Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation			
Section and topic	**Item No**	**Checklist item**	**Page/line numbers**
Section 1: Administrative information			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1, Line 1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	None. The protocol is conducting a new systematic review.
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Page 2, Line 26
Authors:			
Contact information	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and email address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1, Line 8-17
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 10, Line 33-37
Amendments	4	If the report represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and indicate what changes were made; otherwise state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	None
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Page 11, Line 5-6
Sponsor	5b	Provide name of the review funder and/or sponsor	Page 11, Line 5-6
Role of sponsor and/or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	None

Section 2: Introduction			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Page 3-4
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Page 4
Section 3: 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	Page 4-5
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	Page 5-6
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	Page 5-6
Study records			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Page 8
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Page 7
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	Page 7

		confirming data from investigators	
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) and any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Page 7
Outcomes and prioritisation	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritisation of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Page 5 and 7
Risk of bias 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	Page 8
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Page 8
	15b	If data are appropriate for 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)	Page 8
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Page 9

	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Page 9
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Page 9
Confidence in cumulative estimate	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Page 9