

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

## General Information

**\* 1. Please estimate how many years experience you have in conducting systematic reviews**

**2. Please estimate the length of time you have been working in the field of health equity. If you do not work in health equity, please select "Not applicable"**

Comments

**3. Please describe your training/experience related to health equity**

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

## Tell us about one of your recent reviews

Consider a systematic review you are currently working on or have recently published and answer the following questions with that review in mind.

### \*4. At what stage is your systematic review?

### \*5. Which of the categories below does your review best fit into?

- My review is designed to assess effects of interventions targeted at disadvantaged populations
- My review is designed to assess effects of interventions aimed at reducing social gradients across populations (eg. interventions to reduce the social gradient in smoking)
- The intervention/s in my review are not aimed at reducing inequity, however it is important to understand the effects of the intervention/s on equity, either positively or negatively
- My review does not have a major focus on health equity (as defined by the above categories)
- My review is not a review of interventions (please describe the focus of your review, particularly in relation to equity)

### \*6. Did you/Do you plan to use the PRISMA statement to guide your reporting of your review?

- Yes
- No
- I have not heard of the PRISMA statement

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

## Testing out PRISMA-E 2012 on your review

Please answer the question below with your recent review in mind.

### \*7. Below are the extension items in the PRISMA-E 2012 checklist.

**Please indicate beside each item whether you intend to address (or have already addressed) that item in your review.**

|   | Yes                   | No                    | Unsure                |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Title: Identify equity as a focus of the review, if relevant, using the term equity   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Structured Summary: State research question(s) related to health equity   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Structured Summary: Present results of health equity analyses (e.g. subgroup analyses or meta-regression)   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Structured Summary: Describe extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Rationale: Describe assumptions about mechanism(s) by which the intervention is assumed to have an impact on health equity  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Rationale: 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Objectives: Describe how disadvantage was defined if used as criteria in the review (e.g. for selecting studies, conducting analyses or judging applicability)                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Objectives: State the research questions being addressed with reference to health equity  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe the rationale for including particular study designs related to equity research questions   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe the rationale for including the outcomes - e.g. how are these relevant to reducing inequity   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe information sources (e.g. health, non-health, and grey sources) that were searched that are of specific relevance to address the equity questions of the review | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe the broad search strategy and terms used to address equity questions of the review  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: List and define data items related to equity where such data were sought (e.g. using PROGRESS-Plus or other criteria, context)   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe methods of synthesizing findings on health inequities (e.g. presenting both relative and absolute differences between groups)                                   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Methods: Describe methods of additional synthesis approaches related to equity questions, if done, indicating which were pre-specified  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Results: Present the population characteristics that relate to the equity questions across the relevant PROGRESS-Plus or other factors of interest                                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Results: Present the results of synthesizing findings on inequities   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Results: Give the results of additional synthesis approaches related to equity objectives, if done  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Conclusions: Present extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest and describe the evidence and logic underlying those judgements                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Conclusions: Provide implications for research, practice or policy related to equity where relevant (e.g. types of research needed to address unanswered questions)               | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Additional Comments?

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

## Your opinion on the likelihood of the checklist items to change the way you...

This will help us understand what difference each item in PRISMA-E 2012 might make in the way review authors conduct reviews in general. In other words, how helpful is it to be reminded of each item in a reporting checklist?

Consider the question below in terms of your approach to conducting reviews in general, rather than any specific review.

**\*8. Please consider for each item whether you would usually always address that item (regardless of its inclusion in a reporting checklist), or whether you think having it in a reporting checklist would be a helpful reminder.**

|   | I would always address this item, so a checklist would make no difference | I may sometimes address this item, but a checklist would help to remind me | A checklist would make it much more likely for me to address this item | I do not think this item is relevant, so a checklist would make no difference |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Title: Identify equity as a focus of the review, if relevant, using the term equity   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Structured Summary: State research question(s) related to health equity   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Structured Summary: Present results of health equity analyses (e.g. subgroup analyses or meta-regression)   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Structured Summary: Describe extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest  | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Rationale: Describe assumptions about mechanism(s) by which the intervention is assumed to have an impact on health equity  | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Rationale: 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 | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Objectives: Describe how disadvantage was defined if used as criteria in the review (e.g. for selecting studies, conducting analyses or judging applicability)                    | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Objectives: State the research questions being addressed with reference to health equity  | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Methods: Describe the rationale for including particular study designs related to equity research questions   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Methods: Describe the rationale for including the outcomes - e.g. how are these relevant to reducing inequity   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
| Methods: Describe information sources (e.g. health, non-health, and grey sources) that were searched that are of specific relevance to address the equity questions of the review | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |
|   | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

Methods: Describe the broad search strategy and terms used to address equity questions of the review

Methods: List and define data items related to equity where such data were sought (e.g. using PROGRESS-Plus or other criteria, context)

Methods: Describe methods of synthesizing findings on health inequities (e.g. presenting both relative and absolute differences between groups)

Methods: Describe methods of additional synthesis approaches related to equity questions, if done, indicating which were pre-specified

Results: Present the population characteristics that relate to the equity questions across the relevant PROGRESS-Plus or other factors of interest

Results: Present the results of synthesizing findings on inequities

Results: Give the results of additional synthesis approaches related to equity objectives, if done

Conclusions: Present extent and limits of applicability to disadvantaged populations of interest and describe the evidence and logic underlying those judgements

Conclusions: Provide implications for research, practice or policy related to equity where relevant (e.g. types of research needed to address unanswered questions)

Additional Comments?

# PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

## Your thoughts on the overall utility of the PRISMA-E 2012 checklist

Having now seen all the new checklist items in PRISMA-E 2012, please tell us what you think.

### \*9. Would you use PRISMA-E 2012 to assist in reporting equity in your systematic reviews?

- Yes, I would use this checklist for every review
- Yes, I would consider using this checklist depending on the focus of my review
- No, I would not use this checklist because I am already aware of the items to include in reporting equity in my reviews
- No, I would not use this checklist because it is not relevant
- Unsure

Additional comments

### \*10. Overall, do you think using PRISMA-E 2012 would lead you to report (or conduct) your review differently?

- Most definitely
- Possibly
- No, because I already include these items in reporting my reviews
- No, because I would not include many of these items as they are not relevant
- Unsure

Additional comments

## PRISMA-E 2012 Checklist: capturing the experience of review authors

**\*11. Do you think using PRISMA-E 2012 in developing your review would improve the useability of your review for decisions about equity?**

Yes

No

Unsure

Additional comments

**12. Please list any perceived facilitators and advantages for you in using PRISMA-E 2012 to guide reporting on equity in your reviews?**

**13. Please list any potential barriers for you in using PRISMA-E 2012 to guide reporting on equity in your reviews?**

**14. Are there any items missing from PRISMA-E 2012?**