

**ANNEX 1 - PRISMA-P 2015 CHECKLIST**

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>					
<b>Title</b>					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 to 4 (page 1)
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Registration</b>	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	54 (page 3)
<b>Authors</b>					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10 to 59 (page 1) 3 to 13 (page 2)
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	33 to 37 (page 15)
<b>Amendments</b>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Support</b>					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	40 to 49 (page 15)
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>					
<b>Rationale</b>	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 to 57 (page 5) 3 to 40 (page 6)
<b>Objectives</b>	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	44 to 49 (page 6) 24 to 57 (page 8)

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
<b>METHODS</b>					
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	28 to 60 (page 7) 3 to 57 (page 8)
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 to 26 (page 7)
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 to 49 Annex 2
<b>STUDY RECORDS</b>					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	56 to 59 (page 9)
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	54 to 60 (page 9) 2 (page 10)
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 to 19 (page 10)
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	24 to 55 (page 10)
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 to 46 (page 9)
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	42 to 60 (page 11)
<b>DATA</b>					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
	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 (e.g., $I^2$ , Kendall's tau)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	51 to 60 (page 11)
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14 to 16 (page 12)
<b>Meta-bias(es)</b>	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	47 to 49 (page 11)
<b>Confidence in cumulative evidence</b>	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 to 15 (page 10)