**Bovine TB and Liver Fluke Systematic Review**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Study ID | Author(s) | Year |
| Report ID | Reviewed by | Date  |

**Methods:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Age |  |
| Number |  |
| Study population |  |
| Selection method |  |
| Duration |  |
| Setting |  |
| Country |  |
| Fluke detection methods |  |
| TB detection methods |  |
| Details of intervention/dose rate etc |  |
| Design | Retrospective/prospectiveData source of retrospective |

**Risk of bias**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Random allocation (RCT only)Yes | No |
| Allocation concealment (RCT only)Yes | No |
| Selection/sampling biasNo | Yes/possible |
| Response bias (questionnaire studies)No | Yes/possible |
| Recall bias (questionnaire studies)No | Yes/possible |
| Comparability of groups assessed?How? | NoGroups materially different |
| Detection bias (different tests used for different groups)No | Yes/possible |
| Confounders considered?Which ones?[Age, herd size, region,  | No |
| BlindingYes (Who, At which stage of study)No but probably not causing bias | No and may cause bias |
| Missing data: NonePresent, accounted for, not causing bias | Present but not accounted forPresent, accounted for causing bias or unclearNot mentioned |
| All methods performed and reported as described | Some results missing or analysed differently to methods |
| Overall risk of biasLow | High |
| Quality of studyHigh | Low |
|  |  |

**Analysis:**

Described fully?

**Results:**

Data (size and direction of any differences, statistical significance)

Author conclusions:
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