# Data Extraction Form

**Part A: Cover sheet summary**

**Study ID …… Initials of eligibility assessor …….**

**Title of the study …….....**

**……..**

**Publication year ……..**

## Part B: Study characteristics

**Outcome:** Note: if other is selected, study is excluded. □ TB disease prevalence □ LTBI prevalence □ Other ……

**Country of study** Note: if non-high-TB burden country is selected, study is excluded.

□ High-TB burden country (state)…… □ Non-high-TB burden country

**Study design** Note: if other is selected, study is excluded.

□ Cross-sectional study

□ Cohort study

□ Other. State if other …….

**Population**

□ Non-students

□ Students

□ Both {(General population including students and non-students) state proportion that is students, if defined/obtainable ……..

□ Undefined …….

## Diagnostic modality for TB disease or latent TB infection

| **TB disease** | **Prevalence** |
|---|---|
| | **n/N** |
| Clinical | |
| Sputum smear for AFB | |
| Solid or liquid culture | |
| Xpert MTB/RIF assay | |
| Other microbiological. If yes, state ….…… …… | |
| X-ray | |
| **Latent TB infection** | |
| Interferon Gamma Release Assay | |
| Tuberculin Skin Test | |
| Other. If yes, state & exclude ….…….. | |

**Age range of study participants** (Please include percentage aged 10-19 years. If disaggregated data are not obtainable and proportion of individuals aged 10-19 years is less than 75%, the study will be excluded) ……..……..……

## Gender of study participants

| **Gender** | **n/N** | **%** | **No. with LTBI** | **No. with TB disease** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | | | | |
| Female | | | | |
| **Total** | | **100%** | | |

Legend: No=Number

## Decision on inclusion/exclusion

□ Included

□ Excluded. Primary reason …….

□ Unsure. Reason (including need to contact authors) …….

……...

**Other comments** ……

……..

# Part C: Quality assessment

| Item under review | Score awarded (Yes=1 or No=0) |
|---|---|
| **External Validity** | **…** |
| Was the study's target population a close representation of the national population in relation to relevant variables? | … |
| Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population? | … |
| Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR was a census undertaken? | … |
| Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal? | … |
| **Internal validity** | **…** |
| Were data collected directly from the participants (as opposed to a proxy)? | … |
| Was an acceptable case definition used in the study? | … |
| Was the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest shown to have validity and reliability? | … |
| Was the same mode of data collection used for all participants? (1 point) | … |
| Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate? | … |
| Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate? | … |
| **Total** | **…** |

## Summary item on the overall risk of study bias: low, moderate or high risk of bias

**Legend:** As described by Hoy et al, the summary assessment evaluates the overall risk of study bias and is based on the rater's subjective judgment given responses to the preceding 10 items. This approach is consistent with the Cochrane and GRADE (GRADE=Grading of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) working group (26) recommendation or approaches. Furthermore, as summarized in the PRISMA (PRISMA= The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses) elaboration document, summative scales that numerically summarize multiple components into a single number are misleading and unhelpful (27), hence our choice of an overall ordinal scale for risk of bias. Response options for individual items are either low (1) or high risk of bias (0). If there is insufficient information in the article to permit judgment of a particular item, then the article is deemed to be at high risk of bias with respect to that item (21,28,29).