

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-018223
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Härmälä, Suvi; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Parisinos, Constantinos; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Shallcross, Laura; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics O'Brien, Alastair; University College London, Division of Medicine Hayward, Andrew; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics; University College London, Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care
Primary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Keywords:	Pneumococcal vaccine, Influenza vaccine, Chronic liver disease

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO**
4 **PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC**
5 **LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**
6
7
8
9

10
11 Suvi Härmälä¹, Constantinos Parisinos¹, Laura Shallcross¹, Alastair O'Brien² &
12 Andrew Hayward^{1,3}
13
14

15
16
17
18 ¹ Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, United
19 Kingdom.
20

21 ² Division of Medicine, University College London, London, United Kingdom.
22

23 ³ Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London,
24 United Kingdom.
25
26
27
28

29 Corresponding author: Suvi K. Härmälä, Institute of Health Informatics,
30 University College London, 222 Euston Road, London NW1 2DA, United
31 Kingdom, suvi.harmala.14@ucl.ac.uk, +44 (0)20 3549 5338
32
33
34
35
36

37 Keywords: Pneumococcal vaccine, influenza vaccine, chronic liver disease
38
39
40
41

42 Word count (excluding title page, abstract, strengths & limitations, references
43 and table): 3909
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In advanced chronic liver disease, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus put people at an increased risk of serious health complications and death. The effectiveness of the available vaccines in reducing the risk of poor health outcomes, however, is less clear.

Methods and analysis: We will search MEDLINE, EMBASE, Pubmed, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group Specialised Register and The Cochrane Acute Respiratory Infections Group Register of Trials for published reports on randomised controlled trials and observational studies on the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in people with chronic liver disease. Two independent reviewers will screen the studies for eligibility, extract data and assess study quality and risk of bias. Random effects meta-analyses will be performed as appropriate.

Ethics and dissemination: Formal ethical approval is not required, as no primary data will be collected for this study. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.

Prospero registration number: CRD42017067277

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:

- This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P).
- This study protocol has been prospectively registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO).
- Our comprehensive search strategy will minimise the risk of missing relevant studies, in particular, those with a randomised design.
- The selection of studies, data extraction, the risk of bias and quality of evidence assessments will be conducted by two independent authors.
- Inclusion of studies with a non-randomised design may decrease the overall quality of the body of evidence for the study outcomes.

BACKGROUND

Burden of pneumococcal and influenza infections in chronic liver disease

In advanced chronic liver disease, as the immune function progressively deteriorates, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus can lead to serious health complications and death.

In Spain in 2011, the population-level annual incidence rate for pneumococcal pneumonia-related hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at approximately 540 per 100 000 compared to approximately 6 per 100 000 without at-risk conditions,[1]. Adults with liver disease were over 50 times more likely to be hospitalised for pneumococcal pneumonia than adults without at-risk conditions,[1]. Similarly, in England in 2008/2009, for invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD), such as meningitis, bacteraemia and sepsis, the annual incidence of hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at about 100 per 100 000 compared to about 8 per 100 000 in the healthy population,[2]. Approximately 37% of liver disease patients hospitalised for IPD died, compared to 5% of patients without underlying risk conditions,[2]. Chronic liver disease patients were over 30 times more likely to be admitted to hospital and 10 times more likely to die during the IPD-related hospitalisation than adults without at-risk conditions,[2].

Although there are no population-level estimates of severe influenza incidence in people with chronic liver disease, evidence suggests that liver disease patients are at an increased risk of health complications from influenza. A 2-fold increased risk of influenza admission was observed in liver disease patients at 19 hospitals in Russia, Turkey, China, and Spain during the 2013/2014 season,[3]. Similarly, an analysis of data on laboratory-confirmed influenza cases collected from several World Health Organisation (WHO) member states during the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic found liver disease patients to have a greater than 5-fold increased risk of influenza-related hospitalisation and over 17-fold increased risk of death compared to that of healthy individuals,[4].

1
2
3 Furthermore, influenza infection, while not directly targeting the liver, may
4 cause collateral transient liver damage,[5] and trigger hepatic decompensation
5 (such as ascites and hepatic encephalopathy) in liver disease patients,[6].
6
7

8 9 **Types of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines, vaccination policy and** 10 **vaccine uptake** 11

12
13
14 Two types of vaccines, polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccines including
15 serotypes of *S. pneumoniae* (PPV23) and conjugate pneumococcal vaccines
16 including 7 (PCV7), 10 (PCV10) or 13 (PCV13) *S. pneumoniae* serotypes, are
17 available to protect against pneumococcal infection. None of these contains live
18 bacteria.
19
20
21
22

23
24 The most commonly used influenza vaccines are injectable, inactivated vaccines
25 that contain either inactivated whole influenza virus or split or subunit virus
26 products. These vaccines protect either against two influenza A (H1N1 and
27 H3N2) strains and one influenza B (Victoria and Yamagata lineages) strain
28 (trivalent vaccines) or two influenza A and two influenza B strains (quadrivalent
29 vaccines). New vaccines are developed every year to protect against the
30 prevailing strains of the upcoming influenza season and a yearly vaccination is
31 recommended to ensure continued protection. Live attenuated influenza
32 vaccines exist, however, these may not be suitable for people with chronic co-
33 morbidities,[7].
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The majority of European countries recommend both adult influenza (29/29
43 countries) and pneumococcal vaccination (22/29 countries) for specific high-
44 risk groups,[8]. Chronic liver disease patients, however, may not be included in
45 these high-risk target groups in all countries. Whilst 90% (27/ 30) of the
46 countries recommended influenza immunisation for people with liver disease
47 during the 2014-2015 influenza season,[9], only 43% (6/14) of countries
48 surveyed in 2005 recommended pneumococcal vaccination for chronic liver
49 disease patients,[10]. Moreover, whilst the adult vaccination recommendations
50 for influenza are supported by official funding mechanisms in most countries
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (21/29), the cost of the pneumococcal vaccination is covered by only half
4 (11/22),[8].
5
6

7
8 Uptake of influenza vaccine in people with chronic diseases in general is poor.
9 The median coverage rate across Europe in the 2014/2015 season was less than
10 50% (only 7/30 countries were able to provide separate coverage data for
11 individuals with chronic medical conditions),[9]. The situation in liver disease
12 patients as a separate group seems no different with less than 50% of working-
13 age liver disease patients in the UK covered by the influenza vaccine in
14 2015/2016 season,[11]. Although fewer data exist concerning the uptake of
15 pneumococcal adult vaccination,[8], its uptake in liver disease patients is not
16 likely to be any higher than that of influenza vaccine.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Rationale for the review**

25
26

27
28 Approximately 29 million people in Europe alone are affected by some form of
29 liver disease,[12]. Worryingly, due to the increasing prevalence of obesity and
30 persistence of other liver damage risk factors such as alcohol abuse and hepatitis
31 infections, this number is expected to grow,[12]. Whilst evidence suggests that
32 following infection with influenza or *S. pneumoniae*, people with liver disease
33 have a higher than average risk of poor health outcomes, the effectiveness of the
34 vaccines in reducing this risk is less clear and warrants further investigation.
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 To our knowledge, no systematic review to date has investigated the effects of
42 pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in preventing poor health outcomes in
43 chronic liver disease. The present review intends to fill this gap by providing a
44 systematic synthesis of the available evidence. The results of this review may
45 inform future vaccination strategies and help improve vaccination coverage.
46 This, in turn, may have a positive impact on both the number of influenza and
47 pneumococcal disease-related hospital admissions and patient outcomes in liver
48 disease.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

OBJECTIVES

The aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to prevent serious health complications in adults with chronic liver disease.

The objectives are:

- To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to prevent hospitalisation in adults with chronic liver disease.
- To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to prevent death in adults with chronic liver disease.
- To assess the effects of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines for eliciting a serological response in adults with chronic liver disease.

METHODS

This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015,[13].

Eligibility criteria

Types of studies

We will include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with comparison group/s) and case-control studies that report the effects of pneumococcal or influenza vaccines for preventing infection or liver disease-related complications and death in adults with chronic liver disease. We will also include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with or without comparison group/s) and case-control studies that report the serological response to one or both of these vaccines in adults with chronic liver disease. We will only include published studies in English language and studies that have been published or accepted for publication. We will exclude review articles, case reports, cross-sectional studies,

1
2
3 animal studies, editorials, clinical guidelines and any studies that have been fully
4 or partially retracted from publication. Patients included in multiple studies will
5 be reported only once.
6
7

8 9 Types of participants

10
11
12 We will include studies that enrol 18+ year-old adult patients with chronic liver
13 disease of any severity (non-cirrhotic, cirrhotic) or aetiology (viral, alcoholic,
14 non-alcoholic fatty liver, autoimmune).
15
16
17

18 19 Types of interventions

20
21
22 We will include studies that investigate the effects of a conjugate or
23 polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccine (against *S. pneumoniae*) and/or an
24 inactivated (whole virus, split virus or subunit), injectable influenza vaccine.
25
26
27

28 29 Types of comparators

30
31
32 We will include studies comparing one or both of the vaccines of interest to a
33 placebo, an alternative intervention or no intervention. We will also include
34 studies without a comparison group when the outcome studied is the serological
35 response to the vaccine.
36
37
38

39 40 Types of outcome measures

41
42
43 We will include studies that report on one or more of our primary outcomes
44 and/or our secondary outcome of interest.
45
46
47

48 49 *Primary outcomes*

- 50 • All-cause hospitalisation
- 51 • All-cause mortality
- 52
- 53
- 54

55 56 *Secondary outcomes*

- Serological response to vaccine
- Acute respiratory illness-related hospitalisation
- Influenza illness or influenza-like-illness (ILI)-related hospitalisation
- Pneumococcal disease-related hospitalisation
- Hospitalisation for liver disease complications (variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, jaundice and bacteraemia or sepsis)
- Acute respiratory illness-related mortality
- Influenza illness or ILI-related mortality
- Pneumococcal disease-related mortality
- Liver disease-related mortality

Information sources

Electronic searches

To capture all relevant studies, we plan to search the following databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- MEDLINE
- EMBASE
- PubMed
- The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group Specialised Register
- The Cochrane Acute Respiratory Infections Group Register of Trials

Each database will be searched separately and the search strategy first developed in MEDLINE will be adapted to each database interface as appropriate. We plan to also search relevant studies from the reference lists of the eligible studies identified through the electronic searches.

Search strategy

We will use two complementary strategies to identify relevant articles. First, we will identify articles reporting outcomes of vaccination in patients with liver disease by combining search terms for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination with search terms for chronic liver disease (Search 1). This search will be filtered by study design. The provisional search terms for liver disease and pneumococcal and influenza vaccines are listed in Table 1.

Recognising that liver disease patients may be included as subgroups in clinical trials of vaccination, we will also search for randomised controlled trials of influenza and pneumococcal vaccine that have recruited individuals from the general population (Search 2).

To search for studies with adult participants, we will combine the geriatric and adult medicine-specific search strategies by Kastner et al.,[14]. In order to maximise the sensitivity of the searches for randomised clinical trials, we will use a filter that combines terms from the Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search Strategy,[15] and less specific version of the same filter by Chalmers et al.,[16] to identify randomised trials. Similarly, to maximise the sensitivity of searches for case-control and cohort studies, we will use a filter that combines terms from the University of Texas School of Public Health filter for observational studies,[17], SIGN observational study filter,[18] and the BMJ Evidence Centre case-control and cohort strategy,[19]. We will limit our search to studies including adult human study subjects but not based on the setting/country or publication year of the articles. The search terms for adult and study design filters are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. MEDLINE (Ovid) provisional search terms

Search concept	Search terms
Pneumococcal vaccine	1. exp Pneumococcal Vaccines/
	2. exp Pneumococcal Infections/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?pneum* or pneum*) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	4. (PPV?23* or PPSV or PPSV?23* or PCV?7* or PCV?10* or

	PCV?13*).mp.
	5. ((PPV or PCV) adj5 (pneum* or vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	6. ((7?valent or hepta?valent or 10?valent or 13?valent or 23?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
Influenza vaccine	1. Influenza Vaccines/
	2. Influenza, Human/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?influenza or influenza or seasonal or anti?flu or flu) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	4. ((TIV or QIV or trivalent or quadrivalent or 3?valent or 4?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5
Liver disease	1. exp Liver Diseases/
	2. ((liver or hepat*) adj3 disease*).mp.
	3. ("chronic liver" or "chronic hepat*").mp.
	4. cirrho*.mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Adult participants	1. exp Adult/
	2. adult.mp.
	3. (middle?aged or aged).sh.
	4. age*.tw.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Randomised controlled trials	1. randomized controlled trial.pt.
	2. randomi*.ab,ti.
	3. randomly.ab,ti.
	4. controlled clinical trial.pt.
	5. trial.ab,ti.
	6. groups.ab,ti.
	7. drug therapy.fs.
	8. placebo.ab,ti.

	9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8
	10. Animals/
	11. Humans/
	12. 10 not (10 and 11)
	13. 9 not 12
Case-control and cohort studies	1. Epidemiologic Studies/
	2. exp Case control studies/
	3. exp Cohort studies/
	4. Longitudinal studies/
	5. Follow up studies/
	6. Prospective studies/
	7. Retrospective studies/
	8. Control groups/
	9. Matched-Pair Analysis/
	10. (Case* adj5 control*).ti,ab,kw.
	11. (Case* adj5 comparison*).ti,ab,kw.
	12. Control group*.ti,ab,kw.
	13. (Cohort adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	14. Cohort anal*.ti,ab.
	15. (Follow up adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	16. (Observational adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	17. Longitudinal.ti,ab.
	18. Retrospective.ti,ab.
	19. Prospective.ti,ab.
	20. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19
	21. Animals/
	22. Humans/
	23. 21 not (21 and 22)
	24. 20 not 23

Study records

Data management

The search results will be uploaded into reference management software (Mendeley) to remove duplicate records of the same report. The unique records will then be uploaded into web-based, systematic review management software (DistillerSR). Both the initial abstract and title screening and the full-text review and extraction of data from the eligible studies will be performed using standardised, pre-created online forms. All forms will be piloted and revised as needed by the reviewers before starting the review.

Selection process

Articles that have been identified through the broad search of RCTs of pneumococcal or flu vaccination in the general population (Search 2) will first be pre-screened by title by one reviewer (SH). Articles meeting pre-screening criteria will be combined with the articles identified through Search 1. These articles will then all be screened by two independent reviewers (SH&CP) by abstract and title. Where the study eligibility cannot be established based on the title and abstract, the report will be passed on to the full-text review. Similarly, records subject to disagreement over eligibility will be included in the full-text review.

The full-text review will be independently completed for all eligible articles by two independent reviewers authors (SH&CP). Reasons for exclusion of ineligible studies will be recorded. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third review author (AO) and any uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators. Multiple reports of the same study will be collated into one and, where not possible, only the most relevant report based on our eligibility criteria will be included. The study selection process will be recorded and presented in flow diagram format according to the recommendations of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA),[20].

Data collection process

The data will be extracted and entered into standardised, pre-created online data extraction forms independently and in duplicate by two review authors (SH&CP). Disagreement will be resolved by consulting a third review author (LS) and uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators.

Data items

We will extract data on:

- Study participants: inclusion and exclusion criteria, method of recruitment/selection, study population characteristics and any imbalances at baseline (sex, age, aetiology and severity of liver disease, co-morbidities, alcohol use, smoking status, pre-vaccination infection status, medication/treatment other than intervention).
- Interventions and comparators (vaccine type, comparison treatment, dose, route of delivery, number and timing of vaccinations/comparator treatments, number of individuals in intervention and comparison group, follow-up time in intervention and comparison groups)
- Outcomes (definition, time points measured and reported, unit of measurement, number of outcomes in the intervention and control group, unadjusted and adjusted effect measures, covariates that the effect measures were adjusted for, comparisons, missing data and reasons for missingness, statistical methods used, processes for randomisation e.g. allocation concealment)
- Study designs and methods (study type, country and setting, date of study, study duration, aim of study, withdrawals).
- Study quality and study bias (according to the needs of the assessments specified below).
- Study funding and conflicts of interest

1
2
3 Effect measures will be collected in the format in which they are reported and
4 transformed for presentation and analysis if appropriate.
5
6

7 **Outcomes and prioritisation**

8
9

10
11 Our main outcomes of interest are hospitalisation and death. These are potential
12 severe outcomes of influenza illness and pneumococcal disease. It may be
13 challenging to identify and establish, especially if hospital discharge records are
14 reviewed retrospectively, the exact cause of the hospitalisation or death of a
15 patient with an underlying chronic condition. For this reason, our primary
16 outcomes we will include all causes. Additionally, studies may not always specify
17 whether a patient with a diagnosis of an infectious disease or liver disease
18 complication was actually hospitalised. We will assume that when a patient
19 during the follow-up after the vaccination developed any liver disease
20 complication (variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, ascites, jaundice,
21 spontaneous bacterial peritonitis or bacteraemia or sepsis) or was diagnosed
22 with IPD, they also required hospitalisation. Acute respiratory illness, non-
23 invasive pneumococcal disease and influenza illness or ILI may not require
24 hospitalisation so unless it is specified that the patient was hospitalised or the
25 illness was recorded in the hospital records, we will assume the patient was not
26 hospitalised.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Our secondary outcomes of interest are the serological response to
40 pneumococcal and influenza vaccines and a range of cause-specific
41 hospitalisation and mortality. Serological response to a vaccine is an indicator of
42 the vaccine's effect on building protective immunity against the disease the
43 vaccination targets. Since, however, it is difficult to know what level of antibody
44 or increase in antibody concentration may provide protection in people with
45 chronic liver disease, we will evaluate both the post-vaccination antibody level
46 and the pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody
47 concentrations. This effect will be evaluated both for short-term (<6 months)
48 and long-term (≥6 months) after vaccination. In case antibody responses are
49 reported at multiple short-term or long-term time points, we will consider the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time point closest to the timing of vaccination as the as the short-term response
4 and the time point closest to 6 months as the long-term response. The more
5 detailed causes of hospitalisation and death, allow us to understand about the
6 more specific effects of the vaccines.
7
8
9

10 **Assessment of risk of bias in individual studies**

11
12
13
14 We will use the Cochrane Collaborations tool,[15] for assessing the risk of bias in
15 all studies included in the review after the full-text review. The level of risk of
16 bias in random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of
17 participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete
18 outcome data, selective reporting and other sources will be judged as “low”,
19 “high” or “unclear” according to the criteria specified in the Cochrane
20 Handbook,[15].
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 In the non-randomised studies, we will additionally assess the level of risk of
29 confounding bias due to inadequately addressed differences between groups (i.e.
30 is the effect estimate likely to be biased due to unaccounted confounding). We
31 will consider age, sex, severity and aetiology of liver disease to be the most
32 important potential confounders. We will judge the risk of confounding bias to
33 be low if the study addressed the presence of these confounders by restricting
34 participant selection by confounders, demonstrating balance between groups,
35 matching on the confounders or adjusting for the confounders in statistical
36 analyses of the effect size. The risk of confounding bias will be judged low if the
37 confounders were adjusted for, high if the presence of the confounders was not
38 addressed and unclear if there was insufficient information to judge the level of
39 risk.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Two review authors (SH&CP) will independently assess the studies for each of
50 the risk areas by entering a quote from the study to describe the procedures,
51 their judgement together with a justification of the judgement into pre-created
52 online forms in DistillerSR. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third
53 review author (AH). The risk of bias assessments will be presented in a figure
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that shows the level of risk in the different risk areas within each individual
4 study and in a graph that describes the proportion of studies within each risk
5 level per risk area.
6
7

8 9 **Assessment of bias in conducting the systematic review**

10
11
12 We will conduct the systematic review following this pre-specified protocol and
13 report any differences between the methods of the complete review and this
14 protocol in the review.
15
16
17

18 19 **Data synthesis**

20
21
22 Criteria for quantitative data synthesis
23

24
25
26 We plan to carry out a formal meta-analysis only where more than a single study
27 per outcome is identified and the study designs, protocols and measures of
28 treatment effect are considered similar enough to produce a meaningful pooled
29 effect.
30
31
32

33
34 Measures of treatment effect
35

36
37 For dichotomous data, the treatment effect will be estimated and presented as a
38 risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals. For time-to-event data, we will present
39 the results as a log hazard ratio with its standard error. For studies reporting on
40 serological response using a cohort design without a comparison group, we will
41 present the effect of vaccination as the post-vaccination antibody level and the
42 pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentration.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Unit of analysis issues
50

51
52 The outcomes will be analysed at the level of study participants from each
53 individual study.
54
55
56
57
58
59

Dealing with missing data

We will contact investigators to obtain numerical outcome data that have not been fully reported (for instance where when a study is identified as an abstract only or outcomes are reported in figures only). Where possible, we will calculate missing standard deviations from other reported statistics such as confidence intervals or standard errors. The impact of including studies with high levels of missing outcome data on the treatment effect will be explored in the sensitivity analysis.

Assessment of heterogeneity

To assess heterogeneity between studies, we plan to present a forest plot for each of the review outcomes. We will then calculate the formal heterogeneity variance statistics τ^2 (using the Restricted Maximum Likelihood Estimation [REML] method), I^2 and the Q-statistic. We will regard heterogeneity as substantial if τ^2 is greater than 0, I^2 is more than 30% and the p-value for Q-statistic is less than 0.10. We plan to further explore the potential causes of substantial heterogeneity in the subgroup analyses or meta-regression (specified below).

Quantitative data synthesis

Statistical analyses will be performed using Stata or R Studio. To account for the presence of heterogeneity, we will use random-effects meta-analysis to summarise the average effects of vaccination on the defined outcomes across studies. The results will be presented in forest plots with the average treatment effect (RR) with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of τ^2 and I^2 . We will use the pooled average treatment effect to calculate the effectiveness of the vaccines ($100*[1-RR]$) in preventing the primary outcomes. The immunogenetic effect of the vaccines will be summarised as the mean post-vaccination antibody level with 95% confidence intervals and the mean pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentration with 95% confidence

1
2
3 intervals. Observational studies and randomised controlled trial studies will be
4 considered in separate analyses.
5
6

7 Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

8
9

10
11 In case we identify an adequate number of studies (studies per explanatory
12 variable ≥ 10) we plan to investigate the potential causes of heterogeneity
13 between studies through random effects meta-regression analyses. We will
14 consider the following categories of explanatory variables: severity of liver
15 disease, aetiology of liver disease and the reason for hospital admission/
16 mortality (primary outcomes). Inclusion/exclusion of the explanatory variables
17 in the heterogeneity investigations will depend on the characteristics and design
18 of the identified studies. If we do not identify enough studies to perform meta-
19 regressions but there are a minimum 5 studies per analysis we plan to carry out
20 subgroup analyses to investigate whether these explanatory variables can
21 explain heterogeneity between the studies.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Sensitivity analysis

31
32
33

34 In case the identified studies differ in terms of risk of bias, we plan to investigate
35 the impact of excluding studies with high/unclear risk of bias on effect estimates
36 in sensitivity analyses.
37
38
39

40 Qualitative data synthesis

41
42
43

44 We will provide a narrative summary of the study results for all outcomes,
45 categorised by study design and vaccine type (influenza vaccine and
46 pneumococcal vaccine). For the primary outcomes, we will report the cause of
47 hospitalisation and death studied. Characteristics (participants, interventions,
48 comparators, outcomes, study design and methods and notes on funding and
49 conflicts of interests) of all studies included in the review will also be presented
50 in separate tables. The results for outcomes where meta-analysis will not be
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 carried out due to insufficient homogeneity between studies will be presented in
4 forest plots without the pooled effect estimate.
5
6

7 **Meta-bias(es)**

10 Assessment of reporting biases across studies

11
12
13
14 We plan to investigate reporting bias using funnel plots. If there are enough
15 studies in the analysis (minimum 10), we will also carry out the Egger's test to
16 assess whether there is a linear association between the study's result and its
17 standard error.
18
19
20
21

22
23 We plan to assess selective outcome reporting bias by comparing what the study
24 set to measure and analyse in the methods section of the study report (for
25 studies published after 2006, we will also investigate the details trial protocol if
26 it can be identified through the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry
27 Platform,[21] launched in 2007) with the results that were reported. Using the
28 Outcome Reporting Bias in Trials (ORBIT) classification system,[22] we will
29 evaluate whether the risk of selective outcome reporting bias is present and
30 whether the risk is low or high.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Confidence in cumulative evidence**

38
39
40
41 We will use the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and
42 Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group system,[23] to assess and report the overall
43 quality of the body of evidence for each outcome studied. The within-study risk
44 of bias (methodological quality), directness of evidence, heterogeneity, the
45 precision of effect estimates and risk of publication bias will be independently
46 assessed by two review authors (SH&CP). The quality of evidence will be judged
47 and reported as "high", "moderate", "low", or "very low" following the Cochrane
48 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions guidelines,[15].
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council grant number BBSRC BB/M009513/1.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The study was conceived by SH, LS, AO and AH. SH developed the eligibility criteria, search strategy, risk of bias assessment strategy and data extraction plan with guidance from LS, AO and AH. SH wrote the manuscript, to which all authors SH, CP, LS, AO and AH contributed.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Formal ethical approval is not required for this study, as no primary data will be collected. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.

PROTOCOL REGISTRATION

This systematic review protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 13th June 2017 (registration number CRD42017067277).

REFERENCES

- 1 Gil-Prieto R, Pascual-Garcia R, Walter S, *et al*. Risk of hospitalization due to pneumococcal disease in adults in Spain. The CORIENNE study. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2016;**12**:1900–5. doi:10.1080/21645515.2016.1143577
- 2 Jan A, Hoek V, Andrews N, *et al*. The effect of underlying clinical conditions on the risk of developing invasive pneumococcal disease in England. *J Infect* 2012;**65**:17–24. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2012.02.017
- 3 Puig-Barberà J, Natividad-Sancho A, Trushakova S, *et al*. Epidemiology of Hospital Admissions with Influenza during the 2013 / 2014 Northern Hemisphere Influenza Season: Results from the Global Influenza Hospital Surveillance Network. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0154970. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154970
- 4 Kerkhove MD Van, Vandemaele KAH, Shinde V, *et al*. Risk Factors for Severe Outcomes following 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) Infection: A Global Pooled Analysis. *PLoS Med* 2011;**8**:e1001053. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001053
- 5 Polakos NK, Cornejo JC, Murray DA, *et al*. Kupffer Cell-Dependent Hepatitis Occurs during Influenza Infection. *Am J Pathol* 2006;**168**:1169–78. doi:10.2353/ajpath.2006.050875
- 6 Duchini A, Viernes ME, Nyberg LM, *et al*. Hepatic Decompensation in Patients With Cirrhosis During Infection With Influenza A. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;**160**:113–5. doi:10.1001/archinte.160.1.113
- 7 World Health Organization. Weekly epidemiological record: Vaccines against influenza. WHO position paper. 2012;:461–76. <http://www.who.int/wer/2012/wer8747/en/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
- 8 Kanitz EE, Wu LA, Giambi C, *et al*. Variation in adult vaccination policies across Europe: An overview from VENICE network on vaccine recommendations, funding and coverage. *Vaccine* 2012;**30**:5222–8. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.06.012
- 9 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Seasonal influenza vaccination and antiviral use in Europe – Overview of vaccination

- 1
2
3 recommendations and coverage rates in the EU Member States for the
4 2013–14 and 2014–15 influenza seasons.
5
6 2016.http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528
7
8 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
9
10
11 10 Pebody RG, Leino T, Nohynek H, *et al*. Pneumococcal vaccination policy in
12 Europe. *Eurosurveillance*.
13
14 2005;**10**.<http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=564>
15 4 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
16
17
18 11 Public Health England. Influenza immunisation programme for England:
19 GP patient groups - Data collection survey Season 2015 to 2016.
20 2016.<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016> (accessed
21 13 Jun 2017).
22
23
24
25
26 12 Blachier M, Leleu H, Peck-Radosavljevic M, *et al*. The burden of liver
27 disease in Europe: a review of available epidemiological data. *J Hepatol*
28 2013;**58**:593–608. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2012.12.005
29
30
31 13 Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA, *et al*. Preferred reporting items for
32 systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
33 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;**349**:g7647.
34
35 doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647
36
37
38 14 Kastner M, Wilczynski NL, Walker-Dilks C, *et al*. Age-Specific Search
39 Strategies for Medline. *J Med Internet Res* 2006;**8**:e25.
40
41 doi:10.2196/jmir.8.4.e25
42
43
44 15 The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews
45 of Interventions. 2011.www.handbook.cochrane.org (accessed 13 Jun
46 2017).
47
48
49 16 Chalmers JD, Campling J, Dicker A, *et al*. A systematic review of the burden
50 of vaccine preventable pneumococcal disease in UK adults. *BMC Pulm Med*
51 2016;**1**:1–11. doi:10.1186/s12890-016-0242-0
52
53
54 17 University of Texas School of Public Health. Search filters for case-control
55 studies, cohort studies, cross-sectional studies, clinical trials.
56 2012.http://libguides.sph.uth.tmc.edu/search_filters/ovid_psycinfo_filters
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
4
5 18 Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. SIGN search filters for
6 observational studies.
7
8 19 BMJ Evidence Centre. Medline cohort and case-control strategy.
9 2012.[http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.ht](http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html)
10 [ml](http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html) (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
11
12 20 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al*. Academia and Clinic Annals of Internal
13 Medicine Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-
14 Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Annu Intern Med* 2009;**151**:264–9.
15 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
16
17 21 World Health Organization. International Clinical Trials Registry Platform
18 Search Portal. <http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
19
20 22 Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG, *et al*. The impact of outcome reporting
21 bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ*
22 2010;**340**:c365. doi:10.1136/bmj.c365
23
24 23 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al*. GRADE: an emerging consensus on
25 rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*
26 2008;**336**:924–6. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

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

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Status	Page
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification Update	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Completed	1
	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	Completed	2, 21
Authors:				
Contact Contributions	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Completed	1
	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Completed	21
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Completed	17
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Completed	21
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Completed	21
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Completed	21
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the	Completed	4-6

		context of what is already known		
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Completed	7
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	Completed	7-9
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	Completed	9
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	Completed	9-12
Study records:				
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Completed	13
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)	Completed	13
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	Completed	13-14
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	Completed	14-15
Outcomes and	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will	Completed	15-16

prioritization		be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale		
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	Completed	16-17
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Completed	17
	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)	Completed	17-19
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Completed	19
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Completed	19-20
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Completed	20
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Completed	20

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

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.

BMJ Open

EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-018223.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Härmälä, Suvi; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Parisinos, Constantinos; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Shallcross, Laura; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics O'Brien, Alastair; University College London, Division of Medicine Hayward, Andrew; University College London, Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care
Primary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology, Public health
Keywords:	Pneumococcal vaccine, Influenza vaccine, Chronic liver disease

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO**
4 **PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC**
5 **LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**
6
7
8
9

10
11 Suvi Härmälä¹, Constantinos Parisinos¹, Laura Shallcross¹, Alastair O'Brien² &
12 Andrew Hayward^{1,3}
13

14
15
16
17
18 ¹ Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, United
19 Kingdom.

20
21 ² Division of Medicine, University College London, London, United Kingdom.

22
23 ³ Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London,
24 United Kingdom.
25

26
27
28
29 Corresponding author: Suvi K. Härmälä, Institute of Health Informatics,
30 University College London, 222 Euston Road, London NW1 2DA, United
31 Kingdom, suvi.harmala.14@ucl.ac.uk, +44 (0)20 3549 5338
32
33

34
35
36
37 Keywords: Pneumococcal vaccine, influenza vaccine, chronic liver disease
38
39

40
41
42 Word count (excluding title page, abstract, strengths & limitations, references
43 and table): 3909
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In advanced chronic liver disease, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus put people at an increased risk of serious health complications and death. The effectiveness of the available vaccines in reducing the risk of poor health outcomes, however, is less clear.

Methods and analysis: We will search MEDLINE (Ovid), EMBASE (Ovid), Pubmed and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) for published reports on randomised controlled trials and observational studies on the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in people with chronic liver disease. Two independent reviewers will screen the studies for eligibility, extract data and assess study quality and risk of bias. Random effects meta-analyses will be performed as appropriate.

Ethics and dissemination: Formal ethical approval is not required, as no primary data will be collected for this study. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.

Prospero registration number: CRD42017067277

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:

- This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P).
- This study protocol has been prospectively registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO).
- Our comprehensive search strategy will minimise the risk of missing relevant studies, in particular, those with a randomised design.
- The selection of studies, data extraction, the risk of bias and quality of evidence assessments will be conducted by two independent authors.
- Inclusion of studies with a non-randomised design may decrease the overall quality of the body of evidence for the study outcomes.

BACKGROUND

Burden of pneumococcal and influenza infections in chronic liver disease

In advanced chronic liver disease, as the immune function progressively deteriorates, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus can lead to serious health complications and death.

In Spain in 2011, the population-level annual incidence rate for pneumococcal pneumonia-related hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at approximately 540 per 100 000 compared to approximately 6 per 100 000 without at-risk conditions,[1]. Adults with liver disease were over 50 times more likely to be hospitalised for pneumococcal pneumonia than adults without at-risk conditions,[1]. Similarly, in England in 2008/2009, for invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD), such as meningitis, bacteraemia and sepsis, the annual incidence of hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at about 100 per 100 000 compared to about 8 per 100 000 in the healthy population,[2]. Approximately 37% of liver disease patients hospitalised for IPD died, compared to 5% of patients without underlying risk conditions,[2]. Chronic liver disease patients were over 30 times more likely to be admitted to hospital and 10 times more likely to die during the IPD-related hospitalisation than adults without at-risk conditions,[2].

Although there are no population-level estimates of severe influenza incidence in people with chronic liver disease, evidence suggests that liver disease patients are at an increased risk of health complications from influenza. A 2-fold increased risk of influenza admission was observed in liver disease patients at 19 hospitals in Russia, Turkey, China, and Spain during the 2013/2014 season,[3]. Similarly, an analysis of data on laboratory-confirmed influenza cases collected from several World Health Organisation (WHO) member states during the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic found liver disease patients to have a greater than 5-fold increased risk of influenza-related hospitalisation and over 17-fold increased risk of death compared to that of healthy individuals,[4].

1
2
3 Furthermore, influenza infection, while not directly targeting the liver, may
4 cause collateral transient liver damage,[5] and trigger hepatic decompensation
5 (such as ascites and hepatic encephalopathy) in liver disease patients,[6].
6
7

8 9 **Types of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines, vaccination policy and** 10 **vaccine uptake** 11

12
13
14 Two types of vaccines, polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccines including
15 serotypes of *S. pneumoniae* (PPV23) and conjugate pneumococcal vaccines
16 including 7 (PCV7), 10 (PCV10) or 13 (PCV13) *S. pneumoniae* serotypes, are
17 available to protect against pneumococcal infection. None of these contains live
18 bacteria. The most commonly used influenza vaccines are injectable, inactivated
19 vaccines that contain either inactivated whole influenza virus or split or subunit
20 virus products. These vaccines protect either against two influenza A (H1N1 and
21 H3N2) strains and one influenza B strain (trivalent vaccines) or two influenza A
22 and two influenza B strains (quadrivalent vaccines). New vaccines are developed
23 every year to protect against the prevailing strains of the upcoming influenza
24 season and a yearly vaccination is recommended to ensure continued protection.
25 Live attenuated influenza vaccines exist, however, these may not be suitable for
26 people with chronic co-morbidities,[7]. Immune response defects associated
27 with advanced liver disease, [8–11] may also dampen the response to vaccines.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The majority of European countries recommend both adult influenza (29/29
40 countries) and pneumococcal vaccination (22/29 countries) for specific high-
41 risk groups,[12]. Chronic liver disease patients, however, may not be included in
42 these high-risk target groups in all countries. Whilst 90% (27/30) of the
43 countries recommended influenza immunisation for people with liver disease
44 during the 2014-2015 influenza season,[13], only 43% (6/14) of countries
45 surveyed in 2005 recommended pneumococcal vaccination for chronic liver
46 disease patients,[14]. Moreover, whilst the adult vaccination recommendations
47 for influenza are supported by official funding mechanisms in most countries
48 (21/29), the cost of the pneumococcal vaccination is covered by only half
49 (11/22),[12].
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Uptake of influenza vaccine in people with chronic diseases in general is poor.
5
6 The median coverage rate across Europe in the 2014/2015 season was less than
7
8 50% (only 7/30 countries were able to provide separate coverage data for
9
10 individuals with chronic medical conditions),[13]. The situation in liver disease
11
12 patients as a separate group seems no different with less than 50% of working-
13
14 age liver disease patients in the UK covered by the influenza vaccine in
15
16 2015/2016 season,[15]. Although fewer data exist concerning the uptake of
17
18 pneumococcal adult vaccination,[12], its uptake in liver disease patients is not
19
20 likely to be any higher than that of influenza vaccine.

21 **Rationale for the review**

22
23
24 Approximately 29 million people in Europe alone are affected by some form of
25
26 liver disease,[16]. Worryingly, due to the increasing prevalence of obesity and
27
28 persistence of other liver damage risk factors such as alcohol abuse and hepatitis
29
30 infections, this number is expected to grow,[16]. Whilst evidence suggests that
31
32 following infection with influenza or *S. pneumoniae*, people with liver disease
33
34 have a higher than average risk of poor health outcomes, the effectiveness of the
35
36 vaccines in reducing this risk is less clear and warrants further investigation.

37
38 To our knowledge, no systematic review to date has investigated the effects of
39
40 pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in preventing poor health outcomes in
41
42 chronic liver disease. The present review intends to fill this gap by providing a
43
44 systematic synthesis of the available evidence. The results of this review may
45
46 inform future vaccination strategies and help improve vaccination coverage.
47
48 This, in turn, may have a positive impact on both the number of influenza and
49
50 pneumococcal disease-related hospital admissions and patient outcomes in liver
51
52 disease.

53 **OBJECTIVES**

1
2
3 The aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and
4 influenza vaccines to prevent serious health complications in adults with chronic
5 liver disease.
6
7

8
9 The objectives are:

- 10
11 • To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to
12 prevent hospitalisation in adults with chronic liver disease.
- 13
14 • To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to
15 prevent death in adults with chronic liver disease.
- 16
17 • To assess the effects of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines for eliciting
18 a serological response in adults with chronic liver disease.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **METHODS**

25
26
27 This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting
28 Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015,[17].
29
30
31

32 **Eligibility criteria**

33 **Types of studies**

34
35
36 We will include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with comparison group/s)
37 and case-control studies that investigate the effectiveness of pneumococcal or
38 influenza vaccines for preventing hospitalisation or death in adults with chronic
39 liver disease. We will also include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with or
40 without comparison group/s) and case-control studies that report the
41 serological response to one or both of these vaccines in adults with chronic liver
42 disease. We will only include published studies in English language and studies
43 that have been published or accepted for publication. We will exclude review
44 articles, case reports, cross-sectional studies, animal studies, editorials, clinical
45 guidelines and any studies that have been fully or partially retracted from
46 publication. Patients included in multiple studies will be reported only once.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Types of participants

We will include studies that enrol 18+ year-old adult patients with chronic liver disease of any severity (non-cirrhotic, cirrhotic) or aetiology (viral, alcoholic, non-alcoholic fatty liver, autoimmune).

Types of interventions

We will include studies that investigate the effects of a conjugate or polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccine (against *S. pneumoniae*) and/or an inactivated (whole virus, split virus or subunit), injectable influenza vaccine. Vaccines can be adjuvanted, intradermal and of any dose. We will exclude live, recombinant, virosomal and experimental vaccines.

Types of comparators

We will include studies comparing one or both of the vaccines of interest to a placebo, an alternative intervention or no intervention. We will also include studies without a comparison group when the outcome studied is the serological response to the vaccine.

Types of outcome measures

We will include studies that report on one or more of our primary outcomes and/or our secondary outcome of interest.

Primary outcomes

- All-cause hospitalisation
- All-cause mortality

Secondary outcomes

- Serological response to vaccine

- Acute respiratory illness-related hospitalisation
- Influenza illness or influenza-like-illness (ILI)-related hospitalisation
- Pneumococcal disease-related hospitalisation
- Hospitalisation for liver disease complications (variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, jaundice and bacteraemia or sepsis)
- Acute respiratory illness-related mortality
- Influenza illness or ILI-related mortality
- Pneumococcal disease-related mortality
- Liver disease-related mortality

Information sources

Electronic searches

To capture all relevant studies, we plan to search the following databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- MEDLINE (Ovid)
- EMBASE (Ovid)
- PubMed
-

Each database will be searched separately and the search strategy first developed in MEDLINE will be adapted to each database interface as appropriate. We plan to also search relevant studies from the reference lists of the eligible studies identified through the electronic searches.

Search strategy

We will use two complementary strategies to identify relevant articles. First, we will identify articles reporting outcomes of vaccination in patients with liver disease by combining search terms for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination with search terms for chronic liver disease (Search 1). This search will be

1
2
3 filtered by study design. The provisional search terms for liver disease and
4 pneumococcal and influenza vaccines are listed in Table 1.

5
6 Recognising that liver disease patients may be included as subgroups in clinical
7 trials of vaccination, we will also search for randomised controlled trials of
8 influenza and pneumococcal vaccine that have recruited individuals from the
9 general population (Search 2).
10
11
12
13

14 To search for studies with adult participants, we will combine the geriatric and
15 adult medicine-specific search strategies by Kastner et al.,[18]. In order to
16 maximise the sensitivity of the searches for randomised clinical trials, we will
17 use a filter that combines terms from the Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search
18 Strategy,[19] and less specific version of the same filter by Chalmers et al.,[20] to
19 identify randomised trials. Similarly, to maximise the sensitivity of searches for
20 case-control and cohort studies, we will use a filter that combines terms from the
21 University of Texas School of Public Health filter for observational studies,[21],
22 SIGN observational study filter,[22] and the BMJ Evidence Centre case-control
23 and cohort strategy,[23]. We will limit our search to studies including adult
24 human study subjects but not based on the setting/country or publication year
25 of the articles. The search terms for adult and study design filters are listed in
26 Table 1.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Table 1. MEDLINE (Ovid) provisional search terms

Search concept	Search terms
Pneumococcal vaccine	1. exp Pneumococcal Vaccines/
	2. exp Pneumococcal Infections/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?pneum* or pneum*) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	4. (PPV?23* or PPSV or PPSV?23* or PCV?7* or PCV?10* or PCV?13*).mp.
	5. ((PPV or PCV) adj5 (pneum* or vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	6. ((7?valent or hepta?valent or 10?valent or 13?valent or 23?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.

	7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
Influenza vaccine	1. Influenza Vaccines/
	2. Influenza, Human/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?influenza or influenza or seasonal or anti?flu or flu) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	4. ((TIV or QIV or trivalent or quadrivalent or 3?valent or 4?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5
Liver disease	1. exp Liver Diseases/
	2. ((liver or hepat*) adj3 disease*).mp.
	3. ("chronic liver" or "chronic hepat*").mp.
	4. cirrho*.mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Adult participants	1. exp Adult/
	2. adult.mp.
	3. (middle?aged or aged).sh.
	4. age*.tw.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Randomised controlled trials	1. randomized controlled trial.pt.
	2. randomi*.ab,ti.
	3. randomly.ab,ti.
	4. controlled clinical trial.pt.
	5. trial.ab,ti.
	6. groups.ab,ti.
	7. drug therapy.fs.
	8. placebo.ab,ti.
	9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8
	10. Animals/
	11. Humans/

	12. 10 not (10 and 11)
	13. 9 not 12
Case-control and cohort studies	1. Epidemiologic Studies/ 2. exp Case control studies/ 3. exp Cohort studies/ 4. Longitudinal studies/ 5. Follow up studies/ 6. Prospective studies/ 7. Retrospective studies/ 8. Control groups/ 9. Matched-Pair Analysis/ 10. (Case* adj5 control*).ti,ab,kw. 11. (Case* adj5 comparison*).ti,ab,kw. 12. Control group*.ti,ab,kw. 13. (Cohort adj (study or studies)).ti,ab. 14. Cohort anal*.ti,ab. 15. (Follow up adj (study or studies)).ti,ab. 16. (Observational adj (study or studies)).ti,ab. 17. Longitudinal.ti,ab. 18. Retrospective.ti,ab. 19. Prospective.ti,ab. 20. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 21. Animals/ 22. Humans/ 23. 21 not (21 and 22) 24. 20 not 23

Study records

Data management

The search results will be uploaded into reference management software (Mendeley) to remove duplicate records of the same report. The unique records will then be uploaded into web-based, systematic review management software (DistillerSR). Both the initial abstract and title screening and the full-text review and extraction of data from the eligible studies will be performed using standardised, pre-created online forms. All forms will be piloted and revised as needed by the reviewers before starting the review.

Selection process

Articles that have been identified through the broad search of RCTs of pneumococcal or flu vaccination in the general population (Search 2) will first be pre-screened by title by one reviewer (SH). Articles meeting pre-screening criteria will be combined with the articles identified through Search 1. These articles will then all be screened by two independent reviewers (SH&CP) by abstract and title. Where the study eligibility cannot be established based on the title and abstract, the report will be passed on to the full-text review. Similarly, records subject to disagreement over eligibility will be included in the full-text review.

The full-text review will be independently completed for all eligible articles by two independent reviewers authors (SH&CP). Reasons for exclusion of ineligible studies will be recorded. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third review author (AO) and any uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators. Multiple reports of the same study will be collated into one and, where not possible, only the most relevant report based on our eligibility criteria will be included. The study selection process will be recorded and presented in flow diagram format according to the recommendations of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA),[24].

Data collection process

1
2
3
4 The data will be extracted and entered into standardised, pre-created online data
5 extraction forms independently and in duplicate by two review authors (SH&CP).
6
7 Disagreement will be resolved by consulting a third review author (LS) and
8
9 uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators.
10

11 12 13 **Data items**

14
15
16 We will extract data on:

- 17 • Study participants: inclusion and exclusion criteria, method of
18 recruitment/selection, study population characteristics and any
19 imbalances at baseline (sex, age, aetiology and severity of liver disease,
20 co-morbidities, alcohol use, smoking status, pre-vaccination infection
21 status, medication/treatment other than intervention).
22
- 23 • Interventions and comparators (vaccine type, comparison treatment,
24 dose, route of delivery, number and timing of vaccinations/comparator
25 treatments, number of individuals in intervention and comparison group,
26 follow-up time in intervention and comparison groups)
27
- 28 • Outcomes (definition, time points measured and reported, unit of
29 measurement, number of outcomes in the intervention and control group,
30 unadjusted and adjusted effect measures, covariates that the effect
31 measures were adjusted for, comparisons, missing data and reasons for
32 missingness, statistical methods used, processes for randomisation e.g.
33 allocation concealment)
34
- 35 • Study designs and methods (study type, country and setting, date of
36 study, study duration, aim of study, withdrawals).
37
- 38 • Study quality and study bias (according to the needs of the assessments
39 specified below).
40
- 41 • Study funding and conflicts of interest
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 Effect measures will be collected in the format in which they are reported and
54 transformed for presentation and analysis if appropriate.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Outcomes and prioritisation

Our main outcomes of interest are hospitalisation and death. These are potential severe outcomes of influenza illness and pneumococcal disease. It may be challenging to identify and establish, especially if hospital discharge records are reviewed retrospectively, the exact cause of the hospitalisation or death of a patient with an underlying chronic condition. For this reason, our primary outcomes we will include all causes. Additionally, studies may not always specify whether a patient with a diagnosis of an infectious disease or liver disease complication was actually hospitalised. We will assume that when a patient during the follow-up after the vaccination developed any liver disease complication (variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, ascites, jaundice, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis or bacteraemia or sepsis) or was diagnosed with IPD, they also required hospitalisation. Acute respiratory illness, non-invasive pneumococcal disease and influenza illness or ILI may not require hospitalisation so unless it is specified that the patient was hospitalised or the illness was recorded in the hospital records, we will assume the patient was not hospitalised.

Our secondary outcomes of interest are the serological response to pneumococcal and influenza vaccines and a range of cause-specific hospitalisation and mortality. Serological response to a vaccine is an indicator of the vaccine's effect on building protective immunity against the disease the vaccination targets. Since, however, it is difficult to know what level of antibody or increase in antibody concentration may provide protection in people with chronic liver disease, we will evaluate both the post-vaccination antibody level and the pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentrations. This effect will be evaluated both for short-term (<6 months) and long-term (≥ 6 months) after vaccination. In case antibody responses are reported at multiple short-term or long-term time points, we will consider the time point closest to the timing of vaccination as the short-term response and the time point closest to 6 months as the long-term response. The more

1
2
3 detailed causes of hospitalisation and death, allow us to understand about the
4 more specific effects of the vaccines.
5
6

7 **Assessment of risk of bias in individual studies**

8
9
10 We will use the Cochrane Collaborations tool,[19] for assessing the risk of bias in
11 all studies included in the review after the full-text review. The level of risk of
12 bias in random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of
13 participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete
14 outcome data, selective reporting and other sources will be judged as “low”,
15 “high” or “unclear” according to the criteria specified in the Cochrane
16 Handbook,[19].
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In the non-randomised studies, we will additionally assess the level of risk of
25 confounding bias due to inadequately addressed differences between groups (i.e.
26 is the effect estimate likely to be biased due to unaccounted confounding). We
27 will consider age, sex, severity and aetiology of liver disease to be the most
28 important potential confounders. We will judge the risk of confounding bias to
29 be low if the study addressed the presence of these confounders by restricting
30 participant selection by confounders, demonstrating balance between groups,
31 matching on the confounders or adjusting for the confounders in statistical
32 analyses of the effect size. The risk of confounding bias will be judged low if the
33 confounders were adjusted for, high if the presence of the confounders was not
34 addressed and unclear if there was insufficient information to judge the level of
35 risk.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Two review authors (SH&CP) will independently assess the studies for each of
46 the risk areas by entering a quote from the study to describe the procedures,
47 their judgement together with a justification of the judgement into pre-created
48 online forms in DistillerSR. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third
49 review author (AH). The risk of bias assessments will be presented in a figure
50 that shows the level of risk in the different risk areas within each individual
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 study and in a graph that describes the proportion of studies within each risk
4 level per risk area.
5
6

7 **Assessment of bias in conducting the systematic review**

8
9
10 We will conduct the systematic review following this pre-specified protocol and
11 report any differences between the methods of the complete review and this
12 protocol in the review.
13
14
15

16 **Data synthesis**

17
18
19
20
21 Criteria for quantitative data synthesis
22

23
24 We plan to carry out a formal meta-analysis only where more than a single study
25 per outcome is identified and the study designs, protocols and measures of
26 treatment effect are considered similar enough to produce a meaningful pooled
27 effect.
28
29
30

31
32
33 Measures of treatment effect
34

35
36 For dichotomous data, the treatment effect will be estimated and presented as a
37 risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals. For time-to-event data, we will present
38 the results as a log hazard ratio with its standard error. For studies reporting on
39 serological response using a cohort design without a comparison group, we will
40 present the effect of vaccination as the post-vaccination antibody level and the
41 pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentration.
42
43
44
45

46
47
48 Unit of analysis issues
49

50
51 The outcomes will be analysed at the level of study participants from each
52 individual study.
53
54

55
56 Dealing with missing data
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 We will contact investigators to obtain numerical outcome data that have not
5 been fully reported (for instance where when a study is identified as an abstract
6 only or outcomes are reported in figures only). Where possible, we will calculate
7 missing standard deviations from other reported statistics such as confidence
8 intervals or standard errors. The impact of including studies with high levels of
9 missing outcome data on the treatment effect will be explored in the sensitivity
10 analysis.
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 18 Assessment of heterogeneity

19
20
21 To assess heterogeneity between studies, we plan to present a forest plot for
22 each of the review outcomes. We will then calculate the formal heterogeneity
23 variance statistics τ^2 , I^2 and the Q-statistic. We will regard heterogeneity as
24 substantial if τ^2 is greater than 0, I^2 is more than 30% and the p-value for Q-
25 statistic is less than 0.10. We plan to further explore the potential causes of
26 substantial heterogeneity in the subgroup analyses or meta-regression (specified
27 below).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 Quantitative data synthesis

36
37
38 Statistical analyses will be performed using Stata or R Studio. To account for the
39 presence of heterogeneity, we will use random-effects meta-analysis to
40 summarise the average effects of vaccination on the defined outcomes across
41 studies. The results will be presented in forest plots with the average treatment
42 effect (RR) with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of τ^2 and I^2 . We will
43 use the pooled average treatment effect to calculate the effectiveness of the
44 vaccines ($100*[1-RR]$) in preventing the primary outcomes. The immunogenetic
45 effect of the vaccines will be summarised as the mean post-vaccination antibody
46 level with 95% confidence intervals and the mean pre- to post-vaccination fold
47 change in geometric mean antibody concentration with 95% confidence
48 intervals. Observational studies and randomised controlled trial studies will be
49 considered in separate analyses.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

In case we identify an adequate number of studies (studies per explanatory variable ≥ 10) we plan to investigate the potential causes of heterogeneity between studies through random effects meta-regression analyses. We will consider the following categories of explanatory variables: severity of liver disease, aetiology of liver disease and the reason for hospital admission/mortality (primary outcomes). Inclusion/exclusion of the explanatory variables in the heterogeneity investigations will depend on the characteristics and design of the identified studies. If we do not identify enough studies to perform meta-regressions but there are a minimum 5 studies per analysis we plan to carry out subgroup analyses to investigate whether these explanatory variables can explain heterogeneity between the studies.

Sensitivity analysis

In case the identified studies differ in terms of risk of bias, we plan to investigate the impact of excluding studies with high/unclear risk of bias on effect estimates in sensitivity analyses.

Qualitative data synthesis

We will provide a narrative summary of the study results for all outcomes, categorised by study design and vaccine type (influenza vaccine and pneumococcal vaccine). For the primary outcomes, we will report the cause of hospitalisation and death studied. Characteristics (participants, interventions, comparators, outcomes, study design and methods and notes on funding and conflicts of interests) of all studies included in the review will also be presented in separate tables. The results for outcomes where meta-analysis will not be carried out due to insufficient homogeneity between studies will be presented in forest plots without the pooled effect estimate.

Meta-bias(es)

Assessment of reporting biases across studies

We plan to investigate reporting bias using funnel plots. If there are enough studies in the analysis (minimum 10), we will also carry out the Egger's test to assess whether there is a linear association between the study's result and its standard error.

We plan to assess selective outcome reporting bias by comparing what the study set to measure and analyse in the methods section of the study report (for studies published after 2006, we will also investigate the details trial protocol if it can be identified through the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform,[25] launched in 2007) with the results that were reported. Using the Outcome Reporting Bias in Trials (ORBIT) classification system,[26] we will evaluate whether the risk of selective outcome reporting bias is present and whether the risk is low or high.

Confidence in cumulative evidence

We will use the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group system,[27] to assess and report the overall quality of the body of evidence for each outcome studied. The within-study risk of bias (methodological quality), directness of evidence, heterogeneity, the precision of effect estimates and risk of publication bias will be independently assessed by two review authors (SH&CP). The quality of evidence will be judged and reported as "high", "moderate", "low", or "very low" following the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions guidelines,[19].

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council grant number BBSRC BB/M009513/1 to SH.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The study was conceived by SH, LS, AO and AH. SH developed the eligibility criteria, search strategy, risk of bias assessment strategy and data extraction plan with guidance from LS, AO and AH. SH wrote the manuscript, to which all authors SH, CP, LS, AO and AH contributed.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Formal ethical approval is not required for this study, as no primary data will be collected. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.

PROTOCOL REGISTRATION

This systematic review protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 13th June 2017 (registration number CRD42017067277).

REFERENCES

- 1 Gil-Prieto R, Pascual-Garcia R, Walter S, *et al*. Risk of hospitalization due to

- 1
2
3 pneumococcal disease in adults in Spain. The CORIENNE study. *Hum*
4 *Vaccin Immunother* 2016;**12**:1900–5.
5 doi:10.1080/21645515.2016.1143577
6
7
8 2 Jan A, Hoek V, Andrews N, *et al*. The effect of underlying clinical conditions
9 on the risk of developing invasive pneumococcal disease in England. *J*
10 *Infect* 2012;**65**:17–24. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2012.02.017
11
12
13 3 Puig-Barberà J, Natividad-Sancho A, Trushakova S, *et al*. Epidemiology of
14 Hospital Admissions with Influenza during the 2013 / 2014 Northern
15 Hemisphere Influenza Season: Results from the Global Influenza Hospital
16 Surveillance Network. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0154970.
17 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154970
18
19
20
21 4 Kerkhove MD Van, Vandemaele KAH, Shinde V, *et al*. Risk Factors for
22 Severe Outcomes following 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) Infection: A Global
23 Pooled Analysis. *PLoS Med* 2011;**8**:e1001053.
24 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001053
25
26
27
28 5 Polakos NK, Cornejo JC, Murray DA, *et al*. Kupffer Cell-Dependent Hepatitis
29 Occurs during Influenza Infection. *Am J Pathol* 2006;**168**:1169–78.
30 doi:10.2353/ajpath.2006.050875
31
32
33 6 Duchini A, Viernes ME, Nyberg LM, *et al*. Hepatic Decompensation in
34 Patients With Cirrhosis During Infection With Influenza A. *Arch Intern Med*
35 2000;**160**:113–5. doi:10.1001/archinte.160.1.113
36
37
38 7 World Health Organization. Weekly epidemiological record: Vaccines
39 against influenza. WHO position paper. 2012;:461–
40 76.<http://www.who.int/wer/2012/wer8747/en/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
41
42
43 8 Fierer J, Finley F. Deficient Serum Bactericidal Activity Against Escherichia
44 Coli in Patients with Cirrhosis of the Liver. *J Clin Invest* 1979;**63**:912–21.
45 doi:10.1172/JCI109391
46
47
48 9 Hassner A, Kletter Y, Shlag D, *et al*. Impaired monocyte function in liver
49 cirrhosis. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1981;**282**:1262–3.
50
51
52 10 Brien AJO, Fullerton JN, Massey KA, *et al*. Prostaglandin E2 Mediates
53 Immunosuppression in Acutely Decompensated Cirrhosis. *Nat Med*
54 2014;**20**:518–23. doi:10.1038/nm.3516
55
56
57 11 Rajkovic IA, Williams R. Abnormalities of Neutrophil Phagocytosis,
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Intracellular Killing and Metabolic Activity in Alcoholic Cirrhosis and
4 Hepatitis. *Hepatology* 1986;**6**:252–62. doi:10.1002/hep.1840060217
5
6 12 Kanitz EE, Wu LA, Giambi C, *et al.* Variation in adult vaccination policies
7 across Europe: An overview from VENICE network on vaccine
8 recommendations, funding and coverage. *Vaccine* 2012;**30**:5222–8.
9 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.06.012
10
11 13 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Seasonal influenza
12 vaccination and antiviral use in Europe – Overview of vaccination
13 recommendations and coverage rates in the EU Member States for the
14 2013–14 and 2014–15 influenza seasons.
15 2016.[http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528)
16 [DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528)
17 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
18
19 14 Pebody RG, Leino T, Nohynek H, *et al.* Pneumococcal vaccination policy in
20 Europe. *Eurosurveillance*.
21 2005;**10**.[http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=56](http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=564)
22 4 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
23
24 15 Public Health England. Influenza immunisation programme for England:
25 GP patient groups - Data collection survey Season 2015 to 2016.
26 2016.[https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016)
27 [uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016) (accessed
28 13 Jun 2017).
29
30 16 Blachier M, Leleu H, Peck-Radosavljevic M, *et al.* The burden of liver
31 disease in Europe: a review of available epidemiological data. *J Hepatol*
32 2013;**58**:593–608. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2012.12.005
33
34 17 Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for
35 systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
36 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;**349**:g7647.
37 doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647
38
39 18 Kastner M, Wilczynski NL, Walker-Dilks C, *et al.* Age-Specific Search
40 Strategies for Medline. *J Med Internet Res* 2006;**8**:e25.
41 doi:10.2196/jmir.8.4.e25
42
43 19 The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 of Interventions. 2011.www.handbook.cochrane.org (accessed 13 Jun
4 2017).
- 5
6 20 Chalmers JD, Campling J, Dicker A, *et al*. A systematic review of the burden
7 of vaccine preventable pneumococcal disease in UK adults. *BMC Pulm Med*
8 2016;**16**:1–11. doi:10.1186/s12890-016-0242-0
9
10
11 21 University of Texas School of Public Health. Search filters for case-control
12 studies, cohort studies, cross-sectional studies, clinical trials.
13
14 2012.http://libguides.sph.uth.tmc.edu/search_filters/ovid_psycinfo_filters
15 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
16
17
18 22 Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. SIGN search filters for
19 observational studies.
20
21 23 BMJ Evidence Centre. Medline cohort and case-control strategy.
22 2012.[http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.ht](http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html)
23 [ml](http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html) (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
24
25
26 24 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al*. Preferred Reporting Items for
27 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Annu*
28 *Intern Med* 2009;**151**:264–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
29
30
31 25 World Health Organization. International Clinical Trials Registry Platform
32 Search Portal. <http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
33
34 26 Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG, *et al*. The impact of outcome reporting
35 bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ*
36 2010;**340**:c365. doi:10.1136/bmj.c365
37
38
39 27 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al*. GRADE: an emerging consensus on
40 rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*
41 2008;**336**:924–6. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

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

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Status	Page
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification Update	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Completed	1
	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	Completed	2, 21
Authors:				
Contact Contributions	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Completed	1
	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Completed	21
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Completed	17
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Completed	21
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Completed	21
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Completed	21
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the	Completed	4-6

		context of what is already known		
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Completed	7
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	Completed	7-9
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	Completed	9
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	Completed	9-12
Study records:				
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Completed	13
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)	Completed	13
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	Completed	13-14
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	Completed	14-15
Outcomes and	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will	Completed	15-16

prioritization		be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale		
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	Completed	16-17
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Completed	17
	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)	Completed	17-19
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Completed	19
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Completed	19-20
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Completed	20
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Completed	20

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

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.

BMJ Open

EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-018223.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jan-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Härmälä, Suvi; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Parisinos, Constantinos; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics Shallcross, Laura; University College London, Institute of Health Informatics O'Brien, Alastair; University College London, Division of Medicine Hayward, Andrew; University College London, Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care
Primary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology, Public health
Keywords:	Pneumococcal vaccine, Influenza vaccine, Chronic liver disease

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **EFFECTIVENESS OF PNEUMOCOCCAL AND INFLUENZA VACCINES TO**
4 **PREVENT SERIOUS HEALTH COMPLICATIONS IN ADULTS WITH CHRONIC**
5 **LIVER DISEASE: A PROTOCOL FOR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**
6
7
8
9

10
11 Suvi Härmälä¹, Constantinos Parisinos¹, Laura Shallcross¹, Alastair O'Brien² &
12 Andrew Hayward^{1,3}
13

14
15
16
17
18 ¹ Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, United
19 Kingdom.

20
21 ² Division of Medicine, University College London, London, United Kingdom.

22
23 ³ Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London,
24 United Kingdom.
25

26
27
28
29 Corresponding author: Suvi K. Härmälä, Institute of Health Informatics,
30 University College London, 222 Euston Road, London NW1 2DA, United
31 Kingdom, suvi.harmala.14@ucl.ac.uk, +44 (0)20 3549 5338
32
33

34
35
36
37
38 Keywords: Pneumococcal vaccine, influenza vaccine, chronic liver disease
39

40
41
42
43 Word count (excluding title page, abstract, strengths & limitations, references
44 and table): 3909
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In advanced chronic liver disease, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus put people at an increased risk of serious health complications and death. The effectiveness of the available vaccines in reducing the risk of poor health outcomes, however, is less clear.

Methods and analysis: We will search MEDLINE (Ovid), EMBASE (Ovid), Pubmed and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) for published reports on randomised controlled trials and observational studies on the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in people with chronic liver disease. Two independent reviewers will screen the studies for eligibility, extract data and assess study quality and risk of bias. Random effects meta-analyses will be performed as appropriate.

Ethics and dissemination: Formal ethical approval is not required, as no primary data will be collected for this study. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.

Prospero registration number: CRD42017067277

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:

- This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P).
- This study protocol has been prospectively registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO).
- Our comprehensive search strategy will minimise the risk of missing relevant studies, in particular, those with a randomised design.
- The selection of studies, data extraction, the risk of bias and quality of evidence assessments will be conducted by two independent authors.
- Inclusion of studies with a non-randomised design may decrease the overall quality of the body of evidence for the study outcomes.

BACKGROUND

Burden of pneumococcal and influenza infections in chronic liver disease

In advanced chronic liver disease, as the immune function progressively deteriorates, diseases caused by common bacteria *Streptococcus pneumoniae* or influenza virus can lead to serious health complications and death.

In Spain in 2011, the population-level annual incidence rate for pneumococcal pneumonia-related hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at approximately 540 per 100 000 compared to approximately 6 per 100 000 without at-risk conditions,[1]. Adults with liver disease were over 50 times more likely to be hospitalised for pneumococcal pneumonia than adults without at-risk conditions,[1]. Similarly, in England in 2008/2009, for invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD), such as meningitis, bacteraemia and sepsis, the annual incidence of hospitalisation in adults with liver disease was estimated at about 100 per 100 000 compared to about 8 per 100 000 in the healthy population,[2]. Approximately 37% of liver disease patients hospitalised for IPD died, compared to 5% of patients without underlying risk conditions,[2]. Chronic liver disease patients were over 30 times more likely to be admitted to hospital and 10 times more likely to die during the IPD-related hospitalisation than adults without at-risk conditions,[2].

Although there are no population-level estimates of severe influenza incidence in people with chronic liver disease, evidence suggests that liver disease patients are at an increased risk of health complications from influenza. A 2-fold increased risk of influenza admission was observed in liver disease patients at 19 hospitals in Russia, Turkey, China, and Spain during the 2013/2014 season,[3]. Similarly, an analysis of data on laboratory-confirmed influenza cases collected from several World Health Organisation (WHO) member states during the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic found liver disease patients to have a greater than 5-fold increased risk of influenza-related hospitalisation and over 17-fold increased risk of death compared to that of healthy individuals,[4].

1
2
3 Furthermore, influenza infection, while not directly targeting the liver, may
4 cause collateral transient liver damage,[5] and trigger hepatic decompensation
5 (such as ascites and hepatic encephalopathy) in liver disease patients,[6].
6
7

8 9 **Types of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines, vaccination policy and** 10 **vaccine uptake** 11

12
13
14 Two types of vaccines, polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccines including
15 serotypes of *S. pneumoniae* (PPV23) and conjugate pneumococcal vaccines
16 including 7 (PCV7), 10 (PCV10) or 13 (PCV13) *S. pneumoniae* serotypes, are
17 available to protect against pneumococcal infection. None of these contains live
18 bacteria. The most commonly used influenza vaccines are injectable, inactivated
19 vaccines that contain either inactivated whole influenza virus or split or subunit
20 virus products. These vaccines protect either against two influenza A (H1N1 and
21 H3N2) strains and one influenza B strain (trivalent vaccines) or two influenza A
22 and two influenza B strains (quadrivalent vaccines). New vaccines are developed
23 every year to protect against the prevailing strains of the upcoming influenza
24 season and a yearly vaccination is recommended to ensure continued protection.
25 Live attenuated influenza vaccines exist, however, these may not be suitable for
26 people with chronic co-morbidities,[7]. Immune response defects associated
27 with advanced liver disease, [8–11] may also dampen the response to vaccines.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The majority of European countries recommend both adult influenza (29/29
40 countries) and pneumococcal vaccination (22/29 countries) for specific high-
41 risk groups,[12]. Chronic liver disease patients, however, may not be included in
42 these high-risk target groups in all countries. Whilst 90% (27/30) of the
43 countries recommended influenza immunisation for people with liver disease
44 during the 2014-2015 influenza season,[13], only 43% (6/14) of countries
45 surveyed in 2005 recommended pneumococcal vaccination for chronic liver
46 disease patients,[14]. Moreover, whilst the adult vaccination recommendations
47 for influenza are supported by official funding mechanisms in most countries
48 (21/29), the cost of the pneumococcal vaccination is covered by only half
49 (11/22),[12].
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Uptake of influenza vaccine in people with chronic diseases in general is poor.
5
6 The median coverage rate across Europe in the 2014/2015 season was less than
7
8 50% (only 7/30 countries were able to provide separate coverage data for
9
10 individuals with chronic medical conditions),[13]. The situation in liver disease
11
12 patients as a separate group seems no different with less than 50% of working-
13
14 age liver disease patients in the UK covered by the influenza vaccine in
15
16 2015/2016 season,[15]. Although fewer data exist concerning the uptake of
17
18 pneumococcal adult vaccination,[12], its uptake in liver disease patients is not
19
20 likely to be any higher than that of influenza vaccine.

21 **Rationale for the review**

22
23
24 Approximately 29 million people in Europe alone are affected by some form of
25
26 liver disease,[16]. Worryingly, due to the increasing prevalence of obesity and
27
28 persistence of other liver damage risk factors such as alcohol abuse and hepatitis
29
30 infections, this number is expected to grow,[16]. Whilst evidence suggests that
31
32 following infection with influenza or *S. pneumoniae*, people with liver disease
33
34 have a higher than average risk of poor health outcomes, the effectiveness of the
35
36 vaccines in reducing this risk is less clear and warrants further investigation.

37
38 To our knowledge, no systematic review to date has investigated the effects of
39
40 pneumococcal and influenza vaccines in preventing poor health outcomes in
41
42 chronic liver disease. The present review intends to fill this gap by providing a
43
44 systematic synthesis of the available evidence. The results of this review may
45
46 inform future vaccination strategies and help improve vaccination coverage.
47
48 This, in turn, may have a positive impact on both the number of influenza and
49
50 pneumococcal disease-related hospital admissions and patient outcomes in liver
51
52 disease.

53 **OBJECTIVES**

1
2
3 The aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and
4 influenza vaccines to prevent serious health complications in adults with chronic
5 liver disease.
6
7

8
9 The objectives are:

- 10
11 • To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to
12 prevent hospitalisation in adults with chronic liver disease.
- 13
14 • To assess the effectiveness of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines to
15 prevent death in adults with chronic liver disease.
- 16
17 • To assess the effects of pneumococcal and influenza vaccines for eliciting
18 a serological response in adults with chronic liver disease.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **METHODS**

25
26
27 This study protocol follows the recommendations by the Preferred Reporting
28 Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015,[17].
29
30
31

32 **Eligibility criteria**

33 **Types of studies**

34
35
36 We will include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with comparison group/s)
37 and case-control studies that investigate the effectiveness of pneumococcal or
38 influenza vaccines for preventing hospitalisation or death in adults with chronic
39 liver disease. We will also include all randomized clinical trials, cohort (with or
40 without comparison group/s) and case-control studies that report the
41 serological response to one or both of these vaccines in adults with chronic liver
42 disease. We will only include published studies in English language and studies
43 that have been published or accepted for publication. We will exclude review
44 articles, case reports, cross-sectional studies, animal studies, editorials, clinical
45 guidelines and any studies that have been fully or partially retracted from
46 publication. Patients included in multiple studies will be reported only once.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Types of participants

We will include studies that enrol 18+ year-old adult patients with chronic liver disease of any severity (non-cirrhotic, cirrhotic) or aetiology (viral, alcoholic, non-alcoholic fatty liver, autoimmune).

Types of interventions

We will include studies that investigate the effects of a conjugate or polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccine (against *S. pneumoniae*) and/or an inactivated (whole virus, split virus or subunit), injectable influenza vaccine. Vaccines can be adjuvanted, intradermal and of any dose. We will exclude live, recombinant, virosomal and experimental vaccines.

Types of comparators

We will include studies comparing one or both of the vaccines of interest to a placebo, an alternative intervention or no intervention. We will also include studies without a comparison group when the outcome studied is the serological response to the vaccine.

Types of outcome measures

We will include studies that report on one or more of our primary outcomes and/or our secondary outcome of interest.

Primary outcomes

- All-cause hospitalisation
- All-cause mortality

Secondary outcomes

- Serological response to vaccine

- Acute respiratory illness-related hospitalisation
- Influenza illness or influenza-like-illness (ILI)-related hospitalisation (based on hospital discharge codes or clinical diagnosis)
- Pneumococcal disease-related hospitalisation
- Hospitalisation for liver disease complications (variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, jaundice and bacteraemia or sepsis)
- Acute respiratory illness-related mortality
- Influenza illness or ILI-related mortality
- Pneumococcal disease-related mortality
- Liver disease-related mortality

Information sources

Electronic searches

To capture all relevant studies, we plan to search the following databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- MEDLINE (Ovid)
- EMBASE (Ovid)
- PubMed
-

Each database will be searched separately and the search strategy first developed in MEDLINE will be adapted to each database interface as appropriate. We plan to also search relevant studies from the reference lists of the eligible studies identified through the electronic searches.

Search strategy

We will use two complementary strategies to identify relevant articles. First, we will identify articles reporting outcomes of vaccination in patients with liver disease by combining search terms for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination

with search terms for chronic liver disease (Search 1). This search will be filtered by study design. The provisional search terms for liver disease and pneumococcal and influenza vaccines are listed in Table 1.

Recognising that liver disease patients may be included as subgroups in clinical trials of vaccination, we will also search for randomised controlled trials of influenza and pneumococcal vaccine that have recruited individuals from the general population (Search 2).

To search for studies with adult participants, we will combine the geriatric and adult medicine-specific search strategies by Kastner et al.,[18]. In order to maximise the sensitivity of the searches for randomised clinical trials, we will use a filter that combines terms from the Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search Strategy,[19] and less specific version of the same filter by Chalmers et al.,[20] to identify randomised trials. Similarly, to maximise the sensitivity of searches for case-control and cohort studies, we will use a filter that combines terms from the University of Texas School of Public Health filter for observational studies,[21], SIGN observational study filter,[22] and the BMJ Evidence Centre case-control and cohort strategy,[23]. We will limit our search to studies including adult human study subjects but not based on the setting/country or publication year of the articles. The search terms for adult and study design filters are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. MEDLINE (Ovid) provisional search terms

Search concept	Search terms
Pneumococcal vaccine	1. exp Pneumococcal Vaccines/
	2. exp Pneumococcal Infections/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?pneum* or pneum*) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	4. (PPV?23* or PPSV or PPSV?23* or PCV?7* or PCV?10* or PCV?13*).mp.
	5. ((PPV or PCV) adj5 (pneum* or vaccin* or immuni*)).mp.
	6. ((7?valent or hepta?valent or 10?valent or 13?valent or

	23?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*).mp.
	7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
Influenza vaccine	1. Influenza Vaccines/
	2. Influenza, Human/pc [Prevention & Control]
	3. ((anti?influenza or influenza or seasonal or anti?flu or flu) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*).mp.
	4. ((TIV or QIV or trivalent or quadrivalent or 3?valent or 4?valent) adj5 (vaccin* or immuni*).mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5
Liver disease	1. exp Liver Diseases/
	2. ((liver or hepat*) adj3 disease*).mp.
	3. ("chronic liver" or "chronic hepat*").mp.
	4. cirrho*.mp.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Adult participants	1. exp Adult/
	2. adult.mp.
	3. (middle?aged or aged).sh.
	4. age*.tw.
	5. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
Randomised controlled trials	1. randomized controlled trial.pt.
	2. randomi*.ab,ti.
	3. randomly.ab,ti.
	4. controlled clinical trial.pt.
	5. trial.ab,ti.
	6. groups.ab,ti.
	7. drug therapy.fs.
	8. placebo.ab,ti.
	9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8
	10. Animals/

	11. Humans/
	12. 10 not (10 and 11)
	13. 9 not 12
Case-control and cohort studies	1. Epidemiologic Studies/
	2. exp Case control studies/
	3. exp Cohort studies/
	4. Longitudinal studies/
	5. Follow up studies/
	6. Prospective studies/
	7. Retrospective studies/
	8. Control groups/
	9. Matched-Pair Analysis/
	10. (Case* adj5 control*).ti,ab,kw.
	11. (Case* adj5 comparison*).ti,ab,kw.
	12. Control group*.ti,ab,kw.
	13. (Cohort adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	14. Cohort anal*.ti,ab.
	15. (Follow up adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	16. (Observational adj (study or studies)).ti,ab.
	17. Longitudinal.ti,ab.
	18. Retrospective.ti,ab.
	19. Prospective.ti,ab.
	20. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19
	21. Animals/
	22. Humans/
	23. 21 not (21 and 22)
	24. 20 not 23

Study records

Data management

The search results will be uploaded into reference management software (Mendeley) to remove duplicate records of the same report. The unique records will then be uploaded into web-based, systematic review management software (DistillerSR). Both the initial abstract and title screening and the full-text review and extraction of data from the eligible studies will be performed using standardised, pre-created online forms. All forms will be piloted and revised as needed by the reviewers before starting the review.

Selection process

Articles that have been identified through the broad search of RCTs of pneumococcal or flu vaccination in the general population (Search 2) will first be pre-screened by title by one reviewer (SH). Articles meeting pre-screening criteria will be combined with the articles identified through Search 1. These articles will then all be screened by two independent reviewers (SH&CP) by abstract and title. Where the study eligibility cannot be established based on the title and abstract, the report will be passed on to the full-text review. Similarly, records subject to disagreement over eligibility will be included in the full-text review.

The full-text review will be independently completed for all eligible articles by two independent reviewers authors (SH&CP). Reasons for exclusion of ineligible studies will be recorded. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third review author (AO) and any uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators. Multiple reports of the same study will be collated into one and, where not possible, only the most relevant report based on our eligibility criteria will be included. The study selection process will be recorded and presented in flow diagram format according to the recommendations of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA),[24].

Data collection process

The data will be extracted and entered into standardised, pre-created online data extraction forms independently and in duplicate by two review authors (SH&CP). Disagreement will be resolved by consulting a third review author (LS) and uncertainties by correspondence with study investigators.

Data items

We will extract data on:

- Study participants: inclusion and exclusion criteria, method of recruitment/selection, study population characteristics and any imbalances at baseline (sex, age, aetiology and severity of liver disease, co-morbidities, alcohol use, smoking status, pre-vaccination infection status, medication/treatment other than intervention).
- Interventions and comparators (vaccine type, comparison treatment, dose, route of delivery, number and timing of vaccinations/comparator treatments, number of individuals in intervention and comparison group, follow-up time in intervention and comparison groups)
- Outcomes (definition, time points measured and reported, unit of measurement, number of outcomes in the intervention and control group, unadjusted and adjusted effect measures, covariates that the effect measures were adjusted for, comparisons, missing data and reasons for missingness, statistical methods used, processes for randomisation e.g. allocation concealment)
- Study designs and methods (study type, country and setting, date of study, study duration, aim of study, withdrawals).
- Study quality and study bias (according to the needs of the assessments specified below).
- Study funding and conflicts of interest

Effect measures will be collected in the format in which they are reported and transformed for presentation and analysis if appropriate.

Outcomes and prioritisation

Our main outcomes of interest are hospitalisation and death. These are potential severe outcomes of influenza illness and pneumococcal disease. It may be challenging to identify and establish, especially if hospital discharge records are reviewed retrospectively, the exact cause of the hospitalisation or death of a patient with an underlying chronic condition. For this reason, our primary outcomes we will include all causes. Additionally, studies may not always specify whether a patient with a diagnosis of an infectious disease or liver disease complication was actually hospitalised. Unless it is specified that the patient was hospitalised or the illness was recorded in the hospital records, we will assume the patient was not hospitalised.

Our secondary outcomes of interest are the serological response to pneumococcal and influenza vaccines and a range of cause-specific hospitalisation and mortality. Serological response to a vaccine is an indicator of the vaccine's effect on building protective immunity against the disease the vaccination targets. Since, however, it is difficult to know what level of antibody or increase in antibody concentration may provide protection in people with chronic liver disease, we will evaluate both the post-vaccination antibody level and the pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentrations. We will include studies where blood was drawn both before vaccination and at least 2 weeks after vaccination. This effect will be evaluated both for short-term (<6 months) and long-term (≥6 months) after vaccination. In case antibody responses are reported at multiple short-term or long-term time points, we will consider the time point closest to the timing of vaccination as the as the short-term response and the time point closest to 6 months as the long-term response. The more detailed causes of hospitalisation and death, allow us to understand about the more specific effects of the vaccines.

Assessment of risk of bias in individual studies

1
2
3 We will use the Cochrane Collaborations tool,[19] for assessing the risk of bias in
4 all studies included in the review after the full-text review. The level of risk of
5 bias in random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of
6 participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete
7 outcome data, selective reporting and other sources will be judged as “low”,
8 “high” or “unclear” according to the criteria specified in the Cochrane
9 Handbook,[19].
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 In the non-randomised studies, we will additionally assess the level of risk of
17 confounding bias due to inadequately addressed differences between groups (i.e.
18 is the effect estimate likely to be biased due to unaccounted confounding). We
19 will consider age, sex, severity and aetiology of liver disease to be the most
20 important potential confounders. We will judge the risk of confounding bias to
21 be low if the study addressed the presence of these confounders by restricting
22 participant selection by confounders, demonstrating balance between groups,
23 matching on the confounders or adjusting for the confounders in statistical
24 analyses of the effect size. The risk of confounding bias will be judged low if the
25 confounders were adjusted for, high if the presence of the confounders was not
26 addressed and unclear if there was insufficient information to judge the level of
27 risk.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Two review authors (SH&CP) will independently assess the studies for each of
39 the risk areas by entering a quote from the study to describe the procedures,
40 their judgement together with a justification of the judgement into pre-created
41 online forms in DistillerSR. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third
42 review author (AH). The risk of bias assessments will be presented in a figure
43 that shows the level of risk in the different risk areas within each individual
44 study and in a graph that describes the proportion of studies within each risk
45 level per risk area.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Assessment of bias in conducting the systematic review**

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We will conduct the systematic review following this pre-specified protocol and
4 report any differences between the methods of the complete review and this
5 protocol in the review.
6
7

8 9 **Data synthesis**

10 11 12 Criteria for quantitative data synthesis

13
14
15
16 We plan to carry out a formal meta-analysis only where more than a single study
17 per outcome is identified and the study designs, protocols and measures of
18 treatment effect are considered similar enough to produce a meaningful pooled
19 effect.
20
21
22

23 24 Measures of treatment effect

25
26
27 For dichotomous data, the treatment effect will be estimated and presented as a
28 risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals. For time-to-event data, we will present
29 the results as a log hazard ratio with its standard error. For studies reporting on
30 serological response using a cohort design without a comparison group, we will
31 present the effect of vaccination as the post-vaccination antibody level and the
32 pre- to post-vaccination fold change in geometric mean antibody concentration.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Unit of analysis issues

40
41
42 The outcomes will be analysed at the level of study participants from each
43 individual study.
44
45

46 47 Dealing with missing data

48
49
50 We will contact investigators to obtain numerical outcome data that have not
51 been fully reported (for instance where when a study is identified as an abstract
52 only or outcomes are reported in figures only). Where possible, we will calculate
53 missing standard deviations from other reported statistics such as confidence
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 intervals or standard errors. The impact of including studies with high levels of
4 missing outcome data on the treatment effect will be explored in the sensitivity
5 analysis.
6
7

8 9 Assessment of heterogeneity 10

11
12 To assess heterogeneity between studies, we plan to present a forest plot for
13 each of the review outcomes. We will then calculate the formal heterogeneity
14 variance statistics τ^2 , I^2 and the Q-statistic. We will regard heterogeneity as
15 substantial if τ^2 is greater than 0, I^2 is more than 30% and the p-value for Q-
16 statistic is less than 0.10. We plan to further explore the potential causes of
17 substantial heterogeneity in the subgroup analyses or meta-regression (specified
18 below).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Quantitative data synthesis 27

28
29 Statistical analyses will be performed using Stata or R Studio. To account for the
30 presence of heterogeneity, we will use random-effects meta-analysis to
31 summarise the average effects of vaccination on the defined outcomes across
32 studies. The results will be presented in forest plots with the average treatment
33 effect (RR) with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of τ^2 and I^2 . We will
34 use the pooled average treatment effect to calculate the effectiveness of the
35 vaccines ($100*[1-RR]$) in preventing the primary outcomes. The immunogenetic
36 effect of the vaccines will be summarised as the mean post-vaccination antibody
37 level with 95% confidence intervals and the mean pre- to post-vaccination fold
38 change in geometric mean antibody concentration with 95% confidence
39 intervals. Observational studies and randomised controlled trial studies will be
40 considered in separate analyses.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity 51

52
53
54 In case we identify an adequate number of studies (studies per explanatory
55 variable ≥ 10) we plan to investigate the potential causes of heterogeneity
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between studies through random effects meta-regression analyses. We will
4 consider the following categories of explanatory variables: severity of liver
5 disease, aetiology of liver disease and the reason for hospital admission/
6 mortality (primary outcomes). Inclusion/exclusion of the explanatory variables
7 in the heterogeneity investigations will depend on the characteristics and design
8 of the identified studies. If we do not identify enough studies to perform meta-
9 regressions but there are a minimum 5 studies per analysis we plan to carry out
10 subgroup analyses to investigate whether these explanatory variables can
11 explain heterogeneity between the studies.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Sensitivity analysis

20
21
22 In case the identified studies differ in terms of risk of bias, we plan to investigate
23 the impact of excluding studies with high/unclear risk of bias on effect estimates
24 in sensitivity analyses.
25
26
27
28

29 Qualitative data synthesis

30
31
32 We will provide a narrative summary of the study results for all outcomes,
33 categorised by study design and vaccine type (influenza vaccine and
34 pneumococcal vaccine). For the primary outcomes, we will report the cause of
35 hospitalisation and death studied. Characteristics (participants, interventions,
36 comparators, outcomes, study design and methods and notes on funding and
37 conflicts of interests) of all studies included in the review will also be presented
38 in separate tables. The results for outcomes where meta-analysis will not be
39 carried out due to insufficient homogeneity between studies will be presented in
40 forest plots without the pooled effect estimate.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Meta-bias(es)**

50
51
52 Assessment of reporting biases across studies
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We plan to investigate reporting bias using funnel plots. If there are enough
4 studies in the analysis (minimum 10), we will also carry out the Egger's test to
5 assess whether there is a linear association between the study's result and its
6 standard error.
7
8
9

10
11 We plan to assess selective outcome reporting bias by comparing what the study
12 set to measure and analyse in the methods section of the study report (for
13 studies published after 2006, we will also investigate the details trial protocol if
14 it can be identified through the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry
15 Platform,[25] launched in 2007) with the results that were reported. Using the
16 Outcome Reporting Bias in Trials (ORBIT) classification system,[26] we will
17 evaluate whether the risk of selective outcome reporting bias is present and
18 whether the risk is low or high.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Confidence in cumulative evidence**

27
28
29 We will use the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and
30 Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group system,[27] to assess and report the overall
31 quality of the body of evidence for each outcome studied. The within-study risk
32 of bias (methodological quality), directness of evidence, heterogeneity, the
33 precision of effect estimates and risk of publication bias will be independently
34 assessed by two review authors (SH&CP). The quality of evidence will be judged
35 and reported as "high", "moderate", "low", or "very low" following the Cochrane
36 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions guidelines,[19].
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

47
48
49 The authors declare no competing interests.
50
51
52
53

54 **FUNDING**

1
2
3 This work was supported by the UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences
4 Research Council grant number BBSRC BB/M009513/1 to SH.
5
6
7
8

9 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

10
11
12 The study was conceived by SH, LS, AO and AH. SH developed the eligibility
13 criteria, search strategy, risk of bias assessment strategy and data extraction
14 plan with guidance from LS, AO and AH. SH wrote the manuscript, to which all
15 authors SH, CP, LS, AO and AH contributed.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

23
24
25
26 Formal ethical approval is not required for this study, as no primary data will be
27 collected. We will publish results of this study in relevant peer-reviewed medical
28 journal or journals. Where possible, the study results will also be presented as
29 posters or talks at relevant medical conferences and meetings.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **PROTOCOL REGISTRATION**

37
38
39 This systematic review protocol was registered in the International Prospective
40 Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 13th June 2017 (registration
41 number CRD42017067277).
42
43
44
45

46 **REFERENCES**

- 47
48
49 1 Gil-Prieto R, Pascual-Garcia R, Walter S, *et al.* Risk of hospitalization due to
50 pneumococcal disease in adults in Spain. The CORIENNE study. *Hum*
51 *Vaccin Immunother* 2016;**12**:1900–5.
52 doi:10.1080/21645515.2016.1143577
53
54
55 2 Jan A, Hoek V, Andrews N, *et al.* The effect of underlying clinical conditions
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 on the risk of developing invasive pneumococcal disease in England. *J*
4 *Infect* 2012;**65**:17–24. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2012.02.017
- 5
6 3 Puig-Barberà J, Natividad-Sancho A, Trushakova S, *et al.* Epidemiology of
7 Hospital Admissions with Influenza during the 2013 / 2014 Northern
8 Hemisphere Influenza Season: Results from the Global Influenza Hospital
9 Surveillance Network. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0154970.
10 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154970
- 11
12 4 Kerkhove MD Van, Vandemaele KAH, Shinde V, *et al.* Risk Factors for
13 Severe Outcomes following 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) Infection: A Global
14 Pooled Analysis. *PLoS Med* 2011;**8**:e1001053.
15 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001053
- 16
17 5 Polakos NK, Cornejo JC, Murray DA, *et al.* Kupffer Cell-Dependent Hepatitis
18 Occurs during Influenza Infection. *Am J Pathol* 2006;**168**:1169–78.
19 doi:10.2353/ajpath.2006.050875
- 20
21 6 Duchini A, Viernes ME, Nyberg LM, *et al.* Hepatic Decompensation in
22 Patients With Cirrhosis During Infection With Influenza A. *Arch Intern Med*
23 2000;**160**:113–5. doi:10.1001/archinte.160.1.113
- 24
25 7 World Health Organization. Weekly epidemiological record: Vaccines
26 against influenza. WHO position paper. 2012;;461–
27 76.<http://www.who.int/wer/2012/wer8747/en/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
- 28
29 8 Fierer J, Finley F. Deficient Serum Bactericidal Activity Against *Escherichia*
30 *Coli* in Patients with Cirrhosis of the Liver. *J Clin Invest* 1979;**63**:912–21.
31 doi:10.1172/JCI109391
- 32
33 9 Hassner A, Kletter Y, Shlag D, *et al.* Impaired monocyte function in liver
34 cirrhosis. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1981;**282**:1262–3.
- 35
36 10 Brien AJO, Fullerton JN, Massey KA, *et al.* Prostaglandin E2 Mediates
37 Immunosuppression in Acutely Decompensated Cirrhosis. *Nat Med*
38 2014;**20**:518–23. doi:10.1038/nm.3516
- 39
40 11 Rajkovic IA, Williams R. Abnormalities of Neutrophil Phagocytosis,
41 Intracellular Killing and Metabolic Activity in Alcoholic Cirrhosis and
42 Hepatitis. *Hepatology* 1986;**6**:252–62. doi:10.1002/hep.1840060217
- 43
44 12 Kanitz EE, Wu LA, Giambi C, *et al.* Variation in adult vaccination policies
45 across Europe: An overview from VENICE network on vaccine
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 recommendations, funding and coverage. *Vaccine* 2012;**30**:5222–8.
4 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.06.012
5
- 6 13 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Seasonal influenza
7 vaccination and antiviral use in Europe – Overview of vaccination
8 recommendations and coverage rates in the EU Member States for the
9 2013–14 and 2014–15 influenza seasons.
10 2016.[http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528)
11 [DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1528)
12 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
13
- 14 14 Pebody RG, Leino T, Nohynek H, *et al*. Pneumococcal vaccination policy in
15 Europe. *Eurosurveillance*.
16 2005;**10**.[http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=56](http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=564)
17 4 (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
18
- 19 15 Public Health England. Influenza immunisation programme for England:
20 GP patient groups - Data collection survey Season 2015 to 2016.
21 2016.[https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016)
22 [uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-gp-patients-in-england-winter-season-2015-to-2016) (accessed
23 13 Jun 2017).
24
- 25 16 Blachier M, Leleu H, Peck-Radosavljevic M, *et al*. The burden of liver
26 disease in Europe: a review of available epidemiological data. *J Hepatol*
27 2013;**58**:593–608. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2012.12.005
28
- 29 17 Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA, *et al*. Preferred reporting items for
30 systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
31 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;**349**:g7647.
32 doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647
33
- 34 18 Kastner M, Wilczynski NL, Walker-Dilks C, *et al*. Age-Specific Search
35 Strategies for Medline. *J Med Internet Res* 2006;**8**:e25.
36 doi:10.2196/jmir.8.4.e25
37
- 38 19 The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews
39 of Interventions. 2011.www.handbook.cochrane.org (accessed 13 Jun
40 2017).
41
- 42 20 Chalmers JD, Campling J, Dicker A, *et al*. A systematic review of the burden
43 of vaccine preventable pneumococcal disease in UK adults. *BMC Pulm Med*
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 2016;:1–11. doi:10.1186/s12890-016-0242-0
- 21 University of Texas School of Public Health. Search filters for case-control studies, cohort studies, cross-sectional studies, clinical trials. 2012.http://libguides.sph.uth.tmc.edu/search_filters/ovid_psycinfo_filters (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
- 22 Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. SIGN search filters for observational studies.
- 23 BMJ Evidence Centre. Medline cohort and case-control strategy. 2012.<http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
- 24 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al*. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Annu Intern Med* 2009;**151**:264–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
- 25 World Health Organization. International Clinical Trials Registry Platform Search Portal. <http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/> (accessed 13 Jun 2017).
- 26 Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG, *et al*. The impact of outcome reporting bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c365. doi:10.1136/bmj.c365
- 27 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al*. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;**336**:924–6. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

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

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Status	Page
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification Update	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Completed	1
	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	Completed	2, 21
Authors:				
Contact Contributions	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Completed	1
	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Completed	21
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Completed	17
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Completed	21
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Completed	21
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Completed	21
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the	Completed	4-6

		context of what is already known		
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Completed	7
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	Completed	7-9
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	Completed	9
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	Completed	9-12
Study records:				
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Completed	13
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)	Completed	13
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	Completed	13-14
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	Completed	14-15
Outcomes and	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will	Completed	15-16

prioritization		be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale		
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	Completed	16-17
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Completed	17
	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)	Completed	17-19
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Completed	19
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Completed	19-20
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Completed	20
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Completed	20

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

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.