

Supplement 7

Risk of Bias Assessments

Risk of Bias Assessment for Quasi-Experimental Studies (ROBINS-I)

Author, Year	Bias due to confounding (Domain 1)	Bias in selection of participants into the study (Domain 2)	Bias in classification of interventions (Domain 3)	Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (Domain 4)	Bias due to missing data (Domain 5)	Bias in measurement of outcomes (Domain 6)	Bias in selection of the reported result (Domain 7)	Overall bias
Achyut 2011	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Ara 2010	Moderate	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Ashburn 2017	Moderate	Serious	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Avery-Leaf 1997	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Bartel 2010	Moderate	NI	Serious	NI	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
CAREInternational 2012	NI	NI	Serious	NI	NI	Moderate	Serious	Serious
Chamroonsawasdi 2010	Serious	NI	Low	NI	NI	Moderate	Low	Serious
Chege 2004	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	Low	Moderate	Serious	Serious
Daniel 2008	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Das 2012	Serious	NI	Moderate	Moderate	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Serious

Diop 2004	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Low	Serious	Low	Serious
Erulkar 2011	Serious	Serious	Serious	Serious	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Exner 2009	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Foubert 1997	Moderate	NI	Low	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious
Fuertes 2012	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	NI	NI	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Gordon 2003	Low	Serious	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Serious
Harrell 1991	Moderate	Serious	NI	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	Serious
Hillenbrand-Gunn 2010	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Instituto Promundo 2012	Serious	NI	Serious	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious
Kalichman 2009	Low	Low	Low	NI	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Keller 2017	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious
Lin 2009	Serious	Serious	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Serious
Lundgren 2013	Moderate	Low	NI	NI	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Macgowan 1997	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious
Miller 2014	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Pulerwitz 2006	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Low	Serious
Pulerwitz 2010	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Pulerwitz 2015	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Schwarz 2004	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate

Verma 2008	Moderate	NI	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Weisz 2001	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Wolfe 2003	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate

RESPONSE OPTION

Low risk of bias (the study is comparable to a well-performed randomized trial);

Moderate risk of bias (the study appears to provide sound evidence for a non-randomized study but cannot be considered comparable to a well-performed randomized trial);

Serious risk of bias (the study has some important problems);

Critical risk of bias (the study is too problematic to provide any useful evidence and should not be included in any synthesis);

No information on which to base a judgement about risk of bias.

CRITERIA

The study is judged to be at **low risk of bias for all domains**.

The study is judged to be at **low or moderate risk of bias for all domains**.

The study is judged to be at **serious risk of bias** in at least one domain, but not at critical risk of bias in any domain.

The study is judged to be at **critical risk of bias in at least one domain**.

There is no clear indication that the study is at serious or critical risk of bias *and* there is a lack of information in one or more key domains of bias (*a judgement is required for this*).

Risk of Bias Assessment for Randomised Control Trials (RoB 2.0)

RefID	Author, Year	Risk of bias arising from the randomization process (Domain 1)	Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (Domain 2)	Missing outcome data (Domain 3)	Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome (Domain 4)	Risk of bias in selection of the reported result (Domain 5)	Overall bias
1	Abramsky 2014	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns
2	Abramsky 2016	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns
11	Baiocchi 2017	Low	High	Low	High	Some concerns	High
29	Cowan 2010	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	High
36	Davis 2000	High	High	High	Some concerns	High	High
37	Davis 2002	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
52	El-Bassel 2005	Low	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	High
55	Fay 2006	High	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
56	Feder 2000	High	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
57	Feder 2002	High	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
58	Feder 2004	High	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
60	Foshee 1998	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
61	Foshee 2000	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
62	Foshee 2004	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
63	Foshee 2005	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	High

68	Gidycz 2011	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns
72	Gupta 2013	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns
84	Hossain 2014	Some concerns	High	Low	High	Some concerns	High
86	James 2006	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
91	Jewkes 2008	High	High	Low	Low	Some concerns	High
108	Kyegombe 2014	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	Low	High
109	Kyegombe 2015	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	Low	High
110	Labriola 2005	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
119	Maxwell 2004	Some concerns	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
121	Miller 2012	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns
144	Rhodes 2011	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns
148	Salazar 2006	Low	High	Low	High	High	High
149	Salazar 2014	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
151	Saunders 1996	Low	High	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	High
152	Schuler 2012	Low	High	High	High	Some concerns	High
153	Schuler 2012	Low	High	High	High	Some concerns	High
156	Shattuck 2011	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns
162	Taylor 2012	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
163	Taylor 2001	High	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High
164	Taylor 2009	Some concerns	High	Low	High	Some concerns	High

171	Wagman 2015	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	Low	High
-----	-------------	-----	-----	------	---------------	-----	------

**OVERALL RISK-OF-BIAS
JUDGEMENT**

Low risk of bias

Some concerns

High risk of bias

CRITERIA

The study is judged to be at **low risk of bias for all domains** for this result.

The study is judged to raise **some concerns** in at least one domain for this result, but not to be at high risk of bias for any domain.

The study is judged to be at **high risk of bias** in at least one domain for this result.

Or

The study is judged to have **some concerns for multiple domains** in a way that substantially lowers confidence in the result.