Additional file 2: Recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 checklist [48]

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Manuscript reference
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title Page; p.1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Abstract section; p.5
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Title Page; p.1-3
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Main text; Authors' contributions section; p.31
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	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Main text; Declarations section and Funding statement; p.31
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	NA
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	NA
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Main text; Background Section (Current knowledge gaps about the ECHO Model and importance of the proposed systematic review subsection) p.10-12
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Main text; Background Section (Aim and review questions subsection); p.12
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	Main text; Methods Section (Eligibility criteria subsection); p.13-18
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	Main text; Methods Section (Search strategy for identification of studies subsection); p.18-19
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	Additional file 3
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Main text; Methods Section (Selection of studies subsection); p.20
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Main text; Methods Section (Selection of studies subsection); p.20
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Main text; Methods Section (Data extraction and management subsection); p.21-23
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Main text; Methods Section (Data extraction and management subsection); p.21-23
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Main text; Methods Section (Outcomes subsection); p.15-16
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	Main text; Methods Section (Assessment of methodological quality subsection); p.20-21
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Main text; Methods Section (Second step: Quantitative synthesis subsection); p.24-26
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	Main text; Methods Section (Second step: Quantitative synthesis subsection); p.24-26
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Main text; Methods Section (Subgroup and sensitivity analysis subsection); p.24-25
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Main text; Methods Section (First step: Descriptive

			synthesis subsection); p.24
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Main text; Methods Section (Assessment of reporting biases subsection) findings; p.26
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	NA (assessment of confidence in cumulative evidence are currently not recommended in mixed methods systematic reviews) [45]

Note. NA = Not applicable.
* This review protocol was drafted and appraised according to the PRISMA-P statement [48] together with the PRISMA-P 2015 Explanation and Elaboration paper [49] and the PRISMA 2020 updated guidance [50].