PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

This checklist has been adapted for use with the systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central Journals from Table 3 in:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev [Internet]. 2015;4 (1):1. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1

It was adapted following guidelines from the editors-in-chief of *Systematic Reviews*:

Moher D, Stewart L, Shekelle P. Implementing PRISMA-P: Recommendations for prospective authors. Syst Rev [Internet]. 2016;5(1):4–5. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0191-y

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Information reported (Y/N)	Line number(s)
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Y	1-3
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Y	54
Authors:				
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Y	5-19
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Y	309-312
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol,	NA	N/A

		identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments		
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Y	268-273
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Y	301-306
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Y	307
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Y	63-98
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Y	100-126
METHODS				
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Y	141-156
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Y	166-169
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Y	169-174
Study records:				

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Y	186-190
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Y	187-194
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Y	202-210
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Y	203-206
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Y	220-228
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	Y	231-235
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Y	254-266
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	Y	258-266
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Y	260-264
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Y	238-251

Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Y	265-266
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Y	231-235

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.