

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

Prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040997
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Kirthi, Varo; King's College London Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, Ophthalmology Research Office Nderitu, Paul; King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Ophthalmology Alam, Uazman; University of Liverpool Institute of Ageing and Chronic Disease, Diabetes and Endocrinology Research Evans, Jennifer; London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, International Centre for Eye Health Nevitt, Sarah; University of Liverpool, Department of Biostatistics Malik, Rayaz A. ; Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Medicine Jackson, Timothy; King's College London, Ophthalmology; King's College Hospital, Ophthalmology
Keywords:	Diabetic retinopathy < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Medical retina < OPHTHALMOLOGY, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **1 TITLE:**
4

5
6 **2** Prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis
7
8
9

10
11 **3 AUTHORS:**
12

13
14 **4** Varo Kirthi ^{1,2} v.kirthi@nhs.net
15

16 **5** Paul Nderitu ² paulnderitu@nhs.net
17

18 **6** Uazman Alam ^{3,4} uazman.alam@liverpool.ac.uk
19

20 **7** Jennifer Evans ⁵ jennifer.evans@lshtm.ac.uk
21

22 **8** Sarah Nevitt ³ sarah.nevitt@liverpool.ac.uk
23

24 **9** Rayaz A Malik ⁶ ram2045@qatar-med.cornell.edu
25

26 **10** Timothy L Jackson ^{1,2} t.jackson1@nhs.net
27
28

29
30
31
32 **11 Institutional affiliations:** ¹ King's College London; ² King's College Hospital NHS Foundation
33 Trust; ³ University of Liverpool; ⁴ Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; ⁵
34 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; ⁶ Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 **14 Address for correspondence:** Dr Varo Kirthi, Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's
42 College London, Ophthalmology Research Office, Normanby Building, King's College Hospital,
43 London SE5 9RS
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 **17 ABSTRACT:**
53

54 **18 Introduction:** There is growing evidence of a higher than expected prevalence of retinopathy
55 in pre-diabetes. This paper presents the protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 20 retinopathy in pre-diabetes. The aim of the review is to estimate the prevalence of
4
5
6 21 retinopathy in pre-diabetes and to summarise the current data.
7
8
9

10 22 **Methods and analysis:** This protocol is developed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting
11
12 23 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines. A
13
14 24 comprehensive electronic bibliographic search will be conducted in MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web
15
16
17 25 of Science, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), Google Scholar
18
19 26 and the Cochrane Library. Eligible studies will report prevalence data for retinopathy on
20
21
22 27 fundus photography in adults with pre-diabetes. No time restrictions will be placed on the
23
24 28 date of publication. Screening for eligible studies and data extraction will be conducted by
25
26 29 two reviewers independently, using defined inclusion criteria and pre-piloted data extraction
27
28
29 30 forms. Disagreements between these reviewers will be resolved by a third (senior) reviewer.
30
31

32
33 31 The primary outcome is the prevalence of any standard features of diabetic retinopathy on
34
35 32 fundus photography, as per International Clinical Diabetic Retinopathy Severity Scale (ICDRSS)
36
37 33 classification. Secondary outcomes are the prevalence of: (i) any retinal microvascular
38
39 34 abnormalities on fundus photography that are not standard features of diabetic retinopathy
40
41 35 as per ICDRSS classification and (ii) any macular microvascular abnormalities on fundus
42
43 36 photography, including but not limited to the presence of macular exudates, microaneurysms
44
45 37 and haemorrhages. Risk of bias for included studies will be assessed using a validated risk of
46
47 38 bias tool for prevalence studies. Pooled estimates for the pre-specified outcomes of interest
48
49 39 will be calculated using random effects meta-analytic techniques. Heterogeneity will be
50
51 40 assessed using the I^2 statistic.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 41 **Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval is not required as this is a protocol for a systematic
4
5
6 42 review and no primary data are to be collected. Findings will be disseminated through peer-
7
8 43 reviewed publications and presentations at national and international meetings including
9
10 44 Diabetes UK, European Association for the Study of Diabetes, American Diabetes Association
11
12
13 45 and International Diabetes Federation conferences.

14
15
16
17 46 **Registration details:** This protocol has been submitted to PROSPERO for registration. Any
18
19 47 protocol amendments will be updated on the PROSPERO database.

20
21
22
23 48 **Abbreviations:** A full list of the abbreviations used in this protocol is provided in Appendix 1.
24
25
26
27
28

29 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:**

- 30
31 50 • This systematic review protocol follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
32
33 51 Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines, provided in Appendix 2.
34
35
36 52 • This systematic review addresses an important gap in the current evidence by
37
38 53 estimating the prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes.
39
40
41 54 • There is potential for significant clinical and statistical heterogeneity in reporting of
42
43 55 prevalence data between different populations.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **BACKGROUND:**

50
51
52 57 Pre-diabetes is defined by blood glucose levels above the normal range, but below the
53
54 58 threshold for type 2 diabetes mellitus (1,2). The burden of prediabetes is enormous: it is
55
56
57 59 currently estimated to affect 373 million people across the globe and this number is projected
58
59 60 to increase to 587 million (8.3% of the global adult population) by 2045 (3).
60

1
2
3 61 Cohort analysis of people with pre-diabetes reveals an increased incidence of microvascular
4
5 62 and macrovascular disease, including an elevated all-cause mortality, compared to people
6
7
8 63 with normal glucose metabolism (4,5). This suggests that end-organ complications of
9
10 64 hyperglycaemia may be occurring prior to the onset of overt diabetes (6). Furthermore,
11
12
13 65 people with prediabetes and microvascular disease are more likely to develop overt diabetes
14
15 66 (7,8). In a population-based analysis of 49,072 participants with diabetes, the presence of
16
17 67 diabetic retinopathy (DR) was associated with an increased risk (hazard ratio 1.39, 95%
18
19 68 confidence interval 1.09-1.76) of cardiovascular death, non-fatal myocardial infarction or
20
21 69 stroke, after adjustment of traditional risk factors including HbA1c, lipid profile and blood
22
23 70 pressure (9). Despite ongoing debate on how best to identify people with pre-diabetes at high
24
25 71 risk of end-organ complications, long-term data show a reduction in both morbidity and
26
27 72 mortality following early lifestyle interventions (10).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34 73 A systematic review of 35 population-based studies of people with diabetes reported the
35
36 74 prevalence of DR, proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR), diabetic macular oedema (DMO)
37
38 75 and vision-threatening diabetic retinopathy (VTDR) as 34.6%, 7.0%, 6.8% and 10.2%,
39
40
41 76 respectively (11). The early onset of retinopathy in pre-diabetes is of particular concern as DR
42
43
44 77 remains one of the principal causes of vision loss in adults of working age in developed
45
46 78 countries, with considerable health and socioeconomic consequences (12). Given projections
47
48 79 that up to 70% of people with pre-diabetes may eventually develop diabetes during their
49
50
51 80 lifespan, early identification of retinopathy is a significant health priority (6). It is estimated
52
53 81 that up to 95% of vision loss in diabetes is preventable or treatable, if detected early (13).

54
55
56
57 82 Although many studies have reported retinopathy changes in pre-diabetes, there has been
58
59
60 83 no systematic review or meta-analysis of the literature to estimate an overall prevalence.

1
2
3 84 Understanding the prevalence of retinopathy may not only focus attention on early
4
5 85 interventions but may also help refine diagnostic criteria and risk stratification for pre-
6
7 86 diabetes. The aim of this systematic review is to estimate the prevalence of retinopathy
8
9 87 detected on fundus photography in adults with pre-diabetes.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 88 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS:**

17
18 89 **Study design:** Comprehensive literature searches of electronic bibliographic databases will be
19
20 90 conducted in MEDLINE (access via OVID), EMBASE (access via OVID), Web of Science, CINAHL
21
22 91 (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), Google Scholar and the Cochrane
23
24 92 Library. No time restrictions will be placed on the date of publication. All search strategies will
25
26 93 be independently reviewed by an expert information specialist using the Peer Review of
27
28 94 Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) checklist and a draft MEDLINE search strategy is included
29
30 95 in Appendix 3 (14). Additional articles will be identified by searching the references of
31
32 96 included studies and other review articles identified during the course of the searches. Results
33
34 97 from the database searches will be merged using an electronic reference manager to facilitate
35
36 98 removal of duplicates. Trial registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov will be consulted to track
37
38 99 studies that may not have been indexed in the databases. Relevant publications will be
39
40 100 retrieved manually if electronic access is not available.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 101 **Participants, eligibility and setting:** Inclusion criteria will be adults over 18 years of age who
50
51 102 have pre-diabetes defined either by World Health Organisation (WHO) or American Diabetes
52
53 103 Association (ADA) criteria (1,2). This includes impaired fasting glucose (IFG) and impaired
54
55 104 glucose tolerance (IGT) as subgroups of pre-diabetes. Population-based cohort or cross-
56
57 105 sectional studies from any country in any setting will be considered, provided they have been
58
59
60

1
2
3 106 reported in English. Studies must report prevalence data for retinopathy detected on fundus
4
5
6 107 photography, using any accepted method (e.g. 1-, 2-, 3- or 7-field dilated stereoscopic colour
7
8 108 fundus photography) at least once in the study population. A lack of detail on the method
9
10
11 109 used or quality of images taken will be documented but will not be considered an exclusion
12
13 110 criterion. Studies that report other methods of imaging, such as fluorescein angiography or
14
15 111 optical coherence tomography, will be included only if fundus photography data are also
16
17 112 provided. A lack of reporting of the definition of diabetes and/or retinopathy will be
18
19
20 113 documented but will not be considered as a reason for exclusion.
21
22
23

24 114 **Outcomes:** The primary outcome is the prevalence of any standard features of diabetic
25
26 115 retinopathy on fundus photography, as per International Clinical Diabetic Retinopathy
27
28 116 Severity Scale (ICDRSS) classification (15). This will be defined by the presence of any of the
29
30
31 117 following features:
32
33
34

- 35 118 (i) Microaneurysms
36
37
38 119 (ii) Intraretinal haemorrhages
39
40
41 120 (iii) Hard exudates
42
43 121 (iv) Cotton-wool spots
44
45 122 (v) Venous beading
46
47
48 123 (vi) Intraretinal microvascular abnormalities (IRMAs)
49
50 124 (vii) New vessels at the optic disc (NVD) or elsewhere (NVE)
51
52 125 (viii) Vitreous or pre-retinal haemorrhage
53
54
55

56 126 Secondary outcomes are the prevalence of: (i) any retinal microvascular abnormalities on
57
58 127 fundus photography that are not standard features of diabetic retinopathy as per ICDRSS
59
60

1
2
3 128 classification and (ii) any macular microvascular abnormalities on fundus photography,
4
5 129 including but not limited to the presence of macular exudates, microaneurysms or
6
7
8 130 haemorrhages.
9

10
11
12 131 If available, data on glycaemic parameters such as fasting glucose, two-hour oral glucose
13
14 132 tolerance test (OGTT) and HbA1c will be extracted. Similarly, if reported, prevalence data on
15
16
17 133 cardiovascular parameters such as systolic and diastolic blood pressure, lipid profile and
18
19 134 metabolic syndrome will also be extracted. Metabolic syndrome will be defined as per
20
21
22 135 consensus criteria based on WHO, National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment
23
24 136 Panel III (NCEP ATP III) and ADA classifications (2,16–19).
25
26
27

28 137 **Study selection:** Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts from the
29
30 138 searches. Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion with a third (senior) reviewer.
31
32
33 139 Articles of interest will be selected for a full-text assessment. If there is any doubt regarding
34
35 140 the eligibility of a study, the article will be selected for full-text assessment.
36
37
38

39 141 Two reviewers will independently assess the full text articles. Disagreements between these
40
41
42 142 reviewers will be resolved by discussion and where necessary, with a third (senior) reviewer,
43
44 143 to decide if the article is eligible for inclusion.
45
46
47

48 144 A PRISMA flowchart of the selection process will be included in the systematic review (20).
49
50
51

52 145 **Data collection process:** Two reviewers will independently extract data in duplicate using pre-
53
54 146 piloted forms. Data recorded will include: (i) date and country of study; (ii) study design; (iii)
55
56
57 147 age, gender and ethnicity of participants; (iv) definition of retinopathy and method(s) used to
58
59 148 obtain images; (v) definition of pre-diabetes and method(s) used to make diagnosis; (vi) study
60

1
2
3 149 groups and sizes; (vii) overall sample size and (viii) prevalence number and estimate. If
4
5
6 150 present, secondary outcome data will also be recorded, including (i) definition and prevalence
7
8 151 of non-standard retinopathy features and (ii) definition and prevalence of maculopathy
9
10
11 152 features. Where reported, prevalence estimates for co-morbid ocular pathology (e.g.
12
13 153 cataract) and cardiovascular risk factors (e.g. hypertension, metabolic syndrome) will also be
14
15 154 recorded.

16
17
18
19 155 **Risk of bias assessment:** A modified critical appraisal tool for specifically assessing risk of bias
20
21 156 in prevalence studies will be used on selected articles (21). Quality assessment will be
22
23 157 undertaken by two reviewers independently. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion or
24
25 158 referral to a third (senior) reviewer. Judgements on the overall risk of bias will be categorised
26
27 159 as either low, moderate or high risk, based on the risk of bias of the 10 individual items listed
28
29 160 within the tool.

30
31
32
33
34
35 161 **Data analysis:** Data will be analysed using purpose-built software for systematic reviews and
36
37 162 meta-analyses (Review Manager 5). Heterogeneity between included studies will be assessed
38
39 163 based on study design, populations and methods used to measure outcomes. Statistical
40
41 164 heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic and by visual inspection of forest plots.

42
43
44
45
46 165 Characteristics of included studies will be presented in summary tables and narrative text. In
47
48 166 expectation of prevalence varying between studies and populations, pooled prevalence
49
50 167 estimates for the pre-specified outcomes of interest will be calculated applying random
51
52 168 effects meta-analytic methods and reported in forest plots.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 169 Where clinical and/or statistical heterogeneity is deemed too large by the reviewers (e.g. $I^2 \geq$
4
5 170 90%), a systematic review without meta-analysis will be reported. Narrative synthesis will be
6
7
8 171 conducted where quantitative data required for meta-analysis is lacking or absent.
9

10
11
12 172 Depending on availability of data, subgroup analyses using the following covariates will also
13
14 173 be considered:

- 17 174 - WHO region or country
- 19 175 - Study period
- 22 176 - Age group (e.g. 18-30, 31-50, >50 years)
- 25 177 - Ethnicity (especially at-risk groups e.g. South Asian, African, Afro-Caribbean, Hispanic)
- 27 178 - Time since diagnosis of pre-diabetes (e.g. <1 year, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, >10 years)
- 29 179 - Grade of retinopathy as per ICDRSS classification
- 32 180 - Co-morbid ocular pathology (e.g. cataract)
- 34 181 - Co-morbid cardiovascular risk factors (e.g. hypertension, metabolic syndrome)
- 37 182 - Method used to diagnose pre-diabetes (e.g. OGTT)
- 39 183 - Method used to diagnose retinopathy (e.g. 7-field stereoscopic imaging)

43 184 If sufficient data are available, a sensitivity analysis will be performed excluding studies
44
45
46 185 judged to be at high risk of bias.

51 186 **PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:**

54 187 There were no time or funds allocated to patient and public involvement, particularly in the
55
56 188 context of the current coronavirus pandemic, so the reviewers were unable to involve
57
58
59 189 patients. However, this systematic review asks an important clinical question and the protocol
60

1
2
3 190 described follows a standardised approach as per PRISMA-P guidelines. People with pre-
4
5 191 diabetes will be invited to help the reviewers develop a strategy to disseminate the results.
6
7
8
9

10
11 192 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:**
12

13
14 193 This study is a systematic review using aggregated published data, without accessing any
15
16 194 personal identifiable information, hence there are no significant ethical or safety concerns.
17
18 195 The results of this study will be presented at international conferences and submitted for
19
20 196 publication in a peer-reviewed open-access journal. Authors will use their networks to
21
22 197 encourage broad dissemination of the results.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 198 **REFERENCES:**
30

- 31
32 199 1. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus.
33 200 Diabetes Care. 2010 Jan;33(Suppl 1):S62–9.
34
35 201 2. Alberti K, Zimmet P. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its
36 202 complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus provisional report
37 203 of a WHO consultation. Diabet Med J Br Diabet Assoc. 1998 Jul;15(7):539–53.
38
39 204 3. International Diabetes Federation. International Diabetes Federation Atlas (9th Edition).
40 205 2019 [cited 2020 May 1]; Available from: <https://www.diabetesatlas.org/>
41
42 206 4. Tabák AG, Jokela M, Akbaraly TN, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M, Witte DR. Trajectories of
43 207 glycaemia, insulin sensitivity, and insulin secretion before diagnosis of type 2 diabetes:
44 208 an analysis from the Whitehall II study. Lancet Lond Engl. 2009 Jun 27;373(9682):2215–
45 209 21.
46
47 210 5. Vistisen D, Witte DR, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M, Tabák A, Jørgensen ME, et al. Risk of
48 211 cardiovascular disease and death in individuals with prediabetes defined by different
49 212 criteria: the Whitehall II study. Diabetes Care. 2018 Apr;41(4):899–906.
50
51 213 6. Tabák AG, Herder C, Rathmann W, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M. Prediabetes: a high-risk state
52 214 for diabetes development. The Lancet. 2012 Jun 16;379(9833):2279–90.
53
54 215 7. Lee CC, Perkins BA, Kayaniyil S, Harris SB, Retnakaran R, Gerstein HC, et al. Peripheral
55 216 neuropathy and nerve dysfunction in individuals at high risk for type 2 diabetes: The
56 217 PROMISE Cohort. Diabetes Care. 2015 May;38(5):793–800.

- 1
2
3 218 8. Azmi S, Ferdousi M, Petropoulos IN, Ponirakis G, Alam U, Fadavi H, et al. Corneal
4 219 confocal microscopy identifies small-fiber neuropathy in subjects with impaired glucose
5 220 tolerance who develop type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2015 Aug;38(8):1502–8.
6
7
8 221 9. Brownrigg JRW, Hughes CO, Burleigh D, Karthikesalingam A, Patterson BO, Holt PJ, et al.
9 222 Microvascular disease and risk of cardiovascular events among individuals with type 2
10 223 diabetes: a population-level cohort study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2016;4(7):588–
11 224 97.
12
13
14 225 10. Gong Q, Zhang P, Wang J, Ma J, An Y, Chen Y, et al. Morbidity and mortality after
15 226 lifestyle intervention for people with impaired glucose tolerance: 30-year results of the
16 227 Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2019
17 228 Jun;7(6):452–61.
18
19
20 229 11. Yau JWY, Rogers SL, Kawasaki R, Lamoureux EL, Kowalski JW, Bek T, et al. Global
21 230 prevalence and major risk factors of diabetic retinopathy. *Diabetes Care*. 2012 Mar
22 231 1;35(3):556–64.
23
24 232 12. Cheung N, Mitchell P, Wong TY. Diabetic retinopathy. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2010 Jul
25 233 10;376(9735):124–36.
26
27
28 234 13. National Eye Institute. People with diabetes can prevent vision loss. 2019; Available
29 235 from: [https://www.nei.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/diabetes-prevent-vision-](https://www.nei.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/diabetes-prevent-vision-loss.pdf)
30 236 [loss.pdf](https://www.nei.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/diabetes-prevent-vision-loss.pdf)
31
32 237 14. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer
33 238 Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 guideline statement. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
34 239 2016;75:40–6.
35
36
37 240 15. Wilkinson CP, Ferris FL, Klein RE, Lee PP, Agardh CD, Davis M, et al. Proposed
38 241 international clinical diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema disease severity
39 242 scales. *Ophthalmology*. 2003 Sep;110(9):1677–82.
40
41
42 243 16. Alberti KGMM, Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ, Cleeman JI, Donato KA, et al.
43 244 Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International
44 245 Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung,
45 246 and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International
46 247 Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity.
47 248 *Circulation*. 2009 Oct 20;120(16):1640–5.
49
50 249 17. American Diabetes Association. 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of
51 250 Medical Care in Diabetes-2018. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41(Suppl 1):S13–27.
52
53
54 251 18. National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation,
55 252 and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). Third
56 253 Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on
57 254 Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult
58 255 Treatment Panel III) final report. *Circulation*. 2002 Dec 17;106(25):3143–421.
59
60

- 1
2
3 256 19. Yumuk V, Tsigos C, Fried M, Schindler K, Busetto L, Micic D, et al. European Guidelines
4 257 for Obesity Management in Adults. *Obes Facts*. 2015;8(6):402–24.
- 6 258 20. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for
7 259 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009 Jul
8 260 21;6(7):e1000097.
- 11 261 21. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in
12 262 prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater
13 263 agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2012 Sep;65(9):934–9.

16
17
18
19 264 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS:**

20
21 265 VK, UA and TLJ conceived the review topic. VK performed background exploratory searches
22 266 and drafted the initial search strategy. VK, JE and PN co-wrote the initial protocol. UA, SN,
23 267 RAM and TLJ provided critical appraisal and senior oversight of the protocol.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30 268 For the systematic review, VK and PN will perform the searches, data extraction and analysis.
31 269 JE will provide oversight of the searches, data analysis and extraction. SN will provide
32 270 statistical input for data analysis. UA, RAM and TLJ will provide critical appraisal and senior
33 271 oversight of the final manuscript.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 272 **FUNDING STATEMENT:**

44
45
46 273 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
47 274 not-for-profit sectors.

48
49
50
51
52
53 275 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT:**

54 276 The authors have no competing interests to declare.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 277 **KEY WORDS:**
4

5
6 278 Pre-diabetes, retinopathy, systematic review, humans.
7
8
9

10
11 279 **WORD COUNT:**
12

13
14 280 2,288 (excluding references and appendices)
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
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:

ADA	American Diabetes Association
CINAHL	Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature
DR	Diabetic Retinopathy
DMO	Diabetic Macular Oedema
ICDRSS	International Clinical Diabetic Retinopathy Severity Scale
IFG	Impaired Fasting Glucose
IGT	Impaired Glucose Tolerance
IRMA	Intra-Retinal Microvascular Abnormalities
NCEP ATP III	National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel III
NSC	National Screening Committee (United Kingdom)
NVD	New Vessels at the Disc
NVE	New Vessels Elsewhere
OGTT	Oral Glucose Tolerance Test
PRESS	Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies
PRISMA-P	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols
PDR	Proliferative Diabetic Retinopathy
VTDR	Vision-Threatening Diabetic Retinopathy
WHO	World Health Organisation

APPENDIX 3 – DRAFT MEDLINE SEARCH STRATEGY:

1. exp Prevalence/
2. exp Incidence/
3. exp Epidemiology/
4. exp Epidemiologic Methods/
5. exp Population Characteristics/
6. (prevalen* or occur* or inciden* or burden or epidemiolog* or frequenc* or rate).tw
7. Or/1-6
8. exp Glucose Intolerance/
9. exp Prediabetic State/
10. exp Hyperglycemia/
11. exp Glycated Hemoglobin A/
12. glucose intolerance.tw
13. (prediabet* or pre-diabet* or pre diabet* or borderline diabet*).tw
14. hyperglyc?emi*.tw
15. ((impaired fasting adj2 glucose) or IFG or impaired FPG).tw
16. ((impaired glucose adj (tolerance or metabolism)) or IGT).tw
17. Or/8-16
18. exp Diabetic Retinopathy/
19. exp Retina/
20. microvasc* adj2 (change* or disease* or dysfuncti* or complicat*).tw
21. (retinopathy or retinal).tw
22. Or/18-21
23. 7 and 17 and 22

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
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

24. exp animals/ not humans.sh

25. 23 not 24

26. ...dedup 25

For peer review only

APPENDIX 2 – PRISMA-P 2015 CHECKLIST

This checklist has been adapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central journals from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

An Editorial from the Editors-in-Chief of *Systematic Reviews* details why this checklist was adapted - Moher D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Systematic Reviews* 2016 5:15

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Authors					
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"/>	3-16
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	264-271
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	46-47
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
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 type="checkbox"/>	N/A
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	56-87

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Objectives	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"/>	86-87
METHODS					
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"/>	101-113
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"/>	88-100
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"/>	92-95
STUDY RECORDS					
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"/>	161-164
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"/>	137-144
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"/>	145-146
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"/>	146-154
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"/>	114-136
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"/>	155-160
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	161-168
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	169-171

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	172-185
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	169-171
Meta-bias(es)	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"/>	184-185
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A

BMJ Open

Prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040997.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Aug-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Kirthi, Varo; King's College London Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, Ophthalmology Research Office Nderitu, Paul; King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Ophthalmology Alam, Uazman; University of Liverpool Institute of Ageing and Chronic Disease, Diabetes and Endocrinology Research Evans, Jennifer; London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, International Centre for Eye Health Nevitt, Sarah; University of Liverpool, Department of Biostatistics Malik, Rayaz A. ; Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Medicine Jackson, Timothy; King's College London, Ophthalmology; King's College Hospital, Ophthalmology
Primary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Ophthalmology, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Diabetic retinopathy < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Medical retina < OPHTHALMOLOGY, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **1 TITLE:**
4

5
6 **2** Prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis
7
8
9

10
11 **3 AUTHORS:**
12

13
14 **4** Varo Kirthi ^{1,2} v.kirthi@nhs.net
15

16 **5** Paul Nderitu ² paulnderitu@nhs.net
17

18 **6** Uazman Alam ^{3,4} uazman.alam@liverpool.ac.uk
19

20 **7** Jennifer Evans ⁵ jennifer.evans@lshtm.ac.uk
21

22 **8** Sarah Nevitt ³ sarah.nevitt@liverpool.ac.uk
23

24 **9** Rayaz A Malik ⁶ ram2045@qatar-med.cornell.edu
25

26 **10** Timothy L Jackson ^{1,2} t.jackson1@nhs.net
27
28

29
30
31
32 **11 Institutional affiliations:** ¹ King's College London; ² King's College Hospital NHS Foundation
33 Trust; ³ University of Liverpool; ⁴ Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; ⁵
34 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; ⁶ Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 **14 Address for correspondence:** Dr Varo Kirthi, Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's
42 College London, Ophthalmology Research Office, Normanby Building, King's College Hospital,
43 London SE5 9RS
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 **17 ABSTRACT:**
52

53
54 **18 Introduction:** There is growing evidence of a higher than expected prevalence of retinopathy
55 in pre-diabetes. This paper presents the protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 20 retinopathy in pre-diabetes. The aim of the review is to estimate the prevalence of
4
5
6 21 retinopathy in pre-diabetes and to summarise the current data.
7
8
9

10 22 **Methods and analysis:** This protocol is developed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting
11
12 23 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines. A
13
14 24 comprehensive electronic bibliographic search will be conducted in MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web
15
16
17 25 of Science, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), Google Scholar
18
19 26 and the Cochrane Library. Eligible studies will report prevalence data for retinopathy on
20
21
22 27 fundus photography in adults with pre-diabetes. No time restrictions will be placed on the
23
24 28 date of publication. Screening for eligible studies and data extraction will be conducted by
25
26 29 two reviewers independently, using defined inclusion criteria and pre-piloted data extraction
27
28
29 30 forms. Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved by discussion, and if required,
30
31 31 a third (senior) reviewer will arbitrate.
32
33
34

35 32 The primary outcome is the prevalence of any standard features of diabetic retinopathy on
36
37 33 fundus photography, as per International Clinical Diabetic Retinopathy Severity Scale (ICDRSS)
38
39 34 classification. Secondary outcomes are the prevalence of: (i) any retinal microvascular
40
41 35 abnormalities on fundus photography that are not standard features of diabetic retinopathy
42
43 36 as per ICDRSS classification and (ii) any macular microvascular abnormalities on fundus
44
45 37 photography, including but not limited to the presence of macular exudates, microaneurysms
46
47 38 and haemorrhages. Risk of bias for included studies will be assessed using a validated risk of
48
49 39 bias tool for prevalence studies. Pooled estimates for the pre-specified outcomes of interest
50
51 40 will be calculated using random effects meta-analytic techniques. Heterogeneity will be
52
53 41 assessed using the I^2 statistic.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 42 **Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval is not required as this is a protocol for a systematic
4
5
6 43 review and no primary data are to be collected. Findings will be disseminated through peer-
7
8 44 reviewed publications and presentations at national and international meetings including
9
10 45 Diabetes UK, European Association for the Study of Diabetes, American Diabetes Association
11
12
13 46 and International Diabetes Federation conferences.

14
15
16
17 47 **Registration details:** This review has been registered on PROSPERO (ID: CRD42020184820).
18
19 48 Any protocol amendments will be updated on the PROSPERO database.
20
21
22
23
24

25 49 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:**

- 26
27 50 • This systematic review protocol follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
28
29 Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines.
30
31 51
32 52 • This systematic review addresses an important gap in the current evidence by
33
34 estimating the prevalence of retinopathy in pre-diabetes.
35
36 53
37 54 • There is potential for significant clinical and statistical heterogeneity in reporting of
38
39 prevalence data between different populations.
40
41
42
43
44

45 56 **BACKGROUND:**

46
47
48 57 Pre-diabetes is defined by blood glucose levels above the normal range, but below the
49
50 58 threshold for type 2 diabetes mellitus (1,2). The burden of prediabetes is enormous: it is
51
52
53 59 currently estimated to affect 373 million people across the globe and this number is projected
54
55 60 to increase to 587 million (8.3% of the global adult population) by 2045 (3).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 61 Cohort analysis of people with pre-diabetes reveals an increased incidence of microvascular
4
5 62 and macrovascular disease, including an elevated all-cause mortality, compared to people
6
7
8 63 with normal glucose metabolism (4,5). This suggests that end-organ complications of
9
10 64 hyperglycaemia may be occurring prior to the onset of overt diabetes (6). Furthermore,
11
12
13 65 people with prediabetes and microvascular disease are more likely to develop overt diabetes
14
15 66 (7,8). In a population-based analysis of 49,072 participants with diabetes, the presence of
16
17 67 diabetic retinopathy (DR) was associated with an increased risk (hazard ratio 1.39, 95%
18
19 68 confidence interval 1.09-1.76) of cardiovascular death, non-fatal myocardial infarction or
20
21 69 stroke, after adjustment of traditional risk factors including HbA1c, lipid profile and blood
22
23 70 pressure (9). Despite ongoing debate on how best to identify people with pre-diabetes at high
24
25 71 risk of end-organ complications, long-term data show a reduction in both morbidity and
26
27 72 mortality following early lifestyle interventions (10).

28
29
30
31
32
33 73 A systematic review of 35 population-based studies of people with diabetes reported the
34
35 74 prevalence of DR, proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR), diabetic macular oedema (DMO)
36
37 75 and vision-threatening diabetic retinopathy (VTDR) as 34.6%, 7.0%, 6.8% and 10.2%,
38
39 76 respectively (11). The early onset of retinopathy in pre-diabetes is of particular concern as DR
40
41 77 remains one of the principal causes of vision loss in adults of working age in developed
42
43 78 countries, with considerable health and socioeconomic consequences (12). Given projections
44
45 79 that up to 70% of people with pre-diabetes may eventually develop diabetes during their
46
47 80 lifespan, early identification of retinopathy is a significant health priority (6). It is estimated
48
49 81 that up to 95% of vision loss in diabetes is preventable or treatable, if detected early (13).

50
51
52
53 82 Previous studies have suggested that isolated retinopathy changes occur in 5-10% of the
54
55 83 general population and in 2.6-8.6% in those without diabetes or hypertension (14,15).

1
2
3 84 Although several studies have reported retinopathy changes in pre-diabetes, there has been
4
5 85 no systematic review or meta-analysis of the literature to estimate an overall prevalence.
6
7
8 86 Understanding the prevalence of retinopathy may not only focus attention on early
9
10 87 interventions but may also help refine diagnostic criteria and risk stratification for pre-
11
12
13 88 diabetes. The aim of this systematic review is to estimate the prevalence of retinopathy
14
15 89 detected on fundus photography in adults with pre-diabetes.
16
17
18
19
20

21 90 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS:**

22
23 91 **Study design:** Comprehensive literature searches of electronic bibliographic databases will be
24
25
26 92 conducted in MEDLINE (access via OVID), EMBASE (access via OVID), Web of Science, CINAHL
27
28 93 (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), Google Scholar and the Cochrane
29
30
31 94 Library. No time restrictions will be placed on the date of publication. All search strategies will
32
33 95 be independently reviewed by an expert information specialist using the Peer Review of
34
35 96 Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) checklist and a draft MEDLINE search strategy is included
36
37 97 in Appendix 1 (16). Additional articles will be identified by searching the references of
38
39 98 included studies and other review articles identified during the course of the searches. Results
40
41 99 from the database searches will be merged using an electronic reference manager to facilitate
42
43 100 removal of duplicates. Trial registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov will be consulted to track
44
45
46 101 studies that may not have been indexed in the databases. Relevant publications will be
47
48
49 102 retrieved manually if electronic access is not available.
50
51
52
53

54 103 **Participants, eligibility and setting:** Inclusion criteria will be adults over 18 years of age who
55
56 104 have pre-diabetes defined by American Diabetes Association (ADA) criteria (1). This includes
57
58 105 impaired fasting glucose (IFG) and impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) as subgroups of pre-
59
60

1
2
3 106 diabetes. Population-based cohort or cross-sectional studies from any country in any setting
4
5
6 107 will be considered, provided they have been reported in English. Studies must report
7
8 108 prevalence data for retinopathy detected on fundus photography, using any accepted
9
10 109 method (e.g. 1-, 2-, 3- or 7-field dilated stereoscopic colour fundus photography) at least once
11
12
13 110 in the study population. A lack of detail on the method used or quality of images taken will be
14
15 111 documented but will not be considered an exclusion criterion. Studies that report other
16
17 112 methods of imaging, such as fluorescein angiography or optical coherence tomography, will
18
19
20 113 be included only if fundus photography data are also provided. Use of alternative diagnostic
21
22 114 criteria for pre-diabetes, such as World Health Organization (WHO) criteria, will be recorded
23
24 115 and prevalence figures reported separately, but will not be considered a reason for exclusion
25
26
27 116 (2). A lack of reporting of the definition of pre-diabetes and/or retinopathy will be
28
29
30 117 documented but will not be considered a reason for exclusion.

31
32
33
34 118 **Outcomes:** The primary outcome is the prevalence of any standard features of diabetic
35
36 119 retinopathy on fundus photography, as per International Clinical Diabetic Retinopathy
37
38 120 Severity Scale (ICDRSS) classification (17). This will be defined by the presence of any of the
39
40
41 121 following features:

- 42
43
44
45 122 (i) Microaneurysms
46
47 123 (ii) Intraretinal haemorrhages
48
49 124 (iii) Hard exudates
50
51 125 (iv) Cotton-wool spots
52
53 126 (v) Venous beading
54
55 127 (vi) Intraretinal microvascular abnormalities (IRMAs)
56
57 128 (vii) New vessels at the optic disc (NVD) or elsewhere (NVE)
58
59
60

1
2
3 129 (viii) Vitreous or pre-retinal haemorrhage
4
5
6

7 130 Secondary outcomes are the prevalence of: (i) any retinal microvascular abnormalities on
8
9 131 fundus photography that are not standard features of diabetic retinopathy as per ICDRSS
10
11 132 classification and (ii) any macular microvascular abnormalities on fundus photography,
12
13 133 including but not limited to the presence of macular exudates, microaneurysms or
14
15 134 haemorrhages.
16
17
18

19
20
21 135 If available, data on glycaemic parameters such as fasting glucose, two-hour oral glucose
22
23 136 tolerance test (OGTT) and HbA1c will be extracted. Similarly, if reported, prevalence data on
24
25 137 cardiovascular parameters such as systolic and diastolic blood pressure, lipid profile and
26
27 138 metabolic syndrome will also be extracted. Metabolic syndrome will be defined as per
28
29 139 consensus criteria based on WHO, National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment
30
31 140 Panel III (NCEP ATP III) and ADA classifications (2,18–21).
32
33
34
35
36

37 141 **Study selection:** Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts from the
38
39 142 searches and exclude any that clearly do not satisfy the inclusion criteria. Any disagreements
40
41 143 will be resolved by discussion, and if required, a third (senior) reviewer will arbitrate. Articles
42
43 144 of interest will be selected for a full-text assessment. If there is any doubt regarding the
44
45 145 eligibility of a study, the article will be selected for full-text assessment.
46
47
48
49

50 146 Two reviewers will independently assess the full text articles against the eligibility criteria.
51
52 147 Disagreements between these reviewers will be resolved by discussion, and if required, a
53
54 148 third (senior) reviewer will arbitrate.
55
56
57

58
59 149 A PRISMA flowchart of the selection process will be included in the systematic review (22).
60

1
2
3 150 **Data collection process:** Two reviewers will independently extract data in duplicate using pre-
4
5
6 151 piloted forms. Data recorded will include: (i) date and country of study; (ii) study design; (iii)
7
8 152 age, gender and ethnicity of participants; (iv) definition of retinopathy and method(s) used to
9
10 153 obtain images; (v) definition of pre-diabetes and method(s) used to make diagnosis; (vi) study
11
12
13 154 groups and sizes; (vii) overall sample size and (viii) prevalence number and estimate. If
14
15 155 present, secondary outcome data will also be recorded, including (i) definition and prevalence
16
17
18 156 of non-standard retinopathy features and (ii) definition and prevalence of maculopathy
19
20 157 features. Where reported, prevalence estimates for co-morbid ocular pathology (e.g.
21
22
23 158 cataract) and cardiovascular risk factors (e.g. hypertension, metabolic syndrome) will also be
24
25 159 recorded.

26
27
28
29 160 **Risk of bias assessment:** A modified critical appraisal tool for specifically assessing risk of bias
30
31 161 in prevalence studies will be used on selected articles and is included in Appendix 2 (23). The
32
33
34 162 tool includes 9 questions, each scoring 0 or 1, to determine confounding, selection bias, and
35
36 163 bias related to measurement and data analysis. Overall risk of bias will be determined by the
37
38
39 164 total score for each article: 0-3 considered low risk, 4-6 considered moderate risk and ≥ 7
40
41 165 considered high risk. Quality assessment will be undertaken by two reviewers independently.
42
43
44 166 Disagreements will be resolved by discussion, and if required, a third (senior) reviewer will
45
46 167 arbitrate. Judgements on the overall risk of bias will be categorised as either low, moderate
47
48
49 168 or high risk, based on the risk of bias of the 10 individual items listed within the tool.

50
51
52 169 **Data analysis:** Data will be analysed using purpose-built software for systematic reviews and
53
54
55 170 meta-analyses (Review Manager 5). Heterogeneity between included studies will be assessed
56
57
58 171 based on study design, populations and methods used to measure outcomes. Statistical
59
60 172 heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic and by visual inspection of forest plots.

1
2
3 173 Characteristics of included studies will be presented in summary tables and narrative text. In
4
5
6 174 expectation of prevalence varying between studies and populations, pooled prevalence
7
8 175 estimates for the pre-specified outcomes of interest will be calculated applying random
9
10 176 effects meta-analytic methods and reported in forest plots.

11
12
13
14 177 Where clinical and/or statistical heterogeneity is deemed too large by the reviewers (e.g. $I^2 \geq$
15
16 178 90%), a systematic review without meta-analysis will be reported. Narrative synthesis will be
17
18 179 conducted where quantitative data required for meta-analysis is lacking or absent.

19
20
21
22
23 180 Depending on availability of data, subgroup analyses using the following covariates will also
24
25 181 be considered:

- 26
27
28 182 - WHO region or country
- 29
30 183 - Study period
- 31
32 184 - Age group (e.g. 18-30, 31-50, >50 years)
- 33
34 185 - Ethnicity (especially at-risk groups e.g. South Asian, African, Afro-Caribbean, Hispanic)
- 35
36 186 - Time since diagnosis of pre-diabetes (e.g. <1 year, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, >10 years)
- 37
38 187 - Subtype of pre-diabetes (e.g. IFG compared to IGT)
- 39
40 188 - Grade of retinopathy as per ICDRSS classification
- 41
42 189 - Co-morbid ocular pathology (e.g. cataract)
- 43
44 190 - Co-morbid cardiovascular risk factors (e.g. hypertension, metabolic syndrome)
- 45
46 191 - Method or criteria used to diagnose pre-diabetes (e.g. WHO)
- 47
48 192 - Method used to diagnose retinopathy (e.g. 7-field stereoscopic imaging)
- 49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56
57 193 If sufficient data are available, a sensitivity analysis will be performed excluding studies
58
59 194 judged to be at high risk of bias.

1
2
3 195 **Grading of evidence:** Certainty of the evidence will be assessed using the GRADE approach
4
5
6 196 (24,25). Specifically, prevalence studies will be considered to constitute high certainty
7
8 197 evidence to answer this review question, and downgraded for risk of bias, imprecision,
9
10 198 inconsistency, indirectness and publication bias. Two reviewers will independently make this
11
12
13 199 judgement. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion, and if required, a third (senior)
14
15 200 reviewer will arbitrate.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:**
22

23 202 There were no time or funds allocated to patient and public involvement, particularly in the
24
25
26 203 context of the current coronavirus pandemic, so the reviewers were unable to involve
27
28 204 patients. However, this systematic review asks an important clinical question and the protocol
29
30
31 205 described follows a standardised approach as per PRISMA-P guidelines. People with pre-
32
33 206 diabetes will be invited to help the reviewers develop a strategy to disseminate the results.
34
35
36
37
38

39 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:**
40

41 208 This study is a systematic review using aggregated published data, without accessing any
42
43
44 209 personal identifiable information, hence there are no significant ethical or safety concerns.
45
46 210 The results of this study will be presented at international conferences and submitted for
47
48
49 211 publication in a peer-reviewed open-access journal. Authors will use their networks to
50
51 212 encourage broad dissemination of the results.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

213 **REFERENCES:**

- 214 1. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus.
215 Diabetes Care. 2010 Jan;33(Suppl 1):S62–9.
- 216 2. Alberti K, Zimmet P. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its
217 complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus provisional report
218 of a WHO consultation. Diabet Med J Br Diabet Assoc. 1998 Jul;15(7):539–53.
- 219 3. International Diabetes Federation. International Diabetes Federation Atlas (9th Edition).
220 2019 [cited 2020 May 1]; Available from: <https://www.diabetesatlas.org/>
- 221 4. Tabák AG, Jokela M, Akbaraly TN, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M, Witte DR. Trajectories of
222 glycaemia, insulin sensitivity, and insulin secretion before diagnosis of type 2 diabetes:
223 an analysis from the Whitehall II study. Lancet Lond Engl. 2009 Jun 27;373(9682):2215–
224 21.
- 225 5. Vistisen D, Witte DR, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M, Tabák A, Jørgensen ME, et al. Risk of
226 cardiovascular disease and death in individuals with prediabetes defined by different
227 criteria: the Whitehall II study. Diabetes Care. 2018 Apr;41(4):899–906.
- 228 6. Tabák AG, Herder C, Rathmann W, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M. Prediabetes: a high-risk state
229 for diabetes development. The Lancet. 2012 Jun 16;379(9833):2279–90.
- 230 7. Lee CC, Perkins BA, Kayaniyl S, Harris SB, Retnakaran R, Gerstein HC, et al. Peripheral
231 neuropathy and nerve dysfunction in individuals at high risk for type 2 diabetes: The
232 PROMISE Cohort. Diabetes Care. 2015 May;38(5):793–800.
- 233 8. Azmi S, Ferdousi M, Petropoulos IN, Ponirakis G, Alam U, Fadavi H, et al. Corneal
234 confocal microscopy identifies small-fiber neuropathy in subjects with impaired glucose
235 tolerance who develop type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2015 Aug;38(8):1502–8.
- 236 9. Brownrigg JRW, Hughes CO, Burleigh D, Karthikesalingam A, Patterson BO, Holt PJ, et al.
237 Microvascular disease and risk of cardiovascular events among individuals with type 2
238 diabetes: a population-level cohort study. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2016;4(7):588–
239 97.
- 240 10. Gong Q, Zhang P, Wang J, Ma J, An Y, Chen Y, et al. Morbidity and mortality after
241 lifestyle intervention for people with impaired glucose tolerance: 30-year results of the
242 Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2019
243 Jun;7(6):452–61.
- 244 11. Yau JWY, Rogers SL, Kawasaki R, Lamoureux EL, Kowalski JW, Bek T, et al. Global
245 prevalence and major risk factors of diabetic retinopathy. Diabetes Care. 2012 Mar
246 1;35(3):556–64.
- 247 12. Cheung N, Mitchell P, Wong TY. Diabetic retinopathy. Lancet Lond Engl. 2010 Jul
248 10;376(9735):124–36.

- 1
2
3 249 13. National Eye Institute. People with diabetes can prevent vision loss. 2019; Available
4 250 from: <https://www.nei.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/diabetes-prevent-vision->
5 251 [loss.pdf](https://www.nei.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/diabetes-prevent-vision-loss.pdf)
6
7
8 252 14. Wong TY, Klein R, Sharrett AR, Manolio TA, Hubbard LD, Marino EK, et al. The
9 253 prevalence and risk factors of retinal microvascular abnormalities in older persons: The
10 254 Cardiovascular Health Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2003 Apr;110(4):658–66.
11
12 255 15. Nguyen TT, Wang JJ, Wong TY. Retinal vascular changes in pre-diabetes and
13 256 prehypertension: new findings and their research and clinical implications. *Diabetes*
14 257 *Care*. 2007 Oct;30(10):2708–15.
15
16 258 16. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer
17 259 Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 guideline statement. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
18 260 2016;75:40–6.
19
20 261 17. Wilkinson CP, Ferris FL, Klein RE, Lee PP, Agardh CD, Davis M, et al. Proposed
21 262 international clinical diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema disease severity
22 263 scales. *Ophthalmology*. 2003 Sep;110(9):1677–82.
23
24 264 18. Alberti KGMM, Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ, Cleeman JI, Donato KA, et al.
25 265 Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International
26 266 Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung,
27 267 and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International
28 268 Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity.
29 269 *Circulation*. 2009 Oct 20;120(16):1640–5.
30
31 270 19. American Diabetes Association. 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of
32 271 Medical Care in Diabetes-2018. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41(Suppl 1):S13–27.
33
34 272 20. National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation,
35 273 and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). Third
36 274 Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on
37 275 Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult
38 276 Treatment Panel III) final report. *Circulation*. 2002 Dec 17;106(25):3143–421.
39
40 277 21. Yumuk V, Tsigos C, Fried M, Schindler K, Busetto L, Micic D, et al. European Guidelines
41 278 for Obesity Management in Adults. *Obes Facts*. 2015;8(6):402–24.
42
43 279 22. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for
44 280 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009 Jul
45 281 21;6(7):e1000097.
46
47 282 23. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in
48 283 prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater
49 284 agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2012 Sep;65(9):934–9.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 285 24. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an
4 286 emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.
5 287 BMJ. 2008 Apr 26;336(7650):924–6.
6
7
8 288 25. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, Alba C, Lang E, Burnand B, et al. Use of GRADE for
9 289 assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates
10 290 in broad categories of patients. BMJ. 2015 Mar 16;350:h870.
11
12
13
14

15 291 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS:**

16
17
18 292 VK, UA and TLJ conceived the review topic. VK performed background exploratory searches
19
20 293 and drafted the initial search strategy. VK, JE and PN co-wrote the initial protocol. UA, SN,
21
22
23 294 RAM and TLJ provided critical appraisal and senior oversight of the protocol.
24
25

26
27 295 For the systematic review, VK and PN will perform the searches, data extraction and analysis.
28
29 296 JE will provide oversight of the searches, data analysis and extraction. SN will provide
30
31
32 297 statistical input for data analysis. UA, RAM and TLJ will provide critical appraisal and senior
33
34 298 oversight of the final manuscript.
35
36
37
38
39

40 299 **FUNDING STATEMENT:**

41
42 300 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
43
44 301 not-for-profit sectors.
45
46
47
48
49

50 302 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT:**

51
52
53 303 The authors have no competing interests to declare.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 304 **KEY WORDS:**
4

5
6 305 Pre-diabetes, retinopathy, systematic review, humans.
7
8
9

10
11 306 **PLANNED START DATE:**
12

13
14 307 1 August 2020
15
16
17

18
19 308 **PLANNED END DATE:**
20

21
22 309 31 January 2021
23
24
25

26
27 310 **WORD COUNT:**
28

29
30 311 2,474 (excluding references and appendices)
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

APPENDIX 1 – DRAFT MEDLINE SEARCH STRATEGY:

1. exp Prevalence/
2. exp Incidence/
3. exp Epidemiology/
4. exp Epidemiologic Methods/
5. exp Population Characteristics/
6. (prevalen* or occur* or inciden* or burden or epidemiolog* or frequenc* or rate).tw
7. Or/1-6
8. exp Glucose Intolerance/
9. exp Prediabetic State/
10. exp Hyperglycemia/
11. exp Glycated Hemoglobin A/
12. glucose intolerance.tw
13. (prediabet* or pre-diabet* or pre diabet* or borderline diabet*).tw
14. hyperglyc?emi*.tw
15. ((impaired fasting adj2 glucose) or IFG or impaired FPG).tw
16. ((impaired glucose adj (tolerance or metabolism)) or IGT).tw
17. Or/8-16
18. exp Diabetic Retinopathy/
19. exp Retina/
20. microvasc* adj2 (change* or disease* or dysfuncti* or complicat*).tw
21. (retinopathy or retinal).tw
22. Or/18-21
23. 7 and 17 and 22

1
2
3 24. exp animals/ not humans.sh
4

5
6 25. 23 not 24
7

8 26. ...dedup 25
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
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

APPENDIX 2 – CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL FOR PREVALENCE STUDIES USED BY HOY ET AL. (2012):

Name of author(s):			
Year of publication:			
Study title:			
Risk of bias items		Risk of bias levels	Points scored
1	Was the study's target population a close representation of the national population in relation to relevant variables, e.g. age, sex, occupation?	Yes (LOW RISK): The study's target population was a close representation of the national population.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): The study's target population was clearly NOT representative of the national population.	1
2	Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?	Yes (LOW RISK): The sampling frame was a true or close representation of the target population.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): The sampling frame was NOT a true or close representation of the target population.	1
3	Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR, was a census undertaken?	Yes (LOW RISK): A census was undertaken, OR, some form of random selection was used to select the sample (e.g. simple random sampling, stratified random sampling, cluster sampling, systematic sampling).	0
		No (HIGH RISK): A census was NOT undertaken, AND some form of random selection was NOT used to select the sample.	1
4	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	Yes (LOW RISK): The response rate for the study was $\geq 75\%$, OR, an analysis was performed that showed no significant difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders	0
		No (HIGH RISK): The response rate was $< 75\%$, and if any analysis comparing responders and non-responders was done, it showed a significant difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders.	1
5	Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to a proxy)?	Yes (LOW RISK): All data were collected directly from the subjects.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): In some instances, data were collected from a proxy.	1
6	Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	Yes (LOW RISK): An acceptable case definition was used.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): An acceptable case definition was NOT used.	1
7	Was the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest (e.g. prevalence of low back pain) shown to have reliability and validity (if necessary)?	Yes (LOW RISK): The study instrument had been shown to have reliability and validity (if this was necessary), e.g. test-re-test, piloting, validation in a previous study, etc.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): The study instrument had NOT been shown to have reliability or validity (if this was necessary).	1
8	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Yes (LOW RISK): The same mode of data collection was used for all subjects.	0
		No (HIGH RISK): The same mode of data collection was NOT used for all subjects.	1
9	Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the	Yes (LOW RISK): The paper presented appropriate numerator(s) AND denominator(s) for the parameter of	0

	appropriate	interest (e.g. the prevalence of low back pain).	
		No (HIGH RISK): The paper did present numerator(s) AND denominator(s) for the parameter of interest but one or more of these were inappropriate.	1
10	Summary on the overall risk of study bias	LOW RISK	0-3
		MODERATE RISK	4-6
		HIGH RISK	7-9

For peer review only

SUPPLEMENTAL FILE – PRISMA–P 2015 CHECKLIST

This checklist has been adapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central journals from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA–P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

An Editorial from the Editors-in-Chief of *Systematic Reviews* details why this checklist was adapted – Moher D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA–P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Systematic Reviews* 2016 5:15

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Registration	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"/>	47-48
Authors					
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"/>	3-16
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	291-298
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	47-48
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
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 type="checkbox"/>	N/A
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	56-89

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Objectives	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"/>	88-89
METHODS					
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"/>	103-117
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"/>	91-102
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"/>	94-97
STUDY RECORDS					
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"/>	169-170
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"/>	141-149
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"/>	150-151
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"/>	151-159
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"/>	118-140
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"/>	160-168
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	169-172
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	173-176
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	180-192
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	177-179

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Meta-bias(es)	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"/>	193-194
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	195-200

For peer review only