

Annex 2: quality appraisal for cross-sectional studies												
JBI checklist for quantitative studies	Vogel (2012)				Adedine (2018)				Mukamuyango (2020)			
	Yes	No	Unclear	Comment	Yes	No	Unclear	Comment	Yes	No	Unclear	Comment
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	X			Sampling method is well described	X			Sampling method is well described	X			Sampling method is well described
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	X			Clear definition of the subjects and setting is well described	X			Clear definition of the subjects and setting is well described	X			Clear definition of the subjects and setting is well described
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	X			There is an attempt of describing the exposure	X			There is an attempt of describing the exposure	X			There is an attempt of describing the exposure
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	X			Objectives of the study are well described	X			Objectives of the study are well described	X			Objectives of the study are well described
5. Were confounding factors identified?			X	There no clear statement indicating the confounding factors		X		There no clear statement indicating the confounding factors	X			There no clear statement indicating the confounding factors

6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?			X	No clear indication on how the confounding factors were controlled		X		No clear indication on how the confounding factors were controlled	X			There is a clear statement of the confounders
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	X			There is an indication on how the outcomes were assessed	X			There is an indication on how the outcomes were assessed	X			There is a clear statement
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	X			Adequate to answer the study objectives	X			Appropriate statistical analysis was used	X			Adequate to answer the study objectives
<b>JBI checklist for Quantitative studies</b>				<b>Barden-O'Fallon (2017)</b>				<b>Oyugi (2018)</b>				
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unclear</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unclear</b>	<b>Comment</b>	
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?				X			Sampling method is well described	X				
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?				X			Clear definition of the subjects and setting is well described	X				
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?				X			There is an attempt of describing the exposure	X				
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?				X			Objectives of the study are well described	X				
5. Were confounding factors identified?						X	There no clear statement indicating the confounding factors	X				
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?						X	No clear indication on how the confounding factors were controlled	X				
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?				X			There is an indication on how the outcomes were assessed	X				
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?				X			Adequate to answer the study objectives	X				