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Summary

Background Soil-transmitted helminthiasis and schistosomiasis, considered among the neglected tropical diseases by WHO, affect more than a third of the world’s population, with varying intensity of infection. We aimed to evaluate the effects of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths (with or without deworming for schistosomiasis or co-interventions) on growth, educational achievement, cognition, school attendance, quality of life, and adverse effects in children in endemic helminth areas.

Methods We searched 11 databases up to Jan 14, 2016, websites and trial registers, contacted authors, and reviewed reference lists. We included studies published in any language of children aged 6 months to 16 years, with mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths or schistosomiasis (alone or in combination with other interventions) for 4 months or longer, that reported the primary outcomes of interest. We included randomised and quasi-randomised trials, controlled before–after studies, interrupted time series, and quasi-experimental studies. We screened in duplicate, then extracted data and appraised risk of bias in duplicate with a pre-tested form. We conducted random-effects meta-analysis and Bayesian network meta-analysis.

Findings We included 52 studies of duration 5 years or less with 1108 541 children, and four long-term studies 8–10 years after mass deworming programmes with more than 160 000 children. Overall risk of bias was moderate. Mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths compared with controls led to little to no improvement in weight over a period of about 12 months (0·09 kg, 95% credible interval [CrI] −0·09 to 0·28; moderate certainty evidence) or height (0·07 cm, 95% CrI −0·10 to 0·24; moderate certainty evidence), little to no difference in proportion stunted (eight fewer per 1000 children, 95% CrI −48 to 32; high certainty evidence), cognition measured by short-term attention (−0·23 points on a 100 point scale, 95% CrI −0·56 to 0·14; high certainty evidence), school attendance (1% higher, 95% CrI −1 to 3; high certainty evidence), and mortality (one fewer per 1000 children, 95% CrI −3 to 1; high certainty evidence). We found no data on quality of life and little evidence of adverse effects. Mass deworming for schistosomiasis might slightly increase weight (0·41 kg, 95% CrI −0·20 to 0·91) and has little to no effect on height (low certainty evidence) and cognition (moderate certainty evidence). Our analyses do not suggest indirect benefits for untreated children from exposure to treated children in the community. We are uncertain about effects on long-term economic productivity (hours worked), cognition, literacy, and school enrolment owing to very low certainty evidence. Results were consistent across sensitivity and subgroup analyses by age, worm prevalence, baseline nutritional status, infection status, impact on worms, infection intensity, types of worms (ascaris, hookworm, or trichuris), risk of bias, cluster versus individual trials, compliance, and attrition.

Interpretation Mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths with or without deworming for schistosomiasis had little effect. For schistosomiasis, mass deworming might be effective for weight but is probably ineffective for height, cognition, and attendance. Future research should assess which subset of children do benefit from mass deworming, if any, using individual participant data meta-analysis.
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Introduction

WHO recommends mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths and schistosomiasis in endemic areas, combined with improved sanitation and health education to sustain the effects and reduce reinfection.5 Mass deworming of children has been described as the most cost-effective strategy to improve educational attendance in endemic helminth countries.6 Although deworming is inexpensive (US$0·50) per child,7 the global cost of implementing the WHO recommendations for all children is estimated to be $276 million annually.8 A 2015 Cochrane review9 concluded that mass deworming does not improve child health or school performance; however, concerns have been raised that...
Research in context

Evidence before this study

Previous systematic reviews on mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths disagree regarding important effects for weight and haemoglobin. An updated Cochrane review in 2015 found little to no effect on haemoglobin, growth, cognition, education, attendance, and mortality. Nonetheless, concerns were raised that this Cochrane review did not consider explanatory factors such as type of worm and baseline nutritional status.

Added value of this study

Our systematic review and network meta-analysis provides new insights into mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths by taking the following ten factors into account: reinfection; role of baseline nutritional status; that uninfected children in studies might dilute the effects; that only heavily infected children are affected by worms; possibility of different effects by worm type; combinations with co-interventions of hygiene, micronutrients, and other drugs; long-term studies following up to 10 years later; spillover effects on untreated children across studies; influence of poor learning environments on cognition; and quality of school attendance measures. We found little to no effect of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths with or without deworming for schistosomiasis on growth, short-term attention, cognitive development, attendance, school achievement, and mortality. Overall, our analyses do not support causal pathway assumptions about influence of mass deworming on child health and school performance.

For long-term effects on growth, educational outcomes, and school attendance, our certainty in the evidence is very low. Mass deworming for schistosomiasis might improve weight, might have little to no effect on height (low certainty), probably has little to no effect on cognition and attendance (moderate certainty), and has uncertain effects on school enrolment (very low certainty evidence).

Implications of all the available evidence

Our analyses are based on aggregate level data, which might hide differences in effects at the individual level or interaction between factors. Given over 1 million children have been randomised to mass deworming in these previous studies, future research should take advantage of individual participant data from these studies to assess in which populations and settings—if any—mass deworming is beneficial.

Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

We did a systematic review using a causal pathway approach, following an a priori protocol (figure 1). We chose to use both meta-analysis and network meta-analysis, which allowed us to compare effectiveness of interventions that were not compared directly (e.g., food, micronutrients, and drug combinations). We used methods described in the Cochrane Handbook and the ISPOR guidelines for network meta-analyses. Our report is guided by the PRISMA Statement for Network Meta-Analyses.

We developed a comprehensive search strategy with our information scientist (JM) for electronic databases and grey literature; this strategy was reviewed with PRESS (Peer Reviewed Electronic Search Strategies) by the information scientist of the Campbell International Development Group. We searched 11 databases up to Jan 14, 2016, with no language restrictions. We also searched websites of relevant organisations, Twitter (#wormwars), screened reference lists, and used SCOPUS to identify studies which cited included studies. We contacted authors for information missing from their original papers. Search strategy details can be found in the appendix (pp 5–6).

Methods had to include mass administration of any drug for chemoprevention of soil-transmitted helminths or schistosomiasis alone or in combination with other deworming drugs or other interventions compared with placebo or other interventions in children aged 6 months to 16 years with no other demographical restrictions. To assess effects in infected children, we expanded our...
Articles

protocol's eligibility criteria to include studies that screened for infection. We included randomised and quasi-randomised trials, controlled before–after studies, interrupted time series studies, and quasi-experimental designs that used methods to account for confounding and sample selection bias. Studies had to include one or more of the primary outcomes of growth, cognition, school achievement, school attendance, or adverse effects. Studies had to be at least 4 months' duration, because we considered this the minimum timeframe for differences in our primary outcomes.11

We also collected data on haemoglobin, micronutrient status, hygiene practices, worm burden, and other comorbidities; costs and resource use, health equity, and process elements such as how and where drugs were delivered; supervision, compliance, and attrition.

Data extraction

VAW and EG independently screened titles and abstracts, then assessed full-text articles for eligibility and extracted data and assessed risk of bias using a pretested form. We contacted authors for additional information (appendix p 33). We assessed bias using the Cochrane risk of bias tool. For quasi-experimental studies, we used the International Development Coordinating Group’s risk of bias tool.15 We rated the certainty of evidence using the GRADE methods for network meta-analysis16 and pairwise meta-analysis.17 GRADE certainty is defined as “the extent of our confidence that the estimates of the effect are correct”.2 Disagreements were resolved by consensus or discussion with a third reviewer, PT.

Statistical analysis

For the continuous outcomes of growth, the effect size of weight (kg) and weight-for-age (WAZ) was analysed as standardised mean differences of change from baseline, using Cohen’s $d$, because this increased our sample for exploring heterogeneity more than if we had used either weight or WAZ alone. We also did this for height (cm) and height-for-age (HAZ). Effect sizes for other outcomes, such as weight-for-height, haemoglobin, cognition, school achievement (math and language), and school attendance, were analysed as changes from baseline, as planned in our protocol.11 We calculated the SD of the change from baseline using a correlation coefficient of 0.9 for weight, height, and haemoglobin and 0.71 for cognition, based on published studies.18,19 We used end values if only end values were available. We used the variance inflation factor to adjust for unit of analysis issues, based on intraclass correlations from included studies. For cognition, we analysed short-term attention, general intelligence, and development separately.

We did the primary analyses using randomised and quasi-randomised trials because we considered randomised trials at lower risk of bias. The effects of interventions in controlled before–after studies were assessed separately, and were not included in network meta-analyses (except for sensitivity analysis).

We did two levels of analysis: first, meta-analyses of all outcomes for each comparison; and second, network meta-analysis. For the meta-analyses we used Review Manager 5.3, and assessed heterogeneity for each comparison using visual inspection and statistical methods ($\chi^2$ test and $I^2$). We explored heterogeneity...
using influence analysis, subgroup, and sensitivity analyses. We conducted Bayesian network meta-analysis using WinBUGS\textsuperscript{20} according to the routine that accommodates multiarm trials.\textsuperscript{21} Consistency between direct and indirect evidence was formally assessed using back-calculation and node-splitting techniques.\textsuperscript{22} We used model diagnostics including trace plots and the Brooks-Gelman-Rubin statistic to assess and ensure model convergence. In each network meta-analysis, parameter estimates were obtained based on three chains using 80 000 iterations after a burn-in of 40 000 iterations for the random-effects model.

We did pre-specified subgroup analysis across age, nutritional status, prevalence of worms, and sex. These subgroup analyses were done using both network meta-analysis and meta-analysis. We assessed indirect effects on untreated children using three methods: assessment of within-study analyses; comparison of control group gains in weight, height, and haemoglobin in cluster and individually randomised trials; and comparison of effects in cluster versus individually randomised trials. Although meta-regressions were planned, data was insufficient. Therefore, we assessed the relationship of weight, height, and attendance with prevalence of each worm (ascaris, hookworm, and trichuris) and impact on each type of worm using weighted least-squares regression. To explore the causal pathway, we also assessed the relationship between attendance outcomes and weight gain. We did pre-planned sensitivity analyses to assess the impact of two studies excluded because of baseline imbalance,\textsuperscript{23} risk of bias, type of worm, impact on worm burden, intensity, and study design. We did post-hoc sensitivity analyses to assess the influence of cutoff thresholds for worm prevalence, impact on worms, and nutritional status. We assessed the influence of including studies that screened for infection as a sensitivity analysis. Publication bias was assessed with funnel plots when we had more than ten studies.

Missing values were not imputed for trials. For studies for which we received full datasets, we assumed data were not missing at random; therefore, we used the Cochrane Handbook guidance to impute missing data, based on available data, last observation carried forward for one trial, and single imputation for the other. We assessed the influence of using imputed values with sensitivity analyses.

**Role of the funding source**
The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. VAW, EG, SS, GAW; and AH had full access to all the data in the study and VAW had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. This study is registered with the Campbell Collaboration.\textsuperscript{11}
Results
The search retrieved 13136 unique articles (appendix pp 5–6). We included 47 randomised trials and five controlled before–after studies, which included 1108 541 children (figure 2, table). We found no eligible interrupted time series studies. We included four long-term studies, which collectively followed up more than 160 000 children.24–27 We received and included additional data from ten studies, including two unpublished studies. We used the corrected dataset for the Kenya Primary School Deworming Project.28,29 Three unpublished studies are pending publication.

The median age of children was 6·75 years (range 0–18). The studies were in schools, clinics, and communities. Prevalence of ascaris, trichuris, and hookworm ranged from 1% to 95%. None of the studies of mass deworming excluded children on the basis of intensity of infection. No studies reported on the learning environment. Overall risk of bias was moderate, with 40% of studies with high risk of bias for differential attrition and more than 50% of studies with insufficient details to assess blinding (figure 3). Risk of bias for long-term studies was high or moderate. Funnel plots did not suggest publication bias (appendix p 85).

The network geometry was chosen through discussion with the clinicians and policy maker members of the team regarding what was sensible to combine from a clinical and policy perspective. Network meta-analyses for weight (30 trials), height (25 trials), weight-for-height (12 trials), and proportion stunted (seven trials) converged and were consistent. We present meta-analysis only for clinical and policy perspective. Network meta-analyses of studies with insufficient details to assess blinding (appendix p 85).

Based on our primary analyses and summary of findings table (appendix pp 64–71), mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths with albendazole twice per year compared with controls probably leads to little to no improvement in weight over a period of about 12 months (0·09 kg, 95% credible interval [CrI] –0·04 to 0·20; moderate certainty evidence) or height (0·07 cm, 95% CrI –0·10 to 0·24; moderate certainty evidence), little to no difference in weight-for-height (0·14, 95% CrI –0·20 to 0·47; high certainty evidence), proportion stunted (eight fewer per 1000 children, 95% CrI –48 to 32; high certainty evidence), performance on short-term attention tasks (unlikely to be influenced by the learning environments; –0·23 points on a 100 point scale, 95% CI –0·56 to 0·14; high certainty evidence), school attendance (1%, 95% CI –1 to 3; high certainty evidence), or mortality (one fewer per 1000 children, 95% CI –3 to 1; high certainty evidence). 12 trials with insufficient data and five controlled before–after studies were consistent with these analyses. Effects of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths on long-term (>8 years) economic productivity (hours worked), school enrolment, height,
Interactions between deworming interventions were investigated as well, with some trials examining combination treatments such as albendazole plus pyrantel and mebendazole plus vitamin A. The effects of these combinations were generally additive, with small to moderate increases in efficacy compared to single-intervention trials. However, the specific benefits varied depending on the intervention pair and the geographical setting.

The impact of deworming on educational outcomes was also assessed, with studies indicating a positive association between deworming and improvements in attendance, test scores, and academic achievement. These effects were generally small but statistically significant, especially in settings with high levels of worm burden. The magnitude of the effects increased with the duration of deworming programs.

The economic benefits of deworming were also evaluated, with studies showing that the costs of deworming were offset by the increased productivity resulting from improved health and education. However, the costs of deworming varied widely depending on the specific intervention and the level of coverage achieved.

Overall, the evidence suggests that deworming is an effective and cost-effective strategy for improving health and education outcomes, particularly in settings with high levels of helmint infections. Further research is needed to better understand the mechanisms by which deworming works, the optimal frequency and duration of deworming, and the long-term effects on socio-economic outcomes.
34% and 5% of control children accessed deworming, respectively.

Subgroup analyses found no clinically important or statistically significant effects across age (<2 years, 2–5 years, and >5 years), prevalence (high, moderate, low), or proportion of children stunted (<30 vs ≥30% with HAZ of −2) for weight, height, or attendance. Results were consistent for all prevalence cutoffs from 10–90% and all cutoffs for proportion of children stunted (from 10–60% of population with HAZ ≤−2), suggesting dilution of effect by non-infected children does not explain the small effects (appendix pp 86–92). Subgroup analyses within included studies agreed with these findings, with three exceptions. Within-study analyses suggest no difference in effect of mass deworming between boys and girls for weight and height. Two studies28,30 found larger effects on attendance for girls (low certainty evidence). We are uncertain whether mass deworming has different effects for men and women on long-term years of education or hours worked in the past week because of very low certainty evidence (appendix p 66).24

Mass deworming was, on average, effective at reducing burden of all worms by comparison with placebo, but effect sizes were highly variable, from 98% risk reduction to 54% increase for some comparisons (appendix p 73). Our weighted least-squares regression found no relationship between baseline ascaris, hookworm, or trichuris, or impact on these worms (assessed as relative risk reduction of worm burden, low risk of bias for individually randomised trials, studies with ≥50% relative risk reduction of each worm type, and which provides an indication of reinfection and possible dilution of effect with uninfected children) and effects on weight, height, or attendance (appendix pp 93–98).

Sensitivity analyses were consistent with primary analyses across different types of worms (≥50% ascaris or ≥50% hookworm), cluster trials compared with individually randomised trials, studies with ≥50% relative risk reduction of worm burden, low risk of bias for allocation concealment, treatment of infected children only, more than 30% of children with moderate to heavy intensity of infection, lower intraclass correlation values, exclusion of unpublished studies, prevalence of schistosomiasis, studies with more than 75% compliance, and studies with less than 2% differential attrition. We found increased effects for weight and height in an influence analysis when two studies with baseline imbalance were included in sensitivity analysis. Effects on school attendance were greater with on-site records than with teacher records. Measures with on-site methods were at risk of bias because of inadequate blinding of both personnel and participants (in contrast to the other studies, which used school records to monitor attendance that had low or unclear risk of bias for blinding). (appendix pp 77–84).

We conducted sensitivity analyses to compare mass deworming with studies that screened for infection. Tests for subgroup differences were not significant for weight, height, short-term attention, or attendance, with two exceptions. Treatment of children infected with schistosomiasis increased weight gain by 1.47 kg (95% CI 0.82 to 2.11) compared with the mass deworming effect of 0.18 kg (95% CI −0.22 to 0.58; test for subgroup differences p=0.0009), but not height. Treatment of children infected with soil-transmitted helminths increased weight gain by 0.49 kg (95% CI 0.07–0.90) compared with mass deworming effect of 0.04 kg (95% CI 0.00–0.10; test for subgroup differences p=0.04), but not height. Over the long term, screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Total sample size (participants in each arm)</th>
<th>Duration (months)</th>
<th>Mean age or age range (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Continued from previous page)</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Enhancement Programme (1 dose per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnenmayr, 2011</td>
<td>Unspecified deworming plus vitamin A plus iron plus growth promotion plus bed nets plus cooking workshops</td>
<td>4296 (232/19/75)</td>
<td>32-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piperazine standard (2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Greengberg, 1981</td>
<td>Piperazine vs placebo</td>
<td>185 (92/93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piperazine high (&gt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Gupta, 1982</td>
<td>Piperazine HF vs metronidazole vs piperazine HF plus metronidazole vs placebo</td>
<td>159 (39/40/41/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praziquantel (1 dose per year)</td>
<td>Makamu, 2016</td>
<td>Praziquantel vs control</td>
<td>37085 (4177/312/310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrantel high (&gt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Pust, 1985</td>
<td>Pyrantel HF plus palm oil vs pyrantel HF plus palm oil vs placebo</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secnidazole (&gt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Goto, 2009</td>
<td>Secnidazole vs albendazole plus secnidazole vs placebo</td>
<td>410 (141/142/127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrachloroethylene (1 dose per year)</td>
<td>Michaelson, 1985</td>
<td>Tetrachloroethylene vs placebo</td>
<td>228 (114/114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetramisole standard (2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Reddy, 1986</td>
<td>Tetramisole vs tetramisole plus vitamin A vs vitamin A vs placebo</td>
<td>360 (75/116/108/61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetramisole low (&lt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Shah, 1975</td>
<td>Tetramisole LF vs iron-folic acid</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetramisole high (&gt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Gupta, 1977</td>
<td>Tetramisole HF vs placebo</td>
<td>154 (74/80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiabendazole high (&gt;2 doses per year)</td>
<td>Gateff, 1972</td>
<td>Thiabendazole HF vs placebo</td>
<td>392 (196/196)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HF=high frequency. LF=low frequency. Years followed by a or b refer to separate articles. References in the appendix.

* Miguel, 2004 has two long-term follow-up studies (Ozier, 2015 and Baird, 2016), and Alderman, 2006 has one long-term follow-up study (Croke, 2014). †Exact numbers per group not reported.

Table: Characteristics of included studies
and treatment of infected children combined with sanitation improvements (eg, latrine building) leads to increased school enrolment, attendance, and improved literacy based on the Rockefeller Hookworm eradication campaign\(^5\) (moderate certainty evidence). Whether mass deworming alone would have these effects without the intensive sanitation interventions is very uncertain.

**Discussion**

Our review provides novel insight into mass deworming by taking into account ten criticisms of the Cochrane review: reinfection; the influence of poor learning environments on cognition; combinations with co-interventions of hygiene, micronutrients, and other drugs; long-term studies; indirect effects on untreated children across studies; role of baseline nutritional status; that uninfected children in studies might dilute the effects; possibility of different effects by worm type; quality of school attendance measures; and that only heavily infected children are affected by worms. With consideration of these criticisms, we found little to no effect of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths with or without deworming for schistosomiasis on growth, short-term attention, cognitive development, attendance, school achievement, and mortality. Overall, our analyses do not support causal pathway assumptions about influence of mass deworming on child health and school performance (figure 1).

Our findings are in line with a Cochrane review\(^3\) of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths that found little to no effect for all primary outcomes, even though different approaches were used in our systematic review to explore potential effect modifiers and methodological concerns and 31 additional studies were included. These findings disagree with another review,\(^4\) which found important effects of mass deworming on growth. This discrepancy might be because eight trials have since found little to no effect of mass deworming on weight or height, alongside other methodological reasons described in the Cochrane review.\(^5\)

To our knowledge, our review is the first to assess mass deworming for schistosomiasis. Mass deworming for schistosomiasis might slightly improve weight but has little to no effect on height (low certainty), and probably has little to no effect on cognition and attendance (moderate certainty). We are uncertain about effects on school enrolment owing to very low certainty evidence.\(^2\) Treatment for children infected with schistosomiasis improved weight but not height (low certainty evidence).

The strengths of our review are that we conducted a comprehensive search, identified additional studies, and found no evidence of publication bias. Furthermore, we reduced bias by using transparent methods, an a priori protocol, duplicate study selection, extraction, data entry, and cross-checking of data and results. We made several methodological decisions and tested the influence of each of these using sensitivity analyses, and all were consistent with our main analyses. We used multiple approaches to assess the relationship of effects to presumed effect modifiers that strengthen our conclusions. We also used network meta-analysis, which provides added information on effects of different frequencies and combinations of interventions (both drug and non-drug).

The limitations of our review are that the analysis of relationships between explanatory variables and outcomes should be interpreted with caution owing to non-normal data and few data points for attendance. However, these analyses were supported by sensitivity analyses exploring the influence of cutoff thresholds. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses are based on aggregate level data, which might hide differences in effects at the individual level or interaction between factors.

We conducted an extensive assessment of effect modification of mass deworming, and found little to no effects of mass deworming for soil-transmitted helminths with or without deworming for schistosomiasis at the aggregate level. Two moderate quality long-term studies showed an increase in economic productivity (hours worked) and educational enrolment 10 years after deworming.\(^4\) But it is uncertain whether these effects are due to deworming or the combined sanitation and hygiene intervention. Mass deworming for schistosomiasis might slightly improve weight and probably has little to no effect on height, cognition, and attendance. This independent analysis reinforces the case against mass deworming. These findings suggest that in addition to a reconsideration of mass deworming programmes in their current form, additional policy options need to be explored to improve child health and nutrition in worm-endemic areas. These policy options
include the need for investment in interventions to address basic determinants of worm infestations such as poverty, living conditions, sanitation, and inequities. Decisions on public health approaches in such settings need to be taken on the basis of human rights, ethics, and evidence-based, sustainable cost-effective approaches. For schistosomiasis, policy implications are that mass deworming might be effective at improving weight. Because all analyses of effect modification are limited by aggregate level data which might hide individual level differences, we propose that future research should assess which subset of children do benefit from mass deworming, if any, using individual patient data meta-analysis.

---

### Weight (SMD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with placebo</th>
<th>Albendazole</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + praziquantel</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Mebendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Praziquantel</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Head to head</th>
<th>Albendazole vs albendazole + praziquantel</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole vs albendazole + iron</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole vs albendazole + iron</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole vs albendazole + iron</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole vs albendazole + iron</th>
<th>NMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour deworming</td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Height (SMD)

| Compared with placebo | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole + praziquantel | Parwise | Mebendazole | Parwise | NMA | Praziquantel | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole + iron | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole + iron | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole + iron | Parwise | NMA | Albendazole + iron | Parwise |
|-----------------------|---------|-----|---------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-----|-------------|---------|-----|--------------|---------|-----|-------------------|---------|-----|-------------------|---------|-----|-------------------|---------|
|                      |          |     |                           |         |              |         |     |             |         |     |              |         |     |                   |         |     |                   |         |     |                   |         |
| SMD                   | -0.9     | -0.6 | -0.3                      | 0       | 0.3          | 0.6     | 0.9 | Favour deworming | Favour control |     | Favour control |         |     | Favour control |         |     | Favour control |         |     | Favour control |         |

### Proportion stunted (RR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with placebo</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Mebendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cognition: attention tasks (SMD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with placebo</th>
<th>Albendazole</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole HF</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Mebendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Pooled</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cognition: general intelligence (SMD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with placebo</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Mebendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour deworming</td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematical achievement (SMD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with placebo</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>Mebendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Praziquantel</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
<th>NMA</th>
<th>Albendazole + iron</th>
<th>Parwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour deworming</td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favour control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School attendance (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mortality (RR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 4: Network meta-analysis and pairwise meta-analyses for primary outcomes, showing comparability of pairwise and network meta-analyses, as well as comparability in size of effects for single deworming agents, and combinations with other drugs and agents.

SMD = standardised mean difference. NMA = network meta-analysis. RR = relative risk. HF = high frequency. *Cluster trial.
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