

## **Supplementary figure 1: ESBL-E carriage risk of bias tool**

Adapted from CASP checklists, and: Development of a quality appraisal tool for case series using a modified Delphi technique (Institute of Health Economics) 2012 (<https://casp.uk.net> accessed 10th April 2019 and Stockdale et al Lancet Global Health 2017 5(10):PE992-E1003 )

### **Domain 1: Study population/participant recruitment**

**1.** Are the characteristics of the participants included in the study adequately described?

**Yes:** The authors should report the total number, age, and gender distribution of the participants who had stool or rectal swabs taken

**Partially reported:** The criteria above are incompletely reported

**No:** None of the relevant characteristics of the participants is reported.

### **Domain 2. Are the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) to enter the study explicit and appropriate?**

**Yes:** The eligibility criteria are clearly stated and replicable. A statement on age of eligibility is given. Stool or rectal swabs are taken from general community or hospital and not in a special population such as neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) or intensive care unit (ICU).

**Partially reported:** The criteria above are incompletely reported

**No:** The eligibility criteria are not clearly stated or are inappropriate.

### **Domain 3. Were stool culture results precise and reported?**

**Yes:** There is a detailed description of the method of stool processing. There is a detailed description of the method used for organism identification (e.g. API\*). There is a statement confirming the use of external laboratory quality control.

**Partially:** The method of stool culture processing is vague or partially reported (eg. Bactec machine used for incubation, but method of identification not reported). External quality control is not reported.

**No:** The method of stool processing is not reported or quality control was not done

\*Analytical profile index

### **Domain 4. Were the methods of ESBL confirmatory testing precise?**

**Yes:** There is a detailed description of the method of ESBL confirmation and this follows recognised national or international guidelines.

**Partially:** Method of ESBL confirmatory testing vague or partially reported.

**No:** Method of ESBL confirmatory testing not reported or do not follow recognised guidelines.

Appendix: Risk of bias assessment in included studies

[illegible]