PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to Systematic Reviews from Table 3 in Moher et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic Reviews. 2015 4:1 and has also been developed based on the recommended items for a scoping review protocol in best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols[2] onto the PRISMA-P.

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Information reported		Line numbers
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title:					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a scoping review	X		34 & 35
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous scoping review, identify as such		X	n/a
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as JBI/OSF) and registration number	X		162
Authors:					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	X		3-29
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	X		338-342
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		X	n/a
Support:					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	X		343-345
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor		X	n/a
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol		X	n/a
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	X		134-153
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PCC)	X		165-170 211-212
METHODS					

Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PCC, 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	X		172-211
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	X		214-233
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	X		242-243
Study records:					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	X		245-263
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)	X		256-259
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	X		268-274
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PCC items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	X		275-296
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	X		275-296
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	n/a
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be presented	X		298-299
	15b	Describe the planned approach to how extracted data will be presented	X		298-308
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as thematic analyses)		X	n/a
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	X		297-308
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)		X	n/a
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)		X	n/a

*** n/a - not applicable**

**** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From:1. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349:g7647.

2. Peters MD, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. 2022. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evid. Synth. 20 (4), 953–968.