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 paragraph/section
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title paragraph
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	The methods paragraph of the Abstract section
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Paragraphs of the authors and affiliation section Paragraph of the corresponding author section
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Paragraph of the roles of authors section
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	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Paragraph of the grant information section
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Paragraph of the grant information section
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Paragraph of the grant information section
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Paragraph of the introduction section
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Paragraph of the objectives section
METHODS			
Eligibility	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and	The eligibility criteria, population, intervention/exposure,

criteria		report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	comparison and outcome paragraphs of the methods section
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	The information sources paragraph of the methods section
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	The search strategy paragraph of the methods section
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	The data extraction paragraph of the methods section
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)	The data extraction paragraph of the methods section
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	The data extraction paragraph of the methods section
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	The data extraction paragraph of the methods section
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	The measures of effect paragraph of the methods section
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	The risk of bias (quality) assessment paragraph of the methods section
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	The strategy for data synthesis paragraph of the methods section
	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)	The strategy for data synthesis paragraph of the methods section The strategy for data synthesis paragraph of the methods section
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	The strategy for data synthesis paragraph of the methods section
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	NA
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	The meta-analysis paragraph of the methods section
Confidence in	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	The meta-analysis paragraph of the methods section

cumulative 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.