Hoy et al. tool for cross sectional studies	Yes (1)/No (0)
External validity	
1. Was the study's target population a close representation of the national	1
population in relation to Rabies virus prevalence?	
2. Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the study	1
population?	
3. Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR was a	1
census undertaken?	
4. Was the likelihood of nonresponse bias minimal (> 70%)?	1
Internal validity	1
5. Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to a proxy)?	1
6. Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	1
7. Was the study viral detection assay shown to have validity and reliability?	1
8. Was the same mode type of sample collected for all subjects?	1
9. Was the length of the length of the study period > 1 year?	1
10. Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the Lassa virus prevalence	1
or case fatality rate appropriate?	
Total score	10
Interpretation of the risk of bias tool	
• 7-10: Low risk of bias	
• 4-6: Moderate risk of bias	
• 0-3: High risk of bias	

Supplementary Table 3. Items for risk of bias assessment