Annexure 1. PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	☒	☐	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	☐	☒	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	☒	☐	2
Authors					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	☒	☐	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	☒	☐	1
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	☐	☒	NA
Support- Funding not taken					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	☒	☐	1
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	☒	☐	1
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	☒	☐	1
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	☒	☐	pg 1-2
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	☒	☐	p 1
METHODS					

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	☒	☐	pg 2
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	☒	☐	pg 3
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	☒	☐	pg 3
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	☒	☐	pg 3
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	☒	☐	pg 2-3
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	☒	☐	pg 2-3
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	☒	☐	pg 2
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	☒	☐	pg 3
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	☒	☐	pg 3
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	☒	☐	pg 3
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned	☒	☐	pg 3

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
		exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2, Kendall's tau)			
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	☒	☐	pg 3-5
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	☒	☐	pg 3-5
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	☒	☐	NA
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	☒	☐	NA

Annexure 2. Search staretegy

Search Strategy

1 # "early childhood program COVID*" OR "child care" OR "early intervention in COVID*" OR "head start" OR "early education" OR "early childhood education" OR "preschool curriculum" OR "early childhood intervention" OR "early childhood care" OR "infant development" OR "child cognitive development" OR "child linguistic development" OR "child socioemotional development" OR "child physical development" OR "child growth" OR "early childhood care"

2# Child OR infant OR toddler OR children OR newborn OR neonate OR kid OR pre-schooler

3# 1# AND 2#

Annexure 3. ROBIN-I Checklist for methadological quality assessment

RoB: Rias Bias Assessment					
Domains	**LR**	**MR**	**SR**	**CB**	**N/I**
Bias due to confounding					
Bias in selection of participants in the study					
Bias in classification of interventions					
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions					
Bias due to missing data					

Bias due to measurement of outcomes					
Bias in selection of the reported result					

Annexure 4. Data extraction table

Study ID	Country	Aim of the study	Study Design	Start Date	End Date	Funding sources	Conflict of Interest	Population	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria	Method of Recruitment	Total participants	Key findings	Policy Implications

Annexure 5. Quality assessment checklist for cohort and observational studies

Criteria	Yes	No	Other
			(CD, NR, NA)*
1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?			
2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?			
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?			
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?			
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?			
6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?			
7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?			
8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?			
9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?			
10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?			
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?			
12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?			
13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?			
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?			

Annexure 6. CASP tool for qualitative studies quality assurance

1. Was there a clear statement of aims of the research?
2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?
3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?
4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?
5. Was data collected in a way that addresses the research issue?
6. Has the relationship between the researcher and participants been adequately considered?
7. Have the ethical issues been taken into consideration?
8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?
9. Is there a clear statement of findings?
10. How valuable is the research?

Annexure 7. Reasons for Exclusion

1- No mention of intervention for ECD age group (n= 16)
2- Wrong study design (n= 13)
3- Wrong outcomes (n=1)
4- Wrong patient population (n=1)
5- Wrong setting (n=1).