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**Bias assessment methods for the systematic review on complications and mortality of patients with typhoid intestinal perforations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instrument** | **Domain 1** | **Question** | **Levels** |
| JBI-prevalence | Population / setting | 1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Population / setting | 2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Condition measurement | 6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition (case-definition) | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Condition measurement | 7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| Study-specific questions | Condition measurement | Did the authors clearly define what criteria were used to clearly classify a complication? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| Study-specific questions | Condition measurement | Were patients lost to follow-up and was an appropriate follow-up period defined for attributing a death to TIP? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Statistics | 3. Was the sample size adequate? |  |
| JBI-prevalence | Statistics | 5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Statistics | 8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| JBI-prevalence | Other | 4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? | yes/no/unclear/not applicable |
| Study-specific questions | Other | What type of study design was used? | retrospective / prospective / unclear |

JBI-prevalence, Joanna Briggs institute tool for quality appraisal for prevalence studies 2

Yes was defined as low-risk of bias; no as high-risk of bias; unclear as unclear; not applicable as not applicable

The risk of bias was summarised for each domain (population/setting; condition measurement; statistics; other) and the bias for each domain was summarised in overall risk of bias.

Calculation of domain bias:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain | Domain bias level | Calculation |
| Population/setting (2 items);  Statistics (3 items);  Other (2 items) | high | ≥1 items high OR 2 items unclear |
| intermediate | 1 item unclear |
| low | all others |
| Condition measurement  (4 items) | high | ≥2 items high OR ≥ items unclear |
| intermediate | 1 item high OR 1 item unclear |
| low | all others |

Calculation of overall bias:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Overall bias level | Calculation |
| Overall bias,  summary of four domains: | High | ≥2 domains high |
| Intermediate | 1 domain high |
| Low | all others |
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