# Supplementary Text 3: Quality Assessment Coding Criteria

For each report characteristic, we assigned ‘good’, ‘fair’, and ‘poor’. The criteria are described as bellow.

1. Sampling representativeness

Good: the study population can reflect the disease pattern among individuals with and without famine exposure specifically and properly

Fair: the study population has the potential to reflect the disease pattern among individuals with and without famine exposure

Poor: the study population cannot reflect the disease pattern among individuals with and without famine exposure

1. Sample size

Good: the monthly number of exposed subjects is over 40

Fair: the monthly number of exposed subjects is between 10 and 40

Poor: the monthly number of exposed subjects is below 10 or not reported or cannot be calculated

1. Exposure definition

Good: the exposure is defined both quantitatively and qualitatively

Fair: the exposure is defined either quantitatively or qualitatively

Poor: the exposure definition is not justified quantitatively or qualitatively

1. Famine severity assessment

Good: different data sources are used to evaluate famine severity

Fair: single data source is used to evaluate famine severity

Poor: no data is used or reported to evaluate famine severity

1. Confounding adjustment

Good: the confounding adjustment is conducted with explanation or discussion

Fair: the confounding adjustment is conducted without explanation or discussion

Poor: the confounding adjustment is not conducted or reported

1. Outcome assessment

Good: the outcome is assessed clinically or with similar standards

Fair: the outcome is assessed but not clinically

Poor: the outcome assessment method is not described

1. Statistical methods

Good: the proper statistical analysis is conducted and supplemented by sensitivity analysis

Fair: the proper statistical analysis is conducted

Poor: the statistical analysis is not properly conducted or clearly reported