

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review and meta analysis.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Reference: Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

	Reporting Item	Section
Title		
Identification	#1a Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title
Update	#1b If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	n/a
Registration		
	#2 If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	n/a (this protocol is planned for registration on PROSPERO)
Authors		
Contact	#3a Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Author information
Contribution	#3b Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Contributions
Amendments		
	#4 If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol,	n/a

identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments

Support

Sources	#5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	n/a
Sponsor	#5b	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	n/a
Role of sponsor or funder	#5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	n/a

Introduction

Rationale	#6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Abstract and last part of Introduction
Objectives	#7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Last part of introduction

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	Methods and analysis: Eligibility criteria section
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	Methods and analysis: Databases and search strategy section
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	Methods and analysis: Databases and search strategy section and

supplementary file 2

Study records - data management	#11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Methods and analysis: Study selection section
Study records - 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)	Methods and analysis: Study selection section
Study records - 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	Methods and analysis: Data extraction section
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	Methods and analysis: Data extraction section
Outcomes and prioritization	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Methods and analysis: Data synthesis section
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	Methods and analysis: Risk of bias assessment and Quality of evidence sections
Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	n/a (only qualitative synthesis will be sought due to expected heterogeneity)
Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies,	n/a (qualitative synthesis only)

		including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)	
Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	n/a
Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Methods and analysis: Data synthesis section
Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Methods and analysis: Risk of bias section
Confidence in cumulative evidence	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Methods and analysis: Risk of bias and Quality of evidence sections

The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 29. January 2022 using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)