

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 (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in children with overweight. A protocol for systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036058
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Nov-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Rashid, Rajeeb; NHS Lothian - West Lothian Healthcare Division, Paediatrics Condon, Laura; University of Nottingham, School of Medicine Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Jakobsen, Janus; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; Holbaek Sygehus, Department of Cardiology Lindschou, Jane; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Lissau, Inge; University Hospital Copenhagen, Clinical Research Centre
Keywords:	PAEDIATRICS, Paediatric endocrinology < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Child & adolescent psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY

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 <u>licence</u>.

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 <u>Creative Commons</u> 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.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in

 children with overweight. A protocol for systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis Rashid R¹, Condon L², Gluud C³, Jakobsen JC^{3,4,5}, Lindschou JC³, and Lissau I⁶ Affiliations ¹ Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston, United Kingdom, ² School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Medical School, Nottingham, United Kingdom ³ Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark ⁴ Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Denmark ⁵ Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark ⁶ Clinical Research Centre, University Hospital Copenhagen, Hvidovre, Denmark **Correspondence to** Dr Rajeeb Rashid Postal Address: Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston, United Kingdom, EH54 6PP Telephone Number: 0044 – 7984405808 Email: rajeeb.rashid@nhs.net Word Count 2663

ABSTRACT

Introduction The prevalence of overweight and obesity in children is increasing worldwide. Multi-component interventions incorporating diet, physical activity, and behavioural change have been shown to improve body mass index (BMI). However, the impact of psychotherapy is poorly explored. This systematic review aims to assess the benefits and harms of psychotherapeutic approaches for children with overweight.

Methods and analysis We will include randomised clinical trials involving children with overweight irrespective of publication type, year, status, or language. Psychotherapy will be compared with no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical placebo. Children between 0-18 years with overweight will be included. The following databases will be searched: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE, Excerpta Medica database (Embase), PsycINFO, PubMed, and Web of Science (SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI, CCR-EXPANDED, IC), CINAHL and LILACS. Primary outcomes will be body weight, quality of life, and proportion of patients with serious adverse events. Secondary outcomes will be BMI z-score, self-efficacy, anxiety, depression, and proportion of patients with non-serious adverse events. Study inclusion, data extraction, and bias risk assessments will be conducted independently by at least two authors. We will assess risk of bias through eight domains. We will control risks of random errors with Trial Sequential Analysis. The quality of the evidence will be assessed using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Tool (GRADE). The systematic review will be reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidance.

Ethics and Dissemination As individual patient data will not be included, we do not require ethics approval. This review will be published in a peer review journal.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42018086458

Keywords: Obesity, overweight, children, adolescents, psychotherapy, intervention,

2 3	53	treatment, systematic review.
4 5 6	54	
7 8	55	Article summary
9 10 11	56	Strength and limitations of the study
12 13	57	• This review will be the first systematic review to investigate the benefits and harms
14 15	58	of psychotherapy in children with overweight following Cochrane methodology.
16 17	59	• A comprehensive search strategy will be used with a large number of databases
18 19 20	60	searched.
20 21 22	61	Only Randomised Controlled Trials in children with overweight will be included.
23 24	62	• The review will perform Meta-analysis, Trial Sequential Analysis and use the Grading
25 26	63	of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Tool.
27 28 20	64	• We expect high heterogeneity across studies which may lead to challenges in
29 30 31	65	performing a Meta-analysis.
32 33	66	It is anticipated that many papers will not provide sufficient details on all variables of
34 35	67	interest and will lead to reliance on communication with corresponding authors for
36 37	68	additional information
38 39 40	69	
40 41 42	70	
43 44	71	INTRODUCTION
45 46	72	The prevalence of overweight is increasing worldwide both among children and adults
47 48 49	73	irrespective of income (1-3). The rate of paediatric overweight has risen worldwide over the
50 51	74	last few decades (4) despite significant resources being spent on reversing these trends.
52 53	75	This widens health inequality, as the prevalence of children with overweight is higher in
54 55	76	areas of social deprivation (5). Recent data from the World Health Organisation continues to
56 57 58	77	show an increasing prevalence of obesity in children in Europe (6, 7). The International Task
59	78	Force of Obesity produced age and sex specific cut-off for the definition of overweight and

 BMJ Open

obesity in children (8). Throughout this paper, we will use the term overweight for all children
with overweight including all levels of obesity.

These developments have both short-term and long-term consequences on cardio-vascular disease, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, and cancer, resulting in a significant burden on health services across the world (9). The severity of these comorbidities typically increase with the severity of overweight (10, 11). Mental health sequelae such as poor self-esteem, anxiety, and depression may result in bullying, discrimination, long-term socioeconomic disadvantages and is often coupled with difficult family circumstances (12-15)(16).

As such, psychological variables such as quality of life, self-efficacy, life events, parental attitudes, eating disorders and anxiety need to be addressed in the long-term treatment of overweight and obesity. Psycho-education, cognitive behavioural therapy, solution-based therapy, including systemic therapy, and psychodynamic counselling are used (17-19).

95 Psychotherapeutic interventions

Psychotherapy is widely used in the management of overweight children. It may support the child to change and maintain more weight-friendly habits whilst also potentially improving body image, self-esteem, and social adaptation (20). Several types of psychotherapy are used in the treatment of children with overweight. Brief therapy might be an effective modality for weight management in children through helping them to use their inner resources (21, 22). Motivational interviewing appears to be a beneficial communication tool for initiating and maintaining healthy habits and weight reduction through self-help or self-determination (23-27). Family therapy is a form of systemic therapy, widely used to treat child overweight often as part of multi-component programs (28-34). Cognitive-behavioural

BMJ Open

therapy is a very widely used form of psychotherapy that has been used to treat overweight in children (35-37). Group psychotherapy is an alternative to individual programs for supporting weight loss in teenagers (36, 38). Interpersonal therapy is most commonly used to treat low mood, depression, and disordered eating with studies showing indications of its efficacy in decreasing the weight gain in overweight teenage girls (39-41). Finally, psychodynamic therapy emphasises the systematic study of the psychological drivers that underlie human behaviour, feelings, and emotions associated with weight qain (42). Psychotherapeutic approaches thus seek to support the child and their parents towards a healthier weight in the child.

³ 114

115 Systematic reviews on interventions

The effects of interventions for children with overweight have been analysed recently in Cochrane systematic reviews Cochrane reviews (43-45). Quality of life was included in only two of these reviews, showing no effects in children after end of intervention (44, 45). A moderate improvement of health-related quality of life in the intervention groups was seen in older children (P=0.01), but the evidence was uncertain (44, 45). In pre-school children, multi-component interventions showed reductions in BMI (P<0.00001) and improvements in some markers of quality of life (43). Whilst previous reviews have commented upon the significant risk of bias in many studies, none of the earlier reviews have consistently assessed the risk of bias, the risk of random errors, or assessed the overall evidence certainty with GRADE (46-55). In this systematic review, we will assess the beneficial and harmful effects of psychotherapy for in children with overweight taking risks of bias (systematic errors), risks of play of chance (random errors), type of control interventions, and GRADE assessments into consideration.

59 130 **Objectives**

Page 7 of 27

The objective of this review will be to assess the benefits and harms of psychotherapy
versus no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy in children
with overweight (including all levels of obesity).

0 134

135 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

This systematic review protocol has been developed according to the Preferred Reporting
Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines (56)
(Additional File 1).

1 139

140 Criteria for Considering Studies for this Review

141 Types of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of language, publication status, publication type, or publication year will be searched for and included regarding benefits and harms. Eligible studies which are not published in English will be translated using Google translate. Data on harms from quasi-randomised studies, controlled clinical studies, and other observational studies if retrieved from our searches for randomised clinical trials will be included. Such data will be described narratively as adverse events are rarely reported in randomised clinical trials whilst such observational studies may provide information on rare or late occurring adverse events (57).

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

7 150

151 Types of participants

All children whom are overweight, (including all levels of obesity) up to 18 years of age. We will also include RCTs which include and children and young adults below the age of 21 years. Children with associated co-morbidities, either physical or psychological secondary to overweight and obesity will be included.

Page 8 of 27

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

157 Types of interventions

As the experimental intervention, we will include any type of brief therapy, family therapy, cognitive behavioural therapy, interpersonal therapy, or psycho-dynamic therapy as described in the Introduction with the intention to treat overweight children. The therapy can be delivered, face-to-face either individually, delivered to parents only or in groups, in any setting. The control intervention can be no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy.

165 There is no restriction as to who delivers the treatment or treatment duration. We will 166 accept any co-intervention providing that they are planned to be delivered in similar fashion 167 in both the experimental group and the control group.

169 Types of outcomes

170 We will assess all outcomes at two time points:

171 - End of intervention, as defined by trialist (primary time point of interest)

172 - Maximum follow up.

1 174 Primary outcomes

175 1. Body weight measured in kg.

2. Quality of life: as measured by a scale that has been validated for use in the target population (58).

3. Proportion of participants with one or more serious adverse events; that is, any untoward medical occurrence that results in death, is life-threatening, requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity (59, 60).

60 182 *Secondary outcomes* BMJ Open

1 2		Ŭ
2 3 4	183	1. BMI z-score (kg/m2)
5 6	184	2. Self-efficacy.
7 8	185	3. Anxiety.
9 10 11	186	4. Depression.
11 12 13	187	5. Proportion of participants with at least one non-serious adverse event (59, 60).
15 16	188	Exploratory outcomes
17 18	189	1. Body fat (%) measured by bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (61,
19 20	190	62)
21 22 22	191	2. Muscle mass (kg) via bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (61, 62).
23 24 25	192	3. Individual serious adverse events and individual adverse events not considered
26 27	193	serious.
28 29	194	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	195	Search methods for identification of studies
	196	Electronic searches
	197	We will search the following databases: The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, Excerpta Medica
	198	database (Embase), PsycINFO, Web of Science (SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S,
	199	CPCI-SSH, ESCI, CCR-EXPANDED, IC), CINAHL, and LILACS. Examples of keywords used in
41 42 43	200	search strategy include: obesity, overweight, psychotherapy, body mass index, weight gain,
44 45	201	weight loss, hyperphagia and systematic review. A preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE
46 47	202	is enclosed as appendix 2.
48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	203	
	204	Searching other resources
	205	We will search for trials or ongoing studies on the following resources:
	206	ClinicalTrials.gov (www.clinicaltrials.gov)
	207	Google Scholar (<u>https://scholar.google.com/</u>)
59 60	208	European Medicine Agency (http:// www.ema.europa.eu/ema/)

Page 10 of 27

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

9

2				
3 4	209	United States Food and Drug Administration (ww.fda.gov)		
5 6	210	Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency		
7 8	211	(https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-		
9 10 11	212	healthcare-products-regulatory- agency)		
11 12 13	213	The World Health Organization (<u>www.who.int/</u>) ICTRP Search Portal		
14 15	214	Global Obesity Forum (previously International Association for the Study of Obesity)		
16 17	215	(www.iaso.org)		
18 19	216	European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO) (easo.org).		
20 21 22	217			
22 23 24	218	Keywords used in the search strategy		
25 26	219	Obesity		
27 28	220	Overweight		
29 30	221	Psychotherapy		
31 32 33	222	Body mass index		
34 35	223	Weight gain		
36 37	224	Weight loss		
38 39	225	Hyperphagia		
40 41 42	226	Systematic review		
43 44	227	A preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE is enclosed as appendix 2.		
45 46	228			
47 48	229	Data collection and analysis		
49 50 51	230	Selection of studies		
52 53	231	We will perform the review following the recommendations in the Cochrane Handbook for		
54 55	232	Systematic Reviews of Interventions (63). The meta-analyses will be performed using		
56 57	233	Review Manager and Trial Sequential Analysis program (64, 65).		
58 59 60	234			

Page 11 of 27

Two authors will independently screen titles and abstracts. They will retrieve all identified and relevant full text publications after which two authors will independently screen the full text and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies. Disagreement will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a with a third author. Trial selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. Two authors will extract data. Disagreement will be resolved by discussing with a third author. We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together. Data extraction will be performed by two authors independently, who will both compare the extracted data. Disagreements will be resolved by a third author. We will use Review Manager software to extract data. We will note in the 'Characteristics of included studies'

table if outcome data were not reported in a usable way. Two review authors will independently transfer data into the Review Manager file. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a third author.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

The risk of bias of every included trial will be evaluated independently by at least two authors. In case of any disagreement, discrepancies will be discussed with a third author and resolved by consensus. Risk of bias will be assessed using Cochrane's 'Risk of bias' assessment tool and the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) Group's guidance (66, 67). We will evaluate the methodology in respect of:

- Random sequence generation
- Allocation concealment
- Blinding of participants and treatment providers

Blinding of outcome assessment Incomplete outcome data Selective outcome reporting Other risks of bias Overall risk of bias Classification of the trials will follow criteria defined in Attached File 3. **Meta-analysis** Data will be meta-analysed using RevMan 5 statistical software (68). We will use STATA statistical software (STATA 2015) in case of zero event trials, where RevMan 5 zero event handling is insufficient (69, 70). We will assess our intervention effects with random-effects model meta-analyses and fixed-effect model meta-analyses (71-73), using the more conservative point estimate of the two (74). Three primary outcomes will be examined with $P \leq 0.025$ being statistically significant (74). An eight-step procedure will be used to assess if the thresholds for significance are crossed (74). Five secondary outcomes will be examined with P≤0.017 being statistically significant (74). The results of the exploratory outcomes will be considered hypothesis generating only. Analysis of all included studies will be compared to a subgroup analysis comparing trials at low risk of bias compared to trials at high risk of bias. If the results do not differ, primary conclusions will be based at the overall analysis. If the results differ, primary conclusions will be based on studies at low risk of bias. A table describing the types of serious adverse events in each trial will be provided. **Trial Sequential Analysis**

Page 13 of 27

1 2

BMJ Open

3 4	286	Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive
5 6	287	testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. In order to minimise the risks of type I
7 8	288	errors and type II errors (55, 75, 76), Trial Sequential Analysis will be conducted on the
9 10 11	289	outcomes. In order to do so we will calculate the required information size (that is the
12 13	290	number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention
14 15	291	effect) (75).
16 17	292	
18 19 20	293	For continuous outcomes, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a
20 21 22	294	mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.5% for our three primary outcomes
23 24	295	and an alpha of 1.67% for our five secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10% (77). For
25 26	296	dichotomous outcomes, we will use the proportion of participants with an outcome in
27 28 20	297	the control group, a relative risk reduction of 20%, and an alpha of 2.5% for our
29 30 31	298	primary outcomes and an alpha of 1.67% for secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10%
32 33	299	(77). We will calculate risk ratios with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous
34 35	300	outcomes.
36 37	301	
38 39 40	302	Subgroup analysis
40 41 42	303	Subgroup analysis will be performed
43 44	304	• Trials at high risk of bias trials compared to trials at low risk of bias trials.
45 46	305	Trial stratified according to experimental interventions.
47 48	306	Trials stratified according to the control interventions.
49 50	307	• Complexity: trials with participants with no co-morbidities compared to trials with
51 52 53	308	participants pre-existing co-morbidities.
54 55	309	• Trials in which the experimental intervention was evaluated by either the parents or the
56 57 58 59 60	310	child after the treatment sessions had been delivered compared to trials in which the

1 ว		
2 3 4	311	experimental intervention was not evaluated by either the parents or the child after the
5 6	312	treatment sessions had been delivered.
7 8 9	313	
10 11	314	We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager (68).
12 13	315	
14 15	316	Sensitivity analysis
16 17	317	To assess the potential impact of bias, we will perform a sensitivity analysis to exclude trials
18 19 20	318	at overall 'high risk of bias'.
20 21 22	319	To assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will
23 24	320	perform the following sensitivity analyses.
25 26	321	• 'Best-worst-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in
27 28	322	the experimental group had no serious adverse events, including not developing any
29 30 21	323	psychiatric disease such as an eating disorder.
32 33	324	• 'Worst-best-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in
34 35	325	the experimental group, had a serious adverse event, for instance, developing a
36 37	326	psychiatric disease such as an eating disorder.
38 39	327	
40 41 42	328	Statistical heterogeneity will be assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots and I ²
42 43 44	329	statistic values (74). Underlying reasons behind statistical heterogeneity in meta-analyses
45 46	330	will be investigated by assessing trial characteristics.
47 48	331	
49 50	332	Summary of findings table
51 52 53	333	A summary of findings table using each of the prespecified primary outcomes will be
54 55	334	presented using GRADE considerations for studies contributing data to the meta-analyses for
56 57 58 59 60	335	the prespecified outcomes (74, 78-91). Methods and recommendations described in Chapter

8 (Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (63) using GRADEpro software will be used.

DISCUSSION

This review will aim to provide evidence on the potential effects of psychotherapy as an intervention for overweight children. Currently, there is no comprehensive systematic review of psychotherapeutic interventions in the treatment of overweight children to inform clinical practice. Previous systematic reviews in this population have considered behavioural interventions for lifestyle behaviour change as a mediating factor for weight loss initiation and maintenance (44, 45). We will also be able to assess the different types of psychotherapeutic interventions as well as their individual comparison groups (no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy. This review will also highlight any gaps in the evidence base of such interventions which will help to shape the development and optimisation of future interventions.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

> Acknowledgements We would like to thank Sarah Louise Klingenberg, Information Specialist at the Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research for her guidance and assistance on developing search methods and keywords for search strategies.

> Author contributions IL, RR, LC, CG, JCJ, and JL wrote the first draft of the protocol. RR, IL, JCJ, CG, LC, and JL have revised the protocol. All authors critically reviewed and approved the manuscript. IL is the guarantor of the review.

Funding This research received no specific grants from any funding agency.

1		
2		
5 Д	362	
- 5		
6	363	Competing interests None known.
7		
8	364	
9		
10	365	Patient consent Not required.
11		
12 12	366	
13 14		
15	367	Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
16		
17	368	
18		
19	369	REFERENCES
20	270	1 Work V. Labotain T. Warldwide trands in shildhood evenusisht and abasity. International
21	370	1. Wang Y, Lobstein T. Worldwide trends in childhood overweight and obesity. International
22	3/1	Journal of pediatric obesity : JPO : an official journal of the international Association for the Study of
24	372	Obesity. 2006;1(1):11-25.
25	3/3	2. Lobstein T. The prevention of obesity in children. Pediatric endocrinology reviews : PER.
26	374 275	2004;1 Suppi 3:471-5.
27	3/5	3. de Ohis M, Blossner M, Borghi E. Global prevalence and trends of overweight and obesity
28	370	among preschool children. The American Journal of childran huthlion. 2010;92(5):1257-64.
29	3//	4. Jebb SA, Rennie RL, Cole TJ. Prevalence of overweight and obesity among young people in
30 31	370 270	Great Britanii. Public Health Huthition. 2004,7(5):401-5.
32	200	5. Oistad DL, Anchotto K, Teychenne M, Minaker LW, Taber DK, Kaine KD, et al. Can targeted
33	380	policies reduce obesity and improve obesity-related benaviours in socioeconomically disadvantaged
34	201	Association for the Study of Obesity 2017
35	202 202	Association for the study of Obesity, 2017.
36	202	Droliminary Data 2019
37	204 205	Fremminary Data. 2010.
38	202	well being. Health Behavior in school aged children (HPSC) study. International report from the
39 40	200	2012/2014 current 2016 2016
40 41	207	2015/2014 Sulvey. 2010 2010.
42	200	o. Cole 13, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dielz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child
43	202	
44	201	2000,520(7244).1240-5.
45	202	Comorbidities to Clinical Assessment and Treatment, Mayo Clinic proceedings, 2017;02(2):251.65
46	202	Comorbidities to Chinical Assessment and Treatment. Mayo Chinic proceedings. 2017;92(2):231-03.
47	201	Children and Young Adults. The New England journal of medicine, 2015;272(14):1207-17
48	205	11 Konolman D. Hoalth ricks associated with overweight and obesity. Obesity reviews : an
49 50	306	official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity, 2007;8 Suppl 1:12-7
51	207	12 Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, Lynch L, Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental
52	208	health problems in young children. Pediatrics, 2011:128(A):677-84
53	200	12 Griffiths LL Wolke D. Page AS. Horwood IP. Obesity and bullying: different effects for boys
54	<u>400</u>	and girls. Archives of disease in childhood, 2006;91(2):121-5
55	-100 /101	1/ Gortmaker SI Must & Derrin IM Schol AM Dietz WH Social and economic consequences of
56 57	402	overweight in adolescence and young adulthood. The New England journal of medicine
5/ 58	402	$1993 \cdot 329(14) \cdot 1008 \cdot 12$
50 59	404	1555,525(17).1000 12.
60	405	voung adulthood Lancet (London England) 1994-343(8893)-324-7
	1 05	יסמיים מממיניוססמי במוויכי (בסוומסוו, בווצומוומן: בססיקסיקסטסטן.סבא-ד.

BMJ Open

1		10
2		
3	406	16. Lissau I. Breum L. Sorensen TI. Maternal attitude to sweet eating habits and risk of
4	407	overweight in offspring: a ten-year prospective population study. International journal of obesity
5	408	and related metabolic disorders : journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity
6	409	1993·17(3)·125-9
7	405 //10	17 Swencionis C Rendell SI. The nsychology of obesity. Abdominal imaging, 2012;37(5):733-7
8	410	17. Swencionis C, Kenden SL. The psychology of obesity. Abdominal imaging. 2012, 57(5), 755-7.
9 10	411	Treatment New York: The Guilford Press: 2002 n. 201-16
10	41Z //12	10. Wilflow DE Tibbs TL Van Burge DL Boach KD Walker MS Enstein LH Lifestyle interventions
12	415	in the treatment of childhood every eight: a meta analytic review of randomized controlled trials
13	414 415	Health psychology - official journal of the Division of Health Dsychology. American Dsychological
14	415	Association 2007-26/E/E21 22
15	410	ASSOCIATION. 2007;20(5):521-52.
16	417	20. Goldschmidt AB, Best JR, Stein RI, Saelens BE, Epstein LH, Willey DE. Predictors of child
17	418	weight loss and maintenance among family-based treatment completers. J Consult Clin Psychol.
18	419	
19	420	21. Nowicka P, Flodmark CE. Family therapy as a model for treating childhood obesity: useful
20	421	tools for clinicals. Clinical child psychology and psychiatry. 2011;16(1):129-45.
21	422	22. Flodmark CE OT, Ryden O, Sveger T. Prevention of Progression to severe obesity in a group
22	423	of obese schoolchildren treated with family therapy. Pedaitrics. 1993;91(5):880-4.
24	424	23. Flattum C, Friend S, Story M, Neumark-Sztainer D. Evaluation of an individualized counseling
25	425	approach as part of a multicomponent school-based program to prevent weight-related problems
26	426	among adolescent girls. J Am Diet Assoc. 2011;111(8):1218-23.
27	427	24. Andre N, Beguier S. Using motivational interviewing as a supplement to physical activity
28	428	program in obese adolescents: a RCT study. Eat Weight Disord. 2015;20(4):519-23.
29	429	25. Bean MK, Powell P, Quinoy A, Ingersoll K, Wickham EP, 3rd, Mazzeo SE. Motivational
30	430	interviewing targeting diet and physical activity improves adherence to paediatric obesity treatment:
31 22	431	results from the MI Values randomized controlled trial. Pediatr Obes. 2015;10(2):118-25.
22 22	432	26. Warschburger P, Kroeller K, Haerting J, Unverzagt S, van Egmond-Frohlich A. Empowering
34	433	Parents of Obese Children (EPOC): A randomized controlled trial on additional long-term weight
35	434	effects of parent training. Appetite. 2016;103:148-56.
36	435	27. Resnicow K, McMaster F. Motivational Interviewing: moving from why to how with
37	436	autonomy support. The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity. 9.
38	437	England2012. p. 19.
39	438	28. Moens E, Braet C, Van Winckel M. An 8-year follow-up of treated obese children: children's,
40	439	process and parental predictors of successful outcome. Behaviour research and therapy.
41	440	2010;48(7):626-33.
42 42	441	29. Best JR, Goldschmidt AB, Mockus-Valenzuela DS, Stein RI, Epstein LH, Wilfley DE. Shared
43 44	442	weight and dietary changes in parent-child dyads following family-based obesity treatment. Health
45	443	Psychol. 2016;35(1):92-5.
46	444	30. Van Allen J, Borner KB, Gayes LA, Steele RG. Weighing physical activity: the impact of a
47	445	family-based group lifestyle intervention for pediatric obesity on participants' physical activity. J
48	446	Pediatr Psychol. 2015;40(2):193-202.
49	447	31. Jiang JX, Xia XL, Greiner T, Lian GL, Rosenqvist U. A two year family based behaviour
50	448	treatment for obese children. Arch Dis Child. 2005;90(12):1235-8.
51	449	32. Savoye M, Shaw M, Dziura J, Tamborlane WV, Rose P, Guandalini C, et al. Effects of a weight
52	450	management program on body composition and metabolic parameters in overweight children: a
55 57	451	randomized controlled trial. Jama. 2007;297(24):2697-704.
55	452	33. Berkowitz RI, Wadden TA, Tershakovec AM, Cronquist JL. Behavior therapy and sibutramine
56	453	for the treatment of adolescent obesity: a randomized controlled trial. Jama. 2003;289(14):1805-12.
57	454	34. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research
58	455	perspectives. Development Psychology. 1986;22(6):723.
59		
60		

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Braet C, Tanghe A, Decaluwe V, Moens E, Rosseel Y. Inpatient treatment for children with 35. obesity: weight loss, psychological well-being, and eating behavior. J Pediatr Psychol. 2004;29(7):519-29. 36. Luzier JL BK, Weeks JW. Behavioral treatment of pediatric obesity: review and future directions. Children's Health Care. 2010;39(4):312-34. 37. Herrera EA JCSR. A comparison of cognitive and behavioral treatments for pediatric obesity. Children's Health Care. 2004;33(2):151-67. Nowicka P, Hoglund P, Pietrobelli A, Lissau I, Flodmark CE. Family Weight School treatment: 38. 1-year results in obese adolescents. International journal of pediatric obesity : IJPO : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity. 2008;3(3):141-7. 39. Tanofsky-Kraff M, Wilfley DE, Young JF, Mufson L, Yanovski SZ, Glasofer DR, et al. A pilot study of interpersonal psychotherapy for preventing excess weight gain in adolescent girls at-risk for obesity. Int J Eat Disord. 2010;43(8):701-6. 40. Fenner AA, Howie EK, Davis MC, Straker LM. Relationships between psychosocial outcomes in adolescents who are obese and their parents during a multi-disciplinary family-based healthy lifestyle intervention: One-year follow-up of a waitlist controlled trial (Curtin University's Activity, Food and Attitudes Program). Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2016;14(1):100. Tanofsky-Kraff M, Shomaker LB, Wilfley DE, Young JF, Sbrocco T, Stephens M, et al. Targeted 41. prevention of excess weight gain and eating disorders in high-risk adolescent girls: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Clin Nutr. 2014;100(4):1010-8. Bruch H. Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anorexia Nervosa and the Person Within. New York: 42. Basic Books; 1973. 43. Colquitt JL, Loveman E, O'Malley C, Azevedo LB, Mead E, Al-Khudairy L, et al. Diet, physical activity, and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obesity in preschool children up to the age of 6 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2016;3:CD012105. Al-Khudairy L, Loveman E, Colquitt JL, Mead E, Johnson RE, Fraser H, et al. Diet, physical 44. activity and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese adolescents aged 12 to 17 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012691. 45. Mead E, Brown T, Rees K, Azevedo LB, Whittaker V, Jones D, et al. Diet, physical activity and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese children from the age of 6 to 11 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012651. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies 46. between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Annals of internal medicine. 2001;135(11):982-9. 47. Schunemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Brozek J, Etxeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, Mustafa RA, Manja V, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks for adoption, adaptation, and de novo development of trustworthy recommendations: GRADE-ADOLOPMENT. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2017;81:101-10. 48. Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess. 2012;16(35):1-82. Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study 49. design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised, controlled trials. Annals of internal medicine. 2012;157. 50. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. Jama. 1995;273(5):408-12. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Juni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in 51. treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2008;336(7644):601-5.

Page 19 of 27

BMJ Open

1		
2		
3	507	52. Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research
4	508	outcome. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2012:12:Mr000033.
5	509	53. Moher D. Pham B. Jones A. Cook DJ. Jadad AR. Moher M. et al. Does guality of reports of
6	510	randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet
/	511	(London, England), 1998:352(9128):609-13
8 0	512	54 Wettersley I Thorlund K Brok I Gluud C Estimating required information size by
10	513	quantifying diversity in a random-effects meta-analysis. BMC medical research methodology 2009.9
11	51/	55 Wettersley Lakobsen IC Gluud C Trial Sequential Analysis in systematic reviews with
12	515	meta-analysis BMC medical research methodology 2017:17(1):20
13	516	56 Moher D. Shamseer I. Clarke M. Ghersi D. Liberati A. Petticrew M. et al. Preferred reporting
14	517	items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PPISMA-D) 2015 statement Systematic
15	517 E10	reviews 2015:4/1):1
16	510	Teviews. 2015,4(1).1.
17	519	57. Storebo OJ, Pedersen N, Ramstad E, Kleisholm ML, Nielsen SS, Krogn HB, et al.
18	520	Methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents -
19	521	assessment of adverse events in non-randomised studies. The Cochrane database of systematic
20 21	522	reviews. 2018;5:Cd012069.
21	523	58. Ahuja B, Klassen AF, Satz R, Malhotra N, Tsangaris E, Ventresca M, et al. A review of patient-
23	524	reported outcomes for children and adolescents with obesity. Quality of life research : an
24	525	international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation. 2014;23(3):759-
25	526	70.
26	527	59. ICH-GCP, editor ICH harmonised tripartite guideline. Clinical safety data management:
27	528	definitions and standards for expedited reporting E2A International Conference on Harmonisation
28	529	of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use 1994.
29	530	60. ICH-GCP, editor ICH harmonised guideline. Integrated Addendum to ICH E6(R1): Guideline
30	531	for good clinical practice E6(R2) International Council on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements
31	532	for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use 2016.
22 22	533	61. Pietrobelli A, Rubiano F, St-Onge MP, Heymsfield SB. New bioimpedance analysis system:
34	534	improved phenotyping with whole-body analysis. European journal of clinical nutrition.
35	535	2004;58(11):1479-84.
36	536	62. Kabiri LS, Hernandez DC, Mitchell K. Reliability, Validity, and Diagnostic Value of a Pediatric
37	537	Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis Scale. Child Obes. 2015;11(5):650-5.
38	538	63. The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
39	539	Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.
40	540	64. Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5). In: Centre NC, editor. The Cochrane Collaboration. 5.3 ed.
41	541	Copenhagen: The Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.
42 42	542	65. Thorlund K EJ, Wetterslev J, Brok J, Imberger G et al. User manual for trial sequential analysis
45 44	543	(TSA). 2011.
45	544	66. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane
46	545	Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ (Clinical research ed).
47	546	2011;343:d5928.
48	547	67. Sethi NJ, Safi S, Nielsen EE, Feinberg J, Gluud C, Jakobsen JC. The effects of rhythm control
49	548	strategies versus rate control strategies for atrial fibrillation and atrial flutter: a protocol for a
50	549	systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis. Systematic reviews.
51	550	2017;6(1):47.
52	551	68. Collaboration C. Review Manager. Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2014.
ンン 51/	552	69. StataCorp. StataCorp Statistical Software. Release 14 ed. College Station: StataCorp LP: 2014.
54 55	553	70. Sweeting MJ, Sutton AJ, Lambert PC. What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of
56	554	continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data. Statistics in medicine. 2004:23(9):1351-75.
57	555	71. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled clinical trials.
58	556	1986;7(3):177-88.
59		
60		

BMJ Open

19

2		
3	557	72. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemporary clinical trials.
4	558	2015;45(Pt A):139-45.
5	559	73. Demets DL. Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations.
6 7	560	Statistics in medicine. 1987;6(3):341-50.
/ 8	561	74. Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Winkel P, Lange T, Gluud C. Thresholds for statistical and clinical
9	562	significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. BMC Med Res Methodol.
10	563	2014:14:120.
11	564	75. Wettersley J. Thorlund K. Brok J. Gluud C. Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm
12	565	evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2008:61(1):64-75.
13	566	76. Wettersley J. Thorlund K. Brok J. Gluud C. Estimating required information size by
14	567	quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. BMC medical research methodology.
15	568	2009:9:86.
16 17	569	77. Castellini G. Nielsen EE. Gluud C. Comment on: "Cell therapy for heart disease: Trial
17	570	sequential analyses of two cochrane reviews". Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics, 2016.
19	571	78. Guvatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GF, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an
20	572	emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMI (Clinical
21	573	research ed) 2008:336(7650):924-6
22	574	79. Schunemann HL Best D. Vist G. Oxman AD. Letters, numbers, symbols and words; how to
23	575	communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMAL: Canadian Medical Association
24	576	iournal = iournal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2003:169(7):677-80
25	577	80. Guvatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HL, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A, GRADE guidelines: a new
26 27	578	series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Enidemiology, Journal of clinical enidemiology
27 28	579	2011:64(4):380-2
20	580	81 Garattini S. Jakobsen IC. Wettersley I. Berthele' V. Banzi R. Rath A. et al. Evidence-based
30	581	clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Fur Lintern Med. 2016:32
31	582	82 Atkins D Best D Briss PA Eccles M Falck-Ytter Y Elottorn S et al. Grading quality of
32	583	evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmi 2004:328(7454):1490
33	584	83 Guvatt G. Oxman AD. Akl FA. Kunz R. Vist G. Brozek L et al. GRADE guidelines: 1
34	585	Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical
35	586	enidemiology 2011:64(4):383-94
30 27	587	84 Guvatt GH Oxman AD Kunz R Atkins D Brozek I Vist G et al GRADE guidelines: 2 Framing
38	588	the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical enidemiology, 2011;64(4):395-
39	589	
40	590	85 Guvatt GH Ovman AD Vist G Kunz R Brozek L Alonso-Coello P et al GRADE guidelines: A
41	501	Bating the quality of evidence-study limitations (risk of hias) Journal of clinical epidemiology
42	502	2011.64(A).407-15
43	502	2011,04(4),407 15. 86 Guyatt GH Oyman AD Montori V Vist G Kunz R Brozek L et al GRADE guidelines: 5 Rating
44	597	the quality of evidencenublication bias Journal of clinical enidemiology 2011:64(12):1277-82
45	595	87 Guyatt GH Oyman AD Kunz R Woodcock Brozek Helfand M et al. GRADE guidelines: 7
40 47	596	Bating the quality of evidence-inconsistency, Journal of clinical enidemiology, 2011;67(12):1294-
47 48	597	
49	508	SUZ. 88 Guyatt GH, Oyman AD, Kunz P, Woodcock I, Brozek I, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8
50	500	Bating the quality of ovidence, indirectness, Journal of clinical enidemiology, 2011;64/12):1202-10
51	599	Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of chinical epidemiology. 2011,04(12).1505-10.
52	601	9. Bating up the guality of evidence, Journal of clinical epidemiology, 2011;64(12):1211.6
53	602	9. Nating up the quality of evidence, journal of clinical epidemology, 2011,04(12),1311-0.
54	602	11. Making an overall rating of confidence in offect estimates for a single outcome and for all
55	604	automos lournal of clinical opidemiology 2012:66(2):151.7
50 57	604 605	Outcomes, Journal Of Childer epidemiology, 2015,00(2):151-7.
57 58	605	Bronaring summary of findings tables binary outcomes. Journal of divisal enidemiology
59	600	Preparing summary of moungs tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology.
60	007	2013,00(2).136-72.

1		20			
2	600				
4 5	608				
6 7	609	Appendices			
, 8 9	610	Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist.			
10 11	611	Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid).			
$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 546\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ \end{array}$	611 612	Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias.			
54 55					
56 57					
58 59 60					

		אסיקים אסיקים אסיקים שליקים שלים שליקים ש			Page
PRISMA-P 20	15 C	checklist			
This checklist has	been a	می تق dapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Centiਕd iagurr	als from Ta	able 3 in Mo	oher D et al:
Preferred reporting	g items	for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statem	stematic Rei	<i>views</i> 2015	4:1
An Editorial from t	he Edit	ors-in-Chief of Systematic Reviews details why this checklist was adapted -	D, Stewart I	_ & Shekelle	e P:
Implementing PRIS	MA-P:	recommendations for prospective authors. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> 2016 5 :15			
Section/tonic	#	Checklist item	Informatio	on reported	Line
	"		Yes	No	number(s)
	FORMA				
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review 3	x		2
Lindate	16	If the protocol is for an undate of a previous systematic review, identify as such			-
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract		x	51
Authors					
Contact	3а	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide paysical mailing address of corresponding author	Х		5-23
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	X		357-359
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, dentify a such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	as 🗌	Х	
Support					261
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	X		201
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor			301
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol		X	
					56 50
Rationale Obiectives	б 7	Provide an explicit statement of the guestion(s) the review will address with reference to	X X		130-133
	<u> </u>	p i i i i i i i i i i i i i	^		lod Contro
		ଳି For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml କି	(The Ope	n Access Publishe



Page 23 c	of 27
-----------	-------

3 of 27		BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open			2
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information Yes	reported No	Line number(s)
		participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)			
METHODS		s in a second seco	I		
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and reporting the characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteriating eligibility for the review	X		140-167
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study arthors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Х		195-216
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including	X		Additional File 2
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the	X		229-233
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) and be ach phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analyss)	x		235-242
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done indep and antly, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	х		244-250
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	X		Additional File 2
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and so additional outcomes, with rationale	X		169-193
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 an deta synthesis	Х		Additional File 3; 252-266
DATA		7, 2			•
	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	Х		268-283
Synthesis	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, metheds of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., <i>I</i> ² , Kendall's tau)	X		285-300, 328- 330
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Х		302-326
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned		Х	
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	X		Additional file 3
		que Cor poor review entre http://bmienen.hmi.com/cite/shout/cuidelines.yhtml	C) BioN The Oper	Access Publisher

del

		BMJ Open	njopen-20 1 by copyr			Page 24
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	19-036058 ight, inclu	Informatio	n reported	Line
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	on 5 N ding fo	X		332-337
		For peer review on	ovember 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographi Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.			
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.x	html e	(The Ope	n Access Publisher

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

Additional File 2

NOTES: unless stated otherwise, search terms are free text terms; MeSH: Medical subject heading (Medline medical index term); an asterisk (*) stands for 'any character(s)', a question mark stands for 'one or no character'.

- 1. exp Obesity/
- 2. exp Hyperphagia/
- 3. exp body mass index/
- 4. exp Weight Gain/
- 5. exp Weight Loss/
- 6. exp Anti-Obesity Agents/

7. (Pickwick* syndrom* or Prader willi syndrom* or obes* or adipos* or overweight* or 'over weight*' or overeat* or 'over eat*' or 'over feed*' or overfeed* or binge eating disorder* or 'fat overload' syndrom*).mp. or (weight and (gain or cycling or reduc* or loss or losing or maint* or decreas* or watch* or diet* or control*)).ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

- 8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
- 9. exp PSYCHOTHERAPY/

10. (psycho* or counsel* or depression or depressiv* or balint or crisis intervention* or assert* near training or ((person or client) and cent*) or psychodrama* or psycho drama* or paradoxic* techni* or rational emoti* or role play* or relax* near train* or socioenvironment* or socio environment* or sociotherap* or transactional).mp. or behavio?r modific*.ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

11. ((interpersonal or art or aversion or behavio?r or colo?r or cognitiv* or dance or gestalt or music or milieu or nondirectiv* or non directiv* or problem solving or problemsolving or self control or selfcontrol or play or reality or socio or supportiv*) and therap*).ti,ab.

- 12. 9 or 10 or 11
- 13. 8 and 12

14. (random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

15. 13 and 14

16. limit 15 to (("all infant (birth to 23 months)" or "all child (0 to 18 years)" or "newborn infant (birth to 1 month)" or "infant (1 to 23 months)" or "preschool child (2 to 5 years)" or "child (6 to 12 years)" or "adolescent (13 to 18 years)" or "young adult (19 to 24 years)") and humans)

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Random sequence generation

Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.

Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.

High risk: If the allocation sequence is not randomised or only quasi-randomised. These trials will be excluded.

Allocation concealment

Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, onsite locked computer or identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes.

Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.

High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

Blinding of participants and treatment providers

Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.

Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

Blinding of outcome assessment

Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.

Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

Incomplete outcome data

Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes, or (2) the numbers and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive. Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.

High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (e.g. last observation carried forward).

Selective outcome reporting

Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun and the outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol or the protocol was published after the trial has begun, reporting of serious adverse events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.

Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome of serious adverse events were not reported on.

High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

Other risks of bias

Low risk of bias: If the trial appears to be free of other components (for example, academic bias or for-profit bias) that could put it at risk of bias.

Unclear risk of bias: If the trial may or may not be free of other components that could put it at risk of bias.

High risk of bias: If there are other factors in the trial that could put it at risk of bias (for example, authors conducted trials on the same topic, for- profit bias, etc.).

Overall risk of bias

Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified as overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified as 'low risk of bias'.

High risk of bias: The trial will be classified as 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified as 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective out- come reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results with overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary conclusions will be presented in the summary of findings tables.

BMJ Open

Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in children and adolescents with overweight and obesity. A protocol for systematic review with metaanalysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036058.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Rashid, Rajeeb; NHS Lothian - West Lothian Healthcare Division, Paediatrics Condon, Laura; University of Nottingham, School of Medicine Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Jakobsen, Janus; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; Holbaek Sygehus, Department of Cardiology Lindschou, Jane; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research
Primary Subject Heading :	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Mental health, Nutrition and metabolism
Keywords:	PAEDIATRICS, Paediatric endocrinology < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Child & adolescent psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY
	•

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 <u>licence</u>.

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 <u>Creative Commons</u> 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.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Page 2 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in

children and adolescents with overweight and obesity. A protocol for systematic

review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Rashid R¹, Condon L², Gluud C³, Jakobsen JC^{3,4,5}, Lindschou JC³, and Lissau I^{6,7} Affiliations ¹ Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston, United Kingdom. ² School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Medical School, Nottingham, United Kingdom. ³Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark. ⁴ Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Denmark. ⁵ Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark. ⁶ Clinical Research Centre, University Hospital Copenhagen, Hvidovre, Denmark. ⁷Department of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Lund, Lund, Sweden. **Correspondence to** Dr Rajeeb Rashid Postal Address: Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston, United Kingdom, EH54 6PP Telephone Number: 0044 - 7984405808 Email: rajeeb.rashid@nhs.net **Word Count** 2953

1 2	
2 3 4	27
5 6 7	28
/ 8 0	29
10 11	30
12 13	31
14 15	32
16 17	33
18 19 20	34
20 21 22	35
23 24	36
25 26	37
27 28	38
29 30 31	39
32 33	40
34 35	41
36 37	42
38 39	43
40 41 42	44
42 43 44	45
45 46	46
47 48	47
49 50	48
51 52 53	49
54 55	50
56 57	51
58 59	52
60	

28 ABSTRACT

Introduction The prevalence of overweight and obesity in children is increasing worldwide. Multi-component interventions incorporating diet, physical activity, and behavioural change have shown limited improvement to body mass index (BMI). However, the impact of psychotherapy is poorly explored. This systematic review aims to assess the effects of psychotherapeutic approaches for children with all degrees of overweight.

4 Methods and analysis We will include randomised clinical trials involving children and 5 adolescents between 0-18 years with overweight and obesity, irrespective of publication type, year, status, or language up to April 2020. Psychotherapy will be compared with no 6 intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical 7 placebo. The following databases will be searched: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled 8 Trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, PubMed, and 9 0 Web of Science, CINAHL and LILACS. Primary outcomes will be BMI z-score, quality of life measured by a validated scale and proportion of patients with serious adverse events. 1 2 Secondary outcomes will be body weight, self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and proportion of patients with non-serious adverse events. Exploratory outcomes will be body fat, muscle mass 3 4 and serious adverse events. Study inclusion, data extraction and bias risk assessments will be conducted independently by at least two authors. We will assess risk of bias according to 5 6 Cochrane guidelines and the Cochrane EPOC guidance. We will use meta-analysis and control 7 risks of random errors with Trial Sequential Analysis. The quality of the evidence will be assessed using GRADE. The systematic review will be reported according to PRISMA and 8 Cochrane guidelines. 9

50 **Ethics and Dissemination** As individual patient data will not be included, we do not require 51 ethics approval. This review will be published in a peer review journal.

52 **PROSPERO registration number**: CRD42018086458

Page 4 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

53 Keywords: Obesity, overweight, children, adolescents, psychotherapy, intervention,
54 treatment, systematic review.

56 Article summary

57 Strength and limitations of the study

- This review will be the first systematic review of randomised controlled trials to investigate the benefits and harms of psychotherapy in children with overweight following Cochrane methodology.
- The review will perform meta-analysis, Trial Sequential Analysis and use Grading of
 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Tool (GRADE).
- This protocol has been registered on PROSPERO and aims to demonstrate a rigorous,
 methodical approach to our systematic review and thus reduce the risk of bias.
- We expect high heterogeneity across studies which may lead to challenges in performing a meta-analysis.
 - It is anticipated that many papers will not provide sufficient details on all variables of interest and will lead to reliance on communication with corresponding authors for additional information.
- 72 INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of overweight is increasing worldwide both among children and adults irrespective of income (1-3). The rate of paediatric overweight has risen worldwide over the last few decades (4) despite significant resources being spent on reversing these trends. This widens health inequality, as the prevalence of children with overweight is higher in areas of social deprivation (5). Recent data from the World Health Organization continues to show an increasing prevalence of obesity in children in Europe (6, 7). The International Task Force of

Obesity produced age and sex specific cut-off for the definition of overweight and obesity in children (8). Throughout this paper, children and adolescents between 0-18 years will be referred to as children. Children with all degrees of overweight including obese and morbidly obese will be referred to as overweight in the remaining part of the paper.

Overweight has both short-term and long-term consequences on cardio-vascular disease, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome and cancer, resulting in a significant burden on health services across the world (9). The severity of these comorbidities typically increases with the severity of overweight (10, 11). Mental health sequelae such as poor self-esteem, anxiety and depression may result in bullying, discrimination, long-term socioeconomic disadvantages and is often coupled with difficult family circumstances (12-16).

As such, psychological variables such as quality of life, self-esteem, life events, parental attitudes, eating disorders and anxiety need to be addressed in the long-term treatment of overweight and obesity. Psycho-education, cognitive behavioural therapy, solution-based therapy, including systemic therapy, and psychodynamic counselling are used (17-19).

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Psychotherapeutic interventions

Psychotherapy is widely used in the management of overweight children. It may support the child to change and maintain more weight-friendly habits whilst also potentially improving body image, self-esteem and social adaptation (20). Several types of psychotherapy are used in the treatment of children with overweight. Solution focused brief therapy might be an effective modality for weight management in children through helping them to use their inner resources (21, 22). Motivational interviewing appears to be a beneficial communication tool for initiating and maintaining healthy habits and weight reduction through self-help or selfdetermination (23-27). Family therapy is a form of systemic therapy, widely used to treat child
Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

overweight often as part of multi-component programs (28-34). Cognitive-behavioural therapy is a very widely used form of psychotherapy that has been used to treat overweight in children (35-37). Group psychotherapy is an alternative to individual programs for supporting weight loss in teenagers (36, 38). Interpersonal therapy is most commonly used to treat low mood, depression and disordered eating with studies showing indications of its efficacy in decreasing the weight gain in overweight teenage girls (39-41). Finally, psycho-dynamic therapy emphasises the systematic study of the psychological drivers that underlie human behaviour, feelings, and emotions associated with weight gain (42). Psychotherapeutic approaches thus seek to support the child and their parents towards a healthier weight in the child.

3 114

115 Systematic reviews on interventions

The effects of interventions for children with overweight have been analysed recently in Cochrane reviews (43-45). Quality of life was included in only two of these reviews, showing no effects in children after end of intervention (44, 45). A moderate improvement of healthrelated quality of life in the intervention groups was seen in older children (P=0.01), but the evidence was uncertain (44, 45). In pre-school children, multi-component interventions showed reductions in BMI (P<0.00001) and improvements in some markers of quality of life (43).

-3 123

Overall, systematic reviews have not shown that structured interventions in children with overweight are associated with an increased risk of depression or anxiety and may result in a mild reduction in symptoms (46). Similarly, a very recent systematic review demonstrated that paediatric obesity treatment improves self-esteem and body image in the short and medium term. These findings may underpin improvements in other psychological outcomes (47). However, a 5 year follow-up study in morbidly obese adolescents with bariatric surgery demonstrated no significant improvement of self-esteem (48). Potentially, a small proportion

Page 7 of 28

 BMJ Open

of participants may be at risk of developing worsening pathology, which clinicians should monitor, whilst treatment of weight concerns should be considered within treatment plans for young people with depression and obesity (46). Identification of these young people and provision of additional support may improve treatment outcomes whilst benefits to psychological well-being following treatment should be considered when assessing treatment success. Whilst previous reviews have commented upon the significant risk of bias in many studies, none of the earlier reviews have consistently assessed the risk of bias, the risk of random errors, or assessed the overall evidence certainty with GRADE (49-58). **Objective** The objective of this systematic review will be to assess the benefits and harms of psychotherapy versus no intervention in children with all degrees of overweight (including all levels of obesity); wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy or pharmaceutical placebo. METHODS AND ANALYSIS This systematic review protocol has been developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) quidelines (59) (Additional File 1). We will assess the beneficial and harmful effects of psychotherapy for in children with overweight taking risks of bias (systematic errors), risks of play of chance (random errors), type of psychotherapy and control interventions and GRADE assessments into consideration. **Criteria for Considering Studies for this Review**

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

157 Types of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of language, publication status, publication type or publication year will be searched for and include benefits and harms. We will follow PICO criteria as per the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions for inclusion and exclusion criteria (60). Eligible studies which are not published in English will be translated using Google translate. Authors will be contacted if necessary, for an English translation or for any clarification of their data. Data on harms from quasi-randomised studies, controlled clinical studies, and other observational studies if retrieved from our searches for randomised clinical trials will be included. Such data will be described narratively as adverse events are rarely reported in randomised clinical trials whilst such observational studies may provide information on rare or late occurring adverse events (61).

169 Types of participants

All children who are overweight (including all levels of obesity) up to 18 years of age. We will also include randomised clinical trials which include children and young adults below the age of 21 years. Children with associated co-morbidities, either physical or psychological secondary to overweight and obesity will be included.

175 Types of interventions

As the experimental intervention, we will include any type of solution focused brief therapy, family therapy, cognitive behavioural therapy, interpersonal therapy, or psycho-dynamic therapy as described in our introduction with the intention to treat overweight children. The therapy can be delivered, face-to-face either individually, delivered to parents only or in groups, in any setting. The control intervention can be no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical placebo.

Page 9 of 28

1

2							
3 4	183	There is no restriction as to who delivers the treatment or treatment duration. We will accept					
5 6	184	any co-intervention providing that they are planned to be delivered in similar fashion in both					
/ 8 0	185	the experimental group and the control group.					
9 10 11	186						
12 13	187	Types of outcomes					
14 15	188	We will assess all outcomes at baseline and then at two time points:					
16 17	189	- End of intervention, as defined by trialist (our primary time point of interest)					
18 19 20	190	- Maximum follow up.					
20 21 22	191						
23 24	192	Primary outcomes					
25 26	193	1. BMI z-score (kg/m ²).					
27 28	194	2. Quality of life: as measured by a scale that has been validated for use in the target					
29 30 31	195	population (62).					
32 33	196	3. Proportion of participants with one or more serious adverse events; that is, any					
34 35	197	untoward medical occurrence that results in death, is life-threatening, requires					
36 37	198	hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, results in persistent or					
38 39 40	199	significant disability or incapacity (63, 64).					
41 42 43	200	Secondary outcomes					
44 45	201	1. Body weight measured in kg.					
46 47	202	2. Self-esteem.					
48 49	203	3. Anxiety.					
50 51 52	204	4. Depression.					
53 54	205	5. Proportion of participants with at least one non-serious adverse event (63, 64).					
56 57 58 59 60	206	Exploratory outcomes					

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

- 1. Body fat (%) measured by bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (65, 66). 2. Muscle mass (kg) via bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (65, 66). 3. Individual serious adverse events and individual adverse events not considered serious. Search methods for identification of studies **Electronic searches** Searches will include literature up to April 2020. We will search the following databases: The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, Excerpta Medica database (Embase), PsycINFO, Web of Science (SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI, CCR-EXPANDED, IC), CINAHL and LILACS. Examples of keywords used in search strategy include: obesity, overweight, psychotherapy, body mass index, weight gain, weight loss, hyperphagia and systematic review. Controlled descriptors will be included using MeSH. A preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE is enclosed as Additional File 2. Searching other resources We will search for trials or ongoing studies on the following resources: ClinicalTrials.gov (www.clinicaltrials.gov) Google Scholar (https://scholar.google.com/) European Medicine Agency (http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/) United States Food and Drug Administration (ww.fda.gov) Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory- agency)
 - The World Health Organization (www.who.int/) ICTRP Search Portal

1								
2 3 4	233	Global Obesity Forum (previously International Association for the Study of Obesity)						
5 6	234	(www.iaso.org)						
7 8 0	235	• European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO) (easo.org).						
9 10 11	236							
12 13	237	Keywords used in the search strategy						
14 15	238	Obesity						
16 17 19	239	Overweight						
10 19 20	240	Psychotherapy						
21 22	241	Body mass index						
23 24	242	Weight gain						
25 26	243	Weight loss						
27 28 20	244	Hyperphagia						
29 30 31	245	Systematic review						
32 33	246	A preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE is enclosed as Additional File 2.						
34 35	247							
36 37	248	Data collection and analysis						
38 39	249	Selection of studies						
40 41 42	250	We will perform the review following the recommendations in the Cochrane Handbook for						
43 44	251	Systematic Reviews of Interventions (60). The meta-analyses will be performed using Review						
45 46	252	Manager and Trial Sequential Analysis program (67, 68).						
47 48	253							
49 50	254	At least two authors will independently screen titles and abstracts. They will retrieve all						
51 52 53	255	identified and relevant full text publications after which two authors will independently screen						
54 55	256	the full text and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies.						
56 57	257	Disagreement will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a with a third author. Trial						
58 59 60	258	selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items						

Page 12 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. At least two authors will extract data. Disagreement will be resolved by discussing with a third author. We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together.

Data extraction and management

Data extraction will be performed by at least two authors independently using software Covidence (69), who will both compare the extracted data for primary, secondary and exploratory outcomes. Disagreements will be resolved by a third author. We will use Review Manager software to extract data (64). For outcome data not reported in a usable manner we will present this in a table outlining the characteristics of these studies using the following headings: Methods, Participants, Interventions, Outcomes and Notes described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.6.1) of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (60). Two review authors will independently transfer data into the Covidence. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a third author.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

The risk of bias of every included trial will be evaluated independently by at least two authors. In case of any disagreement, discrepancies will be discussed with a third author and resolved by consensus. Risk of bias will be assessed using Cochrane's 'Risk of bias' assessment tool and the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) Group's guidance (70, 71). We will evaluate the methodology in respect of:

- Random sequence generation •
- Allocation concealment •
 - Blinding of participants and treatment providers
- Blinding of outcome assessment
- Incomplete outcome data

BMJ Open

12

2							
3 4	285	Selective outcome reporting					
5 6 7 8	286	Other risks of bias					
	287	Overall risk of bias					
9 10	288	Classification of the trials will follow criteria defined in Additional File 3.					
11 12	289						
13 14	290	Meta-analysis					
15 16	291	Data will be meta-analysed using ReyMan 5 statistical software (72). We will use STATA					
17 18	291	but will be meta analysed using Kevnan 5 statistical solution (72). We will use Shrink					
19 20	292	statistical software (STATA 2015) in case of zero event trials, where RevMan 5 zero event					
20 21 22	293	handling is insufficient (73, 74).					
23 24	294						
25 26	295	We will assess our intervention effects with random-effects model meta-analyses and fixed-					
20 27 28 29 30 31 32	296	effect model meta-analyses (75-77), using the more conservative point estimate of the two					
	297	(78). Three primary outcomes will be examined with P \leq 0.025 being statistically significant					
	298	(78). An eight-step procedure will be used to assess if the thresholds for significance are					
33 34 35	299	crossed (78). Five secondary outcomes will be examined with P \leq 0.017 being statistically					
36 37	300	significant (78). The results of the exploratory outcomes will be considered hypothesis					
38 39	301	generating only. We will measure effect size using standardised mean differences using					
40 41	302	confidence intervals of 95%. Analysis of all included studies will be compared to a subgroup					
42 43	303	analysis comparing trials at low risk of bias to trials at high risk of bias. If the results do not					
45 46	304	differ, primary conclusions will be based at the overall analysis. If the results differ, primary					
47 48	305	conclusions will be based on trials at low risk of bias. A table describing the types of serious					
49 50	306	adverse events in each trial will be provided.					
51 52	307						
53 54	308	Trial Sequential Analysis					
55 56	200	Traditional mota analysis runs the rick of random errors due to enarce data and repetitive					

Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. In order to control the risks of type I

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

errors and type II errors (58, 79, 80), Trial Sequential Analysis will be conducted on the outcomes. In order to do so we will calculate the required information size (that is the number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention effect) (79).

For continuous outcomes, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.5% for our three primary outcomes and an alpha of 1.67% for our five secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10% (81). For dichotomous outcomes, we will use the proportion of participants with an outcome in the control group, a relative risk reduction of 20%, and an alpha of 2.5% for our primary outcomes and an alpha of 1.67% for secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10% (81). We will calculate risk ratios with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous outcomes.

/ 8 322

323 Subgroup analysis

In order to investigate and compare different trials and interventions subgroup analysis willbe performed on the following:

- Trials at high risk of bias trials compared to trials at low risk of bias trials.
- Trial stratified according to experimental interventions.
- Trials stratified according to weight status: overweight, obese or morbidly obese at the point of entry into the trial (8).
- Trials stratified according to duration of intervention, the number of in person sessions,
 and length of sessions in hours (82).
 - Trials stratified if treatment fidelity was assessed or not (83).
- Trials stratified according to the control interventions.
- Complexity: trials with participants with no co-morbidities compared to trials with participants pre-existing co-morbidities.

Page 15 of 28

2 3	336	• Trials in which the experimental intervention was evaluated by either the parents or the					
4 5 6	337	child after the treatment sessions had been delivered compared to trials in which the					
0 7 8	338	experimental intervention was not evaluated by either the parents or the child after the					
9 10	339	treatment sessions had been delivered.					
11 12 13 14	340						
	341	We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager (72).					
15 16	342						
17 18	242	Sonsitivity analysis					
19 20	343						
21 22	344	o assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will perform					
23 24	345	he following sensitivity analyses.					
25 26	346	• 'Best-worst-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the					
27 28	347	experimental group had no serious adverse events, including not developing any					
29 30	348	psychiatric disease such as an eating disorder.					
31 32 33	349	'Worst-best-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the					
34 35	350	experimental group, had a serious adverse event, for instance, developing a psychiatric					
36 37	351	disease such as an eating disorder (46).					
38 39	352	Statistical heterogeneity will be assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots and I ² statistic					
40 41	353	values (78). Underlying reasons behind statistical heterogeneity in meta-analyses will be					
42 43 44	354	investigated by assessing trial characteristics.					
45 46	355						
47 48	356	Summary of findings table					
49 50	357	A summary of findings table using each of the prespecified primary outcomes will be presented					
51 52	358	using GRADE considerations for studies contributing data to the meta-analyses for the					
55 55	359	prespecified outcomes (78, 84-97). Methods and recommendations described in Chapter 8					
56 57	360	(Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of					
58 59 60	361	Interventions (60) using GRADEpro software will be used.					

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

DISCUSSION This protocol intends to outline a rigorous, methodical approach to developing a systematic review to provide evidence on the potential effects of psychotherapy as an intervention for overweight children. The protocol has been registered on PROSPERO and through peer review and publication aims to reduce the risk of bias in the future systematic review. Currently, there is no comprehensive systematic review of psychotherapeutic interventions in the treatment of overweight children to inform clinical practice. Previous systematic reviews in this population have considered behavioural interventions for lifestyle behaviour change as a mediating factor for weight loss initiation and maintenance (44, 45). We will also be able to assess the different types of psychotherapeutic interventions as well as their individual comparison groups (no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical placebo). This review will also highlight any gaps in the evidence base of such interventions which will help to shape the development and optimisation of future interventions. **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION** No ethical approval required. Dissemination of results will be published in peer reviewed journals. Acknowledgements We would like to thank Sarah Louise Klingenberg, Information Specialist at the Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research for her guidance and assistance on developing search methods and keywords for search strategies.

3 4	387	Author contributions IL, RR, LC, CG, JCJ, and JL wrote the first draft of the protocol. RR,
5 6 7	388	IL, JCJ, CG, LC, and JL have revised the protocol. All authors critically reviewed and approved
7 8 9	389	the manuscript. IL is the guarantor of the review.
10 11	390	
12 13	391	Funding This research received no specific grants from any funding agency.
14 15 16	392	
17 18	393	Competing interests None known.
19 20	394	
21 22 23	395	Patient consent Not required.
24	396	
25 26 27	397	Patient and Public Involvement No patient involvement
28 29	398	
30 31	399	Provenance and peer review Not commissioned, externally peer reviewed.
32 33 34	400	
35 36	401	
37 38	402	REFERENCES
39	403	1. Wang Y, Lobstein T. Worldwide trends in childhood overweight and obesity. International
40	404	journal of pediatric obesity 2006;1(1):11-25.
41	405	2. Lobstein T. The prevention of obesity in children. Pediatric endocrinology reviews : PER.
42	406	2004;1 Suppl 3:471-5.
43 44	407	3. de Onis M, Blossner M, Borghi E. Global prevalence and trends of overweight and obesity
45	408	among preschool children. The American journal of clinical nutrition. 2010;92(5):1257-64.
46	409	4. Jebb SA, Rennie KL, Cole TJ. Prevalence of overweight and obesity among young people in
47	410	Great Britain. Public health nutrition. 2004;7(3):461-5.
48	411	5. Olstad DL, Ancilotto R, Teychenne M, Minaker LM, Taber DR, Raine KD, et al. Can targeted
49	412	policies reduce obesity and improve obesity-related behaviours in socioeconomically disadvantaged
50	413	populations? A systematic review. Obesity reviews: 2017.
51 52	414	6. WHO Europe. COSI Factsheet. Childhood Obesity Surveillance Initiative Highlights 2015-17.
53	415	Preliminary Data. 2018.
54	416	7. Growing up unequal: gender and socioeconomic differences in young people's health and
55	417	well-being. Health Behavior in school-aged children (HBSC) study. International report from the
56	418	2013/2014 survey. 2016 2016.
57	419	8. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child
58	420	overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. BMJ (Clinical research ed).
59 60	421	2000;320(7244):1240-3.

Page 18 of 28

17

1

2 3 422 Kumar S, Kelly AS. Review of Childhood Obesity: From Epidemiology, Etiology, and 9. 4 423 Comorbidities to Clinical Assessment and Treatment. Mayo Clinic proceedings. 2017;92(2):251-65. 5 424 Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Moss LA, Skelton JA. Cardiometabolic Risks and Severity of Obesity in 10. 6 425 Children and Young Adults. The New England journal of medicine. 2015;373(14):1307-17. 7 426 Kopelman P. Health risks associated with overweight and obesity. Obesity reviews : an 11. 8 427 official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity. 2007;8 Suppl 1:13-7. 9 10 428 12. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, Lynch J. Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental 11 429 health problems in young children. Pediatrics. 2011;128(4):677-84. 12 430 Griffiths LJ, Wolke D, Page AS, Horwood JP. Obesity and bullying: different effects for boys 13. 13 431 and girls. Arch Dis Child. 2006;91(2):121-5. 14 Gortmaker SL, Must A, Perrin JM, Sobol AM, Dietz WH. Social and economic consequences of 432 14. 15 433 overweight in adolescence and young adulthood. The New England journal of medicine. 16 434 1993;329(14):1008-12. 17 435 Lissau I, Sorensen TI. Parental neglect during childhood and increased risk of obesity in 15. 18 19 436 young adulthood. Lancet (London, England). 1994;343(8893):324-7. 20 437 16. Lissau I, Breum L, Sorensen TI. Maternal attitude to sweet eating habits and risk of 21 438 overweight in offspring: a ten-year prospective population study. International journal of obesity 22 439 and related metabolic disorders : 1993;17(3):125-9. 23 440 17. Swencionis C, Rendell SL. The psychology of obesity. Abdominal imaging. 2012;37(5):733-7. 24 441 RR Wing. Behavioral weight control. In: Wadden TA SA, editor. Handbook of Obesity 18. 25 442 Treatment. New York: The Guilford Press; 2002. p. 301-16. 26 Wilfley DE, Tibbs TL, Van Buren DJ, Reach KP, Walker MS, Epstein LH. Lifestyle interventions 443 19. 27 444 in the treatment of childhood overweight: a meta-analytic review of randomized controlled trials. 28 29 Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological 445 30 446 Association. 2007;26(5):521-32. 31 447 Goldschmidt AB, Best JR, Stein RI, Saelens BE, Epstein LH, Wilfley DE. Predictors of child 20. 32 448 weight loss and maintenance among family-based treatment completers. J Consult Clin Psychol. 33 449 2014;82(6):1140-50. 34 450 21. Nowicka P, Flodmark CE. Family therapy as a model for treating childhood obesity: useful 35 451 tools for clinicians. Clinical child psychology and psychiatry. 2011;16(1):129-45. 36 452 Flodmark CE OT, Ryden O, Sveger T. Prevention of Progression to severe obesity in a group 37 22. 453 of obese schoolchildren treated with family therapy. Pedaitrics. 1993;91(5):880-4. 38 39 454 23. Flattum C, Friend S, Story M, Neumark-Sztainer D. Evaluation of an individualized counseling 40 455 approach as part of a multicomponent school-based program to prevent weight-related problems 41 456 among adolescent girls. J Am Diet Assoc. 2011;111(8):1218-23. 42 457 24. Andre N, Beguier S. Using motivational interviewing as a supplement to physical activity 43 458 program in obese adolescents: a RCT study. Eat Weight Disord. 2015;20(4):519-23. 44 Bean MK, Powell P, Quinoy A, Ingersoll K, Wickham EP, 3rd, Mazzeo SE. Motivational 459 25. 45 460 interviewing targeting diet and physical activity improves adherence to paediatric obesity treatment: 46 461 results from the MI Values randomized controlled trial. Pediatr Obes. 2015;10(2):118-25. 47 48 462 26. Warschburger P, Kroeller K, Haerting J, Unverzagt S, van Egmond-Frohlich A. Empowering 49 463 Parents of Obese Children (EPOC): A randomized controlled trial on additional long-term weight 50 464 effects of parent training. Appetite. 2016;103:148-56. 51 465 27. Resnicow K, McMaster F. Motivational Interviewing: moving from why to how with 52 466 autonomy support. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 9,19 (2012) 53 Moens E, Braet C, Van Winckel M. An 8-year follow-up of treated obese children: children's, 467 28. 54 468 process and parental predictors of successful outcome. Behaviour research and therapy. 55 2010;48(7):626-33. 469 56 57 470 29. Best JR, Goldschmidt AB, Mockus-Valenzuela DS, Stein RI, Epstein LH, Wilfley DE. Shared 58 471 weight and dietary changes in parent-child dyads following family-based obesity treatment. Health 59 472 Psychol. 2016;35(1):92-5. 60

BMJ Open

1 2		
3	172	20 Van Allen L. Borner KB. Gaves LA. Steele BG. Weighing physical activity: the impact of a
4	473	family-based group lifestyle intervention for pediatric obesity on participants' physical activity.
5	474	Pediatr Psychol 2015:40(2):193-202
6	476	31 liang IX Xia XI Greiner T Lian GL Rosenquist LL A two year family based behaviour
7	470	treatment for obese children Arch Dis Child 2005:90(12):1235-8
ð 0	478	32 Savove M Shaw M Dziura I Tamborlane WV Rose P Guandalini C et al Effects of a weight
9 10	479	management program on body composition and metabolic parameters in overweight children: a
11	480	randomized controlled trial IAMA 2007-297(24)-2697-704
12	480	33 Berkowitz RI. Wadden TA. Tershakovec AM. Cronquist II. Behavior therapy and sibutramine
13	482	for the treatment of adolescent obesity: a randomized controlled trial JAMA 2003;289(14):1805-12
14	483	34. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research
15	484	perspectives. Development Psychology, 1986:22(6):723
16	485	35. Braet C. Tanghe A. Decaluwe V. Moens F. Rosseel Y. Inpatient treatment for children with
17 18	486	obesity: weight loss insychological well-being and eating behavior. I Pediatr Psychol
19	487	2004:29(7):519-29
20	488	36. Luzier JL BK. Weeks JW. Behavioral treatment of pediatric obesity: review and future
21	489	directions. Children's Health Care, 2010:39(4):312-34.
22	490	37. Herrera FA JCSR. A comparison of cognitive and behavioral treatments for pediatric obesity.
23	491	Children's Health Care, 2004:33(2):151-67.
24	492	38. Nowicka P. Hoglund P. Pietrobelli A. Lissau I. Flodmark CE. Family Weight School treatment:
25	493	1-year results in obese adolescents. International journal of pediatric obesity : 2008:3(3):141-7.
20 27	494	39. Tanofsky-Kraff M, Wilfley DE, Young JF, Mufson L, Yanovski SZ, Glasofer DR, et al. A pilot
27	495	study of interpersonal psychotherapy for preventing excess weight gain in adolescent girls at-risk for
29	496	obesity. Int J Eat Disord. 2010:43(8):701-6.
30	497	40. Fenner AA. Howie EK. Davis MC. Straker LM. Relationships between psychosocial outcomes
31	498	in adolescents who are obese and their parents during a multi-disciplinary family-based healthy
32	499	lifestyle intervention: One-year follow-up of a waitlist controlled trial (Curtin University's Activity,
33	500	Food and Attitudes Program). Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2016;14(1):100.
34 25	501	41. Tanofsky-Kraff M, Shomaker LB, Wilfley DE, Young JF, Sbrocco T, Stephens M, et al. Targeted
36	502	prevention of excess weight gain and eating disorders in high-risk adolescent girls: a randomized
37	503	controlled trial. Am J Clin Nutr. 2014;100(4):1010-8.
38	504	42. Bruch H. Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anorexia Nervosa and the Person Within. New York:
39	505	Basic Books; 1973.
40	506	43. Colquitt JL, Loveman E, O'Malley C, Azevedo LB, Mead E, Al-Khudairy L, et al. Diet, physical
41	507	activity, and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obesity in preschool
42	508	children up to the age of 6 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online).
45 44	509	2016;3:CD012105.
45	510	44. Al-Khudairy L, Loveman E, Colquitt JL, Mead E, Johnson RE, Fraser H, et al. Diet, physical
46	511	activity and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese adolescents aged 12
47	512	to 17 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012691.
48	513	45. Mead E, Brown T, Rees K, Azevedo LB, Whittaker V, Jones D, et al. Diet, physical activity and
49	514	behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese children from the age of 6 to 11
50	515	years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012651.
51 52	516	46. Jebeile H, Gow ML, Baur LA, Garnett SP, Paxton SJ, Lister NB. Association of Pediatric Obesity
53	517	Treatment, Including a Dietary Component, With Change in Depression and Anxiety: A Systematic
54	518	Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA pediatrics. 2019:e192841.
55	519	47. Gow ML, Tee MSY, Garnett SP, Baur LA, Aldwell K, Thomas S, et al. Pediatric obesity
56	520	treatment, self-esteem, and body image: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Pediatric obesity.
57	521	2020;15(3):e12600.
58		
59 60		

BMJ Open

Jarvholm K, Bruze G, Peltonen M, Marcus C, Flodmark CE, Henfridsson P, et al. 5-year mental 48. health and eating pattern outcomes following bariatric surgery in adolescents: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet Child & adolescent health. 2020;4(3):210-9. 49. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Annals of internal medicine. 2001;135(11):982-9. 50. Schunemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Brozek J, Etxeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, Mustafa RA, Manja V, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks for adoption, adaptation, and de novo development of trustworthy recommendations: GRADE-ADOLOPMENT. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2017;81:101-10. 51. Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess. 2012;16(35):1-82. Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study 52. design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised, controlled trials. Annals of internal medicine. 2012;157. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of 53. methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. Jama. 1995;273(5):408-12. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Juni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in 54. treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2008;336(7644):601-5. 55. Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2012;12:Mr000033. Moher D, Pham B, Jones A, Cook DJ, Jadad AR, Moher M, et al. Does quality of reports of 56. randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet (London, England). 1998;352(9128):609-13. 57. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, Gluud C. Estimating required information size by quantifying diversity in a random-effects meta-analysis. BMC medical research methodology. 2009;9. 58. Wetterslev J, Jakobsen JC, Gluud C. Trial Sequential Analysis in systematic reviews with meta-analysis. BMC medical research methodology. 2017;17(1):39. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting 59. items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic reviews. 2015;4(1):1. 60. Collaboration TC. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Wiley-Blackwell; 2008. Storebo OJ, Pedersen N, Ramstad E, Kielsholm ML, Nielsen SS, Krogh HB, et al. 61. Methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents -assessment of adverse events in non-randomised studies. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2018;5:Cd012069. Ahuja B, Klassen AF, Satz R, Malhotra N, Tsangaris E, Ventresca M, et al. A review of patient-62. reported outcomes for children and adolescents with obesity. Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation. 2014;23(3):759-70. 63. ICH-GCP, editor ICH harmonised tripartite guideline. Clinical safety data management: definitions and standards for expedited reporting E2A. International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use; 1994. ICH-GCP, editor ICH harmonised guideline. Integrated Addendum to ICH E6(R1): Guideline 64. for good clinical practice E6(R2). International Council on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use; 2016.

BMJ Open

2								
3	572	65. Pietrobelli A, Rubiano F, St-Onge MP, Heymsfield SB. New bioimpedance analysis system:						
4	573	improved phenotyping with whole-body analysis. European journal of clinical nutrition.						
5	574	2004:58(11):1479-84.						
6	575	66. Kabiri LS. Hernandez DC. Mitchell K. Reliability, Validity, and Diagnostic Value of a Pediatric						
/	576	Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis Scale, Child Obes, 2015;11(5):650-5						
0 0	577	67 Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5) In: Centre NC editor The Cochrane Collaboration 5.2 ed						
9 10	578	Copenhagen: The Cochrane Collaboration: 2014						
11	570	Copennagen. The Coentrate Consolitation, 2014.						
12	575	(TEA) 2011						
13	50U E01	(13A). 2011.						
14	201	09. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne, Australia. Ventas Health Innovation.						
15	562	70. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Golzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane						
16	583	Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of blas in randomised trials. Bivij (Clinical research ed).						
17	584							
18	585	71. Sethi NJ, Safi S, Nielsen EE, Feinberg J, Gluud C, Jakobsen JC. The effects of rhythm control						
19	586	strategies versus rate control strategies for atrial fibrillation and atrial flutter: a protocol for a						
20	587	systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis. Systematic reviews.						
21	588	2017;6(1):47.						
22	589	72. Collaboration C. Review Manager. Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2014.						
23 74	590	73. StataCorp. StataCorp Statistical Software. Release 14 ed. College Station: StataCorp LP; 2014.						
25	591	74. Sweeting MJ, Sutton AJ, Lambert PC. What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of						
26	592	continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data. Statistics in medicine. 2004;23(9):1351-75.						
27	593	75. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled clinical trials.						
28	594	1986;7(3):177-88.						
29	595	76. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemporary clinical trials.						
30	596	2015;45(Pt A):139-45.						
31	597	77. Demets DL. Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations.						
32	598	Statistics in medicine. 1987;6(3):341-50.						
33	599	78. Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Winkel P, Lange T, Gluud C. Thresholds for statistical and clinical						
34 25	600	significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. BMC Med Res Methodol.						
36	601	2014.14.120						
30	602	79. Wettersley J. Thorlund K. Brok J. Gluud C. Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm						
38	603	evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2008:61(1):64-75						
39	604	80. Wettersley I. Thorlund K. Brok I. Gluud C. Estimating required information size by						
40	605	quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. BMC modical research methodology						
41	606							
42	607	2003, 5.80. 81 Castallini G. Nielsen EF. Gluud C. Comment on: "Cell therapy for heart disease: Trial						
43	609	social analysis of two cochrane reviews". Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics 2016						
44	600	P2 Hoorman WL Jaka MM Borgo IM Trank ES Sommer EC Samuels IP of all The doce of						
45	610	behavioral interventions to provent and treat childhood obesity: a systematic review and meta						
46	010	benavioral interventions to prevent and treat childhood obesity. a systematic review and meta-						
4/	611	regression. The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity. 2017;14(1):157.						
48 40	612	83. Jaka MiNi, Haapala JL, Trapi ES, Kunin-Batson AS, Olson-Bullis BA, Heerman WJ, et al.						
49 50	613	Reporting of treatment fidelity in benavioural paediatric obesity intervention trials: a systematic						
51	614	review. Obesity reviews : 2016;1/(12):128/-300.						
52	615	84. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an						
53	616	emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ (Clinical						
54	617	research ed). 2008;336(7650):924-6.						
55	618	85. Schunemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, Oxman AD. Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to						
56	619	communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association						
57	620	journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2003;169(7):677-80.						
58								
59								
60								

Page 22 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE guidelines: a new 86. series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):380-2. Garattini S, Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Berthele' V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based 87. clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. 88. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. 89. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. 90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395-400. 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence--study limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating 92. the quality of evidence--publication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294-302. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence--indirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 95. 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 96. 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 97. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. **Appendices** Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias.

23 of 28 BMJ Open 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 - Money D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Systematic Reviews* 2016 **5**:15

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information Yes	on reported	Line number(<u>s)</u>
ADMINISTRATIVE IN	IFORMAT				
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	X		2
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such		Х	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract		X	52
Authors		ing, en.t			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide p	X		5-24
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	X		387-389
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, deruify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments		X	
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	X		391
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	X		391
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol		X	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	X		72-140
		aphique d	(Bio The Ope	Med Central en Access Publisher

de

		BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open			Page 24
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information Yes	n reported No	Line number(s)
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	X		142-156,
METHODS		s seiger reicer			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and reported in the characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria and the religibility for the review	X		158-185
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study attabases, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	X		213-245
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including	X		Additional File 2
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the eview	X		249-252
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) and search phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analyss)	X		254-261
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	X		263-272
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	X		Additional File 2
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and s additional outcomes, with rationale	X		187-211
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	X		Additional File 3; 274-288
DATA					
	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	Х		290-321
Synthesis	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 for consistency (e.g., <i>I</i> ² , Kendall's tau)	X		290-321
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	X		323-354
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 6	(Bio N The Oper	Access Publisher

d by copyright, <mark>in</mark> njopen-2019-03<mark>6</mark>

oorted	Line
No	number(s)
Х	

356-361

Additional file

			Informatio	on rep
ection/topic	#		Yes	N
		regression) G 5		
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned		
eta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selection of reporting within studies)	X	
onfidence in umulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	X	
		typpicur (AES). xf and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies. The peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/auidelines.shtml		
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml		



Additional File 2

NOTES: unless stated otherwise, search terms are free text terms; MeSH: Medical subject heading (Medline medical index term); an asterisk (*) stands for 'any character(s)', a question mark stands for 'one or no character'.

- 1. exp Obesity/
- 2. exp Hyperphagia/
- 3. exp body mass index/
- 4. exp Weight Gain/
- 5. exp Weight Loss/
- 6. exp Anti-Obesity Agents/

7. (Pickwick* syndrom* or Prader willi syndrom* or obes* or adipos* or overweight* or 'over weight*' or overeat* or 'over eat*' or 'over feed*' or overfeed* or binge eating disorder* or 'fat overload' syndrom*).mp. or (weight and (gain or cycling or reduc* or loss or losing or maint* or decreas* or watch* or diet* or control*)).ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

- 8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
- 9. exp PSYCHOTHERAPY/

10. (psycho* or counsel* or depression or depressiv* or balint or crisis intervention* or assert* near training or ((person or client) and cent*) or psychodrama* or psycho drama* or paradoxic* techni* or rational emoti* or role play* or relax* near train* or socioenvironment* or socio environment* or sociotherap* or transactional).mp. or behavio?r modific*.ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

11. ((interpersonal or art or aversion or behavio?r or colo?r or cognitiv* or dance or gestalt or music or milieu or nondirectiv* or non directiv* or problem solving or problemsolving or self control or selfcontrol or play or reality or socio or supportiv*) and therap*).ti,ab.

- 12. 9 or 10 or 11
- 13. 8 and 12

14. (random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

15. 13 and 14

16. limit 15 to (("all infant (birth to 23 months)" or "all child (0 to 18 years)" or "newborn infant (birth to 1 month)" or "infant (1 to 23 months)" or "preschool child (2 to 5 years)" or "child (6 to 12 years)" or "adolescent (13 to 18 years)" or "young adult (19 to 24 years)") and humans)

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Random sequence generation

Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.

Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.

High risk: If the allocation sequence is not randomised or only quasi-randomised. These trials will be excluded.

Allocation concealment

Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, onsite locked computer or identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes.

Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.

High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

Blinding of participants and treatment providers

Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.

Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.

Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

Incomplete outcome data

Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes, or (2) the numbers and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive. Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.

High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (e.g. last observation carried forward).

Selective outcome reporting

Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun and the outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol

or the protocol was published after the trial has begun, reporting of serious adverse events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.

Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome of serious adverse events were not reported on.

High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

Other risks of bias

Low risk of bias: If the trial appears to be free of other components (for example, academic bias or for-profit bias) that could put it at risk of bias.

Unclear risk of bias: If the trial may or may not be free of other components that could put it at risk of bias.

High risk of bias: If there are other factors in the trial that could put it at risk of bias (for example, authors conducted trials on the same topic, for- profit bias, etc.).

Overall risk of bias

Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified as overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified as 'low risk of bias'.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

High risk of bias: The trial will be classified as 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified as 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective out- come reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results with overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary conclusions will be presented in the summary of findings tables.

BMJ Open

Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in children and adolescents with overweight and obesity. A protocol for systematic review with metaanalysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036058.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Jul-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Rashid, Rajeeb; NHS Lothian - West Lothian Healthcare Division, Paediatrics Condon, Laura; University of Nottingham, School of Medicine Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Jakobsen, Janus; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; Holbaek Sygehus, Department of Cardiology Lindschou, Jane; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research
Primary Subject Heading :	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Mental health, Nutrition and metabolism
Keywords:	PAEDIATRICS, Paediatric endocrinology < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Child & adolescent psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY
	•

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 <u>licence</u>.

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 <u>Creative Commons</u> 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.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Page 2 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

3	review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis
4	
5	Rashid R ¹ , Condon L ² , Gluud C ³ , Jakobsen JC ^{3,4,5} , Lindschou JC ³ , and Lissau I ^{6,7}
6	
7	Affiliations
8	¹ Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston, United Kingdom.
9	² School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Medical School, Nottingham, United Kingdom.
10	³ Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen
11	University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
12	⁴ Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Denmark.
13	⁵ Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Health Sciences, University of
14	Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark.
15	⁶ Clinical Research Centre, University Hospital Copenhagen, Hvidovre, Denmark.
16	⁷ Department of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Lund, Lund, Sweden.
17	
18	
19	Correspondence to
20	Dr Rajeeb Rashid
21	Postal Address: Paediatric Unit, Department of Child Health, St John's Hospital, Livingston,
22	United Kingdom, EH54 6PP
23	Telephone Number: 0044 – 7984405808
24	Email: rajeeb.rashid@nhs.net/ rajeeb.rashid@nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk
25	
26	Word Count 2976

Psychotherapy versus treatment as usual and other control interventions in

children and adolescents with overweight and obesity. A protocol for systematic

2

1	
2	
3 ⊿	
4	
5	
7	
, 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
25 24	
24 25	
25	
20	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40 41	
41 42	
42 43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59 60	
111	

28 ABSTRACT

Introduction The prevalence of children with overweight and obesity is increasing worldwide. Multi-component interventions incorporating diet, physical activity, and behavioural change have shown limited improvement to body mass index (BMI). However, the impact of psychotherapy is poorly explored. This systematic review aims to assess the effects of psychotherapeutic approaches for children with all degrees of overweight.

34 Methods and analysis We will include randomised clinical trials involving children and adolescents between 0-18 years with overweight and obesity, irrespective of publication type, 35 year, status, or language up to April 2020. Psychotherapy will be compared with no 36 intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical 37 placebo. The following databases will be searched: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled 38 Trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, PubMed, and 39 40 Web of Science, CINAHL and LILACS. Primary outcomes will be BMI z-score, quality of life measured by a validated scale and proportion of patients with serious adverse events. 41 42 Secondary outcomes will be body weight, self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and proportion of patients with non-serious adverse events. Exploratory outcomes will be body fat, muscle mass 43 and serious adverse events. Study inclusion, data extraction and bias risk assessments will be 44 conducted independently by at least two authors. We will assess risk of bias according to 45 Cochrane guidelines and the Cochrane EPOC guidance. We will use meta-analysis and control 46 risks of random errors with Trial Sequential Analysis. The quality of the evidence will be 47 assessed using GRADE. The systematic review will be reported according to PRISMA and 48 Cochrane guidelines. 49

50 **Ethics and Dissemination** As individual patient data will not be included, we do not require 51 ethics approval. This review will be published in a peer review journal.

52 **PROSPERO registration number**: CRD42018086458

Page 4 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Keywords: Obesity, overweight, children, adolescents, psychotherapy, intervention,
treatment, systematic review.

56 Article summary

57 Strength and limitations of the study

- This review will be the first systematic review of randomised controlled trials to investigate the benefits and harms of psychotherapy in children with overweight following Cochrane methodology.
- The review will perform meta-analysis, Trial Sequential Analysis and use Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Tool (GRADE).
- This protocol has been registered on PROSPERO and aims to demonstrate a rigorous,
 methodical approach to our systematic review and thus reduce the risk of bias.
- We expect high heterogeneity across studies which may lead to challenges in performing a meta-analysis.
 - It is anticipated that many papers will not provide sufficient details on all variables of interest and will lead to reliance on communication with corresponding authors for additional information.
- 72 INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of overweight is increasing worldwide both among children and adults irrespective of income (1-3). The rate of overweight in the paediatric population has risen worldwide over the last few decades (4) despite significant resources being spent on reversing these trends. This widens health inequality, as the prevalence of children with overweight is higher in areas of social deprivation (5). Recent data from the World Health Organization continues to show an increasing prevalence of children with obesity in Europe (6, 7). The Page 5 of 28

 BMJ Open

International Task Force of Obesity produced age and sex specific cut-off for the definition of overweight and obesity in children (8). Throughout this paper, children and adolescents between 0-18 years will be referred to as children. Children with all degrees of overweight including obese and morbidly obese will be referred to as overweight in the remaining part of the paper.

Overweight has both short-term and long-term consequences on cardio-vascular disease, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome and cancer, resulting in a significant burden on health services across the world (9). The severity of these comorbidities typically increases with the severity of overweight (10, 11). Mental health sequelae such as poor self-esteem, anxiety and depression may result in bullying, discrimination, long-term socioeconomic disadvantages and is often coupled with difficult family circumstances (12-16).

92 As such, psychological variables such as quality of life, self-esteem, life events, parental 93 attitudes, eating disorders and anxiety need to be addressed in the long-term treatment 94 of overweight and obesity. Psycho-education, cognitive behavioural therapy, solution-based 95 therapy, including systemic therapy, and psychodynamic counselling are used (17-19). Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

97 Psychotherapeutic interventions

Psychotherapy is widely used in the management of children with overweight. It may support the child to change and maintain more weight-friendly habits whilst also potentially improving body image, self-esteem and social adaptation (20). Several types of psychotherapy are used in the treatment of children with overweight. Solution focused brief therapy might be an effective modality for weight management in children through helping them to use their inner resources (21, 22). Motivational interviewing appears to be a beneficial communication tool for initiating and maintaining healthy habits and weight reduction through self-help or self-

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> determination (23-27). Family therapy is a form of systemic therapy, widely used to treat children with overweight, often as part of multi-component programs (28-34). Cognitive-behavioural therapy is a very widely used form of psychotherapy that has been used to treat children with overweight (35-37). Group psychotherapy is an alternative to individual programs for supporting weight loss in teenagers (36, 38). Interpersonal therapy is most commonly used to treat low mood, depression and disordered eating with studies showing indications of its efficacy in decreasing the weight gain in teenage girls with overweight (39-41). Finally, psycho-dynamic therapy emphasises the systematic study of the psychological drivers that underlie human behaviour, feelings, and emotions associated with weight gain (42). Psychotherapeutic approaches thus seek to support the child and their parents towards a healthier weight in the child.

- 3 116
- 117 Systematic reviews on interventions

The effects of interventions for children with overweight have been analysed recently in Cochrane reviews (43-45). Quality of life was included in only two of these reviews, showing no effects in children after end of intervention (44, 45). A moderate improvement of healthrelated quality of life in the intervention groups was seen in older children (P=0.01), but the evidence was uncertain (44, 45). In pre-school children, multi-component interventions showed reductions in BMI (P<0.00001) and improvements in some markers of quality of life (43).

, 125

Overall, systematic reviews have not shown that structured interventions in children with overweight are associated with an increased risk of depression or anxiety and may result in a mild reduction in symptoms (46). Similarly, a very recent systematic review demonstrated that paediatric obesity treatment improves self-esteem and body image in the short and medium term. These findings may underpin improvements in other psychological outcomes (47). Page 7 of 28

 However, a 5 year follow-up study in adolescents with morbid obesity who underwent bariatric surgery demonstrated no significant improvement of self-esteem (48). Potentially, a small proportion of participants may be at risk of developing worsening pathology, which clinicians should monitor, whilst treatment of weight concerns should be considered within treatment plans for young people with depression and obesity (46). Identification of these young people and provision of additional support may improve treatment outcomes whilst benefits to psychological well-being following treatment should be considered when assessing treatment success.

Whilst previous reviews have commented upon the significant risk of bias in many studies,
none of the earlier reviews have consistently assessed the risk of bias, the risk of random
errors, or assessed the overall evidence certainty with GRADE (49-58).

¹ 143

Objective

The objective of this systematic review will be to assess the benefits and harms of psychotherapy versus no intervention in children with all degrees of overweight (including all levels of obesity); wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy or pharmaceutical placebo. Benefits will include a reduction of BMI z-score or body weight and quality of life whilst harms will include developing eating disorders.

7 150

9 151 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

This systematic review protocol has been developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines (59) (Additional File 1). We will assess the beneficial and harmful effects of psychotherapy for in children with overweight taking risks of bias (systematic errors), risks of play of chance **BMJ** Open

(random errors), type of psychotherapy and control interventions and GRADE assessments into consideration.

Criteria for Considering Studies for this Review

Types of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of language, publication status, publication type or publication year will be searched for and include benefits and harms. We will follow PICO criteria as per the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions for inclusion and exclusion criteria (60). Eligible studies which are not published in English will be translated using Google translate. Authors will be contacted if necessary, for an English translation or for any clarification of their data. Data on harms from quasi-randomised studies, controlled clinical studies, and other observational studies if retrieved from our searches for randomised clinical trials will be included. Such data will be described narratively as adverse events are rarely reported in randomised clinical trials whilst such observational studies may provide information on rare or late occurring adverse events (61).

Types of participants

> All children who are overweight (including all levels of obesity) up to 18 years of age. We will also include randomised clinical trials which include children and young adults below the age of 21 years. Children with associated co-morbidities, either physical or psychological secondary to overweight and obesity will be included.

> Types of interventions

As the experimental intervention, we will include any type of solution focused brief therapy, family therapy, cognitive behavioural therapy, interpersonal therapy, or psycho-dynamic therapy as described in our introduction with the intention to treat children with overweight.

Page 9 of 28

2 3	197	The therapy can be delivered, face-to-face either individually, delivered to parents only or in
4 5	102	The therapy can be derivered, face-to-face either individually, derivered to parents only of in
5 6 7	183	groups, in any setting. The control intervention can be no intervention; wait list control;
8	184	treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical placebo.
9 10	185	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	186	There is no restriction as to who delivers the treatment or treatment duration. We will accept
	187	any co-intervention providing that they are planned to be delivered in similar fashion in both
	188	the experimental group and the control group.
18 19	189	
20 21 22	190	Types of outcomes
22 23 24	191	We will assess all outcomes at baseline and then at two time points:
25 26	192	- End of intervention, as defined by trialist (our primary time point of interest)
27 28	193	- Maximum follow up.
29 30 21	194	
31 32 33 34 35 36 37	195	Primary outcomes
	196	1. BMI z-score (kg/m ²).
	197	2. Quality of life: as measured by a scale that has been validated for use in the target
38 39	198	population (62).
40 41 42	199	3. Proportion of participants with one or more serious adverse events; that is, any
42 43 44	200	untoward medical occurrence that results in death, is life-threatening, requires
45 46	201	hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, results in persistent or
47 48	202	significant disability or incapacity (63, 64).
49 50		
51 52	203	Secondary outcomes
53 54	204	1. Body weight measured in kg.
55 56	205	2. Self-esteem.
57 58	206	3. Anxiety.
59 60	207	4. Depression.

Page 10 of 28

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

9

2 3 4 5	208	5. Proportion of participants with at least one non-serious adverse event (63, 64).
6 7	209	Exploratory outcomes
8 9	210	1. Body fat (%) measured by bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (65,
10 11 12	211	66).
12 13 14	212	2. Muscle mass (kg) via bioimpedance or Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (65, 66).
14 15 16	213	3. Individual serious adverse events and individual adverse events not considered
17 18	214	serious.
19 20 21	215	
21 22 23	216	Search methods for identification of studies
24 25	217	Electronic searches
26 27	218	Searches will include literature up to April 2020. We will search the following databases: The
28 29 20	219	Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, Excerpta Medica database (Embase), PsycINFO, Web of Science
30 31 32 33 34	220	(SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI, CCR-EXPANDED, IC), CINAHL and
	221	LILACS. Examples of keywords used in the search strategy will include: obesity, overweight,
35 36	222	psychotherapy, body mass index, weight gain, weight loss, hyperphagia and systematic
37 38 30	223	review. Controlled descriptors will be included using MeSH. A preliminary search strategy for
40 41	224	MEDLINE is enclosed as Additional File 2.
42 43	225	
44 45	226	Searching other resources
46 47	227	We will search for trials or ongoing studies on the following resources:
48 49 50	228	ClinicalTrials.gov (www.clinicaltrials.gov)
50 51 52	229	Google Scholar (<u>https://scholar.google.com/</u>)
53 54	230	 European Medicine Agency (http:// www.ema.europa.eu/ema/)
55 56	231	 United States Food and Drug Administration (ww.fda.gov)
57 58 59	232	Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency
60	233	(https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-

Page 11 of 28

1

2 3	234	healthcare-products-regulatory- agency)
4 5 6	235	The World Health Organization (<u>www.who.int/</u>) ICTRP Search Portal
7 8	236	Global Obesity Forum (previously International Association for the Study of Obesity)
9 10 11	237	(www.iaso.org)
12 13	238	• European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO) (easo.org).
14 15	239	
16 17	240	Keywords used in the search strategy
18 19 20	241	Obesity
20 21 22	242	• Overweight
23 24	243	Psychotherapy
25 26	244	Body mass index
27 28	245	Weight gain
29 30 31	246	Weight loss
32 33	247	Hyperphagia
34 35	248	Systematic review
36 37	249	A preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE is enclosed as Additional File 2.
38 39 40	250	
40 41 42	251	Data collection and analysis
43 44	252	Selection of studies
45 46	253	We will perform the review following the recommendations in the Cochrane Handbook for
47 48	254	Systematic Reviews of Interventions (60). The meta-analyses will be performed using Review
49 50 51	255	Manager and Trial Sequential Analysis program (67, 68).
52 53	256	
54 55	257	At least two authors will independently screen titles and abstracts. They will retrieve all
56 57	258	identified and relevant full text publications after which two authors will independently screen
58 59 60	259	the full text and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies.
Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Disagreement will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a with a third author. Trial selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. At least two authors will extract data. Disagreement will be resolved by discussing with a third author. We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together.

266 Data extraction and management

Data extraction will be performed by at least two authors independently using software Covidence (69), who will both compare the extracted data for primary, secondary and exploratory outcomes. Disagreements will be resolved by a third author. We will use Review Manager software to extract data (64). For outcome data not reported in a usable manner we will present this in a table outlining the characteristics of these studies using the following headings: Methods, Participants, Interventions, Outcomes and Notes described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.6.1) of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (60). Two review authors will independently transfer data into the Covidence. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a third author.

g 276

277 Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

- Allocation concealment
- Blinding of participants and treatment providers

Page 13 of 28

BMJ Open

Blinding of outcome assessment Incomplete outcome data Selective outcome reporting Other risks of bias Overall risk of bias Classification of the trials will follow criteria defined in Additional File 3. **Meta-analysis** Data will be meta-analysed using RevMan 5 statistical software (72). We will use STATA statistical software (STATA 2015) in case of zero event trials, where RevMan 5 zero event handling is insufficient (73, 74). We will assess our intervention effects with random-effects model meta-analyses and fixed-effect model meta-analyses (75-77), using the more conservative point estimate of the two (78). Three primary outcomes will be examined with $P \leq 0.025$ being statistically significant (78). An eight-step procedure will be used to assess if the thresholds for significance are crossed (78). Five secondary outcomes will be examined with $P \leq 0.017$ being statistically significant (78). The results of the exploratory outcomes will be considered hypothesis generating only. We will measure effect size using standardised mean differences using confidence intervals of 95%. Analysis of all included studies will be compared to a subgroup analysis comparing trials at low risk of bias to trials at high risk of bias. If the results do not differ, primary conclusions will be based at the overall analysis. If the results differ, primary conclusions will be based on trials at low risk of bias. A table describing the types of serious adverse events in each trial will be provided. **Trial Sequential Analysis**

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. In order to control the risks of type I errors and type II errors (58, 79, 80), Trial Sequential Analysis will be conducted on the outcomes. In order to do so we will calculate the required information size (that is the number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention effect) (79). For continuous outcomes, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.5% for our three primary outcomes and an alpha of 1.67% for our five secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10% (81). For dichotomous outcomes, we will use the proportion of participants with an outcome in the control group, a relative risk reduction of 20%, and an alpha of 2.5% for our primary outcomes and an alpha of 1.67% for secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10% (81). We will calculate risk ratios with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous outcomes. **Subgroup analysis** In order to investigate and compare different trials and interventions subgroup analysis will be performed on the following: Trials at high risk of bias trials compared to trials at low risk of bias trials. Trial stratified according to experimental interventions. Trials stratified according to weight status: overweight, obese or morbidly obese at the point of entry into the trial (8). Trials stratified according to duration of intervention, the number of in person sessions, and length of sessions in hours (82). Trials stratified if treatment fidelity was assessed or not (83). Trials stratified according to the control interventions.

Page 15 of 28

1 2 BMJ Open

3 4	337	• Complexity: trials with participants with no co-morbidities compared to trials with
5 6	338	participants pre-existing co-morbidities.
7 8	339	• Trials in which the experimental intervention was evaluated by either the parents or the
9 10 11	340	child after the treatment sessions had been delivered compared to trials in which the
11 12 13	341	experimental intervention was not evaluated by either the parents or the child after the
14 15	342	treatment sessions had been delivered.
16 17	343	
18 19	344	We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager (72).
20 21	345	
22 23 24	346	Sensitivity analysis
25 26	347	To assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will perform
27 28	348	the following sensitivity analyses.
29 30	349	• 'Best-worst-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the
31 32 22	350	experimental group had no serious adverse events, including not developing any
33 34 35	351	psychiatric disease such as an eating disorder.
36 37	352	'Worst-best-case' scenario: we will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the
38 39	353	experimental group, had a serious adverse event, for instance, developing a psychiatric
40 41	354	disease such as an eating disorder (46).
42 43 44	355	Statistical heterogeneity will be assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots and I ² statistic
45 46	356	values (78). Underlying reasons behind statistical heterogeneity in meta-analyses will be
47 48	357	investigated by assessing trial characteristics.
49 50	358	
51 52	359	Summary of findings table
55 55	360	A summary of findings table using each of the prespecified primary outcomes will be presented
56 57	361	using GRADE considerations for studies contributing data to the meta-analyses for the
58 59	362	prespecified outcomes (78, 84-97). Methods and recommendations described in Chapter 8
00		

363 (Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*364 *Interventions* (60) using GRADEpro software will be used.

DISCUSSION

This protocol intends to outline a rigorous, methodical approach to developing a systematic review to provide evidence on the potential effects of psychotherapy as an intervention for children with overweight. The protocol has been registered on PROSPERO and through peer review and publication aims to reduce the risk of bias in the future systematic review.

21 371

Currently, there is no comprehensive systematic review of psychotherapeutic interventions in the treatment of children with overweight to inform clinical practice. Previous systematic reviews in this population have considered behavioural interventions for lifestyle behaviour change as a mediating factor for weight loss initiation and maintenance (44, 45). We will also be able to assess the different types of psychotherapeutic interventions as well as their individual comparison groups (no intervention; wait list control; treatment as usual; sham psychotherapy; or pharmaceutical placebo). This review will also highlight any gaps in the evidence base of such interventions which will help to shape the development and optimisation of future interventions.

43 381

45
46382ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

383 No ethical approval required. Dissemination of results will be published in peer reviewed384 journals.

52 385

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Sarah Louise Klingenberg, Information
 Acknowledgements We would like to thank Sarah Louise Klingenberg, Information
 Specialist at the Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research for her
 guidance and assistance on developing search methods and keywords for search strategies.

1		
2 3 4	389	
5 6	390	Author contributions IL, RR, LC, CG, JCJ, and JL wrote the first draft of the protocol. RR,
7 8 0	391	IL, JCJ, CG, LC, and JL have revised the protocol. All authors critically reviewed and approved
9 10 11	392	the manuscript. IL is the guarantor of the review.
12 13	393	
14 15	394	Funding This research received no specific grants from any funding agency.
16 17	395	
18	396	Competing interests None known.
20	330	
21	397	
22		
23 24	398	Patient consent Not required.
25 26	399	
27 28 20	400	Patient and Public Involvement No patient involvement
29 30 31	401	
32 33	402	Provenance and peer review Not commissioned, externally peer reviewed.
34 35	403	
36 37 38	404	
39 40	405	REFERENCES
41	406	1. Wang Y. Lobstein T. Worldwide trends in childhood overweight and obesity. International
42	407	journal of pediatric obesity 2006;1(1):11-25.
43 44	408	2. Lobstein T. The prevention of obesity in children. Pediatric endocrinology reviews : PER.
44 45	409	2004;1 Suppl 3:471-5.
46	410	3. de Onis M, Blossner M, Borghi E. Global prevalence and trends of overweight and obesity
47	411	among preschool children. The American journal of clinical nutrition. 2010;92(5):1257-64.
48	412	4. Jebb SA, Rennie KL, Cole TJ. Prevalence of overweight and obesity among young people in
49	413	Great Britain. Public health nutrition. 2004;7(3):461-5.
50	414	5. Olstad DL, Ancilotto R, Teychenne M, Minaker LM, Taber DR, Raine KD, et al. Can targeted
51 52	415	policies reduce obesity and improve obesity-related behaviours in socioeconomically disadvantaged
53	416	populations? A systematic review. Obesity reviews: 2017.
54	417	6. WHO Europe. COSI Factsheet. Childhood Obesity Surveillance Initiative Highlights 2015-17.
55	418	Preliminary Data. 2018.
56	419	7. Growing up unequal: gender and socioeconomic differences in young people's health and
57	420	well-being. Health Behavior in school-aged children (HBSC) study. International report from the
58 59 60	421	2013/2014 survey. 2016 2016.

Page 18 of 28

17

1

2 3 422 Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child 8. 4 423 overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 5 424 2000;320(7244):1240-3. 6 425 Kumar S, Kelly AS. Review of Childhood Obesity: From Epidemiology, Etiology, and 9. 7 426 Comorbidities to Clinical Assessment and Treatment. Mayo Clinic proceedings. 2017;92(2):251-65. 8 427 10. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Moss LA, Skelton JA. Cardiometabolic Risks and Severity of Obesity in 9 10 428 Children and Young Adults. The New England journal of medicine. 2015;373(14):1307-17. 11 429 11. Kopelman P. Health risks associated with overweight and obesity. Obesity reviews : an 12 430 official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity. 2007;8 Suppl 1:13-7. 13 431 12. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, Lynch J. Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental 14 432 health problems in young children. Pediatrics. 2011;128(4):677-84. 15 433 13. Griffiths LJ, Wolke D, Page AS, Horwood JP. Obesity and bullying: different effects for boys 16 434 and girls. Arch Dis Child. 2006;91(2):121-5. 17 435 14. Gortmaker SL, Must A, Perrin JM, Sobol AM, Dietz WH. Social and economic consequences of 18 overweight in adolescence and young adulthood. The New England journal of medicine. 19 436 20 437 1993;329(14):1008-12. 21 438 Lissau I, Sorensen TI. Parental neglect during childhood and increased risk of obesity in 15. 22 439 young adulthood. Lancet (London, England). 1994;343(8893):324-7. 23 440 16. Lissau I, Breum L, Sorensen TI. Maternal attitude to sweet eating habits and risk of 24 441 overweight in offspring: a ten-year prospective population study. International journal of obesity 25 442 and related metabolic disorders : 1993;17(3):125-9. 26 Swencionis C, Rendell SL. The psychology of obesity. Abdominal imaging. 2012;37(5):733-7. 443 17. 27 444 18. RR Wing. Behavioral weight control. In: Wadden TA SA, editor. Handbook of Obesity 28 29 Treatment. New York: The Guilford Press; 2002. p. 301-16. 445 30 446 Wilfley DE, Tibbs TL, Van Buren DJ, Reach KP, Walker MS, Epstein LH. Lifestyle interventions 19. 31 447 in the treatment of childhood overweight: a meta-analytic review of randomized controlled trials. 32 448 Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological 33 Association. 2007;26(5):521-32. 449 34 450 Goldschmidt AB, Best JR, Stein RI, Saelens BE, Epstein LH, Wilfley DE. Predictors of child 20. 35 451 weight loss and maintenance among family-based treatment completers. J Consult Clin Psychol. 36 452 2014;82(6):1140-50. 37 453 Nowicka P, Flodmark CE. Family therapy as a model for treating childhood obesity: useful 38 21. 39 454 tools for clinicians. Clinical child psychology and psychiatry. 2011;16(1):129-45. 40 455 Flodmark CE OT, Ryden O, Sveger T. Prevention of Progression to severe obesity in a group 22. 41 456 of obese schoolchildren treated with family therapy. Pedaitrics. 1993;91(5):880-4. 42 457 23. Flattum C, Friend S, Story M, Neumark-Sztainer D. Evaluation of an individualized counseling 43 458 approach as part of a multicomponent school-based program to prevent weight-related problems 44 459 among adolescent girls. J Am Diet Assoc. 2011;111(8):1218-23. 45 460 24. Andre N, Beguier S. Using motivational interviewing as a supplement to physical activity 46 461 program in obese adolescents: a RCT study. Eat Weight Disord. 2015;20(4):519-23. 47 48 462 25. Bean MK, Powell P, Quinoy A, Ingersoll K, Wickham EP, 3rd, Mazzeo SE. Motivational 49 463 interviewing targeting diet and physical activity improves adherence to paediatric obesity treatment: 50 464 results from the MI Values randomized controlled trial. Pediatr Obes. 2015;10(2):118-25. 51 465 26. Warschburger P, Kroeller K, Haerting J, Unverzagt S, van Egmond-Frohlich A. Empowering 52 466 Parents of Obese Children (EPOC): A randomized controlled trial on additional long-term weight 53 467 effects of parent training. Appetite. 2016;103:148-56. 54 468 27. Resnicow K, McMaster F. Motivational Interviewing: moving from why to how with 55 autonomy support. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 9,19 (2012) 469 56 Moens E, Braet C, Van Winckel M. An 8-year follow-up of treated obese children: children's, 57 470 28. 58 471 process and parental predictors of successful outcome. Behaviour research and therapy. 59 472 2010;48(7):626-33. 60

2		
3	473	29. Best JR, Goldschmidt AB, Mockus-Valenzuela DS, Stein RI, Epstein LH, Wilfley DE. Shared
4	474	weight and dietary changes in parent-child dyads following family-based obesity treatment. Health
5	475	Psychol. 2016;35(1):92-5.
6 7	476	30. Van Allen J, Borner KB, Gayes LA, Steele RG. Weighing physical activity: the impact of a
/ Q	477	family-based group lifestyle intervention for pediatric obesity on participants' physical activity. J
9	478	Pediatr Psychol. 2015:40(2):193-202.
10	479	31 liang IX Xia XI Greiner T Lian GL Rosengvist LL A two year family based behaviour
11	480	treatment for obese children. Arch Dis Child. 2005;90(12):1235-8
12	400 //81	32 Savove M Shaw M Dziura I Tamborlane WV Rose P Guandalini C et al. Effects of a weight
13	401	management program on body composition and metabolic parameters in overweight children: a
14	402	randomized controlled trial IAMA 2007:207(24):2607 704
15	405	Parkowitz PL Wadden TA Tershakovec AM Cronquist II. Pohavier therapy and cibutramine
16	484	33. Berkowitz Ri, Wadden TA, Tersnakovec Awi, Cronquist JL. Benavior therapy and sibutrainine
17	485	for the treatment of adolescent obesity: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2003;289(14):1805-12.
18	486	34. Brontenbrenner U. Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research
19	487	perspectives. Development Psychology. 1986;22(6):723.
20	488	35. Braet C, Tanghe A, Decaluwe V, Moens E, Rosseel Y. Inpatient treatment for children with
21	489	obesity: weight loss, psychological well-being, and eating behavior. J Pediatr Psychol.
22	490	2004;29(7):519-29.
23	491	36. Luzier JL BK, Weeks JW. Behavioral treatment of pediatric obesity: review and future
25	492	directions. Children's Health Care. 2010;39(4):312-34.
26	493	37. Herrera EA JCSR. A comparison of cognitive and behavioral treatments for pediatric obesity.
27	494	Children's Health Care. 2004;33(2):151-67.
28	495	38. Nowicka P, Hoglund P, Pietrobelli A, Lissau I, Flodmark CE. Family Weight School treatment:
29	496	1-year results in obese adolescents. International journal of pediatric obesity : 2008;3(3):141-7.
30	497	39. Tanofsky-Kraff M, Wilfley DE, Young JF, Mufson L, Yanovski SZ, Glasofer DR, et al. A pilot
31	498	study of interpersonal psychotherapy for preventing excess weight gain in adolescent girls at-risk for
32	499	obesity. Int J Eat Disord. 2010;43(8):701-6.
33	500	40. Fenner AA, Howie EK, Davis MC, Straker LM, Relationships between psychosocial outcomes
34	501	in adolescents who are obese and their parents during a multi-disciplinary family-based healthy
35 26	502	lifestyle intervention: One-year follow-up of a waitlist controlled trial (Curtin University's Activity.
30	503	Food and Attitudes Program). Health Qual Life Outcomes, 2016;14(1):100
38	503	41 Tanofsky-Kraff M Shomaker LB Wilfley DE Young JE Shrocco T Stephens M et al Targeted
39	505	nrevention of excess weight gain and eating disorders in high-risk adolescent girls: a randomized
40	505	controlled trial Am I Clin Nutr 2014:100(A):1010-8
41	500	A2 Bruch H. Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anarexia Nervosa and the Person Within New York:
42	507	Pacie Dooks: 1072
43	500	A2 Colouitt II. Loveman E. O'Mallov C. Azovede LP. Mead E. Al Khudainy L. et al. Diet. nhycical
44	509	45. Colquitt JL, Edverhalt E, O Malley C, Azevedo LB, Medd E, Al-Kildually L, et al. Diet, physical
45	510	activity, and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight of obesity in preschool
46	511	contraire up to the age of 6 years. Countaire database of systematic reviews (Online).
4/	512	2016;3:CD012105.
48	513	44. Al-Knudairy L, Loveman E, Colquitt JL, Mead E, Jonnson RE, Fraser H, et al. Diet, physical
49 50	514	activity and behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese adolescents aged 12
51	515	to 17 years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012691.
52	516	45. Mead E, Brown T, Rees K, Azevedo LB, Whittaker V, Jones D, et al. Diet, physical activity and
53	517	behavioural interventions for the treatment of overweight or obese children from the age of 6 to 11
54	518	years. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online). 2017;6:CD012651.
55	519	46. Jebeile H, Gow ML, Baur LA, Garnett SP, Paxton SJ, Lister NB. Association of Pediatric Obesity
56	520	Treatment, Including a Dietary Component, With Change in Depression and Anxiety: A Systematic
57	521	Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA pediatrics. 2019:e192841.
58		
59		
60		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Gow ML, Tee MSY, Garnett SP, Baur LA, Aldwell K, Thomas S, et al. Pediatric obesity 47. treatment, self-esteem, and body image: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Pediatric obesity. 2020;15(3):e12600. 48. Jarvholm K, Bruze G, Peltonen M, Marcus C, Flodmark CE, Henfridsson P, et al. 5-year mental health and eating pattern outcomes following bariatric surgery in adolescents: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet Child & adolescent health. 2020;4(3):210-9. 49. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Annals of internal medicine. 2001;135(11):982-9. Schunemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Brozek J, Etxeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, Mustafa RA, Manja V, et al. 50. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks for adoption, adaptation, and de novo development of trustworthy recommendations: GRADE-ADOLOPMENT. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2017;81:101-10. 51. Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess. 2012;16(35):1-82. 52. Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised, controlled trials. Annals of internal medicine. 2012;157. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of 53. methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. Jama. 1995;273(5):408-12. 54. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Juni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2008;336(7644):601-5. Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research 55. outcome. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2012;12:Mr000033. 56. Moher D, Pham B, Jones A, Cook DJ, Jadad AR, Moher M, et al. Does quality of reports of randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet (London, England). 1998;352(9128):609-13. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, Gluud C. Estimating required information size by 57. quantifying diversity in a random-effects meta-analysis. BMC medical research methodology. 2009;9. Wetterslev J, Jakobsen JC, Gluud C. Trial Sequential Analysis in systematic reviews with 58. meta-analysis. BMC medical research methodology. 2017;17(1):39. 59. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic reviews. 2015;4(1):1. Collaboration TC. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Wiley-60. Blackwell; 2008. 61. Storebo OJ, Pedersen N, Ramstad E, Kielsholm ML, Nielsen SS, Krogh HB, et al. Methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents -assessment of adverse events in non-randomised studies. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2018;5:Cd012069. 62. Ahuja B, Klassen AF, Satz R, Malhotra N, Tsangaris E, Ventresca M, et al. A review of patient-reported outcomes for children and adolescents with obesity. Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation. 2014;23(3):759-70. ICH-GCP, editor ICH harmonised tripartite guideline. Clinical safety data management: 63. definitions and standards for expedited reporting E2A. International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use; 1994.

Page 21 of 28

BMJ Open

1		20
2		
3	572	64 ICH CCD aditor ICH barmonicad guidaling Integrated Addandum to ICH EE(P1); Cuidaling
4	572	64. ICH-GCP, eutor ICH harmonised guideline. Integrated Addendum to ICH Ed(K1). Guideline
5	5/3	for Bhomes souties is for there a list 2010
6	574	for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use; 2016.
7	575	65. Pietrobelli A, Rubiano F, St-Onge MP, Heymsfield SB. New bioimpedance analysis system:
8	576	improved phenotyping with whole-body analysis. European journal of clinical nutrition.
9	577	2004;58(11):1479-84.
10	578	66. Kabiri LS, Hernandez DC, Mitchell K. Reliability, Validity, and Diagnostic Value of a Pediatric
11	579	Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis Scale. Child Obes. 2015;11(5):650-5.
12	580	67. Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5). In: Centre NC, editor. The Cochrane Collaboration. 5.3 ed.
13	581	Copenhagen: The Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.
14 1 <i>г</i>	582	68. Thorlund K EJ, Wetterslev J, Brok J, Imberger G et al. User manual for trial sequential analysis
15	583	(TSA). 2011.
10	584	69. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne. Australia: Veritas Health Innovation.
12	585	70. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane
19	586	Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials BMI (Clinical research ed)
20	587	2011-343-d5928
21	507	71 Sathi NI Safi S Nielson EE Eainhard I Gluud C Jakahsan IC The affects of rhythm control
22	200	strategies versus rate control strategies for atrial fibrillation and atrial flutter: a protocol for a
23	509	strategies versus rate control strategies for athan hormation and athan nutter, a protocol for a
24	590	systematic review with meta-analysis and that sequential Analysis. Systematic reviews.
25	591	2017;6(1):47.
26	592	72. Collaboration C. Review Manager. Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2014.
27	593	73. StataCorp. StataCorp Statistical Software. Release 14 ed. College Station: StataCorp LP; 2014.
28	594	74. Sweeting MJ, Sutton AJ, Lambert PC. What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of
29	595	continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data. Statistics in medicine. 2004;23(9):1351-75.
30	596	75. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled clinical trials.
31	597	1986;7(3):177-88.
32	598	76. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemporary clinical trials.
33 24	599	2015;45(Pt A):139-45.
34 25	600	77. Demets DL. Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations.
36	601	Statistics in medicine. 1987:6(3):341-50.
30	602	78. Jakobsen JC. Wettersley J. Winkel P. Lange T. Gluud C. Thresholds for statistical and clinical
38	603	significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods BMC Med Res Methodol
39	604	
40	605	79 Wettersley I Thorlund K Brok I Gluud C Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm
41	606	avidance is reached in sumulative meta analysis lournal of clinical enidemiology 2008;61(1):64.75
42	607	Wettercley I. Therlynd K. Brek I. Churd C. Estimating required information size by
43	607	80. Wetterstev J, monunu K, Blok J, Gludu C. Estimating required information size by
44	608	quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. Bivic medical research methodology.
45	609	
46	610	81. Castellini G, Nielsen EE, Gluud C. Comment on: "Cell therapy for heart disease: Trial
47	611	sequential analyses of two cochrane reviews". Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics. 2016.
48	612	82. Heerman WJ, JaKa MM, Berge JM, Trapl ES, Sommer EC, Samuels LR, et al. The dose of
49	613	behavioral interventions to prevent and treat childhood obesity: a systematic review and meta-
50	614	regression. The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity. 2017;14(1):157.
51	615	83. JaKa MM, Haapala JL, Trapl ES, Kunin-Batson AS, Olson-Bullis BA, Heerman WJ, et al.
52 52	616	Reporting of treatment fidelity in behavioural paediatric obesity intervention trials: a systematic
55 57	617	review. Obesity reviews : 2016;17(12):1287-300.
54	618	84. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P. et al. GRADE: an
56	619	emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMI (Clinical
57	620	research ed) 2008-336(7650)-924-6
58	020	
59		
60		

BMJ Open

21

 621 85. Schunemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, Oxman AD. Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMA1: Canadian Medical Association gournal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2003;169(7):677-80. 86. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE guidelines: a new geries of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):380-2. 87. Garattini S, Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Berthele' V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. 88. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(745):1490. 89. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):335-40. 90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Klunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):405-400. 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of Clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1207-82. 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, He	2		
 communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal - journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2003;169(7):677-80. G. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knothreurs A. GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):380-2. S. Garattini S, Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Berthele' V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. Ba Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Flack-Ytter Y, Flortorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490. By Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. Ou Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 400. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence-study limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(2):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):12794- 202. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):12794- 202. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical e	3	621	85. Schunemann HJ. Best D. Vist G. Oxman AD. Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to
 journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2003;169(7):677-80. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunermann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Journal of Clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):380-2. Garattini S, Jakobsen JC, Wetterstev J, Berthele' V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. B. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1400. B. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Aki EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kutz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- doi. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kutz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. Cluyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidenceinclination of Linical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1274-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sutna S, Glasziou P, Al Ka, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):12	4	622	communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association
 Bitcher State and State	5	623	iournal = iournal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2003:169(7):677-80
 Generation of the second second	6	624	86 Guvatt GH Oxman AD Schunemann HI Tugwell P Knottnerus A GRADE guidelines: a new
 2011;64(4):380-2. 2011;64(3):380-2. 2011;64(4):380-2. 2011;64(3):380-2. 2012;64(3):380-2. 2012;64(3):380-2. 2013;64(3):380-2. 2013;64(3):380-2. 2013;64(3):380-2. 2013;64(3):380-2. 2014;64(3):380-2. 2014;64(3):380-2. 2014;64(3):380-2. 2014;64(3):380-2. 2015;64(3):440. 2014;64(3):440. 2014;64(4):421. 2014;64(12):1224. 402. 414. 414.	7	625	series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Enidemiology Journal of clinical enidemiology
 Dull, out, J.S. Garattini, S. Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Berthele' V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based Clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. 88. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter V, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):14490. 89. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GANDE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. 90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 400. 637 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 400. 2011;64(4):407-15. 402. 403. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 403. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 404. 405. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 404. 405. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 404. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Berfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 405. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 406. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Gl	8	625	
 b) b) b	9	020	2011;04(4):380-2.
 clinical practice: overview of threats to the Validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32. 629 88. Atkins D, Best D, Bris PA, Eccles M, Falk-Ytter Y, Flottor S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490. 631 89. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. 11troduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. 633 90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395-400. 637 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. 640 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 741 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 742 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 743 Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 744 302. 745 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 746 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 75 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Batsou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 76 96. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Batsou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. 77 60, Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glassiou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. 78 65 Appendices 79 6, Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Gl	10 11	627	87. Garattini S, Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Berthele V, Banzi R, Rath A, et al. Evidence-based
 Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Hottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BmJ. 2004;328(7454):1490. By Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Xuz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 400. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Mutori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 302. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sutan S, Glasziou P, Akle A, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Gat Buyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sutan S, Glasziou P, Akle A, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Sating up the quality of evidenceincursistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sutan S, Glasziou P, Akle A, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating up the quality of evidence indicet estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. <li< td=""><td>17</td><td>628</td><td>clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32.</td></li<>	17	628	clinical practice: overview of threats to the validity of evidence. Eur J Intern Med. 2016;32.
 evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Aki EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Prozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. O. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Xitz R, Ktkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 400. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Gu P. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 302. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Su Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glaziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Gr Auditional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	12	629	88. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of
 Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 400. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 302. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glaszlou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):131-6. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glaszlou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Sutien S, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glaszlou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12.<!--</td--><td>14</td><td>630</td><td>evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490.</td>	14	630	evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj. 2004;328(7454):1490.
632 Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical 633 epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. 90 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing 635 the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- 636 400. 91 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. 638 Rating the quality of evidence-study limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. 92 640 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating 651 the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 762 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 643 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 644 302. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 646 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. 647 S0. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P,	15	631	89. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1.
 epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1278-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: Rating the quality of evidence - Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 96. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 654 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 655 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	16	632	Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal of clinical
 90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. 82. Rating the quality of evidence-study limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 84. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 84. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1244- 302. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 84. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 10. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 97. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 98. Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 99. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	17	633	epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383-94.
 the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395-400. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1244- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1244- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akur R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. GST Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised tri	18	634	90. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing
 400. 637 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. 638 Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating 640 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 643 Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 644 302. 645 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 646 84. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 647 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 648 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 649 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. 649 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(2):1311-6. 649 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sattanso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 653 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sattasso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 654 Appendices 655 4 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 656 657 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at	19	635	the question and deciding on important outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):395-
 91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):407-15. 20. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 33. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 302. 44. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 457. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 458. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 459. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 464 465 465 466 466 466 467 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 469 469 469 461 461 461 461 461 461 462 463 464 464 465 466 466 466 467 468 468 468 468 468 468 469 468 469 469	20	636	400.
 Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(1):407-15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Seature GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. GY. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Künz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	21	637	91. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4.
 639 2011;64(4):407-15. 640 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. 78. 643 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. 78. 644 302. 645 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 88. 646 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 98. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 99. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 91. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 97. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 653 654 654 Appendices 655 656 Appendices 658 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	22	638	Rating the quality of evidencestudy limitations (risk of bias). Journal of clinical epidemiology.
 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 302. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sautso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 658 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	23	639	2011:64(4):407-15.
 the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidenceinconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: Rating the quality of evidence Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. G2 G3 G4 G4 G4 G55 G4 G4 G55 G56 Appendices Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	24	640	92. Guvatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating
 93. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence—inconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence—indirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1313-31. 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	25	641	the quality of evidencepublication bias. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1277-82.
 G42 55. Colynet Gr, Canton RG, Rating HC, Canton RG, Rating HC, Canton RG, Rating the quality of evidence—inconsistency. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1294- G43 302. G45 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence—indirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. G47 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: G48 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. G49 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: G50 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. G53 Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. G54 Appendices G55 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. G58 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). G59 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	26	642	93 Guvatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock I, Brozek I, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7
 645 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	27 20	6/2	Bating the quality of evidence-inconsistency, Journal of clinical enidemiology, 2011;64(12):1294-
 944 502. 944 502. 94. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. 848 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 98. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 655 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	20 20	644	
 G43 G43 G44 G44 G44 G44 G44 G44 G44 G44	30	044 645	SUZ.
646 Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10. 33 647 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 34 648 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 35 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 36 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all 36 outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 36 652 97. 37. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 38 652 97. 39 Cuyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 39 Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 4013;66(2):158-72. 655 41 656 42 657 43 658 44 658 459 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 53 659 54 55 <tr< td=""><td>31</td><td>045</td><td>94. Guyatt GR, Oxman AD, Kunz K, WOOdcock J, Brozek J, Henand W, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8.</td></tr<>	31	045	94. Guyatt GR, Oxman AD, Kunz K, WOOdcock J, Brozek J, Henand W, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8.
 647 95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Giaszlou P, AKI EA, Alonso-Coelio P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glaszlou P, Alonso-Coelio P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	32	646	Rating the quality of evidenceindirectness. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1303-10.
 648 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of Clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6. 96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 655 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	33	647	95. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glaszlou P, Aki EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines:
 Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: I1. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	34	648	9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(12):1311-6.
 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 654 2013;66(2):158-72. 655 456 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	35	649	96. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines:
 outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 655 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	36	650	11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all
 652 97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. 7 Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 655 656 657 658 658 658 659 659 659 659 659 659 659 659 650 659 659 650 659 650 650 650 650 651 652 652 653 654 655 655 655 655 656 657 658 659 659 659 659 659 650 650 650 650 650 650 651 652 652 652 653 654 655 655 655 656 657 658 659 659 659 650 <	37	651	outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):151-7.
 Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2013;66(2):158-72. 656 657 656 657 658 658 658 658 659 650 659 650 650 650 650 651 652 653 654 655 655 655 656 657 658 659 659 659 659 650 659 650 6	38	652	97. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12.
 40 654 2013;66(2):158-72. 42 655 44 656 Appendices 457 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 48 49 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 41 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	39	653	Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. Journal of clinical epidemiology.
 655 656 Appendices 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	40	654	2013;66(2):158-72.
 ⁴² 655 ⁴³ 656 Appendices ⁴⁶ 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. ⁴⁸ 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). ⁵¹ 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. ⁵³ 657 ⁵⁴ 758 	41		
 Appendices Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	42	655	
 ⁴⁴ 656 Appendices ⁴⁶ 657 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. ⁴⁸ 658 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). ⁵¹ 659 Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. ⁵³ 54 ⁵⁴ 55 ⁵⁶ 57 ⁵⁸ 8 	43 44		
 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	44 15	656	Appendices
 Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist. Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	46		
 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	47	657	Additional File 1: Prisma-P+ checklist.
 Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias. 	48		
Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias.	49	658	Additional File 2: Preliminary search strategy for MEDI INE (Ovid).
Additional File 3: Classification of randomised trials at low and at high risk of bias.	50	000	
 Additional File 5. Classification of randomised thats at low and at high fisk of blas. 54 55 56 57 58 	51	650	Additional File 2: Classification of randomicod trials at low and at high risk of high
53 54 55 56 57 58	52	059	Auditional The 5. Classification of randomised thats at low and at high tisk of blas.
54 55 56 57 58	53		
55 56 57 58	54		
56 57 58	55		
57 58	56		
20	5/		
50	50 50		
60	60		

BMJ Open 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 statements Paviews 2015 4:1 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 - Money D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Systematic Reviews* 2016 5:15

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Informatio	on reported	Line number(s)
ADMINISTRATIVE IN	NFORMA [®]		165	NO	
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Х		2
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such		Х	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract		X	52
Authors					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide paysical mailing address of corresponding author	X		5-24
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review $\frac{1}{2}$	Х		390-392
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, deruify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments		X	
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Х		394
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Х		394
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol		X	
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Х		72-142
		aphique ue	() BioN	led Central



de

		BMJ Open BMJ Open SMJ			Page 24 2
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information Yes	n reported No	Line number(s)
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	X		144-157
METHODS		s seiger reig			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and reported in the characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria and the eligibility for the review	X		159-188
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study at the study at trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	X		216-249
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including	X		Additional File 2
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the eview	Х		252-255
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) to get each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analyss)	X		257-264
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	X		266-275
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	X		Additional File 2
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and graditional outcomes, with rationale	X		190-214
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 deta synthesis	X		Additional File 3; 277-291
DATA					
	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	X		293-324
Synthesis	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 for consistency (e.g., <i>I</i> ² , Kendall's tau)	X		293-324
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	Х		326-357

Page	25	of	28
------	----	----	----

1	
2	
3	Se
4	
5	
6 7	
/ 0	
o Q	Mo
10	
11	Со
12	cui
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
21 22	
22	
23	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34 25	
35 26	
30 37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

f 28		BMJ Open	d by copyright,	njopen-2019-0:	
ection/topic	#	Checklist item	includir	36058 01	
		regression)	ן חg fo		
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	r us	ove F	
eta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, reporting within studies)	Srelat	nove Wer 2	
onfidence in mulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	ted to t	020. Do	
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtr	and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	nloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l	

	Informatio	Line	
	Yes	No	number(s)
		Х	
Э	Х		Additional file 3
	X		359-364



Additional File 2

NOTES: unless stated otherwise, search terms are free text terms; MeSH: Medical subject heading (Medline medical index term); an asterisk (*) stands for 'any character(s)', a question mark stands for 'one or no character'.

- 1. exp Obesity/
- 2. exp Hyperphagia/
- 3. exp body mass index/
- 4. exp Weight Gain/
- 5. exp Weight Loss/
- 6. exp Anti-Obesity Agents/

7. (Pickwick* syndrom* or Prader willi syndrom* or obes* or adipos* or overweight* or 'over weight*' or overeat* or 'over eat*' or 'over feed*' or overfeed* or binge eating disorder* or 'fat overload' syndrom*).mp. or (weight and (gain or cycling or reduc* or loss or losing or maint* or decreas* or watch* or diet* or control*)).ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

- 8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
- 9. exp PSYCHOTHERAPY/

10. (psycho* or counsel* or depression or depressiv* or balint or crisis intervention* or assert* near training or ((person or client) and cent*) or psychodrama* or psycho drama* or paradoxic* techni* or rational emoti* or role play* or relax* near train* or socioenvironment* or socio environment* or sociotherap* or transactional).mp. or behavio?r modific*.ti,ab. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

11. ((interpersonal or art or aversion or behavio?r or colo?r or cognitiv* or dance or gestalt or music or milieu or nondirectiv* or non directiv* or problem solving or problemsolving or self control or selfcontrol or play or reality or socio or supportiv*) and therap*).ti,ab.

- 12. 9 or 10 or 11
- 13. 8 and 12

14. (random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

15. 13 and 14

16. limit 15 to (("all infant (birth to 23 months)" or "all child (0 to 18 years)" or "newborn infant (birth to 1 month)" or "infant (1 to 23 months)" or "preschool child (2 to 5 years)" or "child (6 to 12 years)" or "adolescent (13 to 18 years)" or "young adult (19 to 24 years)") and humans)

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Random sequence generation

Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.

Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.

High risk: If the allocation sequence is not randomised or only quasi-randomised. These trials will be excluded.

Allocation concealment

Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, onsite locked computer or identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes.

Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.

High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

Blinding of participants and treatment providers

Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.

Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.

Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.

High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

Incomplete outcome data

Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes, or (2) the numbers and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive. Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.

High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (e.g. last observation carried forward).

Selective outcome reporting

Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun and the outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol

or the protocol was published after the trial has begun, reporting of serious adverse events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.

Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome of serious adverse events were not reported on.

High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

Other risks of bias

Low risk of bias: If the trial appears to be free of other components (for example, academic bias or for-profit bias) that could put it at risk of bias.

Unclear risk of bias: If the trial may or may not be free of other components that could put it at risk of bias.

High risk of bias: If there are other factors in the trial that could put it at risk of bias (for example, authors conducted trials on the same topic, for- profit bias, etc.).

Overall risk of bias

Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified as overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified as 'low risk of bias'.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

High risk of bias: The trial will be classified as 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified as 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective out- come reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results with overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary conclusions will be presented in the summary of findings tables.