

PRISMA-S Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Location(s) Reported
INFORMATION SOURCES AND METHODS			
Database name	1	Name each individual database searched, stating the platform for each.	Page 2, 7, supplementary file 3
Multi-database searching	2	If databases were searched simultaneously on a single platform, state the name of the platform, listing all of the databases searched.	Page 2, 7, supplementary file 3
Study registries	3	List any study registries searched.	Page 7, supplementary file 3
Online resources and browsing	4	Describe any online or print source purposefully searched or browsed (e.g., tables of contents, print conference proceedings, web sites), and how this was done.	Page 7, supplementary file 3
Citation searching	5	Indicate whether cited references or citing references were examined, and describe any methods used for locating cited/citing references (e.g., browsing reference lists, using a citation index, setting up email alerts for references citing included studies).	Page 8
Contacts	6	Indicate whether additional studies or data were sought by contacting authors, experts, manufacturers, or others.	N/A
Other methods	7	Describe any additional information sources or search methods used.	Page 7
SEARCH STRATEGIES			
Full search strategies	8	Include the search strategies for each database and information source, copied and pasted exactly as run.	Supplementary file 3

Limits and restrictions	9	Specify that no limits were used, or describe any limits or restrictions applied to a search (e.g., date or time period, language, study design) and provide justification for their use.	Page 7
Search filters	10	Indicate whether published search filters were used (as originally designed or modified), and if so, cite the filter(s) used.	Page 7
Prior work	11	Indicate when search strategies from other literature reviews were adapted or reused for a substantive part or all of the search, citing the previous review(s).	Page 6
Updates	12	Report the methods used to update the search(es) (e.g., rerunning searches, email alerts).	Page 7
Dates of searches	13	For each search strategy, provide the date when the last search occurred.	Supplementary file 3
PEER REVIEW			
Peer review	14	Describe any search peer review process.	Published protocol
MANAGING RECORDS			
Total Records	15	Document the total number of records identified from each database and other information sources.	PRISMA Flow chart (Figure)
Deduplication	16	Describe the processes and any software used to deduplicate records from multiple database searches and other information sources.	Page 8

PRISMA-S: An Extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews Rethlefsen ML, Kirtley S, Waffenschmidt S, Ayala AP, Moher D, Page MJ, Koffel JB, PRISMA-S Group.

Last updated February 27, 2020.

PRISMA Equity Checklist

Checklist of Items for Reporting Equity-Focused Systematic Reviews				
Section	Item	Standard PRISMA Item	Extension for Equity-Focused Reviews	Pg #
Title				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	Identify equity as a focus of the review, if relevant, using the term equity	1
Abstract				
Structured summary	2	2. Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	State research question(s) related to health equity.	2
	2A		Present results of health equity analyses (e.g. subgroup analyses or meta-regression).	2
	2B		Describe extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest.	2
Introduction				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Describe assumptions about mechanism(s) by which the intervention is assumed to have an impact on health equity.	N/A
	3A		Provide the logic model/analytical framework, if done, to show the pathways through which the intervention is assumed to affect health equity and how it was developed.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Describe how disadvantage was defined if used as criterion in the review (e.g. for selecting studies, conducting analyses or judging applicability).	6
	4A		State the research questions being addressed with reference to health equity	6
Methods				
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.		6
Eligibility criteria	6	6. Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	Describe the rationale for including particular study designs related to equity research questions.	N/A
	6A		Describe the rationale for including the outcomes - e.g. how these are relevant to reducing inequity.	N/A
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	Describe information sources (e.g. health, non-health, and grey literature sources) that were searched that are of specific relevance to address the equity questions of the review.	Supplementary file 3
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Describe the broad search strategy and terms used to address equity questions of the review.	Supplementary file 3
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).		Table 1 in document with tables, page 1
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.		8
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS,	List and define data items related to equity, where such data were sought	Supplementary file 5

		funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	(e.g. using PROGRESS-Plus or other criteria, context).	
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.		N/A
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).		8, Tables 3 and 4 in document with tables, page 3
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	Describe methods of synthesizing findings on health inequities (e.g. presenting both relative and absolute differences between groups).	8
Risk of bias across studies	15	15. Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).		N/A
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	Describe methods of <u>additional</u> synthesis approaches related to equity questions, if done, indicating which were pre-specified	N/A
Results				
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.		PRISMA Flow Chart (Figure)
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Present the population characteristics that relate to the equity questions across the relevant PROGRESS-Plus or other factors of interest.	Table 5 in document with tables, page 4
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).		N/A
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.		N/A
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	Present the results of synthesizing findings on inequities (see 14).	N/A
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).		N/A
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	Give the results of <u>additional</u> synthesis approaches related to equity objectives, if done, (see 16).	N/A
Discussion				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).		12 - 14
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).		14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	Present extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest and describe the evidence and logic underlying those judgments.	15
	26A		Provide implications for research, practice or policy related to equity where relevant (e.g. types of research needed to address unanswered questions).	15
Funding				
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.		2