

Study (first author)	Study design	Selection				Comparability	Outcome		Quality Score out of 7
		Representativeness of the sample	Sample size	Ascertainment of exposure	Non-respondents	The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled.	Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	
Mulu et al., 2015 [47]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Dereje et al., 2017 [48]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Dessie et al., 2016 [49]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Desta et al., 2016 [50]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Mamuye, 2016 [51]	CS	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Legese et al., 2017 [52]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Ramos et al., 2017 [53]	CS	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Dereese et al., 2016 [54]	CS	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Beyene et al., 2011 [55]	CS	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	5
Debalke et al., 2014 [56]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Mama et al., 2016 [57]	CS	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	6
Mulualem, 2012 [58]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Zenebe et al., 2011 [59]	CS	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	6
Nigussie, 2017 [60]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Amsalu et al., 2016 [61]	RSC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Tadesse et al., 2014 [62]	CS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Wasihun et al., 2015 [63]	PCS	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6

This scale had adapted from Wells *et al.*, (2009), “the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses”. We considered the comparability is controlled if the standard laboratory procedure is described in the articles. Since the outcome of the bacterial sensitivity test is obtained after full growth of the bacterial strains, we assigned one star for the assessment outcomes of all studies.