Appendix 5:

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses for Protocol (PRISMA-P)

ITEM NO.	*SECTION AND TOPIC*		*IDENTIFIED*
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
1a)	Identification	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1
1b)	Update	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
2)	Registration	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Pages 2 and 8
Authors:			
3a)	Contact	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1
3b)	Contribute	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 6 and 10
4)	Amendments	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/A
Support:			
5a)	Source	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Page 10
5b)	Sponsor	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	N/A
5c)	Role of sponsor or funder	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	N/A
INTRODUCTION			
6)	Rationale	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Pages 2-3
7)	Objectives	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Page 3 and Table 1

METHODS			
8)	Eligibility criteria	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Page 4-5
9)	Information source	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Page 5
10)	Search strategy	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Appendix 1
Study records:			
11a)	Data management	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Page 6
11b)	Selection process	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 6
11c)	Data collection process	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 6
12)	Data items	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Appendix 2 and 3
13)	Outcomes and prioritization	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rational	Page 4 and appendix 2 and 3
14)	Risk of bias in individual studies	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	Pages 6-7
Data synthesis:			
15a)		Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Page 7
15b)		If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including	Page 7

		any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	
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 7
16)	Meta-bias(es)	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Page 6-7
17)	Confidence in cumulative evidence	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Page 7