

## Appendix 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) checklist

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Section of manuscript reported
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Title:</b>			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1, Title
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	n/a
<b>Registration</b>	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Page 2, PROSPERO registration number: CRD42022318180
<b>Authors:</b>			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1, Line 3-20
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 14, Line 371-375
<b>Amendments</b>	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state	n/a

		plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
<b>Support:</b>			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Page 15, Line 381-383
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Page 15, Line 381-383
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Page 15, Line 381-383
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
<b>Rationale</b>	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Page 3-5, Introduction
<b>Objectives</b>	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Page 6, Objectives
<b>METHODS</b>			
<b>Eligibility criteria</b>	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Page 6, Eligibility criteria
<b>Information</b>	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases,	Page 7-8, Search strategy

<b>sources</b>		contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
<b>Search strategy</b>	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Page 8, Table 1
<b>Study records:</b>			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Page 11, Line 287-293 and Page 13, Line 334-338
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Page 9-10, Guideline selection and Page 18 Figure 1
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Page 12, Data extraction
<b>Data items</b>	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Page 12, Data extraction
<b>Outcomes and prioritization</b>	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Page 12, Recommendations extraction
<b>Risk of bias in</b>	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual	Page 10, Quality assessment

<b>individual studies</b>		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	
<b>Data synthesis</b>	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	n/a
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as $I^2$ , Kendall's $\tau$ )	n/a
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	n/a
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Page 13, Synthesis of recommendations
<b>Meta-bias(es)</b>	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	n/a
<b>Confidence in cumulative evidence</b>	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Page 11, Interpreting domain scores