The quality assessment of included studies by the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Form for cohort studies.

		Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Total
Crite	rias	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non- exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	- quality
Acceptable		From community of general population	From the same community as exposed cohort	From patients chart review/interview	Yes	Yes, at least age and sex	Contained objective indicators	At least 3 months	Follow up rate more than 80%, or subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias	_
S.N	Authors									
1.	Daniels et al. <sup>25</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
2.	Abebe et al. <sup>24</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
3.	Ibitoye et al. <sup>26</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
4.	Abrahim et al. <sup>27</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	-	*	8
5.	Liu et al. <sup>28</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
6.	Churiso et al. <sup>23</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9

7.	Al-Thaqafy et al. <sup>41</sup>	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	7
8.	Dessie et al. <sup>29</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
9.	Long et al. <sup>30</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
10.	Kaso et al. <sup>31</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
11.	Thai et al. <sup>32</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
12.	Lemma Tirore et al. <sup>33</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
13.	Leulseged et al. <sup>34</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	-	*	8
14.	Ciceri et al. <sup>42</sup>	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	7
15.	Samrawit Fantaw. <sup>35</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
16.	Lu et al. <sup>43</sup>	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	7
17.	Tolossa et al. <sup>36</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
18.	Barman et al. <sup>44</sup>	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	7
19.	Tsegaye et al. <sup>37</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
20.	Zhao et al. <sup>38</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
21.	Desiyalew	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
22.	Habtamu. <sup>39</sup> Thiruvengadam et al. <sup>40</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9