**Table S4. Checklist for quality of reporting: Mixed Methods.**

We appraised the quality of reporting of each study using a checklist of criteria based on methods described in a previous review [[1](#_ENREF_1)]. Mixed methods studies were assessed for the reporting of 11 criteria: study context, sampling strategy, methodology, justification of mixed methods, systematic data analysis, multivariate analysis, minimization of bias, the integration of qualitative and quantitative findings and the extent to which the findings were discussed in reference to policy, programming or further research [[2-4](#_ENREF_2)].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | | | | | | | | | | | **SCORE (n/11)** |
| **Author/Year** | **Description of Context** | **Participants and Sampling described** | | **Methods described** | **Justification of mixed methods** | **Systematic Data Analysis described** | | **Multivariate analysis used** | **Minimization of bias discussed** | **Integration of QUAN/QUAL components** | **Findings discussed** |
|  |  | **QUAN** | **QUAL** |  |  | **QUAN** | **QUAL** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kiningu, 2013 [[5](#_ENREF_5)] | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | 10 |
| Luz, 2013 B [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | √ | √ | √ | √ |  | √ | √ |  |  | √ | √ | 9 |
| Sabin, 2010 [[7](#_ENREF_7)] | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | 10 |
| Smith-Paintain, 2011 [[8](#_ENREF_8)] | √ | √ | √ | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | 10 |
| Stangeland, 2011 [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  |  | √ | √ | 9 |
| Tawfik, 2006 [[10](#_ENREF_10)] | √ | √ | √ | √ |  | √ | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | 9 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description of categories:** √ **indicates it was reported in the article** | |
| **Description of context** | Authors report an adequate description of setting (urban/rural), time of study and location |
| **Participants and sampling described** | Authors report sampling methods, justify use of sampling methods and provide details of participants |
| **Methods described** | Authors use appropriate methods to address aims of study, provide detailed research procedures, express expertise amongst the research team to conduct methods, or report training of facilitators |
| **Justification of mixed methods** | Authors discuss and justify the purpose, priority and sequence of methods used. |
| **Systematic data analysis described** | Authors provide a detailed procedure of analysis, with justification for the method of analysis |
| **Multivariate analysis used** | Authors report use of multivariate analysis to control for confounding |
| **Minimization of bias discussed** | Authors report steps taken to reduce measurement, social desirability, recall, and measurement biases. |
| **Integration of QUAN/QUAL components** | Authors report the integration of QUAN/QUAL methods and results |
| **Findings discussed** | Authors report the findings/results in terms of their impact on further research, programming and policy |
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