PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION		
Title:		
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review – **lines 1-2**
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such – **lines 24-25**
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number – **line 41**
Authors:		
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author – **lines 4-18**
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review – **lines 324-331**
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 – **lines 255-258**
Support:		
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review – **lines 332-334**
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor – **lines 332-334**
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol – **lines 332-334**
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known – **lines 111-114**
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) – **lines 117-125**
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 – **lines 153-194**
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 – **lines 131-133**

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 – **lines 195-205 and table 1, lines 153-205**
Study records: Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review – **lines 255-258**
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) – **lines 197, 203, 207, 221-226**
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 – **lines 255-258 and lines 197, 203, 207, 221-226**
Data items	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 – **lines 203-205**
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale – **line 134**
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 – **lines 206-226**
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised – **lines 236-250**
	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) – **lines 246-253**
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression) – **lines 236-240**
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned – **lines 249-250**
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) - **lines 251-253**
- Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE) – **lines 206-226**

*** 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: 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(jan02 1):g7647.