SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Biomarkers for cognitive impairment in alpha-synucleinopathies: an overview of systematic reviews and meta-analyses

Elisa Mantovani[1,^], Alice Martini[2,3], Alessandro Dinoto[1], Chiara Zucchella[4], Sergio Ferrari[4], Sara Mariotto[1], Michele Tinazzi[1], Stefano Tamburin[1,^]

[1]Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, University of Verona, Piazzale L.A. Scuro 10, I-37134, Verona, Italy

[2]School of Psychology, Keele University, Newcastle ST5 5BG, UK

[3]Addiction Department, Azienda Sanitaria Friuli Occidentale, via Interna 5A, 33170, Pordenone, Italy

[4]Section of Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, Verona University Hospital, Piazzale Aristide Stefani 1, 37126, Verona, Italy.

[^]Corresponding authors. Elisa Mantovani, MPsych, PhD, Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, Neurology Section, University of Verona, Piazzale Scuro 10, I-37134 Verona, Italy; Tel.: +39-347-630-5905; Fax: +39-045-802-7276; Email address: elisa.mantovani@univr.it; ORCID: 0000-0003-3717-7697.

Stefano Tamburin, MD, PhD, Section of Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, University of Verona, Piazzale Scuro 10, I-37134 Verona, Italy. Tel.: +39-347-523-5580; fax: +39-045-802-7276; email: stefano.tamburin@univr.it; ORCID: 0000-0002-1561-2187.

Summary:

Supplementary table 1

PRISMA checklist

Supplementary table 1. JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic reviews and Research Syntheses tool

Ref.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Total score*	Overall judgement
[37]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8	Moderate
[44]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	4	Low
[49]	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	No	No	No	Unclear	No	No	No	0	Low
[50]	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	5	Moderate
[51]	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	4	Low
[32]	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	No	No	Unclear	2	Low
[33]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	6	Moderate
[38]	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Unclear	2	Low
[52]	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	3	Low
[39]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6	Moderate
[53]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	4	Low
[40]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	5	Moderate
[41]	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	1	Low
[42]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	5	Moderate
[43]	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Unclear	2	Low
[56]	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	5	Moderate
[34]	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	3	Low
[30]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	5	Moderate
[54]	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	4	Low

[35]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	7	Moderate
[55]	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	6	Moderate
[45]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	4	Low
[47]	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	5	Moderate
[46]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	6	Moderate
[36]	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	No	Unclear	No	No	Yes	2	Low

Leading explanatory questions per domain:

Q1. Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated in the method section?

Q2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?

Q3. Was the search strategy appropriate?

Q4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?

Q5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?

Q6. Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?

Q7. Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?

Q8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?

Q9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?

Q10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?

Q11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?

*Total score refers to the sum of positive points (“yes”).

Overall judgement: low quality = 0-4; moderate quality = 5-8; high quality = 9-11.

Abbreviations. JBI = Joanna Briggs Institute.

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Pages 3-5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Pages 4-5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page 16
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 17
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Page 17
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 17
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 17
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 17
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 17
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 18
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	N/A
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Page 17
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 17
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Page 17
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Page 17
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Page 5 figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Figure 1
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Pages 5-8, tables 2-4
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Page 8, supplementary table 1
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Page 8, table 5, figure 2
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Pages 9-14
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Pages 14-15
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Pages 14-15
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Pages 15-16
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Page 16
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Page 16
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 19
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 19
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Page 19

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71