# Appendix A3: 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 ref (Stockdale CID and CASP and me if it’s accepted by then but prob not)

**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 community and not 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 testing not reported or do not follow recognised guidelines.

Appendix A4: Risk of bias assessment in included studies

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Domain 1**  Study participants  adequately described? | **Domain 2**  Eligibility criteria explicit and appropriate? | **Domain 3**  Stool culture results precise and reported? | **Domain 4**  ESBL confirmatory appropriate and reportedCo? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |