

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

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

## Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

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

			Page
		Reporting Item	Number
<b>Title</b>			
Identification	<a href="#">#1a</a>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	<a href="#">#1b</a>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	n/a

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

1	<b>Registration</b>		
2			
3			
4		<a href="#">#2</a>	
5		If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as	1
6		PROSPERO) and registration number	
7			
8			
9			
10	<b>Authors</b>		
11			
12			
13	Contact	<a href="#">#3a</a>	
14		Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all	1
15		protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of	
16		corresponding author	
17			
18			
19			
20	Contribution	<a href="#">#3b</a>	
21		Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the	8
22		guarantor of the review	
23			
24			
25			
26	<b>Amendments</b>		
27			
28			
29		<a href="#">#4</a>	
30		If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously	n/a
31		completed or published protocol, identify as such and list	
32		changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important	
33		protocol amendments	
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39	<b>Support</b>		
40			
41			
42	Sources	<a href="#">#5a</a>	
43		Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	8
44			
45	Sponsor	<a href="#">#5b</a>	
46		Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	8
47			
48	Role of sponsor or	<a href="#">#5c</a>	
49	funder	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or	8
50		institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
51			
52			
53	<b>Introduction</b>		
54			
55			
56	Rationale	<a href="#">#6</a>	
57		Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what	2, 3
58			
59			
60			

1		is already known	
2			
3			
4	Objectives	<a href="#">#7</a> Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review	3
5		will address with reference to participants, interventions,	
6		comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	<b>Methods</b>		
12			
13			
14	Eligibility criteria	<a href="#">#8</a> Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study	3, 4, 5
15		design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such	
16		as years considered, language, publication status) to be	
17		used as criteria for eligibility for the review	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24	Information	<a href="#">#9</a> Describe all intended information sources (such as	4
25		electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial	
26	sources	registers or other grey literature sources) with planned	
27		dates of coverage	
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34	Search strategy	<a href="#">#10</a> Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one	Supplemen
35		electronic database, including planned limits, such that it	tary materi
36		could be repeated	als
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42	Study records -	<a href="#">#11a</a> Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage	4, 5
43		records and data throughout the review	
44	data management		
45			
46			
47	Study records -	<a href="#">#11b</a> State the process that will be used for selecting studies	4, 5
48		(such as two independent reviewers) through each phase	
49	selection process	of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in	
50		meta-analysis)	
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57	Study records -	<a href="#">#11c</a> Describe planned method of extracting data from reports	5
58			
59			
60			

1	data collection	(such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate),	
2			
3	process	any processes for obtaining and confirming data from	
4			
5		investigators	
6			
7			
8	Data items	<a href="#">#12</a> List and define all variables for which data will be sought	4, 5, 6
9			
10		(such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned	
11			
12		data assumptions and simplifications	
13			
14			
15	Outcomes and	<a href="#">#13</a> List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	5
16			
17	prioritization	including prioritization of main and additional outcomes,	
18			
19		with rationale	
20			
21			
22			
23	Risk of bias in	<a href="#">#14</a> Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	6
24			
25	individual studies	individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
26			
27		outcome or study level, or both; state how this information	
28			
29		will be used in data synthesis	
30			
31			
32			
33	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15a</a> Describe criteria under which study data will be	6, 7
34			
35		quantitatively synthesised	
36			
37			
38	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15b</a> If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	6, 7, 8
39			
40		planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
41			
42		methods of combining data from studies, including any	
43			
44		planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	
45			
46			
47			
48	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15c</a> Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	6, 7, 8
49			
50		sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
51			
52			
53	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15d</a> If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the	7
54			
55		type of summary planned	
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

1 Meta-bias(es) [#16](#) Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as 7、 8  
2  
3 publication bias across studies, selective reporting within  
4  
5 studies)  
6  
7

8  
9 Confidence in [#17](#) Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be 6  
10  
11 cumulative assessed (such as GRADE)  
12  
13 evidence  
14

15  
16 The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms of the Creative  
17  
18 Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 17. May 2023 using  
19  
20 <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with  
21  
22 [Penelope.ai](#)  
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  
57  
58  
59  
60