PRISMA-P 2015 checklist for systematic review protocol on the epidemiology of major depressive disorder in South Africa (1997–2015)

Section and topic	Item number	Checklist item	Status
Administrative information			
Title			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Done (page 1)
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	Not applicable
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Done (page 2)
Authors			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, email address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Done (page 1)
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Done (page 10)
Amendments	4	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	Done (page 9)
Support			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Done (page 10)
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Done (page 10)
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s) and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Done (page 10)
Introduction			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Done (pages 3–5)
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to PICO	Done (page 5)
Methods			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Done (pages 5–7)
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Done (page 7)
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Done (page 14)
Study records			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Done (pages 7–9)
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (ie, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Done (pages 7–9)
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	Done (page 8)
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any preplanned data assumptions and simplifications	Done (page 8)
Outcomes and prioritisation	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritisation of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Done (pages 5–7)
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	Done (page 8)

Continued

Section and topic	Item number	Checklist item	Status
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Done (pages 8–9)
	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 τ)	Done (pages 8–9)
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Done (pages 8–9)
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Done (pages 8–9)
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Done (pages 8–9)
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Done (page 9)

GRADE, grading of recommendations, assessment, development and evaluation; PICO, participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes; PRISMA-P, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols.