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	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1/Line 2-3	Title
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Page 2/Line 56	Abstract
Authors:				
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1/Line 4-17	Affiliations
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 12-13/Line 307-313	Contributions
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	N/A	N/A
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Page 13/Line 314-317	Funding
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	N/A	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	N/A	N/A
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Page 3-4/Line 89-105	Introduction
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Page 4/Line 109-112	Introduction
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	Page 4-6/Line 121-160	Methods/ Inclusion criteria
Information	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors,	Page 6,8/Line 170-	Methods/ Search

sources		trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	178,181-187	methods for identification of studies
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	Page 6-8/Line 179	Methods/ Table 1
Study records:				
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Page 9/Line 190-191	Methods/ Data collection and analysis/ Selection of studies
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)	Page 9/Line 191-197	Methods/ Data collection and analysis/ Selection of studies
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	Page 9/Line 199-209	Methods/ Data collection and analysis/ Data extraction and management
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	Page 9/Line 200-207	Methods/ Data collection and analysis/ Data extraction and management
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	Page 5-6/Line 144-160	Methods/Inclusion criteria/Types of outcome measures
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	Page 9-10/Line 211-225	Methods/ Assessment of risk of bias

Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Page 10-11/Line 246-253	Methods/ Pairwise meta- analysis
	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)	Page 10/Line 235-244	Methods/ Assessment of similarity and consistency
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Page 11/Line 268-274	Methods/ Subgroup analysis, meta-regression analysis, and sensitivity analysis
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Page 11/Line 251	Methods/ Pairwise meta- analysis
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Page 11/Line 276-277	Methods/ Publication bias assessment
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Page 10/Line 227-233	Methods/ Evaluation of certainty of evidence

*** 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.