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Web Appendix 1: Results of study screening and selection process, 1980-2014

Stage 1: Peer reviewed literature: electronic database search (N=49376)

Excluded: duplicates (N=11876)

Stage 2a: Peer reviewed literature: title/abstract review (N=37500)

Excluded: no outcome or output, not an intervention, not a humanitarian crisis, others (N=37116)

Stage 2b: Peer reviewed literature: full article review (N=384)

Stage 3: Grey literature papers added (N=39)

Stage 4: Peer reviewed and grey literature (N=423)

Excluded after full paper review (N=78)

Stage 5: Final papers selected (N=345)
Web Appendix 2: Quality review criteria (adapted from STROBE and CONSORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STROBE Criteria for Observational Studies</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONSORT Criteria for Clinical Trials</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention:</td>
<td>Eligibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the intervention clearly described?</td>
<td>1. Did study state # not meeting inclusion criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of participants:</td>
<td>2. Did study state # declined to participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the target population defined?</td>
<td>Once Randomized:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a comparison group (e.g. baseline, control)?</td>
<td>Allocation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria defined?</td>
<td>3. Did study state # receiving intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical methods:</td>
<td>4. Did study state # not receiving intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the sample size / method justified with statistical basis?</td>
<td>Follow-Up:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there a statistical test (p-value or confidence interval)?</td>
<td>5. Did study state # lost to follow-up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is there adjustment for confounding?</td>
<td>6. Did study provide reasons for loss to follow-up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations:</td>
<td>Analysis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are study limitations explained (e.g. biases)?</td>
<td>- Did study state reasons participants were excluded from analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are limitations of the study explained (e.g. biases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Web Appendix 3: List of studies included in the study, by health topic

Communicable disease control (by disease type)

Malaria


Polio


Communicable Diseases (Excluding Malaria, NTDs, and Polio)

87. Arumugam, M., et al., Measles transmission following the tsunami in a population with a high one-dose vaccination coverage, Tamil Nadu, India 2004-2005. BMC Infectious Diseases, 2006. 6(143).


**Water and sanitation**


**Nutrition**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Mental Health and Psychosocial Support


Non communicable diseases


300. Amirjamshidi A, et al. (2003), Minimal debridement or simple wound closure as the only surgical treatment in war victims with low-velocity penetrating head injuries. Indications and management protocol based upon more than 8 years follow-up of 99 cases from Iran-Iraq conflict. Surgical Neurology. Vol. 60(2): 105-10; discussion 110-1.
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