

Appendix S6. Quality assessment

Study quality was assessed using standard checklists of quality measures. STROBE¹ (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology) is a 22-item checklist for assessing cohort, case-control and cross-sectional studies, COREQ² (Consolidate criteria for reporting qualitative research) is a 32-item checklist for assessing qualitative research studies. Risk of bias was assessed using relevant sections of these checklists. Quality and risk of bias was assessed by two reviewers (CS and DB)

The overall quality assessment was synthesised using the Gough weight of evidence framework³ to take into account the appropriateness of the study method as well as the relevance of each study to answer the review question. This was assessed, and overall ratings agreed by two reviews (CS and DB). A green rating for quality and bias was awarded if most of the relevant checklist boxes were ticked, an amber rating was given if roughly half the boxes were ticked, and red if few boxes were ticked or a particular area of concern was highlighted. Methodological and topic relevance were rated using a scale of one to three. Studies including additional types of pregnancy loss, such as miscarriage, in addition to stillbirth scored only a maximum of 'two out of three' for methodological relevance. In the overall assessment, the lowest ranking colour or score was used. Studies were not excluded on basis of quality.

Study ID	WoE* A (Study Quality)			WoE* B (Methodological relevance)	WoE* C (topic relevance)	WoE* D (overall judgement)
	Quality	Risk of Bias	Overall			
Qualitative Studies						
Allahdadian 2015				+++	+++	+++
Allahdadian 2016				+++	+++	+++
Andajani 2004				++	++	++
Attachie 2016				+++	+++	+++
Chizhova 2010				+	++	+
Corbet-Owen2001				++	++	++
dos Santos 2004				+++	+++	+++
Haws 2010				++	+	+
Kiguli 2015				+++	+++	+++
Modiba 2007				++	+++	++
Modiba 2008				++	+++	++
Osman 2017				+++	++	++
Petrites 2016				++	++	++
Roberts 2012ii				+++	+++	+++
Santos 2012				++	+++	++
Sereshiti 2016				++	+++	++
Simwaka 2014				++	+++	++
Sisay 2014				++	++	++
Sutan 2012				++	+	+
Controlled Observational Studies (COS)						
Adeyemi 2008				+	+	+

Gausia 2011				++	+	+
Roberts 2012				++	++	++
Non-Controlled Observational Studies (COS)						
Moon Fai Chan 2010				++	+	+
Obi 2009				+	+	+
Paris 2016				+	+	+
Sutan 2010				+	+	+
Mixed methods						
Conry 2008				++	+++	++
Fotrell 2010				++	+++	++
Human 2014				++	+	+
Kuti 2011				++	+++	+++
Roberts 2015				++	+	+
Roberts 2016				++	+	+
Roberts 2016ii				++	+	+
Roberts 2017				++	++	++

Key		
	High quality/low risk of bias	
	Medium quality/unclear risk of bias	Low quality/high risk of bias
+	Weakly relevant	++ Relevant
		+++ Highly relevant
* Weight of Evidence (WoE) approach to allow not only the quality of studies to be assessed but also encourages the relevance of the study to the review topic to be considered.		

- 1 Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, *et al.* Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): Explanation and Elaboration. *PLoS Med* 2007; **4**: e297.
- 2 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Heal Care* 2007; **19**: 349–57.
- 3 Gough D. Weight of evidence: a framework for the appraisal of the quality and relevance of evidence. *Appl Pract Res Ed Res Pap Educ* 2007; **22**: 213–28.