




Supplementary Figure 1A Forest plot comparing anastomotic leak rate for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 1B Forest plot comparing anastomotic leak rate for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 2A Forest plot comparing surgical site infection rate for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 2B Forest plot comparing surgical site infection rate for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 3A Forest plot comparing intra-abdominal collection rate for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 3B Forest plot comparing intra-abdominal collection rate for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 4A Forest plot comparing hospital length of stay for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). An inverse-variance random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and mean differences are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 4B Forest plot comparing hospital length of stay for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *versus* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). An inverse-variance random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and mean differences are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.




Supplementary Figure 5A Forest plot comparing mortality rate for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 5B Forest plot comparing mortality rate for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 6A Forest plot comparing reoperation rate for patients enrolled in a randomised controlled trial receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 6B Forest plot comparing reoperation rate for patients enrolled in an observational study receiving mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) *vs* either a single rectal enema (top) or absolutely no preparation (bottom). A Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was used to perform the meta-analysis and odds ratios are quoted including 95% confidence intervals.