**Norovirus Challenge Studies SR: Study Quality Assessment Rubric**

Adapted from JBI tools for assessing study quality in case series.

1. [Clear.Inclusion.Criteria] Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?

* Yes: Inclusion criteria are stated clearly in the study.
* No: Study was sampled by convenience or without clear exclusion criteria.
* Unclear: Criteria for inclusion are not described.

1. [Reliable.Condition.Measure] Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?

* Yes: The same method was used to assess norovirus infection for all patients.
* No: Participants were assessed for infection in different ways.
* Unclear: Method of assessing infection was not reported.

1. [Valid.Condition.Methods] Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?

* Yes: Infection was assessed using any molecular method (e.g. serology, PCR, etc.).
* No: Infection was assessed using clinical symptoms alone.
* Unclear: Method of assessing infection is not reported.

1. [Same.Cohort] Were all participants sampled from the same underlying population at the same time? (I.e. did the participants form a single cohort?)

* Yes: All participants were sampled from the same general population, or if multiple cohorts were pooled together during the study, the results are stratified by cohort. All patients were infected with the same inoculum, or stratified by inoculum.
* No: Participants were recruited heterogeneously, or pooled cohort results were not stratified. Or patients with different inocula were pooled.
* Unclear: Impossible to tell from given information whether participants were pooled from various cohorts without stratification or not.

1. [Complete.Demographics] Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants included in the study?

* Yes: Age range of participants was reported and medical history of patients was mentioned.
* No: Age range is not reported or medical history not mentioned.

1. [Complete.Clinical] Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?

* Yes: Infection outcome is reported for the same number of patients who were recruited. Or, if numbers are different, the loss of participants is explained.
* No: Number of recruits reported does not match results, or number of total recruits is not reported.

1. [Site.Information] Was there clear reporting of the presenting site or clinic demography?

* Yes: authors describe the target population and state where the trial was conducted.
* No: authors do not describe the study population or do not state where the trial was conducted.
* Unclear: authors briefly describe the study site without detail, or describe the study site only as “multiple centers” or equivalent.

1. Overall risk of bias

* Low: Yes in at least six domains, No in zero domains.
* Moderate: Yes in at least five domains, No in at most one domain.
* High: Yes in fewer than five domains, or No in more than one domain.