Additional File 3. Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies

COMPONENT RATINGS

A) SELECTION BIAS

(Q1) Are the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?
1. Very likely
2. Somewhat likely
3. Not likely
4. Can't tell

(Q2) What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?
1. 80–100% agreement
2. 60–79% agreement
3. less than 60% agreement
4. Not applicable
5. Can't tell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE THIS SECTION</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) STUDY DESIGN

Indicate the study design
6. Randomized controlled trial
7. Controlled clinical trial
8. Cohort analytic (two group pre + post)
9. Case-control
10. Cohort (one group pre + post (before and after))
11. Interrupted time series
12. Other specify ____________________________
13. Can't tell

Was the study described as randomized? If NO, go to Component C.
No    Yes

If YES, was the method of randomization described? (See dictionary)
No    Yes

If YES, was the method appropriate? (See dictionary)
No    Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE THIS SECTION</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) CONFOUNDERS

(Q1) Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?
   14 Yes
   15 No
   16 Can’t tell

The following are examples of confounders:
   17 Race
   18 Sex
   19 Marital status/family
   20 Age
   21 SES (income or class)
   22 Education
   23 Health status
   24 Pre-intervention score on outcome measure

(Q2) If YES, indicate the percentage of relevant confounders that were controlled (either in the design (e.g. stratification, matching) or analysis).
   25 80–100% (most)
   26 60–79% (some)
   27 Less than 60% (few or none)
   28 Can’t Tell

D) BLINDING

(Q1) Was (were) the outcome assessor(s) aware of the intervention or exposure status of participants?
   29 Yes
   30 No
   31 Can’t tell

(Q2) Were the study participants aware of the research question?
   32 Yes
   33 No
   34 Can’t tell

E) DATA COLLECTION METHODS

(Q1) Were data collection tools shown to be valid?
   35 Yes
   36 No
   37 Can’t tell

(Q2) Were data collection tools shown to be reliable?
   38 Yes
   39 No
   40 Can’t tell

Rate this section: STRONG MODERATE WEAK
See dictionary
F) WITHDRAWALS AND DROP-OUTS

(Q1) Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group?
   41 Yes
   42 No
   43 Can’t tell
   44 Not Applicable (e.g., one time surveys or interviews)

(Q2) Indicate the percentage of participants completing the study. (If the percentage differs by groups, record the lowest).
   45 80–100%
   46 60–79%
   47 less than 60%
   48 Can’t tell
   49 Not Applicable (e.g., Retrospective case-control)

RATE THIS SECTION STRONG MODERATE WEAK
See dictionary 1 2 3

G) INTERVENTION INTEGRITY

(Q1) What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest?
   50 80–100%
   51 60–79%
   52 less than 60%
   53 Can’t tell

(Q2) Was the consistency of the intervention measured?
   54 Yes
   55 No
   56 Can’t tell

(Q3) Is it likely that subjects received an unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results?
   57 Yes
   58 No
   59 Can’t tell

H) ANALYSES

(Q1) Indicate the unit of allocation (circle one)
   community organization/institution practice/office individual

(Q2) Indicate the unit of analysis (circle one)
   community organization/institution practice/office individual

(Q3) Are the statistical methods appropriate for the study design?
   60 Yes
   61 No
   62 Can’t tell

(Q4) Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e., intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?
   63 Yes
   64 No
   65 Can’t tell
GLOBAL RATING

COMPONENT RATINGS
Please transcribe the information from the gray boxes on pages 1–4 onto this page. See dictionary for how to rate this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELECTION BIAS</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STUDY DESIGN</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONFOUNDERS</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BLINDING</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHOD</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WITHDRAWALS AND DROPOUTS</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBAL RATING FOR THIS PAPER (circle one):

1  STRONG (no WEAK ratings)
2  MODERATE (one WEAK rating)
3  WEAK (two or more WEAK ratings)

With both reviewers discussing the ratings:

Is there a discrepancy between the two reviewers with respect to the component (A-F) ratings?

No  Yes

If yes, indicate the reason for the discrepancy

1  Oversight
2  Differences in interpretation of criteria
3  Differences in interpretation of study

Final decision of both reviewers (circle one): 1  STRONG

2  MODERATE

3  WEAK