

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	Signpost
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	P1 The lived experiences of parents providing care to young people who self-harm: A protocol for a meta-aggregative synthesis of qualitative studies
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	P1 PROSPERO: CRD42021265525
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	<p>P1 Yanli Zhao Zhengzhou University, School of Nursing and Health, Science Avenue No.101, High-Tech District, Zhengzhou City, Henan Province, China E-mail: zhaoyanli86@126.com</p> <p>Ronnell D Dela Rosa Philippine Women's University, School of Nursing E-mail: rddelarosa@pwu.edu.ph</p> <p>Qiusi Zhang E-mail: qiutiandeguozi@126.com</p> <p>Wei Zhao School of Nursing and Health, Zhengzhou University E-mail: zhaowei2783@zzu.edu.cn</p> <p>Hui Xu E-mail: xuhui896@126.com</p> <p>Rui Wang E-mail: tanguohuli@163.com</p> <p>Ling Ma E-mail: hlml@zzu.edu.cn</p>
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	P9 YLZ conceived the idea for this review, wrote the first draft of the protocol and will act as the first reviewer of this synthesis. QSZ

			will act as the second review. WZ will be the third reviewer. All authors (YLZ, RDDR, QSZ, WZ, HX, RW, LM) had read, offered feedback, and agreed on the final manuscript of this protocol and will be responsible for the refinement of the search strategy, studies screening, quality appraisal, data extraction and synthesis process. This systematic review is being conducted as part of YLZ's part-time PhD and she will serve as the guarantor of the review.
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	Not applicable.
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	P9 This review is supported by the 2023 Humanity and Social Sciences Research Program (2023-ZDJH-207) of Education Department of Henan Province, China.
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	P9.
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	P9.
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	P2-4 Introduction (Paragraph2-4)
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	P4 Introduction (Paragraph5) The mnemonics PICO, an alternative to PICO in qualitative studies, is used here as it is more appropriate to qualitative synthesis.
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	P4-5 Study eligibility criteria (Participant, Phenomena of Interest, Context, Study types) & Study exclusion criteria
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	P5-6 Information sources
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	P6 Search strategy (box 1 Search strategy for PubMed)
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	P7 Data management

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)	P7 Screening and 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	P7-8 Data extraction
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	P7-8 Data extraction (Paragraph1-2), There are no pre-planned data assumptions or simplifications.
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	P8 Data extraction (Paragraph2)
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	P7 Evaluation of methodological quality of included studies
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Not applicable.
	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)	Not applicable.
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	No assessment of meta-biases is planned.
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	P8-9 Data synthesis (Qualitative aggregative meta-synthesis will be undertaken.)
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Not applicable.
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	P8-9 Data synthesis (Paragraph3) (ConQual method will be used to assess the strength of the synthesized 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.