bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	**low risk**	"…in this study who were diagnosed positive in the month of Sept – Oct 2010 and they were randomly divided into three groups."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	**unclear risk**	There is no available information in this article
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	**low risk**	Loss to follow-up: less than 5%
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	**unclear risk**	no evidence is available
Other bias	**low risk**	We did not identify any other sources of bias.