Supporting information Table S2. Study design of the included publications: risks of bias and attrition

Species	Publication	Country	Endpoint	Age group	Attrition					Study design		
	(name, year)		(month)		Enrolle d (n)	Assesed (n)	Assessed (%)	Risk of bias	Control	Blinding	Details	
_	Bornmann										ma, community based, computer-generated	
sh	2001	Gabon	2	school	300	296	99%	low	CS		randomization, other risks of randomisation bias unclear	
	Burchard 1984	Gabon	2	school	165	138	84%	high	CS		school based, risks of randomisation bias unclear	
	Davis 1981	Zambia	1	school	151	151	100%	low	CS	2	ma, school based, Allocation concealment: double blind, low risks of randomisation bias	
	Davis 1701	Zambia	1	SCHOOL	131	131	100 /6	IOW	L3	2	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study,	
	de Clercq 2002	Senegal	2	school	288	267	93%	low	CS		unclear risks of randomisation bias	
	Inyang-Etoh	J									school based, exhaustive, placebo controlled,	
	2008	Nigeria	2	school	312	262	84%	high	CS		randomisation unclear	
											school based, exploratory open-label trial, computer-	
	Keiser 2010	Ivory coast	1	school	83	83	100%	low	CC		generated randomization code, unclear risks of other randomisation bias	
	Keisei 2010	Ivory coast	1	SCHOOL	03	03	100%	IOW	CS		ma, school based, computer-generated sequence,	
	King 2002	Kenya	2	all ages	291	200	69%	high	cs		unclear risks of other randomisation bias	
	g	,_		g							school-based, male only, unclear risks of randomisation	
	Latham 1990	Kenya	2	school	48	48	100%	low	CS		bias	
											ma, school based, exhaustive, stratified randomisation,	
	McMahon 1983	Tanzania	2	all ages	138	125	91%	low	CS		unclear risks other randomisation bias	
	McMahon 1979	Tanzania	1	school	90	77	86%	high	CS		ma, unclear risks of randomisation bias	
	Midzi 2008	Zimbabwe	2	school	675	624	92%	low	sts	na	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study	
	N'goran 2003	Ivory coast	1	school	440	354	80%	high	sts	na	School based, exhaustive, selective treatment study	
	Oyideran 1981	Nigeria	1	school	90	82	91%	low	00		ma, placebo controlled, unclear risks of other randomisation bias	
	Oylueran 1961	Nigeria	1	young	90	02	9170	IOW	CS		Tandomisation bias	
	Rey 1983	Niger	1	adult	208	188	90%	low	cs		ma, school based, unclear risks of randomisation bias	
	.,	3									School based, block randomization, single blind, high	
	Sissoko 2009	Mali	1	school	800	781	98%	low	CS	1	quality	
	Tchuente 2004	Cameroon	1	school	674	515	76%	high	sts	na	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study	
											ma, computer-generated, unclear risks of	
	Wilkins 1987	Gambia	1	school	619	619		na	sts	na	randomisation bias and attrition bias incomplete	
sh + si	Kern 1984	Gabon	2	school	158	158		na	cs		exhaustive, school based, unclear risks of randomisation bias	
sj	Belizario 2007	Philippines	1	school	206	203	99%	low	CS	2	school based, randomized, double blind	
											hospital based, randomized, double-blind, placebo-	
	Hou 2008	China	2	all ages	205	196	96%	low	CS	2	controlled, other bias unclear	
	0111 0044	DI 111	4		000	000	000/				ma, double-blind trial, computerised block size of 4, low	
-1//	Olliaro 2011	Philippines	1	school	203	200	99%	low	CS	2	risk of bias	
sj/sm/	Olds 1999	Kenya,	2	cobool	1540	1540	100%	love	00	2	school based, double blind placebo controlled, multisite,	
sh	OldS 1999	Phillipines,	2	school	1540	1540	100%	low	CS	2	randomised block design of size 80, low risk of bias	

China

		China									
sm	Abu elyazed 1998	Egypt	2	all ages	975	939	96%	low	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, 2 selective treatment studies community based, exhaustive, randomized in two
	Barakat 2005	Egypt	1	all ages	104	83	80%	high	CS		groups, the first for Myrrh and the second for praziquantel, unclear risks of randomisation bias
	Berhe 1999	Ethiopia	2	school	611	541	89%	high	sts	na	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study community based, stratified randomisation, unclear risks
	Botros 2005	Egypt	1,2	all ages	379	271	72%	high	CS		of randomisation bias ma, based not reported, double blind, unclear risks of
	daSilva 1986	Brazil	1	all ages	120	94	78%	high	CS	2	other randomisation bias
	Declerq 2000b Declerq tmih	Senegal	2	all ages	180	156	87%	high	CS		hospital based, unclear risks of randomisation bias ma, community based, unclear risks of randomisation
	2000	Senegal	2	all ages	110	110	100%	low	CS		bias
	Degu 2002	Ethiopia	2	school	154	148	96%	low	sts	na	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study school based, not exhaustive, selective treatment study,
	Friis 1988	Botswana Saudi	2	school	81	81	100%	low	sts	na	stratified randomisation
	Ghandour 1995	Arabia	1	all ages	170	170	100%	low	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study
	Gryseels 1987	Burundi	2	all ages	1138	1049	92%	low	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study ma, community based, unclear risks of randomisation
	Guisse 1987	Senegal	1	school	130	130	100%	low	CS		bias and attrition bias incomplete ma, community based, single blind, unclear risks of
	Homeida 1989	Sudan	2	all ages	885	806	91%	low	CS	1	randomisation bias
	Ismail 1994 Kabatereine	Egypt	2	all ages	463	436	94%	low	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study community based, not exhaustive, selective treatment
	2003 Kardaman	Uganda	2	all ages	617	482	78%	high	sts	na	study ma, community based, exhaustive, unclear risks of
	1983	Sudan	1	all ages	388	347	89%	high	sts	na	randomisation bias school based, exhaustive, unclear risks of
	Massoud 1984	Egypt	1	school	179	179	100%	low	CS		randomisation bias ma, community based, exhaustive, unclear risks of
	McMahon 1981	Tanzania	1	all ages	102	91	89%	high	CS		randomisation bias school based, exhaustive, stratified randomisation,
	Metwally 1995 Mohamed 2009	Egypt	1	school	506 102	366 92	72% 90%	high	CS		unclear risks of randomisation bias school based, open label, unclear risks of randomisation
	Navaratnam	Sudan	ļ	school	102	72	70%	low	CS		bias community based, exhaustive, every second child assigned to the same treatment arm, other risks of
	2012	Uganda	1	preschool	297	203	68%	high	CS		randomisation bias unclear school based, open-label randomised trial, computer-
	Obonyo 2010	Kenya	1	school	212	204	96%	low	cs	1	generated block, single blind, unclear other risks of bias ma, double-blind trial, computerised block size of 4,
	Olliaro 2011	Brazil	1	all ages	196	190	97%	low	CS	2	sealed and numbered envelopes
	Olliaro 2011	Mauritania	1	all ages	186	185	99%	low	CS	2	ma, double-blind trial, computerised block size of 4,

											scaled and numbered crivelopes
	Olliaro 2011	Tanzania	1	school	271	244	90%	low	CS	2	ma, double-blind trial, computerised block size of 4, sealed and numbered envelopes
	Raso 2004	Ivory coast	2	all ages	200	161	81%	high	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study
	Simonsen 1990 Sousa- Figueiredo	Ethiopia	1	school	265	206	78%	high	sts	na	school based, exhaustive, selective treatment study
	2012	Uganda	1	preschool	369	305	83%	high	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study community based, stratified randomisation, unclear risk
	Stelma 1997	Senegal	2	all ages	138	138	100%	low	CS		of bias
	Taddese 1988	Ethiopia	1	adult	200	191	96%	low	CS		ma, farm based, randomly assigned, unclear risk of bias ma, community based, exhaustive, stratified
	Teesdale 1984	Malawi	1	all ages	69	69	100%	low	CS		randomisation, unclear risk of other bias school based, exhaustive, unclear risk of randomisation
	Thiongo'o 2002 Utzinger 2000	Kenya	2	school	1018	1018		na	CS		bias and attrition bias incomplete school based, selective treatment study, unclear risk of
	tmih	Ivory coast	1	school	253	194	77%	high	sts	na	randomisation bias
sm+sh	El Tayeb 1988 Kardaman	Sudan	1	school	111	111	100%	low	cs		school based, exhaustive, randomisation on the toss of a coin, unclear other risks of randomisation bias
	1983 Kardaman	Sudan	1	all ages	43	37	86%	high	sts	na	community based, exhaustive, selective treatment study ma, school based, exhaustive, unclear risks of
	1985	Sudan	2	school	373	373	100%	low	sts	na	randomisation bias ma, school based, exhaustive, single blind, unclear risk
	Taylor 1988	Zimbabwe	1	school	220	211	96%	low	CS	1	of other bias

sealed and numbered envelopes

Legend: Blinding, 1: single, 2: double; endpoint, 1:within one month, 2: within two months; sm, *S. mansoni*; sh, *S. haematobium*; sj, *S. japonicum*; cs, comparative study; sts, selective treatment study; na, not applicable; ma, included in *S. mansoni* or *S. haematobium* meta-analysis; Exhaustive: all people screened whether community or school based study; Selective treatment study: non-comparative study using praziquantel; The attrition risk bias is measured as the number of patients not assessed at endpoint time out of the number of patients enrolled and considered high when greater than 10%.