PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2-3
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4-5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	6
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	6
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	7
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	7
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	7
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	7
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	7
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	8
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	8
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	8-9

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	8-9
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	NA
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	10
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	12
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	12-15
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	12-15
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	12
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	NA
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	16-17
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	17-19
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	19-20
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	Submission system

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

1. “Isosorbide and nifedipine for treatment of Chagas disease digestive manifestations: a systematic review and meta-analysis”
2. Abstract section.
3. “These drugs appear to be effective in relieving symptoms, but their use is controversial because of the high incidence of side effects and no change in the course of the disease. Only a few small studies have evaluated the use of these medications in patients with Chagas disease, and there is no systematic review on this topic.”
4. “(…) the objective of this systematic review was to evaluate the effectiveness of isosorbide and nifedipine versus no treatment for esophageal manifestations of Chagas disease in adult patients and to determine the frequency of side effects.”
5. “The study protocol was 129 registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews 130 (PROSPERO), under the registration number CRD42017055143”
6. Section “Elegibility criteria and outcomes of interest”
7. “We searched MEDLINE (via PubMed), Embase and LILACS databases to retrieve potentially relevant articles from inception to January 2018. We also screened the reference lists of identified publications for additional studies and contacted authors for further information as needed.”
8. “(…) complete search strategies used are shown in S2 appendix.”
9. See sections “Eligibility criteria and outcomes of interest” and “Study selection and data extraction”
10. “(…) and contacted authors for further information as needed. (…) Independently, the same reviewers extracted data from the full text of included studies using a pre-designed data extraction form.”
11. “Data extracted included study characteristics and outcomes of interest.”
12. See section “Risk of bias assessment”
13. “(…) results were presented as mean difference or pooled prevalence”
14. See section “Data analysis”
15. “The overall quality of evidence was assessed using GRADE. (…) Publication bias was not assessed due to the small number of studies.”
16. NA
17. “Fig 1 presents a flow diagram of the included studies (…)”
18. See Table 1.
19. See “Results - Risk of Bias” section and S3 Appendix
20. See section “Results - Effects of isosorbide”, “Results - Effects of nifedipine”, Fig 2, Fig 3 and S6 Appendix
21. See Fig1, Fig2 and S6 Appendix
22. See S5 Appendix
23. NA
24. Discussion section
25. See paragraph beginning with “Our systematic review has some limitations (…)”
26. Discussion section
27. Submission system